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## PREFACE

This twenty-ninth volume in Erasmus' Opera omnia (ASD) is the second within 'ordo' VI, that is the 'ordo' of the New Testament and the Annotations; the Paraphrases belong to 'ordo' VII. The division into 'ordines' - each 'ordo' being devored to a specific literary or thematic category - was laid down by Erasmus himself for the posthumous publication of his works (see General introduction, ASD I, pp. x, xvii-xviii, and C. Reedijk, Tandem bona causa triumphat. Zur Geschichte des Gesamtwerkes des Erasmus von Rotterdam. Vorträge der Aeneas-Silvius-Stiftung an der Universität Basel, XVI, Basel/Stuttgart, 1980, p. i2 sqq., $21-22$ ).

The present volume (tom. VI, 2, edited by Andrew J. Brown, London) contains the second part of Erasmus' edition of the Nouum Testamentum (Greek and Latin text), to wit John and Acts.

The other books of the Nounm Testamentum will be published in ASD VI, I and 3-4. ASD VI, 5-9 will comprise the Annotations on the New Testament; tom. VI, 5 (the Annotations on Matthew-Luke) was published in 2000. The order of publication depends on when the respective volumes are finished.

With regard to the edition of 'ordo' VI the Editorial Board is much indebted to Professor H.J. de Jonge (Leiden) for his expert advice.

The Editorial Board and the editor of the present volume are grateful to all libraries that kindly put books, photostats, microfilms, and bibliographical material at their disposal.

Constantijn Huygens Instituut
The Editorial Board
Postbus 90754
2509 LT Den Haag
June 2001
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Nouum Testamentum. Basileae, H. Frobenius et N. Episcopius, 1535, p. 137.
Ex. Gemeentebibliotheek Rotterdam

## INTRODUCTION

This volume contains the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles from Erasmus' Greek and Latin New Testament, published in five major editions between 1516 and 1535. For a general introduction, the reader is referred to the first volume, $A S D$ VI, 1. A summary of the main points can be given here.

## The Greek and Latin Text

The historical significance of Erasmus' editions of the Greek New Testament, in helping to shape the form of text which for several hundred years would be used by Bible translators, theologians, preachers, and students, has often been emphasised. Less attention has been given to the important role played by the Latin translation, which Erasmus provided in a parallel column beside the Greek text. At a period when the Greek language remained unfamiliar to many, and the universal language of scholarly discourse was Latin, Erasmus' translation supplied an essential key to the understanding of the Greek words. His aim was to convey the meaning of the Greek more accurately and more clearly than the existing Latin Vulgate version, and at the same time to employ a more elegant classical Latin style, purged from linguistic barbarism.

Given the importance, in principle, of such a work, attention has also often been drawn to the excessive haste with which the 1516 editio princeps of the Greek New Testament was produced, and the numerous mistakes which it consequently contained. The first edition of Erasmus' Latin translation was not affected by the same frequency of error, but the unrevised state of many passages, the discrepancies between the Greek and Latin texts, and the inconsistencies of translation method in different sections of the New Testament, tend to leave the reader with the impression that this too was a work of rapid preparation. Such defects were progressively removed in Erasmus' subsequent editions, especially in his second edition of 1519 .

In an earlier stage of his labours on this project, between 1512 and 1514 while Erasmus was living in England, he made a study of the differences between the Latin Vulgate translation and the Greek New Testament text, using such Greek manuscripts as were available to him. He also consulted manuscripts of the Vulgate, comparing them with the late form of Vulgate text which was found in the contemporary printed editions. He recorded his observations in a set of notes on more than a thousand passages. If these notes at all resembled his later published Annotations, they were partly comprised of a series of alternative
renderings or corrections to the Vulgate wording. Whether these notes on matters of translation were inscribed in the margins of a printed copy of the Vulgate, or sometimes involved a handwritten alteration of the printed text, or were compiled into a separate "fair copy", or all three, is not known. Whatever their exact nature, these revisions and corrections would later provide a starting point for the new Latin translation which Erasmus eventually issued in 1516.

According to his later statements on the subject, Erasmus did not originally envisage that he would publish a new translation, but was at one time, in 1514, considering the possibility of publishing his annotations in conjunction with a continuous Greek New Testament text alongside the Latin Vulgate translation. If that was his plan, it was quickly superseded by the idea that the Greek would be accompanied by his own Latin version instead of the Vulgate. There is no reason to think that he had prepared a continuous Greek or Latin text before $1514 .{ }^{1}$ Certainly, when Erasmus travelled to Basle in that year, to arrange for publication, he did not take with him any Greek manuscript.

The simplest expedient for arriving at a complete Greek text was to select an existing Greek manuscript and give it straight to the printer, after making just a few alterations. This was what Erasmus hoped to do. When he reached Basle, however, where the work was to be printed, he soon found that the available manuscripts contained many errors of spelling which had to be corrected. More than this, he discovered that these manuscripts presented unexpected differences of wording, so that he was obliged to resort to textual criticism in order to ascertain the graeca veritas. The result was that his edition was in some degree an eclectic text, and not merely a reproduction of a single, chosen manuscript.

The preparation of the Latin translation which was published in 1516, on the other hand, probably absorbed more of Erasmus' time than his editorial labours on the Greek text, and was in many ways an original, creative endeavour. It was nevertheless, in some respects, an unfinished work. Many passages simply reproduced the Vulgate wording without change. Some passages were only lightly corrected, based on his comparisons between the contemporary printed Vulgate and earlier Vulgate manuscripts, and on his perusal of the scripture citations in the writings of the church fathers: at these points, it is possible to regard Erasmus' Latin translation as being little more than a corrected edition of an ancient Latin text. Other passages, however, were far more extensively revised.

Because of this unevenness of treatment, the nature of Erasmus' translation cannot be satisfactorily assessed from just a few randomly selected portions of text. For example, if the first thirteen verses of John's Gospel in the 1516 Latin version were the only passage to be examined, occupying twenty-four lines, it would be

[^0]found that there are no differences from the Vulgate at all, from which it might be wrongly concluded that Erasmus had scarcely touched the translation. By contrast, the first twenty-four lines of the Acts of the Apostles, covering the first seven verses, contain thirty-eight changes of vocabulary, as well as two omissions, twentythree words added, and ten changes of word-order, amounting to a radically altered version.

It seems that, in the first edition of his translation, Erasmus devoted most effort to his rendering of the Epistles and the first two Gospels, but did less work on Acts, and spent even less time on Luke, John and the Apocalypse. This may reflect the chronological order in which he worked on the various New Testament books. His more detailed revision of the Epistles was perhaps, in part, motivated by the desire to produce a version which was superior to the translation of the Epistles which Jacques Lefevvre had published in 1512. Despite this inconsistency in the way that Erasmus handled different parts of the New Testament, it would still be correct to describe the Latin version of 1516 as a new translation. In 1519, the translation was more thoroughly revised, with particular attention to those passages which had previously been left unchanged.

The Greek and Latin texts printed in the present edition are based on the last folio edition of the New Testament which Erasmus published in 1535. In matters of wording and spelling, the only changes which have been made are corrections of evident printing errors, all of which are shown in the accompanying apparatus. In most cases, such corrections have been taken from one or more of Erasmus' earlier editions. No attempt has been made to correct any readings which appear to have been deliberately introduced by Erasmus or his assistants, or which could have been derived from consultation of Greek manuscripts.

In matters of Greek orthography, the text has been modernised. Capital letters are placed at the beginning of paragraphs, direct speech, and proper names. Accentuation is made to conform with modern practice. In the 1535 edition, the moveable $-\varsigma$ on oút $\omega$ was usually added, even before a following consonant, but moveable $-v$ on dative plurals, and on third-person singular and plural of verbs, was usually added only before a following vowel: these features are retained, but are made consistent throughout the text. In both the Greek and the Latin, worddivision is conformed with modern practice, and all abbreviations are expanded. Paragraphing is introduced, and verse-numbers are inserted (the latter in general conformity with the 27th Nestle-Aland edition of the Greek New Testament). ${ }^{2}$ All cross-references in the apparatus and commentary are keyed to these versenumbers, as is usual for a biblical text, rather than adopting a separate system of line-numbers. The punctuation has been modified, most noticeably by the use of the Greek colon ( $\cdot$ ), and by other changes designed to produce greater consistency between the Greek and Latin texts, but not where a change of meaning would result. The Eusebian canons and tit $\lambda$ ol are omitted, together with all prefatory material.

[^1]
## The Apparatus

The apparatus is printed below the text in two consecutive parts, Greek and Latin, giving the variants of Erasmus' $1516,1519,1522,1527$, and 1535 editions where they differ from the printed text. For the symbols used to represent these editions, see the the Conspectus Siglorum at the end of this introduction. In compiling the apparatus, no attempt has been made to exclude a variant on the grounds that it may have originated as a printing error. In the 1516 edition, in particular, many mistaken readings which at first sight appear to be mere 'printing errors' are in fact derived from the underlying Greek manuscripts which Erasmus consulted, and even defects in the Latin text sometimes appear to have been taken over from editions of the printed Vulgate which Erasmus used as his working copy. To delete such errors would be to remove a significant part of the evidence as to the origin and characteristics of Erasmus' Greek and Latin New Testament. For the sake of consistency and completeness, all differences of wording and spelling are therefore included. Following the practice of modern critical editions of the New Testament, Greek variants are presented in lower-case letters, without accents or breathings.

## The Commentary

The commentary discusses those passages where Erasmus' Latin or Greek texts differ from the Latin Vulgate, and also those passages where his Greek text differs from the Greek manuscripts which were used as printer's copy. The following material is presented. The relevant verse-number is given, followed by the lemma, citing a portion of the Latin and Greek texts. If the lemma differs from the text of the Latin Vulgate or from the text of one or more of Erasmus' editions of his Latin translation, the relevant variant is then cited within brackets. For this purpose, the Latin Vulgate is defined as the 'late Vulgate', as printed either in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 New Testament (the only edition of Erasmus which adds a full Vulgate text) or in the Vulgate lemma of one or more editions of his Annotations. Where this late Vulgate reading agrees with the standard critical editions of the earlier Vulgate, ${ }^{3}$ it is simply designated as 'Vg.', or if it disagrees with those editions it is designated more fully as 'late Vg.' In this way, at every passage of Erasmus' translation, it is easily seen to what extent his work was original or dependent on the Vulgate editions which he used. Where there is a discrepancy between the 1527 Vulgate and the Vulgate lemma of the Annotations, further comparisons are made with other late Vulgate editions, particularly those printed by Johann Froben in 1491 and 1514.

[^2]Where possible, the commentary aims to identify the main reason, though not necessarily a full explanation, for any departure from the Vulgate wording, and to place this in context by referring to Latin usage at other New Testament passages, whether in the Vulgate or in Erasmus' Latin translation. Often a further discussion of the same point will be found in the Annotations, in which case a crossreference is given. Sometimes a change of wording can be explained in terms of an elementary principle of Greek grammar. For example, Erasmus often replaces the present participle of the Latin Vulgate by a past tense when translating the Greek aorist: at such points, a two-word comment, "Greek aorist", is all that needs to be provided. Elsewhere, it can be shown how a particular rendering has been influenced by other considerations of classical Latin style, vocabulary and grammar, or by a comment in the Annotations of Lorenzo Valla, ${ }^{4}$ or some other source. Relevant illustrative material is also provided from Valla's Elegantiae, ${ }^{5}$ and from Erasmus' paraphrase or epitome of that work. ${ }^{6}$

Cross-references are given to points of text and translation which are discussed in Erasmus' apologetic writings against Lee, Stunica, Caranza, and other critics. Further reference is also made to a series of prefaces included in the New Testament editions of 1519,1522 and 1527, consisting of lists of deficiencies in the Vulgate translation, divided into seven categories:

1. Soloecismi per interpretem admissi manifestarii et inexcusabiles, e plurimis pauci decerpti (= Soloecismi).
2. Loca obscura et in quibus lapsi sint magni nominis interpretes, ex innumeris pauca decerpta (= Loca Obscura).
3. Loca manifeste deprauata, sed ex infinitis, vt occurrebant, pauca decerpta (= Loca Manifeste Deprauata).
4. Ad placandos eos, qui putant in sacris libris nibil neque superesse, neque deesse, quaedam excerpsimus ( $=$ Ad Placandos).
5. Quae sint addita in nostris exemplaribus (= Quae Sint Addita).
6. Quae Per Interpretem Commissa.
7. Vbi Interpres Ausus Sit Aliquid Immutare. ${ }^{7}$

For the sake of comparison, a parallel quotation is often given from the Latin translation by Giannozzo Manetti, a fifteenth-century contemporary of Valla. ${ }^{8}$
${ }^{4}$ L. Valla Adnotationes (Paris, 1505).
${ }^{5}$ L. Valla Elegantiae, cited from the Laurentii Vallae Opera (Basle, 1540)
${ }^{6}$ Erasmus Parapbrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae, edited in ASD I, 4.
${ }^{7}$ A transcript of these prefaces is given in A. Reeve - M. A. Screech Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament, Galatians to the Apocalypse (Leiden, New York and Köln, 1993: vol. lii in Studies in the History of Cbristian Thought), pp. 9-29.
${ }^{8}$ Manetti's New Testament translation exists in two manuscripts of the Vatican Library: Urb. Lat. 6 and Pal. Lat. 45. Neither of these gives a definitive text, but Urb. Lat. 6 at many points appears to represent an inferior copy of Pal. Lat. 45, especially as the first ms. is characterised by omissions which exactly coincide with whole lines of text in the second.

Although it need not be supposed that Erasmus had ever seen Manetti's version, which existed only in manuscript, it is instructive to see to what extent they arrived at the same Latin wording, or produced alternative renderings, both working independently from Greek manuscripts.

At many passages, the commentary seeks to identify the manuscript sources which underlie Erasmus' printed Greek text. The Greek material for John and Acts which Erasmus supplied to the printer for his 1516 edition consisted of two Greek manuscripts which were made available to him at Basle, and which he marked up with such alterations as he felt were necessary. Both of these documents have been preserved, now designated as codex 2 , containing the four Gospels, and codex 2815, containing the Acts and Epistles. ${ }^{9}$ Erasmus and his assistants also made use of three other manuscripts at Basle for these portions of the New Testament text, namely codex 1 , containing the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, ${ }^{10}$ codex 817, containing the Gospels together with a commentary by Theophylact, and codex 2816, containing the Acts and Epistles. These sources may be tabulated as follows, accompanied by their current shelf-mark in the university library at Basle, together with an indication of their date:
(a) Gospel of John:

1. Cod. 1, formerly known as $1^{\text {eap (A.N. IV. 2) - } 12 \text { th century. }}$
2. Cod. 2, formerly known as $2^{e}$ (A.N. IV. 1) - 12 th century.
3. Cod. 817 (A.N. III. 15) - 15th century.
(b) Acts of the Apostles:
4. Cod. 1 (details as above).
5. Cod. 2815, formerly known as $2^{\text {ap }}$ (A.N. IV. 4) - 12 th century.
6. Cod. 2816, formerly known as $4^{\text {ap }}$ (A.N. IV. 5) - 15th century.

Codex 2815 was once owned by the Amerbach family, who presumably loaned it to Erasmus or Johann Froben. The remaining four manuscripts at that time belonged to the Basle Dominicans, from whom Erasmus seems to have borrowed codices 2, 817 and 2816 directly, whereas Johann Reuchlin had previously borrowed codex 1 and in turn lent it to Erasmus (cf. ASD IX, 2, p. 130, 11. 432-435; Ep. 300, 1l. 31-36). At an earlier stage, while preparing his Annotations in England, Erasmus consulted additional Greek sources. In his statement in the 1516 Apologia, "Nos in prima recognitione quatuor Graecis adiuti sumus, in

[^3]posteriore quinque", he seems to imply that he had used four Greek manuscripts in England, and five in Basle, covering various parts of the New Testament (these figures perhaps do not include certain manuscripts which were attached to a patristic commentary). One of these documents in England was closely related to the manuscript group which is now designated as 'family 13', resembling but not necessarily identical with codex 69, the fifteenth-century 'Leicester Codex' containing the Gospels, Acts and Epistles (Leicester, Leicestershire Record Office: 6 D 32/1). ${ }^{11}$

While the work was going through the press in 1515-16, the Greek text underwent a further stage of revision, by Erasmus and also, with a degree of independence, by his scholarly assistants, Nikolaus Gerbel and Johannes Oecolampadius. In view of Erasmus' recorded complaint that these helpers made excessive use of codex 1 (see on Ioh. 1,33, in the present volume), it is reasonable to suppose that he was not directly responsible for the wording of some of the passages where the published text agrees with that manuscript rather than with the printer's copy, codices 2 and 2815. At certain other passages, where the published text agrees with none of Erasmus' known manuscripts, it seems likely that Erasmus or his helpers have resorted to conjecture (see on Iob. 4,48). For these reasons the present commentary sometimes uses the phrase 'Erasmian text' to designate readings which are found in Erasmus' printed Greek text, but which do not correspond with the printer's copy, and hence could have been the responsibility of Erasmus' assistants. The 1516 edition of the Greek New Testament was, in effect, a composite work by several hands. This remained true of the later editions, as Erasmus only partly revised the resulting text.

Erasmus made use of further Greek sources for his later editions. For the 1519 edition, he used codex 3 of the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, owned at that time by the Augustinian canons at Corsendonck (this twelfth-century ms. is now at Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: Supp. Gr. 52). It is mentioned in several places in the Annotations: see especially on 2 Cor. 8,4. The adoption of a number of unusual readings in 1519, not derived from codex 3 or from his other known manuscripts, reflects Erasmus' consultation of additional sources. One of these was an unidentified copy of the Gospels, borrowed from another house of Augustinian canons, at Mount St. Agnes near Zwolle (see Epp. 504 and 515). As mentioned in the Apologia, his 1522 edition (and occasionally also the 1519 edition) utilised the 1518 Aldine Greek Bible, which was largely a copy of Erasmus' own first edition but also contained a number of independent variant readings derived from manuscripts at Venice. For his 1527 edition, he was able to consult the New Testament volume of the Complutensian Polyglot, which was printed in 1514 but not publicly distributed until about 1522.

[^4]Where Erasmus' printed Greek text deviates from codices 2 and 2815, the commentary aims to identify the other sources which were followed. At such passages, and also at passages where the Vulgate appears to have followed a different Greek text, reference is made to the larger body of Greek manuscript evidence which is now available, in order to place Erasmus' work in the wider context of the history of the New Testament text.

In the section of the commentary relating to the Gospel of John, Greek manuscripts from the second to sixth centuries A.D. are cited individually, while manuscripts from the seventh century and later are collectively described as 'late mss.' or 'later mss.' In the section relating to the Acts of the Apostles, where fewer manuscripts survive, these categories have been slightly adjusted, so that manuscripts up to the seventh century are cited individually, while the term 'later mss.' is applied to manuscripts from the eighth century onwards. These chronological distinctions are made purely as a matter of convenience, to simplify the available data, having in mind that there are more than 2,000 manuscripts of the Gospel of John, and more than 600 manuscripts of the Acts of the Apostles. There are many divergent groups, families and clusters of manuscripts within the later manuscript tradition, which are being increasingly studied, but no attempt will be made to represent these complex layers of evidence in this edition. Another simplification has been adopted with regard to successive stages of correction within some of the early uncials: for the present purpose, all such corrections are abbreviated as 'corr.', without distinguishing the hands of individual correctors.

The principal sources from which information has been gathered concerning the readings of manuscripts, other than those used by Erasmus, are:
C. Tischendorf Novum Testamentum Graece (Leipzig, 2 vols., 1869-72: 8th edition); H. F. von Soden Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen, 4 vols., 1902-13); Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart, 1993: 27th edition); W. J. Elliott - D. C. Parker The Newe Testament in Greek, iv, The Gospel According to St. John, vol. i, The Papyri (Leiden, New York and Köln, 1995); K. Aland, et al., Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, iii, Die Apostelgeschichte, Band 1, Untersucbungen und Ergänzungsliste (Berlin and New York, 1993: vol. 20 in Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung). Where necessary, these have been supplemented by consultation of the standard editions and facsimiles of individual mss. The readings of $\boldsymbol{7}^{106107}$ have been taken from The Oxyrhynchus Papyri lxv (1998), nos. 4445-6.

One theme of the commentary is that it is not an adequate procedure merely to contrast Erasmus' text with the form of Greek text which has been popularised in the modern critical editions, which tend to reflect the assumption that the later manuscripts generally represent an inferior form of text. Since all of Erasmus' Greek manuscripts belonged to the later period, it is inevitable that a crude application of such a comparison has an inherent bias, which has in the past resulted in an adverse judgment on the quality of the text which Erasmus published. The term 'later mss.' does not in itself indicate a difference of quality, as it
is demonstrable from patristic and versional evidence that many of the readings which enjoy almost unanimous support among the later manuscripts were in existence at least as early as the fourth century, even when lacking support among the Greek manuscripts which happen to have survived from that early period.

The real problem with Erasmus' text is not that he somehow 'failed' to embrace the form of text found in the earliest uncials (such as codex B, of which he was later supplied with a list of its characteristic readings: cf. on Act. 27,16), but that he did not examine a sufficient number of manuscripts, or with sufficient care, to enable him to eliminate the errors which had crept into some sectors of the manuscript evidence during the later part of the medieval period, that he made excessive use of conjecture to restore the text, and that he did not exercise proper control over his assistants, who were unduly favourable towards the adoption of Greek variants which supported the Vulgate. What Erasmus published, despite these shortcomings, was for the most part a recognisably ancient form of Greek New Testament text, which provided a justification for the new Latin translation which accompanied it.

To obtain fuller details of certain aspects of Erasmus' work on the Greek New Testament, for example concerning his treatment of the evidence of the church fathers, it will be necessary to consult the volume containing his Annotations. However, the information supplied in the present edition makes it possible to distinguish between those readings of Erasmus which enjoy hardly any manuscript support, and are therefore suspect (some of which found their way into the later Textus Receptus of Robert Estienne and the Elzeviers), and those readings which have widespread or ancient attestation and are hence worthy of further consideration as representing an early form of New Testament text.

Table of New Testament Manuscripts cited in the Commentary

| Codex | Date | Codex | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Gospel of Jobn) |  |  |  |
| $33^{5}$ | III | W | V |
| $77^{6}$ | IV | 060 | VI |
| $77^{22}$ | III | 065 | VI |
| $77^{28}$ | III | 068 | V |
| $77^{45}$ | III | 070 | VI |
| $39^{66}$ | II/III | 078 | VI |
| $77^{75}$ | III | 083 | VI/VII |
| $79^{90}$ | II | 086 | VI |
| $77^{106}$ | III | 087 | VI |
| 37107 | III | 091 | VI |
| * | IV | 0162 | III/IV |
| A | V | 0216 | V |
| B | IV | 0217 | V |
| C | V | 0301 | V |
| D | V | 1 | XII (formerly cod. $1^{\text {eap }}$ ) |
| N | VI | 2 | XII (formerly cod. $2^{\text {e }}$ ) |
| P | VI | 3 | XII |
| Q | V | 69 | XV |
| T | V | 817 | XV |
| (Acts of the Apostles) |  |  |  |
| $7^{88}$ | IV | 057 | IV/V |
| $37^{33}$ | VI | 066 | VI |
| $77^{38}$ | III/IV | 076 | V/VI |
| $3{ }^{45}$ | III | 093 | VI |
| $77^{48}$ | III | 096 | VII |
| $77^{50}$ | IV/V | 097 | VII |
| $77^{53}$ | III | 0165 | V |
| $79^{56}$ | V/VI | 0175 | V |
| $378{ }^{74}$ | VII | 0189 | II/III |
|  | III | 0236 | V |
| $\boldsymbol{N}$ | IV | 0244 | V |
| A | V | 0294 | VI/VII |
| B | IV | 1 | XII (formerly cod. $1^{\text {eap }}$ ) |
| C | V | 3 | XII |
| D | V | 69 | XV |
| E | VI | 2815 | XII (formerly cod. $2^{\text {ap }}$ ) |
| 048 | V | 2816 | XV (formerly cod. $4^{\text {ap }}$ ) |
|  | her deta Aland $K$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { anuscril } \\ & \text { te (see p. } \end{aligned}$ | $n$ be found in 9 , above). |

# CONSPECTVS SIGLORVM 

## Editiones

A: ed. pr., Basileae, Io. Frobenius, Febr. 1516 (Nouum Instrumentum).
B: ed. Basileae, Io. Frobenius, Mart. 1519 (Nouum Testamentum).
$C$ : ed. Basileae, Io. Frobenius, 1522.
D: ed. Basileae, Io. Frobenius, Mart. 1527.
E: ed. Basileae, Hier. Frobenius et Nic. Episcopius, Mart. 1535
(fundamentum huiusce editionis).

## Signa superscripta

* textus editionum
(vbi ei opponitur diuersa lectio vel in $b$ vel in $c$ vel in $m g$ ).
$b \quad$ verbum in ima paginae ora impressum
(vocatum a typographis, reclamans, Anglice, catchreord).
$c$ lectio data in tabula corrigendorum.
$m g$ lectio marginalis.


# ЕҮАГГЕАION KATA IRANNHN 

## EVANGELIVM SECVNDVM IOANNEM

1
 ग̃v $\quad$ тpòs tòv | $\theta$ zóv, kai $\theta$ हòs ग̃v



1In principio erat sermo, et sermo erat \| apud deum, et deus erat ille

$$
\text { LB } 338
$$

Inscriptio IOANNEM $A B D E$ : IOHANNEM $C \mid 1,1$ prius sermo $B$-E: verbum $A \mid$ alt. sermo $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid$ ille $B-E:$ om. $A \mid$ tert. sermo $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 2$ Hic $B-E: \operatorname{Hoc} A$

1,1 sermo (1st.-3rd.) $\lambda$ óyos ("verbum" 1516 $=$ Vg.). In his 1516 Annot., Erasmus was content to observe that this Greek word was capable of being rendered in several different ways in the Latin language, listing sermo as one of the alternatives for verbum. The word sermo was already well established in the Latin Vulgate translation at more than one hundred other places throughout the New Testament. However, to alter the familiar wording of a passage which related to the person and deity of Christ was a most sensitive issue. In his decision to revise this section, Erasmus may have been partly influenced by Lorenzo Valla's advocacy of sermo in a note on Iob. 1,14 (Valla Annot., ad loc.). Although Erasmus did not change the translation of the present passage until 1519, he had already substituted sermo for verbum at forty-three other places in the 1516 edition, starting from Mt. 7,24. In 1519, he introduced this change more widely, at a further 109 places including the present verse. Generally Erasmus retained verbum where the context indicated that $\lambda$ ó $\gamma$ os denoted a single word, but where it referred to a longer utterance, or speech, or sermon, or "the word of God", he preferred to render it by sermo. The changed rendering of this particular verse in 1519 provoked a virulent controversy, for which he was not wholly unprepared: in 1522 Annot., he remarked that the reason why he had not altered this passage in 1516 was that he feared it might give a handle to potential detractors. His seemingly innocent change to the traditional wording of
such a familiar passage was at once seized upon as a dangerous theological innovation. Such was the storm of criticism that he found it necessary to defend this aspect of his translation in a separately printed work, the Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo', which was issued in 1520 ( $L B$ IX, $111 \mathrm{~B}-122 \mathrm{~F}$ ), as well as by a greatly expanded note in 1522 Annot., justifying his rendering of the passage on the grounds of theology, linguistic usage, and the testimony of the church fathers.

1 ille (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus adds ille to express the Greek article, o (i.e. not merely "a word" but "the Word"), and to indicate the subject of the verb. Similar additions of a pronoun, with the intention of improving clarity and precision, are frequent throughout the N.T. This usage does occur in the Vulgate elsewhere, but less often than in Erasmus. Among the changes made in the translation of the Gospel of John, in 1519, these additions are more frequent in the first and sixth chapters. However, such added pronouns are untypical of classical Latin idiom, which lacks a proper equivalent of the article, and they tend to convey a greater emphasis than the Greek article would normally imply. See Annot., and also Erasmus' further comments in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 169 F-171 C; 251 D-F.
2 Hic oũtos ("Hoc" $1516=$ Vg.). This change follows from the substitution of a masculine noun, sermo, in the previous verse.


 ह̀v Tท̃̃ okotị́ qaivel, kai ì okotía $\alpha u$ ú-









et sine eo factum est nihil, quod factum est. ${ }^{4}$ In ipso vita erat, et vita erat lux hominum, ${ }^{5}$ et lux in tenebris lucet, et tenebrae eam non apprehenderunt. $\mid{ }^{6}$ Erat homo missus LB 340 a deo, cui nomen Ioannes. ${ }^{7}$ Hic venit ad testificandum, vt testaretur de luce, vt omnes crederent per ipsum. ${ }^{8}$ Non erat ille lux illa, sed missus erat, vt testaretur de luce. ${ }^{9}$ Erat lux illa, lux vera: quae illuminat omnem hominem venientem in mundum. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{In}$ mundo erat, et

3 eo $B-E$ : ipso $A \mid 5$ apprehenderunt $B-E$ : comprehenderunt $A \mid 6$ Erat $B-E$ : Fuit $A \mid$ nomen $B-E$ : nomen erat $A \mid$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid 7$ ad testificandum $B-E$ : in testimonium $A \mid$ testaretur $B-E$ : testimonium perhiberet $A \mid$ luce $B-E$ : lumine $A \mid \operatorname{ipsum} B$ - $E$ : illum $A \mid$ 8 illa $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ missus erat $B-E$ (ital.): om. $A \mid$ testaretur $B-E$ : testimonium perhiberet $A \mid$ luce $B$-E: lumine $A \mid 9$ lux illa $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ in $B-E$ : in hunc $A$

3 eo aủtoũ ("ipso" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The pronoun is changed, on this occasion, for little more than stylistic variety, to avoid repetition of ipsum, which was used earlier in the verse.
3 nibib quod factum est oúbè èv, ō ү'́yovev ("nihil. Quod factum est" Vg.). The different punctuation exhibited by the Vulgate makes quod factum est the subject of the following verb, with support from $7^{75 \text { corr }} \mathrm{CD} \mathrm{W}^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows the punctuation found in codd. 1, 2 and 817, supported by $\mathrm{N}^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss. Valla Annot. mentioned this change of punctuation, and further suggested that extitit should here be substituted for factum est (though Erasmus, in Annot., misunderstands Valla to mean that extitit should replace fuit in vs. 6).
5 apprehenderunt катє́入 $\alpha \beta \varepsilon v$ ("comprehenderunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution is found at Phil. 3,12. In a different context, at 1 Cor. 9,24, Erasmus retains comprebendo from the Vulgate. At the present passage he deliberately avoids the sense, "understood", preferring "grasped". However, the Greek verb is ambiguous, and it could be said that the Vulgate preserves that ambiguity. See also on Iob. 11,57.
6 Erat '̇y'̇̀eto ("Fuit" 1516=Vg.). From Annot., it appears that this change of tense was designed to match the use of erat in vs. 8 .

6 nomen ốvouc ("nomen erat" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate addition may reflect a Greek variant, adding $\eta=$, as in $\aleph^{*} \mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$, or it may simply have been an arbitrary decision of the translator as suggested in 1516 Annot. Despite complaining of the Vulgate rendering in Annot., Erasmus retained the verb in the first edition of his translation. As at many other passages, this apparent inconsistency can plausibly be attributed to the fact that, in the hasty production of the 1516 edition, he did not finish preparing his annotations until after the sheets containing the translation had been printed: the alternative explanation, or excuse, that such inconsistencies arose from Erasmus' professed fear of incurring criticism, is limited mainly to those points of translation which were capable of giving rise to theological debate (cf. on sermo at vs. 1). In 1516, his revision of the Vulgate translation was less thorough in LukeJohn than in MatthewMark, owing to pressure of time, so that in 1519 the further revisions which were required in Luke-John were correspondingly more numerous. In 1519, Erasmus made his rendering of this passage conform more closely with his Greek text, perhaps influenced by the literal translation, nomen ei Ioannes, which was offered by Valla Annot.

6 Ioannes ("Iohannes" 1522-7). There is considerable variation among Erasmus' editions as to
the Latin spelling of this name throughout the N.T. In 1516-19, the form is usually Ioannes, but Iohannes is found in 1516 at $M t .9,14 ; 11,11$ 13; Gal. 2,9; Ap. Ioh. 1,1, and in 1519 at Mc. 5,$37 ; L c .3,15$. In 1522 , the spelling is generally changed to Iobannes, except for Mt. 3,1, 4; Mc. 1,9, 14; Lc. 11,1; Ioh. 3,23-5,36; Act. 11,16; 13,24, 25; Gal. 2,9. In 1527, Iobannes is changed back to Ioannes at Mt. 3,13; 9,14-21,25; 21,32; Mc. 1,4, 6; 2,18; 3,17; 5,37; 6,24; 11,30, 32; Lc. 1,13; 3,15; 20,6; Act. 1,5; 12,12; Ap. Iob. 21,2; 22,8 . Elsewhere, inconsistently, the 1527 edition changes Ioannes to Iobannes at $L c$. 11,$1 ; 16,16$; Ioh. 3,23, 25-7; Act. 10,37. Finally in 1535, Ioannes is uniformly restored throughout the N.T.
7 ad testificandum eis $\mu \alpha \rho т$ ррiov ("in testimonium" $1516=$ Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal here. Elsewhere, in rendering the similar phrase, عis $\mu \alpha \rho \tau u ́ p i o v$, Erasmus always retains in testimonium. At the present passage, however, he may have wished to avoid the possible misunderstanding of venit in testimonium as meaning "came into the testimony". Another instance of the use of the gerundive in rendering eis occurs in 1519 at Act. 7,5 (possidendam for in possessionem).

7 testaretur $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \cup \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \eta$ ("testimonium perhiberet" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The verb $\mu \alpha \rho$ тире́ $\omega$ occurs thirty-three times in the Gospel of John. In 1516, Erasmus generally retained testimonium perbibeo of the Vulgate. In 1519, he frequently changes this to testor, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Iob. 3,11, 32, but still retained testimonium perbibeo in eight places. At other passages of John, in 1519, he also put testis sum, testificor, testimonium reddo, and testimonium fero, and at Act. 15,8 , testimonium praebeo. Then in 1522, most of the passages which he has formerly changed to testor are now changed again to testificor, but not at the present passage. Since these alterations are carried out with little consistency, it may be concluded that they are made for the sake of varying the vocabulary, to reduce the constant repetition of the cumbersome phrase testimonium perbibeo. Valla Annot. suggested using testificaretur in vs. 7 , and testaretur in vs. 8. This may be compared with Giannozzo Manetti's consistent substitution of testificor at all thirty-three instances of $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega$ in this book, in his fifteenth-century N.T. translation.

7 luce $\phi \omega$ tós ("lumine" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change, which was recommended by Valla Annot., conforms with the use of $l u x$ at Ioh. 1,4,

5, 8, 9. A similar substitution occurs at $M t$. 10,27; Eph. 5,13; 1 Petr. 2,9. Elsewhere, Erasmus is often content to retain the variety of style displayed by the Vulgate, whether lux or lumen. See Annot. on vs. 8.

7 ipsum á่Toũ ("illum" $1516=$ Vg.). In 1516 Annot., Erasmus mentions the ambiguity of the Greek pronoun, as referring equally to John or to the light. He later decided, on the authority of certain "doctores" (1527 Annot.), that the pronoun refers to John, and hence substitutes ipsum to exclude the alternative interpretation. This change was anticipated by Manetti.

8 lux illa tò $\varphi \omega ̃ s$ ("lux" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The added pronoun in 1519 was designed to convey the force of the Greek article (i.e. although John was "a light", only Christ was "the Light"), and to show the connection with previous references to lux in vss. 4-7, as had already been proposed in 1516 Annot. For Edward Lee's objection to this change, and Erasmus' reply, see Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 177 F-179 A.
8 missus erat (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This verb was inserted in smaller type in 1519 (converted to italics in 1535), to supply what was implicit in the elliptical Greek expression here. See Annot.

8 testaretur $\mu \alpha$ ртирŋ́on ("testimonium perhiberet" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 7.

8 luce toũ фமтós ("lumine" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 7.

9 lux illa (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). These words were inserted to avoid the misinterpretation that "the true light" here referred to John the Baptist. Although the phrase has no explicit equivalent in the Greek text, Erasmus did not on this occasion make use of the smaller type which he had used for missus erat in the previous verse. See Annot.

9 mundum тòv кóбuov ("hunc mundum" 1516 $=$ late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus comments that the Vulgate quite often uses bic to render the Greek article, but that it produced an inconsistency with the following verse, where mundus occurs three times without bic. A similar addition was made in the late Vulgate at Ioh. 11,27. At other passages Erasmus was sometimes content to retain this Vulgate usage, and at Ioh. 17,5 he even added bic where it was lacking in the Vulgate. At the present passage, Manetti similarly omitted bunc.
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mundus per ipsum factus est, et mundus eum non cognouit. ${ }^{11}$ In sua venit, et sui eum non receperunt. ${ }^{12}$ Quotquot autem receperunt eum, dedit eis vt liceret filios dei fieri, videlicet his qui credidissent in nomen ipsius: ${ }^{13}$ qui non ex sanguinibus, neque ex voluntate carnis, neque ex voluntate viri, sed ex deo nati sunt. ${ }^{14}$ Et sermo ille caro factus est, et habitauit in nobis: et conspeximus gloriam eius, | gloriam velut vnigeniti a patre: plenus gratia et veritate. ${ }^{15}$ Ioannes testificatur de ipso, et clamat dicens: Hic erat de quo dicebam, qui quum me sequeretur, antecessit me, quia prior me
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## 1,15 о отाठ B-E: отוб $A$

11 sua $B$-E: propria $A \mid 12$ vt liceret $B-E$ : potestatem $A \mid$ videlicet $B-E$ (ital.): om. $A \mid$ credidissent $B$ - $E$ : credunt $A \mid$ nomen ipsius $B-E$ : nomine eius $A \mid 14$ sermo ille $B$ - $E$ : verbum $A \mid$ factus $B-E$ : factum $A \mid$ conspeximus $B-E$ : vidimus $A \mid$ plenus gratia et veritate $B-E$ : plenum gratiae et veritatis $A \mid 15$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ testificatur $C-E$ : testimonium perhibet $A$, testatur $B \mid$ clamat $B-E$ : clamauit $A \mid$ quum ... antecessit me $B-E$ (exc. cum pro quum $B-D$ ): post me venturus est, prior me coepit esse $A$

11 sua $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ î îto ("propria" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs in 1516 at 1 Cor. 3,8; 15,38; 1 Petr. 3,5; and in 1519 at Iob. 16,32. Erasmus puts sua here to make clear that it is based on the same Greek word as sui later in the same verse, thus removing an inconsistency of the Vulgate: see Annot. He is content to retain proprius at a number of other passages, e.g. Mt. 25,15; Ioh. 7,18; 8,44. Sometimes he changes suus or tuus to proprius: Mc. 15,20; Lc. 6,41 (1519); Rom. 8,3; 10,3 etc.
 In 1519, Erasmus often changes potestas to autoritas, but in the present context he felt that a different expression was required, to convey the sense that the possibility of becoming a child of God was conferred by divine permission rather than as something which depended on the acquisition of a special power or authority.

12 videlicet ( omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This word was added in smaller type in 1519 (converted
to italics in 1535), to show that it was an amplification of the meaning. The same addition, without using a different typeface, was made in 1519 at Act. 15,29; 19,22.
12 credidissent mıбteúovaiv ("credunt" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Greek present participle could be rendered by either the present or the imperfect tense in Latin. Erasmus' substitution of the pluperfect tense was unsatisfactory, as the Greek expression meant not only coming to faith but the continuing exercise of that faith.
12 in nomen عis tò ôvou人 ("in nomine" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus conforms more closely with the Greek accusative. The same substitution occurs at Ioh. 2,23; 3,18 (both in 1519), but not at 1 Iob. 5,13. See Annot., and Valla Annot., ad loc.
12 ipsius $\alpha$ 'toũ ("eius" $1516=$ Vg.). By using ipsius, Erasmus makes clear that $\alpha \cup ̛ T o u ̃ ~ r e f e r s ~$ back to the main subject of the sentence, i.e. Christ or the Word.

14 sermo ille ... factus est ò $\lambda$ óyos ... Ẻץ'́veto ("verbum ... factum est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For sermo, see on vs. 1. Erasmus adds the pronoun ille to show the connection with that verse: see Annot.
14 conspeximus ${ }^{\text {é } \theta \varepsilon \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha ~(" v i d i m u s " ~} 1516$ $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change was made to distinguish between $\theta \varepsilon \alpha ́ o \mu \alpha ı$ and $\delta \rho \alpha ́ \omega$. Erasmus does not use conspicio to translate $\theta_{\text {cóo }}{ }^{\prime} \alpha_{l}$ elsewhere, though he uses a related verb, conspicor, at vs. 38 (1519). In 1516 Annot., he recommended using specto, which he introduced into his rendering of Mt. 6,1; 23,5 (1519). More often he is content to retain video.
14 velut $\dot{\omega}$ ("quasi" Vg.). This is the first change of wording to be found in the 1516 translation of the Gospel of John. Erasmus here wished to convey the sense that the glory of the Word made flesh did not merely resemble but truly was the glory of the only begotten Son of God. In the Gospels, the Vulgate has quasi twenty-two times, and velut just five times. Erasmus shows a definite tendency to avoid quasi, which he uses in the Gospels in only four places (seven in 1516), while using velut or veluti in fifteen places (fourteen in 1516). A similar substitution occurs at ten further N.T. passages. See Annot. This was in accordance with the suggestion in Valla Annot., that velut, tanquam, or $v t$ were all to be preferred to quasi at this passage. Cf. also Valla Elegantiae II, 36; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 327, 11. 316-328. The use of quasi appears in Erasmus' list of notable "solecisms" of the Latin Vulgate, the Soloecismi, attached to his 1519-27 editions. He further defended his treatment of the passage in Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 396 B-C. See further on vss. 32 and 39, and also on Rom. 9,32.
14 plenus gratia et veritate $\pi \lambda$ ńp ${ }^{2} \mathrm{x}$ Xápıtos kà $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ zías ("plenum gratiae et veritatis" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Usually the Vulgate constructs plenus with the ablative, but Erasmus retains the genitive after plenus at $A p$. Ioh. 5,$8 ; 15,7$. Both constructions are allowed by Valla Elegantiae III, 33; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, $A S D$ I, 4, p. 296, Il. 453-455.
15 testificatur uартиреĩ ("testimonium perhibet" 1516 = Vg.; "testatur" 1519). See on vs. 7.
15 clamat кє́кроүє ("clamauit" 1516). The change made in 1516 was in exact conformity with the Greek perfect tense here, and had already been made by Manetti. In Annot., Erasmus drew attention to the curious shift
from present to perfect tense exhibited by цортирєĩ and кє́кробує, and considered the possibility that the tense of the second verb was perfect in form but present in meaning, with the result that in 1519 he reverted to the Vulgate rendering.
15 de quo dicebam ôv єitiov ("quem dixi" Vg.). A comparable use of de quo occurs at Ioh. 1,45, de quo scripsit. Erasmus strives for a more Latin turn of phrase, compared with the over-literal Vulgate rendering. However, his use of the imperfect tense is not warranted by the Greek text: for other such alterations of tense, see Iob. 1,30; Act. 11,8; 22,10; Hebr. 3,10.
15 o. This word was omitted from the 1516 Greek text, probably by accident, as such an omission is virtually unsupported by Greek mss., and it is correctly cited in 1516 Annot.
 ("post me venturus est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same change occurs at vs. 27 , but at vs. 30 Erasmus inconsistently retains venit, which could be understood as either a present or a perfect tense. In Annot., he argues that a past tense is required here because of the tense of the following verb, $\gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \quad v \in v$. Valla Annot. preferred, more literally, post me veniens.

15 antecessit me ếnт me factus est" Vg.; "prior me coepit esse" 1516). The purpose of this change is to distinguish between $\gamma i v o \mu \alpha ı$ and $\pi<1 \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega$, and to avoid the unsuitability of factus ("made" or "created") in referring to the Son of God. A similar substitution occurs at vss. 27 and 30 (both in 1519). The only other N.T. occurrence of antecedo is at $L c .22,47$, where Erasmus follows the Vulgate rendering of $\pi \rho \circ \varepsilon \in \chi о \mu \alpha 1$. In 1516 Annot. on the present verse, he advocated either coepit esse ante me or iam praecessit. This may be compared with his note on vs. 17, where he suggested rendering $\gamma i v o \mu a 1$ by coepio esse or orior. The phrase coepio esse was also introduced into his translation at $M t .16,2 ; M c .4,10$, but it was less appropriate at Ioh. $1,15,17$, where үéyovev and $\varepsilon$ é $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} v \in t o$ refer to a definite past event. Elsewhere, Erasmus finds a variety of other ways of translating yivoual (see, for example, the following note), though he also often retains facio from the Vulgate. Other examples include the substitution of innotesco for notum facio, in rendering $\gamma \vee \omega \sigma \tau$ òv ह́ү'́veto and фãepòv éýveto (see on Act. 1,19); aedo for facio in rendering moté $\omega$, in connection
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erat. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Et}$ de plenitudine eius, nos omnes accepimus, et gratiam pro gratia: ${ }^{17}$ quia lex per Mosen data est, gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum exorta est. ${ }^{18}$ Deum nemo vidit vnquam. Vnigenitus filius, qui | est in LB 344 sinu patris, ipse enarrauit.
${ }^{19} \mathrm{Et}$ hoc est testimonium Ioannis, quando miserant Iudaei ab Hierosolymis sacerdotes et Leuitas, vt interrogarent eum: Tu quis es? ${ }^{20}$ Et confessus est, et non negauit. Et confessus est, inquiens: Non sum ego Christus. ${ }^{21} \mathrm{Et}$ interrogauerunt eum: Quid ergo? Helias es tu? Et dicit: Non sum. Es tu propheta ille? Et respondit: Non. ${ }^{22}$ Dixerunt ergo ei: Quis es, vt responsum demus his qui miserunt nos? Quid dicis de te ipso? ${ }^{23}$ Ait: Ego vox clamantis in deserto, dirigite viam domini: sicut dixit Hesaias propheta. ${ }^{24}$ Et qui missi fuerant, erant ex Pharisaeis. ${ }^{25}$ Et interrogauerunt eum, ac

18 ou $\delta$ єıs $B-E:$ ои $\delta \varepsilon \varsigma ~ A \mid 23$ тך B-E: om. $A \mid 24$ єк $A-D: \varepsilon v E$

17 exorta $B-E$ : facta $A \mid 19$ Ioannis $A B E$ : Iohannis $C D \mid$ miserant $B-E$ : miserunt $A \mid$ 20 inquiens $B-E$ (ital): om. $A \mid 21 \operatorname{dicit} A^{c} B-E$ : $\operatorname{dixit} A^{*} \mid$ Es tu propheta ille $B-E$ : Propheta es $\operatorname{tu} A \mid 23$ Hesaias $E$ : Esaias $A-D \mid 25$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$
with the performance of miracles and signs (see on Ioh. 2,11); seruo for saluum facio (see on Iob. 3,17); vespera est for sero factum est (see on Ioh. 6,16); and the replacement of facio by praesto (see on Iob. 7,19), efficio (see on Act. 3,12), and accido (see on Act. 7,40). See also on lob. 3,21, for avoidance of such expressions as veritatem facio, iudicium facio, legem facio, and misericordiam facio. At the present passage, Valla Annot. suggested using genitus est or axtitit.
17 exorta est $\bar{k}$ घveso ("facta est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 15, above, regarding Erasmus' avoidance of facio. He nowhere else puts exorior for
 and diviotnul (see on Act. 6,9). He substitutes orior for facio at thirteen further passages, mostly
in the book of Acts in 1519, and occasionally the same edition introduces coorior (Act. 20,37; 23,10 ) and oborior (Act. 2,43).

19 miserant ởтย́ $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \mid \lambda \propto \nu$ ("miserunt" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus has a tendency to prefer the pluperfect tense in his Latin rendering, but the change is not strictly necessary here, as the main verb, $\varepsilon$ 的Tiv, is in the present tense. Other changes to the pluperfect, often improving the sequence of tenses, occur e.g. at $L c .19,32$; 22,13; Ioh. 1,33; 2,22; 4,46, 50 (all in 1519); 6,13; 7,50 (1519); 8,3, 31 (1519); 12,9; 18,9; 21,23; Act. 11,12.

19 Leuitas $\Lambda$ evitas ("Leuitas ad eum" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a different Greek text, adding
$\pi \rho o ̀ s$ aúróv, as in $3{ }^{66 c o r r}$ vid A and some later mss. In codd. B C ${ }^{*}$, ா $\rho$ òs $\alpha$ ưtóv is added after $\alpha^{\alpha} \pi t \varepsilon \sigma \sigma t \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha v$. Erasmus follows cod. 2 in omitting these words, with support from $\$ 7^{66^{*} 75} \aleph \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }}$ $\mathrm{W}^{\text {supp }}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Thus, in his first significant departure from the text underlying the Vulgate in this Gospel, Erasmus adopted a reading which would later turn out to have the most widespread support among the mss., not only from the medieval period but also from as early as the third century. The words ad eum were similarly omitted by Manetti.
20 inquiens (omitted in $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus adds inquam, inquit, etc. at six passages in 1516, and at a further eight passages in 1519, whether to supply an ellipsis in the narrative, or to mark a shift from indirect to direct speech, or for a particular emphasis. Sometimes these additions are in brackets or (as here) in smaller type in the 1519 edition, and in italics in 1535 . The Vulgate generally confines its use of this verb to passages containing $\varphi \eta \mu$ i. See Annot. on the present verse, and on Act. 1,4; 17,3.
20 Non sum őtı Oưk єiuí ("Quia non sum" Vg.). Erasmus omits quia, arguing in Annot. that the word could lead to an absurd misunderstanding that the subject of the verb was the writer of the gospel rather than John the Baptist (cf. on Ioh. 4,17). When dealing with quia and quoniam for óts elsewhere, he frequently deletes these words, regarding them as superfluous when used merely to introduce direct speech, or he substitutes a different word such as quod (which, in 1519, was often accompanied by the subjunctive). In this verse, Manetti has quod for quia. This aspect of Vulgate usage is included in the Solocismi. Erasmus elsewhere retains quia mainly in the sense of "because". The point is further discussed in Annot. on Rom. 8,36.
21 'Hiios. Generally following cod. 2, the rough breathing was used for this name throughout the 1516-35 editions, except for a few passages where no breathing was added because the name was printed with a capital letter.
21 dicit $\lambda^{\prime} \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{E}$ ("dixit" 1516 Lat. text $=$ late Vg.). In the 1516 errata, Erasmus changes to dicit. The perfect tense of the late Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss.
21 Es tu propheta ille 'O трофท่тทs єI $\sigma$ ("Propheta es tu" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The added pronoun, ille, indicates that it is not just "a prophet"
but specifically the prophet whom Moses had promised would come: see Annot. on vs. 25.
23 Tin. The Greek article was incorrectly omitted in 1516, through misreading a correction in cod. 2. In that ms., the words $\dot{\varepsilon} v$ Tñ were originally omitted, but were restored by a later corrector, though in an earlier hand than that of Erasmus.
23 Hesaias 'Hoatas ("Esaias" 1516-27 = Vg.). In 1516, the spelling Hesaias occurs only at Lc. 3,4; 4,17. In 1519, it is introduced also at Ioh. 12,38, 39, 41. In 1522, it is further introduced at Mt. 3,3. Finally in 1535, all remaining instances of Esaias are converted to Hesaias. In the Greek text, in accordance with the usual practice of cod. 2 , the name was uniformly printed with a rough breathing from 1516 onwards, or with no breathing at all at a few passages where the name was provided with a capital letter.
$24 \dot{\varepsilon} k$. The substitution of $\dot{\varepsilon} v$ in the 1535 edition is grammatically impossible, and is clearly a printing error. Other evident misprints introduced by that edition, affecting the Greek text, are found at $I o h .1,46 ; 4,33 ; 7,20,37$. For Greek misprints in Acts, see on Act. 7,27. The absence of newly created errors of this kind from the last fourteen chapters of John or the first six chapters of Acts (approximating to signatures o-q), in the 1535 edition, could indicate that a different typesetter, or a more careful proof-reader, was at work in that part of the N.T., though not to the extent of avoiding all errors of accentuation.
25 ac kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). The substitution of $a c$ and atque is frequent in most of the New Testament books, for the sake of stylistic variety. From Matthew to Philemon, most occurrences of ac were introduced in 1519. Neither ac nor atque is used anywhere in the Gospel of John in 1516. Even in 1519, ac is not found in chapters 14 to 17 of John's Gospel, and nowhere in the Johannine epistles. In Acts, the word occurs thirteen times in 1516, but in a further 109 places in 1519, and sporadically at additional passages in 1522-35. From Hebrews to the Apocalypse, nearly all substitutions of ac occurred in 1516, with little change in the later editions. In the Vulgate, ac is not often used. Another way of avoiding et was by adding que to the following word, a frequent practice in 1519: see on vs. 39, below. Other common alternatives were quoque and etiam: see on Iob. 5,27; 6,36.









 'l $\omega \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \eta S \beta \alpha \pi \tau i \zeta \omega \nu$.


dixerunt ei: Cur ergo baptizas, si tu non es Christus, neque Helias, neque propheta ille? ${ }^{26}$ Respondit eis Ioannes, dicens: Ego baptizo aqua, sed in medio vestrum stat quem vos nescitis. ${ }^{27}$ Ipse est qui quum me sequeretur, antecessit me: cuius ego non sum dignus, vt soluam corrigiam calciamenti. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Haec}$ in Bethabara facta sunt trans Iordanem, vbi loannes baptizabat.
${ }^{29}$ Postero die videt Ioannes Iesum venientem ad se, et ait:


25 Cur $B-E$ : Quid $A \mid$ ergo $A-D$ : ego $E \mid$ ille $D E$ : om. $A-C \mid 26$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ aqua $B-E$ : in aqua $A \mid$ sed in medio $C$ - $E$ : medius autem $A$, sed medius $B \mid$ stat $B-E$ : stetit $A \mid 27$ quum ... antecessit me $B-E$ (exc. cum pro quum $B-D$ ): post me venturus est, qui ante me factus est $A \mid$ corrigiam $B$-E: eius cortigiam $A \mid 28$ Ioannes baptizabat $B E$ : erat Ioannes baptizans $A$, Iohannes baptizabat $C D \mid 29$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D$

25 Cur Ti ("Quid" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution occurs elsewhere in John at four other passages, all in 1519. The purpose was perhaps to avoid the misinterpretation of quid as meaning "what" instead of "why", though at a number of passages Erasmus leaves quid unaltered. In the Vulgate N.T., cur is used only at $A c t .5,3$, but much more frequently in the O.T. See also Annot. on Ioh. 4,27.

25 ergo oũv ("ego" 1535). The 1535 reading makes no grammatical sense in this context, and must therefore be considered a misprint.
25 neque (2nd.) oüte ("nec" Vg. 1527). Erasmus conforms with the earlier Vulgate spelling, as found in Annot., lemma, and also in Manetti.
 $22=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In the $1516-19$ editions, $\delta$ is omitted from the Greek text, even though it is found in nearly all mss., including those which Erasmus usually consulted. A similar omission of o before $\pi \rho \circ 甲 \eta i^{\prime} n s$ occurs at Iob. 7,40. It is likely that in both passages the omission was unintentional, resulting from an oversight by the printer, which went undetected either by Erasmus or his assistants. As will be seen elsewhere, he occasionally resorted to conjecture
to emend the text, but when he did so his tendency was to add articles rather than omit them. The accidental omission led him astray when preparing 1519 Annot., in which he assumes that the 1516 Greek text accurately reproduced the wording of his mss. and that the article must therefore have been omitted by the writer of the Gospel, so that the passage meant "a prophet". At the same time he now acknowledged the existence of other mss. in which of was present, which he could have found, for example, in cod. 3. Then in 1522, he silently restores $\delta$ to the Greek text, but without making a corresponding change in the Latin translation or in Annot. Finally in 1527, he added ille to the Latin translation, to conform with his rendering of vs. 21, but 1527-35 Annot. continue to make the mistaken omission of o from the citation of the Greek text.

26 aqua ह̀v Üסatı ("in aqua" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus also omits in before aqua in vss. 31, 33, in the 1519 edition, and makes a similar change at Mt. 3,11; Mc. 1,8, taking év in an instrumental sense, rather than as denoting the location or method of baptism. Erasmus also frequently treats $\hat{\varepsilon} v$ in this way when followed
by other nouns, e.g. omitting in before spiritu at Ioh. 1,33; 4,23, 24 (all in 1519).
26 sed in medio $\mu$ écos ס ह́ ("medius autem" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "sed medius" 1519). Erasmus frequently substitutes sed, at, caeterum, contra, immo, porro, rursus, tamen, vero, or verum, in order to produce greater variety of style, and to reduce the monotonous repetition of autem. The word autem nevertheless remains in more than 1,500 passages throughout the N.T. The prepositional phrase in medio was less literal than the Vulgate: probably Erasmus disliked the coupling of the adjective medius with a following genitive, a usage which was comparatively infrequent in classical Latin idiom.
 is in conformity with Vulgate usage elsewhere, e.g. at Mt. 12,47; 20,6; Lc. 8,20; Act. 7,33. As indicated in Annot., the Greek verb is perfect in form, but present in meaning.
 ("post me venturus est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 15.
 ("qui ante me factus est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 15 , where a similar change occurs. At the present passage, there is an additional relative pronoun, ós, which was not found in vs. 15, and is left untranslated by Erasmus, who probably regarded it as redundant: cf. his omission of eius later in the sentence. The spelling ĕ $\mu \pi \rho \circ \theta \varepsilon v$ in 1516 is a misprint. The same error occurs in vs. 30 .
27 corrigiam aủtoũ tòv íhávta ("eius corrigiam" Vg.; "eius cortigiam" 1516). Erasmus objects in Annot., that eius is superfluous in translation, as the same sense was already given by cuius. He recognised that such repetitions were characteristic of Hebrew idiom, but regarded them as producing poor style when translated word for word into Latin. The spelling cortigiam in 1516 is a misprint. Manetti replaced eius corrigiam calciamenti by corrigiam calciamenti sui.
28 Bethabara Bŋ $\theta \alpha \beta \alpha p \alpha \tilde{\alpha}$ ("Bethania" Vg.). Erasmus' Greek text here follows his cod. 2, in which the word is a roughly written correction, made by an earlier user of the ms. The original scribe of cod. 2 seems to have put $B \eta \theta \alpha v i \alpha$. On finding this textual alteration, if Erasmus now turned to consult his cod. 1 , he would have found that this too had $B \eta \theta \alpha \beta \alpha p a \tilde{\alpha}$. Elsewhere in the Gospels, there are several references to a place called Bethany, near to Jerusalem,
which may have led certain early scribes to substitute this familiar name, mistakenly, for the less well-known Bethabara which lay beyond the river Jordan. A similar point was made by Chrysostom, whose testimony Erasmus cites in Annot. Both of these variant forms of text are of great antiquity. Among the Greek mss., $\mathrm{B} \eta \theta \alpha \mathrm{vi}$ is is found in $3^{6675} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{ABC} \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$ and many later mss., including cod. 817, while $\mathrm{B} \eta \theta \alpha \beta \alpha \rho \alpha \tilde{\alpha}$ is supported by cod. $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{T}^{\text {vid }}$ 083 and another large section of the later mss. A range of early patristic and versional evidence can be adduced for each reading. Erasmus included Bethania among his Loca Manifeste Deprauata, first issued in 1519.
 $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus regarded the Vulgate use of the present participle, in combination with an auxiliary verb in the imperfect tense, as being poor Latin style, even if it was faithful to the exact form of the Greek expression. Another change of this kind occurs at Iob. 3,23, and also at Mc. 1,4 (both in 1519), in rendering $\varepsilon$ हүध́veтo $\beta \alpha \pi \tau T i \zeta \omega \nu$. Occasionally Erasmus made such substitutions in his 1516 edition, e.g. perseuerabant for erant perseuerantes at Act. 1,14. In 1519, this change of usage became more frequent, putting aegrotabat for erat ... languens at Ioh. 11,1 ; stabat ... et calefaciebat for erat ... stans et calefaciens at Iob. 18,25; dormiebat for erat ... dormiens at Act. 12,6; and pertrabebat ... et caedebam for eram concludens ... et caedens at Act. 22,19. Further examples will be found at $L c .1,10,22$; 4,$44 ; 19,47$. At Ioh. 10,40, however, Erasmus has fuerat baptizans, similar to the Vulgate rendering, and he retains eram, erat or erant with a present participle at Ioh. 13,23 and many other passages.
29 Postero die Tñ̃ ÉTraúpiov ("Altera die" Vg.). A similar substitution, for altera and alia, occurs at Mt. 27,62; Mc. 11,12; Ioh. 1,35; 6,22; Act. 25,6,23, in the pursuit of greater precision. Further, whereas the Vulgate often treated dies as feminine in gender, Erasmus regarded it as masculine. Inconsistently he retains a feminine adjective with dies at $M t .20,19 ; 27,62 ; M c$. 10,34; Lc. 9,22; 13,32; 18,33; Ioh. 2,1; Ap. Iob. 18,8 . See also Annot., where Erasmus also suggests using postridie, an idea which he tacitly borrowed from Valla Annot. On postridie, see on Act. 10,9.
29 videt $\beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon \in ⿺$ ("vidit" late Vg.). The perfect tense of the late Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti also had videt.
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 oũtós દ̇ढтiv ó viòs toũ $\theta \varepsilon \circ$ ũ.



Ecce agnus ille dei, qui tollit peccatum mundi. ${ }^{30} \mathrm{Hic}$ est de quo dice|bam: Post me venit vir, qui me antecessit: quia prior me erat, ${ }^{31}$ et ego nesciebam eum: sed vt manifestus fiat Israeli, propterea veni ego aqua baptizans. ${ }^{32} \mathrm{Et}$ testificatus est Ioannes, dicens: Vidi spi|ritum descendentem specie columbae de coelo, et mansit super eum: ${ }^{33}$ et ego non noueram eum, sed qui misit me vt baptizarem aqua, is mihi dixit: Super quem videris spiritum descendentem ac manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat spiritu sancto. ${ }^{34} \mathrm{Et}$ ego vidi et testificatus sum, hunc esse filium dei.
${ }^{35}$ Postero die iterum stabat Ioannes, et ex discipulis eius duo,



29 ille $B$-E: om. $A \mid 30$ me antecessit $B$-E: ante me factus est $A \mid 31$ manifestus frat $B$-E: manifestetur $A \mid$ aqua $B-E$ : in aqua $A \mid 32$ testificatus est $C-E$ : testimonium perhibuit $A$, testatus est $B \mid$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ specie columbae $B-E$ : quasi columbam $A \mid 33$ non noueram $B-E$ : nesciebam $A \mid$ aqua $B-E$ : in aqua $A \mid$ is $B-E$ : ille $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ spiritu $B-E$ : in spiritu $A \mid 34$ testificatus sum C-E: testimonium perhibuit $A^{*}$, testimonium perhibui $A^{c}$, testatus $\operatorname{sum} B \mid$ hunc esse filium $B$-E: quod hic est filius $A \mid 35$ Ioannes $A B$ : Iohannes $C D$

29 agnus ille ó d̛̉uvós ("agnus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar addition occurs at vs. 36. By rendering the article in this way, Erasmus signified Christ's uniqueness as the Lamb of God, and not just "a lamb".

29 dei $\theta \varepsilon \circ$ ("dei, ecce" late Vg.). The added ecce of the late Vulgate lacks Greek ms. support, and probably arose by contamination from the Old Latin version. The word ecce was omitted by Manetti.
29 peccatum $\alpha \alpha_{\mu \alpha р т i \alpha v ~(" p e c c a t a " ~ l a t e ~ V g .) . ~ I n ~}^{\text {. }}$ Annot., Erasmus mentions that Vulgate mss. have the singular form, peccatum. He included peccata in his Loca Manifeste Deprauata.
 a similar unnecessary substitution of the imperfect tense by Erasmus' translation.
 me factus est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 15 , regarding antecedo. The spelling épitpo $\theta \varepsilon v$ in 1516 is a misprint. The same error occurred in vs. 27.

31 manifestus fiat $\varphi \propto v \in \rho \omega \theta \neq T$ ("manifestetur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change reflected Erasmus' uneasiness over the use of the verb manifesto, because of its relative infrequency in classical Latin. At nineteen out of forty-three passages where this verb occurred in the 1516 edition, he changed it in 1519 to manifestus fio and a variety of other expressions, such as conspicuus fio (see on Iob. 3,21), declaro (see on Iob. 7,4), and patefacio.
31 Israeli т $\tilde{\sim}$ 'lopaŋ́入 ("in Israel" late Vg., and some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate use of in is
unsupported by Greek mss.: see Annot. In 1516, Erasmus treats Israel and Israbel as indeclinable, with the exception of Israeli here and at Act. 13,24, and Israbeli at Rom. 11,25. In 1519, the exceptions become more numerous: Israeli at Act. 1,6; 5,31; 13,23; Israelis at Iob. 3,10; Act. 28,20; Eph. 2,12; and Israelem at 1 Cor. 10,18; Gal. 6,16. The reason for giving it a dative form here, perhaps, is to avoid Israel being misunderstood as the subject of manifestus fiat, and to make clear that Christ was to be manifested to Israel and not merely in Israce.
 See on vs. 26.

32 testificatus est Éमapтúp $\bar{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \nu$ ("testimonium perhibuit" $1516=$ Vg.; "testatus est" 1519). See on vs. 7.

32 Vidi öтı Te日éapaıl ("quia vidi" Vg.). See on vs. 20. Manetti put quod vidi.
 columbam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution may be compared with the Vulgate rendering of
 at Lc. 3,22. In Annot. on Mt. 3,16, Erasmus emphasised that the Spirit appeared in the visible shape of a dove, and that the comparison with a dove did not relate merely to the manner of descent. There is a degree of inconsistency, however, in his replacement of sicut by tanquam at $M t .3,16$, and of tanquam by quasi at $M c .1,10$, in rendering the same Greek word in exactly the same context. Manetti used sicut columbam at the present verse, in accordance with Vulgate usage at the passage in Matthew. On quasi, see further on vss. 14 and 39.

33 non noueram oủk ñ రॄєv ("nesciebam" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .). Erasmus' use of the pluperfect is more accurate: see on vs. 19, and Annot. He did not make the same alteration at vs. 31 , where the same Greek word occurs. His general practice was to use scio and nescio with reference to knowledge of a fact or a skill, but to substitute other verbs for knowledge of a person or thing: cf. Ioh. 6,64; 7,27-29; 8,19, 55; 10,4; 13,17; 14,17; 15,21; 18,2 (all in 1519); 20,9; 21,17.
33 sed $q u i \dot{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta$. The $1516-19$ editions had $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$, omitting $\delta$, through misreading the text of cod. 2, which supports Erasmus' later wording.
33 vt baptizarem $\beta \alpha \pi т t i \zeta \varepsilon ı v$ ("baptizare" Vg.). Erasmus frequently avoids using an infinitive
to express a purpose, preferring to use $w t$ followed by a subjunctive form of the verb, or sometimes a gerund. Other examples are found at Ioh. $4,7,15,38 ; 6,10 ; 8,5$. Manetti similarly avoided such infinitives, but more frequently preferred to replace them with a gerund (in Pal Lat. 45, his text originally seems to have retained baptizare from the Vulgate, but this was changed to ad baptizandum by a later correction).
 ("in aqua ... in spiritu" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 26. The 1516 Greek text departed from codd. 2 and 817 here, and followed cod. 1 in adding $T \tilde{\sim}$ before U $\delta \alpha a \tau 1$, with support from $\$ 7^{66} \mathfrak{*}$ and a few later mss. In 1519, Erasmus silently deleted $T \tilde{\omega}$, in conformity with cod. 3, supported by $\boldsymbol{7 P}^{75}$ A B C N P W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ and most later mss. It is possible that the article was an unauthorised addition by one of Erasmus' assistants, who had cod. 1 to hand while correcting the proofs of the 1516 edition. As will be seen at other passages, they had a tendency to adopt from cod. 1 those readings which conformed more closely with the Latin Vulgate (cf. Erasmus' complaint in Apolog. adv. monach. bisp., LB IX, 1049 D; Apolog. resp. inuect. Ed. Lei, Ferguson, pp. 274-5, 11. 909-916), but this particular variant was not capable of affecting the Latin translation.

33 is ėkeivos ("ille" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Substitutions of is qui for ille qui occur at a number of other passages in 1519, e.g. at Iob. 5,10, 11; 7,50.

33 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ). See on vs. 25.
34 testificatus sum $\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \rho т \dot{\text { úp }} \mathrm{K} \alpha$ ("testimonium perhibui" 1516 errata $=V$ g.; "testatus sum" 1519). See on vs. 7.

34 bunc esse filium ötı oũtós モ̇ఠtiv ò viós ("quia hic est filius" Vg.; "quod hic est filius" 1516). Examples of similar substitutions of the accusative and infinitive construction can be found in 1516 at Ioh. 4,1, and in 1519 at Iob. 5,32; Act. 4,16; 1 Cor. 14,23; 15,12; 2 Cor. 12,4; 1 lob. 4,13. In this way, Erasmus could avoid the possible misunderstanding of quod as meaning "because". For the removal of quia, see on vs. 20. Manetti put quod bic est filius, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
35 Postero die Tỹ Éroúpıov ("Altera die" Vg.). See on vs. 29, and Annot.
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${ }^{36}$ et intuitus Iesum ambulantem，dicit： Ecce agnus ille dei．${ }^{37} \mathrm{Et}$ audierunt eum duo discipuli loquentem，et se－ quati sunt Iesum．${ }^{38}$ Conuersus autem Iesus，et conspicatus eos sequentes se， dicit eis：Quid quaeritis？Qui dixerunt ei：Rabbi（quod dicitur si interpre－ teris，magister），vbi habitas？${ }^{39}$ Dicit eis：Venite et videte．Venerunt，vide－ runtque vbi maneret，et apud eum manserunt die illo：hora autem erat ferme decima．${ }^{40}$ Erat Andreas fra－ ter Simonis Petri，vnus ex duobus qui audierant a Ioanne，et sequuti fuerant eum．${ }^{41}$ Reperit hic prior fratrem suum Simonem，et dicit ei：

## 38 auta A C－E：outa B｜$\lambda_{\varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1 ~ A ~ B: ~}^{\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon}$ C－E

36 ille $B$－E：om．$A \mid 38$ conspicatus $B$－E：videns $A \mid$ si interpreteris $B$－E：interpretatum $A \mid$ 39 videruntque $B$－E：et viderunt $A \mid$ ferme $B$－E：fere $A \mid 40$ loanne $A B E$ ：Iohanne $C D$

36 intuitus $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \alpha \propto$（＂respiciens＂Vg．）．For the sake of accuracy，Erasmus very frequently replaces a Vulgate present participle by a past tense，where the Greek has an aorist participle， as used here．Where possible，he would substitute a deponent verb for this purpose，as the past participle would then usually retain an active sense，as it does in this verse，but he was often prepared to convert active to passive where a suitable deponent verb did not exist．The substi－ tution of intuitus here had already been suggested by Valla Annot．，on analogy with the Vulgate usage of this word at vs．42．The Vulgate also used intueor at Mc．10，21，27．In Annot．，Erasmus further objected that respicio meant to look back with one＇s head turned，rather than simply to look at．A similar substitution of intueor occurs at Lc．22，61（1519）．At Mt．6，26，Erasmus changes to verto oculos．Elsewhere，he retains respicio in the sense of＂have regard for＂，in ren－
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \imath \beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega($（ $c .1,48 ; 9,38)$ etc．Sometimes respicio is replaced by aspicio，in rendering $\beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ at Act．3，4；Ap．Ioh．5，3，and Ė甲орá $\omega$ at Act．4，29．
36 dicit $\lambda_{\hat{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathrm{\varepsilon ı}$（＂dixit＂late Vg．）．The perfect tense of the late Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss．Manetti also had dicit．

36 agnus ille ó đ̉̉uvós（＂agnus＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on vs． 29.
38 conspicatus $\theta \varepsilon \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$（＂videns＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． This is the only place where Erasmus uses conspicor．See on vs． 14 for his use of the related verb，conspicio，to distinguish between $\theta$ éáouaı and ópd$\omega$ ．At the present passage，conspicor is a more convenient verb for rendering the Greek aorist participle（cf．on intuitus at vs．36）．

38 sequentes se d́ko入ovӨoũvtas．Erasmus retains se from the Vulgate，although the Vulgate rendering may reflect a different Greek text，
 Greek mss．lack the pronoun．For this reason se was omitted by Manetti．
38 Qui of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ．Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving סé untranslated，while Manetti had ipsi autem．

38 ๙ủtuั．The spelling oútẽ in 1519 can be seen from the accentuation to be a misprint for avंT巛ั rather than an attempt to substitute oÜT $\omega$ ，which would have given a different meaning．
38 ＇P $\alpha \beta \beta$ Ei．Erasmus adopts the spelling of cod． 2 ，whereas most other mss．have＇$P \alpha \beta \beta i$ ．

The same occurs at all fourteen other passages in the Gospels where this word occurs.
$38 \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha$. The variant, $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, found in 1522-35, is a misprint arising from itacism.

38 si interpreteris $\mathfrak{e} \rho \mu \eta \nu \varepsilon v o ́ u \varepsilon v O v$ ("interpretatum" $1516=$ Vg.). A similar substitution occurs in 1516 at Mc .15 .22 , and in 1519 at lob. 1,41, 42; 9,7. Erasmus also puts si quis interpretetur at Mt. 1,23; Mc. 5,41; 15,34. Although he does not favour the passive use of this verb, it is retained at Act. 9,36; 13,8.
39 videruntque kai $\mathbb{\text { EIBov}}$ ("et viderunt" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The use of -que is frequently adopted in 1519 , especially to join pairs of verbs or nouns, giving greater stylistic variety. This usage is more frequent in Matthew to Luke, and Acts. In the Gospel of John, it does not occur at all in 1516 or the Vulgate, and only twenty-one times in 1519. See also on ac at vs. 25.

39 autem $\delta$ ह́. In nearly all mss., including codd. 1 and $2^{*}, 8^{\dot{\varepsilon}}$ is omitted. Erasmus added the word in the margin of cod. 2, no doubt after finding $\delta \varepsilon$ in cod. 817, which here conformed with autem of the Vulgate. In the following sentence, by contrast, given an identical set of data in respect of the presence or absence of $\delta \dot{\xi}$, he decided to omit the word, together with its accompanying Latin rendering. From one point of view, this might be seen as just another example of haphazard editing. However, this would be to ignore the part played by contextual considerations in Erasmus' method of work. In Annot., he argued that this reference to the "tenth hour" showed that the visit of the two disciples of Jesus was late in the day and not at a time which would usually have been regarded as convenient. On finding $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in one of his mss., he may well have felt that it helped to emphasise the surprising nature of this part of the narrative, to which he had drawn attention, and he therefore decided to include it in his text. The same consideration would not have applied to the following sentence, where the addition of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ would have seemed superfluous to the sense. What Erasmus did not know was that, among the Greek mss. as a whole, the support for $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in vs. 39 was very weak, being found in just a few late mss., of which his cod. 817 happened to be one. Partly through the influence of the Vulgate, and partly because of Erasmus' opinion as to the requirements of the context, this poorly
supported variant passed into the Textus Receptus. Manetti deleted autem.
39 ferme $\dot{\text { © }}$ ("quasi" Vg.; "fere" 1516). Similar substitutions of ferme in rendering $\dot{\omega}$ and $\dot{\omega} \sigma \in$ occur at $M c .8,9 ;$ Iob. 4,6; 6,10, 19; 19,14 (1519), 39; Act. 5,7; 10,3 (1519); 19,34; Ap. Ioh. 8,1 (1519). Occasionally Erasmus also substitutes fere or circiter. The Vulgate N.T. sometimes has fere but never ferme. In Annol., Erasmus objects to quasi in such contexts, dismissing Suetonius' use of the word as a novelty, not common in classical usage. On quasi, see further on vss. 14 and 32, above. On fere, see Valla Elegantiae II, 49; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 254, 11. 301-308.
40 Erat 形 ("Erat autem" Vg.). The Vulgate addition reflects a Greek variant, 解 $\delta \bar{\varepsilon}$, found in codd. A ${ }^{\text {ssupp }}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 817. Erasmus follows his codd. 1 and 2, supported by most other mss., commencing with $39^{6675} \mathcal{K}$ B C P. Regarding $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, see further on vs. 39.
41 Reperit Eúpiøкєı ("Inuenit" Vg.). This substitution occurs more than fifty times in the N.T. The word reperio is found nowhere in the Vulgate N.T., though it is frequently used in the O.T. In Annot. on vs. 45 (and also on Act. 8,40), Erasmus distinguishes between reperio, in the sense of finding accidentally or coming across something, and inuenio, in the sense of finding as a result of searching. If this rule were applied to the present verse, it would mean that Andrew came across (reperit) his brother, Simon, and told him that they had found (inuenimus) the Messiah, that is, as the culmination of their spiritual quest. With the same consideration in view, Erasmus occasionally uses offendo as an alternative for reperio (see on Act. 10,27), and nanciscor as an alternative for inuenio (in the sense of "find and obtain": see on Ioh. 12,14). On this subject, see Valla Elegantiae V, 2; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 264, 11. 564-565; p. 279, 11. 996-998; p. 286, 11. 204206; p. 310, 11. 848-850; Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 148-50, 11. 755-771. However, in classical usage, these distinctions were not so rigidly observed.
41 prior $\pi \rho \tilde{\omega}$ Tos ("primum" Vg .). The Vulgate seems to reflect a different Greek text, mpడ̃тov, as found in $7^{6675} \chi^{\text {corr }}$ A B 083 and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by $\mathrm{K}^{*} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$ and most of the later mss. Although the reading $\pi \rho \tilde{\omega}$ тоv
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Inuenimus Messiam, quod est, si interpreteris, vnctus. ${ }^{42}$ Et adduxit eum ad Iesum. Intuitus eum Iesus, dixit: Tu es Simon, filius Iona: tu vocaberis Cephas, quod sonat, si interpreteris, lapis.
${ }^{43}$ Postero die voluit Iesus exire in Galilaeam, et reperit Philippum, et dicit ei: Sequere me. ${ }^{44}$ Erat autem Philippus a Bethsaida, ciuitate Andreae et Petri. ${ }^{45}$ Reperit Philippus Nathanael, et dicit ei: De quo scripsit Moses in lege et prophetae, inuenimus, Iesum filium Ioseph Nazarenum. ${ }^{46} \mathrm{Et}$ dixit ei Nathanael: A Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse? Dicit ei


41 si interpreteris, vnctus $B-E$ : interpretatum Christus $A \mid 42$ Iona $B-E$ : Ioanna $A$ | sonat, si interpreteris, lapis $B$-E: interpretatur Petrus $A \mid 45$ Nathanael $B$-E: Nathanahel $A$ | 46 Nathanael B-E: Nathanahel $A$
is of venerable antiquity, it is possible that it could have been deliberately substituted for прळ̃тos by an ancient scribe who supposed that to call Andrew "the first" detracted from the preeminence of Peter among the apostles (cf. Mt. 10,2). On Erasmus' preference for the comparative adjective, in Latin, see on Iob. 20,4.
41 Eúp $\dot{k} \kappa \alpha \mu \varepsilon v$. The misspelling, évíiкauev, in the 1516 text, was taken from cod. 2. In vs. 45 , this time without the support of cod. 2, the 1516 edition again has evipikauev, probably arising from a simple harmonisation with the error in vs. 41. In the 1516 errata, the misspelling in the present verse is corrected, but not at vs. 45.

41 Megoiav. The 1516 edition has $\mu$ eqiav, as found in codd. 2 and 817 , with most other late mss. The change to $\mu \in \sigma \sigma$ iov in 1519 corresponded with the text of $\${ }^{66} 75106$ vid $\mathcal{N}$ A B W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ 083 and some later mss., including cod. 1 (but not cod. 3, which had $\mu \varepsilon \sigma$ íav). Erasmus made a similar change at Iob. 4,25.
 tum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . See on vs. 38$.
41 unctus Xpiotós ("Christus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is the only place where Erasmus renders xpiotós as an adjective, "anointed". Elsewhere, he retains it as a name, Cbristus. Cf. his substitution of lapis for Petrus in vs. 42.
42 Intuitus ${ }^{\text {én }} \beta \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \alpha \propto s$ ("Intuitus autem" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as found in $\boldsymbol{7}^{75}$ and many later mss; in cod. $W^{\text {supp }}$ it is kai $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \alpha \varsigma$. Erasmus followed his usual mss., which all omit $\delta \xi$, in company with $\not 7^{66106} \mathrm{NB}$ a and another large section of the later mss.
42 Iona 'I $\omega v \tilde{\alpha}$ ("Ioanna" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). Erasmus' Greek spelling here follows the text of all his usual Greek mss., supported by most other mss., commencing with codd. A B ${ }^{\text {corr. }}$. The Vulgate resembles a Greek variant, 'I $\omega \alpha v v a ̃$, found in only a few of the later mss. Another variant, 'lwávocu, is found in $7 \mathbf{B}^{6675} 106 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{~B}^{*}$ $W^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss. In support of 'I $\omega$ ávvou as the original reading, it has been
suggested that ${ }^{\prime} \mid \omega \nu \tilde{\alpha}$ could be a harmonisation with the reference to Bàp ' $\mid \omega v \alpha \tilde{\alpha}$ at $M t$. 16,17 . However, the reading adopted by Erasmus has a good claim to authenticity. If ' $1 \omega v \tilde{\alpha}$ were original, a far nearer source of scribal corruption is available as an explanation of the variant 'I $\omega$ óvvou in the present verse: namely, a harmonisation within the immediate context, through careless scribal confusion with the name of John the Baptist, 'lwóvvou, in vs. 40. On another passage involving a textual variation as to the spellings, ' $1 \omega v \tilde{\alpha}$, ' $1 \omega \alpha v v a ̃$, and ' $1 \omega$ ávvov, see on Ioh. 21,15-17. See also Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
 tatur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) A comparable use of sono occurs at Mt. 1,23; Iob. 9,7 (1519). On the use of interpretor, see on vs. 38, above.
42 lapis $\pi$ étpos ("Petrus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). As with vnctus for Cbristus at vs. 41, Erasmus in 1519 here translates the word $\pi$ típos rather than leaving it as a name.
43 Postero die Tñ èmaúpiov ("In crastinum" Vg.). Following a hint from Valla Annot, this change produced consistency with vs. 29. Erasmus had a further reason for objecting to in crastinum, meaning literally "tomorrow" rather than "on the next day", as he regarded this as being more suitable for direct speech, as may be seen from Annot. on the present passage and on Act. 20,7. Accordingly he retains the same phrase at Mt. 6,34 to render Eis tì̀ $\alpha$ üpıov, in a passage where Jesus was directly addressing his disciples.
43 voluit Iesus ... dicit ei $\eta^{\theta} \theta \in \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ ó 'Inooũs ... $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \in \iota$ ๙ủTqu ("voluit ... dicit ei Iesus" Vg.). Erasmus here follows the reading of his cod. 2, with the support of some other late mss. Another section of the later mss. altogether omits $\delta$ 'I $\eta$ ooũs. However, most of the mss.,
 with the Vulgate in placing o ' $\mathrm{l} \eta \sigma o u ̃ s$ after $\alpha^{\prime}$ '解, as found in Erasmus' codd. 1 and 817.

43 reperit túpíokel ("inuenit" Vg.). See on vs. 41.
 untranslated, as in the Vulgate. In Annot, he argued that, for translation purposes, the context made this word redundant. Manetti, more precisely, added de before ciuitate.
45 Reperit qúpírkeı ("Inuenit" Vg.). See on vs. 41, and Annot.

45 De quo "Ov ("quem" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,15 (de quo dicabam).
45 घن́pín $\alpha \mu \varepsilon v$. For the misspelling eúpikauev in 1516, see on vs. 41.
 Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 10,38. Erasmus makes this change in order to show that these words, in the Greek text, are applied to Christ and not to Joseph. See Annot. The spelling $N a \zeta \alpha p \in \theta$ is taken from codd. 1 and 2, in conformity with the Vulgate. Most mss., however, seem to read $N \alpha \zeta \alpha \rho^{\prime} \tau$, as found in cod. 817. The same applies to vs. 46. Elsewhere, Erasmus uses the adjectival form of several other place names to designate the inhabitants, in 1519 unless otherwise indicated: Aegyptii (Act. 7,10-in 1516), Arimathiensis (Iob. 19,38), Asiani (Act. 6,9), Betbaniensis (Iob. 11,1), Clilics (Act. 6,9; Act. 21,39 - in 1527), Ioppenses (Act. 10,23), Itali (Hebr. 13,24-in 1516), Samaritana (Iob. 4,7), Thessalonicenses (Act. 17,13-in 1516), Thyatiri (Act. 16,14).
$46 \mathrm{~N} \alpha \zeta \alpha \rho \dot{\theta} \theta$. On this spelling, see the previous note. The variant $N \alpha \xi \alpha \rho \in \theta$, introduced in 1535, is clearly a misprint: see on lob. 1,24 . In the 1516 edition, this sentence is punctuated as a statement rather than a question, in both the Greek and Latin texts. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus says that "the Greeks" read it as a statement, though his usual mss. all appear to contain a question mark here. In Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 130, 11. 426-441, he further claimed that the question mark was missing from the manuscript which he had at first used ("codice quo primum vtebar"), a phrase which would normally be taken to refer to one or other of the Greek mss. which he consulted in England when preparing the Annot. However, it is possible that these assertions by Erasmus were based on the mistaken assumption that the 1516 text here correctly reproduced the copy which he had supplied to the printer. Some of his annotations were not written until after the pages containing the N.T. text had been printed, and hence could have been influenced by errors introduced into the N.T. by an assistant or a typesetter, as Erasmus did not always consult his mss. afresh during his final revision and expansion of the notes for the 1516 edition. In his later editions of the N.T., Erasmus restored the question mark to the Greek text and his Latin version, but not in the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition.
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Philippus: Veni et vide. ${ }^{47}$ Vidit Iesus Nathanael venientem ad se, et dicit de eo: Ecce vere Israelita, in quo dolus non est. ${ }^{48}$ Dicit ei Nathanael: Vnde me nosti? Respondit lesus, et dixit ei: Priusquam te Philippus vocaret quum esses sub ficu, videbam te. ${ }^{49}$ Respondit Nathanael, et ait ei: Rabbi, tu es ille filius dei, tu es ille rex Israel. ${ }^{50}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: Quia dixi tibi, Videbam te sub ficu: credis. Maiora his videbis. ${ }^{51} \mathrm{Et}$ dicit ei: Amen amen dico vobis, posthac videbitis coelum apertum, et angelos dei ascendentes ac descendentes super filium hominis.

2Et die tertia nuptiae fiebant in Cana Galilaeae, et erat mater Iesu ibi. ${ }^{2}$ Vocatus est autem et Iesus ac discipuli eius ad nuptias.

47 Nathanael $B-E$ : Nathanahel $A \mid 48$ Nathanael $B-E$ : Nathanahel $A \mid$ nosti $B-E$ : noscis $A \mid$ videbam $B$-E: vidi $A \mid 49$ Nathanael $B$ - $E$ : Nathanahel $A \mid$ ei $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ prius ille $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ alt. ille $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 50$ Videbam $B-E$ : vidi $A \mid 51$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$ 2,1 fiebant $B$-E: factae sunt $A \mid$ Cana $B-E$ : Chana $A \mid 2$ et Iesus ac $B-E$ : Iesus et $A$

48 Dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{E}$ ("Dixit" late Vg.). The tense of the late Vg . is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti had Dicit.
48 nosti $\gamma$ ıv由́okeıs ("noscis" 1516). Erasmus elsewhere usually retains the Vulgate use of the perfect tense of nosco.
$48 \delta$ 'Inooũs. In cod. 2 , the article $\delta$ is omitted, with support from most other mss., commencing with $7^{6675} \mathrm{AB} W^{\text {supp. }}$. The Erasmian text imported the word from codd. 1 and 817, supported only by cod. K and a few later mss. This change was not affected by the Vulgate, because of the inability of Latin to express the definite article. Both here and at a number of other passages, the ms. evidence strongly suggests that the original Greek text did sometimes omit $\delta$ before 'Inooũs. At such passages, later scribes would occasionally insert $\delta$, whether deliberately or unconsciously, through familiarity with the frequent N.T. usage of inserting
the article before a name. Equipped with relatively fewer mss., which disagreed with one another on this point, Erasmus or his assistants seem to have concluded, mistakenly, that omissions of the article must have resulted from scribal error, and that the 'missing' words should therefore be restored. Sometimes there was limited ms. support for making such a change, but on other occasions it is probable that the article was added by arbitrary conjecture. These alterations were made after Erasmus' marking up of cod. 2 for the printer, as insertions of o before 'Inooũs are not to be found among his handwritten corrections in that manuscript. For further additions of an article, see loh. 2,19; 3.5; 4,13; 6,29; 7,21, 39; 9,3; 11,9, 20; 14,23; 18,8, 36; 19,11; 20,14, 31; Act. 6,14. At Ioh. 1,50, by contrast, the article is not added.
48 videbam elסov ("vidi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at vs. 50 (1519), and also at

Mt. 17,8; Mc. 6,50. Erasmus felt that the context required a tense which would express a continuous action, though since $\epsilon \delta \frac{0}{}$ is aorist in form, the Vulgate rendering could satisfactorily have been retained here.
 ("Respondit ei ... ait" Vg.; "respondit ... ait" 1516 Lat.). Whereas in his 1516 rendering, Erasmus does not insert $e i$ in either position, he conforms in 1519 with his Greek text, based on cod. 2 , supported by most other mss., commencing with cod. A. The version of Manetti put Respondit ... dicit ei. The Vulgate word-order has the support of only a few late Greek mss. Some early mss. have a further variant, àmexpion
 ${ }_{3} 7^{66} 75 \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss., favoured by modern editors. A fourth variant is found
 (omitting $\alpha^{\prime}$ ữ). It might perhaps be argued that kai $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{c}$ could have been added later, to fit the usual Hebraising formula of "he answered and said". However, the usual form in
 kai $\lambda$ '́ $\mathbf{y}$ E. Indeed, the latter reading could be commended as a lectio difficilior, because of the juxtaposition of aorist and present tenses. An ancient editor who sought to match the usual N.T. style is most unlikely to have added kai $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon$, but would have put kai $\varepsilon$ l $\pi \varepsilon v$, to harmonise with the form of expression found in vss. 48 and 50 . This rare combination of ámeкрi $i \eta$ and $\lambda \varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{y}$ occurs also at $M c .7,28$, where it prompted scribes to create at least six different variants, to avoid the apparent awkwardness of the expression, e.g. by the substitution of
 cod. 69). Faced with this unusual contrast of tenses, some scribes (as in cod. $\$$ or its precursor) may have altered $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon$ to $\varepsilon\{\pi \in v$, to produce a sequence of two aorists. Other scribes, more radically, perhaps decided to omit one of the 'offending' verbs and to move the position of aủTẽ so that it could still follow the remaining verb. Many examples of this kind of editorial activity, generally linked with an abbreviating tendency, can be found among the early papyri. The effect on the meaning is relatively slight, but it is arguable that Erasmus has here preserved a superior text.
49 'Paßßei. This spelling was taken from cod. 2: see on vs. 38, above.
49 ille filius ... ille rex $\delta$ viòs ... ס $\beta \alpha \sigma t \lambda \in u ́ s$ ("filius ... rex" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). As elsewhere, Erasmus
inserted ille to make clear that this was not merely "a son" or "a king", but the unique Son of God and the only true King of Israel, spoken of by the prophets.
50 Videbam EIסov ("vidi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 48.
50 Maiora $\mu \mathrm{E} i \zeta \omega$ ("Maius" Vg.). The Vulgate seems to reflect a different Greek text here, reading ueĭ̧ov, with poor support from Greek mss. In cod. $2^{*}$, Erasmus found the reading $\mu \mathrm{Ei} \zeta \omega \nu$, supported by $33^{75}$ and some later mss. Another ancient reading was $\mu \varepsilon i \zeta$ ova, exhibited by $7^{66} \mathrm{~N}$. After consulting his other mss., however, Erasmus manually corrected his cod. 2 , to make it read $\mu \varepsilon i \zeta \omega$, as found in codd. 1 and 817 , together with most other mss., commencing with codd. A B (Wsupp).
51 posthac videbitio ${ }^{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ ' áa $\rho \tau 1$ ô $\psi \& \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ("videbitis" Vg.). The Vulgate is again based on a different Greek text, omitting ám' ${ }^{\prime}$ 'ptr, with support from $\mathbf{P}^{66} 75 \mathrm{~B}$ W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2 (in which he corrected ő $\psi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha 1$ to oठ $\psi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ), supported by cod. $A$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. It has been suggested that the words are a scribal 'gloss', derived from $M t .26,64$. What the two passages have in common is that $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ ' áprı refers to a distant future event, whereas the Greek phrase usually refers to something which immediately commences. However, since the two passages are not parallel and relate to different contexts, there was little reason for any scribe to think of adding these words here in John's Gospel, if they were originally absent. It would be easier to argue that a scribe was more likely to omit the words than to add them, perceiving that the usual interpretation of $\alpha^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ ápti ("from now on") could lead to the strange notion that Nathanael would immediately see the heavens opened and the angels ascending and descending. Valla Annot.
 Manetti put a modo.
51 ac kaí ("et" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 25.
2,1 fiebant ĖYÉvéto ("factae sunt" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus substitutes the imperfect tense, to convey the sense that the events of vss. 1-10 all occurred while the wedding was in progress.
2 et kai (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg .). The late Vg. omission has little ms. support. Manetti also had et here.
2 ac koí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
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${ }^{3}$ Et vbi defecisset vinum, dicit mater $\mid$
LB 350
Iesu ad eum: Vinum non habent. ${ }^{4}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Quid mihi tecum est, mulier? Nondum venit hora mea. ${ }^{5}$ Dicit mater eius ministris: Quodcunque dixerit vobis, facite. ${ }^{6}$ Erant autem ibi lapideae hydriae sex, positae secundum purificationem Iudaeorum, capientes singulae metretas binas aut ternas. ${ }^{7}$ Dicit eis Iesus: Implete hydrias aqua. Et impleuerunt eas vsque ad summum. ${ }^{8} \mathrm{Et}$ dicit eis: Infundite nunc, et ferte architriclino: et tulerunt. ${ }^{9}$ Postquam autem gustasset architriclinus aquam in vinum versam, neque sciret vnde esset, sed ministri sciebant qui hauserant aquam, vocat sponsum, ${ }^{10}$ et dicit ei: Omnis homo primo loco bonum vinum ponit, et quum inebriati fuerint, tunc id quod deterius est. Tu seruasti bonum vinum vsque ad hoc tempus. ${ }^{11} \mathrm{Hoc}$ aedidit initium signorum Iesus in Cana Galilaeae, et manifestauit gloriam suam, et crediderunt in eum discipuli eius. ${ }^{12}$ Post haec descendit Capernaum ipse et mater eius, et fratres eius, et discipuli eius, et ibi manserunt non multis diebus.

## 

3 vbi defecisset vinum $B$-E: deficiente vino $A \mid 4$ Dicit $B-E:$ Et dicit $A \mid 5$ Quodcunque $A B D E$ : Quoduncque $C \mid 6$ aut $B-E$ : vel $A \mid 7$ eis $B^{c} C-E$ ei $A B^{*} \mid 8$ Infundite $B-E$ : Haurite $A \mid 9$ Postquam $B$-E: $\operatorname{Vt} A \mid$ gustasset $B-E$ : gustauit $A \mid$ in vinum versam $B-E$ : vinum factum $A \mid$ neque sciret $B-E$ et non sciebat $A \mid$ sed ministri $B-E$ : ministri autem $A \mid$ sponsum $B$-E: sponsum architriclinus $A \mid 10$ primo loco $B$-E: primum $A \mid \operatorname{ad}$ hoc tempus $B-E$ : huc $A \mid$ 11 aedidit $B$-E: fecit $A \mid$ Cana $B$-E: chana $A$
 ("deficiente vino" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist: see on Iob. 1,36.
4 Dicit $\lambda$ ह́yeı ("Et dicit" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 1,2 and 817, supported by most other mss., commencing with $77^{75} \kappa^{*}$, whereas the Vulgate is based on the less well attested variant, kai $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \mathrm{F}$, found
in $37^{66} \mathcal{X}^{\text {corr }}$ A B W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss. As happened quite often in 1516, the Latin rendering reproduced the wording of the Vulgate, in opposition to the accompanying Greek text. The inconsistency was remedied in 1519. Manetti made the same change.
4 tecum kai ooí ("et tibi" Vg.). A similar change occurs at Mt. 8,29; Mc. 1,24; 5,7; Lc. 4,34
（nobiscum）； 8,28 ，to produce a more Latin idiom． See Annot．，and also Erasmus Resp．ad annot．Ed． Lei，$L B$ IX， 179 E－180 A．

6 aut ท（ $^{\prime}$（vel＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus prefers the more emphatic aut，in rendering this Greek word．Similar substitutions occur e．g．at Mt． 10,$14 ; 12,25 ; 15,5$（1519），etc．
$7 \Gamma_{\varepsilon \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha т \varepsilon} . . . \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta \sigma \alpha v$ ．Erasmus found in cod． 2 the inconsistent reading，$\gamma \varepsilon \mu i \sigma \propto \tau \varepsilon$ ．．． $\varepsilon \gamma \xi \mu \eta \sigma a v$ ．Instead of correcting $\varepsilon \gamma \xi \mu \eta \sigma a v$ to غ $\gamma$ ย $\mu i \sigma \alpha v$ ，he mistakenly altered $\gamma \varepsilon \mu$ íवate to
 ling the original error．A similar misspelling， also derived from cod．2，occurs at Ioh．6，13．
8 dicit eis $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon l}$ aủtoĩs（＂dicit eis Iesus＂Vg．）． The Vulgate addition of Iesus is supported by only a few later Greek mss．It is possible that it arose as a scribal corruption in the Old Latin translation，through harmonisation with dicit eis Iesus in the previous verse．There was also the possibility of dittography by Greek scribes， accidentally repeating the last three letters of AYTOIL to produce AYTOII O I $\Sigma$ ，corres－ ponding with the usual abbreviated form of the divine name．Erasmus corrected this by reference to his cod．2，here in agreement with codd． 1 and 817．Manetti likewise omitted lesus．
8 Infundite＇AvT $\lambda$ クं $\sigma a c t$（＂Haurite＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． This change seems to be for little more than variety of style，to avoid repetition of the same verb in the following verse，which has bauserant． Erasmus retains baurio for the other instances of $\alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} v \tau \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ at Ioh．4，7，15．Elsewhere，he uses infundo only once，at $L c .10,34$ ，to render ยாாบモ́ $\omega$ ．
 autem gustauit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．This substitution of postquam in rendering $\dot{\omega}$ occurs only once elsewhere，at Act．27，1．Far more frequently Erasmus retains vt．The spelling os in the 1519 edition is clearly a misprint for $\dot{\omega}$ ．
9 in vinum versam olvov $\gamma \varepsilon y \varepsilon \nu \eta \mu \varepsilon^{\prime} v o v$（＂vinum factum＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，15，for Erasmus＇frequent avoidance of facio．The late Vulgate use of factum is an error，as the verb should have agreed in gender with aquam．The original Vulgate reading，factam，was more ac－ curate．At Iob．4，46，referring to the same miracle，Erasmus retains facio but again adds a preposition：fecerat（or fecit，in 1516）ex aqua vinum for fecit aquam vinum．

9 neque sciret kai oủk そौסءı（＂et non sciebat＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Similar substitutions are found at Lc．24，11；Iob． 10,28 （both in 1519）．Usually Erasmus reserves neque for a sequence of two negative expressions．He disliked the phrase non scio，elsewhere replaced by nescio，e．g．at Mc．12，24；Lc．23，34（1519）．For his frequent avoidance of $e t$ when followed by a negative， see on Iob．2，16．
9 sed ministri ol $\delta$ ह̀ $\delta$ oćáovol（＂ministri autem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．For the avoidance of autem，see on Iob．1，26．
9 vocat $\varphi \omega$ viveı ．．．ó àpXıtpik入ıvos（＂vocat ．．． architriclinus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Since Erasmus had already used architriclinus earlier in the verse， he regarded it as redundant for the purpose of translation．
10 primo loco $\pi \rho \tilde{\cos }$（＂primum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Erasmus perhaps made this change to avoid the possibility that primum might be misunderstood as an adjective rather than an adverb．
10 Tu бú（＂Tu autem＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek ms．support．The word autem was also omitted by Manetti．
10 vsque ad hoc tempus Ê Es ă áptı（＂vsque adhuc＂ Vg．；＂vsque huc＂1516）．In 1516 Annot．，Erasmus recommended vsque nunc．The 1519 rendering smoothes away the awkwardness of the express－ ion by using a prepositional phrase．This may be compared with Mt．11，12，where he changed vsque nunc to vsque ad bunc diem．Similarly the phrase vsque modo becomes ad hoc vsque tempus at Mt．24，21，and ad boc vsque temporis at Iob． 5,17 （both in 1519）．Generally he eliminates vsque modo，vsque nunc，and vsque adbuc，and puts vsque ad or hactenus：see also loh．16，24； 1 Cor．4，13；8，7．Inconsistently he retains vsque adbuc at 1 Iob．2，9．

11 aedidit Èmoiñe（＂fecit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．In 1519，in rendering Tote $\omega$ and $\gamma$ ivoual，Erasmus changed facio or fio to aedo in twenty－five places， nearly all relating to the performance of signs and miracles．In 1516，he used aedo only at $M c$ ． 13,22 ，to render $\delta i \delta \omega \mu$ ．There are also several passages where he retains facio in a similar context，such as Iob．3，2；6，2，14，30；12，37； 20，30．For Erasmus＇avoidance of facio elsewhere， see on Ioh．1，15．
12 baec toũto．In his rendering，Erasmus retains the plural from the late Vulgate，as at Iob．11，11； $20,20,22$ ．By contrast，at Iob．11，7，he changes post baec of the Vulgate to post boc．










 tòv OŤov toũ тatpós hov, ơkov ép-


${ }^{13} \mathrm{Et}$ in propinquo erat pascha Iudaeorum, et ascendit Iesus Hierosolymam, ${ }^{14}$ et reperit in templo eos, qui vendebant boues et oues et columbas, et numularios sedentes. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ quum fecisset flagellum e funiculis, omnes eiecit e templo, oues simul ac boues, et numulariorum effudit aes, mensasque subuertit. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Et}$ his qui columbas vendebant, dixit: Auferte ista hinc: nec facite domum patris mei, domum mercatus. ${ }^{17}$ Recordati vero sunt discipuli eius, quod scriptum est: Zelus
 ко $\lambda \lambda \beta_{\imath}$ ют $\omega v ~ A$

13 in propinquo $B$ - $E$ : prope $A \mid$ pascha $B-E$ : pasca $A \mid 14$ reperit $B-E$ : inuenit $A \mid$ eos ... oues $B-E$ : vendentes oues et boues $A \mid$ numularios $B-E$ : nummularios $A \mid 15$ prius e $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ all. e $B$-E: de $A \mid$ simul ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ numulariorum $B$-E: nummulariorum $A \mid$ mensasque $B-E$ et mensas $A \mid 16$ nec facite $B-E$ : et nolite facere $A \mid 17$ vero sunt $B$ - $E$ : sunt vero $A$

13 in propinquo $\varepsilon$ è $\gamma \gamma$ ús ("prope" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus usually retains prope, except here and at Lc. 21,30, 31 (both in 1519). At Ioh. 11,55, where the Vulgate has proximum ... erat, the 1516 edition has in propinquo ... erat, which Erasmus changed in 1519 to instabat. At Ioh. 7,2 , in 1519, he substitutes in propinquo for in proximo, probably to avoid giving the impression that the feast was necessarily to be held on the very next day (the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition actually has in proximo die at that passage). The phrase in propinquo does not occur in the Vulgate.
14 reperit eũpev ("inuenit" $1516=V g$.). See on Iob. 1,41.
14 eos qui vendebant tou's $\pi \omega \lambda$ oũvtas ("vendentes" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus uses a more Latin turn of phrase here, avoiding the use of the present participle as if it were a noun. Similar substitutions occur at Mt. 25,9; Mc. 11,15, but not at Lc. 19,45.
14 boues et oues $\beta$ óas каі тро́ $\beta \propto т \alpha$ ("oues et boues" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate
word-order lacks support from Greek mss., other than cod. $\boldsymbol{\aleph}^{*}$. In 1516, Erasmus followed cod. 2 in adding toús before Bóas, with negligible ms. support. Manetti had the same word-order as Erasmus' 1519 edition.

15 flagellum $\varphi р \propto \gamma \dot{\text { ®́ }} \lambda_{1} 10 \nu$ ("quasi flagellum" Vg.). In 1516-19, Erasmus follows the text of his cod. 817, which has $\varphi p \not \subset \gamma \gamma^{E} \lambda 10 v$, while cod. 2 has фроүध́ $\lambda ı$ ıv. In 1522, he changed his Greek text to read $\varphi p \propto \gamma \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda 10 v$, which is the spelling found in 1516 Annot., supported by most other mss. In 1519-35 Annot., is found the further variant, $\varphi \rho \propto \gamma \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \lambda_{1} \circ v$. More important than these variations of spelling is the question of the presence or absence of $\dot{\omega} s$ before $\varphi p \propto \gamma \bar{\epsilon} \lambda$ $\lambda 10 v$, as it is evident that the Vulgate is based on a Greek text that had $\dot{\omega} \varsigma p \propto \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda 10 v$. That reading is found in $7^{66} 75 \mathrm{~N}$ Wsupp 0162 , cod. 1 and a few later mss. Erasmus' omission of $\omega$ is is supported by his codd. 2 and 817 , in company with most other mss., commencing with K A B P. In this instance, modern editors have come down on the side of Erasmus in
spite of the opposing evidence of the thirdcentury papyri, on the grounds that the word ผ́s was more likely to have been added by copyists to soften the apparent harshness of the simple statement that Jesus made a whip. Erasmus states in Annot., that quasi is not added in the Greek mss. Since cod. 1 has $\omega$, it is evident that he did not consult it at this point. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.

15 e ... e ék ... êk ("de ... de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For this substitution, see Annot. on Mt. 1,3, where Erasmus objects that the Vulgate's frequent use of $d e$ in the sense of "from" was not typical of classical idiom. Out of more than 300 instances where the Vulgate had de for ék, Erasmus changed it at eighty-nine passages in 1516, mostly in Matthew, Mark and the Epistles, but scarcely touched Luke, John, Acts and the Apocalypse. This corroborates many other pieces of evidence that he began his translation work on the Epistles and then turned to the Gospels, but after completing Mark, he found he had insufficient time to revise the remaining books, which were treated more superficially. In preparing his second edition of 1519 , he was able to go through the remaining four books more thoroughly, introducing a further fifty-three substitutions for $d e$, while making just eight further such changes in the rest of the N.T. While this helped to redress the uneven distribution of his previous editorial changes, these four books still remained less thoroughly corrected, a situation which continued in the three later editions of 1522-35. He left more than half the instances of $d e$ for ék unchanged.

15 simul ac $\tau \varepsilon$... каil ("quoque et" Vg.; "et" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the rendering of $\tau \varepsilon$ by quoque (meaning "also"). This is comparable with his removal of such words as etiam and itaque in translating $\tau \in$ at other passages. He sometimes also replaces quoque by que, ac, and et. He was content to use quoque et in rendering kà̀ ... кaí at Mt. 8,27; Lc. 8,25 (1519). Manetti used et ... et at the present passage. On $\tau \varepsilon \ldots$ koí, see further on Act. 1,1.

15 ко入иßıбтడ̃v. This spelling was adopted in 1519, possibly as an arbitrary correction by Erasmus (it was not supported by cod. 3). The same spelling was used already in 1516 at $M t$. 21,12 , without authority from his usual mss.

In most of the mss., it is ко $\lambda \lambda \cup \beta 1 \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$, as printed in 1516 at the present passage.

15 mensasque kà тđ̀̀s тpaтtéל̧as ("et mensas" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,39 re -que.
 $1516=$ late Vg.). Alterations introducing nec (and neque) are frequent in 1519, though less so in Matthew and the Epistles. Its occurrence in 1516 in Luke-John-Acts-Apocalypse is noticeably less frequent than in the remaining books. Erasmus often preferred to avoid the use of $e t$ followed by a negative, but since many instances of et non are retained, it may be concluded that such changes were mainly intended to vary the style. In adding koí, his Greek text here follows codd. 1 and 817, supported by $7^{66} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss., reproducing the text which underlay the Vulgate rendering. In his cod. 2 , kai is omitted, with support from most other mss., commencing with $3^{75}$ \& B N P 0162. From the point of view of scribal habits, it could be said that каi was more likely to have been added later to smooth out what may have appeared to be an abrupt transition to a new statement. It is possible that this deviation of the Erasmian text from cod. 2 was among those passages where his over-zealous assistants imposed a proVulgate reading from cod. 1: cf. on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti put et ne facite.
16 mercatus é̉ This is the only instance of mercatus in Erasmus' N.T., to render the only instance of $\varepsilon$ ह́ $\mu$ ópiov, echoing the Vulgate use of mercator for éцтороs at Ap. Ioh. 18,3, 15, 23. However, at Mt. 22,5 he retains negociatio to render é $\mu$ торía, and also negociator for $\varepsilon$ épтороs at Mt. 13,45; Ap. Ioh. 18,11. Whereas negociatio (or negotiatio) refers generally to the conduct of business transactions, mercatus in classical usage relates more specifically to the holding of a market, and is hence a more suitable expression in the present context.
17 Recordati vero sunt $\varepsilon$ g̀vń $\sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \delta$ ह́ ("Recordati sunt vero" $1516=$ late Vg.). The change of Latin word-order is unaffected by the Greek text. Erasmus preferred to make vero and autem the second word of a sentence, as was more frequent in classical usage. Manetti put Recordati sunt autem.

17 quod ǒ Tl ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti similarly had quod here.
 $\theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ oũv oi 'louסaĩol, kai $\varepsilon i ̃ t o v ~ \alpha u ̉-~$












${ }^{23}{ }^{\circ} \Omega \Omega$ 效
 हis tò ơvoua aủtoũ, $\theta$ हமpoũvtes $\alpha$ ủ-
 'Iŋのoũs oủk ह̇דाiఠtevev éautòv aủtoĩs,
domus tuae exedit me. ${ }^{18}$ Responderunt ergo Iudaei, et dixerunt ei: Quod signum ostendis nobis, quod ista facias? ${ }^{19}$ Respondit lesus, et dixit eis: Destruite templum hoc: et in tribus diebus erigam illud. ${ }^{20}$ Dixerunt ergo Iudaei: Quadraginta et sex annis extructum est templum hoc, et tu in tribus diebus eriges illud? ${ }^{21} \mathrm{At}$ ille dicebat de templo corporis sui. ${ }^{22}$ Quum ergo resurrexisset e mortuis, recordati sunt discipuli eius, quod hoc dixisset eis, et crediderunt scripturae et sermoni quem dixerat Iesus.
${ }^{23}$ Quum autem esset Hierosolymis in pascha in die festo, multi crediderunt in nomen eius, videntes signa eius quae edebat. ${ }^{24}$ Ipse autem Iesus non credebat semet ipsum eis,

22 autais C-E: om. A B
17 exedit $B-E$ : comedit $A \mid 18$ quod ista facias $B-E$ : quia haec facis $A \mid 19$ Destruite $B-E$ : Soluite $A \mid$ erigam $B-E$ : excitabo $A \mid 20$ extructum $B-E$ : aedificatum $A \mid$ eriges $B-E$ excitabis $A \mid$ 21 At ille $B$-E: Ille autem $A \mid 22$ e $B-E$ : a $A \mid$ eis C-E: om. $A B \mid 23$ pascha $B$-E: pasca $A \mid$ nomen $B-E$ : nomine $A \mid$ edebat $E$ : faciebat $A$, aedebat $B C D$

17 exedit $\mathrm{k} \propto \mathrm{T}$ £́ $\propto \gamma \varepsilon$ ("comedit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' choice of exedo in 1519 is a stronger word, well suited to figurative expressions such as this. An alternative might have been deuorauit, consistent with his retention of deuoro at $L c$. 15,30; Ap. Iob. 10,9, 10; 12,4; 20,9. However, he may have felt that deuoro had pejorative connotations, which led him to seek a new word, from outside the Vulgate's stock of vocabulary. Erasmus here deserts his cod. 2, which offered him the reading катафф́रधтवal (future tense), correcting it to read katé¢ory by a note in the lower margin of the ms. His motive was probably not primarily to conform with the text underlying the Vulgate, but to find a reading which agreed more closely with the wording of $P_{s}$. 69,9 , to which the present passage refers. He took кateqवरy from his cod. 817, supported by only a few other late mss., including cod. 69. However, the fact that kaтафáyetan is found in most of the Greek mss., commencing
with $7^{75}$ A B N P 0830162 , as well as in cod. 1 , gives strong grounds for suspecting that the Vulgate reading was based on a harmonisation with the Old Testament passage. Through Erasmus, the poorly supported kateqør passed into the Textus Receptus.
18 quod ... facias o̊tı ... TOוєĩs ("quia ... facis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... facis.
18 ista $\tau \alpha$ Ũта ("haec" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus generally paid great attention to subtle distinctions of meaning between iste, bic, ille, ipse, is. In the present context iste conveys a note of disapproval. In the Gospel of John, the Vulgate uses iste at five passages, to render oũtos, each time followed by Erasmus' 1516 edition. In 1519, he introduced iste at six further passages of John, including this verse. Sometimes the implied meaning is "this thing of which you have just spoken" (e.g. at Ioh. 4,15; 6,34; 12,7),
or sometimes it is merely an expedient to avoid repetition of bic (Iob. 5,16; 6,5).
$19 \delta^{\prime}$ I $\eta \sigma o u ̃ s$. As at Ioh. 1,48 (see note ad loc.), the Erasmian text imports of from codd. 1 and 817, to remedy what was believed to be an omission in cod. 2. The addition is supported by $\$ \mathrm{~N} 083$ with a few later mss. The word is omitted by most other mss., commencing with $7^{66}{ }^{75}$ A B P W ${ }^{\text {supp. The less well attested }}$ reading passed from Erasmus into the Textus Receptus.
19 Destruite ^úбate ("Soluite" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus prefers to use soluo in the sense of "loosen". The other N.T. passages relating to the destruction of the temple have кor $\alpha \lambda$ úc, for which he retains destruo at Mt. 26,$61 ; 27,40$, but substitutes demolior for destruo at Mc. 15,29; Act. 6,14 (1519), and diruo for dissoluo at Mc. 14,58.
19 erigam є́ $\gamma є p \tilde{\sim}$ ("excitabo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In 1519, Erasmus appears to be content with excito in Annot., but changes his translation to read erigo both here and in vs. 20. Elsewhere, he uses erigo to refer to a literal raising up, but excito for awakening from sleep or raising from the dead. In the present context of a building, erigo seemed more appropriate. He also substitutes erigo for leuo at Mt. 12,11, for eleuo at Mc. 1,31; 9,27; Act. 10,26 (1519), and for alleuio at Iac. 5,15: see further on Iob. 4,35.
20 extructum est $\dot{\varrho} \kappa \circ \delta o \mu \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta$ ("aedificatum est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mc. 14,$58 ; 15,29 ; L c .12,18$ (all in 1519). The verb extruo does not occur at all in 1516 or in the Vulgate N.T. At most occurrences of oikoסouéw, Erasmus is content with aedifico, including $M t$. 26,61; 27,40 which refer to the building of the temple.
20 eriges Eै $\gamma$ \&peĩs ("excitabis" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 20.
21 At ille ékeĩvos $\delta$ ć ("Ille autem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
21 aútoũ. This is the first instance, in the Gospel of John, of the use of a rough breathing on the third-person pronoun, introduced in the 1519 edition. In 1519 Annot., on Ioh. 6,5, Erasmus argued that where this pronoun is reflexive in sense, it should be written with a rough breathing (i.e. on analogy with Écuroũ), though he commented that this practice was not observed by the Greeks in "ecclesiastical" books. In his Greek text of 1519, he introduced
the rough breathing at many instances of the reflexive third-person pronoun throughout the N.T., including thirty-six in the Gospel of John, and seven in Acts. The 1522 edition later reverted to $\propto \cup ่ \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ from $\propto \cup ์ T \omega ̃ \nu$ at Act. 15,26, but introduced $\alpha \cup ์ T o u ̃ ~ f o r ~ \propto \cup ่ T o u ̃ ~ a t ~ A c t . ~ 21,11 . ~ . ~$ In addition, in the 1535 edition of John's Gospel, there are three instances of wronglyplaced rough breathings ( $\alpha$ ÚTũ at Ioh. 14,23 and 18,$5 ;$ oútoĩs at $I o b .20,23$ ), which are now corrected by reference to the previous edition of 1527. The difference between the 1516 and later editions on such points are not recorded in the present apparatus.
$22 e$ द́к ("a" $1516=$ Vg.). Similar substitutions occur, e.g. at Mc. 9,10; Act. 17,31 (both in 1519); Rom. 6,4. Elsewhere, Erasmus more often retains a mortuis for ék vekpãv.
22 quod ... dixisset ठדtı ... 色 $\lambda \varepsilon y \varepsilon \nu$ ("quia ... dicebat" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The Vulgate is more accurate here in reproducing the Greek imperfect tense. Manetti preferred quod ... dicebat.
22 eis aútoĩs (omitted in $1516-19=$ Vg.). The reading aútoĩs is found in just a few of the later mss., but not in any which Erasmus is known to have consulted. He did not include it in his text of 1516, as it was not in the mss. which he used for that edition, nor was it in the Vulgate. It is striking that oútoĩs is found in the Complutensian Polyglot, whose distribution was in progress during 1522, but it is unlikely that Erasmus received a copy of the Polyglot in time to use it for his own third edition which was published in that year. He does not directly mention the Polyglot in his Annot. until 1527. The existence of a number of other unusual Greek variants in his 1522 edition, most of them not coinciding with the Complutensian Polyglot (one exception is at Ioh. 13,36), may indicate that he at that time had a passing enthusiasm for a particular ms. which had come to his attention between 1519 and 1522 . This poorly supported reading found its way into the Textus Receptus.
22 dixerat EITtev ("dixit" Vg.). By using the pluperfect here, Erasmus improves the sequence of tenses. See on Ioh. 1,19 for other examples.
23 in nomen kis tò òvoua ("in nomine" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,12.
23 edebat Е̇тто'́є ("faciebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "aedebat" 1519-27). See on vs. 11.

Sià̀ tò aủtòv $\gamma$ lvడ́okelv mávtas, ${ }^{25}$ кaì őti oủ Xpeíav eixev iva tis uaptupクion
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eo quod ipse nosset omnes, ${ }^{25}$ nec opus haberet vt quisquam testaretur de homine: ipse enim sciebat quid esset in homine.

3Erat autem homo ex Pharisaeis, Nicodemus nomine, princeps Iudaeorum. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Hic}$ venit ad Iesum nocte, et dixit ei: Rabbi, scimus quod a deo veneris magister. Nemo enim potest haec signa facere quae tu facis, nisi fuerit deus cum eo. ${ }^{3}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: Amen amen dico tibi, nisi quis natus fuerit e supernis, non potest videre regnum dei. ${ }^{4}$ Dicit ad eum Nicodemus: Quomodo potest homo nasci, quum sit senex? Num potest $\mid$ in ventrem matris suae iterum introire ac nasci? ${ }^{5}$ Respondit Iesus: Amen amen dico tibi, nisi quis natus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non potest introire in regnum dei. ${ }^{6}$ Quod natum est ex carne, caro est: et quod natum est ex spiritu, spiritus est. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Ne}$ mireris quod dixi tibi, oportet vos nasci e supernis. ${ }^{8}$ Spiritus vbi vult, spirat, et

25 nec opus $B-E$ : et quod opus non $A \mid$ testaretur $B-E$ : testimonium perhiberet $A$ 3,3 natus $B-E$ : renatus $A \mid$ e supernis $B-E$ : denuo $A \mid 4$ alt. potest $B-E$ : potest homo $A \mid$ iterum $B-E$ : iterato $A \mid$ ac nasci $B$ - $E$ : et renasci $A \mid 5$ natus $B-E$ : renatus $A \mid 7$ Ne $B-E$ : Non $A \mid$ e supernis $B-E$ : denuo $A$

24 omnes móvtas. This reading seems to have been taken from codd. 1 and 817 , with support from nearly all other mss., as well as from the Vulgate. Erasmus' cod. 2 originally had $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v \tau \alpha$, which he corrected into móvtas. In 1516 Annot., in a note which may have been prepared earlier while he was in England, he states that the Greek text ("graece") has $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha$, a reading which is not found in his usual mss. at Basle. Unless he was misquoting the ms. in question, however, his source for $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ т $\alpha^{\prime} \nu T \alpha$ was not cod. 69, for this agrees with cod. 2 in omitting tó. When revising his Annot. for publication in the 1516 edition, he did not recheck this part of
his material. In 1519, he amended his Annot., to acknowledge that other mss. have a different reading. See also Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 180 A-B.

25 nec opus baberet kai ơti oủ Xpéiov EIXEv ("et quia opus ei non erat" Vg.; "et quod opus non haberet" 1516). For the use of nec, see on vs. 16. Elsewhere, opus babeo replaces opus est at Mt. 9,12. It is also substituted for a variety of other expressions: for indigeo at Mt. 6,32; Ioh. 13,10 (1519); for necesse babeo at Mc. 2,17; for necessitatem babeo at Mc. 2,25 (1519); for necessarius est at Mc. 11,3; for necessarium babeo at Lc. 11,8; 19,34

LB 352
(both in 1519); for desidero at Mc. 14,63; for operam desidero at $L c$. 19,31. Erasmus retains opus est at Mt. 3,14; 6,8; Ioh. 13,29.
25 quisquam TIS ("quis" Vg.). Erasmus frequently makes this change where tis means "anyone", while reserving quis as an interrogative pronoun and in phrases such as ne quis, si quis, and nisi quis. However, he has quis on its own as an indefinite pronoun at $I o b .9,32 ; 15,13 ; 16,30$.
25 testaretur uaptuprion ("testimonium perhiberet" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,7.
3,1 oैvouc. Nearly all mss., including those of Erasmus, read övou^ aútẽ, apart from ${ }^{*}$ which has óvómartı (which is more frequent in
 seems to have been deleted here through carelessness, for it is retained after ővoura at Ioh. 1,6; Ap. Iob. 6,8; 9,11.
2 ' $\mathrm{Pa} \beta \beta \mathrm{El}$. This spelling was derived from cod. 2: see on Ioh. 1,38.
2 quod ठitı ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
3 natus fucrit $\gamma \varepsilon v v \eta \theta$ ñ ("renatus fuerit" 1516 $=$ late Vg .). Erasmus here restores the more accurate rendering found in the earlier Vulgate, in conformity with his Latin mss.: see Annot. The use of renascor is dependent on the interpretation of $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} v \omega \theta \mathrm{Ev}$ as meaning denuo: see the following note. Further discussion of this point is found in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 180 B-C. Manetti also had natus fuerit. Valla Annot., however, preferred genitus fuerit.
 substitution occurs also at vs. 7: see Annot. The Greek word can be understood in either of these senses, whether "from above" or "again". The latter sense is found at Gal. 4,9. At five further passages in 1519, Erasmus puts e supernis for de sursum or de super: Iob. 3,31; 19,11; Iac. 1,$17 ; 3,15,17$. At $M t .21,7$ (1519), in rendering Emóvoc, Erasmus replaces desuper by super, and again at $I o b .19,23$, in rendering èk $\tau \omega ̃ v$ a̛ $v \omega \theta \varepsilon v$, he replaces de super by a summo. The result was that de sursum and de super were removed from the Latin vocabulary of the N.T. Manetti put de super here, but inconsistently retained denuo in vs. 7.
4 Dicit $\lambda$ é $\gamma$ El ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). Erasmus conforms with the earlier Vulgate as required by the Greek text. Manetti likewise had Dicit.
4 nasci (twice) $\gamma \varepsilon v \nu \eta \theta$ ग̈vaı ("renasci" late Vg .; "nasci ... renasci" 1516). As in vs. 3, Erasmus
restores the earlier Vulgate rendering, in accordance with his Latin mss.: see Annot. The version of Manetti also had nasci in this verse.
$4 \mathrm{Num} \mu \dot{\prime}$ ("Numquid" Vg.). In rendering $\mu \eta$ and $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau$, Erasmus in 1519 virtually eliminates numquid or nunquid from his N.T., except at Lc. 6,39; Ioh. 8,53; Act. 7,28; Rom. 10,19; Iac. 3,11, 12.
4 potest (2nd.) סúvaral ("potest homo" 1516). This insertion of homo in 1516 adds nothing to the sense, and may possibly not have been intended by Erasmus, as it duplicates the occurrence of homo earlier in the verse.
4 iterum ठeútepov ("iterato" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus recognised that iterato was not common in classical usage.
$4 a c$ кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
$5 \delta$ 'Inooũs. As at Ioh. 1,48 (see note ad loc.), the Erasmian text adds the article. It was omitted by cod. 2 , supported on this occasion by codd. 1 and 817, in company with $78^{6675}$ $\mathfrak{N}$ A ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ and most later mss. Authority for adding $\delta$ is found in codd. B N and some later mss., including cod. 69. It is possible, however, that Erasmus or his assistants made an arbitrary correction here. This less well attested reading passed into the Textus Receptus.
5 natus fuerit $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta$ ñ ("renatus fuerit" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 3 . Manetti made the same change.
 The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek ms. support. In Annot., Erasmus comments on the absence of sancto from one of his Latin mss.
$7 \mathrm{Ne} \mu \mathrm{n}$ ("Non" $1516=\mathrm{V}$.). This change produced a better Latin construction. A similar correction occurs at Ioh. 14,1, 27; 19,24 (all in 1519). Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
7 quod ${ }^{\text {ofı }}$ ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also had quod.
7 oportet óтı סєi. Erasmus' addition of $\overline{\text { ötı }}$ follows cod. 2 , supported by hardly any other mss. Probably the reading arose from a scribe's attempt to smooth the introduction to the quotation. As elsewhere, Erasmus treats the word as redundant for the purpose of translation: see on Iob. 1,20.
7 e supernis ởvc日ev ("denuo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 3 .
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vocem eius audis, sed nescis vnde veniat et quo vadat. Sic est omnis qui natus est e spiritu. ${ }^{9}$ Respondit Nicodemus, et dixit ei: Quomodo possunt haec fieri? ${ }^{10}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: Tu es ille magister Israelis, et haec ignoras? ${ }^{11}$ Amen amen dico tibi, quod scimus, loquimur: et quod vidimus, testamur: et testimonium nostrum non accipitis. ${ }^{12} \mathrm{Si}$ terrena dixi vobis, et non creditis, quomodo si dixero vobis coelestia, credituri sitis? ${ }^{13} \mathrm{Et}$ nemo ascendit in coelum, nisi qui descendit e coelo, filius hominis, qui est in coelo. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{Et}$ sicut Moses exaltauit serpentem in deserto, ita exaltari oportet filium hominis: ${ }^{15} \mathrm{vt}$ omnis qui credit in eum, non pereat, sed habeat vitam aeternam. ${ }^{16}$ Sic enim deus dilexit mundum, vt filium suum vnigenitum daret: vt omnis qui credit in eum, non pereat, sed habeat vitam aeternam. ${ }^{17}$ Non enim misit deus filium suum in mundum, vt condemnet mundum, sed vt seruetur mundus per eum.




8 e $B-E$ : ex $A \mid 10$ Israelis $B$ - $E$ : Israel $A \mid 12$ creditis $B-E$ : credidistis $A \mid$ credituri sitis $B-E$ : credetis $A \mid 13$ e $B-E$ : de $A \mid 15$ eum $B-E$ : ipso $A \mid 17$ condemnet $B$ - $E$ : iudicet $A \mid$ seruetur $B-E$ : saluetur $A \mid$ eum $B-E$ : ipsum $A$

8 et (2nd.) kai ("aut" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering reflects a different Greek text, having $\eta$, as in cod. A and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by 39675 א B N Wsupp 083086 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti had the same wording as Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate.
10 ille magister ó $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mathrm{k} \alpha \lambda$ os ("magister" Vg.). Erasmus adds ille to convey the sense that Nicodemus was not just any teacher,
but a teacher with a grand reputation. See Annot.
10 Israelis toũ 'l $\sigma \rho \alpha \mathfrak{\eta} \lambda$ ("in Israel" Vg.; "Israel" 1516). The rendering Israel, adopted in 1516, was in accordance with a suggestion of Valla Annot. In 1519, the further change to Israelis made it clearer that this was a genitive: see Annot., and also on Iob. 1,31.
11 quod (1st.) ő $\mathrm{\tau}$ I $\delta$ ("quia quod" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti made the same change.

12 non creditis oủk émioteveete ("non credidistis" 1516). The 1516 edition had ouk $\varepsilon$ हा। corresponding with the changed tense of the Latin rendering, and following cod. 2, with support from a few other late mss. (cod. $2^{*}$ may originally have had an incorrect spelling, oűk ह̇т। to be in a different hand, though by an earlier corrector than Erasmus). In 1519 Annot., Erasmus comments that other mss. read ou moवtevete, in the present tense, and this is in fact the reading of most of the Greek mss., including his cod. 3. Strangely, however, he changes the 1519 text to read oúk $\varepsilon$ हाiఠrev́ere, in the imperfect tense, a reading which he does not report in Annot., and having negligible ms. support, while restoring his translation to the present tense as in the Vulgate.
12 dixero vobis $\boldsymbol{\text { elt }} \boldsymbol{\pi} \omega$. Erasmus retains vobis from the Vulgate, though the latter reflects the addition of üuiv, as found in codd. 1, 817 ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and most other mss. His Greek text follows cod. 2.
12 credituri sitis mाбTعÚणクTE ("credetis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In 1516, Erasmus put Tlఠteviotet, as in cod. 817, and this also seems to be the original reading of cod. 2 (which was overwritten by a later correction, though in an earlier hand than Erasmus, to read $\pi 1 \sigma \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\sigma} \sigma \eta \tau \varepsilon$. In 1519, he substitutes motev́onte, which he reports in Annot. as being the reading of "correct Greek copies" ("emendatis exemplaribus Graecis"). This variant is found in many of the later mss., including codd. 1, 3 and 69 . A few mss. also have mıवTEvete, as in $37{ }^{75}$ ( N ) 083. However, Erasmus' original choice in 1516 had wider support among the mss., as mioteverte is found in most mss., commencing with \& A B.
13 e ek ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on loh. 2,15.
15 in eum eis aủtóv ("in ipso" 1516 Lat. $=V g$.). The Vulgate may reflect a different text, either
 aủT$\uparrow$, as in ${ }^{666}$, each reading having additional support from a few later mss. However, these mss., unlike the Vulgate, also omitted the words $\mu \dot{\eta} \alpha \pi{ }^{2} \dot{d} \lambda \eta$ nol $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$, giving rise to the
 was a later addition, designed to harmonise with the following verse. An alternative explanation is that the shorter reading was the work of an ancient abbreviator whose purpose was to remove or rewrite passages whose wording appeared to be repetitious. Further, it is
questionable whether the evangelist, who is elsewhere careful in matters of word-order, would have chosen a wording which created an
 connected with mюбtev $\omega v$ or the following Éxn. At Iob. 20,31, by contrast, the prepositional phrase èv tĕ óvóuact aưtoũ is carefully positioned after $\zeta \omega \dagger \nu \cup$ Ë $\chi \eta T \varepsilon$, making clear that it is not connected with miotevoutes. A further variant, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \pi^{\prime}$ aútóv, is found in cod. A. Erasmus' Greek text here follows cod. 2, supported by most of the mss., commencing with $\mathcal{N} \mathrm{N}(086)$. Manetti put in ipsum here.
15-16 eैxn (twice). In 1516, Erasmus' Greek text had Exyel in both vss. 15 and 16 , which was the original reading of cod. 2. He had corrected the ms. to read $\bar{\varepsilon} \times \eta$ in both places, as in cod. $1{ }^{\text {corr }}$ and most other mss., but the typesetter seems to have misread the correction, or perhaps one of Erasmus' assistants imported the error from cod. 817, which also has éxel. The subjunctive form, ex $\times n$, is expected here, following on from iva. The error was corrected in the 1516 errata.
 $\pi \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, makes no sense in the context, and must be considered a misprint, possibly as a result of misreading a standard abbreviation used by the scribe of cod. 2. Another misprint has given rise to the substitution of $\dot{\omega}$ for L̈वTE later in the verse.
17 condemnet kpivn ("iudicet" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See Annot., for the distinction between condemno and iudico. The Greek word can be translated in either way, but Erasmus felt that in the present context a rendering was required which would more effectively convey the opposite of seruo ("save"). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 7,1; Iob. 3,18; Act. 13,27; Iac. 5,9 (all in 1519).

17 seruetur $\sigma \omega \theta$ ñ ("saluetur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The usual Vulgate word for "save" is saluo or saluum facio, and sometimes saluifico. Erasmus substituted seruo in about fifty places, mostly in 1519, removing all instances of saluo and saluifico, neither of which exists in classical Latin. He similarly replaced saluator by seruator. see on Iob. 4,42.
17 eum aủtoũ ("ipsum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The reason for this change is that iprum referred back to deus rather than to filium: Erasmus' translation makes it clearer that salvation was to be through the Son.
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${ }^{18}$ Qui credit in eum, non condemnatur. Qui vero non credit, iam condemnatus est, quia non credidit in nomen vnigeniti filii dei. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{Haec}$ est autem condemnatio, quod lux venit in mundum, et dilexerunt homines magis tenebras quam lucem. Erant enim eorum mala opera. ${ }^{20}$ Omnis enim qui mala agit, odit lucem: nec venit ad lucem, ne arguantur opera ipsius. ${ }^{21}$ Qui autem operatur veritatem, venit ad lucem: vt conspicua fiant facta ipsius, quod per deum sint facta.
${ }^{22}$ Post haec venit Iesus et discipuli eius in terram Iudaeam, et illic morabatur cum eis, ac baptizabat. ${ }^{23}$ Baptizabat autem et loannes in Aenon iuxta Salim, quia aquae multae erant illic, et veniebant ac baptizabantur. ${ }^{24}$ Nondum enim coniectus fuerat Ioannes in carcerem. ${ }^{25}$ Orta est autem quaestio ex discipulis loannis cum Iudaeis de purificatione. ${ }^{26}$ Et venerunt ad Ioannem, et dixerunt ei: Rabbi, qui erat tecum trans Iordanem, cui tu testimonium perhibuisti, ecce is baptizat,

18 condemnatur $B-E$ : iudicatur $A \mid$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ condemnatus $B$ - $E$ : iudicatus $A \mid$ nomen $B$ - $E$ : nomine $A \mid 19$ Haec est autem condemnatio $B$ - $E$ : Hoc est autem iudicium $A$ | 20 nec $B-E$ : et non $A \mid$ ipsius $B-E$ : eius $A \mid 21$ operatur $B-E$ : facit $A \mid$ conspicua fiant facta ipsius $B-E$ : manifestentur opera eius $A \mid$ per deum $B-E$ : in deo $A \mid 22$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$ 23 Baptizabat ... Ioannes $B$ C $E$ : Erat autem et Ioannes baptizans $A$, Baptizabat ... Iohannes $D$ | Aenon $B-E$ : Aennon $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 25$ Orta $B-E$ : Facta $A \mid$ quaestio $B-E$ : questio $A \mid$ Ioannis $A-C$ : Iohannis $D \mid 26$ Ioannem $A$-C E: Iohannem $D \mid$ is $B-E$ : hic $A$

18 condemnatur ... condemnatus est крiveтal ... ке́крıтаı ("iudicatur ... iudicatus est" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on vs. 17.
18 vero $\delta$ ह́ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In the present passage, the substitution of vero is mainly for stylistic variety: see on Iob. 1,26 . However, in other contexts, vero could be useful in conveying a continuative rather than an adversative sense.
18 in nomen घis tò ồvoua ("in nomine" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,12.
19 Haec ... condemnatio aÜTT ... кpiórs ("Hoc ... iudicium" $1516=$ Vg.). A similar substitution
occurs elsewhere at Ioh. 5,24, 29; Rom. 5,16; 1 Cor. 11,34; 1 Tim. 3,6 (all in 1519), rendering either kpiбıs or крína. Usually Erasmus retains iudicium. See on vs. 17 re condemno, and Annot.

19 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

20 mala $\Phi \alpha \cup ̃ \lambda \alpha$ ("male" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the possible misunderstanding of the late Vulgate translation as referring to a person who is afflicted by evil, rather than one who performs evil deeds. Manetti preferred praua here.

20 nec кal oúk ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on lob. 2,16.
$20 n e i v \alpha \mu \eta$ ("vt non" Vg.). Erasmus generally eliminates $v t$ non in final clauses, except e.g. at Ioh. 4,15; 7,23; 19,31; Ap. Ioh. 3,18; 20,3.

20 ipsius $\alpha u ̉ t o u ̃ ~(" e i u s " ~ 1516=V g.) . ~ B y ~ m a k i n g ~$ this change, Erasmus presumably wished to make clear that the pronoun refers back to the subject of the sentence rather than to lux. Manetti put sua.

20 oủtoũ Tò êpya. This word-order was derived from cod. 2, supported by $7^{75} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss. including cod. 1. The most widely attested reading, however, is Tò̀ ép $\alpha \propto$ $\alpha u ่ T o u ̃, ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~ c o d . ~ 817 ~ a n d ~ m o s t ~ o t h e r ~ m s s ., ~$ commencing with $7^{66}$ א B N 083086.

21 operatur moiడ̃ ("facit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The expression "to do the truth" occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only at $1 I o b .1,6$, where Erasmus inconsistently retains veritatem non facimus. He may have felt that facio was not a suitable verb, as a person can speak, believe, or know the truth, whereas what a person does is not the truth itself but may be the result of believing that truth. Comparable substitutions in 1519 are: iudico for iudicium facio at Ioh. 5,27, factis praesto legem for facio legem at Ioh. 7,19, and legem factis exprimo for factor legis at Rom. 2,13; praesto misericordiam for facio misericordiam at Iac. 2,13; and in 1516, sermonem ... factis exprimo for verbi ... factor at Iac. 1,23. For Erasmus' avoidance of facio voluntatem, see on Ioh. 4,34.
21 conspicua fiant $\varphi \propto v \in \rho \omega \theta \tilde{\eta}$ ("manifestentur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on lob. 1,31. Erasmus uses conspicuus in four other places: Mt. 6,5, 18 (both in rendering $\varphi$ aivw); Act. 4,16 (in 1519, for
 does not occur anywhere in the Vulgate.

21 facta (1st.) हैp $\gamma \alpha$ ("opera" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at about twenty-five other places, mostly in 1516, in accordance with Vulgate usage at e.g. Lc. 23,41; Rom. 8,13. Usually Erasmus retains opus. Possibly the present alteration was intended to preserve the linguistic connection between $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \rho \gamma \alpha$ and cipүaopéva (rendered by sint facta), whereas the use of opus made it appear to be connected with operor earlier in the sentence, which was based on a different Greek verb, moté $\omega$.
21 ipsius á̛тоũ ("eius" $1516=$ Vg.). See on ipsius in vs. 20. Manetti again preferred sua.

21 quod ... sint ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{T} \tau \mathrm{I} . .$. 白 $\sigma \tau 1 v$ ("quia sunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20.
21 per deum ह̉v $\theta \varepsilon \underset{\text { a ( }}{ } \mathbf{i}$ in deo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus treats $\mathfrak{e j v}$ as having an instrumental sense here: cf. on Ioh. 1,26. Similar changes occur at Iob. 13,31-2; 14,13-14; 16,25, 30; 17,11, 17, 19; 20,31 (all in 1519).
22 morabatur $\delta$ เ̇́тpı $\beta \varepsilon$ ("demorabatur" Vg.). This substitution also occurs at Act. 25,14 (1516 only). At four passages, Erasmus retains demoror: Act. 14,3; 15,35; 20,6; 25,6. At other passages, in 1519, he tries commoror (Act. 14,$28 ; 16,12$; 25,14 ), following Vulgate usage at Act. 12,19; and versor (Ioh. 11,54). Manetti substituted commorabatur.

22 ac koi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
 zans" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,28.

23 ac kai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
24 coniectus $\beta \in \beta \lambda \eta \mu$ évos ("missus" Vg.). Erasmus makes a similar substitution at seventeen other passages, as mitto primarily relates to "sending" rather than "throwing". Elsewhere, Erasmus uses several other compounds of iacio to replace mitto: including iacio, abiicio, eiicio, obiicio, and proiicio. On coniicio, see further on Iob. 7,44; and see on Ioh. 13,2, for the alternative substitution of immitto.

25 Orta est $̇$ £̇ย̇veto ("Facta est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,17.
25 autem ouvv. Erasmus retains autem from the contemporary printed Vulgate, whereas the more literal ergo might have been expected, as in many Vulgate mss. The use of autem is closer to the Greek $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as found in $\boldsymbol{N}^{*}$. Other instances of autem for $\mathrm{o}^{2} v$ occur at Ioh. 12,2; 19,13.

25 Iudaeis 'lovס๙í $\omega \nu$. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1, in agreement with the Vulgate ("some Jews", or "the Jews"), supported by $3^{76}$ $\aleph^{*}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' codd. 2 and 817 had 'louסגiou ("a Jew"), in company with most other mss., commencing with $7^{75}{ }^{75}$ corr A B N W ${ }^{\text {supp }} 070086$. The less widely attested reading passed from Erasmus into the Textus Receptus.
$26{ }^{\text {² }} \mathrm{P} \alpha \beta \beta$ Ei. This spelling was derived from cod. 2: see on Iob. 1,38.
26 is oútos ("hic" $1516=V g$.). This change was possibly intended to avoid any misunderstanding of hic as meaning "here", a kind of ambiguity
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et omnes veniunt ad eum. ${ }^{27}$ Respondit loannes, et dixit: Non potest homo accipere quicquam, nisi fuerit ei datum e coelo. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Ipsi}$ vos testes estis, quod dixerim, Non sum ego Christus, sed missus sum ante illum. | ${ }^{29}$ Qui habet sponsam, sponLB 354 sus est: amicus autem sponsi qui stat et audit eum, gaudio gaudet propter vocem sponsi. Hoc ergo gaudium meum impletum est. ${ }^{30}$ Illum oportet crescere, me vero minui. ${ }^{31}$ Qui e supernis venit, supra omnes est. Qui e terra profectus est, terrenus est, et e terra loquitur. Qui e coelo venit, supra omnes est, ${ }^{32}$ et quod vidit et audiuit, hoc testatur, et testimonium eius nemo accipit. ${ }^{33}$ Qui accepit eius testimonium, is obsignauit quod deus verax sit. ${ }^{34} \mathrm{Nam}$ is quem misit deus, verba dei loquitur: non enim buic ad mensuram dat deus spiritum. ${ }^{35}$ Pater diligit filium, et omnia dedit illi in manum. ${ }^{36}$ Qui credit

27 Ioannes $A$-C $E$ : Iohannes $D|\mathrm{e} B-E: \operatorname{de} A| 28$ testes estis $B$-E: testimonium perhibetis $A \mid$ 30 vero $B$-E: autem $A \mid 31$ e supernis $B-E$ : desursum $A \mid$ alt. e $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ profectus $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ terrenus $B$-E: de terra $A \mid$ tert e $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ quart. e $B-E$ : de $A \mid 33$ eius testimonium, is $B-E$ : is eius testimonium $A \mid 34 \mathrm{Nam}$ is quem $B-E$ : Quem enim $A \mid$ huic $B-E$ (ital): om. $A \mid$ 35 illi in manum $B$-E: in manu eius $A$
to which Erasmus was sensitive. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 1,18; 9,20 (both 1519). Erasmus also sometimes puts iste for bic, for the same reason: see Act. 6,14 (1519); 8,10 (1522). Cf. also on Act. 9,14, on boc loco for bic.
$27 e$ èk ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
28 vos $\dot{4} \mu$ кis ("vos mihi" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text, having úueis $\mu \mathrm{OL}$, as in $7^{66}$ A B D $083086^{\text {rid }}$ and many later
 Erasmus follows his codd. 2 and 817 , supported by $\exists^{75} \mathcal{N}$ and many later mss. The same change was made by Manetti.

28 testes estis $\mu$ артиреĩte ("testimonium perhibetis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,7.

28 sed $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ öt 1 ("sed quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put sed quod.
 1,26.
31 e supernis äv $v \theta \varepsilon v$ ("desursum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 3.
31 supra (twice) ह̇máva ("super" late Vg.). This substitution, in effect, restores the earlier Vulgate wording. There are many discrepancies among the Vulgate mss. at other passages containing these words. Erasmus generally reserves supra for "above" (rendering ėmávoc, ư $\pi$ tip, and occasionally mapó and úmepáv $\omega$ ), and super for "on" (rendering Emi ), though with some inconsistencies. This resulted in many alterations
to the late Vulgate, which seems to use the words interchangeably. For this distinction of meaning, see Valla Elegantiae II, 53; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 320, 11. 137-139.
$31 e$ (2nd. to 4th.) ék ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,15, and Annot.
 est" $1516=$ late Vg .; Annot., lemma). The wordorder de terra est is found in several printed editions of the late Vulgate, including that of Froben in 1491. It was also exhibited by the much earlier printed edition, supposedly dated c. 1465 , which Erasmus acquired between 1522 and 1525 ("meus veteris typographiae": Annot. 1527; cf. Apolog. adv. debacch. Pett. Sutor., LB IX, 766 E). In Annot., Erasmus further attributes the same reading to some Vulgate mss. However, the earlier Latin mss. generally have a different word-order, est de terra, and this is the reading found in Froben's Vulgate edition of 1514, as also printed in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. Similar additions of proficiscor occur at $M t .1,20 ; 5,37$ : see also the next note. Manetti put Existens autem de terra.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .). In 1519, Erasmus distinguishes between the two occurrences of ék tĩs $\gamma$ ग̃js by translating the first in the sense of origin (proficiscor e), and the second, here, in the sense of character (terrenus). This has the further benefit of avoiding the confusing repetition of de terra est. As indicated in Annot., some copies of the late Vulgate omitted de terra est et, as exemplified by the Koberger folio edition of 1501 and the Sacon folios of 1506 and 1509. This clause was, however, included in the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514 , and was duly printed in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. The passage is listed in the Ad Placandos, from 1519 onwards.

33 Qui ó ("Qui autem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek support.

33 accepit $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \nu$ ("acceperit" late Vg .). This use of acceperit (whether understood as a perfect subjunctive or a future perfect) was not required by the sentence structure, though it was widespread among the printed editions of the late Vulgate at this passage. Erasmus more correctly substituted the perfect indicative. The earlier Vulgate had accipit.

33 is (Vg. omits; 1516 inserts is after accepit). The pronoun is clearly misplaced in the 1516 edition, arising from a mistake by the printer or one of Erasmus' assistants. Either in his working copy of the Latin Vulgate, or in a transcript prepared by an assistant, Erasmus probably added is in the margin, intending that this pronoun should link the second verb more smoothly with the subject of the sentence. If he did not legibly mark the position in the line where the word was to be inserted, this could easily have given rise to a later error.

33 obsignauit ह̇oథpóyıбEv ("signauit" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 27,66; Rom. 15,28 (for adsigno); 2 Cor. 1,22; Eph. 1,13; 4,30; Ap. Iob. 10,4; 22,10 (both in 1519), but retains signo at Ap. Iob. 5,1; 7,3-8; 20,3. At Iob. 6,27 (1519) he puts consigno. Although signo is common in classical usage in the sense of attaching a seal, it has a wide range of other connotations. Erasmus prefers a word which less ambiguously conveys the required sense of confirming with a seal. See Annot.

33 quod Ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
34 Nam is quem öv $\gamma$ 人́ ("Quem enim" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In 1516, the substitution of nam for enim occurs twenty-eight times in Matthew and Mark, and also frequently in the Epistles, but with only three instances in Luke, John and Acts, and none in the Apocalypse, providing another example of Erasmus' less thorough revision of these four books. In 1519, nam is introduced into Luke, John and Acts at eight further passages. The change is mainly for the sake of varying the vocabulary. Overall, enim remains more frequent than nam. Another substitute for enim is siquidem, used frequently in the Epistles, and also at Iob. 4,47 (1519): see ad loc. Erasmus further inserts the pronoun is, to provide a clearer subject for loquitur.

34 buic (omitted in $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). Erasmus adds a pronoun here, in italics, to make clear that the Spirit was given "without measure" to Christ alone. See Annot., and also Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 252 B-C.
 eius" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus gives a less literal rendering here, in order to avoid the interpretation of in manu as implying "by the hand of Christ": see Annot.
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filio, habet vitam aeternam: qui vero non credit filio, non videbit vitam, sed ira dei manet super eum.

4Vt ergo cognouit dominus, audisse Pharisaeos, quod Iesus plures discipulos faceret et baptizaret quam loannes ${ }^{2}$ (quanquam Iesus ipse non baptizaret, sed discipuli eius), ${ }^{3}$ reliquit Iudaeam et abiit iterum in Galilaeam. ${ }^{4}$ Oportebat autem eum transire per Samariam. ${ }^{5}$ Venit ergo in ciuitatem Samariae, quae dicitur Sychar, iuxta praedium quod dedit Iacob Ioseph filio suo. ${ }^{6}$ Erat autem ibi fons lacob. Iesus ergo fatigatus ex itinere, sedebat sic super fontem. Hora erat ferme sexta: ${ }^{7}$ venit mulier Samaritana, vt hauriret aquam. Dicit ei

4,6 prius $\pi \eta \gamma \eta A B D E: \pi \cup \gamma \eta C \mid 7 \alpha u \ln B-E: \alpha u \eta A$

36 prius filio $C$ : in filium $A B \mid$ vero non credit $C$ - $E$ : autem incredulus est $A B$
4,4 per $A^{c} B-E$ : per mediam $A^{*} \mid 5$ dicitur $A$-C E: dixitur $D \mid 7$ Samaritana $B$-E: Samaria $A$

36 filio (1st.) Eis tòv vióv ("in filium" 1516$19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The 1522 edition makes a similar change at Ioh. 11,48. At the present passage, perhaps, the intention was to produce a neat symmetry with credit filio in the next part of the sentence. However, this rendering is less accurate, as the Greek construction is not the same in both places. Usually Erasmus retains credo in, followed by the accusative, when rendering miotevic els at other passages. The difference of meaning is not unimportant, as the use of the dative case might indicate no more than a belief that the words of Christ were true, whereas the use of credo in followed by the accusative implies a belief in or upon the person of Christ: expressing the difference between mere intellectual belief and a truly spiritual faith and trust. The usage "believe upon" is very common in John's Gospel, but infrequent elsewhere.
36 vero $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
 $19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus chooses a simpler expression here. By contrast, at Rom. 11,30, he substitutes incredulus for non credo, influenced by the presence of incredulitas later in that verse.
$36 \mu^{\prime} v e \varepsilon$. In Annot., Erasmus cites an alternative reading, $\mu \in v \varepsilon i ̃$, in which the changed accent indicates a future tense ("will remain"), found in cod. 817. His own preference was for the present tense, $\mu$ ével, in accordance with other mss. ("nonnullis exemplaribus"), as exemplified by codd. 1 and 2. This matter was further discussed in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 180 E-F.

4,1 dominus kúpios ("lesus" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having 'Inooũs, as found in $\mathcal{D} 086$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, here supported by $79^{6675}$ A B C W ${ }^{\text {supp }} 083$ and most of the later mss., together with the mss. used by Valla Annot. The doubtful repetition of
'Inooũs in this sentence, as exemplified by cod. $\kappa$, has been claimed by some as a lectio difficilior, proving authenticity. From the point of view of transcriptional probability, however, as both of these divine names were generally abbreviated as IC and KC , an accidental change could equally have been made in either direction. For other examples of substitutions of 'Inooũs for kúpios, enjoying support from D and cod. 1 , see e.g. Lc. 7,13; 13,15; 22,61. At the present passage, it remains that $\delta$ kúpios is the more widely attested reading, as well as being the first instance in the Gospel of John where Jesus is directly referred to as "the Lord". Manetti similarly had dominus.
 ("quia audierunt Pharisaei" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,34 for other substitutions of the accusative and infinitive construction. Manetti put quod audierant Pbarisei.

2 lesus ipse 'İסoũs aútós ("Iesus" Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by only a few of the later Greek mss. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.

3 iterum $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda I v$. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate in adding $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı$, supported by $7^{66} 75 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{~B}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C} D \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }} 083086$ and a few later mss. In codd. 2 and 817, the word is omitted, with support from most other mss., commencing with codd. A B*. Since Erasmus made no mark or correction in cod. 2 at this point, it is possible that this is among the passages where his assistants made unauthorised use of cod. 1 to make the Greek text conform more closely with the Vulgate. It has been suggested that the omission of this word could have arisen from an ancient scribal error, or through deliberate deletion. It is also true that the word is used more frequently in John than in the other Gospels, and could therefore be said to be a distinctive feature of his style. However, there is the further possibility that the word was an ancient editorial insertion, designed to indicate that this was a second return into Galilee, having in mind that an earlier return appears to be referred to at $I o h$. 1,43 . See on Ioh. 6,15 for another passage where there is a divergence among the mss. concerning má $\lambda ı v$. Manetti omitted the word, following the text of most Greek mss.

4 per Sid ("per mediam" 1516 Lat. text $=$ late Vg.). This late Vulgate addition lacks Greek
support, and was deleted in the errata of the 1516 edition, thus restoring the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot. In Manetti's version, mediam was omitted.
$4 \Sigma \alpha \mu \alpha i^{\prime} \alpha$. This spelling is derived from cod. 2, while most mss. have oounapeios. In vs. 5 where cod. 2 has $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha p \varepsilon i \alpha \rho$, the Erasmian text puts $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha$ pias to conform with vs. 4 . See also Iob. 4,7, 9, 39; 8,48.

6 ergo oũv ("autem" Vg. 1527 and some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate reading has little support from Greek mss. Cf. on Ioh. 3,25. Manetti put igitur.

6 éka0iלદro. This is an arbitrary correction by Erasmus or his assistants, without ms. authority: his mss. all had ékoӨ́̇Цєто. His text made


 to $\kappa \alpha \theta_{1} \zeta o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l ~ a t ~ A c t . ~ 6,15 ; ~ w h i l e ~ r e t a i n i n g ~$
 Ioh. 20,12.

6 super émi ("supra" late Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,31 for the distinction of meaning. Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot. The version of Manetti also had super.

6 Hora $\omega \rho \alpha$ ("Hora autem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is virtually unsupported among the Greek mss., except by cod. W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$.

6 ferme $\dot{6} \sigma \varepsilon i($ "quasi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
7 Samaritana ék Tñs इauapiós ("de Samaria" Vg.; "Samaria" 1516). The substitution of Samaritana is superior to the Vulgate rendering, for the context indicates that the woman was from the town of Sychar, in the region of Samaria, rather than from the city named Samaria. The spelling $\sum \alpha \mu \alpha p i \alpha s$, for $\sum \alpha \mu \alpha p \varepsilon i \alpha \alpha$, is derived from cod. 2, as in vs. 4 . For the change to an adjectival form of the name, see on Ioh. 1,45 (Nazarenus).

7 vt bauriret ${ }^{\alpha} v \tau \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha 1$ ("haurire" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 (vt baptizarem). Manetti anticipated Erasmus in this rendering. At vs. 15 , in a similar context, Erasmus again resembles Manetti in putting ad bauriendum.

7 Dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). Erasmus conforms with the earlier Vulgate, more accurately rendering the present tense. Manetti likewise had Dicit.
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Iesus: Da mihi quod bibam. ${ }^{8} \mathrm{Nam}$ discipuli eius abierant in ciuitatem, vt cibos emerent. ${ }^{9}$ Dicit ergo ei mulier illa Samaritana: Quomodo tu Iudaeus quum sis, potum a me poscis quae sum mulier Samaritana? Non enim commercium habent Iudaei cum Samaritanis. ${ }^{10}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: Si scires donum dei, et quis sit qui dicit tibi: Da mihi quod bibam: tu petisses ab eo, et dedisset tibi aquam viuam. ${ }^{11}$ Dicit ei mulier: Domine, neque quo haurias, habes, et puteus profundus est: vnde ergo habes aquam illam viuam? ${ }^{12} \mathrm{Num}$ tu maior es patre nostro lacob, qui dedit nobis puteum, et ipse ex eo bibit, et filii eius et pecora eius? ${ }^{13}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: Omnis qui bibit ex aqua hac, sitiet ite|rum. ${ }^{14}$ Quisquis autem LB 356 biberit ex aqua quam ego dabo ei, non sitierit in aeternum: sed aqua quam ego dabo ei, fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam. ${ }^{15}$ Dicit illi mulier: Domine, da mihi istam aquam vt non sitiam, neque veniam huc ad hauriendum. ${ }^{16}$ Dicit ei lesus: Vade, voca virum tuum, et veni huc.
 $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha p ı \tau \alpha і s A \mid 14 \delta і \psi \eta \sigma \eta$ B-E: $\delta ı \psi \eta \sigma \in 1 A$

7 quod bibam $B-E$ : bibere $A \mid 9$ potum $B-E$ : bibere $A \mid$ commercium habent $B-E$ : commertium $A \mid 10$ quod bibam $B$ - $E$ : bibere $A \mid 11$ profundus $B$ - $E$ : altus $A \mid 14$ sitierit $B-E$ : sitiet $A \mid$ 15 illi $B$ - $E$ : ad eum $A \mid$ istam $B-E$ : hanc $A \mid$ ad hauriendum $B-E$ : haurire $A \mid 16$ ei $A B D E$ : ai $C$

7 quod bibam Tıİ̃ ("bibere" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus substitutes a more Latin phrase for the literal Vulgate rendering. Similar changes occur at Mt. 14,16; Mc. 6,37; Lc. 9,13; Ioh. 4,10, 33 (all in 1519), but not at Mt. 25,35. Sometimes he supplies a noun, as in dare cibum at Mt. 25,42; Lc. 8,55, and poscis potum at Ioh. 4,9 (all in 1519). Manetti preferred ad bibendum both here and in vs. 10 (the first hand of Pal.

Lat. 45 had bibere in both places, changed to ad bibendum by a later correction).
8 Nam үáp ("enim" Vg.). See on Iob. 3,34.
$8 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \sigma \propto v$. This spelling came from

 The 1516 edition had -ĩtıs, $-\mathbf{i t i \delta O}$ and -ícols, partly derived from cod. 2 . This ms. originally
had -Eĩtis, -eitioos and then, inconsistently, -itans. Erasmus changed the first two spellings to agree with the third, writing his corrections into the ms. See on vss. 4, 5, 7, 39 .
9 potum $\pi$ เیĩ ("bibere" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 7.
9 commercium babent ... cum סurХpãvtal ("coutuntur" Vg.; "commertium ... cum" 1516, omitting "habent"). The omission of babent in 1516 is a grammatical error, probably arising from the printer or one of Erasmus' assistants misreading his intended alteration here. In Annot., he notes the absence of the verb coutor from classical usage, and further includes this in the Soloecismi. He defended his treatment of this word in Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 396 D.
10 sit द̇שTוV ("est" Vg.). This subjunctive is made necessary by the earlier use of scires.
10 quod bibam т1घ̃v ("bibere" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 7.
 Erasmus comments in Annot. (following Valla Annot.), that forsitan is a misunderstanding of $\alpha{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} v$, and inconsistent with the treatment of $\varepsilon \in \delta \omega K \varepsilon \nu$ äv shortly afterwards. He similarly omits forte and forsitan at Mt. 11,23; Iob. 5.46 ( 1516 only); 8,19. Manetti here substituted vtique for forsitan, similar to the unsatisfactory change which Erasmus made in 1519 at Ioh. 5,46, in accordance with Vulgate usage at a number of other passages. In Annot. on Ioh. 14,7, 28, Erasmus expresses approval of the Vulgate use of vtique, and appears to take issue with Valla's objection to the word. However, Valla's approach to the present passage was preferable, treating ${ }^{\circ} \nu$ as redundant for the purpose of translation. See on lob. 18,30 for Erasmus' questionable use of baud-
 also suggests poposisises as an alternative for petisses.
11 quo baurias ăvт ${ }^{2} \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ ("in quo haurias" Vg.). Adopting a suggestion of Valla Annot., Erasmus regarded the omission of in as better Latin style. In Annot,, again borrowing from Valla, he recommends an alternative, baustrum, which was found in Lucretius 5, 516. He did not, however, venture to include this word in his translation, perhaps on the grounds of its rarity in classical usage. Manetti tried instrumentum bauriendi.

11 profundus $\beta \alpha \theta \dot{\prime}$ ("altus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The logical reason for Erasmus' objection to altus is that this word relates to height, while profundus relates to depth: cf. profunditas for allitudo ( $\beta$ व́̈os) at Mt. 13,5; Rom. 11,33; Ap. Ioh. 2,24; profundus for altissimus at 2 Cor. 8,2. See Annot.
11 aquam illam tò üठ $\omega \rho$ tó ("aquam" Vg.). Erasmus adds illam to convey the significance of the Greek article in referring back to the mention of living water in vs. 10.
12 Num $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,4.
13 ólngoũs. The Erasmian text again arbitrarily inserts the article, contrary to the reading of codd. 1, 2, 817 and most other mss., commencing with $7^{66} 75 \mathrm{~K}$ A B C D W Wupp 083. The addition is supported only by codd. N 086 and a few later mss. This less well attested reading passed into the Textus Receptus. See on Ioh. 1,48.
14 Quisquis òs ... ẳv ("Qui" Vg.). Erasmus quite often substitutes quisquis and quicunque for $q u i$ and omnis $q u i$, but also retains $q u i$ at many other such passages. In the Vulgate, quisquis occurs only rarely. For the interchangeability of quisquis and quicunque, see Valla Elegantiae III, 16; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, $A S D$ I, 4, p. 308, 11. 774775.
14 sitierit $\delta \iota \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ("sitiet" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The 1516 edition has $\delta 1 \psi$ ńбध, following codd. 1 , 2 and 817 , in company with $3 \beta^{75} \mathrm{~K}$ ABD N 083 and some later mss. In 1519, Erasmus' adoption of $\delta 1 \psi \eta \dot{\sigma}$ n was supported by $7^{66}$ $\mathrm{C}^{\text {cort }} \mathrm{W}^{\text {supp }} 086$ and most of the later mss. (but not by cod. 3, which has $\left.\delta 1 \psi \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \mathrm{E}\right)$.
15 illi $\pi$ тpòs aưtóv ("ad eum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs e.g. at Act. 22,10. Erasmus' use of the dative was more in accordance with good Latin style, but was less literal than the Vulgate. He was content to retain ad eum at Ioh. 2,3; 3,4. At Act. 1,7, he puts ad illos for eis.
15 istam toũto ("hanc" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The use of istam makes clear the connection with the living water of which Jesus had just spoken: see on Ioh. 2,18 for this idiomatic use of iste.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,33 (vt baptizarem). Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change (the first hand of Pal Lat. 45 had haurire, changed to ad bauriendum by a later correction). At vs. 7, Erasmus again resembled Manetti in putting vt bauriret, in a similar context.
16 Dicit $\lambda \hat{E} \gamma \varepsilon \leq$ ( "Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 7.
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${ }^{17}$ Respondit mulier, et dixit ei: Non habeo virum. Dicit ei Iesus: Bene dixisti, Non habeo virum. ${ }^{18}$ Quinque enim viros habuisti, et nunc quem habes, non est tuus vir. Hoc vere dixisti. ${ }^{19}$ Dicit ei mulier: Domine, video quod propheta es tu. ${ }^{20}$ Patres nostri in monte hoc adorauerunt: et vos dicitis, quod Hierosolymis est locus, vbi oporteat adorare. ${ }^{21}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Mulier, crede mihi, venit hora quando neque in monte hoc, neque Hierosolymis adorabitis patrem. ${ }^{22}$ Vos adoratis quod nescitis, nos adoramus quod scimus, quia salus ex Iudaeis est. ${ }^{23}$ Sed venit hora, et nunc est, quando veri adoratores adorabunt patrem spiritu ac veritate. Nam et pater tales quaerit qui adorent ipsum. ${ }^{24}$ Spiritus est deus, et eos qui adorant eum, spiritu ac veritate oportet adorare. ${ }^{25}$ Dicit ei mulier: Scio quod Messias venturus est, qui dicitur Christus: quum ergo venerit ille, nobis nuntiabit omnia. ${ }^{26}$ Dicit ei lesus: Ego sum qui loquor tibi.
${ }^{27} \mathrm{Et}$ continuo venerunt discipuli eius, et mirabantur quod cum



20 oporteat adorare $B$-E: adorare oportet $A \mid 21$ Hierosolymis $B$-E: in Hierosolymis $A \mid$ 23 spiritu $B-E$ : in spiritu $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ : se $A \mid 24$ spiritu $B-E$ : in spiritu $A$ | ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 25$ venturus est $B$-E: veniet $A \mid 27$ quod $B-E$ : quid $A$

17 Respondit ádrekpî̀ ("Respondit ei" Vg. 1527). The additional pronoun of the late Vulgate lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti also omitted $e$.

17 dixit ei $\mathfrak{E I T \varepsilon ย \nu}$ aủTนั ("dixit" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting ởTนั้, supported by (א) A D and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Erasmus follows cod. 2, in company with $7^{66} 75$ B C N 086 and
many later mss. It is possible that the addition of cùvẽ originally arose as a scribal harmonisation to context, influenced by the ubiquitous presence of indirect pronouns after verbs of speech in this part of the chapter.
17 Dicit $\lambda \hat{\text { éfel ( }}$ (Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 7.
17 dixisti $\mathfrak{\text { fltas }}$ öTı ("dixisti, quia" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects strongly to the use of quia at this point, not only because it is
superfluous and not good Latin usage, but because it makes Jesus appear to say, absurdly, that he had no husband. Manetti solved the problem by putting dixisti quod non babes.
18 © ởvíp. Erasmus, or one of his assistants, adds the article, $\delta$, from cod. 1 , with little other ms. support: the reading seems to be peculiar to family 1 . He perhaps felt that the article was required by the sense.
19 quod ötı ("quia" Vg). See on Ioh. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
20 quod ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Tl}$ ("quia" Vg). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti again made the same change.
20 oporteat adorare $\delta$ Eĩ тpookuveiv ("adorare oportet" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus observes classical Latin usage in adopting the subjunctive for reported speech. The Vulgate reflects a different Greek word-order, пpoakuveiv $\delta$ Eĩ, found in $3{ }^{6675}$ ※ A B C* D N (W) and a few later mss. The word-order of Erasmus' text follows codd. 1,2 and (817), with cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss.
21 Dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \in 1$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 7.
 $=$ some Vg. mss.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Some older Vulgate mss. have quia venit. Manetti put quod veniet.
21 Hierosolymis èv 'Isporoxúnoıs ("in Hierosolymis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Such substitutions of the locative case of place names occur elsewhere in 1519 at $L$ c. 2,25, 43; 9,31; 13,4; 24,18; Ioh. 10,22; Act. 1,8; 2,5; 67; 8,40; 9,21, 28, 36, 43; 10,1; 13,5; 14,1, 8, 25; 16,2; 25,4; 1 Thess. 2,2. At three passages in 1519, Erasmus uses the locative of the singular form of the name, Hierosolymae (Act. 1,$19 ; 9,13 ; 21,11$ ). The locative appears in the Vulgate at many other passages, e.g. at $M c$. 14,3; Lc. 23,7; Iob. 2,23; 4,20 (late Vg.), 45; 5,2.
 from cod. 2.
23 spiritu ėv $\pi$ Tvéúuctı ("in spiritu" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,26
$23 a c \mathrm{kal}$ ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
23 ipsum ởtóv ("eum" Vg.; "se" 1516). The change to ipsum makes clear that the one who is to be adored is God the Father, the subject of the sentence: see Annot.
 See on Iob. 1,26.

24 ac кai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.

25 quod ótı ("quia" Vg). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
25 Meøolas. The 1516 edition has Mevias, as in codd. 2 and 817 and most other late mss. (but not cod. 1). The substitution of Meooias in 1519 is supported by $77^{66(75)}$ א A B C D N W supp and some later mss. (but not cod. 3). Erasmus made a similar change at Iob. 1,41.
25 venturus est $\epsilon^{\varepsilon} \mathrm{PX} \varepsilon \tau \propto 1$ ("venit" Vg.; "veniet" 1516). The change to veniet in 1516 was in accordance with some mss. of the Vulgate, as cited in Annot. The rendering of the present tense of épxoual by a future tense in Latin occurs in 1516 at Iob. 5,24, 25, 28; 16,2, and in 1519 at lob. 4,$35 ; 7,41,42 ; 11,27 ; 14,3 ; 16,25$, and is consistent with Vulgate usage at $I o b$. 6,14.
25 nuntiabit ávoçyE入eĩ ("annunciabit" Vg.). This change was unnecessary and inconsistent with Erasmus' retention of annuncio at ten other passages, though the Vulgate itself uses nuntio at Iob. 5,15; Act. 16,38.
25 ätavta. This reading was taken from cod. 1, either by Erasmus or by his assistants, with support from $3^{6675} \times$ B C ${ }^{*}$ Wsupp and a few later mss. In Erasmus' codd. 2, 817, the spelling is Távida, as found in codd. A C corr D N 086 and most of the later mss. The form armas is not used elsewhere by John, but is most frequent in Luke and Acts.
26 Dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \mathrm{y}$ ( "Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 7.
26 tibi $\sigma 01$ ("tecum" Vg.). Erasmus is more literal here. The Vulgate rendering may have been influenced by the presence of loqueris cum $e a$ in the following verse, where the Greek has

27 тоútu. The 1516 edition has toũto in the Greek text, as in cod. 2, without other ms. support, but Erasmus correctly has toúte in Annot., and in the 1516 errata.
27 quod ठт 1 ("quid" 1516 = Annot., lemma; "quia" Vg. $1527=$ Vg. mss.). Erasmus notes in Annot., that quid is not a correct translation of ötl, and speculates that the Vulgate is based on a Greek text reading ti here, though there appears to be no ms. authority for this. The late Vulgate rendering which he cites is no doubt a corruption internal to the Latin tradition, originally quia but harmonised with the two following occurrences of quid later in the same verse. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in substituting quod.
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muliere loqueretur. Nemo tamen dixit, Quid quaeris, aut cur loqueris cum ea? ${ }^{28}$ Reliquit ergo hydriam suam mulier, et abiit in ciuitatem, et dicit illis hominibus: ${ }^{29}$ Venite, videte hominem, qui dixit mihi omnia quaecunque feci: num hic est ille Christus? ${ }^{30}$ Exierunt ergo e ciuitate, et veniebant ad eum. ${ }^{31}$ Interea rogabant eum discipuli, dicentes: Rabbi, comede. ${ }^{32}$ Ille autem dixit eis: Ego cibum habeo comedendum, quem vos nescitis. ${ }^{33}$ Dicebant ergo discipuli inter se: Nunquis attulit ei quod ederet? ${ }^{34}$ Dicit eis Iesus: Meus cibus est vt faciam quod vult is qui misit me, et perficiam opus eius. ${ }^{35}$ Nonne vos dicitis: Adhuc quatuor menses sunt, et messis veniet? Ecce dico vobis, attollite oculos vestros, et videte regiones, quoniam albae sunt iam ad messem. ${ }^{36}$ Et qui metit, mercedem accipit: et congregat fructum in vitam aeternam: vt et qui seminat, simul gaudeat, et qui metit. ${ }^{37}$ In hoc enim est sermo verus, quod alius est qui seminat,

## $33 \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda$ ous $A-D: \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta$ кous $E \mid 36$ alt. $\circ$ Өєpı $\zeta \omega \nu$ B-E: $\theta \varepsilon \rho ı \zeta \omega v ~ A$

27 cur $B$ - $E$ : quid $A \mid 29$ num $B-E$ : Nunquid $A \mid 30$ e $B$-E: de $A \mid 31$ comede $B-E$ : manduca $A \mid 32$ comedendum $B$-E: manducare $A \mid 33$ Nunquis $B-E$ : Num quis $A \mid$ quod ederet $B$ - $E$ : manducare $A \mid 34$ quod vult is $B$-E: voluntatem eius $A \mid$ et $B$-E: vt $A \mid 35$ dicitis $B$-E: dicitis quod $A \mid$ veniet $B-E$ : venit $A \mid$ attollite $B-E$ : leuate $A \mid$ quoniam $B-E$ : quod $A \mid$ sunt $B-E$ : $\operatorname{sint} A \mid 37$ sermo verus $B-E$ : verbum verum $A$

27 cur тi ("quid" $1516=$ Vg.). See on lob. 1,25, and Annot.
28 dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \in 1$ ("dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 7.
29 Venite $\Delta \varepsilon$ ũte ("Venite et" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek support. Manetti also omitted et.
29 num $\mu \dot{\prime} \tau \mathrm{l}$ ("Nunquid" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 3,4.
29 bic oữos ("ipse" Vg.). The Vulgate seems to reflect the substitution of aútós for oũtos,
though without ms. support. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
29 ille Christus ó Xpıotós ("Christus" Vg.). The use of ille conveys the force of the Greek article, "the Christ".
30 ék ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
31 "P $\alpha \beta \beta \varepsilon$ i. This spelling was derived from cod. 2: see on Ioh. 1,38.
31 comede $\varphi$ á $\gamma \varepsilon$ ("manduca" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus generally eliminates manduco from the
N.T., substituting edo, comedo, capio cibum, or vescor. In 1519, manduco is retained only at Mc. 8,1; Iob. 6,31. In classical Latin, manduco means "chew" and only later became a standard word for "eat".
32 comedendum раүкĩv ("manducare" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On manduco, see the previous note. For Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33.
33 inter se тро̀s $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda$ ous ("ad inuicem" Vg.). Erasmus treats inuicem as an adverb rather than a noun, and removes all instances of inuicem when following a preposition. As well as inter se, he also elsewhere substitutes such phrases as inter sese, alius alium, and alter ab altero. Sometimes he simply added a pronoun, as in vos inuicem at Iob. 15,12. In the Soloecismi, re Act. 2,12, Erasmus objects that ad inuicem is unknown in classical Latin. See also on Iob. 13,34, below, for his use of vos mutuo at several passages. On the uses of inuicem, see Valla Elegantiae II, 59; III, 74; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, $A S D$ I, 4, p. 222, 11. 415-417; p. 264, 11. 573-577. The spelling $\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta$ kous in the 1535 edition is clearly a printing error: see on Ioh. 1,24.
33 Nunquis Mítıs ("Nunquid aliquis" Vg.). In 1516, Erasmus had the spelling Num quis in his translation, but nunquis in Annot. At Ioh. 7,48 he changed nunquis to num quis in 1527, leaving the present passage as the only occurrence of nunquis in the N.T., possibly by an oversight.
33 quod ederet фоү६iv ("manducare" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive, and on vs. 31 regarding manduco. Manetti preferred ad manducandum (again, the first hand of Pal. Lat. 45 had manducare, changed to ad manducandum by a later correction).
34 quod vult is tò $\theta \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \eta \alpha$ ("voluntatem eius" $1516=$ Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 21,31; Iob. 6,38; Eph. 6,6 (all in 1519). Erasmus inconsistently retains facio voluntatem at Mt. 7,21; 12,50; Mc. 3,35; Hebr. 10,7, 9; 13,21; 1 Ioh. 2,17. At Ioh. 7,17; 9,31 (both in 1519) he substitutes voluntati obtempero. See on Ioh. 3,21 for Erasmus' avoidance of other expressions combining facio with an abstract concept.
34 et k $\alpha i$ ("vt" 1516 Lat. $=V \mathrm{~g}$.). Erasmus is more literal here. Since there is no Greek ms. support for a repetion of $\bar{I} v \alpha$ at this point, it is possible that the original Vulgate rendering was et (or et $v t$ ), later easily corrupted into $v t$ within the Latin tradition. See Annot. The version of Manetti likewise had et here.

35 Adbuc ő $\tau 1$ "ETl ("quod adhuc" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,20, and Annot. The version of Manetti put quod, omitting adbuc, reflecting the omission of ËTl, as in $7^{75}$ D $086^{\text {vid }}$ and many later mss.
35 тєтра́д $\mu \eta v \frac{v}{}$. This was the reading which Erasmus cited in Annot. His codd. 1, 2 and $817^{\text {corr }}$ have тeтр́́ $\mu \eta v O S$, as in cod. 69 and nearly all other mss. In cod. $817^{*}$, тєтра́ $\mu \eta{ }^{\text {vov }}$ seems to have been the original reading.
35 veniet E้pXeTal ("venit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., Erasmus recommends ventura est. See on vs. 25 , above.
35 attolite é $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \cos ^{(" l e u a t e " ~} 1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The verb attollo occurs only once in 1516, replacing extollo at 2 Cor. 11,20. In 1519, Erasmus introduces it at a further six passages: $L c .6,20$; 18,13; 21,28; lob. 11,41; Act. 4,21, and at the present verse, replacing either leuo or eleuo. Other substitutes which he commonly used were tollo and erigo (see on Iob. 2,19). He also used tollo to replace subleuo in 1519 at Iob. 6,5; 17,1 . The result was that leuo and subleuo remained at only two passages: 1 Thess. 5,14 (where subleuo replaced suscipio), and Ap. Iob. 10,5 , while eleno was completely removed. These verbs occur in classical usage in the sense of "raise" or "lift up", but they can also mean "lessen" or "make light". Possibly Erasmus wished to avoid such an ambiguity. Cf. Valla Elegantiae V, 81; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 222, II. 392-396; p. 271, 11. 768-771. Manetti contented himself with substituting eleuate here.
35 quoniam ... sunt ${ }^{\text {ottl ("quia ... sunt" Vg.; }}$ "quod ... sint" 1516). The change to quoniam confines the interpretation to a causal sense, whereas the Vulgate is ambiguous. Manetti put quod ... sunt.
$36 \delta \theta \varepsilon \rho i \zeta \omega \nu$ (2nd.). The omission of $\delta$ in 1516 is unsupported by mss., and inconsistent with $\delta \theta \varepsilon p i \zeta \omega \nu$ and $\delta$ $\sigma \pi \varepsilon i p \omega v$ earlier in the verse.
37 sermo verus $\delta \lambda$ дóyos ... $\delta$ d́ $\lambda \eta$ ŋөıós ("verbum verum" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,1. In 1516 Annot., lemma, Erasmus attributed sermo verus to the Vulgate: even if this was cited incorrectly, it indicated that he was already considering the use of sermo in his translation. Manetti had sermo verax.
37 quod ö'tı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The change was anticipated by Manetti.
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et alius est qui metit. ${ }^{38}$ Ego misi vos ad metendum, quod vos non laborastis. Alii laborauerunt, et vos in labores eorum introistis.
${ }^{39}$ Ex ciuitate autem illa multi crediderunt in eum Samaritanorum propter sermonem mulieris, testificantis quod dixisset sibi omnia quaecunque fecisset. ${ }^{40}$ Quum venissent ergo ad illum Samaritani, rogauerunt eum vt apud se maneret. Et mansit ibi duos dies. ${ }^{41}$ Ac multo plures crediderunt propter sermonem ipsius. ${ }^{42} \mathrm{Et} \mathrm{mu-}$ lieri dicebant: Iam non propter tuam orationem credimus: ipsi enim audiuimus et scimus quod hic est | vere seruator mundi, Christus.
${ }^{43}$ Post duos autem dies exiit inde, et abiit in Galilaeam. ${ }^{44}$ Ipse enim Iesus testatus est, quod propheta in sua patria honorem non haberet. ${ }^{45}$ Quum ergo venisset in Galilaeam, exceperunt eum Galilaei, quum omnia vidissent quae fecerat Hierosolymis in die festo, et ipsi enim venerant ad diem festum. ${ }^{46}$ Venit ergo Iesus iterum in Cana Galilaeae, vbi fecerat ex aqua vinum. Et erat quidam regulus, cuius filius infirmabatur Capernaum.
 om. $A \mid 46$ ouv $A C$-E vuv $B$

38 ad metendum $B-E$ : metere $A \mid 39$ sermonem $B-E:$ verbum $A \mid$ testificantis ... sibi $B-E$ : testimonium perhibentis, dixit mihi $A \mid$ fecisset $B-E$ : feci $A \mid 40$ apud se $B-E:$ ibi $A$ | 41 Ac $B-E$ : Et $A \mid 42$ Iam $B-E:$ om. $A \mid$ orationem $B$-E: loquelam $A \mid$ seruator $B$ - $E$ : saluator $A \mid 44$ testatus est $B$-E: testimonium perhibuit $A \mid$ haberet $B$-E: habet $A \mid$ 46 fecerat $B$ - : fecit $A$

38 ad metendum $\theta_{\text {epi }} \zeta_{\mathrm{\varepsilon Lv}}$ ("metere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change (though the first hand of Pal. Lat. 45 had metere, which was changed to ad metendum by a later correction).

38 labores tòv ко́ттоv. Erasmus' rendering follows the late Vulgate. Manetti, more accurately, had laborem as in the earlier Vulgate.
$39 \Sigma \alpha \mu \alpha p \varepsilon เ \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$. The 1516 edition has $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha p 1-$ $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$, in accordance with Erasmus' handwritten correction in cod. 2 . The ms . originally had $-\varepsilon ı t \tilde{\omega} v$. See on vs. 4 , above.
39 sermonem тòv $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$ ("verbum" $1516=V$.). See on Ioh. 1,1. Manetti also had sermonem.
39 testificantis $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup р о \cup ́ \sigma \eta s ~(" t e s t i m o n i u m ~$ perhibentis" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,7.

The spelling uavtupoúons in 1519 is a misprint.
39 quod dixisset o̊ ${ }^{\text {Tl }}$ ElTte ("quia dixit" Vg.; "dixit" 1516). The 1516 omission, both in Greek and Latin, does not appear to have been based on the authority of any Greek ms. For another such omission of ô T , see on Iob. 5,24. For the avoidance of quia, see on Iob. 1,20 . Manetti also put quod here.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The conversion of direct to indirect speech avoids ambiguity here: cf. on vs. 17. Erasmus similarly converts to indirect speech at Ioh. 16,5.
$40 \sum \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \varepsilon i t \alpha$. For once the 1516 edition follows the spelling of cod. $2^{*}$ on this point, even though Erasmus amended the ms. to read $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha \rho i ̃ t \alpha$. See on vs. 4.
40 apud se $\pi \alpha \rho$ ' $\alpha \cup$ 'toĩs ("ibi" $1516=$ Vg.). The Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss. here. Possibly ibi represents a harmonisation with the use of this word later in the same verse. Manetti put apud eos.
41 Ac кaí ("Et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
 eum" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering corresponds with the addition of eis aútóv in cod. N and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by most other mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The words in eum were also omitted by Manetti.

41 ipsius $\alpha \cup ̉ T o u ̃ ~(" e i u s " ~ V g.) . ~ E r a s m u s ~ e x p l a i n s ~$ in Annot., that this change is intended to make clear that the reference is to the word of Christ rather than of the woman.
 bant quia iam non" Vg.; "dicebant, non" 1516). For the omission of quia, see on Ioh. 1,20 . The further omission of iam in 1516 may have arisen from an unclear correction by Erasmus in his working copy of the Vulgate, perhaps allowing his pen to score through quia iam instead of just through quia. Manetti put dicebant quod non amplius.

42 orationem $\lambda \alpha \lambda{ }^{\prime} \alpha \alpha^{\prime} v$ ("loquelam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus retains loquela at Mt. 26,73; Mc. 14,70, perhaps on the grounds that $\lambda \alpha \lambda l^{\prime}$ there referred to the accent or dialect, or manner of speaking, rather than the substance of the speech. However, this consideration cannot
have applied to his retention of loquela again at Iob. 8,43. In classical Latin, the word is mainly confined to poetic usage. Erasmus' use of oratio differs from the Vulgate, where this word often occurs in the sense of "prayer": see on Act. 1,14.
42 quod õtl ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

42 seruator ó $\sigma \omega т ท ́ \rho$ ("saluator" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution occurs in 1519 at all sixteen passages where saluator was used in 1516. See on Iob. 3,17 for the similar removal of saluo: neither of these words occurs in classical Latin.
42 Cbristus ó Xpıotós (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{P}^{6675} \aleph \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{~W}^{\text {supp }}$ 083 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his codd. 1,2 and 817, in company with most other mss., commencing with codd. A $C^{\text {corr }}$ D N. See Annot. The same addition was made by Manetti.

44 testatus est $\varepsilon$ घ́ $\alpha$ ртúр $\eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ ("testimonium perhibuit" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,7.
44 quod ... baberet őtı ... ễXel ("quia ... habet" Vg.; "quod ... habet" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... babet, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.

46 Iesus ó 'Inooũs (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{6675} \aleph$ B CD W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ 086 and a few later mss., including cod. 817. Erasmus follows codd. 1 and 2, supported by codd. A N and most of the later mss. Manetti made the same change.
46 fecerat $̇$ モ̇Toí $\eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ("fecit" $1516=$ Vg.). Having regard to the context, Erasmus wished to make clear that Jesus' second visit to Cana was subsequent to the miracle of the wine. For other substitutions of the pluperfect tense, see on Ioh. 1,19. Manetti had effecerat.

46 ex aqua vinum tò üठwp olvov ("aquam vinum" Vg.). Erasmus alleviates the bald, literal rendering of the Vulgate by adding a preposition. Cf. Ioh. 2,9, aquam in vinum versam for aquam vinum factum.
$46 \beta \alpha \sigma 1 \lambda_{1 k}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$. In Annot., Erasmus expresses his opinion that the true reading should be $\beta \propto \sigma$ 位$\lambda i \sigma k O s$, while admitting that this was not found in any of his mss. His suggested reading is actually found in cod. D., though with little other support.
${ }^{47}$ oũtos ákoúoas őtı ’Inooũs ŋ̃KEi ėk tท̃s
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${ }^{47}$ Hic quum audisset, quod Iesus aduenisset a Iudaea in Galilaeam, abiit ad eum, et rogabat eum vt descenderet, ac sanaret ipsius filium: siquidem is agebat animam. ${ }^{48}$ Dixit ergo Iesus ad eum: Nisi signa et prodigia videritis, non creditis. ${ }^{49}$ Dicit ad eum regulus: Domine, descende priusquam moriatur filius meus. ${ }^{50}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Vade, filius tuus viuit. Credidit homo sermoni quem dixerat ei lesus, et ibat. ${ }^{51} \mathrm{Iam}$ autem eo descendente, serui occurrerunt ei, et nunciauerunt, dicentes: Filius tuus viuit. ${ }^{52}$ Sciscitatus est ergo horam ab eis, in qua melius habuisset. Et dixerunt ei: Heri hora septima reliquit eum febris. ${ }^{53} \mathrm{Cog}$ nouit ergo pater, quod illa hora erat, in qua dixisset sibi Iesus, Filius tuus viuit: et credidit ipse, et domus eius tota. ${ }^{54} \mathrm{Hoc}$ iterum secundum signum aedidit Iesus, quum venisset a Iudaea in Galilaeam.
 $A-C$ : оı oıı๙ $D E$

47 quod $B$-E: quia $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ ipsius filium $B-E$ : filium eius $A \mid$ siquidem is agebat animam $B-E$ : Incipiebat enim mori $A \mid 50$ dixerat $B-E$ : dixit $A \mid 52$ Sciscitatus est $B-E$ : Interrogabat $A \mid 53$ dixisset sibi $B-E$ : dixit ei $A \mid 54$ aedidit $B-E$ : fecit $A$

47 quod Őтı ("quia" $1516=$ Vg.). See on loh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
$47 a c$ каi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
47 ipsius filium aủtoũ tòv vióv ("filium eius" 1516 = Vg.). The Vulgate word-order has little Greek support. Erasmus' use of ipsius makes clear that the reference is to the son of the nobleman, the subject of the sentence. Manetti preferred suum.
47 siquidem $\gamma$ áp ("enim" $1516=V g$.). See on lob. 3,34 for other substitutions for enim . The
change to siquidem occurs frequently in the Epistles, but elsewhere only at Mt. 12,34. Manetti had nam here.

47 is (Vg. omits). Erasmus adds this pronoun to make clear that the subject of the verb is the nobleman's son.
 cipiebat ... mori" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus also suggests erat enim moriturus, to replace the strange-sounding phrase of the Vulgate. Manetti actually adopted moriturus erat. However, the
use of the future participle could have meant merely that he was going to die at some time in the future (as at lob. 11,$51 ; 12,33 ; 18,32$ ), and does not so well express the imminence of death. For the same reason, Erasmus substituted agebat animam for moriturus erat at $L$ c. 7,2, referring to the centurion' servant. Other examples of the removal of incipio are found at Mc. 13,4; Lc. 21,7 (1519); Act. 3,3; 18,14 (1519); 19,27; 23,27; 27,2, 10, 30. Erasmus retained incipio for $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ at $A c t$. 27,33 (contrary to his recommendation in Annot., ad loc.); Ap. Iob. 3,16.

48 creditis тюбтev́のŋтt. Erasmus' cod. 2 had mıбтยvं $\sigma \tau \varepsilon$, future tense. The reading which was adopted in 1516, mıбтєv̇E $\varepsilon$, in the present tense, has hardly any Greek ms. support, and it is possible that Erasmus or one of his assistants introduced it by conjecture, based on the Vulgate rendering: for other pro-Vulgate conjectures, see on Ioh. 6,60 (áxov́ovtes); 8,9, 49; 9,15, 28; 14,22; 17,11, 20; 19,36; 20,29. In 1519, he restored the Greek subjunctive, mıotevं$\sigma \eta T \varepsilon$, found in most mss., including codd. 1 , 3 and 817 , but without making a corresponding change in the translation.

50 Dicit $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1}$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 7.
50 Credidit kǫ èmióqevǫv. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in omitting to render koi, though the Vulgate is probably here based on a Greek text which lacked this conjunction, as in $7^{6675} \mathrm{NBD}$ Wsupp and a few later mss. His Greek text conformed with cod. 2, supported by codd. A C N and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti accordingly translated this as et credidit.

50 dixerat घiTev ("dixit" $1516=V g$.). For the improved sequence of tenses by using the pluperfect, see on Iob. 1,19.

51 serui ol סoṽ̃ol @ủtoũ. Erasmus again follows the Vulgate rendering, ignoring the possibility that the latter reflects a Greek text in which aÚToũ is omitted, as in $\mathbb{K} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1. His Greek text here follows codd. 2 and 817, this time supported by $7^{6675}$ A B C N (W ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ ) and most later mss. For once, his assistants did not adopt the reading of cod. 1. Manetti put serui sui.

51 dicentes $\lambda \hat{y}$ Youtes ötı ("dicentes, quia" $V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put dicentes quod.

51 tuus $\sigma 00$ ("eius" Vg.). The Vulgate pronoun reflects a different Greek text, having aủzoũ, as in $77^{66^{7} 75} \times$ A B C and one or two later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $7^{66 c o r r} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{N}$ and virtually all later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 (though the latter has viós for mais). It has been suggested that oou may be a harmonisation with the similar expression $\delta$ viós $\sigma 00 \zeta \tilde{\eta}$ in vss. 50 and 53. However, it is also possible that ou'toũ arose through harmonisation with the immediately preceding sequence of aủtoũ ... aủtoũ ... aủtน̃ within vs. 51 itself. Manetti had suus.

52 Sciscitatus est $\mathfrak{\text { Ėmúveto ("Interrogabat" } 1 5 1 6}$ $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses sciscitor once elsewhere, to render $\pi u v \theta \dot{d} v o \mu a t$ at lob. 13,24. A different change occurs at Mt. 2,4, from sciscitor to percontor, a word which he substitutes for interrogo at Act. 23,19. Elsewhere, he retains interrogo in six places to render this Greek verb. The Vulgate's use of the imperfect here may either be an error of translation, or it could have reflected the reading étuvóviveto, now found in only a few of the later mss. For the distinction between interrogo, percontor, and sciscitor, see Valla Elegantiae V, 61; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 266, 11. 634-635. Cf. also on percontor at Act. 1,6.
52 babuiset EैסXє ("habuerat" Vg. 1527 and some Vg. mss.). The earlier Vulgate had babuerit, as cited in Annot., lemma.

52 Heri ötı X Xés ("quia heri" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti's rendering was quod beri. The spelling $\sigma \times \theta$ es in 1516 is another misprint.
53 quod ... erat öTı ... ("quia ... esset" late Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... sanatus fuerat.

53 dixisset EIT $\pi v$ ("dixit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,19 regarding the pluperfect tense. Manetti substituted dixerat.

53 sibi $\alpha \cup ँ \Psi \tilde{( }$ ("ei" $1516=V$ g.). Similar substitutions of this reflexive pronoun, to refer back to the main subject, occur at Mt. 1,24; 16,1; 18,28; 25,34 (1519); Mc. 10,32, 45; Lc. 8,39; Iob. 13,3 (1519); 21,17.

53 nो oikía. The reading of oikio in 1527-35 must be considered a misprint.
54 aedidit ETroinoEv ("fecit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ). See on Iob. 2,11.
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5Post haec erat dies festus Iudaeorum, et ascendit Iesus Hierosolymam. ${ }^{2}$ Est autem Hierosolymis ad Probaticam, piscina, quae nominatur Hebraice Bethesda, quinque porticus habens: ${ }^{3}$ in his iacebat multitudo magna languentium, caecorum, claudorum, aridorum, expectantium aquae motum. ${ }^{4}$ Angelus enim descendebat certo tempore in piscinam, et turbabat aquam. Itaque qui primus descendisset
 єтороббето то $A$

5,2 Hebraice $B$-E: haebraicae $A \mid$ Bethesda $C-E$ : bethsesda $A$, bethseda $B \mid 4$ enim $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ certo tempore $B$ - $E$ : secundum tempus $A \mid$ turbabat aquam $B-E$ : turbabatur aqua $A \mid$ Itaque $B-E$ : Et $A \mid$ descendisset $B$ - $E$ : descendisset in piscinam $A$
 tica" late Vg.). As pointed out in Annot., the earlier Vulgate mss. read super probatica. The omission of super is supported by cod. $\boldsymbol{\aleph}^{*}$ and one or two later Greek mss., as well as two mss. of the Old Latin version. The later Vulgate, as at a number of other passages, may here have been contaminated by interaction with part of the Old Latin tradion. Erasmus prefers ad, to avoid the ambiguity of super, which could be misunderstood as implying "on the Sheep Gate" or even "above the Sheep Pool". He included the Vulgate rendering among the Loca Obscura. The solution offered by Valla Annot. was to place super probatica before Hierosolymis.
 nominatur" Vg.). This Greek verb occurs only once elsewhere in the N.T., at Act. 15,40 , where it has the sense of "choose". Erasmus uses cognomino to translate a variety of other verbs,
 present passage he may have felt that cognomino was best reserved for names of persons rather than places. On the other hand, the verb nomino is elsewhere used to translate $k \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ and óvouá $\zeta \omega$. It would have been more in line with his customary practice in rendering $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma^{\circ}$ $\mu \varepsilon v o s$, if he had used quae dicitur (as adopted by Manetti) or quae vocatur here: cf. his retention of quae dicitur Sychar at Ioh. 4,5. The Greek text of the 1516 edition had $\eta \hat{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon y o \mu \varepsilon \dot{v} \eta$ following cod. 2, with support from cod. D and some
later mss., including cod. 1. In 1519, Erasmus restored the better attested Greek reading, found in his cod. 3, in company with cod. 817 and most other mss., commencing with $3^{66 \text { corr }} 75$ $\boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }}$ A B C N T ( $\mathrm{W}^{\text {supp }}$ ) 078.
2 Bethesda Bn $\theta$ ecód ("Bethsaida" Vg.; "bethsesda" 1516; "bethseda" 1519). Erasmus' Greek text here follows cod. 2, supported by codd. A C 078 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 (cf. $\beta \eta \sigma \theta \varepsilon \sigma \delta \alpha$ in cod. N). From the account given in Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., $A S D$ IX, 2, pp. 130-2, ll. 442-453, it appears that the spelling betbsesda, in the 1516 Latin translation, was a misprint for bethesda, corresponding with the reading $\beta \eta \theta \varepsilon \sigma \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ in the accompanying Greek text. After the pages containing the text and translation had been printed, Erasmus seems to have changed his mind on this point, as he put the spellings $\beta \dot{\eta} \theta \sigma \varepsilon \delta \alpha$ and Bethseda in 1516 Annot., and in 1519 he further introduced bethseda into the translation (inconsistently leaving $\beta \eta \theta \in \sigma \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ in the Greek text), and advocated the same spelling in the 1519-27 editions of his Loca Manifeste Deprauata. It does not seem likely that all these manifestations of betbseda were solely the fault of the compositor, as Erasmus seems to suggest in his reply to Stunica in 1521. In his 1522 edition, however, he decided to alter the translation and Annot. to read bethesda, conforming at last with his printed Greek text. His objection to Betbsaida, as found in the Vulgate, was that it appeared
to reflect a harmonisation with the town of that name in Galilee, mentioned in Ioh. 1,44. The Vulgate is supported by several early mss. which have $\beta \eta \theta \sigma \alpha \delta^{\prime} \alpha \dot{\alpha}$, namely $7^{75}$ B T W ${ }^{75}$ (cf. also $\beta_{\eta} \delta \sigma \sigma \alpha, \delta \alpha v$ in $3^{66^{*}}$ ). If this was the result of a harmonistic scribal corruption, as appears to be the case, it provides an example of how the joint testimony of the venerable mss., $3^{75}$ and B, can sometimes preserve an ancient error. Other strange spellings are to be found: $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \zeta \varepsilon \theta \dot{\alpha}$ in cod. $D$, and $\beta \eta \theta \zeta \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha}$ in cod. $\mathbb{N}$, the latter finding favour with some modern editors.
2 otod́s. Erasmus in 1516-19 has $\sigma T \omega \alpha{ }_{2} s$. His cod. 2 originally had $\sigma$ Tod́s, which he manually corrected to read $\sigma T \omega \alpha{ }^{\prime} s$, apparently without Greek ms. authority. He made the same emendation in cod. 2 at Ioh. 10,23, but his 1516 edition ignores this change and has the correct reading, $\sigma$ Toã, at that passage.

4 enim үáp ("autem" 1516 Lat. = late Vg., with most Vg. mss.). The Vulgate could reflect a Greek variant, $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, but since this has hardly any ms. support, it is more likely that autem arose simply as an imprecision of translation. In this verse, even more than usual, the 1516 Latin rendering reproduces the Vulgate wording without properly reconciling it with the accompanying Greek text: see also the notes on Itaque and descendisset. Most Vulgate mss. also here add domini, supported by the reading kupiou in cod. A and a few later mss. In omitting kupiou, Erasmus followed cod. 2, with support from $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} 078$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. It should also be mentioned that the whole section, Ekסex $\circ \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \omega \nu$ (vs. 3) to
 D T Wsupp, with one or two later mss. Though this section is condemned by many critics as a scribal 'gloss', it remains possible that an ancient editor could have deliberately excised the words because of their unusual subject matter, perhaps deeming unorthodox the notion that any miracle of healing could be performed through an angel. Erasmus' Annot. do not show any awareness of such an omission. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
4 certo tempore катф̀ кaıpóv ("secundum tempus" $1516=$ late Vg ., with some Vg. mss.). This change was perhaps made for the sake of clarity, to avoid the obscurity of secundum tempus, which could be misunderstood as meaning "a second time": cf. the substitution of
iuxta for secundum in rendering kaтò Tòv xpóvov at Mt. 2,16. At the present passage, Manetti proposed oportuno tempore.
 batur aqua" late Vg., with some Vg. mss.; "turbabatur aqua" 1516). The 1516 rendering, in the passive, is consistent with its accompanying Greek text, ह̇тapáooceto tò ű $\delta \omega \rho$, which was taken from cod. 2, with support from codd. $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} 078$ and a few later mss., including cod. 817. However, the spelling ėtapáббєтo seems to have arisen by duplication of the immediately following tó. The active form of the verb, ėт $\alpha$ poo $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon$, which Erasmus adopted in 1519 , is found in cod. 3 , in company with cod. 1 and most other mss., commencing with cod. A. In Annot., he acknowledges the existence of both readings, and also of Vulgate mss. which had mouebat. His use of the verb turbo is more vivid and forceful than moueo, and is consistent with Vulgate usage at vs. 7 , in rendering the same Greek verb. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
4 Itaque oũv ("Et" 1516 Lat. = late Vg., with some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate rendering does not appear to have any Greek support. Erasmus' Greek text here follows his usual mss. In Annot., he also suggests igitur or ergo, as found in earlier Vulgate mss. The substitution of itaque for ergo occurs at sixteen passages elsewhere in the N.T., mainly in the Epistles, and it is also sometimes substituted for igitur. However, Erasmus changes ergo to igitur far more frequently than he changes it to itaque: see on Ioh. 6,62 . The change is mainly for stylistic variety. Manetti began this sentence with Qui igitur.
4 primus три̃тоs ("prior" late Vg., with some Vg. mss.). Erasmus' rendering had been advocated by Valla Annot., and was also found in a portion of the Vulgate mss., as well as in Manetti.
 1516 Lat. = late Vg., with some Vg. mss.). Here again the late Vg. addition lacks Greek ms. support. Erasmus' Greek text, as usual, follows cod. 2, together with codd. 1 and 817, while in Annot., he mentions the absence of in piscinam from his mss., seeing this variant as an explanatory addition to the text. An interesting comment on this passage in his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 181 B-D, implies that, for the 1519 edition of the N.T., he employed an assistant, a "famulus" (described as being
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post turbationem aquae, sanus fiebat a quocunque detinebatur morbo. ${ }^{5}$ Erat autem quidam homo illic, qui triginta et octo annos morbo tenebatur. ${ }^{6}$ Hunc quum vidisset Iesus decumbentem, et cognouisset quod iam multum temporis morbo teneretur, dicit ei: Vis sanus fieri? ${ }^{7}$ Respondit ei languidus: Domine, hominem non habeo, vt quum turbata fuerit aqua, mit|tat me LB 360




5 illic, qui $B-E$ : ibi $A \mid$ morbo tenebatur $B-E$ : habens in infirmitate $A \mid 6$ decumbentem $B-E$ : iacentem $A \mid$ temporis morbo teneretur $B-E$ : tempus haberet $A \mid 7$ Sed ... iam $B$ - $E$ : Dum venio enim ego $A |$| 10 | ei $B-E$ : illi $A$ |
| :--- | :--- |

"Graeci sermonis aliquanto doctior quam nunc etiam est Leus"), to identify and correct the discrepancies which had occurred between the Greek and Latin columns of the previous edition of 1516. Manetti here put descendebat.
4 turbationem $\tau \alpha \rho \alpha \eta \dot{\nu} \nu$ ("motionem" late Vg., with some Vg. mss.). In 1516-27 Annot., lemma, the Vulgate reading is cited as "motum", as found in some other Vulgate mss. The use of turbatio is consistent with Erasmus' substitution of turbo for moueo earlier in the verse, to render the related verb, тapáoow. See Annot. This rendering was again anticipated by Manetti.

4 é $\gamma$ éveto. In 1516-19, Erasmus had éүíveto from cod. 2, supported by codd. 1 and 817. Both spellings have widespread support among the Greek mss.

4 morbo vooń $\mu \propto \pi t$ ("infirmitate" late Vg., with some Vg. mss.). Erasmus generally reserves infirmitas to render áoөeveia, and uses morbus
to render the stronger expression, vóvos, which he regarded as synonymous with vó $\sigma \eta \mu \alpha$. Manetti here preferred egritudine. The spelling $\sigma \eta_{\mu} \mu \mathrm{t}$ in the 1516 Greek text was a misprint, corrected in the errata of that edition.
5 illic ékeĩ ("ibi" $1516=$ Vg.). The same substitution occurs at twenty other passages, mainly in Matthew, where illic was absent from the Vulgate in the first twenty-three chapters.
 See on Ioh. 1,28 for Erasmus' avoidance of the Vulgate combination of present participle and imperfect tense. Erasmus achieves a better Latin idiom here, at the expense of literal accuracy. A similar substitution of teneo for babeo, and conversion from active to passive, occurs in the next verse.
 Vg.; "in infirmitate" 1516). It would have been better if Erasmus had retained infirmitas here,
as morbus is now made to stand for two different Greek words in vss. 4-5. In 1516-19, Erasmus has $\not \subset \sigma \theta \varepsilon v i ́ \alpha$, , a misspelling derived from cod. 2. The Vulgate addition of sua corresponds with a Greek variant adding $\alpha$ '̛Toũ, as found in $7^{6675} \aleph B C^{*} D\left(W^{\text {supp }}\right)$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. In omitting aủtoũ, Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by codd. A C ${ }^{\text {corr }} 078$ and most of the later mss. Manetti had in infirmitate, omitting sua, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.

6 Hunc toũtov ("Hunc autem" Vg. 1527, with some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek support. Manetti omitted autem.
6 decumbentem катаке1 $\mu \mathrm{v}$ оv ("iacentem" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs in 1519 at Act. 9,33; 28,8. Erasmus provides a more precise rendering of the Greek compound verb, but since he retained iaceo in vs. 3 (and elsewhere), the present change may also have been partly designed to produce variety of style.
6 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
6 temporis xpóvov ("tempus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The idiomatic phrase multum temporis is also found at Mc. 6,35; Act. 14,28 (1519), in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt. 25,19. Cf. also Erasmus' use of pusillum temporis at Iob. 7,33 (1519), perpusillum temporis at Hebr. 10,37, aliquantum temporis at Act. 15,33; 18,23, and ad boc wsque temporis at Iob. 5,17 (1519).
6 morbo teneretur हैXel ("haberet" 1516 = late Vg.). For a similar alteration of the literal meaning by substituting the passive of teneo for babeo, see on vs. 5. Erasmus further adds morbo for clarity. See Annot., where he suggests in infirmitate.
 épxou๙ı é $\gamma \omega$ ("Dum venio enim ego" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Since there is hardly any Greek ms. support for substituting $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$ for $\delta \varepsilon$, the Vulgate use of enim is probably an imprecision of translation. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus recommended the use of caeterum interea, but when he came to prepare the 1519 edition, that suggestion was superseded by sed interim. His addition of iam, though not strictly literal, is a vivid touch which helps to convey the narrative effect of the present tense of the Greek verbs: other additions of iam occur in 1516 at Mt. 10,23; Act. 21,27; 23,27; and in 1519 at Mc. 11,19; 14,17; Lc. 1,7; 22,14; Ioh. 6,16; Act. 9,33; 18,14;

24,10, etc. Manetti substituted Dum autem ego venio.
8 Dicit $\lambda \hat{k} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{El}$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). Erasmus more accurately renders the present tense, as in the earlier Vulgate. Manetti also had Dicit.
8 grabatum кр́́ $\beta \beta \alpha$ тоv ("grabbatum" late Vg.). On this spelling, see Annot. By a misprint, the Greek text became k $\rho \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta$ отov in 1519 , corrected again in 1522.
9 éyiveto. The sentence kaì eỦécos ... mepl$\varepsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon 1$ was originally omitted in Erasmus' cod. 2. In the right margin, a barbaric hand, probably earlier than Erasmus, inserts the following wording: kaı $\varepsilon \cup \theta \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$ eүalveth olyıns $\omega \alpha v \theta \rho о т$ тоs каı преv тоv краßат[ov] $\alpha \cup$ тои $\kappa \alpha \iota \pi \varepsilon \rho ı \varepsilon[\pi \alpha] \tau 1$. Erasmus replaced this correction by rewriting it, with somewhat improved spelling, in the upper margin, but wrote éyiveto instead of é $\gamma$ ย́veto. Both his codd. 1 and 817 have éy $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} v \in \tau$ other mss.
9 grabatum кр $\alpha \beta \beta \propto \tau о v$. The misspelling $\gamma p \alpha \beta$ $\beta$ atov, in the 1516 edition, is not due to cod. 2, but probably to one of Erasmus' assistants, as the same error occurs in the following vss. 10-12. The Greek spelling was, in effect, made to conform with the Latin. Part of Erasmus' correction to cod. 2 has been cropped off during a later rebinding of the ms., damaging the first part of the word k $\rho \alpha \beta \beta \alpha$ о $\alpha$, , so that only the lower strokes of the letters кр $\alpha \beta$ - can be seen in the top right-hand corner ( f . 204r.), but it appears to read k $\rho \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \propto$ отоv rather than үро́ $\beta \beta$ атои.
10 oi. This word was omitted in 1516-19 without ms. authority, possibly from a printer's error.
10 ei qui Tஸ̃ ("illi qui" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,33 . Manetti made the same change.
10 grabatum кра́ $\beta \beta \propto$ тоv ("grabatum tuum" Vg.). The spelling in cod. 2, both here and in vss. 11-12, was kpóßortov, while cod. 1 has кр $\alpha \beta \propto$ тrov, a fact which is not reflected in 1519 Annot., where Erasmus says that "the Greeks" have kpó $\beta \beta \alpha$ тоv, though the latter spelling is found in codd. 3 and 817 . For the misspelling, $\gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \alpha \pi \sigma \nu$, in the 1516 edition, see on vs. 9. The Vulgate addition of tuum may reflect a Greek variant adding oou, as in $7^{6675} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{N} \mathrm{W}{ }^{\text {supp }}$ and some later mss. In omitting the word, Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by codd. A B $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }}$ and most later
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 oủ Súvatal ó viòs mokeiv $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \varphi^{\prime}$ घavtoũ


${ }^{11}$ Respondit eis: Qui me sanum fecit, is mihi dixit, Tolle grabatum tuum, et ambula. ${ }^{12}$ Interrogauerunt ergo eum, Quis est ille homo qui dixit tibi, Tolle grabatum tuum, et ambula? ${ }^{13}$ Is autem qui sanatus fuerat effectus, nesciebat quis esset. Iesus enim subduxit se quod turba esset eo in loco. ${ }^{14}$ Postea reperit eum Iesus in templo, et dixit illi: Ecce sanus factus es, ne posthac pecces, ne quid deterius tibi contingat. ${ }^{15}$ Abiit ille homo, et nuntiauit Iudaeis quod Iesus esset a quo sanatus fuisset.
${ }^{16}$ Ac propterea persequebantur Iudaei Iesum, et quaerebant illum occidere, quod ista fecisset in sabbato. ${ }^{17}$ Iesus autem respondit eis: Pater meus ad hoc vsque temporis operatur, et ego operor. ${ }^{18}$ Propterea ergo magis quaerebant eum Iudaei interficere, quia non solum soluisset sabbatum, sed et patrem suum dixisset deum, aequalem se faciens deo. ${ }^{19}$ Respondit itaque Iesus, et dixit eis: Amen amen dico vobis, non potest filius a se facere quicquam, nisi quid viderit patrem facientem. Quaecunque enim ille fecerit, haec
 бol ti $A \mid 19$ molouvta $A$ C-E: moluvta $B$

11 is $B-E$ : ille $A \quad 13$ sanatus $E$ : sanus $A-D \mid$ subduxit ... eo $B-E$ : declinauit a turba constituta $A \mid 14$ reperit $B$ - $E$ : inuenit $A \mid$ quid deterius tibi $B-E$ : deterius tibi aliquid $A \mid$ 15 quod $B-E$ : quia $A \mid$ a quo sanatus fuisset $B-E$ : qui fecit eum sanum $A \mid 16$ Ac $B-E$ :om. $A$ | et ... fecisset $B$ - $E$ : quia haec faciebat $A \mid 17$ ad hoc vsque temporis $B$ - $E$ : vsque modo $A$ | 18 soluisset $B$ - $E$ : soluebat $A \mid$ dixisset $B-E$ : dicebat $A \mid 19$ quid $B-E$ : quod $A$
mss., including codd. 1 and 817. It is possible that $\sigma 0 \cup$ was a harmonisation with kpó $\beta \beta \alpha$ тóv oou in vss. 8, 11 and 12. Manetti similarly omitted tuum.
11 is ékeivos ("ille" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33.
13 sanatus laxesis ("sanus" $1516-27=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The whole expression sanatus fuerat effectus, in 1535,
is not likely to have been written by Erasmus, as effectus is redundant once sanus has been converted to a participle. Manetti, more correctly, had sanatus fuerat without effectus, and this may have been what Erasmus intended.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses subduco to render a variety of other Greek expressions: $\alpha \downarrow \alpha \beta \imath \beta \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega \omega$


 $\lambda о \mu \alpha ı$ (2 Thess. 3,6) ப்то $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ (Act. 1,9), Úтাобтé $\lambda \lambda \omega$ (Gal. 2,12; Hebr. 10,38). Elsewhere, he retains declino for к $\lambda i \mathbf{i v} \omega$ and ékк入ive. See Annot.
 constituta" $1516=$ late Vg.). Erasmus recognises that the Greek genitive absolute construction here expresses a causal connection. See Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered by a turba que (= quae) erat.
13 eo in loco èv Tஸ̃ tótTफ ("in loco" 1516 $=$ Vg.). As elsewhere, Erasmus attaches more emphasis to the Greek article. There was also the possibility that in loco might otherwise be misunderstood as meaning "in position". Similar changes occur at $I o b .6,10 ; 19,41$.
14 reperit єÚpíđkıı ("inuenit" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,41.
 peccare" Vg.). Substitutions of ne and a subjunctive, to replace noli or nolite and the infinitive, are quite frequent elsewhere. The change from iam to posthac also occurs at $M c .11,14 ; 14,25$, 41; Lc. 15,21 (1519); 16,2; Ioh. 8,11 (1519); 14,30 (1519); 15,$15 ; 16,10$ (1519). The word occurs in the Vulgate only at Hebr. 4,8. Erasmus wishes to convey clearly that the instruction applied not only to the present but also to the future. See Annot.; Valla Elegantiae II, 56; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 222, 1. 429; p. 224, 1. 439; p. 298, 1. 499. See also on Act. 20,25, on the substitution of postbac for amplius. Manetti put ne amplius pecces.
14 quid deterius tibi XEĩpóv tí ool ("deterius tibi aliquid" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The use of quid is more normal in classical Latin, following the earlier negative, ne. The word-order $\sigma o i=t i$ in 1516 is derived from cod. 2, supported by many other mss., commencing with $3{ }^{66} 75$ A B C N. The correction in 1519 , from ooi Tl to ti ool, is supported by $\mathbb{N} \mathrm{D} W$ and many later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 (but not cod. 3).

15 quod ÖTı ("quia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti also made this change.
15 a quo sanatus fuisset ò moıทŋ́oas ả̛tòv ú $\gamma ı \tilde{\eta}$ ("qui fecit eum sanum" $1516=$ Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal here. Possibly Erasmus wished to prevent any misunderstanding which might
arise from using the pronouns eum or se here, and also to avoid facio.
16 Ac propterea Kai $\delta$ ı̀ тоũto ("Propterea" 1516 = Vg.). Since there is little Greek ms. support for the omission of kai, the Vulgate omission of et should probably be regarded as an imprecision of translation. Manetti put et propter boc.
16 et quaerebant illum ocidere kai Éל'ŋ̇touv a'tòv áтоктєival (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3{ }^{66} 75 \times \mathrm{B}$ CDW and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text followed codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other mss., commencing with codd. A N ( $\alpha$ токтіv $\alpha$ ). However, in 1519 Annot., he suggests that the words may have been added to explain the later statement in vs. 18 that the Jews tried "even more" ( $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v$ ) to kill Jesus. Other possible explanations are that the clause could have been omitted in some mss. through scribal carelessness, or through an ancient editorial tendency to delete words and phrases which appeared repetitious. Manetti's rendering was et querebant eum interficere.
16 quod ${ }^{\text {Ótı }}$ ("quia" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20.
16 ista $\tau \alpha$ ũt $\alpha$ ("haec" $1516=$ Vg.). This substitution serves little purpose other than stylistic variety. See on Ioh. 2,18.
16 fecisset $\varepsilon$ єтоі́єı ("faciebat" $1516=V g$.). The Vulgate is more literal here, correctly giving the continuous sense of the Greek imperfect tense. The same occurs in vs. 18.
 modo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,10 regarding vsque modo. On the removal of modo, see further on Ioh. 9,25 . For the use of the genitive, temporis, see on vs. 6, above.
18 soluisset ... dixisset $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \cup \mathcal{}$... $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon$ ("soluebat ... dicebat" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 16 (fecisset).
19 quid $\pi 1$ ("quod" $1516=V g$.). This change makes clear that the word is an indefinite pronoun. See Annot., where Erasmus also suggests that, for the purpose of translation, it is permissible to omit this word. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) made the same change.

19 Toisĩ (1st.). Erasmus here follows codd. 2 and $817^{* \text { vid }}$, supported by cod. A and some later mss. A better attested reading is moiñ, as found in codd. 1 and $817^{\text {corr, }}$, together

кaì ó viòs óp фìeĩ tòv vióv, kai mávvta סєíkvuaiv aủ-
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itidem et filius facit. ${ }^{20}$ Pater enim diligit filium, et haec omnia demonstrat ei quae ipse facit: et maiora his demonstrabit ei opera, vt vos miremini. ${ }^{21}$ Sicut enim pater suscitat mortuos et viuificat, sic et filius quos vult, viuificat. ${ }^{22}$ Neque enim pater iudicat quenquam, sed omne iudicium dedit filio, ${ }^{23} \mathrm{vt}$ omnes honorent filium, sicut honorant patrem. Qui non honorat filium, non honorat patrem qui misit illum. ${ }^{24}$ Amen amen dico vobis, qui sermonem meum audit, et credit ei qui misit me, habet vitam aeternam, et in condemnationem non veniet, sed transiuit a morte in vitam. ${ }^{25}$ Amen amen dico vobis, quod veniet hora, et nunc est, quando mortui audient vocem filii dei: et qui audierint, viuent. ${ }^{26}$ Sicut enim pater habet vitam in semet ipso, sic dedit et filio habere vitam in semet ipso, ${ }^{27}$ et potestatem dedit ei iudicandi quoque, quia filius hominis est. ${ }^{28}$ Nolite mirari hoc, quia veniet hora in qua omnes qui in monumentis | sunt, audient LB 362

## 

19 itidem et filius $B$-E: et filius similiter $A \mid 20$ haec $D E:$ om. $A-C \mid 23$ honorent $B$-E: honorificent $A \mid$ honorant $B$-E: honorificant $A \mid$ prius honorat $B$-E: honorificat $A \mid$ alt. honorat $B$-E: honorificat $A \mid 24$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid$ condemnationem $B-E$ : iudicium $A \left\lvert\,$|  | 27 | iudicandi quoque $B-E:$ iudicium faciendi $A$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad 29\right.$ prodibunt $B$-E: procedent $A \mid$ condemnationis $B-E$ : iudicii $A \mid 30$ ex $B-E:$ a $A$

with most other mss., commencing with \$ ${ }^{66} 75$ ※ B W.

19 itidem et filius kai ó viòs ónoíws ("et filius similiter" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate word-order is closer to the Greek text. Erasmus may have
felt that itidem expressed a closer identity between the works of the Father and of the Son, somewhat stronger than mere similarity. The only other places where he uses this word are 1 Tim. 3,8; Tit. 2,3, where the Vulgate uses similiter to render $\dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha \cup ́ t \omega s$. Usually Erasmus
is content with similiter. Cf. Valla Elegantiae II, 50; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 269, I. 707-709, defining itidem as meaning "per omnia similiter".
20 baec omnia тד́́vTa ("omnia" 1516-22 = Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal here, as the addition of baec has no Greek authority.
20 סeikvualv. The misspelling Sikvuow in 1516 is derived from cod. 2.
23 bonorent ... bonorant ... bonorat ... bonorat
 ficent" etc. $1516=V g$.). In 1519, Erasmus eliminates honorifico from the three N.T. passages where it occurred in the 1516 edition: here and at Iob. 8,$49 ; 12,26$. In the other two passages, he put cobonesto for the same Greek verb. In 1516, he had already substituted bonoro for bonorifico at Mt. 15,6. At 1 Petr. 2,17 (1519) he again makes the same substitution, in place of bonorifico of the Vulgate (simply omitted in 1516). The word bonorifico does not occur in classical Latin usage. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making these changes.
24 vobis úuiv ("vobis, quia" Vg.). Although Erasmus often omits quia in quotations (see on Ioh. 1,20 ), the Vulgate here follows a different Greek text, adding ö T , as found in codd. 1 , $2,817^{\text {corr }}$ and virtually all mss. apart from cod. D. Possibly Erasmus' text was influenced by cod. $817^{*}$, in which ö T t was originally omitted. A comparable omission of 0 otı in 1516 occurs at Iob. 4,39. Manetti put vobis quod.
24 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ ó $\mathbf{y o v}$ ("verbum" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,1. Manetti anticipated this change.
24 condemnationem kpíqıv ("iudicium" 1516 $=\mathrm{V}$ g.). See on Iob. 3,19.
 4,25 .
 with some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate use of the future tense is unsupported by Greek mss., and may well represent a corruption from transitit or transit, as found in other Vulgate mss.: see Annot. The version of Manetti also had transiuit here.
25 quod ${ }^{2}$ тı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
 4,25.
27 iudicandi quoque kà kpíquv поıฐ̃v ("iudicium facere" late Vg .; "iudicium faciendi" 1516). See
on Iob. 1,33 for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, and on Iob. 3,21 for the avoidance of facio. Erasmus' use of quoque rather than et is to be found at more than forty other passages: in Mark, Luke and John, such changes were all made in 1519 rather than the 1516 edition. The word occurs in the Vulgate at twenty passages in the N.T., and much more frequently in the O.T. At the present passage, the late Vulgate omission of $e t$ is supported by $39^{6675}(\mathbb{K})$ A B N W 070 and a few later mss., which omit koi. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, in company with cod. D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 , in agreement with the reading of the earlier mss. of the Vulgate: see Annot. The version of Manetti had vt iudicium faceret (though in Pal Lat. 45, this was a later correction, and the first hand had iudicium facere).
28 veniet épXetaı ("venit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,25.
28 eius aútoṽ ("filii dei" late Vg.). The late Vulgate has little Greek ms. support other than cod. N, toũ vioũ toũ $\theta$ вoũ. In Annot. 1522, Erasmus comments that his reading, aútoũ (which he cites only in Latin, as eius), was found in "a Greek codex" ("Graeco codice"), as if he were using only one Greek ms., whereas it is found in virtually all mss. He objected to the late Vulgate reading as being a redundant repetition of the same statement in vs. 25. Manetti substituted suam.
 $=\mathrm{V}$.). The use of prodeo is introduced at five
 2,6; Mc. 5,30; Iob. 18,38 (all in 1519); Act. 28,15, and to render $\alpha$ vaßaive at $M t$. 17,27. It occurs twice in the Vulgate N.T., at Iob. 11,44 and 1 Ioh. 2,19. Elsewhere, Erasmus sometimes retained procedo. See Annot., where he suggests that prodeo more clearly expresses the sense of coming out from inside a place. In Annot. on lob. 15,26 , he says that procedo is more suitable for referring to a ceremonial public appearance ("proprie procedit, qui pompa quadam prodit in publicum").
29 condemnationis kpioses ("iudicii" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 3,19.
30 ex ám' ("a" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution is found at Iob. 8,28 (1522). This change is inconsistent with Erasmus' retention of a se at $I o b .5,19$, and a me at $I o b$. 7,17 , etc. The Greek idiom occurs mainly in John.





















 £́ $\omega$ рákate. ${ }^{38}$ kai tòv $\lambda$ óyov aủtoũ oủk





 ${ }^{41} \delta o ́ \xi \alpha v$ т $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha{ }^{2} v \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega v$ oủ $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \omega$.



iudicium meum iustum est: quia non quaero voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem eius qui misit me, patris. ${ }^{31} \mathrm{Si}$ ego testimonium perhiberem de me ipso, testimonium meum non esset verum. ${ }^{32}$ Alius est qui testimonium perhibet de me, et scio verum esse testimonium, quod testificatur de me. ${ }^{33}$ Vos misistis ad Ioannem, et is testimonium reddidit veritati. ${ }^{34}$ Ego autem non ab homine testimonium accipio, sed haec dico vt vos salui sitis. ${ }^{35}$ Ille erat lucerna ardens et lucens, vos autem voluistis ad tempus exultare in luce eius. ${ }^{36}$ At ego testimonium habeo maius testimonio Ioannis. Opera enim quae dedit mihi pater vt perficiam ea, ipsa inquam opera quae ego facio, testificantur de me, quod pater miserit me. ${ }^{37} \mathrm{Et}$ qui misit me, pater, ipse testificatus est de me. Neque vocem eius vnquam audistis, neque speciem eius vidistis: ${ }^{38}$ et sermonem eius non habetis in vobis manentem: quia quem misit ille, huic vos non creditis. ${ }^{39}$ Scrutamini scripturas, quia vos videmini vobis in ipsis vitam aeternam habere, et illae sunt quae testificantur de me, ${ }^{40}$ nec vultis venire ad me vt vitam habeatis. ${ }^{41}$ Gloriam ab hominibus non accipio, ${ }^{42}$ sed cognoui vos quod dilectionem dei non habeatis in vobis. ${ }^{43}$ Ego veni nomine patris mei,

31 perhiberem $B$-E: perhibeo $A \mid$ esset $B$-E: est $A \mid 32$ verum esse $B$-E: quod verum est $A \mid$ testificatur C-E: perhibet $A$, testatur $B \mid 33$ is $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ reddidit $B$-E: perhibuit $A \mid$ 35 tempus $B-E:$ horam $A \mid 36$ At ego testimonium habeo $B-E$ : Ego autem habeo testimonium $A \mid$ testimonio loannis $B-E$ : Ioanne $A \mid$ inquam $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ testificantur $C-E$ : testimonium perhibent $A$, testantur $B \mid 37$ testificatus est $C$ - $E$ : testimonium perhibuit $A$, testatus est $B \mid 38$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid$ manentem $B$-E: manens $A \mid 39$ videmini vobis $B$-E: putatis $A \mid$ testificantur $C-E$ : testimonium perhibent $A$, testantur $B \mid 40$ nec $B-E$ : et non $A \mid$ 43 prius nomine $B-E$ : in nomine $A$

30 patris matpós (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{P B}^{6675}$ \& A B D N W and some later mss., including cod. 1.

Erasmus follows his codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other late mss. Manetti also added patris.

31 testimonium perbiberem ... esset $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup р \tilde{\sim} . .$. हैंढтוv ("testimonium perhibeo ... est" 1516 $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal here, whereas Erasmus regarded the subjunctive as more normal for a conditional clause. Manetti, as usual, substituted testificor for testimonium perbibeo.
 rum est" Vg.; "quod verum est" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,34 for other substitutions of the accusative and infinitive construction. Manetti put quod verum est, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
 nium eius" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading corresponds with the addition of cútoũ in cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}$ and a few later mss. It was not in any Greek or Latin mss. known to Erasmus: see Annot. 1527. Manetti similarly omitted eius.
32 testificatur $\mu$ артирєĩ ("perhibet" $1516=$ Vg.; "testatur" 1519). Erasmus seeks to give a more accurate rendering here: see on Ioh. 1,7.
33 et is кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus inserts a pronoun to mark the change of subject.
33 testimonium reddidit $\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \rho т \cup ́ р \eta к \varepsilon$ ("testimonium perhibuit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change was for the sake of variety. A similar substitution occurs at Ioh. 10,25; Act. 13,22; Gal. 4,15 (all in 1519); 3 Ioh. 1,3 (1522). See also on Iob. 1,7.
35 tempus ${ }^{2} \rho \alpha v$ ("horam" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus evidently felt that the literal sense was inappropriate to the context. Similar substitutions occur in 1516 at $M t$. 18,1; Mc. 11,11; Iob. 16,4, and in 1519 at Iob. 16,2, 25, 32. Inconsistently, the same change is not made at Iob. 17,1.
36 At ego éyc̀ $\delta$ é ("Ego autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,26.
 ("habeo testimonium" $1516=$ Vg.). The revised word-order is less literal, but more natural in Latin.
36 maius testimonio Ioannis $\mu \varepsilon i \zeta \omega$ тoũ 'l$\omega \alpha{ }^{\prime} v v^{\prime}$ ("maius Ioanne" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus supplies testimonio to convey the sense of this elliptical Greek expression, objecting in Annot., that the evangelist does not intend to make a comparison with John the Baptist as a person, but rather with John's testimony.
36 inquam (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,20.
36 testificantur $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup р \varepsilon i ̃ ~(" t e s t i m o n i u m ~ p e r-~$ hibent" $1516=$ Vg.; "testantur" 1519). See on Iob. 1,7.
 misit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20.
37 testificatus est $\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \rho т \cup ́ \rho \eta к \varepsilon$ ("testimonium perhibuit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "testatus est" 1519). See on Ioh. 1,7.
38 sermonem ... manentem tòv $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v . . . ~ \mu E ́ v o v t \alpha ~$ ("verbum ... manens" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
39 videmini vobis סoкєiTs ("putatis" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus also substituted videamini at Mt. 3,9 ( 1516 only). At $I o h .11,56$, rendering the impersonal סOkEĩ, he similarly replaces puto by videtur. Cf. his use of video to replace arbitror at Ioh. 16,2 . He was content, however, to retain puto for ठoks $\omega$ at Lc. 12,40, 51; 13,2, 4; Ioh. 5,45. See Annot.
39 quae testificantur $\alpha$ i $\mu \alpha \rho$ тบpoṽ $\sigma \alpha$ ("quae testimonium perhibent" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "quae testantur" 1519). See on Iob. 1,7.
40 nec kai oú ("et non" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 2,16.
41 Gloriam סó $\alpha \propto v$ ("Claritatem" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Iob. 17,5, 22, 24; Act. 22,11; 1 Cor. 15,41; 2 Cor. 3,18; 4,6; Col. 1,11, though claritas is retained at Lc. 2,9; Ap. Iob. 7,12; 21,11, 23. See also on Iob. 12,23 for the elimination of clarifico. While claritas conveys certain aspects of $\delta \dot{\delta} \xi \alpha$, in the sense of brightness or fame, it is less appropriate in the present passage, where the sense of "praise" or "honour" is required by the context of receiving $\delta o ́ \xi \alpha$ from others. See Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
42 quod öTı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The omission of in before nomine also occurs at Mc. 9,41; Iob. 10,25; 14,13, 26 (all in 1519); 15,16 (1522); 17,12 (1519). In 1519, at fifteen passages, Erasmus substitutes sub nomine, but in 1522, in deference to criticism that this implied a fictitious name, he changed sub nomine back to nomine and in nomine (except at Lc. 9,49; 21,8): see Annot. on Act. 4,17. Sometimes he used per nomen, as at Ioh. 14,$14 ; 17,11 ; 20,31$ (all in 1519): for the substitution of per for in, see further on Iob. 3,21. From 1522 Annot., on Iob. 16,23-6, it can be seen that Erasmus regarded in nomine as a Hebraism, while accepting that it must be retained in translation, as being part of the "peculiar" language of the scriptures.
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nec recipitis me. Si alius venerit nomine suo, illum recipietis. ${ }^{44}$ Quomodo vos potestis credere, qui gloriam a vobis inuicem accipitis, et gloriam quae a solo deo proficiscitur, non quaeritis? ${ }^{45}$ Nolite putare quod ego accusaturus sim vos apud patrem. Est qui accusat vos, Moses, in quo vos speratis. ${ }^{46} \mathrm{Si}$ enim credidissetis Mosi, credidissetis vtique mihi: de me enim ille scripsit. ${ }^{47} \mathrm{Si}$ autem illius scriptis non creditis, quomodo verbis meis credetis?

6Post haec abiit Iesus trans mare Galilaeae, quod est Tiberiadis, ${ }^{2}$ et sequebatur eum turba multa, quia videbant eius signa quae faciebat super his qui infirmabantur. ${ }^{3}$ Subiit autem in montem lesus, et ibi sedebat cum discipulis suis. ${ }^{4}$ Instabat autem pascha dies festus Iudaeorum. ${ }^{5}$ Quum sustulisset ergo oculos Iesus, et vidisset quod multa turba veniret ad se, dicit ad Philippum: Vnde ememus panes, vt edant isti? ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem dicebat tentans eum:

## 6,2 aбөєvouvt $\omega \nu$ A C-E: $\alpha \sigma \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon о и \nu t \omega \nu ~ B$

43 nec recipitis $B$-E: et non accipitis $A \mid$ all. nomine $B$-E: in nomine $A \mid$ recipietis $B$ - : accipietis $A \mid 44$ proficiscitur $B$-E: est $A \mid 46$ prius credidissetis $B$-E: creditis $A \mid$ alt. credidissetis $B$-E: creditis $A \mid$ vtique $B-E$ et $A \mid 47$ scriptis $B-E$ : litteris $A$
6,1 Tiberiadis $B-E$ : Tyberiadis $A \mid 2$ turba multa $B$-E: multitudo magna $A \mid 4$ Instabat autem pascha $B-E$ : Erat autem proximum pasca $A \mid 5$ sustulisset $B-E$ : subleuasset $A \mid$ edant isti $B$-E: manducent hi $A$

43 nec kal ous ("et non" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,16.

43 recipitis $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v e t} \varepsilon$ ("accepistis" late $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$; "accipitis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.). The use of accipitis is recommended here in Annot. Other substitutions of recipio in 1519 occur at Ioh. 6,21; 13,12, 20. Since acipio is retained in vs. 44 , it is apparent that such changes were for little more than stylistic variety, to counteract the Vulgate preference for accipio. Manetti had accipitis.

43 recipietis $\lambda \grave{\eta} \psi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ("accipietis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See the previous note. Manetti put acipiatis.
44 a vobis inuicem $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \dot{n} \lambda \omega \nu$ ("ab inuicem" Vg.). See on Iob. 4,33. At Act. 15,39, Erasmus substitutes alter ab altero for ab inuicem.
44 quae ... proficiscitur $\mathrm{T} \boldsymbol{\pi} \nu$ ("quae ... est" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The verb is left unstated in the Greek text. The adoption of proficiscor, a verb of motion, is questionable, as the context refers to the "receiving" of glory.

45 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．This change was also made by Manetti．
46 credidissetis（twice）Èmानтєv́عтe（＂crederetis＂ Vg．；＂creditis＂1516）．Erasmus prefers the plu－ perfect tense，as better expressing the sequence of thought here，but the Vulgate more accurately conveys the continuity of the Greek imperfect tense．See Annot．In Manetti，this was rendered by crederitis ．．．crederetis．
46 vtique ${ }^{\text {áv }}$（＂forsitan＂Vg．； 1516 Lat．omits）． See on Ioh．4，10，and Annot．The 1516 rendering is preferable，simply omitting the word，as advocated by Valla Annot．However，Manetti preferred vtique．
 addition is unsupported by Greek mss．Manetti also omitted $e t$ ．
 This change，no doubt，is designed to avoid the usual sense of litterae as meaning＂letters＂．
6，2 turba multa őX入os mo入ús（＂multitudo mag－ na＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitution occurs at vs． 5 ．Erasmus prefers to reserve multitudo for $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta \circ 5$ ，turba for öx $\begin{gathered}\text { os，and populus（or }\end{gathered}$ plebs）for $\lambda$ aós．In applying this distinction，he has few inconsistencies，except in retaining turba for $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta$ os at $L c .23,27$ ；putting multitu－ do for ö $\mathrm{X} \lambda \mathrm{os}$ at $M t .14,5$ ；and retaining populus for óx ${ }^{\text {dos at Mt．} 27,24 ;}$ Lc．13，17；Act．21，27． He invariably uses multa instead of magna，as the appropriate adjective to accompany turba． See Annot．This change was anticipated by Manetti．
 The Vulgate omission may reflect a text omit－ ting aútoũ，as in $7^{66} \mathrm{~K}$ A B D W and some later mss．，including cod．1．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817 ，supported by cod． N and most of the later mss．It has been suggested that aỦToũ may represent a harmonisation with Iob．2，23，where the phrase aن่тoũ tò o $\eta \mu \mathrm{E} \mathrm{I}^{\alpha}$ $\alpha$ ह̇toifl also occurs．However，the two passages are several chapters apart，and have no direct connection，other than a reference to people seeing the miracles which Jesus had done．From the point of view of scribal habits，it is easier to account for the word being original and then subsequently omitted，since the apparent ＇redundancy＇of aútoũ（as the required sense is sufficiently contained in the accompanying verb）may have led to its omission by those scribes who tended to abbreviate the text． Manetti put signa eius．

3 autem 8 É（＂ergo＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a variant reading，ouvv，found in codd．DW and a few later mss．，including cod． 1 （cf．vss． 10 ， 11）．A few mss．also have koi，as in cod． $\mathrm{K}^{*}$ ． Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817，suppor－ ted by most other mss．，commencing with $7^{66} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {corr }}$ A B N．The same change was made by Manetti．
4 Instabat autem ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ 就 $\varepsilon$ é $\gamma \gamma u ́ s$（＂Erat autem proximum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitu－ tion occurs at loh．11，55．Erasmus introduces insto，in this sense，at only one passage in 1516 （Act．18，21），rendering êp ex oual．This was com－ parable with the Vulgate use of insto to render éviornul at 2 Thess．2，2； 2 Tim．3，1；and to render ${ }^{\varepsilon} \varphi(\sigma$ In $\eta \mathrm{l}$ at 2 Tim．4，6．In 1519，Eras－ mus introduces it at nine further passages in the Gospels，including the present verse，ren－
 the Vulgate， $\begin{aligned} & \text { gryus is normally translated by }\end{aligned}$ prope in Matthew and Luke，and in proximo in Mark．In 1519，Erasmus avoids proximus in the sense of＂near＂at Iob．6，19；7，2，preferring appropinquo and propinquus．He may have felt that the use of proximus，which can also mean ＂next＂，might give rise to a misunderstanding of the passage as meaning＂the next passover was a feast of the Jews＂．Manetti put Erat autem prope．
 occurs in all five N．T．editions，has no justifi－ cation from mss．
5 Quum sustulisset Ėtóapas（＂Cum subleuasset＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．4，35．Manetti contented himself here with substituting elenasset．
5 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Manetti also made this change．
5 multa turba тoג̀ेs öx 10 （＂multitudo maxi－ ma＂Vg．）．See on vs．2．Manetti put turba multa．
5 se aútóv（＂eum＂Vg．）．See on Iob．2，21，and also Annot．，regarding Erasmus＇use of a rough breathing on the Greek pronoun．
5 dicit $\lambda^{\kappa} y \in 1$（＂dixit＂late Vg．）．Erasmus more accurately renders the present tense，as in the earlier Vulgate and Manetti．
5 edant $\downarrow \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \sigma \mathrm{v}$（＂manducent＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．4，31．
5 isti oũto（＂hi＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The change of pronoun is probably intended to avoid repe－ tition by boc at the beginning of the next sentence．
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ipse enim sciebat quid esset facturus. ${ }^{7}$ Respondit ei Philippus: Ducentorum denariorum panes non sufficiunt eis, vt vnusquisque pusillum quippiam accipiat. ${ }^{8}$ Dicit ei vnus ex discipulis $\mid$ ipsius, Andreas frater Simonis Petri: ${ }^{9}$ Est puer vnus hic, qui habet quinque panes ordeaceos et duos pisces: sed haec quid sunt inter tam multos? ${ }^{10}$ Dixit autem Iesus: Facite vt homines discumbant. Erat autem gramen multum in eo loco. Discubuerunt ergo viri numero ferme quinquies mille. ${ }^{11}$ Accepit autem panes Iesus, quumque gratias egisset, distribuit discipulis, discipuli vero discumbentibus. Similiter et ex piscibus quantum volebant. ${ }^{12} \mathrm{Vt}$
$6 \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon B-E: \eta \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \nu A \mid 11 \eta \theta \varepsilon \lambda o \nu C-E: \eta \theta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \nu A B$
7 pusillum quippiam $B-E$ : modicum quid $A \mid 8$ ipsius $B-E$ eius $A \mid 9$ tam multos $B-E$ : $\operatorname{tantos} A \mid 10$ vt homines discumbant $B$-E: homines discumbere $A \mid$ gramen $B-E$ : foenum $A \mid$ eo $B$-E: om. $A$ | ferme quinquies mille $B-E$ : fere quinque milia $A \mid 11$ autem $B-E$ ergo $A$ | quumque $B-E$ (cumque $B-D$ ): et cum $A$ | vero $B-E$ : autem $A$ | discumbentibus $B-E$ : discumbetibus $A \mid$ volebant $C$ : : volebat $A B$

6 光 $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$. In 1516, Erasmus had $\eta_{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon v$, supported by his codd. 1,2 and 817, together with \$7 ${ }^{66} \mathrm{D}$ and many later mss. He restored $\varepsilon \mu \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ in 1519 , corresponding with the text of his cod. 3 and most other mss., commencing with ( $\boldsymbol{7}^{75}$ ) * A B N W.

7 vnusquisque Ékaotos $\alpha \cup \cup T \omega ̃ \nu$. Erasmus’ rendering follows the Vulgate, which is based on a different Greek text, omitting $\alpha \cup \mathcal{T} \omega \tilde{\nu} \nu$, as in $7^{6675}$ ※ A B N W and a few later mss. His Greek text follows cod. 2, in company with cod. D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti added eorum here.
7 pusillum quippiam $ß$ poxú 71 ("modicum quid" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Iob. 7,33. Erasmus sensed that the context required a word meaning "just a little", whereas modicus could imply merely an average quantity. The word modicus is used eighteen times in the Vulgate Gospels, reduced to three in 1516, and none in 1519. See Annot. on Iob. 16, 17 regarding the misuse of this expression, and see further
on Iob. 7,33 for Erasmus' treatment of modicum tempus. He substitutes quispiam for aliquis in several places, to convey a greater degree of uncertainty as to the precise identity or quantity. He refrains from using quid as an indefinite pronoun, except in the phrases ne quid, nisi quid and si quid, and accordingly replaces quid by quicquam at $M c .13,15$, and by aliquid at $I o b .7,4 ;$ Act. 28,21 (both 1519).
8 ipsius aं̉toũ ("eius" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' use of the reflexive pronoun here is not strictly necessary, except for the purpose of varying the vocabulary. Manetti had suis.
9 tam multos toooútous ("tantos" $1516=\mathrm{V}$ g.). The same substitution occurs at $M t$. 15,33; Iob. 12,37 (1519); Gal. 3,4, following Vulgate usage at 1 Cor. 14,10 . In the present context, as pointed out in Annot., the reference is to the number of persons rather than their size.
10 autem (1st.) $\delta^{\delta} \varepsilon$ ("ergo" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, oũv, as found in $7^{66}$ D and a few later mss. (cf. vss. 3, 11). In a few
other mss., including $37^{75 v i d} \aleph B$, the word is simply omitted. Erasmus follows his cod. 2, supported by codd. A N W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti put vero.
10 vt homines discumbant tov̀s ávepótous àvoтєбeiv ("homines discumbere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on lob. 1,33.
10 gramen xóptos ("foenum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs at Mt. 6,30; 14,$19 ; M c$. 6,39 (1519); Lc. 12,28 (1519); 1 Petr. 1,24. The reason for the change is that, while gramen is a good classical word for "grass", foenum means "hay" which is only suitable to the context of 1 Cor. 3,12. The word gramen nowhere appears in the Vulgate N.T. though it is used a few times in the O.T. See Annot., where Erasmus also suggests berba, the rendering which had been adopted by Manetti.
10 in eo loco èv тب̃ то́tب ("in loco" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 5,13.
 on Iob. 1,39.
10 quinquies mille $\pi \varepsilon v \operatorname{tak} 1 \sigma x i \lambda 101$ ("quinque milia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.) Other substitutions of the adverbial form of the numeral, with mille, occur at Mt. 14,21; 15,38; 16,9, 10; Mc. 5,13; 8,9; Lc. 9,14 (1519); Act. 2,41.
11 autem $\delta$ é ("ergo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate again reflects a Greek variant reading, oưv, as
 (cf. vss. 3,10 ). In cod. 1, kai $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \dot{\omega}$ is substituted
 in company with most other mss., commencing with codd. $\mathbf{N}^{*} \mathrm{~N}$, and also supported by Valla Annot.
11 quumque кai ... ("et cum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,39.
11 discipulis, discipuli vero toîs $\mu \alpha \theta \eta$ ๆaĩs, ol $\delta$ ह̀ $\mu a 0 \eta t \alpha i(V g . o m i t s ;$ "discipulis, discipuli autem" 1516). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{288 v i d} 6675 v i d N * A B N$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}$ and most of the later mss., together with Valla Annot. In 1535 Annot., Erasmus suggests that the words may have been added from one of the other Gospels. However, in the Gospel accounts of the feeding of the 5,000 , none of the three synoptic Gospels has the wording found here in John. The closest is Mt. 14,19, which reads toîs $\mu \alpha$ थ $\eta$ tains tov's áptous, of $\delta \dot{E} \mu \alpha \theta \eta t a i ̃$, in most of the mss.

If there was an intention to harmonise with $M t$. 14,19 , it is strange that toùs óptous was omitted from the 'harmonised' text in John. Another imagined source of harmonisation might be Mt. 15,36 , where some early mss. read
 ever, that passage relates to the separate miracle of the feeding of the 4,000 . An alternative explanation of the discrepancy is that an early scribe omitted the five words by the common error of parablepsis, his eye jumping from the first toins to the second, and this mistake then found its way into a number of subsequent copies. By a similar error, one copyist of Manetti's version (Urb. Lat. 6) wrote discipulis and then jumped straight to quantum volebant, omitting discipuli ... piscibus. The other ms. of Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) had discipulis, discipuli autem ..., as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
11 volebant $\eta \theta \varepsilon \lambda 0 v$ ("volebat" 1516-19 = late Vg.). At the time of preparing his Annot., Erasmus was using a Vulgate edition in which he found volebant, as cited in the lemma. This was also the reading of earlier Vulgate mss. There were also copies of the late Vulgate which offered volebat, as found in the Froben 1491 and 1514 editions, and this is what was later printed in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. Although he argued for volebat in the Annot., it is not possible to say whether his Latin rendering of 1516 at this point represented a conscious act of revision, or whether it was simply based on a late-Vulgate working copy, which already had that reading. The reading $\ddot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda \varepsilon v$, in the $1516-19$ editions, appears to be unsupported by Greek mss., and those which Erasmus usually consulted all have $\eta \theta \in \lambda o v$. His citation of $\eta \theta \in \lambda \in v$ in 1516 Annot., and later, might be thought to indicate that he had found this reading in an unknown ms. Possibly, however, it was caused by his misreading the script of cod. 817, in which the last two letters are represented by an abbreviation, which would normally be recognised as meaning -ov but could be misunderstood, at a cursory glance, as -ev. Nevertheless, his Annot. continued to cite the spelling, $\tilde{\eta}_{\theta \in \lambda} \theta v$, and when he found the same reading in the 1518 Aldine Bible, he took this as further support for his earlier printed text, not realising that the Aldine was itself largely derived from his own edition of 1516. Despite this confusion in Annot., he inserted the correct reading in the Greek and Latin text of 1522-35.
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autem impleti sunt, dicit discipulis suis: Colligite quae superfuerunt fragmenta, ne quid pereat. ${ }^{13}$ Collegerunt ergo, et impleuerunt duodecim cophinos fragmentorum ex quinque panibus ordeaceis quae superfuerant his qui comederant. ${ }^{14}$ Illi ergo homines quum vidissent quod lesus fecerat signum, dicebant: Hic est vere propheta ille qui venturus est in mundum. ${ }^{15}$ Iesus ergo quum cognouisset quod venturi essent, ac rapturi ipsum vt facerent ipsum regem, secessit iterum in montem ipse solus.
${ }^{16}$ At vbi iam vespera esset, descenderunt discipuli eius ad mare: ${ }^{17}$ et conscensa naui, venerunt traiecto mari ad oppidum Capernaum. Iamque tenebrae erant, nec venerat ad eos lesus. ${ }^{18}$ Mare autem vento magno flante intumescebat.

12 superfuerunt $B$-E: superfuerint $A \mid$ quid pereat $B$-E: pereant $A \mid 13$ ordeaceis $B$-E: ordeaceis et duobus piscibus $A \mid$ comederant $B$-E: manducauerant $A \mid 14$ Hic $B$-E: Quia hic $A \mid$ ille $B$-E: om. $A \mid 15$ ac rapturi ipsum vt $B-E$ : vt raperent eum et $A \mid$ alt. ipsum $B-E$ : eum $A \mid$ 16 At vbi iam vespera esset $B-E$ : Vt autem sero factum est $A \mid 17$ conscensa naui $B$-E: cum ascendissent nauim $A \mid$ traiecto mari ad oppidum $B$-E: trans mare in $A \mid$ Iamque tenebrae $B-E$ : Et tenebrae iam factae $A \mid$ nec $B-E$ et non $A \mid 18$ intumescebat $B$ - $E$ : exurgebat $A$

12 dicit $\lambda$ é $\gamma \varepsilon ı$ ("dixit" Vg.). The perfect tense adopted by the Vulgate lacks Greek support. Manetti also put dicit.
 Vg. 1527; "superfuerint" 1516). Erasmus may have avoided supero because of potential confusion with the common meaning of this verb as "overcome", and also in order to achieve consistency with vs. 13 , where the Vulgate uses superfuerunt in rendering the same Greek verb. At the present passage, the earlier Vulgate had superauerunt.
 pereant" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission to render $i l$ has no early ms. support, and may
be considered an inaccuracy of translation: cf. Annot.

13 ह $\varepsilon$ ย $̇ \mu \eta \sigma \alpha v$. This spelling is derived from cod. 2, as in $I o b .2,7$, with little other ms. support.

13 ordeaceis $T \omega ̃ \nu$ kpi日ivcov ("ordeaceis et duobus piscibus" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss., and may have been partly derived from Mc. 6,43. The retention of these words in the 1516 rendering was the result of careless and incomplete revision. Erasmus included this phrase in his Quae Sint Addita. See also Annot. The additional words were omitted by Manetti.

13 superfuerant $\varepsilon \pi \pi \varepsilon \rho i \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \cup \sigma \varepsilon$ ("superfuerunt" Vg.). Erasmus seeks to improve the sequence of tenses. For his preference for the pluperfect, see on Ioh. 1,19. Manetti made the same change.

13 comederant $\beta \varepsilon \beta \rho \omega$ кóoıv ("manducauerant" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 4,31.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,20, and Annot. In Manetti's version, this was dicebant quod.

14 propheta ille ó mрофท่тns ("propheta" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,21, and Annot.
15 quod ס̃tı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
15 ac rapturi ... vt кגi $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta$ eıv ... īva ("vt raperent ... et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate has little Greek support, except from cod. $\boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ which substitutes kai for iva. Manetti's version had vt caperent ... et.
15 ipsum (twice) aủtóv ("eum" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus substitutes the reflexive pronoun, to refer back to the subject of the sentence. See Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered as eum ... ipsum.

15 secessit ${ }^{2} v \varepsilon \varepsilon \chi \omega \dot{p} \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ("fugit" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant, фعúyє, as found in cod. $\mathbf{N}^{*}$. See Annot. This suggestion that Jesus "fled" may have begun as an interpretation by an ancient commentator, that later found its way into the text. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
15 T $\dot{\alpha} \lambda ı$. The omission of this word in 1516 corresponded with the text of codd. 2 and 817, together with cod. W and possibly most of the later mss. In 1519, Erasmus added it to his text, in company with cod. 1 and many other mss., commencing with 7 $^{75}$ ※ A B D N (but not including cod. 3). If the word was originally part of the text, it could have been omitted later by scribal error. However, there is also the possibility that the word originated as an explanatory gloss, by an early scribe who wondered why Jesus was said to go up the mountain when, from vs. 3, it appeared that he was already on the mountain for the feeding of the 5,000 . See on Ioh. 4,3 for another example of a textual problem involving $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\lambda} ı v$.

16 At vbi iam " $\Omega_{s} \delta$ ह́ ("Vt autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For the substitution of at, see on Iob. 1,26, and for the removal of $v t$, see on Ioh. 2,9 . On the addition of iam, see on Ioh. 5,7.

16 vespera esset ỏ $\Psi i ́ \alpha$ ह́y $̇ v e t o ~(" s e r o ~ f a c t u m ~ e s t " ~ ' ~$ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The substitution of vespera also occurs at Mt. 20,8; 27,57; Mc. 4,35; 6,47; 15,42; Ioh. 20,19, in accordance with Vulgate usage at several other passages. In Annot., Erasmus comments that the Vulgate use of sero as a noun was not normal in classical Latin. Both Valla Annot. and Manetti proposed serum here. For the avoidance of facio, see on Ioh. 1,15 .
 ascendissent nauim" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution of conscendo occurs at Mt. 14,22; Mc. 6,45 ; $L c .8,37$; and also, in rendering हmıßaiv , at Act. 21,2, 6; 27,2; and in rendering
 Act. 21,15 (both 1519). More often, Erasmus puts ingredior, given as an alternative in Annot. on this passage. He retains ascendo for $\varepsilon \in \beta \alpha i v \omega$ at Lc. 8,22; Iob. 6,24.

17 traiecto mari тépav тท̃s $\theta \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \eta \varsigma$ ("trans mare" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution is made at $M c .5,1$ (1519), but not at Iob. 6,1, where the same phrase occurs. In the present passage, Erasmus may have objected to the sequence of two prepositional phrases, and for that reason converted the first into an ablative absolute. For his use of traiticio, see further on Act. 21,2.
17 ad oppidum Capernaum eis Katrepvaoúp ("in Capernaum" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus adds oppidum by way of explanation, as also at $M t$. 17,24 . For the similar addition of $v r b s$, see on Act. 14,25. Erasmus substituted ad in the sense of "towards", as the context showed that the disciples had not yet completed their journey.
 yóveı ("Et tenebrae iam factae erant" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At $M t .27,45$ and $L c .23,44$, rendering бко́тоs є́y'́veto, Erasmus retains tenebrae factae sunt. At the present passage, he does not accurately convey the required sense, "it had now become dark".

17 nec kal oủk ("et non" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 2,16.
18 autem te. Erasmus reproduces the Vulgate rendering, though it is possible that the Vulgate could have followed a Greek text having 8 é, as found in $3^{75 v i d} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{N}$ and a few later mss.
18 intumescebat біпүєípєто ("exurgebat" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus here finds a far more vivid word to convey the surging, swelling motion
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${ }^{19}$ Quum remigassent ergo ferme stadia viginti quinque aut triginta, vident Iesum ambulantem super mare, et appropinquantem naui, ac timuerunt. ${ }^{20}$ Ille autem dicit eis: Ego sum, nolite timere. ${ }^{21}$ Voluerunt ergo recipere eum in nauim, et ilico nauis appulerat terrae ad quam ibant.
${ }^{22}$ Postero die turba quae stabat trans mare, vt vidit quod nauicula alia non esset ibi, nisi vna illa in quam ingressi fuerant discipuli eius, et quod non introisset cum discipulis suis Iesus in nauiculam, sed soli discipuli eius abissent: ${ }^{23}$ aliae vero superuenerunt nauiculae a Tiberiade iuxta locum vbi comederant panem, posteaquam gratias egisset dominus. ${ }^{24}$ Quum ergo vidisset turba, quod Iesus non esset ibi ,

19 є甲оß $\eta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu A B D E: \alpha \varphi \circ \beta \eta \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu C$

19 super $B$-E: supra $A$ appropinquantem naui, ac $B$-E: proximum naui fieri et $A \mid 21$ recipere $B$-E: accipere $A$ | ilico $D E$ : statim $A$, illico $B C \mid$ appulerat terrae ad $B$-E: fuit ad terram $A$ | 22 nauiculam $B$-E: nauim $A \mid 23$ nauiculae $B$-E: naues $A \mid$ Tiberiade $B$-E: Tyberiade $A \mid$ comederant $B-E$ : manducauerant $A \mid$ posteaquam gratias egisset dominus $B-E$ : gratias agente domino $A$
of the sea, compared with the colourless rendering of the Vulgate. He does not use the word elsewhere in the N.T. Manetti had surgebat.
19 ferme ís ("quasi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
19 super Ėmi ("supra" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Iob. 3,31. Manetti also had super.
19 appropinquantem éryùs ... $\gamma$ vóuevov ("proximum ... fieri" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). From Annot., it appears that Erasmus regarded the Vulgate rendering as being too "Greek". He also suggested the use of accedo. See on vs. 4, for his avoidance of proximus elsewhere. Manetti had prope nauim venientem.
19 ac каі ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25 .
21 recipere $\lambda \alpha \beta$ ®ĩ ("accipere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 5,43.
21 ilico eúntéss ("statim" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. the substitution of ilico for continuo at Mt. 4,20;
Mc. 1,31 (1519). The word ilico occurs just once in the Vulgate N.T., at $L c$. 1,64. Another alternative which Erasmus used for statim and continuo was protinus. These changes were mainly for stylistic variety.
 ad terram" 1516 = late Vg.). In 1516 Annot., Erasmus also suggested facta est in terra, a stilted expression which he fortunately did not include in his translation. Elsewhere, he uses appello in the sense of a ship coming to land, at Act. 20,15 (for $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ ); 27,3 (for ккт$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$ ). The use of the pluperfect emphasises the suddenness of their arrival: see on Iob. 1,19 for Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect tense. This passage was listed among the Soloecismi, which provoked criticism from Stunica: for Erasmus' reply, see his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 396 D.

21 ad quam eis $\eta v$ ("quam" 1516 = late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission of a preposition lacks Greek support. Manetti also inserted ad here.
21 ibant ÚTinyov ("ibat" Annot., lemma). Although Erasmus implies that he was using a Vulgate edition which had ibat when he prepared his Annot., most copies of the late Vulgate seem to have ibant, as in the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514, and the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 edition.
22 Postero die Tñ̃ ÉTroúpıov ("Altera die" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29, and Annot.

22 vt vidit iठ $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{L} v$ ("vidit" Vg.). The Vulgate seems to be based on a Greek text having eidev, as in $3^{28} \times D$. A few other mss. also have
 2, supported by most other late mss., including codd. 1 and 817 . The reading i i $\omega v$ could be described as a lectio difficilior, which requires the remainder of vss. 22-3 to be understood as a long parenthesis, with no main verb, until resumed by eldev in vs. 24 . From the point of view of ancient editorial practice, the tendency would have been to simplify the unusual sentence structure by converting the participle into the main verb. On this basis, if $i \delta \omega \nu$ were original, the reading ef $\delta \varepsilon v$ could perhaps be viewed as the primary correction, followed by a secondary change into efiolov by a few subsequent scribes.
22 quod (twice) ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti also made this change.
22 illa in quam ingressi fuerant discipuli eius
 omits). The lengthy Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{75}{ }^{7 \text { corr }}$ A B N W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported (with minor variations) by $\boldsymbol{K}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and most of the later mss. Cod. 817 agrees with Erasmus' text, except that it has $\alpha v \in \in \eta \sigma \alpha v$ for ${ }^{e} v \in \varepsilon^{\prime} \beta \eta \sigma \alpha v$. It has been suggested that the clause originated as a scribal explanation concerning the boat, but the absence of these words from a limited number of witnesses could alternatively be explained in terms of careless omission of a line of text from an ancient exemplar. Manetti rendered this by illa in quam ascenderant discipuli sui.
22 nauiculam $\pi \lambda$ oı́́pıov ("nauim" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg .). Erasmus elsewhere complains of inconsistency in the Vulgate rendering of this
word: cf. Annot. on vs. 17. However, the Vulgate may here have followed a Greek variant, $\pi \lambda$ oĩov, found in (K) A B D N W 091 and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by most other late mss. A similar divergence among the mss. occurs in vs. 23 . From the point of view of scribal tendencies, an accidental change from $\pi \lambda o r \alpha \alpha_{1}$ ov to $\pi \lambda o i ̃ o v$ is just as likely as a change in the opposite direction, as these similar-sounding words are both present in this part of the chapter and could hence easily be confused with one another. Elsewhere, $\pi \lambda$ oinov is the more common N.T. expression. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
23 nauiculae $\pi \lambda$ ordpı $\alpha$ ("naues" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). See the previous note. The Vulgate may here have followed a Greek variant $\pi \lambda o i \pi \alpha$, as in $\boldsymbol{q}^{75}$ ( K ) B W and one or two later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, this time supported by codd. 1 and 817, together with A (D) N 091 and most of the later mss. Manetti again made the same change.
23 comederant है $\propto \propto \gamma \circ \nu$ ("manducauerant" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
23 posteaquam gratias egisset dominus $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \chi \chi \alpha \rho 1 \sigma \tau \eta$ баvtos toũ kupiou ("gratias agentes deo" late Vg.; "gratias agente domino" $1516=$ some Vg. mss.). For Erasmus' substitution of the pluperfect in rendering the Greek aorist participle, see on Ioh. 1,36. He introduces postquam or posteaquam at several other passages, e.g. Mt. 5,2; 15,36; Act. 1,2, 8; 19,2 (1519). The late Vg. rendering is unsupported by Greek mss. It is likely that the reading arose by a corruption internal to the Latin tradition, adding -s to agente and misreading dno (= domino) for deo. A few mss. completely omit the phrase, in particular codd. D 091 and cod. 69* (though it is added in the margin of cod. 69 by a later hand). Such an omission is mentioned in Annot. as occurring in one of Erasmus' Greek mss. Since cod. 1 has toũ kupiou eúxapl$\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a v \tau 05$, and both codd. 2 and 817 have
 in Annot. possibly refers to Erasmus' consultation of cod. 69, or a closely related ms., during his preparatory work in England. Manetti's version (in both mss.) ungrammatically put gratias egerunt domino without any preceding conjunction.
24 quod ÓTl ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
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neque discipuli eius, ascenderunt et ipsi in nauiculas, et venerunt Capernaum, quaerentes lesum: ${ }^{25}$ et quum inuenissent eum trans mare, dixerunt ei: Rabbi, quando huc venisti? ${ }^{26}$ Respondit eis Iesus, et dixit: Amen amen dico vobis, quaeritis me, non quia vidistis signa, sed quia comedistis de panibus, et saturati estis. ${ }^{27}$ Operemini non cibum qui perit, sed qui permanet in vitam aeternam, quem filius hominis dabit vobis: hunc enim pater consignauit deus. ${ }^{28}$ Dixerunt ergo ad | eum: Quid facimus, vt operemur opera dei? ${ }^{29}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit eis: Hoc est opus dei, vt credatis in eum quem misit ille. ${ }^{30}$ Dixerunt ergo ei: Quod ergo tu facis signum, vt videamus et credamus tibi? Quid operaris? ${ }^{31}$ Patres nostri manducauerunt manna in deserto, sicut scriptum est: Panem de coelo dedit eis ad edendum. ${ }^{32}$ Dixit ergo eis lesus: Amen amen dico vobis, non Moses dedit vobis illum panem de coelo, sed pater meus dat vobis panem de coelo verum. ${ }^{33}$ Panis enim dei est qui de coelo descendit, et dat vitam mundo. ${ }^{34}$ Dixerunt ergo ad eum: Domine, semper da nobis panem istum. ${ }^{35}$ Dixit autem eis












 $\delta \omega \sigma$ v úuĩv tòv äptov ėk toũ oủpavoũ


 тро̀s aútóv, Kúple, тávtote $\delta$ òs ग̀uĩv

 טціи $A-E$

26 comedistis de panibus $B-E$ : manducastis ex panibns $A$ (sic) | 27 permanet $A B D E$ : pemanet $C \mid$ consignauit $B$ - $E$ : signauit $A \mid 31$ ad edendum $B$ - $E$ : manducare $A \mid 32$ illum $B$ - $E$ : om. $A \mid$ 34 istum $B-E$ : hunc $A$

24 ascenderunt ${ }^{2} v \in \varepsilon^{\prime} \beta \sigma \alpha v$. It is possible that the Vulgate here reflects a variant, $\alpha^{\prime} v \varepsilon^{\prime} \beta \eta \sigma \alpha v$, as in $39^{75} \aleph^{*}$ and a few later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. At other passages Erasmus preferred conscendo or ingredior in rendering $\varepsilon \mu \beta \alpha i v \omega$ and $\varepsilon \pi / 1 \beta \alpha i v \omega:$ see on vs. 17.

24 et ipsi kal aủtoí (Vg. omits). Erasmus follows his cod. 2 here, supported by cod. 1 and a few other late mss. The Vulgate omission of both words is supported only by cod. $\aleph^{*}$ and a few later mss. In cod. 817 and most of the remaining mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{\nexists}^{75} \aleph^{\text {corr }}$

A B NW, the reading is cu'toi without kai. Erasmus' poorly supported reading passed into the Textus Receptus.
24 nauiculas tà $\pi \lambda$ orápıa. In 1516, in conflict with his Latin rendering which came from the Vulgate, Erasmus follows cod. 2 in reading to $\pi \lambda$ oĩa, with support from cod. A and most later mss., including cod. 1 . In 1519 , he conformed his Greek text with the Latin rendering, substituting $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ m $\pi$ oıópıa, supported by $3^{7{ }^{75}} \mathrm{~K}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{B} D \mathrm{NW}$ and some later mss., including cod. 817 (but not cod. 3). See on vs. 22 for other variants involving $\pi \lambda$ oldapo.
 cod. 2. See on Iob. 1,38.
26 comedistis éqó́yєтє ("manducastis" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
$26 d e$ ék ("ex" 1516 = Vg.). Usually Erasmus prefers e or ex for ék: see on Ioh. 2,15. He retains ex boc pane at Ioh. 6,51.
27 Operemini épyó̧́єの日e ("Operamini"Vg.). Erasmus sometimes prefers the subjunctive form (i.e. in a jussive sense), rather than using the imperative of a passive or deponent verb: cf. Mt. 4.19; Mc. 1,17 (both in 1519); 5,44; Lc. 19,13 (1519); Act. 2,40 (1519); 3,19 (1516 only); 5,20; 8,24 (both in 1519).
27 sed à $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$. Erasmus follows his cod. 2, which agrees with the Vulgate here, supported by cod. $\mathcal{K}$ and a few later mss. However, codd. 1 and 817, together with most other mss., commencing with $33^{75}$ A B D N W, add tiv $\beta \rho \omega ̃ \sigma เ v$. The less well attested reading, which underlay the Vulgate translation, passed via Erasmus into the Textus Receptus. Manetti added cibum, in accordance with the text of most Greek mss.
27 consignauit ėo $\varphi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \gamma ı \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ ("signauit" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is the only place where Erasmus uses consigno. See on Iob. 3,33 regarding obsigno. See also Annot. on both passages.
28 facimus moooũuev ("faciemus" Vg.). Here Erasmus corrected his cod. 2, which had mol$\tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (present subjunctive), and indicated in the margin of the ms. that it should be moouüev (present indicative), a reading which he took from cod. 817. The reason for adopting this correction is unclear, as the Vulgate future tense is more in line with the sense of $\pi \circ 1 \omega \tilde{\mu \varepsilon \nu \text {, }}$ which is also found in cod. 1 and virtually all other mss. Cf. vs. 37 below, for a similar substitution of a variant from cod. 817.

Erasmus' poorly attested reading passed into the printed editions of Robert Estienne, but later editions of the Textus Receptus restored тоוֹ̃ $\mu \mathrm{\varepsilon}$, following the example of the Complutensian Polyglot.
$29 \delta$ 'Inooũs. In codd. 2 and $817, \delta$ is omitted, in agreement with most other mss., commencing with $\$ 7^{75} \mathrm{~N} \mathbf{W}$. The Erasmian text coincides with the reading of cod. 1 , adding $\delta$, with the support of many other mss., beginning with codd. A B D N T. See on Ioh. 1,48 for other additions of the article. The less widely attested reading again passed into the Textus Receptus.
29 mıбтєÚवŋte. In the 1516-19 editions, the Erasmian text had mioteú $\eta t \varepsilon$, following the authority of cod. 1 , with support from $\exists^{75} \aleph$ A B N T and a few later mss. The reading which Erasmus restored in 1522, тוनтєú $\eta \eta \tau \varepsilon$, was found in codd. 2,3 and 817 , in company with most other mss., commencing with codd. D W.
31 ad edendum $\varphi \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{i} v$ ("manducare" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,31. Earlier in the verse, unusually, Erasmus retained manduco in rendering the same Greek verb. Either this was an oversight, or it was intended to avoid repetition. Manetti here substituted ad manducandum (Pal. Lat. 45 originally had manducare, changed to ad manducandum by a later correction).
32 illum panem tòv äptov ("panem" 1516
$=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The insertion of illum conveys the sense of the Greek article, in referring back to the bread which was mentioned in the previous verse. See Annot.
33 dei toũ $\theta$ вoũ ("verus" late Vg.). The late Vulgate substitution is unsupported by Greek mss., and no doubt arose as a corruption within the later Latin tradition, by harmonisation with the end of the previous verse. Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot.

34 ทֹцĩv. All five editions mistakenly read Úpĩv here, which was introduced in 1516 as a printer's error, and Erasmus subsequently failed to correct it. Since it yields an impossible sense, "Lord, give to you" instead of "Lord, give to us", Erasmus cannot have intended this, and the correct reading is therefore restored to the text.
34 istum toüTov ("hunc" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,18.













 тós $\mu \varepsilon$, iva $\pi$ तãs ó $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \tilde{\nu} \nu$ tòv vióv, kai

 خ̀ $\mu$ ह́pac.
${ }^{41}$ 'Eүó $\gamma \gamma \cup \zeta$ ov oưv oi 'louסaĩol mepi

 yov, OủX oũtós éotiv 'Inooũs, ó viòs



Iesus: Ego sum panis ille vitae. Qui venit ad me, non esuriet: et qui credit in me, non sitiet vnquam. ${ }^{36} \mathrm{Sed}$ dixi vobis, quod etiam vidistis me, nec creditis. ${ }^{37}$ Omne quod dat mihi pater, ad me veniet: et eum qui venerit ad me non eiicio foras. ${ }^{38}$ Quia descendi de coelo, vt faciam non quod ego volo, sed quod vult is qui misit me. ${ }^{39}$ Haec est autem voluntas eius qui misit me, patris, ne quid perdam ex omnibus quae dedit mihi, sed resuscitem illa in nouissimo die. ${ }^{40} \mathrm{Haec}$ est autem voluntas eius qui misit me: vt omnis qui videt filium, et credit in eum, habeat vitam aeternam, et ego suscitabo eum in nouissimo die.
${ }^{41}$ Murmurabant ergo Iudaei de illo quod dixisset, Ego sum panis ille, qui de coelo descendi. ${ }^{42} \mathrm{Et}$ dicebant: Nonne hic est Iesus, filius Ioseph, cuius nos nouimus patrem et matrem? Quomodo ergo dicit hic,

## $35 \pi \varepsilon เ \nu \alpha \sigma \eta$ B-E: $\pi \varepsilon เ \nu \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \iota A \mid \delta \iota \psi \eta \sigma \eta$ B-E: $\delta ı \psi \eta \sigma \in \iota A$

35 ille $D E$ : om. $A-C \mid 36$ quod etiam $B-E$ : quia et $A \mid$ nec creditis $B-E$ : et non crediditis $A \mid$ 37 quod $A B D E$ : qnod $C \mid$ venerit $B-E$ : venit $A \mid 38$ vt $\ldots$ volo $B-E$ : non vt faciam voluntatem meam $A$ | quod vult is $B-E$ : voluntatem eius $A \mid 39$ ne ... mihi $B-E$ : vt omne quod dedit mihi non perdam ex eo $A \mid$ illa $B$ - $E$ : illud $A \mid 40$ suscitabo $B$ - $E$ : resuscitabo $A \mid 41$ quod $B-E$ : quia $A$ | ille $B-E$ : viuus $A \mid 42$ lesus $B-E$ : om. $A$

35 panis ille ò ăptos ("panis" $1516-22=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is one of the few changes to be made in the 1527 edition, producing consistency with the same phrase in vss. 41,48 and 50 . The addition signifies the uniqueness of this bread as being the "Living Bread" from heaven.

 of verbending which is found also in $\mathrm{N} \mathrm{AB}^{*}$ (W) and some later mss., including cod. 817. Erasmus here preferred the reading teiváosi ... $\delta i \psi \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon$, found in cod. 1, supported by codd. (D) T and some later mss. The result was that he manually altered cod. 2 to read $\pi$ tivácel, which was duly reproduced by his 1516 edition.

In 1519, he restored the sequence, - $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta$... $-\eta \quad \eta n$, attested by $B^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss. (but not cod. 3, which here agreed with cod. 1).
35 vnquam тळ́тоте ("in aeternum" late Vg .). The late Vulgate here implies a Greek variant, eis tov aiãva, but this is found only in one or two later mss. Probably in aeternum originated as an internal Latin corruption, from harmonisation with non sitiet in aeternum at Ioh. 4,14. Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot. The version of Manetti also had vnquam.
36 quod etiam ötı kai ("quia et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on loh. 1,20 for the avoidance of quia. The
substitution of etiam for et was quite frequent: in 1516 for Matthew and Mark, and in 1519 for Luke and John, this being another example of the incomplete revision of the third and fourth Gospels in the 1516 edition. See also on Ioh. 1,$25 ; 15,24$. Manetti put quod et.
36 nec kal oủ ("et non" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 2,16.
36 creditis TเбTєÚยтย ("credidistis" late Vg.; "crediditis" 1516). The late Vulgate reading is unsupported by Greek mss. The impossible form, crediditis, found in 1516, may have arisen from an illegible correction which Erasmus had written into his marked-up copy of the Vulgate.
 Erasmus elsewhere freely translates the present tense of $\varepsilon{ }^{2} p x o \mu a r$ by either a present or future tense in Latin. His adoption of venerit (whether taken as perfect or future perfect), in conjunction with the present-tense eiicio, is less satisfactory.
37 eiicio ${ }^{\text {ex }} \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ ("eiciam" Vg.). As at vs. 28 ( $\pi 010$ ũ $\mu \varepsilon v$ ), Erasmus here adopts a poorly attested reading from cod. 817. His codd. 1 and 2 had ék $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$ (future tense), as in most other mss.
38 vt faciam non quod ego volo oủX iva moin Tò $\theta$ ध́ $\lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ тò é $\mu$ úv ("non vt faciam voluntatem meam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,34.
38 quod vult is tò $\theta \dot{\text { é }} \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ ("voluntatem eius" $1516=$ Vg.). See ibid.
39 autem סé ("enim" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss., and may be a harmonisation with the similar expression in vs. 40.
39 ne quid perdam ex omnibus quae dedit mibi ...
 ả̛toũ ... ả̛tó ("vt omne quod dedit mihi, non perdam ex eo ... illud" 1516 = late Vg.). Erasmus radically alters this sentence, sacrificing accuracy in order to clarify the meaning, and partly also to avoid using vt ... non (see on Ioh. 3,20 ). Compared with his treatment of the Epistles, this kind of rewriting of the translation is rare in his version of the Gospel of John: cf. on Iob. 7,14 . Manetti's version followed the late Vulgate, except that he added pater after mibi (supported by a few of the later Greek mss.), and substituted eum for illud, corresponding with aútóv, as found in codd. NW and many of the later mss.
 mei qui misit me" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text adding motpós or тотрós yov, supported by some late mss. Some other mss. substitute maтрós $\mu$ оv for тé $\mu \psi \alpha v$ тós $\mu \varepsilon$, as in $39^{6675} \times$ B C D N T W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , together with most other mss., commencing with cod. A. It has been suggested that тоũ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \mu \propto v \tau o ́ s ~ \mu \varepsilon$ represents a harmonisation with the similar phrase in vs. 39. Another possibility is that matpós $\mu \circ u$ began as an explanatory gloss in the margin, which was misunderstood by some scribes, who either added or substituted the words from the margin into the text. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) originally had cius qui misit me patris, but in the later ms. of his translation (Urb. Lat. 6), patris was omitted.
40 suscitabo a̛vaotńow ("resuscitabo" 1516 $=$ Vg.). The same substitution occurs at vss. 44 and 54 (both in 1519), though Erasmus retains resuscito at vs. 39 and Act. 13,33, in rendering the same Greek word. Elsewhere, he reserves
 suscito is more common in classical usage.
41 quod ס́tı ("quia" $1516=$ Vg.). See on $I o b$. 1,20 . This change was also made by Manetti.
41 O TI (2nd.). The insertion of a second $\delta \mathrm{TI}$ at this point is based solely on cod. 2, without other ms. support. Erasmus leaves it untranslated as it introduces speech.
41 panis ille ò ơptos ("panis viuus" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg .). The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek ms. support, and seems to have arisen as a Latin harmonisation with panis viuus in vs. 51 . Accordingly the passage is listed in the Quac Sint Addita; see also Annot. In omitting viuus, Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate reading. On ille, see on vs. 35 . Manetti had just panis.
42 Iesus 'Inooũs (omitted in 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission is supported by cod. $N$ and a few later mss., including cod. 817*. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and $817^{\text {corr }}$, in company with nearly all other mss. In cod. 1, it is $\delta$ ' $1 \eta \sigma o u ̃ s$. Erąpmus again restores the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot. The passage is included in the Ad Placandos.
42 dicit bic $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \in 1$ Oũtos ötı ("dixit hic quia" Vg. 1527; "dicit hic quia" Vg. mss.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put dicit iste quod.







 ákoúvas mapó̀ toũ matpòs kaì $\mu \alpha \theta$ ف́v,






 ó ắptos ó èk toũ oủpavoũ кат $\alpha \beta \alpha i v \omega v$,











De coelo descendi? ${ }^{43}$ Respondit ergo Iesus, et dixit eis: Nolite murmurare inter vos. ${ }^{44}$ Nemo potest venire ad me, nisi pater qui misit me, traxerit eum, et ego suscitabo eum in nouissimo die. ${ }^{45}$ Est scriptum in prophetis, Et erunt omnes docti a deo. Omnis ergo qui audiuit a patre et didicit, venit ad me, ${ }^{46}$ non quod patrem viderit quisquam, nisi is qui est a deo, hic vidit patrem. ${ }^{47}$ Amen amen dico vobis, qui confidit mihi, habet vitam aeternam. ${ }^{48}$ Ego sum panis ille vitae. ${ }^{49}$ Patres vestri comederunt manna in deserto, et mortui sunt. ${ }^{50} \mathrm{Hic}$ est panis ille de coelo descendens, vt ex ipso edat aliquis, et non moriatur. ${ }^{51}$ Ego sum panis viuus qui de coelo descendi. Si quis ederit ex hoc pane, viuet in aeternum. Et panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est, quam ego dabo pro mundi vita. ${ }^{52}$ Decertabant ergo ludaei inter se, dicentes: Quomodo potest hic nobis carnem illam suam dare ad edendum? ${ }^{53}$ Dixit ergo eis | Iesus: Amen amen dico vobis, nisi ederitis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis eius

## 44 prius це $B-E: \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon A$

44 suscitabo $B$-E: resuscitabo $A \mid 45$ doctia deo $B-E$ : docibiles dei $A \mid 47$ confidit mihi $B-E$ : credit in $\operatorname{me} A \mid 48$ ille $B$-E: om. $A \mid 49$ comederunt $B$-E: manducauerunt $A \mid 50$ ille $C-E$ : om. $A B \mid$ edat $B$-E: manducaret $A \mid 51$ ederit $B-E$ : manducauerit $A \mid 52$ Decertabant $B-E$ : Litigabant $A \mid$ illam suam $C$ - : suam $A$, om. $B \mid$ edendum $B$-E: manducandum $A \mid 53$ ederitis $B$-E: manducaueritis $A$

43 inter vos $\mu \in \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ("in inuicem" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,33, and Annot. In Manetti's version was just inuicem.
$44 \mu \varepsilon$ (1st.). The reading $\varepsilon \in \mu \dot{\varepsilon}$, in the 1516 edition, is found in cod. 2 and a few other mss., including cod. B.

44 suscitabo ${ }^{2} v \alpha \sigma$ ரíoo ("resuscitabo"
$=V$ g.). See on vs. 40.

45 docti a deo हıסaktol toũ $^{6}$ धroũ ("docibiles dei" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .). In Annot., Erasmus offers docilis as a literal rendering of $\delta 1 \delta$ aktós, objecting that docibilis does not occur in classical usage, and that it would anyway be the equivalent of $\delta 1 \delta \alpha k т 1 k \delta \delta$, i.e. "apt to teach", in an active sense, which was recorded by Valla Annot. as being found in some of his Greek mss. In Valla Elegantiae VI, 26, docilis is similarly preferred to
docibilis: see also Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 248, 11. 109-112. More problematic was Erasmus' addition of toũ, both in his text and Annot, with virtually no ms. support. It was probably included by conjecture, based on the observation that $\theta$ eós usually occurs with the article: see on Iob. 1,48 for arbitrary insertions of an article before 'lnooũs. This mistaken conjecture survived into the Textus Receptus.
45 ergo oưv (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{6675}$ K B CD N T W and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by cod. A and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti made the same change.
45 audiuit $\dot{\text { ánoúgoss. The Erasmian text here }}$ follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by P $7^{6675 v i d} \mathcal{N}$ A B C N T W and many later mss. This may be among the passages which were altered by Erasmus' assistants. The reading of codd. 2 and 817 was d́koú $\omega v$, supported by most other mss., commencing with cod. D. It is possible that ákoúaxs originally arose as a harmonisation to context, to conform with the aorist tense of the immediately following participle, $\mu \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} v$.
46 quod ôtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. $1,20$.
47 confidit mibi $\pi$ ) me " $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution of confido occurs at Mc. 9,42 (1519). This change produces an inconsistency with Erasmus' retention of credo at seven other places in the present chapter and at most other passages where this Greek verb occurs. Elsewhere, he sometimes follows the Vulgate in using confido to render $\pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$ or $\theta \alpha \rho \sigma \varepsilon \epsilon \omega$ (see on Ioh. 16,33).
48 panis ille ó äptos ("panis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 35.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 4,31.
50 panis ille $\delta$ ớptos ("panis" 1516-19 = Vg.). Seee on vs. 35.
 ("si quis ex ipso manducauerit" Vg.; "ex ipso manducaret aliquis et" 1516). On manduco, see on Iob. 4,31. Erasmus' restructuring of this clause enables a more literal rendering of Tis ... kai, distinguishing it from the construction éáv tis in vs. 51. In Annot., he recommends vt quis ex eo edat et. Manetti put si quis de eo ipso manducauerit.

51 ederit фó $\gamma$ ท ("manducauerit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 4,31.
 The Vulgate omission is supported by $\not \boldsymbol{7}^{6675} \mathrm{~B}$ C D TW and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by most other late mss., including codd. 1 and 817. It might be argued that the omission has the advantage of being a lectio difficilior because of the awkward syntax ("it is my flesh on behalf of the life of the world"), which later scribes would have sought to ameliorate by adding a few words to smooth the flow of the sentence. An alternative explanation would be that a reck-
 $\delta \omega \sigma \omega$ in his exemplar, and decided to omit them because they appeared to repeat the phrase $\delta \mathrm{v}$ हों $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$ which occurs a little earlier in the same sentence. However, the omission leads to such a dislocation of syntax that it could fitly be described as a lectio impossibilior. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus here.
52 Decertabant énúxovto ("Litigabant" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses decerto elsewhere to render d'y $\omega$ vícouवl, at Iob. 18,36; Col. 1,29 (1519); 2 Tim. 4,7, and $\sigma u v a \theta \lambda \xi \omega$ at Pbil. 1,27; 4,3 (both in 1519), while retaining litigo for $\mu \mathbf{\alpha} \times{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha$ at Act. 7,26. In Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus also suggests pugnabant, comparable with his substitution of pugno in rendering the same Greek verb at 2 Tim. 2,24; Iac. 4,2. The use of pugnabant had already been adopted by Manetti here. Erasmus perhaps wished to avoid litigo because of its connotation of legal argument.
 See on Ioh. 4,33.
52 carnem illam suam $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\sigma \alpha ́ \rho \beta \alpha \alpha$ ("carnem suam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$; "carnem" 1519). The insertion of illam seems superfluous and unnatural here, as it is common in Greek for the article to be used in a simple possessive sense, when it accompanies a noun relating to part of the human body: cf. Mt. 8,20 ( $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\eta} \nu \mathrm{K} £ \varphi \propto \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ );
 Lc. 24,40 (tàs XEipas kaì toùs móסas). Cf. Annot.
52 edendum $\Phi \propto \gamma \varepsilon \pi v$ ("manducandum" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
53 ederitis 甲а́ $\gamma \eta$ тє ("manducaueritis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 4,31.
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sanguinem, non habetis vitam in vobis. ${ }^{54}$ Qui edit carnem meam, et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam: et ego suscitabo eum in nouissimo die. ${ }^{55}$ Caro enim mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus. ${ }^{56}$ Qui edit meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in illo. ${ }^{57}$ Sicut misit me viuens pater, et ego viuo propter patrem: ita et qui ederit me, viuet ipse quoque propter me. ${ }^{58}$ Hic est panis ille qui de coelo descendit: non sicut comederunt patres vestri manna, et mortui sunt: qui ederit hunc panem, viuet in aeternum. ${ }^{59} \mathrm{Haec}$ dixit in synagoga docens in Capernaum.
${ }^{60}$ Multi ergo his auditis ex discipulis eius dixerunt: Durus est hic sermo: quis potest eum audire? ${ }^{61}$ Sciens autem Iesus apud semet ipsum quod murmurarent de hoc discipuli ipsius, dixit eis: Hoc vos offendit? ${ }^{62}$ Quid igitur si videritis filium hominis ascendentem eo vbi erat prius? ${ }^{63}$ Spiritus est qui viuificat, caro non prodest quicquam. Verba quae ego



54 edit $B-E$ : manducat $A \mid$ carnem meam $E$ : meam carnem $A-D \mid$ suscitabo $B-E$ : resuscitabo $A \mid 56$ edit $B$-E: manducat $A \mid 57$ et ego $C-E$ : ita et ego $A B \mid$ ita $C$-E: om. $A B \mid$ ederit $B$-E: manducat $A \mid$ viuet ipse quoque $C$ C: et ipse viuet $A B \mid 58$ ille $C \cdot E$ : om. $A B \mid$ comederunt $B-E$ : manducauerunt $A \mid$ ederit $B-E$ : manducat $A \mid 60$ his auditis $B-E$ : audientes $A \mid$ quis $B-E$ : Et quis $A \mid 61$ ipsius $B$-E: eius $A \mid 62$ Quid igitur si $B$-E: Si ergo $A \mid$ eo $B-E$ : om. $A$

53 babetis éXETE ("habebitis" late Vg.). The late Vulgate follows the Old Latin version in using the future tense, interpreting according to the context, but without Greek ms. support. See Annot.
54 edit $\tau \rho \omega \dot{\gamma} \omega \nu$ ("manducat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,31 . Erasmus, probably quite correctly, follows the Vulgate in treating $\tau \rho \omega \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ as synonymous with $\varepsilon \sigma \theta i \omega$, here and in vss. 56
and 57. In vs. 58 , his use of edo for $\tau \rho \omega \boldsymbol{}$, and comedo for é $\varphi$ oroov (aorist of éa0ic), misleadingly implies a distinction of meaning, but elsewhere he uses edo and comedo interchangeably.
54 carnem meam $\mu \circ u$ т $\grave{\lambda} \nu \quad \sigma \alpha ́ p k \alpha$ ("meam carnem" $1516-27=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change of wordorder in the 1535 edition is less literal, and inconsistent with Erasmus' retention of meam
carnem in vs. 56 . Since this is the only change made by the 1535 Latin rendering in the whole of ch. 6 , it may be questioned whether this alteration was authorised.
54 suscitabo đ̛̉vaotńow ("resuscitabo" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 40.
56 edit $\tau \rho \omega \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \nu$ ("manducat" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 54.
57 et ego ... ita et kởy $\omega$... kaĺ ("et ego ... et" Vg.; "ita et ego ... "et" 1516-19). Erasmus inserts ita to correspond with the earlier sicut. see Annot. Similar additions occur in 1519 at Iob. 10,$15 ; 15,9 ; 20,21$, in accordance with Vulgate usage at several passages in the Epistles (and also found in the late Vulgate at Ioh. 17,18; Act. 7,51).
57 ederit $\tau \rho \omega \dot{\gamma} \omega \nu$ ("manducat" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 54 regarding edo, and see also Annot. This substitution of the future perfect tense occurs again in vs. 58.
 viuet" $1516-19=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,27 , and Annot. In Manetti's version, this was et ille viuet.
58 panis ille ó äptos ("panis" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on vs. 35.
58 comederunt È $\varphi \propto \gamma \circ$ ("manducauerunt" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on vs. 54.
58 ederit $\tau \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \omega \nu$ ("manducat" $1516=V_{g}$.). See on vss. 54 and 57. The misspelling tpóyตv in the 1516 edition is derived from cod. 2 . The same error occurred in cod. 2 at vs. 57 , where the word was spelled correctly in Erasmus' Greek text.
60 bis auditis d́ $k o \cup ́ \sigma \alpha v t e s$ ("audientes" 1516 $=$ Vg.). In 1516, Erasmus' Greek text has ódroúovtes, a reading which is not found in codd. $1,2,69,817$, and lacks other ms. support. It has the appearance of being a conjecture, based on the use of a present participle by the Latin Vulgate: see on Ioh. 4,48 for other pro-Vulgate conjectures. However, elsewhere Erasmus regarded it as a common fault of the Vulgate, to use a present participle to render a Greek aorist participle (see on Ioh. 1,36), so that it is unlikely that he would have supposed that a Greek variant, odzov́ovtes, underlies the Vulgate at the present passage. Looking again at the relevant line of text in the 1516 edition (ákov́outes $\varepsilon$ k
 that the word-spacing between ớkoúovies and $\dot{\varepsilon} k$, and between $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ and $\mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$, is somewhat
wider than between the other words on the same line, and the whole line is more widely spaced than any other line on this page, leaving room for an additional three characters. This suggests that the line was probably altered at a late stage in the typesetting, or even after printing had begun. The intention, perhaps, was to delete the mistaken repetition of a short word or a syllable, but one of Erasmus' assistants rashly took it upon himself to emend the Greek text to make it agree with the Latin, thus producing this unusual variant. Manetti put qui audierant.
60 quis tis ("Et quis" $1516=$ late Vg .). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
61 quod ס̃דו ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
61 ipsius á̉toũ ("eius" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun to refer back to Jesus as the subject of the sentence. Manetti had sui.
61 offendit $\sigma \mathrm{k} \alpha v \delta \alpha \lambda i \zeta \varepsilon \mathrm{l}$ ("scandalizat" Vg.). Erasmus removes every occurrence of scandalizo in the N.T., mostly in 1516, and the remainder in 1519. The same applies to scandalum, which disappears by 1522, except for one instance which Erasmus overlooked, at Ap. Ioh. 2,14. In Annot. at Mt. 5,29, he objects to the use of scandalizo, as not being a proper Latin word, and recommends using offendo, obstaculo fuerit, or offendiculo fucrit.
62 Quid igitur si $\mathfrak{E}$ c̀̀v oưv ("Si ergo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus explains in Annot., that the addition of quid is necessary to convey the sense implicit in the Greek expression. The Vulgate Gospels have a preference for ergo rather than igitur, for the latter occurs only seven times (reduced to five in the late Vulgate). Erasmus uses igitur fifty times in the Gospels; of the eight instances in John, six are introduced in 1519. See also on Ioh. 5,4, regarding the alternative use of itaque. Such changes are for the sake of varying the vocabulary. Manetti put Si igitur.
$62 \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \eta \pi \tau \varepsilon$. The 1516 edition has the incorrect indicative form, $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon i ̃ t \varepsilon$, from cod. 2.
62 eo vbi ómou ("vbi" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus similarly supplies $e o$ at several other passages in 1519 , where $v b i$ accompanies a verb of motion: Mc. 5,40; Iob. 7,34, 36; 11,32.
$63 \dot{\omega} \varphi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i$. The misspelling ó $\phi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i ̃$, in the 1516-19 editions, is taken from cod. 2.
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loquor vobis, spiritus et vita sunt. ${ }^{64}$ Sed sunt quidam ex vobis, qui non credunt. Nouerat enim ab initio Iesus, qui essent non credentes, et quis proditurus esset ipsum. ${ }^{65} \mathrm{Et}$ dicebat: Propterea dixi vobis, quod nemo potest venire ad me, nisi fuerit ei datum a patre meo. ${ }^{66} \mathrm{Ex}$ eo tempore multi discipulorum eius desciuerunt, eo relicto, nec amplius cum illo ambulabant. ${ }^{67}$ Dixit ergo Iesus ad duodecim: Num et vos vultis abire? ${ }^{68}$ Respondit ergo ei Simon Petrus: Domine, ad quem ibimus? Verba vitae aeternae habes: ${ }^{69}$ et nos credimus et cognouimus, quod tu es Christus filius dei viui. ${ }^{70}$ Respondit eis Iesus: Nonne ego vos duodecim elegi, et ex vobis vnus diabolus est? ${ }^{71}$ Dicebat autem de Iuda Simonis Iscariota: hic enim


63 loquor $B-E$ : locutus sum $A \mid 64$ Nouerat $B-E$ : Sciebat $A \mid$ alt. non $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ proditurus $B$ - $E$ : traditurus $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ : se $A \mid 66$ eo tempore $B$ - $E$ : hoc $A \mid$ desciuerunt ... amplius $B-E$ : abierunt retro, et iam non $A \mid 67$ Num $B-E$ : Nunquid $A \mid 68$ aeternae $B-E$ : eternae $A \mid$ 69 quod $B-E$ : quia $A \mid 70$ eis $A B D E$ ei $C \mid 71$ Iscariota $B-E$ : Iscariotha $A$

63 Loquor $\lambda \alpha \lambda \omega$ ("locutus sum" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, $\lambda \varepsilon$ $\lambda \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$, as found in $\mathbf{7}^{66}$ к B C D N T W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by most other late mss. It might be argued that this was a late harmonisation, based on the same wording at Ioh. 14,10, т $\alpha \dot{\rho} \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \not \approx$ ${ }^{E} \gamma \omega \dot{\omega} \lambda \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} \dot{u} \mu i \nu \nu$, which is found there in most mss., commencing with $3{ }^{66} \aleph$ A W. However, at that passage, a few mss. read $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$, as in $7^{75} \mathrm{~B}$, while others again have $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$, as in cod. D. The existence of the latter variant at Iob. 14,10 raises the question whether the reading $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{\eta} k \alpha$ at $I o b .6,63$ might similarly have originated as a substitution by an ancient scribe or editor, perhaps through familiarity with the repeated use of the phrase $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \mathrm{K} \alpha$ $\dot{u} \mu \mathrm{i} v \mathrm{v}$ later in the Gospel (at 14,$25 ; 15,3,11$;

16, 1, 4, 6, 25, 33). Manetti anticipated Erasmus in putting loquor.
64 Nouerat 亿ौ| $\delta \mathrm{\varepsilon l}$ ("Sciebat" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33.
64 non credentes $\mu \grave{\eta}$ mı $\sigma t \varepsilon$ '́ovtes ("credentes" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate rendering corresponds with the omission of $\mu \eta$ by cod. $\mathcal{K}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by 366 . ${ }^{66 o r r} 75$ vid B C D N T W and nearly all later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti changed the word-order, with qui non essent credentes.
64 proditurus $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega \nu$ ("traditurus" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The substitution of prodo for trado occurs twenty times in the 1519 edition, in the sense of "betray". The verb prodo is used only at Mc. 14,10 in the Vulgate N.T. (changed to trado in 1516-19), and only once in 1516
（at Eph．5，13，in a different sense）．See Annot． at $M c .14,21$（1522），where Erasmus mentions the view that trado properly means to＂hand over＂something．There are also a number of passages where Erasmus retains trado in the sense of＂betray＂，e．g．at Ioh．21，20．
64 ipsum aủtóv（＂eum＂Vg．；＂se＂1516）．Eras－ mus＇use of se in 1516 was capable of being misunderstood as implying＂betray himself＂． The pronoun ipse more clearly refers back to the subject of the sentence．
65 suiv．The reading ${ }^{\text {un }} \mu \tilde{\sim} \nu$ in the 1516 Greek text was probably no more than a misprint，as it was corrected in the errata of that edition．
65 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Manetti made the same change．
66 eo tempore toútou（＂hoc＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．This addition of tempore followed a suggestion of Valla $A n n o t$ ．The word was placed in italics by Erasmus，to show that it is only implied，and not explicit in the Greek text．See Annot．
 ótríw（＂abierunt retro＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus is less literal here，probably to avoid the mis－ understanding that they＂went away backwards＂． The verb destisco，meaning to＂defect＂or＂rebel＂， also occurs at 1 Tim．4，1 and Hebr．3，12， rendering $\dot{\alpha} \varphi / \sigma \tau \eta \mu \mathrm{IL}$ ．It is nowhere found in the Vulgate．Cf．Valla Elegantiae V，86，giving descisco as the equivalent of subtrabo（＂withdraw＂），for which Erasmus substituted deficio（meaning to ＂defect＂or＂desert＂）in Paraphr．in Eleg．Laur． Vallae，$A S D$ I，4，p．244，11．23－24．Manetti＇s version had abiere retro．
66 nec amplius kai oủkéti（＂et iam non＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus also uses nec amplius at Act．8，39 （1519）．On his use of nec，see on Iob．2，16．The substitution of non amplius for iam non occurs elsewhere at Rom．6，9； 2 Cor．5，16；Gal．3，25； Eph．4，14，28；Hebr．8，12；10，17， 18 （1519），in the sense of＂no longer＂rather than＂not now＂． In two places he put non amplius for amplius non（Act．13，34； 1 Thess．3，5）．Manetti here has et amplius ．．．non．
67 Num Mý（＂Nunquid＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Iob．3，4．
69 quod otı（＂quia＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh． 1，20．Manetti（Pal Lat．45）also had quod．
 The Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting toũ $\zeta \tilde{\omega}$ 亿тоs，as in $\mathbf{7}^{6675}$ B C D W and some
later mss．，including cod．1．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817 ，supported by most other mss．， commencing with cod．N．Most of the earlier uncials which lack toũ Ц $\tilde{\nu} v$ tos also substitute ${ }^{2} \mathrm{z}$ yos for $\chi$ plotòs $\delta$ viós．It has been suggested that the longer reading arose from harmonisa－ tion with Mt．16，16，where the same phrase occurs．However，there is also the unfortunate possibility that the shorter reading，$\delta{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{z} \gamma 10 \mathrm{~s}$ toũ $\theta$ हoũ，was a harmonisation with $M c$ ．1，24； $L$ c．4，34，where this expression was used by the man who had an unclean spirit．The disciples＇ faith went further than that of the demons． Manetti（PaL Lat．45）similarly added viui．
70 eis aủtoĩs（＂ei＂ 1522 Lat．）．The singular pronoun，$e i$ ，could be understood as referring to Peter，to whom Jesus was replying．The reading occurs in some Vulgate mss．，and corresponds with aن̉tต̃ in cod． 69 and a few other late mss．However，since Erasmus made no change to his Greek text，this temporary alteration of his Latin translation should pro－ bably be considered an error of the printer．See on Iob． 9,20 for other similar errors．
70 ú $\mu \tilde{s} \mathrm{~s}$ ．In 1519，the first－person plural Úueis makes no sense in this context，and must be considered a misprint．
70 diabolus $\delta$ t́á $\beta$ o $\lambda o s$ ．In 1516 Annot．，Erasmus objected to the use of this non－Latin word，and recommended delator or calumniator．However， in 1519 he argued for the retention of diabolus on the grounds that it was an accurate interpre－ tation of the name of Satan，citing the opinion of Chrysostom．Valla gives criminator as the correct Latin equivalent，in his In Errores Anto－ nii Raudensis Adnotationes（Laurentii Vallae Opera， Basle，1540），p．402， 11. 21－22；see also Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，p．246， 1． 85.
71 Iscariota ’lokapı由́tnv（＂Scariot（h）is＂Vg．； ＂Iscariotha＂1516）．The Vulgate use of the genitive form of this name，agreeing with the preceding Simonis（i．e．＂Judas the son of Simon Iscariot＂），corresponds with the Greek variant， ＇lokapı＇்Tou，found in 月 $^{66} 75 \mathrm{~V}^{\text {corr }}$ B C W and a few later mss．Erasmus has the accusative case，agreeing with Iuda rather than Simonis （i．e．＂Judas Iscariot，the son of Simon＂），fol－ lowing cod．2，supported by cod． N and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 817．The accusative might be seen as a harmonisation with other N．T．passages，but there is also the possibility that the genitive form，＇lokapı＇்тou，
 T $๊ \nu ~ \delta \omega ́ \delta \varepsilon \kappa \alpha$.
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erat proditurus eum, quum esset vnus ex duodecim.

7Versabatur lesus post haec in Ga lilaea: non enim volebat in Iudaea versari, quia quaerebant eum Iudaei interficere. ${ }^{2}$ Erat autem in propinquo dies festus Iudaeorum scenopegia. ${ }^{3}$ Dixerunt igitur ad eum fratres eius: Transi hinc, et vade in Iudaeam, vt et discipuli tui videant opera tua quae facis. ${ }^{4}$ Nemo quippe in occulto facit aliquid, et quaerit ipse palam esse. Si haec facis, declara te ipsum mundo. ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Nam}$ ne \| fratres quidem eius credebant in eum. ${ }^{6}$ Dicit ergo eis Iesus: Tempus meum nondum adest: tempus autem vestrum semper est paratum. ${ }^{7}$ Non potest mundus odisse vos: me autem odit, quia ego testimonium fero de illo, quod opera eius mala sint. ${ }^{8}$ Vos ascendite ad diem festum hunc. Ego nondum ascendo

## 71 proditurus $B-E$ : traditurus $A$

7,1 Versabatur $B-E$ : Ambulabat $A \mid$ Galilaea $B-E$ : Galilaeam $A \mid$ versari $B$ - $E$ : ambulare $A \mid$ 2 propinquo $B-E$ : proximo $A \mid$ scenopegia $B-E$ : scenopegiae $A \mid 3$ igitur $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ 4 facit aliquid $B-E$ : quid facit $A \mid$ declara $B-E$ : manifesta $A \mid 5$ Nam ne fratres quidem $B-E$ : Neque enim fratres $A \mid 7$ fero $B$ - $E$ : perhibeo $A$
arose by attraction to the case of the immediately preceding word, $\sum i \mu \omega \nu$ os (as occurs in one ms. at Iob. 12,4: see note ad loc.), or from a desire to smooth away the apparent awkwardness of the sequence 'loú $\delta \alpha v$ इí $\mu \omega v o s$ ' $1 \sigma \kappa \alpha \rho 1 \omega \in \tau \eta$ (accusative-genitive-accusative). The reference to "Judas Iscariot", rather than "Simon Iscariot", is supported elsewhere by the reading of $39^{66}$ $\aleph$ B (W) at Ioh. 13,2, and of $\mathrm{P}^{66}$ A W at Ioh. 13,26.
71 proditurus mapadıס́óvaı ("traditurus" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on vs. 64.
 рıтотєĩv ("Ambulabat ... ambulare" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses versor in twelve places in 1516 to translate several other Greek verbs ( $\alpha v \alpha$ -

though not терıттотє́w. In 1519, he introduced versor at a further thirteen places (rendering $\delta ı \alpha т \rho(\beta \omega, \pi \varepsilon \rho 1 \pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \omega$, торєúouaı), usually to replace ambulo in contexts where the literal sense of "walking" is not required. At several passages, however, he is content to retain ambulo even where it is used metaphorically, e.g. at Rom. 14,15. The word versor does not occur in the Vulgate N.T. See Annot. In leaving kal untranslated, Erasmus follows the Vulgate rendering. However, the earlier Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting kaí, as in $7^{66} \boldsymbol{\aleph}^{*} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }}$ D and a few later mss. (the later Vulgate copies inserted autem after post baec: see the following note for the Vulgate word-order). In the remainder of the mss., kai is included, and hence Manetti began the sentence with Et ambulabat.

1 post haec $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ тaũta. In the Vulgate, these words are placed at the beginning of the sentence, reflecting an underlying variation in the
 'Inooũs, as found in $3 \boldsymbol{P}^{66} 75$ vid $\aleph B C D W$ and many later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' word-order follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by most other late mss. Manetti omitted post baec, with support from a few of the later mss.

 Vg.; "in Galilaeam ... in Iudaea" 1516). Erasmus here corrects a mistranslation: see Annot. In Manetti's version is found the same inconsistency as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
2 in propinquo ${ }^{\text {Ěy }}$ y's ("in proximo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,13. Manetti preferred prope here. The 1527 Vulgate column further had die for dies.
 1516). Whether taken as a plural or a genitive, the 1516 Latin spelling appears less accurate.
3 igitur oũv ("autem" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus makes a similar change at Iob. 18,12 (1519). For passages incorrectly retaining autem for oưv, see on Iob. 3,25. The use of autem by the Vulgate might appear to represent a different Greek text, reading $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, but this is found in hardly any mss. Manetti put ergo.
4 facit aliquid $\mathrm{T1}$ тoıEI ("quid facit" 1516 = late Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,7. Manetti's version had aliquid facit.
4 palam Èv mappnoiọ ("in palam" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus hints that the phrase in palam is not good Latin, probably because he felt that palam, being an adverb, should not follow a preposition: cf. his avoidance of $a d$ inuicem (see on Iob. 4,33). For other changes involving palam, see on Ioh. 10,24 . The subject is also discussed in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 181 D-182 B. Manetti rendered this by in propatulo.
4 declara $\varphi$ avép $\omega \sigma o v$ ("manifesta" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.).
A comparable substitution of declaro occurs at 2 Cor. 3,3 (1519). For Erasmus' frequent avoidance of manifesto in 1519, see on Iob. 1,31.
5 Nam ne ... quidem oưठछ̇ $\gamma$ dap ("Neque enim" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change is required by the context. The substitution of ne ... quidem
("not even") for nec and neque ("and ... not") occurs in 1516 at nineteen passages, all in Matthew, Mark and the Epistles, and in 1519 at a further nine passages, of which seven are in Luke-John-Acts: a further example of the less complete revision of these books in the 1516 edition.
6 adest Tóppeठtiv ("aduenit" Vg.). A similar change occurs at $M t .26,50$, recognising that the Greek verb literally means "to be present", rather than to come or to arrive. However, Erasmus retains venio in rendering the same verb at e.g. Act. 10,$21 ; 12,20 ; 17,6$. In Valla, adsum is treated as equivalent to aduenio: see his Elegantiae V, 51; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallac, ASD I, 4, p. 217, 11. 243-251, 259-265. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
7 testimonium fero $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup \rho \omega \tilde{0}$ ("testimonium perhibeo" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,7.
7 quod Őtı ("quia" late Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
8 nondum ( 1 st .) oữ ("enim non" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition of enim is unsupported by Greek mss. In Annot., Erasmus also mentions the existence of Vulgate mss. which have enim nondum. The earlier Vulgate has non, reflecting the substitution of ouvk for oű $\pi \omega$, as in codd. $א \mathrm{D}$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $7^{6675}$ B N T W 070 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The reading oưt $\pi \omega$ was also recorded in Valla Annot. Some modern editors prefer oúk, as being a lectio difficilior, arguing that oưt $\omega$ was introduced to remove an apparent inconsistency with vs. 10 . However, the tendency of K and D to omit words and syllables, whether by accident or design, in defiance of the combined testimony of most other mss. in this part of John, raises a question over their value as witnesses for ouv in the present verse: cf. the omission of kai by $7^{66} \mathcal{N}^{*} D$ in vs. 1 ; the substitution of $\theta$ हढpoṽow by $\boldsymbol{K}^{*}$ in vs. 3 ; the omission of $\sigma o u$ by $\mathbb{K}^{*}$ D, again in vs. 3 ; the omission of oưv by $\mathrm{K}^{*} \mathrm{D} W$ in vs. 6 ; the substitution of ou for oưtc by $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ in vs. 6; the omission of $\delta \varepsilon$ by $\mathcal{N} 070$ in vs. 9 ; the omission of $\omega \varsigma{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K} \mathcal{N}$ in vs. 10 , etc. Manetti also had nondum here.
8 ascendo do $\alpha \alpha \beta \alpha i v \omega$ ("ascendam" late Vg ., with some Vg. mss.). Erasmus restores the more accurate present tense of the earlier Vulgate, also adopted by Manetti. See Annot.





























ad festum hoc, quia meum tempus nondum impletum est. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{Haec}$ autem quum dixisset illis, mansit in Galilaea. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Vt}$ autem ascenderunt fratres eius, tunc et ipse ascendit ad festum, non manifeste, sed velut in occulto. ${ }^{11}$ Iudaei ergo quaerebant eum in festo, et dicebant: Vbi est ille? ${ }^{12}$ Et murmur multum erat in turbis de eo. Quidam enim dicebant, Bonus est: alii autem dicebant, Non, sed seducit turbam. ${ }^{13}$ Nemo tamen palam loquebatur de illo propter metum Iudaeorum.
${ }^{14}$ Quum autem iam dimidium festi peractum esset, ascendit Iesus in templum, ac docebat. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ mirabantur Iudaei, dicentes: Quomodo hic literas scit, quum non didicerit? ${ }^{16}$ Respondit eis Iesus, et dixit: Mea doctrina non est mea, sed eius qui misit me. ${ }^{17}$ Si quis voluerit voluntati eius obtemperare, cognoscet de doctrina, vtrum ex deo sit, an ego a me ipso loquar. ${ }^{18}$ Qui a semet ipso loquitur, gloriam propriam quaerit. Qui autem quaerit gloriam eius qui misit ipsum, hic verax est, et iniustitia in illo non est. ${ }^{19}$ Nonne Moses dedit vobis legem? Et tamen nemo ex vobis, factis praestat legem.

## 7,17 Өє $\lambda \eta$ B-E: $\theta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \in ⿺ A$

8 festum hoc $B-E$ : diem festum istum $A \mid 10$ festum $B-E$ : diem festum $A \mid 11$ festo $B-E$ : die festo $A \mid 12$ multum $B-E$ : multus $A \mid$ turbis $B-E$ : turba $A \mid 14$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 15$ literas $B-E$ : litteras $A \mid 17$ voluntati eius obtemperare $B-E$ : voluntatem eius facere $A \mid 18$ ipsum $B-E$ : $\operatorname{eum} A \mid 19$ tamen $B-E: o m . A \mid$ factis praestat $B-E$ : facit $A$

8 festum (2nd.) тìv £́ротìv ("diem festum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In such contexts, Erasmus regarded diem as optional. Other such changes in 1519 are found in vss. $10-11$, and at 12,$20 ; 13,1$; cf. Mt. 27,15; Lc. 23,17, and in 1516 at Mc. 15,6; Ioh. 7,14 . At sixteen other passages, he retained dies festus. Manetti preferred festiuitatem (see on vs. 37).
8 hoc таútŋv ("istum" $1516=$ Vg. mss.; "illum" Vg. 1527). This substitution is necessary,
to avoid an unwanted contrast being made with the feast that was mentioned earlier in the verse. Manetti put istam, agreeing with festiuitatem.
9 autem $\delta$ é (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by codd. ※ D 070 and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , in company with nearly all other mss., commencing with P$^{66} 75$ B N T W. The reason why a few scribes omitted $\delta \varepsilon$ may have
been that, following his remarks about the coming feast day, Jesus' action in remaining in Galilee was only to be expected. This word was also added by Manetti.

9 illis aủtoĩs ("ipse" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of ou'tós, as found in $7^{66} \mathrm{~K}$ $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{~N} W 070$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by most other mss., beginning with $7^{75}$ B $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{T}$. Manetti put eis.
 $=$ Vg.). See on vs. 8. Manetti again had festiuitatem.
10 velut $\omega$ s ("quasi" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,14.
 on vs. 8. Manetti, as usual, preferred festiuitate.

12 murmur multum үoүүvoud̀s mo入ús ("murmur multus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The gender of this noun is usually neuter in classical Latin, as mentioned in Annot. The same change was favoured by Manetti and Valla Annot.
12 turbis тоĩs ö $\chi \lambda$ os ("turba" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with a Greek variant, T $\tilde{\tilde{\omega}}{ }^{\circ} \times \lambda \omega$, found in $\boldsymbol{p}^{66} \times \mathrm{D}$ and one later ms. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{75 v i d} \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{~T} \mathrm{~W} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{most} \mathrm{later} \mathrm{mss.}$, codd. 1 and 817. It is possible that $T \tilde{\omega}{ }^{0} \times \lambda \lambda \omega$ arose from harmonisation with the same phrase later in the verse.
12 Bonus o̊tı 'AyaOós ("Quia bonus" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod bonus.
12 autem סé. Erasmus, or one of his assistants, inserted the particle $8 \dot{\varepsilon}$ from cod. 1, to agree with the Vulgate, with further support from $3^{75} \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{~T} \mathrm{~W} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{few} \mathrm{later} \mathrm{mss}$. in codd. 2 and 817, together with most other mss., commencing with $7^{66} \aleph \mathrm{D}$. The word may originally have been inserted by an ancient scribe or editor who thought that the occurrence of $\mu \dot{v} v$, earlier in the verse, required a corresponding SÉ. Manetti omitted autem.
12 turbam tòv ö $x \lambda$ дov ("turbas" Vg.). The Vulgate use of the plural lacks Greek support, apart from cod. 69.
14 Quum autem iam dimidium festi peractum esset
 die festo mediante" Vg.). Since the verb medio, or medior, does not exist in classical Latin, Erasmus therefore rephrases the whole clause: see Annot. The verb perago occurs eleven times in his N.T. He introduces it e.g. at Act. 20,3,
in the phrase peractis mensibus tribus: cf. the Vulgate usage of multo tempore peracto at Act. 27,9, in rendering $\delta 1 \propto \gamma i v o \mu \alpha 1$. As noted at Iob. 6,39, this kind of rewriting of the translation is more frequent in the Epistles than the Gospels. Manetti tried Iam autem festiuitate intercedente, giving a different sense; Valla Annot. suggested using in medio festo or circa medium festi. Erasmus lists the passage among the Soloccismi. Edward Lee and Stunica both defended the Vulgate as being more literal here: for Erasmus' replies, see his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 182 C-E, and Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., $L B$ IX, 396 E.
14 ac kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
16 Respondit ${ }^{\alpha}$ artekpion. Under Vulgate influence, the Erasmian Greek text here follows cod. 1 in omitting oưv after ơ ortekpion, with support from cod. D and some later mss., with the result that it was also omitted from the Textus Receptus. The word is included in codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{P}^{66} 75 \mathrm{vid}$ § $\mathrm{B} \mathrm{N} \mathrm{TW}$.
$17 \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta$ n. In 1516, the reading $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon 1$ is taken from cod. 2, with little other ms. support.
17 voluntati ... obtemperare tò $\theta$ غ́ $\lambda \eta \mu \alpha$... тоוะĩ ("voluntatem ... facere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,34. A similar substitution is made at $I o b .9,31$ (1519). The verb obtempero occurs in the Vulgate at Hebr. 5,9; 12,9, in rendering úmakoú $\omega$ and ப́moтd́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$ (changed by Erasmus to obedio and subiicio). Elsewhere, Erasmus uses obtempero at Rom. 2,8 and 1 Petr. 3,1, in rendering órme: $\theta^{\prime}$ é $\omega$ and $\pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$.

18 ipsum ávóv ("eum" 1516 = late Vg.). The reflexive pronoun is used to refer back to the subject of the sentence. The same change was made by Manetti.
19 Et tamen кai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). In 1519, this phrase is introduced five times in John's Gospel (here, and at 7,$22 ; 8,55 ; 9,30 ; 16,32$ ) and at 2 Cor. 6,10 . In 1516, it is found at 2 Cor. 6,8, 9; 1 Petr. 1,7; 2,20, but nowhere in the Vulgate N.T. The reason for the change is to convey the less common adversative sense of koi, as meaning "and yet" rather than simply "and", at such passages. Erasmus also sometimes uses atqui to convey the same sense: see on vs. 26, and Annot. ad loc.

19 factis praestat поוזĩ ("facit" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 3,21. The substitution of praesto for facio occurs in 1516 at Rom. 4,21; and in 1519 at Mt. 6,1, 2, 3; 7,22; Lc. 1,51; Act. 9,36; 10,2;
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Quid me quaeritis interficere? ${ }^{20}$ Respondit turba, et dixit: Daemonium habes: quis te quaerit interficere? ${ }^{21}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit eis: Vnum opus feci, et omnes miramini. ${ }^{22}$ Propterea Moses dedit vobis circuncisionem: non quia ex Mose sit, sed quia ex patribus. Et tamen in sabbato circunciditis hominem. ${ }^{23}$ Si circuncisionem accipit homo in sabbato, vt non soluatur lex Mosi, mihi indignamini, quod totum hominem sanum fecerim in sabbato? ${ }^{24}$ Nolite iudicare secundum aspectum, sed iusto iudicio iudicate. ${ }^{25}$ Dicebant ergo quidam ex Hierosolymitanis: Nonne hic est quem quaerunt interficere? ${ }^{26}$ Atqui ecce palam loquitur, et nihil ei dicunt. Num vere cognouerunt principes, hunc esse vere Christum? ${ }^{27}$ Sed hunc nouimus vnde sit. Christus autem quum venerit, nemo scit vnde sit. ${ }^{28}$ Clamabat ergo Iesus in templo docens, ac dicens: Et me nostis: et vnde sim, nostis: et a me ipso non veni, sed est verax qui misit me, quem vos non nouistis.
 кıрvete $B C^{*}$

22 sit $B$-E: est $A \mid$ alt. quia C-E: om. $A B \mid$ tamen B-E: om. $A \mid 23$ quod $B$-E: quia $A \mid$ fecerim $B$-E: feci $A \mid 24$ iusto iudicio $B$-E: iustum iudicium $A \mid 26$ Atqui $B-E:$ om. $A$ | 27 nouimus $B$-E: scimus $A \mid 28$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ prius nostis $B$-E: scitis $A \mid$ alt nostis $B-E$ : scitis $A \mid$ non nouistis $B-E$ : nescitis $A$

Iac. 2,13. Cf. also Erasmus' use of exbibeo at Act. 24,17 (1519). On this use of praesto, see his Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 302, 11. 607-609, representing an expansion of the comment in Valla Elegantiae VI, 16.
$20 \dot{\alpha}$ बтекрi $\hat{\eta}$. The reading $\dot{\alpha}$ बтокрi $\hat{\eta} \eta$ in 1535 is a misprint: see on Iob. 1,24.

21 ó 'Inooũs. The Erasmian text here inserts $\delta$ without authority from codd. 1,2 , and 817. Although it occurs in codd. D N T W and some later mss., it is probable that Erasmus or his assistants made this insertion as a grammatical conjecture. See on Iob. 1,48. The article is omitted in most mss., commencing with ${ }^{396} 75 \mathrm{~N}$.
 expresses the idea that this was only a supposi－ tion rather than an actual fact．
22 sed quia $\langle\lambda \lambda$＇（＂sed＂ $1516-19=V \mathrm{~g}$ ．）．This second occurrence of quia supplies an ellipsis in the Greek wording．
22 Et tamen kai（＂Et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on vs． 19.

23 mihi indignamini Énoi रо入õ̃te（＂mihi cur indignamini＂late Vg ．）．The late Vulgate addition corresponds with the reading $\pi \tilde{\rho} \varsigma \varepsilon \in \mu \frac{1}{\chi} \chi \circ \lambda a ̃ t \varepsilon$ ， found in cod．D，but otherwise unsupported among Greek mss．：see Annot．The word cur was likewise omitted by Manetti．
23 quod ．．．fecerim ótı ．．．ह́ттоínб人（＂quia ．．． feci＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti put quod ．．．feci．
24 aspectum ő $\psi ı v$（＂faciem＂Vg．）．Erasmus here adopts another suggestion from Valla Annot． The word aspectus is used elsewhere，by both Erasmus and the Vulgate，to render iסéa，$\pi$ 位－ $\sigma \omega \pi \frac{v}{}$ ，and őpaors．Manetti tried speciem at this passage．In Annot．，Erasmus argues that the context requires the more general sense of ＂what can be seen with the physical eyes＂， rather than just facial appearance．
24 iusto iudicio тìv $\delta$ וка́á $\alpha v$ kpíovv（＂iustum iudicium＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．Erasmus did not regard the literal rendering of the Vulgate as being in accordance with good classical usage．However， an example of iudicium iudico can be found in Ennius（Fragmenta scaenica 70）．
25 Hierosolymitanis $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$＇โєробо $\cup \mu \mu \tau \omega ̃ \nu$（＂ Hi － erosolymis＂Vg．）．The Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss．Erasmus＇rendering is anti－ cipated by Manetti．At Mc．1，5，Erasmus followed the Vulgate in using a slightly different word，Hierosolymitae，to render the same Greek expression．
26 Atqui kai（omitted in 1516 Lat．$=$ late Vg．）． Erasmus introduces atqui in eight passages of the Epistles，in 1516，and at three further passages in the Gospels in 1519 （including this verse）．It does not occur in the Vulgate．Here， the word is used to convey the adversative sense of kat．See also on et tamen at vs．19，and also Annot．The version of Manetti just put et，as in the earlier Vulgate．
26 Num иŋ́тотє（＂Numquid＂Vg．）．See on Ioh． 3，4，and Annot．In Manetti＇s version（in both mss．），this was rendered Nunc aliquando．

26 bunc esse vere Cbristum õti oũtós éativ ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma \delta^{\circ}$ Xpıotós（＂quia hic est Christus＂ Vg．）．For the accusative and infinitive con－ struction，see on Ioh．1，34．The Vulgate omis－ sion of vere，corresponding with the Greek omission of $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ，is supported by $3^{66} \mathcal{N}$ B D N T W and some later mss．，including cod．1．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817，in company with most other late mss．In favour of the Vulgate，it has been suggested that $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} s$ could have been added to harmonise with similar expressions at Ioh．4，42；6，14；7，40． On the other hand，the repetition of $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\omega} s$ within the same verse（in view of the earlier
 occurrence．An ancient scribe who found the word repeated in this way，in his exemplar， might have thought that the second instance of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ was redundant，and therefore omitted it．See Annot．In Manetti，this was rendered as quod bic est vere Cbristus．
27 nouimus oî $\delta \propto \mu \varepsilon v$（＂scimus＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．1，33．Erasmus，more precisely，distin－ guishes this verb from yıv由்okel later in the same verse．Manetti＇s solution was to put scimus ．．．cognoscet．
28 Iesus in templo docens ó＇Inooũs év T币̃ ípఝ̃ $\delta_{1} \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \nu$ ．The word－order of the Erasmian Greek text follows cod．1，so as to agree with the late Vulgate，with support from codd．$\$$ D N and a few later mss．His codd． 2 and
 corresponding with the rendering of the earlier Vulgate，and supported by most Greek mss．， commencing with ${ }^{66}{ }^{75}$ B T W（some of which exhibit minor discrepancies as to the presence of the article，$\delta$ ）．
$28 a c$ каí（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25．
28 кaí $\mu \varepsilon$ ．This was an arbitrary change by Erasmus or his printer．His codd．1，2，817， and virtually all other mss．，have the form


28 nostis ．．．nostis ．．．non nouistis oîסare ．．． оíరate ．．．oủk oíסate（＂scitis ．．．scitis ．．． nescitis＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，33．

28 verax à $\lambda \eta \eta$ өıvós（＂verus＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at 1 Thess．1，9；Ap．Ioh．3，7； 6,10 ，consistent with Vulgate usage at other passages where $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \lambda_{\eta} \eta$＇s or $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta_{\theta} v o{ }^{\prime} s$ is applied to a person：e．g．at Ioh． 3,$33 ; 7,18 ; 8,26$ ，etc．（i．e． ＂truthful＂rather than＂real＂）．Manetti made the same change．



















${ }^{29}$ Ego vero noui eum, quia ab ipso sum, et ille me misit. ${ }^{30}$ Quaerebant ergo eum apprehendere, et nemo misit in illum manus, quia nondum venerat hora eius. ${ }^{31}$ De turba autem multi crediderunt in eum, et dicebant: Christus quum venerit, num signa plura aedet iis quae hic aedidit? ${ }^{32}$ Audierunt Pharisaei turbam murmurantem de illo haec, et miserunt Pharisaei ac principes sacerdotum ministros, vt apprehenderent eum. ${ }^{33}$ Dixit ergo eis Iesus: Adhuc pusillum temporis vobiscum sum, et abeo ad eum qui me misit. ${ }^{34}$ Quaeretis me, nec inuenietis: | et vbi ego sum, eo vos non potestis venire. ${ }^{35}$ Dixerunt ergo Iudaei inter sese: Quo hic iturus est, quod nos non inueniemus eum? Num in

## $29 \delta \varepsilon$ B-E: om. $A$

29 vero noui $B-E$ : scio $A \mid 31$ et $A C-E$ ac $B \mid$ num $B$ - $E$ : nuuquid $A$ (sic) | aedet $B-E$ : faciet $A \mid$ aedidit $B-E$ : fecit $A \mid 32$ Pharisaei ac principes sacerdotum $B-E$ : principes et pharisaei $A$ | apprehenderent $B-E$ : appraehenderent $A \mid 33$ pusillum temporis $B$ - $E$ : modicum tempus $A \mid$ abeo $B-E$ : vado $A \mid 34$ nec $B-E$ : et non $A \mid$ eo $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 35$ quod $A C-E$ : quia $B \mid$ nos $B-E$ : om. $A$

29 vero 8 é (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In his 1516 Greek text, Erasmus omitted $\delta$ ס́, following cod. 2, with support from $7^{75}$ B T W and most later mss., together with the Latin Vulgate. By the time he came to prepare his note on the passage for 1516 Annot., he ignored the reading of cod. 2 , and was consulting other mss. which included $\delta \varepsilon$, so that he now advocated inserting vero. This was put into effect in his 1519 edition, in both text and translation, with support from his codd. 1 and 817 (but not cod. 3), accompanied by ${ }^{666} \mathcal{K} \mathrm{D} N$ and some later mss. This less widely attested reading survived into the Textus Receptus.
29 noui of $\bar{\alpha} \alpha$ ("scio" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,33, and Annot.
29 eum ả̛tóv ("eum, et si dixero quia nescio eum, ero similis vobis mendax, sed scio eum" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus points out that
this lengthy addition of the late Vulgate seems to have been taken from Ioh. 8,55. He listed it in his Quae Sint Addita. The addition was also condemned in Valla Annot., on the strength of seven Greek mss. and "most" of the Latin mss. which he consulted. Manetti's version gave an even longer addition here.
29 et ille Kả̛ksĩvos ("et ipse" Vg.). Erasmus probably regarded the use of a reflexive pronoun as unnecessary, and repetitive here. The same change was made by Manetti.
30 manus tàs Xeĩpos. The Erasmian Greek text follows cod. 1, in conformity with the Vulgate, with support from codd. NW and some later mss. The reading of codd. 2 and 817 was Tìv XEijpa, found in most other mss., commencing with $\$^{66} 75$ vid $\mathcal{K}$ B D T. The plural form could have arisen as a harmonisation with the cus-

at other N.T. passages, e.g. at vs. 44. Manetti put manum, with support from most of the Greek mss.
$30 \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \lambda \hat{\prime} \theta \eta$. This spelling was taken from cod. 2. Most mss. have $\hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \eta \lambda \cup ̛ \theta E$.

31 et kaí ("ac" 1519 only). See on Ioh. 1,25.
31 nиm $\mu \mathfrak{\eta} т 1$ ("numquid" Vg.; "nuuquid" 1516). See on Ioh. 3,4.
31 signa plura $\pi \lambda$ हíova oqueía ("plura signa" Vg.). By changing the Latin word-order, Erasmus positions plura closer to the pronoun iis, which relates to it.
 ... facit" Vg.; "faciet ... fecit" 1516). See on Iob. 2,11 for the substitution of aedo. The Vulgate use of the present tense, facit, reflects a Greek text substituting тoreĩ for Émoínoev, as in $\aleph^{*}$ D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathbf{3}^{66} 75 \mathrm{vid} \boldsymbol{x}^{\text {corr }}$ B N T W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti had faciet ... fecerat.
31 is quae ${ }^{J} \nu \mathbf{\nu}$ ("quam quae" Vg.). Erasmus supplies an additional pronoun, to make the point of comparison more clear. Manetti similarly replaced quam by bis.
32 miserunt Pharisaei ac principes sacerdotum minis-
 ÚTmpétas ("miserunt principes et pharisaei ministros" 1516 Lat. $=V \mathrm{Vg}$.). The Greek wordorder reflected by the Vulgate is ámé $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \alpha v$
 found in $3^{755}$ B N T W and some later mss., including cod. 1. The Erasmian text, here, is a mixture, bowing to Vulgate influence by taking the position of $\dot{\text { utrnpétas (ministros) }}$ from cod. 1, but basing the rest of the clause on codd. 2 and 817. This resulted in a confection supported by virtually no mss., but which later survived into the Textus Receptus. The whole
 Úmๆpétas ol Фapıoaiol kal ol ápxıepzĩs, in company with most other late mss. A third form of text is represented by $\mathrm{P}^{66}(\mathbb{N}) \mathrm{D}$, which
 oi Фapioaioo. The Vulgate omission of sacerdotum after principes may reflect a harmonisation with vs. 26, as there appear to be no Greek mss. supporting ${ }^{\alpha} p \chi$ оvtes in the present verse. Manetti put miserunt Pbarisei et principes ministros.
33 eis củtoĩs. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1, in conformity with the late Vulgate, with support from cod. $T$ and a few later mss.

This reading again persisted into the Textus Receptus. In codd. 2 and 817, the word is omitted, in company with the earlier Vulgate and most of the Greek mss., commencing with $\mathbf{B}^{66} 75$ K B D N W. Manetti, accordingly, omitted eis.
33 pusillum temporis uıkpòv Xpóvov ("modicum tempus" 1516 = Vg.). At Ioh. 12,35, Erasmus translates the same Greek expression by ad breue tempus, but retains the use of modicum with tempus at Ap. Ioh. 6,11; 12,12 (for ò $\lambda i$ íyov kaloóv); 20,3. For his frequent removal of modicus elsewhere, see on lob. 6,7; 13,33.
33 abeo Úmóry ("vado" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution, in rendering ن́mó $\gamma \omega$ and mopev́ouca, occurs quite often in Matthew (up to ch. 16) and Mark, but nowhere in Luke, once in John, and once in Acts: another example of the less complete revision of the last three books. Occasionally Erasmus substitutes proficiscor. at Mt. 17,27; Mc. 16,10; Act. 20,22 (1519), all rendering mopeúouar. In the Vulgate, vado is used at almost every instance of $\dot{m} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ and торeúoual, wherever the sense would permit the use of the forms vado, vade, and vadit.
34 nee kà oủx ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,16.
$34 e o$ (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus added this adverb, to correspond with the earlier $v b i$ : see on Ioh. 6,62.
35 inter sese mpòs Écutoús ("ad semet ipsos" late Vg.). The word sese is introduced twentyseven times in 1516, and a further eleven times in 1519. At the present passage, Erasmus no doubt wished to avoid the unwanted inference that the Jews were individually talking to themselves. At Ioh. 12,19 he put inter se, and at Mc. 10,26 (1519), intra sese.
35 quod ótı ("quia" $1519=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20 . The temporary return to quia in 1519 may have been unintentional. Manetti also had quod.
35 nos गं $\mu \varepsilon i ̃ s$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by codd. ※ D but hardly any of the later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathbf{7}^{66} 75 \mathrm{vid}$ B N T W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti made the same change.

35 घúp $\dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon v$. This spelling is taken from cod. 2. Most mss. have eúpท́oouev.
35 Num $\mu \dot{\prime}$ ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Iob. 3,4.
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dispersionem gentium iturus est, et docturus gentes? ${ }^{36}$ Quis est hic sermo quem dixit, Quaeretis me, et non inuenietis: et vbi ego sum, eo vos non potestis venire?
${ }^{37}$ In nouissimo autem die magno festi stabat Iesus, et clamabat, dicens: Si quis sitit, veniat ad me, et bibat. ${ }^{38}$ Qui credit in me, sicut dixit scriptura, flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae viuae. ${ }^{39} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem dixit de spiritu, quem accepturi erant credentes in ipsum. Nondum enim erat spiritus sanctus, quia Iesus nondum erat glorificatus. ${ }^{40}$ Multi ergo de turba quum audissent hunc sermonem, dicebant: Hic est vere propheta. ${ }^{41}$ Alii dicebant: Hic est Christus. Quidam autem dicebant: Num a Galilaea
 $\eta \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda$ оv $A$

35 gentium $B$-E: graecorum $A \mid$ gentes $B-E:$ graccos $A \mid 36$ ego sum, eo $B-E$ : sum ego $A \mid$ 37 festi $B$-E: festiuitatis $A \mid$ quis $B-E$ : qnis $A \mid 38$ dixit $E$ : dicit $A-D \mid 39$ ipsum $B$ - $E$ : eum $A \mid 40$ de $B$-E: ex illa $A \mid$ hunc sermonem $B$-E: hos sermones eius $A \mid 41$ Hic est $A B D E$ : Hic est vere propheta. Alii dicebant: Hic est $C \mid$ Num $B-E:$ Nunquid $A$

35 gentium ... gentes ${ }^{\text {E }} \mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda \dot{1} \nu \omega \nu$... ${ }^{\circ} E \lambda \lambda \eta$ vas ("graecorum ... graecos" 1516). The Vulgate quite often renders this word by gentilis, for which Erasmus usually substitutes Graecus, as here in the 1516 edition, and as recommended in Annot. and Valla Annot. (on Ioh. 12,20). Since he usually reserves gens for évos and ÉOvikós, his reversion in 1519 to the Vulgate use of gens, at the present passage, appears inconsistent, but he may have decided that the accompanying reference to the $\delta$ ta $\sigma \pi$ Topa indicated that the "Greeks" in this instance were Jewish proselytes. See further on Ioh. 12,20.
 Vg .). The change of word-order is governed by classical Latin usage rather than any requirement of the Greek text.
36 eo (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 34.
 printing error: see on Iob. 1,24.

37 festi $\uparrow$ ñs Eoprins ("festiuitatis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The word £op ${ }^{\prime}$ is is usually elsewhere translated as dies festus in the Vulgate. In classical Latin, festiuitas would convey the sense of conviviality, charm or wit, rather than a religious feast day. Manetti, by contrast, preferred festiuitas to dies festus at other passages in John. See on vs. 8.
38 dixit El (Tev ("dicit" 1516-27 Lat. = late Vg.). Erasmus, in 1535, is more literal here. Inconsistently, he does not make the same correction at vs. 42. Manetti also had dixit.
$38 \zeta \tilde{\nu} \nu$ tos. The outlandish $\zeta \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau ו \sigma o u$, proposed in the 1516 errata, was a worse error than the misspelling $\xi \tilde{\omega} v t o s$ which was present in the 1516 text, caused by misreading the script of cod. 2.
39 दू$\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \circ \nu$. The reading $\eta_{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \circ v$ in 1516 is derived from cod. 2., though it is also found in cod. $817^{\text {corr. }}$. Most mss. have $\tilde{\varepsilon} \mu \mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda o v$.

39 ipsum ả̛tóv ("eum" 1516 = Vg.). The substitution of a reflexive pronoun is significant, as it prevents the reader misinterpreting the clause as referring to belief in the Spirit rather than belief in Christ. The same change was made by Manetti.

39 sanctus व̌yıov ("datus" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek text in which ${ }^{\circ} \gamma 1{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{v}$ was omitted, as in $3^{66 \text { corr } 75} \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{~T}$ and a few later mss.; cf. also cod. B, which reads a $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ ov $\delta \mathrm{E}-$ Soustovo. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathbf{P}^{66^{6}} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{W}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The word $\alpha{ }^{2} \gamma 10 v$ also appears in cod. D ( $\tau$ ò acyıov $\varepsilon \pi^{\prime}$ aútoús). Erasmus included the passage in the Quae Sint Addita. Further discussion of the point is found in his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 182 E-183 A. In 1527 Annot., he expressed the opinion that ${ }^{2} \gamma 10 v$ was a later addition. The same view has been espoused by more recent N.T. editors, on the grounds that there was a pious scribal tendency to add the word at passages where it was originally omitted. However, if a $\gamma 10 v$ was originally present in the text, it is possible that an ancient scribe or editor might have omitted it in an attempt to make the passage refer to "the spirit" rather than "the Holy Spirit", in conformity with Toũ
 verse. Like some of the other variants here, such an alteration could have been designed to prevent the heretical notion that the Holy Spirit did not yet exist, which might arise from an over-literal interpretation of the words "not yet was the Holy Spirit". Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
39 o'Inooũs. The article is inserted by Erasmus or his assistants, acting on conjecture rather than ms. authority. His codd. 1, 2 and 817 omitted $\delta$, in company with virtually all other mss. The extraneous article persisted into the Textus Receptus. See on Ioh. 1,48.
40 Multi ergo de turba mod入oi oũv ह̇к toũ óx ${ }^{\circ}$ ou ("Ex illa ergo turba" Vg ; "multi ergo ex illa turba" 1516). The Vulgate reflects a
 mo $\lambda \lambda$ oi), found in $77^{66 c o r r} 75 \aleph$ B D TW and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by ( $\mathbf{7}^{66^{6}}$ ) N and most later mss. The question here is whether the shorter reading is to be commended as a lectio difficilior or whether the resulting syntax is so infelicitous that it should be
regarded as a lectio impossibilior, disconnecting this phrase from the rest of the sentence. Erasmus did not see any need here for the pronoun illa, as the crowd was already sufficiently defined: see Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
40 bunc sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("hos sermones eius" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, aủtoũ тต̃v $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega v$ toú$\tau \omega v$, as in $\not 7^{66^{*}} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{D}$. Another early variant was Tõv $\lambda$ óy $\omega v$ тоút $\omega v$ (omitting aủtoũ), as in $77^{66 \mathrm{corr}} 75 \mathrm{~V}^{\text {corr }}$ B N T and some later mss., including cod. 1. Several other variants also exist. Erasmus follows his codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other late mss. Despite the lack of ancient testimony in its favour, the reading tòv $\lambda$ óyov is more in accordance with the style of John's Gospel, where $\lambda$ óyos is rarely found in the plural. It also has the merit of providing an explanation for the other variants: if this shorter reading ("the word", or "the saying") were original, it would not be surprising if some scribes tried to link it more closely with the previous verses, by adding aútoũ or toũtov, or by changing it to tãv $\lambda \delta \gamma \omega \nu$ toút $\omega \nu$. Manetti put just verba, corresponding with $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \lambda \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega v$.
40 трофи́тпई5. The omission of $\delta$ before $\pi \rho о-$ $\phi \eta ่ T \eta s$ is unsupported by Greek mss., and may have been unintentional: see on Ioh. 1,25.
41 dicebant ( 1 st.). The repetition here in 1522 Lat. of the words Hic est vere propheta. Alii dicebant is a printer's error.
41 Quidam autem ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda 01 \delta E$ É. In the text of cod. $2^{*}$ the whole phrase oũtós q́ativ ó Xpiotós,
 in the margin by Erasmus. The source for this "restoration" looks like a blend of cod. 1, which offered him oütós éativ ó Xpıotós, oi
 $7^{66 c o r r}{ }^{75}$ B N T W), and of cod. 817, which
 (omitting $\delta \delta$, with support from $7^{66^{*}} \mathcal{N}$ and most later mss.). The reading $\alpha \lambda \lambda o l \mid \varepsilon \varepsilon$ is found in hardly any mss., though this was the variant which, through Erasmus, became part of the Textus Receptus. At the same time, he failed to change quidam to alii, to agree with his chosen Greek text. Manetti's version replaced Quidam autem dicebant Numquid with Non enim.
41 Num Mǹ $\gamma$ áp ("Nunquid" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,4. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in omitting to render $\gamma$ óp.
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veniet Christus? ${ }^{42}$ Nonne scriptura dicit, quod ex semine Dauid, et de Bethleem castello, vbi erat Dauid, veniet Christus? ${ }^{43}$ Dissensio itaque orta est in turba propter eum. ${ }^{44}$ Quidam autem ex ipsis volebant apprehendere eum, sed nemo coniecit in eum manus.
${ }^{45}$ Venerunt ergo ministri ad pontifices et Pharisaeos, et dixerunt eis illi: Quare non adduxistis illum? ${ }^{46}$ Responderunt ministri: Nunquam sic locutus est homo, sicut hic homo. ${ }^{47}$ Responderunt ergo eis Pharisaei: Num et vos seducti estis? ${ }^{48}$ Num quis ex principibus credidit in eum, aut ex Pharisaeis? ${ }^{49}$ Sed turba haec quae non nouit legem, execrabiles sunt. ${ }^{50}$ Dicit Nicodemus ad eos, is qui venerat ad eum nocte, qui vnus erat de numero eorum: ${ }^{51}$ Num lex nostra iudicat hominem, nisi prius audierit $a b$ ipso, et cognouerit quid faciat? ${ }^{52}$ Responderunt, et dixerunt ei: Num et tu Galilaeus es? Scrutare, et vide quod a Galilaea propheta non surrexerit.

42 үраф $A$ C-E: $\gamma p \alpha \chi \eta B \mid 45$ ouv C-E: om. A B

41 veniet $B-E$ : venit $A \mid 42$ veniet $B-E$ : venit $A \mid 43$ orta $B-E$ : facta $A \mid 44$ coniecit in $B-E$ : misit super $A \mid 46$ alt. homo $B$ - $E$ : loquitur $A \mid 48$ Num quis $E$ : Nunquis $A$-C, Num quis vel Nunquis $D$ (incerte) | 49 execrabiles $B-E$ : maledicti $A \mid 50$ Dicit $B$-E: Dixit $A \mid$ is $B$ - $E$ : ille $A \mid$ venerat $B-E$ : venit $A \mid$ de numero eorum $B-E$ : ex ipsis $A \mid 52$ Scrutare $B-E$ : Scrutare scripturas $A \mid$ surrexerit $B-E$ : surrexit $A$
 Ioh. 4,25.

42 dicit $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ \{tev. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using the present tense to render the Greek aorist here, inconsistent with dixit in vs. 38. Manetti correctly had dixit in both places.

42 quod õtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.

42 veniet ย̂́pXETOı ("venit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 4,25 .

43 orta est é $\gamma$ Évéto ("facta est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,17.
44 coniecit $\varepsilon$ हा $\varepsilon \in \beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \nu$ ("misit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is the only place where Erasmus uses coniicio to render $\varepsilon \operatorname{mr} \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$, though he several times uses it for $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ : see on $l o b .3,24$. In rendering
the same Greek verb at $L c$. 20,19 and Act. 12,1 (but not at Ioh. 7,30), he substitutes iniicio for mitto, in accordance with Vulgate usage elsewhere. Manetti preferred immisit here, as used by the Vulgate at Mt. 9,$16 ; L c .5,36$ : see on Ioh. 13,2.
 Vg.; "super illum" Vg. 1527, and Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate copies have divergent readings here: while the Froben edition of 1491 had eum, his edition of 1514 has illum, as in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 edition. The change of preposition is in accordance with Vulgate usage at $M t .26,50 ; M c .14,46 ; L c .20,19$; Act. 5,18. The intention, perhaps, was to make clear that the meaning is "on", rather than "over" or "above". Similar changes occur at e.g. Act. 8,24 (1519); 11,15; 14,10 (1519); 20,9, 37; 27,44; 28,3.
45 ergo oṽ. The omission of ouvv in the Greek text of $1516-19$ was probably a printer's error, as Erasmus' Latin translation retained ergo, and the word was not omitted in the Vulgate or in any of his usual mss. A similar omission of ouv occurs at Iob. 21,5, though in that passage it appears to be deliberate, as it conforms with the Latin rendering.
45 illum aủtóv ("eum" Vg. 1527, and Vg. mss.). It is possible that in 1516 Erasmus was using a copy of the late Vulgate which had illum, as found in the Froben 1491 edition, in which case the use of illum in Erasmus' translation could not be considered to be an innovation. The reading cum in the Vulgate column of the 1527 N.T. corresponds with the text of the Froben edition of 1514.
 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering corresponds with the text of cod. D, which has $\lambda \propto \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\text { in. Erasmus conforms with the earlier Vul- }}$ gate, as also adopted by Manetti.

47 Num M ${ }^{\prime}$ ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,4.
48 Num quis $\mu$ '́ $\tau 15$ ("Numquid aliquis" Vg .; "Nunquis" 1516-22). Cf. ibid.

49 execrabiles émıкато́potoı ("maledicti" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution also occurs at Gal. 3,10, 13 (both 1519), leaving the word maledictus only at Mt. 25,41 (for karopóoual). In 1516, in rendering xatópa, Erasmus replaced maledictio by execratio at 2 Petr. 2,14, which he changed to execrabilis in 1519. In another place,
rendering k $\alpha$ т $\alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha$ at $M c .11,21$, he substituted execror for maledico. For his treatment of maledico elsewhere, see on Ioh. 9,28 . See also Annot.
50 Dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("Dixit" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading, dixit, is exhibited by e.g. the Froben Vulgate of 1491 and the Koberger edition of 1501, corresponding with eimev in $\$^{66} \aleph$. The earlier Vulgate mss. have dicit, as found in the Froben 1514 edition and the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. This agreed with Erasmus' Greek text, which followed cod. 2, supported by $9^{75}$ B D N TW and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti also had dicit.

50 is qui $\delta$ ("ille qui" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,33 . This change was also made by Manetti.
50 venerat $\begin{gathered} \\ \lambda\end{gathered} \theta \omega \dot{v}$ ("venit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,19 for Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect. Manetti made a similar substitution.
 $=$ Vg.). Erasmus substitutes a more classical phrase. For similar changes, introducing de numero, see Mt. 8,21; 16,14; 26,47 (1519); Mc. 8,28; Ioh. 12,2 (1519); Rom. 1,6; 1 Tim. 1,20; 2 Tim. 2,17; Hebr. 7,5.
51 Num Mí ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,4.
52 Num Mí ("Numquid" Vg.). See ibid.
52 Scrutare épeúvqoov ("Scrutare scripturas" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate seems to have been contaminated by the Old Latin version here, reflecting the addition of ta $s$ үpapás, as in codd. (D) W, probably from harmonisation with Ioh. 5,39. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by virtually all other mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti also omitted scripturas.
52 quod ÓTI ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
 1516). The Vulgate present tense is based on a different Greek text, éyeipetal, found in ${ }^{3(66)} 75 \times B D(N) T W$ and some later mss. Erasmus' printed Greek text corresponds with cod. 817, supported by most other late mss. (cod. $2^{*}$ has $\varepsilon$ Éygíyepte, corrected by Erasmus to read Éygireptal, which was the reading of cod. 1). In 1535 Annot., however, he describes the Greek text underlying the Vulgate as "genuine" ("germanam").
 á́toũ. |
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${ }^{53}$ Et profectus est vnusquisque | in LB 374
domum suam.
8 Iesus autem perrexit in montem Oliuarum, ${ }^{2}$ et diluculo iterum venit in templum, cunctusque populus venit ad eum, et sedens docebat eos. ${ }^{3}$ Adducunt autem ad eum scribae et Pharisaei mulierem in adulterio deprehensam, et quum statuissent eam in medio, ${ }^{4}$ dicunt ei: Magister, haec mulier deprehensa est in ipso adulterio. ${ }^{5}$ In lege autem, Moses praecepit nobis, vt huiusmodi lapidarentur. Tu ergo quid dicis? ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem dicebant, tentantes eum, vt possent accusare eum. Iesus autem inclinans se deorsum, digito scribebat in terra.

6 катпךүорєıи $B-E:$ катт $\gamma \omega \rho \varepsilon ı \nu ~ A$

8,1 oliuarum $B-E$ : oliueti $A \mid 2$ cunctusque $B-E$ : et omnis $A \mid 3$ ad eum $B-E$ : om. $A$ quum statuissent $B-E$ (cum statuissent $B-D$ ): statuerunt $A \mid 4$ dicunt $B$ - $E$ : et dixerunt $A$ 5 praecepit $B-E$ : mandauit $A \mid$ vt huiusmodi lapidarentur $B-E$ : huiusmodi lapidare $A$ 6 terra $B$ - $E$ : terram $A$

7,53-8,11 The Pericope de Adulteria. Erasmus discusses this passage at length in Annot. He considers the possibility that it was added from an apocryphal gospel, or that John himself added it at a later date. With deference to the church's acceptance of the passage as genuine, he refrained from moving the passage from its current place in the N.T. text. He mentions that it is missing from many Greek mss. ("plerisque Graecis exemplaribus"), that some add it at the end of the Gospel ("in nonnullis adiecta erat in calce"), but that it was found in its usual place in one of his Greek copies ("in vno quodam exemplari Graeco"). In favour of omission was his cod. 817 , supported by \$36675 $\mathrm{K}^{\text {vid }} \mathrm{B} \mathrm{C}^{\text {vid }} \mathrm{N}$ TW and some later mss.; in cod. 1 , the passage was placed at the end of the Gospel, while his cod. 2 has it in the present position, supported by cod. D and most later mss. Erasmus also knew that the passage was in at least some of the Greek mss. used in Valla Annot., which commented on Ioh. 8,9. Further discussion is found in Resp. ad
annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, $189 \mathrm{C}-190 \mathrm{C}$; and Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 132-4, 11. 469494.
 The Vulgate reflects the plural, $\varepsilon$ éropzú $\begin{aligned} & \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \text {, }\end{aligned}$ as found in cod. D and some later mss. Erasmus' substitution of proficiscor was more accurate, in that the Greek verb means to "depart" or "go" rather than to "return". He retains reuertor for a variety of other Greek verbs. See Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered by iuit.
 Erasmus represents the Greek plural more accurately, consistent with Vulgate usage at $M c$. 11,$1 ; 13,3 ; 14,26 ; L c .22,39$. In 1516, he removed Oliueti at only one passage, Mt. 21,1 (see Annot., ad loc.). In 1519, he removed six other instances of Oliueti, but not at Act. 1,12 where the Greek text has ểaıı̃̃vos.
2 cunctusque kà $\pi \alpha \tilde{s}$ ("et omnis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution of cunctus is found at Lc. 20,45 (1519); cf. also cunctus for vniuersus at

Act. 20,28. At many other passages, in rendering mã́s and ${ }^{2} \lambda o s$, Erasmus substitutes totus or vniuersus. However, he follows the Vulgate in not using vniuersus anywhere in the Gospel of John. Where the required meaning was "the whole of", Erasmus did not usually regard omnis as a suitable word, though he retains it in this sense at $L c .3,21 ; 7,29 ; 13,17 ; 21,38$. See further on Act. 5,34.
2 ad eum трòs aủtóv. This was omitted by cod. 2, but under the influence of the Vulgate these words were restored from cod. 1, with support from cod. D and many later mss. Although Erasmus was generally suspicious of agreements between cod. 1 and the Vulgate, a few of the corrections which he made to cod. 2 give preference to cod. 1 in this part of ch. 8.
3 ¢ $£$ poual. This was the reading of cod. 2 and relatively few other mss. A better attested reading, ayoual, was available in cod. 1.
3 ad eum тpós aútóv (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by cod. D and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, in company with many other late mss.
$3 \mathrm{e} v(1 \mathrm{st}$ ). This was taken from cod. 2. Most mss., including cod. 1, have $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \mathrm{i}$.
3 ката $\lambda \eta \varphi \theta$ Eĩ $\alpha v$. In cod. $2^{*}$ the original spelling was $\kappa \propto \tau \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \varphi \varphi \theta \dot{j} \sigma \alpha v$, manually corrected by Erasmus to read кат $\alpha \lambda$ еє $\varnothing$ Eícov, as adopted in his 1516-27 editions. Most mss. have котєя$\lambda \eta \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \vartheta \eta \nu$, as in cod. 1.
 et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,19 for Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect.
4 dicunt $\lambda$ éyouav ("dixerunt" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having eftov. Both readings have wide attestation. Erasmus follows his codd. 1 and 2, with support from cod. D. This change was also made by Manetti.
4 ei aủtü. In cod. 2* is added meıpáそoutes ("tempting him"). A longer addition is found in cod. D. Manually deleting the word in his ms., Erasmus omits it from his text, following the Vulgate and cod. 1, with support from most other late mss. Manetti adds tentantes.
 ("modo ... in adulterio" Vg.). Erasmus tries to convey more accurately the sense that the woman was "caught in the act": see Annot.

5 praecepit ह̀vтєí入 $\alpha$ то ("mandauit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is not consistent in his treatment of mando. In 1516, he changed praecipio to mando in nine places in Matthew, Mark, and Acts, rendering several different Greek verbs. At three further passages he substituted mando for other Vulgate words (Mt. 15,4; 1 Cor. 14,34; Tit. 2,15 ). Then in 1519, seven of these earlier substitutions of mando were now converted to pracipio, generally restoring the Vulgate wording. At the same time, in that edition, Erasmus introduced pracipio at six other passages, replacing mando here and at Mt. 28,20; and replacing denuntio at Act. 4,18; 5,40; 2 Thess. 3,6, 12. Possibly, in 1516, he had doubts as to the
 and $\delta ı a \sigma t \hat{k} \lambda \lambda^{2} \mu \alpha 1$, and then perhaps decided in 1519 that his earlier choice of mando sounded too much like a peremptory command, rather than the instruction of a teacher or guide. Another change which he made in 1519 was to alter most instances of mandatum to pratceptum: see on Iob. 11,57. On the uses of mando and pracipio, see Valla Elegantiae V, 68; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 274, 11. 869-871; p. 301, 11. 585-588.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) See on Iob. 1,33 , for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti anticipated him in this change (the first hand of Pal. Lat. 45 originally had lapidare, corrected later to read $v t$... lapidarentur).
 in 1516, was taken from cod. 2.
6 котакú $\psi a s$. This reading lacks ms. authority. Both of Erasmus' mss., codd. 1 and 2, here have kd́t $\omega$ kúqas. However, in vs. 8, cod. 1 has
 an assistant) arbitrarily changed the text in vs. 6. Most mss. have кáto kúqus in both places.
6 кфтє́үрафєv. This was taken from cod. 2. The reading of cod. 1 and many other mss. is ёүрафеv.

6 in terra Els $\operatorname{Tinv} \gamma \tilde{\eta} v$ ("in terram 1516 = late Vg., and some Vg. mss.). Here and in vs. 8, Erasmus follows the earlier Vulgate in using the
 supported by many other late mss., but he deleted this phrase as he did not find it in cod. 1 or the Vulgate. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
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${ }^{7}$ Quum ergo perseuerarent interrogare, erexit se, et dixit eis: Qui vestrum immunis est a peccato, primus in illam lapidem iaciat. ${ }^{8}$ Et iterum se inclinans scribebat in terra. ${ }^{9}$ Audientes autem haec singulatim alius post alium exibant, initio facto a senioribus: et relictus est solus Iesus ac mulier in medio stans. ${ }^{10}$ Quum autem erexisset se Iesus, et neminem videret praeter mulierem, dixit ei: Mulier, vbi sunt illi tui accusatores? Nemo te condemnauit?

7 interrogare $B-E$ : interrogantes $A$ | vestrum immunis est a peccato $B-E$ : sine peccato est vestrum $A \mid$ iaciat $B-E$ : mittat $A \mid 9$ singulatim alius post alium $B-E$ : vnus post vnum $A$ | initio facto $B$ - $E$ : incipientes $A \mid$ relictus est $B-E$ : remansit $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 10$ Quum autem erexisset $B-E$ (exc. Cum pro Quum B-D): Erigens autem $A \mid$ videret $B-E$ : videns $A$

7 ergo $\delta$ É. Erasmus retains ergo from the late Vulgate, even though it is not supported by his Greek text or mss. It would have been more accurate to render by autem, as in the earlier Vulgate copies, and as adopted by Manetti.
7 interrogare ép $\omega \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon s$ aủtóv ("interrogantes" 1516 = late Vg.; "interrogantes eum" Vg. mss.). The Greek text is that of cod. 2 and most later
 supported by fewer mss. Erasmus left aủtóv untranslated, under influence from the late Vulgate: this word was omitted by cod. D and a few later mss. The version of Manetti inserted eum. Erasmus' use of the infinitive after perseucro is more in accordance with classical usage, though he retains a participle with this verb at Act. 12,16.
7 erexit se et kaì ơvakúqas. The Greek wording is taken from cod. 2, supported by many other late mss. The Latin rendering, however, which comes from the Vulgate, more nearly corresponds with a different Greek text, duvéku $\mathcal{\varepsilon}$ к кí, which is found in cod. 1 , in company with cod. D and many later mss.

7 Qui vestrum immunis est a peccato 'O ávauápтทтоs $\mathbf{u} \mu \omega ̃ \nu$ ("Qui sine peccato est vestrum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus prefers a rendering which carries the connotation of incapacity to commit $\sin$. See Annot. This is the only N.T. occurrence of diváúaptŋтоs. Erasmus made a similar substitution in rendering ä́mTáotos at Iud. 24. Where possible, he avoided using sine, when
translating Greek nouns and adverbs commencing with the negative prefix ${ }^{\circ}$-. Often he finds a Latin word prefixed with in- or im-(ill-, irr-, etc.), but also uses a variety of other expressions involving absque, citra, alienus, expers, careo, etc. Other instances of such changes are illiteratus for sine litteris (áypó $\mu \mu \alpha$ тоs) at Act. 4,13; immaculatus for sine macula (aै $\sigma$ тinios) at 1 Tim. 6,14, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Iac. 1,27; 1 Petr. 1,19; 2 Petr. 3,14; immisericors for sine misericordia (óve $\lambda \varepsilon \eta \dot{\prime} \mu \omega$ ) at Rom. 1,31; impauide for sine timore ( $\left.\alpha \varphi \delta^{\prime} \beta \omega \varsigma\right)$ at Phil. 1,14; inanimus for sine anima ( $\alpha$ a $\psi \cup X O s$ ) at 1 Cor. 14,7; inculpate for sine querela ( $\left.{ }^{\alpha} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \tau \omega\right)$ ) at 1 Thess.
 1 Cor. 1,8; Tit. 1,6, 7; incunctanter for sine dubitatione (ávavтıррŋंтడs) at Act. 10,29 (1519); indesinenter for sine intermissione ( $\alpha \delta 1 \propto \lambda \varepsilon i(\pi T \omega \varsigma)$ at Rom. 1,9; 1 Thess. 1,$2 ; 2,13 ; 5,17$; ineruditus for sine disciplina (àmaí(EEuTOS) at 2 Tim. 2,23;
 irreprehensibilis for sine querela (äдє $\mu$ ттоs) at Lc. 1,6; Pbil. 3,6, and for sine reprebensione (वे $\mu \omega$ $\mu \eta$ тоऽ) at Pbil. 2,15; 1 Thess. 3,13; mutus for sine voce ( $\alpha$ м $\varphi \omega v \circ s$ ) at Act. 8,32; 1 Cor. 14,10.

7 тра̃тоя. This reading comes from cod. 1, supported by cod. D and most later mss., as well as the Vulgate. In cod. 2, it is $\pi \rho \tilde{\sim} \tau 0 v$, i.e. "the first stone".

7 cútivv. This was taken from cod. 2, with support from cod. D and most later mss., while


7 iaciat $\beta \propto \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ́ T \omega$ ("mittat" $1516=V g$.). The Greek present tense imperative is taken from cod. 1, with little other ms. support. In cod. 2 , it is the aorist imperative, $\beta \alpha \lambda$ ét $\omega$, as in cod. D and most later mss. See on Ioh. 20,27 for other arbitrary alterations to the aorist of $\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$, and see on Iob. 3,24 for Erasmus' avoidance of mitto. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
8 катакú $\psi \alpha \varsigma$. This reading came from cod. 1: see on vs. 6.
8 in terra हis $\tau \mathfrak{\eta} v \gamma \tilde{\eta} v$ ("in terram" late Vg., and some Vg. mss.). See on vs. 6.
9 Audientes ả́кov́ovtes. While some of the later mss. support ákoúoutes, its inclusion in Erasmus' text may reflect a fresh conjecture based on the Vulgate, for both codd. 1 and 2, together with Annot. and Valla Annot., and most mss., read d́koúcavtes in the aorist tense. Cod. 2 and many other late mss. also add the clause
 $\delta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$ in cod. 2) $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \chi \not \subset \mu \varepsilon v O 1$, which Erasmus omits from his text under the influence of cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by cod. D and many later mss. He debated the authenticity of this clause with Edward Lee: Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 190 C-D. Valla Annot. records it as being part of the Greek text. Manetti likewise found these words in his mss., which he translated as cum autem audisent et a conscientia redarguti essent.
9 baec. Erasmus retains this word from the late Vulgate, as it supplies a suitable object for the verb. It is not explicitly supported by the Greek text, and was omitted by Manetti.
9 singulatim alius post alius Els kâ' EIS ("vnus post vnum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Greek text here follows cod. 2, with many other late mss. In cod. 1, it is हis Ékooctos. Erasmus' alteration to the translation may be compared with a suggestion in Valla Annot., that a more classical rendering would be viritim or singillatim or separatim singuli. However, Valla's Greek text omitted the first ET 5 , and Manetti similarly had just singuli.
9 initio facto ảp̧̣á $\mu \varepsilon v o l$ ("incipientes" 1516 = Vg.). Greek aorist.

9 трєбßuт́́p $\omega v$. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus com-
 here. Since he did not find this reading in codd. 1 or 2, or in Valla Annot., it is possible that this note was prepared in England, where
he seems to have had access to cod. 69 or another member of $\mathrm{fam}^{13}$, in which these words are present (although in that group of mss., the Pericope de Adulteria is placed at the end of $L c$. ch. 21). The phrase is also found in many other Greek mss.: in 1522 Annot., he modifies his earlier reference to "the Greeks" into "some Greek manuscripts" ("Graeci quidam codices"). This changed wording of Annot. was partly influenced by an objection which was raised by Edward Lee: see Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 190 D-E.
9 relictus est $\kappa \propto \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon$ í $\varphi$ O ("remansit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The verb relinquo is better suited to the context: see Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.

9 Iesus ó 'Inooũs. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by most other late mss. (though with some diversity as to the word-order) and the late Vulgate. The words are omitted in cod. 1, in company with cod. D and the earlier Vulgate copies.
9 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
9 stans $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha$. This is derived from cod. 1 and the Vulgate. In cod. 2, it is oṽoa, as found in cod. D and most later mss., corresponding with existens in Manetti's translation.

10 Quum autem erexisset ơvakú $\psi a s \delta_{\text {é ("Erigens }}$ autem" $1516=$ Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti put erectus autem.

10 et neminem videret (videns 1516) praeter mulie-
 (Vg. omits). This whole clause is taken from cod. 2, supported by many other late mss. The Vulgate and cod. 1 join cod. D and many later mss. in omitting the words. Manetti's rendering (Pal Lat. 45) was et neminem conspicatus preter mulierem.
10 Mulier 'H $\gamma v v \dot{\prime}$. These words are omitted in cod. 2, while cod. 1 has $\gamma$ úvaı, both readings having the support of many of the later mss. The reading $\grave{\dagger} \gamma u v \dot{\eta}$, however, lacks Greek ms. support, and appears to be an incorrect conjecture based on the Latin wording.
10 illi tui accusatores ékeivol oi katท́yopoí бov ("qui te accusabant" late Vg.). This reading is taken from cod. 2, with support from many other late mss. The late Vulgate corresponds with the text of some late mss., which omit Ékeivol. In cod. 1 and the earlier Vulgate, the whole phrase is omitted, with support from cod. D. Manetti had illi accusatores tui.































${ }^{21}$ Eltev oưv má $\lambda$ เv aủtoĩs ó 'lnooũs,


 oũv oi ’lou

${ }^{11}$ Quae dixit: Nemo, domine. Dixit autem lesus: Nec ego te condemno: vade, et posthac ne peccaueris.
${ }^{12}$ Iterum ergo Iesus locutus est eis, dicens: Ego sum lux mundi: qui sequitur me non ambulabit in tenebris, sed habebit lumen vitae. ${ }^{13}$ Dixerunt ergo ei Pharisaei: Tu de te ipso testificaris, testimonium tuum non est verum. ${ }^{14}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit eis: Et si ego testimonium perhibeam de me ipso, verum est testimonium meum, quia scio vnde veni, et quo vado: vos autem nescitis vnde venio, et quo vado. ${ }^{15}$ Vos secundum carnem iudicatis, ego non iudico quenquam: ${ }^{16}$ porro et si iudicem ego, iudicium meum verum est, quia solus non sum, sed ego et qui misit me, pater. ${ }^{17}$ Quin et in lege vestra scriptum est, quod duorum hominum testimonium verum est. ${ }^{18}$ Ego sum qui testimonium fero de me ipso, et testimonium fert de me qui misit me, pater. ${ }^{19}$ Dicebant ergo ei: Vbi est pater tuus? Respondit Iesus: Neque me nostis, neque patrem meum. Si me nouissetis, et patrem meum nouissetis. ${ }^{20}$ Haec verba loquutus est Iesus in gazophylacio, docens in templo. Et nemo apprehendit eum, quia nondum venerat hora eius.
${ }^{21}$ Dixit ergo iterum eis Iesus: Ego vado et quaeretis me, et in peccato vestro moriemini: quo ego vado vos non potestis venire. ${ }^{22}$ Dicebant ergo Iudaei: Num interficiet semet ipsum, quia dicit, Quo ego vado, vos
 סє ouv $A^{*} \mid$ prius $\eta \delta \varepsilon i t \varepsilon ~ B-E: 1 \delta \eta \tau \varepsilon ~ A$

11 posthac ne peccaueris $B-E$ : iam amplius noli peccare $A \mid 13$ testificaris $C$ - $E$ : testimonium perhibes $A$, testaris $B \mid 18$ fero $B$ - $E$ : perhibeo $A \mid$ fert $B$-E: perhibet $A \mid 19$ nostis $B-E$ : scitis $A \mid 22$ Num $B$-E: Nunquid $A$

11 condemno кatakpiva（＂condemnabo＂Vg．）． The Vulgate implies a different Greek accentu－ ation，katakpiv$\tilde{\text { a }}$ ．Manetti made the same change as Erasmus．
 amplius noli peccare＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）．Erasmus similarly uses ne posthac to render $\mu \eta$ KÉtı at Iob． 5,14 ：see ad loc．However，the Vulgate amplius reflects the addition of ámò toũ vũv before $\mu \eta \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \tau 1$ ，as found in cod．1，with support from cod．D and many later mss．Erasmus＇Greek text here follows cod．2，supported by another large section of the later mss．On ne for nolo， see on Ioh．5，14．Manetti put amodo ne amplius pecces．
 （＂locutus est eis Iesus＂Vg．）．The Vulgate cor－ responds with a different Greek word－order，
 and a few later mss．，including cod．1．Another group of mss．has aưToĩs èná̀ $\eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ ó＇l $\eta \sigma o u ̃$ ， as in $¥^{66} \times$ B TW and some later mss．The reading found in cod． N and most of the later mss．，including cod．817，is aúroĩs $\delta$＇Inooũs $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ．The particular word－order found in Erasmus＇Greek text is taken from cod．2，with support from virtually no other mss．，early or late：this poorly attested variant remained in the Textus Receptus．
 The tense of the late Vulgate lacks Greek ms． support．The reading $\pi \varepsilon \rho 1 \pi \alpha \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \operatorname{in} 1516$ is taken from cod．2，with support from codd． 1 and $817^{\text {corr }}$ ，together with cod．D and many later mss．The change to mepimatrion in 1519 corresponded with the text of cod． $817^{* \text { vid }}$ ，in company with most other mss．，commencing with $7^{66} 7$ vidid $\times$ B N T W（but not including cod．3）．
13 testificaris $\mu \alpha$ 人ptupeis（＂testimonium perhibes＂ 1516 ＝Vg．；＂testaris＂1519）．See on Iob．1，7．
14 testimonium perbibeam $\mu \alpha \rho т u \rho \omega \tilde{0}$（＂testimo－ nium perhibeo＂Vg．）．Erasmus prefers to use the subjunctive，as this is a concessive clause．
14 et quo vado（2nd．）kaì moṽ ப́mór $\omega$（＂aut quo vadam＂late Vg ．）．The Vulgate reflects the
 N T 070 and some later mss．，including codd．
 is omitted）．Erasmus follows cod．2，in company with most other mss．，commencing with $39^{75^{+}}$ $\$ \mathrm{~W}$ ．The future tense，vadam，in the Vulgate
column of the 1527 edition，is also found in some earlier Vulgate mss．，but without Greek support．Manetti made the same change．
16 porro $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Vg}$ ．omits）．Erasmus makes frequent use of porro to represent this Greek particle， where a continuative rather than an adversative sense is required，though more often in Matthew and the Pauline Epistles．See also on Ioh．1，26， and Valla Elegantiae II，24；Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，p．298，11．492－494．
16 iudicem kpive（＂iudico＂Vg．）．Erasmus again prefers the subjunctive after $e t s$ ，as in vs． 14.
17 Quin et kai ．．． סés（＂Et＂Vg．）．Erasmus $^{2}$ introduces quin seventeen times in 1516，and at a further eighteen passages in 1519．See Valla Elegantiae II，45；Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg．Laut． Vallae，ASD I，4，p．307，11．766－769．
17 quod ${ }^{\text {Otıl }}$（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，20．This change was also made by Manetti．
18 testimonium fero．．．fert цартир $\tilde{\nu}$ ．．．นартирєĩ （＂testimonium perhibeo ．．．perhibet＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． This change avoids repetition of perbibeo from vs．14．See also on Iob．1，7．
 the 1516 Greek text is not supported by mss．， and was probably a printer＇s error．It is corrected in the 1516 errata．
19 nostis ．．．nouissetis．．．nouissetis oi̋ $\delta a \tau \varepsilon$ ．．．ท̆ $\delta \varepsilon$ ETTE ．．．⿹勹䶹 $\delta \varepsilon$ ıाтE（＂scitis ．．．sciretis ．．．sciretis＂Vg．； ＂scitis ．．．nouissetis ．．．nouissetis＂1516）．See on Ioh．1，33 regarding nosco．In 1516，the reading

19 et kai ．．．áv（＂forsitan et＂Vg．）．See on Iob． 4，10，and Annot．While Manetti put vtique， Valla Annot．recommended that forsitan should simply be omitted．
$20 \gamma \alpha \zeta \circ థ \cup \lambda \propto \kappa \varepsilon i ́ \varphi$. ．Cod． 2 has $\gamma \alpha \zeta \omega థ \cup \lambda \alpha к i \varphi$, and cod． 817 has $\gamma \alpha \zeta$ Oqu入axi $\varphi$ ，as in most other mss．The spelling in Erasmus＇text could have been influenced by cod． 1 ，whose text is slightly indistinct here and could perhaps have been read as $\gamma \alpha \zeta$ ¢о $u \lambda$ वккí $\varphi$ by one of Erasmus＇ assistants．
20 nondum oütw（＂necdum＂Vg．）．The Vulgate word，necdum，is less common than nondum in classical usage．Cf．Annot．on Mc．4，40．Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change．
22 Num Mítı（＂Nunquid＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）See on Iob．3，4．
$22 \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon l} \delta_{\mathrm{Tl}}$ ．The word $\mathrm{o}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{I}$ is added from cod． 2 ，supported by only a few late mss．
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non potestis venire? ${ }^{23}$ Et dicebat eis: Vos ab infernis estis, ego de supernis sum. Vos de mundo hoc estis, ego non sum de hoc mundo. ${ }^{24}$ Dixi ergo vobis, quod moriemini in peccatis vestris. Si enim non credideri|tis, quod LB 376 ego sum, moriemini in peccatis vestris. ${ }^{25}$ Dicebant ergo ei: Tu quis es? Et dicit eis Iesus: In primis quod et loquor vobis. ${ }^{26}$ Multa habeo quae de vobis loquar ac iudicem: sed qui me misit, verax est: et ego quae audiui ab eo, haec loquor in mundo. ${ }^{27}$ Non cognouerunt quod de patre eis loquutus esset. ${ }^{28}$ Dixit ergo eis Iesus: Quum exaltaueritis filium hominis, tunc cognoscetis quod ego sum, et quod ex me ipso facio nihil: sed ita vt docuit me pater, haec loquor. ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Et}$ qui me misit, mecum est. Non reliquit me solum pater, quia ego quae placita sunt ei, facio semper. ${ }^{30}$ Haec illo loquente multi crediderunt in eum.
${ }^{31}$ Dicebat ergo Iesus ad eos qui crediderant ipsi Iudaeos: Si vos manseritis in sermone meo, vere discipuli mei estis: ${ }^{32}$ et cognoscetis veritatem, et ve|ritas liberos reddet

28 inoous $A$ B D E: inoou $C$
23 ab infernis $B-E$ : de deorsum $A \mid$ supernis $A^{c} B$-E: superne $A^{*} \mid 25$ In primis quod $B-E$ : Principium qui $A \mid 26$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 27$ quod de patre $B$-E: quid patrem $A \mid$ loquutus esset $B-E$ (locutus esset $B-D$ ): diceret $A \mid 28$ sum C-E: $\operatorname{sim} A B \mid$ quod ex $C-E:$ a $A B \mid$ facio $A C-E$ : faciam $B \mid$ ita vt $B-E$ : sicut $A \mid$ loquor $A C E$ : loquar $B \mid 31$ crediderant ipsi $B-E$ : crediderunt ei $A \mid$ estis $B-E$ : eritis $A$

23 ab infernis ǵk T $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ кót $\omega$ ("deorsum" late Vg.; "de deorsum" $1516=$ Vg. mss.). Erasmus similarly replaces deorsum by inferius at $M c$. 14,66, and by inferne at Act. 2,19 (1519). In 1516 Annot., he suggested ex inferis or ax iis quae inferne sunt. He generally retained deorsum and sursum only when accompanied by verbs of motion. He substitutes $a$ or $a b$ for $d e$ in rendering ék at about twenty passages. More often he uses $e$ or ex. see on Ioh. 2,15.

24 quod (twice) ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Loh. 1,20 . Manetti again made the same change.
 ("peccato vestro" Vg.). The Vulgate use of the singular is unsupported by Greek mss. This change was also found in Manetti's version.
25 Et dicit kal $\varepsilon$ IT Ev ("Dixit" Vg.). The Vulgate followed a Greek text omitting koi, as in $37^{66} 75 \mathrm{BTW}$ and some later mss., including
cod. 1. In codd. § D , is found $\mathfrak{e f t e v}$ oũv. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by most other mss., commencing with cod. N. In Manetti, this was rendered more correctly by Et dixit, in the perfect tense.
25 In primis Tinv áp $\mathrm{X} \eta \nu$ ("Principium" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., following Valla Annot., Erasmus argues that the Greek has an adverbial sense, and that Jesus is not saying, in this passage, that he himself is "the beginning". This change provoked theological criticism from Edward Lee, to whom Erasmus replied at great length in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 183 A-189 C; 252 C-D.
25 quod ơ t ("qui" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss., and was criticised in Valla Annot. Earlier Vulgate copies have quia, as adopted by Manetti. See Annot.
 ("loqui et iudicare" Vg.; "quae ... loquar et iudicem" 1516). See on Iob. 1,33 for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, and on $I o b$. 1,25 for his use of ac.
27 Non oủk ("Et non" Vg.). The Vulgate addition has little Greek ms. support.
27 quod ótı ("quia" Vg.; "quid" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also had quod. A brief discussion of this passage is included in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 190 E-191 B.
27 de patre tò $\pi$ Tactep ("patrem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus adds a preposition to make the passage more intelligible.
27 eis củtoĩs ("eius" late Vg.). The late Vulgate genitive is supported by cod. D and a few later mss., which have ou'roũ, as also cited in Valla Annot. Here, Erasmus restores the rendering which he found in some earlier mss. of the Vulgate: see Annot.
27 loquutus esset हैं $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \nu$ ("dicebat deum" late Vg.; "diceret" 1516). The late Vulgate addition of deum is supported by codd. $\mathbf{N}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss., which add todv $\theta$ Eóv. These two words are omitted from the Greek text cited in Valla Annot. Erasmus prefers to reserve dico for contexts requiring the sense of "say" or "tell", e.g. to introduce a quotation, but he uses loquor when the required sense is "speak". At many other passages, however, he uses the words interchangeably.
28 quod ... sum, et quod ... facio ... loquor őtı ...

et ... facio ... loquor" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g} \text {; "quod ... sim, et ... }}$ facio ... loquor" 1516; "quod ... sim, et ... faciam ... loquar" 1519). See on Iob. 1,20. The use of the subjunctives faciam and loquar, in 1519 alone, links these verbs more directly with the earlier cognoscetis quod. The same result was achieved in 1522 by inserting a second quod. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he substituted quod for quia.
28 ex ám" ("a" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on Iob. 5,30.
28 ita vt kâ'ेs ("sicut" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. on Erasmus' insertion of ita at $I o b .6,57$.
28 pater $\pi \alpha т \dot{\prime} \rho$ нou. Erasmus' Latin rendering here follows the Vulgate, which was based on a Greek text in which you was omitted, as in $7^{6675} \mathrm{~N}$ N T and some later mss. His Greek text is taken from cod. 2, this time with support from cod. B and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti, accordingly, added meus.
29 Non oủk ("Et non" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is supported by cod. 1 and a few other late mss., which have kai ouk. Erasmus here follows the testimony of codd. 2 and 817, with most other mss., in restoring the earlier Vulgate reading.
29 pater ó matíp (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{66} 75 \times$ B $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ T W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows his codd. 2 and 817, in company with cod. N ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
31 crediderant тєாா冋тevkótas ("crediderunt" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,19, for Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect. Manetti anticipated him in this change.
31 ipsi $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{\sim}(" e i " 1516=V$ g.). The reflexive pronoun is substituted, as usual, to refer back to the subject of the sentence.
31 estis हैनte ("eritis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate future tense would require a Greek variant, Eqб $\sigma \theta e$, which Erasmus says is found in several mss. ("nonnullis": 1522 Annot.). However, since this reading was not found in his usual mss. or indeed in any other known Greek mss., it is probable that this part of his note has been inserted in the wrong place, as it fits much better with vs. 36: see ad loc.
32 liberos reddet $\mathrm{E} \lambda \varepsilon \cup \cup \in \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \in \mathrm{e}$ ("liberabit" Vg .). A similar substitution occurs at vs. 36 and also at Rom. 8,2. Erasmus felt that the context required the sense of granting permanent
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vos. ${ }^{33}$ Responderunt ei: Semen Abrahae sumus, neque cuiquam seruiuimus vnquam: quomodo tu dicis, Liberi reddemini? ${ }^{34}$ Respondit eis Iesus: Amen amen dico vobis, quod omnis qui facit peccatum, seruus est peccati. ${ }^{35}$ Seruus autem non manet in domo in aeternum, filius manet in aeternum. ${ }^{36} \mathrm{Si}$ ergo vos filius liberos reddiderit, vere liberi estis. ${ }^{37}$ Scio quod semen Abrahae estis. Sed quaeritis me interficere, quia sermo meus non habet locum in vobis. ${ }^{38}$ Ego quod vidi apud patrem meum loquor: et vos quod vidistis apud patrem vestrum, facitis. ${ }^{39}$ Responderunt, et dixerunt ei: Pater noster Abraham est. Dicit eis Iesus: Si filii Abrahae essetis, opera Abrahae faceretis. ${ }^{40}$ Nunc autem quaeritis me interficere hominem, qui veritatem vobis loquutus sum, quam audiui a deo. Hoc Abraham non fecit. ${ }^{41}$ Vos facitis opera patris vestri. Dixerunt itaque ei: Nos e stupro non sumus nati. Vnum patrem habemus deum. ${ }^{42}$ Dixit eis Iesus: Si deus pater vester esset, diligeretis vtique me. Ego enim ex deo

36 є $\sigma \tau \varepsilon A B C^{*} D^{*} E^{*}: \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon C^{m g} D^{m g} E^{m g} \mid 39 \eta \mu \omega \nu D E: \cup \mu \omega \nu A-C$

33 neque cuiquam $B-E$ : et nemini $A \mid 36$ reddiderit $B-E$ : fecerit $A \mid$ estis $B-E$ : eritis $A \mid$ 37 semen $B-E$ : filii $A \mid$ estis $C-E$ : sitis $A B \mid 38$ alt. quod $B$ - $E$ : quae $A$ (compend.) $\mid 39$ eis $B-E$ : ei $A \mid 41$ e stupro $B-E$ : ex fornicatione $A$
freedom, rather than a single act of deliverance from danger or disease: see Annot. However, this produces an artificial harmonisation with the rendering of $\begin{gathered} \\ \lambda \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered}$ Elsewhere, Erasmus retains the verb, libero, e.g. at Rom. 6,18; 8,21; Gal. 5,1.

33 neque cuiquam каi oủסєvi ("et nemini" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On Erasmus' use of neque, see on Ioh. 2,16, and for quisquam see on Ioh. 2,25. Elsewhere, he quite often retains et nemo.

33 reddemini $\gamma \varepsilon \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ("eritis" Vg.). Erasmus more accurately conveys the sense of yivouar, i.e. "you will become free". Cf. on his use of reddo in vs. 32.
34 quod $\delta$ OTI ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
35 filius ó viós ("filius autem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with a Greek variant, $\delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ viós, found in ${ }^{7}{ }^{66}$ D 070 and a few later mss. Erasmus restores the earlier Vulgate reading,
following cod. 2, supported by $37^{75}$ B C N and most later mss., including cod. 1. In cod. 817, óviòs ... aiãva is omitted through homoeoteleuton. Manetti here omitted autem.
36 liberos reddiderit è̉ $\lambda \cup \theta \varepsilon \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \eta$ ("liberauerit" Vg.; "liberos fecerit" 1516). See on vs. 32.
36 estis ह̇णTE ("eritis" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' authority for $\mathfrak{e} \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ is not strong. When correcting cod. 2 for the press, he saw that it had $\varepsilon \sigma \in \sigma \theta \alpha t$, which he rightly altered to read eै $\sigma \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$. However, after consulting cod. 817 , in which $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma$ 的 found in the text, but $\varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ in the margin, Erasmus or his assistants may have thought that the reading should be $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma$ on analogy with vs. 31, and therefore inserted it at the present verse. By 1522, he became aware that other authorities (in fact, virtually all the Greek mss.) agree with the Vulgate by putting $\varepsilon$ é $\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, and so he now inserted that reading in the N.T. margin. One of his authorities for $\varepsilon$ ย $\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ was the Aldine Bible of 1518 , which usually reproduced his own text of 1516 but sometimes included different readings. Probably it was the Aldine edition which motivated the revised 1522 wording of his Annot:: "Quemadmodum et hodie [ $\varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon]$ legitur in nonnullis", although this sentence was inserted at the wrong place, appearing to relate to vs. 31 , whereas it really applies to vs. 36 . The Aldine edition was responsible for several marginal notes on textual points in Erasmus' N.T.
37 quod ... estis őtı ... $\begin{gathered}\text { éote ("quia ... estis" Vg.; }\end{gathered}$ "quod ... sitis" 1516-19). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also put quod ... estis.
37 semen $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \mu \alpha$ ("filii" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). This correction is required for the sake of accuracy, and for consistency with vs. 33. Manetti made the same substitution.

37 babet locum Xமрєĩ ("capit" Vg.). Erasmus removes the obscurity of the Vulgate expression. At two other passages, Erasmus substitutes capax sum in rendering the same Greek verb: Mt. 19,11; 2 Cor. 7,2. See also Annot.
38 meum $\mu \mathrm{O}$ ( Vg . omits). While some late Vulgate copies contain this word, it is omitted from the 1527 Vulgate column, and from earlier Vulgate mss., with support from ${ }^{766} 75$ B C (W) 070 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2 , in company with codd. $\mathbb{K} \mathrm{D}$ N and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The word meum was also adopted by Manetti.

38 ovv. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving this word untranslated. No textual variation appears to be involved here. A similar inaccuracy is retained from the Vulgate at Ioh. 18,40, and possibly also at $I o h .19,4$.
38 quod (2nd.) ő ("quae" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, $\alpha$, as found in $38^{6675} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ B C D N W and some later mss., including cod. l. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by most other mss., commencing with cod. $\chi^{\text {corr }} 070$.
$39 \dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$. The reading $\dot{\mu} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ in 1516-22 makes no sense in the context, and clearly arose from a misprint.
39 eis $\alpha$ 'voĩs ("ei" 1516 Lat.). The use of the singular in the 1516 rendering is inaccurate and inappropriate to the context, and hence probably a misprint. See on Ioh. 9,20.
39 essetis ${ }^{\text {j}}$ TE ("estis" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, $\varepsilon$ écte, as in $7^{6675} \times \mathrm{B} D$ 070 and a few later mss. Erasmus, as usual, follows cod. 2, supported by codd. C N W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 . See Annot. The same change was advocated by Valla Annot. and Manetti.
39 faceretis ह̇ттокєĩte ("facite" Vg.). As pointed out in Annot., the Vulgate seems to reflect a Greek variant, тоוєite, which is found in $\mathbf{P}^{66} \mathrm{~B}^{*}$ and hardly any later mss. In Valla Annot., тоєєite is given as the text, but facere$t$ is as the rendering. Erasmus follows codd. 1, 2 and 817, supported by most other mss., commencing with $\mathbf{p l}^{75}$ ※ $\mathrm{B}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C} D \mathrm{~N}$ W 070 . The same change, again, was made by Manetti.
41 e stupro दُк торveias ("ex fornicatione" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The word fornicatio is not found in this sense in classical Latin. In 1516, stuprum occurs only at Mt. 15,19. In the 1519 edition, fornicatio is replaced by stuprum eleven times, scortatio nine times, libido twice, leaving fornicatio at three passages in the Apocalypse. At two further passages (Ap. Ioh. 17,2; 19,2), Erasmus follows the Vulgate in rendering mopveía by prostitutio. Valla defined stuprum as including all forms of illegal sexual intercourse, in his Elegantiae VI, 45; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 320, 11. 107-109.
42 Dixit єITє $\nu$ ("Dixit ergo" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the addition of oṽv, found in $\mathcal{X} 070$ and most later mss., including cod. $817^{\text {corr. }}$. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by





























processi et veni. Neque enim a me ipso veni, sed ille me misit. ${ }^{43}$ Quare loquelam meam non agnoscitis? Quia non potestis audire sermonem meum. ${ }^{44}$ Vos ex patre diabolo estis, et desideriis patris vestri vultis obsequi. Ille homicida erat ab initio, et in veritate non stetit, quia non est veritas in eo. Quum loquitur mendacium, ex propriis loquitur: quia mendax est, atque eius rei pater. ${ }^{45}$ Ego autem quia veritatem dico, non creditis mihi. ${ }^{46}$ Quis ex vobis arguit me de peccato? Porro si veritatem dico, quare vos non creditis mihi? ${ }^{47}$ Qui ex deo est, verba dei audit. Propterea vos non auditis, quia ex deo non estis. ${ }^{48}$ Responderunt ergo Iudaei, et dixerunt ei: Nonne bene dicimus nos, quod Samaritanus es tu, et daemonium habes? ${ }^{49}$ Respondit Iesus: Ego daemonium non habeo, sed cohonesto patrem meum, et vos ignominia affecistis me. ${ }^{50}$ Ego autem non quaero gloriam meam: est qui quaerat et iudicet. ${ }^{51}$ Amen amen dico vobis, si quis sermonem meum seruauerit, mortem non videbit in aeternum. ${ }^{52}$ Dixerunt ergo illi Iudaei: Nunc cognouimus

 $B-E: \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon 1 A$ | $\quad$ тоv $\alpha 1 \omega v \alpha C-E: \alpha \iota \nu \alpha A B$

43 agnoscitis $B$-E: cognoscitis $A \mid 44$ desideriis $C-E$ : desyderia $A$, desyderiis $B \mid$ obsequi $B-E$ : facere $A \mid$ atque eius rei pater $B-E$ : et pater eius $A \mid 45$ quia $B-E$ : si $A \mid 46$ Porro $C-E$ : om. $A B \mid 49$ cohonesto $B$ - $E$ : honorifico $A \mid$ ignominia affecistis $B$ - : inhonorastis $A$

39675 B C N W and many later mss., including codd. 1 and 817*.

43 agnoscitis $\gamma$ IvผंळKETE ("cognoscitis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs fifteen times in 1516, and a further four times in

1519, including the present passage. In these contexts, Erasmus felt that the sense of "recognise" or "realise" was more suitable than "know". In the same way he also substituted agnitio for cognitio at several passages of the Epistles. See Annot. on Lc. 1,4 and Rom. 1,28
for an elegant explanation of this distinction of meaning．

44 татро́s（1st．）．In 1516，Erasmus more cor－ rectly put toũ татрós，taken from cod．2，and also found in codd． 1 and 817，together with nearly all other mss．The omission of toũ from 1519 onwards，which was not prompted by cod．3，has virtually no ms．support and may well have been accidental．This omission per－ sisted into the Textus Receptus．
 （＂desyderia ．．．facere＂ $1516=$ Vg．；＂desyderiis ．．． obsequi＂1519）．This is the only place where Erasmus uses obsequor in the N．T．Cf．voluntati ．．．obtemperare at Ioh．7，17．For his avoidance of facio，see on Ioh．1，15．

44 óv日рюттоктóvos．The misspelling d́vөрото－ Któvos in 1516－19 is taken from cod． 2.
$44 \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{I}$（1st．）．This spelling，again，was derived from cod．2．Most mss．have $\lambda \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta}$ ．

44 atque eius rei pater каi ó moтท่̀p $\alpha \cup ̉ T 0$（＂et pater cius＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．As explained in Annot．， the Vulgate permits the unwanted interpretation that the Devil had a father．On atque，see on Ioh．1，25．

45 quia ötı（＂si＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）．The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek ms．support，and is probably a harmonisation with si veritatem dico in the following verse．Erasmus restores the wording of the earlier Vulgate．Manetti preferred quoniam here．
 Vulgate future tense is unsupported by Greek mss．Erasmus again restores the earlier Vul－ gate rendering：see Annot．In Manetti＇s ver－ sion，the later ms．（Urb．Lat．6）also had arguit， while the earlier ms．（PaL．Lat．45）retained arguet．

46 Porro si cí $\delta$ é（＂Si＂1516－19 Lat．＝Vg．）． The Vulgate is based on a Greek text which lacks $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ，as in $37^{6675} \times$ B C N W and some later mss．，including cod．1．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817，supported by most other late mss．

48 ग̀นEĩs．The impossible reading úuEĩs in 1516 － 27 is a misprint．

48 quod ס́tı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，20 Manetti also made this change．
$48 \sum \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \varepsilon i ́ t \eta s$ ．In 1516，Erasmus had $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha$ pí－ tns from cod．2．See on Ioh．4，4．

49 cobonesto $\tau 1 \mu \tilde{\omega}$（＂honorifico＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．5，23 regarding honorifico．Erasmus uses cobonesto only here and at Ioh．12，26（1519）， a word which nowhere appears in the Vulgate． Manetti had bonoro．
 rastis＂ 1516 ＝late Vg．）．Virtually all mss．，in－ cluding those which Erasmus usually consulted， have ớтıц⿱㇒木弓६єтє，in the present tense，as also cited in Annot．，and consistent with the reading of the earlier Vulgate，inbonoratis．In Resp．ad annot．Ed．Lei，LB IX， 191 B－C，written in 1520，
 бorte in other mss．（＂aliis codicibus＂）and that he had preferred to adopt this because it agreed with the Vulgate wording（＂quod congrueret cum nostra lectione＂）．However，as four years had passed since his first edition was published， there is room for doubt as to whether he correctly recalled how this variant had found its way into his text．The reading $\grave{\eta} \tau \mu \alpha \alpha_{\sigma} \alpha r \varepsilon$ ， in the aorist tense，looks more like a conjecture， either by Erasmus or one of his assistants， based on the wording of the late Vulgate． Cf．on Iob． 4,48 for other such conjectures． The idiomatic substitution of afficio，in render－ ing this Greek verb，also occurs at Act．5，41 （1519），contumelia afficerentur，Rom．1，24，ignomi－ nia afficiant，comparable with Vulgate usage at Mt．22，6，contumeliis affectos．For Valla＇s comments on the various uses of afficio，see his Elegantiae， III，94；Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae， ASD I，4，p．218，ll．282－285，297－299．For other instances of afficio，see on Ioh．16，20；Act． 1，3．Manetti had inbonoratis，as in the earlier Vulgate．
$51 \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$ ．The spelling $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \dot{j} \sigma \varepsilon=$ in the 1516 edition is taken from codd． 1 and 2 ，with support from cod．$K$ ．In cod． 817 and most other mss．，it is $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$ ．

51 tòv 人i$\tilde{\omega} v \alpha$ ．The omission of tóv in 1516－ 19 is probably a misprint，as codd． 1,2 and 817 have the article，and Erasmus has tò $\alpha \dot{\omega} \omega \sim \alpha$ in the following verse．

52 illi cútụ（＂ei＂late Vg．）．The change does not appear necessary．However，since other copies of the late Vulgate omitted the pronoun， e．g．the Froben edition of 1491 ，it may have been a matter of Erasmus adding a word rather than altering it．
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 โยp๐ũ.
quod daemonium habes. Abraham mortuus est, et prophetae: et tu dicis, Si quis sermonem meum seruauerit, non gustabit mortem in aeternum. ${ }^{53}$ Nunquid tu maior es patre nostro Abraham qui mortuus est? Et prophetae mortui sunt. Quem te ipsum tu facis? ${ }^{54}$ Respondit Iesus: Si ego glorifico me ipsum, gloria mea nihil est. Est pater meus qui glorificat me, quem vos dicitis deum vestrum esse, ${ }^{55}$ et tamen non cognouistis eum, ego autem noui eum. Et si dixero quod non nouerim eum, ero similis vestri, mendax. Sed noui eum, et sermonem eius seruo. ${ }^{56}$ Abraham pater vester exultauit vt videret diem meum, et vidit atque gauisus est. ${ }^{57}$ Dixerunt ergo Iudaei ad eum: Quinquaginta annos nondum habes, et Abraham vidisti? ${ }^{58}$ Dixit eis Iesus: Amen amen dico vo|bis, antequam Abraham nasceretur, ego sum. ${ }^{59}$ Tollebant ergo lapides, vt iacerent in eum. Iesus autem abscondit se, et exiuit e templo.



52 habes $A C$-E: habeas $B \mid 55$ tamen $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ nouerim $B$ - $E$ : scio $A \mid$ vestri $B$ - $E$ : vobis $A \mid$ alt. noui $B-E$ : scio $A \mid 56$ atque $B-E$ et $A \mid 58$ Abraham $A^{c} B-E$ :om. $A^{*} \mid$ nasceretur $C-E:$ esset $A B \mid 59$ Tollebant $B-E$ : Tulerunt $A \mid$ e $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ templo $B-E$ : templo transiens per medium illorum et praeteriit sic $A$

52 quod ... babes ótr $^{\text {... ÊXers ("quia ... habes" }}$ Vg.; "quod ... habeas" 1519). See on Ioh. 1,20. The 1519 edition used the subjunctive more often after quod: cf. faciam in vs. 28 (1519). Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
 was taken from cod. 2, though codd. 1 and 817 had $\gamma$ Evơntol, which is better attested among the Greek mss., and was duly adopted in

1519 (cf. also $\gamma$ Eúonte in cod. 3). Erasmus' reversion to $\gamma$ evéctal in 1522 may have been due to the influence of the Aldine edition, even though the latter was in many respects no more than a copy of Erasmus' edition of 1516.
$53 t u$ (2nd.) ou (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{P}^{66} 75 \mathrm{~K}$ A B C D N W and many later mss., including
codd. 1 and 817. Erasmus follows cod. 2 and most other late mss. Manetti inserted $t u$ after quem.
54 deum vestrum esse őti $\theta$ हòs $\dot{U} \mu \tilde{\mu} v$ 白 $\sigma$ Tl ("quia deus noster est" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,34 for Erasmus' use of the accusative and infinitive construction. In the Vulgate, noster reflects a Greek text having $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ for $\dot{U} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$, as found in $7^{66 \text { corr }}{ }^{75}$ A B ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ C NW 070 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Erasmus follows cod. 2 , supported by $77^{66^{*}}$ \& $B^{*} D$ and many later mss., corresponding with vester in some copies of the late Vulgate but not the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition. Manetti put quod deus vester est.
55 et tamen non kai oủk ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 7,19.

55 quod őtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
55 nouerim ... noui or $\delta \alpha$ (2nd.-3rd.) ("scio ... scio" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On the use of nosco for knowing a person, see on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti had nouerim ... scio.

55 vestri Ú $^{\prime} \omega \tilde{\nu} \nu$ ("vobis" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate possibly reflects a Greek variant, Ú uiv, found in $\boldsymbol{p}^{75}$ A B D W and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus took $u$ uñu from codd. 2 and 817 , with the support of $77^{66} \aleph$ C N 070 and most later mss. Since this is the only N.T. instance where ${ }^{3} \mu \mathrm{olos}$ is accompanied by a genitive, it has the virtue of being a lectio difficilior. In Erasmus' Latin rendering, he usually has the dative after similis, but occasionally uses the genitive, e.g. at Mt. 6,8; Act. 3,22; 7,37 (all in 1519); Ap. Iob. 9,10.

56 et kai (late Vg. omits). The late Vulgate omission lacks Greek ms. support.

56 atque kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
58 nasceretur $\gamma \mathrm{Evé} \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ ("fieret" Vg.; "esset" 1516-19). This change is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt. 21,19. In the present passage, Erasmus wished to use a more concrete verb than "be" or "become", to convey the distinction between Abraham, who did not exist until he was born, and Christ, who eternally existed (as the Son of God) before being born into this world: see Annot.
59 Tollebant गुpav ("Tulerunt" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus chooses a more suitable verb, but he should preferably have retained the perfect tense: cf. his substitution of sustulerunt for
tulerunt at Ioh. 20,2 (1519). Similar substitutions of tollo for fero occur at Mt. 14,12, 20; 15,37; 24,39; Mc. 6,29; Lc. 5,25 (1519); Iob. 11,41; 20,13 (1519); Col. 2,14. Erasmus retains fero for this Greek verb at $M c .8,20 ; L c .9,3 ; 11,52 ;$ Act. 21,11.
$59 e$ ék ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
59 templo iєpoũ. In 1516, the words $\delta i \varepsilon \lambda \theta \omega \nu$
 dered as "transiens per medium illorum et praeteriit sic") are added here from cod. 2, supported by cod. A and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. A slightly differ-

 $\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{\text {corr }}$ C N 070. Then in 1519, Erasmus omits this passage from his text and translation, in conformity with the Vulgate. In 1519 Annot., he further cites the authority of Chrysostom, Cyril and Augustine, and expresses the
 taken from $L c .4,30$, and that kal $\pi \alpha \rho \tilde{\eta} \gamma \in \nu$ oÚTcus was added to make a smooth connection with the beginning of ch. 9. Similarly, in Erasmus' Quae Sint Addita, first issued in 1519, and which mostly concerned errors of the Vulgate, he claimed that at this point the Greek mss., rather than the Latin translation, contained redundant words ("In Graecorum codicibus quaedam redundant"). This is an example of his occasional willingness to rely on patristic authority, and the Vulgate, rather than his Greek mss. It does not appear that Erasmus knew of ms. authority for making this omission, but his decision is supported by $7^{66} 75 \mathbf{N}^{*}$ B D W and a few later mss. (though not including cod. 3). The commonly accepted explanation of this passage in terms of harmonisation is not necessarily correct. While the addition of émopeúधто in $\kappa^{\text {corr }}$ and a few other early mss. may have arisen from a secondary harmonisation with $L c .4,30$, the possibility remains that the rest of the wording was original, and that an ancient scribe accidentally omitted a whole line (or two lines) of text, and that this error was in turn copied into several other mss. Cf., for example, the omission by $\mathbf{p l}^{75} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{~W}$ of twelve words
 omission by ${ }^{275}$ of seven words through homoeoteleuton (tís ... duvӨрஸ́тоu) at Ioh. 12,34. Manetti added transiens per medium eorum et preteriit sic.

9
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9Et praeteriens Iesus vidit hominem caecum a natiuitate, ${ }^{2} \mathrm{et}$ interrogauerunt eum discipuli eius, dicentes: Rabbi, quis peccauit, hic an parentes eius, vt caecus nasceretur? ${ }^{3}$ Respondit Iesus: Neque hic peccauit, neque parentes eius, sed vt manifestentur opera dei in illo. ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Me}$ oportet operari opera eius qui misit me, donec dies est. Venit nox quando nemo potest operari. ${ }^{5}$ Quamdiu fuero in mundo, lux sum mundi. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Hoc}$ quum dixisset, expuit in terram: et fecit lutum ex sputo, et illeuit lutum super oculos caeci, ${ }^{7}$ et dixit ei: Vade, laua in piscina Siloae, quod si interpreteris, sonat missus. Abiit ergo et lauit et venit videns. ${ }^{8}$ Itaque vicini et qui viderant eum prius, quod mendicus esset, dicebant: Nonne hic est qui sedebat, et mendicabat? ${ }^{9}$ Alii dicebant, Hic est: alii rursus, Similis est ei: ille dicebat, Ego sum. ${ }^{10}$ Dicebant


9,2 an $B-E$ : aut $A \mid 4$ quando $A-C E$ : quado $D \mid 7$ piscina Siloae $B-E$ : natatoria Syloe $A \mid$ si interpreteris, sonat $B-E$ : interpretatur $A \mid 8$ mendicus $B-E$ : caecus $A \mid 9$ rursus $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ ei $B-E$ : eius $A$

9,1 Iesus ó 'Inooũs. Erasmus follows cod. 2 in including these words, supported by only a few other late mss. and the late Vulgate. In 1527 Annot., he commented that Iesus was absent from the earlier Vulgate copies. The words o 'Inooũs are omitted by codd. 1 and 817, in company with most other mss., early and late. Manetti accordingly omitted Iesus.
2 dicentes $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma o v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by hardly any mss. other than cod. D , which also omits the preceding
 as Erasmus.

2 'Po $\beta \beta$ zi. This spelling is taken from cod. 2. See on Ioh. 1,38.

2 an ŋु ("aut" $1516=V g$.). The use of $a n$ is appropriate in questions containing two mutually exclusive alternatives: see Annot.; Valla Annot.; Valla Elegantiac II, 17; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, pp. 222-4, ll. 434-436, 447.

3 ó İๆooũs. The Erasmian text again supplies the article, lacking in codd. 1,2 and most other mss. It may have been present, however, in cod. $817^{* \text { rid }}$, with support from codd. D N and a few later mss. See on Ioh. 1,48. This less well attested reading continued into the Textus Receptus.
5 fuero ${ }^{\sim}$ ("sum" Vg.). At six other passages where Erasmus uses quamdiu, he is content that
it should be accompanied by the present tense. His use of the future perfect here may be compared with his use of quoad ea vixerit at Rom. 7,1 (1519).
6 Hoc toũta ("Haec" Vg.). Erasmus is less accurate here. There seems to be no justification for changing plural to singular in the Latin rendering.
6 illeuit ĖTéxplos ("liniuit" late Vg .). The verb linio is less common than lino in classical usage, though the meaning is the same. Erasmus chooses a word which is closer in form to the Greek compound verb. He does not use illino elsewhere. In Annot., he also suggested using inungo, a verb which he adopts at vs. 11 to represent the same Greek word.
6 caeci тои̃ ти $\lambda \lambda$ оũ ("eius" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text omitting тoũ тup入oũ or substituting cútoũ, both of which variants have early support. The omission is witnessed by $\mathbf{P}^{6675} \aleph$ B $0700216^{\text {vid }}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1 , while $\alpha u$ ưoũ is found in a few other mss., commencing with codd. D N. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by A C W and most of the later mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
7 Vade ${ }^{\circ}$ Ytaye ("Vade et" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is virtually unsupported by Greek mss.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate uses natatoria only here and in vs. 11, whereas in Iob. 5,2-7, it had used the more classical pisisina. See Annot. The substitution of piscina was anticipated by Manetti and Valla Annot.
7 si interpreteris, sonat £́puПvévetou ("interpretatur" $1516=\mathrm{V}$ g.). This verb does not have a passive sense in classical Latin. See on Iob. 1,38. The misspelling épuiveverau in the 1516 edition was taken from cod. 2.
8 vicini et Yeítoves kai ("vicini" late Vg. $=$ Annot., lemma). It appears that when Erasmus prepared his 1516 Annot., his printed copy of the late Vulgate omitted the conjunction, et, but the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition inserted it, together with the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514. The omission lacks Greek support. Manetti began the sentence with Vicini ergo et.
8 quod ... esset öTı ... 敄 ("quia ... erat" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... erat.

8 mendicus $\pi$ тTwxós ("caecus" 1516). Erasmus' substitution of caecus in 1516, accompanied by tuqiós in the Greek text, was based on cod. 2, supported by cod. Coorr and most later mss, including cod. 817. His reversion to the Vulgate, mendicus, in 1519 was based partly on the evidence of Augustine, arguing in Annot. that this was better suited to the context ("appositius ad sensum"). His adoption of $\pi \tau \omega \times$ ós, which is not found in any mss., seems to have been a conjecture, based on $L$ c. $16,20,22$, though this Greek word usually means "poor" rather than "beggar". The Greek variant which underlay the Vulgate was not $\pi T \omega \chi$ ós, but mpooaitns, as found in ${ }^{(66)} 75$ AB C ${ }^{*} \mathrm{D}$ N (W) and some later mss., including cod. 1. It would seem that Erasmus did not freshly consult cod. 1 when preparing his 1519 edition (his cod. 3, on the other hand, had $\tau \cup \varphi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \varsigma$ ).
 See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had dicebant ... quod.
9 rursus $\delta \varepsilon$ ("autem" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus uses rursus and rursum more frequently than the Vulgate. He sometimes puts rursus for autem or vero, especially in a sequence listing several alternatives, but he mainly used the word as an alternative for $i$ terum in rendering $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda 1 v$. See Valla Elegantiae II, 56; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 313, 11. 933-934. See also on Iob. 1,26.
9 Similis ón "Onotos ("Nequaquam, sed similis" Vg .). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of
 and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' cod. 2* had ötı $\delta \mu 01 \omega$, which he corrected to
 other mss., commencing with codd. A D N. Manetti put quod similis.
 use of the dative or genitive after similis, see on Ioh. 8,55 . This change was also made by Manetti.
9 ille Ékĩvos ("ille vero" late Vg .). The late Vulgate addition is derived from the Old Latin version, corresponding with the addition of $8 \dot{\varepsilon}$ in $\mathbf{7}^{66} \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ A C ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N} 070$ and a few later mss. Erasmus restores the earlier Vulgate reading, following cod. 2, in company with $7^{75} \mathrm{~K}^{\text {corr }}$ B C ${ }^{*}$ DW and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti also omitted vero.
9 dicebat घ̈ $\lambda_{\varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \nu}$ ötı ("dicebat quia" Vg.). See on lob. 1,20 . Manetti put dicebat quod.

 "AvӨp.








 oũv ท̉pడ́t










ergo ei: Quomodo aperti sunt tibi oculi? ${ }^{11}$ Respondit ille, et dixit: Ille homo qui dicitur Iesus lutum fecit, et inunxit oculos meos, et dixit mihi: Vade ad piscinam Siloae, et laua. Vt autem abii ac laui, visum recepi. ${ }^{12}$ Dixerunt ergo ei: Vbi est ille? Ait: Nescio.
${ }^{13}$ Adducunt ad Pharisaeos eum qui dudum caecus fuerat. ${ }^{14}$ Erat autem sabbatum quum lutum faceret Iesus, et aperiret oculos eius. ${ }^{15}$ Iterum ergo interrogabant eum et Pharisaei, quomodo visum recepisset. Ille autem dixit eis: Lutum mihi imposuit super oculos, et laui et video. ${ }^{16}$ Dicebant ergo ex Pharisaeis quidam: Non est hic homo a deo, quia sabbatum non obseruat. Alii autem dicebant: Quomodo potest homo peccator haec signa aedere? Et dissensio erat inter eos. ${ }^{17}$ Dicunt caeco iterum: Tu quid dicis de illo, quia aperuit tibi oculos tuos?
$10 \alpha v \varepsilon \omega X^{\theta} \eta \sigma \alpha \nu C-E: \eta \nu \varepsilon \omega X^{\theta} \eta \sigma \alpha \nu A B \mid 13 \pi \rho o s A^{c} B-E: \tau \rho o s A^{*}$
11 piscinam Siloae $B-E$ : natatoriam Syloae $A \mid \operatorname{Vt}$ autem $B-E$ : Et $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ et $A \mid$ visum $B-E$ : et visum $A \mid 13$ ad Pharisaeos eum $B-E$ (ad pharisaeos eum): eum ad pharisaeos $A \mid$ 14 quum $B-E$ (cum $B-D$ ): quando $A \mid$ faceret $B-E$ : fecit $A \mid$ aperiret $B-E$ : aperuit $A$ | 16 obseruat $B-E$ : custodit $A \mid$ aedere $B-E$ : facere $A \mid 17$ quia $B-E$ : qui $A$
 in $1516-19$ is from cod. 2 , with support from 38675vid $<$ B C D N W and many later mss. The change to $\alpha v \varepsilon \dot{\varphi} X \forall \eta \sigma \alpha v$ in 1522 is in accordance with the text of most of the mss., commencing with cod. A, and including codd. 1 and 817.
11 et dixit (1st.) kà eltev (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{6675} \mathrm{~K}$ B C D W 070 and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other mss., commencing with cod. A. The rendering of Manetti was et ait.

11 inunxit ṫtéxploz ("vnxit" Vg.). The purpose of this change was to provide a closer equivalent
for the Greek compound verb: cf. Erasmus' susbstitution of illino at vs. 6. Elsewhere, he retains vngo for $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon i \varphi \omega, \mu u p i \zeta \omega$ and $X p i \omega$. Here Manetti preferred liniuit.
11 piscinam тìv ко $\lambda \cup \mu \beta \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \rho \alpha \nu$ ("natatoriam" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 7. Manetti again anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate is possibly based on a different Greek text here: cf. the substitution of $\alpha \pi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ v$ oưv by cod. D. The version of Erasmus gives an accurate rendering of the Greek participle. In Annot., he also suggested putting Cum abiissem autem. Manetti put Abii autem ... et.
11 ac kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.

11 visum recepi $\alpha \dot{v} \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \lambda_{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \alpha$ ("video" late Vg.). The late Vulgate use of the present tense is unsupported by Greek mss. Further, as indicated in Annot., áv $\alpha \beta \lambda$ ह́тTL means to regain one's sight, not merely to see. Similar substitutions of visum recipio occur at Mt. 11,5; 20,34; Mc. 10,51, 52; Lc. 18,41, 43 (1519); Iob. 9,15, 18; Act. 9,17, following Vulgate usage at $A c t .9,12,18$. Erasmus inconsistently retains video at Lc. 7,22. Manetti put vidi, as in the earlier Vulgate.
12 Dixerunt ergo EImov oưv ("Et dixerunt" late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with a Greek
 عitiov, found in $3^{75}$ cod. 1 and a few other late mss. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other mss., commencing with ( ${ }^{66}$ D) N. Some older Vulgate copies simply omit $e t$, with support from cod. A and a few later mss. Manetti made the same change.
13 ad Pharisaeos eum aủtòv mpòs toùs $\Phi \alpha$ pioxious ("eum ad pharisaeos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus changes the Latin word-order to make a clearer link with the following subordinate clause.
13 dudum ттотв (Vg. omits). Erasmus introduces dudum only here and at $M c$. 15,44 (where the Greek is $\eta(\delta \eta)$. Elsewhere, the Vulgate usually renders тоте by aliquando, which Erasmus often changed to quondam. The insertion of dudum here produces an unwanted ambiguity, as the word can mean "for a long time" rather than "formerly" or "once". Valla, on the other hand, preferred to use dudum to mean "a short time ago" or "for a short time": see his Elegantiae II, 34; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 248, 11. 113-117. Manetti put olim.
14 quит ... faceret ... aperiret Öтє ... ध̇тоі́nбєv
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution of quum, with a subjunctive, occurs at $M t$. 12,3; Mc. 2,25 (1519); 8,19, 20; 14,12.
15 et Pbarisaei kaì oi Dapıoaĩol ("Pharisaei" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text omitting koí, as in $77^{66^{*}}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2 , supported by virtually all other mss. Manetti made the same addition.
15 visum recepisset $\alpha$ वंv́́ $\beta \lambda_{\varepsilon \in \Psi \in \nu}$ ("vidisset" Vg.). See on vs. 11, and Annot.
 late Vg.). The substitution of impono is consistent with Vulgate usage at other passages. The adoption of $\mu \mathrm{ot}$ in the Greek text was not supported
by any of Erasmus' usual mss., which all have the genitive, $\mu \mathrm{ou}$. The reading, $\mu \mathrm{ol}$, is found only in cod. N and a few later mss. Possibly this is another example of a conjecture by Erasmus or one of his assistants, correcting the Greek by reference to the Latin Vulgate. See on Ioh. 4,48. However, oou is not changed to $\sigma 01$ at vss. 10 and 26, where $t i b i$ occurs in the Latin rendering. Manetti translated this clause by lutum posuit super oculos meos.
16 quia of 71 ("qui" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss. A similar change occurs in the following verse. Manetti put quia.
16 obseruat тпpeĩ ("custodit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A comparable substitution occurs at $M c .6,20$ (for $\sigma u v t \eta \rho \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ ), in accordance with Vulgate usage at a few other passages, e.g. at 1 Ioh. 2,3. Elsewhere, Erasmus sometimes retains custodio in this sense (e.g. at 1 Ioh. 3,22 ; Ap. Ioh. 12,17; 14,$12 ; 22,7$ ), and also frequently follows the Vulgate in using seruo for inpé $\omega$. Manetti had seruat here.
16 autem $\delta$ É. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1 and the late Vulgate, supported by $\aleph$ B D W 070 and a few later mss. Erasmus' codd. 2 and 817 omit $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, together with most other mss., commencing with $3{ }^{66}{ }^{75} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{~N}$, in agreement with the earlier Vulgate rendering. Manetti omitted autem.
16 baec тоוळũT $\alpha$. Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering. Manetti, more accurately, had talia.
16 aedere тоเєiv ("facere" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,11.
16 dissensio $\sigma x^{i} \sigma \mu \alpha$ ("schisma" Vg.). This substitution of a more Latin word is consistent with Vulgate usage elsewhere (Ioh. 7,$43 ; 10,19$ ), as pointed out in Annot. The change was anticipated by Manetti.
17 Dicunt $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon}$ Yoưı ("Dicunt ergo" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of $o^{r} v$, as in \$7 ${ }^{6675} \times \mathrm{K}$ B D N W and many later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with another large section of the later mss. Manetti put Et dicunt.
17 quia öTı ("qui" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more accurate here. A similar change was made in vs. 16. See Annot. In Valla Annot., a preference is expressed for quod.
17 aperuit tibi ग̈voıફ६ ("aperuit" Vg.). Erasmus' addition of tibi is unsupported by mss. Since
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Ille autem dixit: Propheta est. ${ }^{18}$ Non crediderunt ergo Iudaei de illo, quod caecus fuisset, et visum recepisset, donec vocauerunt parentes eius, qui visum receperat, ${ }^{19}$ et interrogauerunt eos, dicentes: Hic est filius vester, quem vos dicitis caecum natum esse? Quomodo ergo nunc videt? ${ }^{20}$ Responderunt eis parentes eius, et dixerunt: Scimus quod hic est filius noster, et quod caecus natus est: ${ }^{21}$ quomodo autem nunc videat, nescimus: aut quis eius aperuerit oculos, nos nescimus. Ipse aetatem habet, ipsum interrogate, ipse de se loquetur. ${ }^{22}$ Haec dixerunt parentes eius, quod timerent Iudaeos. Iam enim conspirauerant Iu|daei, vt si quis eum confiteretur esse Christum, e synagoga eiiceretur. ${ }^{23}$ Propterea parentes eius dixerunt, Aetatem habet, ipsum interrogate. ${ }^{24}$ Vocauerunt ergo rursum hominem, qui fuerat caecus, et dixerunt ei: Da gloriam deo. Nos scimus quod hic homo peccator est. ${ }^{25}$ Respondit ergo ille, et dixit: An peccator sit, nescio: vnum scio,

21 ๆนєıs $D$ E: uนєıs $A-C$

18 quod $B-E$ : quia $A \mid$ visum recepisset $B$ - $E$ : vidisset $A \mid 20$ eis $A B$ : ei $C-E \mid 21$ aperuerit $B-E$ : aperuit $A \mid$ alt. ipse $A^{c} B-E$ : om. $A^{*} \mid 22$ quod timerent $B-E$ : quoniam timebant $A \mid$ e synagoga eiiceretur $B$ - $E$ : extra synagogam fieret $A$
it is included in Annot., lemma, it appears that this is what he found in his copy of the late Vulgate, although it is not printed in the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition or in the Froben Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514. Sometimes the lemma of Annot. incorrectly substitutes the wording of Erasmus' translation for the Latin Vulgate.
17 dixit ETmev ótl ("dixit quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put dixit quod.
18 quod o̊tı ("quia" $1516=$ Vg.). See again on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

18 visum recepisset ... visum receperat $\alpha \dot{\alpha} v \in \dot{\beta} \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi \in \nu$ ... тои̃ đ́vaß $\lambda^{2}$ é $\psi \alpha v$ tos ("vidisset ... viderat" Vg.; "vidisset ... visum receperat" 1516). See on vs. 11. Manetti had respexerat ... viderat.
19 dicitis $\lambda$ é $\gamma \varepsilon$ cre. Here the Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by most other mss. Both codd. 2 and 817 had $\varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, in the imperfect tense, found in relatively few other late mss., though this reading was adopted by Manetti, who put dicebatis.
19 caecum natum esse öti тu甲入òs É $\gamma \varepsilon \nu v \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ ("quia caecus natus est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,34 for Erasmus' preference for the accusative and
infinitive construction. Manetti followed the Vulgate, but substituted quod for quia.
20 Responderunt dंтtekpiӨךoov. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, with support from codd. D W 070 and some later mss., including cod. $817^{*}$. Some early mss. add oũv, as found in $7^{6675} \mathrm{~K}$ B. However, Erasmus' cod. 2 added $\delta$ É, in company with most other mss., commencing with codd. A N, and this was adopted by Manetti, who added autem.
20 eis aủtoĩs ("ei" 1522-35 Lat.). The singular form, ei, in 1522-35 was no more than a misprint, without support from the Vulgate, the Greek mss., or the context. A similar error occurred in 1516-19 at Ioh. 2,7 (corrected in the 1519 errata); 6,70 (1522); 8,39 (1516); 10,25 (1516); 12,35 (1522-35); 16,31 (1522). Manetti omitted the word.
20 quod (twice) ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
21 aperuerit ${ }^{\eta} v o i \xi \varepsilon \nu$ ("aperuit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' use of the subjunctive is influenced by the following verb, nescio, producing consistency with the subjunctive, videat, earlier in the verse: cf. Mt. 26,70; Lc. 22,60 (1519).
21 ๆ̀uEĩs. The variant $\dot{\text { uneĩs }}$ in $1516-22$ is a printer's error.
21 Ipse aetatem babet, ipsum interrogate aủtòs
 rogate, aetatem habet" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having aủòv ép
 ( $\aleph^{\text {corr }}$ ) B (D) and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by codd. A N and most later mss.

 W. If $3^{96} \mathrm{et} \mathrm{al}$. represented the original reading, it would be possible to explain the reading of most of the mss. as being a harmonisation with vs. 23. On the other hand, if Erasmus' wording preserves the original, then a possible sequence of events is that, first, some mss. (of which cod. W is a later copy) editorially abbreviated the text by omitting aútós and đủtòv દ̇p $\omega \tau \dot{\prime} \dot{\prime} \sigma \tau \varepsilon$, and then other mss. later restored aútós, while
 it in the wrong place. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus, but put is instead of ipse.
21 ipse (2nd.) aủtós (omitted in 1516 Lat. text). In making the previous correction, Erasmus or one of his assistants inadvertently
omitted the second $i p s e$, which was duly restored in the 1516 errata.
21 loquetur $\lambda \alpha \lambda \dot{\jmath} \sigma \varepsilon 1$ ("loquatur" Vg.). The Vulgate rendering receives little support from Greek mss., and was also criticised in Annot. and Valla Annot. The same change was made by Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45).
22 quod timerent ṍtı éqоßоũvтo ("quoniam timebant" 1516 = late Vg.). In a questionable change of the meaning of this passage, Erasmus makes the clause into part of what the blind man's parents said, rather than John's explanation of why they had spoken the words recorded in the previous verse. Manetti's version (Pal. Lat. 45) had quia timebant, as in the earlier Vulgate.
22 ouveté $\theta$ evto. This spelling is not found in any of Erasmus' mss., and may have been a conjecture. His codd. 1 and 2 have ovvet $\varepsilon \in \varepsilon$ eivto, as found in nearly all other mss., while cod. 817 had ouvé $\theta$ evto.
 ("extra synagogam fieret" $1516=$ Vg.). In 1516 Annot., Erasmus comments that ${ }^{\circ}$ (Troouvó$\gamma \omega \gamma$ os means alienus a congregatione, comparable with his use of alienus a synagoga in rendering the same Greek word at Ioh. 16,2. In Annot. on the latter passage, he also suggests interdico vobis synagogam, borrowing a phrase of Valla Annot. By 1519, he decided to use the verb eiicio at the present passage, in conformity with Vulgate usage at $I o b$. 12,42. Inconsistently he did not make the same change in 1519 at Ioh. 16,2.
23 dixerunt हITTOU ótı ("dixerunt quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put dixerunt quod.
24 quod Ötı ("quia" Vg.). See again on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti (PaL. Lat. 45) made the same change.
25 Respondit ergo ille et dixit àтeкрín $\eta$ oũv Ékeivos kà Eittev ("Dixit ergo eis ille" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering would require an underlying Greek text having $\varepsilon \mathbb{E} \pi \varepsilon \nu$ OƯv oủtoins Ékeĩvos, which has virtually no Greek support. However, the omission of kal $\varepsilon$ ITrev is supported by $3^{66}{ }^{75} \aleph$ A B D W and some later mss., including cod. 1 (which also omits $0^{r v} v$ ). Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with cod. N and most later mss. This change was also made by Manetti.
25 An ... sit El ... Évtıv ("Si ... est" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs sixteen times elsewhere, following Vulgate usage at 2 Cor. 2,9, usually to indicate that the speaker hesitates to affirm




















quod caecus quum fuerim, nunc videam. ${ }^{26}$ Dixerunt ergo illi iterum: Quid fecit tibi? Quomodo aperuit tibi oculos? ${ }^{27}$ Respondit eis: Dixi vobis iam, nec audistis: cur iterum vultis audire? Num et vos vultis discipuli eius fieri? ${ }^{28}$ Conuitiati sunt ergo ei, et dixerunt: Tu discipulus illius esto, nos autem Mosi discipuli sumus. ${ }^{29}$ Nos scimus quod Mosi loquutus est deus, hunc autem nescimus vnde sit. ${ }^{30}$ Respondit ille homo, et dixit eis: In hoc enim mirabile quiddam est, quod vos nesciatis vnde sit, et tamen aperuit meos oculos. ${ }^{31}$ Scimus autem quod peccatores deus non audit: sed si quis dei cultor est, et voluntati ipsius obtemperat, hunc audit. ${ }^{32} \mathrm{~A}$ seculo non est auditum quod quis aperuerit oculos caeci nati. ${ }^{33}$ Nisi esset hic a deo, non

31 moin $B-E: \operatorname{mots1} A$

25 fuerim C-E: essem $A B \mid$ nunc videam $B-E$ : modo video $A \mid 27$ nec $B-E$ : et non $A$ $\operatorname{cur} B-E$ : Quid $A \mid 28$ Conuitiati sunt $B-E$ : Maledixerunt $A \mid$ dixerunt $B$-E: dixerunt ei $A$ esto $B-E$ : sis $A \mid 30$ quiddam $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ quod $B-E$ : quia $A \mid$ nesciatis $B-E$ : nescitis $A \mid$ tamen $B$-E: om. $A \mid 31$ voluntati ipsius obtemperat $B$ - $E$ : voluntatem eius facit $A \mid$ alt. audit $B$ $E$ : exaudit $A \mid 32$ seculo $C$-E: saeculo $A B \mid$ aperuerit $B$-E: aperuit $A \mid$
the point at issue. Cf. Annot. on Mc. 15,44, and for another use of an, see on vs. 2 , above.
25 quod ... videam óтı ... $\beta \lambda$ ह́тc ("quia ... video" Vg.; "quod ... video" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... video, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
25 quum fuerim $\omega \nu$ ("cum essem" 1516-19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Neither rendering literally conveys the paradoxical flavour of the Greek expression ("although I am a blind man, I now see"). Manetti made a similar change, while changing the word-order to cum cecus fuerim.
25 nunc ăptı ("modo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution, in rendering ג́pti and vũv, occurs in John's Gospel once in 1516 (at Iob. 13,7), and at eight further places in 1519. Erasmus prefers to avoid using modo except in the sense
of "only just" or "a short while ago": e.g. at Mt. 9,18; Iob. 11,8 (1519). However, he retains a modo for $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ व́ptı at Mt. 26,$64 ;$ Ap. Ioh. 14,13. For his removal of vsque modo, see on Iob. 2,10.

26 ergo oũv. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $77^{66} 75 \mathrm{~N}^{\text {corr }}$ B $\mathrm{D} N \mathrm{~W}$ and some later mss. The reading of codd. 2 and 817 was $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as found in most other mss., commencing with cod. A, corresponding with autem in Manetti's version.

26 iterum $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı v$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of $\mathrm{p}^{75} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ B D W and a few others. Erasmus follows cod. 2, this time with the support of $\not ¥^{66} \aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A N 070 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti made the same change.

27 nec kai oủk ("et" Vg.; "et non" 1516). There is little Greek support for the Vulgate omission of the negative, except $7^{66 \text { vid }}$. Erasmus follows cod. 2 , in company with virtually all other mss. Manetti had et non.
$27 \operatorname{cur}$ тi ("Quid" 1516=Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
27 Num $\mu$ ' ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Iob. 3,4.
 runt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In 1516, the verb conuicior (or conuitior) is introduced only at Mc. 15,29, and at four further passages in 1519: Mc. 3,28; Lc. 22,65; Act. 13,45 (1519 only); 18,6 (1519 only). It is used in the Vulgate N.T. just once, to render óvel $\delta i \zeta \omega$ at $M c$. 15,32 (rendered by Erasmus as probra iacio). From Annot. on the present passage, it appears that Erasmus here regarded maledico as the equivalent of male precor (to "curse"), and therefore unsuited to this context. He retains maledico for $\lambda o 1 \delta o p \in \epsilon$ at $A c t$. 23,4; and for $\lambda o i \delta o p i \alpha$ at 1 Tim. 5,14.
28 ergo oưv. The Greek text here departs from Erasmus' usual mss., to conform with the late Vulgate. Among the few mss. to add ouvv were cod. 69 and other members of fam ${ }^{13}$, one of which he could have consulted in England. However, it is quite possible that the word was introduced through a fresh conjecture by one of Erasmus' assistants, who found a discrepancy between the Latin and Greek texts and thought that he should supply the 'missing' word. See on Ioh. 4,48 for other pro-Vulgate conjectures. The word ouvv is omitted in codd. 2, 817, and most other mss., commencing


 in $3 \mathbf{3}^{75} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ B W 070. The poorly attested oviv persisted into the Textus Receptus. Manetti omitted ergo.
28 dixerunt $\mathfrak{\varepsilon l} \pi \mathrm{Tov}$ ("dixerunt ei" 1516 Lat.). The added pronoun in 1516 has little Greek support, and may have been a mistake. The word is not found in the Froben Vulgate editions of 1491 or 1514 , or in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 edition.
28 esto El ("sis" $1516=$ late $V$ g.). Neither of these renderings is entirely literal, as the Greek verb is neither imperative nor subjunctive. The Vulgate may imply a different Greek word-
 a few later mss.

29 quod ${ }^{\text {OTtI }}$ ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
29 loquutus est $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$. This use of the aorist tense in the Greek text is here supported only by cod. A and a few later mss., which Erasmus is not known to have consulted. Virtually all other mss. have the perfect tense, $\lambda_{E} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon \nu$, as in codd. 1, 2, 69 and 817. Erasmus or an assistant seem to have introduced $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ either by mistake or conjecture here.
30 mirabile quiddam tò $\theta \alpha u \mu \alpha \sigma$ тóv ("mirabile" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Erasmian text adds to from cod. 1, with support from $7^{6675} \mathrm{~N}$ B N 070 and some later mss. It is omitted in codd. 2 and 817, together with A D W and most remaining mss. This is a rare instance of following cod. 1 without any question of Vulgate influence. The word quiddam is used by Erasmus four times in the Epistles in 1516, then at five passages in the Gospels in 1519.

30 quod ... nesciatis ötı ... oủk oîరate ("quia ... nescitis" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20 . Manetti put quod ... nescitis.
30 et tamen кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 7,19 .
31 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
31 voluntati ipsius obtemperat to $\theta \hat{E} \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \alpha$ à̉Toũ Toiñ ("voluntatem eius facit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on loh. 3,17 regarding obtempero. The use of the reflexive pronoun, ipsius, is intended to show that this refers to God, the subject of the verb, audit. The reading गогєĩ in the 1516 edition is taken from cod. 2, supported by cod. $817^{\text {*vid }}$ and many other late mss. In codd. 1 and $817^{\text {corr, }}$, together with most other mss., it is moiñ.
31 audit (2nd.) đ̉koúsı ("exaudit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). The Vulgate uses exaudio here to avoid repetition of audio, which occurred earlier in the verse. In Annot., Erasmus objects that this may lead the reader to suppose that a difference of meaning is intended. This is inconsistent with his preference, elsewhere, for varying the style and vocabulary. Manetti and Valla Annot. both proposed the same change to the Vulgate rendering.
32 quod ... aperverit őti $\ddagger$ nuol $\xi$ ("quia ... aperuit" Vg.; "quod ... aperuit" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
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potuisset facere quicquam. ${ }^{34}$ Responderunt, et dixerunt ei: In peccatis natus es totus, et tu doces nos? Et eiecerunt eum foras.
${ }^{35}$ Audiuit Iesus quod eiecissent eum foras: quumque inuenisset eum, dixit ei: Tu credis in filium dei? ${ }^{36}$ Respondit ille, et dixit: Et quis est domine, vt credam in eum? ${ }^{37}$ Et dixit ei Iesus: Et vidisti eum, et qui loquitur tecum, ipse est. ${ }^{38}$ At ille ait: Credo domine. Et adorauit eum. ${ }^{39}$ Et dixit ei Iesus: In iudicium ego in hunc mundum veni: vt qui non vident, videant: et qui vident, caeci fiant. ${ }^{40} \mathrm{Et}$ audierunt quidam ex Pharisaeis haec, qui cum ipso erant, et dixerunt ei: Num et nos caeci sumus? ${ }^{41}$ Dixit eis Iesus: Si caeci essetis, non haberetis peccatum. Nunc vero dicitis, Videmus: idcirco peccatum vestrum manet.

10Amen amen dico vobis, qui non intrat per ostium in stabulum ouium, sed ascendit aliunde, ille fur est et latro. ${ }^{2}$ Qui autem intrat per ostium, pastor est ouium. ${ }^{3}$ Huic ostiarius aperit, et oues vocem eius audiunt. Et proprias oues vocat nominatim, et educit eas. ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Et}$ quum proprias oues emiserit, ante eas vadit, et oues illum sequuntur, quia nouerunt vocem eius. ${ }^{5}$ Alienum autem non sequentur, sed effugient $a b$ eo, quia non nouerunt vocem alienorum. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Hoc}$ prouerbium dixit eis Iesus. Illi autem non cognouerunt, quae essent quae loqueretur



33 potuisset $B-E$ : poterat $A \mid 35$ quumque $B-E$ (cumque $B-D$ ): et cum $A \mid 36$ Et $D E$ : om. $A-C \mid 41$ idcirco peccatum $B$-E: peccatum ergo $A$ 10,1 stabulum $B$-E: ouile $A \mid 4$ nouerunt $B$-E: sciunt $A$

33 potuisset $\eta$ ŋ́ठ́vorto ("poterat" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' change to the subjunctive follows from the use of esset earlier in the verse. See Annot. A more correct sequence of tenses was offered by Manetti and Valla Annot., substituting posset, which Erasmus mentions as an alternative rendering in Annot.
35 quod eiecissent óTı $\varepsilon \xi \in \beta \alpha \lambda o v$ ("quia eiecerunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod eiecerant.
35 quumque ("et cum" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.

36 Et quis Kai tis ("Quis" 1516-22 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant omitting kai, as in codd. $\boldsymbol{X}^{*} \mathrm{~A}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathbf{P}^{66} 75 \boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }}$ B D W 070 (though with variations as to the word-order of the rest of the sentence), together with codd. 1 and 817 and most other mss. The first three editions of Erasmus' Latin translation are inconsistent with his Greek text on this point. Manetti also made this change.
 a mistake, and does not appear to have ms. support.
38 adorauit пробєкúvๆбєv ("procidens adorauit" Vg.). The Vulgate addition has no direct support from Greek mss. Manetti omitted procidens.

40 baec тגŨTa (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $K^{*} D$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, accompanied by $3{ }^{66} 75 \aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A} \mathrm{B}$ W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The same change was made by Manetti.
40 Num Mí ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,4.
41 dicitis $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ õ tl ("dicitis quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti had dicitis quod.

41 idcirco peccatum गे oưv $\alpha \mu \alpha p т i \alpha$ ("et peccatum" late Vg. = Vg. 1527; "peccatum" Annot., lemma $=$ Vg. mss.; "peccatum ergo" 1516). The reading et peccatum is found in the Froben Vulgate of 1514 as well as the 1527 Vulgate column, but et was omitted in the Froben edition of 1491. The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, either kal ì $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho t i \alpha$, found in $\mathbf{F}^{75}$ and a few later mss., or it $\alpha \mu \alpha p t i \alpha$, found in $3^{66} \mathrm{~K}^{*} \mathrm{~B}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by most other mss., commencing
with cod. A. In 1516 Annot., he renders as peccatum igitur, but did not later update this to take account of his changed rendering in the 1519 edition. He has idcirco only here in the Gospels, and four times in the Epistles, usually to replace ideo in rendering סì̀ toũto and таро̀ тои̃то. Manetti preferred Peccatum igitur.
10,1 stabulum тìv aủ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ ("ouile" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus retains ouile for $\alpha \cup \dot{\lambda} \lambda \dot{\eta}$ at vs. 16, below. At the present verse, in Annot., he argues that the use of ouile is unsuitable when combined with ouium, because of the apparent redundancy involved in the expression, "sheep-fold of the sheep". Manetti put babitaculum here, for a similar reason.
4 द̇к $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta$. This was the original reading of cod. $2^{*}$. Erasmus manually corrected this to $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon 1$, which happens to coincide with the text of cod. 69, which he could theoretically have consulted in England. However, it was more likely to have been due to a hasty conjectural change of spelling, rather than a careful comparison of manuscript variants (see on Iob. 20,27 for other arbitrary changes involving $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega)$. In his $1516-19$ Greek text, the spelling became $\varepsilon \in \beta \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta$, as in cod. 817, and finally in 1522 the better-attested aorist tense was restored.
4 nouerunt oit $\delta$ aol ("sciunt" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33.
 Vg .). The present tense of the late Vg . is unsupported by Greek mss., and looks like an internal Latin corruption. In 1516, Erasmus
 by codd. A B D and some later mss. The correction to d́ko ${ }^{\prime} 0 \cup \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \sigma$ in in 1519 was in accordance with the text of codd. 1, 3,817 and most other mss., commencing with $\mathbf{P}^{6 \text { vid }} 6675$ $\aleph \mathbf{W}$. The same change was made by Manetti.
5 effugient $\boldsymbol{q}^{\text {Eú̧̧ovtaı ("effugiunt" Vg. 1527). }}$ The late Vulgate use of the present tense lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti put fugient.
6 quae essent quae $\operatorname{Tiv} \alpha$ 茾 $\alpha$ ("quid" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the Greek variant, ti, found in $>^{66^{*}}$. Erasmus follows the reading of codd. 1 and $817^{\text {corr }}$ here, supported by most other mss., commencing with $\$^{66 c o r r} 75 \times \mathrm{AB}$ D W. His cod. 2 has the incorrect substitution of $\tilde{\eta}$ for $\eta v$. In Annot., Erasmus further cites
 Manetti put qualia essent que (= quae).






























eis. ${ }^{7}$ Dixit ergo eis iterum Iesus: Amen amen dico vobis, ego sum ostium ouium. ${ }^{8}$ Omnes quotquot ante me venerunt, fures sunt et latrones, sed non audierunt eos oues. ${ }^{9}$ Ego sum ostium: per me si quis introierit, seruabitur, et ingredietur, et egredietur, et pascua inueniet. ${ }^{10}$ Fur non venit, nisi vt furetur et mactet, ac perdat. Ego veni vt vitam habeant, et abundantius habeant. ${ }^{11}$ Ego sum pastor ille bonus. Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ouibus. ${ }^{12}$ Mercenarius autem, et qui non est pastor, cuius non sunt oues propriae, videt lupum venientem, ac deserit oues, fugitque, et lupus rapit ac dispergit oues. ${ }^{13}$ Mercenarius autem fugit, quia mercenarius est, et oues non sunt illi curae. ${ }^{14}$ Ego sum pastor ille bonus, et cognosco oues meas, et cognoscor a meis. ${ }^{15}$ Sicut nouit me pater, ita et ego | noui LB 384

16 akovøovaı $B$ - $E$ : akovo $\omega \sigma$ ı $A$

9 seruabitur $B$-E: saluabitur $A \mid 10$ ac $B-E$ et $A \mid 11$ ille $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 12$ Mercenarius $B-E$ : Mercennarius $A \mid$ ac deserit $B$ - $E$ : et dimittit $A \mid$ fugitque $B$ - $E$ : et fugit $A \mid$ alt ac $B$ - $E$ et $A \mid$ 13 Mercenarius $B-E$ : Mercennarius $A \mid$ mercenarius $B-E$ : mercennarius $A \mid$ oues non sunt illi curae $B$-E: non est illi curae de ouibus $A \mid 14$ ille $B$-E: om. $A \mid 15$ ita $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ noui $B$ - $E$ : agnosco $A \mid 16$ illas quoque $B-E$ et illas $A \mid$ fiet $B$-E: fiat $A \mid$ vnus $B-E$ et vnus $A$

7 ego óti $\varepsilon$ ह̀ $\dagger \omega$ ("quia ego" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ego.
 Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by

[^5]and $817^{\mathrm{mg}}$ ，together with many other mss．， commencing with $\mathbf{P}^{66} \boldsymbol{w}^{\text {corr }}$ A B D W．It was unusual for Erasmus to depart from cod． 2 where it agreed with the Vulgate，especially as he suggests in Annot．，that the words $\pi \rho \dot{\text { én }}$ ， are an explanatory addition．At the time of writing this note，he evidently did not have cod． 2 in front of him，as he states simply that ＂the Greeks＂have тод̀ $\mathfrak{\text { ǵnoũ．}}$

9 seruabitur $\sigma \omega \theta$ ฑ́б\＆тaı（＂saluabitur＂ 1516 $=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．3，17．
10 ac кגí（＂et＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
11 ille bonus ó ka入ós（＂bonus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． The pronoun was added to show that this ＂shepherd＂was to be distinguished from all other shepherds，conveying the sense of the Greek article：see Annot．The same addition is made at vs． 14.

11 ouibus т $\omega \nu \tau \rho \circ \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} T \omega \nu$（＂ouibus suis＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss．Erasmus restores the earlier Vulgate rendering，which was also adopted by Manetti．
12 videt $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon i ̃$（＂vidit＂Vg．1527）．The late Vulgate use of the perfect tense，again，lacks Greek ms．support．
$12 a c$（twice）kai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
12 deserit «̛̣ínoı（＂dimittit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A comparable substitution occurs at $M t$ ．19，5，in
 also sometimes puts desero for derelinquo in ren－ dering é $\gamma \kappa \propto \tau \propto \lambda$ हít $\omega$ ，following Vulgate usage at Hebr．10，25．In the present context，he probably wished to avoid the idea that the hired servant would＂send away＂the sheep．See also on lob．11，48 regarding other substitutions for dimitto．
12 fugitque kal $\phi \in u ́ \gamma \in ⿺$（＂et fugit＂ $1516=$ Vg．）． See on Iob．1，39．
12 rapit $\dot{\alpha} p \pi \propto \dot{C} \zeta \mathrm{si}$ aủtó．Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving the pronoun untranslated． The only ms．in support of omitting seems to be cod．D．The version of Manetti，more accurately，added eas．
13 oues non sunt illi curae oủ $\mu$ ह́入हı $\alpha \cup ̉ T \tilde{\sim}$ $\pi \varepsilon \rho 1$ Tడ̃v $\pi \rho \circ \beta \alpha ́ r \omega \nu$（＂non pertinet ad eum de ouibus＂Vg．；＂non est illi curae de ouibus＂1516）．As Erasmus indicates in Annot．， tacitly following Valla Annot．，the verb pertineo has unwanted connotations here．The same
substitution occurs at Mc． 4,38 ；Ioh． 12,6 ：see also Annot．on these passages．Erasmus＇use of illi here provides a more emphatic contrast． Manetti had non est cura ei de ouibus．
14 ille bonus ó ка入ós（＂bonus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on vs． 11.

14 oues meas тờ épớ．Erasmus retains oues from the late Vulgate，as being a legitimate expansion of the meaning．
 （＂cognoscunt me meae＂Vg．）．Erasmus renders the Greek passive more literally．See Annot． This change was anticipated by Manetti．
15 ita et ego кả $\gamma \omega$（＂et ego＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．The word ita is added by way of clarification， to correspond with the earlier sicut．See on Ioh．6，57．
15 noui yıvஸ́okw（＂agnosco＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．Eras－ mus produces a more consistent rendering，in view of the repetition of the Greek verb．Manetti had cognoscit ．．．cognosco．
15 ouibus $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \beta \dot{\alpha}$ т $\omega \nu$（＂ouibus meis＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by mss．As at vs．11，Erasmus restores the older Vulgate rendering．Manetti likewise omitted meis．

16 illas quoque kởkeĩva（＂et illas＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Iob．5，27，for Erasmus＇use of quoque．
16 ákoúqoưı．In 1516，Erasmus had ởkoú－ $\sigma \omega \sigma i v$ ，from cod．2，supported by $\$$ A W and some later mss．The correction to dókoúvovol in 1519 corresponded with the text of codd． 1 and 817，together with most other mss．，com－ mencing with ${ }^{666} 75 \mathrm{~B}$（but not including cod．3）．Manetti had audiunt，which would imply a Greek text which had ákoúovor．
16 fiet $\gamma \varepsilon v \chi^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \tau_{\alpha}$（＂fiat＂ 1516 Lat．）．The use of the subjunctive in the 1516 rendering may have been derived from an edition of the late Vulgate： the reading fiat is found，for example，in the Froben edition of 1491.
16 ouile moi $\mu \nu \eta$（＂ouile et＂ 1516 Lat．$=V \mathrm{Vg}$ ）． The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant adding koi，but this has little support among the Greek mss．In Annot．，Erasmus notes that Valla Annot． preferred grex for moíuvך，a rendering adopted by Manetti．Erasmus further speculates that the following phrase，Eis mouniv is a later addition， on the basis of patristic testimony from Chrysos－ tom and Augustine，but it appears to be found in most Greek mss．
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vt iterum sumam eam. ${ }^{18}$ Nemo tollit eam a me, sed ego pono eam a me ipso. Potestatem habeo ponendi eam, et potestatem habeo rursus sumendi eam. Hoc mandatum accepi a patre meo.
${ }^{19}$ Dissensio igitur iterum facta est inter Iudaeos, propter sermones hos. ${ }^{20}$ Dicebant autem multi ex ipsis: Daemonium habet, et insanit: quid eum auditis? ${ }^{21}$ Alii dicebant: Haec verba non sunt daemonium habentis. Num daemonium potest caecorum oculos aperire?
${ }^{22}$ Facta sunt autem encaenia Hierosolymis, et hyems erat, ${ }^{23}$ et ambulabat Iesus in templo in porticu Salomonis. ${ }^{24}$ Circundederunt ergo eum Iudaei, et dicebant ei: Quousque animam nostram suspendis? Si tu es Christus, dic nobis ingenue. ${ }^{25}$ Respondit eis lesus: Dixi vobis, nec creditis. Opera quae ego facio nomine patris mei, haec testimonium reddunt de me. ${ }^{26}$ Sed vos non creditis, quia non estis ex ouibus meis, quemadmodum dicebam vobis. ${ }^{27}$ Oues meae vocem meam audiunt, et ego cognosco eas, et sequuntur me, ${ }^{28} \mathrm{et}$ ego vitam aeternam do eis, nec peribunt in aeternum, neque rapiet eas quisquam de manu mea. ${ }^{29}$ Pater meus qui dedit mihi, maior omnibus est, et nemo

23 болоншขтоऽ B-E: болоцшvоs $A \mid 29 \mu о 1$ B-E: $\mu о \cup A$

18 rursus $B-E$ : denuo $A \mid 19$ igitur $B-E:$ om. $A \mid 21$ Num $B-E$ : Nunquid $A \mid 22$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierosolymis $A \mid 24$ suspendis $B-E$ : tollis $A \mid$ ingenue $B-E$ : palam $A \mid 25$ eis $B-E$ : ei $A \mid$ Dixi $B-E$ : Loquor $A \mid \operatorname{nec} B-E$ et non $A \mid$ nomine $B-E$ : in nomine $A \mid$ reddunt $B$ - $E$ : perhibent $A \mid 26$ quemadmodum dicebam vobis $B$-E: om. $A \mid 28$ nec $B$-E: et non $A \mid$ neque $B$-E: et non $A$

17 vt iva ("et" late Vg., and some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate substitution has very little

Greek ms. support, and probably arose from a textual corruption within the Latin tradition.

18 rursus $\pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda ı v$（＂iterum＂Vg．；＂denuo＂1516）． See on Ioh．9，9 for Erasmus＇use of rursus．Here it is little more than change for the sake of variety，as he retains iterum in vss． 17 and 19， in rendering the same Greek word．
19 igitur oưv（omitted in $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The Vulgate omission is supported by ${ }^{045 v i d} 75 \mathcal{K}$ B W and a few later mss．Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2，supported by most other Greek mss．，commencing with $\mathrm{P}^{66} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{D}$ and including codd． 1 and 817．Manetti put ergo．
21 Num $\mu$ ń（＂Nunquid＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．3，4．
 lymis＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob． 4,21 for Erasmus＇ use of the locative，omitting in．Some mss．read
 following cod．2，Erasmus adopts the most widely attested reading，supported by $⿻^{45} N D$ and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 817．Manetti also omitted in．
23 इо入оцต̃vтos．In 1516，Erasmus followed codd． 1 and 2 in adopting the spelling roxo－ $\mu \omega ̃ v o s$ ，which also happens to be the reading of most Greek mss．；he also adopted this spelling at Act．3，11．In 1519，he changes to бо入оиш̈vтos at the present passage（as in codd． 3 and 817）and at Mt．12，42，while retaining бo入ouल̃va，－ш̃vos at Mt．1，6；Lc．11，31；Act． 3，11；5，12．
24 suspendis cüpess（＂tollis＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ）．In this context，Erasmus wishes to avoid the un－ wanted connotation of＂destroy＂，as explained in Annot．
24 ingenue mappnoia（＂palam＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）． This is the only N．T．passage where Erasmus uses ingenue．In two other places in 1519，he substitutes aperte（Mc．8，32；Iob．16，29），and once propalam（Ioh．11，54）．He is content to retain palam at lob． $7,4,13,26 ; 16,25 ; 18,20$ ，this being the usual Vulgate rendering in the Gospels． See Annot．on the present passage，where Erasmus also interprets as libere，a rendering which he adopted at Mc．8，32（1516 only）；and at Act． 2，29（for audenter）．In the Acts and Epistles， the Vulgate usually renders this Greek word by fiducia，which Erasmus often retains，while also substituting libertas at several passages．See further on Act．2，29；9，27．
25 eis aútoĩs（＂ei＂ 1516 Lat．）．The use of $e i$ in 1516 was probably a printer＇s error．See on Iob．9，20．

25 Dixi Eltrov（＂Loquor＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）．The Vulgate possibly follows a different Greek text here：cf．$\lambda \alpha \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$ in cod．D．See Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
25 nec kai oủ（＂et non＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．2，16．
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．5，43．
25 testimonium reddunt uaptupsi（＂testimonium perhibent＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，7；5，33．
26 quia non ötı oúk．The Erasmian Greek text here follows cod． 1 and the Vulgate，supported by $\mathbf{P}^{66}{ }^{75} \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{BD}$ W and some later mss．In codd． 2 and 817，the reading is oú $\gamma$ áp，as in most other mss．，commencing with cod．A， corresponding with the rendering Non enim in Manetti＇s version．
26 quemadmodum dicebam vobis kầेs $\mathfrak{\varepsilon l m o v}$ Uuiv（omitted in 1516 Lat．＝Vg．）．The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{966 c o r t} 75 \mathcal{K}$ W and a few later mss．Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2，supported by $¥^{66^{4}} \mathrm{AD}$ and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 817．In Annot．， Erasmus suggests that these words were not part of the original，but were added later．Since this reading was found in his Greek mss．，he felt that he could not omit it from his text．It is possible，however，that the phrase was deli－ berately omitted in some early mss．，on the grounds that the preceding words，．．．$\dot{\text { En }} \mathrm{T} \tilde{\nu} \nu$ $\pi \rho \circ \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega v \tau \tilde{\omega} v \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ，had not been used by Jesus earlier in the Gospel narrative．From this point of view，the words katiss eltov úpiv have a greater claim to authenticity，as being a lectio difficilior．cf．Iob．6，36 for another passage where Jesus refers to a previous remark which he had made，not recorded in the Gospel itself． Manetti put sicut dixi vobis．
28 nec ．．．neque kaì oủ ．．．kaì oủx（＂et non＂ （twice） $1516=\mathrm{V}$ ．）．See on Iob．2，16．
29 qui ．．．maior ös ．．．$\mu \mathrm{E}$ i $\zeta \omega \nu$（＂quod ．．．maius＂ Vg ．）．Here the Vulgate reflects a Greek text having 0 ．．．$\mu \varepsilon i \check{\zeta} \circ v$ ，as found in cod． $\mathrm{B}^{*}$ alone． Erasmus follows cod．2，supported by $7^{66}$ and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 817. Other variants are òs ．．．$\mu$ eĭ A（B＇orr），and oo ．．．$\mu \mathrm{E} i \zeta \omega \nu$ ，found in $\mathcal{N}$ D W and Valla Annot．，though both Valla and Manetti offered the same rendering as Erasmus．See also Annot．
$29 \mu 0$. In 1516，the reading，$\mu \mathrm{OV}$ ，is a misprint， unsupported by any of Erasmus＇mss．
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potest rapere de manu patris mei. ${ }^{30}$ Ego et pater vnum sumus. ${ }^{31}$ Sustulerunt ergo rursum lapides Iudaei, vt lapidarent eum. ${ }^{32}$ Respondit eis Iesus: Multa bona opera ostendi vobis ex patre meo: propter quod eorum operum me lapidatis? ${ }^{33}$ Responderunt ei Iudaei, dicentes: Ob bonum opus non lapidamus te, sed ob blasphemiam: et quia tu homo quum sis, facis te ipsum deum. ${ }^{34}$ Respondit eis Iesus: Nonne scriptum est in lege vestra, Ego dixi, dii estis? ${ }^{35}$ Si illos dixit deos, ad quos sermo dei factus est, et non potest solui scriptura, ${ }^{36}$ quem pater sanctificauit et misit in mundum, vos dicitis me blasphemare, quia dixerim, Filius dei sum? ${ }^{37} \mathrm{Si}$ non facio opera patris mei, nolite credere mihi. ${ }^{38} \mathrm{Sin}$ vero facio, et si mihi non credatis, operibus credite, vt cognoscatis et credatis, | quod pater in me est, et ego LB 386 in eo.
${ }^{39}$ Quaerebant iterum eum apprehendere, et exiuit de manu eorum, ${ }^{40}$ et abiit iterum trans Iordanem in eum locum, vbi fuerat loannes baptizans primum, mansitque illic. ${ }^{41} \mathrm{Et}$
 miatevete $A$

31 rursum $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 32$ operum $B-E$ : opus $A \mid 33$ Ob bonum opus $B-E$ : De bono opere $A \mid$ ob blasphemiam $B-E$ : de blasphemia $A \mid 35$ scriptura $A D E$ : scriptura de eo $B C \mid$ 36 me blasphemare $B-E$ : blasphemas $A|\operatorname{dixerim} B-E: \operatorname{dixi} A| 38 \operatorname{Sin}$ vero $B-E:$ Si autem $A$ | prius credatis $B-E$ : credetis $A \mid$ eo $B-E$ : patre $A \mid 40$ fuerat $B-E$ : erat $A \mid$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ mansitque $B-E$ : et mansit $A$

31 ergo rursum oṽv món入ıv ("ergo" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission is supported by cod. D and a few later mss. The earlier Vulgate omits ergo as well, with similarly limited support from $\exists^{45}$ and one later ms. Some early Greek mss. also have just $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı v$, as in $\mathcal{K}$ B W. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $77^{66} \mathrm{~A}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. In Annot., he suggested adding iterum, which
was the rendering which had been adopted by Manetti.

32 operum ย̆pүळv ("opus" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). In 1516, the spelling $\varepsilon_{\rho} \rho \gamma \gamma \omega$ was a misprint. Erasmus found $\varepsilon_{\rho} \rho \gamma \omega \nu$ in cod. 2 , but codd. 1 and 817, together with most other mss., have Épyov, the reading which underlay the Vulgate translation.

33 dicentes $\lambda$ źyoutes (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3{ }^{45} 66$ K A BW and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows his codd. 2 and 817, in company with cod. D and most later mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
33 Ob bonum opus ... ob blaspbemiam Пepi ... $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \mu l \alpha s$ ("De bono opere ... de blasphemia" $1516=$ Vg.), Erasmus does not elsewhere use ob to render $\pi \varepsilon \rho \mathrm{pi}$. He uses the word twentyseven times in total, in rendering $\varepsilon \in v, ~ \notin \pi i, ~ \delta i \alpha ́, ~$ eivekev, etc., rather more often than in the Vulgate.
33 lapidamus $\lambda_{1} \theta$ ácousv. In 1516-22, the reading $\lambda_{1} \theta \dot{\alpha} \zeta \circ \mu \varepsilon v$, present tense, was more correct, in accordance with virtually all mss., as well as the Latin Vulgate. The change to $\lambda_{1} \theta$ dorouev in the 1527-35 editions, using the future tense, lacks ms. support, and may have arisen as a misprint, as the Latin rendering remained unchanged.
34 vestra üuc̃v ("vestra, quia" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text adding öti, as in $39^{66} 75$ $\mathcal{N}$ B D W and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by cod. A and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti similarly omitted quia.
36 quem ofv ("de eo quem" 1519-22 Lat.). The addition in 1519-22 alters the meaning by linking this clause with the immediately preceding word, scriptura, instead of taking the clause as defining the subject of the following verb, blasphemo. In 1527, Erasmus interpreted the passage in a manner which was more compatible with the Vulgate rendering. See Annot.
 blasphemas" Vg.; "blasphemas" 1516). Erasmus alters the grammatical structure, for the sake of clarity. See Annot. The version of Manetti substituted quod blasphemo, for the same reason.
36 dixerim EfTov ("dixi" $1516=V$ g.). Usually Erasmus retains the indicative after quia. Here, he intends that the clause should be understood as part of the accusation which was made by the Jews. In Annot., he recommends quod, in place of quia.
38 Sin vero $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon l} \boldsymbol{\delta \varepsilon}$ ("Si autem" $1516=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). This substitution also occurs at Mt. 18,16. Erasmus elsewhere prefers to replace si autem by quod si, but also makes use of other expressions such as sin autem (in accordance with Vulgate usage at $L c .10,6 ; 13,9$ ) and sin minus. On this point,
see Valla Elegantiae, II, 26; Erasmus Paraphr, in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 316, 11. 26-29. In Matthew, Luke and John, the Vulgate uses si autem about twenty-five times, of which fourteen are altered by Erasmus in 1516, mainly in Matthew, and then a further nine are altered in 1519, in Luke and John, leaving si autem only at $L c .12,28$ and Iob. 5,47.
38 credatis (1st.) mוбтeúpTE ("vultis credere" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g} \text {; " "credetis" }} 1516$ Lat.). The Vulgate gives a somewhat free rendering, to prevent an apparent contradiction with the next part of the sentence. This corresponds with the text of cod. D, Ө́̇̇ete mooteviav, which may have been a retranslation from the Latin. In 1516, Erasmus had mıбTevete, this being a correction which he wrote in cod. 2, which here offered one of its many itacisms, moбevífal. There is wide attestation for both miotevée (found in cod. $1^{* v i d}$ ) and $\pi I \sigma T U^{\prime \prime} \eta T E$ (found in codd. $1^{\text {corr }}$ and 817). Manetti used the perfect subjunctive, credideritis.
38 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
38 eo वủtẽ ("patre" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $\tau \tilde{\omega} \pi \alpha \pi \rho i$, found in $7^{6675} \mathrm{~K}$ B D W and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $39^{45} \mathrm{~A}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti put $i p s o$.
39 iterum eum $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı v$ aủtóv ("ergo eum" $V g$.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text substituting oưv for $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda i v$, as in $\mathbf{K}^{*}$ and a few later mss. In $\boldsymbol{\nexists}^{75}$, $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \nu v$ is simply omitted. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by cod. B and many later mss., including cod. 817*. In Annot, he suggested using rursum here. Many other mss. read oũv má $\lambda 1 v$ aútóv, as in $7^{66}$ and cod. $817^{\text {corr }}$, or oưv aútòv $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda 1 v$, as in $\kappa^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A}$ W and cod. 1. In accordance with the latter reading, Manetti put ergo eum rursus.
39 manu $\tau$ ins $\bar{x}$ xipós ("manibus" Vg.). The
 as found in cod. 1 and a few other mss., or it may simply be an example of loose translation. Erasmus' codd. 2 and 817 , with virtually all other mss., have the singular. Manetti made the same change.
40 fuerat 70 ("erat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect, see on $I o b .1,19$.
40 mansitque kai $\xi^{\mu} \mu \mathrm{L} v \mathrm{vev}$ ("et mansit" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
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multi venerunt ad eum, ac dicebant: Ioannes quidem signum aedidit nullum. Omnia autem quaecunque dixit Ioannes de hoc, vera erant. ${ }^{42} \mathrm{Et}$ crediderunt multi illic in eum.

11Aegrotabat autem quidam nomine Lazarus Bethaniensis a castello Mariae et Marthae huius sororis. ${ }^{2}$ Maria autem erat ea quae vnxit dominum vnguento, et extersit pedes eius capillis suis, cuius frater Lazarus aegrotabat. ${ }^{3}$ Miserunt ergo sorores eius ad eum, dicentes: Domine, ecce quem amas, aegrotat. ${ }^{4}$ Audiens autem Iesus, dixit: Infirmitas haec non est ad mortem, sed pro gloria dei, vt glorificetur filius dei per eam. ${ }^{5}$ Diligebat autem Iesus Martham et sororem eius et Lazarum. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Vt}$ ergo audiuit quod aegrotaret, tum quidem temporis mansit in eodem loco duobus diebus. ${ }^{7}$ Deinde post hoc dicit discipulis: Eamus in Iudaeam iterum. ${ }^{8}$ Dicunt ei discipuli: Rabbi, modo quaerebant te Iudaei lapidare, et iterum vadis illuc? ${ }^{9}$ Respondit Iesus:
$41 \eta \lambda \theta \circ v A B C^{c} D E: \eta \theta \theta \circ v C^{*}$
41 ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ prius Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ aedidit $B-E$ : fecit $A \mid$ alt. Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid 42$ illic $B$ - $E$ : ibi $A$
11,1 Aegrotabat autem quidam nomine $B-E$ : Erat autem quidam languens $A \mid$ Bethaniensis a $B-E$ : a Bethania, de $A \mid$ huius sororis $B-E$ : sororis eius $A \mid 2$ ea $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ aegrotabat $B-E$ : infirmabatur $A \mid 3$ aegrotat $B$ - $E$ : infirmatur $A \mid 6$ aegrotaret, tum $B-E$ : infirmaretur, tunc $A \mid$ temporis $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 8$ modo $B-E$ : nunc $A$

41 ac кai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
 See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put dicebant quod.
41 aedidit Ėтоiŋ $\sigma \in \nu$ ("fecit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,11.
42 crediderunt multi illic ÉTríбтєטनळv mо入入оi Ékeĩ ("multi crediderunt" Vg.; "crediderunt multi ibi" 1516). The Vulgate corresponds with a Greek variant, mo $\quad \lambda \lambda$ oi ėmíatevoorv (omitting ékeĩ), as in $\mathbf{7}^{45 v i d}$ and a few later mss. The
word-order mo $\lambda \lambda$ оi $\varepsilon$ ह́miбtevoळv is also found in $7^{6675} \times \mathrm{B} D(\mathrm{~W})$ and cod. 1 , though all of these, together with cod. A (which has
 the sentence. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, with most other late mss. On the substitution of illic for ibi, see on Ioh. 5,5. Manetti's rendering was multi ibi crediderunt.

11,1 Aegrotabat autem quidam nomine ${ }^{\tau} \mathrm{H} v \delta^{\delta}$ é tis ảo $\sigma \mathrm{Ev} \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("Erat autem quidam languens"
$1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus also substitutes aegroto for infirmor at vss. 2,3 and 6 , to render the same Greek verb. Elsewhere, aegroto occurs only at
 in the Vulgate, but only in the Old Testament. In classical Latin usage, the adjective infirmus is more suitable than the passive of the verb infirmo, to describe those who are sick or unwell. Nor are langueo and languidus the most common words in prose authors for referring to illness. At Mt. 14,14, Erasmus replaces languidos by qui male valebant, to translate toن's áppஸ́otous. At Act. 19,12, in rendering áotevé $\omega$, he substitutes infirmus for languidus. However, he retains languidus at $I o b .5,7$, and occasionally also infirmor and langueo at other passages. For his avoidance of erat with a present participle, see on Ioh. 1,28. The use of aegroto here was anticipated by Manetti, who substituted egrotans for languens, while retaining the rest of the Vulgate phrase.
1 Bethaniensis đ̊пò B $\eta$ $\theta$ ovíss ("a Bethania" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus describes his wording as "more Latin": see on Iob. 1,45 for other adjectival forms of place-names.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 8,23.
 eius" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The substitution of buius makes clear that the reference is to Mary rather than Lazarus. The rendering sororis eius seems to have been in the Vulgate edition which Erasmus used in preparing his translation in 1516, as it is cited in Annot., lemma, and conforms with the earlier Vulgate text. However, many late Vulgate copies had the plural, sororum eius, as cited in 1527 Annot., and as printed in the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514 and in the 1527 Vulgate column: this reading probably arose as an internal corruption within the Latin tradition. Manetti put sororis suae.
2 ea quae in ("quae" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The inserted pronoun provides a smoother grammatical link with the following clause.
2 aegrotabat ${ }^{\eta} \sigma \theta \in \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon!$ ("infirmabatur" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 1 .

3 eius au่toũ. The Erasmian text here follows codd. 1, $817^{\text {corr }}$ and the late Vulgate, with support from cod. D and several later mss. In codd. 2 and $817^{*}$, the pronoun is omitted, in company with nearly all other mss. and the earlier Vulgate.

3 aegrotat áodeveĩ ("infirmatur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 1.
4 dixit Eltev ("dixit eis" Vg.). The Vulgate addition lacks Greek support. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
4 per eam $\delta 1$ ' aủñ̃s ("per eum" late Vg .). The late Vulgate alteration from feminine to masculine is, again, unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot., and Valla Annot. This reading was listed by Erasmus among the Loca Manifeste Deprauata. Manetti also had per eam, as in the earlier Vulgate (in both mss. of his translation, the text originally had eum, later corrected to eam).
5 eius ๙ủtĩs ("eius Mariam" Vg.). The Vulgate addition, once more, has no support from the Greek mss. Manetti substituted suam.
6 quod aegrotaret öтı dं $\sigma \theta \varepsilon v \varepsilon I ̃$ ("quia infirmabatur" Vg.; "quod infirmaretur" 1516). See on vs. 1 regarding aegroto. On quod for quia, see on lob. 1,20 . Manetti put quod infirmabatur.
6 tum quidem temporis tóte $\mu$ 白 ("tunc quidem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The spelling, tum, does not occur in the Vulgate N.T. One reason for the change may have been to avoid placing tunc before a word beginning with $q$ : cf. Gal. 4,8. However, Erasmus allows tunc qui at $M t$. 24,16; Mc. 13,14; Lc. 21,21; and tunc quod at 1 Cor. 13,10. He introduces tum elsewhere twenty-five times, of which ten were in 1519: see further on vs. 48, below. The insertion of temporis was perhaps intended to reflect the fact that Jesus stayed where he was, not just for a moment, but for a longer period.
7 boc тои̃то ("haec" Vg.). The Vulgate plural is virtually unsupported among the Greek mss.
7 discipulis toĩs $\mu \alpha$ थो $\quad$ тaïs ("discipulis suis" Vg.). The Vulgate may be based on a Greek variant adding aútoũ, as found in codd. A D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $7^{\text {bivid } 66 c o r t ~} 75 \aleph$ B W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti also omitted suis.
8 'PaßßEi. This spelling was taken from cod. 2. See on Ioh. 1,38.
8 modo vũv ("nunc" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 9,25.
$9 \delta$ Inooũs. The Erasmian text, as elsewhere, inserts the article, possibly from cod. 1, supported here by $\exists^{45}$. It is omitted in codd. 2 and 817, together with most other mss. See on Iob. 1,48.
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Nonne duodecim sunt horae diei? Si quis ambulauerit in die, non offendit: quia lucem huius mundi videt. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Si}$ quis autem ambulauerit in nocte, offendit: quia lux non est in eo. ${ }^{11}$ Haec ait, et post haec dicit eis: Lazarus amicus noster dormit, sed vado vt a somno excitem eum. ${ }^{12}$ Dixerunt ergo discipuli eius: Domine, si dormit, saluus erit. ${ }^{13}$ Dixerat autem Iesus de morte eius, at illi putauerunt, quod de dormitione somni diceret. ${ }^{14}$ Tunc ergo lesus dixit eis manifeste: Lazarus mortuus est, ${ }^{15}$ et gaudeo propter vos, vt credatis, quod non fuerim ibi. Sed eamus ad eum. ${ }^{16}$ Dixit ergo Thomas qui dicitur Di dymus, ad discipulos: Eamus et nos vt moriamur cum eo.
${ }^{17}$ Venit itaque Iesus, et inuenit eum quatuor dies iam in monumento habentem. ${ }^{18}$ Erat autem Bethania iuxta Hierosolymam fere stadiis quindecim. ${ }^{19}$ Multique ex Iudaeis venerant ad Martham ac Mariam, vt consolarentur eas de fratre suo. ${ }^{20}$ Martha ergo vt audiuit quod Iesus venisset, occurrit illi: Maria vero domi desidebat. ${ }^{21}$ Dixit ergo Martha ad Iesum: Domine, si fuisses hic, frater meus non fuisset mortuus. ${ }^{22}$ Sed et nunc scio, quod quaecunque poposceris a deo, daturus tibi sit deus. ${ }^{23}$ Dicit illi Iesus: Resurget frater tuus. ${ }^{24}$ Dicit ei Martha: Scio quod resurget in resurrectione in nouissimo die. ${ }^{25}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Ego sum resurrectio et vita.


10 quis autem $B-E$ : autem quis $A \mid 13$ at illi $B-E$ : illi autem $A \mid 16$ vt $B-E$ : et $A \mid 19$ Multique $B-E$ : Multi autem $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 20$ venisset $B-E$ : venit $A \mid$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ desidebat $B-E$ : sedebat $A \mid 22$ quod $B-E$ : quia $A \mid$ daturus tibi sit $B$ - $E$ : dabit tibi $A$

9 тєрıтهтєEi．This spelling came from cod． 2. Most mss．have $\pi \varepsilon \rho ו \pi \alpha \tau \pi \tilde{n}$ ．The same variant occurs in the following verse．
 ＂Si autem quis＂1516）．The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss．
$10 \pi \varepsilon p ı \pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon i$. As in the previous verse，this spelling came from cod．2，whereas most other mss．have $\pi \varepsilon \rho ı \pi \alpha \pi \eta ี$.
11 baec toũto．In his rendering，Erasmus retains the plural from the late Vulgate，as at Ioh．2，12： see note ad loc．
11 ह́ $\xi \cup \pi v \eta \dot{\jmath} \sigma \omega$ ．This comes from cod．2．Most mss．have $\varepsilon \in \xi u \pi v i \sigma \omega$ ．
13 at illi ékeĩvot סé（＂illi autem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Iob．1，26
13 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，20． Manetti made the same change．
15 quod non fuerim őtı oủk $\eta \not \mu \eta \nu$（＂quoniam non eram＂Vg．）．See again on Iob．1，20．Manetti had quod non eram．
16 ad discipulos тоĩs $\mu \propto \theta \eta$ roiis（＂ad condisci－ pulos＂Vg．）．Here Erasmus deserts his usual mss．，codd． 1,2 and 817 ，which all read roirs $\sigma u \mu \mu \alpha 0 \eta \tau \alpha i ̃ s$, as found in nearly all other mss． Nor does his reading match cod．69，which has $\sigma \tilde{v} \nu$ тоĩs $\mu \alpha 0 \eta \tau \alpha i ̃ s$ ．It would therefore seem that there is an element of conjecture here． Manetti put condiscipulis．
16 vt iva（＂et＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）．The late Vulgate is not supported by Greek mss．Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate rendering：see Annot．，and Valla Annot．The version of Manetti also had $v t$ ．

18 fere $\dot{\text { ćs（＂quasi＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，39．}}$
19 Multique каi то入入оi（＂Multi autem＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having mo入入oi $\delta \varepsilon ́$, as in $\mathbf{7 月}^{66 v i d} 75 v i d ~ K ~ B C D$ W and a few later mss．Cod． 1 has moג Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817，supported by most other mss．，commencing with cod．A．
$19 \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda u ́ \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v$ ．This spelling is from cod． 2. Most mss．have $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \eta \lambda u ́ \theta \varepsilon ı \sigma \alpha v$.
19 ad Martham трòs тג̀́s терi MápӨ $\alpha v$ ．Eras－ mus retains the Vulgate rendering，arguing in Annot．，that Valla Annot．was wrong to demand a more literal translation here．However，the Vulgate seems to have followed a different Greek text，$\pi \rho \dot{s} s$ тìv Máp $\theta \alpha v$ ，as in $\$ \beta^{66} 75 \mathrm{vid}$ $\aleph$ B C＊W and some later mss．，or $\pi \rho \mathrm{C}^{*}$

Máp $\theta \alpha v$ ，as in cod．D．It could be said that Erasmus＇Greek text represents a lectio difficilior， found in codd．1， 2 and 817，with support from most other mss．，commencing with ${ }^{45 v i d}$ A $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr．}}$ ．The omission of $\pi$ Trós in the 1522 edition was probably a printing error．Manetti changed the word－order，putting ad Mariam et Martbam．
19 ac kai（＂et＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
$19 \pi \alpha р \alpha \mu \cup \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega v \tau \alpha$ ．The spelling $\pi \alpha р \alpha \mu \cup \theta \eta^{\prime}-$ oovtar in 1516 was partly based on cod．2， which had the itacistic mapauvӨnंбоvтє．Most mss．have тор $\alpha \mu \cup Ө$ тi $\sigma \omega v \tau \alpha$ ．
20 quod ．．．venisset ōtı ．．．हैpХहтهı（＂quia ．．． venit＂Vg．；＂quod ．．．venit＂1516）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti put quod ．．．venit．
20 o＇ $\operatorname{In} \sigma 0$ ũs．The article is again inserted by Erasmus or his assistants，contrary to the reading found in his mss．See on Iob．1，48．This poorly attested addition persisted into the Textus Receptus．
20 vero $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$（＂autem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh． 1，26．
 A comparable substitution occurs at Mt．9，9， rendering kód $\eta \mu$ ơı．However，Erasmus retains sedeo in similar contexts at $L c$ ．24，49；Act．18，11． His intention here，perhaps，was to convey the sense that Mary＂remained＂or＂stayed behind＂， rather than just＂sat＂．However，he would have been aware of the use of desideo in Plautus and Terence，where the meaning is to sit about in idleness：this additional connotation is not directly expressed by the Greek verb，but would have been appropriate in the context of $L c$ ． 10,40 ，where Martha complained of Mary＇s sitting at Jesus＇feet．
21 ท̂ Máp $\theta \alpha$ ．The Erasmian text inserts the article from cod． 1 ，supported by $\boldsymbol{7}^{66} 75$ vid B C D W and many later mss．In codd． 2 and 817 ，in company with $7^{45} \mathrm{~A}$ and most later mss．，the word is omitted．
 （＂quia ．．．dabit tibi＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Iob．1，20．Manetti had quod ．．．dabit tibi．
24 Dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{l}$（＂Dixit＂Vg．1527）．Erasmus more accurately renders the present tense，as in the earlier Vulgate．Manetti had Ait．
24 quod ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Tl}$（＂quia＂Vg．）．See again on Ioh．1，20． Manetti made the same change．
25 Dicit elTtev（＂Dixit＂Vg．）．Erasmus＇rendering corresponds more closely with $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon$ ，as found





тои̃ $\theta$ हoũ, ò عis tòv kócuov épxóuevos.


























Qui credit in me, etiam si mortuus fuerit, viuet: ${ }^{26}$ et omnis qui viuit et credit in me, non morietur in aeternum. Credis hoc? ${ }^{27}$ Ait illi: Etiam domine. Ego credo, quod tu sis Chri|stus ille filius dei, qui in munLB 388 dum venturus erat. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Et}$ quum haec dixisset, abiit et vocauit Mariam sororem suam clanculum, dicens: Magister adest, et vocat te. ${ }^{29}$ Illa vt audiuit, surgit cito, et venit ad eum. ${ }^{30}$ Nondum autem venerat Iesus in castellum, sed erat in eo loco, vbi occurrerat ei Martha. ${ }^{31}$ Iudaei ergo qui erant cum ea in domo et consolabantur eam, quum vidissent Mariam quod cito surrexisset et exisset, sequuti sunt eam, dicentes: Vadit ad monumentum, vt ploret ibi. ${ }^{32}$ Maria ergo quum venisset eo, vbi erat Iesus, videns eum, accidit ad pedes eius, et dicit ei: Domine, si fuisses hic, non esset mortuus frater meus. ${ }^{33}$ Iesus ergo vt vidit eam plorantem, et Iudaeos qui venerant cum ea plorantes, infremuit spiritu et turbauit se ipsum, ${ }^{34}$ et dixit: Vbi posuistis eum? Dicunt ei: Domine, veni et vide. ${ }^{35}$ Lachrymatus est Iesus. ${ }^{36}$ Dixerunt ergo Iudaei: Ecce quomodo amabat eum. ${ }^{37}$ Quidam autem ex ipsis dixerunt: Non poterat hic qui aperuit

27 Etiam $B$ - $E$ : Vtique $A \mid$ credo $B-E$ : credidi $A \mid$ quod tu sis $B D E$ : quia tu es $A$, quod tu scis $C \mid$ ille $B$ - $E$ : om. $A \mid$ mundum $B-E$ : hunc mundum $A \mid$ venturus erat $B$ - $E$ : venisti $A \mid$ 28 clanculum $B$-E: silentio $A \mid 29$ surgit $B-E$ : surrexit $A \mid 30$ eo $B-E$ : illo $A \mid 31$ exisset $B-E$ : exiisset $A \mid 32$ eo $B-E: o m . A \mid$ accidit $B-E$ : cecidit $A \mid \operatorname{dicit} B-E: \operatorname{dixit} A$
in fam ${ }^{13}$ and a few other late mss. However, the inconsistency between his Greek and Latin texts is perhaps best explained as the result of his use of an edition of the late Vulgate which substituted Dicit, as found in Froben's Vulgate edition of 1491 and several others, though not in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 edition. Manetti similarly had Dicit.

27 Etiam Nai ("Vtique" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs at Mc. 7,28(1519), consistent with Vulgate usage at many other passages, as pointed out in Annot. Erasmus retains vtique for $v a i$ at $L c .7,26$.

27 credo тєтібтеuka ("credidi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is less literal here, though he justifies
his rendering in Annot., on the grounds that the Greek past tense can sometimes be present in meaning. Cf. on Ioh. 1,15 .
27 quod tu sis ótı $\sigma$ ù $\varepsilon$ l ("quia tu es" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "quod tu scis" 1522). See on Ioh. 1,20. The substitution of scis for sis in 1522 was a misprint. Manetti put quod tu es.
27 Christus ille ó Xpıoтós ("Christus" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,29.
27 dei toũ $\theta_{\text {goũ ("dei viui" late Vg.). The late }}$ Vulgate addition is supported by only a few late mss. which add тоũ $\zeta \tilde{\omega} v t o s$, and probably arose by harmonisation with Mt. 16,16.
27 qui ... venturus erat ó ... épXónevos ("qui ... venisti" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,25 , and Annot.
27 mundum tòv кóбuov ("hunc mundum" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). This late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss., as mentioned in Annot.

28 clanculum $\lambda$ ó $\theta \rho \alpha$ ("silentio" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus introduces the adverb, clanculum, at only two other passages: at Mt. 1,19, for $\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \theta p \alpha$, and at Act. 17,7 (1519), in rendering úmo 0 éXo$\mu a \mathrm{l}$. Among classical authors, this Latin word was not common except in the plays of Plautus and Terence. Elsewhere in the N.T., he followed the Vulgate in using clam at Mt. 2,7, and occulte at Act. 16,37, to render the same Greek expression. At the present passage, the context requires the meaning, "secretly": in Annot., Erasmus pointed out the absurdity of calling someone "silently". Manetti anticipated him in making this change.
29 surgit é $\gamma$ eíperal ("surrexit" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The perfect tense of the late Vulgate corresponds with $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \rho \theta \eta$ in $7^{75} \times \mathrm{B} \mathrm{C}^{*}$ D W and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $7^{45} 66$ A C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 . He here restores the older Vulgate rendering: see Annot. The version of Manetti also had surgit.
30 autem 8́́ ("enim" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with $\gamma$ áp in cod. D, though this might have been no more than a retranslation from the Latin at this point.
30 erat ${ }^{\eta} v$ ("erat adhuc" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text, adding ${ }^{\text {E゙T }} \mathrm{T}$, as found in $7^{66} 75 \times$ B C W and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817 , in company with most other mss.,
commencing with $3^{35}$ A D. Manetti similarly omitted adhuc.
30 ео т $\uparrow$ ("illo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. on Ioh. 6,62. Manetti omitted this pronoun.
31 quod cito surrexisset et exisset Õт1 тaxécos ávéotn kai है $\xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \mathrm{Ev}$ ("quia cito surrexit et exiit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti rendered as quod cito surrexit et abiit.
31 dicentes $\lambda$ ह́youtes öт! ("dicentes quia" Vg.). See again on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put dicentes quod.
32 eo vbi ÕTtou ("vbi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 6,62.
32 accidit ÉTteqev ("cecidit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs at Lc. 8,41 (1519). Erasmus also used accido to render тробтiттт at Mc. 5,33; 7,25; Lc. 5,8 (all in 1519). Elsewhere, he sometimes substituted prosterno or procido. He disliked cado in the context of worship, as this verb could imply an accidental fall rather than a deliberate act of prostration, though he allowed cado to remain in this sense in several passages of the Apocalypse, a book which he revised far less thoroughly. See further on Act. 16,29 . In rendering $\pi i \pi t \omega$ at other passages, Erasmus occasionally made use of such alternatives as collabor, concido, and decido. For his rendering of other compounds of $\pi i \pi T \omega$, see on Act. 9,18 for ${ }^{\circ} \pi т о т і т \pi \omega$, Act. 12,7 for
 evoking alternative renderings for cado.
32 ad mpós. The Erasmian Greek text is taken from cod. 1, supported by $7^{75 v i d}$ \& B C* D W and some later mss. In codd. 2 and 817 the reading was sis, as found in most mss., commencing with $\$^{66} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr. }}$.
32 et dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ y o u \sigma \alpha$ ("et dixit" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus' rendering is closer to the sense of the Greek present participle. Manetti, more literally, had dicens.
34 теӨض́кळте. The spelling comes from cod. 2. Most mss. have teӨzíkote.
35 Lachrymatus est é éd́kpuoev ("Et lachrymatus est" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the insertion of kal before éסókpuąv in $\aleph^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2, supported by $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{66}$ A B C W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817.
36 'loudaĩol. All mss. appear to insert oi before 'louסaioor, including codd. 1, 2 and 817. The omission perhaps arose as a misprint in 1516,









 $\theta$ €oũ; ${ }^{41}$ ท̃pav oưv tòv $\lambda i \theta \circ v$, oũ ñv ó













 Өóvtes тро̀s tìv Mapiav, kai $\theta \varepsilon \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon-$

 трòs toùs Фapiनaíous, каi घĩtov aưtoĩs
 ol đ̉pXıєpEĩs kaì oi Фapıaaĩol ouvéSplov,
oculos caeci, facere, vt et hic non moreretur? ${ }^{38}$ Iesus ergo rursum fremens in semet ipso, venit ad monumentum. Erat autem spelunca, et lapis impositus erat ei. ${ }^{39}$ Ait Iesus: Tollite lapidem. Dicit ei Martha soror eius qui mortuus fuerat: Domine, iam olet, quatriduanus est enim. ${ }^{40}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Nonne dixi tibi, quod si credideris, visura esses gloriam dei? ${ }^{41}$ Sustulerunt ergo lapidem a loco, vbi is qui mortuus fuerat, erat positus. Iesus autem attollens sursum oculos, dixit: Pater gratias ago tibi, quoniam audisti me. ${ }^{42}$ Ego autem sciebam quod semper me audis, sed propter turbam quae circunstat dixi, vt credant quod tu me miseris. ${ }^{43}$ Atque haec quum dixisset, voce magna clamauit: Lazare, veni foras. ${ }^{44}$ Et prodiit qui fuerat mortuus, manus et pedes habens reuinctos fasciis sepulchralibus, et facies illius sudario erat obuincta. Dicit eis Iesus: Soluite eum, et sinite abire.
${ }^{45}$ Multi ergo ex Iudaeis qui venerant ad Mariam, et viderant quae fecisset Iesus, crediderunt in eum. ${ }^{46}$ Quidam autem ex ipsis abierunt ad Pharisaeos, et dixerunt eis quae fecisset Iesus. ${ }^{47}$ Congregauerunt ergo pontifices et Pharisaei concilium,

37 et $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 38$ impositus $B-E$ : superpositus $A \mid 41$ a loco $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ attollens sursum oculos $B-E$ : eleuatis sursum oculis $A \mid 42$ quae $B-E$ : qui $A$ (compend.) | 43 Atque $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 44$ manus ... sepulchralibus $B-E$ : ligatus manus et pedes institis $A \mid$ obuincta $B-E$ : circumligata $A$
which Erasmus failed to correct in his later editions. His usual tendency was to add the article rather than omit it.

37 caeci тoũ тиф入оũ ("caeci nati" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss., and appears to be a harmonisation with Ioh. 9,32. Manetti also omitted nati.

37 vt et ivo koí ("vt" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission has little Greek support. Manetti had the same wording as Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate.

38 impositus erat èmékeıro ("superpositus erat" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus retains superpositus at Iob. 21,9, the only other N.T. passage where
the Vulgate uses this word. In the present context, the change may have been designed to reflect the likelihood that the tomb had an entrance from the side, rather than vertically from above.
39 Dicit $\lambda$ é $\overline{\varepsilon 1}$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 24.
39 olet 0 ¿̌ı ("fetet" Vg.). As explained in Annot., Erasmus preferred oleo, as being a more decorous verb that preserved the ambiguity of the Greek expression.
40 Dicit $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \in 1$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 24.
40 quod ... visura esses ötı ... ö $\psi \varepsilon ⿺$ ("quoniam ... videbis" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... videbis.
41 Sustulerunt గึpav ("Tulerunt" Vg.). See on Iob. 8,59.
41 a loco, vbi is qui mortuus fuerat, erat positus
 ... positus" 1516, omitting "a loco"). The Vulgate omission is supported by $36{ }^{66} 75$ vid $\aleph ~ B$ $C^{*} \mathrm{D}$ W and a few later mss. In cod. 1 , in company with cod. A and a few others, is found oũ $\tilde{\eta} \nu$, omitting ó $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \omega \dot{s}$. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by cod. $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss. In cod. 817, the text is the same, except that ormou is substituted for ov. The clause has sometimes been regarded as an explanatory addition, though it is also possible that an ancient scribe might have omitted it, either by accidental omission of a line of text, or by deliberate excision and abbreviation of material which he deemed superfluous. Manetti's version was wbi fuerat defunctus positus.
41 attollens sursum oculos ग̃ $\rho \varepsilon$ toùs ó $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \circ$ ن̀s ã̛vo kaí ("eleuatis sursum oculis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at $L c .6,20$ (1519). For Erasmus' treatment of leuo and eleuo, see on Ioh. 4,35. Manetti put eleuauit oculos sursum et.

42 quod (1st.) őtu ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

42 turbam quae tòv öx $\chi$ خov tóv ("populum qui" Vg.; "turbam qui" 1516). See on Ioh. 6,2. The ungrammatical retention of qui in 1516 (using a standard abbreviation for this word) would not have been intended by Erasmus, and could have arisen from an unclear correction in his working copy of the Vulgate, or from a printer's error. Manetti substituted turbam circunstantem for populum qui circumstat.
 misisti" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... misisti.

43 Atque кaí (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti put et.
44 prodiit $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon v$ ("statim prodiit" Vg.). The Vulgate addition is supported only by cod. D, which may itself be a retranslation from the Latin here, as at other passages. Manetti substituted exiit.

44 manus et pedes babens reuinctos fasciis sepul-
 keıpíaıs ("ligatus manus et pedes institis" 1516 $=$ late Vg .). In removing ligo, Erasmus may have wished to avoid the possible misunderstanding that the hands were tied to the feet. The verb reuincio does not occur elsewhere in his N.T. He uses fascia as a substitute for pannus in rendering $\sigma$ тrapyovó $\omega$ at $L c .2,7,12$, in relation to the "swaddling clothes" of the newly born Christ. See Annot. The version of Manetti had ligatus pedes et manus institis, as in the earlier Vulgate.
44 crat obuincta $\pi \varepsilon p 1 \varepsilon \delta$ Éסero ("erat ligata" Vg.; "erat circumligata" 1516). The substitution of circumligo in 1516 was an attempt at greater precision. Erasmus uses the verb obuincio again at Ioh. 19,40 , to render $\delta \varepsilon ́ \omega$, with reference to the burial garments of Christ, but it had the disadvantage of being unknown in classical Latin usage.
44 Dicit $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma^{\varepsilon ı}$ ("Dixit" late Vg.). The late Vulgate use of the perfect tense lacks Greek support. Manetti also had Dicit here.
45 Mariam Tìv Mapióv ("Mariam et Martham" late Vg.). Again, there is no Greek authority for this late Vulgate addition.
45 fecisset ह̇דoí $\eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ ("fecit" Vg.). Erasmus' substitution of the pluperfect produces an improved sequence of tenses. Manetti put fecerat here, but not in vs. 46.
 note.
47 Congregauerunt $\sigma u v \dot{\gamma} \gamma \propto \gamma 0 v$ ("Collegerunt" Vg.). A comparable substitution occurs at Act. 15,25 . Erasmus probably thought that congrego was more suitable to accompany the singular noun, concilium. See further on Act. 1,21. In 1519 Annot., he comments on the addition of kळт $\dot{\alpha}$ тои̃ 'Inooũ in some mss., speculating
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ac dicebant: Quid facimus, quia hic homo multa signa aedit? ${ }^{48} \mathrm{Si}$ permiserimus eum sic, omnes credent ei: venientque Romani, et tollent tum locum nostrum, tum gentem. ${ }^{49}$ Vnus autem ex ipsis, Caiaphas nomine, quum esset pontifex anni illius, dixit eis: Vos nescitis quicquam, ${ }^{50}$ nec perpenditis quod expedit nobis, vt vnus homo moriatur pro populo, ac non tota gens pereat. ${ }^{51}$ Hoc autem a semet ipso non dixit, sed quum esset pontifex anni illius, vaticinatus est quod Iesus moriturus esset pro gente, ${ }^{52}$ et non tantum pro gente, sed vt filios dei qui erant dispersi, congregaret in vnum. ${ }^{53} \mathrm{Ab}$ illo ergo die consultabant inuicem, vt interficerent eum. ${ }^{54}$ Iesus ergo iam non propalam ambulabat inter Iudaeos, sed abiit in regionem iuxta desertum, in ciuitatem quae dicitur Ephraim, et ibi versabatur cum discipulis suis.

47 ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ aedit $B$-E: facit $A \mid 48$ permiserimus $B$-E: dimittimus $A \mid$ ei $C-E$ : in eum $A B \mid$ venientque $B-E$ : Et venient $A \mid$ Romani $A E$ : Rhomani $B-D \mid$ tum locum nostrum, tum $B$-E: nostrum et locum et $A \mid 49$ Caiaphas $B-E$ : Cayphas $A \mid 50$ perpenditis quod $B$ - $E$ : cogitatis quia $A \mid$ nobis $B$-E: vobis $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 51$ vaticinatus est $B$-E: prophetauit $A \mid$ alt. esset $B$-E: erat $A \mid 53$ consultabant inuicem $B$-E: cogitauerunt $A \mid 54$ propalam $B$-E: $\operatorname{palam} A|\operatorname{inter} B-E: \operatorname{apud} A| E p h r a i m B-E:$ Effraem $A \mid$ versabatur $B-E:$ morabatur $A$
that this was taken from another Gospel (cf. Mt. 27,1). These additional words are found in cod. 3 as well as cod. 69. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in putting congregauerunt, and added aduersus Iesum after concilium.
47 ac каí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
47 aedit moıᄐี̃ ("facit" $1516=V g$.). See on lob. 2,11.
48 permiserimus ả $\varphi \tilde{\varphi} \mu \varepsilon v$ ("dimittimus" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at $M t .5,40$ (1519). Erasmus also replaces admitto by permitto at $M c .5,19,37$. He puts sino for dimitto at Mt. 8,22; Mc. 7,12; 11,6; Lc. 13,8 (1519), rendering the same Greek verb, and also in rendering ta $\alpha$ at Act. 14,16. Manetti put dimiserimus.

48 ei हis aủtóv ("in eum" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on Iob. 3,36.
48 venientque kai è $\lambda \in \dot{u} \sigma o v t a ı ~(" E t ~ v e n i e n t " ~$ $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,39.
48 Romani. In 1535, the name is consistently spelled Romanus in all twelve places where it occurs (in John and Acts). In 1516, it is Rbomanus in three places (Act. 22,25, 27; 28,17). In 1519-22, it is always Rbomanus. In 1527, it is Rbomanus everywhere except at Act. 2,10.
48 tum locum nostrum, tum $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \omega ̃ v$ кà tòv то́то⿱ каi' ("nostrum et locum et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The construction tum ... tum is found also at Act. 1,1; 26,22 (1519); 1 Thess. 5,15 (1519);

Hebr. 6,19. See also on vs. 6, above. In some copies of the late Vulgate, including the Vulgate column of the 1527 edition, et is omitted before locum, with support from cod. D and a few later mss. Manetti's version was nobis et locum et.
49 Caiaphas nomine Kaïóqpas. Erasmus retains nomine from the late Vulgate, in company with cod. 1 and a few other late mss., which add óvó $\mu \alpha$ тı before Kaíápas.
50 perpenditis $\delta 1 \propto \lambda 0 \gamma 1 \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ("cogitatis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The verb perpendo occurs three times elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T.: for considero at Act. 12,12 (ouvopáw), for cogito at 2 Cor. 10,7 ( $\lambda 0 \gamma$ i $\zeta$ о $\mu \mathrm{a}$ ), and for arbitror at Hebr. 11,19 ( $\lambda$ оүi弓ou๙ı). Valla defined perpendere as meaning "exacte ponderare, atque examinare": Valla Elegantiae, V, 82; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 292, 11. 349-351. Sometimes Erasmus substituted disputo, where appropriate to the context. He retains cogito for $\delta 1 a \lambda 0 \gamma i \zeta o \mu \alpha \downarrow$ at ten other passages. The Greek text here follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other late mss. In cod. 1 , however, the reading is $\lambda 0 \gamma i \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, as found in ( $7^{66}$ ) ※ A B D (W) and some later mss.
50 quod ótı ("quia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,20 . The same change was made by Manetti.
50 nobis गันĩv ("vobis" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with the variant Úpĩv, found in $33^{45}{ }^{66} \mathrm{~B} D$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by codd. A W 065 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817.
 atur homo" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering conforms with the Greek word-order. Manetti made the same change.
50 ac кái ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
 $1516=$ Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mc. 7,6 (1519); 1 Petr. 1,10; Iud. 14. Erasmus also replaces prophetizo by vaticinor at Mt. 26,68; Lc. 22,64 (both in 1519). The verb vaticinor has a better pedigree in classical Latin usage. However, propbeto is retained at twenty other passages, mainly in Acts, 1 Corinthians and the Apocalypse.
 okelv ("quia ... moriturus erat" late Vg.; "quod ... moriturus erat" 1516 ). The 1516 rendering is in accordance with the earlier Vulgate. For
the substitution of quod and the subjunctive, see on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... erat moriturus.

52 vtiva kaí. Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated, in company with some Vulgate mss. and the Old Latin version.
 gitauerunt" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate may reflect the variant $\varepsilon$ EOUVAモúơvto, found in $3{ }^{45} 6675 \mathrm{vid}$ ※ B D W and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, supported by codd. A 065 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. He similarly substitutes consulto for cogito in rendering $\beta$ ouneúouat at Ioh. 12,10; Act. 5,33. See Annot., where he also recommends consilium ineo, a solution which he adopts at Mt. 26,4; Act. 9,23 (both in 1519). Manetti had consuluerunt here. Valla, however, regarded consulto as being more frequent than consulo in classical usage, for such a context: see Elegantiae, V, 40; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 234, 1l. 738-741.
54 propalam таррпоía ("in palam" Vg.; "palam" 1516). This is the only instance of propalam in Erasmus' N.T. For his treatment of $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \eta \sigma i \alpha$ elsewhere, see on lob. 10,24. Manetti here used palam.
54 inter ẻv ("apud" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus is more precise here: see Annot. He retains apud for ${ }^{\text {ev }}$ at $\operatorname{loh} .6,61 ;$ Act. 2,29. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
 Vulgate rendering, and leaves є́кєี̈Өєv untranslated. The Vulgate, however, may have been based on a Greek text omitting ékeï $\theta \varepsilon v$, as in cod. D and some later mss., including cod. 817.

54 Ephraim 'Eqpaí ("Effrem" and "Ephrem" Vg.; "Effraem" 1516). Erasmus conforms the Latin spelling with his Greek text: see Annot.
54 versabatur $\delta$ ı́étpı $\beta$ ("morabatur" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) This may be compared with the substitution of diuersor for moror in rendering $\eta \dot{\cup} \lambda i \zeta_{\varepsilon т о}$ at $L c$. 21,37 (1519). In rendering $\delta 1 \propto т$ рi $\beta \omega$ elsewhere, Erasmus puts commoror at Act. 14,28; 25,14 (both in 1519), in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 12,19, but substitutes moror for demoror at loh. 3,22. In 1519, he retains moror from the Vulgate only at Act. 7,2 (for kortolкє́ $\omega$ ), but introduces it for Xpovi( $\omega$ at Lc. 1,21 (1519). For a different use of versor, see on Ioh. 7,1.
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${ }^{55}$ Instabat autem pascha Iudaeorum, et ascenderunt multi Hierosolymam e regione ante pascha, vt purificarent se. ${ }^{56}$ Quaerebant ergo Iesum, et colloquebantur inter se in templo stantes: Quid videtur vobis, quod non venerit ad diem festum? ${ }^{57}$ Dederant autem pontifices et Pharisaei praeceptum, vt si quis cognouisset | vbi esset, indiLB 390 caret, vt comprehenderent eum.

12Iesus ergo ante sex dies paschae venit Bethaniam, vbi Lazarus fuerat mortuus, quem suscitauit a mortuis. ${ }^{2}$ Fecerunt autem ei coenam ibi, et Martha ministrabat. Lazarus vero vnus erat de numero discumbentium cum eo. ${ }^{3}$ Maria ergo accepit libram vnguenti nardi pisticae preciosae, et vnxit pedes lesu, et extersit pedes eius capillis suis, domus autem impleta est ex odore vnguenti. ${ }^{4}$ Dicit ergo vnus ex discipulis eius, Iudas Simonis
 то $C \mid 4$ бı $\mu \omega \nu \circ$ B-E: om. $A$

55 Instabat autem pascha $B-E$ : In propinquo autem erat pasca $A \mid$ e $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ alt. pascha $B-E$ : pasca $A \mid$ purificarent se $B-E$ : sanctificarent seipsos $A \mid 56$ venerit $B-E$ : venit $A \mid$ 57 praeceptum $B-E$ : mandatum $A \mid$ cognouisset $B-E$ : cognouerit $A \mid$ esset, indicaret $B-E$ : sit, indicet $A \mid$ comprehenderent $B-E$ : apprehendant $A$
12,1 paschae $B-E$ : pascae $A \mid$ a mortuis $B-E$ : Iesus $A \mid 2$ de numero discumbentium $B-E$ : ex discumbentibus $A \mid 3$ domus autem $B-E$ : et domus $A \mid 4$ Dicit $B$ - $E$ : Dixit $A \mid$ Simonis B-E: om. $A$
 autem erat" Vg.; "In propinquo autem erat" 1516). See on Ioh. 6,4. Manetti substituted Erat autem prope.
$55 e$ éк ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
55 purificarent ò $\gamma v i \sigma \omega \sigma \mathrm{v}$ ("sanctificarent" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs at Act. 21,24 (1519). Erasmus reserves sanctifico for
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma 1 \alpha{ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ consistently throughout the 1519 N.T., while using purifico for $\kappa \alpha \theta \alpha p i \zeta \omega$.

55 se Éơutoús ("se ipsos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Elsewhere, Erasmus often retains se ipsum, and sometimes even adds ipsum (ipsos, ipsis, etc.), where the single reflexive pronoun would have been sufficient. See on Act. 9,34 for his treatment of ह̇น๙utoũ and $\sigma \varepsilon \propto \cup \tau 0$, etc.

56 inter se $\mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \omega$（＂ad inuicem＂Vg．）． See on Ioh．4，33．
56 videtur vobis סоквĩ Úpĩv（＂putatis＂Vg．）．See on Ioh． 5,39 ．Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change．
 uenit＂late Vg．；＂quod non venit＂1516）．See on Iob．1，20．Manetti had quod non venit，as in Erasmus＇ 1516 edition．
 the pluperfect is found in cod． $817^{\text {corr vid，}}$ ，with a few other late mss．Erasmus＇codd． 1 and 2 had $\delta \varepsilon \delta \omega \dot{6} \varepsilon 1 \sigma \alpha v$ ，in company with most other mss．，while cod．817＊had $\delta \varepsilon \delta \omega$ © $\alpha \sigma$ ．
57 praeceptum ėvto入n่v（＂mandatum＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．In translating évto $\overline{\text { ń，Erasmus intro－}}$ duced praeceptum at ten passages of the Pauline Epistles in 1516，and at a further thirty－five places in 1519，mainly in the Gospels and General Epistles．He retained mandatum at nineteen passages，but none in Mark or Luke． See on Ioh．8，5，for his similar preference for praecipio rather than mando．
57 cognouisset ．．．esset，indicaret ．．．comprehenderent
 ．．．sit，indicet ．．．apprehendant＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Erasmus substitutes a more classical sequence of tenses，suitable for reported speech．His change from apprebendo to comprebendo here was in accordance with Vulgate usage at 2 Cor． 11，32，but he retained apprehendo at eight other passages where $\pi \iota \alpha \zeta \omega$ occurs．There was more point in his substitution of comprebendo，in rendering $\sigma u \lambda \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ at $A c t .12,3$ ，consistent with the Vulgate＇s usual rendering of that Greek verb．Manetti followed the Vulgate，but substituted ipsum for vbi sit．
 was partly based on cod． 2 ，which had te $\begin{aligned} & \text { vikós．}\end{aligned}$ Most mss．，including codd． 1 and 817，have тєӨレๆкผ＇s．
1 a mortuis ġk vekpũv（＂Iesus＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）． The Vulgate substitution of Iesus does not exactly correspond with any Greek mss．The 1516 Greek text of Erasmus differed from the Latin，putting Ek vekpãv $\delta$＇ $1 \eta \sigma o u ̃ s, ~ a s ~ i n ~ c o d d . ~$ 2 and $817^{*}$ ，with support from codd．A D W 065 and some later mss．A similar reading，ék $\nu$ vкр $\tilde{\omega} \nu$＇ $1 \eta \sigma o u ̃ s$, is found in $\exists^{66} \mathrm{~B}$ ，while cod． ※゙ has（ $(\mathbf{\delta})$＇Iŋooũs ék vekpãv．Erasmus＇decision to omit $\delta$＇Inooũs in 1519 was supported by cod． 3 and most other late mss．，including
codd． 1 and $817^{\text {corr．}}$ ．Manetti made the same change．
2 autem oũv．Erasmus＇Latin rendering follows the Vulgate，with little Greek ms．support，and in conflict with his own Greek text．For similar retentions of autem for oũv，see on Ioh．3，25． At Ioh．7．3；18，12（1519），Erasmus corrected the inaccurate Vulgate rendering of ouv．Manetti put ergo．
 （＂ex discumbentibus＂ 1516 Lat．＝Vg．）．It is possible that the Vulgate may be based on a different Greek text here，adding ék before $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$ ， as in $7^{66} \mathbb{K}$ ，but the Vulgate elsewhere sometimes has vnus ex or vnus de even when no Greek mss．offer an added preposition：cf．Mt． 16，14；26，47；Mc．8，28．Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2，with support from codd．A D W 065 and most later mss．，including cod． 1
 ávakeı $\left.\mu \dot{v} v \omega v \sigma^{\prime} v\right)$ ．For the construction $v n u s$ de numero，see on Ioh．7，50．Erasmus does not make the same change at $I o b$ ．12，4．
3 nardi pisticae，preciosae vápסои आוनтікท̃ऽ то入и－ tínov（＂nardi pistici，pretiosi＂Vg．）．In Annot． on Mc．14，3，Erasmus explains that nardus is feminine．However，instances of classical usage with the neuter gender also exist．Manetti，ques－ tionably，substituted nardi fidelis pretiosi（though in Pal．Lat．45，fidelis is a later correction）．
3 domus autem $\grave{\eta}$ ס̀̀ oikía（＂et domus＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus is more literal here，though the context does not require $\delta$ é to be understood in an adversative sense．Manetti also made this change．

3 тоũ $\mu u ́ p o u$ ．The reading tò $\mu u ́ p o u$ in 1522 is clearly a misprint．The same edition also mistakenly substitutes tó for toũ in vs． 7.
4 Dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$（＂Dixit＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）． Erasmus，more accurately，restores the present tense，as in the older Vulgate rendering，also adopted by Manetti．
4 Simonis $\Sigma i \mu \omega v o s$（omitted in $1516=V g$ ．）． The omission of $\sum i \mu \omega v o s$ by the 1516 Greek text was partly supported by cod． 1 ，which substituted $\delta$ for $\sum i \mu \omega \nu \circ s$ ，in company with $17^{6675 v i d} \times B(D) W 0217^{\text {vid }}$ and a few later mss． The name $\sum i \mu \omega \nu$ os was present in codd． 2 and 817，as also in codd．A Q 065 and most of the later mss．，including cod．3，which may have been Erasmus＇basis for restoring the word in 1519．If the name was not originally present，
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Iscariotes, qui erat eum proditurus:
${ }^{5}$ Quare hoc vnguentum non veniit trecentis denariis, et datum est egenis? ${ }^{6}$ Dixit autem hoc, non quod pauperes illi curae essent, sed quia fur erat, ac marsupium habebat, eaque quae mittebantur, portabat. ${ }^{7}$ Dixit ergo Iesus: Sine illam, in diem sepulturae meae seruauit istud. ${ }^{8}$ Pauperes enim semper habetis vobiscum, me vero non semper habetis. ${ }^{9}$ Cognouit ergo turba multa ex Iudaeis, quod illic esset: et venerunt non propter Iesum tantum, sed vt Lazarum quoque viderent, quem suscitauerat a mortuis. ${ }^{10}$ Consultabant autem principes sacerdotum, vt et Lazarum interficerent, ${ }^{11}$ quia multi propter illum abibant ex Iudacis, et credebant in Iesum.
${ }^{12}$ Postero die turba multa quae venerat ad diem festum, quum audissent quod veniret Iesus Hierosolymam, ${ }^{13}$ acceperunt ramos palmarum, et processerunt obuiam ei, et clamabant: Hosanna, benedictus qui venit in nomine domini rex Israel. ${ }^{14}$ Nactus autem Iesus asellam, sedit super eam: sicut scriptum est: ${ }^{15}$ Noli timere filia Sion, ecce rex tuus venit sedens super pullum asinae. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Haec}$ autem

## 

4 proditurus $B-E$ : traditurus $A \mid 6$ ac marsupium habebat, eaque $B-E$ : et loculos habens ea $A$ | 7 istud $B-E$ : illud $A \mid 8$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A \mid 9$ quoque $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 12$ veniret $B$ - $E$ : venit $A \mid 14$ asellam $B-E$ : asellum $A \mid$ eam $B-E$ : eum $A$
it would be possible to see it as the result of a harmonisation with Iob. 6,71; 13,2, 26. Alternatively, if $\sum i \mu \omega v o s$ was genuine, it is possible that the apparent awkwardness of the sequence,
 genitive - nominative) led some scribes to smooth out the text by substituting $\delta$ for $\Sigma i \mu \omega \nu$ os: cf. on Iob. 6,71. The name Simonis was added by Manetti.

4 Iscariotes' lokapiótns ("Scariot(h)is" and "Iscariotis" Vg .). The genitive form of this name has little Greek support. Cf. also cod. D, which has áтò Kapuผ́tou.
4 proditurus $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$... $\pi \alpha p \alpha \delta ı \delta o ́ v a ı ~(" t r a d i-~$ turus" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,64.
6 non quod pauperes illi curae essent oủx ötı mepì

egenis pertinebat ad eum" Vg.). For Erasmus' avoidance of pertineo, see on Iob. 10,13, and Annot. His substitution of pauper for egenus is presumably only for variety of style, as he leaves egenus in vs. 5 . Manetti, more consistently, had pauper in both verses, this being the usual Vulgate rendering of $\pi \tau \omega$ xós elsewhere: his rendering ran non quia de pauperibus ei cura esset.

6 ac marsupium babebat eaque kaì tò $\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma$ óкouov ElXe, kai tó ("et loculos habens, ea" $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The word marsupium conveys the sense of a purse or bag, whereas loculi has the meaning of cash-box. Erasmus was perhaps familiar with marsupium from the works of Plautus. Cf. Annot,, where he also suggests scrinium. At Ioh. 13,29, where the same Greek word occurs, Erasmus retains loculos. The Vulgate here follows a Greek variant having ëx $\mathrm{E} \nu \mathrm{f}$ for ETX $\mathrm{K} \mathrm{\alpha i}$, as in $¥^{75} \mathrm{~K}$ B D Q (W) and a few later mss, including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by $37^{66} \mathrm{~A}$ 065 and most later mss. (though in cod. 2, since the $\mathfrak{E l}$ - of elxev looks as if it might be a correction, the original reading might have been ẾoXev). Manetti put et loculos habebat et ea.
7 Sine "Apes ("Sinite" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading is perhaps a harmonisation with $M c$. 14,6, or was influenced by the plural babetis (or babebitis) in the following verse: cf. Valla Annot. The version of Erasmus restores the earlier Vulgate rendering, as indicated in Annot.
 ("vt in diem ... seruet" Vg.). The Vulgate was
 ... тпр a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by codd. A 065 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. See Annot., and Valla Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
7 istud ả̛tó ("illud" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,18. Manetti substituted ipsum.
8 móvtote (1st.). The reading móvto-ev in 1522 looks as if it might have been intended to be $\pi \alpha v t o \theta \in v$, but this lacks ms. support and is probably only a misprint.
8 habetis (twice) éXeTe ("habebitis" late Vg.; "habetis ... habebitis" Vg. 1527). In Annot., Erasmus points out the error of the late Vulgate use of the future tense here, again tacitly following Valla Annot.

8 vero B'́s $^{\prime}$ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
 See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... erat.
$9 v t . .$. quoque iva kai ("vt" 1516 Lat. $=V_{g}$.). The Vulgate corresponds with the omission of koi, as in cod. D alone, which could in turn have been a retranslation from the Latin.
 Erasmus' use of the pluperfect, see on Ioh. 1,19. Manetti made the same change.
 Vg.). See on Ioh. 11,53. Manetti again had consuluerunt.
12 Postero die Tñ Ėtaúpıov ("In crastinum autem" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,43, and Annot. The Vulgate addition of autem lacks Greek support.
 "quod venit" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... veniebat.
$13 \delta \beta \alpha \sigma 1 \lambda \varepsilon$ ús $^{\prime}$. Erasmus, or one of his assistants, adds $\delta$ from cod. 1 , with support from $\boldsymbol{p}^{66}$ $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss. His codd. 2 and 817 omit the word, in company with cod. A and most later mss. Some early mss. also offer кai ó Bagtieús, as in N* B QW.
 ("Et inuenit ... et sedit" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering preserves the Greek grammatical structure. The substitution of nanciscor also occurs at $L c$. . 1,30 (1519); Act. 18,2; 21,2; 24,5; 27,6 (1519). This word is nowhere used in the Vulgate N.T. It has the additional connotation of "obtain" and not merely to find as a result of searching. Erasmus' use of nanciscor here may be designed to indicate that the animal was not found by Jesus himself but by his disciples. See Annot., and see also on reperio at Iob. 1,41. Manetti's version was Inuenit autem ... et sedit.
14 asellam ... eam óvópıov ... ả̉tó ("asellum ... cum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., Erasmus explains that the Greek neuter here can be interpreted as either male or female.
15 venit ${ }^{\text {ÉpXEтоı }}$ ("venit tibi" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate addition of $t i b i$ has little Greek ms. support, and is probably a harmonisation with Zch. 9,9.
16 autem $\delta \underline{E}(\mathrm{Vg}$. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{66} \mathcal{K}$ B QW and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, with support
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non cognouerunt discipuli eius primum, sed quando glorificatus est Iesus, tunc recordati sunt, quod haec essent scripta de eo, et quod haec fecissent ei. ${ }^{17}$ Testificabatur igitur turba quae erat cum eo, quando Lazarum vocauit de monumento, et suscitauit eum a mortuis: ${ }^{18}$ propterea et obuiam venit ei turba quod audierant eum aedidisse hoc signum. ${ }^{19}$ Pharisaei ergo dixerunt inter se: Videtis quod nihil proficitis? Ecce mundus post eum abiit.
${ }^{20}$ Erant autem quidam Graeci ex his qui ascenderant, vt adorarent in festo. ${ }^{21} \mathrm{Hi}$ ergo accesserunt ad Philippum qui erat a Bethsaida Galilaeae, et rogabant eum, dicentes: Domine, volumus Iesum videre. ${ }^{22}$ Venit Philippus, et dicit Andreae. Andreas rursum et Philippus dicunt Iesu. ${ }^{23}$ Iesus autem respondit eis, dicens: Venit hora vt glorificetur filius hominis. ${ }^{24}$ Amen amen dico vobis, nisi granum frumenti deiectum in terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet. Si vero mortuum fuerit, multum fructum affert. ${ }^{25}$ Qui amat animam suam, perdet eam. Et qui odit animam suam in hoc mundo, in vitam aeternam custodiet eam. ${ }^{26}$ Si quis mihi ministrat, me sequatur. Et vbi sum ego, illic et mi|nister
 ABDE: $\theta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu C$

16 alt. quod $B$-E: om. $A \mid 17$ Testificabatur igitur C-E: Testimonium ergo perhibebat $A$, Testabatur igitur $B \mid 18$ aedidisse $B$-E: fecisse $A \mid 20$ festo $B$-E: die festo $A \mid 22$ dicunt $B$ - $E$ : dixerunt $A \mid 23$ glorificetur $B$ - $E$ : clarificetur $A \mid 24$ deiectum $B-E$ : cadens $A$
from codd. A D and most later mss., including 16 quod ... essent $\delta$ oti ... 甬v ("quia ... erant" Vg.). codd. 1 and 817. Manetti likewise added autem. See on lob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... erant.
$16 \pi р \tilde{т} \tau \boldsymbol{v}$. The spelling $\pi \rho \tilde{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ (sic), in 1516 , is clearly a misprint.

16 quod baec fecissent тaũта émтоíñav ("haec fecerunt" Vg.; "haec fecissent" 1516). Erasmus
adds a second quod to link this clause more clearly with recordati sunt．
17 Testificabatur igitur ę̇uaptúpıı oũv（＂Testimo－ nium ergo perhibebat＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．；＂Testabatur igitur＂1519）．See on Iob．1，7 regarding the translation of $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ．For igitur，see on Iob．6，62．Manetti put Testificabatur ergo．
18 et kai．The Erasmian text restored kaí from codd． 1 and $817^{*}$ ，probably through the influ－ ence of the Vulgate，but this time with strong support from $\mathbf{F}^{66 \text { corr } 75} \times A B^{\text {corr }} D W$ and most of the later mss．The word is omitted in codd． 2 and $817^{\text {corr，}}$ ，in company with $39^{66^{*}}$ and a few later mss．In cod． $\mathrm{B}^{*}$ ，it is inserted after

18 quod audierant őtı グkouoav（＂quia audi－ erunt＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20 for the substitution of quod，and on Ioh．1，19 regarding the pluperfect tense．Through Vulgate influence，the Erasmian text has the plural，$\eta_{\text {Kovo }}$ 位，from cod．1，with support from $\#^{66} *$ A B D QW and many later mss．In codd． 2 and 817 was found
 corresponding with quod audiuit in Manetti＇s translation．
18 aedidisse $\pi \varepsilon \pi т о \_\eta \kappa \varepsilon ́ v \alpha 1$（＂fecisse＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．2，11．
19 inter se тpòs éoutoús（＂ad semet ipsos＂ Vg．）．See on Ioh．7，35．Manetti had intra se ipsos．
19 quod ótl（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．The same change was made by Manetti．
19 proficitis $\dot{\omega} \varphi \in \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ t \varepsilon$（＂proficimus＂Vg．）．The Vulgate use of the first－person plural is unsup－ ported by Greek mss．Manetti made the same change as Erasmus（though in Pal．Lat．45， proficitis is a later correction）．
19 mundus ó кóбนos（＂mundus totus＂Vg．）． The Vulgate follows a Greek variant adding on $\lambda$ os，as in codd．D Q and some later mss．The original scribe of cod． 69 seems to have begun to write $\delta \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda 0 s$ after kó $\sigma \mu \circ \varsigma$ ，but then changed
 In Annot．，however，Erasmus says that＂the Greeks＂do not have this word．In omitting önos，his Greek text follows cod．2，supported by $3^{66} \aleph \mathrm{ABW}$ and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 817．He further listed the passage in his Quae Sint Addita．Manetti similarly omit－ ted totus．
20 Graeci ${ }^{\circ} E \lambda \lambda \eta v e s$（＂gentiles＂Vg．）．A similar substitution is found at twelve other passages，
so that，by 1519 ，gentilis is wholly removed from the N．T．See Annot．，where Erasmus
 usually renders by gens．See further on Iob．7，35． Valla Annot．recommended the same change at the present passage．
20 festo $\boldsymbol{T y}$ ñoptñ（＂die festo＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on Ioh．7，8．Manetti，as elsewhere，substituted festiuitate．
 $\mu E \nu$ in 1522 should be considered a misprint．
 follows the Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated， but the Vulgate is based on a Greek variant omitting koí，as in cod．D．A few mss．also omit kal $\pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda ı v$ ，as in $7^{75 v i d}$ A B．The Greek text of Erasmus follows cod．2，supported by（ $\left(\boldsymbol{P}^{66^{+}} \mathrm{K}\right)$ W and most later mss．including codd． 1 and 817．Manetti put et iterum Andreas．
22 dicunt $\lambda \varepsilon ́ y o v \sigma ı$（＂dixerunt＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg ．）．The late Vulgate use of the perfect tense here is unsupported by Greek mss．Manetti had dicunt，as in Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate．
23 glorifictur $\delta \circ \xi \propto \sigma \theta \tilde{1}$（＂clarificetur＂ 1516 ＝late Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at ten passages in 1516，and at another ten places in 1519．See also on vs．28，below，for Erasmus＇further substitution of illustro．The result was that clarifico was completely removed from the N．T． In fact，neither clarifico nor glorifico occurs in classical usage．See on $I o b .5,41$ for the similar replacement of claritas by gloria．See also on Act． 21,20 ，for the use of glorifico to replace magnifico． In Resp．ad annot．Ed．Lei，LB IX， 193 D－E， commenting on a similar change at Iob．17，4， Erasmus defended himself against the charge that he was altering the accepted wording．At the present passage，Manetti again used the same rendering as Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate．
24 deiectum $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \omega \dot{ }$（＂cadens＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitution of deiicio occurs at $M t$ ． 7,27 ．The main reason for the change at the present passage is that Erasmus wanted to use a past participle for rendering the Greek aorist （see on Iob．1，36），and this was not available with the intransitive verb，cado．
24 vero 8＇́（＂autem＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，26．
25 custodiet $\varphi \cup \lambda \alpha ́ \xi \varepsilon 1$（＂custodit＂Vg．）．Erasmus accurately renders the future tense，adopting the same rendering as Manetti．


















 vónou ơtı ó Xpıotòs uével eis tòv גíñva-


 ó 'Inooũs, "Eti pikpòv xpóvov tò $\varphi \tilde{\text { ans }}$
meus erit. Si quis mihi ministrauerit, cohonestabit eum pater. ${ }^{27}$ Nunc anima mea turbata est. Et quid dicam? Pater, seruato me ex hora hac. Sed propterea veni in horam hanc. ${ }^{28}$ Pater, illustra nomen tuum. Venit ergo vox de coelo, dicens: Et illustraui, et rursus illustrabo. ${ }^{29}$ Turba ergo quae stabat et audierat, dicebat tonitruum esse factum. Alii dicebant: Angelus ei loquutus est. ${ }^{30}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit: Non propter me haec vox venit, sed propter vos. ${ }^{31}$ Nunc iudicium est mundi huius. Nunc princeps mundi huius eiicietur foras. ${ }^{32} \mathrm{Et}$ ego si exaltatus fuero a terra, omnes traham ad me ipsum. ${ }^{33}$ Hoc autem dicebat, significans qua morte esset moriturus. ${ }^{34}$ Respondit ei turba: Nos audiuimus ex lege, quod Christus manet in aeternum: et quomodo tu dicis, oportet exaltari filium hominis? Quis est iste filius hominis? ${ }^{35}$ Dixit ergo eis Iesus: Adhuc ad breue tempus lumen


26 cohonestabit $B$ - $E$ : honorificabit $A \mid$ pater $B-E$ : pater meus $A \mid 27$ seruato $B$ - $E$ : saluifica $A \mid$
28 illustra $B$ - $E$ : glorifica $A \mid$ dicens $B-E$ (ital): dicens $A$ (rom.) | illustraui $B$ - $E$ : clarificaui $A$ | rursus illustrabo $B-E$ : iterum clarificabo $A \mid 29$ Alii $B-E$ : Alii autem $A \mid 35$ eis $A B$ ei $C-E \mid$ ad breue tempus $B$ - $E$ : exiguo tempore $A$

26 Si quis (2nd.) kai códv tis. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated, but the Vulgate omission was based on a Greek text omitting koi, as in $3 \boldsymbol{P}^{66^{*} 75} \times \mathrm{B} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{W} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{some}$ later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by most other mss., commencing with cod. A. The version of Manetti accordingly put Et si quis.
26 cobonestabit тı $\mu \dot{\operatorname{\eta } \sigma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ ("honorificabit" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,23; 8,49. Manetti had bonorabit.
26 pater ò $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \eta_{p}$ ("pater meus" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect the addition of $\mu \mathrm{O}$, as in $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{66 \mathrm{corr}}$ and a few later mss. Manetti omitted meus.

27 seruato $\sigma \tilde{\sigma} \sigma 0 v$ ("saluifica" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at vs. 47 , the only other place where the Vulgate uses saluifico. See on Ioh. 3,17 for Erasmus' removal of saluo at many other passages. The forms of the singular imperative, -ato, eto, -ito, are introduced by Erasmus in twenty-four places, in accordance with occasional Vulgate usage at Ioh. 20,15; $2 \mathrm{Tim} .3,1$. He also retains the plural scitote at a number of passages, this being the normal classical form of the imperative of scio. Manetti put salua here.
 Vg.). Erasmus' rendering conforms with the Greek word-order. Later in the verse, he similarly
puts boram hanc, while the 1527 Vulgate column has banc boram.
28 illustra ... illustraui ... illustrabo סó§aбov ...
 clarificabo" Vg.; "glorifica ... clarificaui ... clarificabo" 1516). This substitution of illustro also occurs at 2 Thess. 1,12. At Rom. 11,13 (1519), illustro replaces bonorifico in rendering the same Greek verb. The only other instance of illustro is at 1 Cor. 4,5 , rendering $\varphi \omega \tau i \zeta \omega$. Elsewhere, Erasmus preferred glorifico, as also advocated in 1516 Annot. on the present passage: see on Ioh. 12,23 . The verb illustro has a better pedigree in classical Latin usage than either glorifico or clarifico. Manetti followed the Vulgate except that he substituted clarificabo for darificaui.
28 de coelo, dicens ⿺𠃊 k toũ oúpavoũ. The word dicens is taken from the late Vulgate, which probably derived it from the Old Latin version, corresponding with the addition of $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \circ v o \sigma$ in cod. D and a few later mss. In 1516, the word was printed in ordinary type, then changed to a smaller typeface in 1519 , and finally in 1535, it was placed in italics, to show that it is an amplification of the Greek text.
28 rursus $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \lambda ı$ ("iterum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 9,9.
29 ergo ouvv ("autem" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate substitution corresponds with $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, found in cod. W. The version of Manetti had ergo.
29 ह̈̀ $\lambda$ gre. Erasmus' cod. 2 had the grammatically incorrect plural form of the verb, ${ }^{\text {en }} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \circ \mathrm{v}$.
29 Alii " $\lambda \lambda$ dol ("Alii autem" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate may reflect the addition of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as in cod. W. In Manetti, autem was omitted.
31 buius (1st.) Toútou (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $79^{66^{4}} \mathrm{D}$ W and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2, in company with $7^{66 \text { corr } 75}$ ( $N$ ) A B and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti similarly added buius.
31 mundi buius (2nd.) тои̃ ко́бนои тои́tou ("huius mundi" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering observes the Greek word-order more closely. Manetti made the same change.
32 omnes דd́dutas ("omnia" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, móvto, as in $\boldsymbol{7}^{66} \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ (D) and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, with support from $7^{75} \mathrm{X}^{\text {corr }}$ A B W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 . His emphatic statement in Annot. regarding the
unvarying testimony of the Greek mss. at this point ("ad eum certe modum constanter habent exemplaria Graeca") was based not only on his own mss. but also on the declaration in Valla Annot. that this reading was in accordance with the "Graecam veritatem" and that "nemo Graecorum aliter vnquam legit". See also Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 192 A-B. The spelling Tóvtes in 1527-35 is a misprint.
33 áтoӨvíokev. The incorrect spelling ámofviokev, in 1516-19, is taken from cod. 2.
34 quod ס'тı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
34 Quis Tis ("Et quis" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss. The
 originally omitted in cod. $2^{*}$, and Erasmus wrote it into the margin of the ms., though still omitting értw. This showed that he was using cod. 817 as his source for the marginal correction, for that ms. similarly omits $\begin{gathered}\text { Extiv, whereas }\end{gathered}$ cod. 1 and most other mss. contain it. Through the influence of cod. 1, however, Ėotiv was inserted into the 1516 Greek text. Erasmus no doubt perceived that the sentence could easily have been overlooked as a result of the scribal error of homoeoteleuton, through the ending of two successive sentences with the words toí
 $7^{375}$, in company with cod. 69 and a few other late mss., as well as Manetti's Latin translation (both mss.), whether through an error of transcription or because it was missing from the Greek mss. which Manetti used.
35 eis đủroĩs ("ei" 1522-35 Lat.). The spelling ei in 1522-35 undoubtedly arose as a misprint, as there was no change in the accompanying Greek text, nor was any justification for such a change provided by the Greek mss. or the context. See on Ioh. 9,20.
35 ad breue tempus uıкрòv Xpóvov ("modicum" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$; "exiguo tempore" 1516). A similar substitution occurs at 1 Petr. 1,6, rendering ò $\lambda 1$ Yov. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus recommended pusillum temporis, a phrase which he adopted in his translation at Iob. 7,33 (1519): see on Iob. 6,7; 7,33. He also proffered the opinion that Xpóvov was a later explanatory addition to the text, though there is no support among the Greek mss. for such a view. The passage is included in his Loca Obscura. Valla Annot. had also complained of the obscurity of this passage and advocated the substitution of modico tempore.
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vobiscum est. Ambulate donec lucem habetis, ne vos tenebrae occupent. Et qui ambulat in tenebris, nescit quo vadat. ${ }^{36}$ Dum lucem habetis, credite in lucem, vt filii lucis sitis. Haec loquutus est Iesus, ac digressus abscondit se $a b$ eis.
${ }^{37}$ Quum autem tam multa signa fecisset coram eis, non credebant in eum: ${ }^{38}$ vt sermo Hesaiae prophetae impleretur quem dixit: Domine, quis credidit sermoni nostro: et brachium domini cui reuelatum est? ${ }^{39}$ Propterea non poterant credere, quia iterum dixit Hesaias: ${ }^{40}$ Excaecauit oculos eorum, et indurauit cor eorum, ne videant oculis, et ne intelligant corde, et conuertantur et sanem eos. ${ }^{41}$ Haec dixit Hesaias, quando vidit gloriam eius, et loquutus est de eo. ${ }^{42}$ Veruntamen etiam ex principibus multi crediderunt in eum, sed propter Pharisaeos non confitebantur, ne e synagoga eiicerentur. ${ }^{43}$ Dilexerunt enim gloriam hominum magis quam gloriam dei.
${ }^{44}$ Iesus autem clamauit, et dixit: Qui credit in me, non credit in me, sed in eum qui misit me. ${ }^{45}$ Et qui videt me, videt eum qui misit me. ${ }^{46}$ Ego lux in mundum veni, vt omnis qui credit in me, in tenebris non maneat. ${ }^{47}$ Et si quis audierit verba mea, et non crediderit, ego non iudico eum. Non enim veni, vt iudicem mundum, sed vt seruem mundum. ${ }^{48}$ Qui reiicit me,
 C-E: $\pi 1 \sigma \tau \varepsilon \cup \eta A B$

35 occupent $B$-E: comprehendant $A \mid 36$ ac digressus $B-E$ : et abiit, et $A \mid 37$ tam multa $B-E$ : $\operatorname{tanta} A \mid 38$ Hesaiae $B-E$ : Esaiae $A \mid$ sermoni $B-E$ : auditui $A \mid 39$ quia $B-E$ : quod $A \mid$ Hesaias $B-E$ : Esaias $A \mid 41$ Hesaias $B-E$ : Esaias $A \mid 42$ etiam $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ e $B-E$ : de $A$ | 47 seruem $B$ - $E$ : saluificem $A \mid 48$ reiicit $B-E$ : spernit $A$

35 vobiscum $\mu \in \theta^{\prime}$ บ์ $\mu \omega ̃ v$（＂in vobis＂Vg．）．The
 found in $\mathbf{7}^{66} 75$ vid $\times$ B D W and some later mss．，including cod．1．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817，in company with most other mss．， commencing with cod．A．See Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
35 donec Ēんs（＂dum＂Vg．）．This change appears to be solely for the sake of varying the vocabu－ lary，to avoid the repetition of dum，which is used at the beginning of the next verse．
 ．．．comprehendant＂Vg．；＂ne ．．．comprehendant＂ 1516）．See on Ioh． 3,20 for the avoidance of $v t$ non．At Ioh．1，5（1519），Erasmus preferred to substitute apprebendo，in a similar context．He elsewhere uses ocrupo five times，to render ккте́х $\omega$（Mt．21，38），котарүє́ $\omega$（Lc．13，7＝Vg．）， тро入ацßóvш（1 Cor．11，21；Gal．6，1），and $\pi \lambda \varepsilon о v \varepsilon \kappa т \varepsilon \in \omega$（ 2 Cor．2，11）．Manetti put $n e$ ．．． comprebendant，as in Erasmus＇ 1516 edition．
36 фமто́s．In 1516，фотós is no more than a misprint．
36 ac digressus kò $\alpha$ वrte $\lambda \theta$ ف́v（＂et abiit et＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）．The Vulgate rendering corresponds with the reading kai $\alpha \pi \eta \tilde{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon v$ кai in cod．D， though this may be no more than a retranslation from the Latin here．The verb digredior nowhere appears in the Vulgate N．T．In Erasmus＇version， it is used thirteen times，of which twelve are the perfect participle，providing him with a convenient means of representing the Greek aorist（cf．on Iob．1，36）．On ac，see on Ioh．1，25．
37 tam multa тобのヘ̃Ta（＂tanta＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．6，9．In 1516 Annot．，Erasmus sugges－ ted putting tot．The passage is listed in the Solocismi．
38 prophetae то⿱̃ трофท́tou（late Vg ．omits）． The late Vulgate omission is supported by only a few of the later Greek mss．Manetti made the same change as Erasmus．
38 sermoni $T$ ñ đ̛̉ $k$ ） Rom．10，16（1519），in rendering the same quota－ tion from Isaiah，Erasmus has sermonibus，plural． He prefers to reserve auditus to represent the faculty of hearing，as at Rom．10，17； 1 Cor． 12，17．See further on Act．28，26．
$38 \eta^{\eta} \mu \omega ̃ \nu$ ．The incorrect reading，$\dot{\mu} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ，in 1516－22，was taken from cod． 2.

39 quia of Tl （＂quod＂1516）．The change in 1516 introduced an unwanted ambiguity，making it possible to misunderstand the passage as
meaning that the people were unable to believe that Isaiah had uttered the following words． Cf．on Iob．14，19．
40 ne ．．．et neivo $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ．．．kai（＂vt non ．．．et non＂ late Vg．）．See on Ioh．3，20．Manetti had $\boldsymbol{v t}$ non ．．．et，as in the earlier Vulgate．
41 ide．This reading came from cod．2，with support from only a few other late mss．Most other mss．have $\varepsilon$ โ $\delta \mathrm{E}$ ．
42 etiam ex ék（＂et ex＂ $1516=$ Vg．mss．；＂ex＂ Vg． 1527 and some Vg．mss．）．In 1516－19， Erasmus had kal ék from cod．2，as found in virtually all mss．The omission of kai in 1522－ 35 may have been accidental，as it conflicts with the Latin rendering and has little Greek support（cf．cod．W，which omits kal èk）．On the substitution of etiam，see on Ioh．6，36．
42 ne îva $\mu \dot{\eta}$（＂vt ．．．non＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．3，20．
42 e synagoga àmобuvó $\gamma \omega \gamma$ оl（＂de synagoga＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．For Erasmus＇frequent removal of de，see on Ioh．2，15．Manetti put extra synagogam， as used by the Vulgate at Ioh．9，22：see ad loc．
42 Yivcutad．This spelling lacks Greek ms． support，and may be a conjecture：cf．Erasmus＇ substitution of $\varepsilon$ ₹ץiveto，at Ioh．5，9．In Annot．， more correctly，he had ү $\dot{v} \omega \nu \tau \alpha$.
$46 \mu \varepsilon ́ v n$ ．This reading，again，appears to be un－ supported by mss．The correct spelling is $\mu$ eivn．
47 crediderit $\pi เ \sigma T \varepsilon \cup \cup \sigma \eta$（＂custodierit＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text，$\Phi u \lambda \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \eta$ ， as in $7^{6675} \aleph$ A B D W 070 and some later mss．，including cod．1．In Erasmus＇Greek text of $1516-19$ ，the reading mıбדधu＇n was not in accordance with any of his usual mss．His cod． $2^{*}$ had mioteúcel，which he manually corrected to $\pi$ IのT\＆JOT，as found in cod． 817 and most other late mss．This was the reading which he eventually restored in his 1522 edition．In 1519 Annot．，Erasmus surmised that the Greek word underlying the Vulgate was тпрท்〒ท！：an indica－ tion that he did not freshly consult cod． 1 when revising the Annot．，as he would then have known that the alternative reading was $\varphi \cup \lambda \alpha \xi \eta$ ． His use of crediderit was anticipated by Manetti．
47 seruem $\sigma \omega \sigma \omega$（＂saluificem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on vs．27．Manetti had saluem．
48 Qui reiicit ó $\dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \omega ̃ \nu$（＂Qui spernit＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitution occurs at Gal． 3，15； 1 Thess．4，8，though Erasmus retains sperno at three other passages．See Annot．，where he cites Cyprian as authority for his rendering．
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 ékeĩvos, Kúple, oú hou vímteis toùs móסas;



nec accipit verba mea, habet qui iudicet ipsum. Sermo quem loquutus sum, ille iudicabit eum in extremo die: ${ }^{49}$ quia ego ex me ipso non sum locutus: sed qui misit me pater, ipse mihi mandatum dedit, quid dicam et quid loquar. ${ }^{50} \mathrm{Et}$ scio, quod mandatum eius vita aeterna est. Quae ergo ego loquor, sicut dixit mihi pater, sic loquor.

13Ante festum autem paschae sciens Iesus, quod venisset hora ipsius, vt transiret ex hoc mundo ad patrem, quum dilexisset suos qui erant in mun|do, vsque ad fiLB 394 nem dilexit eos. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Et}$ coena facta, cum diabolus iam immisisset in cor Iudae Simonis Iscariotae vt proderet eum, ${ }^{3}$ sciens Iesus quod omnia dedisset sibi pater in manus, et quod a deo exisset, et ad deum iret, ${ }^{4}$ surgit a coena, et ponit vestimenta: et cum accepisset linteum, praecinxit se. ${ }^{5}$ Deinde misit aquam in peluim, et coepit lauare pedes discipulorum, et extergere linteo, quo erat praecinctus. ${ }^{6}$ Venit ergo ad Simonem Petrum. Et dicit ei Petrus: Domine, tu mihi lauas pedes? ${ }^{7}$ Respondit Iesus, et dixit ei: Quod ego facio, tu nescis nunc, scies autem postea. ${ }^{8}$ Dicit ei Petrus: Non

13,5 $\mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \omega \nu B-E: \tau \omega \nu \mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \omega \nu A$

48 nec $B$-E: et non $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ : eum $A \mid$ extremo $B$ - $E$ : nouissimo $A$
13,1 festum autem paschae $B$-E: diem autem festum pascae $A \mid$ ipsius $B-E$ : eius $A \mid 2$ immisisset $B-E$ : misisset $A$ | Iscariotae vt proderet eum $B-E$ : vt traderet eum Iscariotes $A \mid 3$ sibi $B-E$ : ei $A \mid$ exisset $B$ - $E$ : exiuisset $A$

48 nec каì $\mu \eta$ ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,16.
48 ipsum átóv ("eum" $1516=$ Vg.). The reflexive pronoun is substituted, as usual, to
refer back more clearly to the subject of the sentence.
48 extremo ह̇ $\sigma \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} T \eta$ ("nouissimo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.).
A similar substitution occurs at ten other
N.T. passages, though elsewhere in John's Gospel nouissimus is retained. The word extremus is found in Vulgate usage, but mainly in the O.T. Manetti put vltima.

50 quod Őtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
 late Vg.; "diem autem festum" $1516=$ Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate omission of autem lacks Greek ms. support. On festum, see on Iob. 7,8. Manetti rendered this by festiuitatem vero.
 See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod venerat.
1 ipsius ả̛toũ ("eius" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun again, to remove any ambiguity. Valla Annot. suggested sua.
1 transiret $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \tilde{7}$ ("transeat" Vg.). This change to the imperfect tense is dictated by the adoption of venisset earlier in the sentence. Manetti made the same change.

1 vsque ad cis ("in" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Mt. 10,22; Mc. 13,13; Eph. 1,10 (1519), in accordance with Vulgate usage at 1 Cor. 1,8 ; Hebr. 3,14. This idiom is a more expressive way of rendering the Greek preposition.
 est" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek support.
2 immisisset in $\beta \in \beta \lambda$ пко́тos $\varepsilon$ is ("misisset in" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Iob. 18,11; 20,27; Iac. 3,3 (all in 1519), which may be compared with the Vulgate's use of immitto to render $\varepsilon$ ह́mı $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ at Mt. 9,16; Lc. 5,36. For other substitutions for mitto, see on Iob. 3,24.
2 Iudae Simonis Iscariotae vt proderet eum 'loú-
 ("vt traderet eum Iudas Simonis Scariot(h)is" Vg.; "Iudae Simonis vt traderet eum Iscariotes" 1516 Lat.). The word-order of the 1516 rendering ("... put into the heart of Judas the son of Simon, that Iscariot should betray him") is not supported by any Greek mss., and can scarcely have been intended by Erasmus. It may have arisen from a misunderstanding by one of his assistants, as to the correct position of the phrase vt traderet eum. The Vulgate word-order corresponds with a Greek variant, iv $\alpha \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \tilde{\omega}$ au'tòv 'loúסoss $\sum i \mu \omega \nu \circ s$ 'lokapı'́tov, found in cod. 070 and a few later mss. The same wordorder is found in $\boldsymbol{N}^{*} B$ (but substituting
 (substituting 'l$\sigma \kappa \alpha p ı \omega ́ \tau \eta \varsigma)$. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, with support from cod. A and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. On prodo, see on Iob. 6,64. Manetti put Iudae Simonis Scariothis vt traderet eum.
3 Iesus ó 'I $\eta$ ooũs (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{7}^{66} \mathrm{NBDW}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, in company with codd. A 070 and most later mss., including cod. 1. Manetti also added Iesus.
3 quod ... dedisset öTı ... ठ́́ $\delta \omega$ кєv ("quia ... dedit" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20, and Annot. In Manetti, this was quod ... dedit.
3 sibi $\alpha \cup \cup T \varphi ̃$ ("ei" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The reflexive pronoun is substituted to refer back to Jesus as the subject of the sentence. For the insertion of the rough breathing in the 1519-35 editions, see on Iob. 2,21. See also Annot. The version of Manetti omitted ei, but added suas after manus.
 ("quia ... exiuit ... vadit" Vg.; "quod ... exiuisset ... iret" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... exiuit ... vadit.
4 vestimenta Tò i $\mu$ átio ("vestimenta sua" Vg.). The Vulgate addition is no more than a matter of translation, though it corresponds with the addition of aúroũ in cod. D and a few later mss. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.

5 misit $\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{\varepsilon l}$. Erasmus retains the perfect tense of the late Vulgate, in conflict with his Greek text and most Greek mss.
$5 \mu \alpha \eta \eta \tau \omega \nu$. The addition of $\tau \omega \nu$ before $\mu \alpha \theta_{\eta-}$ Tw̃v in 1516 follows cod. 2, with support from most other mss., including codd. 1 and 817. In view of the lack of ms. support for omission of the article (it was also present in cod. 3), and the absence of any other plausible motive for removing it, the reading of $1519-35$ is possibly to be regarded as a misprint.
6 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$ ("dixit" Vg. 1527). The use of the perfect tense by some copies of the late Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti had dicit, as in Erasmus and the Froben Vulgate edition of 1491, as well as the earlier Vulgate.
6 Petrus ह̇кeĩos. Erasmus follows the Vulgate rendering, without Greek ms. support. Manetti substituted ille.

7 nunc äptı ("modo" Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,25.
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lauabis meos pedes in aeternum. Respondit ei Iesus: Si non lauero te, non habes partem mecum. ${ }^{9}$ Dicit ei Simon Petrus: Domine, non tantum pedes meos, sed et manus et caput. ${ }^{10}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Qui lotus est non opus habet, nisi vt pedes lauet, sed est mundus totus. Et vos mundi estis, sed non omnes. ${ }^{11}$ Sciebat enim quisnam esset qui proderet ipsum, propterea dixit: Non estis mundi omnes. ${ }^{12}$ Postquam ergo lauisset pedes eorum, receptisque vestibus suis accubuisset, iterum dixit eis: Scitis quid fecerim vobis? ${ }^{13}$ Vos vocatis me magistrum ac dominum, et bene dicitis, sum etenim. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{Si}$ ergo ego laui pedes vestros dominus et magister, vos quoque debetis inuicem alii aliorum lauare pedes. ${ }^{15}$ Exemplum enim praebui vobis, vt quemadmodum ego feci vobis, ita et vos faciatis. ${ }^{16}$ Amen amen dico vobis, non est seruus maior domino suo, neque legatus maior est eo qui legauit ipsum. ${ }^{17} \mathrm{Si}$ haec nouistis, beati estis si feceritis ea. ${ }^{18}$ Non de omnibus vobis loquor. Ego scio quos elegerim. Sed vt adimpleatur scriptura:

8 viuns B-E: viusis A
8 habes $B$ - $E$ : habebis $A \mid 10$ opus habet $B$ - $E$ : indiget $A \mid$ lauet $B-E$ : lauat $A \mid 11$ proderet $B-E$ : traderet $A \mid$ ipsum $C-E$ : se $A B \mid \mathbf{1 2}$ lauisset $B-E$ : lauit $A \mid$ receptisque ... accubuisset $B-E$ : et accepit vestimenta sua, et cum recubuisset $A \mid 13$ magistrum ac dominum $B$ - $E$ : magister et domine $A \mid 14$ vos quoque $B-E$ : et vos $A \mid$ inuicem alii aliorum $B-E$ : alter alterius $A \mid$ 15 praebui $B-E$ : dedi $A \mid 16$ legatus $B-E$ : apostolus $A \mid$ legauit ipsum $B-E$ : misit illum $A$ | 17 nouistis $B$ - $E$ : scitis $A \mid 18$ loquor $B-E$ : dico $A$

8 víuns. The reading vi$\psi \varepsilon$ is in 1516 is found in both codd. 1 and 2, though cod. 817 and most other mss. have vi $\psi$ ns.
8 meos $\mu \mathrm{O}$ ("mihi" Vg.). This change is consistent with pedes meos in vs. 9, though Erasmus retains mibi in vs. 6. The same change was made by Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45).
8 babes ểess ("habebis" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate future tense is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot., following Valla Annot.

10 opus babet $\mathrm{Xp} \mathrm{\varepsilon í} \mathrm{\alpha} \sim$ ËX $£ 1$ ("indiget" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 6,32; Hebr. 5,12, consistent with Vulgate usage at Mt. 21,3 and elsewhere. At 1 Cor. 12,21; 1 Thess. 5,1, Erasmus also puts opus est. He retains indigeo at five other passages.

10 nisi $\eta$ ŋ. In cod. 2 and several other late mss., $\eta$ is omitted, in company with some Vulgate mss. which omit nisi. The rendering nisi, found in other Vulgate mss., is closer to another

Greek variant，$\varepsilon$ i $\mu$ ，found in $7^{66}$ B C ${ }^{*}$ W and a few later mss．The Erasmian text restores $\eta$ from codd． 1 and 817，with support from most other mss．，commencing with $>^{75} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr．}}$ ． Following the construction $n i s i v t$ ，in 1516 ，the substitution of the indicative，lauat，was probably a misprint．
11 quisnam ．．．proderet tòv Tapaסıठóvta（＂quis－ nam ．．．traderet＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．6，64， regarding the use of prodo．
11 ipsum củtóv（＂eum＂Vg．；＂se＂1516－19）．The purpose of ipsum in 1522 is to refer less ambiguously to Jesus，as the principal subject of the sentence．
12 lauisset éviభを（＂lauit＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．Erasmus similarly substitutes the pluperfect subjunctive after postquam at Mt．27，31（1519）；Mc．1，14； 16,19 ；Act． 15,13 ，but he also sometimes retains the perfect indicative．
12 recoptisque vestibus suis accubuisset кגi $\overline{\text { èn }} \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon$
 menta sua，et cum recubuisset＂ $1516=$ late Vg ．）． For the rough breathing on aútoũ，in the 1519－ 35 editions，see on Iob．2，21．For other substitu－ tions of recipio，see on Ioh． 5,43 ．The change here from vestimentum to vestis is purely for variety of style，to avoid repetition of vestimentum from vs．4．These words also occur interchange－ ably at e．g．Mt．9，16；Mc．15，20，24．By using the ablative absolute construction，Erasmus neatly shortens these subordinate clauses．In rendering duvamitte，he substitutes accumbo for recumbo at three other passages：$L c .11,37$ ； 14，10； 17,7 （and for discumbo at Lc．22，14），all in 1519，but retains recumbo at Iob．21，20．He further substitutes accumbo for recumbo or discum－ $b o$ in rendering several other Greek verbs，at sixteen passages：ávak $\lambda i v \omega$ ，каттакえiv $\omega$ ，ávó－
 followed the Vulgate but omitted et before accepit．
13 magistrum ac dominum ó $\delta_{1} \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \mathrm{k} \alpha \lambda$ 人os каi kúplos（＂magister et domine＂ $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． The reading of cod． 2 was $\delta$ kúplos kai $\delta$ סıס́coka 10 s，as found in many other late mss．Erasmus or his assistants decided to follow codd． 1 and 817 ，which had $\delta \delta \delta \delta$＇$\sigma-$ к $\alpha \lambda$ os kai ó kúplos，supported by most other mss．，so as to conform more closely with the Vulgate word－order．In the process of making this change，the article before kúplos was mistakenly omitted．The Vulgate use of
the vocative case has no Greek support here． See Annot．

14 vos quoque каi ن́uॄĩs（＂et vos＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on lob．5，27．Manetti had just vos．
14 inuicem alii aliorum $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \omega$（＂alter alterius＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus makes this substitution also at Gal．6，2．This may be compared with his use of alius alium inuicem at Mt．24，10； inuicem alius alium at Rom．15，14（1519）；inuicem alia pro aliis at 1 Cor．12，25；inuicem alius in alium at Eph．4，32；inuicem alius alii at Iac．5，16． See Annot．The version of Manetti was ad inuicem．

15 praebui $\varepsilon$ है $\delta \omega \mathrm{k} \alpha$（＂dedi＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．This substitution does not occur elsewhere．Eras－ mus perhaps considered that a change of verb was appropriate here，to indicate that Christ set himself forth as an example for his dis－ ciples to follow，rather than giving them a merely hypothetical example as part of his teaching．
15 товєite．Erasmus here follows the incorrect reading of codd． 2 and 817 ．Virtually all other mss．，including cod． 1 ，have $\pi \circ เ \eta ̃ T \varepsilon$ ，as expected after iva．
 A similar substitution occurs at 2 Cor．8，23．See Annot，，where Erasmus argues that this is not a reference to the title of＂Apostle＂，but to the fact of being＂sent＂．
16 maior est $\mu \mathrm{Ei}, \omega \nu$ ．Erasmus retains the added est from the late Vulgate．
16 legauit пє́цичоитоs（＂misit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Despite Erasmus＇justification of his rendering in Annot．，the choice of legauit produces an artificial etymological connection with legatus， unwarranted by the Greek text．Erasmus does not use this verb elsewhere in the N．T．
16 ipsum aútóv（＂illum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The reflexive pronoun is used to refer back to the main subject．Manetti made the same change．

17 nouistis oilסate（＂scitis＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，33．

17 estis $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \sigma e \\ \text {（＂eritis＂Vg．）．The Vulgate use of }\end{gathered}$ the future tense does not receive explicit support among the Greek mss．
18 loquor $\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \omega$（＂dico＂ $1516=V_{\text {g．}}$ ）．See on Iob．8，27．






 $\mu \varepsilon$.

















Qui edit mecum panem, sustulit aduersum me calcaneum suum. ${ }^{19}$ Nunc dico vobis priusquam fiat: vt quum factum fuerit, credatis, quod ego sim. ${ }^{20}$ Amen amen dico vobis, qui recipit quencunque misero, me recipit. Qui autem me recipit, recipit eum qui me misit.
${ }^{21}$ Cum haec dixisset Iesus, turbatus est spiritu, et testificatus est, dixitque: Amen amen dico vobis, quod vnus ex vobis proditurus est me. ${ }^{22}$ Aspiciebant ergo se inuicem discipuli, haesitantes de quo diceret. ${ }^{23}$ Erat autem vnus ex discipulis Iesu recumbens in sinu ipsius, nimirum is quem diligebat Iesus. ${ }^{24}$ Innuit ergo huic Simon Petrus, vt sciscitaretur, quis esset de quo loqueretur. ${ }^{25}$ Itaque quum recubuisset ille super pectus Iesu, dicit ei: Domine, quis est? ${ }^{26}$ Respondit Iesus: Ille est, cui ego intinctum panem porrexero. Et cum intinxisset panem, dedit ludae Simonis Isca|riotae. ${ }^{27}$ Et post offulam

18 edit $B-E$ : manducat $A \mid$ sustulit aduersum $B-E$ : leuauit contra $A \mid 19$ Nunc $B-E$ : Amodo $A \mid$ quod ego sim $B-E$ : quia ego sum $A \mid 20$ prius recipit $B-E$ : accipit $A \mid$ quencunque $B-E$ : si quem $A \mid$ alt. recipit $B-E$ accipit $A \mid$ tert. recipit $B$-E: accipit $A \mid$ quart. recipit $B$ - $B$ : accipit $A \mid 21$ testificatus $C-E$ : protestatus $A$, testatus $B \mid$ dixitque $B-E$ : et dixit $A \mid$ quod $B$ - $E$ : quia $A \mid$ proditurus est $B-E$ : tradet $A \mid 23$ autem ... is $B$-E: ergo recumbens vnus ex discipulis eius in sinu Iesu $A \mid 25$ super $B-E$ : supra $A \mid 26$ Respondit $A E$ : Respondet $B-D \mid$ Iscariotae $B$-E: Ischariotis $A^{*}$, ischariote $A^{c} \mid 27$ offulam $B$-E: buccellam $A$

18 edit $\tau \rho \omega \mathbf{\gamma} \omega v$ ("manducat" $1516=V g$.). See on Iob. 4,31.
18 sustulit छ̇דท̃p\&v ("leuabit" late Vg.; "leuauit" $1516=$ Vg. mss.). See on Iob. 4,35, and Annot. The late Vulgate use of the future tense is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti had leuauit, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition and the earlier Vulgate.
18 aduersum étr" ("contra" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus makes this substitution at $M t .12,30$, in rendering korád. Usually he is content to retain contra.
 on Ioh. 9,25, and Annot.

19 quod ... sim ôtı ... Eijıı ("quia ... sum" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... sum.
20 recipit (four times) $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \omega \nu$ ("accipit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 5,43.
20 quencunque żóv $\tau 1 v \alpha$ ("si quem" $1516=$ Vg.). Comparable substitutions are found in 1516 at Mc. 8,34 (for $8 \sigma$ тıs); and in 1519 at loh. 16,23
 Erasmus retains si quis for éáv tis.
 text follows cod. 2 , in company with cod. 1 and a few other late mss. Nearly all other mss.,
including cod. 817, have $\pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \psi \propto v \tau \alpha$. The minority reading is probably a harmonisation with Mt. 10,40; Mc. 9,37; Lc. 9,48.
21 Cum baec Taũta ("Et cum haec" Vg. 1527). The added conjunction of the late Vulgate lacks Greek ms. support.
21 testificatus est ẺM $\alpha \rho \tau \cup \dot{p} \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ("protestatus est" $1516=$ Annot., lemma and Vg. mss.; "testatus est" $1519=$ Vg. 1527). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 20,23. See further on Ioh. 1,7. In Annot., Erasmus recommended testatus est, as used in his 1519 rendering, and as proposed in Valla Annot. As usual, Manetti had testificatus est.
21 dixitque кaì єittev ("et dixit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
21 quod őтı ("quia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on $I o b$. 1,20. Manetti also had quod.
21 proditurus est $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \omega \dot{\sigma}$ ("tradet" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,64.
22 se inuicem عis á $\lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda$ ous ("ad inuicem" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,33.
23 autem $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("ergo" 1516 Lat. = Vg. mss.). The earlier Vulgate rendering lacks Greek ms. support. A few mss. omit $\delta \delta$, as in codd. B C*. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, in company with $7^{66} \aleph$ A $C^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D} W$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in adopting autem, coinciding also with the 1527 Vulgate column.
23 vnus de discipulis lesu recumbens in sinu ipsius

 pulis eius in sinu Iesu" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus changes the Latin word-order to clarify the sense. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he substituted suis for eius.
23 nimirum is quem $\delta v$ ("quem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus introduces nimirum at ten other passages in 1519. In his 1516 edition, it occurs only at Rom. 6,5. The word is used only once in the Vulgate, at $I o b$ 12,7. At the present passage, nimirum provides a smoother connection between this clause and the earlier part of the sentence.
 ("et dixit ei, Quis est" late Vg.; "dicit" for "dixit" Vg. mss.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, resembling codd. B C 068, which
 follows cod. 2, supported by $3{ }^{66 c o r r} \mathrm{~A}$ (D) W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817.

In Annot., he suggested using interrogo, resembling Manetti's use of vt interrogaret quisnam esset.

24 loqueretur $\lambda$ ह́yєı ("dicit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,27. Manetti had diceret.
25 Itaque $\delta \dot{\text { É }}$. Erasmus' Latin rendering, which is taken from the Vulgate, reflects a Greek text substituting oviv, as in ${ }^{7}{ }^{66} \times \mathrm{DW}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1 . The word is omitted in codd. B C. In Erasmus' Greek text, however, the reading $\delta$ é comes from codd. 2 and 817, in company with cod. A and most later mss. From the point of view of scribal tendencies, $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon}$ is a lectio difficilior, as the context does not at first sight appear to require an adversative particle here, and the word was hence more likely to be altered or omitted by an ancient scribe or editor who found it in his exemplar. Manetti substituted Cum autem for Itaque cum.
25 ille éksĩvos. The Erasmian text here follows codd. 1, 817 and the Vulgate, in company with $\aleph$ A D W and many later mss. In cod. 2, the reading is ékeĩvos oûtç, as found in ${77^{66} \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{C}}^{66}$ and another large section of the later mss. Manetti put ille ipse, perhaps reflecting a Greek variant, ékeivos aủtós.
25 super Ėtrí ("supra" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 3,31. Manetti made the same change.
26 Respondit đ́ттокрiveтal ("Respondet" 151927). The present tense of $1519-27$ is more consistent with the Greek text, corresponding with the tense of dicit in the previous verse. The reversion to Respondit in 1535 may conceivably have been a misprint.
26 Iscariotae 'loxapı由́тற̧ ("Scariot(h)is" Vg.; "Ischariotis" 1516 Lat. text; "ischariote" 1516 errata). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, 'lokaptótou, as found in codd. § B C 068 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathbf{7}^{66} \mathrm{~A}$ W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The spelling 'Ібкळрו'்тои may represent a harmonisation with the genitive case of the immediately preceding $\sum i \mu \omega \nu \circ \varsigma$. See on Iob. 6,71; 12,4, and Annot.

27 offulam tò $\psi \omega \mu$ iov ("buccellam" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). The same change occurs in vs. 30, though Erasmus retains panem twice in vs. 26 , in rendering the same Greek word. See Annot. A complaint regarding the inconsistency of the Vulgate rendering here was also found in Valla Annot. The problem was resolved differently by Manetti, who substituted buccellam twice in vs. 26.

























ingressus est in eum satanas. Dicit igitur ei Iesus: Quod facis, fac citius. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem nemo intelligebat discumbentium ad quid dixisset ei. ${ }^{29}$ Quidam enim putabant, quia loculos habebat Iudas, quod dixisset ei Iesus, Eme ea, quae opus sunt nobis ad diem festum, aut egenis vt aliquid daret. ${ }^{30}$ Quum ergo accepisset ille offulam, exiuit continuo. Erat autem nox.
${ }^{31}$ Quum ergo exisset, dixit Iesus: Nunc glorificatus est filius hominis, et deus glorificatus est per eum. ${ }^{32} \mathrm{Si}$ deus glorificatus est per eum, et deus glorificabit eum per se, et continuo glorificabit eum. ${ }^{33}$ Filioli adhuc paulisper vobiscum sum. Quaeretis me, et sicut dixi Iudaeis, Quo ego vado, vos non potestis venire: ita et vobis dico nunc. ${ }^{34}$ Praeceptum nouum do vobis, vt diligatis vos mutuo, sicut dilexi vos, vt et vos diligatis vos mutuo. ${ }^{35}$ In hoc cognoscent omnes, quod discipuli mei sitis, si charitatem habueritis inter vos mutuam. ${ }^{36}$ Dicit ei Simon Petrus:

27 ingressus est $B-E$ : introiuit $A \mid$ Dicit igitur $B-E$ : Et dicit $A \mid 28$ intelligebat $B-E$ : sciuit $A \mid$ dixisset $B$ - $E$ : dixerit $A \mid 30$ offulam $B$-E: buccellam $A \mid 31$ prius glorificatus $B-E$ : clarificatus $A \mid$ alt. glorificatus $B-E$ : clarificatus $A \mid$ per eum $B-E$ : in eo $A \mid 32$ glorificatus $B-E$ : clarificatus $A \mid$ per eum $B-E$ : in eo $A \mid$ prius glorificabit $B-E$ : clarificabit $A \mid$ per se $B-E$ : in semetipso $A \mid$ alt. glorificabit $B$-E: clarificabit $A \mid 33$ ita $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ nunc $B$-E: modo $A \mid 34$ Praeceptum $B-E$ : Mandatum $A \mid$ prius vos mutuo $C-E$ inuicem $A B \mid$ alt. vos mutuo $C-E$ : inuicem $A B \mid$ 35 charitatem $B$-E: dilectionem $A \mid$ mutuam $B-E$ : om. $A$

27 тóte. Erasmus followed the late Vulgate in leaving this word untranslated. However, the late Vulgate omission may have been influenced by the Old Latin version, which omits the word, in company with codd. $\mathcal{X} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss.
27 ingressus est $\varepsilon \operatorname{lo\eta } \eta \lambda \theta \varepsilon v$ ("introiuit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus frequently substitutes ingredior for introeo and intro in Matthew, Mark and Hebrews, but nowhere in Luke and only here in John. Again this provides further evidence of
his less thorough revision of the last two Gospels. The Vulgate shows a preference for intro in Matthew, but for introeo in Mark, an imbalance which is still seen in Erasmus' rendering.
27 Dicit igitur $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota ~ o ̛ ̃ v$ ("Et dicit" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with the substitution of кà $\lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon ı$ (cf. к $\lambda \underset{\varepsilon}{\gamma} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{l}$ in cod. D). The earlier Vulgate has just Dicit, supported by only a few of the later Greek mss. Manetti put Dixit ergo.

28 intelligebat ${ }^{\text {Ex }} \gamma \nu \omega$ ("sciuit" $1516=V g$.). This substitution occurs elsewhere at 1 Cor. 14,9 ; 2 Cor. 3,2. Manetti preferred cognouit.
28 dixisset $\varepsilon โ \pi \varepsilon \nu$ ("dixerit" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,19 for Erasmus' use of the pluperfect. Manetti put diceret.
30 offulam тò $\psi \omega \mu$ iov ("buccellam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 27.

31 Quum ergo őte oưv. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, with support from $3^{66} \aleph B C D D$ and some later mss. In codd. 2 and 817, ouv is omitted, as in cod. A and most later mss., allowing the punctuation

31 dixit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon}\} \in \mathrm{El}$. Erasmus retains the perfect tense of the late Vulgate, without explicit support from Greek mss. Probably he thought that a shift to the present tense would be too abrupt, coming immediately after the pluperfect tense of exisset. Another instance of dixit for $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in 1$ occurs at $I o b .18,17$. Cf. also on Iob. 20,6. Manetti had ait (except that the words erat ... ait Iesus were omitted by the first hand of Pal. Lat. 45 , but were later restored in the margin).
31 glorificatus est (twice) $\varepsilon \delta 0\}$ áoo $\eta$ ("clarificatus est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,23.
 on Ioh. 3,21.
 was missing from codd. 1 and $2^{*}$, in company with $7^{66} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ B C ${ }^{*}$ D W and a few later mss., possibly as a result of the scribal error of homoeoteleuton. Erasmus wrote it into the margin of cod. 2, taking the wording from cod. 817 , with support from $\$^{\text {corr }}$ A $C^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss.
32 glorificatus est ... glorificabit ...glorificabit éסo̧á-
 ... clarificabit ... clarificabit" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,23.
 on lob. 3,21.
32 per se èv £́autũ ("in semet ipso" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 3,21, and Annot.
33 tekvía. In Annot., Erasmus comments that some mss. ("nonnulli codices") have t'́kva. However, his usual mss., codd. 1, 2 and 817, all have tekvía, as found also in cod. 69 and virtually all other mss. He may have found the reading tékva in another ms. which he consulted in England.

33 paulisper $\mu$ וкро́v ("modicum" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at 2 Cor. 11,1, but elsewhere Erasmus prefers pusillum: Mt. 26,39; Iob. 14,19; $16,16-19$. He uses paulisper three times for $\beta$ poxú тı, replacing ad breue at Act. 5,34; replacing paulo minus at Hebr. 2,7 (1535); and replacing modicum at Hebr. 2,9 (1535). See on Ioh. 6,7; 7,33, for Erasmus' removal of modicum from the Gospels. The correct use of paulisper is described in Valla Elegantiae II, 48; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, pp. 28990, 11. 281-284.
33 ita et каí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,57.
33 nunc $\alpha$ "́ptı ("modo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 9,25.
34 Praeceptum Evto $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 11,57.
34 vos mutuo (twice) à $\lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ous ("inuicem" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same change occurs at Ioh. 15,17 (1522); Rom. 12,10; 2 Cor. 13,12; Gal. 5,17 (1519); 1 Thess. 4,18; 5,11; 1 Petr. 5,14, and also as a substitute for alterutrum at Rom. 15,5; 1 Iob . 3,23; 4,11; 2 Ioh. 5. At some passages, Erasmus also uses mutuus, as an adjective, to achieve a similar result: Ioh. 13,35 (1519); Rom. 1,12; 1 Thess. 3,12; 2 Thess. 1,3; 1 Iob. 1,7. See on Iob. 4,33 for the alternative substitution of inter se. For the use of mutuo, see Valla Elegantiae, II, 59; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 278, 11. 983-985. Manetti's text (both mss.) omits sicut ... inuicem, through an error either of transcription or of his underlying Greek mss.
 See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... estis.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution occurs at nine other passages, all in the Epistles, but more often the change is an opposite direction, putting dilectio for cbaritas. The Vulgate tends to use cbaritas in Matthew-Luke, but dilectio in John. At many passages, Erasmus uses the two words interchangeably. For this sense of charitas, see Valla Elegantiae, IV, 62; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, $A S D$ I, 4, p. 234, 11. 703-707, offering the definition "charitas primo amor, sed tantum hominum in homines".
 comes from cod. 2.
 cem" Vg.; "inter vos" 1516). See on Ioh. 4,33; 13,34.
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Domine, quo vadis? Respondit ei Iesus: Quo ego vado, non potes me nunc sequi, sequeris autem postea. ${ }^{37}$ Dicit ei Petrus: Domine, quare non possum te sequi nunc? Animam meam pro te ponam. ${ }^{38}$ Respondit ei Iesus: Animam tuam pro me pones? Amen amen dico tibi, non canet gallus, donec ter me negaueris.

14Et ait discipulis suis: Ne turbetur cor vestrum. Creditis in deum, et in me credite. ${ }^{2}$ In domo patris mei mansiones multae sunt. Quod si secus esset, dixissem vobis, Vado paraturus vobis locum. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Et}$ si abiero ad parandum vobis locum,

36 घүल C-E: om. $A B$
14,3 єтоцаба। $B$-E: єтоицабо $A$

36 nunc $B-E$ : modo $A \mid 37$ Domine $B-E:$ om. $A \mid \operatorname{nunc} B-E$ : modo $A \mid 38$ canet $B$-E: cantabit $A \mid$ negaueris $B-E$ : neges $A$
14,1 Ne $B$-E: Non $A \mid 2$ Quod si secus esset $B D E:$ in quo minus $A$, Quod si caecus esset $C$ | paraturus $B$-E: parare $A \mid 3$ ad parandum $B$-E: et praeparauero $A$
$36 e i$ (2nd.) $\propto \cup \cup T \tilde{u}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by codd. B C ${ }^{*}$. Erasmus follows cod. 2, in company with $3{ }^{66} \$$ A C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ D W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti made the same change.
36 ego vado ह̉y $\dot{\omega}$ úmó $\gamma \omega$. The omission of $\bar{~} \gamma \omega \dot{ }$ in 1516-19 was in accordance with cod. 2, supported by $39^{66}$ A B C W and many later mss.,
 could have been influenced by the Vulgate, though it is found in cod. 817 and many other Greek mss., commencing with $\geqslant \mathrm{D}$. The presence of éyć in the Complutensian Polyglot was probably not yet known to Erasmus: cf. on Iob. 2,22. Manetti omitted ego.
36 nunc vũv ("modo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,25.
36 sequeris áko $\lambda_{0}$ outń $\sigma$ ıs $\mu \mathrm{ol}$. Erasmus' rendering follows the Latin Vulgate, which was based
on a Greek variant omitting $\mu \mathrm{O}$, in company with $3^{36} \times B C^{*} W$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. His Greek text followed codd. 2 and 817, supported by cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ (D) and most later mss.
37 ¿́ Пє́троц. The Erasmian text adds $\delta$ from cod. 1, with support from $7^{66} \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{~W}$ and a few later mss. It was omitted in Erasmus' codd. 2 and 817, together with most other mss., commencing with $\aleph$ A C. Cf. the insertion of o before 'Inooũs at many passages: see on Ioh. 1,48.

37 Domine Kúpız (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\aleph^{*}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by codd. 1 and 817 , along with most other mss., beginning with $\mathbf{7 B}^{66} \boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }}$ A B C D W.
37 nunc ắptı ("modo" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 9,25.

38 canet $\varphi \omega \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon$ ("cantabit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs in 1516 at $M c$. $14,68,72$, and in 1519 at $L c .22,34,60,61$; Iob. 18,27, while inconsistently retaining canto at Mt. 26,34, 74, 75. In rendering ${ }_{9}^{\circ} \delta \omega$, Erasmus similarly substitutes cano in 1516 at Eph. 5,19; Col. 3,16, and in $1519 \mathrm{at} A p$. Iob. 5,9, but retains canto at Ap. Iob. 14,3; 15,3. For describing the crowing of cockerels, either of these verbs is appropriate in classical Latin usage.
38 negaucris árrapvíon ("neges" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus produces a better sequence of tenses here. A similar substitution of the future perfect, following donec, occurs at fourteen other N.T. passages. Manetti put negabis.
14,1 Et ait discipulis suis K $\alpha$ elt тגĩs ג乇์toũ. These five Greek words, which are absent from the text of cod. 2, appear to represent a conjecture by Erasmus or one of his assistants. The wording could have been based partly on retranslation from the late Vulgate, partly on consultation of passages such as $M c$. 3,9 and Ioh. 6,12, where similar phraseology occurs, and partly on the lectionary apparatus located in the margins of many Greek mss. At the present passage, the upper margin of cod. 1 reads, in red ink, elttev ó kúplos toĩs Éauтои̃ $\mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \alpha i ̃ s, \mu \eta$ т тар $\alpha \sigma \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \omega$, while the upper margin of cod. 2 has $\varepsilon i \pi \pi \in \nu \delta$ kúpios toĩs
 clause was that it should be inserted by way of introduction when this portion of scripture was publicly read. In 1522 Annot., Erasmus observed that these words were missing from the earlier Vulgate copies, and from all the Greek mss. ("in vetustis codicibus non addebantur, ac ne in Graecis quidem omnibus"), and suggested that they were added by some scholar ("ab erudito quopiam"). The words may have entered the later Vulgate by contamination from mss. of the Old Latin version. The only Greek ms. to include this clause in the text seems to be cod. D , whose wording frequently suffers from Old Latin influence. For the rough breathing on oútoũ in the 1519-35 editions, see on lob. 2,21.

## 1 Ne Mń ("Non" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,7.

 $1516=$ Vg.; "Quod si caecus esset" 1522, errore). A classical precedent can be found for the Vulgate use of si quo minus (as in Livy 31, 12, 4), but the new phrase proposed by Erasmus enjoys a more solid pedigree among the works
of Plautus and Cicero. The only comparable use of secus elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T. is at 1 Tim. 5,25, ea quae secus babent (т ${ }^{\alpha} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma$ ${ }^{1} X \quad$ OvTa). In 1519, he removed nearly all instances of secus in the sense of "beside". At other passages having ei $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \dot{\eta}$, he follows the Vulgate in putting alioquin at Mc. 2,21; Lc. 5,36; 14,32; 2 Cor. 11,16 (1519); but replaces alioquin by alioqui at Mt. 6,1; 9,17; Mc. 2,22; Lc. 5,37; Iob. 14,11 (these last three in 1519); and substitutes alioqui for si quo minus at Ap. Ioh. 2,16 (1519), and $\sin$ minus for $\sin$ autem at $L c .10,6$; 13,9; Ap. Ioh. 2,5. In Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus suggested sin minus or alioqui, as in Valla Annot. A different rendering had been adopted by Manetti, who had si autem non.
2 Vado Пopev́ouarı ("quia vado" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text inserting ${ }^{0} \mathrm{Tl}$ before торEU'Oual, as in $7^{66 c o r r} \boldsymbol{*}$ A B C ${ }^{*}$ D W. Erasmus follows cod. 2, corroborated by the text cited in Valla Annot., and with support from $7^{66^{*}} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ and most of the later mss., including cod. 817 (cod. 1 omits торєúouat ... Úliviv). In Annot., Erasmus observed that some Greek codices lack óTı ("non est in quibusdam Graecis codicibus"), without saying whether he knew of other mss. which add the word. He may have been aware of the presence of 8 T 1 in cod. 69 (or a closely related ms., belonging to the same fam ${ }^{13}$ ), which he is thought to have consulted in England. Manetti similarly omitted quia.
2 paraturus étoluáaळı ("parare" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For Erasmus' frequent avoidance of the infinitive of purpose, see on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti preferred to make use of the gerund construction here, ad parandum (found as a later correction in Pal. Lat. 45, which originally seems to have read parare).
3 ad parandum £́тоוนáo๙ı ("et praeparauero" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The reading of Erasmus' Greek text in 1516, غ́тouव́o $\sigma \omega$, followed cod. 2 , with support from many other mss., commencing with codd. A W. Evidently following this Greek wording, Manetti put parabo. The Vulgate reflects a different Greek variant, koi ÉToú $\alpha \sigma \omega$, found in ${ }^{966} \leqslant$ B C N and many later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' change
 wording of his codd. 3 and 817, along with a large group of other later mss., as well as cod. D.























iterum veniam et assumam vos ad me ipsum, vt vbi sum ego, et vos sitis: ${ }^{4}$ et quo ego vado, scitis, et viam scitis. ${ }^{5}$ Dicit ei Thomas: Domine, nescimus quo vadis, et quomodo possumus viam scire? ${ }^{6}$ Dicit ei lesus: Ego sum via, et veritas et vita. Nemo venit ad patrem, nisi per me. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Si}$ cognouissetis me, et patrem meum vtique cognouissetis. Et nunc cognoscitis eum, et vidistis eum. ${ }^{8}$ Dicit ei Philippus: Domine, ostende nobis patrem, et sufficit nobis. ${ }^{9}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Tanto tempore vobiscum sum, et non cognouisti me? Philippe, qui vidit me, vidit patrem. Et quomodo tu dicis, Ostende nobis patrem? | ${ }^{10}$ Non credis, quod ego in


3 veniam $B-E$ : venio $A \mid$ assumam $B-E$ : accipiam $A \mid 7$ nunc $B-E$ : amodo $A \mid 9$ Et quomodo $B-E:$ Quomodo $A \mid 10$ quod $B-E$ : qnod $A \mid \operatorname{sum} C-E:$ om. $A, \operatorname{sim} B \mid$ prius in me $B-E$ : in me est $A \mid 11$ Credite $A^{c} B-E$ : Non creditis $A^{*} \mid$ sum $C-E:$ om. $A, \operatorname{sim} B \mid$ me. $B-E:$ me est? $A$
 similar substitutions of the future tense in rendering ËpXoual, see on Iob. 4,25. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
3 assumam T $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda$ ń $\psi o \mu \alpha ৷$ ("accipiam" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' choice of assumo at the present passage is consistent with the accustomed Vulgate usage elsewhere in the Gospels. He makes the same substitution at $M t$. 2,13, 14, 20, 21; while at Mt. 1,20, 24 he replaces accipio by adiungo. By contrast, he uses accipio as a substitute for suscipio at Ioh. 19,16 (1519), while retaining suscipio at Mt. 27,27, to translate the same Greek verb. In the Epistles, accipio is the usual Vulgate rendering, generally in the context of receiving a teaching, and Erasmus retains that usage. He
regarded assumo as more suitable in the Gospels, where it often bears the meaning "take with" rather than "receive".
4 Éy $\omega$. In 1516-19, Erasmus omitted this pronoun, following cod. 2, in company with $33^{66} \mathrm{DW}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1. His restoration of $\varepsilon \gamma \omega$ in 1522 was probably influenced by the Vulgate but also conformed with the text found in cod. 817 and most other Greek mss., commencing with $\aleph$ A B C N Q. Cf. another insertion of $\varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \dot{\prime}$ in 1522, at Ioh. 13,36.
6 et veritas kà $\grave{\eta}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \varepsilon ı \alpha$ ("veritas" late Vg ., and some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate omission of the conjunction lacks Greek support. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.

7 nunc ởm’ ápti ("a modo" $1516=V g$.). In 1535 Annot., Erasmus also suggests iam nunc as a possible rendering. See on Iob. 9,25.
7 cognoscitis $\gamma ı \omega \omega ் \sigma$ кєтe ("cognoscetis" late Vg., and some Vg . mss). The future tense of the late Vulgate could reflect a Greek variant, $\gamma v \omega \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, but this is supported by few mss. other than cod. א. Erasmus here restored the earlier Vulgate rendering: see Annot.
8 juiv (2nd.). The misspelling, úpiv, created by a printer's error, crept from the 1516 catchword into the main text of the 1519 edition, but was corrected in 1522.
9 cognouisti è $\gamma v \omega \kappa \alpha s$ ("cognouistis" Vg.). The Vulgate use of the plural here appears to be unsupported by Greek mss. See also Annot.
9 vidit ... vidit £̇ $\omega$ рaxผ̀s ... ėف́pake ("videt ... videt" late Vg., and some Vg. mss.). The Greek mss., again, do not support the present tense used by the late Vulgate. Erasmus in effect restored the earlier Vulgate wording: see Annot.
9 patrem ( 1 st .) Tòv $\pi \alpha \pi \in \rho \alpha$ ("et patrem" ${ }^{\mathrm{Vg} .)}$. The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, kai tòv $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha$, as found in $\boldsymbol{P}^{75}$. Erasmus reproduces the text of his cod. 2, supported by virtually all other mss., commencing with $7^{66} \leqslant \mathrm{AB}$ D N W, and including codd. 1 and 817.
9 Et quomodo кaì тడ̃s ("Quomodo" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text in which kai is omitted, as in $7^{66}$ B QW. Erasmus' Greek text adheres to cod. 2, in company with A D N and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The same change was made by Manetti.
10 quod ego in patre sum (sim: 1519) ... in me of T ו
 in patre ... in me est" Vg.; "qnod ego in patre ... in me est" 1516, sic). The Vulgate is more literal here. Erasmus brings the verb to an earlier position in his rendering, to achieve a more elegant classical form of expression. Other instances of his use in 1519 of the subjunctive, sim, after an earlier quod, are found at lob. 14,11, 20; 18,8, 37: see also on Iob. 1,20. Manetti followed the Vulgate, but had quod for quia.
 Vg .; "Non creditis mihi" 1516 text). The Vulgate might be thought to reflect a Greek variant, ov moбtevete, but neither this reading nor oú TIбтev́eté $\mu \mathrm{O}$ (as printed in the 1516 Greek text) is now found in more than a few late mss., and certainly not in those which Erasmus
usually consulted. From the lemma for this passage given in Valla Annot., it might be deduced that there were some Vulgate mss. which had Non creditis mibi, and that a manuscript or printed copy having such a reading was used as the basis for the Latin text of Erasmus' 1516 edition. However, in the printed editions of the Vulgate circulating in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, including e.g. the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514 , the word mibi was commonly omitted, and the same is true of the Vulgate lemma in 1516 Annot. and the Vulgate column of Etasmus' 1527 N.T. An alternative explanation of the insertion of mibi in 1516 is that it could have arisen from an error which Erasmus made when marking up his working copy of the Vulgate, adding mibi while failing to alter Non creditis, or the printer could have misread the alterations which Erasmus had made. At a later stage, perhaps during the proof-reading of the 1516 edition, either Erasmus or one of his assistants conjecturally emended the Greek text by inserting oủ, to make the Greek agree with the dubious wording of the Latin translation in the adjacent column. This textual choice may also have been influenced by a confusion in the wording of Valla Annot, where a comment on vs. 11 is immediately followed by a note incorrectly offering oủ mıఠтev่ete ötı, rather than oú miбteveis óti, as the Greek text underlying non credis quia of vs. 10. The passage of Valla, apart from minor orthographical corrections, runs as follows: "[vs. 11] 'Non creditis michi quia ego in patre et pater in me est'. Aliter graece legitur, 'Credite mihi quia ego: тוбтev̇eté $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ '. [vs. 10] Philippo per interrogationem responsum est, 'Non credis quia ego in patre et pater in me est: oú mıवтévete סтt." In any event, by the time Erasmus came to prepare 1516 Annot, he had decided that ous was unacceptable, and that the text of vs. 11 should have read Credite mihi and mıotev́eté $\mu \mathrm{O}$, as recorded in his errata. The same wording had been adopted by Manetti. In 1516, Erasmus' Greek and Latin texts both follow the Vulgate in making this sentence a question, but once the verb was altered to an imperative (Credite), it was necessary to remove the question-mark, as was done in the 1519 edition.
11 quod ego in patre sum (sim: 1519) ... in me ${ }^{\text {ot }}$ I
 in patre ... in me est?" Vg.; "quod ego in patre ... in me est?" 1516). See on vs. 10 . The word
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Alioqui propter ipsa facta credite mihi. ${ }^{12}$ Amen amen dico vobis, qui credit in me, opera quae ego facio, et ipse faciet: et maiora his faciet, quia ego ad patrem vado. ${ }^{13}$ Et quicquid petieritis nomine meo, hoc faciam, vt glorificetur pater per filium. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{Si}$ quid petieritis per nomen meum, ego faciam. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Si}$ diligitis me, praecepta mea seruate.
${ }^{16} \mathrm{Et}$ ego rogabo patrem, et alium consolatorem dabit vobis, vt maneat vobiscum in aeternum, ${ }^{17}$ spiritum veritatis quem mundus non potest accipere: quia non videt eum, nec nouit eum. Vos autem cognoscitis eum, quia apud vos manet, et in vobis erit.
 ABDE: $\mu \varepsilon \nu \eta C$

11 Alioqui $B-E$ : Alioquin $A \mid$ ipsa facta $B-E$ : opera ipsa $A \mid 12$ his $B-E$ : horum $A \mid 13$ quicquid $B-E$ : quodcumque $A \mid$ nomine $B-E$ : in nomine $A \mid$ per filium $B-E$ : in filio $A \mid 14$ per nomen meum $B-E$ : in nomine meo $A \mid 15$ praecepta $B-E$ : mandata $A \mid 16$ consolatorem $B-E$ : paracletum $A \mid 17$ nouit $B-E$ : scit $A$
é $\sigma$ tiv was added to the Greek text from cod. 1, supported by some other late mss., but probably originating from a harmonisation with vs. 10 . In codd. 2 and 817 , along with $3{ }^{66} 75$ $\aleph$ B D QW, and most of the later mss., zotiv is omitted. Erasmus' reading was revived by later editions of the Textus Receptus, even though Robert Estienne corrected it. Manetti followed the Vulgate, but had quod for quia, as in vs. 10.
11 Alioqui घì $\delta$ غ̀ $\mu \eta$ ("Alioquin" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 2. Manetti again put si autem non, as in the earlier verse.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 3,21. This change is mainly for the sake of varying the vocabulary, in view of the use of opera in vss. 10 and 12.
11 mihi (2nd.) $\mu \mathrm{o}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the Greek text of $3{ }^{6675} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{D}$ W and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, which here agrees with A B Q and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti likewise added mihi.

12 bis toútcu ("horum" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus criticises the over-literal Vulgate rendering of the Greek genitive, as the expected classical Latin usage was that maior should be followed by the ablative case. Valla Annot. raises the same objection, and the required change was also adopted by Manetti. Erasmus' 1516 translation made a similar substitution at $M c .12,31$ and 3 Ioh. 4 . The present passage appears in his 1519-22 editions of the Soloecismi, and he further defended his criticism of maiora borum in Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 396 E.
12 patrem tòv martépa $\mu \circ$. Erasmus' rendering follows the Vulgate in omitting the pronoun. However, the Vulgate was based on a Greek text omitting $\mu \circ \mathrm{v}$, as in $33^{6675}$ N A B DQW and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek follows codd. 2 and 817, in agreement with most other late mss. Manetti, accordingly, added meum.
13 quicquid ó Tl ẳv ("quodcumque" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Erasmus makes a similar substitution
at seventeen other passages, conforming with Valla's preference for quicquid as a noun (or rather, pronoun), and quodounque as an adjective: Valla Elegantiae III, 16; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 308, 11. 776-779; Erasmus 1519 Annot., ad loc. Inconsistently, he retained quodcunque at $L c .10,35$ and $\operatorname{Iob} .2,5$, providing a further instance of his less thorough revision of these two Gospels, compared with his work on Matthew-Mark. In 1516, perhaps through an intervention by one of Erasmus' assistants, the reading oo édo was drawn from codd. 1 and 817, in company with $3 \mathbf{7}^{66}$ and a few later mss. In 1519, he reverted to the text of cod. 2, o Tı $\mathrm{a} v$, which he would also now have found in cod. 3 , with support from $7^{75 \text { vid }}$ $\aleph \mathrm{ABDQW}$ and the majority of later mss.
13 petieritis $\alpha i \tau \eta \sigma \eta$ te ("petieritis patrem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading corresponds with the addition of tòv $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon{ }^{2} \mathrm{p}$, found in only a few late mss., and not in any which were consulted by Erasmus. Besides the testimony of the Greek copies, he points out in Annot. that patrem is missing from the older Vulgate mss.: "non additur nec in Graecis, nec in antiquis exemplaribus". The omission of patrem incurred criticism from Edward Lee in 1520, rebutted by Erasmus in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 192 C-E. The word was similarly omitted by Manetti.
13 nomine èv тน̃ óvóuactl ("in nomine" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 5,43.
 See on Iob. 3,21.
14 petieritis $\alpha i \boldsymbol{T} \dot{\prime} \sigma \eta \tau \varepsilon$ ("petieritis me" Vg.). The reading $\alpha$ i $\tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \tau^{\top} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon$, in 1516 , was based on cod. 2 (while correcting an itacism in its spelling, aitńontaí $\mu \mathrm{E}$ ), coinciding with the Vulgate and the text of $7 \exists^{66} \mathrm{~N}$ B W 060 and some later mss. To judge from 1535 Annot., however, Erasmus' omission of $m e$ from his translation was deliberate, as he argues that such omission is to be preferred on theological grounds. In 1519, he deleted $\mu \mathrm{E}$ from the Greek text, in company with most of the mss., commencing with A D Q and including cod. 817. In doing so, he did not receive assistance from his cod. 3 , which here inserts $\mu \mathrm{E}$. In cod. 1, on the other hand, the whole verse was omitted, as a result of parablepsis. The verse was also omitted from the text of Manetti's translation (both mss.), through either an error of transcription or a defect in his underlying Greek mss.

14 per nomen meum èv тã óvóuactí uov ("in nomine meo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change is different from that which Erasmus made in vs. 13 , partly motivated by a desire for stylistic variety. See on Iob. 5,43.
14 ego غ̇y白 ("hoc" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, toũto, as found in 2775 A B 060. Erasmus follows his codd. 2 and 817, in company with $\mathbf{i}^{66^{*}} \aleph \mathrm{DQW}$ and most later mss.
15 praecepta tàs évvto ${ }^{2}$ ós ("mandata" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 11,57.
16 consolatorem т $\pi \alpha \alpha ́ к \kappa \lambda \eta$ тоv ("paracletum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same change occurs, again in 1519 , at Ioh. 16,7 . This is analogous to the Vulgate use of consolo at Is. 40,1 and Mt. 5,4. However, Erasmus retains paracletus at Ioh. 14,26 and 15,26 ; and at 1 Iob. 2,1 he has aduocatum as in the Vulgate. He explains in Annot. that he wishes to avoid the misunderstanding that there were two "paracletes". This provoked further complaint from Lee, answered by Erasmus in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 192 E-193 A.
$16 \mu \varepsilon \dot{v} \eta \mathrm{y}$. The incorrect spelling found in the 1516 text, $\mu$ ह́vel, was drawn from cod. 2, being one of the many itacisms found in that manuscript. The restoration of $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \eta \eta$ in 1519 accords with the reading of $\mathbf{~}^{66} \mathrm{ADW}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 (but not cod. 3). A few other mss. have ग̄ for $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \underset{n}{ }$, as in $\mathbf{7 月}^{75} \times \mathrm{B} Q$.
 Vg. mss.). The reading vidit, which Erasmus cited in Annot., is not printed in the Vulgate column of the 1527 N.T. or in the earlier Froben editions of the Vulgate text. However, since vidit is found in the lemma of Valla Annot., this may have been Erasmus' immediate source. Manetti had videt.
17 nouit $\gamma$ ıvడ́бkEı ("scit" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti here put cognoscit.
17 cognoscitis $\gamma$ Ivબ́aKETE ("cognoscetis" late Vg. and many Vg. mss.). Erasmus follows cod. 2, in which he manually corrected $\gamma i v \omega \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$ (an itacistic error of spelling) to read $\gamma เ \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} K \in \tau$, in company with most other mss., including codd. 1 and 817. The late Vulgate reading appears to be unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti also had cognoscitis here.
17 manet $\mu \varepsilon ́ v e ı ~(" m a n e b i t " ~ V g.) . ~ T h e ~ V u l g a t e ~$ reading implies a different accentuation, $\mu \in v \varepsilon i ̃$,
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${ }^{18}$ Non relinquam vos orphanos, veniam ad vos. ${ }^{19}$ Adhuc pusillum, et mundus me iam non videt: vos autem videtis me. Quia ego viuo, et vos viuetis. ${ }^{20}$ In illo die vos cognoscetis, quod ego sum in patre meo, et vos in me, et ego in vobis. ${ }^{21}$ Qui habet praecepta mea et seruat ea, ille est qui diligit me. Qui autem diligit me, diligetur a patre meo: et ego diligam eum, et aperiam ei me ipsum. ${ }^{22}$ Dicit ei Iudas, non ille Iscariotes: Domine, quid factum est, quod manifestaturus es nobis te ipsum, et non mundo? ${ }^{23}$ Respondit lesus, et dixit ei: Si quis diligit me, sermonem meum seruabit, et pater meus diliget eum: et ad eum veniemus, et mansionem apud eum faciemus. ${ }^{24}$ Qui non diligit me, sermones meos non seruat: et sermo quem auditis, non est meus, sed eius qui misit me patris.
${ }^{25}$ Haec loquutus sum vobis apud vos manens. ${ }^{26}$ Paracletus autem ille qui est spiritus sanctus, quem spiritum mittet pater nomine meo, ille vos 1 LB 400 docebit omnia, et suggeret vobis omnia quaecunque dixi vobis. ${ }^{27}$ Pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam do vobis. Non quomodo mundus dat, ego do vobis. Ne turbetur cor vestrum, neque

## $22 \eta \mu \nu \operatorname{A}$-C: vuıv $D E \mid 23$ о $\pi \alpha т п \rho ~ B-E: \pi \alpha т \eta \rho ~ A$

19 Quia $B-E$ : quod $A|20 \operatorname{sum} A C-E: \operatorname{sim} B| 21$ praecepta $B$-E: mandata $A \mid$ aperiam $B-E$ : manifestabo $A \mid 22$ Iscariotes $B$-E: Ischariotes $A \mid 23$ sermonem $A B D E$ : setmonem $C$ | 24 sermo $B$-E: sermonem $A \mid 26$ ille qui est $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ spiritum $B-E$ (ital):om. $A \mid$ nomine $B-E$ : in nomine $A \mid$ dixi $B$-E: dixero $A \mid 27 \mathrm{Ne} B-E$ : Non $A$
changing the tense of the verb from present to future. See Annot, and Valla Annot. The spelling $\mu \hat{v} \eta \eta$ in 1522 was probably a misprint.
18 Non oúk ("Nec" Vg. 1527). Erasmus' Latin rendering is in accordance with Annot., lemma, and earlier Vulgate mss. The same reading was adopted by Manetti.

19 pusillum uıкрóv ("modicum" Vg.). See on Iob. 7,33 and 13,33.
19 videtis $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon$ eite ("videbitis" late Vg. and some $\mathrm{Vg} . \mathrm{mss}$.). For similar changes of tense, see Ioh. $16,10,17,19$. Erasmus here restored the earlier Vulgate rendering: see Annot. From 1519 onwards, the insertion of a full-stop after
videtis me considerably altered the meaning of the Latin translation, whereas the punctuation of the Greek text remained unchanged: see the following note.

19 Quia ötı ("quod" 1516). In 1516, the use of a comma after videtis, coupled with the replacement of quia by quod, was liable to give rise to a different understanding of the passage, as meaning "you see me, that I am alive, and you will live" or "you see me because I live, and you will live", instead of "you see me: because I live, you also will live. Cf. on Ioh. 12,39 for another inappropriate substitution of quod.

20 quod ego sum ótı $̇$ દ̇үம́ ("quia ego sum" Vg.; "quod ego sim" 1519 only). See on vs. 10. Manetti made the same change.

21 praecepta tàs èvto入ás ("mandata" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 11,57.
21 aperiam है $\mu \varphi \alpha v i \sigma \omega$ ("manifestabo" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). By contrast, manifesto is retained in vs. 22: cf. Annot. Regarding manifesto, see further on Ioh. 1,31 and 7,4. Erasmus does not elsewhere use aperio or manifesto to render this Greek verb.

22 quid ti. Here the Erasmian text deviates from its usual underlying mss., possibly through a conjecture inspired by the Vulgate, so as to omit kai before ti, in company with $77^{66^{*} 75}$ A B D and a few later mss. The reading of cod. 2 is kai Ti , as found in $7^{66 \text { corr }} \mathfrak{K}$ QW and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. This textual change was ignored in Annot., and persisted into the Textus Receptus. It would be possible to argue for the superiority of kai ti, as being a lectio difficilior, in view of the apparent strangeness of introducing a question with kai when there is no preceding clause with which to connect it. This usage does not occur elsewhere in this Gospel except at Ioh. 9,36, where the unexpected wording again led to the omission of kai by the Vulgate and the Textus Receptus, this time supported by $\boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ A 070. Manetti put et quid.
22 quod Ötl ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
22 กпи $\mathfrak{v} v$. The reading úpiv in 1527-35 is impossible in the context, and must be considered a misprint.
23 ó 'Inooũs. As at other passages, Erasmus or his assistants insert the article in defiance of
their usual mss. at Basle. This was probably based on conjecture, although in this verse the article happens also to be present in cod. 69 and relatively few other late mss. All the remaining mss. omit ó, commencing with $\$^{66} 75$ $\aleph$ A B D W. This questionable textual choice again remained in the Textus Receptus. See on Iob. 1,48.
$23 \delta \pi \alpha \pi \eta \dot{p}$. The omission of the article in 1516 was unsupported by mss. Unlike the previous example, this may have been accidental.
24 sermo ó $\lambda$ '́yos ("sermonem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate use of the accusative instead of nominative, in the sequence "sermonem ... non est meus", contravened an elementary requirement of Latin grammar. In Annot., Erasmus joins Valla Annot. in criticising this apparent grammatical lapse, and adds the suggestion that it may have arisen from later scribal error. Manetti likewise adopted sermo for his translation. The point was debated between Erasmus and Stunica: see Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 134-136, 11. 524-530.

24 auditis ákoúعтє ("audistis" Vg.). The perfect tense of the Vulgate lacks support among the Greek mss. See 1519 Annot.

26 ille qui est spiritus ... quem spiritum tò $\pi v \in u ̃ \mu \alpha \ldots$.. $\delta$ ("spiritus ... quem" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus explains that the added words are necessary to make the sentence run more smoothly. A similar expansion occurs at Iob. 16,13. Valla Annot. suggested using id est spiritus.
26 nomine $\mathfrak{\varepsilon ̇ v}$ Tヘ̃̃ óvóuơtl ("in nomine" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 5,43.
26 quaecunque $\delta \sigma \sigma$. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1, under influence from the Vulgate, with support from only a few of the later mss. The better attested reading was $\alpha$, cited in Valla Annot. and found in codd. 2 and 817, along with $3 \exists^{66} 75$ vid $\& ~ A ~ B ~ D ~ a n d ~ m o s t ~ o t h e r ~$ mss.
26 dixi єITov ("dixero" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate future perfect tense corresponds with
 Annot., Erasmus is only aware of غitov.
27 oủ ... $\delta i \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{I} \dot{\cup} \mu \mathrm{i} v$. Erasmus here uses codd. 1 and 817 to restore an eight-word omission in cod. 2, caused by homocoteleuton.
27 Ne $\mu$ ' ("Non" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,7.
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formidet. ${ }^{28}$ Audistis quod ego dixi vobis, Vado, et venio ad vos. Si diligeretis me, gauderetis vtique, quod dixerim, Vado ad patrem, quia pater maior me est. ${ }^{29}$ Et nunc dixi vobis priusquam fiat, vt quum factum fuerit, credatis. ${ }^{30}$ Posthac non multa loquar vobiscum. Venit enim princeps mundi huius, et in me non habet quicquam. ${ }^{31} \mathrm{Sed} \mathrm{vt}$ cognoscat mundus quod diligo patrem, et sicut mandatum dedit mihi pater, sic facio. Surgite, eamus hinc.

15Ego sum vitis vera, et pater meus agricola est. ${ }^{2}$ Omnem palmitem in me non ferentem fructum tollit, et omnem qui fert fructum purgat, vt fructum copiosiorem afferat. ${ }^{3}$ Iam vos mundi estis propter sermonem, quem loquutus sum vobis. ${ }^{4}$ Manete in me, et ego in vobis. Sicut palmes non potest ferre fructum a semet ipso, nisi manserit in vite: sic nec vos, nisi in me manseritis. ${ }^{5}$ Ego | LB 402 sum vitis, vos palmites. Qui manet in me, et ego in eo, hic fert fructum multum: quia sine me nihil potestis facere. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Si}$ quis in me non manserit, eiectus est foras sicut palmes, et exaruit: et colligunt eos, et in ignem coniiciunt et ardent. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Si}$ manseritis in me, et verba

[^6]28 quod dixerim $B-E$ : quia $A \mid 30$ Posthac $B-E: \operatorname{Iam} A$
15,2 tollit $B-E$ : tollet eum $A \mid$ purgat $B-E$ : purgabit eum $A \mid$ copiosiorem $B-E$ : plus $A \mid$ 6 eiectus est $B-E$ : mittetur $A \mid$ exaruit $B-E$ : arescet $A \mid$ eos $B-E$ : ea $A \mid$ coniiciunt $B-E$ : mittunt $A$

28 quod (1st.) ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
28 quod dixerim ő 1 हीtoov ("quia" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817 , with support from most of the later mss., and the reading cited in Valla Annot.

The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, omitting Eltov, as in $\aleph$ A B D $060^{\text {vid }}$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. Manetti put quia dixi.
28 pater ó martip. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate in omitting $\mu \mathrm{OU}$ after
$\pi \alpha \pi n \dot{\rho}$, in company with $\chi^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A} \mathrm{B} \mathrm{D*} \mathrm{and}$ a few later mss. The reading of codd. 2 and 817 ,
 most later mss., corresponding with the addition of meus in Manetti's translation.
30 Postbac non oúké兀ı ("Iam non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 5,14. Manetti here had Non amplius.
30 buius toútou. The Erasmian text again follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate in adding тoúrou, this time supported by just a few late mss. This reading, which may have originated as a harmonisation with passages such as Iob. 12,31 and 16,11 , was carried over into the later Textus Receptus. In codd. 2 and 817, in common with $\mathcal{X}$ A B D and most later mss., the word is omitted. In Annot., Erasmus cites kó $\sigma \mu$ ou toútou without mentioning the existence of any textual variation among his Greek mss. It is possible that he here relied on the printed text already compiled by his assistants, and did not freshly consult his mss. for the purpose of this note. Manetti omitted buius.
31 quod 8 ort ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
15,2 tollit aịpet cútó ("tollet eum" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). From Annot., it appears that Erasmus regarded the addition of cútó as reflecting a Hebraism, redundant in a Latin rendering. He also points out, as does Valla Annot, that aipes requires a rendering in the present tense, contrary to the Vulgate. The same applies to kafatpes, below. Similar corrections of tense also occur in vs. 6.
2 purgat ka0aipıt aủtó ("purgabit eum" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See the previous note, and Annot., together with Valla Annot.
2 copiosiorem $\pi \lambda$ tiova ("plus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In having an adjective rather than an adverb, Erasmus' revised rendering is closer to the Greek. In Annot., following Valla Annot., he suggests a possible error within the Latin tradition here, or that the original Latin translator may have made a mistake. The passage is listed in his Soloecismi, and was further discussed in Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 396 E-F. Manetti put vberiorem.
 derived from cod. 2. Erasmus corrected it in the errata of that edition.
4 нeivate èv énoí, кd̉yc̀ èv úuĩv. Erasmus restores this sentence, omitted in cod. $2^{*}$ by homoeoteleuton, and inserts it in the margin
of the ms., to conform with the text of codd. 1 and 817 , and most other mss.
6 eiectusest ${ }^{2} \beta \lambda \lambda_{n} \theta$ n ("mittetur" 1516 Lat. $=V \mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus follows Valla Annot. in rendering the Greek aorist more literally than the Vulgate: see Annot. For the substitution of eiicio, see on Iob. 3,24.
6 exaruit ${ }^{\text {É }} \mathrm{\eta} \eta \mathrm{p}$ ávon ("arescet" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). For the correction of tense, see Annot., and the previous note. The use of exaruit was proposed by Valla Annot. Other substitutions of exaresco occur at Mt. 13,6; 21,20 (1519); Mc. 11,20-1 (for aridam factam); Iac. 1,11 (for arefacio), in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mc. 4,6; 1 Petr. 1,24. Erasmus retains aresco at $M c .9,18 ;$ Lc. 8,6; Ap. Iob. 14,15.
6 colligunt ouváyououv ("colligent" Vg.). Again, in Annot., Erasmus follows Valla Annot. in objecting to the Vulgate use of the future tense: see on vs. 2.
 Annot., Erasmus speculates as to the reasons for this "manifest solecism" in the late Latin text, while mentioning that some older copies had eos. In fact, the late Vulgate reading receives support from some Greek mss. which have aútó, as in K D and cod. 1, which Erasmus does not seem to have consulted at this point. In his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 396 F397 B , he incorrectly maintained that aU'to had no ms. authority. His Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with codd. A B and most later mss. ( $\boldsymbol{p}^{66}$ adds aútó after $\beta \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda$ oval). Valla Annot. similarly had củtó, which he rendered by ea, as adopted in Erasmus' 1516 translation. Erasmus included this passage in the Solocismi.
6 mũp. Erasmus follows cod. 2 in omitting tó before $\pi$ Ũp, in company with cod. D and a few later mss. This poorly supported reading remained in the Textus Receptus. Codd. 1 and 817, together with most other mss., commencing with $\widehat{x}$ A B, have to $\pi$ ũp, as also found in Valla Annot.
 "mittunt" 1516). In 1516, Erasmus restored the rendering which was found in earlier Vulgate mss.: see Annot. On coniicio, see also on Iob. 3,24. Manetti had iacient, while Valla Annot. had iaciunt.
6 ardent кגietaı ("ardet" late Vg.). The Greek verb, though singular in form, can be translated
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mea in vobis manserint, quicquid volueritis, petetis, et fiet vobis. ${ }^{8}$ In hoc glorificatus est pater meus, vt fructum copiosum afferatis, et efficiamini mei discipuli. ${ }^{9}$ Sicut dilexit me pater, ita et ego dilexi vos. Manete in dilectione mea. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Si}$ praecepta mea seruaueritis, manebitis in dilectione mea, sicut et ego patris mei praecepta seruaui, et maneo in eius dilectione. ${ }^{11} \mathrm{Haec}$ loquutus sum vobis, vt gaudium meum in vobis maneat, et gaudium vestrum impleatur. ${ }^{12} \mathrm{Hoc}$ est praeceptum meum, vt diligatis vos inuicem, sicut dilexi vos. ${ }^{13}$ Maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet, vt quis animam suam ponat pro amicis suis. ${ }^{14}$ Vos amici mei estis, si feceritis quaecunque ego praecipio vobis. ${ }^{15}$ Non posthac vos dico seruos, quia seruus nescit quid faciat dominus eius. Vos autem dixi, amicos: quia omnia quae audiui a patre meo, nota feci vobis. ${ }^{16}$ Non vos me elegistis, sed ego elegi vos et constitui vos, vt eatis et fructum afferatis, et fructus vester maneat: vt quicquid petieritis patrem nomine meo, det vobis. ${ }^{17}$ Haec praecipio vobis, vt diligatis vos mutuo. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Si}$ mundus vos odit, scitis quod me priusquam vos odio habuerit. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{Si}$ de mundo

7 quicquid $B-E$ : quodcumque $A \mid 8$ glorificatus $B-E$ : clarificatus $A \mid$ copiosum $B-E$ : plurimum $A \mid 9$ ita $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 13$ vt quis animam suam ponat $B$-E: quam vt animam suam ponat quis $A \mid 15$ quae $B$-E: quaecumque $A \mid 16$ constitui $B-E$ : posui $A$ | quicquid $B-E$ : quodcumque $A \mid$ nomine $C-E$ : in nomine $A$, sub nomine $B \mid 17$ praecipio $C-E$ : mando $A B \mid$ vos mutuo $C$-E: inuicem $A B \mid 18$ priusquam vos $B-E$ : priorem vobis $A \mid$ habuerit $B-E$ : habuit $A$
either as plural (following on from the neuter plural, aútó), or as singular (following the neuter singular, aútó): see on cưTó́, above. Erasmus again followed Valla Annot. on this point. Manetti substituted ardebit.

7 quicquid ò żádv ("quodcumque" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 14,13.

8 glorificatus est $\mathfrak{E} \delta \circ \bigcirc \mathfrak{\xi} \dot{\alpha} \sigma 0 \eta$ ("clarificatus est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 12,23.

8 copiosum mo入úv（＂plurimum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitution occurs at Mc．10，46（for ikavós）；Act．15，32．In Annot．，Erasmus also suggested using multum．At Ioh．15，5，he was content to retain fructum multum，and similarly had multum fructum at Ioh．12，24．His use of copiosum in the present verse was no doubt intended to vary the vocabulary，at the same time as removing the incorrect superlative of the Vulgate．Manetti，more consistently，had multum here．Erasmus further substituted multus for plurimus at Lc．10，41（1519）；12，19，while retaining the incorrect plurimus at $L c .8,4$ ．He elsewhere puts copiosus for multus at Mt．9，37， and for magnus at 1 Petr．1，3，in accordance with Vulgate usage at several other passages，as mentioned in Annot．
9 ita et ego kỏ $\gamma \omega$（＂et ego＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．6，57．
$9 u^{u} \mu \tilde{a} 5$. In 1516，the ending of this word was given as a compendium，which was misread by the printer in 1519 as a nominative，úpeirs．The misprint was removed in 1522.
10 et ego éyć．Erasmus follows the Vulgate in inserting et，though the Vulgate may here be based on a Greek variant，kớy $\dot{\prime}$ ，as found in $\aleph \mathrm{D}$ ，which probably arose through harmonisa－ tion with vs．9．Manetti omitted et．
11 maneat $\mu \mathrm{Ei} \mathrm{v} \eta$（＂sit＂Vg．）．The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text，having गु，as in codd．A B D and a few later mss．，including cod．1．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817，in company with $\mathcal{X}$ and most of the later mss．， as well as Valla Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
12 vos inuicem $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{n} \lambda$ ous（＂inuicem＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．4，33．
13 vt quis animam suam ponat iva tis tinv $\Psi \cup X \eta ̀ v ~ \alpha U ́ T o u ̃ ~ \theta n ̃ ~(" q u a m ~ v t ~ a n i m a m ~ s u a m ~$ ponat quis＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）．Erasmus＇rendering is closer to the Greek word－order．In Annot．，he records the omission of quam in earlier Vulgate mss．For the rough breathing on $\alpha \dot{T} T 0$ in the 1519－35 editions，see on Ioh．2，21．
14 quaecunque $\delta \sigma \alpha$（＂quae＂Vg．）．The Vulgate follows a different Greek text，reading ${ }^{\circ}$ ，as in $3^{66} \leqslant \mathrm{D}$ and some later mss．，including cod． 1．Erasmus，as usual，follows codd． 2 and 817， with support from cod．A 065 and most of the later mss．Manetti also made this change．
15 Non posthac oủkétl（＂Iam non＂Vg．）．See on Iob．5，14．Manetti used Non amplius．

15 vos dico úhãs $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$（＂dicam vos＂late Vg． $=$ Annot．，lemma）．The late Vulgate reading， cited in Annot．，is exhibited by the Froben edition of 1491，among others．However，the 1527 Vulgate column agrees with the Froben 1514 edition of the Vulgate，as well as the earlier Vulgate mss．，in putting dico vos，reflecting a Greek text having $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ ú $\mu \alpha \tilde{\varrho}$, as found in $37^{66}$ \＆A B and a few later mss．Erasmus follows his cod．2，supported by codd．D 065 and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 817．See Annot．
15 quac á（＂quaecumque＂ 1516 Lat．＝Vg．）．The Vulgate has support here from cod． $\mathrm{D}^{*}$ and a few of the later mss．，including cod．817， reading ö $\sigma \alpha$ ．Erasmus follows codd． 1 and 2， in company with $\boldsymbol{p}^{66} \aleph$ A B N and most later mss．Manetti also had quae．
16 constitui $\varepsilon$＊$\theta \eta \kappa \alpha$（＂posui＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at Act．1，7；Rom． 4，17； 1 Thess．5，9（1519），and also in rendering keĩ $\alpha$ at at Phil．1，17； 1 Iob．5，19（both 1519），in accordance with Vulgate usage at Hebr．1，2．
16 quicquid oo Tl ä̀v（＂quodcumque＂ 1516 $=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．14，13．
 $=$ Vg．；＂sub nomine＂1519）．See on Iob．5，43． Manetti substituted meum for in nomine meo， perhaps reflecting a Greek text in which èv Tũ ỏvóん๙xtı was omitted．
17 praecipio évт́̇̇入入ouă（＂mando＂1516－19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．8，5．Manetti put boc man－ datum do for baec mando（though in Pal．Lat． 45 ，the first hand had boc mando，changed to boc mandatum do by a later correction in the margin）．
17 vos mutuo ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ n่ $\lambda$ ous（＂inuicem＂1516－19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．13，34．
18 scitis $\gamma ı v \omega \dot{\sigma} \mathrm{KETE}$（＂scitote＂Vg．）．In Annot．， Erasmus comments on the ambiguity of the Greek verb，which can be indicative or im－ perative．Manetti had cognoscite（representing a later correction in Pal Lat．45，which originally seems to have had scitote）．
18 quod ．．．odio babuerit o̊ TI ．．．$\mu \varepsilon \mu \mathrm{i} \sigma \eta$ кеv（＂quia ．．．odio habuit＂Vg．；＂quod ．．．odio habuit＂ 1516）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti put quod ．．．odio babuit，as in Erasmus＇ 1516 edition．
18 priusquam vos тр $\omega$ тov ن́ $\mu \omega ̃ \nu$（＂priorem vobis＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．Erasmus prefers to take $\pi \rho \tilde{\sim}$ тоv as an adverb rather than an adjective： see Annot．
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 $\sigma K \alpha v \delta \alpha \lambda_{1} \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \tau \varepsilon .{ }^{2} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2} \sigma \omega v \alpha \gamma \omega \dot{-}$


fuissetis, mundus quod suum est, diligeret. Quia vero de mundo non estis, sed ego selegi vos de mundo, propterea odit vos mundus. ${ }^{20}$ Mementote sermonis quem ego dixi vobis: Non est seruus maior domino suo. Si me persequuti sunt, et vos persequentur. Si sermonem meum seruauerunt, et vestrum seruabunt. ${ }^{21}$ Sed haec omnia facient vobis propter nomen meum, quia non nouerunt eum qui misit me. ${ }^{22} \mathrm{Si}$ non venissem et loquutus fuissem eis, peccatum non haberent. Nunc autem non habent quod praetexant peccato suo. ${ }^{23}$ Qui me odit, is et patrem meum odit. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Si}$ opera non fecissem inter eos quae nemo alius fecit, peccatum non haberent. Nunc autem et viderunt et oderunt, non solum me, verum etiam patrem meum. ${ }^{25} \mathrm{Sed}$ boc accidit, vt compleatur sermo qui in lege eorum scriptus est: Odio habuerunt me gratis. ${ }^{26}$ Quum autem venerit paracletus, quem ego mittam vobis a patre, spiritus veritatis, qui a patre procedit, ille testimonium perhibebit de me. ${ }^{27}$ Quin et vos testes estis, quia $\mid a b$ initio mecum estis.

16 Haec loquutus sum vobis, vt ne quid offendamini. ${ }^{2}$ Alienos a synagogis facient vos. Sed veniet tempus, vt quisquis interficiet vos,

19 est $B-E$ : erat $A \mid$ selegi $B-E$ : elegi $A \mid 20$ sermonis $C-E$ : sermonis mei $A B \mid 21$ non nouerunt $B-E$ : nesciunt $A \mid 22$ non habent quod praetexant $B$ - $E$ : excusationem non habent de $A \mid$ 23 is $B$ - $E$ : om. $A \mid 24$ non solum me, verum etiam $B-E$ : et me et $A \mid 25$ hoc accidit $B-E$ (ital): om. $A \mid$ compleatur $B$ - $E$ : adimpleatur $A \mid 26$ spiritus $B$ - $E$ : spiritum $A \mid 27$ Quin $C-E$ : om. $A B \mid$ testes estis $B$ - $E$ : testimonium perhibebitis $A$
16,1 ne quid offendamini $B-E$ : non scandalizemini $A \mid 2$ tempus $B-E$ : hora $A \mid$ quisquis $B-E$ : omnis qui $A \mid$ interficiet $D E$ : interficit $A$, interficiat $B C$

19 quod suum est tò íBıov ("quod suum erat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Greek word will permit the use of either tense. However, the present tense is more in accord with classical Latin usage in this context.

19 selegi $\varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \xi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ("elegi" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus nowhere else uses seligo in the N.T. Since he retained eligo in vs. 16, it is possible that his present purpose was to vary the vocabulary.

20 sermonis toũ $\lambda$ óyou ("sermonis mei" 1516-19 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate pronoun mei could reflect the addition of $\mu \mathrm{ov}$, as found in some later Greek mss. Erasmus expressed his opinion in Annot., that the Vulgate addition is merely an attempt to convey the emphasis of the Greek article. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
21 vobis úpiv. Erasmus restores $\dot{U} \mu \pi{ }^{2} v$ with the aid of cod. 817 and the Vulgate, supported by codd. A $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N} 065$ and most later mss. His cod. 2 had $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{a} \varsigma$, as in a few other late mss., while cod. 1 had eis $\dot{\mu} \mu \tilde{\alpha} s$, also found in $7^{36} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{B} \mathrm{D}^{*}$.
21 non nouerunt oủk oïరaol ("nesciunt" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33.
22 non babent quod praetexant трóqooเv oủk ÊXoưı mepi ("excusationem non habent de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This use of paraphrase is relatively uncommon in Erasmus' translation of the Gospels. The verb practexo does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., though praetextus is used on four occasions. In Annot., Erasmus recommends praetextus, and explains that excusatio could refer to a justifiable form of defence, whereas $\pi \rho$ ó $_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$ orts implies a defence that is no more than a sham.
23 is et kal ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The pronoun is added, to provide a smoother connection with the earlier qui.
24 inter eos $\varepsilon$ ह́v oủtoĩs ("in eis" Vg.). A similar substitution of inter, in the sense of "among" is found at more than forty other passages, in non-reflexive phrases. For the reflexive use of inter se, etc., see on Ioh. 4,33. Manetti omitted the phrase.
24 non solum me, verum etiam kaì épè kaí ("et me et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For the frequent substitution of etiam for et, see on Ioh. 6,36. The phrase verum etiam is introduced at twenty-six other passages. The Vulgate uses this phrase only at Phil. 2,27, elsewhere preferring sed etiam. Manetti put just me et.
25 Sed boc accidit ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' ("Sed" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus added the words boc accidit to improve clarity, placing them in small type in 1519-27, and in italics in 1535.
25 compleatur $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \tilde{n}$ ("adimpleatur" 1516 $=$ late Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 5,17; 12,17; 13,14; Gal. 6,2 (1519), and also compleo for impleo at eleven further passages. At three passages, impleo is replaced by expleo:

Act. 7,23; 9,23 (both in 1519); Rom. 13,8. The verb compleo is sometimes used in this sense of "fulfil" in the Vulgate O.T. In the N.T., there are several passages where textual variants within the Vulgate tradition offer both impleo and adimpleo as alternative readings. In 1519, Erasmus retains adimpleo only at Mt. 21,4; Ioh. 13,18; Act. 13,33; Eph. 1,23. In 1519 Annot. on Mt. 1,22, he comments, incorrectly, that impleo is unknown in classical Latin usage in the sense of "accomplish". With this in mind, he altered a few instances of impleo to perficio at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel: Mt. 1,22; 2,15, 17 (all in 1519), while inconsistently retaining impleo in the same sense at a number of other passages, e.g. at Iob. 12,38; 18,32; 19,24, 36.
25 Odio babuerunt Őti 'E $\mu$ ion $\sigma \alpha v$ ("Quia odio habuerunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had just oderunt.
26 spiritus tò $\pi v \varepsilon u ̃ \mu \alpha$ ("spiritum" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus treats the phrase, spiritus veritatis, as being in apposition to paracletus: see Annot., following a suggestion of Valla Annot.
27 Quin et vos кai ن́uEĩ̌ $\delta$ ह́ ("et vos" 1516-19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . See on Ioh. 8,17. Manetti has et vos$ etiam.
27 testes estis $\mu \alpha \rho т и р \varepsilon i ̃ t e ~(" t e s t i m o n i u m ~ p e r h i b e-~$ bitis" 1516 = late Vg.). See on Iob. 1,7. Erasmus tacitly follows Valla Annot. in restoring the present tense. See Annot., where he recommends perbibetis, which was the reading of the earlier Vulgate. Manetti put testificabimini.
 te ("vt non scandalizemini" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The substitution of $v t$ ne occurs at ten other passages. For Erasmus' avoidance of $v t$ non, see on Iob. 3,20 , and for his removal of scandalizo, see on Iob. 6,61.
2 Alienos a synagogis đ̀тоouvorćyous ("Absque synagogis" Vg.). See on Ioh. 9. 22, and Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered by Extra synagogas.
2 veniet tempus épXєтоı $\omega \rho \propto$ ("venit hora" Vg.; "veniet hora" 1516). For Erasmus' treatment of $\frac{1}{\rho} \mathrm{pXO} \mathrm{\mu} \mathrm{\alpha l}$, see on Ioh. 4,25, and for the substitution of tempus, see on Ioh. 5,35. See also Annot.
 qui interficit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg} . ;$ "quisquis interficiat" 1519-22). See on Ioh. 4,14. Manetti put omnis qui interfecerit.
 ${ }^{3}$ kal taũta moiñoovolv Újĩv, ǒti oủk
























videatur cultum praestare deo. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Et}$ haec facient vobis, quia non nouerunt patrem neque me. ${ }^{4}$ Sed haec loquutus sum vobis, vt quum venerit tempus illud, reminiscamini eorum quod ego dixerim vobis. ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Haec}$ autem vobis ab initio non dixi, quia vobiscum eram. Nunc autem vado ad eum qui misit me, et nemo ex vobis interrogat me, quo vadam. ${ }^{6}$ Sed quia haec loquutus sum vobis, moestitudo impleuit cor vestrum. ${ }^{7}$ Sed ego veritatem dico vobis, expedit vobis vt ego vadam. Si enim non abiero, consolator ille non veniet ad vos. Sin autem abiero, mittam eum ad vos. ${ }^{8}$ Et quum venerit ille, arguet mundum de peccato et de iustitia et de iudicio. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{De}$ peccato quidem, quia non credunt in me. ${ }^{10}$ De iustitia vero, quia ad patrem vado, et posthac non videtis me. ${ }^{11} \mathrm{De}$ iudicio autem, quia princeps huius mundi iam iudicatus est. ${ }^{12}$ Ad haec multa habeo quae vobis dicam, sed non potestis portare nunc. ${ }^{13}$ Quum autem venerit ille qui est spiritus veritatis, ducet vos in

## 16,3 чиı $C-E: \eta \mu ı \operatorname{A} B$

2 praestare $B-E$ : exhibere $A \mid 4$ illud $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 5$ Nunc autem $B-E$ : Et nunc $A$ | vadam $B-E$ : vadis $A \mid 6$ moestitudo $B-E$ : tristicia $A \mid 7$ consolator ille $B-E$ : paracletus $A$ 10 posthac $B-E: \operatorname{iam} A \mid$ videtis $B-E$ : videbitis $A \mid 12$ quae vobis dicam $B-E$ : vobis dicere $A \mid$ nunc $B-E$ : modo $A \mid 13$ qui est $B-E$ : om. $A$

2 videatur $\delta$ ó $\ddagger$ ñ ("arbitretur ... se" Vg.). Erasmus is more literal here. In rendering ठok $\varepsilon \omega$ elsewhere, he inconsistently substitutes arbitror for puto at 1 Cor. 4,9; 2 Cor. 12,19, and opinor for videor at 1 Cor. 7,40 (1519). At Ioh. 21,25 (1519) he puts opinor for arbitror in rendering oluar. Sometimes he retains arbitror for such verbs as
 tions of videor for puto, see on Ioh. 5,39. See also Annot.

2 cultum $\lambda \propto$ треíav ("obsequium" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Rom. 9,$4 ; 12,1$. In classical Latin, obsequium refers to obedience rather than
religious observance: cf. Annot. The version of Manetti had obsequium diuini cultus.
2 praestare троб甲́́pєıv ("exhibere" 1516). The use of exhibeo may be compared with Erasmus' substitution of obsequiis ad oculum exbibitis at Col. 3,22 (for ó $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \circ \delta \circ \cup \lambda$ दíoıs). In 1519, Erasmus reverted to the Vulgate expression. Manetti substituted offerre.
3 vobis Ú $\mu i v$. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the late Vulgate in inserting this pronoun, with support from $\aleph \mathrm{D}$ and some later mss., though by a misprint the 1516-19 editions put $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \mathrm{i} v$. In codd. 2 and 817, supported
by codd．A B and most other mss．，the pronoun is omitted，in company with the earlier Vulgate， and also Manetti．
 $\mu \nu \eta \mu \circ \nu \varepsilon U ́ \eta T \varepsilon \propto \cup \cup T \omega ̃ \nu$（＂hora eorum，reminisca－ mini＂Vg．；＂tempus，reminiscamini eorum＂ 1516）．The Vulgate reflects a different Greek
 $\mathbf{N}^{\text {corr }}$ and a few later mss．Some early mss．also
 in $\mathbf{7}^{66 \text { vid }}$ A B and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod． 2 （except for its misspelling，$\mu \nu \eta \mu \mathrm{o}$ veveral，which he manually corrected to read $\mu \nu \eta \mu \circ v \varepsilon \dot{\prime} \eta \tau \varepsilon)$ ，with support from cod． $\mathbb{N}^{*}$ and most later mss．In cod．1，ци $\eta$ นovevieire is put

 retains the verb reminiscor，which occurs uniquely here in his N．T．，despite arguing for memores sitis or memineritis in Annot．At 2 Cor．7，15，he replaces reminisor with recolo．He renders the Greek article，$\grave{\eta}$ ，by illud，to show the connection with tempus in vs．2．On tempus for bora，see on Iob．5，35．
4 quod ．．．dixerim ${ }^{\text {OTTı }}$ ．．．Elmov（＂quia ．．．dixi＂ Vg．）．See on Iob．1，20．Manetti put quod ．．．dixi．
5 Nunc autem iõ̃v $\delta \varepsilon \in($＂Et nunc＂ 1516 Lat． $=$ late Vg ．）．The late Vulgate rendering is perhaps a corruption of $A t$ nunc，which is found in earlier Vulgate mss．Manetti anticipated Erasmus in putting Nunc autem here，which is the more usual Vulgate expression，as found in $L c .16,25$ ； 19，42；lob．8，40；15，22，24；17，13；18，36．
5 vadam $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{\pi}$ óýsis（＂vadis＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．Erasmus＇ translation converts direct to indirect speech． A similar shift to indirect speech occurs at Iob．4，39．
6 moestitudo ท่ $\lambda$ útn（＂tristicia＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）A similar substitution occurs at $L c .22,45$（1519）． In 1516，Erasmus replaced tristitia by dolor at Ioh． 16,21 ，and at several passages in the Epistles， this being more common than moestitudo（or maestitudo）in classical Latin usage．At some passages，he also used molestia for the same Greek word．Then in 1519，he substituted moeror at Iob． $16,20,22$ ，thus completing the removal of tristitia（or tristicia，as spelled in 1516）from the N．T．Cf．Annot．on Mt．26，38， commenting on his substitution of moestus for tristis．See on vs．20，below，for Erasmus＇removal of many instances of contristo．
6 impleuit $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \kappa \in \nu$（＂implebit＂Vg．1527）． The late Vulgate use of the future tense resulted
from a textual corruption，internal to the Latin tradition．Manetti had impleuit．
7 enim $\gamma$ óp．The Erasmian text follows cod． 1 and the Vulgate，with support from ※ B D and a few later mss．Codd． 2 and 817 have $\varepsilon$ है＇ as in cod．A and most later mss．
7 consolator ille ó mapák $\lambda \eta$ tos（＂paracletus＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．14，16．
7 Sin autem éàv dé（＂Si autem＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．10，38．
9 credunt TIఠTEÚoưıv（＂crediderunt＂late V g．）． The late Vulgate use of the perfect tense does not enjoy Greek ms．support．Manetti had credunt．
10 patrem $\pi \alpha \tau^{\prime} p \alpha$ ．The Erasmian text again follows cod． 1 and the Vulgate，supported by K B D W and some later mss．Codd． 2 and 817 add $\mu 0 v$ ，as found in cod．A and most of the later mss．，as reflected in Manetti＇s addition of meum．
10 posthac non oủkétı（＂iam non＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Iob．5，14．In Annot．，Erasmus advocates non amplius or postea．Manetti had non amplius here．
10 videtis $\theta$ E $\omega$ peit $\varepsilon$（＂videbitis＂ 1516 Lat．$=V g$ ．）． Similar changes of tense in rendering this verb occur at $I o b .14,19 ; 16,17,19$ ．See also Annot．
11 iam iudicatus est kéxpltal．Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in adding iam，without explicit Greek support．The word was omitted by Ma－ netti，in company with the earlier Vulgate．
12 Ad haec ÉTl（＂Adhuc＂Vg．）．Erasmus here interprets है́t as meaning＂in addition to this＂ rather than＂still＂．Usually he retains adbuc， and does not elsewhere render $\begin{gathered}\text { ext } \\ \text { in this way．}\end{gathered}$
12 quae vobis dicam $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \varepsilon ⿺ 辶$ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，33，for Erasmus＇ avoidance of the infinitive．
12 nunc äptı（＂modo＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．9，25．
13 ille qui est spiritus $\mathfrak{k} k$ Eivos tò $\pi v \varepsilon$ Ũमの（＂ille spiritus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus wishes to mark the distinction between ékeivos（masculine， referring back to $\delta$ т Tapák $\lambda \eta$ ๆtos in vs．7）and tó（neuter article，agreeing with $\pi v \in \tilde{u} \mu \mathrm{C})$ ：see Annot．A similar periphrasis is introduced at Iob．14，26（1519）．
 vos＂Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus criticises the Vul－ gate rendering，which translates the Greek verb as if it were $\delta ı \eta \gamma \eta \dot{\sigma} \in \tau \alpha 1$ ．See also his Resp．ad
$\pi \alpha ̃ \sigma \alpha v ~ T \eta ̀ v ~ \alpha ̛ ̉ \lambda \eta ́ \theta \varepsilon ı \alpha v ~ o u ̉ ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ \lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \dot{-}$














 tí éotiv ô $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$, тò Mıкрóv; oúk оî $\delta \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$ тi $\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃$. ${ }^{19}$ है $\gamma \nu \omega$ oũv ó






omnem veritatem. Non enim loquetur a semet ipso, sed quaecunque audierit, loquetur, et quae futura sunt, annunciabit vobis. ${ }^{14}$ Ille me glorificabit, quia de meo accipiet, et annunciabit vobis. ${ }^{15}$ Omnia quaecunque habet pater, mea sunt: propterea dixi vobis, quod de meo accipiet et annunciabit vobis. ${ }^{16}$ Pusillum, et non videtis me, et iterum pusillum et videbitis me, quia ego vado ad patrem. ${ }^{17}$ Dixerunt ergo quidam ex discipulis eius inter se: Quid est hoc quod dicit nobis, Pusillum et non videtis me, et rursus pusillum et videbitis me, et quia ego vado ad patrem? ${ }^{18}$ Dicebant ergo: Quid est hoc quod dicit, Pusillum? Nescimus quid loquatur. ${ }^{19}$ Cognouit autem Iesus quod vellent ipsum interrogare, et dixit eis: De hoc quaeritis inter vos quod dixi, Pusillum et non videtis me, et iterum pusillum et videbitis me? ${ }^{20}$ Amen amen dico vobis, plorabitis et lamentabimini vos,



15 prius vobis $E$ : om. $A-D \mid 16$ ego $C-E$ : om. $A B \mid 17$ quidam $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ ego $C-E$ : om. $A B \mid 19$ ipsum $C-E$ : se $A B \mid$ me? $A E$ : me. $B-D \mid 20$ alt. amen $A-C E$ : om. $D \mid$ plorabitis $B-E$ : quia plorabitis $A \mid$ lamentabimini $B-E$ : flebitis $A$
annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 193 C-D. Manetti put inducet vos in.
13 quaecunque ö $\sigma \alpha$ ỡv. The Erasmian text here follows the text of cod. 817, supported by cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss. Many mss. also have ő ơ $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ érv, as in cod. A. Erasmus' cod. 2 had ó $\varepsilon$ 白 $v$, apparently with no other ms. support, while cod. 1 had just ö $\sigma \alpha$ (omitting ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{v}$ ), as in $\mathcal{N} \mathrm{B} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{~W}$ and a few later mss.
13 audierit ởkoúoṇ ("audiet" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, d́kov́ré, as found in codd. B D W and some later mss., including codd. 1 and 2, with the result that this reading was adopted for the 1516 Greek text. The change to ớkov́on in 1519 was in accordance
with codd. 3 and 817, together with cod. $A$ and most later mss.
13 quae futura sunt tò̀ épXó sunt" Vg.). Erasmus is less literal here.
14 glorificabit So ${ }^{2} \alpha ́ \sigma \in 1$ ("clarificabit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,23.
15 dixi vobis altov ("dixi" 1516-27 = Vg.). In 1535 Annot., Erasmus does not explain his addition of vobis, though it corresponds with $\dot{U} \mu i \pi v$ in a few mss., such as $\boldsymbol{k}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$.
15 quod ötl ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
15 accipiet $\lambda \dot{\prime} \psi \varepsilon T \alpha 1$. Erasmus follows cod. 2 (apart from its misspelling, $\lambda(\psi \in \tau \alpha)$ ) and the

Vulgate, supported by $\chi^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A}$ and some later mss. In cod. 2, the words toũ Époũ 入iүeta appear to be the work of an early corrector. The reading of codd. 1 and 817 was $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v e \mathrm{e}$, as found in B D N W 068 and most later mss. Erasmus' less well attested reading persisted into the Texcus Receptus.
16 Pusillum (twice) uıкрóv ("Modicum" Vg.). See on Ioh. 7,33; 13,33.
16 non oun ("iam non" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, oúkétr, as in ${ }^{3} \beta^{66 v i d}$ K B D N W 068 and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by cod. A and most later mss. Manetti put non amplius for iam non.
16 ego $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\text { c }}$ (omitted in $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The omission of $\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \dot{\omega}$ in 1516-19 followed codd. 1, 2 and 817, in company with the Vulgate, and codd. A N 068 and most of the later mss. Several early mss. omit the whole clause, of 1 ... Tactépa, namely $3{ }^{566}$ K B D W. Erasmus' insertion of ${ }^{\mathbf{\varepsilon}} \gamma \dot{\text { c }}$ in 1522 had the support of some late mss., possibly originating from harmonisation with vs. 17, and this was the reading which survived into the Textus Recpptus. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus
17 quidam ex èk ("ex" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus adds quidam for clarification.
17 inter se mpòs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \lambda o u s(" a d ~ i n u i c e m " ~ V g) . ~.$. See on Iob. 4,33.
17 nobis $\bar{\eta} \mu \tilde{v}$. The reading $\dot{\text { Univiv }}$ in $1522-7$ is probably a misprint, as there is no corresponding change in the Latin rendering, though it is also found in the Aldine edition, which Erasmus used when preparing his edition of 1522.
17 Pusillum (twice) Mıкpóv ("Modicum" Vg.). See on Iob. 7,33; 13,33, and Annot.
17 videtis $\theta$ eढpeiite (videbitis" Vg.). See on vs. 10, and Annot.
17 rutsus $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda 1 \nu$ ("iterum" Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,9. 17 et quia kai önı ("quia" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate omission is supported only by a few later Greek mss., representing a harmonisation with vs. 16. Erasmus follows the earlier Vulgate rendering, also adopted by Manetti.
17 ego érć (omitted in 1516-19 Lat. $=V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{5 \text { svid } 66 \text { vid }}$ $\aleph \mathrm{A} B \mathrm{~N}$ and some later mss., including cod. 817. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 1 and 2, in company with codd. D W and most later mss. The same change was made by Manetti.

18 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon$ ¢́єı ("dicit nobis" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate addition of nobis has little Greek ms. support. Manetti omitted the word.
18 Pusillum tò Mıкpóv ("Modicum" Vg.). See on Iob. 7,33; 13,33. The spelling $\mu$ ıkpós in 1516 is a misprint.
18 loquatur $\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{I}$ ("loquitur" Vg.). Erasmus uses the subjunctive for indirect questions after scio and nescio, etc.
19 autem $\mathrm{ov}^{\circ} v$. Erasmus' rendering follows the Vulgate, which reflects a Greek variant, substituting $\delta \hat{\xi}$, as found in some later mss. His Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by most other mss., commencing with codd. A N. The particle is omitted in $3^{5} \aleph$ B DW and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Manetti put ergo.
 Vg .). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod volebant.
19 ipsum á̛тóv ("eum" Vg.; "se" 1516-19). Erasmus, in 1522 , prefers to avoid the ambiguity of $s e$, and substitutes ipsum to refer back to the subject of the sentence.
19 Ep $\rho \tau \eta \pi \sigma a x$. This reading is based on cod. 2,
 rected by Erasmus to read Ep $\rho \omega \tau \eta \pi \sigma a$. This reading appears to have no other ms. support, though cod. D has $\dot{k}^{2} \varepsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta \pi \sigma a l$. The reading of codd. 1 and 817 is $\varepsilon p \omega \tau \alpha ̃ v$, as found in virtually all other mss.
19 quod (2nd.) ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti made the same change.
19 Pusillum (twice) Mıкpóv ("Modicum" Vg.). See on Ioh. 7,33; 13,33.
19 videtis $\theta \in \omega$ реite ("videbitis" Vg.). See on vs. 10.
20 amen (2nd.) $\alpha \mu \dot{\eta} v$ (omitted in 1527 Lat.). The 1527 omission was probably a printing error.
20 plorabitis ótı к入ఎর́סete ("quia plorabitis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod plorabitis.
20 lamentabimini $\theta$ р $\eta v$ ท́бete ("flebitis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus prefers to reserve fleo to translate $\kappa \lambda \alpha i \omega$. Valla similarly distinguished between fleo, with reference to weeping, and lamentor, which was performed "voce querula et tristi oratione": Elegantiae, V, 52; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 256, 11. 343349. Erasmus' substitution of lamentor is consistent with Vulgate usage at $L c .23,27$, though at
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mundus contra, gaudebit. Vos autem moerore afficiemini, sed moeror vester vertetur in gaudium. ${ }^{21}$ Mulier quum parit, dolorem habet, quia venit hora eius. Quum autem pepererit puerum, iam non meminit anxietatis: propterea quod gaudeat hominem esse natum in mundo. ${ }^{22}$ Et vos igitur nunc quidem moerorem habetis, sed iterum videbo vos, et gaudebit cor vestrum, et gaudium vestrum nemo tollit a vobis. ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Et}$ in illo die me non interrogabitis quicquam. Amen amen dico vobis, quaecunque petieritis patrem in nomine meo, dabit vobis. ${ }^{24}$ Hactenus non petistis quicquam in nomine meo. Petite, et accipietis, vt gaudium vestrum sit perfectum.
${ }^{25}$ Haec per prouerbia loquutus sum vobis. Veniet tempus, quum iam non per prouerbia loquar vobis, sed palam de patre meo annunciabo vobis. ${ }^{26}$ In illo die in nomine meo petetis. Et


20 contra $B-E$ : autem $A$ | moerore afficiemini $B-E$ : contristabimini $A \mid$ moeror vester $B-E$ : tristicia vestra $A \mid 21$ anxietatis ... mundo $B-E$ : pressurae propter gaudium, quia natus est homo in mundum $A \mid 22$ moerorem $B-E$ : tristiciam $A \mid$ habetis $B-E$ : habetis se $A \mid 23$ quaecunque $B-E$ : si quid $A \mid$ alt. in $A C-E$ : sub $B \mid 24 \operatorname{in} A C E$ : sub $B \mid$ perfectum $B-E$ : impletum $A \mid$ 25 prius per prouerbia $B-E:$ in prouerbiis $A$ | Veniet tempus $B-E:$ Venit hora $A$ alt. per prouerbia $B$-E: in prouerbiis $A \mid 26$ alt. in $A$ C-E: sub $B$

Mt. 11,17; Lc. 7,32 (both in 1519), he puts lugubria cano for lamento. In Annot., he also suggests lugebitis. Manetti proposed vlulabitis.
20 contra $\delta \dot{E}$ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution occurs several times in the Epistles, at 1 Cor. 7,34; 14,22; 2 Cor. 7,10; Gal. 5,22 (1519); Iac. 1,10. Erasmus further replaces vero by contra at Rom. 9,31; 1 Cor. 11,15. See also on Ioh. 1,26 regarding the avoidance of autem.
20 moerore afficiemini $\lambda \cup \pi \eta \theta$ خं $\sigma \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ("contristabimini" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Similar substitutions occur elsewhere in 1519, at Mt. 17,23; 2 Cor. 2,24;


It is not a phrase which occurs in the Vulgate or in the 1516 edition. However, in 1516, Erasmus replaces contristo with a variety of other expressions: putting indolesco at Mt. 14,9; 18,31 (for $\lambda \cup \pi \pi^{\prime} \epsilon$ ), condolesco at Mc. 3,5 (for $\sigma \cup \lambda \lambda \cup \pi \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha$ ), dolore afficio at Mc. 6,26 (for mepìivtos rivouax), tristis redditus at Mc. 10,22 (for otuyváoas), doleo at 1 Thess. 4,13, and afligo at 1 Petr. 1,6 (both for $\lambda u \pi t \varepsilon \omega)$. For Erasmus' idiomatic use of afficio, see also on Iob. 8,49. In 1519, he removes contristo at a further twelve passages, though at eight passages this verb is retained. Cf. on vs. 6, for Erasmus' treatment of tristitia. The verb contristo is not
common in classical Latin prose writers, whereas moereo and moeror (or rather, maereo and maeror) were better established.
20 moeror vester $\dagger \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda u ́ \pi \eta \eta \dot{U} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("tristicia vestra" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 6. Manetti's version (both mss.) omits the clause sed tristicia ... gaudium.
21 тіктท!. The reading тiктєı in 1516 -19 is taken from cod. 2, supported by some other late mss.
 vs. 6.
21 pepererit $\begin{array}{r} \\ \text { vinion ( } \\ \text { ("peperit" Vg. 1527). The }\end{array}$ late Vulgate rendering, which substitutes the perfect tense for the future perfect, is supported by many Vulgate mss.
21 anxietatis $T \eta ̃ s ~ \theta \lambda i \psi \psi \epsilon \omega$ ("pressurae" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs in 1519 at Lc. 21,25, in rendering ouvox $\dot{n}$, and in 1516 Erasmus uses anxietas several times to replace angustia: at Rom. 2,9; 2 Cor. 2,4; 6,4; 12,10 (for $\sigma$ тevoxwpia in these last two instances). At other passages, in rendering $\theta \lambda i \psi 15$, e.g. at lob. 16,33 (1519), he tends to replace pressura or tribulatio by afflictio. The word pressura is not used in this sense in classical Latin, and tribulatio was not used at all by classical authors.
21 propterea quod gaudeat hominem esse natum
 ("propter gaudium quia natus est homo" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is less literal in this rewriting of the sentence structure, but produces a purer Latin idiom. His insertion of the article, $\delta$, before a̛vөp $\omega$ tros, was in defiance of his mss., though it is supported by cod. ${ }^{*}$.
21 in mundo छis tòv кóбuov ("in mundum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This rendering of the Greek prepositional phrase is less accurate than the Vulgate.
22 moerorem $\lambda u ́ \pi \eta \nu$ ("tristiciam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 6.
22 sed iterum $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda 1 \nu \bar{\nu} \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("iterum autem" Vg.; "se. Sed iterum" 1516). See on Iob. 1,26, regarding the use of sed. The addition of se in 1516 was a printing error. Possibly the compositor began by putting Sed iterum, and then a proof-reader wrote se in the margin, to show that the capital letter was to be changed to lower-case, which the compositor misunderstood as an instruction that se should be inserted rather than substituted.

22 tollit aipes ("tollet" Vg.). A similar change of tense occurs at loh. 15,2 (1519). The Vulgate here corresponds with the reading dopeĩ, found in $7^{5}{ }^{5}$ B D* and a few later mss. Erasmus follows codd. 1, 2 and 817, together with most other mss., commencing with $\exists^{22} \wedge$ A C $D^{\text {corr }}$. See Annot.
23 ép. $\sigma \varepsilon T a l$ from cod. 2, an itacistic scribal error, characteristic of the ms. This was corrected in the 1516 errata.
23 quaecunque őтı ő $\sigma \alpha$ ả̛v ("si quid" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.) See on Iob. 13,20. The Vulgate may have followed a different Greek text, such as a $\alpha v \mathrm{~T}$,
 Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by most other late mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Other variants also exist. Manetti put quod quecunque.
23 in nomine $\varepsilon$ हैv т $\uparrow$ óvó $\alpha \alpha$ ("sub nomine" 1519 only). See on Ioh. 5,43, and Annot.
24 Hactenus $\varepsilon$ है $\omega$ s ãpтı ("Vsque modo" Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,17.

24 in év ("sub" 1519 only). See on Ioh. 5,43, and Annot.
 pletum" 1516). This substitution is comparable with Erasmus' use of perficio in 1519 to replace impleo at Mt. 1,22; 2,15, 17: see on Iob. 15,25. Cf. also 2 Iob. 12, where plenus is replaced by completus. Manetti had impletum at the present passage.
25 per prouerbia (twice) iv mapoumians ("in prouerbiis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 3,21.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For the future tense, see on $I o b$. 4,25 , and regarding tempus, see on Ioh. 5,35 . The
 following cod. 1 and the Vulgate, with support from $77^{\text {svid }} 66 \aleph$ B C $D^{*} W$ and some later mss. The word $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ or $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}$ is found in codd. 2 and 817 , in company with codd. A C ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}$ N and most later mss.

25 patre meo toũ matpós. In his rendering, Erasmus retains the added pronoun from the late Vulgate. Although a few of the later Greek mss. add uov, they are not likely to have affected the late Vulgate translation.
26 in (2nd.) èv ("sub" 1519 only). See on Iob. 5,43, and Annot.
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non dico vobis, quod ego rogaturus sim patrem pro vobis. ${ }^{27}$ Ipse enim pater amat vos, quia vos me amastis et credidistis, quod a deo exiuerim. ${ }^{28}$ Exiui a patre, et veni in mundum: iterum relinquo mundum, et vado ad | patrem. ${ }^{29}$ Dicunt ei discipuli eius: Ecce nunc aperte loqueris, nec prouerbium vllum dicis. ${ }^{30}$ Nunc scimus quod scis omnia, nec opus est tibi vt quis te interroget. Per hoc credimus, quod a deo existi. ${ }^{31}$ Respondit eis Iesus: Nunc creditis. ${ }^{32}$ Ecce instat tempus, et iam venit, vt dispergamini vnusquisque in sua, meque solum relinquatis. Et tamen non sum solus, quia pater mecum est. ${ }^{33} \mathrm{Haec}$ loquutus sum vobis, vt in me pacem habeatis: in mundo afflictionem habetis, sed bono animo sitis, ego vici mundum.

17Haec loquutus est Iesus, et sublatis oculis in coelum, dixit: Pater, venit hora, glorifica filium tuum, vt et filius tuus glorificet te. ${ }^{2}$ Sicut dedisti ei potestatem omnis carnis, vt quotquot dedisti ei, det eis vitam aeternam. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Haec}$ est autem vita aeterna, vt cognoscant te solum deum verum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum. ,
 ("quia ego rogabo" Vg.; "quod ego rogabo" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ego rogabo, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
26 pro $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{i}$ ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution is consistent with Vulgate usage, in the context of prayer, at $L c .22,32$; Iob. 17,9, 20 and several other passages. Manetti made the same change.
 ... exiui" late Vg.; "quod ... exiui" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,20. The earlier Vulgate was more literal in inserting ego after quia, as in vs. 26. Manetti had quod ... exiui.
29 aperte $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \eta \sigma i \alpha(" p a l a m " 1516=$ Vg.). See on loh. 10,24.
 $\mu i \alpha v$ ("et prouerbium nullum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For nec, see on Ioh. 2,16.
30 quod (twice) őtı ("quia" Vg.; "quia ... quod" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
30 nec kai oủ ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,16.
$30 \operatorname{Per}$ èv ("In" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 3,21.
31 eis aủtoĩs ("ei" 1522 Lat.). This change was probably a misprint. See on Ioh. 9,20.
31 Nunc "Aptı ("Modo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,25.
 $1516=$ Vg.). Regarding insto, see on Ioh. 6,4, and for tempus, see on Ioh. 5,35 . Elsewhere in the Gospels, Erasmus uses insto to represent
 at $A c 18,21$. At the present passage, he wished to avoid the sequence venit ... venit to convey the present and perfect tenses of $\varepsilon$ ex explained in Annot. For the same reason, Valla Annot. had suggested using aduentat here.
32 sua Tò 1 ťı $\alpha$ ("propria" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,11.
32 meque kà $\varepsilon$ है'́́ ("et me" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
32 Et tamen non kaì oủk ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 7,19.
33 afflictionem $\theta \lambda i \psi ı v$ ("pressuram" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 21.
33 babetis ÉXete ("habebitis" Vg.). The Vulgate future tense corresponds with ${ }^{\xi} \xi \varepsilon T \varepsilon$, as in cod. D and a few later mss., including codd. 1,69 and $817^{*}$. In Annot., Erasmus refers only to ÉXete, and shows no awareness of the other
reading. His text agrees with codd. 2 and $817^{\text {corr }}$, supported by $\$$ A B C (N W) and most later mss., as well as Valla Annot.
33 bono animo sitis $\theta \alpha \rho \sigma \varepsilon i ̃ t e ~(" c o n f i d i t e " ~ 1516$ $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 9,2; 14,27 (for babeo fiduciam); Mc. 10,49 (for animaequior sum); Act. 23,11 (for constans sum), all rendering the same Greek verb. This is comparable with Vulgate usage of bono animo in rendering ev̛̉vú́c at Act. 27,22, 25. Erasmus, however, retains confido at Mt. 9,22; Mc. 6,50; and inserts it at $L c .8,48$. See also on Ioh. 6,47.
17,1 sublatis oculis ... dixit ériñpe toùs ó $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \circ$ '̀s वÚToŨ ... kal $\varepsilon$ โTா ("subleuatis oculis ... dixit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 6,5 for a comparable substitution. In using a participle, Erasmus follows the Vulgate construction. However, the Vulgate probably followed a Greek text which replaced ध̇ார̃̃pe with émópas and deleted kaí after oúpavóv, as found in $7^{66 v i d} * B C^{*}$ D W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with A $C^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ and most of the later mss. For this reason, Manetti changed the translation to eleuauit oculos suos ... et dixit.
 ("clarifica ... clarificet" $1516=$ Vg.). See on lob. 12,23.

1 vt et ivo koil ("vt" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text omitting kox, as in $\mathcal{N}$ A B $\mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ W 0301 and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by $\mathbf{7 p}^{107 \mathrm{vid}} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ and most later mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
2 quotquot $\pi \tilde{\alpha} v$ ő ("omne quod" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus usually reserves quotquot to render o $\sigma 01$, more frequently than in the Vulgate.
2 है $\delta \omega \mathrm{k} \alpha{ }^{2}$ (2nd.). Erasmus follows cod. 2, in company with many other late mss. In codd. 1 and 817 , the reading is $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \omega k \alpha$, perfect tense, as also found in К A B C D N W and most later mss. This does not affect the Latin translation.
$2 \delta \omega \sigma \eta$. The reading $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \varepsilon 1$, in the 1516 Greek text, is found in codd. 1, 2 and 817 , supported by most other mss., commencing with codd. B N 0301. In the 1516 errata, this was altered to $\delta \omega \sigma \eta$ (sic), which became $\delta \omega \sigma \eta$ in 1519, with the support of $\boldsymbol{X}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{AC}$ and some later mss. In choosing this reading, Erasmus was perhaps swayed by the grammatical propriety of having a subjunctive after iva.
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${ }^{4}$ Ego te glorificaui super terram, opus consummaui quod dedisti mihi vt facerem. ${ }^{5}$ Et nunc glorifica me tu pater apud temet ipsum gloria quam habui, priusquam hic mundus esset, apud te. ${ }^{6}$ Manifestaui nomen tuum hominibus, quos dedisti mihi de mundo. Tui erant, et mihi eos dedisti, et sermonem tuum seruauerunt. ${ }^{7}$ Nunc cognouerunt quod omnia quaecunque dedisti mihi, abs te sunt. ${ }^{8}$ Quia verba quae dedisti mihi, dedi eis: et ipsi acceperunt: et cognouerunt vere, quod a te exiui: et crediderunt quod tu me misisti. ${ }^{9}$ Ego pro eis rogo. Non pro mundo rogo, sed pro his quos dedisti mihi, quia tui sunt. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Et}$ mea omnia tua sunt, et tua mea sunt, et glorificatus sum in eis. ${ }^{11} \mathrm{Et}$ iam non sum in mundo, et hi in mundo sunt, et ego ad te venio. Pater sancte, serua eos per nomen tuum, quos dedisti mihi: vt sint vnum, sicut et nos. ${ }^{12}$ Quum essem cum eis in mundo, ego seruabam eos nomine tuo. Quos dedisti mihi, ego custodiui, et nemo ex eis periit, nisi filius ille perditus, vt scriptura compleretur. ${ }^{13}$ Nunc autem ad te venio, et haec loquor in mundo, vt habeant gaudium meum impletum in semet ipsis. ${ }^{14}$ Ego tradidi eis sermonem tuum et mundus eos odio habuit: quia non sunt de mundo, sicut et ego non sum de mundo. ${ }^{15}$ Non rogo vt tollas eos e mundo, sed vt serues eos a malo. ${ }^{16}$ De mundo non sunt, sicut et ego non sum de mundo. ${ }^{17}$ Sanctifica



4 facerem $B-E$ : faciam $A \mid 7$ quaecunque $B-E$ : quecunque $A \mid 9$ alt. rogo $A^{c} B-E$ : om. $A^{*} \mid$ 11 per nomen tuum $B-E$ : in nomine tuo $A \mid 12$ in mundo $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ nomine $B-E$ : in nomine $A \mid$ ille perditus $B-E$ : perditionis $A \mid$ compleretur $B-E$ : impleatur $A \mid 14$ tradidi $B-E: \operatorname{dedi} A \mid 15$ e $B-E: \operatorname{de} A$

4 glorificaui é $\delta$ '́ $\xi \alpha \sigma \alpha$ ("clarificaui" Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,23.
 mus observes a more classically correct sequence of tenses, in which he was anticipated by Manetti.

5 glorifica ... gloria סó\}aøov ... סó乡ṇ ("clarifica ... claritate" Vg.). See on Iob. 5,41; 12,23, and Annot.

5 bic mundus tòv кóouov ("mundus" Vg.). Erasmus is less literal here. At Ioh. 1,9; 11,27, in the 1519 edition, he removes bunc before mundum, arguing against the Vulgate rendering in Annot. on Ioh. 1,9.

5 esset عlval ("fieret" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering may, as suggested in Annot., reflect a different Greek text, $\gamma i v \in \sigma \theta \alpha 1$, but the only support for this is $\gamma \dot{\varepsilon} v \in \sigma \theta \alpha_{1}$ in cod. D, which may be a retranslation from the Latin. In Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 193 F-194 A, Erasmus asserted that he found Elval in most of the Greek mss. ("plurimis Graecorum libris").

6 tuum (2nd.) oou ("meum" late Vg.). The firstperson pronoun substituted by the late Vulgate has minimal support from Greek mss. Manetti had tuum.

7 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

7 quaecunque ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \alpha$ ("quae" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here, as there is little ms. justification for ${ }^{\circ}$, which might otherwise have been thought to underlie the Vulgate rendering.

8 quod (twice) ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Tt}$ ("quia" Vg.). See on loh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.

10 glorificatus sum $\delta \in \delta o ́ \xi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha ı$ ("clarificatus sum" Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,23.
 nomine tuo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,43.

11 quos oús. Erasmus' Greek text here deviates from his usual mss., under the influence of the Vulgate. His codd. 1, 2 and 817 all had $\dot{\omega}$ (referring back to obvóucrı), as found in $7^{66 v i d} 107 \times$ A B C W and most of the later mss. The reading ouvs is found only in codd. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ and a few later mss., including
cod. 69. It is possible that Erasmus obtained this reading from cod. 69 , or a closely related ms., while he was in England, though there is no reference to this point in Annot. The change could equally have been made through simple conjecture, based on the Vulgate, either by Erasmus or one of his assistants who noted a discrepancy between quos and $\grave{\omega}$. This less well attested reading remained in the Textus Receptus.

11 et nos $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \mu \varepsilon i ̃ s$. The reading $\dot{\sim} \mu \varepsilon i ̃ \Omega$, in the 1516 22 editions, is no more than a printer's error. Erasmus retains et from the Vulgate, with some ms. support, including $\not \mathrm{P}^{107} \mathrm{~B}^{*}$ and cod. 69, which insert kal before $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \varepsilon i ̃ s$. Most other mss. omit kaí.

12 in mundo हैv T巛̃ кó $\sigma \mu \omega$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of $7^{66} \aleph$ B C ${ }^{*}$ D W and a few later mss., including cod. 1. The Greek wording here follows codd. 2 and 817, with support from codd. A C ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ and most of the later mss. Manetti also added in mundo.
 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 5,43.

12 ego custodiui $\dot{\varepsilon} \varphi \cup ́ \lambda \alpha \xi \alpha$. Erasmus retains the pronoun, ego, from the later Vulgate, although it is not supported by Greek mss. or by mss. of the earlier Vulgate. Manetti omitted the word.

12 ille perditus $T \tilde{j} 5$ ártanéás ("perditionis" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus wishes to eliminate the Hebraism, as explained in Annot. A similar change occurs at 2 Thess. 2,3 (1519).

12 compleretur $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \tilde{\eta}_{n}$ ("impleatur" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 15,25 .

14 tradidi $\delta$ é $\delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ ("dedi" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' adoption of trado was perhaps motivated by the feeling that to "give" a word was an unnatural form of expression.

14 et ego $\varepsilon$ y $\omega$. Erasmus retains et from the Vulgate, though unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti omitted the word.
$15 e$ द́k ("de" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
16 et ego è $\gamma \omega \dot{ }$. As in vs. 14, Erasmus again retains et from the Vulgate, with little Greek ms. support apart from cod. D. Manetti omitted it.
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eos per veritatem tuam. Sermo tuus veritas est. ${ }^{18}$ Sicut tu me misisti in mundum, ita et ego misi eos in mundum, ${ }^{19}$ et pro eis ego sanctifico me ipsum, vt sint et ipsi sanctificati per veritatem. ${ }^{20}$ Non pro eis autem rogo tantum, sed et pro iis qui credituri sunt per sermonem eorum in me: ${ }^{21} \mathrm{vt}$ omnes vnum sint: sicut tu pater in me, et ego in te, vt et ipsi in nobis vnum sint, vt credat mundus quod tu me miseris, ${ }^{22}$ et ego gloriam quam dedisti mihi, dedi eis: vt sint vnum, sicut et nos vnum sumus. ${ }^{23}$ Ego in eis, et tu in me, vt sint consummati in vnum, et vt cognoscat mundus, quod tu me misisti, et dilexisti eos, sicut et me dilexisti. ${ }^{24}$ Pater, quos dedisti mihi, volo: vt vbi sum ego, et illi sint mecum: vt videant gloriam | meam, LB 408
$26 \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \eta$ A B D E: $\eta \gamma \alpha \pi \eta C$

17 per veritatem tuam $B$-E: in veritate $A \mid 19$ per veritatem $B$-E: in veritate $A \mid 20$ iis $B$-E: eis $A \mid$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 21$ miseris $B-E$ : misisti $A \mid 23$ quod $B-E$ : quia $A \mid$ 24 conditum mundum $B-E$ : constitutionem mundi $A \mid 25$ miseris $B-E$ : misisti $A$
18,1 cedron $B-E$ : cedrorum $A$
 veritate" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . For Erasmus' use of$ per, see on Ioh. 3,21. The Vulgate omission of
tuam reflects the omission of $\sigma 0 u$ by $7^{766} \mathrm{~A}$ B C* D W and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817,
supported by $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ and most later mss． Manetti put in veritate tua．
 $t u$ from the late Vulgate，without explicit Greek support．The word was omitted by Manetti，in company with the earlier Vulgate．
18 ita et ego kởץ́㇒．In Annot．，Erasmus also argues for a more literal alternative rendering， omitting ita，as in earlier copies of the Vulgate． The word was omitted by Manetti．
 $=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．3，21．
20 iis $\boldsymbol{\tau} \omega{ }^{2} v$（＂eis＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．Erasmus prefers the spelling io before a relative pronoun．
20 qui credituri sunt mıбт\＆uoóvtcuv．Erasmus＇ Greek text deserts his usual codd．1， 2 and 817， which all read mıбтєvóvtc $\nu$ ，in the present tense．The change to mortevoóvtcu，future tense，was a conjecture by Erasmus or one of his assistants，designed to produce conformity with the Vulgate，for which the only Greek ms． support was the testimony of cod． $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr．}}$ ．This questionable variant persisted into the Textus Receptus．For other pro－Vulgate conjectures，see on Ioh．4，48．
20 sermonem тоũ $\lambda$ óyou（＂verbum＂ $1516=$ Vg．）． See on loh．1，1．
21 quod ．．．miseris őtı ．．．ártéのтєı入入s（＂quia ．．． misisti＂Vg．；＂quod ．．．misisti＂1516）．See on Iob． 1,20 ．This is the first change by the 1516 Latin rendering since vs．10．Manetti had quod ．．． misisti．
22 gloriam тìv סó̧av（＂claritatem＂Vg．）．See on Iob．5，41．
22 dedisti $\delta$ é $\delta \omega k \alpha s$（＂tu dedisti＂late Vg．）．Eras－ mus this time restores the earlier Vulgate reading by omitting the pronoun，which is an amplifi－ cation of the Greek verb．Manetti also omitted $t u$ ．
22 at nos $\dagger \mu \varepsilon i ̃ s . ~ E r a s m u s ~ r e t a i n s ~ t h e ~ a d d e d ~ e t ~$ of the late Vulgate，with little Greek ms．support． The word was omitted by Manetti，in company with the earlier Vulgate．
23 et vt kai iva（＂et＂Vg．）．The Vulgate may reflect a different Greek text，omitting iva，as in $3{ }^{66} \mathbb{X} W$ and a few later mss．，including cod． 1．A few other mss．also read iva without kad， as in codd．B C D．Erasmus follows codd． 2 and 817 ，supported by most other mss．，com－ mencing with codd．A N ．The same change was made by Manetti．

23 quod őtı（＂quia＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob ． 1，20．Manetti also made this change．
23 et me è $\mu$ é．Once again，Erasmus follows the Vulgate in retaining et，this time with little ms． support other than cod．W．
24 sum ego elıi $\varepsilon$ éyć（＂ego sum＂Vg．）．The Vulgate word－order lacks specific Greek support． Some late Vulgate copies，including the Froben edition of 1491，had sum ego，as found in Erasmus＇rendering，and the same word－order was used by Manetti．
24 gloriam тìv $\delta o ́ \xi \alpha v$（＂claritatem＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．5，41．
 stitutionem mundi＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar change occurs at Hebr．9，26（for origine mundi）； 1 Petr．1，20；Ap．Ioh．17，8（1519）．At Mt．25，34 （1519），Erasmus substitutes exordium for consti－ tutio．At Eph．1，4；Hebr．4，3，he makes use of the expression iacio fundamenta．He retains constitutio mundi at Mt．13，35；Lc．11，50，and origo mundi at Ap．Ioh．13，8．
25 סíkaıc．Here cod． $2^{*}$ had $\approx \gamma 1 \varepsilon$ ，which arose from harmonisation with vs．11，apparently without other other ms．support．Erasmus in－ serted סíkale into the margin of the ms．，in agreement with codd． 1 and 817 ，together with virtually all other mss．，and the Vulgate．
25 et（1st．）kai（omitted in late Vg．）．The late Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of cod．D，but nearly all other mss．have kai． Manetti also had et．
 misisti＂Vg．；＂quod ．．．misisti＂1516）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti put quod ．．．misisti，as in Erasmus＇ 1516 edition．
26 ipsis（1st．）aủtoĩs（＂eis＂Vg．1527）．Eras－ mus＇rendering here coincides with the earlier Vulgate．
 In 151 h Annot．，Erasmus（following a suggestion of Valla Annot．）argued that the presence of the article showed that $K \varepsilon \delta \delta \rho \omega \nu$ was not simply a Hebrew name，and he therefore provided a translation of the word，cedrorum or＂of the cedars＂．Later，he reverted to the interpretation of Reuchlin，that it was a Hebrew name after all，and restored the Vulgate wording（though the Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant，toũ Kєठpผ่v，found in cod．A and a few later mss．）． The point was discussed in his Apolog．resp．Iac． Lop．Stun．，ASD IX，p．136，11．531－541．
 वủtóv，тòv тóттоv，őTı то入入ókıs $\sigma \cup v \eta ́ X O \eta$
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12 ＇H oũv $\sigma \pi$ हĩpa kaì ò Xı入íapXos kaì

eius．${ }^{2}$ Nouerat autem et Iudas，qui prodebat eum，locum，quia frequenter Iesus conuenerat illuc cum discipulis suis．${ }^{3}$ Iudas ergo quum accepisset co－ hortem，et a pontificibus ac Pharisaeis ministros，venit illuc cum laternis ac facibus et armis．${ }^{4}$ Iesus itaque sciens omnia quae ventura erant super se， processit ac dixit eis：Quem quaeritis？ ${ }^{5}$ Responderunt ergo ei：Iesum Nazare－ num．Dicit eis Iesus：Ego sum．Stabat autem et Iudas，qui prodebat eum， cum ipsis．${ }^{6}$ Vt ergo dixit eis，Ego sum： abierunt retrorsum et ceciderunt in terram．${ }^{7}$ Iterum ergo interrogauit eos： Quem quaeritis？Illi autem dixerunt： Iesum Nazarenum．${ }^{8}$ Respondit Iesus： Dixi vobis，quod ego sum．Si ergo me quaeritis，sinite hos abire．${ }^{9} \mathrm{Vt}$ com－ pleretur sermo quem dixerat：Ex iis quos dedisti mihi，non perdidi quen－ quam．${ }^{10}$ Simon ergo Petrus quum haberet gladium，eduxit eum，et per－ cussit pontificis seruum，et abscidit auriculam eius dextram．Erat autem nomen seruo Malchus．${ }^{11}$ Dicit ergo Iesus Petro：Immitte gladium tuum in vaginam．An non bibam poculum quod dedit mihi pater？
${ }^{12}$ Cohors igitur et tribunus ac mi－ nistri Iudaeorum comprehenderunt

18，10 єт๙ıбє $B-E: \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \nu ~ A$
2 Nouerat $B-E$ ：Sciebat $A \mid$ prodebat $B-E$ ：tradebat $A \mid 3$ prius ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ alt．ac $B-E$ ： et $A \mid 4$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid 5$ ergo $D E$ ：om．$A$－C｜prodebat $B-E$ ：tradebat $A \mid 8$ sum $A C-E$ ： $\operatorname{sim} B \mid 9$ compleretur $B-E$ ：impleretur $A \mid$ Ex ．．．perdidi $B-E$ ：quos dedisti mihi non perdidi ex eis $A \mid 10$ quum haberet $B-E$（cum haberet $B-D$ ）：habens $A \mid \operatorname{dextram} B-E$ ：dexteram $A \mid$ 11 Immitte $B-E$ ：Mitte $A \mid$ An ．．．pater $B-E$ ：Calicem quem dedit mihi pater，an non bibam illum $A \mid 12$ igitur $B-E$ ：autem $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A$

[^7]2 ouvnix $\begin{aligned} \eta \\ \text { ．Cod．} 2 \text { adds koí，with support }\end{aligned}$ from cod． N and many of the later mss．The Erasmian text follows cod． 1 and the Vulgate， this time with support from cod． 817 and most other mss．，commencing with $\$$ ABCDW．
$3 a c$ (twice) kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is the first insertion of ac since Iob. 13,13, surprising in view of Erasmus' fondness for the word in his 1519 edition.
4 se aủtóv ("eum" Vg.). Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun to refer back to the subject of the sentence, as suggested by Valla Annot.
4 processit ac ${ }^{\text {² }} \xi \varepsilon \lambda \theta \omega \dot{\prime}$ ("processit et" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On ac, see on Iob. 1,25. The Vulgate may here follow a different Greek text, $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ кaí, as in codd. B C ${ }^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by most other mss., commencing with $\mathbb{K}$ A C ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$ W. Manetti, more literally, substituted egressus.
5 Responderunt ergo árтєкрi $\theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ ("Responderunt" $1516-22$ = Vg.). Erasmus' insertion of ergo in 1527-35 was without explicit authority from Greek mss., and he made no change here in the Greek text.
5 Dicit $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). Erasmus renders the present tense more accurately, as in the earlier Vulgate. Manetti also had Dicit.
5 qui prodebat ठ $\pi \alpha p \alpha \delta 1 \delta o u ́ s$ ("qui tradebat" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,64.
8 ó İpooũs. The Erasmian text coincides with cod. 1 in adding the article here, with support from codd. D N and some later mss. It was omitted in codd. 2 and 817, in company with $\aleph$ A B C W and most of the later mss. See on Ioh. 1,48.
8 quod ... sum ótt ... slut ("quia ... sum" Vg.; "quod ... sim" 1519). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... sum.
9 compleretur $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \tilde{\eta}$ ("impleretur" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 15,25.
9 dixerat eittev ("dixit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,19 for Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect.
 oủtต̃ข ("Quia ... non perdidi ex eis" late Vg.; "... non perdidi ex eis" 1516, omitting "quia"). In this alteration of the word-order, Erasmus is less literal than the Vulgate, but achieves a more natural form of Latin expression. On iis, see on Ioh. 16,20. Manetti put quod ... non perdidi ex eis.
10 quиm baberet ${ }^{\text {Eै }} \chi \omega \nu$ ("habens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus interprets the participle in a causal sense. Either translation is legitimate.
$10 \Pi \eta_{\kappa} \lambda_{\kappa \cup \sigma \varepsilon}$. This itacistic misspelling is derived from cod. 2, supported by a few other late mss.

The usual reading is $\varepsilon i \lambda_{k u \sigma \varepsilon v, ~ a s ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~}^{n}$ codd. 1 and 817 , with most other mss., and as found at Ioh. 21,11 in both cod. 2 and Erasmus.
 another itacism from cod. 2.
10 dextram tò $\delta \mathrm{E} \xi$ ıóv ("dexteram" 1516 = late Vg. and some Vg. mss.). Erasmus more often has the form dextera and dexteram. Manetti had dextram here.
11 Dicit $\mathfrak{\text { IT } \pi \varepsilon \nu ~ ( " D i x i t " ~ V g . ) . ~ S e e ~ o n ~ I o h . ~ 1 1 , 2 5 . ~}$
11 Immitte Bá $\mathrm{\lambda}_{\mathrm{t}}$ ("Mitte" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 13,2.
11 tuum oou. The Erasmian text adds the pronoun from cod. 1 and the late Vulgate, supported by many of the later Greek mss. The word is omitted in codd. 2 and 817, in company with the earlier Vulgate and $7^{66}$ ※ A B C D NW and many later mss. Manetti omitted tuит.
11 An non bibam poculum quod dedit mibi pater
 mí $\omega$ aútó ("Calicem quem dedit mihi pater, non vis vt bibam illum" late Vg.; "Calicem ... pater, an non bibam illum" 1516). This rewriting of a whole clause is relatively infrequent in Erasmus' rendering of John's Gospel, here designed to achiever a smoother word-order. The use of an non is used elsewhere by Erasmus in twenty other places. In the Vulgate N.T., the phrase occurs in this interrogative sense at Rom. 9,21; 2 Cor. 13,5. The Vulgate has poculum, for "cup", at $A p$. Ioh. 17,$4 ; 18,6$, but usually renders by calix. In 1516, Erasmus substitutes poculum in ten places. Then in 1519, he introduced it in a further sixteen places, mainly in the Gospels, and again at one more passage in 1522, leaving calix unchanged at Mt. 26,39; Mc. 9,41; Ap. Ioh. 14,10; 16,19. In Annot. on Mt. 20,22, Erasmus distinguishes between the two Latin words, poculum being the generic term for any kind of drinking vessel, whereas calix corresponds with $\kappa u ́ \lambda ı \xi$, a winecup. Manetti's rendering was Calicem quem dedit mibi pater, nunc quidem bibam ipsum.
12 igitur oũv ("autem" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek support. Erasmus makes a similar correction at Ioh. 7,3 (1519), but see on Ioh. 3,25 for passages where he left the inaccurate use of autem unchanged. Manetti had ergo, as in the earlier Vulgate.
12 ac кai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
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Iesum, et ligauerunt eum, ${ }^{13}$ et $a b-$ duxerunt eum ad Annam primum: erat enim socer Caiaphae, qui erat pontifex anni illius. ${ }^{14}$ Erat autem Caiaphas is qui consilium dederat Iudaeis, quod expediret vnum hominem mori pro populo. ${ }^{15}$ Sequebatur autem Iesum Simon Petrus, et alius discipulus. Discipulus autem ille erat notus pontifici, et introiuit cum Iesu in atrium pontificis. ${ }^{16}$ Petrus autem stabat ad ostium foris. Exiuit er|go discipulus ille alter, qui erat notus pontifici, et dixit ostiariae, et introduxit Petrum. ${ }^{17}$ Dixit ergo Petro ancilla ostiaria: Num et tu ex discipulis es hominis istius? Dicit ille: Non sum. ${ }^{18}$ Stabant autem serui et ministri qui prunas congesserant, quia frigus erat, et calefaciebant se. Erat autem cum eis et Petrus stans et calefaciens se.
${ }^{19}$ Pontifex ergo interrogauit Iesum de discipulis suis et de doctrina ipsius. ${ }^{20}$ Respondit ei Iesus: Ego palam loquutus sum mundo. Ego semper docui in synagoga et in templo, quo omnes Iudaei conueniunt, et in occulto loquatus sum nihil. ${ }^{21}$ Quid me interrogas? Interroga eos qui audierunt quid loquutus sim ipsis. Ecce hi sciunt quae dixerim ego. ${ }^{22}$ Haec autem quum dixisset, vnus
$20 \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha B-E: \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \sigma \eta \sigma \alpha A$
13 Caiaphae $B$-E: Cayphae $A \mid 14$ Caiaphas is $B-E$ : Cayphas $A \mid 17$ Num $B-E$ : Nunquid $A \mid$ 19 ipsius B-E: eius $A$

13 abduxerunt ámíy $\propto \gamma \bigcirc 0$ ("adduxerunt" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a different Greek text,
 and a few later mss. However, at Mc. 14,53 the Vulgate renders $\alpha^{\alpha} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ by adduco without any support from such Greek ms. variants. At

Mt. 27,2, Erasmus retains adduco from the Vulgate. Elsewhere, at several passages, he substitutes abduco for duco, educo, and perduco, in rendering the same Greek verb. At the present passage, he follows cod. 2 , with support from $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A}$ C N and most later mss., including codd. 1
and 817. In 1527-35 Annot., citing the authority of Cyril, Erasmus commends the suggestion that vs. 24 should, in effect, be moved to the end of vs. 13 , in order to 'improve' the sequence of the narrative. He drew further attention to this view by inserting a marginal note beside vs. 13 in the N.T. text.

14 is qui $\delta$ ("qui" $1516=V g$.). The pronoun, $i s$, is added to make a smoother connection with the first part of the sentence.
14 quod expediret $\delta$ ótı $\sigma u \mu \varphi \in ́ p \varepsilon ı$ ("quia expedit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod confert.
15 a $\lambda \lambda$ os. Erasmus does not appear to have had specific ms. authority for omitting $\delta$ before ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ os, though the omission coincides with the text of $77^{66} \mathbb{N}^{*} A B D^{\text {supp }} W$ and a few later mss. His usual mss., codd. 1, 2 , and 817 , all have $\delta \quad \alpha \lambda \lambda 0 \rho$, in company with cod. $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}$ N and most later mss.: i.e. not just "another" disciple, but "the other" disciple. In view of the similar omission at Ioh. 20,3 (1516 only), again without relying on ms. authority, these alterations are possibly to be regarded as deliberate conjectures by Erasmus, rather than accidental errors.
$15 \delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \eta \eta s$. These words, which were omitted by cod. $2^{*}$, were entered by Erasmus in the margin of the ms., in agreement with codd. 1 and 817, together with most other mss. and the Vulgate.
 1516-27) lacks ms. support, and represents an unsuccessful attempt to correct an itacistic error in cod. 2, which had Eiot rect spelling should have been єí $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} k \in$, as in codd. 1 and 817, with most other mss.
16 ille alter $\delta{ }^{\circ} \alpha \lambda \lambda o s(" a l i u s " V g$.). Erasmus wishes to make clear that this was the same disciple as the alius in vs. 15 . Other substitutions of alter for alius occur at six places in 1516, and a further thirteen times in 1519 , on the grounds that alter was the correct word for referring to one out of only two alternatives. On the distinction of meaning, see Valla Elegantiae III, 59; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 221, 11. 370-376, 386-388.
17 Dixit $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{k}$. Erasmus' use of the perfect tense agrees with the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition, contrary to the present tense of his Greek text. The earlier Vulgate more accurately had Dicit, as also adopted by Manetti. A similar discrepancy exists at Iob. 13,31.

17 Num Mí ("Nunquid" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 3,4.
 кótes ("ad prunas" Vg.). This Vulgate omission of a verb is unsupported by Greek mss. Erasmus' choice of congero ("heap together") is somewhat more expressive than the Greek moté $\omega$, and is comparable with the Vulgate use of carbones congero to render $\alpha \sim \theta p a k \propto s ~ \sigma \omega p \varepsilon v ่ \omega$ at Rom. 12,20 (replaced by Erasmus with carbones coaceruo). Erasmus has congero elsewhere only at Iac. 5,3 (1519); Iud. 8. See Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered as et prunas faciebant, more literal but less idiomatic than Erasmus here.
18 et Petrus ¿ ПÉтроs. Erasmus retains the added et from the Vulgate, reflecting the addition of kaí before ó ПЕ́тpos, as in $7^{66 v i d} \times$ B C (W) and a few later mss., including cod. 1. His Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by codd. A $D^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and most later mss. Manetti omitted et.
19 ipsius $\propto \cup ̉ T 0$ ("eius" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). It is questionable whether this sequence of suis ... ipsius is any less obscure than that of the Vulgate, suis ... eius. In both renderings, which are equally designed to avoid repetition, the shift of pronoun could mislead the reader into supposing that one of these pronouns referred back to Caiaphas. Valla Annot. argued that whichever pronoun was preferred, the same word should be used in both places.
20 Tñ $\sigma u{ }^{2} \propto \gamma \omega \gamma \tilde{n}$. Erasmus, or his assistant, adds the article $\tau \pi n$ from cod. 1, with support from only a few other late mss. His codd. 2 and 817 omitted $\tau \tilde{n}$, in company with $\mathcal{N}$ A B $C D^{\text {supp }} N W$ and most later mss. The less well attested Erasmian reading persisted into the Textus Receptus.
20 omnes mórvtes. The Erasmian text again deviates from cod. 2, to adopt a reading found in cod. 1, this time with the support of the Vulgate, ※ A B C* N W and some later mss., including cod. 817. The reading of cod. 2 was mávtote, found also in codd. $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$ and most of the later mss.

21 loquutus sim ${ }^{\ell} \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma \alpha$ ("loquutus sum" Vg.). Erasmus prefers a subjunctive after quid. It is possible that he was following a copy of the late Vulgate which had $\operatorname{sim}$ for $s u m$, as in the Froben edition of 1491 , in which case Erasmus' rendering could not be regarded as an innovation.
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 крivate aủtóv. غโtov oưv aủtẹ̃ oi
 $v a l$ oúסéva. ${ }^{32}$ ivva ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ t o u ̃ ~ ' I \eta \sigma o u ̃ ~$

 oũv घis tò mpaıtढ́pıov mó́ $\lambda ı v$ ò $\Pi_{\imath} \lambda \tilde{\alpha}-$


assistens ministrorum dedit alapam Iesu, dicens: Siccine respondes pontifici? ${ }^{23}$ Respondit ei Iesus: Si male loquutus sum, testificare de malo: sin bene, cur me caedis? ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Et}$ misit eum Annas vinctum ad Caiapham pontificem.
${ }^{25}$ Stabat autem Simon Petrus et calefaciebat se. Dixerunt ergo ei: Num et tu ex discipulis eius es? Negauit ille, et dixit: Non sum. ${ }^{26}$ Dicit ei vnus ex seruis pontificis cognatus eius, cuius absciderat Petrus auriculam: Nonne ego te vidi in horto cum illo? ${ }^{27}$ Iterum ergo negauit Petrus, et statim gallus cecinit.
${ }^{28}$ Ducunt ergo Iesum a Caiapha in praetorium. Erat autem mane, et ipsi non introierunt in praetorium, ne contaminarentur, sed vt ederent pascha. ${ }^{29}$ Exiuit ergo Pilatus ad eos foras, et dixit: Quam accusationem affertis aduersus hominem hunc? ${ }^{30}$ Responderunt, et dixerunt ei: Si non esset hic nocens, haudquaquam tibi tradidissemus eum. ${ }^{31}$ Dicit ergo eis Pilatus: Accipite eum vos, et secundum legem vestram iudicate eum. Dixerunt ergo ei Iudaei: Nobis non licet interficere quenquam. ${ }^{32} \mathrm{Vt}$ sermo Iesu impleretur quem dixit, significans qua morte esset moriturus. ${ }^{33}$ Introiuit ergo iterum in praetorium Pilatus, et vocauit Iesum, et dixit ei: Tu es ille rex Iudaeorum?

22 Siccine $B-E: \operatorname{Sic} A \mid 23$ testificare $C-E$ : testimonium perhibe $A$, testare $B \mid \sin B$-E: si autem $A \mid$ cur $B$-E: quid $A \mid 24$ vinctum $B-E: \operatorname{ligatum} A \mid$ Caiapham B-E: Caypham $A \mid$ 25 Stabat ... calefaciebat $B-E$. Erat autem Simon Petrus stans et calefaciens $A \mid$ Num $B-E$ : Nunquid $A \mid 26$ absciderat $B$ - $E$ : abscidit $A \mid 27$ cecinit $B$-E: cantauit $A \mid 28$ Ducunt $B$-E: Adducunt $A \mid$ Caiapha $B-E$ : Caypha $A \mid$ ne $B-E$ : vt non $A \mid \operatorname{sed} A B D E$ sex $C \mid$ ederent pascha $B$-E: manducarent pasca $A \mid 30$ nocens, haudquaquam $B$-E: malefactor, non $A \mid$ 33 ille $B-E$ : om. $A$

22 Siccine Oũtcs ("Sic" $1516=$ Vg.). This is the only occurrence of siccine in Erasmus' N.T. In the Vulgate, it is used only at $1 \mathrm{Sm} .15,32$. The word implies a greater degree of indignation than sic. For other words adding $-n e$, see on vs. 39, below.
23 testificare $\mu \alpha р т \cup ́ p \eta \sigma o v$ ("testimonium perhibe" $1516=$ Vg.; "testare" 1519). See on Iob. 1,7.
$23 \sin$ cỉ $\delta$ é ("si autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 10,38.
23 cur ti ("quid" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.
24 Et misit órté $\sigma$ тєı $\lambda \varepsilon v$. Erasmus' rendering follows the Vulgate, which may reflect the addition of $\delta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon}$, as in cod. $\mathcal{\aleph}$. Some other early mss., codd. B C ${ }^{*}$ N W, together with cod. 1, add oưv. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by codd. A $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$ and most later mss.
24 vinctum $\delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \mu$ évov ("ligatum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus substitutes vincio for alligo at Mt. 12,29; 14,3; Act. 9,14; 21,13; 22,29; 2 Tim. 2,9 (1519), mainly in contexts referring to the binding of a prisoner. He further substitutes alligo, reuincio, or obuincio for ligo at Mt. 16,19; Mc. 11,2, 4; Ioh. 11,44 (1519); 19,40, while retaining ligo at five other passages.
25 Stabat autem Simon Petrus et calefaciebat se
 ("Erat autem Simon Petrus stans et calefaciens se" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,28 for Erasmus' avoidance of the combination of the imperfect tense and present participle.
25 Num Mí ("Nunquid" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 3,4.
25 Negauit गो $\rho \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \alpha$ то. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, with support from many other mss., commencing with $\mathcal{N} A$ B C* ${ }^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ W. Codd. 2 and 817 add ouv, supported by cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss.
26 Dicit ei $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \in 1$ ("Dicit" Vg.). Erasmus' addition of $e i$ is not supported by Greek mss., or by the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition. It is probable that he was following a different form of the late Vulgate, in which ei was added, as in the Froben edition of 1491.
 For Erasmus' use of the pluperfect, see on Ioh. 1,19.
 See on Ioh. 13,38.
28 Ducunt ... a "Ayovoiv ... ámó ("Adducunt ... ad" late Vg.; "Adducunt ... a" 1516 = Vg. mss.). In Annot., partly based on Valla Annot., Erasmus criticises the inaccurate late Vulgate rendering, which is unsupported by Greek mss. The passage is further included in his Loca Obscura and Loca Manifeste Deprauata. Manetti put Adducunt ... a.
28 ne iva $\mu$ ท' ("vt non" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 3,20.
28 ederent $\phi \alpha ́ \gamma \omega \sigma 1$ ("manducarent" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
 is found in only a few mss., consisting principally of cod. N and fam ${ }^{13}$, including cod. 69. In cod. 1, together with codd. (N) B C ${ }^{*}$ (W) and a few later mss., $\varepsilon \xi \xi \omega$ is inserted after Пı $\lambda \tilde{\alpha}-$ tos. It is uncertain whether Erasmus actually imported this reading from a ms. belonging to fam ${ }^{13}$. As elsewhere, he or his assistants could have inserted $\tilde{\xi} \xi \omega$ at this point by a fresh conjecture based partly on cod. 1 and partly on the Vulgate. In codd. 2 and 817, $\varepsilon \xi \omega$ is omitted, in company with codd. A $C^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$ and most of the later mss. Other variants also exist. Manetti omitted foras.
30 nocens какотоıós ("malefactor" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at 1 Petr. 2,14. However, at 1 Petr. 2,12, Erasmus preferred maleficus. The word malefactor is rare in classical usage.
30 baudquaquam oủk ăv ("non" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus' much stronger expression is nowhere found in the Vulgate. He uses it for ouk ởv elsewhere at Mc. 13,20; 1 Cor. 2,8; 11,31; Gal. 1,10 (1519); Hebr. 8,7, and also employs it for oủ $\mu$ '̀ at Mt. 23,39 (1519); Mc. 10,15; 1 Cor. 8,13 (1519). Erasmus' use of baudquaquam for oúk $\alpha v$ and $\mu \dot{\eta} \not \approx v$ is as inaccurate as his use of vtique for ã̛v: see on Ioh. 4,10 . Correspondingly, Manetti's use of non vtique here was not an improvement.
31 Dicit $\varepsilon$ intev. Erasmus retained Dicit from the late Vulgate, whereas the earlier Vulgate more correctly had Dixit, as was also adopted by Manetti. See on Iob. 11,25 for the discrepancy of tense.
33 ille rex ó $\beta \propto \sigma$ ৷ $\lambda$ eús ("rex" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). By this use of ille, Erasmus wishes to convey the force of the Greek article, suggesting that Jesus
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${ }^{34}$ Respondit Iesus: A temet ipso tu hoc dicis, an alii dixerunt tibi de me? ${ }^{35}$ Respondit Pilatus: Num ego Iudaeus sum? Gens tua et pontifices tradiderunt te mihi. Quid fecisti? ${ }^{36}$ Respondit Iesus: Regnum meum non est ex hoc mundo. Si ex hoc mundo esset regnum meum, ministri mei vtique decertarent, ne traderer Iudaeis. Nunc autem regnum meum non est hinc. ${ }^{37}$ Dixit itaque ei Pilatus: Ergo rex es tu? Respondit lesus: Tu dicis, quod rex sum ego. Ego in hoc natus sum, et ad hoc veni in mundum, vt testimonium feram veritati. Omnis qui est ex veritate, audit vocem meam. ${ }^{38}$ Dicit ei Pilatus: Quid est veritas? Et quum hoc dixisset, iterum prodiit ad Iudaeos, et dicit eis: Ego nullam inuenio in eo causam. ${ }^{39}$ Est autem consuetudo vobis, vt vnum dimittam vobis in pascha. Vultisne ergo dimittam vobis illum regem Iudaeorum? ${ }^{40}$ Clamauerunt rursum | omnes, dicentes:

36 prius ex $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ ne $B-E$ vt non $A \mid 37$ prius sum $A C-E: \operatorname{sim} B \mid$ feram $B-E:$ perhibeam $A \mid 38$ prodiit $B-E$ exiuit $A \mid 39$ pascha $B-E$ : pasca $A \mid$ Vultisne $B-E$ :Vultis $A \mid$ illum $B-E$ : om. $A$ | 40 Barabbam $A B E:$ Barrabam $C D \mid$ Barabbas $A B E:$ Barrabas $C D$
19,3 ac $B-E$ : Et veniebant ad eum et $A$
was no ordinary king. A similar addition occurs in vs. 40 . See also on Ioh. 1,49.
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \kappa p i \theta \eta$, the Erasmian text is influenced by
cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $7^{66 \text { vid }} \mathrm{A}$ B C ${ }^{*} \mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ W 087 and some later mss. However, of those mss. which omit $\alpha \dot{*} T \tilde{\varphi}$, including cod. 1, most also substitute d́теккріиवто. Codd. 2 and 817 add $\alpha \cup \mathcal{T} \tilde{\varphi}$, in company with most other mss., commencing with $\aleph^{\text {corr }}$, reflected in Manetti's addition of $e i$.
$34 t u \sigma u ́$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate may be based on a text omitting $\sigma \dot{0}$, as in $\left\{7^{66^{*}} \aleph^{*} D^{\text {supp }}\right.$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathrm{B}^{66 \mathrm{corr}}$ vid ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ A B C N W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti made the same change.
 dixerunt" Vg.). Erasmus' Latin word-order may have been based on late Vulgate copies which differed from his 1527 Vulgate column. The word-order dixerunt tibi is found in the Froben edition of 1491, among others. The reading ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda 0 s$ ool $\varepsilon$ ITtev in Erasmus' 1516 Greek text followed cod. 2 , in company with cod. N and a few later mss. In 1519 , he restored $\alpha \lambda \lambda$ ol and eftov, to conform with the Vulgate and most of the Greek mss., including codd. 1, 3 and 817.

35 Num Mìtı ("Numquid" Vg.). See on Iob. 3,4.
35 pontifices of d́pxıepeĩs ("pontifices tui" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading is unsupported by Greek mss.
$36 \delta$ Incoũs. The addition of the article is possibly another conjecture of Erasmus or his assistants, as it is missing from his usual codd. 1,2 and 817 , together with most other mss., commencing with $7^{66} \times \mathrm{A}$ B C D ${ }^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{W}$. However, it is present in cod. 69, supported by cod. N and some later mss. See on lob. 1,48. This doubtful addition continued into the Textus Receptus.
36 ex (1st.) ék ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on lob. 2,15.
$36 n e$ iva $\mu \eta$ ("vt non" $1516=V g$.). See on Iob. 3,20.
 sum" Vg.; "quod rex sim" 1519 only). See on Iob. 1,20 . The same change was made by Manetti.
37 testimonium feram $\mu \alpha \rho т \cup \rho \dot{j} \dot{\sigma} \omega$ ("testimonium perhibeam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,7.
38 Dicit ... dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon 1$... $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \in 1$ ("Dixit ... dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 5.

38 prodit ${ }^{\text {E } \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon \text { ( "exiuit" } 1516=}=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mc. 5,30 (1519). Erasmus also uses prodeo to replace egredior at Mt. 2,6 (1519). Elsewhere, he is often content to retain
 of other Latin verbs: including abeo, egredior, emano, and venio. See further on lob. 5,29.
39 vobis (1st.) Uuĩv (omitted in Vg. 1527 and some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate omission is supported by only a few of the later Greek mss.
39 Vultisne $\beta$ Ко̛́入є $\sigma \theta$ ("Vultis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus occasionally adds the interrogative, $-n e$, a usage which occurs nine times in 1516 (at Mt. 12,10; 19,3; Mc. 10,2; Lc. 22,49; Act. 8,30; 17,$19 ; 19,2 ; 21,37$; lac. 2,20), and at a further two passages in 1519 (here, and at vs. 22). In the Vulgate, it occurs at Act. 8,30, in the form putasne.
39 illum regem tòv $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \in ̇ \alpha$ ("regem" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 33.
40 Clamauerunt ṫxpaúy $\alpha \sigma a v$ ỡv. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving ouvy untranslated. See on Ioh. 8,38. Manetti added ergo.
19,3 ac dicebant kai eum, et dicebant" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate followed a Greek text adding kai ìpхоито
 B N W and a few later mss., including cod. 69. In 1527 Annot., Erasmus comments that the additional words are not found "in the Greeks" ("in Graecis"), even though in theory he had once been in a position to consult cod. 69, or another member of fam ${ }^{13}$, which had this clause. His Greek text follows cod. 2, in company with codd. A $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817 . On the substitution of ac, see on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti had just et dicabant.
4 Exiuit $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon v$ oữv. The Vulgate column of $^{2}$ Erasmus' 1527 N.T., more correctly, had Exiuit ergo. Erasmus' Latin rendering was probably following a copy of the late Vulgate which omitted ergo, such as the Froben edition of 1491, in company with earlier Vulgate mss. The earlier Vulgate may in turn reflect a Greek text omitting ouv, as in $\mathbb{K} D^{\text {supp }}$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. Some mss. also
 $7^{66^{*} \text { vid }}$ A B. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by $77^{66 c o r r} \mathrm{~N}$ W and most later mss.
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 ${ }^{11}$ व่́тєкрїŋ




Ecce adduco vobis eum foras, vt cognoscatis quod nullam in eo causam inuenio. ${ }^{5}$ Exiuit ergo Iesus foras, gestans spineam coronam, et purpureum pallium. Et dicit eis: Ecce homo. ${ }^{6}$ Quum ergo vidissent eum pontifices et ministri clamabant, dicentes: Crucifige, crucifige. Dicit eis Pilatus: Accipite eum vos, et crucifigite: ego enim non inuenio in eo causam. ${ }^{7}$ Responderunt ei Iudaei: Nos legem habemus, et secundum legem nostram debet mori: quia filium dei se fecit. ${ }^{8}$ Quum ergo audisset Pilatus hunc sermonem, magis timuit: ${ }^{9}$ et ingressus est praetorium iterum, et dicit ad lesum: Vnde es tu? Iesus autem responsum non dedit ei. ${ }^{10}$ Dicit ergo ei Pilatus: Mihi non loqueris? Nescis quod potestatem habeam crucifigendi te, et potestatem habeam absoluendi te? ${ }^{11}$ Respondit Iesus: Non haberes potestatem aduersum me vllam, nisi tibi datum esset e supernis. Propterea qui me tradidit tibi, maius peccatum habet.


4 in eo causam inuenio $B$ - $E$ : inuenio in eo causam $A \mid 5$ gestans $B$ - $E$ : portans $A \mid$ pallium $B-E$ : vestimentum $A \mid 10$ prius habeam $B$-E: habeo $A \mid$ alt habeam $B$-E: habeo $A \mid$ 11 e supernis $B$ - : desuper $A$

4 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.) See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
 वitiov éjpíK $\omega$ ("nullam inuenio in eo causam" 1516 = late Vg.). The Latin word-order used by Erasmus in 1519 happens to correspond uniquely with that of cod. A (ov́ $\delta \varepsilon \mu i \alpha v$ év $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{\sim}$ aitionv eúpíokw), but is more likely to have been affected by considerations of classical Latin syntax rather than consultation of Greek mss. here. Manetti anticipated him in adopting this word-order.

5 foras $\varepsilon$ g $\xi \omega$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is virtually unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.

5 gestans popãv ("portans" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Rom. 13,4; 1 Cor. 15,49 . Erasmus further puts gesto for vestio at Mt. 11,8, and for induo at Iac. 2,3, thus ensuring that the same verb is used to render all N.T. instances of $\varphi 0$ pé $\omega$. The word gesto is used by the Vulgate at four O.T. passages. It is preferred by Erasmus here because it denotes the wearing of the crown and robe, whereas
porto could be understood as meaning that these items were carried in the hand. Cf. Valla Elegantiae VI, 51; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, p. 297, 11. 479-482, where it is suggested that porto is more appropriate for carrying something large or heavy. Erasmus elsewhere generally retains porto, especially in rendering $\beta \alpha \sigma$ тó $\zeta \omega$, and occasionally for $\alpha i ̈ p \omega$ and $\varphi$ 追 $\rho \omega$.
5 spineam coronam tòv ởkóveıvov oté $\propto$ ovov ("coronam spineam" late Vg.). Erasmus restores the word-order of the earlier Vulgate, in conformity with the Greek text. The same word-order is found in Manetti's version.
5 pallium íá́tiov ("vestimentum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution also occurs at Mc. 10,50; 13,16; Lc. 6,29; 1 Petr. 3,3, usually to make clear that the item of clothing is only an outer garment: see Annot. on Lc. 6,29. The word pallium occurs in the Vulgate N.T. only at Mt. 5,40, but much more frequently in the O.T. At the present passage, the change has more to do with the fine alliterative effect of purpureum pallium. Elsewhere, Erasmus often retains vestimentum for ifórtov, while sometimes changing it to vestis for the sake of stylistic variety: see on Ioh. 13,12.
5 'IDoú. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1 , in company with $\aleph B W$ and a few later mss. Codd. 2 and 817 have 18 e , supported by most other mss., commencing with codd. A $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$.

6 clamabant ${ }^{\text {ékpaú }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \alpha \sigma \alpha v$. Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering of the Greek aorist by the imperfect tense, as he also does at vs. 15. Manetti, more accurately, had clamauerunt.
6 crucifige (2nd.) $\sigma \tau \alpha$ ' 0 مoov ("crucifige eum" late Vg.). The Erasmian text follows cod. 1, this time in company with the earlier Vulgate mss. rather than the usual editions of the late printed Vulgate, with support from $37^{66}$ A B W and some later mss. Codd. 2 and 817 add củtóv, as found in $K D^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and most later mss. Manetti put crucifige ipsum.
 no sense in this context, but may have arisen from the compositor misreading the script of cod. 2.
7 nostram $\grave{\dagger} \mu \omega \tilde{\omega}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of $3 \mathbf{p}^{66 \mathrm{vid}} \mathcal{N} \mathrm{B}$ $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{NW}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by cod. A and most later
mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti also added this word.
7 filium dei se छ̇œutòv tòv viòv $\theta$ Eoũ. This reading does not exactly match any of Erasmus' mss. Cod. 2 has Éoutiò $\theta_{\text {goũ vióv, as found }}$ in cod. 817 and many other late mss. In cod. 1 , the word-order is the same as the Vulgate, having viòv $\theta$ عoũ éxutóv, with support from $\$^{66 v i d} \mathbb{*} B$ and some later mss. In reversing the word-order to read viòv $\theta_{\text {eoũ }}$ Erasmus' text partly follows cod. 1. However, the retention of EauTóv as the first word, coupled with the arbitrary insertion of tóv, creates a completely new reading, apparently not found in any Greek mss. A more widely attested reading, found in codd. $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and many later mss., was éautòv viòv $\theta$ عoũ, corresponding with se ipsum filium dei in Manetti's translation.
9 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{c}$ ("dixit" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading lacks Greek ms. support. Erasmus renders the present tense more accurately, as in the earlier Vulgate.
10 Dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). See the previous note.
 ("quia ... habeo ... habeo" Vg.; "quod ... habeo ... habeo" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... babeo ... babeo, as in Erasmus' 1516 translation. The spelling EXX, for E $\bar{E} X \omega$ (1st.) in the 1516 edition, is a misprint.
10 crucifigendi ... absoluendi $\sigma$ тоир $\omega \tilde{\sigma}^{\circ} \alpha 1$... $\alpha^{\alpha}$ то$\lambda \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha_{1}$ ("crucifigere ... dimittere" Vg.). For the avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. Manetti achieved a similar effect here by using the subjunctive: vt crucifigam ... vt dimittam (though in Pal. Lat. 45, these words only occur as a later correction, and the first hand seems to have written crucifigere ... dimittere). Erasmus elsewhere substitutes absoluo for dimitto at Mt. 18,27; Ioh. 19,12 (1519); Act. 3,13, and also at
 Vulgate N.T., absoluo occurs only at Act. 19,39, for émi入úw. More frequently, Erasmus retains dimitto.
11 ó 'Inooũs. The Erasmian text agrees with cod. 1 in adding the article, in company with $\aleph$ A N W and some later mss. In codd. 2 and 817, with most other mss., commencing with codd. B $D^{\text {supp }}$, the article is omitted. See on Ioh. 1,48.
11 e supernis $\alpha \sim \omega \omega \theta \varepsilon v$ ("de super" $1516=V g$.). See on Iob. 3,3.
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${ }^{12}$ Et ex eo quaerebat Pilatus absoluere eum. Iudaei autem clamabant, dicentes: Si hunc absolueris, non es amicus Caesaris. Quicunque se regem facit, contradicit Caesari. ${ }^{13}$ Pilatus autem quum audisset hunc sermonem, produxit foras lesum, seditque pro tribunali in loco qui dicitur Lithostrotos, Hebraice autem Gabbatha. ${ }^{14}$ Erat autem parasceue paschae, hora ferme sexta, et dicit Iudaeis: Ecce rex vester. ${ }^{15}$ Illi autem clamabant: Tolle, tolle, crucifige eum. Dicit eis Pilatus: Regem vestrum crucifigam? Responderunt pontifices: Non habemus regem, nisi Caesarem. ${ }^{16}$ Tunc ergo tradidit eum illis, vt crucifigeretur.

Acceperunt autem Iesum, et abduxerunt, ${ }^{17}$ atque is baiulans crucem suam, exiuit in eum, qui dicitur Caluaria, locum, Hebraice autem Golgotha, ${ }^{18} \mathrm{vbi}$ crucifixerunt eum, et cum eo alios duos hinc et hinc,

## $13 \gamma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \theta \alpha B-E: \gamma \alpha \beta \alpha \theta \alpha A \mid 17$ os $B-E: \operatorname{cs} A$

12 ex eo $B$ - $E$ : exinde $A \mid$ absoluere $B$ - $E$ : $\operatorname{dimittere} A \mid$ absolueris $B-E$ : dimiseris $A \mid$ Quicunque $C-E$ : Omnis qui $A$, Quisquis $B \mid 13$ hunc sermonem, produxit $B$ - $E$ : hos sermones, adduxit $A \mid$ seditque $B-E$ : et sedit $A \mid$ Hebraice $B-E$ : haebraice $A \mid$ Gabbatha $B-E$ : gabatha $A \mid 14$ paschae $B$-E: pascae $A \mid$ ferme $B-E$ : quasi $A \mid 16$ Acceperunt $B$ - $E$ : Susceperunt $A \mid$ abduxerunt $B-E$ : eduxerunt $A \mid 17$ atque is $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ crucem suam $B$ - $E$ : sibi crucem $A \mid$ Caluaria $B$ - $E$ : Caluariae $A \mid$ Golgotha $B-E$ : golgatha $A$

12 Et ex eo èk roútou ("Et exinde" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg .). Erasmus retains $E t$ from the late Vulgate, in conflict with his Greek text and most of the Greek mss. A comparable substitution of ex eo tempore for exinde, to render ámò тóte, occurs at Mt. 4,17; 16,21; 26,16 (1519). At Act. 13,21, Erasmus retains exinde for ékeĩӨev. See Annot. While Valla Annot. proposed using ex boc, Manetti put Exinde, omitting et.
 ("dimittere ... dimittis" Vg.; "dimittere ... dimiseris" 1516). See on vs. 10 .
12 Quicunque mã́s ó ("Omnis enim qui" late Vg.; "Omnis qui" 1516; "Quisquis" 1519). See on Ioh. 16,2. The late Vulgate addition of enim
corresponds with cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$ and several mss. of the Old Latin version.
12 aưtóv. In 1516, Erasmus' text had aủtóv with a smooth breathing, changed to cuitóv in 1519. Nearly all the mss., including his codd. 1,2 and 817, have a different reading, éautóv. Erasmus' poorly attested variant survived into the Textus Receptus. For his use of the rough breathing on the pronoun, see on Iob. 2,21.
13 autem ourv. Erasmus retains the late Vulgate rendering, in conflict with his Greek text. The earlier Vulgate, more accurately, had ergo, as also found in Manetti. For other instances of the incorrect retention of autem, see on Ioh. 3,25.

13 bunc sermonem toũtov tòv $\lambda$ íyov（＂hos sermones＂ 1516 Lat．＝Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text，$\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \lambda o ́ y \omega \nu$ toút $\omega \nu$ ，or тoút $\omega \nu \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ ，found in $\$$ A B D ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ W 065 and many later mss．，including cod． 1. In cod．2＊${ }^{*}$ ，Erasmus found the ungrammatical тоút $\omega \nu$ Tต̃v $\lambda \dot{o} \gamma \circ v$ ，which he corrected to read toũtov tòv $\lambda \delta j^{\prime}$ ov，in agreement with cod．817，supported by cod． N and most later mss．
13 produxit ${ }^{\text {グYocyev（＂adduxit＂} 1516=}=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． This change was perhaps for little more than stylistic variety，in view of Erasmus＇retention of adduco in vs． 4.
 See on Ioh．1，39．
13 Litbostrotos $\wedge_{1} \theta_{o ́ \sigma t p \omega t o v ~(" L i t h o s t r a t o s " ~}^{\text {＂}}$ late Vg．）．See Annot．，for comment on several variations in the spelling of this word．The adoption of Lithostrotos had previously been advocated by Valla Annot．
13 Gabbatha $\Gamma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha 0 \tilde{\alpha}$（＂gabatha＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）．The 1516 Latin spelling corresponded with the spelling $\gamma \alpha \beta a \theta \tilde{\alpha}$ in the accompanying Greek text，following cod．2．In most mss．， including codd． 3 and 817 ，it is $\gamma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha 0 \tilde{\alpha}$ ， as correctly given in 1519．It would appear that some late Vulgate copies here mistaken－ ly substituted Golgotha for Gabbatha，which would account for the appearance of Golgotba at this point both in 1516 Annot．and in both mss．of Manetti＇s version．In Apolog．resp．Iac Lop．Stur．，ASD IX，2，p．136，11．542－549， Erasmus confirmed that，at the time of pre－ paring Annot．，he was using a faulty copy （＂mendosum exemplar＂）of the Vulgate，in which this substitution occurred．In the Froben 1491 and 1514 editions of the Vulgate，the reading is Gabatba．
14 ferme $\dot{\omega} \sigma$（＂quasi＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，39．
15 clamabant Ékpá＇yaסov．As at vs．6，Erasmus retains the Vulgate imperfect tense．However， the Vulgate may here reflect a Greek variant， ėkpaúya̧ov，as in codd． $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and some later mss．
15 Dicit $\lambda \hat{\lambda} \hat{\varepsilon}$ ！（＂Dixit＂Vg．）．The perfect tense used by the earlier Vulgate，as well as the 1527 Vulgate column，is unsupported by mss．Eras－ mus may have been following a late Vulgate copy which had Dicit，as in the Froben edition of 1491．Manetti also had Dicit．

16 eum illis aủtòv aủtoĩs（＂eis illum＂Vg．）． The Vulgate word－order is supported only by cod．N．Manetti put eum ipsis．
16 Acceperunt Паре́入 $\alpha \beta$ ov（＂Susceperunt＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．14，3．
 $=$ Vg．mss．；＂eduxerunt eum＂Vg．1527）．See on Iob．18，13．Erasmus prefers to reserve educo for解 $\dot{\alpha} y \mathrm{y}$ ．The late Vulgate addition of eum is supported by cod．K，which adds aúróv．The Erasmian Greek text，under influence from the Vulgate，takes $\alpha$ สin $\gamma \propto \gamma \quad$ from cod．1，suppor－ ted by $\mathbf{p}^{66 \mathrm{vid}} \mathbb{K} \mathrm{NW}$ and some later mss．
 is wholly omitted．Codd． 2 and 817 have ${ }_{n}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \propto \gamma o v$ ，as found in codd．$D^{\text {supp }} 065$ and most later mss．Manetti substituted ducebant．
17 atque is kal（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．On atque，see on Iob． 1,25 ．Erasmus adds the pronoun，is，to provide a clearer subject for the following verb．
17 crucem suam tòv otaupòv aútoũ（＂sibi crucem＂ 1516 Lat．$=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant，éळutẽ Tòv otouvóv，as found in $\exists^{66600 r r} \aleph(B) W$ ．Some later mss．，including cod．1，have tòv otaupòv éautẽ，while cod． 817 has just tòv otaupóv，omitting aủtoũ． Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2，supported by codd．A N 065 and most later mss．See Annot．For his introduction of the rough breath－ ing on aÚtoũ in the 1519－35 editions，see on Ioh．2，21．Manetti anticipated Erasmus＇change to the Latin rendering．
17 eum tóv．The Erasmian text follows cod． 1 and the Vulgate，supported by \＆A B $D^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ W 065 and many later mss．In codd． 2 and 817， with many other late mss．，Tómov is substituted for tóv here．
17 Caluaria Kpaviou（＂Caluariae＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． The Vulgate is more literal here，in representing the Greek genitive．
 mus retains the late Vulgate rendering，which might be thought to reflect a different Greek
 found in a few late mss．However，this omission， in the Latin rendering of Erasmus and the Vulgate，is more likely to have arisen from a desire to avoid repetition of the earlier qui dicitur．Manetti，more precisely，rendered this by et dicitur Hebraice．The substitution of $\mathrm{\omega}_{5}$ for os，in 1516，reproduces the incorrect spelling of cod． 2.
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medium autem Iesum. ${ }^{19}$ Scripsit autem et titulum Pilatus, et posuit super crucem. Erat autem scriptum: Iesus Nazarenus rex Iudaeorum. ${ }^{20}$ Hunc ergo titulum multi Iudaeorum legerunt, quia prope ciuitatem erat locus vbi crucifixus est Iesus. Et erat scriptum Hebraice et Graece et Latine. ${ }^{21}$ Dicebant ergo Pilato pontifices Iudaeorum: Noli scribere, Rex Iudaeorum: sed quod ille dixerit, Rex sum Iudaeorum. ${ }^{22}$ Respondit Pilatus: Quod scripsi, scripsi. ${ }^{23}$ Milites ergo quum crucifixissent Iesum, acceperunt vestimenta eius, et fecerunt quatuor partes, vnicuique militi partem, et tunicam. Erat autem tunica inconsutilis, a summo contexta per totum. ${ }^{24}$ Dixerunt ergo inter se: Ne scindamus eam, sed sortiamur de illa cuius sit. Vt scriptura impleretur, dicens: Partiti sunt vestimenta mea sibi, et in vestem meam miserunt sortem. Et milites quidem haec fecerunt. ${ }^{25}$ Stabant autem iuxta crucem Iesu mater eius, et soror matris eius Maria Cleopae, et Maria Magdalene. ${ }^{26}$ Quum vidisset er|go LB 414



24 Ne $B$-E: $\operatorname{Non} A \mid 25$ Cleopae $D$ E: vxor Cleophae $A$, vxor Cleopae $B C \mid 26$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$
29 impositam $B$ - $E$ : imponentes $A$

20 тท̃ऽ mó $\lambda \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$ ó тóтоऽ. The easier wordorder of the Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by cod. W and a few later mss., including cod. 69. In codd. 2 and 817, the reading is o то́тоৎ тท̃ऽ тó $\lambda \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$, in company with $7^{66 v i d} \aleph$ A B D ${ }^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N} 065$ and most of the later mss. The poorly attested reading offered by cod. 1 survived into the Textus Receptus.

20 et Graece 'E $\lambda \lambda \eta \eta$ vioti' ("Graece" Vg.). Erasmus adds the conjunction, for the sake of good Latin style.
21 quod ille dixerit őtı ėkeĩvos દitte ("quia ipse dixit" Vg.). For the removal of quia, see on Iob. 1,20 . Erasmus' use of ille is more appropriate than ipse in this context, and was anticipated by Manetti, who put quod ille dixit.
23 Iesum tòv "Iŋ $\sigma 0$ ũv ("eum" Vg.). The Vulgate seems to follow a different Greek text, reading aútóv, though this is only found in a few late mss. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.

23 a summo ék $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$ ăv $v \omega \theta \varepsilon \nu$ ("de super" Vg.). See on Iob. 3,3.
24 inter se тро̀s $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \lambda$ ous ("ad inuicem" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,33.
24 Ne Mŕ ("Non" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 3,7.
$24 \varepsilon \ddot{\varepsilon} \beta \alpha \lambda o v$. In 1516, the incorrect use of the imperfect tense, $\bar{\varepsilon} \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda o v$, was derived from cod. 2, without other ms. support.
24 of $\mu \dot{v} \nu$. The omission of $\mu \varepsilon ́ v$ in 1516 again followed cod. 2, unsupported by other mss.
25 Cleopae тоũ K $\lambda \omega \pi$ ã ("Cleophae" late Vg.; "vxor Cleophae" 1516; "vxor Cleopae" 151922). Erasmus added vxor in 1516 by way of clarification. The fact that he deleted it in 1527 may have been a tacit acknowledgment that "Mary of Cleopas" could equally refer to a sister or daughter of Cleopas (or Clopas).
26 i $\delta \omega \dot{\omega}$. The misspelling i $\delta \omega \dot{\omega}$ in 1516 is derived from cod. 2.
26 ac kai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
26 astantem $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega ̃ \tau \alpha$ ("stantem" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate in rendering this compound verb. The same substitution occurs at Mc. 15,39, in accordance with Vulgate usage elsewhere. The same change was made by Manetti.

26 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 9.
27 dicit $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \in 1$ ("dixit" Vg. 1527). See ibid.

27 sua tà î $\delta 1 \alpha$ ("suam" late Vg.). Erasmus restores the earlier Vulgate rendering: see Annot. The version of Manetti substituted propria.
 ("seeing") was taken from cod. 2, supported by cod. 817 and many other late mss. In 1522, the substitution of ciठcos may have been partly influenced by the Vulgate, but has the support of $\aleph A B D^{\text {supp }} N W$ and many later mss., including cod. 1 , and also the Complutensian Polyglot. Manetti had conspicatus.
28 quod ... consummata essent őtı ... TETÉ入 $\varepsilon \sigma T \alpha 1$ ("quia ... consummata sunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... consumata sunt.
28 omnia iam $\pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$ ทך $\delta \eta$ ("omnia" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reflects the omission of $\eta \delta \eta$, as in cod. $W$ and a few later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Some mss. have $\eta \because \delta \eta \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \alpha$, as in $33^{66} \mathrm{~A} B \mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$, corresponding with the word-order of the earlier Vulgate. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by $\mathcal{X}$ and most later mss. Manetti made the same change.
28 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$ ("dixit" late Vg.). See on vs. 9.
29 igitur ... vero oưv ... ס́ ("autem ... ergo" late Vg.). The earlier Vulgate had the word-order ergo ... autem. The transposition found in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. was widespread among other printed editions of the late Vulgate. See on Iob. 6,62 regarding igitur. The substitution of vero for autem here, in a continuative sense, was more appropriate to the context: see on Ioh. 3,18.

29 impleuerunt spongiam aceto et bysopo, et impositam (imponentes 1516) admouerunt $\pi \lambda \lambda_{n} \sigma \alpha \nu-$
 тробทंve circumponentes, obtulerunt" Vg.). Erasmus' radical alteration of the Latin rendering is less accurate. His notion of translating $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \in \omega$ if it were constructed with $\pi \lambda$ ń $\sigma \alpha v$ res rather than $\pi \varepsilon \rho i \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon s$ is incorrect, and makes the purpose of impositam correspondingly obscure. His substitution of impono for circumpono is less precise as a rendering of $\pi \varepsilon p ı i \theta \eta \mu \mathrm{l}$, and also occurs at $M c .15,36$, though he ventures to substitute circumpono for impono at Mc. 15,17, to translate the same Greek verb. The verb admoueo, which occurs in the Vulgate only in 1-2 Maccabees, is used twice elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T., replacing mitto in rendering ėmı $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ at Lc. 9,62 (1519), and replacing adfero at Ioh. 20,27, in rendering $\varphi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omega$. At $L c .23,36$, however,

 $\nu \alpha S ~ T \eta ̀ \nu ~ к є 甲 \propto \lambda \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon ́ \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon ~ т O ̀ ~ \pi \nu \varepsilon \cup ̃ \mu \alpha . ~$



















 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1,{ }^{\text {"O }}$





ori eius. ${ }^{30}$ Quum ergo accepisset Iesus acetum, dixit: Consummatum est, et inclinato capite tradidit spiritum.
${ }^{31}$ Iudaei ergo, quoniam parasceue erat, vt non remanerent in cruce corpora sabbato (erat enim magnus dies ille sabbati), rogauerunt Pilatum, vt frangerentur eorum crura, ac tollerentur. ${ }^{32}$ Venerunt ergo milites, et primi quidem fregerunt crura, et alterius qui crucifixus est cum eo. ${ }^{33}$ Ad lesum autem quum venissent, vt viderunt eum iam mortuum, non fregerunt eius crura: ${ }^{34}$ sed vnus militum lancea latus eius fodit, et continuo exiuit sanguis et aqua. ${ }^{35} \mathrm{Et}$ qui vidit, testimonium perhibuit, et verum est testimonium eius. Et ille scit quod vera dicit, vt et vos credatis. ${ }^{36}$ Facta sunt enim haec, vt scriptura impleretur: Os non comminuetis ex eo. ${ }^{37} \mathrm{Et}$ rursus alia scriptura dicit: Videbunt in quem pupugerunt.
${ }^{38}$ Post haec autem rogauit Pi latum Ioseph Arimathiensis, qui erat discipulus Iesu, sed occultus propter metum Iudaeorum: vt tolleret corpus Iesu, idque permisit



31 ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 33$ fregerunt $B-E$ : ftegerunt $A \mid 37$ rursus $B-E$ : iterum $A \mid$ pupugerunt $B-E$ : transfixerunt $A \mid 38$ Arimathiensis $B-E$ : ab Arimathaea $A \mid$ idque $B-E$ : et $A$
in a similar context to the present passage, Erasmus was content to retain offero. The Vulgate seems to reflect a different Greek wording, such
 тєріӨ́vtes, тробtiveykav, similar to the text of $7^{66 \mathrm{vid}}(\aleph) \mathrm{B} W$ and a few later mss., including cod. 1 , though these mss. also omit the preceding oi $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, and add oũv after $\sigma \pi$ óy $\gamma \circ v$. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by codd. $A D^{\text {supp }} N$ and most of the
later mss., with the exception that it incorrectly substitutes ப்бஸ்T川 for v́бoஸ் $\pi \omega$, possibly influenced by the Vulgate spelling of the word. In 1522, Erasmus had the spelling тро've $\quad$ ккаv, corrected to $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \dot{v E} \gamma \kappa \alpha v$ in 1527. Manetti's version was impleuerunt spongiam aceto et isopo circumposucrunt et obtulerunt.

31 quoniam parasceue erat, vt ... sabbato ह̇ँtei $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma k E \cup \eta \eta_{\eta}^{\eta} \nu, i v \alpha \ldots \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \dot{T}, \ldots$. The Erasmian
text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $\#^{66} \mathrm{~K}$ B W and a few later mss. In codd. 2 and 817 , the word-order is iva ...
 $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and most of the later mss., corresponding with the word-order of Manetti's translation.
31 †juÉpo. Erasmus follows cod. 2 in omitting خं before $\dagger \mu \dot{\xi} \rho \alpha$, with support from $\aleph$ A W and many later mss. In codd. 1 and 817, together with codd. B D ${ }^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and most later mss., the article is inserted.
31 ille ékelvy. The Erasmian text follows cod. 817 and the Vulgate, with support only from cod. $\mathrm{B}^{*}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 69 (though this had a different word-order, Toṽ $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \dot{\alpha}$ тou ह́keivn). In codd. 1 and 2 , the reading is ékeivou, as in $\$^{\text {b6vid }} \approx$ A $B^{\text {corr }} D^{\text {supp }}$ NW and most later mss., translated by Manetti as illius. The less well attested ékeivy reappears in the Elzevier editions of the Tertus Receptus, even though corrected in the meantime by R. Estienne.

31 ǹ $\rho \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta \sigma \alpha v$. In the $1522-35$ editions, the spelling ép $\dot{\cos } \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \alpha v$ was probably a misprint. The form $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \omega$ 'n $\sigma \alpha v$, used in 1516-19, is in accordance with the text of most mss., and is retained at $\operatorname{Iob} .1,21,25 ; 5,12 ; 9,2,19$.
31 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25 .
$32 \sigma \kappa^{\prime} \lambda \eta$. The omission of tó before $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \lambda \eta$ appears to be without ms. support, and probably arose by a mistake of the printer, which remained uncorrected through all five editions. The same error does not occur in vss. 31 or 33 .
 comes from cod. 2, with little other ms. support.
 Annot. and Valla Annot., the Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, $\eta v o i \xi \varepsilon$, though this is now found in only a few late mss. As well as recommending fodit, Valla also suggested $p u p u g i t$ or punxit.
35 quod ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{T}$ ו ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. $1,20$. Manetti also made this change.
35 vt et iva kai. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, with support from $7^{66} \mathcal{K}$ A B D ${ }^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N} W$ and some later mss. In codd. 2 and 817, kai is omitted, in company with most other late mss. Manetti accordingly omitted $e t$.

36 comminuetis $\sigma \cup v \tau p 1 \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$. Cod. $2^{*}$ had ouvtpißn்бєтal, as found in codd. 1 and 817, together with virtually all other mss. Erasmus
 This could be seen either as an arbitrary correction, mistakenly regarding - $\eta$ бETهı as yet another itacism, or as a deliberate pro-Vulgate conjecture, designed to harmonise with $E x$. 12,46.

36 ex eo á $\pi^{\prime}$ aútoũ. The insertion of the preposition, d $\pi^{\prime}$ ', in 1522-35, has support from $X$ and many later mss., including cod. 817 , and produces conformity with the Septuagint version of $E x$. 12,46. It also happens to be supported by the Complutensian Polyglot. In 1516-19, Erasmus followed codd. 1 and 2 in omitting $\alpha^{\prime} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ ', in company with most other mss., commencing with A B D ${ }^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ W.
37 rursus $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı v$ ("iterum" $1516=V$ g.). See on Iob. 9,9.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At the only other N.T. occurrence of غ̇ккevtí $\omega$, at $A p$. Iob. 1,7 , the Vulgate has $p u-$ pugerunt, which Erasmus changed to expunxerunt in 1516, and then to compunxerunt in 1519 . See Annot.
38 autem $\delta$ É. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by ( $\left(\mathrm{P}^{66} \mathrm{~W}\right) \mathbb{N}$ B $D^{\text {supp }} \mathrm{N}$ and many later mss. In codd. 2 and 817 , together with many other late mss., $\delta \varepsilon$ is omitted.
38 Arimathiensis àmò Apıua0aias ("ab Arimathia" Vg.; "ab Arimathaea" 1516). At Mc. 15,43 (1519), Erasmus makes a different change, replacing $a b$ by ortus ex ciuitate, and at $L c$. 23,51 this becomes oriundus ab. See on Iob. 1,45 for other substitutions of the adjectival form of place names. The omission of $\delta$ before dá in 1527-35 may not have been intended by Erasmus, though this word is also omitted by $7^{66 \text { vid }}$ A B D ${ }^{\text {supp }}$ and a few later mss.
38 qui crat $\omega \nu$ ("eo quod esset" Vg.). Erasmus is more literal here, though either rendering is legitimate. Cf. Iob. 18,10 for a passage where, by contrast, he interprets the participle in a causal sense. Manetti omitted the phrase.
 Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26 . Manetti made the same change. The spelling кeкрuиévos in 1522 is a misprint.
 $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' addition of $i d$ is intended
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Pilatus. ${ }^{39}$ Venit autem et Nicodemus, qui venerat ad Iesum nocte primum, ferens mixturam myrrhae et aloes ad libras ferme centum. ${ }^{40}$ Acceperunt ergo corpus Iesu, et obuinxerunt illud linteis cum aromatibus, sicut mos est Iudaeis sepelire. ${ }^{41}$ Erat autem in eo loco vbi crucifixus est, hortus, et in horto monumentum nouum, in quo nondum quisquam positus erat. ${ }^{42} \mathrm{Ibi}$ ergo propter parasceuen Iudaeorum, quod in propinquo esset monumentum, posuerunt Iesum.

20Vno vero die sabbatorum Maria Magdalene venit mane, quum adhuc tenebrae essent, ad monumentum, videtque lapidem sublatum a monumento. ${ }^{2}$ Currit ergo et venit ad Simonem Petrum, et ad alterum illum discipulum, quem amabat Iesus, et dicit illis: Sustulerunt dominum e monumento, et nescimus vbi posuerint eum. ${ }^{3}$ Exiit ergo Petrus et ille alius discipulus, et venerunt ad monumentum. ${ }^{4}$ Cur|rebant autem duo simul, et ille alius discipulus praecucurrit citius Petro, venitque prior ad
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20,3 $\varepsilon \xi \eta \lambda \theta \varepsilon \nu A^{c} B-E: \varepsilon \zeta \eta \lambda \theta \circ v A^{*} \mid \circ \alpha \lambda \lambda \circ \operatorname{B-E}: \alpha \lambda \lambda \cos A$
39 ad libras ferme $B$-E: ferme libras $A \mid 41$ eo $B$-E: om. $A \mid 42$ Iudacorum $B$ - $E$ : Iudaeorrum $A$ 20,1 Vno vero die $E$ : Vna autem $A$, Primo vero die $B-D \mid$ videtque $B$ - $E$ : et videt $A \mid 2$ Currit $B$-E: Cucurrit $A \mid$ alterum $B$-E: alium $A \mid$ Sustulerunt $B$-E: Tulerunt $A \mid$ e $B$-E: de $A \mid$ 4 venitque $B$ - $E$ : et venit $A$
to provide an explicit object for the verb, though elsewhere he is sometimes content to use permitto in contexts where an object is only implied, e.g. at Lc. 8,32; Act. 19,30.

38 Pilatus ó $\Pi_{i} \lambda$ ãros ("Pilatus. Venit ergo et tulit corpus Iesu" Vg.). The omission of this sentence is one of the more serious defects of Erasmus' text and translation of John's Gospel. In codd. 1 and $2^{*}$, in company with cod. $A$ and a few later mss., the text of this verse ends with
 most other mss., two further sentences are
 kai ทัpe to $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ toũ In $\eta o u ̃$. It appears that because of the repetition of the words tò $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ Toũ 'Inooũ, some scribes accidentally omitted these two sentences by the error of homoeoteleuton. Erasmus only partly corrected this
 $\delta \Pi_{i} \lambda \alpha \tilde{\alpha}$ тоs in the margin of cod. 2, probably relying on his cod. 817 in conjunction with the

Vulgate, but he failed to add the second of the missing sentences, $\uparrow \uparrow \lambda \theta \varepsilon v$ oưv kai $\mathfrak{\eta} \rho \varepsilon$ тò $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ тои̃ 'İбoũ.
39 uúpvns. This error of spelling is unsupported by Greek mss., which mostly read $\sigma u u^{p} v \eta$ ns, as found in codd. 1, 2 and 817.
39 ad libras ferme $\dot{\omega} \sigma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda$ itipas ("quasi libras" Vg.; "ferme libras" 1516). See on Iob. 1,39 for the removal of quasi. In reading $\omega \sigma$ हi, the Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $\mathbf{p}^{66 \text { vid }} \mathrm{ANW}$ and many later mss. Codd. 2 and 817 have $\omega$, as found in many other mss., commencing with $\aleph B D^{\text {supp. }}$
40 ergo $0{ }^{\text {r }} \mathrm{v}$ ("autem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading does not appear to have Greek ms. support.
 on Ioh. 11,44.
40 illud aủтó ("eum" Vg.). The Vulgate reading implied a Greek text which had aưtóv, found only in a few late mss. See Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered by ipsum.
40 linteis ${ }^{0} 0$ ovions. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $\mathbf{\#}^{66} \boldsymbol{K}$ B N W and some later mss. In codd. 2 and 817, it is $\hat{e} v \dot{d} \theta$ oviors, as in codd. A $D^{s u p p}$ and most of the later mss.

41 in eo loco èv tẽ tótç ("in loco" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 5,13.
 iuxta erat" Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,13. Manetti's version had quia prope erat.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "Primo vero die" 1519-27). See on Iob. 1,29 for the masculine gender of dies. Erasmus' change from vna to primo in 1519 is a little surprising in view of his general retention of vnus or vna from the Vulgate in such contexts. At Mc. 16,2 (1519) he changed to primi to match primo die at $M c .16,9$, but in the latter passage the underlying Greek was $\pi p \omega \dot{T} \eta$ rather than $\mu \mathrm{a}$. At $M t$. 28,1, he changed prima to vnam, arguing in Annot. ad loc., that it meant "one day out of seven", i.e. not necessarily the first day of the week, but in an added note in 1522 he conceded that it could still mean "first". The substitution of vero for autem, frequent elsewhere, is more appropriate at the present passage, where the context requires a continuative sense to be given to the Greek particle: see on Ioh. 3,18.

1 sabbatorum $\tau \tilde{v} v \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \dot{T} \omega v$ ("sabbati" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 28,1; Lc. 24,1 (1519); Act. 20,7; 1 Cor. 16,2. Erasmus consistently distinguishes between the plural and singular forms of this Greek word, except at $L c$. 13,14 (1519) where he puts singular for plural. At the present passage, Manetti put sabatorum.

1 бкотвís. This spelling is derived from cod. 2. Most other mss. have oкотias.
1 videtque kai $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon ⿺$ ("et vidit" late Vg.; "et videt" 1516 = Vg. mss.). Erasmus restores the more accurate rendering of the earlier Vulgate mss. On que, see on Iob. 1,39.
2 Currit $\tau \rho \overline{\text { ÉXel }}$ ("Cucurrit" $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate perfect tense is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
2 alterum illum тòv ä̀ $\lambda$ дov ("alium" Vg.; "alium illum" 1516). See on Iob. 18,16. At vss. 3 and 4, Erasmus retains ille alius of the Vulgate.
2 dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("dixit" late Vg.). The perfect tense of the late Vulgate lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti also put dicit.
2 Sustulerunt "Hpav ("Tulerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on loh. 8,59.
$2 e$ ék ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
2 posuerint ënkav ("posuerunt" Vg.). This use of the subjunctive is appropriate for indirect questions after nescio: see on Ioh. 16,18. A similar change occurs at vs. 15 (1519), but the indicative is retained for posuerunt in vs. 13.
$3 \varepsilon \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \in v$. The misprint $\varepsilon \in \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta o v$ (sic) in the 1516 Greek text looks as if it might have been intended to be $\bar{\xi} \zeta \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta o v$, but this is unsupported by mss., and was corrected in the 1516 errata. In cod. 2, the $-\varepsilon$ - in $-\theta \varepsilon v$ is partly damaged, and this may have caused the typesetter to misread it.
$3 \delta \alpha \lambda \lambda 10 s$. The omission of $\dot{\delta}$ in 1516 was without ms. authority, except for cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {supp }}$, and was possibly a conjecture of Erasmus: see on Ioh. 18,15.
4 venitque kai $\eta \lambda \theta \varepsilon$ ("et venit" $1516=V g$.). See on lob. 1,39.
4 prior тра̃тos ("primus" Vg.). Erasmus makes a point of using comparative adjectives, rather than the superlative, when only two persons or things are being compared, in accordance with classical Latin usage. Other such substitutions
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monumentum．${ }^{5}$ Et quum se incli－ nasset，vidit posita linteamina，non tamen introiuit．${ }^{6}$ Venit ergo Simon Petrus sequens eum et introiuit in monumentum，et vidit linteamina po－ sita，${ }^{7}$ et sudarium quod fuerat super caput eius non cum linteaminibus positum，sed separatim inuolutum in vnum locum．${ }^{8}$ Tunc ergo introiuit et ille alius discipulus，qui venerat prior ad monumentum，viditque et credidit：${ }^{9}$ nondum enim nouerant scripturam，quod oportuisset eum a mortuis resurgere．${ }^{10}$ Abierunt ergo rursus discipuli ad semet ipsos．
${ }^{11}$ Maria autem stabat ad monu－ mentum foris plorans．Dum ergo fleret，inclinauit se in monumen－ tum，${ }^{12}$ et videt duos angelos amic－ tos albis，sedentes vnum ad caput， et alterum ad pedes illic，vbi posu－ erant corpus Iesu．${ }^{13}$ Dicunt ei illi： Mulier，quid ploras？Dicit eis：Sus－ tulerunt dominum meum，nec scio vbi posuerunt eum．${ }^{14} \mathrm{Haec}$ quum dixisset，conuersa est retrorsum，et videt Iesum stantem，nec sciebat

7 evtetu

6 vidit $A$ E：videt $B-D \mid 8$ alius $B-E:$ om．$A \mid$ viditque $B-E$ et vidit $A \mid 9$ nouerant $B$－$E$ ： nouerunt $A \mid$ oportuisset $B$－E：oportuit $A \mid 10$ rursus $B$－E：iterum $A \mid 11$ inclinauit se $B$－E： inclinauit se，et prospexit $A \mid 12$ albis $B-E$ ：in albis $A \mid$ alterum $B-E$ ：vnum $A \mid$ illic $B$－E：om．$A \mid 13$ Sustulerunt $B$－E：Tulerunt $A \mid$ nec scio $B$－E：et nescio $A \mid 14$ videt $A^{c} B-E$ ： vidit $A^{*} \mid$ nec $B$－E：et non $A$
occur at Mt．21，28（1519），31；Ioh．20，8； 1 Tim． 2，13；Hebr．9，18；10，9．Cf．also the substitution of superior at Act．1，1，and see Annot．on Mt． 21,31 ．An inconsistent change in the opposite direction，from prioribus to primis，occurs at Lc．11，26（1519）．

6 vidit $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon ⿺ 𠃊 ⿻ 上 丨 𣥂 ~(" v i d e t " ~ 1519-27) . ~ E r a s m u s ' ~ u s e ~$ of the perfect tense in 1516 and 1535，to translate the Greek present tense，reproduces
the late Vulgate rendering，and is consistent with his retention of the late Vulgate vidit for $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ т t \varepsilon 1$ at vs． 5 ，but without support from Greek mss．In both instances，Erasmus may have taken account of the fact that a past tense was used for verbs which preceded and followed vidit，and he wished to avoid the awkward transition from past to present，and then back again to a past tense in the following clause． See on Ioh．13，31．Erasmus＇use of the present
tense in 1519-27 was, in effect, a restoration of the earlier Vulgate rendering and closer to the meaning of the Greek text. At vss. 12 and 14, he substitutes the present tense, videt, and in Annot. ad loc. he objects to the Vulgate's use of vidit for $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon$.i.
7 Évtetu $\lambda_{1 \gamma \mu \text { gévov. In 1516, the incorrect }}$ spelling, évtetv $\lambda_{1}$ Yนév $v \nu$, is derived from cod. 2.

8 ille alius ò ờ $\lambda \lambda$ os ("ille" 1516 Lat. $=V g$.). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti had just alius here.
8 prior $\pi \rho \omega \tilde{T}$ тos ("primus" Vg.). See on vs. 4.
8 viditque kaì eIEe ("et vidit" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
 1516). See on Ioh. 1,33.

9 quod oportuisset ötı $\delta$ Eĩ ("quia oportuit" late Vg.; "quod oportuit" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod oportebat, possibly following a different form of the late Vulgate, which had quia oportebat.
10 rursus discipuli $\pi \alpha \dot{ } \lambda ı \nu . .$. oi $\mu \alpha \nexists \eta \tau \alpha i$ ("iterum discipuli" 1516 = Annot., lemma). The wordorder of the 1516 rendering corresponds with the text of some copies of the late Vulgate, including the Froben edition of 1491. The Vulgate column of the 1527 N.T., together with the Froben 1514 edition, had discipuli iterum. See on Iob. 9,9, and Annot. Erasmus particularly wished to avoid giving the impression that the disciples went away more than once. Manetti omitted iterum.
11 inclinauit se mapékuчev ("inclinauit se et prospexit" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). At $L c .24,12$, in a similar context, Erasmus adopts a different translation of the same Greek verb, putting prospicio for procumbo, explaining the meaning in Annot. ad loc., as obliquato capite prospicere. That was consistent with the Vulgate rendering of тарокúттт at 1 Petr. 1,12. At a further occurrence of this Greek verb, at Iac. 1,25, Erasmus substitutes prospicio for perspicio. Although his use of inclino at the present passage was consistent with the Vulgate rendering of vs. 5 , this loses the distinction between mapaxú $\pi \tau \omega$
 was used to render the latter verb at Ioh. 8,6, 8. The distinction between these Greek verbs could have been preserved if he had used prospicio at lob. 20,5, 11.

12 videt $\theta \varepsilon \omega p \varepsilon \mathrm{I}$ ("vidit" Vg.). The tense of the Vulgate is not supported by Greek mss. See on vs. 6, and Annot.
12 amictos $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} v$ ("in" Vg.; "amictos in" 1516). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 1,10. Cf. also Erasmus' use of vestitu ... vestiuntur for in veste ... sunt at Lc. 7,25 (1519), and veste indutus for in veste at Iac. 2,2. However, he retains in albis at $A p$. Iob. 3,4, and similar phrases at $L c .20,46$; 24,4; Act. 10,30. See Annot.
12 alterum Eva ("vnum" $1516=V g$.). This substitution, in accordance with classical Latin idiom, occurs also at Mt. 20,21; 24,40, 41; 27,38 (all 1519).
12 illic, vbi ठттои ("vbi" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus inserts illic, probably to avoid vbi being understood too closely with the preceding noun, pedes.
12 posuerant $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \theta_{\eta \kappa \alpha \sim}$ ("positum erat" late Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, ékeito, found in virtually all the Greek mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Erasmus follows cod. 2 , in which $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{2} \eta \kappa \alpha v$ probably represents a harmonisation with the same verb in vs. 13.
13 Dicunt kai $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma o v \sigma ı v$. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated, with only cod. $\boldsymbol{K}$ for support. Similar omissions occur in vss. 14 and 22. Manetti put et dicunt.
13 Sustulerunt öтı "Hpav ("Quia tulerunt" Vg.; "Tulerunt" 1516). For the omission of quia, see on Ioh. 1,20, and for sustulerunt (from tollo), see on Ioh. 8,59.
13 nec scio kaì oủk or $\delta \alpha$ ("et nescio" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Regarding nec, see on Iob. 2,16. Erasmus retains et nescio at Ioh. 20,2; Act. 12,9; 1 Ioh. 2,11; Ap. Iob. 3,3, 17.
14 Haec каi taũta. As at the beginning of vss. 13 and 22, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated, but here the Vulgate may be based on a Greek text omitting kaí, as in $\aleph$ A B D N W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with most other late mss. Manetti's version had Et bec.
14 videt $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon i ̃$ ("vidit" 1516 Lat. text = late Vg.). See on vs. 6, and Annot. The rendering which Erasmus had retained from the late Vulgate is corrected in the 1516 errata.
14 nec sciebat kaì oủk \#ुँ $\delta$ el ("et non sciebat" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 13. Manetti put et nesciebat.















 बU゙Tทั.


 $\eta \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o t ~ \delta ı \alpha ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ ф o ́ ß o v ~ т \omega ̃ v ~ l o u \delta \alpha i ́ \omega v, ~$ रु $\lambda \theta \varepsilon \nu$ ó 'Iŋ


 $\mu \alpha \theta \eta t \alpha i$, iठóvtes tòv KÚpiov. ${ }^{21}$ єitाev




quod Iesus esset. ${ }^{15}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Mulier, quid ploras? Quem quaeris? Illa existimans quod hortulanus esset, dicit ei: Domine, si tu asportasti eum, dicito mihi vbi posueris eum, et ego eum tollam. ${ }^{16}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Maria. Conuersa illa, dicit ei: Rabboni, quod dicitur magister. ${ }^{17}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Noli me tangere. Nondum enim ascendi ad patrem meum. Sed vade ad fratres meos, et dic eis: Ascendo ad patrem meum et patrem vestrum, et deum meum, et deum vestrum. ${ }^{18}$ Venit Maria Magdalene, annuncians discipulis quod vidisset dominum, et ea dixisset sibi.
${ }^{19}$ Quum ergo vespera esset die illo qui erat vnus sabbatorum, et fores essent clausae, vbi erant discipuli congregati propter metum Iudaeorum, venit lesus, stetitque in medio et dicit eis: Pax vobis. ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Et}$ quum haec dixisset, ostendit eis manus ac latus suum. Gauisi sunt ergo discipuli, viso domino. ${ }^{21}$ Dixit ergo eis iterum: Pax vobis. Sicut misit me pater, ita et ego mitto vos. ${ }^{22}$ Haec quum dixisset, flauit in eos et dicit eis: Accipite spiritum sanctum.

15 каүш $A$ B C $C^{c} D E$ кү $\alpha \omega C^{*} \mid 16$ р $\alpha \beta \beta$ ovvi $A D E: \rho \alpha \beta \beta$ ovvoı $B C$

15 posueris $B$ - $E$ : posuisti $A \mid 17$ ascendi $A B D E$ : abscendi $C \mid$ Sed vade $B-E$ : Vade autem $A \mid$ tert. et $B$-E: om. $A \mid 19$ stetitque $B$-E: et stetit $A \mid 20$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 21$ ita $B$-E: om. $A \mid 22$ flauit in eos $B-E$ : insufflauit $A$
 See on Ioh. 1,20 . The same change was made by Manetti.

14 ठ'Inooũs. Again, Erasmus or his assistants arbitrarily insert the article, with little ms. support. It is omitted in codd. 1, 2, 69 and 817 ,
together with nearly all other mss. See on Iob. 1,48 .
15 Dicit ... dicit $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1$... $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("Dixit ... dixit"
Vg. 1527). See on vs. 2.
15 quod ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.

15 asportasti $\varepsilon \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha s$ ("sustulisti" Vg.). This is the only occurrence of asporto in Erasmus' N.T., and is well suited to the context. No doubt he wished to make a distinction from tollo, which is used later in this verse to render a different Greek verb, ailpw. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in making this change.
15 posueris eum aủtòv है̂̀nkas ("posuisti eum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 2 regarding the use of the subjunctive. The Greek word-order is derived from cod. 2, supported by cod. N and some later mss. Erasmus' Latin word-order follows the Vulgate, which reflects a Greek text having
 with most other mss., commencing with $\aleph \mathrm{A}$ B D W.
16 Dicit ... dicit $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \in 1 . . . \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma є 1$ ("Dixit ... dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 2.
16 'Pa $\beta \beta$ ouvi. The spelling ${ }^{\text {º }} \alpha \beta \beta$ ouvoi' in 1519-22 was probably a misprint (cod. 3 has paßouvi).
17 Dicit $\lambda \dot{\prime} \gamma \in 1$ ("Dixit" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 2.
17 Sed vade mopqúou סé ("Vade autem" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
17 et deum (1st.) kò $\theta$ Eóv ("deum" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission of et lacks Greek support. Manetti had et deum.

 ported by cod. $W$ and a few later mss. Another
 mss., including $7^{66^{+}} K^{*}$ A B 078. In codd. 1 and 817, together with most other mss., commencing with $7^{66 c o r r} \mathcal{X}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D} N$, the reading

18 quod vidisset dominum et ea dixisset sibi ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{T}$ ו
 ("Quia vidi dominum et haec dixit mihi" Vg.). The Vulgate implies a different Greek
 $\mu \mathrm{ol}$, but this is not supported by Greek mss. A few mss. have émpora, in the first person, but combine this with aUTñ, in the third person, as found in $7^{66} \times \mathrm{B} N \mathrm{~W}$. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2, in company with codd. A D 078 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. His Latin rendering here for the most part follows a suggestion of Valla Annot. See also Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered by quod viderat dominum et bec dixerat ei.

19 vespera ó 4 ías ("sero" Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,16. Manetti began the sentence with Sero autem facto.
19 qui erat wnus $T \underset{T}{\mu} \mu \tilde{\sim} \tilde{\sim}$ ("vna" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29.
 See on Ioh. 1,39.
19 dicit $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("dixit" late Vg.). The late Vulgate use of the perfect tense has negligible Greek ms. support. Manetti had ait.
20 baec тои̃то. Erasmus' rendering follows the late Vulgate plural, in conflict with his Greek text and most mss. (apart from cod. W). See on Ioh. 2,12, for other instances of baec for тои̃то.
20 dixisset $\mathrm{E} \pi \mathrm{T} \omega \mathrm{v}$ ("dixit" Vg. 1527). The reading of the 1527 Vulgate column is grammatically incorrect, after cum.
20 ac каi' ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
20 suum $\propto \cup ์ T 0$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of cod. N and a few later mss., including cod. 1. In a few others, commencing with $\aleph$ A B D W 078, it is aútoĩs. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, which have $\alpha$ u'toũ, in company with $7^{66 v i d}$ and most later mss. For his use of the rough breathing in the 1519-35 editions, see on Ioh. 2,21. Manetti put eius.
21 iterum ó 'Iๆбoũs mó $\lambda ı v$. Erasmus' rendering follows the Vulgate, supported by K DW and a few later mss., which omit ó 'Inooũs. In cod. 1, the word-order is $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} 1 v$ o ${ }^{\prime} I \eta \sigma o u ̃ s$. Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817, supported by codd. A B N 078 and most later mss. Manetti had Iesus iterum.
21 ita et ego káy ${ }^{\prime}$ ("et ego" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 13,33.
22 Haec kà̀ тоũto. Erasmus' rendering follows the late Vulgate in putting plural for singular, as at vs. 20: see on Ioh. 2,12. He also follows the Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated, with support from cod. D alone among the Greek mss. Cf. Erasmus' similar omissions in vss. 13 and 14. Manetti began this sentence with $E t$ cum boc.
22 flauit in eos $̇$ éveqúaŋ $\eta$ ("insufflauit" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus substitutes a more idiomatic classical Latin expression, in place of the rare verb, insufflo.
22 dicit $\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\prime} \boldsymbol{y}_{\mathrm{El}}$ ("dixit" late Vg.). See on vs. 2.





















 oi $\mu \eta$ ì íóvtes kai miotev́oavtes.




 ध̇otiv ó Xpıotòs ó viòs toũ $\theta$ вoũ, kai
${ }^{23}$ Quoruncunque remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis: quoruncunque retinueritis, retenta sunt. ${ }^{24}$ Thomas autem vnus ex duodecim, qui dicitur Didymus, non erat cum eis quando venit Iesus. ${ }^{25}$ Dixerunt ergo ei alii discipuli: Vidimus dominum. Ille autem dixit eis: Nisi videro in manibus eius vestigium clauorum, et mittam digitum meum in vestigium clauorum, et mittam manum meam in latus eius, non credam. ${ }^{26} \mathrm{Et}$ post dies octo iterum erant discipuli eius intus, et Thomas cum eis. Venit Iesus ianuis clausis, et stetit in medio, et dixit: Pax vobis. ${ }^{27}$ Deinde dicit Thomae: Infer digitum tuum huc, et vide manus meas, et admoue manum tuam, et immitte in | latus meum, et noli esse incredulus, sed credens. ${ }^{28}$ Respondit Thomas, et dixit ei: Dominus meus et deus meus. ${ }^{29}$ Dicit ei Iesus: Quia vidisti me, Thoma, credidisti: beati qui non viderunt et crediderunt.
${ }^{30}$ Multa quidem et alia signa fecit Iesus in conspectu discipulorum suorum, quae non sunt scripta in libro hoc. ${ }^{31} \mathrm{Haec}$ autem scripta sunt, vt credatis, quod Iesus est Christus ille filius dei, et

25 alt. $\tau \omega v$ B-E: тоv $A \mid 27 \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \varepsilon A^{c} B-E: \beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon A^{*}$

23 Quoruncunque $B-E$ : Quorum $A \mid$ quoruncunque $B-E$ : et quorum $A \mid 24$ qui $B-D E^{*}$ : ui $E^{b} \mid 25$ prius vestigium $B$ - $E$ : figuram $A \mid$ alt. vestigium $B-E$ : figuram $A \mid 26$ dixit $B-E$ : dixit eis $A \mid 27$ immitte $B-E$ : mitte $A \mid$ credens $B-E$ : fidelis $A \mid 28$ ei $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 31$ ille C-E: om. A B

23 Quoruncunque ... quoruncunque वैv tivav ... ${ }^{\alpha} v{ }^{\circ} \nu \mathrm{tiv} \omega \nu$ ("Quorum ... et quorum" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{V}$ g.). See on Ioh. 13,20. The Vulgate addition of $e t$ does not have explicit Greek support.

25 vestigium (twice) tòv tútrov ("fixuram ... locum" late $\mathrm{Vg} .=\mathrm{Vg} . \mathrm{mss}$.; "figuram ... figuram" 1516). The use of vestigium in 1519 was better
suited to the context: see Annot., where Erasmus (partly following Valla Annot.) also notes the existence of some Vulgate mss. which had figuram for fixuram. Manetti had figuram twice, anticipating Erasmus' 1516 rendering. The Vulgate's use of locum, however, is based on a slightly different Greek text, substituting тómov for $\boldsymbol{T} \dot{\prime} \pi \mathrm{T} O$, as in codd. A 078 and a few later
mss. Other variants also exist. Erasmus follows cod. 2 in reading túrov in both places, with support from $X^{\text {corr }}$ B D W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817.
$25 \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tilde{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ (twice). The reading $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tilde{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ ... тòv $\tilde{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$, in 1516 , represents a partly corrected version of cod. 2, which had tov $i \lambda \omega \nu . .$. тòv $\tilde{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$, apparently without other ms. support.
26 dixit ElT€v ("dixit eis" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition of a pronoun is supported only by a few of the later mss. Manetti omitted eis.
27 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon$ ("dixit" late Vg.). See on vs. 2.
27 admoue 甲́́pe ("adfer" Vg.). This change appears to be designed for greater stylistic variety, to avoid the similarity of adfer and infer, which was used earlier in the verse. On the use of admoueo, see also on Ioh. 19,29.
27 immitte $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$ ("mitte" $1516=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). For the use of immitto, see on Iob. 13,2. The reading $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ (aorist imperative), in the 1516 Greek text, was not what Erasmus originally intended, although it is supported by nearly all the Greek mss. He found $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ in cod. $2^{*}$, but manually corrected this into $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$. At a later stage, his assistants evidently decided to revert to $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$, which they would have found in both codd. 1 and 817 , so that this was the spelling that was actually printed. Then in the 1516 errata, Erasmus reinstated his desired reading, $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$. This is a small but significant example of his use of conjectural emendation to prepare his Greek N.T. text. In removing the frequent errors of spelling which confronted him in cod. 2, he often found it easier to rely on his own grammatical knowledge for such corrections rather than to lose precious time by repeatedly consulting his other mss. on these smaller points. This had the unfortunate result that he sometimes altered a genuine reading, in the mistaken belief that it was a scribal error. Similar arbitrary corrections of cod. 2 by Erasmus, changing $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ to $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$, can be detected in the manuscript at Mt. 17,27 and $L c .4,9$. This process of conjectural alteration of the text did not end with the marking up of cod. 2, but was continued by Erasmus and his assistants during the later stages of typesetting and correcting the proofs. In this way, further changes from $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ to $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$ were made at $M t .4,6 ; 5,29$, 30; 18,8; from ë́k $\beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon$ to ĕk $\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$ at $M t$. 7,5; Lc. 6,42; and from $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ to $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, in the

1516 errata, at Iob. 21,6. Cf. also $\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \omega$ for $\beta \alpha \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \omega$ at $I o b .8,7$, though this at least had a semblance of support from cod. 1.
27 credens miotós ("fidelis" 1516=Vg.). Borrowing a suggestion of Valla Annot., Erasmus explains in Annot., that he wishes to convey the "prosonomasia" of miбtós and äriotos. In the context of the faith of a Christian believer, Erasmus usually follows the Vulgate in retaining fidelis.
28 Respondit ${ }^{2}$ atekpi $\theta \eta$. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, in company with $\mathbb{N}$ B C ${ }^{*}$ D W and some later mss. In codd. 2 and 817, was found кai ódeкрі白 $\eta$, as in most other mss., commencing with codd. A C ${ }^{\text {corr. }}$
28 o $\Theta \omega \mu a ̃ s$. Erasmus' Greek text arbitrarily adds the article, with support only from cod. $\aleph$ and a few later mss. In codd. 1, 2 and 817, the article is omitted, as in most other mss., commencing with codd. A B C D W. Cf. the frequent insertion of the article before 'l $\eta$ oous: see on Iob. 1,48. The poorly attested reading persisted into the Textus Receptus.
28 ei aủtũ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. The version of Manetti also had ei.
29 Dicit $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{El}}$ ("Dixit" late Vg.). The late Vulgate use of the perfect tense is supported by codd. $\kappa^{*} \mathbb{W}$ and a few later mss., which have Eltev Dé. Erasmus follows codd. 1, 2 and 817, $^{2}$ in company with most other mss. Manetti had Dicit here.
29 Thoma $\Theta \omega \mu \tilde{\alpha}$. The Erasmian text follows the late Vulgate in inserting this name, which appears to be unsupported by Greek mss. It later became embedded in the Textus Receptus. This belongs to the category of pro-Vulgate conjectural emendations: see on Ioh. 4,48 .
31 quod Öтı ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
31 ' ${ }^{\prime}$ Inooũs. As elsewhere, the article is arbitrarily inserted, with support from only a few late mss. It is omitted in codd. 1, 2 and 817, in company with virtually all other mss. See on Ioh. $\mathbf{1 , 4 8}$. The inadequately supported reading was again retained by the Textus Receptus.
31 ille filius ó viós ("filius" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The addition of ille, based on the Greek article, indicated that Christ was not merely "a son", but uniquely was "the Son" of God. See on lob. 1,49 .
 $\mu \alpha \pi 1$ aỦToũ.
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vt credentes vitam habeatis per nomen eius.

21Postea manifestauit se iterum lesus ad mare Tyberiadis. Manifestauit autem sic. ${ }^{2}$ Erant simul Simon Petrus et Thomas, qui dicitur Didymus: et Nathanael, qui erat a Cana Galilaeae, et filii Zebedei, aliique ex discipulis eius duo. ${ }^{3}$ Dicit eis Simon Petrus: Vado piscatum. Dicunt ei: Venimus et nos tecum. Exierunt et ascenderunt in nauim statim, et illa nocte nihil ceperunt. ${ }^{4}$ Mane autem iam facto stetit lesus in littore, non tamen cognouerunt discipuli, quod lesus esset. ${ }^{5}$ Dicit eis Iesus: Pueri, num quid opsonii habetis? Responderunt ei: Non. ${ }^{6}$ At ille dicit eis: Mittite in dexteram nauigii partem rete, et inuenietis. Miserunt ergo, et iam non valebant illud trahere prae multitudine piscium. ${ }^{7}$ Dicit ergo discipulus ille quem diligebat Iesus, Petro: Dominus est. Simon ergo Petrus quum audisset quod dominus esset, tunica succinxit se,



## 31 per nomen $B$-E: in nomine $A$

21,1 Tyberiadis $A D E$ : Tiberiadis $B C \mid 2$ Nathanael B-E: Nathanahel $A \mid$ Cana $B$-E: Chana $A \mid$ Zebedei $E$ : Zebedaei $A-D \mid$ aliique $B$-E: et alii $A \mid 3$ ceperunt $B$-E: prendiderunt $A \mid$ 4 littore $B E$ : litore $A C D \mid 5$ num quid $B-E$ : nunquid $A \mid 6$ dexteram $A C-E$ : dextram $B$

## 31 per nomen $\mathfrak{E} \nu$ t $\tau \tilde{\varphi}$ obvópaxtı ("in nomine" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 5,43.

21,1 lesus ó 'Inooũs. At this point, cod. $2^{*}$
 of which the last four words appear to reflect a harmonisation with vs. 14 , with support from many other late mss. Erasmus accordingly inserted a marginal note in cod. 2 , showing that 'Inooũs was to be followed by the phrase $\varepsilon$ घmi Tñs $\theta \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \pi n s$. However, in omitting toĩs $\mu \alpha \theta \eta t a i s$, he was led astray by cod. 817 and
the Vulgate, for in cod. 1 and nearly all other Greek mss., commencing with $7^{66 \mathrm{vid}}$, ABC D N W, these two words are found to be part of the text. Manetti added discipulis suis.
2 aliique kà $\alpha \lambda \lambda$ ol ("et alii" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,39 .
3 piscatum ${ }^{\text {à }} \lambda_{\text {Iev́sı }}$ ("piscari" Vg.). This use of the supine, to express purpose, is rare in Erasmus' N.T. He may have had in mind the passage from Plautus (Rudens 898), "qui abiit piscatum ad mare". Cf. also nuptum dare
(Mt. 24,38; Mc. 12,25, etc.), irent emptum (Mt. 25,10); and in 1519, ducit aquatum (Lc. 13,15).
3 Exierunt $\bar{\varepsilon} \tilde{\tilde{j}} \lambda \lambda$ oov ("Et exierunt" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek variant having kai غ́ $\xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ov, as in cod. A and a few later mss. In codd. K N and many later mss., the text reads $\varepsilon \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 v$ oũv. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by B C D W and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti made the same change.
$3{ }^{\alpha} v^{\prime} \hat{\beta} \eta \sigma \alpha v$. This reading has limited support among the later mss., though it may represent an unintentional departure from the text of codd. 1, 2 and 817, which all had evép $\quad$ 的v, as found in § ABCDNPW and most later mss.
3 statim eúOús (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by K B C* D N W and a few later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows codd. 2 and 817, in company with codd. A $\mathrm{C}^{\text {cort }} \mathrm{P}$ and most later mss., together with Valla Annot. The rendering proposed by Manetti was confestim.
3 ceperunt हैтiacov ("prendiderunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change is partly for stylistic variety, as Erasmus retains prendidistis in vs. 10. The forms prendiderunt and prendidistis were both condemned by Valla Annot, as barbarisms. In Annot., Erasmus follows Valla in commenting that capio is used at both passages in some Vulgate mss. In Valla Annot., certain other Vulgate mss. were cited as having praebenderunt, a rendering which was adopted by Manetti.
$4 \gamma \varepsilon v o \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \eta s$. The reading $\gamma$ ivouévns in 151619 comes from cod. 2, with support from codd. A B C and some later mss., implying that the day "was dawning" rather than that dawn had already broken. Most mss., commencing with $\mathcal{N}$ N P W, and including codd. 1 and

4 o 'Inooũs. The Erasmian text inserts the article, this time with support from codd. 1 and 817 , together with most other mss., commencing with cod. N. In cod. 2, in company with $\mathbb{N}$ A B C D P W and some later mss., the article is omitted. See on Iob. 1,48.
4 quod ... esset ötı ... ध́atı ("quia ... est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
5 Dicit $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \mathrm{y}$ a ("Dixit ergo" late Vg .). The tense of the verb in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 edition is unsupported by Greek mss. Certain other copies of the late Vulgate,
including the 1491 and 1514 Froben editions, agreed with the earlier Vulgate in putting Dicit ergo. The Vulgate addition of ergo corresponds with the reading $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{s}$ oưv in codd. $1,2,69$, 817 and most other mss. Erasmus or his assistants do not seem to have had good reason for omitting oṽv here, though the word happens to be omitted in cod. N and a few later mss. Manetti had Dicit ergo.
5 num quid $\mu \eta \eta^{\pi} \mathrm{Tl}$ ("nunquid" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus treats $\mu \eta \chi^{T I}$ as two separate words, rather than as the single interrogative particle, $\mu \eta \dot{T} \mathrm{t}$. In Annot., he also suggests num quod, borrowing from Valla Annot.
5 opsonii mpooq́óyiov ("pulmentarium" Vg.). Erasmus prefers to use a classical Latin word, in the sense of edible provisions, whereas the Vulgate term denotes a kind of flavouring. Cf. Annot.

6 At ille dicit $\delta \delta \delta_{\mathfrak{E}} \mathfrak{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{T} \pi \varepsilon v$ ("Dicit" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \xi \varepsilon$, omitting $\delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as in codd. $\aleph^{*}$ W and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2 with support from ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ A B C D N P and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 817. Manetti substituted Ipse autem dixit.
$6 \mathrm{~B} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$. The reading $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, in the 1516 Greek text, comes from cod. 2, with the support of codd. 1 and 817 , along with virtually all other mss. In the 1516 errata, Erasmus' change to $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$ हтe seems to be an arbitrary correction: see on $I o b .20,27$ for other conjectural alterations affecting this Greek verb.
 Vg.; "dextram ... partem" 1519). Erasmus gives a more precise rendering here, in which he was anticipated by Manetti.
7 ergo (2nd.) ouvv (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti used igitur.
7 quod ... esset öтı ... É Étı ("quia ... est" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti's version had quod ... est.
7 ह̇mevoútinu. The spelling ėmevoútuv in 1516-19 may have been due to the compositor misreading the letter $\eta$ in cod. 2. Another misprint produced the following word, $\delta$ ze $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\omega}$ -
 in the errata. This was caused by misreading the character $\zeta$ in the script of cod. 2. A similar mistake had also resulted in $\xi \tilde{\omega} v t o s$ at Iob. 7,38.



 кобícv, oúpovtes тò סíктvov tũv ix $\forall u ́ \omega v$.















 $\nu \varepsilon к \rho \tilde{\nu} \nu$.







erat enim nudus, et misit se in mare. ${ }^{8}$ Alii autem discipuli nauigiolo venerunt: non enim longe aberant a terra, sed circiter cubitis ducentis, trahentes rete piscium. ${ }^{9}$ Vt ergo descenderunt in terram, viderunt prunas positas, et piscem superpositum, et panem. ${ }^{10}$ Dicit eis Iesus: Afferte de piscibus quos prendidistis nunc. ${ }^{11}$ Ascendit Simon Petrus, et traxit rete in terram, plenum magnis piscibus centum quinquaginta tribus. Et quum tot essent, non est scissum rete. ${ }^{12}$ Dicit eis Iesus: Venite, prandete. Et nemo discipulorum audebat interrogare eum, dicens: Tu quis es? - quum scirent quod dominus esset. ${ }^{13}$ Venit itaque Iesus, et accipit panem, et dat eis, et piscem similiter. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{Hac}$ iam tertia vice manifestatus est Iesus discipulis suis quum resurrexisset a mortuis.
${ }^{15}$ Quum ergo prandissent, dicit Simoni Petro Iesus: Simon Ioannis, diligis me plus quam hi? Dicit ei: Etiam domine, tu scis quod amem te. Dicit ei: Pasce agnos meos. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Di}-$ cit ei rursus iterum: Simon Ioannis, diligis me? Ait illi: Etiam domine, tu scis quod amem te. $\mid$ Dicit ei

12 discipulorum audebat $B$ - $E$ : audebat discumbentium $A \mid$ dicens $B-E$ (ital.): om. $A \mid$ quum scirent $B-E$ (cum scirent $B-D$ ): scientes $A \mid 13$ Venit itaque $B-E$ : Et venit $A \mid$ accipit $B-E$ : accepit $A \mid 14$ Hac iam tertia vice $B-E$ : Hoc iam tertio $A \mid 15$ dicit $B-E$ : $\operatorname{dixit} A \mid$ Ioannis $A B$ : Iohannis $C D$, Ioannes $E \mid$ quam hi $D E$ : his $A-C \mid 16$ Ioannis $A B E$ : Iohannis $C D \mid$ alt. ei $B-E$ : ei iterum $A$
 is the only instance in Erasmus' N.T. of the diminutive nauigiolum, which is comparatively rare in classical literature. Elsewhere, he uses nauicula for all other occurrences of $\pi \lambda$ old́piov, and usually nauis for $\pi \lambda o i ̃ o v$. The Vulgate follows the Old Latin preference for using nauicula not only for mhoid́pov in Mark and

John, but also for $\pi$ तोoĩov in Matthew, while using nauis for $\pi \lambda$ oĩov in the other N.T. books.
 Vulgate uses absum mainly in rendering $\mu \dot{\eta}$ yevoito, but Erasmus uses it in the more general sense of "be distant from". Similar
substitutions occur at Mt. 15,$8 ; M c .12,34 ;$ Lc. 7,6; 15,20 (both 1519); 24,13; Act. 1,12; 17,27 (1519); Eph. 2,17.

8 circiter $\omega$ ("quasi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
11 tot $\tau 0 \sigma 0 \cup ́ T \omega v$ ("tanti" Vg.). Erasmus argues in Annot., that it is the number rather than the size of the fish which is emphasised here.
12 discipulorum audebat हैтó $\lambda \mu \alpha \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \mu \propto \eta \tau \omega ̃ \nu$ ("audebat discumbentium" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). Apart from the word-order, the late Vulgate use of discumbentium is unsupported by Greek mss. and may have arisen as a corrupted form of discentium, which is found in some Vulgate mss. Manetti anticipated Erasmus' rendering here.
12 dicens (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This italicised word was probably added to improve the sentence flow, though Erasmus quite often uses interrogo to introduce a direct question without such an addition. Cf. on Ioh. 1,20, for his insertion of inquit, etc., at several passages, to mark a shift from indirect to direct speech.
12 हls. This 'Homeric' form of the secondperson singular, found in all five editions, should probably be regarded as a printer's error for $\varepsilon$, which remarkably remained uncorrected. It has no ms. support.
12 quum scirent siסótes ("scientes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist.
 Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... est.
13 Venit itaque ẼpXeтal oưv ("Et venit" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus' Greek text follows codd. 2 and 817 , supported by cod. A and most later mss. However, oũv is omitted in $\mathbb{K}$ B C D W and some later mss., including cod. 1 , so that Manetti had just Venit.
13 accipit $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \varepsilon 1$ ("accepit" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate use of the perfect tense is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot.
13 dat $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma ı v$ ("dabat" late Vg.). The imperfect tense of the late Vulgate lacks Greek support. See Annot.
14 Hac iam tertia vice toũto そ้ठך tpítov ("Hoc iam tertio" $1516=$ Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 26,42 (1519), putting altera vice for secundo. Cf. Annot.
14 quum resurrexisset ${ }^{\text {è }} \mathrm{y}$ ¢ $\theta \mathrm{Eis}$ ("cum surrexisset" late Vg., with some Vg. mss.). When rendering Ejysipw, in the context of resurrection from the dead, Erasmus generally follows the Vulgate in
using either surgo or resurgo, but sometimes he substitutes excito, suscito, or resuscito.
15 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ("dixit" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate perfect tense is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti also had dicit.
15 Ioannis 'lwavvã ("Iohannis" 1522-7 = Vg.; "Ioannes" 1535). In Annot., the Greek word is cited as i $\omega v \alpha \tilde{\alpha}$, accompanied by the comment that i wavvã was found in "some" mss. ("in nonnullis"). This statement receives doubtful justification from cod. 69, which reads i $\omega$ avã in vs. 17 , though not in vss. 15-16. Both codd. 1 and 2 have iccvã in vss. 15-17, while cod. 817 has a folio missing. The Vulgate reflects the Greek variant, icávvou, found in $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathbf{B}$ $\mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ W. Most mss., commencing with codd. A $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{N}$, agree with codd. 1 and 2 in reading $i \omega v \alpha \tilde{0}$ in vss. 15-17, as also cited by Valla Annot. In Erasmus' 1535 Latin rendering, Ioannes in vs. 15 appears to be a misprint for Ioannis, which is correctly given in vss. $16-17$. See on Ioh. 1,6 for the variations in the spelling of this name. Manetti put Iona here and in vss. 16-17.
15 plus quam bi тлеiov тоútcu ("plus his" $1516-22=V$ g.). As indicated in Annot., the Vulgate rendering is ambiguous. Surprisingly, Erasmus' suggested improvement did not find its way into his Latin N.T. until 1527. The phrase was omitted by Manetti's translation (both mss.).
15 quod amem ő $\tau ı$ чı $\lambda \bar{\omega}$ ("quia amo" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had quod amo.
16 rursus iterum тó́ $\lambda 1 \nu$ סєútepov ("iterum" Vg.). The Vulgate rendering corresponds with the omission of Tró $\lambda 1 \nu$ in cod. D, or of Sev́tepov in $\mathbf{N}^{*}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2, supported by most of the remaining mss. Cod. 1 has $\pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda ı v$ tò $\delta \varepsilon u ́ t \varepsilon p o v$. Manetti, more literally, put iterum secundo.
16 'I $\omega a v v a \tilde{a}$. See on vs. 15.
16 Ait illi $\lambda \varepsilon ́ y \varepsilon ı ~ \alpha u ̉ t ஸ ̣ ~(" A t ~ i l l e " ~ V g . ~ 1527) . ~$ The late Vulgate substitution appears to be unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti had Dicit ei.
16 quod amem ${ }^{\circ}$ Tı $q ı \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ("quia amo" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti, again, had quod amo.
16 Dicit ei (2nd.) $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma є ı ~ o u ̉ t \tilde{̣}$ ("Dicit ei iterum" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek support. Manetti had the same wording as Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate.












 $\mu \mathrm{ol}$.
 тòv $\mu \alpha 0 \eta$ тinv, o̊v ク̉ץáma ó 'Incoũs,

 $\pi \varepsilon$, Kúple, тis żotiv ò mapaঠiઠoús $\sigma \varepsilon$;












Pasce oues meas. ${ }^{17}$ Dicit ei tertio: Simon Ioannis, amas me? Indoluit Petrus, quod dixisset sibi tertio, Amas me? - dixitque ei, Domine, tu omnia nosti, tu scis quod amem te. Dicit ei Iesus: Pasce oues meas. ${ }^{18}$ Amen amen dico tibi, quum esses iunior, cingebas te, et ambulabas quo volebas: quum autem senueris, extendes manus tuas, et alius te cinget, et ducet quo non vis. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem dixit, significans qua morte glorificaturus esset deum. Et quum hoc dixisset, dicit ei: Sequere me.
${ }^{20}$ Conuersus Petrus, videt illum discipulum, quem diligebat Iesus, sequentem, qui et recubuit in coena super pectus eius, et dixit: Domine, quis est ille qui tradit te? ${ }^{21}$ Hunc ergo quum vidisset Petrus, dicit Iesu: Domine, hic autem quid? ${ }^{2}$ Dicit ei lesus, Si eum | velim manere donec LB 422

20 бe CE: om. AB
17 Ioannis $A B E$ : Iohannis $C D \mid$ Indoluit $B-E$ : Contristatus est $A \mid$ dixitque $B-E$ et dixit $A \mid$ 18 prius quo $B$-E: vbi $A \mid 20$ videt $B-E$ : vidit $A \mid$ te $D E$ : om. $A-C \mid 23$ sermo $E$ : sermo iste A-D

16 חoí $\mu \varepsilon v \varepsilon$. This itacistic spelling is derived from cod. 2. The correct spelling, found in most other mss., and in Annot., is moinalve. The same error occurs at $L c .17,7$, corrected in 1519, and at $A p$. Iob. 12,5, corrected in 1522.
16 oues meas т $\alpha$ т тр́́ $\beta$ ата ("agnos meos" Vg.). Erasmus wishes to distinguish from Td $\dot{\alpha}{ }^{2} p v i ́ \alpha$, which was used in vs. 15. See Annot. The

Vulgate sequence agnos ... agnos ... oues is unsupported by Greek mss. Erasmus' change was anticipated by Manetti and Valla Annot.

17 'l $\omega a v v a ̃$. See on vs. 15.
17 Indoluit è̉ $\lambda \cup \pi r^{\prime} \theta \eta$ ("Contristatus est" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 14,9; 18,31. See on Iob. 16,20.
 ei" Vg.). For the removal of quia, see on Iob. 1,20 . The reflexive pronoun, $s i b i$, was intended to refer more clearly to Peter, but it is not without ambiguity. Manetti put quod dixerat ei.
17 dixitque kaì $\varepsilon$ lTtev ("et dicit" Vg.; "et dixit" 1516). The 1516 rendering, et dixit, corresponds with the text of some late Vulgate copies, including the Froben edition of 1491. The present tense of the earlier Vulgate corresponds with the substitution of $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon 1$ for $\varepsilon \bar{\ell} \pi \in \nu$ in $\leqslant$ A D N W and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows his cod. 2, supported by codd. B C and most later mss. On que, see on Ioh. 1,39 . Manetti had et dixit.
17 quod amem ötı фı $\downarrow \tilde{\omega}$ ("quia amo" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod amo.
17 Iesus $\delta$ 'Inooũs (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by K DW and some later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows cod. 2, with support from codd. $A$ ( $B C$ ) $N$ and most later mss.
 here virtuously produces consistency with the rendering of the second instance of örou later in the verse: see Annot. This change had previously been advocated by Manetti and Valla Annot.
18 non uis oủ $\theta$ ' $\lambda$ ess ("tu non uis" late Vg.). The added pronoun of the late Vulgate corresponds with the insertion of $\sigma$ vefore oú in codd. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{W}$. In omitting $\sigma \dot{\text { ú, Erasmus follows }}$ codd. 1 and 2, in company with most other mss. Manetti also omitted $t u$.
 esset" Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,23.
 the Vulgate in leaving $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ untranslated. The Vulgate, however, may have been based on mss. which omit $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as in codd. A B C W. Erasmus' Greek text here follows cod. 2, in company with $\aleph \mathrm{D} \mathrm{N}$ and most later mss., including cod. 1.
 Vulgate perfect tense does not have explicit Greek support.
 late Vg .). Erasmus inserts the pronoun, ille, to supply the missing antecedent for qui. The future tense of the late Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot.

20 te $\sigma \varepsilon$ (omitted in 1516-19 Greek, and 1516-22 Lat.). The omission in Erasmus' earlier editions does not appear to have Greek ms. authority. Possibly $t e$ was omitted from his rendering by accident, and then his assistants deleted $\sigma \varepsilon$ to make the Greek match the Latin text.
21 Hunc ergo toũtov. Erasmus' Latin rendering follows the Vulgate, which reflects the addition of ouvv, as found in K B C D and a few later mss. The word is omitted in codd. 1 and 2 , in company with most other mss., commencing with codd. A W. In Manetti, accordingly, ergo was omitted.
21 dicit $\lambda \hat{\xi} \boldsymbol{\xi} \mathrm{t}$ ("dixit" late Vg .). The late Vulgate perfect tense is supported by $\mathbb{W}$ and a few later mss., which have eltev. Erasmus follows codd. 1 and 2, with support from most other mss., commencing with codd. A B C D. The version of Manetti also put dicit.
22 Si ... velim 'Eà̀v ... $\theta^{\prime} \lambda \omega$ ("Sic ... volo" late Vg.). Erasmus argues in Annot., partly following Valla Annot., that the Vulgate originally had si rather than sic, and that the late Vulgate reading reflected a scribal corruption within the Latin tradition. The reading, sic, is found in many Vulgate mss., but others have si sic, supported only by cod. D among the Greek mss. The passage is listed in the Loca Manifeste Deprauata, and was also discussed in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, $194 \mathrm{~F}-195 \mathrm{D}$. A similar set of readings is found in vs. 23. Manetti had si... volo in both places.
 $27=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) Although there are a few mss. which omit ouvtos, it is unlikely that the omission of iste in 1535 was affected by consideration of the Greek text, as the latter remained unaltered. The omission was either accidental, or arose from an attempt to harmonise the translation with the abbreviated version found in Annot, where iste is omitted from both the Vulgate lemma and the suggested alternative rendering. Manetti put sermo hic.
23 quod ... non moreretur öti ... oủk ámoəvñoke1 ("quia ... non moritur" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20, and Annot. The version of Manetti was quod ... non moritur.
23 dixerat $\mathfrak{E T m \in v}$ ("dixit" Vg.). The use of the pluperfect yields an improved sequence of tenses: see on Iob. 1,19.
23 Si ... velim 'Eà̀v ... $\theta^{\prime} \lambda \omega$ ("Sic ... volo" late Vg.). See on vs. 22.



 т ${ }^{\text {人 }}$ үрофо́ $\mu \varepsilon v \alpha \beta 1 \beta \lambda i \alpha$.

TEへOг
quod verum est testimonium eius. ${ }^{25}$ Sunt autem et alia multa quae fecit Iesus: quae si scribantur per singula, nec ipse, opinor, mundus caperet eos qui scriberentur libros.

FINIS

25 ipse ... caperet $B$-E: ipsum arbitror mundum capere posse $A \mid$ scriberentur $B$ - $E$ : scribendi $\operatorname{sint} A$
Subscriptio FINIS $D$ E: Euangelii secundum Ioannem finis $A$, EVANGELII SECVNDVM IOANNEM, FINIS $B$, EVANGELII SECVNDVM IOHANNEM, FINIS $C$

24 quod Ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
25 nec ipse, opinor, mundus caperet oủסغ̀ aủtòv ofuaı tòv kó $\sigma \mu$ оv $\chi \omega \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ ("nec ipsum arbitror mundum capere posse" $1516=$ late Vg.). On opinor, see on Ioh. 16,2. In Annot., Erasmus comments on the omission of posse from some Vulgate mss. His alteration of the sentence structure produces greater clarity. Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate rendering, omitting posse.

25 qui scriberentur то̀ үрафó $\mu \varepsilon v \alpha$ ("qui scribendi sunt" Vg.; "qui scribendi sint" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus advocates qui scribendi forent.
$25 \beta 1 \beta \lambda i \alpha$. In codd. 2 and 817 , together with cod. C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., the word $\alpha \mu \dot{\eta} v$ is added at the end. The Erasmian text follows cod. 1 in omitting this, with support from * A B C ${ }^{*}$ D W and a few later mss., together with the late Vulgate and some Vulgate mss.

## ПРАЕЕІІ <br> T $\Omega \mathrm{N}$ АПОГTO^ $\Omega \mathrm{N}$

## ACTA APOSTOLORVM

1Tòv $\mu$ ม̀v mpãtov $\lambda o ́ y o v ~ घ ̇ m o ı \eta \sigma a ́-~$ $\mu \eta \nu \pi \varepsilon \rho i \quad \pi \alpha ́ v t \omega \nu, ~ \tilde{\omega}$ ©єóqi-

 pas, ėvteìánevos toĩs àmootó̀


1Superiore quidem volumine diximus Theophile, de omnibus quae coepit Iesus tum facere tum docere, ${ }^{2}$ ad eum vsque diem quo postquam impartitus in hoc ipsum spiritum sanctum, mandata dedisset quos delegerat, apostolis,

1,1 Superiore $B-E$ : Superiori $A \mid$ coepit $B-E$ : cepit $A \mid 2$ mandata dedisset $B-E$ : mandasset $A \mid$ quos delegerat, apostolis $C-E$ : apostolis, quos delegerat $A B$

1,1 Superiore (Superiori: 1516) quidem volumine diximus Tòv цı̀̀ mp ("Primum quidem sermonem feci" Vg.). While Erasmus does not elsewhere put superior for primus, he sometimes substitutes prior, on the grounds that a comparative adjective is better suited to a comparison between two persons or things: see on Ioh. 20,4. In Annot, on the present passage, he further explains that sermo is inappropriate for referring to a written work, namely the Gospel of Luke. By changing the grammatical structure, he also avoids the use of facio: see on Ioh. 1,15.
 ("de omnibus, o Theophile" Vg.). Erasmus feels free to change the word-order, to bring omnibus closer to the following subordinate clause, which relates to it. His omission of $o$ here may have been prompted by the consideration that it was made redundant by the vocative case of the following Theophile. At several passages where it would otherwise not have been entirely clear that the following word was a vocative, Erasmus adds $o$, even when absent from the Greek text: in the phrases o pusillae fidei at $M t$. 6,30 (1516 only); o parum fidentes at Mt. 6,30; 16,8; Lc. 12,28 (all in 1519); o peccatores at Iac. 4,8 (1519). Manetti has o Theophile, de omnibus.
 ("facere et docere" Vg.). The construction $\tau \varepsilon . .$. kai is found more frequently in Acts than in any other N.T. book, and is generally ignored by the Vulgate, whereas Erasmus usually tries to find an equivalent for $\tau \varepsilon$. In Annot., he
suggests the alternative renderings et ... et (as recommended by Valla Annot.), and vel ... vel. At other passages he further makes use of such expressions as pariter ... ac, simul ... et, simul ... ac. In vs. 8 of this chapter, he has non solum ... verum etiam. See also on Iob. 2,15.
 ("vsque in diem qua" $V \mathrm{gg}$.) A similar substitution of ad eum vsque occurs at $L c .1,20 ; 17,27$ (both 1519); Act. 1,22. Cf. also ad bunc vsque diem for vsque adbuc, etc., at Rom. 1,13; 1 Cor. 4,13; 15,6; 2 Cor. 3,15 (all 1519). Erasmus retains vsque in diem at Mt. 26,29; 27,8, 64; 28,15; Act. 2,29; 23,1 , in rendering ${ }^{\alpha} \chi \rho \stackrel{\text { or }}{ }{ }^{\varepsilon} \omega{ }^{2}$, but elsewhere quite frequently puts $\tau s q u e ~ a d$. For the gender of dies, see on Ioh. 1,29.
2 postquam ... mandata dedisset $\varepsilon$ ह̀тєı $\lambda$ áuєvos ("praecipiens" Vg.; "postquam ... mandasset" 1516). The construction with postquam provides a more accurate rendering of the Greek aorist: see on Iob. 1,36; 6,23, and Annot. For the use of mando and mandatum, see on Ioh. 8,5; 11,57.
2 impartitus in boc ipsum spiritum sanctum $\delta 1 \alpha$ $\pi v \in U ́ \mu \propto T O s ~ \alpha ́ \gamma i o u ~(" p e r ~ s p i r i t u m ~ s a n c t u m " ~$ Vg.). For this expansion of the meaning, see Annot. The addition of in boc ipsum is not without ambiguity. For Erasmus' reply to objections raised by Edward Lee to his rendering of the passage, see his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, $L B$ IX, 203 B-E.
2 quos delegerat, apostolis тоĩs ả̉тобтó入o1s ... oús $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \vDash \lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi \propto$ тo ("apostolis ... quos elegit" Vg.;

 वủTóv，द̀v по入入оĩs тeкипрioıs，$\delta \mathfrak{\prime}$

 ßaбilisios toũ $\theta \varepsilon \circ$ ．｜${ }^{4}$ ккi $\sigma u v-$
 ＇Ієробо入ú $\mu \omega \nu \quad \mu \grave{\eta} \quad \chi \omega p i \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı, \quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$



 oủ $\mu \varepsilon т \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ то入入̀̀s taútas ì $\mu$ épas．
sursum assumptus est：${ }^{3}$ quibus etiam se ipsum exhibuerat viuentem，postea－ quam supplicio fuisset affectus，idque compluribus argumentis dum per LB 436 dies quadraginta conspicitur ab illis， ac loquitur eis de regno dei：${ }^{4}$ et congregans illos in idem loci，prae－ cepit eis ne discederent Hierosoly－ mis，sed vt expectarent promissum patris：de quo（inquit）audistis ex me： ${ }^{5}$ quoniam Ioannes baptizauit quidem aqua，vos autem baptizabimini spiritu sancto post dies hosce non multos．

3 ac $B$－E：et $A \mid 5$ loannes $A B D$ ：Iohannes $C \mid$ spiritu $B-E$ ：in spiritu $A$
＂apostolis，quos delegerat＂1516－19）．Erasmus changes the word－order for the sake of clarity． The substitution of deligo for eligo occurs also at $L c .10,42 ;$ Act．13，17（both in 1519）；15，22， 25； 1 Cor．1，27－8； 1 Petr．1，1．See Annot．The verb deligo nowhere appears in the Vulgate．Elsewhere， Erasmus retains eligo in rendering this Greek verb．Occasionally he puts deligo for ordino and praeordino：see on Act．10，41．Manetti，less accurately，tried a different word－order which radically altered the meaning of the passage， putting apostolis quos elegit per spiritum sanctum．
 In Annot，on analogy with the Vulgate rendering of Act．10，16，Erasmus recommends using recipio， a substitution which he introduces at $M c$ ． 16，19；Act．1，22；20，14；23，31； 1 Tim．3，16．
3 etiam se ipsum exhibuerat oĩs kai $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma т \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ éautóv（＂et praebuit se ipsum＂Vg．）．This change is consistent with Vulgate usage at $M t$ ． 26，53； 2 Cor．11，2；Col．1，22，28； 2 Tim．2，15． A similar substitution of exbibeo for adsigno occurs at $A c t .9,41$ ，and for $d o$ at $A c t .10,40$ ．By contrast，at Rom．6，19；12，1，Erasmus changes exbibeo to prabbeo，rendering the same Greek verb．In 1535 Annot．on Rom．12，1，he comments in detail on the distinction of meaning．Manetti tried constituit se ipsum．
3 viuentem $\zeta \tilde{\omega} v \tau \alpha$（＂viuum＂Vg．）．Erasmus provides a more literal rendering of this Greek participle，making a similar substitution at eleven other passages，in accordance with Vulgate
usage e．g．at Iob．6，57；Act．20，12．At Act．9，41， Erasmus retains the adjectival form of the word．
3 posteaquam supplicio fuerat affectus $\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ тò maӨєiv $\alpha u ̉ T o ́ v ~(" p o s t ~ p a s s i o n e m ~ s u a m " ~ V g) .$. The word passio，used by the Vulgate，does not occur in this sense in classical Latin authors． Erasmus＇idiomatic use of afficio here is com－ parable with the Vulgate phrase，morte afficio， at Mt．10，21；Mc．13，12；Lc．21，16．See also on Ioh．8，49．Manetti avoided the use of passio by putting，more simply，postquam passus est．
3 idque compluribus argumentis हैv то $\lambda \lambda$ оĩs тєк $\mu$ П－ piors（＂in multis argumentis＂Vg．）．The insertion of idque clarifies the connection with the main verb，exbibuerat．Whereas complures is found in the Vulgate N．T．at Mc．5，26 alone，Erasmus uses it in thirteen places，of which eight are in Acts，usually as an alternative for multi or plures． He omitted in，as explained in Annot．，because he here understood $\varepsilon v$ in an instrumental sense：cf．also on Ioh．1，26，above．Manetti had in multis signis．
3 dum ．．．conspicitur ab illis ótrTavó $\mu \varepsilon v o s ~ \propto \cup ̉ t o i ̃ s ~$ （＂apparens eis＂Vg．）．As indicated in Annot．，the rendering needs to convey the sense that Jesus was actually seen by the disciples after the resurrection，whereas something which merely ＂appeared＂could have been false or imaginary． Valla Annot．had similarly suggested putting conspectus eis．Erasmus＇construction with dum makes the temporal connection with argumentis
more clear. His substitution of illis for eis is affected by the decision to add eis after loquitur.
3 ac loquitur eis kaì $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$ ("et loquens" Vg.; "et loquitur eis" 1516 Lat.). The substitution of loquitur follows from the use of dum: see the previous note. On ac, see on Ioh. 1,25. Erasmus' addition of eis is not explicitly supported by the Greek text. Manetti made use of a different verb, putting et disserens.
4 congregans illos in idem loci $\sigma u v a \lambda i \zeta o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s ~$ ("conuescens" Vg.). Erasmus' text here follows cod. 2815 (from which his 1516 edition was typeset in this part of the N.T.), supported by ※ A B C E and most later mss. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus follows Valla Annot. in supposing that the original Vulgate reading was conuersans, representing a Greek variant, $\sigma u v \propto u \lambda_{1} \zeta \dot{\partial} \mu \in v o s$, which is found in many of the later mss. However, from 1522 onwards, he considerably altered and enlarged his note on the meaning of these Greek verbs, presenting arguments for both renderings. This was partly prompted by criticism from Edward Lee and Stunica: see Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 204 B-C, and Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 136-8, 11. 559-566. On congrego, see further on vs. 21. The idiomatic use of idem followed by a genitive is not found elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T. However, cf. on boc negocii at Act. 6,3.
 $\mu \eta \geqslant \chi \omega p i \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ ("ab Hierosolymis ne discederent" Vg.). Other omissions of $a b$, before Hierosolymis, occur at Mc. 7,1; Act. 22,18 (both in 1519). Similar omissions occur before Atbenis at Act. 18,1; Bethania at Mc. 11,12; Roma at Act. 18,2 (all in 1519); and before Epheso at Act. 18,21 . The word-order preferred by Manetti was ne ab Hierosolimis discederent.
4 vt expectarent $\pi \varepsilon \rho ı \mu$ éveıv ("expectarent" Vg.). The insertion of $v t$ is required, to complete the transition from a negative to a positive command.
4 promissum тท̀v ह̇דळ $\gamma \gamma \in \lambda i ́ \alpha v$ ("promissionem" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 13,23 ( 1516 only), in accordance with Vulgate usage at $L c .24,49$; Act. 23,21. The point of this change is that promissum can be used not only for the verbal action of making a promise, but also to refer to the thing that is promised: the latter sense is required by the context at this passage. Elsewhere, Erasmus generally follows the Vulgate in using promissio or repromissio for this Greek word.
$4 d e q u o \eta \nu($ "quam" Vg.). This change reinforces the sense of promissum, as referring to the thing promised: see the previous note.
4 inquit. Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in adding this word, which is unsupported by Greek mss., except by cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$ which adds $\varphi \eta \sigma ו \nu$ (a reading which may itself have arisen as a retranslation from a Latin source). The word is omitted from earlier Vulgate mss. Erasmus was probably correct, in Annot. on this passage, to view this addition as being purely a matter of translation, to mark the shift from reported to direct speech, rather than arising from a different Greek text, and he therefore places the word in brackets. He included this point among the Quae Sint Addita, as well as in his Vbi Interpres Ausus Sit Aliquid Immutare. See also on Iob. 1,20, above, and Annot. on Act. 17,3.
4 ex me $\mu \mathrm{ov}$ ("per os meum" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the Greek variant, סio toũ $\sigma ד \delta ́ \mu \alpha \sigma^{\prime} S \mu \circ \cup$, found in cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$. Virtually all other mss. support the reading followed by Erasmus. See Annot. The version of Manetti had a me, inserted before audistis.
5 quoniam ótı ("quia" Vg.). Erasmus seems to take $\delta \mathrm{T}$ I in a causal sense, rather than treating the following clause as defining the "promise" or as quoting something which Jesus had previously said.
5 baptizauit quidem $\mu \varepsilon ̇ \nu ~ \dot{~} \beta \alpha \dot{\text { ámtıoॄv ("quidem }}$ baptizauit" Vg.). This reversal of the Latin word-order produces a less literal rendering, moving the emphasis away from Ioannes.
 insertion of in, in 1516, may have been intended to mark the distinction made by the Greek text, which has $\varepsilon$ év before mveúucril but not before Unסxrt. However, Erasmus did not make the same addition, in 1516, at the parallel passage at Act. 11,16. Then in 1519, he decided to interpret the Greek preposition in an instrumental sense here, and reverted to the Vulgate rendering: see Annot. on the present passage. For other such changes, see above, on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti's version had in spiritu.
 taútas ǹ népas ("non post multos hos dies" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering yields a clearer sense. A comparable substitution occurs at $L c .15,13$ (1519), putting post dies non multos for non post multos dies. His use of the emphatic suffix
 $\alpha u ̛ t o ́ v, ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma o v t e s, ~ K u ́ p ı \varepsilon, ~ \varepsilon l ~ e ̨ v ~ t u ̣ ~ X p o ́-~$


 vous ท̂̀ kaıpoús, oûs ò matì̀ हैंعто










${ }^{6}$ Illi igitur vbi conuenissent, percontabantur illum, dicentes: Domine, num in tempore hoc restituis regnum Israeli? ${ }^{7}$ Dixit autem ad illos: Non est vestrum nosse tempora et articulos temporum, quos pater in sua ipsius constituit potestate: ${ }^{8}$ sed accipietis virtutem, posteaquam spiritus sanctus aduenerit super vos, et eritis mihi testes non solum Hierosolymis, verum etiam in vniuersa Iudaea, Samariaque, denique vsque ad extrema terrae. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{At}$ que haec loquutus, videntibus iisdem, in altum sublatus est: et nubes subduxit illum ab oculis eorum. ${ }^{10}$ Quumque essent defixis in coelum oculis,

6 Israeli $B$-E: ipsi Israel $A \mid 7$ temporum B-E: om. $A \mid 8$ Hierosolymis $B$-E: in Hierusalem $A$ | 9 in altum $B$-E: om. $A$
-ce, as in bisce and basce, appears elsewhere at Mt. 5,19; Act. 25,18; Hebr. 1,2; 9,23; 2 Petr. 3,1. Manetti, somewhat adventurously, used a different punctuation, and attached this clause to the beginning of the following sentence, omitting igitur.
6 Illi igitur vbi conuenissent of $\mu \mathrm{e} v$ oưv ouvenOóvtes ("Igitur qui conuenerant" late Vg.). The insertion of illi makes clear that this is a reference to the apostles mentioned in the previous verses. Erasmus does not usually place igitur as the first word in a sentence or clause, except
 stitution of illi igitur occurs at Act. 8,4 (1519).
6 percontabantur illum rogabant eum" Vg.). A comparable substitution occurs at Act. 23,19, to render muvéávouci.
 Erasmus retains interrogo from the Vulgate. The verb percontor does not occur in the Vulgate N.T. See also on lob. 4,52 . The use of illum appears repetitive after illi at the beginning of the sentence. Manetti put interrogabant ipsum.
6 num sl ("si" Vg.). As pointed out in Annot., the Greek word frequently has an interrogative sense, and this is required here by the context. In classical Latin, $s$ is used for indirect questions rather than as an interrogative in direct speech.
 mus, more accurately, gives the present tense.
6 Israeli T $\tilde{\omega}$ 'l $\sigma p \alpha \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ("Israel" Vg.; "ipsi Israel" 1516). The insertion of $i$ psi in 1516 was designed to avoid the indeclinable form of the name, Israel, being misunderstood as meaning "of Israel". In 1519, Erasmus solved the problem by using the inflected form, Israeli, meaning "to Istael". See on loh. 1,31, and Annot.
7 ad illos mpòs aủtoús ("eis" Vg.). Erasmus provides a more literal rendering of the Greek preposition. See on Iob. 4,15.

7 et articulos temporum, quos خ̂̉ kaıpoús, oưs ("vel momenta, quae" Vg.; "et articulos quos" 1516). A similar substitution occurs at 1 Thess. 5,1;1 Petr. 1,11. At the present passage, Erasmus wishes to clarify the distinction between Xpóvos and kaıpós: see Annot., and also Valla Annot. In Manetti's version, momenta is replaced by occasiones.
 ("posuit in sua" Vg.). Erasmus makes a similar addition of ipsius at 2 Petr. 2,22, in rendering toios, but usually he is content with suus. In Annot,, he also suggested using propria, which was the rendering which had been adopted by Manetti. On constituo, see on Ioh. 15,16.

8 posteaquam ... aduenerit super ėtre入Өóvtos ... ${ }^{E} \varphi^{\prime}$ ("superuenientis spiritus sancti in" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus refers to an ambiguity in the Greek, as to whether the Holy Spirit was the source of, or merely accompanied, the power which was to be given to the apostles. Preferring the latter interpretation, he converted the construction into a temporal clause. His use of the future perfect tense provided a more satisfactory rendering of the Greek aorist participle. In rendering ėmépXouar elsewhere, he usually retains superuenio. Manetti contented himself with improving the word-order, which he changed to spiritus sancti superuenientis in.

8 non solum Hierosolymis, verum etiam $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ т $\tau$ ${ }^{8}$ IEpov $\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\mu} \mu$ kai ("in Hierusalem et" Vg.; "non solum in Hierusalem, verum etiam" 1516). For Erasmus' greater precision in translating $\tau \varepsilon$... kaí, see on vs. 1. See also Annot., where he disagrees with the suggestion that $e t$ should simply be added before in Hierusalem, as proposed by Valla Annot. The indeclinable form of the Greek name, 'Iepouv $\alpha \lambda \eta \mu$, is used very frequently in Luke and Acts, but hardly at all in Matthew, Mark and John. The alternative form, 'Iqporódvua, is spread through all five of these books, though found somewhat less often in Luke. In the Epistles and Apocalypse, the usual form is Tepou $\alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\mu} \mu$. Generally the Vulgate accurately preserves the distinction by using Hierusalem and Hierosolyma, the latter existing in two forms, both as feminine singular and as neuter plural. In 1516, Erasmus follows the Vulgate usage, but in 1519, he changes Hierusalem to Hierosolyma (-am, -ac, -orum, -is), in fifty-seven out of seventy-three occurrences. One reason for this change was to remove ambiguity, as to whether Hierusalem should be understood as an accusative or an ablative in certain contexts. Another reason may have been that Erasmus regarded Hierosolyma as a more classical form of the name. A related set of eleven changes in 1519 , confined to Matthew and Mark, alters the feminine singular, Hierosolymam, to neuter plural, but in the errata to the 1519 edition, Erasmus restored Hierosolymam at five of these altered passages. In the Vulgate mss. and printed editions, there is considerable diversity in the treatment of this latter distinction, which may help to explain Erasmus' apparent vacillation on the matter. Occasionally, in 1519, he also substituted vrbs Hierosolymorum (Mt. 2,3; Act. 8,$26 ; 11,27$ ): for other additions of $v r b s$, see on Act. 14,25. On his use of the locative
forms, Hierosolymis and Hierosolymae, see also on Ioh. 4,21.
8 vniuersa máon ("omni" Vg.). This change conforms with Vulgate usage at $L c .7,17 ; 23,5$, but Erasmus retains omnis Iudaea at Lc. 6,17. For his disapproval of the use of omnis in the sense of "the whole of", see on Iob. 8,2.
8 Samariaque kai $\sum \alpha \mu \alpha p \varepsilon i q(" e t ~ S a m a r i a " ~$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,39. Manetti preferred atque Samaria.

8 denique kai ("et" Vg.). Erasmus resorts to denique at only one other passage, $M t$. 13,23 . In the present context, although the word is less literal than the Vulgate rendering, it provided a more emphatic way of marking the future culmination of the spread of the Gospel into the whole world. This is comparable with Erasmus' addition of deinde at Act. 26,20 (1519). See also Annot.
8 extrema É $\sigma x$ व́rou ("vltimum" Vg.). Erasmus' use of the plural is again less literal than the Vulgate. Elsewhere, he shows a preference for extremus as a substitute for nouissimus. see on Iob. 12,48.
9 Atque baec loquutus кaì тaũта єimف́v ("Et cum haec dixisset" Vg.). On atque, see on Ioh. 1,25 , and for Erasmus' use of loquor, see on Iob. 13,18. The substitution of this verb here is mainly for the sake of stylistic variety.
9 iisdem aút $\tilde{\omega} v$ ("illis" Vg.). This substitution, again, is designed to vary the style. In this verse, the Vulgate used the pronouns illis, eum, eorum, for which Erasmus puts iisdem, illum, eorum, thus avoiding repetition. Manetti had tried ipsis, ipsum, eorum.
 Vg.; "sublatus est" 1516). A comparable addition of in altum occurs at $L c$ c. 24,50; Act. 13,17 (both in 1519). For Erasmus' removal of eleuo, see on Iob. 4,35 .
9 subduxit $\cup \cup \pi t \in \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon v$ ("suscepit" Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,13.
9 illum aủtóv ("eum" Vg.). See on iisdem, earlier in this verse.
10 essent defixis in coelum oculis átevi弓outes fooav els tòv oúpavóv ("intuerentur in coelum" Vg.). Erasmus employs an expression of greater intensity, better suited to the Greek verb: see Annot. By changing the word-order, he also wished to remove an ambiguity as to whether in coelum was to be understood as the direction
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 aỦToũ.
eunte illo, ecce viri duo astiterunt illis amicti vestibus albis, ${ }^{11}$ qui et dixerunt: Viri Galilaei, quid statis intuentes in coelum? Hic Iesus qui as|sumptus est a vobis in coeLB 438

## 

10 eunte illo $B$-E: dum iret ille Et $A \mid 12$ ab Hierosolymis $B$-E: a Hierusalem $A \mid 13$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ frater $C-E$ : filius $A B \mid 14$ deprecatione et obsecratione $B-E$ : oratione ac deprecatione $A$
of the apostles' gaze, or the direction in which Jesus went. A similar use of defigo is found at Lc. 4,20; 22,56 (both in 1519); Act. 3,4. At other instances of átevi $\omega$, Erasmus also uses oculos intendo at Act. 7,55; 11,6; 13,9 (1519); 23,1; 2 Cor. 3,7, but retains intueor at Act. 3,12; 6,15; 10,4; 14,9.
10 eunte illo пторॄvopย́vou aủtoũ ("euntem illum" Vg; dum iret ille" 1516). The removal of dum in 1519 also occurs at six passages in the Gospel of Luke. Manetti had euntem ipsum here.
10 ecce kal i8oú ("Et ecce" 1516). In 1519, Erasmus reverts to the Vulgate rendering, arguing in Annot., that in Luke's style, kai is often superfluous for the purpose of translation. Manetti had et ecce, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
 mus' rendering more closely observes the Greek word-order here.

10 illis cưtoĩs ("iuxta illos" Vg.). The Vulgate preposition iuxta is redundant after $a(d)$ stiterunt. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in omitting iuxta, but adopted eis as the pronoun.
10 amicti $\grave{\varepsilon} v$ ("in" Vg.). See on Iob. 20,12. Manetti replaced in vestibus albis, more literally, by in veste alba. From Annot., it appears that Erasmus did not feel that the latter change would have any effect on the meaning.
11 oi. The omission of this pronoun in the Greek text of 1516 is supported by a few late mss., but not those which Erasmus usually consulted. It was possibly a printer's error, as the Latin rendering was left unchanged.
 similar substitution occurs at $L$ c. 22,61 (1519), in accordance with the usual Vulgate rendering of this Greek verb. Erasmus uses aspicio to translate $\beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \mathrm{m} \omega$ at Mt. 5,28 ; Iob. 13,22 ( $=\mathrm{Vg}$. ); Act. 3,4; Ap. Iob. 5,3. It is not certain
whether the Vulgate rendering at the present
抻 ${ }^{56} \boldsymbol{\aleph}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A} C(\mathrm{D})$ and most later mss., or on $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi r o v t e s$, found in other mss., commencing with $77^{74 v i d} \aleph^{*}$ B E. Manetti preferred inspicientes here.
12 abest ab Hierosolymis (a Hierusalem: 1516)
 TOU ËXOV ס́סóv ("est iuxta Hierusalem, sabbati habens iter" Vg.). Erasmus' omission of iuxta is scarcely warranted by the explanation given in Annot. On Hierosolymis, see on vs. 8 , and for absum, see on Ioh. 21,8 . Manetti substituted prope Hierosolimam for iuxta Hierusalem.
13 ascenderunt in coenaculum óvé $\beta \eta \sigma \alpha v$ Eis tò ÚTtep $\uparrow$ ov ("in coenaculum ascenderunt" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek wordorder, eis to útrepũov ávé $\beta \eta \sigma \alpha v$, found in codd. A B C. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, with support from $\aleph^{\text {corr }}(\mathrm{D}) \mathrm{E}$ and nearly all the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See also Annot. The word-order of Erasmus' rendering was anticipated by Manetti.
 bant" Vg. mss.; "manebat" Vg. 1527). This is the only instance of mansito in Erasmus' N.T. The word was rare in classical usage, but is here employed by Erasmus to convey the sense of the Greek compound verb, кат $\alpha \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega$ (which occurs only here in the Greek N.T.), as distinct from $\mu \varepsilon ̇ v \omega$.
13 et Petrus et Iacobus et Ioannes ó тє Пétpos kai 'lókeßos kai 'lwávvuns ("Petrus et Ioannes et Iacobus" Vg. 1527). See on vs. 1 for Erasmus' rendering of $\mathbf{T \varepsilon} \ldots$ koi. The Vulgate again reflects a different Greek word-order, ő $\tau \varepsilon$
 $\boldsymbol{*}$ A B C (D) and a few later mss. Other variants also exist. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and nearly all other late mss. See also Annot. In Manetti, the wording was Petrus et Iacobus, Ioannes.
13 Iacobi frater'lakळ́ßou ("lacobi" Vg.; "Iacobi filius" 1516-19). Erasmus felt the need to supply an additional word. His interpretation in 151619, making Jude the son of James, was in accordance with the usual meaning of the Greek genitive in such contexts. However, in 1522, no doubt after further consideration of Mt. 13,55; Mc. 6,3; Iud. 1, which indicate that Jude was the brother of James, he substituted
frater for filius. At Lc. 6,16 (loú $\delta \alpha v$ 'lak ${ }^{\prime} \beta \circ$ ), he was content to retain Iudam Iacobi from the Vulgate.
14 perseuerabant โ̃ $\sigma \alpha \nu$ тробкартєрои̃vтєs ("erant perseuerantes" Vg.). The combination of a Greek auxiliary verb in the imperfect tense with a present participle of another verb, which is quite common in Luke and Acts, can usually be adequately represented in Latin by a single verb in the imperfect tense. See on Ioh. 1,28 for Erasmus' avoidance of the over-literal translation of this Greek idiom. Inconsistently, he retains erant ... perseuerantes at Act. 2,42. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in putting perseuerabant.
14 deprecatione et obsecratione $\tau \tilde{\pi} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon \cup \chi \tilde{n}$ каl Tற̃̃ $\delta \in \eta \dot{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon 1$ ("oratione" Vg.; "oratione ac deprecatione" 1516). The Vulgate follows a Greek text in which kal Tñ $\delta \in \underset{j}{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon ⿺$ is omitted, as in $\boldsymbol{7}^{74} \times \mathrm{A} \mathrm{B} \mathrm{C}{ }^{*} \mathrm{DE}$ and ten later mss. The reading adopted by Erasmus is found in codd. 1 and 2816, together with cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ and more than 400 of the later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 407-8). The corresponding page in his cod. 2815 is now torn, so that the text stops short at mpoosuX-, but there is clearly space on the line for the remaining words. Probably it was undamaged at the time when Erasmus used it as printer's copy. The addition of et obsecratione had previously been advocated by Valla Annot. See also Erasmus Annot. The longer text has sometimes been said to reflect harmonisation with other N.T. passages where mpooevxŋ́ and $\delta \varepsilon ́ \eta \sigma 15$ are paired together. There is also the possibility that an early scribe or editor of the text was offended at the apparently repetitious nature of the expression and hence abbreviated it. The replacement of oratio by deprecatio occurs at ten other passages in 1519, and by precatio in a further nineteen places, resulting in the virtual elimination of oratio in the sense of "prayer", though Erasmus allowed it to remain (possibly by oversight) at Act. 10,4; 2 Cor. 9,14. See on Act. 10,30 for his similar replacement of oro by precor at seven passages. Manetti had oratione ac deprecatione.
14 cumque kai oúv ("et" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\sigma \dot{v} v$, as in $\mathcal{K} A \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 ${ }^{\text {vid }}$ in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with B $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$. Manetti put et cum.
















${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ in diebus his exurgens Petrus in medio discipulorum, dixit (eratque turba nominum simul fere centum viginti): ${ }^{16}$ Viri fratres, oportuit impleri scripturam hanc, quam praedixit spiritus sanctus per os Dauid, de Iuda, qui fuit dux iis qui comprehenderunt Iesum: ${ }^{17}$ quia cooptatus erat in numerum nostrum et sortitus erat partem ministerii huius. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ is quidem parauit agrum ex mercede iniquitatis, suspensusque crepuit medius, et effusa sunt omnia viscera eius. ${ }^{19}$ Et innotuit omnibus habitantibus Hierosolymae, ita vt appellaretur ager ille lingua illis vernacula

15 Et $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ his $B$-E: illis $A \mid$ eratque $B$-E: Erat autem $A \mid 17$ cooptatus $B$-E: connumeratus $A \mid$ in numerum nostrum $B-E$ : nobiscum $A \mid$ erat partem $B-E$ est sortem $A \mid$ 18 is $B-E:$ hic $A \mid$ parauit $B-E$ : possedit $A \mid$ ex $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ suspensusque $B-E$ : et suspensus $A \mid$ effusa $B-E$ : diffusa $A \mid 19$ innotuit $B-E$ : notum factum est $A \mid$ Hierosolymae $B-E$ : Hierusalem $A$

15 Et Kai (omitted in 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission lacks Greek support. From this verse onwards, the changes made by the 1519 edition become more numerous, by comparison with the first part of the chapter. Because Erasmus had already revised the first section quite thoroughly in 1516, he perhaps felt that that part of the chapter did not require so much attention in his second edition.

15 bis taútaus ("illis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more literal here. Manetti replaced in diebus illis by in his diebus.
 The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi \omega \tilde{\nu}$, found in $\mathcal{N A ~ B ~ C *}^{*}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus as usual follows cod. 2815, together with codd. Coorr vid D E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot. While some have suggested that $\mu \mathrm{a} \theta \eta \tau \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ is a later scribal correction, there is also the possibility that $\alpha \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \tilde{\omega} \nu$ is a harmonisation to context, influenced by $\alpha \delta \varepsilon \ell \lambda$ oirs in vs. 14 and $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi o i ́$ in vs. 16 . In $7^{74 \times \mathrm{vid}}$ is found the
improbable reading, $\tau \tilde{v} \nu$ ámooró̀ $\lambda \omega v$. Manetti already had discipulorum.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $\delta \varepsilon$ for $\tau \varepsilon$, found in codd. C $D^{\text {corr }}$, a reading which Erasmus seems to commend in Annot. However, his Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by $\mathcal{K}$ A B E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
15 nominum óvoúćtov ("hominum" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with $\alpha v \delta \rho \omega \nu$ of cod. E. However, judging from the resemblance of the two words in Latin, it was reasonable for Erasmus to conclude that the variant arose within the Latin tradition, as a deliberate alteration by a later corrector, and that the Vulgate originally had nominum: see Annot., borrowing a suggestion of Valla Annot. Accordingly, Erasmus included the passage among the Loca Manifeste Deprauata.
16 oportuit ${ }^{\text {E }}$ Eء1 ("oportet" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the reading, $\delta \in \tilde{1}$, of cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd.

1 and 2816, together with $\$$ A B C D ${ }^{\text {oorr }} \mathrm{E}$ and nearly all later mss. See also Annot. The version of Manetti similarly had oportuit.
16 banc тaút $\boldsymbol{v}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by codd. X A B C ${ }^{*}$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1 and 2816, as well as $\mathrm{C}^{\text {cori }}$ D E and most later mss. See Annot. The same rendering is found in Manetti.
16 iis qui тoĩs ("eorum qui" Vg.). Erasmus is slightly more literal here.
17 quia oftı ("qui" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading lacks Greek support and probably arose from a scribal error within the Latin tradition. See also Annot.

 nobis" Vg.; "connumeratus erat nobiscum" 1516). The verb connumero is rare in classical Latin. However, Erasmus' choice of replacement is not entirely suitable. It might have been preferable if he had borrowed from the Vulgate translation of vs. 26 , so as to substitute adnumeratus ... cum nobis here in vs. 17, while reserving coopto to render the different Greek verb, $\sigma u \gamma к \alpha \tau \alpha \psi \eta \varphi i \zeta \omega$, in vs. 26 . The use of coopto at vs. 26 was recommended by Valla Annot. The Vulgate's use of in nobis reflects the substitution of $\dot{\varepsilon} v \dot{\eta} \mu i \bar{v}$ for $\sigma \dot{\sigma} v \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu i v$, supported by codd. N A B C D E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti is identical with the rendering which Erasmus followed in 1516, connumeratus erat nobiscum.
17 sortitus erat $\mathfrak{e x} \lambda \times x \in v$ ("sortitus est" $1516=V_{g}$.). Erasmus produces a better sequence of tenses. See on loh. 1,19 for his preference for the pluperfect.
17 partem tòv k $\lambda$ ñpov ("sortem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus was probably uneasy about the repetitive nature of the expression, sortior sortem, and therefore chose to render $k \lambda \pi \tilde{\eta} \rho o v$ differently. He retains sortem for the same Greek word in vs. 25.
18 is oũtos ("hic" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A possible motive for this substitution was to avoid the misunderstanding of $b i c$ as meaning "here". See on Iob. 3,26. Manetti put hic ergo.
18 parauit Eктท่णबто ("possedit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs at Act. 8,20. In Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus argues that

Judas did not literally "possess" the field in question, as it was bought with his money after his death: cf. Mt. 27,3-10. Cf. also Act. 22,28 (1519), where Erasmus substitutes comparo for consequor, in rendering the same Greek verb.
18 ex éк ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,15.
18 toũ unoөoũ. The article, toũ, is derived from cod. 2815, with support from only a few other late mss. Henceforth it was to remain in the Textus Receptus. Most mss. have just $\mu ı \sigma \circ$ oũ, as in codd. 1 and 2816.
18 suspensusque kaì $\pi \rho \eta \nu \grave{s} \gamma \gamma$ हvónevos ("et suspensus" 1516 = Vg.). On $\neg q u e$, see on Ioh. 1,39 . Although Erasmus retains suspensus out of a desire to harmonise with Mt. 27,5, he recognises in Annot. that the Greek expression more literally means pronus factus or, with Augustine, deiectus in faciem.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . This change was in accordance with$ Vulgate usage of effundo for most other instances of ékxte. A similar substitution occurs at Rom. 5,5 . Erasmus conveys the sense of the Greek verb, more accurately, as "pour out" rather than "spread".
19 innotuit $\gamma v \omega \sigma$ ) ${ }^{2} v$ द̀ $\gamma \dot{\varepsilon} v \in \tau 0$ ("notum factum est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 9,42; 19,17 (both in 1519). As elsewhere, Erasmus seeks to avoid the excessive use of facio. In 1519, he introduces innotesco at three other passages, in rendering pavepòv ह̀ ý̇veto
 See also on Act. 23,15 (1519), where he changes notum facio to significo, in rendering é $\mu \varphi \alpha v i \zeta \omega$.
19 Hierosolymae Tєpova $\alpha \lambda \dot{n} \mu$ ("Hierusalem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 8, and Ioh. 4,21, for this locative form of the name. Manetti put in Hierusalem.
 ๙ủt $\omega$ v ("lingua eorum" Vg.). The Vulgate appears to reflect a Greek variant omitting isiọ, as in K B* D, though the early Latin translators may simply have regarded the word as redundant in view of the presence of the possessive pronoun, aủtẽv. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, with support from codd. A B ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ C E and virtually all later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Modern editors have tended to accept i8ic as genuine, on the grounds of the possibility of haplography and also by comparison with the use of i8io in Act. 2,6, 8, in a similar context. This is the only instance of vernaculus
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Aceldama: hoc est, ager sanguinis. ${ }^{20}$ Scriptum est enim in libro Psalmorum: Fiat commoratio eius deserta, et non sit qui inhabitet in ea: et episcopatum eius accipiat alter. ${ }^{21}$ Oportet igitur vt ex his viris qui nobiscum versati sunt | toto tempore, quo dominus Iesus perpetuam vitae consuetudinem egit nobiscum, ${ }^{22}$ exorsus a baptismo Ioannis ad eum vsque diem quo receptus est a nobis: vnus quispiam constituatur, qui sit vna nobiscum testis resurrectionis eius. ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Et}$ statuerunt duos, Ioseph qui vocatur Barsabas, qui cognominatus est Iustus, et Mathiam. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Et}$ facta precatione, dixerunt: Tu domine, qui corda nosti omnium, ostende vtrum elegeris ex his duobus, ${ }^{25} \mathrm{vt}$ accipiat sortem ministerii huius et
$20 \psi \alpha \lambda \mu \omega \nu$ B-E: $\psi \alpha \mu \omega \nu A \mid 21$ ouv B-E: $\tau \omega \nu A \mid \eta \mu \alpha s D E: u \mu \alpha s A-C$
19 Aceldama $B-E$ : Acheldemach $A \mid 21$ igitur $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ dominus $B-E:$ om. $A \mid 22$ exorsus a baptismo loannis $B E$ : om. $A$, exorsus a baptismo Iohannis $C D \mid 24$ facta precatione $B-E$ : oratione facta $A$
in Erasmus' N.T. He did not see the need to add the word at Act. 2,6, 8 . For Valla's comments on the expression vernacula lingua, see his Elegantiae I, 5; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, $A S D$ I, 4, p. 326, ll. 300-301. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) had propria eorum lingua.
19 Aceldama 'Акє $\lambda \delta \alpha \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ("Acheldemach" 1516 $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate spelling has some support, from codd. $\mathrm{K} A$, which read AX ${ }^{\wedge} \lambda \delta \alpha \mu \alpha^{\prime} \chi$, while cod. B has Aкє $\lambda \delta \alpha \mu \alpha \dot{\chi}$, and cod. D 'Aкє $\lambda \delta \propto \propto \mu o ́ x$. Erasmus gives a straightforward transliteration of the Greek spelling found in his cod. 2815, supported by cod. C and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. He regarded this as a more accurate representation of the original Hebrew name than that given by the Vulgate: see Annot., and also Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 140, II. 590-599.

20 eius (1st.) au'toũ ("eorum" Vg.). The Vulgate represents a harmonisation with Ps. 69,25, in which the plural is used: correspondingly,
$\alpha \cup \cup T \omega ̃ v$ is found in a few late mss. at the present passage. Manetti had eius here.
20 alter Ëтepos. Erasmus' rendering follows the late Vulgate, though in Annot., he advocates alius, without mentioning that this was the reading of earlier Vulgate mss.

21 igitur oưv ("ergo" Vg.; omitted in 1516). The reading $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \sigma u v \in \lambda \theta o ́ v t \omega \nu$ in 1516, omitting ouvv, was based on cod. 2815, apparently with no other ms. support. When Erasmus tried to rectify this in 1519 by adding ouvv (as found in codd. 1, 3, 2816 and most other mss.), he or his printer accidentally removed the following $\tau \omega \tilde{\nu}$, so producing yet another incorrect reading. On Erasmus' preference for igitur, see on Ioh. 6,62.

21-22 vt ... constituatur, qui sit ... testis $\mu \dot{\alpha} \rho$ тvpa ... $\gamma \in \nu \in ́ \sigma \theta \propto ı$ ("testem ... fieri" Vg.). Erasmus makes the construction clearer, though his use of constituo ("appoint") goes somewhat beyond the meaning of $\gamma \varepsilon v \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\sigma} \theta \propto a$.

21 qui nobiscum versati sunt $\sigma \cup v \varepsilon \lambda \theta$ óvrav $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu i ̃ v$ （＂qui nobiscum sunt congregati＂late Vg．）．For Erasmus＇use of versor，see on Ioh． 7,1 ．He uses congrego mainly for rendering $\sigma u v \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \pi \sigma u v \alpha \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ ，and occasionally for $\sigma u v a \theta \rho o i \zeta \omega$ ， $\sigma u v \alpha \lambda i \zeta o \mu \alpha ı$（at vs．4，above），$\delta \mu \circ \theta u \mu \alpha \delta \delta \dot{v}$ Yivoual，and $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \varphi \omega$ ．Manetti put qui con－ uenerunt nobiscum．

21 toto èv mavti（＂in omni＂Vg．）．See on Iob．8，2．

21 dominus Iesus ．．．egit nobiscum عiఠ $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon$ ．．．$\varepsilon \varphi^{\prime}$ †̀ $\mu$ ãs $\delta$ ó Kúplos＇lnooũs（＂intrauit et exiuit inter nos dominus Iesus＂Vg．；＂Iesus ．．．egit nobiscum＂ 1516 Lat．，omitting＂dominus＂）．The omission of dominus in 1516 may have been unintentional． Similarly，in the Greek text，the substitution of Ú $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ for ${ }^{\dagger} \mu \tilde{\mu} \tilde{S}$ in $1516-22$ was probably acci－ dental，as it lacks Greek ms．support and is in conflict with Erasmus＇rendering．For the sake of clarity，he changed the Latin word－order，by bringing the name of Jesus to the beginning of this lengthy clause．More radical was Erasmus＇ substitution of the words perpetuam vitae con－ suetudinem egit nobiscum for intrauit et exiuit inter nos．By adopting this loose paraphrase，he hoped to make clear the meaning of what he regarded as a proverbial form of expression：see Annot．At Act．11，26（1519），he uses consuetudinem ago to render $\sigma u v o ́ \gamma \omega$ ．Manetti translated this phrase by ingressus est dominus lesus inter nos．

22 exorsus a baptismo Ioannis ỏṕ̧̧ánevos ．． ＇Iwóvvou（＂incipiens a baptismate Iohannis＂ Vg．；omitted in 1516 Lat．）．The omission in the 1516 Latin rendering，again，appears to be accidental：cf．the omissions in the previous verse．Erasmus＇use of exordior is found also at Lc．23，5；24，27（1519）；Act．11，15，but nowhere in the Vulgate．His substitution of baptismus for baptisma is found elsewhere at 1 Petr．3，21，but he makes an opposite kind of change at $M c$ ． 10，38－9；Act．10，37；Rom．6，4（1516 only），where he puts baptisma for baptismus．However，in both Erasmus and the Vulgate，the form bap－ tismus is the more frequent．Manetti substituted initiatus for incipiens．

22 ad eum vsque diem quo E ． （＂vsque in diem qua＂Vg．）．See on vs．2．Manetti tried vsque ad eam diem．
22 receptus est đ̛̉ve入ṇ́ $\varphi \theta \eta$（＂assumptus est＂Vg．）． See on vs． 2 （sursum assumptus）．
22 vnus quispiam ${ }^{\text {® }} \mathrm{v}$ 人 тои́t $\omega \nu$（＂vnum ex istis＂ Vg．）．On quispiam，see on Ioh．6，7．Erasmus did
not consider it necessary to provide any further rendering of toút $\omega \nu$ here，as it was already translated in ex bis viris in vs． 21.

22 vna nobiscum $\sigma$ ט̀v $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu i \pi v$（＂nobiscum＂Vg．）． The more emphatic idiom，vna ．．．cum，was used in the 1516 edition thirty－two times，and in a further seven places in 1519，but nowhere in the Vulgate N．T．
23 qui vocatur tòv ko入oúuะvov（＂qui vocabatur＂ Vg．）．Erasmus＇use of the present tense seems less appropriate here，in view of the aorist tense of the other two verbs in this sentence，$\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \alpha v$ and $\varepsilon \pi \pi \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ ，though either rendering is le－ gitimate．Manetti had similarly adopted qui vocatur．

23 Mathiam Ma0iav．This Greek spelling was not found in any of Erasmus＇usual mss．，and appears to be an arbitrary correction，influ－ enced by the late Vulgate．The same change occurs in vs．26．Most mss．have Moctí $\alpha$ ， corresponding with the earlier Vulgate use of Matthiam．
 Vg．；＂oratione facta＂1516）．Greek aorist．On precatio，see on Act．1，14．
24 vtrum őv ．．．ह゙va（＂quem ．．．vnum＂Vg．）． Similar substitutions occur at Mt．21，31；Lc． 7,$42 ; 22,27$ ．Erasmus regards vter as better classical style，when a question refers to a choice between two alternatives．Cf．his pre－ ference for alter rather than alius：see on Ioh． 18，16．The use of veter is discussed in Valla Elegantiae III，30；Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg． Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，pp．331－2，ll．430－435．
24 тои́тడv．Nearly all mss．，including those of Erasmus，read toút $\omega \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ．The omission of T $\tilde{\omega} \nu$ is probably no more than a printer＇s error， by haplography．

25 vt accipiat $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon i ̃ v$（＂accipere＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，33，for Erasmus＇avoidance of the infini－ tive．See also Annot．As elsewhere，Manetti here preferred to use a gerundive，ad accipiendum．
25 sortem tòv к $\lambda$ ñpov（＂locum＂Vg．）．The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text，Tòv rórrov，as found in ${ }^{974}$ A B C＊$D$ and a few later mss．Erasmus follows his cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．，commencing with $\aleph \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ ．It has been suggested that $k \lambda \hat{n} p o v$ was imported from vs．17．Another possibility is that $k \lambda$ ñpov was original，and that the substitution of tómov in a few mss．arose from harmonisation to the
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 ह̇v "Iepovo $\alpha \lambda \eta ̀ \mu$ катоוкоũvtes ’louסaĩoı,



apostolatus, vnde praeuaricatus excidit Iudas, vt abiret in locum suum. ${ }^{26} \mathrm{Et}$ dederunt sortes eorum, et cecidit sors super Mathiam, et cooptatus est ad numerum vndecim apostolorum.

2Et quum compleretur dies pentecostes, erant omnes vnanimiter in eodem loco. | ${ }^{2}$ Et factus est repente LB 442

## 2,4 пр§аито C-E: прई $\alpha$ то A B

25 vnde $B$ - $E$ : de quo $A \mid$ excidit $B-E$ : est $A \mid 26$ dederunt $B-E$ : dedernnt $A \mid$ ad $C-E:$ in $A B$ 2,3 linguae $A^{c} B-E$ : linguaes $A^{*} \mid$ sederuntque $D E$ : seditque $A-C \mid \quad 4$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$ coeperuntque $B-E$ : et coeperunt $A \mid$ ille $C-E$ : om. $A B \mid 5$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid$ earum $C-E$ : om. $A$, eorum $B \mid$ sunt $C-E$ : est $A B \mid 6$ Is rumor quum increbruisset $B$ - $E$ (exc. cum pro quum $B-D$ ): Facta autem hac voce $A$
immediate context, influenced by the occurrence of tómov later in vs. 25. In Annot., Erasmus also suggested using baereditatem. Manetti adopted sortem, anticipating the change which Erasmus incorporated in his translation.
 parable substitution, in rendering $\pi \varepsilon p i$ oũ, occurs in 1519 at Act. 19,40.

25 praeuaricatus excidit $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \beta \geqslant \eta$ ("praeuaricatus est" $1516=$ Vg.). Another example of a change involving excido in 1519 is found at Act. 12,7. In the present context, Erasmus makes the addition to bring out the double meaning of $\pi \alpha \rho \beta \alpha i v \omega$.
26 eorum $\alpha \cup \operatorname{cin} v$ ("eis" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a different Greek text, having cútoĩs, as in
codd. ※ A B C D ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1 and 2816, supported by codd. D* E and most of the later mss. It has been suggested that, because of its ambiguity, aútoĩs is a lectio difficilior, and therefore more likely to be original. However, this argument is not particularly compelling, as $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{\omega} v$ itself can be interpreted in two different ways, referring either to those who cast the lots or to those for whom the lots were cast (cf. Annot.), in which case aưToĩs could have been a later substitution, designed to clarify the ambiguity of aútw̃v.
26 Mathiam Ma0iav. See on vs. 23.
26 cooptatus est ad numerum $\sigma u \gamma к \propto т \varepsilon \psi \eta$ ¢ío日n $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ("adnumeratus est cum" Vg.; "cooptatus
est in numerum" 1516-19). See on vs. 17, and Annot.

 indicated in Annot., Erasmus' use of the singular gives a more accurate representation of the Greek text. The shift to the plural, within the Latin tradition, could easily have arisen by scribal error, adding just one letter. Valla Annot. and Manetti had already proposed this change.
1 vnanimiter $\delta \mu 0 \theta \mathrm{v} \mu \mathrm{a} \delta \delta{ }^{2}$ ("pariter" $V \mathrm{~g}$.). This change is in accordance with Vulgate usage at six other passages of Acts. In Annot., Erasmus speculates that the true reading here was ojucoóv, and that this underlay the Vulgate rendering. However, $\delta \mu \alpha \delta \delta \dot{v}$ is not found anywhere else in the N.T., nor in any of the mss. More likely, the Vulgate was based on a Greek text having $\delta \mu \mathrm{ov}$, found in ${ }^{\aleph}$ A B C* and seven later mss. The word is omitted in cod. D. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1 and 2816, with $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and more than 400 later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 409-10). Manetti, again, anticipated the change made by Erasmus.
2 sonitus ग̈Xos ("sonus" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Hebr. 12,19. Erasmus reserves sonus to translate $\Phi \theta$ ofyos. The Vulgate does not differentiate between the two Greek words, rendering $\varphi \theta \dot{\circ} \gamma y$ os by sonus at Rom. 10,18 , and sonitus at 1 Cor. 14,7.
2 impetu venientis flatus $\varphi$ epouévns $\pi$ тvoñs ("aduenientis spiritus" Vg.). Erasmus wishes to distinguish between wind and spirit, mvoí and Tvẽ̃uc: see Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered by allati spiritus.
3 visae sunt $\omega \varphi \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v$ ("apparuerunt" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus recommends conspicio, a rendering which he adopts for this Greek verb at Mt. 17,3; Mc. 9,4 (1519); Act. 7,26 (1522); Hebr. 9,28. Elsewhere, he often retains appareo from the Vulgate, generally in the context of supernatural appearances. The substitution of visae sunt had been recommended by Valla Annot.
3 dissectae $\delta ı \alpha \mu \varepsilon p ı \zeta$ ̧́nevaı ("dispertitae" Vg.). By this change, Erasmus removes the ambiguity as to whether the tongues of fire were subdivided into separate flames or divided among the disciples, opting for the first interpretation: cf. Annot. For another use of disseco, see Act. 23,7.
3 velut igneae $\dot{\sigma} \varepsilon \mathrm{E}$ tuvós ("tanquam ignis" Vg.). Again Erasmus avoids ambiguity, as to whether ignis is nominative or genitive: see

Annot. The phrase velut igneace also appeared in Valla Annot, as well as the alternative possibility of tanquam ex igne. For Erasmus' use of velut, see on Ioh. 7,10. Manetti here offered the rendering tanquam igneau.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The 1527 substitution of the plural verb is less strictly accurate than the Vulgate, and was a consequence of the earlier change from ignis to igneae. In Erasmus' Greek text, the implied subject of $\begin{gathered}\text { ḱć } \\ 01 \sigma \varepsilon \\ \text { is singular, i.e. "fire" }\end{gathered}$ rather than "tongues". Manetti similarly changed to the plural, with et sederunt.
4 ac каi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.

 the 1516-19 Greek text, was probably a printer's error, as it was not found in Erasmus' mss. and is unsuited to the context. On-que, see on Iob. 1,39.
4 aliis ÉTépaıs ("variis" late Vg. and some Vg. mss.). The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek support. Erasmus restores the reading of the earlier Vulgate: cf. Annot. The reading aliis was also recommended by Valla Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered by diuersis.
4 spiritus ille тò $\pi \nu \varepsilon \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ ("spiritus sanctus" Vg.; "spiritus" 1516-19). The Vulgate addition of sanctus has little Greek ms. support, apart from cod. E , and is made superfluous by the presence of trvéuctos doyiou earlier in the verse. Erasmus' use of ille, in 1522, referred back more clearly to this previous mention of the Holy Spirit. Manetti had just spiritus, as favoured by Erasmus in 1516-19.
5 Hierosolymis év "Iqpouc $\alpha \lambda \dot{n} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,8 .
5 earum quac ... sunt $\tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ ("quae ... est" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "eorum quae ... est" 1519). The shift from masculine (or neuter) plural to the feminine singular, in the 1519 rendering, is ungrammatical and not likely to have been written by Erasmus. Possibly the wording which he had in mind was eorum quac ... sunt (neuter), as proposed in 1516 Annot., or eorum qui ... sunt (masculine), which he offers as an alternative rendering in 1522 Annot. Either way, it is probable that the 1519 compositor altered or overlooked the second part of Erasmus' intended revision.
6 Is rumor quum increbruiset $\gamma$ Evouevns ... $\varphi \omega \nu \tilde{s}$ S Taútins ("Facta autem hac voce" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.).
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confusa est quod audiret vnusquisque lingua sua illos loquentes. ${ }^{7}$ Stupebant autem omnes ac mirabantur, dicentes inter sese: Nonne ecce omnes isti qui loquuntur, Galilaei sunt? ${ }^{8} \mathrm{Et}$ quomodo nos audimus eos sua quisque lingua in qua nati sumus? ${ }^{9}$ Parthi et Medi et Elamitae, et habitatores Mesopotamiae, Iudaeaeque et Cappadociae, Ponti et Asiae, ${ }^{10}$ Phrygiae et Pamphyliae, Aegypti et partium Libyae eius quae est finitima Cyrenae, et aduenae Romani, ${ }^{11}$ Iudaeique et proselyti, Cretes et Arabes, audimus eos loquentes nostris linguis magnifica dei. ${ }^{12}$ Stupebant autem omnes ac mirabantur, inter se dicentes: Quidnam vult hoc esse? ${ }^{13}$ Alii autem irridentes dicebant: Musto expleti sunt isti.
${ }^{14}$ Stans autem Petrus cum vndecim, extulit vocem suam, ac loquutus est eis: Viri Iudaei, et qui habitatis Hierosolymis vniuersi, hoc vobis notum sit, et auribus percipite verba mea. ${ }^{15}$ Non enim sicut vos existimatis,
 $A^{c} B-E: \mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \sigma т \omega \mu$ моо $A^{*}$

7 ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ sese $B$-E: se $A \mid 8$ eos B-E: om. $A \mid$ in B-E: om. $A \mid 10$ eius B-E: om. $A \mid$ Romani $A D E$ : Rhomani $B C \mid 11$ magnifica $B-E$ : magnalia $A \mid 12$ ac $B-E$ et $A \mid 14$ extulit $B-E$ e eleuauit $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ et $A \mid$ Hierosolymis $B$-E: Hierusalem $A$

Erasmus wished to remove the ambiguity of vox, which could otherwise be interpreted as meaning the sound of the wind or the voice of the apostles: see Annot. At the same time, he finds a more vivid replacement for facio.
6 confusa est $\sigma u v \varepsilon \chi \dot{U} \cup \eta$ ("mente confusa est" Vg.). As indicated in Annot., the Vulgate addition of mente is not explicitly supported by the Greek text, although it was a legitimate interpretation. The word was similarly deleted by Manetti.
 Vg.). Erasmus' substitution of the subjunctive
form of the verb slightly changed the meaning, so that the crowd "was confused to hear ..." rather than "was confused because they heard ..."

7 omnes (1st.) $\pi$ duvtes. This word was omitted in Erasmus' cod. 2815, in company with codd. B D and about twenty later mss., including cod. 2816*. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and $2816^{\text {corr, }}$, supported by codd. א (*) A C E 096 and over 400 later mss., together with the Vulgate (cf. Aland Dic Apostelgecchicbte 410-12, in which cod. 2815 is incorrectly listed as containing TdóvTES). Manetti's omission of omnes
here is indicative of the type of Greek text which he used as the basis for his translation．
7 ac кai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
7 inter sese mpòs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda$ ous（ $V g$ ．omits；＂inter se＂1516）．The Vulgate omission is supported by 77 $^{74}$ ※ A B C ${ }^{*}$ and seven later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and over 400 other mss．，commencing with codd．Corr D E 096 （Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 407－8）．On sese，see on Ioh．7，35．In Annot．， Erasmus also suggests alius alii．Manetti put ad inuicem．
8 audimus cos ǻkov́ousv（＂audiuimus＂Vg．；＂audi－ mus＂1516）．The Vulgate use of the perfect tense is in conflict with the Greek text．In Annot．，Erasmus suggests that the Vulgate may originally have read audimus，and that this was changed into audiuimus by scribal corruption within the Latin tradition．The same considera－ tions apply to the occurrence of audiuimus in the Vulgate at vs．11．The substitution of audimus， in both places，had been previously advocated in Valla Annot．In Erasmus＇rendering，the addition of the pronoun，eos，amplifies the sense by supplying an object for the verb．
 $\grave{\dagger} \mu \omega ̃ \nu$（＂vnusquisque linguam nostram＂late Vg．and some Vg．mss．）．See Annot．，where Erasmus expresses his opinion that $\dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$ ，in this clause，cannot easily be translated into good classical Latin．Manetti tried propriam linguam nostram．
8 in qua év 甬（＂qua＂1516）．The omission of the preposition，in 1516，may have been inadvertent．

9－10 babitatores Mesopotamiae ．．．partium oi kat－
 （＂qui habitant Mesopotamiam ．．．partes＂Vg．）． In Annot．，Erasmus follows Valla Annot．in suggesting the use of qui babitamus or babitantes， on the grounds that babitant，in the third person，does not agree with the immediately preceding verb，audimus（or audiuimus in the Vulgate）．He uses babitator also at Ap．Iob． 12，12．
10 eius quae $T \eta$ ñ（＂quae＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus wishes to emphasise the distinction between two Libyan provinces：see Annot．
10 finitima Cyrenae korrò Kupŋ̇uŋv（＂circa Cyre－ nen＂Vg．）．The word finitimus，which occurs in the Vulgate at Iud．7，is introduced by Erasmus at eight other passages，usually in association
with regio，to render mepixwpos．In the 1516 edition，a printer＇s error puts kupívuv for кupívŋv，which led to the further error，кupívך， in 1519.

11 Iudacique＇louסaĩoí $\tau \varepsilon$ каí（＂Iudaei quoque et＂Vg．）．See on Iob．2，15，and Annot．
11 audimus ókov́ouev（＂audiuimus＂Vg．）．See on vs．8，and Annot．
 makes no sense in the context，and is a misprint． 11 magnifica Tò $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ \alpha$（＂magnalia＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．In the only other N．T．instance of this Greek word，at Lc．1，49，Erasmus similarly substitutes magnifica for magna，in 1519．The word magnalia does not occur in classical literature．
12 ac каí（＂et＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Iob．1，25．
12 inter se $\alpha \not \approx \lambda$ 人os $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \alpha ̈ \lambda \lambda o \nu$（＂ad inuicem＂ Vg．）．See on Iob．4，33．In Annot．，Erasmus also recommends alius ad alium．He assigned this Vulgate use of inuicem to the Solocismi．Stunica defended the Vulgate wording of this passage， and was in turn answered by Erasmus in Epist． apolog．adv．Stun．，LB IX， 397 B．
13 Musto ötı 「入єúkous（＂Quia musto＂Vg．）． See on Iob．1，20．

13 expleti sunt isti $\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \mu$ évol $\mathfrak{\text { eloi（＂pleni }}$ sunt isti＂ Vg ．）．The use of the participle of expleo is closer to the grammatical form of the Greek expression：see Annot．，where Erasmus also suggests impleti sunt．He objected that isti was redundant，as it was not supported by his Greek mss．，but curiously he retained it in his translation．In 1527 Annot．，he added that it was not present in the＂more correct＂copies of the Vulgate（＂emendatioribus Latinis＂）．In cod．D，ovito is added before $\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \sigma T \omega \mu \mathcal{E}^{v} \nu O I$ ， but this may be a retranslation from the Latin， as it does not appear to be found in any other Greek mss．at this passage．The spelling $\mu \in \mu \in \sigma T \omega$－ $\mu$ ivol，in the 1516 text，is a misprint，which was duly corrected in the errata．Manetti omitted isti．
14 extulit 光 $n$ ñps（＂eleuauit＂ 1516 ＝late Vg ．）． See on Ioh．4，35．
14 ac каi（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
14 Hierosolymis＇Іepouб $\alpha \lambda \eta$＇$\mu$（＂Hierusalem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．1，8．
15 existimatis ப́тто入aนßávete（＂aestimatis＂Vg．）． Erasmus makes a similar change at $L c .7,43$ ．In Annot．on that passage，he also recommends
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hi ebrii sunt, quum sit hora diei tertia. ${ }^{16}$ Sed hoc est quod dictum LB 444 est per prophetam Ioel: ${ }^{17} \mathrm{Et}$ erit in nouissimis diebus, dicit deus, effundam de spiritu meo super omnem carnem. Et prophetabunt filii vestri et filiae vestrae, et iuuenes vestri visiones videbunt, et seniores vestri somnia somniabunt. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ quidem super seruos meos et super ancillas meas in diebus illis effundam de spiritu meo, et prophetabunt, ${ }^{19} \mathrm{et}$ dabo prodigia in coelo superne, et signa in terra inferne, sanguinem et ignem et vaporem fumi. ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Sol}$ conuertetur in tenebras, et luna in sanguinem, antequam veniat dies ille domini magnus atque illustris. ${ }^{21}$ Et futurum est, vt omnis quicunque inuocauerit nomen domini seruetur. ${ }^{22}$ Viri Israelitae, audite verba haec: Iesum Nazarenum, virum exhibitum a deo erga vos virtutibus et prodigiis et signis, quae fecit per illum deus in medio vestri, sicut et ipsi scitis, ${ }^{23}$ hunc definito consilio et praescientia dei traditum, quum accepissetis per manus iniquorum, crucifixum interemistis: ${ }^{24}$ quem deus

16 Ioel $B-E$ : Iohel $A \mid 17$ et iuuenes $D E$ : iuuenes $A-C \mid 19$ superne $B-E$ : sursum $A \mid$ inferne $B-E$ : deorsum $A \mid 20$ atque illustris $B-E$ : et manifestus $A \mid 21$ futurum est, vt $B-E$ : erit $A \mid$ seruetur $B$-E: saluus erit $A \mid 22$ deus $A^{c} B$-E: om. $A^{*} \mid 23$ crucifixum $B$-E: affigentes $A$
the use of opinor. He further substitutes existimo in rendering tiy 1,7; vouił由 at Act. 14,19; 16,27; 17,29; 21,29, following the example of the Vulgate at Act.
 at Mt. 27,9 (1519), $\lambda$ oyi Koual at 1 Cor. 4,1, and ย̇тоттev่ $\operatorname{at} 1$ Petr. 2,12. Valla distinguishes between aestimo, meaning "consider", and existimo, meaning to "form a judgment" after such consideration has been undertaken: Elegantiae

V, 20; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallat, ASD I, 4, p. 251, 11. 219-222. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in putting existimatis here.
16 трофர்тоv. The omission of toṽ before троф $\tilde{n}^{\text {tov }}$ is without ms. authority, and may have arisen as a printer's error.

17 deus ó $\theta$ Eós ("dominus" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having kúpios, found in codd. D E and a few later mss.

17 et iuuenes kal of veaviokol ("iuuenes" 151622 Lat.). The omission of et in 1516-22 seems to have been accidental. Manetti substituted et adolescentes.
18 Et quidem kaitol. In codd. 1, 2815 and 2816, Erasmus would have found the reading kaí $\gamma \varepsilon$, as found in virtually all other Greek mss. In his cod. 2815, the $-\gamma$ - is here written as a small uncial $-\Gamma$-, which was misread by one of the 1516 compositors as a $-\tau$-, so as to produce kaí $\tau \varepsilon$. In Annot., Erasmus needlessly conjectured that the Greek text underlying the Vulgate translation must have been kaitol. Consequently, in his 1516 errata, he substitutes kolitol into the N.T. text, without any known ms. authority. Yet at $L c .19,42$, he follows the Vulgate in using et quidem to render koi $\gamma \in$. If he had freshly consulted his mss. at this point, when compiling Annot., instead of relying on his own defectively printed Greek text (of which the printing was complete before he finished preparing Annot.), he would have seen that such a conjecture was unnecessary. The substitution of rou's for tós, in the 1516 edition, was another misprint, caused through misreading the script of cod. 2815.
18 super (2nd.) ह̇ $\pi i ́$ (Vg. 1527 omits). The late Vulgate omission lacks Greek support. Manetti had super, as in the earlier Vulgate.
19 superne ... inferne ả̛vف ... кớTف ("sursum ... deorsum" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,23.
20 dies ille тìv $\grave{\dagger} \mu \varepsilon ́ p a v . .$. Tท่v ("dies" Vg.). By adding ille, based on the Greek article, Erasmus makes clear that "the day of the Lord" was to be a unique event, whereas a reader of the Vulgate might otherwise have supposed that there could be more than one such day.
20 atque illustris kai $\varepsilon$ ह̇rı甲 $\alpha v \tilde{\eta}$ ("et manifestus" $1516=$ Vg.). This is the only N.T. passage where Erasmus uses illustris. He reserves manifestus mainly for rendering pavepós and qavepów. On atque, see on Ioh. 1,25.
21 futurum est, $v t$ है $\sigma$ Taı ("erit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Elsewhere, Erasmus introduces the construction, futurum est, at Mt. 10,26; 16,27; 17,22; Lc. 1,20 (1519); Act. 2,30; 3,23 (1519); 19,27; 28,6; 2 Cor. 10,15; 2 Petr. 1,14, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt. 2,13; $L c$. 9,44.
21 zớv. This reading is found only in codd. B E and a few later mss. Erasmus' text, whether by an arbitrary correction or a printer's error, here departs from codd. 1, 2815 and

2816, which all had ơv, as found in most other mss.

21 seruetur $\sigma \omega 0 \dot{1} \sigma \in \operatorname{col}$ ("saluus erit" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 3,17. Manetti preferred saluabitur.
 Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus surmises that a slightly different Greek text underlay the Vulgate ren-

 possibility was that the Vulgate reflected the verb $\delta$ oki $\mu \zeta \omega$, as found in the reading of cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {*vid }}, \delta \varepsilon \delta o k ı \alpha \sigma \mu$ évov, but this could also have been a retranslation from the Latin.
22 erga vos عis Ú Uuãs ("in vobis" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering is more accurate than the Vulgate, which might otherwise have been thought to reflect a Greek variant, ėv úpĩv, not found in any mss.
22 et ipsi кai aútoi (late Vg. omits). These words were omitted in Froben's Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514 as well as the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. The later Clementine Vulgate had et vos. In the earlier Vulgate mss. is found just vos, reflecting the omission of koi, as in $\aleph$ A B C ${ }^{*}$ D E, with a few later mss. in support. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti already had et ipsi here.
23 quum accepissetis $\lambda \alpha \beta$ óvtes ( $V g$. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of $3^{74} \aleph^{*}$ A B C* and seven later mss. The Erasmian text follows codd. 1 and 2816, with support from $\boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }}$ D E and more than 400 later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 415-17). In cod. 2815, there is a longer
 probably caused by accidental omission of a whole line of text. In Annot., Erasmus does not refer to any variation among his Greek mss. at this passage. Manetti's version had et ... apprebensum.
23 crucifixum тробтท'\}๙vтes ("affigentes" 1516 $=$ Vg. 1527 and Vg. mss.; "affligentes" late Vg. $=$ Annot., lemma). The late Vulgate reading, affligentes, which was found in Froben's 1514 edition, represents a manifest scribal corruption of the earlier affigentes, which Froben had printed in his edition of 1491. See Annot. In 1519, Erasmus' more explicit rendering was partly designed to prevent any further error arising from the similarity of affigo and affligo.

















 घiठc̀s őti ő
 モ̇דi тоũ Өpóvou aủtoũ, тò katà $\sigma a ́ p-$

suscitauit solutis doloribus mortis, quatinus impossibile erat teneri illum $a b$ ea. ${ }^{25}$ Dauid enim dicit de eo: Prouidebam dominum coram me semper, quoniam a dextris est mihi, ne commouear. ${ }^{26}$ Propter hoc laetatum est cor meum, et exultauit lingua mea: insuper et caro mea requiescet in spe. ${ }^{27}$ Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno, nec sines vt sanctus tuus videat corruptionem. ${ }^{28}$ Notas mihi fecisti vias vitae, replebis me iucunditate cum facie tua. ${ }^{29}$ Viri fratres, quandoquidem licet libere dicere apud vos de patriarcha Dauid, quod et defunctus est et sepultus est, et sepulchrum eius est apud nos vsque in hodiernum diem. | ${ }^{30}$ Propheta igitur quum esset, et sciret quod iureiurando iurasset sibi deus, futurum, vt de fructu lumbi ipsius, quantum ad carnem, Christus exoriretur ac sederet super sedem eius, ${ }^{31}$ praescius
 троiठ $\omega v$ B

24 quatinus $B-E$ : quatenus $A \mid 25$ commouear $A-C E$ : commoueat $D \mid 26$ laetatum $B-E$ : letatum $A \mid 27$ sines vt sanctus tuus $B$ - $E$ : dabis sanctum tuum, vt $A \mid 28$ iucunditate $B-E$ : iocunditate $A \mid 29$ quandoquidem licet $B-E$ : liceat $A^{*}$, cum liceat $A^{c} \mid 30$ vt $B-E$ : vt aliquis $A$ | quantum ... ac B-E: om. $A$

24 mortis ... ab ea toũ $\theta$ रvó́tou ... ن́m' đủtoũ ("inferni ... ab eo" Vg.). As pointed out in Annot., the Vulgate reflects the substitution of ớSou for $\theta$ ovó́tou. This reading is found only in cod. D , and probably arose by harmonisation with vss. 27 and 31 (cf. also Ps. 16,10). Manetti put mortis ... ab eo.
24 quatinus кaөótı ("iuxta quod" Vg.; "quatenus" 1516). Erasmus uses quatenus or quatinus at seven other passages to render ' $\dot{\varphi} \varphi^{\prime}$ ö $\sigma \circ v$ (Mt.
 3,12 - both in 1519), ko0فs (2 Cor. 8,5), and ka0' óoov (Hebr. 9,27). In the 1519 edition, except at the present passage, the word is uniformly spelled quatenus. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests using propterea quod. Manetti substituted quoniam.

25 de eo cis cưTóv ("in eum" Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal here, while Erasmus renders in accordance with the context.

25 coram me évátrióv $\mu \circ \mathrm{O}$ ("in conspectu meo" late Vg.). Erasmus' rendering conforms with the earlier Vulgate.
27 åou. The Erasmian text follows cod. $2815^{\text {corrs }}$, supported by codd. 1 and 2816, along with cod. E and most later mss. Cod. 2815*, together with $\aleph$ A B C D and some later mss., had $\alpha \delta \eta \nu$. Erasmus or his assistants may have preferred $\mathfrak{q} \delta \delta 0$ partly on the grounds of classical Greek usage (with the implied meaning, "house of Hades"), and partly with a view to producing consistency with vs. 31, where cod. 2815 and most other mss. have $\dot{\alpha} \delta \delta_{0}$. The question here is whether scribes were more likely to have
substituted this reading because of their supposed familiarity with classical literature, or whether a few scribes ignorantly replaced ${ }_{\alpha} \delta \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{ov}}$ by $\neq \frac{q}{c} \delta \eta \nu$ through an over-zealous application of the rule that the preposition eis must always be followed by an accusative.
 oov iठEĩv סıaథ0opáv ("dabis sanctum tuum videre" Vg.; "dabis sanctum tuum, vt videat" 1516). A comparable substitution of permittes for dabis occurs at Act. 13,35 (1519), where the same Psalm is quoted. For Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. Manetti had dabis vt sanctus tuus videat.
29 quandoquidem licet ȩ́óv ("liceat" 1516 text = Vg.; "cum liceat" 1516 errata). In Annot., Erasmus explains é $\oint \dot{o} v$ as being the equivalent of the genitive absolute, and this was the motivation for the change which he introduced in the errata of his 1516 edition. The word quandoquidem does not occur in the Vulgate. Erasmus uses it at twenty-two passages, e.g. to replace quoniam and quoniam quidem, in ren-

29 libere $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ mappnoías ("audenter" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). See on Iob. 10,24; Act. 9,27. Erasmus also uses libere loquor at Act. 18,26; 26,26, in rendering
 adoption of libertas in dicendo for mapp $\eta$ oia at Act. 4,13. Elsewhere, he usually followed the Vulgate in using fiducia. The Vulgate use of audenter here was ambiguous, as it could mean either boldly or rashly. The point was further discussed in Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 205 D-E. Manetti preferred confidenter.
29 apud (1st.) $\pi \rho \rho_{s}$ ("ad" Vg .). Erasmus similarly uses apud for mpós after mappnocó̧̌oual at Act. 26,26 (1519). Often he retains dico ad for $\lambda \varepsilon \bar{\gamma} \omega$ mpós. Cf. precor apud, for precor ad, at Act. 8,24 (1519).
29 quod et ötı kai ("quoniam" late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission of et receives very little Greek ms. support. See Annot.
30 quod o̊tı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20.
30 sibi ả̛тчั ("illi" Vg.). Erasmus follows classical usage in substituting the reflexive pronoun, to refer back to the main subject. Manetti anticipated him in this change.
30 futurum, $v t$... sederet ka0ioal ("sedere" Vg.; "futurum vt aliquis ... sederet" 1516). See on vs. 21 for this construction. The addition of aliquis, as in 1516, is only necessary if the clause
tò katà ... Xplotóv is omitted: see below, and Annot. The version of Manetti used the construction quod ... secundum carnem surgeret Cbristus vt sederet.
30 ipsius $\alpha$ Ủtoũ ("eius" Vg.). The alteration of this pronoun is intended to make clear that it refers to David rather than to God. Manetti put sui.
30 quantum ad carnem, Christus exoriretur ac ד̀
 in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by N A B C D Dorr and seven later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgecchichte 417-21, for the statistics regarding the later mss. in this note). In 1516, this clause was omitted from the Greek text, through a conjecture based on the Vulgate. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus attempted to justify this on the grounds that it was an addition by a later scribe ("suspicor adiectum ab eruditulo quopiam, cui alioqui sermo videbatur parum absolutus"), a conclusion which was prompted partly by the fact that his Greek mss. had divergent readings here. The whole clause is present in codd. 1 and 2815, but in cod. 2816 tò katò $\sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} k \alpha$ is omitted. All three mss. further have ávactingelv for dovaotĩ $\sigma \alpha$, in company with about 400 other late mss., including cod. 3. However, in 1519 , when Erasmus decided to insert the words into his text, he changed
 and about twenty later mss.), and he or his printer mistakenly placed the clause after $\alpha \cup \forall T o u ̃$ (2nd.) instead of aúroũ (1st.). In 1527, this passage was listed in Erasmus' Ad Placandos.
31 praescius mposiठं's ("prouidens" Vg.). The printer's error, $\pi p o i ̈ \delta \omega$ 's, in 1516 was probably intended to be $\pi p o s i \delta \omega \dot{s}$, in agreement with Erasmus' rendering, though it also resembles пpoïठ $\omega$ v, which was cited in Annot. The reading тpoeiठ'́s was further mentioned in Annot., as being found "in nonnullis": it may have been known to Erasmus only from cod. 1, but it is also found in a few other late mss., as well as in cod. D ${ }^{\text {corr } . ~ H i s ~ o t h e r ~ m s s ., ~ c o d d . ~} 2815$ and 2816 both had mpoï $\delta \omega v$, in company with $\aleph$ B and most later mss. In 1516 Annot., the position of $\pi$ тoïठ $\omega \mathbf{\omega}$ immediately after the lemma may indicate that Erasmus, after his N.T. text had been printed, decided that $\pi \rho 0-$ $i \delta \omega \nu$ was correct. Accordingly, his next edition, of 1519 , temporarily restored $\pi$ poï $\delta \omega v$ to the text, but without any change to the accompanying translation. Then in 1522, instead of













 ＇Iopà̀入 öтו kúpiov kaì Xpiotòv aủtòv







loquutus est de resurrectione Christi， quod non derelicta sit in inferno anima eius，neque caro eius viderit corruptionem．${ }^{32}$ Hunc Iesum susci－ tauit deus，cuius omnes nos sumus testes．${ }^{33}$ Dextera igitur dei exaltatus et promissione spiritus sancti accep－ ta a patre，effudit hoc quod nunc vos videtis et auditis．${ }^{34}$ Non enim Dauid ascendit in coelos，sed dicit ipse：Dixit dominus domino meo， Sede a dextris mihi，${ }^{35}$ donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tu－ orum．${ }^{36}$ Certo sciat ergo tota domus Israel，quod dominum et Christum fecerit deus，hunc Iesum quem vos crucifixistis．
${ }^{37}$ His autem auditis compuncti sunt corde，et dixerunt ad Petrum ac reliquos apostolos：Quid faciemus viri fratres？ ${ }^{38}$ Petrus ait ad illos：Delictorum poeni－ tentiam agite，et baptizetur vnusquisque

34 mihi $B-E:$ meis $A \mid 36$ dominum $B-E:$ et dominum eum $A \mid 37$ ac $B-E:$ et $A \mid$
38 Delictorum C－E：om．$A B \mid$ poenitentiam agite $A C$ CE：Resipiscite $B$
making the Latin rendering conform with the Greek text，Erasmus made the Greek conform with his Latin wording，reverting to the poorly attested $\pi$ pooziб́s．s．
$31 \mu$ év．In view of the peculiar syntax resulting from the presence of this word，together with the fact that all pre－16th－century mss．appear to substitute the article， 7 ñs，this reading must be considered to be a printer＇s error，which was allowed to persist through all five editions of Erasmus＇work．
31 quod ．．．viderit öтı ．．．घاסE（＂quia ．．．vidit＂ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．
31 non oúk（＂neque＂Vg．）．The Vulgate use of neque reflects the substitution of oưTE，as found in $\$$ A B C and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod． 2815 with support from a few other mss．，commencing with cod．E．Most of the mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816，have ou
in combination with коवт $\varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i \varphi \theta \eta$ ：see the next note．Manetti similarly adopted non．

31 derelicta sit $\bar{z} \gamma к \propto т е \lambda \dot{\prime} \dot{\varphi} \varphi \theta \eta$（＂derelictus est＂ Vg．）．Erasmus took his Greek text from cod． 2815，with limited support from $\mathbb{N}$ A B C DE and more than 120 later mss．，which show divergent forms of spelling，such as $\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma \mathrm{k} \alpha$ тe－ $\lambda \varepsilon i \varphi \theta \eta$（adopted in 1519－35 Annot．）， | $v k \alpha$ |
| :---: |$\alpha-$ $\lambda \varepsilon i \varphi \theta \eta, \hat{\varepsilon}^{\gamma} \kappa \alpha т \in \lambda \eta \mu \varphi \theta \eta$ ．In codd．1，69， 2816 and over 300 other late mss．，the reading is коте入si甲 $\theta \eta$（see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 421－4），as cited in 1516 Annot．，lemma．When he prepared this note，Erasmus evidently did not consult cod．2815．The substitution of the feminine，derelicta，arose from the restoration of $\dot{\eta} \psi \cup X \dot{\eta} \alpha \dot{\sim} \tau 0 \tilde{u}$ later in the sentence：see the following note．Manetti had derelicta est．

 Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{7}^{749 \text { vid }}$ ※ A

B C* D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$. Manetti preferred anima sua.
32 suscitauit ${ }^{2} \dot{\sim} v \in ́ \sigma T \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ ("resuscitauit" Vg.). See on Iob. 6,40. Manetti anticipated this change.
 Vg.). The Vulgate word-order corresponds with $\mu \alpha ́ p т \cup р \not ́ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ́ \sigma \mu \varepsilon v, ~ a s ~ i n ~ c o d . ~ D . ~$
33 boc quod toũto $\delta$ ("hunc quem" Vg.). The masculine pronoun used by the Vulgate would be understood as referring to the Spirit, with the further implication that the Holy Spirit was seen and heard by Peter's audience. Erasmus avoids this unsatisfactory interpretation, and takes toũto as referring simply to the things which the people had seen and heard. See Annot. Manetti likewise had boc quod.
33 nunc vũv (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74 \text { vid }} \aleph A C^{*}$ and some later mss. In codd. B D, kaí is substituted for $v \underset{\sim}{v} v$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, with support from codd. 1, 2816, together with $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most of the later mss. Manetti's version also had nunc here.
34 sed dicit $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1$ ס́́ ("cidicit autem" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti translated by ait autem.
34 mibi uou ("meis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs at Mc. 12,36 (cf. Mc. 10,37, 40, in 1519), but not at Mt. 22,44; Lc. 20,42; Hebr. 1,13 , where the same O.T. passage is also quoted (Ps. 110,1). See Annot. on Mc. 10,40, where Erasmus describes mihi as being in better Latin style ("Latinius").
36 Certo $\alpha \sigma \varphi \propto \lambda \hat{\omega}{ }^{\circ}($ "Certissime" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Act. 24,22 (1519), removing the unwanted superlative. See Annot. The version of Manetti, quite literally, put secure.
36 tota $\pi$ ãs ("omnis" Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,2.
36 quod ... fecerit őtı ... ย̇тoínoe ("quia et ... fecit" Vg.; "quod et ... fecerit" 1516). Erasmus' 1516 Latin rendering corresponds with the addition of kai after $\delta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau$, printed in the 1516 Greek text on the basis of cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., as well as the Vulgate. The omission of kat and et in 1519 was prompted by cod. 3, with support from relatively few late mss. The word et was also omitted from the 1527 Vulgate column. On the substitution of quod, see on Iob. 1,20.
36 et Cbristum kal Xpiotòv aủtóv ("eum et Christum" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate
reflects a different Greek word-order, oủtòv kai Xplotóv, as in $17^{74} \times$ A B C D ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and most other mss., commencing with cod. E. The word-order of cod. 2816 was kai Xpiotòv ó $\theta$ zòs aútóv. For the purpose of his Latin rendering, from 1519 onwards, Erasmus regarded eum as redundant, in view of the following bunc. Manetti had et Cbristum ipsum.

37 ac kaí ("et ad" Vg.; "et" 1516). On ac, see on Iob. 1,25 . The Vulgate addition of this second ad does not seem to have Greek ms. authority. Manetti also had ac.
37 тоเท่ $\sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon v$. The reading of $1516-19$, moוn'oousv, was based on cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and many other mss., commencing with cod. D . The reading moın $\sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, in 1522 , also has widespread support, including cod. 1 , together with $7^{7 \text { 74vid }} \times$ A B C E
38 Petrus Métpos ("Petrus autem" late Vg.; "Petrus vero" Vg. mss.). Erasmus follows cod. 2815 in omitting $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ after Пغ́тpoৎ, with hardly any other ms. support.
38 ait ad illos: Delictorum poenitentiam agite $\varepsilon$ घ̆ $\eta$ mpós aútoús, Metavońoate ("ad illos: Poenitentiam, inquit, agite" Vg.; "ait ad illos, poenitentiam agite" 1516; "ait ad illos: Resipiscite" 1519). The Vulgate word-order reflects a Greek text omitting Ê $\varphi \eta$ before $\pi \rho o ́ s$, and adding $\varphi \eta \sigma$ iv after Meтavoń $\sigma \alpha \tau \varepsilon$, as in $7^{77^{7 v i d ~}}$ $\aleph \mathrm{AC}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1,2816 and most other mss., commencing with cod. E. In 1516, Erasmus introduced resipisco at four passages, and in 1519 at a further eighteen places, including the present verse, in accordance with Vulgate usage at $2 \mathrm{Tim} .2,26$. His further change, in 1522, to delictorum poenitentiam agite, is comparable with his substitution of poenitentiam agite vitae prioris at Mt. 3,2. Changes of this kind were a distinctive feature of Erasmus' N.T. translation, and were widely understood as being a thinly-veiled criticism of contemporary theology and ecclesiastical practice. The point here was to distinguish between spiritual "repentance" and the notion of "doing penance": see Annot. on Mt. 3,2, etc. In Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus also suggested Poeniteat vos, a rendering which he adopts at Act. 3,19. Manetti put ait eis: Penitentiam agite.
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vestrum in nomine Iesu Christi in remissionem peccatorum, et accipietis donum spiritus sancti. ${ }^{39}$ Vobis enim facta est repromissio et filiis vestris, et omnibus qui longe sunt, quoscunque aduocauerit dominus deus noster. ${ }^{40}$ Aliisque verbis plurimis testificatus est, et exhortatus est eos, dicens: Seruemini a generatione ista praua. ${ }^{41}$ Qui ergo libenter acceperunt sermonem eius, baptizati sunt: et accesserunt in die illo animae circiter ter mille. ${ }^{42}$ Erant autem perseuerantes in doctrina apostolorum, et communicatione, et fractione panis, et precationibus. ${ }^{43}$ Obortus est autem omni animae timor, multaque prodigia et signa per apostolos aedebantur. ${ }^{44}$ Omnes autem qui credebant erant coniuncti, et habebant omnia communia. ${ }^{45}$ Possessionesque et substantias vendebant, ac diuidebant illa omnibus, prout cuique opus erat. ${ }^{46} \mathrm{Et}$ quotidie perdurantes vnanimiter in templo, et frangentes per singulas domos panem, inuicem sumebant cibum,

38 prius in $A$ C-E: sub $B \mid 40$ Aliisque $B$-E: Aliis etiam $A \mid$ prius est $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ Seruemini $B-E$ : Saluamini $A \mid 41$ accesserunt $B$ - $E$ : appositae sunt $A \mid 42$ precationibus $B$-E: orationibus $A \mid 43$ Obortus est $B$-E: Fiebat $A$ | aedebantur $B-E$ : fiebant $A \mid 45$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 46$ quotidie $B$-E: cotidie $A$

38 in (1st.) ह̇דi ("sub" 1519) See on Iob. 5,43.
38 peccatorum $\alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \mu \rho \tau i \omega ̃ v$ ("peccatorum vestrorum" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{v} v$, as in N AB and nine later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1 and 2816, together with D E and more than 400 of the later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 424-6). In view of the omission of a pronoun after most other N.T. instances of äpésis àduaptiõv, it has been said that the omission of $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$ at the present passage is the result of harmonisation with the customary usage. It is also possible that the occurrence of ekootos $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$ earlier in this verse induced some scribes to add $\dot{\mu} \mu \tilde{v} v$ again after $\alpha \mu \alpha \rho t i \omega ̃ \nu$ (cf. also the
addition of $\tilde{\eta} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ after $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \varphi \varepsilon \sigma I \nu T \tilde{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i \tilde{\omega} \nu$ in a few late mss. at Col. 1,14). Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
39 facta est tơTlv ("est" Vg.). Erasmus' addition is an amplification of the sense: see Annot.
40 Aliisque Ėtépo1s тะ ("Aliis etiam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus regarded etiam as an over-mphatic translation of te: see Annot. A similar substitution of -que occurs at Act. 6,7; 8,13. See also on Iob. 2,15. Manetti's solution was et aliis.
40 testificatus est et exhortatus est $\delta$ ธєцартúp\&то
 Vg.; "testificatus et exhortatus est" 1516). Instead of changing exbortabatur to conform with the perfect tense of the preceding testificatus est, it
would have been more accurate if Erasmus had used the imperfect tense in rendering both verbs. The words et exbortabatur were omitted from Manetti's translation (both mss.).
40 Seruemini $\Sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{T} \varepsilon$ ("Saluamini" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 3,17 regarding seruo. For this use of the subjunctive, see on Ioh. 6,27.
 omission is supported by $37^{74}$ N A B C and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with cod. E. See Annot. The version of Manetti also had libenter.
 Possibly Erasmus wished to distinguish ámo-
 recipio at three other passages in Acts which speak of receiving the word: Act. 8,14; 11,1; 17,11 (1519).
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate is more strictly literal, retaining the passive form of the Greek expression. Erasmus, no doubt, wished to remove a possible ambiguity. Elsewhere in rendering this Greek verb, he sometimes substitutes the more explicit addo, at Mt. 6,27; Act. 2,47; 11,24; Gal. 3,19. Manetti put appositi sunt.
41 illo Eksivn ("illa" Vg.). Regarding the gender of dies, see on Iob. 1,29 .
41 ter mille tpıбхi入ıas ("tria milia" Vg.). See on Iob. 6,10.
 The Vulgate would appear to require an underlying Greek text substituting $7 \tilde{j} \varsigma ~ k \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varepsilon \omega s$, but this has no ms. support. There are, however, a few mss. in which kal is omitted, commencing with codd. א* A B C D*. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1 and 2816, together with $\aleph^{\text {corr }}\left(\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}\right) \mathrm{E}$ and most later mss. See Annot. In Manetti's version, this was ac fractione.
42 precationibus taĩs mporeuxaĩs ("orationibus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . See on Act. 1,14.$
43 Obortus est घ̇y घ́veto ("Fiebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On Erasmus' use of orior and its compounds, see on Iob. 1,17. This is the only instance of oborior in Erasmus' N.T. Manetti preferred factus est.
43 multaque mo $\quad \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon$ ("multa quoque" Vg .). See on Ioh. 2,15 for Erasmus' removal of quoque in rendering $\tau \in$.

43-44 aedebantur. Omnes autem غ̀ $\mathfrak{\text { Éveto. Tớvtes }}$ $\delta \varepsilon \in$ ('in Hierusalem fiebant, et metus erat magnus in vniuersis. Omnes etiam" late Vg.; "fiebant, Omnes autem" 1516). See on Ioh. 2,11 for Erasmus' preference for aedo in such contexts. The spelling è $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon$ eto is that of cod. 1 and only a few other late mss. Codd. 2815 and 2816 had हyiveto, in company with nearly all other mss. The longer text offered by the Vulgate corresponds with the addition of $\mathrm{E} \nu$ 'Ispova $\alpha \lambda \hat{\prime} \mu$,

 different forms, in about forty later mss. In omitting these words, Erasmus follows his codd. 1, 2815, 2816, with support from 390 other mss., commencing with codd. B D (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 426-9). See Annot. In Manetti, the same Greek text as Erasmus was followed, but fiebant was retained.
44 coniuncti E̊Ti tò aútó ("pariter" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus cites the text as $\varepsilon$ is Tò aútó, though his usual mss. all read èmi for eis. At vs. 1, he retained the more literal in eodem loco for the same Greek expression, and that was the rendering which Manetti adopted at the present passage.
 nes" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here, in providing a rendering for kai. In Annot., he suggested et possessiones, and this was the rendering which had been adopted by Manetti.
45 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
 que" Vg.; et cotidie" 1516). In the 1516 edition, cotidie is the more common spelling. On quoque, see on Ioh. 2,15. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in this change.
46 per singulas domos кat' oikov ("circa domos" Vg.). A similar change occurs at Act. 5,42 (1519), consistent with Vulgate usage at Act. 14,23; 15,21. Cf. also Erasmus' substitution of per singulos domos for per domos at Act. 8,3 (1519); 20,20 (1522). In Annot., Erasmus also suggested domesticatim. Valla Annot. proposed circa singulas domos, while Manetti used per domos here.
46 inuicem sumebant $\mu$ Етє $\lambda \alpha \alpha_{\mu} \beta$ बvov ("sumebant" Vg .). In Annot, Erasmus argues that the meaning is to "take from another" ("ab alio sumere"). At Act. 27,33, where the same Greek verb is used, Erasmus was content to retain sumere cibum.
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cum exultatione et simplicitate cordis ${ }^{47}$ laudantes deum, et habentes gratiam apud totum populum. Dominus autem addebat qui salui fierent quotidie congregationi.

3Simul autem Petrus et Ioannes ascendebant in templum, ad horam precationis nonam. ${ }^{2}$ Et quidam vir qui erat claudus ex vtero matris suae, baiulabatur, | quem ponebant quotidie ad portam templi, quae dicitur Speciosa, vt peteret eleemosynam ab introeuntibus in templum. ${ }^{3}$ Is quum vidisset Petrum ac Ioannem ingressuros in templum, rogabat vt eleemosynam acciperet. ${ }^{4}$ Defixis autem in eum oculis Petrus cum Ioanne dixit: Aspice in nos. ${ }^{5}$ At ille intendebat in eos, sperans se aliquid accepturum ab eis. ${ }^{6}$ Petrus autem dixit: Argentum et aurum non est mihi: quod autem habeo, hoc tibi do. In nomine Iesu Christi Nazareni, surge et ambula. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Et}$ apprehensa manu eius dextra, erexit eum. Protinus autem consolidatae sunt plantae illius ac tali. ${ }^{8}$ Et exiliens stetit et ambulabat, intrauitque cum illis in
 $7 \delta \varepsilon A-C E: \delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon D \mid \quad \sigma \varphi \cup \rho \alpha B-E: \sigma \varphi \cup \rho i \alpha A$

47 totum populum $D E$ : omnem plebem $A-C \mid$ fierent quotidie $B-E$ : fiebant cotidie $A$ 3,1 Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ precationis $B$ - $E$ : orationis $A \mid 2$ quotidie $B-E$ : cotidie $A \mid$ 3 ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ Ioannem $A B E$ : Iohannem $C D \mid$ vt eleemosynam acciperet $B$ - $E$ : elcemosynam $A \mid 4$ Ioanne $A B E$ : Iohanne $C D \mid 7$ dextra $B$ - $E$ : dextera $A \mid$ plantae illius ac tali $B$ - $E$ : bases eius et plantae $A \mid 8$ intrauitque $B$ - $E$ : et intrauit $A$

47 laudantes aivoũvtes ("collaudantes" Vg.). By contrast, at Rom. 15,11, Erasmus substitutes collaudate for laudate, rendering the same Greek verb. Manetti also put laudantes.

47 apud mpós ("ad" Vg.). This change is made necessary by the context. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 26,26 (1519), consistent with Vulgate usage at Rom. 4,2 and elsewhere. See also on Act. 2,29.

47 totum populum $\delta$ § ${ }^{2}$ ov tòv $\lambda$ aóv ("omnem plebem" $1516-22=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On totus for omnis, see on Ioh. 8,2. Erasmus elsewhere substitutes populus for plebs in rendering $\lambda$ aós at ten passages. Despite objecting in Annot. on the present passage, he leaves plebs unaltered in many other places in Luke and Acts. Like the Vulgate in these two books, he uses plebs and populus almost interchangeably. See further on Iob. 6,2. Manetti likewise adopted totum populum.

47 addebat mporetiOEı ("augebat" Vg.). The Vulgate use of augeo ... in was inappropriate to the context. The substitution of addebat had already been proposed by Valla Annot. Quite plausibly, in Annot., Erasmus suggests that the original reading of the Vulgate was addebat, and that this was later altered to augebat by scribal corruption. See also on vs. 41. Manetti's version (Pal. Lat. 45) had apponebat.
47 qui salui fierent tov̀s $\sigma \omega \zeta$ ¢นévous ("qui salui fiebant" $1516=$ late $V g$.). Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate rendering, possibly to avoid the interpretation that the people "were becoming saved". Manetti preferred eos qui quotidie saluabantur.
2,47-3,1 congregationi. Simul autem Petrus $\tau$ ñ
 ipsum. Petrus autem" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus comments on the difference of punctuation. The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, émi
 as in $\mathbf{7}^{7 \text { 7vid }} 9$ vivid $\times$ A B C and six later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and about 390 of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 4347). The words $\tau$ ñ Ekк $\lambda$ noiq were also in the text cited by Valla Annot. For Erasmus' use of congregatio, see on Act. 5,11. Manetti had ecclesie apponebat in id ipsum. Petrus et.
3,1 precationis $\operatorname{Tñs} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon u x n ̃ s$ ("orationis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,14.
3 ac kaí ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
3 ingressuros $\mu$ ह́ $\lambda$ 入ovtas tiotévan ("incipientes introire" Vg.). The spelling $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda$ доvtes in 1519 is a misprint. For the removal of incipio, see on Ioh. 4,47, and Annot. On ingredior, see also on Iob. 13,27. Manetti had made the same change.
 ("eleemosynam" 1516). Erasmus' 1516 rendering corresponded with his omission of $\lambda \alpha \beta$ ziv from the accompanying Greek column, following cod. 2815, with support from cod. D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In 1519, he inserted $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon$ inv into the text, following cod. 3 and restoring the Vulgate rendering, strangely in conflict with his complaint in 1519 Annot, to the effect that some Greek mss. added the word in order to conform with the Vulgate ("In nonnullis tamen additur $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \tau v, ~ v t ~ c u m ~ n o s t r i s ~ c o n s e n t i a n t ") . ~ T h e ~ i n-~$ sertion of $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon^{v}$ is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B

C E and some later mss. Manetti (PaL Lat 45) had just eleemosynam, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
4 Defixis ... oculis ádevioras ("Intuens" Vg.). Greek aorist. See on Act. 1,10, and Annot. The version of Manetti was Intuitus.
4 Aspice B $\lambda \varepsilon$ є $\psi o v$ ("Respice" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,36, and Annot.
6 oúk. Erasmus' text here diverges from his mss., which have oux, as found in nearly all other mss.
$6 \mathrm{~N} \alpha \zeta \omega \rho \alpha i o u$. The reading $N \alpha \zeta \alpha \rho \alpha i o u$ in 1516 appears to be an arbitrary correction of spelling, as it is not supported by Erasmus' mss., and similar changes also occur at $M c$. 10,47; Act. 4,10; 6,14.
7 kpartioas. This rare Greek variant, which persists through all five of Erasmus' editions, was derived from cod. 2815. In most other mss., including codd. 1 and 2816, the text has mad́cas. In Annot, he shows awareness of both readings. Possibly кротijoos began as a marginal note in a manuscript, offering a synonym for trá̛oas.
 Ioh. 18,10. Manetti here put eum per manum dexteram apprehensum.
 2,19 for Erasmus' use of erigo. For the removal of leuo and its compounds, see on loh. 4,35. Manetti substituted eleuauit.
 Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the reading кai mapoxp $\tilde{\eta}_{\mu} \alpha$ in cod. D, though this could have been a retranslation from the Latin. Manetti changed to Confestim vero.
 opupd́ ("bases eius et plantae" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The reading $\sigma \varphi u p i \alpha$, of 1516 , seems to have been taken from cod. 1 , with virtually no other ms. support. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus objects to the use of bases, as being a mere transliteration of the Greek word. In classical Latin authors, the word is not used in this sense. In 1527, he noted the Vulgate use of bases among the Quae Per Interpretem Commissa. The substitution of illius is for the sake of stylistic variety, after eius and eum, earlier in the verse. Manetti put bases suac ac plantae.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39 .
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templum inambulans et saliens ac laudans deum. ${ }^{9}$ Et vidit eum totus populus ambulantem ac laudantem deum. ${ }^{10}$ Agnoueruntque illum, quod ipse esset is qui ad eleemosynam sederat ad speciosam portam templi. Et impleti sunt admiratione et stupore super eo quod contigerat illi. ${ }^{11}$ Quum teneret autem qui sanatus fuerat claudus, Petrum et Ioannem, cucurrit totus populus ad eos in porticu quae appellatur Solomonis, stupefactus.
${ }^{12}$ Quo viso Petrus respondit ad populum: Viri Israelitae, quid miramini super hoc, aut nos quid intuemini, quasi nostra virtute aut pietate


8 inambulans $B$-E: ui ambulans $A^{*}$, ambulans $A^{c} \mid$ ac $A^{c} B$-E: et $A^{*} \mid 9$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ 10 is $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ sederat $B-E$ : sedebat $A \mid$ admiratione et stupore $C$ C. stupore et extasi $A$, stupore et ecstasi $B \mid$ super $B-E: \operatorname{in} A \mid 11$ Ioannem $A B E:$ Iohannem $C D \mid$ porticu $B$-E: porticum $A \mid$ Solomonis, stupefactus $B$-E: Salomonis stupentes $A \mid 12$ super $B-E$ : in $A \mid$ pietate $B-E$ : potestate $A$

8 inambulans терıтотడ̃ท ("ambulans" 1516 errata $=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "ui ambulans" 1516 text). The strange misprint in 1516 looks more like an error for inambulans than ambulans, especially as Erasmus later put inambulans in his 1519 edition. He follows the Vulgate in using inambulo to render $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \varepsilon \rho ı 1 \pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \epsilon$ at 2 Cor. 6,16. Probably he wished to avoid the repetition of ambulo, which had been used earlier in the same verse.

8 saliens $\propto \lambda \lambda \lambda o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s\left(\right.$ ("exiliens" ${ }^{\text {Vg. }}$.). As pointed out in Annot., the revised rendering preserves the distinction between the two Greek verbs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha ı$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \mu \alpha 1$. This coincided with comments which had already been made by Valla Annot. However, at Act. 14,10, where $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ouol again occurs in a similar context, Erasmus retains exilio.
$8 a c$ kai ("et" 1516 text = Vg.). The substitution of ac in 1516 errata reflects Erasmus' developing preference for ac. see on Ioh. 1,25.

9 eum totus populus aủtòv $\pi a \tilde{a} s$ ó $\lambda$ aoós ("omnis populus eum" Vg.). On totus, see on Iob. 8,2. The Vulgate here follows a different Greek word-order, mã́s ò $\lambda$ coòs aủtóv, as found in $\boldsymbol{p}^{74 \mathrm{wid}} \boldsymbol{K} \mathrm{ABCD}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with cod. E.
9 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti also had ac.
10 Agnoueruntque ètryivんokóv te ("Cognoscebant autem" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ for TE , as in $\mathbf{7}^{74} \times \mathrm{ABC}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, together with codd. (D) E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. On agnosco, see on Iob. 8,43. Manetti put et cognoscebant.
10 quod ... esset ótı ... ग̄v ("quoniam ... erat" Vg .). Erasmus here prefers to take ötı as introducing an indirect question after $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi / \gamma \mid v \omega \sigma \pi \omega$, rather than in a causal sense, though either
interpretation is possible. Manetti had quod ... erat.
10 is qui ... sederat ó ... ка0 $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon v o s$ ("qui ... sedebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). As indicated in Annot., the context requires a different tense from the imperfect, which implied that the man who had been healed still continued to sit and beg.
 ("stupore et extasi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. ; "stupore et ecstasi" 1519). Erasmus' main purpose here is to remove the non-Latin extasi (or ecstasi) of the Vulgate: cf. Annot. His use of admiratio can be compared with the occurrence of this word in the Vulgate at $A p$. Iob. 17,6, to render $\theta \alpha \tilde{u}-$ $\mu \alpha$. Erasmus further introduced admiratio at
 lem with admiratio is its ambiguity, conveying either "admiration" or "amazement". Elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in rendering $\theta$ d́ $\mu \beta$ ßos by pauor and stupor (Lc. 4,36; 5,9). In rendering ék $\sigma$ Taбıs, he follows the Vulgate in using stupor at $M c .5,42 ; L c .5,26$, but at $M c .16,8$, he substitutes stupor for pauor.
10 super èmi ("in" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' choice of preposition is more suitable in this context. Similar substitutions occur in almost twenty other passages, mainly in the 1519 edition, in accordance with Vulgate usage elsewhere. Occasionally, Erasmus has super for $\pi$ mpi or ev , in similar contexts of joy or amazement, e.g. at Act. 7,41; 2 Cor. 12,9 (both in 1519). He also sometimes substitutes super for $i n$, when followed by the accusative.
11 Quum teneret кратои̃vtos ("Cum viderent" late Vg .). The late Vulgate reading has partial support from just one late Greek ms. (cod. 629: see Aland Die Apostelgeschicbte 442), which has
 earlier Vulgate reading: cf. Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered more literally by the ablative absolute, Obtinente autem ...
11 qui sanatus fuerat claudus toũ îàévtos $x \omega \lambda$ 入oũ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the Greek variant aútoũ, found in $\mathbf{7}^{74} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B CE 057 and about forty later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and almost 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 438-42). Manetti put ... claudo qui sanus factus fuerat.
11 totus mã̃ ("omnis" Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,2. Manetti's version omits this word.

11 in porticu ėmi Tñ̃ $\sigma$ Toã̛ ("ad porticum" Vg.; "in porticum" 1516). Erasmus' rendering is more precise here: see 1535 Annot. The version of Manetti had in porticum, as used by Erasmus in 1516.
11 Solomonis टо入оцต̃vos ("Salomonis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Greek spelling found in most of the mss., including those of Erasmus, is $\sigma \circ \lambda \circ \mu \omega \tilde{v}$ -
 been a conjecture, to bring the text into line with the spelling found in his mss. at other passages. See further on Ioh. 10,23.
11 stupefactus ${ }^{\text {exe }} \theta \alpha \alpha \beta$ Ol ("stupentes" $1516=V g$.). See on vs. 10 , regarding $\theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta$ os. There is no single group of cognate Latin words which adequately conveys the range of meaning covered
 while at the same time distinguishing from
 $\theta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta$ os in vs. 10 and ${ }^{6} \kappa \theta \alpha \mu \beta$ os in vs. 11 is inevitably broken by the restrictions of Latin vocabulary. Erasmus renders é $\kappa \theta \alpha \mu \beta \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ by obstupesco at $M c .9,15$, or by expauesco at $M c .14,33$ (somewhat inappropriately); $16,5,6$, depending on his judgment as to whether the context related to fear or amazement. Manetti put obstupefacti.
 Erasmus wishes to convey the sense of the Greek aorist participle, at the same time as supplying an object for the verb: see Annot. However, in omitting to translate $\delta \underline{\varepsilon}$, he is less strictly literal than the Vulgate. Manetti substituted Cum autem vidisset.
12 super boc Émi toútç ("in hoc" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 10.
12 pietate ev̉ $\sigma \in$ हsic ("potestate" 1516 Lat. = late Vg .). The late Vulgate rendering, potestate, was cited in Annot., lemma, and corresponds with the Sacon folio Vulgate of 1513, as well as the abbreviated form, ptate, printed in Froben's edition of 1491. However, Froben's 1514 edition of the Vulgate more correctly had pietate, as printed in the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. In Annot., although Erasmus later became aware that some earlier Vulgate mss. have pietate, he speculated that the Greek text underlying potestate was ésouría, which he commended as a superior reading. This was not supported by any Greek mss., and it seems more probable that potestate represents an internal Latin corruption from pietate, which it somewhat resembles. Manetti had pietate.
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effecerimus vt hic ambularet? ${ }^{13}$ Deus Abraham et Isaac et lacob, deus patrum nostrorum glorificauit filium suum Iesum, quem vos tradidistis ac negastis in conspectu Pilati, quum ille iudicasset esse absoluendum. ${ }^{14}$ Vos autem sanctum et iustum negastis, et postulastis vt virum homicidam donaret vobis: ${ }^{15}$ autorem vero vitae interfecistis, quem deus suscitauit a mortuis, cuius nos testes sumus: ${ }^{16}$ et per fiduciam nominis eius, hunc quem videtis ac nostis, consolidauit nomen ipsius: et fides quae per eum est, dedit ei integritatem istam in conspectu omnium vestrum. ${ }^{17}$ Et nunc fratres scio, quod per ignorantiam fecistis, sicut et principes vestri. ${ }^{18}$ Deus autem quae praenunciauerat per os omnium prophetarum suorum, Christum passurum, impleuit sic. ${ }^{19}$ Poeniteat vos igitur erroris
 ACE: apxiyov B

12 effecerimus ... ambularet $B$-E: fecerimus hunc ambulare $A \mid 13 \operatorname{vos} B-E:$ vos quidem $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 16$ per fiduciam $B-E$ : in fide $A \mid$ videtis $B-E$ : vos videtis $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ consolidauit $B-E$ : confirmauit $A \mid$ ipsius $B-E$ : suum $A \mid$ quae $A-D$ : que $E \mid$ integritatem $B-E$ : integram sanitatem $A \mid 18$ quae $B-E$ : qui $A \mid 19$ erroris $D E$ : om. $A-C$

12 effecerimus тєттоıŋко́बı ("fecerimus" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The spelling тזєтоוŋко́бo1, in 1516, was a misprint, as also was d̛́Ttekpivóvocto earlier in the verse. In rendering moté $\omega$, Erasmus further substitutes efficio at Mt. 5. 32; Mc. 1,17 (1519); 1 Thess. 5,24 (1519); Hebr. 13,21; 2 Petr. 1,10, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Ioh. 5,13; 15,8; 2 Cor. 5,21. He also used efficio for several other Greek verbs, including èvepy $\varepsilon$ é and kaтєpүá̧Oual. For other substitutions for facio, see on Ioh. 1,15.
12 vt bic ambularet toũ mepımateĩv aủtóv ("hunc ambulare" 1516=Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33, for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti put eum ambulare.
13 Isaac et Iacob 'loa<̀k k $\alpha$ ' 'lakผ' $\beta$ ("Deus Isaac, et Deus Iacob" Vg.). The Vulgate addition

 'loacòk koi $\theta$ Eòs 'lak $\omega$, as in codd. A D, together with a few later mss. In 1527 Annot., citing the testimony of Chrysostom, Erasmus expressed approval of the Vulgate reading, suggesting that the repeated $\delta \theta$ zós was omitted by a later scribe ("sciolus aliquis") who thought that it would otherwise appear that there were several gods. However, in his own Greek text, he follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. B E $0236^{\text {vid }}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Another explanation of the textual variant is that some mss. added $\delta \theta \varepsilon \delta \dot{s}$ from such passages as Mt. 22,32; Mc. 12,26; Lc. 20,37. At Act. 7,32, on the other hand, most mss. have ó Ocós twice, while $\boldsymbol{\$ p}^{74} \times \operatorname{ABC}$ omit. Manetti similarly omitted deus.

13 vos úpĩs（＂vos quidem＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）． The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\mu \mathrm{E} v$ ，as found in codd．1， 2816 and nearly all other mss．，commencing with 月 $^{74} \times$ A B C E． Erasmus＇Greek text follows his cod．2815，with support from cod．（D）and only a few later mss．，including cod．69．This omission persisted into the Textus Receptus．Manetti also omitted quidem．
13 ac kai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25．
13 in conspectu кळтஷ̀ $\pi$ то́б由тоv（＂ante faciem＂ Vg．）．Erasmus also introduces in conspectu at a number of passages in rendering $\varepsilon$ év＇imiov and кのтevćmiov，mainly in the Epistles，in accord－ ance with Vulgate usage at e．g．Ioh．20，30；Act． 4，19．He retains ante faciem for кото̀ тро́ $\sigma \omega \pi$ тоv at Lc．2，31，and in several places for $\pi \rho o ̀$ $\pi \rho о \sigma \omega ் т о \cup$.
13 quum ille iudicasset kpivavtos ẻkeivou（＂iudi－ cante illo＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．See Annot．
13 esse absoluendum ởтт入へúsıv（＂dimitti＂Vg．）． See on Iob．19，10．Manetti substituted vt di－ mitteretur．
14 postulastis ท่̣Tí $\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta$（＂petistis＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at nine other passages，in accordance with Vulgate usage elsewhere．More often，Erasmus retains peto．The distinction being made here is that postulo is the equivalent of＂demand＂，while peto means＂ask humbly＂ or＂beseech＂：Valla Elegantiae V，58；Erasmus Parapbr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，p．296， 11．466－467．Manetti anticipated this change．
14 vt ．．．donaret X $\alpha$ pıöñvaı（＂donari＂Vg．）． See on Ioh．1，33，for avoidance of the infini－ tive．Manetti＇s version（Pal．Lat．45）had $v t$ ．．． donaretur．
16 per fiduciam ÉTाi Tñ̃ Tíateı（＂in fide＂ 1516 $=$ Vg．）．Usually Erasmus retains fides for Tiotis． At a very few passages，where he felt that the context would permit the word to be interpreted as＂confidence＂rather than＂faith＂，he sub－ stituted fiducia：e．g．at Mc．4，40；Iac．1，6（both 1519）．Another reason for changing the present passage was to avoid the repetition of fides twice in the same verse，but this results in a loss of connection between the two occurrences of miotis in the Greek text．For his use of fiducia in rendering mappnoia，see on Ioh．10，24．See also Annot．
16 videtis $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon i ̃ t \varepsilon$（＂vos vidistis＂late Vg．；＂vos videtis＂1516）．The late Vulgate rendering is unsupported by mss．See Annot．The version of

Manetti had vos videtis，as later translated by Erasmus in 1516.
$16 a c$ kall（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．1，25．
 $=$ Vg．）．Elsewhere，Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using confirmo for $\sigma$ тєpєó $\omega$ at Act． 16,5 ，and
 Here，he wishes to keep the connection with the use of otepeó in vs．7，the only other place where consolido appears in his N．T． Cf．Annot．
16 ipsius $\alpha$ ’̛Toũ（＂eius＂Vg．；＂suum＂1516）． Erasmus prefers the reflexive pronoun，to refer back，less ambiguously，to the name of Jesus， rather than the name of the man who has just been mentioned．

16 ei $\mathfrak{U} T \underset{\sim}{0}$（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission does not appear to enjoy Greek ms．support． See Annot．，where Erasmus renders by illi． Manetti put ei．
16 integritatem Tìv $\delta \lambda$ ok $\lambda \eta p i \alpha \sigma$（＂integram sanitatem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus felt that sanitas， or＂good health＂，was not quite an appropriate term for one who had been cured of a disability： see Annot．The version of Manetti had integram banc sortem，connecting the Greek word with кли̃pos．
17 quod öTı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．
18 quae $\alpha$（＂qui＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）．The late Vul－ gate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss．： see Annot．
18 praenunciauerat трокотт́㇒ $\gamma$ єı $\lambda \varepsilon$（＂praenunci－ auit＂Vg．）．Erasmus improves the sequence of tenses by using the pluperfect：see on Ioh．1，19．
18 Cbristum passurum ma日eĩv то̀v Xpıoтóv （＂pati Christum suum＂Vg．）．Erasmus＇use of the future tense is more appropriate here，in the context of prophecy．The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\alpha u ̛ T o u ̃$ ，as found in $\$ 7^{74 v i d} \mathbb{K}$ B C D E and a few later mss．The same mss． omit $\alpha \dot{\prime}$ тоũ before $\pi \alpha \theta \varepsilon i v$, supporting the omission of suorum by the earlier Vulgate；the 1527 Vulgate column inserts suorum before prophetarum．Erasmus follows cod．2815，together with codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss． Manetti put quod Cbristus pateretur．
 nitemini enim＂Vg．1527；＂Poenitemini igitur＂ Vg．mss．；＂Poeniteat vos igitur＂1516－22）．In 1516，Erasmus substitutes poeniteo，without sup－ plying an object，at three passages in Matthew



 риүцย́vov úpĩv ’Iŋбoũv Xpıбтóv, ${ }^{21}$ öv
















et conuertimini vt deleantur peccata vestra, ${ }^{20}$ vt quum venerint tempo|ra LB 450 refrigerationis a conspectu domini, et miserit eum qui ante praedicatus est vobis Iesum Christum, ${ }^{21}$ quem oportet quidem coelum accipere vsque in tempora restitutionis omnium, quae loquutus est deus per os omnium sanctorum suorum a saeculo prophetarum. ${ }^{22}$ Moses quidem ad patres dixit: Prophetam suscitabit vobis dominus deus vester de fratribus vestris, mei similem. Audietis eum iuxta omnia quaecunque loquutus fuerit vobis. ${ }^{23}$ Futurum est autem vt omnis anima quae non audierit prophetam illum, exterminetur e populo. ${ }^{24}$ Quin et omnes prophetae a Samuele ac deinceps quotquot loquuti sunt, etiam annunciauerunt dies istos. ${ }^{25}$ Vos estis filii prophetarum ac testamenti, quod testatus est deus

19 conuertimini $B$-E: conuertamini $A \mid 20$ refrigerationis $C-E$ : refrigerii $A B \mid 21$ accipere $B$-E: suscipere $A \mid$ alt. omnium B-E: om. $A \mid$ saeculo $A B D E$ seculo $C \mid 22$ ad patres $B$ - $B$ : om. $A \mid$ mei similem. Audietis eum $B-E$ : tanquam meipsum audietis $A \mid 23$ Futurum est $B-E$ : Erit $A \mid$ e populo $B$-E: de plebe $A \mid 24$ Samuele ac $B$-E: Samuel et $A \mid$ etiam $C-E$ et $A B \mid$ 25 ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ testatus est $B$-E: disposuit $A$
where the Vulgate has poenitentiam ago (Mt. 3,2; 4,$17 ; 11,20$ ). In 1522, he felt the need to add an object at several such passages: Mt. 3,2 (vitae prioris); 11,20 (scelerum); Lc. 10,13 (scelerum suorum). See Annot. Erasmus included this Vulgate use of poenitemini among the Soloecismi, and further discussed the point in Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 B-C. Manetti preferred Penitentiam igitur agite.
 1516). In 1519, Erasmus reverts to the Vulgate form of the imperative. On the use of the subjunctive instead of the passive imperative, see on Iob. 6,27.
20 refrigerationis ảva $\psi v ́ \xi \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~(" r e f r i g e r i i " ~ 1516-~$ $19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The word refrigeratio is more common in classical Latin than refrigerium, but it is
doubtful whether either alternative fully conveys the Greek meaning.
20 ante praedicatus трокєкприүиє́vov ("praedicatus" Vg.). The Greek expression appears to be little more than a conjectural emendation by Erasmus or one of his assistants, based on the Vulgate and the use of $\pi \rho о к \eta р \cup ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ at $A c t$. 13,24 . Virtually all Greek mss. have тpokexeiplo$\mu \dot{v} v o v$ at the present passage, commencing with $7^{74 v i d}$ A B C D E and including codd. 1, 2815, 2816. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus seems to hint that the reading of his mss. was a scribal error, derived from Act. 22,14; 26,16. His poorly supported choice of wording persisted into the Textus Receptus.
21 accipere $\delta$ é $\xi \alpha \sigma 0 \propto \wedge$ ("suscipere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at 2 Cor. 8,17.

Cf. on Ioh. 14,3; Act. 17,11. Elsewhere, in rendering $\delta \dot{\text { Éx }}$ 〇O $\alpha$, Erasmus retains suscipio at Lc. 8,$13 ; 10,8,10 ;$ Act. 7,59 . Manetti put recipere.
21 omnium (2nd.) mávt $\omega \nu$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text substituting $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$, as in $\mathcal{N} A B C D$ and a few later mss. In cod. $E$ and most later mss., including codd. 2815 and 2816, the text has $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ т $\tilde{\nu}$ (by parablepsis, cod. 1 has $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi о к \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \varsigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \tilde{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma i \omega \nu)$. The omission of tw̃ $\nu$ from Erasmus' text has just a few late mss. in support, and possibly arose from a printing error, by haplography: it nevertheless persisted into the Textus Receptus. Cf. Annot. The version of Manetti similarly added omnium.
22 M $\omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. The spelling $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \tilde{\eta} s$, in the 1516-27 editions, was derived from cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1 and 2816 and many other mss. The correction in 1535 also has good ms. support, but could have been an arbitrary change. Similar corrections to the spelling of this name were made in that edition at some twenty-four passages, sometimes with ms. authority, sometimes probably by mere conjecture. Several times in 1516, Erasmus introduced $\mu 0$ üवர̃ $s$ (e.g. Act. $7,22,32,40$ ). In 1522 , his preference seemed to be for $\mu \omega$ Üoñs (cf. Act. 7,22, 29, 32, 35, 40 etc.).
22 ad patres $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тpòs toùs $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ p \alpha s$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus leaves $\gamma$ óp untranslated, but adds Nam in Annot. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting all four words, as in $3^{74 v i d} \mathfrak{K}$ A B C and thirteen later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and more than 380 other late mss., and also by codd. D E and more than thirty other mss. which add mpòs tous $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha s$ after eltiev (some of these further add $\eta \mu \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ or $\cup \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ after matépos): see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 445-7. However, contrary to the information given by Aland, cod. 2816
 after $\mu$ év. See Annot., and also Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 205 E . The version of Manetti had Moyses enim ad patres, omitting quidem.
22 dixit єโTॄย on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put dixit quod.
22 vester úuñv. In cod. 2815, the reading is $\dagger \mu \omega ̃ \nu$, as in $\aleph^{*}$ C E and many later mss. The Erasmian text here follows codd. 1, 2816 and the Vulgate, with support from most of the
remaining mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{\aleph}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A} D$. Manetti substituted noster, corresponding with ท่น $\omega$ ข $\nu$.
 ókoú $\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ("tanquam meipsum audietis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs at Act. 7,37. In Annot., Erasmus cites the Vulgate rendering of Dt. 18,18 for comparison (similem tui), and argues against the Vulgate punctuation of the present passage. The substitution of eum for ipsum had previously been proposed by Valla Annot., with the further suggestion that tanquam should be replaced by sicut.
23 Futurum est autem vt ... exterminetur Ễสส๙ı
 terminabitur" Vg.; "Erit autem, vt ... exterminetur" 1516). For this construction, see on Act. 2,21.

23 quae $\eta$ गTrs ä́v ("quaecunque" Vg.). This change was possibly designed to avoid repetition of quaecunque from the previous verse. Manetti made the same change.
$23 e$ ék ("de" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
23 populo тoũ $\lambda \alpha 0$ ("plebe" $1516=V g$.). See on Act. 2,47. Manetti similarly had populo.
24 Quin et omnes kal mávtes $\delta$ é ("Et omnes" Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,17, and Annot., where Erasmus also suggests Sed et omnes.
24 Samuele $\sum \alpha \mu$ oví $\lambda$ ("Samuel" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus prefers the declinable form of the name here and at Act. 13,20 (1519); Hebr. 11,32.
$24 a c$ кoi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
$24 \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \xi \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. The spelling $\kappa \alpha T^{\prime} \varepsilon \xi \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$, in 1516, was an arbitrary correction, unsupported by mss.
24 quotquot ठ̋бol ("qui" Vg.). See on Ioh. 17,2. Manetti preferred quicunque.
24 etiam каi ("et" 1516-19 = Vg. mss.; late Vg. omits). The late Vulgate omission had negligible Greek support. For the substitution of etiam, see on Ioh. 6,36. Manetti omitted the word.
25 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
25 testatus est $\delta$ té $\theta \varepsilon$ cro ("disposuit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change accords with the Vulgate rendering of Hebr. 10,16. However, at that passage, Erasmus substitutes condo for testor, while leaving testamentum quod disponam unaltered at Hebr. 8,10.
mpòs toùs matépas $\grave{\eta} \mu \omega ̃ \nu, ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$ ${ }^{\text {A }}$
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 таऽ кגi трєбßuтépous каi $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha т \varepsilon i ̃ \varsigma ~$
erga patres nostros, dicens ad Abraham: Et in semine tuo benedictionem consequentur omnes familiae terrae. ${ }^{26}$ Vobis primum deus, quum suscitasset filium suum Iesum, misit eum benedicentem vobis, ita vt vnusquisque vestrum conuerteret se $a b$ iniquitatibus suis.

4Loquentibus autem illis ad populum, superuenerunt illis sacerdotes ac magistratus templi et Sadducaei, ${ }^{2}$ moleste ferentes quod docerent populum, et annunciarent in nomine Iesu resurrectionem ex mortuis: ${ }^{3}$ et iniecerunt eis manus, posueruntque eos in custodiam in posterum diem, nam erat iam vespera. ${ }^{4}$ Multi vero eorum qui audierant sermonem, crediderunt: et factus est numerus virorum circiter quinque milia. ${ }^{5}$ Factum est autem postero die vt congregarentur principes eorum et seniores et scribae

## 

25 erga $B-E$ : ad $A$ ad $A$-D: ab $E \mid$ benedictionem consequentur $B$ - $E$ : benedicentur $A$ | 26 vobis, ita $B-E: \operatorname{vos} A \mid$ vnusquisque ... suis $B-E$ : conuertat se vnusquisque a maliciis vestris $A$ 4,1 alt. illis $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 2$ in $A C-E$ : sub $B \mid 3$ posueruntque $B-E$ : et posuerunt $A \mid$ nam erat $B$-E: Erat autem $A \mid 4$ vero $B$ - $E$ : autem $A \mid 5$ postero $B$ - $E$ : in postero $A$

25 erga тор́s ("ad" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus uses erga sixty-six times in 1516, and seventy-seven times in 1519 , usually in the sense of "towards", whereas it only occurs twice in the Vulgate N.T.

25 nostros $\mathfrak{T} \mu \omega \tilde{\nu}($ "vestros" Vg.). The Vulgate pronoun reflects a Greek variant, $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$, found in $\$ 17^{74} \aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A B E and some later mss., including cod. 2816. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and most other mss., commencing with codd. $\boldsymbol{\aleph}^{*} \mathrm{C}^{\text {vid }} \mathrm{D} 0165$. Manetti also put nostros.

25 benedictionem consequentur $\varepsilon^{3} \lambda о \gamma \eta \theta$ ク́боvтal ("benedicentur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For this substitution, see Annot. on Gal. 3,8. The Greek text offered by Erasmus is not from the mss. which
he usually consulted for his 1516 edition, though it is found in codd. $A^{*} B$ and a few later mss. (including cod. 3). In codd. 1, 2815, 2816 and most other Greek mss., commencing with $\mathbf{p l}^{74}$ ※ $\mathrm{A}^{\text {corr }}$ D E 0165, it is $\varepsilon v \in \cup \lambda 0 \gamma \eta$ Ońoovtal. Since Erasmus' text makes the same change at Gal. 3,8, it would appear that this was deliberate at both passages, possibly influenced by the commentary of Theophylact on the Pauline Epistles.
25 familiae $\pi \alpha$ тpıaí. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus also cites the reading $\varphi u ́ \lambda \alpha \_$from "nonnullis exemplaribus", which would be closer to the Latin rendering. This reading is found in cod. 3 and relatively few other late mss., and may have been derived from the Septuagint of $G n .12,3$.

26 'uiniv. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and 2816, supported by most other mss. His cod. 2815 incorrectly has $\dagger$ iniv.
 Greek aorist. See Annot. The version of Manetti put suscitauit.
26 Iesum 'Inooũv (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{7}^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ B C D E 0165 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. A and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti likewise added Iesum.
26 vobis (2nd.) úuãs ("vos" 1516). Contrary to the usage of the 1516 Latin translation here, the verb benedico is usually accompanied by the dative, but Erasmus retains benedixit nos at Eph. 1,3.
26 ita $v t$ èv $T \tilde{\varphi}$ (" vt " $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus similarly introduces ita vt at Phil. 2,27; 1 Thess. 5,23; 1 Petr. 3,4. This expression occurs in the Vulgate, in rendering $\omega \sigma$ тe. Manetti altered the construction to vt benediceret ... et conuerteret vnumquenque.
26 vnusquisque vestrum conuerteret se àmoot ${ }^{2}$ ह́$\phi$ ¢Iv ěkacatov ("conuertat se vnusquisque" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) The insertion of vestrum is a helpful amplification, justified by the presence of $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ at the end of the sentence: see the next note.
$26 a b$ iniquitatibus suis àmò tãv movnpiõv $\dot{\cup} \mu \tilde{\mu} v$ ("a nequitia sua" Vg.; "a maliciis vestris" 1516). The substitution of iniquitas is consistent with the Vulgate rendering of $L$ c. 11,39. Erasmus puts malicia at Mt. 22,18; Act. 8,22; Rom. 1,29; fraus at Mc. 7,22; versutia at 1 Cor. 5,8; Eph. 4,14; and astutia at Eph. 6,12, thus removing all instances of nequitia from the N.T. In 1516-27 Annot, however, Erasmus gives nequitiis as the literal meaning, while referring (with tongue in cheek) to those Latin purists who thought that the word was more appropriate to misdeeds which arose from debauchery and lust. It is questionable whether iniquitas is any more suitable, as in classical Latin it tends to mean "unfairness" or "inequality" rather than "wickedness". The Vulgate use of the pronoun sua could reflect the substitution of cưT $\omega$ v for $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$, as in cod. $C^{*}$ and a few later mss., though it is probably only a matter of translation. Manetti preferred a malignitatibus vestris.
4,1 aủt $\tilde{v}$. The spelling aủtē, in 1516 , is a misprint.

1 illis (2nd.) aủtoĩs (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. other than cod. D. Manetti had eis.
1 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
2 moleste ferentes $\delta$ Ioctovoú $\mu \varepsilon \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ol}}$ ("dolentes" Vg.). In 1519, at the only other occurrence of this Greek verb, at Act. 16,18, Erasmus substitutes aegre ferens for dolens of the Vulgate (after putting taedio affectus in 1516). These are the only two instances of the use of an adverb with fero in Erasmus' N.T. Elsewhere, he retains doleo to render ó $\delta v v$ v́oucıı at $L c .2,48 ; A c t .20,38$, and introduces it to render other Greek verbs at 2 Cor. 6,10; Eph. 4,19 (1519); 1 Thess. 4,13.
2 in nomine ${ }^{\text {Ev }} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \tilde{\varphi}$ ("in" Vg.; "sub nomine" 1519). Erasmus adds nomine by way of clarification, rather than through any difference of Greek text. On sub, used in 1519 only, see on Iob. 5,43. Manetti had in Iesum for in Iesu, as in some late Vulgate copies.
2 ex mortuis $\tau \grave{\eta} v$ ह̀k vekp $\tilde{v}$. The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $¥^{77 v i d} \mathcal{N}$ A B C E and a few later mss. Codd. 2815 and 2816 had $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu v$ Ekp $\tilde{\nu} v$, also found in D 0165 and most of the later mss.
3 eis cu่toins ("in eos" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering does not appear to indicate the use of a different Greek text.
3 posueruntque каi $\notin \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau t o$ ("et posuerunt" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
3 posterum diem $\mathrm{T} \eta \mathrm{V}$ aũpıov ("crastinum" $V \mathrm{~g}$.). See on Iob. 1,43.
3 nam crat 和 $\gamma$ व́p ("Erat autem" $1516=$ late Vg.). The reading ${ }^{n} v \delta \dot{E}$, in 1516 , is not taken from Erasmus' usual mss., and looks like a conjecture based on the late Vulgate, lacking Greek ms. authority.
4 vero $\delta$ ' $\varepsilon$ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{V}$ g.). See on Iob. 1,26. Manetti already had vero.
4 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v ~(" v e r b u m " ~ V g.) . ~ S e e ~$ on Iob. 1,1. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
4 circiter $\omega \sigma \varepsilon^{\prime}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74}$ A A and a few later mss. A few mss. substitute $\dot{\omega}$, as in codd. B D 0165 . Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In Annot, he also suggested using ferme. Manetti put quasi.
5 postero die tìv aưpıov ("in crastinum" Vg.; "in postero die" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,43.
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 p $\eta \sigma i ́ \alpha v$ кai 'lwávvov, kà кат $\alpha \lambda \alpha \beta$ óne-


Hierosolymis, ${ }^{6}$ et Annas princeps sacerdotum et Caiaphas et Ioannes et Alexander et quotquot erant de genere pontificio. ${ }^{7}$ Et quum statuissent eos in medio, interrogabant: Qua virtute, aut quo nomine fecistis hoc vos? ${ }^{8}$ Tunc Petrus repletus spiritu sancto, dixit ad eos: Principes populi et seniores Israel, ${ }^{9}$ si nos hodie examinamur de eo quod benefecerimus homini infirmo, qua ratione iste saluus factus sit: ${ }^{10}$ notum sit omnibus vobis et toti plebi Israel, quod per nomen lesu Christi Nazareni, quem vos crucifixistis, quem deus suscitauit a mortuis, per hunc iste astat coram | vobis sanus. ${ }^{11}$ Hic est lapis ille qui reiectus est a vobis aedificantibus, qui factus est caput anguli, ${ }^{12}$ nec est in alio quoquam salus. Nec enim aliud nomen est sub coelo datum inter homines, in quo oporteat nos saluos fieri.
${ }^{13}$ Videntes autem Petri in dicendo libertatem ac Ioannis, compertoque quod homines essent illiterati et

10 va̧由paıov B-E: va弓apaıou A | 12 ито тоv oupavov D E: от. A-C

5 Hierosolymis $B$-E: in Hierusalem $A \mid 6$ Caiaphas $B-E$ : Cayphas $A \mid$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid 7$ Qua $B-E$ : In qua $A \mid$ quo $B$-E: in quo $A \mid 9$ examinamur $B-E$ : diiudicamur $A \mid$ qua ratione $B-E$ : in quo $A \mid$ sit $A^{c} B-E$ est $A^{*} \mid 10$ toti $B-E$ : omni $A \mid$ per nomen $B-E$ : in nomine $A \mid$ per hunc $B$-E: in hoc $A \mid 11$ ille $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ reiectus $B$-E: reprobatus $A \mid$ caput $B$ - : in caput $A \mid 12$ prius nec $B-E$ : et non $A \mid$ inter homines $B-E$ : hominibus $A \mid 13$ in dicendo $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ Ioannis $A B E$ : Iohannis $C D \mid$ compertoque $B$-E: et comperto $A$

5 Hierosolymis sis " lepovo $\alpha \lambda \lambda_{n} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,8.
6 pontificio ápxııpartikoũ ("sacerdotali" Vg.). In rendering d́pxııpeús, Erasmus generally follows Vulgate usage, having princeps sacerdotum in Matthew, Mark, Luke and Acts, but pontifex in John and Hebrews. The Vulgate rendering of the present passage could reflect the substitution of ieporikoũ, found in a few late mss., but
it is more likely that these were influenced by the Vulgate. Manetti put pontificali.
7 quum statuisent $\sigma$ тíбovtes ("statuentes" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti had statuerunt ... et.

7 Qua ... quo 'Ev toía ... èv moí ("In qua ... in quo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 5,43, for the omission of the Latin preposition. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) had in qua ... in quali.

8 Israel toũ＇l $\sigma \rho \propto \dot{\eta} \lambda$（＂Israel，audite＂late Vg．）． The late Vulgate rendering corresponds with the addition of ákov́corte，as found in cod．E and a few later mss．Erasmus assigned this extraneous word to the 1527 edition of his Quae Sint Addita．However，in Vulgate mss．，Israel audite is altogether omitted，with support from 7 $7^{74}$ ㅅ A B 0165 and three later mss．Erasmus mentions the earlier Vulgate reading in Annot．， but in his text he follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and more than 400 other mss．，commencing with cod．D（see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 448－9）．Manetti similarly omitted audite．
 $1516=$ late Vg．）．Elsewhere，Erasmus introduces examino once in 1516，at Act．22，24，and three times in 1519，at Act．12，19；22，29；28，18，ren－ dering ởvokpiv $\omega$ and ơvveráちん．Erasmus retains diiudico for ávakpive at several passages of 1 Corinthians，even changing examino to diiudico at 1 Cor．2，14．See also on Act．24，8；25，26．
9 de eo quod benefecerimus bomini infirmo ह̇गi
 hominis infirmi＂Vg．）．As explained in Annot．， Erasmus wishes to avoid the ambiguity of the genitive case，which could have been mis－ understood as implying that a good work was performed by the lame man．Manetti（Pal．Lat． 45）put in beneficio bominis infirmi．
9 qua ratione ．．．saluus factus sit ह̀v tivi ．．． $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \sigma \tau \alpha_{1}$（＂in quo ．．．saluus factus est＂ 1516 text $=$ Vg．；＂in quo ．．．saluus factus sit＂ 1516 errata）．Again Erasmus wishes to remove the obscurity of the Vulgate rendering：see Annot． The substitution of sanus for saluus in 1516－27 Annot．，lemma，does not correspond with the usual Froben editions of the Vulgate or with Erasmus＇ 1527 Vulgate column．Manetti＇s ver－ sion was in quo ．．．est saluatus．
10 toti $\pi \alpha v \tau i$（＂omni＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh． 8，2．Manetti substituted vniuerso populo for omni plebi．
10 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．
10 per nomen हैv Tஸ̃ óvó $\mu \alpha \mathrm{Tl}_{1}$（＂in nomine＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on $I o b .5,43$ ．In the late Vulgate，the words domini nostri are added here， with little support from Greek mss．，except cod．E which adds kupíou．
10 Cbristi Xpıotoũ．In Annot．，Erasmus omits Xpıбтoũ，though apparently without ms．authority．

10 Na̧wpaiou．For the spelling Na̧apaiou in 1516，see on Act．3，6．
 Erasmus prefers to apply this phrase to Christ， whereas the Vulgate is ambiguous as to whether it refers to Christ or to the name of Christ．
11 lapis ille qui o $\lambda$ iOos o（＂lapis qui＂ 1516 $=$ Vg．）．Conveying the sense of the Greek article， Erasmus adds ille to signify that this is a ref－ erence to the corner－stone of Ps．118，22，rather than just＂a stone＂．
11 reiectus $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \xi \bigcirc \cup \theta \varepsilon \nu \eta \theta$ zís（＂reprobatus＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．In Annot．，Erasmus also explains this as meaning contemptus or pro nibilo babitus．Else－ where，he retains reprobo for $\dot{\alpha} т о \delta о к ı \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ．
 Erasmus omits the preposition，in the interests of good Latin style．
12 nec（1st．）kà OỦk（＂et non＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on Iob．2，16．
12 quoquam oủסॄvi（＂aliquo＂Vg．）．See on Iob．2，25．
12 sub coelo úmò tòv oúpavóv．This phrase is omitted from the Greek text of the 1516－22 editions，reproducing the shorter text of cod． 2815，and also of codd．1， 2816 and many other late mss．，in conflict with the Latin rendering， which followed the Vulgate．In 1527，Erasmus reinstated the words in the Greek text，perhaps taking them from the Complutensian Polyglot， with support from § A B D E 0165 and many later mss．
12 inter bomines év à $v \theta$ pம́moıs（＂hominibus＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．The Vulgate corresponds with the omission of èv in cod．D．See Annot．
13 in dicendo libertatem тìv ．．．тapp $\quad \sigma i \alpha v$ （＂constantiam＂Vg．；＂libertatem＂1516）．See on Act．2，29，and Annot．，where Erasmus also suggests audaciam．Manetti substituted confiden－ tiam（cf．his use of confidenter at Act．2，29）．
13 ac каí（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
13 compertoque kai кarta入 $\alpha \beta$ ó $\mu \mathrm{Evol}$（＂comperto＂ Vg．；＂et comperto＂1516）．Erasmus is more literal in rendering kai．On the use of－que，see on Ioh．1，39．Manetti put et cognito．
13 illiterati $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \mu \propto т о 1$（＂sine litteris＂Vg．）． Erasmus＇choice of expression is no more classical，but closer in form to the Greek．For the removal of sine，see on Ioh．8，7．Manetti anticipated Erasmus in this change．
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idiotae, admirabantur et agnoscebant eos, quod cum Iesu fuissent: ${ }^{14} \mathrm{homi}$ nem autem videntes stantem cum eis qui sanatus fuerat, nihil poterant contradicere: ${ }^{15}$ iussis autem illis e concilio secedere, conferebant inter sese, ${ }^{16}$ dicentes: Quid faciemus hominibus istis? Nam conspicuum signum aeditum esse per eos, omnibus habitantibus Hierosolymis manifestum est, nec possumus inficiari. ${ }^{17}$ Sed ne amplius diuulgetur in populum, minaciter interminemur eis, ne posthac loquantur in nomine hoc vlli hominum. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ accersitis illis, praeceperunt ne omnino loquerentur, neque docerent in nomine Iesu. ${ }^{19}$ At Petrus et Ioannes respondentes, dixerunt ad eos: An iustum sit in conspectu dei, vos potius audire quam deum, iudicate. ${ }^{20}$ Non enim possumus

14 autem $B-E$ : quoque $A \mid 15$ concilio secedere $B-E$ : consilio discedere $A \mid 16$ nam conspicuum $B-E:$ Quoniam quidem notum $A \mid$ aeditum esse $B-E$ : factum est $A \mid$ Hierosolymis manifestum $B-E:$ Hierusalem. Manifestum $A \mid$ nec $B$-E: et non $A \mid$ inficiari $B-E$ : negare $A \mid 17$ minaciter interminemur $B$-E: comminemur $A \mid$ posthac $B-E:$ vltra $A \mid$ alt. in $A C E:$ sub $B \mid$ 18 praeceperunt $B$-E: denunciauerunt $A \mid 19$ At Petrus $B$ - $E$ : Petrus vero $A \mid$ Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes CD

13 agnoscebant ÉTтยүivตণKov ("cognoscebant" Vg.). For the change of verb, see on Ioh. 8,43. In Annot., Erasmus recommends the use of the perfect tense, agnouerunt, which he had previously substituted at Act. 3,10.
13 quod ... fuissent ött ... ท̃ $\sigma \alpha v$ ("quoniam ... fuerant" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... fuerant.
14 autem $\delta$ ह́ ("quoque" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). As mentioned in Annot., the Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting $\tau \varepsilon$, as in $\boldsymbol{p l}^{74}$ § A B $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti substituted vero.
14 sanatus тєӨєрaтtєu Vulgate tends to use sano for ldooual, and curo for $\theta_{\varepsilon p o r \pi}$ úv. Erasmus replaces many instances of curo with sano, except at Mt. 12,10; Lc. 4,23;

8,43; 9,6; Ap. Iob. 13,3, 12, and at passages where curo means "care for". The verb sano is more frequent in classical usage, in the sense of "heal".
 ("Iusserunt autem eos ... et" Vg.). By using the ablative absolute construction, Erasmus more closely matches the sense of the Greek subordinate clause. As elsewhere, he takes the liberty of converting active to passive. Manetti replaces eos ... secedere by vt bi ... abirent.
15 e concilio ê $\xi \omega$ тои̃ $\sigma u v \in \delta$ piou ("foras extra concilium" Vg.; "e consilio" 1516). Erasmus removes another instance of foras extra, which he regarded as a non-classical usage, at Mt. 21,17 (see Annot., ad loc., where he also recommends leaving extra). See also on Act. 7,58. Manetti simply put extra concilium, omitting foras.

15 secedere $\alpha$ वтє $\lambda$ 日вĩ ("discedere" $1516=V g$.). The verb secedo is better suited to the context, in the sense of a temporary withdrawal, rather than a final departure. Cf. on Act. 5,34. Manetti had $v t$... abirent.
15 conferebant $\sigma u v \in ́ \beta \propto \lambda o v$. Erasmus' Greek text, in the aorist tense, is in conflict with his mss. and with the imperfect tense of his Latin rendering. It is likely that $\sigma u v \varepsilon \beta \alpha \lambda o v$ entered his text by a printer's error, although it happens to be found in cod. D and a few of the later mss. This less well attested reading persisted into the Textus Receptus. Erasmus' codd. 1, 2815, 2816 all had $\sigma u v \varepsilon^{\prime} \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda o v$, as found in most other mss., commencing with $\aleph$ A B E. A similar change of tense, probably also an error, occurs at Act. 17,18.
15 inter sese mpòs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\lambda} \lambda$ ous ("ad inuicem" Vg.). See on Iob. 4,33.
 ("Quoniam quidem ... factum est" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). Erasmus is more accurate in rendering $\gamma \dot{\alpha} p$. For his use of the accusative and infinitive construction, see on lob. 1,34. For aedo, see on Iob. 2,11. In Annot., Erasmus suggested etenim instead of nam. Manetti preferred quia ... factum.
16 conspicuum $\gamma v \omega \sigma$ оóv ("notum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 3,21 for the use of conspicuus. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests manifestarius, though this has an unduly pejorative connotation. He wanted to avoid notus, which tended to mean "known" rather than "notable".

16 Hierosolymis "lepovo $\alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$ ("Hierusalem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,8. The insertion of a full-stop or colon after this word, in the 1516 edition and the late Vulgate, produces a different sense. As indicated in Annot., Erasmus preferred to attach mã̃ı тоĩs катоוкоบ̃бוv to $\varphi \alpha v e \rho o ́ v$ rather than to $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ óv.
16 nec kai oủ ("et non" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,16. Manetti put et negare non possumus for et non possumus negare.
16 inficiari «́pvíซ $\sigma \sigma \theta \alpha$ ("negare" $1516=V g$.). Usually Erasmus follows the Vulgate in retaining nego for d́pvéoual, except for a few passages where he substitutes abnego (Lc. 22,57; 1 Tim. 5,8; 2 Petr. 2,1), and once where he puts renuo (Hebr. 11,24). The verb inficior occurs nowhere else in his N.T.
 $\mu \varepsilon \theta \propto$ ("comminemur" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus
finds a more vivid expression to convey the Hebraistic idiom: see Annot. He introduces interminor at four other passages as a substitute for comminor and praecipio: in rendering
 Mt. 12,16; Mc. 3,12 (1519); 8,30. However, he retains comminor for $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \mu ß \rho ı \mu \alpha ́ o u \alpha ı 1 ~ a t ~ M c . ~ 1,43, ~$ and in one place substitutes it for increpo, in rendering $\varepsilon$ éritupád at $L c$. 9,21. The word interminor does not occur in the Vulgate. See on vs. 21 below, for another instance of the removal of comminor. Manetti proposed minis comminemur.
17 ne posthac $\mu \eta$ кह̇т1 ("ne vltra" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,14. Manetti, rather less elegantly, substituted vt non amplius.
 1519 only). See on Ioh. 5,43.
18 accersitis illis кa入́́ eos" Vg.). Greek aorist. Erasmus introduces accerso in nineteen places, particularly to replace voco, in rendering several different Greek verbs. He treats it as belonging to the third conjugation (accerso, accersere), as recommended in Valla Annot. at Act. 10,32. Valla further commented on the Vulgate treatment of this verb as belonging to the fourth conjugation (accersio, accersire), in his Elegantiae I, 23. The verb accersio is used in the Vulgate once in the Gospel of Mark, and ten times in Acts, but nowhere in the remaining N.T. books. See also on Act. 20,17; 24,24; 27,21. Manetti put accitis eis.
18 praeceperunt торர́ $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \propto \nu$ ("denunciauerunt" 1516 = Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus queries whether the verb denuncio is appropriate when the hearer is personally present. In 1519, Erasmus removes all remaining instances of denuncio, except at 1 Tim. 1,3 and Hebr. 12,26. When translating $\pi \alpha \rho \propto \gamma \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$, the Vulgate usually has pracipio, except here and at Act. 5,40; 17,30; 23,30; 2 Thess. 3,6, 10, 12; 1 Tim. 1,3. Manetti had adopted mandauerunt.
18 тои̃ 'Inooũ. The article toũ is omitted in cod. 2815, as in cod. $\mathrm{B}^{*}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus or his assistants restored the word from codd. 1 and 2816, in company with most other mss.
19 At Petrus ó סè Пétpos ("Petrus vero" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti's version was Petrus autem.
19 An ... sit Ei ... ह̇otıv ("Si ... est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,25, and Annot.



















 $\sigma \alpha v$ ह̀mì тò aủtò kaтò тои̃ kupíou kaì katà toũ Xpıotoũ aủtoũ. ${ }^{27}$ бuv-

 'Hpడ́ठŋs te kaì Пóvtios Пı入ãтos oùv

quae vidimus et audiuimus, non loqui. ${ }^{21}$ At illi additis minis, dimiserunt eos: nihil inuenientes qua ratione punirent eos, propter populum, quia omnes glorificabant deum super eo quod acciderat. ${ }^{22}$ Annorum enim erat amplius quadraginta homo, in quo aeditum fuerat signum istud sanationis.
${ }^{23}$ Dimissi autem venerunt ad suos, et annunciauerunt quaecunque sibi principes sacerdotum et seniores dixerant. ${ }^{24}$ Qui quum audissent, vnanimiter attollebant vocem ad deum, dixeruntque: Domine, tu es deus qui fecisti coelum ac terram, mare et omnia quae in eis sunt, ${ }^{25}$ qui per os Dauid pueri tui dixisti: Quare fremuerunt gentes, et populi meditati sunt inania? ${ }^{26}$ Astiterunt reges terrae, et principes conuenerunt in vnum aduersus dominum et aduersus Christum eius. ${ }^{27}$ Conuenerunt enim vere aduersus sanctum filium | LB 454

21 ко $\alpha \alpha \sigma \omega v \tau \alpha$ ı $B$ - $:$ : ко $\lambda \alpha \sigma о \nu \tau \alpha ı ~ A$
21 qua ratione $B-E$ : quomodo $A \mid 22$ aeditum $B-E$ : factum $A \mid$ sanationis $B-E$ : sanitatis $A \mid$ 23 annunciauerunt $B C E$ : annunciauerunt eis $A$, anunciauerunt $D \mid 24$ attollebant $B$-E: leuauerunt $A \mid$ dixeruntque $B$-E: et dixerunt $A \mid$ es $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ ac $B$ - $E$ : et $A \mid 25$ os $B$-E: os patris nostri $A \mid 26$ eius. $B$-E: eius? $A \mid 27$ filium $B$-E: puerum $A$
 nantes" Vg.). Greek aorist. See on vs. 17 for the removal of comminor. See also Annot. Erasmus here conveys the force of the Greek compound verb more effectively. Manetti put comminati.
21 nibil $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ ("non" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek text substituting $\mu \dot{\eta}$, found only in cod. D and a few later mss. Manetti had made the same change as Erasmus.
21 qua ratione tò $\pi \tilde{\omega}$ ("quomodo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The purpose of Erasmus' alteration is to make clear that the point under discussion was not the method of punishment, but the lack of a
pretext for any kind of punishment. Manetti tried quemadmodum.
21 ко入áб $\omega v t \alpha$ ı. In 1516, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in reading ко $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma o v t \alpha$, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In 1519, he changed to ko $\lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \omega v \tau \alpha$, supported by $\mathcal{K}$ A Borr D E and a few later mss. (not including cod. 3).
 See on Iob. 12,23, and Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
21 deum super tòv $\theta$ عòv ह̀mí ("id quod factum fuerat in" Vg.). As pointed out in Annot., the

Vulgate seems to include a double translation
 tòv $\begin{aligned} & \text { éo } v ~ i s ~ u n s u p p o r t e d ~ b y ~ G r e e k ~ m s s . ~ M a n e t t i ~\end{aligned}$ put deum in.
22 aeditum fuerat éyeyóveı ("factum fuerat" 1516 = late Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,11.
22 sanationis Tñs iáčeんs ("sanitatis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The word sanatio is nowhere used in the Vulgate. Erasmus uses it to render itaols and líaua, probably on the grounds that sanitas denotes a state of good health rather than an act of healing. However, he leaves sanitas unaltered at Lc. 13,32; Ap. Ioh. 22,2 (for $\theta_{\text {epa }}$.
 runt eis" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate additional pronoun has negligible Greek ms. support. Manetti likewise omitted eis at this point.

## 23 quaecunque sibi ... dixerant ö $\sigma \alpha$ т $\quad$ pòs $\alpha u ̛ T o u ̀ s ~$

 ... Eftrov ("quanta ad eos ... dixissent" Vg.). A similar substitution of quaecunque occurs at $L c$. 4,23; 8,39 (1519); Act. 14,27 (1519); 15,4. In the present context, quaecunque is more suitable, as the question of size or degree, conveyed by quanta, is not relevant. See Annot. Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun, sibi, to refer back to the main subject. Manetti's version (both mss.) had quanta eis ... dixissent, but omitted the following clause, qui ... dixerunt at the beginning of vs. 24, by an error of transcription.24 attollebant $\mathrm{T}^{\mathrm{T}} \rho \alpha v$ ("leuauerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,35.
24 dixeruntque kà єĩtov ("et dixerunt" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
24 es deus $\delta$ Otós (Vg. omits; "deus" 1516). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{7}^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. D E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot. The version of Manetti put just deus here.
24 ac каil ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
24 mare каі ті̀v $\theta \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$. Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in leaving koí untranslated, a rendering which may have originated as a harmonisation with Ps. 145,6. Manetti had ac mare.
25 qui $\delta$ ("qui spiritu sancto" Vg.). The Vulgate seems to reflect a Greek text adding סiò Tiveú$\mu \propto$ тоs dofiou, as in cod. $D$ and two later mss. In about twenty-five other mss., including 3 $^{74}$ * A B E, is found the exceedingly improbable

 the words toũ тגтрòs $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \tilde{\mu} \nu$ possibly represent the importation of a marginal gloss based on Mc. 11,10, and mveúuatos d́yíou a correction derived from Act. 1,2. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and more than 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 450-3). See Annot. The words spiritu sancto and patris nostri were similarly omitted by Manetti.
25 os $\sigma$ тó ${ }^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{2}$ тos ("os patris nostri" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects a text adding toũ татро́s $\dagger \mu \omega ̃ \nu$. See the preceding note.
26 eius. aỦToũ. ("eius?" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The Greek column of the 1516 edition does not insert a question-mark here. Erasmus preferred to understand the verse as a statement.
27 vere $\varepsilon^{\prime} \pi{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \alpha \lambda \eta \theta$ zias ("vere in ciuitate ista" Vg.). The Vulgate addition of in ciuitate ista corresponds with a Greek text adding $\dot{E} v ~ T \tilde{\eta}$ Tó $\lambda_{E l}$ TQÚTn, found in $7^{7 \text { fvid }} \mathcal{N}$ (A) B D E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot., where he suggests that the Vulgate phrase was an explanatory addition. Manetti (both mss.) omitted both vere and in ciuitate ista.
27 filium $\pi \alpha \tilde{1} \delta \alpha$ ("puerum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This produces consistency with the Vulgate rendering of vs. 30. See Annot., for a discussion of the unsuitability of puer with reference to the Son of God, because of its connotation of servant. The same problem had been mentioned in Valla Annot. This provoked objections from Edward Lee, Stunica, and also Sancho Carranza, to all of whom Erasmus replied in detail in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, $205 \mathrm{~F}-$ 207 B; Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 140-6, 1l. 600-714; Apolog. c. Sanct. Caranz., $L B$ IX, 414 A-428 E; as well as expanding his note on the subject in 1522 Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
27 vnxeras ÉXpıoas ("vnxisti" Vg.). For Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect, see on Ioh. 1,19.
27 simul et тє каi ("et" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1, and Annot. The version of Manetti had ac.
28 ad faciendum тоוர̃ $\sigma \propto 1$ ("facere" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, for avoidance of the infinitive. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests vt facerent, which happened to be the rendering adopted by Manetti.


 тoĩs סoú $\lambda$ ois $\sigma o u, \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha p p \eta \sigma i ́ \alpha s ~ \pi \alpha ́ \alpha-~$
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 $\chi \omega \rho i \omega v$ ท̂̀ Oỉkic̃v Úmŋ̃pXov, $\pi \omega \lambda 0 u ̃ v-$


 т
quaecunque manus tua et consilium tuum prius decreuerat vt fierent. ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Et}$ nunc domine aspice in minas eorum: et da seruis tuis, vt cum omni fiducia loquantur sermonem tuum, ${ }^{30}$ manum tuam porrigendo in hoc, vt sanatio et signa et prodigia aedantur per nomen sancti filii tui Iesu. ${ }^{31}$ Et quum orassent illi, motus est locus in quo erant congregati, et repleti sunt omnes spiritu sancto, et loquebantur sermonem dei cum fiducia.
${ }^{32}$ Multitudinis autem credentium erat cor vnum et anima vna, nec quisquam aliquid eorum quae possidebat, suum esse dicebat, sed erant illis omnia communia. ${ }^{33} \mathrm{Et}$ virtute magna reddebant apostoli testimonium resurrectionis domini Iesu, et gratia magna erat super omnes illos: ${ }^{34}$ neque enim quisquam egens erat inter illos. Quotquot enim possessores agrorum aut aedium erant, vendentes afferebant precia corum quae vendita fuerant, ${ }^{35}$ et ponebant ad pedes apostolorum. Distribuebatur autem singulis prout cuique opus erat. ${ }^{36}$ Ioses
$32 \alpha \cup \tau \omega$ B-E: $\alpha u T \omega \nu A \mid 33$ avaotaozeऽs B-E: $\alpha v \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \omega s ~ A$

29 vt $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ loquantur sermonem $B-E$ : loqui verbum $A \mid 30$ aedantur $B-E$ : fiant $A$ | 31 sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 32$ aliquid ... possidebat $C E$ : eorum quae possidebat aliquid $A B$, aliquid eorum quae possidebant $D \mid 34$ aedium $B-E$ : domorum $A \mid 35$ ad $B-E$ : ante $A$

28 quaecunque ô $\sigma \alpha$ ("quae" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here: cf. on vs. 23. Manetti made the same substitution.
28 prius decreuerat mроஸ́рıєє ("decreuerunt" Vg.). Erasmus here attempts greater precision. Elsewhere, he does not maintain a clear distinction between the different forms of this verb, as he uses praffinio both for mpoopíל $\omega$ at Rom. 8,29 (1519); 1 Cor. 2,7, and also for ópiک $\omega$ at Act. 17,26 (1519); Hebr. 4,7. In Annot., he also recommends using praestituo.

28 vt fierent $\gamma \varepsilon v^{\prime} \tilde{\sigma}^{\sigma} \theta \propto \wedge$ ("fieri" Vg.). See on lob. 1,33 , again, for avoidance of the infinitive. See also Annot.

29 aspice Eैדाठe ("respice" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,36.
29 vt ... loquantur $\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ v$ ("loqui" $1516=V g$.). See on Iob. 1,33. Manetti had used the same construction as Erasmus here.

29 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.

30 manum tuam porrigendo in hoc $\varepsilon$ ह̀v Tụ Tìv XEipá $\sigma$ OU ह̇ктeivelv $\sigma$ ("in eo quod manum tuam extendas" late Vg.). Erasmus recasts the word-order for greater clarity. Elsewhere, he generally retains extendo for èkTeiv $\omega$, except at Mt. 8,3; 12,49; Mc. 1,41; Lc. 5,13, where he substitutes protendo. Possibly he had in mind that a majestic, authoritative movement of the 'hand of God' was different in character from an ordinary human gesture. At other passages, he follows the Vulgate in using porrigo in the sense of "provide" or "proffer". In Annot, Erasmus put forward the rendering in extendendo manum tuam, similar to the phrase in extendenda manu tua which had been proposed by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti kept closer to the Vulgate construction, in putting in eo quod manum tuam ostendas.
30 vt ... aedantur eis ... үiveatal ("ad ... fieri" late Vg.; "vt ... fiant" 1516). For the substitution of aedo, see on Ioh. 2,11. Valla Annot. suggested ad ... facienda, while Manetti had $v t$... fiant, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
30 sanatio lacıv ("sanitates" $V g$.). The Vulgate plural is unsupported by Greek mss. On sanatio, see on vs. 22, and Annot.
31 illi ๙ữ $^{2} \nu$ (Vg. omits). Either interpretation is legitimate here. Manetti had cum ipsi orasent.
31 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v(" v e r b u m " ~ 1516=V g) . ~.$. See on Ioh. 1,1.
32 cor vnum iो kapסía. Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in adding vnum, with little support from Greek mss.
 XóvTLu aủT⿳⺈ ("eorum quae possidebat aliquid" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "aliquid eorum quae possidebant" 1527 Lat.; "eorum quae possidebant aliquid" 1527 Vg. .) Erasmus' adoption in 1522 of a more natural Latin word-order had been anticipated by Manetti, and was also closer to the Greek. The 1516 Greek text followed codd. 1 and 2816 in substituting $\alpha \cup \cup T \omega ั \nu$ for $\alpha \cup ̉ T \tilde{\omega}$, in company with many other late mss. The reading which Erasmus restored in 1519, au̇t $\tilde{\varphi}$, was found in codd. 3 and 2815, with support from $\mathbb{X}$ A B E and many later mss. However, the change to the plural, possidebant, which occurs in both Latin columns of the 1527 edition, is not likely to have been authorised by Erasmus, and may have arisen from a printer's error in one column, followed by a
mistaken attempt by a proof-reader to make the other column agree with the one that had the error. Froben's Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514 had possidebat.
33 domini Iesu toũ kupiou'Iŋooṽ ("Iesu Christi domini nostri" late Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having 'Iŋбoũ Xpıotoũ toũ kupiou, as found in codd. \$ A and ten later mss. (of which eight also add $\dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$ ). In codd. D E and about seventy later mss., the reading is тoũ kupíou 'Inбoũ Xpıттoũ. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and over 350 other mss., commencing with $7^{8}$ and cod. B (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 4546). Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
33 super omnes illos emil mávtas aủtoús ("in omnibus illis" Vg.). See on Act. 3,10. Manetti put in eis omnibus.
34 aedium oikicu ("domorum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus substitutes aedes for domus at eight other passages in Matthew, Mark, Luke and Acts, but never when a plural sense is required. Since aedes is plural in form, but usually understood in a singular sense (when referring to a private house rather than temples), its introduction here causes ambiguity, and is contrary to the rule suggested by Valla Elegantiae III, 7; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 248, ll. 141-145.
34 quae vendita fuerant $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi ı \pi \rho \alpha \sigma \kappa о \mu E ́ v \omega \nu$ ("quae vendebant" Vg.). Erasmus' use of the passive is more accurate here.
35 ad mapó ("ante" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution also occurs at $L c .17,16 ;$ Act. 4,37; 5,10 , consistent with Vulgate usage at Mt. 15,30; $L c$. $8,35,41 ;$ Act. 5,2 . Erasmus similarly puts ad for secus in rendering mapd at several other passages. See Annot., where he also recommends iuxta. Manetti here preferred secus.
35 Distribuebatur $\mathrm{\delta}_{1 \varepsilon} \mathrm{E}$ iסотo ("diuidebatur" late Vg .). This change is in accordance with Vulgate usage at $L c .11,22 ;$ Iob. 6,11. Erasmus elsewhere follows the Vulgate in using diuido for $\mu \in \rho i \zeta \omega$ and $\delta ı \alpha \mu \varepsilon \rho i \zeta \omega$.
35 к $\alpha 0$ ótı ${ }^{\circ}$ ăv. In codd. 2815 and $2816^{*}$ is substituted kaÓ, in company with a few other late mss. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and 2816 corr, supported by nearly all other mss.
36 loses 'l $\omega \sigma$ Ins ("Ioseph" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the Greek variant, ' $1 \omega \sigma \dot{\prime} \varphi$, as found in $7^{7 \text { 74id }} \boldsymbol{*}$ A B D E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816




 $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi$ оото́ $\lambda \omega v$.

5’Avìp סé tis Avavías óvóuatı oùv

 ouveiסvías kai Tñs $\gamma$ uvaıkòs $\alpha$ ưtoũ, kai


 סíav $\sigma 0 \cup, \psi \varepsilon \cup ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha i ́ \sigma \varepsilon$ tò $\pi v \in \tilde{u} \mu \alpha$ тò




 ${ }^{5}$ Akoú $\omega v$ סè Avavias toùs $\lambda$ 'óyous toú-

vero qui cognominatus est Barnabas ab apostolis, quod est, filius consolationis, Leuites, Cyprius genere, ${ }^{37}$ quum haberet agrum, vendidit eum: et attulit precium et posuit ad pedes apostolorum.

5Vir autem quidam nomine Ananias cum Sapphira vxore sua vendiderat possessionem, ${ }^{2}$ et seposuerat de precio, conscia etiam vxore sua, et allatam partem aliquam ad pedes apostolorum posuit. ${ }^{3}$ Dixit autem Petrus: Anania, cur impleuit satanas cor tuum, vt mentireris spiritui sancto, et fraudares de precio agri? ${ }^{4}$ Nonne prorsus tibi manebat et venundatus in tua erat potestate? Quare posuisti in corde tuo rem istam? Non es mentitus hominibus, sed deo. ${ }^{5}$ Audiens autem Ananias haec verba, collapsus expirauit. Et ortus est timor
 то入ŋ


36 vero $B$-E: autem $A$
5,2 allatam $B-E$ : afferens $A \mid$ aliquam $B-E$ : quandam $A \mid 3$ impleuit $A$ (exx.) $B-E$ : tentauit $A$ (eacx) | fraudares $A^{*} B-E$ : fraudare $A^{b} \mid 4$ prorsus $B-E$ : manens $A \mid$ venundatus $B-E$ : venundatum $A \mid 5$ ortus $B-E$ : factus $A$
and most other late mss., together with the text cited in Valla Annot. See also Erasmus Annot.
36 vero ס'́ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
36 Úmó. In 1516, Erasmus had đ́rTó, as found in his cod. 2815, along with cod. 1 and most other mss., commencing with $\mathbb{K}$ A B E. In 1519, following cod. 3 , he substituted Úmó, which is found in cod. D and many later mss., including cod. 2816.
36 est ह̇ $\sigma \tau ו v$ ("est interpretatum" Vg.). The Vulgate here follows a better supported Greek text, adding $\mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \rho \mu \eta v \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v$, as found in virtually all mss., including codd. 1, 3 and 2816. Erasmus was on this occasion led astray by his
cod. 2815 , which is almost the only ms. to omit this word. In 1519 Annot., however, he did record that $\mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \rho \mu \eta \nu \in \cup o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu O \nu$ was added in some Greek mss. ("in nonnullis Graecorum codicibus").
37 ad Trapá ("ante" Vg.). See on vs. 35. Manetti this time had iuxta.

5,1 vendiderat $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \pi \omega \lambda \eta \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ("vendidit" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,19 .
1 possessionem $\mathrm{kT} \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ("agrum" Vg.). This change was consistent with the Vulgate rendering of the other three N.T. occurrences of кт $\tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ (Mt. 19,22; Mc. 10,22; Act. 2,45). In Annot., Erasmus points out that the Greek word could also refer to a house, and not just land.

2 seposuerat ${ }^{\text {żvoóqíoवтo ("fraudauit" Vg.). Eras- }}$ mus is more literal here, though in Annot. he commends the Vulgate as giving a correct interpretation, and he retains fraudo for the same Greek verb in vs. 3 . This would suggest that his change in vs. 2 was partly motivated by the desire to avoid repetition. At Tit. 2,10, he substitutes suffuror for fraudo in rendering the only other N.T. occurrence of this Greek verb. On this point, at least, the Vulgate was more consistent.
 doubtful whether the Vulgate rendering reflects any difference of Greek text, as there is little explicit ms. support for the addition of agri. Erasmus offers a more strictly literal rendering. Manetti similarly omitted agri.
2 etiam kaí (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss.
2 allatam èvé $\gamma$ Kas ("afferens" $1516=V g$.). Greek aorist. See Annot. The version of Manetti put cum attulisset.
2 aliquam Tl ("quandam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus prefers to put the matter more indefinitely, also sensing that pars aliquis was more in keeping with classical usage. See Annot.
3 Petrus Пє́тpos ("Petrus ad Ananiam" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is supported only by cod. D and a few later mss. Erasmus here restored the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot. The same omission of ad Ananiam was made by Manetti.
 some copies $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). As mentioned in Annot., the Vulgate reflects a Greek text having Émeipaoev, as found in $37^{74}$ alone. A few other mss. have $\varepsilon \pi \eta \dot{p} \omega \sigma \varepsilon v$, as in $\mathbb{N}^{*}$ and cod. 2815. Erasmus' Greek text followed codd. 1 and 2816, supported by nearly all other mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{8} \aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A B D E 0189, together with the text cited by Valla Annot.
3 vt mentireris ... fraudares $\psi \varepsilon \cup ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha i \quad \sigma \varepsilon$... $\nu \circ \sigma \varphi i ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha i ́ l ~ \sigma \varepsilon$ ("mentiri te ... fraudare" Vg.). The fact that the Vulgate does not insert $t e$ after fraudare is an indication that it was following a Greek text in which the second $\sigma \varepsilon$ was omitted, as in $37^{874}$ ※ A B E 0189 ${ }^{\text {vid }}$ and some later mss. Erasmus took the reading voo $\varphi$ i$\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha i \quad \sigma \varepsilon$ from cod. 2815 , in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with cod. D. For his avoidance of the infinitive,
see on Ioh. 1,33, and Annot. The retention of fraudare in the 1516 catchword may be connected with the printer's use of an incorrectly marked copy of the Vulgate. Manetti put vt spiritui sancto mentireris et vt fraudares.
4 prorsus $\mu$ évov ("manens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate gives a strictly literal rendering of this Hebraistic expression. Erasmus prefers to substitute an emphatic adverb. He uses prorsus at only one other passage, 1 Cor. 11,5, translating ยิv ... छ̇бтו kai tò aÚtó as perinde est prorsus. See Annot.
 from codd. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and nearly all other mss. The substitution of the aorist tense, $\varepsilon$ é $\mu \mathrm{L} v \varepsilon$, in 1527-35, has only a few late mss. in support, and may even have been a printer's error.
4 venundatus трaӨ́̇v ("venundatum" 1516 = Vg.). In Annot., echoing a similar complaint by Valla Annot., Erasmus objects to the fact that the neuter suffix used by the Vulgate does not agree with the gender of the expected antecedent, ager. He therefore included this passage among the Soloecismi. When Stunica suggested that the Vulgate reading was the result of scribal corruption among the Latin mss., Erasmus continued to maintain that it was a solecism of the translator: see Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 C.

4 rem istam tò $\pi \rho o ̃ ̃ \gamma \mu \alpha$ тоũto ("hanc rem" Vg.). See on Iob. 2,18, for the use of iste to convey a note of disapproval.
5 Avavias. The omission of the article of is supported by cod. D and a few later mss., but not by those which Erasmus usually consulted. His tendency elsewhere was to add, rather than omit, the article before names. This omission may conceivably have arisen as a printer's error.

5 collapsus тєбผ่ ("cecidit, et" Vg.). Erasmus finds a way of following the participle more closely. He uses the same solution at Act. 9,4, and further substitutes collabor for decido at Act. 15,16. The Vulgate uses the word collabor twice in the O.T. (at $1 \mathrm{Sm} .21,13 ; D n .8,18$ ) but nowhere in the N.T. books. For other substitutions for cado, see on Ioh. 11,32. Manetti had cecidit atque.
5 ortus est Ėy'́véo ("factus est" $1516=V$ g.). See on Ioh. 1,17.





 тก̃ ó Пéтpos, Eitté $\mu \mathrm{ol}$, el toooútou

 $\alpha \cup ̉ т \eta ่ \nu, ~ T i ́ ~ o ̋ t i ~ \sigma u v \varepsilon \varphi \omega v \eta ่ \theta \eta ~ \cup ̛ ́ n ̃ v ~ \pi \varepsilon ı \rho \alpha ́-~$








 TOÙS ả́koúovtas taũta.



magnus super omnes qui audierunt haec. ${ }^{6}$ Surgentes autem iuuenes amouerunt eum, elatumque sepelierunt. ${ }^{7}$ Intercessit autem ferme horarum trium interuallum, vxor quoque ipsius, nesciens | quod factum fuerat, introiuit. LB 456 ${ }^{8}$ Respondit autem ei Petrus: Dic mihi, num tanti agrum vendidistis? At illa dixit: Etiam, tanti. ${ }^{9}$ Petrus autem ait ad eam: Cur conspirastis inter vos, vt tentaretis spiritum domini? Ecce pedes eorum qui sepelierunt virum tuum, ad ostium adsunt, et efferent te. ${ }^{10}$ Confestim autem concidit ad pedes eius, et expirauit. Ingressi autem iuuenes, repererunt illam mortuam, et extulerunt ac sepelierunt iuxta virum suum. ${ }^{11}$ Et ortus est timor magnus super vniuersam congregationem, et super omnes qui audiebant haec.
${ }^{12}$ Per manus autem apostolorum aedebantur signa ac prodigia multa in populo. Et erant vnanimiter omnes

6 elatumque $B$ - $E$ : et elatum $A \mid 7$ Intercessit $B$ - $E$ : Factum est $A \mid$ vxor quoque $B-E$ : et vxor $A \mid 8$ Respondit $B$ - $E$ : Respondet $A \mid 9$ ait $B$ - $E$ : om. $A \mid 10$ concidit $B$ - $E$ : cecidit $A \mid 11$ ortus $B-E$ : factus $A \mid$ prius super $B-E$ : in $A \mid$ alt. super $B-E$ : in $A \mid 12$ aedebantur $B$ - $E$ : fiebant $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ populo $B-E$ : plebe $A$

5 baec (2nd.) taũta (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{8} \boldsymbol{\aleph}^{*}$ A B D 0189 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti inserted bec ( $=$ baec) before audierunt.

6 elatumque koi $̇$ ह́ $\xi \varepsilon v \in ́ \gamma к \propto \vee T E S$ ("et efferentes" Vg.; "et elatum" 1516). Greek aorist. The spelling
 the presence of a slight break in the upper stroke of the letter - $\varepsilon$ - in cod. 2815, so that it might be mistaken for $-\alpha$ - On the use of -que, see on Ioh. 1,39. Manetti rendered this by et extulerunt ac.

7 Intercessit £̇ $\gamma$ Éveto ("Factum est" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus, as elsewhere, avoids facio, and renders according to the context.

7 ferme $\omega$ ("quasi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
7 interuallum סıóббтๆu人 ("spacium" Vg.). Erasmus here produces consistency with the Vulgate rendering of $\delta 1 \iota^{\dagger} \sigma \tau \eta \mu \mathrm{l}$ at $L c$. 22,59, where interuallum is similarly used. See Annot.
7 vxor quoque kà ì $\gamma u v \eta$ ("et vxor" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,27.
8 Respondit ${ }^{\text {ártracpion ("Dixit" late Vg.; "Respon- }}$ det" 1516 Lat.). The late Vulgate might appear to reflect a different Greek text, $\varepsilon$ €i $\pi \varepsilon \nu$, but since this is only found in cod. D , it is more likely that the difference of verb arose simply as an alternative rendering, based on the observation that Peter was not answering a previous question. Erasmus, in 1519, restored the earlier Vulgate rendering: see Annot. The version of Manetti also had Respondit here.

8 mibi $\mu 01$ ("mihi, mulier" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition of mulier is unsupported by Greek mss. The word was omitted by Manetti.
8 num ai ("si" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6.
9 ait $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ itte (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{74} \times \mathrm{BD}$ 0189 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with cod. A. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
9 Cur Tí ötı ("Quid vtique" Vg.). On cur for quid, see on Ioh. 1,25. Erasmus tends to reserve vtique to render ${ }^{*} v$ (see on Ioh. 5,46 ). The Vulgate also used the word to render vai and $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu t \omega s$. Here, it has the effect of emphasising the question. Erasmus, on the other hand, regarded vtique as redundant in this context. Manetti chose to put Quare.
9 conspirastis inter vos $\sigma u v E \varphi \omega v \eta \eta^{\theta} \eta$ ú $\mu i ̃ v$ ("conuenit vobis" Vg.). Erasmus is more vivid and clear. At Act. 23,20, he makes a similar substitution in rendering $\sigma u v \operatorname{cin}^{\prime} \theta \mu \mathrm{l}$, consistent with the Vulgate rendering of Iob. 9,22 . See Annot. With rather less success, Manetti tried consonauit vobis: beside the fact that the perfect tense should preferably have been consonuit, this verb was not used in classical literature to refer to the process of reaching an agreement. In a different context, at Act. 15,15 , consono is used by both Erasmus and Manetti.
9 vt tentaretis $\pi \varepsilon ı \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha l$ ("tentare" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, and Annot. The word-order of Manetti's version was vt spiritum domini tentaretis.
9 ad ostium adsunt ह̇тì тท̃ $\theta u ̛ \rho \alpha$ ("ad ostium" Vg.). Erasmus adds a verb, by way of clarification.

10 autem $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ (Vg. omits). There is no Greek authority for the Vulgate omission. Manetti likewise inserted autem.

10 concidit ËTtモఠモ ("cecidit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Rom. 11,11; 1 Cor. 10,8 , and also in rendering котатim$\tau \omega$ at $A c t$. 28,6. For other alterations in rendering $\pi i \pi T \omega$, see on Ioh. 11,32. Erasmus' main purpose here was to avoid ambiguity, removing the unwanted connotation of an accidental fall.

10 ad mapá ("ante" Vg.). See on Act. 4,35. In Erasmus' cod. 2815, the reading is Utró, a variant which lacks support from other Greek mss. His text here followed codd. 1 and

2816, in company with cod. E and most of the
 A B D 0189, have mpós. Manetti also had ad here.
 aorist. See on Ioh. 13,27. Manetti anticipated Erasmus in this change.
10 repererunt £ũpov ("inuenerunt" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,41.
10 ac кaí ("et" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti also put ac.
10 iuxta $\pi \rho o ́ s(" a d " V g$.). The same substitution occurs at $L c$. 19,29. Erasmus' rendering is more natural in this context: see Annot. Cf. also iuxta for circa at Mc. 4,1; 5,11, and for ante at Mc. 11,4. In cod. 2815, the whole phrase $\pi$ pós Tòv á̛voipa aúTñs is omitted. The missing words were restored from codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti again anticipated this change.
11 ortus est È ééveto ("factus est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,17.
11 super vniuersam congregationem $\dot{\varepsilon} \Phi^{\prime}$ O̊ $\lambda \eta \nu$ T $\eta \nu$ éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha v$ ("in vniuersa ecclesia" Vg.; "in vniuersam congregationem" 1516). On super, see on Act. 3,10. The Vulgate is inconsistent in using the ablative case here, while using the accusative case in the immediately following phrase, when the Greek construction is identical. Erasmus similarly substitutes congregatio in 1516 at Rom. 16,5; Col. 4,15; Pbm. 2; 3 Ioh. 10, and also in 1519 at Act. 7,38; 11,26; 1 Cor. 14,4, 33; 2 Cor. 1,1. More frequently, he retains ecclesia. Manetti put in totam ecclesiam.
$11 \operatorname{super}$ (2nd.) Ẻrí ("in" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 3,10.
11 qui audiebant toùs ákoúovtas ("qui audierunt" Vg.). Erasmus conveys the continuous sense of the present participle. Manetti, less accurately, had qui bec audierant, in the pluperfect tense.
12 aedebantur घ̀үÉveto ("fiebant" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On aedo, see on Ioh. 2,11. In 1516, Erasmus followed the spelling $\varepsilon \gamma i v \in T o$, offered by his cod. 2815 , supported by ${ }^{774 \mathrm{vid}} \mathbb{}$ A B (D) E and most of the later mss., including cod. 1. Then in 1519 , he adopted $\varepsilon$ ध́ध́veto, as found in codd. 3, 2816 and many other late mss.
12 ac ка́ ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
12 populo т $\tilde{\sim} \lambda \alpha \alpha \tilde{\omega}$ ("plebe" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 2,47. Manetti similarly used populo here.
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 $\gamma \varepsilon \nu o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ o ́ ~ a ̉ p X i \varepsilon p \varepsilon u ̀ s ~ k \alpha i ~ o l ~ o u ̀ v ~$ $\alpha u ̉ T \omega ్, ~ \sigma u v e k \alpha ́ \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$ Tò $\sigma u v \varepsilon ́ \delta p i o v ~ k \alpha \grave{~}$ $\pi \alpha \tilde{\alpha} \alpha \nu$ т $̀ v ~ \gamma \varepsilon p o u \sigma i ́ \alpha \nu ~ т \omega ̃ \nu ~ \cup i \omega ̃ \nu ’ l \sigma \rho \alpha \grave{\eta} \lambda$,
in porticu Solomonis. ${ }^{13}$ Caeterorum autem nemo audebat se coniungere illis, sed magnificabat eos populus. ${ }^{14}$ Magis autem accrescebat credentium domino multitudo virorum simul ac mulierum, ${ }^{15}$ ita $v t$ in plateas exportarent infirmos, et ponerent in lectulis ac grabatis, vt venientis Petri vel vmbra obumbraret aliquem illorum. ${ }^{16}$ Conueniebat autem et multitudo vicinarum ciuitatum Hierosolymam, afferens aegros ac vexatos a spiritibus immundis, qui sanabantur omnes.
${ }^{17}$ Exurgens autem princeps sacerdotum et omnes qui cum illo erant, quae est factio Sadducaeorum, repleti sunt aemulatione, ${ }^{18} \mathrm{et}$ iniecerunt manus in apostolos, et posuerunt eos in custodia publica. ${ }^{19}$ Sed angelus domini per noctem aperuit ianuas carceris, eductisque illis dixit: ${ }^{20}$ Ite, et stantes loquamini in templo populo omnia verba vitae huius. ${ }^{21}$ Illi vero quum haec audissent, intrauerunt diluculo in templum, ac docebant. Adueniens autem princeps sacerdotum et qui cum eo erant, conuocauerunt concilium et vniuersum seniorum ordinem filiorum Israel,

12 Solomonis $B-E$ : Salomonis $A \mid 13$ Caeterorum $B-E$ : Coeterorum $A \mid 14$ virorum simul $B-E$ : virorumque $A \mid 15$ grabatis $A-C$ : grabbatis $D \mid 16$ Hierosolymam, afferens $B-E$ : Hierusalem, afferentes $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 17$ aemulatione $B-E$ : zelo $A \mid 19$ Sed angelus $B-E$ : Angelus autem $A \mid$ eductisque $B-E$ : Et eductis $A \mid 20$ loquamini $B-E$ : loquimini $A \mid$ populo $B-E$ : plebi $A \mid 21$ Illi vero $B-E$ : Qui $A \mid$ haec $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$

14 accrescebat тробєтiOоvто ("augebatur" Vg.). See on Act. 2,41. This is the only occurrence of accresco in Erasmus' N.T. The spelling -оvто is derived from codd. 1 and 2816, supported by just a few other late mss. In cod. 2815, and most other mss., the spelling is $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon \tau i \theta \varepsilon v t o$. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests using appono. Manetti substituted adaugebantur.
14 domino $\tau \tilde{\omega}$ кupi $\omega$ ("in domino" Vg.). Erasmus is more strictly literal, as there is no Greek support for the preposition here. See Annot. The word in was also omitted by Manetti.

14 virorum simul ac ávסp $\omega$ v $\tau \varepsilon$ Kaí ("virorum ac" Vg.; "virorumque ac" 1516). See on Act. 1,1. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests virorumque et.
15 exportarent ékфépeıv ("eicerent" Vg.). As Erasmus comments in Annot., the Vulgate rendering would have been better suited to ék $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon} v$, but this is not found in the Greek mss., and does not fit the context. Earlier in the chapter, at vss. $6,9,10$, the verb ékøép. is rendered by effero. The verb exporto occurs nowhere else in Erasmus' N.T. In Annot., he also suggests educo, which is less suitable, as it does not imply that
the sick were carried．Valla Annot．and Manetti both preferred efferrent．
15 venientis Petri Èpxouévou Пétpou（＂veniente Petro ．．．illius＂Vg．）．The Vulgate interprets the Greek construction as a genitive absolute，while Erasmus，more perceptively，takes it as a subjec－ tive genitive，linked with oklá．This change was anticipated by Manetti．
15 vel kã̛v（＂saltem＂Vg．）．This change is con－ sistent with the Vulgate rendering of $\kappa \alpha{ }^{\circ} v$ at Mc．5，28；6，56．Erasmus does not use saltem anywhere in his N．T．
15 aliquem tivi（＂quemquam＂Vg．）．Erasmus generally confines his use of quenquam to negative expressions，in rendering oubeis． See Annot．The version of Manetti also had aliquem．
15 illorum $\alpha$ ธ̉T $\omega$ v（＂illorum，et liberarentur ab infirmitatibus suis＂late Vg．＝Annot．，lemma）． The Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514，together with Erasmus＇ 1527 Vulgate column，added omnes after liberarentur．With or without omnes， Erasmus recognised that this extra clause of the late Vulgate was an explanatory addition，men－ tioning in 1522 Annot．，that it was missing from some of the earlier Vulgate mss．，as well as from the Greek mss．In 1527，he included this passage among the Quae Sint Addita．The late Vulgate reading is supported by codd． D E，but even these two mss．substantially differ as to the wording．Manetti put eorum et liberarentur ab infirmitate．
16 Conueniebat ouvípxETO（＂Concurrebat＂Vg．）． Erasmus is more accurate here．This change was anticipated by Manetti．
16 Hierosolymam єis＂lєpovoo $\lambda \grave{\prime} \mu$（＂Hierusalem＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）．See on Act．1，8．The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant，omitting eis，as in \｛解 ${ }^{74}$ A B 0189 and a few later mss．Erasmus＇ Greek text follows cod．2815，in company with codd．D E and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816.
16 afferens $\varnothing$ ह́povtes（＂afferentes＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Erasmus makes the verb agree with multitudo， which is in the singular．The Vulgate，more literally，retains the Greek usage of a singular noun with a plural verb．Manetti adopted et afferebant．
16 ac kaí（＂et＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25． Manetti also makes use of ac here．
 See on Act．4，14．

17 factio aipeols（＂haeresis＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at Act．15，5；24，5（1519 only），while retaining baeresis at Act． 24,14 ，and secta at Act．24，5（1516 and 1522－35）；26，5；28，22； Gal．5，20； 2 Petr．2，1，and substituting secta for baeresis at 1 Cor．11，19．Erasmus further uses factio for $\mu \varepsilon ́ p o s$ at Act．23，9，and $\delta 1 \times \circ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma$ í $\alpha$ at 1 Cor．3，3．Manetti put secta．
17 aemulatione 弓＇ं $\mathrm{\lambda}$ OU（＂zelo＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitution occurs at Iac．3，14， 16 （both in 1519），in conformity with the Vulgate ren－ dering of Rom．13，13 and several other passages． Erasmus also substituted aemulor for zelo at Iac． 4,2 （1519）．He retains zelus for $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \lambda$ os at Act．13，45，in rendering the same Greek word， and at Act．17，5 for $\zeta \eta \lambda o ́ \omega$ ．
18 manus тàs xeĩpas aủtడ̃v．Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving $\alpha \cup \dot{T} \tilde{\omega} \nu$ untranslated． However，the Vulgate may reflect a Greek text which omitted this word，as in $3^{35} \aleph$ A B D 0189 and a few later mss．Erasmus＇Greek text followed cod．2815，in company with cod．E and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti put manus suas．
19 Sed angelus ơّүү६入os ס́́（＂Angelus autem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，26．
19 aperuit п̈voļs（＂aperiens＂Vg．）．Greek aorist． A few mss．have ávoi $\xi \propto 5$ ，as in $7^{74} \times$ A． Erasmus＇follows cod．2815，supported by codd．B（D）E 0189 and most later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816.
 educens eos＂Vg．；＂Et eductis illis＂1516）．Greek aorist．On que，see on Ioh． 1,39 ．
20 loquamini $\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ t \varepsilon$（＂loquimini＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh． 6,27 for this use of the subjunctive．
20 populo $\tau \tilde{\omega} \lambda \alpha \tilde{\omega}$（＂plebi＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．2，47．Manetti also used populo here．
21 Illi vero quum baec audissent ớKoúбavtes ס́́ （＂Qui cum audissent＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）．Erasmus adds baec by way of clarification：cf．his addition of eos in Act．2，8．In adding vero for $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ，he makes a small improvement of accuracy．Manetti put Cum vero ipsi audiuissent．
21 ac kai（＂et＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25． Manetti also had ac．
21 vniuersum seniorum ordinem mão $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \nu$ тìv $\gamma$ epouaiav（＂omnes seniores＂Vg．）．This is the only N．T．occurrence of $\gamma$ epovaía．Erasmus＇ substitution here is comparable with his use of seniorum ordo for $\pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \beta \cup T$ épiov at Act．22，5 （1522）．See Annot．
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miseruntque ad carcerem qui adducerent eos. ${ }^{22}$ Quum autem venissent ministri, nec reperissent illos in carcere, reuersi nunciauerunt, ${ }^{23}$ dicentes: Carcerem quidem inuenimus clausum cum omni diligentia, et custodes foris stantes ante ianuas. Quum aperuissemus autem, neminem intus reperimus. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Vt}$ autem audierunt hos sermones et sacerdos et magistratus templi principesque sacerdotum, ambigebant de illis quidnam hoc futurum esset. ${ }^{25}$ Adueniens autem quidam nunciauit eis: Ecce viri quos posueratis in carcere, sunt in templo stantes ac docentes populum. ${ }^{26}$ Tunc abiit magistratus cum ministris, et adduxit illos sine vi. Timebant enim populum, ne lapidarentur. ${ }^{27} \mathrm{Et}$ quum adduxissent illos, statuerunt in concilio. Et interrogauit eos princeps sacerdotum, ${ }^{28}$ dicens: Nonne etiam atque etiam praecepimus vobis, ne doceretis in nomine isto? Et ecce replestis Hierosolymam doctrina vestra, et vultis inducere super nos sanguinem hominis istius. ${ }^{29}$ Respondens autem Petrus et apostoli, dixerunt: Obedire oportet deo magis quam hominibus. ${ }^{30}$ Deus patrum nostrorum suscitauit Iesum, quem vos interemistis suspendentes in ligno. ${ }^{31}$ Hunc prin|cipem et seruatorem deus exaltauit dextera sua, ad dandam poenitentiam Israeli, remissionemque peccatorum: ${ }^{32}$ ac nos sumus ei testes

21 miseruntque $B-E$ : et miserunt $A \mid 22$ nec reperissent $B-E$ : et non inuenissent $A \mid$ in carcere $B$-E: om. $A \mid 23$ reperimus $B-E$ : inuenimus $A \mid 24$ principesque $B-E$ : et principes $A$ 25 carcere $B-E$ : carcerem $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 28$ etiam atque etiam $B-E$ : praecipiendo $A$ in $A C-E$ : sub $B \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ : Hierusalem $A \mid 31$ seruatorem $B$-E: saluatorem $A$ Israeli, remissionemque $B$-E: Israel et remissionem $A \mid 32$ ac $B$-E: et $A$
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) ．See on Iob． 1,39$.
21 qui adducerent eos áx日̇̃̃aı aủtoús（＂vt adducerentur＂${ }^{\text {Vg．．．}}$ ．Erasmus offers a more idiomatic rendering，though the Vulgate more literally preserves the passive form of the verb．
22 nec reperissent illos in carcere oủX EUpov đủtoùs èv Tñ qu入̀akỹ（＂et aperto carcere non inuenissent illos＂Vg．；＂et non inuenissent illos＂ 1516 Lat．）．The omission of in carcere in 1516 seems to have been caused by confusion between vs． 22 and 23：in 1516－27 Annot．，the Latin lemma et aperto carcere is from vs．22， but the accompanying citation of the Greek text，duoi $\xi$ avtes $\delta \varepsilon$ ，is from vs． 23 ．The Vul－ gate wording is partly supported by cod．D and just a few later mss．For reperio，see on Iob．1，41，and on nec，see on Iob．2，16． Manetti translated this as non inuenerunt eos in custodia．
22 㱜（2nd．）．The Vulgate and Erasmus leave this particle untranslated．Its omission in the Greek text of the 1519 edition was probably influenced by the Latin rather than any evidence of Greek mss．，as there are very few mss．which omit the word．Manetti，more literally，added autem after reuersi．
23 foris É $\xi \omega$（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by nearly all Greek mss．Erasmus is here led astray by his cod． 2815 which appears to stand virtually alone in adding $\ell \xi \omega$ ， a poorly supported variant which remained in the Textus Receptus．
23 Quum aperuissemus ávoi $\xi$ avtes（＂aperientes＂ Vg．）．Greek aorist．See Annot．
23 reperimus घüpouev（＂inuenimus＂ $1516=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ．）． See on Iob．1，41．Manetti anticipated this change．
24 et sacerdos et O тe iepevis kai ò（Vg．omits）． The Vulgate reflects the omission of ifesis kai （d），as in $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \mathrm{~S}$ A B D and thirty－seven other mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and about 370 other late mss．（see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 460－3）．On the rendering of $\tau \varepsilon \ldots$ kai，see on Act．1，1． Manetti put sacerdotes et，apparently reflecting the rare substitution of oi iepeis for ó $\tau \in$ iepeus， recorded only in cod． E and one later ms． （cod．1884）．
24 principesque sacerdotum kai oi ỏppxıpeĩs（＂et principes sacerdotum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob． 1,39 ．Manetti put et pontifices．

24 boc futurum esset $\gamma^{\text {Evoito }}$ to Vg．）．The Vulgate treats toũto as redundant． For the construction with futurum，see on Act．2，21．Manetti put boc fieret．
25 Ecce ${ }^{\text {ota }}$＇ 1 Iooú（＂Quia ecce＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti had quod ecce．
 Iob．1，19，for Erasmus＇use of the pluperfect．
25 in carcere ह่v $\tau \mathfrak{n}$ ）$\varphi u \lambda \alpha<n ̃$（＂in carcerem＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）．Erasmus is more accu－ rate here，restoring the earlier Vulgate reading． Manetti preferred in custodia．
$25 a c$ kai（＂et＂1516＝Vg．）．See on Iob．1，25．
28 Nonne OU（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omis－ sion is supported by $37^{74} \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ A B and a few later Greek mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815， supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．，commencing with $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}$ E．See Annot．， where he also renders by $A n$ non．Manetti had Nonne．
28 etiam atque etiam $\pi \alpha p a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i \underset{~(" p r a e c i p i e n-~}{\text {（ }}$ do＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．Cf．Erasmus＇similar avoidance of Hebraistic idiom at Act．4，17．See Annot．， suggesting also praccepto or acriter．Manetti tried preceptis．
28 in $\mathfrak{e ̇ \pi i}$（＂sub＂1519）．See on Iob．5，43．
 lem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）See on Act． 1,8 ．
 Erasmus here follows the rendering of the earlier Vulgate．
29 o Пétpos．The presence of the article here is supported by cod．2815，together with cod． 2816 and some other late mss．In cod． 1 and most other mss．，it is omitted．
31 seruatorem $\sigma \omega T \pi ̃ \rho \alpha$（＂saluatorem＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．4，42．
31 Israeli $\uparrow \tilde{\omega}$＇lopari入（＂Israel＂1516＝Vg．）．See on Iob．1，31．
31 remissionemque kai ảp६бv（（＂et remissionem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，39．
$32 a c$ kaí（＂et＂ $1516=V_{g}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25．
32 ei aútoũ（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omis－ sion is supported by $\mathbf{7}^{7 \text { 74id }} \mathcal{N}$（A） $\mathrm{D}^{*}$ and a few later mss．Erasmus，as usual，follows cod．2815，here supported by codd． $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．See Annot．The deletion
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 $\alpha u ̉ T \tilde{,}, \delta 1 \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \circ \rho \pi i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v .{ }^{38}$ каì $\tau \alpha ̀ ̀ v \tilde{v} v$
horum quae dicimus: insuper autem et spiritus sanctus, quem dedit deus obedientibus ipsi.
${ }^{33}$ Haec autem quum audissent, dissecabantur, et consultabant vt interficerent illos. ${ }^{34}$ Surgens autem quidam in concilio Pharisaeus nomine Gamaliel, legis doctor in precio habitus apud totum populum, iussit vt paulisper secederent foras apostoli. ${ }^{35}$ Dixitque ad illos: Viri Israelitae, attendite vobis super hominibus istis quid acturi sitis. ${ }^{36}$ Ante hos enim dies extitit Theudas, dicens se esse aliquem, cui adhaesit numerus virorum circiter quadringentorum, qui occisus est, et omnes qui credebant ei dissipati sunt, et redacti ad nihilum. ${ }^{37}$ Post hunc extitit Iudas Galilaeus in diebus professionis, et auertit populum multum post se, et ipse periit, et omnes quotquot paruerant ei dispersi sunt. ${ }^{38} \mathrm{Et}$ nunc

32 тvevua B-E: тиєuमа $A \mid 36$ тробєко $\lambda \lambda \eta \theta \eta A^{c} B-E: \pi р о \sigma \varepsilon к \lambda \eta \theta \eta A^{*}$

32 quae dicimus $B-E$ : verborum $A \mid$ ipsi $B-E$ : illi $A \mid 34$ concilio $A B D E$ : consilio $C \mid$ in precio ... populum $B$ - $E$ : honorabilis vniuersae plebi $A$ | 36 adhaesit $B-E$ : consensit $A$ | 37 multum $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ paruerant $B D E$ : consenserant $A$, paruearant $C$
of aútoũ by some early witnesses may have been prompted by a desire to avoid the more difficult usage of a double genitive (both aútoũ and $\dot{\rho} \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \tau \nu)$.

32 borum quae dicimus т $\omega \nu$ ค́ $\eta \mu \alpha ́ t \omega \nu$ тоÚт $\omega \nu$ ("horum verborum" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus somewhat paraphrases the Greek expression, to make it clearer.

32 insuper autem et kai ... $\delta$ ह́ ("et" Vg.). Erasmus renders this relatively uncommon Greek construction in the same way at Hebr. 9,21. It is possible that the Vulgate reflects a Greek text in which $\delta \varepsilon$ is omitted, as in $\$^{45} \times \mathrm{ABCD}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. On this occasion, his text has the merit of offering a lectio
difficilior. See Annot., for his exposition, where he also renders by Quin et.
32 obedientibus тоі̃ร $\pi \varepsilon 1 \theta \propto \rho \chi$ ои̃бוv ("omnibus obedientibus" Vg.). The Vulgate addition lacks Greek support.
32 ipsi đủtน̃ ("sibi" Vg.; "illi" 1516). Erasmus prefers to use ipsi, to refer back less ambiguously to the subject of the verb.
33 quum audissent ákov́cavtes. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1, 2816 and the Vulgate, with support from $\boldsymbol{7}^{74} \aleph$ A B D E and many later mss. In his cod. 2815, the text has dónoúovtes, in the present tense, as in $\boldsymbol{7}^{45}$ and many later mss.

33 consultabant $\mathfrak{\beta} \beta$ ouñúovto ("cogitabant" Vg.). See on Iob. 11,53, and see also Annot. The version of Manetti substituted consulebant.

33 vt interficerent $\alpha$ व̉v See on Iob. 1,33, and Annot. In Manetti's version, the word-order was changed to $v t$ eos interficerent.
34 in precio babitus T ( $\mu \mathrm{LOS}$ ("honorabilis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The word bonorabilis, meaning "held in honour", does not occur in this sense in classical Latin. Erasmus uses in precio in rendering סoke $\omega$ at Gal. 2,2, 6; for ëvtupos at Phil. 2,29;

34 apud totum populum $\pi \alpha v \tau i ̀ ~ T \tilde{\varphi} \lambda \alpha \tilde{\varphi}$ ("vniuersae plebi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The use of apud yields a clearer sense. On populus, see on Act. 2,47. Erasmus substitutes totus for $v$ niuersus at seventeen passages in 1516, and at a further eight passages in 1519 , most of which relate to öخos rather than mãs. In the present verse, the change appears to be for little more than stylistic variety, in view of the two other occurrences of vniuersus earlier in this chapter. Elsewhere, he is content to use vniuersa turba at Mt. 13,2; Mc. 9,15; Lc. 23,18, and vniuersus populus at $M t .27,25$. At some passages, Erasmus seems to have felt that vniuersus was too emphatic, and he also preferred to use it as an adjective rather than a noun, except when rendering ỡtas (cf. Mt. 24,39; Lc. 3,16; Act. 2,14; 16,28). See further on Ioh. 8. 2. Manetti put omni populo.

34 vt paulisper secederent foras apostoli |  |
| :---: |
|  |
| $\omega$ | ßpoxú

 homines fieri" Vg.). This recasting of the sentence arises partly from a difference of Greek text, partly from the difficulty of interpreting moiñoar. In cod. 2815, in company with $7^{74}$ and a few later mss., $\bar{\xi} \xi \omega$ is omitted, resulting in virtual nonsense. The word is restored by Erasmus or his assistants from codd. 1 and 2816, with support from most other mss. Further, the word, t , is found in most of the later mss. (contrary to the indications given in $\mathrm{N}^{27}$ ), including cod. 2815. The word-order of
 moiñ $\sigma a 1$. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text
 in $\mathbf{7}^{4574} \times \mathrm{A}$ B alone (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 463-5). This change could have arisen by harmonisation to context, as the words toĩs duvp $\omega$ itrols appear in the following verse. Erasmus' choice of secedo is not entirely suitable, as it does not convey the required degree of compulsion implied by moiñoal: cf. Annot., where he also suggests using emitto. At Act. 4,15,
the adoption of secedo was more appropriate, in rendering the different verb, áritepxoual. See on Ioh. 13,33 regarding the use of paulisper. Manetti's solution was vt ad breue apostoli foras efficerentur.
36 Theudas $\Theta$ eusã̃ ("Theodas" $V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate spelling of this name is not warranted by the Greek text. See Annot.
36 adhaesit $\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon к о \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ ("consensit" 1516 $=$ Vg.). In his 1516 Greek text, Erasmus had прогЕк $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$, as in cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and most other mss., commencing with codd. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$ E: cf. also прооєк $\lambda$ i $\theta$, found in K A B C ${ }^{\text {cort }}$ and cod. 69. In 1516 Annot., and also the 1516 errata, he had пробеко $\lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$, as found in cod. 2816 and some other late mss. The Vulgate use of consentio represented a harmonisation with consenserunt in vs. 37. Erasmus' substitution of adbaereo is consistent with the Vulgate rendering of троско $\lambda \lambda$ व́oual at $M c .10,7$, and of ко $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \omega$ at $L c .10,11 ; 15,15$; Act. 17,34; Rom. 12,9. However, at a few other passages he prefers adglutino, for тробко入$\lambda$ áouar at Mt. 19,5 (1519), and for ко $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\omega} \omega$ at 1 Cor. 6,16, 17.
36 qui (2nd.) öסol ("quicunque" Vg. 1527 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.). In his Latin rendering, Erasmus may have here been following a copy of the late Vulgate which had qui, as found e.g. in the Froben edition of 1491 and the Sacon edition of 1513.
37 multum ikavóv (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{~}^{74} \aleph$ $\mathrm{A}^{*} \mathrm{~B}$ and a few later mss. In codd. C D, the reading is mo $\lambda \hat{u}^{\prime} v$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. $A^{\text {corr }} E$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot. The version of Manetti inserted plurimum before populum.
 "consenserant" 1516). Erasmus did not regard consentio as an accurate translation of Tei $\theta$ o $\mu$ al. For consistency, it might have been preferable to repeat credebant from vs. 36 . Erasmus' choice was for the sake of varying the vocabulary. Manetti preferred obedierunt.
38 nunc tà võv ("nunc itaque" Vg.). The Vulgate addition of itaque does not appear to reflect any difference of Greek text. Manetti's version (both mss.) has quem nunc, probably a scribal error for quae nunc, as quem makes little sense in this context.
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 toùs ‘Eßpaious，ótit Tap\＆Өzตpoũvto év
dico vobis，abstinete ab hominibus istis，et sinite illos：quoniam si est ex hominibus consilium aut opus hoc， dissoluetur：${ }^{39} \sin$ ex deo est，non potestis dissoluere，ne quando et deo repugnare reperiamini．In huius autem sententiam pedibus itum est a caeteris： ${ }^{40}$ et quum aduocassent apostolos，caesis praeceperunt，ne loquerentur in nomine Iesu，et dimiserunt eos．${ }^{41}$ Et illi qui－ dem ibant gaudentes a conspectu con－ cilii，quod digni habiti essent，vt pro nomine eius contumelia afficerentur． ${ }^{42}$ Et quotidie in templo et in singu－ lis domibus non cessabant docere et annunciare Iesum Christum．

6In diebus autem illis crescente numero discipulorum，ortum est murmur Graecorum aduersus Heb－ raeos，eo quod despicerentur in
$39 \sin B-E$ ：si vero $A \mid \operatorname{In} .$. caeteris $B-E$ ：Consenserunt autem illi $A \mid 40$ praeceperunt $B-E$ ： denunciauerunt $A \mid$ ne $B$－E：ne omnino $A \mid$ in $A C-E$ ：sub $B \mid 41$ concilii $A B D E$ ：consilii $C \mid$ contumelia afficerentur $B$－$E$ ：contumeliam paterentur $A \mid 42$ quotidie $B$－$E$ ：cotidie $A$｜ in singulis domibus $B-E$ ：circa domos $A \mid$ annunciare $B-E$ ：euangelizare $A$

38 abstinete ámóणтクTを（＂discedite＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus discerns that the context requires a word meaning to refrain from attacking，rather than the bland expression adopted by the Vulgate． Elsewhere，he uses abstineo only in the sense of abstaining from certain foods or from a moral evil．At six other passages，he retains discedo for $\alpha \varphi i \sigma \tau \eta \mu \mathrm{l}:$ see on Act．18，2．
38 consilium $\mathfrak{\eta}$ ß $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta}$（＂consilium hoc＂Vg．）． The Vulgate addition reflects a Greek text adding $\alpha U ̋ T \eta$ ，as in 月 $^{74} \aleph$ A B C D E and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．See Annot．The word boc was also omitted by Manetti．
38 opus boc tò êpyov toũto（＂opus＂Vg．）．The Vulgate omission of boc at this point is unsup－ ported by Greek mss．See Annot．The version of Manetti put istud for boc．
$39 \sin$ € 8 ＇$\varepsilon$（＂si vero＂ $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$ ．）．See on Ioh．10，38．Manetti had si autem．

39 potestis $\delta$ U＇vaOes（ $^{2}$（＂poteritis＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant，$\delta \cup v \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ，found in $3^{74 \mathrm{vid}}$ \＆B C（D）E and many later mss． Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1，2816 and most other mss．，commencing with cod．A．
 late Vulgate copies had dissoluere illud，the 1491 and 1514 Vulgate editions of Froben，together with the Vulgate column of Erasmus＇ 1527 N．T．，omitted illud，which accounts for the omission of the pronoun from his rendering， in conflict with his Greek text．In some mss．， aU＇Toús is substituted for aútó，as in $7^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ D E and the earlier Vulgate，which had dissoluere eos．Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod． 2815 ，supported by cod． $\mathrm{C}^{\text {＊vid }}$ and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti put ipsum dissoluere．
39 ne quando $\mu$ ŋ́тоте（＂ne forte＂Vg．）．This substitution also occurs at about sixteen other
passages, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mc. 4,12; 2 Tim. 2,25. See Annot. The version of Manetti made the same change.
 The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek support. See Annot. Earlier Vulgate mss. have inueniamini: see on Iob. 1,41. The latter choice of verb was adopted by Manetti.
39 In buius autem sententiam pedibus itum est a
 autem illi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., Erasmus recommends paruerunt or obtemperarunt, rather than this long periphrasis: cf. his use of paruerunt at vs. 37 . The phrase pedibus itum est is derived from the voting procedure of the Roman senate. Manetti put Crediderunt autem ei.
40 quит aduocassent $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa \propto \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o l$ ("conuocantes" Vg.). Greek aorist. A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 15,10; Act. 6,2 (1516 only). Sometimes Erasmus puts accerso or voco for conuoco. Generally he regarded conuoco as an inaccurate rendering of the Greek verb, though (perhaps through inadvertence) he retained it at $L c .7,19 ; 16,5$. Elsewhere, he follows the Vulgate in using conuoco for $\sigma u \gamma к \propto \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ and $\sigma v v a \theta p o i \zeta \omega$. See Annot. on Mt. 10,1; 16,10. Manetti substituted conuocatos.
 runt" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 4,18. Manetti preferred mandaucrunt.
$40 n e \mu \eta^{\prime}$ ("ne omnino" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss., and no doubt arose from harmonisation with Act. 4. 18, where $\mu \eta$ is reinforced
 the earlier Vulgate reading: see Annot. The version of Manetti had vt non amplius, as if rendering $\mu \eta \kappa \varepsilon \tau 1$ (cf. Act. 4,17).
40 in ह́mí ("sub" 1519). See on Iob. 5,43.
 reading, $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \cup \sigma \varepsilon v$, in the singular. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and 2816, in company with most other mss.
 niam ... sunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti substituted quia ... fuerant.
41 vt ... contumelia afficerentur $\dot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \mu \alpha \sigma \theta \nexists \nu \propto a$ ("contumeliam pati" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$; "vt ... contumeliam paterentur" 1516). See on Iob. 1,33, for the avoidance of the infinitive. For afficio, see on Ioh. 8,49 . A very similar wording had been proposed by Manetti, vt ... contumeliis afficerentur.

41 eius $\propto \cup ̉ т$ т̃̃ ("Iesu" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having toũ Inooṽ, as found in most of the later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, here supported by only a few other late mss. In cod. 1 and a few other mss., including $7^{74} \aleph$ A B C D, cuitoũ is simply omitted. In cod. 2816, тои̃ Хpıoтoũ $\eta \xi \xi \Leftarrow \theta \eta \sigma a v$ is substitu-

 tem die" Vg.). Erasmus removes the ambiguity as to whether mã́s here means "the whole" or "every", deciding in favour of the latter. Cf. his substitution of quotidie for per omnes dies at Act. 17,17. The Vulgate may reflect the substitution of $\delta \boldsymbol{\xi}$ for $\tau \varepsilon$, as in cod. D and a few later mss.
42 in singulis domibus кat" olkov ("circa domos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 2,46. See also Annot.
42 docere et annunciare $\delta i \delta$ óokovtes kai eủor $\gamma \mathrm{E}$ $\lambda_{1} \zeta$ ónevor ("docentes et euangelizantes" Vg.; "docere et euangelizare" 1516). For reasons of Latin style, Erasmus prefers to use the infinitive after cesso, whereas the Vulgate retains the Greek usage of a participle. Similar substitutions of an infinitive after cesso and desino occur at Act. 20,31; Eph. 1,16; Col. 1,9, consistent with Vulgate usage elsewhere. See Annot. Erasmus tried to limit the occurrence of euangelizo, which was no more than a transliteration from the Greek word. In 1516, he substituted annuncio at Rom. 10,15 , and praedico at nine other places in the Epistles. In 1519, he turned his attention to Luke and Acts, where he substituted annuncio or praedico for euangelizo at ten further passages, in accordance with occasional Vulgate usage at e.g. Act. 10,36; 11,20. Manetti (both mss.), less accurately, had docentes et euangelizabant, though there may have been a scribal error here.
$6,1 \pi \lambda \eta \theta v v o v^{v} \tau \omega v$. This spelling is unsupported by Greek mss. Although it could have begun merely as a printer's error, there are other indications that Erasmus (or his assistants) had a tendency to treat verbs ending in -uvo as if they were a contracted form of -vvé $\omega$ : cf. the incorrect forms, $\mu \mathrm{E} \propto \alpha \lambda v \operatorname{cou}^{\prime} \nu T \omega \nu$ and évk $\lambda \eta$ р 10,46; 19,9. At the present passage, all Erasmus' usual mss. had $\pi \lambda \eta \theta u v \delta \dot{v} t \omega v$, as in 1516 Annot. The spelling $\pi \lambda \eta \theta v v o u v i t \omega \nu$ was used in Annot. from 1519 onwards.
1 ortum est é $\gamma$ ย́veto ("factum est" late Vg.). See on Iob. 1,17.
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ministerio quotidiano viduae ipsorum. ${ }^{2}$ Caeterum duodecim illi, quum iussissent adesse multitudinem discipulorum, dixerunt: Non est placitum, vt nos derelicto sermone dei, ministremus mensis. ${ }^{3}$ Circunspicite ergo fratres, viros ex vobis spectatae probitatis septem, plenos spiritu sancto et sapientia, quibus delegabimus hoc negocii. ${ }^{4}$ Nos vero deprecationi et administrando sermoni incumbemus. ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Et}$ placuit hic sermo coram tota multitudine. Et elegerunt Stephanum virum plenum fide ac spiritu sancto et Philippum et Prochorum et Nicanorem et Timonem et Parmenam et Nicolaum proselytum Antiochenum. ${ }^{6}$ Hos statuerunt in conspectu aposto|lorum: et quum orassent, imposuerunt eis manus. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Et}$ sermo dei crescebat, ac multiplicabatur numerus discipulorum Hierosolymis valde,

6,2 пробка $\lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu о$ о $A$ B D : прока $\lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu о$ о $C$
6,1 quotidiano $B-E$ : cotidiano $A \mid$ ipsorum $B-E$ eorum $A \mid 2$ Caeterum ... multitudinem $B$-E: Aduocata autem duodecim multitudine $A \mid$ placitum $B$-E: aequum $A \mid \operatorname{nos} B$-E: om. $A \mid$ 3 Circunspicite $E$ (Circūspicite): Consyderate $A$, Circumspicite $B-D \mid$ spectatac probitatis $B-E$ : boni testimonii $A$ | quibus delegabimus hoc negocii $B$ - $E$ : quos constituamus in hunc vsum $A$ | 4 deprecationi.. incumbemus $B$-E: orationi et ministerio verbi instantes erimus $A \mid 5$ hic $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ tota $B$-E: omni $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ proselytum $B$-E: aduenam $A \mid 7$ sermo dei $B$-E: verbum domini $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ et et $A \mid$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A$

1 ipsorum $\alpha$ 'ũ $\omega$ v ("eorum" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus substitutes ipsorum to refer back more clearly to the "Greeks".
2 Caeterum ... quum iussissent adesse multitudinem
 uocantes autem ... multitudinem" Vg.; "Aduocata autem ... multitudine" 1516). Greek aorist. The spelling $\pi \rho о к \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ vol in 1522 is a misprint. For substitutions for conuoco, see on Act. 5,40. See also Annot. The word caeterum (or ceterum) is used in the Vulgate N.T. only twice, at 1 Cor. 1,$16 ; 14,16$ (changed by Erasmus to praeterea and alioqui), but is introduced in sixtyfour further passages in 1516, then at another fourteen passages in 1519, and two more in

1522, usually as a substitute for autem, and mainly for stylistic variety. In nine passages of the 1516 edition, the spelling is ceterum, all corrected to caeterum in 1519. Manetti's version ran Cum vero vocassent ... multitudinem.
2 duodecim illi ol $\delta \omega \dot{\omega} \delta \mathrm{Ek} \alpha$ ("duodecim" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Erasmus adds illi to show that these were the twelve apostles, rather than just any twelve of the disciples.
2 placitum ápєoтóv ("aequum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution conforms with Vulgate usage at Ioh. 8,29; Act. 12,3; 1 Iob. 3,22. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests gratum, which he adopts into his translation at Act. 12,3 (1519). Manetti put placet.

2 vt nos ... ministremus $\mathfrak{\text { finã̃s } . . . ~ \delta ı a k o v \varepsilon i v ~ ( " n o s ~}$ ... ministrare" Vg.; "vt ... ministremus" 1516 Lat., omitting "nos"). For avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. Manetti had nobis vt ... ministremus.

2 derelicto sermone каталвiчavtas tòv 入óyov ("derelinquere verbum" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,1, regarding sermo. This conversion to the ablative absolute construction provided a further means of avoiding the use of the infinitive.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) Elsewhere, in both the Vulgate and in Erasmus' N.T., this Greek verb is rendered visito, though at several passages he also substitutes inuiso (at Act. 7,23; Hebr. 2,6; Iac. 1,27). In the present context, a different sense is required, as provided by the more vigorous verb, circunspicio.
3 spectatae probitatis uaptupounévous ("boni testimonii" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is the only N.T. passage where Erasmus uses either spectatus or probitas. In Annot., he objects that the Vulgate rendering is ambiguous, as to whether the testimony was borne by the men or about them. This may be compared with his treatment of testimonium babens, which he replaces by testimonio probatus at Act. 22,12 (1519), and by testimonio comprobatus at 1 Tim. 5,10. However, he retains testimonium babens at Act. 10,22. Manetti proposed per testimonia probatos.
3 quibus delegabimus hoc negocii oüs катабтท்оо$\mu \varepsilon \nu$ ह̀mi $T n ̃ s$ Xpeías taútns ("quos constituamus super hoc opus" Vg.; "quos constituamus in hunc vsum" 1516). The 1519 rendering falls into the category of paraphrase at this passage. The verb delego does not occur anywhere else in Erasmus' N.T. Elsewhere, he is content to retain constituo, e.g. at Tit. 1,5, and at most other passages where katiotnul is found. Nor does this idiomatic use of the genitive of negocium appear elsewhere in his N.T. However, the phrase boc negocii is used in Erasmus De Construct., ASD I, 4, p. 134, 1. 381. Cf. also idem loci at Act. 1,4. In Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus indicates that he does not favour the suggestion of Valla Annot., to substitute super banc necessitatem for super boc opus. Manetti tried super banc indigentiam.
4 deprecationi $\tau \tilde{\pi}$ т $\pi$ poovuxñ ("orationi" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,14. Manetti had in oratione.
4 administrando sermoni $\frac{1 \pi}{1}$ סıakovị́ toũ $\lambda$ óyou ("ministerio verbi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. the
substitution of administratio at Rom. 12,7; 1 Cor. 3,7, 8 (all in 1519). Erasmus' purpose here is probably to remove an imagined ambiguity. However, the alteration brings a loss of connection with ministerio in vs. 1. On sermo, see on Ioh. 1,1. Manetti inserted in before ministerio.
 erimus" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus also makes use of incumbo for this Greek verb at Rom. 13,6, but retains instantes at Rom. 12,12. What he probably objected to, at the present passage, was the combination of the present participle with an auxiliary verb: see on Iob. 1,28 . On the meaning of incumbo, see Valla Elegantiae III, 44; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 264, ll. 582-584. Manetti had perseucrabimus.
5 bic sermo ó $\lambda o ́ y o s ~(" s e r m o " ~ 1516=V g) .$. Erasmus adds bic to convey the sense of the Greek article.
5 tota mavtós ("omni" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 8,2.
5 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti also had ac.
5 proselytum mpoońגutov ("aduenam" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs at Act. 13,43 (1519), consistent with Vulgate usage at $M t$. 23,15; Act. 2,11. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using aduena in rendering ह̇דा $\delta \eta \mu \mu^{\prime} \omega$, тарятi$\delta \eta \mu \circ \varsigma$, and mגpoikos. See Annot., citing Valla Annot. in favour of proselytum here.
6 in conspectu घ̇vడ́miov ("ante conspectum" Vg.). See on Act. 3,13. Erasmus retains ante conspectum at $A p$. Iob. 12,10; 14,10. Manetti put coram apostolis.
6 quum orassent $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon u \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \mathrm{Evol}$ ("orantes" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). Greek aorist. Manetti made the same change.
7 sermo ó $\lambda$ óyos ("verbum" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
7 dei toũ $\theta$ eoũ ("domini" $1516=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with toũ kupiou, found in codd. D E and a few later mss., together with the Old Latin version. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by $\mathrm{p}^{74} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{~A}$ B C and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816, in company with the earlier Vulgate. Manetti also had dei.
7 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti also made use of $a c$ here.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,8 .
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multaque turba sacerdotum obediebat fidei．${ }^{8}$ Porro Stephanus plenus fide ac fortitudine aedebat prodigia et signa magna in populo．
${ }^{9}$ Exorti sunt autem quidam e syna－ goga，quae appellatur Libertinorum et Cyrenensium et Alexandrinorum et Cilicum et Asianorum，disputan－ tes cum Stephano，${ }^{10}$ nec poterant resistere sapientiae et spiritui qui lo－ quebatur．${ }^{11}$ Tunc subornarunt viros qui dicerent：Audiuimus eum dicen－ tem verba contumeliosa in Mosen ac deum．${ }^{12}$ Commoueruntque ple－ bem et seniores et scribas，atque inuadentes corripuerunt eum，et ad－ duxerunt in concilium，${ }^{13}$ statuerunt－ que falsos testes qui dicerent：Homo iste non cessat loqui verba con－ tumeliosa aduersus locum sanctum hunc et legem．${ }^{14}$ Audiuimus enim eum dicentem：Iesus Nazarenus iste demolietur locum hunc，et mutabit

7 multaque $B$－E：Multa etiam $A \mid 8$ Porro Stephanus B－E：Stephanus autem $A$ fide $E$ ： gratia $A-D \mid$ ac $B-E$ et $A \mid$ aedebat $B-E$ ：faciebat $A \mid 9$ Exorti sunt $B$－$E$ ：Surrexerunt $A \mid$ e $B$－E：de $A \mid$ Cilicum et Asianorum B－E：eorum qui erant a Cilicia et Asia $A \mid 10$ nec $B$－E： et non $A \mid 11$ subornarunt $B$－E：summiserunt $A \mid$ contumeliosa $B-E$ ：blasphemiae $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ ： et $A \mid 12$ atque $B-E$ et $A \mid 13$ statueruntque $B$－E：et statuerunt $A \mid$ contumeliosa $B$－E：om．$A^{*}$ ， blasphema $A^{c} \mid 14$ iste demolietur $B$－E：hic destruit $A$

7 multaque то入ús тE（＂Multa etiam＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．2，40，and Annot．The version of Manetti put multa quoque．
7 iepé $\omega \nu$ ．The spelling iєp $\omega \nu$ in 1516 （＂holy men＂）makes less sense，and is probably only a misprint as it is unsupported by mss．
8 Porro Stephanus $\Sigma$ TÉ¢ $\alpha v o s ~ \delta e ́ ~(" S t e p h a n u s ~$ autem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．8，16．
8 fide miбтews（＂gratia＂1516－27 Lat．＝Vg．）． The Vulgate follows a Greek text having Xópitos， as in $\mathbf{3 月}^{845 v i d} 74$ ※ B D 0175 and eighty－four later mss．Erasmus follows his cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and about 360
other late mss．（see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 465－7）．The simplest explanation of miotec here is that it represents a harmonisation with vs．5．If，on the other hand，miotecs had been the original wording，it is possible that an early annotator of the text might have made a note in the margin，referring to the description of Christ as minjpns xópitos（from loh．1，1）， which could then easily have led some scribes to substitute $\chi$ 人́pitos for $\pi i \sigma \tau \varepsilon \omega s$ in the text of the present passage．Manetti also had fide．

8 ac kal（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25． Manetti again had ac．

8 aedebat $\varepsilon$ غ́тоíєı ("faciebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,11.
 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,17. Erasmus similarly replaces surgo and exsurgo by exorior at Act. 7,18; 20,30; Hebr. 7,11 (all in 1519); 7,15.
9 e ćk ("de" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
9 quae appellatur $\tau \eta ̃ 5 \lambda \varepsilon \gamma o \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta s$ ("quae appellabatur" Vg. 1527). Either rendering is legitimate.
9 Cilicum et Asianorum tw̃ $\nu$ àmò Kı $\lambda_{ı k i ́ a s ~ k a ̀ ~}^{\text {kit }}$ A A ías ("eorum qui erant a Cilicia et Asia" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,45.
10 nec koì oưk ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,16.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus chooses a word with a stronger pejorative sense. For other instances of the removal of summitto, see on Act. 27,17.
 late Vg.). Erasmus is more literal here. Manetti tried quod audiuimus.
11 contumeliosa $\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \varphi \eta \mu \alpha$ ("blasphemiae" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 19,37 (1519). Erasmus also uses contumeliosa in vs. 13, below. Elsewhere, he sometimes replaces blasphemia with conuitium or maledicentia. See further on $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ at Act. 13,45. At the present passage, Erasmus may have felt that the sin of blasphemia could be committed only against God, and not against a prophet. The word does not occur in classical Latin. It is possible that the Vulgate reflects a slightly different Greek text, substituting $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \Phi \eta \mu i \alpha \sigma$, found in codd. $\aleph^{*} \mathrm{D}$ virtually alone.

11 ac каi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.
12 Commoueruntque ouvexivךのớv te ("Commouerunt itaque" Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,15. Manetti put et commouerunt.

12 atque kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
12 inuadentes èmi $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \in \varsigma$ ("concurrentes" Vg.).
Erasmus prefers a verb which conveys a sense of aggression, as appropriate to the context. He retains concurro for $\sigma u v \in \varphi i^{\sigma}$ Tqul at Act. 16,22. Manetti adopted cum astitissent.
12 corripuerunt $\sigma u \underline{1} \rho \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha v$ ("rapuerunt" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 19,29. At the other two N.T. instances of $\sigma u v \alpha \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$, Lc. 8,29 (1519) and Act. 27,15, Erasmus puts corripio for arripio. He may have regarded
corripio as being closer to the exact form of the Greek compound verb. Manetti anticipated Erasmus' rendering.
 $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
13 contumeliosa $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \varphi \eta \mu \alpha$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. text = Vg.; "blasphema" 1516 errata). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{88 v i d} 45 v i d 74$ A B C D 0175 and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In Annot., he ventures to express his opinion that the word is a later addition, superfluous in the present context. He continued to maintain this view in Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, $L B$ IX, 207 B -C. If the word had been genuine, there was also the possibility that it could have been removed by certain early scribes who had a tendency to abbreviate the text. Manetti put blasphemiae.
13 bunc roútou (Vg. omits). Erasmus adds тои́тou from cod. 2815, with support from ( ${ }^{8}$ ) B C and some later mss. The Vulgate omission is this time supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \aleph \mathrm{~A}$ D E 0175 and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
14 dicentem $\lambda$ éyoutos, o̊tı ("dicentem, quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. In cod. 2815, the
 originally omitted, but were inserted in the margin of the ms. by Erasmus, following codd. 1 and 2816. The words in the margin were later partly cropped during rebinding. Manetti put dicentem quod.
14 ' $O$ 'I $\eta \sigma 0$ ũs. The Erasmian text adds the article without authority from Greek mss. See on Ioh. 1,48.
 1516, see on Act. 3,6.
14 iste oṽtos ("hic" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus prefers iste, partly because the word conveys disapproval, and partly because bic is ambiguous, as it could also mean "here" as well as "this". Cf. on Ioh. 3,26.
14 demolietur кøт $\alpha \lambda$ ú $\sigma \in 1$ ("destruet" Vg.; "destruit" 1516 Lat.). A similar substitution occurs at Mc. 15,29. Elsewhere, Erasmus sometimes retains destruo in rendering this Greek verb: at Mt. 24,2; 26,61; 27,40; Rom. 14,20; Gal. 2,18.
14 bunc тоŨTov ("istum" Vg.). This changed wording echoes the use of locum sanctum bunc in the previous verse. Manetti also put bunc.
 ớtevioavtes eis aủtòv ätavtes of kâl-
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instituta, quae tradidit nobis Moses. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ intuentes eum omnes qui sedebant in concilio, viderunt faciem eius tanquam faciem angeli.

7Dixit autem princeps sacerdotum: Num haec ita se habent? ${ }^{2}$ At ille ait: Viri fratres et patres, audite: Deus gloriae apparuit patri nostro Abrahae, quum esset in Mesopotamia, priusquam moraretur in Charran, ${ }^{3}$ et dixit ad illum: Exi de terra tua, et de cognatione tua, et veni in terram quancunque monstrauero tibi. ${ }^{4}$ Tunc exiit e terra Chaldaeorum, et habitauit in Charran. Et inde postquam mortuus est pater eius, transtulit illum in terram hanc, in qua nunc vos habitatis. ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Et}$ non dedit illi haereditatem in ea, ne vestigium quidem pedis, et repromisit illi eam se daturum possidendam, et semini eius post ipsum, quum non haberet filium. ${ }^{6}$ Loquutus est autem deus sic, quod futurum esset semen eius inquilinum in terra aliena,
$14 \mu \omega \sigma \eta S$ E: $\mu \omega \cup \sigma \eta s ~ A-D$
7,2 $\eta \mu \omega \nu$ B-E: $v \mu \omega \nu A$

14 instituta, quae $B-E$ : traditiones quas $A$
7,2 At ille $B$-E: Qui $A \mid 3$ quancunque $A B D E$ : quancunquam $C$ (compend.) | 4 e $B$-E: $\operatorname{de} A \mid 5$ ne vestigium quidem $B-E$ : nec vestigium $A \mid$ possidendam $B-E:$ in possessionem $A \mid$ 6 deus sic $A^{c} B-E$ : ei deus $A^{*}$
 $1516=$ Vg.). In rendering ${ }^{\text {en }}$ 加, Erasmus substitutes instituta for mos at Act. 16,21 (1519); 28,17, and for consuetudo at Act. 21,21 (1519). In rendering $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \delta o \sigma$ s in 1519, he further substitutes instituta for traditio at Mc. 7,3; Gal. 1,14, and for praecepta at 1 Cor. 11,2; and also replaces traditio by ritus traditus at Mc. 7,5, by constitutio at Mc. 7,8, 9, 13; Col. 2,8 , and by institutio at 2 Thess. 2,15; 3,6. However, he retains traditio at Mt. 15,2, 3, 6 for mopádoors, and at 1 Petr. 1,18 in rendering

татротарабо́tov. One reason for Erasmus' preference for instituta was that it was more common in classical usage. Cf. Annot. on the present passage and at $M t .15,2$. See also Valla Elegantiae IV, 11; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 262, ll. 535-538.
14 M $\omega \sigma \tilde{j} \bar{s}$. See on Act. 3,22 for this spelling. In 1516-27, Erasmus had $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \eta ̃ s, ~ a s ~ i n ~$ codd. 1, 2815 and 2816.

15 ka0ŗó $\mu \in v o l$. This spelling was not derived from any of Erasmus' mss., which all
offered him kafeלónevol, as found in most other mss.
7,1 Num El áp ("Si" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6, and Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
1 babent è $\overline{\text { ex }}$ ("haberent" late Vg. = Vg. 1527). In Annot., lemma, the Vulgate reading is cited as babent, in agreement with the earlier Vulgate mss. This was also the rendering adopted by Manetti.
2 At ille ó $\delta$ '́ ("Qui" 1516 Lat. $=V \mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 8,31 (1519). See also on $I o b .1,26$. The Vulgate leaves $\delta \bar{\varepsilon}$ untranslated. As pointed out in Annot., the Vulgate rendering does not make clear that Stephen is the new subject. Manetti put Ipse autem.
$2 \pi \mu \tilde{\omega} v$. The reading $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ in 1516 is merely a printer's error, without support from Erasmus' mss.
3 quancunque गึv ơّv ("quam" Vg.). See on Iob. 4,14 (quisquis).
$4 e$ ék ("de" $1516=V_{g}$.). See on Iob. 2,15.
$4 \mu \varepsilon \tau \varphi \in \kappa \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$. This spelling corresponds with cod. 1 (on analogy with $\kappa \alpha \boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{\kappa} \kappa \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ earlier in the verse). Most mss., including codd. 2815 and (2816), have $\mu \varepsilon т \dot{\text { кıाбєv. }}$

4 banc тaútnv ("istam" Vg.). Erasmus prefers to use $b i c$, rather than iste, for oũtos, except where it was necessary to avoid ambiguity or to convey a particular emphasis. See on Iob. 2,18.
5 ne vestigium quidem oú $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ ) $\beta \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ("nec passum" Vg.; "nec vestigium" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus distinguishes between the length of one foot, and a whole pace which must by definition be a greater distance than a foot. The use of vestigium had already been proposed by Valla Annot. On ne... quidem, see on Iob. 7,5. Manetti remained closer to the Vulgate, with neque passum.
 misit" late Vg.). The late Vulgate substitution of sed appears to be supported only by cod. D. Manetti had et repromisit.
5 illi eam se daturum aủtã סoũvaı ... बỦтív ("dare illi eam" Vg.). Similar substitutions occur at $M t .14,7 ; L c .22,5$, in accordance with Vulgate usage at $M c$. 14,11. Erasmus felt that the future tense was more appropriate for the content of a promise. The Vulgate reflects a different word-order, $\delta$ oũvaı au่T$\tilde{\text { a }}$, found in codd. 1 , 2816 and most other mss. Erasmus here follows
cod. 2815, with support from a smaller group of later mss. Manetti put dare ipsi eam.
 nem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' use of the gerundive is clearer and more idiomatic than the literal rendering of the Vulgate. See on Ioh. 1,7 (ad testificandum). Cf. also his substitution of vice filii for in filium at vs. 21, below.
6 deus sic oútcos o $\theta$ eós ("ei deus" 1516 Lat. text $=$ late Vg .). The late Vulgate rendering
 as in $7^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ and a few later mss., including cod. 2816. Cod. D adds mpòs aútóv after $\theta$ zós. Erasmus' Greek text follows his cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1, together with B C E and most of the later mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti had ei sic deus.
 Cf. Act. 2,21 on the use of futurum. Regarding quia, see on Iob. 1,20, and Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered by Quod erit.
6 eius वủtoũ ("tuum" late Vg. = Vg. 1527). In Annot., lemma, Erasmus gives eius as the Vulgate reading, as found in the Froben Vulgate edition of 1491. The late Vulgate use of tuum, as found in the Vulgate column of his 1527 edition, and also in the Froben Vulgate of 1514, corresponds with the Greek variant, oov, as in cod. ${ }^{\kappa}$ and a few later mss., possibly from harmonisation with Gn. 15,13. Manetti used suum.
6 inquilinum тó́poikov ("accola" Vg.). Erasmus nowhere else uses inquilinus in the N.T., but explains in Annot., that he preferred it as conveying the exact sense of the Greek. In Annot., he also appears to recommend incola as an alternative, as was proposed by Valla Annot:: cf. Act. 13,17, where Erasmus is content to retain incola in rendering mapoikio. Elsewhere, he generally follows the Vulgate in using aduena for тópoikos and тарєтiঠ $\eta \mu o s$. The distinction between inquilinus, incola, and accola is further clarified in Valla Elegantiae IV, 54; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallat, ASD I, 4, p. 213, 11. 141-143; p. 264, 11. 556560 , defining an accola as merely someone who dwells near a particular place, not necessarily as an immigrant from another country, whereas an inquilinus could be a citizen who resided in someone else's house or land. Manetti had peregrinum here, as used by both the Vulgate and Erasmus in rendering $\pi \alpha \rho 01 \kappa \varepsilon \omega$ at $L c .24,18$.
















quodque seruituti illud subiecturi essent, et male tractaturi annis quadringentis. ${ }^{7}$ Et gentem cuicunque seruierint, iudicabo ego, dixit deus. Et post haec exibunt et seruient mihi in loco hoc. ${ }^{8}$ Et dedit illi testamentum circuncisionis, atque hic genuit Isaac, et circuncidit eum in die octauo: et Isaac genuit Iacob, et Iacob genuit duodecim patriarchas. ${ }^{9}$ Et patriarchae inuidia moti, loseph vendiderunt in Aegyptum. Et erat deus cum eo, ${ }^{10}$ et eripuit eum ex omnibus afflictionibus eius, et dedit ei gratiam et sapientiam coram Pharaone rege Aegyptiorum. Et constituit eum praefectum super Aegyptum et super totam domum suam. ${ }^{11}$ Venit autem | fames in vniuersam terram
 каi $\theta \lambda i \psi ı \varsigma \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta$, кai oủX $\varepsilon$ űpıokov Xop-







Aegypti et Chanaan, et afflictio magna, nec inueniebant cibos patres nostri. ${ }^{12}$ Quum audisset autem Iacob esse frumenta in Aegypto, misit patres nostros primum: ${ }^{13}$ et quum iterum misisset eos, agnitus est loseph a fratribus suis, et innotuit Pharaoni genus Ioseph.
$9 \operatorname{\imath \omega \sigma \eta \varphi } A C-E: \operatorname{lo\sigma \eta \varphi } B$

6 quodque $B-E$ : et $A \mid 7$ dixit deus $B-E$ : dicit dominus $A \mid$ hoc $B-E$ : isto $A \mid 8$ atque $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ alt. genuit $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ tert. genuit $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 9$ inuidia moti $B-E$ : emulantes $A \mid$ 10 afflictionibus $B-E$ : tribulationibus $A \mid$ coram Pharaone rege $B-E$ : in conspectu Pharaonis regis $A \mid 11$ afflictio $B-E$ : tribulatio $A \mid \operatorname{nec} B-E$ : et non $A \mid 13$ misisset eos $B-E$ : venissent $A \mid$ innotuit $B$ - $E$ : manifestatum est $A$

6 quodque (et: 1516) seruituti ... subiecturi essent ... male tractaturi kai $\delta$ ou $\bar{\omega} \sigma \sigma$ voıv ... какผ́oovow ("et seruituti ... subicient ... male tractabunt" Vg.). Erasmus repeats quod because of the change of subject. See also Annot. On -que, see on Ioh. 1,39. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he put ipsum seruituti for seruituti eos: see below.

6 illud aútó ("eos" Vg.). The Vulgate change of pronoun was not necessarily prompted by a different Greek text, though ou'roús is found in cod. D. See Annot.

6 quadringentis TETpoкóбıの ("quadringentis triginta" late Vg. $=$ Vg. 1527). In 1527 Annot., Erasmus has quadringentis in the lemma, as found in the Froben Vulgate edition of 1491. He attributes the addition of triginta to his "aeditione peruetusta" (i.e. his copy of a printed edition, dated c. 1465: see on Ioh. 3,31), and this was also the reading of Froben's Vulgate edition of 1514 and the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. This added word is unsupported by Greek mss., and represents a harmonisation with Gal. 3,17. Manetti similarly omitted triginta.

7 dixit deus $\mathfrak{\varepsilon i n t \varepsilon v}$ ס $\theta$ Eós ("dicit dominus" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading lacks Greek support. See Annot. The version of Manetti had ait deus.
7 boc toútب ("isto" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 4.
8 atque kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
8 bic oüTos ("sic" Vg.). Erasmus here follows cod. $2815^{\text {corr, }}$, supported by only a few other late mss., whereas the Vulgate reflects the reading of nearly all other mss., oütcs. The original reading of Erasmus' cod. 2815, as far as can be discerned with the aid of ultra-violet light, seems to have been ouvtos. However, the letter $-\omega$ - has been erased, possibly by the original scribe, and -o- was substituted, to produce oũtos. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus voices suspicion that "the Greeks", from hatred of circumcision, changed oưtws into ơtos ("Suspicor factum, vt Graeci odio circuncisionis, mutarint ..."). He no doubt was at that time also consulting cod. 3 , used at other passages of his 1519 edition: it is among the few mss. to read oũtos. However, in 1527 Annot., by implying that all his mss. ("mei codices") have ourtos, he mistepresents the fact that his codd. $1,2815^{\text {*idd }}$ and 2816 all had oűtws. If he had consulted those mss. afresh, he would have been in a position to reinstate oưTos in the text. The latter reading was adopted by the Complutensian Polyglot, as recorded in 1527 Annot.
 adheres to the Greek syntax.
8 genuit (2nd.-3rd.) (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus repeats the verb for the sake of clarity: see Annot.
9 inuidia moti $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ tes ("emulantes" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus generally follows the Vulgate in using aemulor for $\zeta\rceil \lambda$ ó $\omega$ and inuidia for $\phi \theta$ óvos. In the present context he preferred the stronger of these two expressions.
10 aflictionibus $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \quad \theta \lambda i \psi \varepsilon \omega \nu$ ("tribulationibus" $1516=\mathrm{V}$.). See on Ioh. 16,21 (anxietas).
10 coram Pbaraone rege évovitiov Фapac̀ ßact$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega s$ ("in conspectu Pharaonis regis" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change is consistent with Vulgate usage at $L$ c. 20,26; 24,19; Act. 8,32. A similar substitution, in rendering Evémiov, occurs at Act. 10,4, 31 (both 1519). Erasmus retains in conspectu for évavtion at Mc. 2,12. On his
use of in conspectu at other passages, see on Act. 3,13.
10 Aegyptiorum Alyútrov ("Aegypti" Vg.). This substitution is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Hebr. 11,26. See on Ioh. 1,45. Erasmus wished to avoid the repetition of Aegypti, which is used later in the verse.
10 praefectum ग̀yoúúnvov ("praepositum" Vg.). Erasmus selects a more common Latin expression: the phrase praefectus Aegypti occurs in Pliny and Suetonius. A similar substitution, in rendering EもvápXns, occurs at 2 Cor. 11,32. Depending on the context, Erasmus also uses dux, praeses, and princeps, in
 ferred principem here.
 Manetti anticipated this change.
 tum" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text having тinv Aïyuttov, as in $\mathbf{p}^{45} 74 \times \mathrm{KBC}$ and twelve later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and more than 400 of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 467-9). Manetti made the same change.
11 afflictio $\theta \lambda i \psi 15$ ("tribulatio" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.) See on Iob. 16,21.

11 nec kal oủX ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,16.
12 frumenta бĩт ("frumentum" Vg.). Erasmus more accurately conveys the Greek plural. Manetti likewise had frumenta.
13 quum iterum misisset eos $\mathfrak{e v} \tau \underset{\sim}{c} \delta \varepsilon \cup T \varepsilon ́ p \omega$ ("in secundo" Vg.; "quum iterum venissent" 1516 ). Erasmus supplies the missing context, while the Vulgate is strictly literal. See Annot.
13 agnitus est àve $\gamma v \omega \mathrm{p} i \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mathrm{O}_{\eta}$ ("cognitus est" Vg.). See on Iob, 8,43. Manetti also made this change.
 est" 1516 = Vg.). See on Act. 1,19.
13 Ioseph (2nd.) тоũ 'l$\omega \sigma \grave{\varphi} \varphi$ ("eius" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text having aúroũ, as in $30^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ E. In a few mss., commencing with $\mathfrak{P}^{33}$ B C, the reading is ' $1 \omega \sigma \eta(\varphi$, omitting toũ. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1 and 2816, together with $\mathbf{7 9 5}^{45} \mathrm{D}$ and most of the later mss. Manetti made the same substitution.
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${ }^{14}$ Misso autem nuntio Ioseph accersiuit Iacob patrem suum, omnemque cognationem suam in animabus septuaginta quinque. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ descendit lacob in Aegyptum, defunctusque est ipse et patres nostri. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Et}$ translati sunt in Sychem, et positi sunt in sepulchro, quod emit Abraham precio argenti a filiis Emor filii Sychem. ${ }^{17}$ Quum autem appropinquaret tempus promissionis, de qua iurauerat deus Abrahae, creuit populus et multiplicatus est in Aegypto, ${ }^{18}$ donec exortus est alius rex, qui non nouerat loseph. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{Hic}$ circumueniens genus nostrum, afflixit patres nostros, vt exponerent infantes suos, ne foetus essent vitales. ${ }^{20}$ Eodem tempore natus est Moses, et fuit gratus deo, qui nutritus est tribus mensibus in domo patris. ${ }^{21}$ Expositum autem illum sustulit filia Pharaonis, et nutriuit eum sibi vice filii. ${ }^{22}$ Et eruditus est Moses omni sapientia Aegyptiorum, et erat potens in factis et in dictis. ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Vt}$ vero expletum est ei quadraginta annorum tempus,
 Houons $A B$, $\mu \omega \cup \sigma \eta s C D \mid 23$ ws $B-E$ : os $A$

14 omnemque $B-E$ : et omnem $A \mid 15$ defunctusque $B-E$ : et defunctus $A \mid 17$ de qua $B-E$ : quam $A \mid$ Abrahae $B-E$ : Abrabae $A \mid 18$ donec exortus est $B-E$ : quoadusque surrexit $A \mid$ nouerat $B-E$ : nouit $A \mid 21$ sustulit $B-E$ : sustulit eum $A \mid$ vice filii $B-E$ : in filium $A \mid 23$ Vt vero expletum est $B$ - $E$ : Cum autem impleretur $A$
 Greek aorist. Erasmus makes a similar addition at Mt. 14,35; Act. 20,17, to supply an object for the verb. Cf. also his addition of satellitibus at Mt. 2,16, and of carnificibus at Mt. 14,10. Manetti put Misit ... et.
14 omnemque kai $\pi \alpha ̃ \sigma \alpha \nu$ ("et omnem" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
 addition of suam is retained from the late Vulgate, with support from codd. D E and
many later mss. Erasmus' Greek text here follows cod. 2815 in omitting oútoũ after ouy ${ }^{\text {évelon }}$, in company with $7^{74}$ א A B C and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
 tus est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39. Manetti replaced this with et mortuus est.
$16{ }^{\text {'E }}$ º́p. This spelling is derived from cod. 2815. Codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. have ' $Е \mu \mu o ́ \rho$, though some have ' $Е \mu \mu \omega \prime \rho$.

17 de qua ĩs（＂quam＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus probably felt that to＂swear a promise＂，or to ＂confess a promise＂was an unnatural form of expression，and hence substituted a prepositional phrase．
17 iuraucrat $\nleftarrow \mu \circ \sigma \varepsilon v$（＂confessus erat＂${ }^{\text {Vg．}}$ ．）As Erasmus discerns in 1535 Annot．，the Vulgate reflects a different Greek text，$\omega \mu 0 \lambda \delta \gamma \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ ， as found in $\mathbf{7}^{74}$（※）A B C and eight later
 $7^{95} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{E}$ and one other．Erasmus follows cod． 2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and about 440 other late mss．（see Aland Die Apostel－ geschicbte 470－1）．Manetti made the same change as Erasmus．
17 ह̇m $\lambda \eta \theta \dot{v} v \theta \eta$ ．Erasmus＇cod． 2815 had $\mathfrak{k \pi} \pi \lambda \eta$－ Óveto，found in very few other mss．His text follows the reading of codd．1， 2816 and nearly all other mss．
18 donec äxpıs oũ（＂quoadusque＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． A similar substitution occurs at 1 Cor．4，5； Hebr．1，13，in rendering $\neq \omega 5$ oũ．Elsewhere， Erasmus retains quoadusque at Mt．18，34；$L$ c． 24,$49 ;$ Ap．Iob． 7,3 ，in rendering both of these Greek phrases．
18 exortus est àvéotin（＂surrexit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Act．6，9．
 Aegypto＂late Vg．）．The added words of the Vulgate，in Aegypto，reflect a Greek variant adding $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ Aliyumtov，found in $77^{33 v i d} 74 \mathrm{~K}$ A B C and some later mss．Erasmus follows his cod．2815，this time with support from 7 ${ }^{45 v i d i d}$ D E，together with most of the later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti put rex alter．
18 nouerat ${ }^{n} \delta \mathrm{E}$（＂sciebat＂Vg．；＂nouit＂1516）． See on Ioh．1，33，and Annot．The version of Manetti had cognoscebat．
19 foetus essent vitales 弓ん○үoveĩöal（＂viuifica－ rentur＂$V$ g．）．Elsewhere，Erasmus reserves viuifico mainly for $\zeta \omega \circ \pi+\frac{1}{6} \omega$ ，in the context of bringing to life something which was dead．A different verb is appropriate to the arrival of a newborn child．In Annot．，Erasmus suggests partus rather than foetus．Manetti tried viuerent．
$20 M \omega \sigma \eta{ }^{\prime}$ ．The reading $\mu \omega$ ürins，found in the 1516－27 editions，was supported by codd．1， 2815 and 2816．See on Act．3，22．
20 patris toũ motpós（＂patris sui＂Vg．）．The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant adding oútoũ，as in codd．D E and some later mss．，
including cod． $2816^{\text {corr．}}$ ．Erasmus follows cod． 2815，supported by codd．1，2816＊and most other mss．，commencing with $\$ 7^{74}$ \＆A B C． The version of Manetti similarly omitted sui．
 posito ．．．illo＂Vg．）．The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having ėkte日̇̇̀vtos $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ đủtoũ，found in $7^{74}$ A B C D and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，with cod．E and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti put Expositum ．．．ipsum．
21 sustulit ávei $\lambda$ हтo aủtóv（＂sustulit eum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）Erasmus leaves aútóv untranslated， probably regarding eum as superfluous after illum．The Greek word is in fact omitted in many later mss．，but not in those which Eras－ mus usually consulted．Manetti made the same omission．
21 vice filii єis vióv（＂in filium＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Instead of the literal translation offered by the Vulgate，Erasmus makes the sense clearer．Other substitutions of vice，with the genitive，occur at 1 Cor．14，22； 2 Cor． 6,18 （both in 1519）． Cf．on vs． 5 ，above，for an alternative treatment of eis by using the gerundive．
22 M $\omega \sigma \tilde{n} s$ ．The reading $\mu 0 u ̈ \sigma \tilde{n} s$ ，in Erasmus＇ 1516－19 editions，was not taken from his codd． 1,2815 or 2816 ，which all had $\mu \omega$ Üбñs，as adopted in 1522－27．See on Act．3，22．
 （＂verbis et in operibus suis＂Vg．）．Erasmus follows the word－order of cod．2815，in company with only a few other late mss．The word－order of the Vulgate is better supported，but the addition of suis reflects a Greek variant，adding cu̇toũ，as found in p $^{74 v i d}$ \＆A B CDE and some later mss．（codd． 1 and 2816 have $\lambda$ óyous
 dictum for verbum also at Mt．12，37；19，11； Lc．12，10（1519）；Act．7，29（1519）．For the sub－ stitution of factum for opus，see on Ioh．3，21． Manetti had verbis et operibus．
 ．．．impleretur＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The spelling ös in 1516 is a misprint，possibly caused by the fact that cod． 2815 has the $-\omega$－as a rubricated capital．See on lob． 15,25 regarding expleo．In using $v t$ for $\omega \varsigma$ ，Erasmus follows the practice of the Vulgate at a number of other passages． Manetti put $V t$ ．．．impletum est．
23 vero $8 \dot{\varepsilon}$（＂autem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on lob． 1,26 ．
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subiit in cor eius, vt inuiseret fratres suos filios Israel. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Et}$ quum vidisset quendam iniuria affici, defendit eum, et vltus est vicem eius qui affligebatur, percusso Aegyptio. ${ }^{25}$ Existimabat autem intelligere fratres suos, quod deus per manum ipsius daret salutem illis. At illi non intellexerunt. ${ }^{26} \mathrm{Et}$ sequenti die conspectus est illis litigantibus, et redegit eos in concordiam, dicens: Viri, fratres estis, cur vos inuicem laeditis? ${ }^{27}$ Caeterum is qui iniuriam faciebat proximo repulit eum, dicens: Quis te constituit principem ac iudicem super nos? ${ }^{28}$ Nunquid interficere me tu vis, quemadmodum interfecisti heri Aegyptium? ${ }^{29}$ Fugit autem Moses ad dictum hoc, et factus est aduena in terra Madian, vbi generauit filios duos. ${ }^{30}$ Et expletis annis quadraginta, apparuit illi in deserto montis Sina angelus domini in flammeo incendio rubi.



23 subiit $B$ - $E$ : ascendit $A \mid 24$ defendit ... eius $B$ - $E$ : vindicauit illum et fecit vltionem, ei $A \mid$ 26 conspectus $C-E$ : visus $A B \mid$ redegit $B-E$ : reconciliabat $A \mid$ concordiam $B-E$ : pacem $A \mid$ laeditis $C-E$ : leditis $A B \mid 27$ Caeterum is qui $B-E$ : Qui autem $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 29$ ad dictum hoc $B-E$ : in verbo isto $A \mid 30$ flammeo incendio $B-E$ : flamma ignis $A$

23 subiit $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} v \in ́ \beta \eta$ ("ascendit" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' choice of verb is better suited to the context. On other substitutions for ascendo, see on Ioh. 6,17.

23 inuiseret Éगा॰кќ $\psi \propto 0 \theta \propto 1$ ("visitaret" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Hebr. 2,6; Iac. 1,27. Erasmus retains visito at seven other passages. The verb inuiso is used at four passages of the Vulgate O.T.

24 iniuria affici ${ }^{\alpha} \delta ı к о$ únevov ("iniuriam patientem" Vg.). On another occasion, Erasmus uses iniuriam patior to render the same Greek verb, at 1 Cor. 6,7. On afficio, see on lob. 8,49.

24 defendit $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu u ̛ v \propto r o$ ("vindicauit" $1516=V g$.). Elsewhere, Erasmus reserves vindico for ék (Lc. 18,3, 5; Ap. Ioh. 6,10; 19,2).

24 eum ("illum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change hardly affects the sense of the passage. Possibly Erasmus wanted to make clear that both this pronoun, and also eius later in the verse, refer to the same person. Manetti, translating more literally, omitted the pronoun.
 vltionem, ei" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus seeks to improve on the over-literal rendering used by the Vulgate. Manetti tried fecit vindictam.
 iniuriam sustinebat" Vg.). Erasmus takes this Greek verb as being synonymous with $\theta \lambda i \beta o \mu \alpha 1$. He also wished, no doubt, to avoid the repetition of iniuria.
25 suos củtoũ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate reflects the omission of aútoũ, as in $37^{74} \times \mathrm{BC}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. A D E. Manetti also added suos.
25 quod Őtı ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
 Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek text substituting $\delta \varepsilon$ for $\tau \varepsilon$, as in cod. E and some later mss. Erasmus, as usual, follows his cod. 2815, this time supported by $37^{74} \aleph A B C D D^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put ac sequenti.

26 conspectus est $\omega \varphi \theta \eta$ ("apparuit" Vg.; "visus est" 1516-19). See on Act. 2,3. At the present passage, Erasmus wished to avoid any idea that this was a supernatural manifestation.
26 redegit $\sigma u v \dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ ("reconciliabat" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate imperfect tense reflects the Greek variant, $\sigma u v \dot{\eta} \lambda \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon v$, as found in $7^{74} \times$ B C D and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, with support from codd. 1 and 2816, together with codd. A E and most of the later mss. On redigo, see the next note.
 mss.; "pace" late Vg.). Usually Erasmus retains pax. He may have taken the phrase redigo ... in concordiam from Plautus (Amphitruo 475), regarding this as more idiomatic than the Vulgate rendering.
26 cur ivaxi ("vt quid" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Mt. 27,46 (1519), and also in rendering eis Ti at $M c .15,34$, and Ti at Rom. 8,24 (1519). In rendering ivorti at $L c$. 13,7 (1519), Erasmus substituted ad quid.
 cetis alterutrum" Vg.). Erasmus completely removes alterutrum from the N.T., as it means "one or the other" rather than "one another". Sometimes he substitutes inter se or mutuo. In rendering $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta ı k \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$, Erasmus makes this substitution at Phm .18 , but retains noceo at Lc. 10,19; Act. 25,11, and in seven places in the Apocalypse. He further introduces laedo
at 2 Cor. 7,12. Manetti proposed iniuriamini adinuicem.
27 Caeterum is qui ó $\delta$ ह́ ("Qui autem" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On caeterum, see on Act. 6,2. Erasmus adds the pronoun is, simply to provide an antecedent for the following qui.
$27 a c$ kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti also had ac.
27 ŋjuãs. The reading úpãs in $1516-22$, being unsuited to the context and contrary to Erasmus' mss., no doubt arose from a printer's error. Although this was corrected in 1527, the same error was reintroduced in 1535 . Other Greek misprints introduced in 1535, in Acts, will be found at Act. 8,$7 ; 9,8 ; 10,17,22,30 ; 20,4 ; 24,5$; 26,$16 ; 27,17$. For such misprints in the Gospel of John, see on Ioh. 1,24.
29 M $\omega \sigma$ ñs. For Erasmus' preference for the spelling $\mu \omega$ üбग̃ँs in 1522-27, see on Act. 3,22. Codd. 1, 2815 and 2816 have $\mu \omega$ ひ̈б $\eta$ s here.
 verbo isto" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On dictum, see on vs. 22. Regarding boc for isto, see on vs. 4.
29 Madian Maסıớv. The Greek spelling in 1522-35 has been conformed with the late Vulgate. In Erasmus' earlier editions, the spelling, more correctly, was $\mu \alpha \delta \iota_{\alpha} \mu$, as in most of the Greek mss.
30 domini kupiou (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\$ \boldsymbol{p}^{74} \aleph$ A B C and a few later mss. Erasmus followed cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. D E. The same change was made by Manetti.
30 flammeo incendio $\varphi$ 入оү ${ }^{1}$ тupós ("igne flammae" Vg.; "flamma ignis" 1516). The Vulgate appears to reflect a Greek variant, mupi $\varphi \lambda 0 \gamma o ́ s$, found in $7^{74}$ A C E and some later mss. Erasmus followed his cod. 2815, supported on this occasion by codd. ※ B D and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. This may be contrasted with 2 Thess. 1,8, where most of the mss. have mupi pioyós, while the Vulgate implies $\varphi \lambda 0 \gamma i$ muposs: at that passage, Erasmus has incendio flammae. He further substitutes incendium for ignis at Mt. 5,22 (1519) and Iud. 23, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Ap. Ioh. 18,9, 18. In Annot. on the present passage, he indicates that he has modified the Hebraistic idiom for the sake of better Latin style. Manetti substituted flamma ignis, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
${ }^{31}$ ó $\delta$ ह̀ M $\omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$ iठ
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${ }^{31}$ Moses autem vt conspexit, admiratus est visum. Porro quum accederet vt attenderet, facta est ad eum vox domini: ${ }^{32}$ Ego sum deus patrum tuorum, deus Abraham, deus Isaac, et deus Iacob. Tremefactus autem Moses, non audebat attendere. ${ }^{33}$ Dixit autem illi dominus: Solue calciamentum pedum tuorum: locus enim in quo stas, terra sancta est. ${ }^{34}$ Vidi, vidi, inquam, afflictionem populi mei qui est in Aegypto, et gemitum eorum audiui, et descendi vt eruam eos. Nunc venito, et mittam te in Aegyptum. ${ }^{35}$ Hunc Mosen quem negauerunt, dicentes, Quis te constituit principem et iudicem? - hunc, inquam, deus principem et redemptorem miserat per manum angeli, qui apparuerat illi in rubo. ${ }^{36} \mathrm{Hic}$ eduxit illos, aedens prodigia et signa in Aegypto, et in rubro mari, et in deserto annis quadraginta. ${ }^{37} \mathrm{Hic}$ est Moses, qui dixit | filiis Israel:
 $A|32 \mu \omega \sigma \eta s E: \mu \circ \sigma \sigma \eta s A B, \mu \omega v \sigma \eta s C D| 35 \mu \omega \sigma \eta \nu E: \mu \omega v \sigma \eta \nu A C D, \mu \nu \sigma \sigma \eta \nu B \mid$ $37 \mu \omega \sigma \eta s$ : $\mu \omega v \sigma \eta s$ A-D

31 vt conspexit $B$ - $E$ : videns $A \mid$ Porro ... attenderet $B-E$ : Et accedente illo vt consyderaret $A$
32 attendere $B-E$ : consyderare $A \mid 33$ dominus $B-E$ : deus $A \mid 34$ Vidi, vidi $B-E$ : Videns vidi $A \mid$ inquam $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ venito $B-E$ : veni $A \mid 35$ inquam $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ miserat per manum $B-E$ : misit in manu $A \mid$ apparuerat $B-E$ : apparuit $A \mid 36$ aedens $B-E$ : faciens $A$

31 M $\omega \sigma \tilde{n} s$. In 1516-27, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in reading $\mu \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \tilde{\rho}$, in company with codd. 1 and 2816. See on Act. 3,22.
31 vt conspexit i i $\omega$ v ("videns" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist.
31 admiratus est $\varepsilon \theta \propto \cup \cup \mu \alpha \sigma \varepsilon$. In 1516, Erasmus had the imperfect tense, $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \propto \cup \cup \mu \alpha \zeta \varepsilon$, derived from cod. 2815 , in company with codd. 1,2816 and most other mss., commencing with $37^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ D E. His adoption of the aorist, $\varepsilon$ 解u $\mu \alpha \sigma \varepsilon$, in 1519, produced conformity with the Vulgate,
with support from codd. A B C and only a few of the later mss. (not including cod. 3). Although a scribal error could easily have occurred in changing just one letter, this reading may have originated as a harmonisation with the tense of the preceding participle, $i \delta \omega v$. Nevertheless, it later became established as part of the Textus Receptus.
 $\alpha u ́ t o u ̃ ~(" E t ~ a c c e d e n t e ~ i l l o " ~ 1516 ~=~ V g.) . ~ T h e ~$ 1516 edition, by a misprint, substitutes a
capital $\Pi$ for the $\pi \rho$ - of $\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon \rho X о \mu$ v́vou. The construction with quum here does not significantly affect the meaning, except that it gives Erasmus the opportunity to reduce the number of pronouns. On porro, see on Ioh. 8,16. Manetti had et accedente eo.
31 vt attenderet кат $\alpha v \circ \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha_{1}$ ("vt consyderaret" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs in vs. 32, though Erasmus retains considero at Iac. 1,234. Possibly he wanted a verb which conveyed the sense of visual examination rather than mental reflection, but attendo also introduces an unwanted connotation of "listening": Moses did not know that he would hear anything until after he had begun to draw near to the burning bush.
31 vox domini $\varphi \omega v \eta$ kupíou ("vox domini dicens" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition of dicens has only slender support among the Greek mss.
32 deus Isaac kai ò $\theta$ हòs ’loaćk. Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in leaving kaí untranslated. Manetti inserted ac before deus.
32 M $\omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. The reading $\mu$ oüбñs in 1516-19 was not based on Erasmus' usual mss., and was probably an arbitrary correction. In 1522-7, as noted elsewhere, Erasmus' favoured spelling was $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \tilde{\lceil } s$, as found in codd. 1, 2815 and 2816. See on Act. 3,22.

32 attendere кот $\propto \nu 0 \eta ̃ \sigma \propto ı$ ("consyderare" 1516 = Vg.). See on vs. 31.
33 dominus ó kúplos ("deus" 1516 Lat.). The reading deus, which lacks Greek ms. support, is found in some editions of the late Vulgate, such as that of Froben in 1491, and probably originally arose as a misreading of dns, the shortened form of dominus. A similar variation occurs at Act. 8,25.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus replaces the more literal Hebraistic expression. On his addition of inquam, for solemn emphasis, see on Ioh. 1,20. In Annot., he also suggested Attente vidi.
34 vt eruam ${ }^{\ell} \xi \xi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \propto ı$ ("liberare" Vg.). The change of verb is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt. 5,29; 18,9. Erasmus also follows the Vulgate in using eripio for $\varepsilon \xi \propto<1 p \varepsilon ́ \omega$ at several other passages. For his avoidance of the infinitive, see on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti put vt liberarem.
34 Nunc kaì vũv ("Et nunc" Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal here.

34 venito $\delta$ \&ũpo ("veni" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On this form of the imperative, see on Iob. 12,27. This rendering was proposed by Valla: see Annot., where Erasmus follows Valla Annot. in mentioning the possible misunderstanding of veni as the perfect indicative, "I have come".
34 et mittam kai $\alpha$ สтоõт $\lambda \tilde{\omega}$. The addition of ká is unsupported by Greek mss., and appears to be a conjecture, designed to harmonise with the Vulgate rendering. Manetti had vt mittam (though $v t$ was omitted by the first hand of PaL. Lat. 45).
$35 M \omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu$. The reading $\mu \omega \cup ̈ \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu$ in 1516 was derived from cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1 and 2816. This was arbitrarily corrected to $\mu 0$ ü $\sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu$ in 1519, then back to $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu$ in 1522, and finally $\mu \omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu$ in 1535. See on Act. 3,22.
35 inquam (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus adds inquam to mark the resumption from the earlier bunc at the beginning of the verse: see on Iob. 1,20.
35 miserat ... apparuerat ódrt่́ ("misit ... apparuit" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' choice of the pluperfect is questionable, as it could make it appear that the incident of the burning bush took place before the killing of the Egyptian.
35 per manum हैv Xelpí ("cum manu" Vg.; "in manu" 1516). Erasmus in 1519 selects a phrase which is more natural in the present context. Manetti had in manu, as used by Erasmus in 1516.

36 aedens moıñ $\sigma \alpha$ ("faciens" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,11. Manetti, rendering the Greek aorist more accurately, put cum fecisset.
36 Aegypto $\boldsymbol{T}$ ñ Alyúmiu ("terra Aegypti" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with the variant, $\gamma \tilde{\eta}$ Aiyútitou, found in $\boldsymbol{p p}^{74} \mathrm{D}$ and some later mss., and later adopted by the Textus Receptus. Erasmus seems to have misread his mss., for codd. 1, 2815 have $\gamma \tilde{n}$ for $T \tilde{1}$ (while cod. 2816 has neither $\gamma \tilde{n}$ nor $\tau \tilde{n}$ ). The article nowhere else occurs with Allyumtos in Erasmus' N.T., even though he here enjoys the support of codd. B C and a few of the later mss. The most widely attested reading is $\gamma \tilde{n} \mathrm{Al}$ $\gamma^{\prime} \mathbf{u}^{\prime \prime} T \omega$, found in codd. \& A E and most later mss.
$37 \mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} s$. The spelling in the $1516-27$ editions, $\mu \omega$ üのñऽ, was based on cod. 2815, again supported by codd. 1 and 2816. See on Act. 3,22.
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Prophetam suscitabit vobis dominus deus vester e fratribus vestris similem mei, illum audietis. ${ }^{38} \mathrm{Hic}$ est qui fuit in congregatione in solitudine cum angelo qui loquebatur ei in monte Sina, et cum patribus nostris, qui accepit sermonem viuum vt daret nobis. ${ }^{39} \mathrm{Cui}$ noluerunt obedire patres nostri, sed repulerunt et auersi sunt corde suo in Aegyptum, ${ }^{40}$ dicentes ad Aaron: Fac nobis deos qui praecedant nos. Mosi enim huic, qui eduxit nos de terra Aegypti, nescimus quid acciderit. ${ }^{41} \mathrm{Et}$ vitulum fecerunt in diebus illis, et obtulerunt hostiam simulachro, et laetabantur super operibus manuum suarum. ${ }^{42}$ Conuertit se autem deus, et tradidit eos vt colerent militiam coeli, sicut scriptum est in libro prophetarum: Num victimas et hostias



37 dominus $E$ : om. $A-D \mid$ vester $B-E:$ om. $A \mid$ e $B-E: \operatorname{de} A \mid$ similem mei, illum $B-E$ : tanquam me ipsum $A \mid 38$ congregatione $B$ - $E$ : ecclesia $A \mid 40$ acciderit $B$ - $E$ : acciderit sit ei $A$ | 41 hostiam $A$-D: hostium $E \mid$ simulachro $E$ : simulacro $A-D \mid$ laetabantur super $B-E$ : letabantur in $A \mid 42$ colerent militiam $B$-E: seruirent militiae $A \mid$ Num $B-E$ : Nunquid $A$

37 dominus kúpıos (omitted in 1516-27 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{74} \aleph$ A B D and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text, apart from the misprint kúpıev in 1516, followed cod. 2815, in company with codd. C E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti similarly added dominus.

37 vester $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $33^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C D and a few later mss. Erasmus took $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ from cod. 2815 , in common with codd. 1, $2816^{\text {corr }}$ and many other late mss. In cod. E and most of the later mss., including cod. $2816^{* v i d}$, the reading is $\eta \dot{\eta} \tilde{\omega} \nu$. Manetti, accordingly, added noster.

37 e ék ("de" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,15. Manetti had ex.

37 similem mei, illum audietis $\dot{\text { @่s }}$ éné, aủtoũ
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 3,22 for a similar change. Erasmus did not find aútoũ ókoúveo $\theta \varepsilon$ in his codd. 1 or 2815, but the words appear as a later correction in his cod. 2816, possibly by harmonisation with Act. 3,22. In support of this longer reading are codd. $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{D}) \mathrm{E}$ and some later mss., and this is the reading which remained in the Textus Receptus. The words aútoũ ákoú $\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ are omitted in most of the Greek mss., commencing with $\mathbb{\aleph}$ A B, with support from some mss. of the Vulgate: see Annot. In copies of the late Vulgate, me ipsum is written as one word, meipsum, leading Erasmus to speculate that the text underlying the Vulgate was $\dot{\omega}$ ह́ $\varepsilon \mu \alpha u \tau 0$ ũ. Manetti (both mss.) had tanquam me, omitting ipsum audietis.

38 congregatione $\boldsymbol{T \eta}$ èkк $\lambda \eta \sigma$ ợ ("ecclesia" 1516 $=$ Vg. 1527, and Vg. mss.; "ecclesia et" Annot., lemma). See on $A c t .5,11$. In the present context, referring to the Old Testament, Erasmus probably felt that the Christian connotation of "church" or ecclesia was anachronistic. In Annot., he further comments on the redundant insertion of $e t$ after ecclesia in some copies of the late Vulgate, though it is not added in the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514.
38 sermonem viuиm $\lambda$ о́yov $\zeta \tilde{\omega} \nu t \alpha$ ("verba vitae" Vg.). On sermo, see on Iob. 1,1. The Vulgate would correspond with a different Greek wording, such as $\lambda$ óyous $\zeta \omega$ ग̃js (cf. Pbil. 2,16; 1 Iob.
 but without ms. support at the present passage. Erasmus derived $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o v$ from his cod. 2815, with many other late mss. in support. In 1519 Annot., he also shows awareness of the reading, $\lambda \hat{\sigma}^{\gamma}$ ।a $\zeta \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha$, found in his codd. 1, 3 and 2816, in company with $\boldsymbol{p}^{(45) 74}$ \& A B C D E and many later mss. The latter reading was reflected in Manetti's eloquia viuentia.
38 vt daret $\delta$ oũval ("dare" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33 . Manetti made the same change.
38 nobis inuiv ("vobis" late $\mathrm{Vg} .=1519-35$ Annot., lemma). The reading attributed to the Vulgate in Annot. is found in the Froben edition of 1491, though not in the 1514 edition or in Erasmus' 1527 Vulgate column. It corresponds with Univ, found in $77^{74} \times B$ and some later mss.
39 nostri $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \omega ̃ \nu$ ("vestri" late Vg . $=$ Annot., lemma). Again, in Annot,, a reading is attributed to the Vulgate, in conflict with the text of the 1527 Vulgate column, and this time having only a few late mss. in support. The reading vestri is found in several late Vulgate editions, including those of Froben in 1491 and 1514.
39 corde suo $\tau \pi ̃ 1$ каpסíạ $\alpha u ̉ \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("cordibus suis" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, substituting taĩs kapסíals aủt $\omega$ v, found in
 Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and most other late mss. (cod. $2816^{\text {corr }}$ has

40 nobis $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{iv}$. From the context, and the retention of nobis in the Latin rendering, it is clear that $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \tilde{v}$ is the intended reading, and that $\dot{u} \mu i v$ is nothing but a printer's error of 1519-35.
 was contrary to the reading of codd. 1,2815
and 2816, which had $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \tilde{\eta} s$, as adopted for the 1522-27 editions. See on Act. 3,22.
 "acciderit sit ei" 1516). The duplication of wording in the 1516 edition perhaps arose from an imperfectly marked correction, either in a marked-up copy of the Vulgate which Erasmus gave to the printer, or in the proofs. Erasmus may have written acciderit in the margin or between the lines, and struck out factum without also scoring through the word sit. In 1519, a further error seems to have occurred, as instead of just deleting sit, the printer also omitted the following word, ei. It is unlikely that this is what Erasmus intended, as the pronoun was present in his Greek text and there was no particular reason why he should have wished to omit it from his rendering. The substitution of acido is frequent elsewhere in the N.T., being introduced at nineteen passages in 1516, and a further twenty-seven in 1519, in keeping with Erasmus' wish to vary from the monotonous repetition of facio. See on Iob. 1,15. Manetti had acciderit ei.
41 bostiam $\theta$ voiav ("hostium" 1535). The spelling bostium is an unfortunate misprint of the 1535 edition, which would produce an absurd interpretation of the passage, whether as the accusative of ostium (cf. Mc. 1,33; 1 Cor. 16,9), or as the genitive plural of bostis.
41 super èv ("in" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 3,10.
42 Conuertit se Ëのтpeqe ("Conuertit" Vg.). This change is comparable with Vulgate usage at Act. 3,26. A reflexive sense is required by the context.
 ("seruire militiae" Vg.; "vt seruirent militiae" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,33, for the avoidance of the infinitive. The substitution of colo occurs at nine other passages, for seruio and deseruio, but at nine further passages containing this Greek verb, the Vulgate rendering is retained. See Annot. on Rom. 1,9, where Erasmus distinguishes between $\lambda \propto \pi \rho \in \dot{v} \omega$ and $\delta$ ou入dé $\omega$. Manetti's version (PaL Lat. 45) had vt servirent militiae.
42 Num Mí ("Nunquid" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 3,4.
42 et (2nd.) kai ("aut" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. In view of the discrepancy between the Vulgate at this passage and the Vulgate rendering of $A m .5,25$, it seems possible that the Vulgate may originally have read et here, which was later altered to aut by scribal error.
































obtulistis mihi annis quadraginta in deserto, domus Israel? ${ }^{43}$ Et suscepistis tabernaculum Moloch, et sydus dei vestri Rempham, figuras quas fecistis ad adorandum eas. Et transferam vos vitra Babylonem. ${ }^{44}$ Tabernaculum testimonii fuit patribus nostris in deserto, sicut ordinauerat illis, loquens ad Mosen vt faceret illud secundum formam, quam viderat. ${ }^{45}$ Quod et induxerunt, qui successerunt, patres nostri cum Iesu in possessionem gentium, quas expulit deus a facie patrum nostrorum vsque ad dies Dauid, ${ }^{46}$ qui inuenit gratiam coram deo, et petiit vt inueniret tabernaculum deo Iacob. ${ }^{47}$ Solomon autem aedificauit illi domum. ${ }^{48} \mathrm{Sed}$ excelsissimus ille non in manufactis templis habitat, sicut propheta dicit: ${ }^{49}$ Coelum mihi sedes est, terra autem scabellum pedum meorum. Quam domum aedificabitis mihi, dicit dominus, aut quis locus requietionis meae est? ${ }^{50}$ Nonne manus mea fecit haec omnia? ${ }^{51}$ Duri ceruice et incircuncisi corde et auribus, vos semper spiritui sancto resistitis, sicut patres vestri, ita et vos. ${ }^{52}$ Quem prophetarum non sunt persequuti patres vestri? Et occiderunt eos qui praenunciabant de aduentu iusti illius, cuius vos nunc proditores et occisores fuistis: ${ }^{53}$ qui accepistis

52 qoveis $A$-C: $甲$ wvess $D E$
43 sydus $B-E$ : sidus $A \mid$ vitra $B-E$ : in $A \mid 44$ nostris $B-E$ : vestris $A \mid$ ordinauerat $B-E$ : disposuit $A \mid 46$ coram deo $B-E$ : ante deum $A \mid 47$ Solomon $B$-E: Salomon $A \mid 48$ excelsissimus ille non $C-E$ : non is est excelsissimus qui $A B \mid$ habitat $D E$ : habitet $A$-C | 51 Duri $B$-E: Dura $A$ | resistitis $B$-E: restitistis $A \mid 52$ illius $C$-E: om. $A B \mid$ occisores $B$-E: homicidae $A$

43 ad adorandum тробкuvEiv ("adorare" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33, and also Annot., where Erasmus suggests an alternative rendering, vt adoretis. Manetti preferred the imperfect subjunctive, $v t$ adoraretis.

43 vltra $\begin{gathered}\text { érékelva ("in" } 1516 \text { = late Vg.; "trans" }\end{gathered}$ Vg. 1527 and Vg. mss.). In 1522 Annot., Erasmus says that he found in in some copies of the Vulgate ("nonnullis exemplaribus"). A comparable substitution of viltra occurs at $M t .4,15$, in
rendering $\pi$ ह́pav, following the example of the Vulgate at Mc. 10,1. More often, Erasmus retains trans. For Stunica's speculation that the Greek text originally had étrékeiva $\Delta \alpha \mu \alpha \sigma$ кoũ, see Erasmus Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 148, 11. 732-746. Manetti put in.
44 fuit $\mathrm{T}^{0} v$ ("fuit cum" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering reflects the addition of $\dot{\varepsilon} v$, as found in codd. D* E and many later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by $7^{74} \times \mathrm{ABCD} \mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816: see Annot. The version of Manetti put erat cum.
44 nostris $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \omega \tilde{v}$ ("vestris" 1516 Lat.). The 1516 rendering corresponds with the Froben Vulgate edition of 1491, though not the 1514 edition or the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. Cf. vestri for nostri at vs. 45. It corresponds with the reading $\dot{u} \mu \omega \tilde{v}$, found in cod. A and some later mss. Manetti had vestris, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
 deus" late Vg.; "disposuit illis" 1516 Lat.). A similar substitution of ordino occurs at Act. 20,13 (1519); Tit. 1,5, in accordance with Vulgate usage at 1 Cor. 9,$14 ; 16,1 ;$ Gal. 3,19 . However, Erasmus retains dispono for this Greek verb at Lc. 22,29; Hebr. 8,10, and for $\delta 1 \propto \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ at 1 Cor. 11,34. For his preference for the pluperfect tense, see on Iob. 1,19. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in adding the pronoun, illis, without explicit Greek support. Nor does the further late Vulgate addition of deus enjoy any support from the Greek mss.: see Annot. The version of Manetti had just disposuit.
44 M $\omega \sigma$ ñ. Erasmus here departs from the spelling $\mu \omega$ ü̃ñ, found in his codd. 1,2815 and 2816. See on Act. 3,22.

45 qui successerunt $\delta 1 \alpha \delta \varepsilon \xi \alpha \dot{\alpha} E v O I$ ("suscipientes" Vg .). Erasmus corrects a serious mistranslation by the Vulgate. The Greek verb does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.
45 nostri $\dagger \mu \omega \tilde{\nu}$ ("vestri" late $\mathrm{Vg} .=$ Annot., lemma ). The late Vg . reading lacks Greek support. It is found in the Froben Vulgate of 1491, but not in his 1514 edition or in Erasmus' 1527 Vulgate column. See Annot.
 diebus" Vg.). See on Act. 1,2. Manetti put vsque in dies.
46 coram deo évஸ́miov toũ $\theta$ छoũ ("ante deum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus similarly removes ante
deum at seven other passages, in rendering
 19; 16,15; Act. 23,1 (all in 1519); 1 Thess. 1,3; 3,13. He retains ante deum only at $A p$. Iob. 16,19. Cf. on Act. 3,13 and 6,6, for his treatment of ante faciem and ante conspectum. Manetti anticipated this change.
48 excelissimus ille non oúx ò íqiotos ("non excelsus" Vg ;" "non is est excelsissimus qui" 1516-19). Erasmus is more accurate in using the superlative. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 16,17. Elsewhere, he generally follows the Vulgate in rendering this Greek word by altissimus. Manetti put excelsus ... non.
48 manufactis Xelpotrorítols ("manu factis" Vg.). Erasmus objects in Annot, that this should be written as a single word, and it was so printed in his 1527 Vulgate column.
48 templis vaoĩs (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{\nexists}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C D E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti also added templis.
48 babitat кaтоккĩ ("habitet" 1516-22). This use of the subjunctive in 1516-22 is unnecessary, and may have been inadvertent.
48 propheta $\delta$ mpopítns ("per prophetam" late Vg.). The late Vulgate alteration is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti had propheta.
51 Duri ceruice et incircuncisi $\sigma k \lambda \eta \rho \circ т \rho o ́ x \eta \eta$ 이
 late Vg., and some Vg. mss.; "Dura ceruice et incircuncisi" 1516). The nominative used here by Erasmus is more literally accurate: cf. Annot.
51 corde 7 ñ kap $\delta i \neq$ ("cordibus" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text substituting kap $\delta$ íars, as in $7 ¥^{74}$ ( $\aleph$ ) A C D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti similarly had corde.
51 resistitis ávtıitimtere ("restitistis" $1516=$ late Vg .). Erasmus' use of the present tense is more accurate: see Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
52 iusti illius toũ סıkaiou ("iusti" 1516-19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). By adding illius, Erasmus emphasises that this individual was uniquely "the just one", conveying the sense of the Greek article.
52 occisores poveĩ ("homicidae" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The misspelling $\varphi \omega V$ Eĩ in $1527-35$ is not likely

Tòv vófov eis $\delta 1 \propto \tau \alpha \gamma \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \alpha^{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$, kai oủk દ̇qu入áधate．

54 ＇Akoúovtes סè taũta סııтtpiovto taĩs карסías $\alpha u ̉ \tau \omega ̃ \nu, ~ к \alpha i ~ \varepsilon ̂ ß p u \chi o v ~ t o u ̀ s ~ o ̉ \delta o ́ v-~$
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 $\gamma o ́ v \alpha T \alpha$, ékpa§є $\varphi \omega \nu \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \eta$ ，Kúplє，$\mu \grave{\eta}$



8इaũ入os $\delta \varepsilon ̇$ ग̃ $v$ ouveuסokw̃v Tท̃ ởval－




legem per dispositiones angelorum， nec seruastis．
${ }^{54}$ Audientes autem haec dissecaban－ tur cordibus suis，et stridebant denti－ bus suis in eum．${ }^{55}$ Quum autem esset plenus spiritu sancto，intentis in coe－ lum oculis，vidit gloriam dei，et Iesum stantem a dextris dei．${ }^{56} \mathrm{Et}$ ait：Ecce video coelos apertos，et filium homi－ nis stantem a dextris dei．${ }^{57}$ Exclaman－ tes autem voce magna，continuerunt aures suas，et impetum fecerunt vna－ nimiter in eum．${ }^{58} \mathrm{Et}$ eiectum eum e ciuitate lapidabant，ac testes de－ posuerunt vestimenta ad pedes adoles－ centis，qui vocabatur Saulus．${ }^{59} \mathrm{Et}$ lapidabant Stephanum inuocantem，ac dicentem：Domine Iesu，suscipe spiri－ tum meum．${ }^{60}$ Positis autem genibus， clamauit voce magna：Domine，ne statuas \｜illis peccatum hoc．Et quum LB 466 hoc dixisset obdormiuit．

8Saulus autem consenserat in ne－ cem eius．Facta est autem in illo die persequutio magna aduersus ecclesi－ am，quae erat Hierosolymis，et omnes dispersi sunt per regiones ludaeae et

54 alt．बuT由人 B－E：om．$A$
8，1 т $\varepsilon B-E: \delta \varepsilon A$

53 nec seruastis $B-E$ ：et non custodistis $A \mid 54$ alt．suis $B-E$ ：om．$A \mid 58$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ $\operatorname{ad} B-E$ ：sua secus $A \mid 59$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ spiritum $B-E$ ：sppiritum $A$
8，1 consenserat in necem $B-E$ ：erat consentiens neci $A \mid$ illo $B-E$ ：illa $A$
to have been Erasmus＇deliberate choice，as the word continues to be spelled poveis in Annot．，and at the other N．T．passages where it occurs．His preference for occisor，at first sight，appears inconsistent with his retention of bomicida on ten other occasions to render фoveús，and also ávep． póvos．See Annot．However，he probably disliked the construction of bomicida with an objective genitive，and solved the problem by using
occisor，a word which is rare in classical litera－ ture，but which he could have found in Plautus （Miles 1055）．Another possible alternative was interfector，somewhat more common in Latin authors．
 tione＂late Vg．）．The Vulgate use of the singular is unsupported by Greek mss．See Annot．The version of Manetti put in mandata．

53 nec kaì oủk ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,16.
 $=$ Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at $M t$. 19,20; Lc. 18,21; Act. 16,4 (1519); Rom. 2,26; Gal. 6,13; 1 Tim. 5,21; 6,20; 2 Tim. 1,14. Erasmus evidently regarded the combination of custodio and legem, etc., as poor Latin style, though he retained custodio in this sense at Lc. 11,28; Act. 21,24. Where the meaning, more literally, is to guard a person or a thing, Erasmus usually follows the Vulgate in using custodio, but he twice uses adseruo in such a context, in rendering mapatๆpé $\omega$ and $\varphi \cup$ $\lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$. See further on Act. 9,24.
54 suis (2nd.) $\propto \cup ̉ T \omega ̃ v ~(o m i t t e d ~ i n ~ 1516 ~=~ V g) . ~.$. In 1516, Erasmus or his assistants followed codd. 1, $2816^{*}$ and the Vulgate in rejecting $\alpha \cup \mathfrak{T} \tilde{\omega} \nu$, in company with most other mss. The word $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{\omega} \nu$ was found in his cod. 2815, while cod. $2816^{\text {corr }}$ had Éourãv. In 1519, Erasmus again found ou'tãv in cod. 3 and restored it to his text, supported only by cod. E and a few of the later mss.
55 intentis ... oculis árevioas ("intendens" Vg.). Greek aorist. See on Act. 1,10, for Erasmus' use of oculos intendo. Manetti preferred intuitus.
55-6 a dextris (twice) ék $\delta \varepsilon \xi 1 \omega ̃ \nu$ ("a dextris virtutis" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading is unsupported by Greek mss., as indicated in Annot., and appears to have arisen from harmonisation with Lc. 22,69. Manetti similarly omitted virtutis.
58 eiectum ék $\beta \propto \lambda o ́ v t e s$ ("eicientes" Vg.). Greek aorist.
58 e ciuitate $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$ т $\eta ̃ \varsigma$ тó $\lambda \in \omega \varsigma$ ("extra ciuitatem" Vg.). Similar substitutions occur at Mt. 21,17, 39; Mc. 12,8; Lc. 4,29; Act. 4,15; 14,19; 21,30. Erasmus retains extra at Mc. 5,10; 8,23; Lc. 20,15. Cf. on Act. 4,15. In Annot. on Mt. 21,39, Erasmus prefers $e$, as being "Latinius".
58 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek text adding $\alpha \cup \dot{T} \tilde{\omega} v$ or $\varepsilon \propto \cup \tau \tilde{v} v$, as in $\$$ A B C D E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1 , 2816 and most other late mss. However, the Vulgate elsewhere sometimes adds possessive pronouns when permitted by the context, even when absent from the Greek text: see on Ioh. 13,4.

58 ad mapá ("secus" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 4,35.
59 ac кхí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti also used ac here.
60 magna $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta$ ("magna dicens" Vg.). The Vulgate addition is supported only by cod. D and a few late mss. Manetti similarly omitted dicens.
60 peccatum boc тìv án $\mu \rho$ тíav тaútŋךv ("hoc peccatum, quia nesciunt quid faciunt" Vg. 1527). The Vulgate word-order may reflect a Greek text having $\tau \alpha u ́ T \eta \nu$ тì $\nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i \alpha v$, as in $7^{45 v i d}$ A B C D. However, the late Vulgate addition of quia ... faciunt is a harmonisation with $L c .23,34$, and lacks Greek ms. support. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, this time in company with $3^{374} \mathrm{~N}$ E and nearly all later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti had boc peccatum, as in the earlier Vulgate.
60 obdormiuit ékoı $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \eta$ ("obdormiuit in domino" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot. This passage was included in Erasmus' 1527 edition of his Quae Sint Addita. Manetti also omitted in domino.
 tiens" $1516=V g$.). The Vulgate is more accurate, though in less idiomatic Latin. Erasmus would have been closer to the Greek expression if he had used the imperfect tense, consentiebat, rather than the pluperfect.
 Erasmus' change of rendering was prompted by the consideration that in classical Latin a prepositional phrase was more normal after consentio, for specifying the course of action which was agreed or approved.
1 illo éksivñ ("illa" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29.
1 aduersus ecclesiam Ėדì tì̀v Ėkk $\lambda \eta \sigma$ í $\alpha$ ("in ecclesia" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. It is possible that the Vulgate originally read in ecclesiam, later altered by a scribal corruption. Cf. Annot. The version of Manetti put in ecclesiam.
$1 \tau \varepsilon$. The reading $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, in Erasmus' 1516 edition, is taken from cod. 2815, with support from $37^{74}$ B C D E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In 1519, he changed to $\tau \varepsilon$, in company with cod. A and a few later mss. (but not including cod. 3 ), in conformity with the Vulgate.
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Samariae praeter apostolos. ${ }^{2}$ Curauerunt autem vna Stephanum viri religiosi, feceruntque planctum magnum super eum. ${ }^{3}$ Saulus vero deuastabat ecclesiam per singulas domos intrans, trahensque viros ac mulieres tradebat in custodiam.
${ }^{4}$ Illi igitur dispersi peragrabant, annunciantes sermonem dei. ${ }^{5}$ Philippus autem peruenit in ciuitatem Samariae, ac praedicabat illis Christum. ${ }^{6}$ Intendebant autem turbae his, quae a Philippo dicebantur, vnanimiter audientes et videntes signa quae aedebat. ${ }^{7}$ Spiritus enim immundi, e multis qui ab illis tenebantur, exibant, clamantes voce magna. Multi autem paralytici et claudi sanati sunt. ${ }^{8}$ Et factum est gaudium magnum in illa ciuitate. ${ }^{9}$ Vir autem quidam nomine Simon, qui ante in ea ciuitate artem exercuerat magicam, ac gentem dementauerat Samariae, dicens

## 7 exovt $\omega \nu$ A-D: exovtov $E$

2 vna $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ religiosi, feceruntque $B$-E: timorati, et fecerunt $A \mid 3$ singulas $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ trahensque $B$-E: et trahens $A \mid 4$ Illi ... sermonem $B$-E: Igitur qui dispersi erant pertransibant, euangelizantes verbum $A \mid 5$ peruenit $B$-E: descendens $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: om. $A \mid 6$ aedebat $B$-E: faciebat $A \mid 7$ immundi $A^{c} B$-E: om. $A^{*} \mid$ exibant, clamantes voce magna $B$-E: clamantes voce magna exibant $A \mid$ sanati $B$-E: curati $A \mid 9$ ante $B$-E: ante fuerat $A \mid$ ea $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ exercuerat $B-E$ exercens $A \mid$ ac gentem dementauerat $B$-E: et seducens gentem $A$

2 Curauerunt... vna ouvekóuıбवv ("Curauerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus seeks to give a more precise rendering of the Greek compound verb: see Annot., where he interprets as simul curauerunt. For other additions of $v n a$, see on Act. 1,22. Manetti had contulerunt.
2 religiosi єủ入aßeĩs ("timorati" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change follows the example of the Vulgate at Act. 2,5. In rendering the same Greek word at Lc. 2,25, Erasmus substitutes pius, as also suggested in Annot. on the present passage. The word timoratus does not occur in classical Latin. Manetti anticipated the change made by Erasmus.

2 fecruntque kai Ėтoıṅoavto ("et fecerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,39.
3 vero dén ("autem" late Vg.). See on Iob. 1,26. $^{2}$
3 per singulas kató ("per" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 2,46. In Annot., Erasmus also recommends domesticatim.
3 trabensque $\sigma \dot{\prime} p \omega \nu$ Te ("et trahens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,39.
 ("Igitur qui dispersi erant" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus wishes to make clear the connection with those whom Saul persecuted, as described in the previous verse. See Annot. See also on Act. 1,6,
for another substitution of illi igitur. Manetti is closer to the Vulgate, with Qui igitur dispersi erant.
4 peragrabant $\delta_{1 \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \text { Ov ("pertransibant" } 1516}$ $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs in 1519 at Act. 9,32; 13,14, following the example of the Vulgate at $A c t$. 19,1. Erasmus also put peragro for transeo at Act. 14,24; 16,6 (1519), and for perambulo at Act. 13,6 (1519). The verb peragro conveys the sense of travelling through all parts of a particular area, rather than merely following a straight route from one side to the other. At Act. 10,38, Erasmus substituted obambulo. Manetti (both mss.) replaced pertransibant euangelizantes by euangelizabant.
4 annunciantes Ev̇ory ${ }^{2} \lambda_{1}$ Ğ́nsvol ("euangelizantes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 5,42.
4 sermonem dei tòv $\lambda$ jóyov ("verbum dei" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,1, regarding the use of sermo. Erasmus' addition of dei is derived from the late Vulgate, unsupported by Greek mss. other than cod. E.
5 peruenit ... ac катє $\lambda \theta \omega \dot{ }$ ("descendens" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist. A similar substitution of peruenio for descendo occurs at Act. 18,22 (151622 only). Cf. also the replacement of venio by peruenio at Act. 27,5, in rendering the same Greek verb. Erasmus retains descendo at several other passages. Manetti's version had discedens.
6 autem $\tau \varepsilon$. Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering, though this was probably based on a different Greek text, substituting $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as found in $37^{74} \times \mathrm{NB} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{D}{ }^{\text {corr }}$ and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
6 aedebat Ėtoís ("faciebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,11.
7 Spiritus enim immundi; e multis qui ab illis
 To dákáfapta ("Multi enim eorum qui habebant spiritus immundos" Vg.). The spelling exóvtov, in the 1535 edition, is a misprint: for other such errors, see on Act. 7,27. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting moג入oi for то $\quad \lambda \lambda \omega ̃ \nu$, as in $39^{74}$ N A B C D ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and a few later mss. Although Erasmus was not aware of the Greek variant, he makes a valid point in Annot., that the Vulgate rendering does not yield good sense. The wording of this note was partly borrowed from Valla Annot, who gave a more literal rendering, Multorum enim
babentium spiritus immundi. Erasmus modified the word-order for the sake of clarity, while taking his Greek text from cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. He included this passage among the Soloecismi, and further discussed the wording in his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 C. The version of Manetti had Spiritus enim immundi a multis babentibus.

7 exibant, clamantes voce magna ßоడ̃vта $\mu \in \gamma \alpha \dot{\lambda} \eta$ П $\varphi \omega \nu$ ñ écñpXETO ("clamantes voce magna exibant" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus again reverses the Latin word-order. The phrase voce magna, in the Vulgate, may reflect a changed Greek wordorder, $\varphi \omega v \underset{n}{n} \mu \varepsilon \gamma^{\alpha} \lambda \eta$, as in $7^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B C D $E$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Erasmus took $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ ग $\varphi \omega \eta \tilde{\eta}$ from his cod. 2815 , supported by relatively few other late mss.
7 sanati sunt $\begin{gathered}\text { ésparteúñoav ("curati sunt" }\end{gathered}$ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 4,14.
8 Et factum est kai éy'̇veto ("Factum est ergo" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect the Greek variant,
 later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti made the same change.
9 ante in ea ciuitate attem exercuerat magicam
 fuerat in ciuitate magus" Vg .; "ante fuerat in ciuitate artem exercens magicam" 1516). Erasmus, more accurately, treats $\mu \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega \nu$ as a verb rather than a noun. See also Annot. However, in both Erasmus and the Vulgate, the sentence is defective, in that it lacks a main verb. He introduces exerceo at nine other passages: cf. his use of the phrase curiosas artes exercuerant at Act. 19,19, in rendering тà $\pi \varepsilon \rho i \varepsilon p \gamma \alpha \pi \rho \alpha \xi^{\alpha} v-$ $\tau \omega v$. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he omitted ante.
9 ac kaí (Vg. omits; "et" 1516). The Vulgate omission is supported only by cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$. Manetti had $e t$.

 ducens gentem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This alteration is in keeping with the Vulgate use of demento in vs. 11. In Annot., Erasmus mentions the complaint of Valla Annot. concerning the unwarranted diversity of vocabulary used by the Vulgate in rendering the same Greek verb | $\varepsilon$ |
| :---: |
| $\xi$ |
| $j$ | vss. 9,11 , and 13. Manetti put seducebat gentem.







 тои̃ $\theta$ हои̃, kai toũ ỏvónatos toũ 'I $\eta$ -















 vos ס̇̀ ó
se esse quempiam magnum, ${ }^{10}$ cui auscultabant illi a minimo vsque ad maximum, dicentes: Iste est virtus dei, quae vocatur magna. ${ }^{11}$ Auscultabant autem ei, propterea quod multo tempore magicis artibus dementasset eos. ${ }^{12}$ Quum vero credidissent Philippo, euangelizanti de regno dei, deque nomine Iesu Christi, baptizabantur viri simul ac mulieres. ${ }^{13}$ Tunc Simon et ipse credidit, et quum baptizatus esset, adhaerebat Philippo. Vidensque signa et virtutes fieri, stupens admirabatur. ${ }^{14}$ Quum autem audissent apostoli qui erant Hierosolymis, quod recepisset Samaria sermonem dei, miserunt ad eos Petrum ac Ioannem. ${ }^{15}$ Qui quum descendissent, orauerunt pro ipsis vt acciperent spiritum sanctum. ${ }^{16}$ Nondum enim in quenquam illorum illapsus fuerat, sed baptizati tantum erant in nomine Christi Iesu. ${ }^{17}$ Tunc imponebant manus super illos, accipiebantque spiritum sanctum. ${ }^{18}$ Quum vidisset autem Simon, quod per impositionem

10 illi $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ Iste $C-E$ : Hic $A B \mid 12$ deque $B-E$ : et $A \mid 13$ admirabatur $D E$ : ammirabatur $A-C \mid 14$ sermonem $C-E$ : verbum $A B \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ Ioannem $A B E$ : Iohannem $C D \mid$ 15 descendissent $B$-E: venissent $A \mid 16$ alt. in $A C-E$ : sub $B \mid 17$ accipiebantque $B-E$ : et accipiebant $A$

9 quempiam tiva ("aliquem" Vg.). See on Iob. 6,7. In a similar context, at Act. 5,36, Erasmus retains aliquis.
10 auscultabant illi пробะĩхоข ("auscultabant omnes" Vg.; "auscultabant" 1516). The Vulgate follows a Greek text adding móvTES, as found in $\aleph$ A B C D E and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most later mss. Manetti put intendebant, omitting omnes.
10 Iste $\mathrm{O}{ }^{\tau}$ tos ("Hic" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). One reason for this substitution may have been that Erasmus perceived an ambiguity as to whether bic meant "this" or "here": see on Ioh. 3,26. Manetti anticipated this change.

10 quae vocatur magna ì $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$. Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering, accepting it as a valid expansion of the Greek article: see Annot. However, the Vulgate was more likely to have been based on a different Greek text, having
 E and twenty-four later mss.; cf. also $\tilde{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \circ \mu \dot{v} \eta \eta$ $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$, found in nine late mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and more than 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 471-3). Accordingly, both Valla Annot. and Manetti advocated the omission of quae vocatur.
 ("Attendebant ... eum" Vg.). This change was
intended to produce consistency with the Vulgate use of ausculto in vs. 10: see Annot. on that passage, partly following Valla Annot. However, in vs. 6, and also at Act. 16,14, Erasmus retained intendo, in rendering the same Greek verb.
11 propterea quod $\delta$ iò̀ tó ("propter quod" Vg .). This change had been advocated by Valla Annot. In Erasmus' translation, a similar substitution occurs in rendering $\delta$ ócti, at Act. 18,10; Gal. 2,16 (1519); Iac. 4, 2, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 27,4; Phil. 2,26. The Vulgate use of propter, if understood as a preposition, yields a quite different sense: see Annot. The version of Manetti put quoniam.

11 ikळv⿳ั xpóvต. In Erasmus' cod. 2815 is found the reading ikavòv Xpóvov, in company with only a few other late mss. He or one of his assistants took $\mathfrak{i k \alpha v \tilde { \omega }}$ रpóv $\omega$ from codd. 1 and 2816. This is the first deviation from cod. 2815 since vs. 1. The phrase might perhaps have been left uncorrected, had it not been for the fact that Erasmus' attention was drawn to another unusual variant in this ms., kupiou 'Inooũ, in the following verse, which prompted him to consult his other mss.

11 magicis artibus taĩs $\mu \mathrm{c} \gamma \mathrm{z}$ kís ("magicis suis" Vg.). In accordance with classical usage, Erasmus treats magicus as an adjective rather than a noun. Cf. his reference to curiosas artes at Act. 19,19. See Annot., referring to the alternative rendering magiis, which had been adopted by both Valla Annot. and Manetti.

12 Өєoṽ. Erasmus' cod. 2815* here had the rare variant, kupiou 'Iŋ $\sigma$ oũ (cf. kupiou for $\theta$ हoũ, in cod. $\mathbf{N}^{*}$ ). He corrected this by reference to the Vulgate, together with codd. 1 and 2816, writing [ $\theta$ ] Eov in the margin of cod. 2815.

12 deque nomine kai ("in nomine" late Vg.; "et nomine" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.). Erasmus repeats the preposition $d e$, to prevent the misunderstanding which had led to the changed punctuation of the late Vulgate: the latter incorrectly connected in nomine lesu Cbristi with baptizabantur. In Annot., Erasmus suggested et nomine, while Manetti put et de nomine.

12 тои̃ 'Iŋбои̃ Xрוбтои̃. This reading does not appear to have ms. support, as virtually all mss. (including codd. 1 and 2816) read 'Iŋбои̃ Xpıбтои̃ here, omitting toũ. Cod. 2815 has a different reading, toũ Xpiotoũ, again having hardly any other mss. in support. The

Erasmian text attempted to amend this by adding 'Iŋбoũ before Xpıotoũ, but left the incorrect article in position. This mistaken reconstruction of the text persisted into the Textus Receptus.
12 simul ac те каi ("ac" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1.
13 Vidensque $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon$ ("videns etiam" Vg.). See on Act. 2,40. Manetti put et videns.
 et virtutes maximas" $V$ g.). Erasmus retains the Vulgate word-order, which probably reflected a Greek variant, having oŋneĩo kai סuváuels $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \bar{\alpha} \lambda \alpha s$, as in $\mathbf{~}^{74} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B C (D) and some later mss. His own Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti had virtutes et signa.
14 Hierosolymis èv "lepooò únols ("in Hierosolymis" Vg. 1527). See on Ioh. 4,21.
14 quod Ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti made the same change.
14 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" 1516-19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,1.
$14 a c$ kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti also had ac here.
15 quum descendisent кат $\alpha \beta$ д́vтеs ("cum venissent" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate nowhere else uses venio to translate this Greek verb. Manetti, again, made the same change.
16 illapsus fuerat èmıTт Erasmus again finds a more accurate replacement for the inadequate rendering offered by the Vulgate. At Act. 11,15, Erasmus also uses illabor to replace cado (late Vulgate), but retains cado at Act. 10,44, in similar contexts. See Annot., where Erasmus also recommends elapsus and delapsus. The renderings delapsum and illapsum were similarly advocated by Valla Annot.
16 in (2nd.) eis ("sub" 1519 only). See on Iob. 5,43.
16 Cbristi Xрıбтoũ ("domini" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text, having kupiou, as in $7^{74} \approx$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti similarly substituted Cbristi.

17 accipiebantque kai è $\lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta$ ßovov ("et accipiebant" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
18 quod ${ }^{\text {Otri }}$ ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also had quod.
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manuum apostolorum daretur spiritus sanctus，obtulit eis pecunias，${ }^{19}$ dicens： Date et mihi potestatem istam，vt cui－ cunque imposuero manus，accipiat spi－ ritum sanctum．${ }^{20}$ Petrus autem dixit ad eum：Pecunia tua tecum sit in per－ ditionem，quoniam donum dei existi－ masti pecuniis parari．${ }^{21}$ Non est tibi pars neque sors in ratione hac：cor enim tuum non est rectum coram deo． ${ }^{22}$ Resipisce igitur ab ista malicia tua， et roga deum，si forte remittatur tibi cogitatio cordis tui．${ }^{23}$ In felle enim amaritudinis｜et colligatione iniqui－

## 

18 manuum $B-E$ ：manus $A \mid 19$ potestatem istam $B-E$ ：hanc potestatem $A \mid 20$ pecuniis $B-E$ ： per pecuniam $A \mid 21$ prius est $B$－E：est $\operatorname{enim} A \mid 22$ ista $B-E:$ hac $A \mid 23$ colligatione $B$－E： obligatione $A \mid 24$ Precemini $B-E:$ Precamini $A \mid$ apud $B-E$ ad $A \mid$ eueniat in $B$－E：veniat super $A \mid$ quae $A B D E$ ：que $C \mid 25$ testificati $B-E$ ：testificantes $A \mid$ sermonem $B-E$ ：verbum $A \mid$ reuersi sunt $B-E$ ：redibant $A \mid$ oppidulis $B-E$ ：regionibus $A$

18 manuum tడ̃v Xєן $\omega \tau v$（＂manus＂ 1516 Lat． $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The Vulgate use of the singular is unsupported by Greek mss．In Annot．，Erasmus suggested that，for reasons of style，the translators of the Vulgate avoided a double genitive plural． Manetti made the same substitution．
18 pecunias Xpグицата（＂pecuniam＂Vg．）．This substitution，again，is closer to the Greek use of the plural．A similar change occurs in vs．20， consistent with Vulgate usage at Mc．10，23－4； Lc．18，24．However，Erasmus retains the singu－ lar form of the word at $A c t .24,26$ ．Manetti also had pecunias．
 potestatem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The use of istam here conveyed the sense of＂this power which you possess＂．
 pecuniam＂1516）．See on vs．18．Manetti had per pecunias．
20 parari kтãoӨaı（＂possideri＂Vg．）．See on Act．1，18．
21 est（1st．）$}$（＂est enim＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）． The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss．Manetti omitted enim．
 isto＂${ }^{\text {Vg．．）．Erasmus evidently regarded sermo as }}$ awkward in the present context．At Act．15，6 （1519），he similarly substitutes negocium for verbum．On the substitution of bac，see on Act．7，4．
21 घن̈日eĩ．Cod． 2815 has the unusual read－ ing，$\varepsilon \dot{U}^{\prime} \theta$＇ns，a form of the adjective which is
occasionally found in the Septuagint. Erasmus or his assistants corrected this by reference to codd. 1 and 2816.
22 Resipisce igitur $\mu$ 上тavónoov oũv ("Paenitentiam itaque age" Vg.). See on Act. 2,38 for resipisco. Erasmus has a preference for igitur, which more emphatically conveys the sense of "therefore" or "consequently" than itaque: see on Ioh. 5,4; 6,62. Manetti had Penitentiam ergo age.
22 ista malicia $\tau \tilde{j} \mathrm{~s}$ kakías ... Taútns ("hac nequitia" Vg.; "hac malicia" 1516). See on Act. 3,26 for the removal of nequitia. As in vs. 19 , Erasmus uses the more idiomatic iste, to refer to something which belonged to the listener.
22 cogitatio ท̂ Ėmivola ("haec cogitatio" Vg.). The Vulgate addition may represent an expansion of the Greek article rather than a different Greek text. Manetti omitted baec.
23 colligatione $\sigma$ 'vo $\delta$ € $\sigma$ ov ("obligatione" 1516 $=$ Vg.). At Eph. 4,3 and Col. 3,14, Erasmus retains vinculum in rendering this Greek word, and recommends in vinculis in Annot. on the present passage. The Vulgate use of obligatio, however, conveyed the wrong meaning.
$24 \delta \Sigma i \mu \omega v$. The Erasmian text restores $\delta$ from codd. 1 and 2816, in company with most other mss. It was omitted in cod. 2815, together with cod. E and a few later mss.
24 Precemini $\Delta \varepsilon \mathrm{r}^{\prime} \theta \mathrm{\eta} \tau \varepsilon$ ("Precamini" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ). See on Iob. 6,27 for this use of the subjunctive.
24 apud $\pi$ тpós ("ad" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). See on Act. 2,29.
24 ne quid ötmes $\mu \eta \delta^{\delta \epsilon v}$ ("vt nihil" Vg.). Cf. on Iob. 3,20 , for Erasmus' avoidance of $v t$ non.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A comparable substitution of euenio occurs in rendering Epxoual at Phil. 1,12, analogous with the Vulgate use of the same verb to render $\sigma u \mu \beta$ aive at $M c .10,32$. In rendering ėmépXoucı elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using superuenio, at $L c .21,26,35$; Act. 13,40, and aduenio at lac. 5,1. For the substitution of in for super, see on Ioh. 7,44 . Manetti here preferred superueniat in.
25 testificati $\delta_{1} \alpha \mu \alpha \rho т \cup \rho \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu v o l$ ("testificantes" 1516). In 1516, the present participle, ס1auaptupóuevol, was derived from cod. 2815, with support from cod. K and many later mss., including cod. 1. In 1519 , Erasmus adopted the aorist participle, $\delta ı \propto \mu \alpha p t u p \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l$, as found
in codd. 3 and 2816, in company with $7^{774 \mathrm{id}}$ A B C D E and another large group of later mss. His change was influenced partly by the perfect tense of the Vulgate rendering, and partly by the aorist tense of the adjacent participle in the Greek text, $\lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \cup \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$.
25 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
25 dei toũ kupiou ("domini" Vg. 1527, and Vg. mss.). This discrepancy between Erasmus' Greek text and his Latin rendering continued through all five editions. Probably one of his working copies of the Latin Vulgate had dei at this point, as found for example in the Froben edition of 1491. As at Act. 7,33, this could have originated as a misreading of $d n i$, the abbreviated form of domini, though a few Greek mss., including 87 $7^{4} \mathrm{~A}$, have toũ $\theta \in 0 \tilde{u}$. In cod. 2816, the words were originaily omitted, but were later inserted by an interlinear correction.
25 reuersi sunt $\dot{\prime} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma T \rho \varepsilon \Psi a v$ ("redibant" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The verb imootp $£ \varphi \omega$ is largely confined to Luke and Acts. Erasmus elsewhere retains redeo at $L c .2,43 ; 8,39,40 ; 17,18 ;$ Act. 21,6 , in rendering the same Greek word. The imperfect tense of the Vulgate reflects the substitution of $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \varphi \circ v$, found in $\mathbf{7 P}^{74} \times$ A B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. C E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
25 oppidulis кผ́uas ("regionibus" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus speculates that the Greek text underlying the Vulgate was $\chi$ 由́pas, though this is found in hardly any mss. He elsewhere uses oppidulum only at $L$ c. 10,38 , replacing castellum. At seven other passages, mainly in Matthew and Mark, he replaces castellum by vicus, as recommended in Annot. on the present passage, while in Luke and John castellum is generally retained. It would appear that by the time he reached Luke, Erasmus had forgotten his earlier plan of substituting vicus, typical of his less thorough revision of the third and fourth Gospels. See Annot. on Mt. 9,35, for his definition of castella as small fortified towns, whereas vici were unfortified. A similar distinction is made in Valla Elegantiae IV, 20; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 288, 11. 235-236. Manetti put castellis here.
25 euangelizabant घủ $\gamma \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda$ íravto. Inconsistent with his substitution of the perfect tense, reuersi sunt, earlier in the verse, Erasmus' Latin
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${ }^{26}$ Angelus autem domini loquutus est ad Philippum, dicens: Surge, et vade meridiem versus, ad viam quae descendit ab vrbe Hierosolymorum ad ciuitatem Gazam, haec est deserta. ${ }^{27}$ Et surgens abiit, et ecce vir Aethiops, eunuchus, praefectus Candaces reginae Aethiopum, quem praefecerat vniuersae gazae suae, venerat adoraturus Hierosolymam, ${ }^{28}$ et reuertebatur sedens super currum suum, legebatque Hesaiam prophetam. ${ }^{29}$ Dixit autem spiritus Philippo: Accede, et adiunge te ad currum istum. ${ }^{30}$ Accurrens autem Philippus, audiuit eum legentem Hesaiam prophetam: et dixit: Intelligisne quae legis? ${ }^{31} \mathrm{At}$ ille ait: Quinam enim possim, nisi aliquis dux viae mihi fuerit? Rogauitque Philippum, vt ascenderet, sederetque secum. ${ }^{32}$ Argumentum autem scripturae quam legebat, erat hoc: Tanquam ouis ad occisionem ductus est, et sicut agnus coram tondente se mutus, sic non aperuit os suum. ${ }^{33}$ In humilitate
$32 \delta \varepsilon$ B-E: тє $A$

26 meridiem versus $B$-E: contra meridianum $A \mid$ vrbe Hierosolymorum B-E: Hierusalem $A \mid$ ad ciuitatem $C-E:$ in $A, o m . B \mid 27$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid 28$ legebatque $B-E$ : legensque $A \mid$ Hesaiam $E:$ Esaiam $A-D \mid 30$ Hesaiam E: Esaiam $A-D \mid 31$ At ille $B-E$ : Qui $A$ | Quinam enim C-E: Et quomodo $A$, Nam qui $B \mid$ possim $B$-E: possum $A \mid$ viae $A B C^{b} D E:$ om. $C^{*} \mid$ sederetque $B-E$ : et sederet $A \mid 32$ quam $B-E$ : quod $A \mid$ occisionem $B-E$ : occasionem $A$
rendering here retains the imperfect tense of the Vulgate, even though the latter was based on a Greek variant, $\varepsilon^{\prime} \eta \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i \zeta$ оvto, found in $3^{74}{ }^{74}$ A B C D E and a few later mss. His own Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.
26 meridiem versus кळтф̀ $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu \beta \rho i \alpha \nu$ ("contra meridianum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus here follows Valla Annot. in adopting a more idiomatic expression than the strictly literal rendering offered by the Vulgate. See Annot., where

Erasmus also suggests ad meridiem. Manetti put contra meridiem.

26 кат $\alpha \beta \alpha i ́ v o v \sigma \alpha v$. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus reported the reading $\varphi$ 'fpouoav in "nonnulli codices", as found in cod. 3.
 lem" 1516 = Vg.). See on Act. 1,8.

26 ad ciuitatem kis ("in" $1516=$ Vg.; 1519 Lat. omits). A similar addition of ciuitas occurs at Mt. 2,1 (1519); 4,13;Mc. 15,43 (1519); Act. 19,26
（1527）．Cf．on the addition of vrbs at Act．14，25． In 1522，it appears that Erasmus wanted to make clear that Gaza，by contrast with its surrounding region，was not＂deserted＂：see 1519－22 Annot．However，by a modification in 1527 Annot．，he adopts a quite different explan－ ation，that there were two Gazas，the more ancient of them being deserted．
27 praefectus SuváのтTทs（＂potens＂Vg．）．Erasmus prefers this more technical word，though in Annot．he also suggested magistratus．Both render－ ings had been proposed by Valla Annot．See also on Act．7，10．Manetti adopted princeps．
27 quem praefecerat òs 甬 $\varepsilon$ érí（＂qui erat super＂ Vg．）．Erasmus paraphrases the meaning with a more idiomatic turn of phrase．Cf．Act．12，20， where he substitutes qui praeerat．
 （＂omnes gazas eius＂Vg．）．On vniuersus see on Act． 1,8 ．The Vulgate change from singular to plural，gazas，is unsupported by Greek mss． Manetti put omnem gazam suam．
27 adoraturus пробкuvท่б由v（＂adorare＂Vg．）． The Vulgate infinitive has minimal Greek ms． support．See Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
27 Hierosolymam eis＂lepovoa $\lambda \eta$ n＇$\mu$（＂in Hieru－ salem＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．This change is consistent with Vulgate usage at vs． 25 and Act． 1,12 ． Erasmus＇usual practice，in accordance with good Latin style，is to omit the prepositions in and ad before the names of towns and small islands in the accusative case．For his occasional addition of in before place－names in 1516，see on Act．13，51．On the substitution of the form Hierosolym－，see on Act．1，8．
28 super ध̇דi（＂supra＂Vg．1527）．See on Ioh．3，31．
28 legebatque kai áveyivwoke（＂legensque＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ Vg．）．The Vulgate receives partial support from cod．D，which has ơvor $\begin{aligned} & \text { evvóokc } v \text { ，omit－}\end{aligned}$ ting kai．Manetti had et legebat．
 intelligis＂Vg．）．On－ne，see on Ioh．18，39． Erasmus removes the clumsy double verb of the Vulgate．In Annot．，he also suggested Nunquid intelligis，which had been adopted by both Valla Annot．and Manetti．
31 At ille ò ס́ś（＂Qui＂ 1516 Lat．＝Vg．）．Erasmus， again，is more accurate．See on Act．7，2．Manetti simply put et．

31 Quinam enim possim Пũऽ $\gamma$ áp（＂Et quomodo possum＂ 1516 Lat．$=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．；＂Nam qui possim＂ 1519）．This is the only occurrence of quinam in Erasmus＇N．T．His juxtaposition of－nam and enim has an appearance of redundancy．In Annot．，by contrast，he recommends Qui nam or Qui enim．As Erasmus further pointed out in Annot．，the Vulgate use of $e t$ here is a poor rendering of $\gamma$ d́p：no mss．appear to have kai mẽs．Valla Annot．suggested quonam modo possim，while Manetti＇s version was Quomodo enim possum．
 tion occurs at Lc．13，5．At Mt．10，13，Erasmus tried $\sin$ minus．Elsewhere，he sometimes retains si non from the Vulgate．The same change was made by Manetti．
$31 d u x$ viae mihi fuerit $\delta \delta \eta \gamma \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta^{\mu}$（＂ostenderit mihi＂Vg．）．Erasmus conveys the meaning of the Greek word more fully and accurately：cf． Annot．，where he recommends duxerit．Manetti put instrueret me．
31 sederetque ka0ioat（＂et sederet＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．1，39．Manetti put ascendens sederet for ascenderet et sederet．
32 Argumentum ．．．boc ŋं ．．．тeptox $\grave{\eta}$ ．．．$\alpha u ̛ T \eta$ （＂Locus ．．．hic＂Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus also suggests sententia．Behind this alteration was the thought that a＂place＂cannot literally be read．
32 ס $\varepsilon$ ．The substitution of $\tau \varepsilon$ in 1516 was not derived from Greek mss．，and was probably accidental．
32 quam $\pi_{\nu}$（＂quod＂1516）．In 1516，Eras－ mus associates the subordinate clause with argumentum rather than scriptura，though the Greek would permit either．Manetti，with a similar motive，substituted quem，to agree with locus．
32 mutus ä̃ $\varphi \omega v o s$（＂sine voce＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at 1 Cor． 14,10 ，in conformity with Vulgate usage at 1 Cor．12，2； 2 Petr．2，16． On the removal of sine，see on Ioh．8，7．
32 aperuit j̀voíyel．The Greek reading here represents an arbitrary correction，as all of Erasmus＇mss．had ávoiyei．In Annot．，he also cites óvoiyєl from the Septuagint at Is．53，7． From the change to 1527 Annot．，it would appear that Erasmus preferred aperit，in the present tense，rather than aperuit，but he made no corresponding change in his Latin and Greek texts．
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ipsius iudicium eius sublatum est. Generationem autem eius quis enarrabit? Quoniam tollitur de terra vita eius. ${ }^{34}$ Respondens autem eunuchus Philippo, dixit: Obsecro te, de quo propheta dicit hoc, de se, an de alio quopiam? ${ }^{35}$ Aperiens autem Philippus os suum, et incipiens a scriptura ista, praedicauit illi Iesum. ${ }^{36} \mathrm{Et}$ dum irent per viam, venerunt ad quandam aquam. Et ait eunuchus: Ecce aqua: quid vetat quominus baptizer? ${ }^{37}$ Dixit autem Philippus: Si credis ex toto corde, licet. Et respondens ait: Credo filium dei esse Iesum Christum. ${ }^{38} \mathrm{Et}$ iussit sisti currum. Ac descenderunt ambo in aquam, Philippus simul et eunuchus, et baptizauit eum. ${ }^{39}$ Quum autem ascendissent ex aqua, spiritus domini rapuit Philippum, nec amplius vidit eum eunuchus. Ibat enim per viam suam gaudens. ${ }^{40}$ Philippus autem repertus est Azoti, et pertransiens euangelizabat ciuitatibus cunctis, donec veniret Caesaream.

9Saulus autem adhuc spirans minas ac caedem | aduersus discipulos LB 470

34 quopiam $B$-E: aliquo $A \mid 35$ praedicauit $B$-E: euangelizauit $A \mid 38$ Ac $B-E$ : Et $A$ | 39 ascendissent ex $B-E$ : ascendisset de $A \mid$ nec amplius $B-E$ : et amplius non $A \mid 40$ repertus $B-E$ : inuentus $A$ | Azoti $B-E$ : in Azoto $A$ 9,1 ac caedem aduersus $B$ - $E$ : et cedem in $A$

33 ipsius $\propto \cup ̉ T o u ̃ ~(V g . ~ o m i t s) . ~ T h e ~ V u l g a t e ~ o m i s-~$ sion is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \aleph \mathrm{AB}$ and a few later mss., possibly from harmonisation with the Septuagint. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. C E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti rendered by sua.
33 autem 8 é (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by \& A BC and a few later mss.,
again possibly by harmonisation with the Septuagint. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $7^{74} \mathrm{E}$. The version of Manetti also added autem.
33 tollitur aipstan ("tolletur" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus hints that the late Vulgate reading has resulted from a scribal error ("perperam habetur in nostris codicibus"), though he
does not cite the earlier Vg. mss. to prove the point.
34 dicit $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \in \mathrm{E}$ ("dixit" 1516-27 Annot., lemma). The Froben Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514, as well as the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T., all read dicit at this point.

34 quopiam tivos ("aliquo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 6,7. Manetti replaced alio aliquo by aliquo alio.
35 praedicauit eủn $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda$ ícato ("euangelizauit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 5,42.
36 quid tí ("quis" late Vg.). The late Vulgate alteration is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot.
36 vetat $\kappa \omega \lambda \cup \cup \in \varepsilon ~(" p r o h i b e t " ~ V g.) . ~ A ~ s i m i l a r ~$ substitution occurs in 1519 at $L$ c. 11,52; 23,2; Act. 24,23; 1 Cor.14,39, following Vulgate usage at Lc. 18,16; Act. 16,6. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests obstat. At two other passages (Act. 11,17; 1 Thess. 2,16) he substitutes obsisto, and once compesco (Act. 27,43). Elsewhere, he generally retains probibeo to render the same Greek verb, especially at $A c t$. 10,47 , in a similar context. He probably had in mind that probibeo required a person as subject, and implied a verbal command.
36 quominus baptizer $\mu \varepsilon \beta \alpha \pi \tau \tau 1 \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v a ı$ ("me baptizari" Vg.). Erasmus also introduces quominus at Act. 10,47 ; Rom. 15,22, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 20,27. For his avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33 .
37 Dixit ... Cbristum $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{I}$ te ... Xpıбтóv. Erasmus did not find this verse in his codd. 1 or 2815 , but derived the wording from the margin of cod. 2816: see Annot, where he suggests that it was originally omitted by scribal error ("librariorum incuria"). Consequently, he inserted a caret mark at the end of vs. 36 in cod. 2815, accompanied by a symbol in the margin, to indicate that an addition was required. The subject was further discussed in his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 207 C.E. This passage, with some variations of wording, is also found in cod. E and about sixty later mss. It is omitted, however, by $\mathbf{8}^{4574} \approx \mathrm{ABC}$ and more than 400 of the later mss. (see Aland Dic Apostelgeschichte 475-9). Manetti's translation (both mss.) included this verse, but omitted Christum, without any support from Greek mss.
38 sisti $\sigma T \tilde{\eta} v \alpha 1$ ("stare" $V g$. .). Erasmus' intention here, presumably, is to avoid the impression that the eunuch gave an order to the chariot,
rather than to the driver. Manetti put vt currus staret for stare currum.
$38 A c$ каi ("Et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
38 ambo đ̛น甲ótepol ("vterque" Vg.). This substitution is in accordance with Vulgate usage at six other passages. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains vterque at Mt. 13,30; Lc. 5,38; 7,42; Act. 23,8; Eph. 2,14, and further substitutes vterque for ambo at $M t .9,17 ; E p h .2,18$. The word $a m b o$ is particularly suited to a joint action by two people, meaning "both" rather than "each". See Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
38 simul et $\mathrm{T} \varepsilon$... kai ("et" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1 , and Annot.
39 ascendissent óvéß $\eta \sigma \alpha v$ ("ascendisset" 1516 Lat. = late Vg .). The singular form of the verb, used by the late Vulgate, has little support from Greek mss. Manetti also had ascendissent.
39 ex ék ("de" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 2,15.
39 nec amplius kai oủk ... oủkétı ("et amplius non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 6,66. Manetti put just et non.
40 repertus est eúpé̀n ("inuentus est" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,41 , and Annot. This change of verb was further discussed by Erasmus in his Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 148 50, 11. 755-771.
40 Azoti घis "A ${ }^{\prime} \omega$ tov ("in Azoto" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,21 for Erasmus' use of the locative case. See also Annot.
9,1 हैтı ह̇ $\mu \pi v \in \omega v$. In Annot., Erasmus cites the omission of $\frac{\text { ét }}{}$, and speculates that the original text had ÉTl $\pi v \in \omega v$, which was later corrupted into $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi v^{\prime} \epsilon \omega v$, omitting $\varepsilon$ ét. His conjectured
 late mss. However, since ém $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \mu \pi v^{\prime} \epsilon \omega v$ is found in his codd. 1, 2815 and 2816, it seems likely that this was a note which he first penned in England, consulting a ms. which had just $\bar{\varepsilon} \mu-$ $\pi v E \omega v$, as found in a few of the later mss. (cf.

 rum et caedis" Vg.; "minas et cedem" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus argues that the accusative case is required here by good Latin style. On ac, see on Iob. 1,25.
1 aduersus sis ("in" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution occurs also at $L$ c. 7,30 (1519), and more frequently when rendering émi. In Annot., Erasmus indicates that this change is desirable for the sake of clarity ("apertius").








 Tís $\varepsilon$ l, kúple; ó סè kúpios $\mathfrak{\varepsilon l t e v , ~ ’ E y \omega ́ ~}$










quas perferret Damascum ad synagogas: vt si quos inuenisset eius viae seu viros seu mulieres, vinctos duceret Hierosolymam. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Et}$ quum iter faceret, contigit vt appropinquaret Damasco. Et subito circunfulgurauit eum lux de coelo, ${ }^{4}$ collapsusque in terram, audiuit vocem, dicentem sibi: Saul, Saul, quid me persequeris? ${ }^{5}$ Dixit autem: Quis es domine? Dominus autem dixit: Ego sum Iesus, quem tu persequeris. Durum est tibi contra stimulos calcitrare. ${ }^{6}$ Is tremens ac stupens dixit: Domine, quid me vis facere? Et dominus ad eum: Surge, et ingrederc ciuitatem, et dicetur tibi quid te oporteat facere. ${ }^{7}$ Viri autem illi qui erant ei comites itineris, stabant attoniti, audientes quidem vocem, neminem tamen videntes. ${ }^{8}$ Surrexit autem Saulus e terra, apertisque

## 9,7 Өewpouvtes $A$ B: өєopouvtes C.E

2 quas perferret $B-E$ : in $A \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid 4$ collapsusque $B-E$ : et cadens $A \mid 6$ Is $B-E$ : Et $A \mid$ dicetur $B$-E: ibi dicetur $A \mid 7$ ei $B$-E: illi $A \mid$ attoniti $B$ - $E$ : stupefacti $A \mid \operatorname{tamen} B-E$ : autem $A \mid 8$ e $B-E$ : de $A$

2 quas perferret cis ("in" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This expansion, again, was by way of clarification.
2 eius $7 \tilde{j}$ s ("huius" Vg.). Erasmus' choice of pronoun seems more appropriate, being part of a sentence in indirect speech. See Annot. A few late mss. add roútns after ó $\delta$ oũ, corresponding more closely with the Vulgate rendering.
2 seu viros seu ärvopas te kaí ("viros ac" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1, and Annot.
2 duceret ó $\gamma$ ớ $\gamma \eta$ ("perduceret" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at $M c .15,22$, but Erasmus retains perduco at Act. 11,26; 23,18. Manetti put adduceret.
2 Hierosolymam eis 'Ispovoon $\lambda_{\eta} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 8,27. Manetti put Hierusalem, omitting in.
3 circunfulgurauit тєрın'णтрळчєv ("circumfulsit" Vg.). Erasmus makes the same change at Act. 22,6 , while retaining circunfulgeo for $\pi є p i \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \pi \omega$
at Lc. 2,9; Act. 26,13. However, circumfulguro does not exist in classical Latin, hence Erasmus' diffidence in speaking of the word in Annot. on the present passage.

4 collapsusque каl $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \omega \dot{v}$ ("et cadens" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist. Regarding collabor, see on Act. 5,5. On -que, see on Iob. 1,39.
 Vg.). At all passages where the Hebraistic, indeclinable form of this name occurs, Erasmus consistently uses Saul, reserving the inflected
 The same suggestion is found in Valla Annot.
 is no explicit Greek support for the Vulgate rendering. Manetti made the same change.
5 Dominus autem dixit ó סè kúplos ElTev ("Et ille" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a different Greek text, omitting kúpios $\varepsilon I \pi \varepsilon v$, as in $\mathbf{7}^{74}$ A B C and a few later mss. A few others have $\delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$
 as in cod. $\$$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most of the later mss. Manetti substituted Dominus vero ait.
5-6 Durum ... ad eum бк入про̀े ... трòs aن̉tóv. In codd. 1 and 2815*, at this point, is found solely the word $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ (or $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ in cod. 2816), in place of the twenty words standing in Erasmus' printed Greek text. In cod. $2815^{\text {corr }}$, there is a caret mark in the text, accompanied by a brief comment, "duo versus", in the upper margin. Nor had Valla found these words in his Greek mss.: see Valla Annot. It seems that the presence of this passage in the late Vulgate prompted Erasmus to reconstruct the words which were 'missing' from the Greek text. It would not be correct, however, to say that he simply retranslated from the Vulgate, as he has
 Vulgate has stimulum, in the singular. The first five words of this added section, ok $\quad \eta \rho o v^{v}$ бol тро̀s кє́vтра $\lambda \alpha к т i \zeta$ हıv are taken directly from Act. 26,14, where the same phrase occurs (by contrast, in cod. E, this clause is added at the end of Act. 9,4). However, the next phrase, тр́́ $\mu \omega \nu$... тоוท̃̃ $\sigma \alpha$, has no direct parallel in other parts of Acts, and is undoubtedly a retranslation from the Latin. Erasmus' choice of an active form for the verb $\theta \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ was unfortunate, as the other N.T. occurrences of this verb are passive in form, based on $\theta \alpha \mu \beta$ ह́o $\mu \alpha ı$ ( $M c .1,27 ; 10,24,32$ ). A phrase more akin to Luke's style would perhaps have been
 $3,11 ; 7,32 ; 16,29)$. The next section of Erasmus' handiwork, kai ó kúplos mpòs aútóv, was partly modelled on vs. 11 ( $\delta$ 交 $\delta$ kúpios mpòs ou'tóv). Finally, to fit the additional words into the text, he was obliged to delete the word $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, which was found in all his mss. The result of Erasmus' conjectural restoration of the Greek text was that the Textus Receptus would hereafter contain, at this passage, twenty words which are almost entirely devoid of Greek ms. support. In 1516 Annot., he acknowledged that the passage was not found in the Greek mss. Then in 1519 Annot., by adding "plerisque" ("In plerisque Graecis codicibus"), he gave the impression that some Greek mss. might contain the passage in question, and later, in 1522, he further hinted that such mss. might reflect a process of scribal error, through which the extra words could have been added from the
margin. In 1527, he referred to Vulgate mss. in which the words et tremens ... ad eum were omitted. His Latin rendering of the passage remained the same in all five editions, with the small exception that in 1519-35 he substituted Is for $E t$ before tremens. Further discussion of this subject was contained in Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 207 E-F. Manetti retained the late Vulgate unchanged at this passage.
6 dicetur $\lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \eta \neq \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mathrm{I}$ ("ibi dicetur" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition of $i b i$ is supported by only a few late Greek mss., and appears to represent a harmonisation with kớkeĩ of Act. 22,10. Manetti omitted ibi.
7 erant ei comites itineris ouvoס́viovtes aủTũ ("comitabantur cum illo" Vg. 1527; "erant illi comites itineris" 1516). In Annot., lemma, Erasmus cites concomitabantur as the Vulgate reading, though the Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514 have comitabantur, as in Erasmus' 1527 Vulgate column. However, he would have been aware of concomitabantur from the lemma of Valla Annot. Elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using comitor and the accusative, for ouvépxo-
 he objected to the late Vulgate use of concomitor, and suggested the rendering qui iter faciebant cum illo. Valla Annot. had raised the same objection, and had proposed a similar rendering, qui cum eo iter faciebant. This, again, closely resembled Manetti's use of iter faciebant cum eo.
7 attoniti èvveó' ("stupefacti" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus elsewhere uses attonitus at $L c .24,22$ (1519) in rendering $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \xi \in \sigma \eta \eta \sigma \alpha v$, while at Act. 3,11 (1519) he adopts stupefactus for êk $\theta \propto \mu \beta \circ \varsigma$. See Annot.

7 tamen $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The reason for this substitution is to avoid the repetition of autem from earlier in the verse: see on Ioh. 1,26.
 persisting through the 1522-35 editions, arose from nothing more than a misprint.

8 e ámó ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution, in rendering d́rtó, occurs at thirteen passages in Matthew to Luke, but not in the Gospel of John. Erasmus no doubt thought that $d e$ was inappropriate when coupled with a verb signifying motion in an upwards direction. However, he retained ascendo with de at Ap. Iob. 11,$7 ; 13,1,11 ; 17,8$, this being a N.T. book which he only lightly revised.

































oculis neminem videbat. Sed manu ducentes illum, introduxerunt Damascum. ${ }^{9}$ Et erat tribus diebus non videns, ac non comedit neque bibit.
${ }^{10}$ Erat autem quidam discipulus Damasci, nomine Ananias: et dixit ad illum per visum dominus: Anania. Et ille ait: Ecce ego domine. ${ }^{11} \mathrm{Et}$ dominus ad eum: Surge et vade in vicum qui vocatur Rectus, et quaere in domo Iudae, Saulum nomine Tarsensem. Ecce enim orat. ${ }^{12}$ Et vidit per visum virum Ananiam nomine introeuntem, et imponentem sibi manum, vt visum reciperet. ${ }^{13}$ Respondit autem Ananias: Domine, audiui ex multis de viro hoc, quanta mala fecerit sanctis tuis Hierosolymae. ${ }^{14}$ Et hoc loco habet potestatem a principibus sacerdotum, vinciendi omnes qui inuocant nomen tuum. ${ }^{15}$ Dixit autem ad eum dominus: Vade, quoniam organum electum est mihi iste, vt portet nomen meum coram gentibus et regibus ac filis Israel. ${ }^{16}$ Ego enim ostendam illi, quanta oporteat eum pro nomine meo pati. ${ }^{17}$ Et abiit Ananias, et introiuit in domum, et imponens ei manus dixit: Saul frater, dominus misit me, qui apparuit tibi in via qua veniebas, vt visum recipias, et implearis spiritu sancto. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ confestim deciderunt $a b$ oculis eius tanquam squamae,


8 neminem $B-E$ : nihil $A \mid$ Sed manu $B-E:$ Manu autem $A \mid 9$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ comedit $B-E$ : manducauit $A \mid 10$ per visum $B-E$ : in visu $A \mid 11$ Tarsensem $B-E$ : Tharsensem $A \mid 12$ reciperet $B-E:$ recipiat $A \mid 13$ Hierosolymae $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid 14$ hoc loco $B$ - $E$ : hic $A \mid$ 15 organum electum $B-E$ : vas electionis $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$

8 neminem oúరévo ("nihil" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). As recognised in Annot., the Vulgate reflects a

Greek variant, oú $\delta \varepsilon ́ v$, found in $\exists^{74} \aleph A^{*} B$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815,
supported by codd. $A^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{CE}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Valla Annot. and Manetti proposed the same change.
8 Sed manu ducentes illum Xeıpay aủtóv ("Ad manus autem illum trahentes" Vg.; "Manu autem ducentes illum" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus comments on the inappropriate use of trabo, a verb which implied that Paul was physically dragged along against his will. Another instance of the removal of ad manus is found at Act. 22,11 (1522). Valla raised a similar objection to trabo, and suggested putting manu autem illum ducentes, while Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) put Manuducentes autem ipsum.
 in cod. 2815, probably by the error of parablepsis. Erasmus or his assistants restored the text from codd. 1 and 2816.
9 ac кגí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti replaced et non by nec.
 See on Ioh. 4,31.
10 per visum żv ópó́ $\mu \propto$ тı ("in visu" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same change occurs at Act. 10,3 (1519). Cf. per manum at Act. 7,35, and see on Ioh. 3,21 for the instrumental use of $\varepsilon v$. The spelling ópó $\mu \propto \pi$ т in 1522 is a misprint. Manetti had in visione.
10 'Iסó'. This word was omitted by cod. 2815, and was restored by Erasmus or his assistants from codd. 1 and 2816.
 Vulgate omission is supported by $11^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ A and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 . In codd. B C, the words are inserted after ơ้ $v \delta$ pa. Manetti again put in visione, as in vs. 10.
12 ย̇miti $\theta \in \varepsilon \tau \tau \alpha$. Erasmus derived this reading from cod. 2815, while codd. 1, 2816 and virtually all other mss. have émiӨ่́vтa.
12 manum Xeipa ("manus" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant, Xeijpas, found in $\boldsymbol{F}^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \mathbb{\aleph}^{*}$ A C, or Tàs XEĩpas, found in $\mathbb{\aleph}^{\text {corr }}$ B E, both readings having support from a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. The singular form is relatively rare in such contexts in Acts, and it is possible that the plural variant represents a harmonisation with the more common usage. Manetti also had manum.

12 visum reciperet $\alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} v \alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \eta$ ("visum recipiat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Although the substitution of the imperfect subjunctive was no doubt designed to improve the sequence of tenses, the perfect tense of the main verb, vidit, will permit either recipiat or reciperet in the subordinate clause. In vs. 17, Erasmus uses the present subjunctive, in vt visum recipias. Manetti preferred respiceret.
13 ax ămó ("a" Vg.). Similar substitutions of $e x$ for $a b$ or $d e$, after audio, occur at $L c .22,71$ (1519); Act. 28,22 (1519); 1 Iob. 1,5, rendering ámó and mopó. Erasmus retains a for m $\pi \rho \alpha$ at several other passages.
13 Hierosolymae ह̇v ‘lepov $\alpha \alpha \lambda \eta \eta$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,8 .
14 boc loco $\omega \mathrm{\omega} \delta \varepsilon$ ("hic" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change is designed to prevent the ambiguity arising from the two senses of bic, as adverb and pronoun. A similar substitution occurs at $M t$. 12,6, 41, 42; Lc. 11,31, 32 (both in 1519). See Annot. ad loc., on all these. See also on $I o b .3,26$ for the substitution of is and iste for bic.
14 vinciendi $\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \propto_{1}$ ("alligandi" Vg.). This alteration produces consistency with vinctos in vss. 2 and 21. See on Ioh. 18,24.
 tionis" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate is more literally accurate, but Erasmus here attempts a rendering which yields a clearer sense. The word organum does not elsewhere appear in his N.T. Usually he retains vas from the Vulgate. See Annot.
15 ac $\tau \in($ ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
17 Saul इaoú入 ("Saule" Vg.). See on vs. 4, and Annot.
 Vg. 1527; "misit me Iesus" Vg. mss.). The Vulgate addition corresponds with the addition of 'Inooũs after $\mu \varepsilon$ in $\mathbf{p}^{45} 74 \times$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most later mss. Manetti similarly omitted Iesus.
17 visum recipias aُvaß $\beta$ ह́ $\psi \eta!$ ("videas" Vg.). This achieves consistency with the Vulgate rendering of vss. 12 and 18: see Annot. See also Ioh. 9,11.
18 deciderunt ởné่Ttєơo ("ceciderunt"Vg.). Erasmus gives a more precise rendering of this Greek compound verb, which occurs only here in the N.T. At Act. 20,9 (1519), Erasmus substitutes decido for cado in rendering $\pi i \not \pi \tau \omega$. See on Ioh. 11,32, for other such changes, and see also Annot.
 ${ }^{19}$ кai $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \dot{ }$ т т

 таĩs $\sigma u v a \gamma \omega \gamma \alpha i ̃ s ~ \varepsilon ̇ к n ́ p u \sigma \sigma \varepsilon ~ т о ̀ v ~ X p ı \sigma-~$ tóv, öti oũtós દُбтiv ó viòs toũ $\theta$ eoũ.





入ov èveסuvapoũto, kai ouvéXuve toùs 'louß́aious toùs катоикоũvtas द̀v $\Delta \alpha$ -
 ó Xpiotós.



 öтt
et visum recepit, et surgens baptizatus est. ${ }^{19}$ Quumque cepisset cibum, corroboratus est. Fuit autem Saulus cum discipulis qui erant Damasci, per dies aliquot. ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Et}$ continuo in synagogis praedicabat Christum, quod is esset filius dei. ${ }^{21}$ Stupebant autem omnes qui eum audiebant, ac dicebant: Nonne hic est qui expugnabat Hierosolymis eos, qui inuocabant nomen istud? Et huc ad hoc venit, vt vinctos illos duceret ad principes sacerdotum? ${ }^{22}$ Saulus autem multo magis inualescebat, et confundebat Iudaeos qui habitabant Damasci, affirmans quod is esset Christus.
${ }^{23}$ Expletis | autem diebus compluriLB 472

19 Quumque cepisset $B-E$ (Cumque cepisset $B-D$ ): et cum accepisset $A \mid$ corroboratus $B-E$ : confortatus $A \mid 20$ continuo $B$ - $E$ : continuo ingressus $A \mid$ synagogis $B-E:$ Synagogam $A \mid$ Christum B-E: Iesum $A \mid$ is $B-E:$ hic $A \mid 21$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid 22$ inualescebat $D$ : conualescebat $A-C \mid$ quod is esset $B-E$ : quoniam hic est $A \mid$ 23 Expletis ... occiderent $B$-E: Cum autem implerentur dies multi consilium fecerunt in vnum Iudaei vt eum interficerent $A$ | 24 Sed intellectae $B-E$ : Notae autem factae $A$ | Adseruabantque $E$ : Custodiebantque $A$, Asseruabantque $B-D \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$

19 Quumque cepisset cibum каl $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega े \nu ~ \tau р о ф ท ่ v$ ("et cum accepisset cibum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On -que, see on Iob. 1,39. Erasmus also introduces the idiomatic phrase, capio cibum, in 1516 at Mt. 15,20; Mc. 2,16; 1 Cor. 5,11, and in 1519 at Mc. 6,31; 7,3; Lc. 7,36; 14,1; 15,2, in rendering $\varepsilon \sigma \theta i \omega$ and $\sigma u v \varepsilon \sigma \theta i \omega$. Another phrase which he uses is cibum sumo at Act. 27,34 (for $\pi p o 0-$ $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} v \omega$ троф $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime}$ ) and Gal. 2,12 (for $\sigma v v \varepsilon \sigma \theta i ́ \omega$ ), in accordance with the Vulgate rendering of $\mu \varepsilon т \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ тро甲ர̃s at Act. 2,46; 27,33. See also Ioh. 4,31.

19 corroboratus est $\varepsilon$ घंví $\chi \cup \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ ("confortatus est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus removed all instances of conforto from the N.T. In 1516, in rendering
évסUvapó $\omega$, he substituted robustum facio (Rom. 4,20), fortis sum (Eph. 6,10; 2 Tim. 2,1), potentem facio (Pbil. 4,13), potentem reddo (1 Tim. 1,12); and in rendering крата́ó $\omega$, he substituted fortis sum ( 1 Cor. 16,13); and for $\delta \cup v a \mu o ́ \omega$, potentem facio (Col. 1,11). Then in 1519, following the Vulgate example at Eph. 3,16, he replaced several further occurrences of conforto with corroboro: at Lc. 1,80; 2,40 (both kparatów) and 2 Tim. 4,17 ( $\varepsilon v \delta u v \propto \mu o ́ \omega)$, as well as the present passage. At the same time, in 1519, Erasmus changed his earlier suggestion of potentem facio to corroboro at Pbil. 4,13; Col. 1,11. Finally in 1522, he substituted corroboro for the last remaining instance of conforto, at Lc. 22,43 (for évioxú $\omega$ ). The word conforto
does not exist in classical Latin, and even in later Latin it was ambiguous in meaning. See Annot. on Lc. 1,80; Rom. 4,20; Pbil. 4,13; 1 Tim. 1,12.
19 Saulus $\delta$ Eaũ入os (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{374}$ A A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti also put Saulus.
20 in synagogis ềv taĩs ouvarchraĩs ("ingressus in synagogas" late Vg.; "ingressus in Synagogam" 1516 Lat.). The late Vulgate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss. The 1516 adoption of Synagogam, in the singular, seems to be based on cod. 2816, which had
 ingressus.
20 Cbristum tòv Xpıotóv ("Iesum" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.) The Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting tòv $1 \eta \sigma o u ̃ v$, as in $\boldsymbol{7}^{45} 74$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus, as usual, follows cod. 2815 , in company with codd. 1,2816 and most other late mss.

20 quod ... esset o̊tı ... ह̇otv ("quoniam ... est" Vg.). See on lob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... est.
20 is oŨтos ("hic" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 3,26 for this removal of the ambiguity of bic. Erasmus' choice of pronoun is also better suited to indirect speech.
$21 a c$ kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
21 Hierosolymis èv "lepoưo $\lambda$ ńn ("in Hierusalem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,8.
22 इaũ̃os. In cod. 2815, it is maũos, supported by few mss. Erasmus or his assistants restored $\sigma \alpha \tilde{\lambda} \lambda$ os to the text, by reference to the Vulgate and codd. 1 and 2816, in company with virtually all other mss.
22 inualescebat ṫveסuvauoũto ("conualescebat" $1516-22=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus elsewhere follows the Vulgate in using inualesco for émाoxúa (Lc. 23,5), кatıбхú $\begin{gathered}\text { (Lc. 23,23), 1oxú } \omega \text { (Act. 19,16). }\end{gathered}$ At the present passage he probably wished to avoid the ambiguity of conualesco, which could also mean to recover from illness.
22 auvéxuve. This was the reading which Erasmus cited in Annot. In cod. 2815 is the variant ouveXee, also found in cod. E and a few later mss. Erasmus or his assistants corrected this from codd. 1 and 2816.

22 quod is esset ôtı oưtós धotiv ("quoniam hic est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On the use of quod, see
on Iob. 1,20. On the substitution of is, see on vs. 20. Manetti had quod bic est.
23 Expletis autem diebus compluribus' $\Omega s \delta \varepsilon \begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon \pi \\ \lambda\end{gathered} \rho-$ ои̃vто †̀ $\mu$ épal íkovái ("Cum autem implerentur dies multi" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Ioh. 15,25 , on expleo, and on Act. 1,3 for complures. Manetti put At cum implerentur dies multi.
23 inierunt inter se ... consilium $\sigma \cup v \varepsilon \beta$ Ou $\lambda \varepsilon \cup ́ \sigma \alpha v T O$ ("consilium fecerunt in vnum" $1516=$ late Vg.). Erasmus also substitutes ineo at Mt. 26,4 (1519) in rendering the same Greek verb, and at $M c .3,6$ (1519); 15,1 in rendering $\sigma \cup \mu \beta \circ\langle\dot{\lambda} 10 \nu$ moté $\omega$, following the example of the Vulgate at $M t .27,1,7$. Erasmus further uses consilium capio to replace consilium facio at Mt. 12,14, and to replace consilium ineo at Mt. 22,15. On the avoidance of facio, see on Iob. 1,15. In Annot., Erasmus complains of the addition of in vnum. Manetti put just consuluerunt.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The sole reason for this change seems to be to avoid repetition of interficio, which also occurs at the end of the following verse. At vs. 29, Erasmus retains occido from the Vulgate. Manetti's version was $v t$... interimerent.
23 illum oủtóv ("eum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus preferred illum here, to refer back to a more remote antecedent, i.e. Saul, rather than to Christ who was mentioned at the end of the previous sentence. Manetti had ipsum.
24 Sed intellectae sunt $\mathfrak{\xi} \gamma v \omega \dot{\sigma} \neq \eta$ ס́̇ ("Notae autem factae sunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus elsewhere retains notum facio for $\gamma \nu \omega$ pi $\zeta \omega$. On sed, see on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti proposed innotuerunt autem.
24 Adseruabantque $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon т \dot{p} \rho o u v \tau \varepsilon$ ("Custodiebant autem et" Vg.; "Custodiebantque" 1516). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant replacing $\tau \varepsilon$ by $\delta \varepsilon$ k $\alpha$, , as in $7^{7^{74}} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. A similar substitution of asseruo, in rendering $\varphi \cup \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, occurs at Act. 12,4 (1519). See also on Act. 7,53, for substitutions of seruo for custodio. In other contexts, Erasmus retains obseruo to render тapartnpé $\omega$. Manetti put et custodiebant.
24 ac kai ("et" 1516). A similar change from $a c$ to $e t$ occurs in 1516 at Act. 26,7: see ad loc. In 1519, Erasmus reverted to the Vulgate wording. Manetti replaced ac nocte by noctuque.












 pevóuevos ẻv 'Iepouoa入ínu, каì mappךola̧ónevos èv tẹ óvóuacti toũ kupiou





eum discipuli nocte, per murum demiserunt, submittentes in sporta. ${ }^{26}$ Quum autem Saulus venisset Hierosolymam, tentabat se iungere discipulis, et omnes timebant eum, non credentes quod esset discipulus. ${ }^{27}$ Barnabas autem apprehensum illum duxit ad apostolos, ac narrauit illis quomodo in via vidisset dominum, et quod loquutus esset ei, et quomodo in Damasco fortiter egisset in nomine Iesu. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Et}$ erat cum illis intrans et exiens Hierosolymis, cum fiducia loquens in nomine domini lesu. ${ }^{29}$ Loquebaturque et disputabat aduersus Graecos: illi vero quaerebant occidere eum. ${ }^{30}$ Quod quum cognouissent fratres, deduxerunt eum Caesaream, et emiserunt Tarsum.

25 demiserunt $B-E$ : dimiserunt eum $A \mid$ submittentes $E$ : summittentes $A-D \mid 26$ Saulus $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ : in hierusalem $A \mid 27$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ fortiter egisset $B$ - $E$ : fiducialiter egerit $A \mid 28$ intrans et exiens $A E$ : versans $B-D \mid$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid$ cum fiducia loquens $C$ - $E$ : fiducialiter agens $A B \mid$ Iesu $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 29$ aduersus Graecos $B-E$ : cum Graecis $A \mid$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A$

25 eum discipuli aủtòv ol $\mu \alpha \theta \eta$ тá́ ("discipuli eius" Vg.; "eum discipuli eius" late Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of oi $\mu \alpha \theta \eta t \alpha i=\alpha \cup ̛ T o u ̃$, as in $37^{74} \aleph$ A B C and five later mss. Four late mss. have $\alpha \dot{u}$ тò $v$ oi $\mu \alpha \theta \eta-$ т $\alpha$ i $\propto$ Ủтои̃, as represented by the late Vulgate. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and more than 400 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 481-3). Erasmus does not comment in Annot. on the peculiar notion found in the Vulgate, that there were Christians at Damascus known as the "disciples of Paul". Since there were already Christian disciples at Damascus before Paul's arrival and there is no mention of new disciples being added as a result of his preaching there, and since further he is
nowhere else described as having his own disciples, and the very concept was contrary to what he taught (cf. 1 Cor. 1,12-17; 3,4-11), the reading oi $\mu \alpha 0 \eta t \alpha i$ aúroũ seems to face insuperable objections. The only argument in its favour, apart from the antiquity of the few Greek mss. which contain it, is that it is a lectio difficilior. It seems more likely, however, that $\alpha u$ 'toũ was due to scribal error, by the change of just one letter, and that this is among the passages where the combined testimony of $\mathbf{p}^{74} \times$ A B C may represent an inferior text. Manetti put eum noctu discipuli for discipuli eius nocte.

25 demiserunt $\kappa \alpha \theta \pi \pi \kappa \propto \nu$ ("dimiserunt eum" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate addition of eum at
this point in the text is supported by $\mathbf{7}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C and a few later mss. See the previous note. The Vulgate does not appear to recognise any distinction of meaning between demitto and dimitto, and always uses the latter form of the verb (though demitto occurs in Vulgate mss. at 2 Cor. 11,33; Iac. 5,15). Manetti put dimiserunt, omitting eum.
26 Saulus $\delta$ Eaũ̃os (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{p}^{74} \times$ A B C and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti also added Saulus.
 lem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 8,27. Manetti had in Hierosolimam.
$27 a c$ кai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
27 quod loquutus esset ötı ह̀ $\lambda \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \sigma E v$ ("quia locutus est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod locutus est.
27 fortiter egisset ह̀mappnotáoato ("fiducialiter egerit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs at Act. 14,3 (1519). At Act. 9,28 (1522), however, Erasmus substitutes cum fiducia loquor (see ad loc.), and at Act. 18,26 libere loquor. See also on Act. 2,29 regarding $\pi \alpha p p \eta \sigma i \alpha$. The word fiducialiter does not occur in classical Latin.

28 intrans et exiens Hierosolymis eiotiopevóus-
 trans et exiens in Hierusalem 1516 Lat. $=V g$.; "versans Hierosolymis" 1519-27 Lat.). In the Greek column of his editions of 1516-27, Erasmus had eis instead of кoi èktopevousvos $\varepsilon$ ev, in accordance with his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $7^{74}$. In 1535, he changed to кal ékTopevóuevos ev, relying on the Vulgate and Chrysostom, while at the same time expressing his opinion in Annot., that the shorter reading was genuine ("germanus"). The longer reading (but with eis for $\bar{\varepsilon} v$ ) is also found in codd. $\times$ A B C E and many later mss. On versor, see on Ioh. 7,1. See also on Act. 1,21. For Hierosolymis, see on Act. 1,8. Manetti changed the word-order to produce ingrediens in Hierusalem et egrediens.
28 cum fiducia loquens каì mapp†бба̧ónevos ("fiducialiter agens" 1516-19 Lat. = Vg.). See on
vs. 27 for Erasmus' removal of fiducialiter ago. His use of cum fiducia loquor is comparable with his substitution of sumpta fiducia at Act. 13,46 (see ad loc.), and with the frequent Vulgate usage of fiducia in rendering mapp $\quad$ oía. See also Annot. In Erasmus' rendering, kai is left untranslated, following the Vulgate, though the latter was probably based on a Greek variant omitting kai, as in $7^{74} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ A B C and a few later mss. In his Greek text, Erasmus here follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Some copies of the late Vulgate also add et before fiducialiter, replaced by Manetti with ac fiducialiter.

28 Iesu 'Inooũ (omitted in $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $¥^{74} \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ A B E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with $\$^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti had Iesu, but omitted domini, with support from cod. C and many later mss.

29 Loquebaturque $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \in \varepsilon$ te ("Loquebatur quoque gentibus" late Vg.). See on Act. 2,11, regarding quoque. The late Vulgate addition of gentibus is unsupported by Greek mss.: see Annot. The version of Manetti had just loquebatur.

29 aduersus Graecos tròs tờs "E入入n $\quad$ viotós ("cum Graecis" 1516 = Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate at several passages in using disputo with cum in rendering $\sigma \cup \zeta \eta \eta t e ́ \omega$ and $\delta 1 \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\gamma}$ оиal. His use of aduersus here suggests that he regarded the present debate as more hostile in nature: cf. Annot.

29 vero $\delta^{\prime}$ ' ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,26. Manetti substituted $A t$ ipsi for illi autem.
 Vg.). Similar substitutions occur at Lc. 20,10, 11 (both 1519); Act. 17,14, but Erasmus retains dimitto at $L c$. 1,53 for the same Greek verb. He also puts emitto for dimitto in rendering
 $\lambda \omega$ at Mt. 21,3. See also on Act. 11,13 for the substitution of emitto for mitto. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving aúvóv untranslated at this point, though it is possible that the Vulgate was based on a Greek text omitting the word, as in $17^{74} \mathrm{~A} E$ and many later ms.
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${ }^{31}$ Igitur ecclesiae quidem per totam Iudaeam et Galilaeam et Samariam habebant pacem, et aedificabantur versantes in timore domini, et consolatione sancti spiritus multiplicabantur.
${ }^{32}$ Factum est autem vt Petrus dum peragraret per omnes, deueniret etiam ad sanctos qui habitabant Lyddae. ${ }^{33}$ Reperit autem ibi hominem quendam nomine Aeneam, annis iam octo decumbentem in grabbato, qui erat paralyticus. ${ }^{34}$ Et ait illi Petrus: Aenea, sanet te dominus Iesus Christus. Surge, et sterne tibi ipsi. Et continuo surrexit. ${ }^{35} \mathrm{Et}$ viderunt eum omnes qui habitabant Lyddae et Assarone, qui conuersi sunt ad dominum. ${ }^{36}$ Ioppae autem fuit quaedam discipula nomine Tabitha, quae interpretata dicitur Dorcas. Haec erat plena operibus bonis et


31 Igitur $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ versantes $B-E$ : ambulantes $A \mid 32$ peragraret per omnes $B-E$ : transiret $\operatorname{vniuersos} A \mid$ etiam $B-E:$ : om. $A \mid 33$ Reperit $B$-E: Inuenit $A \mid$ Aeneam $E$ : Aenaeam $A-D \mid$ annis $B$-E: ab annis $A \mid \operatorname{iam} B$-E: om. $A \mid$ decumbentem $B$-E: iacentem $A \mid$ grabbato $B$-E: grabato $A \mid 34$ Aenea $E$ : Aenaea $A-D \mid$ ipsi $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 36$ Ioppae $B-E: \operatorname{In}$ Ioppe $A$

31 Igitur ... quidem $\mu \dot{̀} \nu$ ỡv ("quidem" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission of igitur seems to be a matter of translation rather than the use of a different Greek text: cf. Annot. The expression $\mu \dot{\Sigma} \nu$ oưv occurs quite frequently in Acts: at twelve passages, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ untranslated; at eleven passages, he retains $e t$... quidem from the Vulgate; on three occasions, he goes further, using igitur ... quidem at the present passage, quidem igitur at Act. 19,32 (1519), and itaque ... quidem at Act. 26,4; at Act. 16,5 he has itaque for et ... quidem. Manetti put Ecclesie ergo, omitting quidem.

31 ecclesiae ... multiplicabantur ai ... èkк入nбíaı
 The Vulgate corresponds with a different Greek
text, having it ... ह̇кк入ךбia ... Elxev ... olko-
 as in $7^{77^{7}} \mathrm{NABC}$ and thirty-two later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by cod. (E) and more than 400 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 483-6). It is plain that this change from plural to singular, or from singular to plural, did not originate by accident. It has been suggested that the use of the plural was a later change, designed to conform with the use of ékk $\lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha$ in Act. 15,41 and 16,5. At those passages, the churches in question were in different parts of Syria, Cilicia, and Galatia. More geographically relevant to the present verse, there are also direct references to a plurality of churches in Judaea at Gal. 1,22 and 1 Thess. 2,14. However, apart from the present passage, there are no
other references to a plurality of churches anywhere in the first ten chapters of Acts, but only to a single church, and more especially the church at Jerusalem. In the account of Saul's journey to Damascus, there is no mention of 'the church at Damascus' but only of synagogues and individual disciples, some of whom might be supposed to have fled there in consequence of the persecution in Jerusalem. In Act. 8,1-3, Saul was an instigator of persecution against "the church". It is therefore entirely possible that an early scribe or editor who found a reference to "churches" in Act. 9,31, in a passage which recorded the end of that same period of persecution, might have seen fit to substitute the singular, as being more in keeping with the context of the earlier part of Acts. See also Annot., and Valla Annot., where the use of the plural had already been recommended. Other changes of translation in this sentence are discussed below. Manetti used the plural throughout this verse.
31 versantes topsuóneval ("ambulans" Vg.; "ambulantes" 1516). On versor, see on Ioh. 7,1. See the above note for the change from singular to plural. Manetti preferred procedentes.
 Vg.). The substitution of multiplico is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 6,7; 7,17; 12,24; 2 Cor. 9,10; Hebr. 6,14; 1 Petr. 1,2. Cf. the substitution of multiplico for adimpleo at 2 Petr. 1,2; Iud. 2. For the change from singular to plural, see above. Manetti put replebantur.
 transiret" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Act. 8,4.
32 omnes mávivinv ("vniuersos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 5,34. Manetti made the same change.
32 etiam kai (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti inserted et before deueniret.
33 Reperit £ũpe ("Inuenit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,41 .
33 Aeneam Aivoiov ("Aenaeam" 1516-27). Erasmus or his assistants took this Greek spelling from cod. 1, from which they also drew aivaia in vs. 34. However, they would have done better to retain aivéav and aivéa from codd. 2815 and 2816, in company with nearly all other mss.
 Comparable changes occur at Act. 24,10 (1519);

Rom. 15,23; 2 Cor. 8,10. Erasmus retained $a b$


33 decumbentem катакєí $\mu \in \nu O \nu$ ("iacentem" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 5,6.
34 Aenea Aivaía ("Aenaea" 1516-27). See on vs. 33.
34 dominus Iesus Cbristus ó 'Inooüs Xpıotós. In cod. 2815, the text has solely od Xpiotós, with support from just a few other late mss. Erasmus or his assistants remedied this by inserting 'Inooũs between $\delta$ and Xpiocós in their Greek text. However, this word-order is not supported by the Greek mss., which mostly have ingoũs ó xpiotós, as in codd. 1 and 2816, together with codd. $B^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$. A few other mss., including $\boldsymbol{7}^{74}{ }^{7} \mathrm{~B}^{*} \mathrm{C}$, have just ingoũs xpiotós. The Latin rendering contains a further problem, in retaining dominus from the late Vulgate, which is supported only by cod. A and a few later mss., in conflict with the accompanying Greek text and the Greek mss. which Erasmus usually consulted. Through negligent revision of his successive editions, this inconsistency between his Latin and Greek columns remained uncorrected. Manetti omitted dominus.
34 tibi ipsi $\sigma \varepsilon \alpha u T \tilde{\varphi}$ ("tibi" 1516= Vg.). Erasmus makes the same addition at Act. 16,28; Rom. 2,$5 ; 1$ Tim. 4,16, seeking to convey more precisely the emphasis of the Greek pronoun. Similar additions of ipsum (ipsi, ipso) are made at thirteen other passages in rendering ofautov, Épautóv, etc. For his treatment of Éautóv, see on Iob. 11,55 . Manetti made the same change.
35 Assarone tòv A A $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \omega v$ ("Sarone" late Vg.). The Vulgate spelling reflects a Greek variant, oxpẽva, found in $37^{5374}$ ( $\mathcal{N}$ A) B C E and some later mss. Some other late mss. also have oapũvav. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. 1 and most other late mss. (cod. 2816 had đ́ádp $\omega v \alpha$ ). See Annot.
36 Ioppae èv ’lótion ("In Ioppe" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This use of the locative case is found again in vs. 43 (1519). See on Iob. 4,21.
36 ㄱv (1st.). The omission of this word in 1519 is unsupported by Greek mss., and seems to have been a printing error.
 probable printing error, which arose in 1516 and persisted through all five editions. The correct spelling, as found in codd. 1, 2815, 2816 and most other mss., was $\delta 1 \varepsilon \rho \mu \eta \nu E \cup O \mu \dot{v} \eta$.
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eleemosynis quas praestabat. ${ }^{37}$ Factum est autem in diebus illis, vt infirmata moreretur. Quam quum lauissent, posuerunt in coenaculo. ${ }^{38}$ Quum autem vicina esset Lydda Ioppae, ac discipuli audissent quod Petrus esset in ea, miserunt ad eum, rogantes, ne grauaretur venire vsque ad se. ${ }^{39}$ Exurgens autem Petrus venit cum illis. Et quum aduenisset, duxerunt illum in coenaculum, et circunsteterunt illum omnes viduae flentes, et ostendentes tunicas vestesque, quas faciebat quum esset cum ipsis Dorcas. ${ }^{40}$ Eiectis autem omnibus foras, Petrus positis genibus orauit: et conuersus ad corpus dixit: Tabitha, surge. At illa aperuit oculos suos, visoque Petro resedit. ${ }^{41}$ Data autem illi manu, erexit eam: et quum vocasset sanctos ac viduas, exhibuit eam viuam. ${ }^{42}$ Id autem innotuit per totam Ioppen, et crediderunt multi in $\mid$ dominum. LB 474 ${ }^{43}$ Factum est autem vt dies multos maneret Ioppae apud Simonem quendam coriarium.

40 avactn $\theta_{1} A^{c} B-E: \alpha v \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \sigma T 1 ~ A^{*}$

36 praestabat $B$-E: faciebat $A \mid 38$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ miserunt $B-E$ : miserunt duos viros $A$ 39 ostendentes $B$ - $E$ : ostendentes ei $A \mid$ vestesque $B-E$ : et vestes $A \mid$ cum ipsis $B-E$ : secum $A$ | 40 Tabitha $B$-E: Tabita $A$ | suos, visoque $B$-E: et viso $A \mid 41$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 42$ Id autem innotuit $B-E$ : Notum autem factum est $A \mid$ totam $B-E$ : vniuersam $A \mid$ dominum $B-E$ : domino $A$ | 43 maneret Ioppae $B$-E: moraretur in Ioppe $A$

36 praestabat Ėmoícı ("faciebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 7,19.
37 Quam quum lauissent, posuerunt $\lambda 0$ oúravtes
 posuerunt eam" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with a different Greek word-order, גoúravtes
 few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815,
supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\nexists^{45}{ }^{53} \aleph^{\text {corr }}$ C E. The version of Manetti was Cum vero lauissent eam posuerunt.

38 vicina ... Ioppae ẺYYùs ... тñ ’lómmñ ("prope ... ab Ioppe" Vg.). The construction of prope with $a b$ did occur in classical usage, even if Erasmus disliked it. A comparable
substitution of vicina for iuxta occurs at Act. 27,8. However, Erasmus retains Bethania iuxta Hierosolymam at Iob. 11,18. Manetti put propinqua Ioppe.
$38 a c$... audissent ởкoúбबขves ("audientes" Vg.; "et ... audissent" 1516). As well as changing the tense, to take account of the Greek aorist participle, Erasmus attains a more natural Latin word-order. Manetti put qui audierant.
38 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant adding Súo ävobpas, found in 735 ${ }^{45}$ ※ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, with support from codd. 1, $2816^{*}$ and most other late mss., though he records in Annot., that in one of his mss. (cod. 2816) he found that the words סvio ávסpas were added in the margin. Both readings involve a grammatical problem, which could have induced some scribes either to add or omit $\delta$ v́o äv $v$ pas. If this phrase were originally part of the text, the apparent clash between the accusative of ${ }_{\alpha} v \delta \rho \alpha s$ and the nominative of $\pi \alpha p \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda 0 u ̃ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, might have made it convenient to omit the phrase. On the other hand, if the phrase were not originally in the text, some scribes might have wished to add something, in order to provide an explicit antecedent for aÚtoĩs in vs. 39. Manetti omitted duos viros.
 ("Ne pigriteris venire vsque ad nos" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having $\mu \eta$
 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with $\mathbf{3}^{45 v i d} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr vid }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In Annot., he treats the Vulgate rendering as a mistranslation rather than a matter of textual variation in the underlying Greek. The verb pigritor does not occur in classical Latin. Manetti's rendering was ne negligeret ad eos accedere.
 $1516=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
39 vestesque kail i $\mu$ ćría ("et vestes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
 Vg.; "cum esset secum" 1516). The Vulgate
rendering does not enjoy any Greek ms. support. The substitution of secum, which Erasmus introduced here in the 1516 edition, also occurs at Mc. 2,26 (1519); 3,14; Lc. 6,4; 7,36 (1516 only); Act. 14,27. See also Annot., where he further suggests rendering by dum cum illis esset. In Valla Annot., the proposed translation was dum erat cum illis, and Manetti very similarly put dum erat cum eis.
40 positis genibus $\theta_{\text {kis tà Yóvata ("ponens }}$ genua" Vg.). Greek aorist. A similar substitution occurs at $M c .15,19$, following the example of the Vulgate at Lc. 22,41; Act. 7,60; 20,36; 21,5. Manetti put genibus appositis.
40 ทךvoise. In codd. 2815 and 2816, the text has $\delta 1 \eta \operatorname{vol} \xi \varepsilon$, supported by a few other late mss. Erasmus or his assistants restored the correct reading from cod. 1.
40 suos $\alpha \cup ̉ T \eta ̃ s$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The late Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti also added suos.
40 visoque kai iठoũба ("et viso" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
41 Data ... manu סoùs ... XEĩpa ("Dans ... manum" Vg.). Greek aorist.
41 ac kaí ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.
41 exbibuit $\pi \alpha p \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ ("assignauit" Vg.). The Vulgate choice of verb is unexpected. Erasmus' substitution of exhibeo is more consistent with Vulgate usage elsewhere. At Rom. 15,28, in rendering $\sigma \varphi p \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, he replaced assigno with obsigno. See further on Act. 1,3.
42 Id ... innotuit $\gamma v \omega \sigma$ т̀̀v ... é $\gamma$ ย́vєтo ("Notum ... factum est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,19.
42 totam ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \eta$ ns ("vniuersam" $1516=V g$.). See on Act. 5,34. This change was already made by Manetti.
42 in dominum érì tòv kúpıov ("in domino" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., lemma, the Vulgate reading is cited as domino, omitting in, though the Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514, as well as the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T., all have in domino. See on Iob. 3,36. Valla Annot. and Manetti both had in dominum.
43 vt ... maneret $\mu$ кivă ("vt ... moraretur" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 11,54 for Erasmus' treatment of moror elsewhere, in rendering other Greek verbs. Manetti substituted vt ... commoraretur.
43 Ioppae év 'lómтñ ("in Ioppe" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 36.
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10Vir autem quidam erat Caesareae, nomine Cornelius, centurio ex cohorte quae dicitur Italica, ${ }^{2}$ religiosus ac timens deum cum tota domo sua, praestans eleemosynas multas plebi, deprecansque deum semper. ${ }^{3}$ Is vidit per visum manifeste ferme hora diei nona angelum dei introeuntem ad se, dicentemque sibi: Corneli. ${ }^{4}$ At ille intuens eum, ac timore correptus, dixit: Quid est domine? Dixit autem illi: Orationes tuae et eleemosynae tuae ascenderunt in memoriam coram deo. ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Et}$ nunc mitte viros Ioppen, et accerse Simonem qui cognominatur Petrus. ${ }^{6}$ Hic diuersatur apud Simonem quendam coriarium, cui est domus iuxta mare. Hic dicet tibi, quid te oporteat facere. ${ }^{7}$ Et quum discessisset angelus qui loquebatur illi, vocauit duos famulos suos, et militem religiosum ex his qui sibi adhaerebant.


10,1 Caesareae B-E: in Caesarea $A \mid$ ex cohorte $B-E$ : cohortis $A \mid 2$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ tota $B-E$ : omni $A \mid$ praestans $B-E$ : faciens $A \mid$ deprecansque $B-E$ : et deprecans $A \mid 3$ per visum $B-E$ : in visu $A \mid$ ferme $B-E$ : quasi $A \mid$ dicentemque $B-E$ : et dicentem $A \mid 4$ eleemosynae $A-C E$ : eleemosinae $D \mid$ coram deo $B-E$ : in conspectu dei $A \mid 5$ Ioppen $B-E$ : in Ioppen $A$ | 6 diuersatur $B-E$ : hospitatur $A \mid$ cui $B-E$ : cuius $A \mid 7$ famulos $B-E$ : domesticos $A \mid$ adhaerebant $B-E$ : cohaerebant $A$

10,1 Caesareae 文v Kaıo人peiọ ("in Caesarea" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs at Act. 25,4 (1519). For other instances of Erasmus' use of the locative case, see on Iob. 4,21 . The spelling kaıkapsia in 1516 is a misprint.
1 ex cohorte èk $\sigma \pi \varepsilon$ ipns ("cohortis" $1516=V g$.). As pointed out in Annot., a centurion would not have been in charge of a whole cohort. The same change had been advocated by Valla Annot.
2 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.

2 tota mavti ("omni" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,2.

2 praestans Toic̃ $\nu$ TE ("faciens" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 7,19 for the substitution of praesto. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting $\tau \varepsilon$, as in $\mathbf{~}^{74} \aleph$ A B C E and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text, though not his Latin, follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.

2 deprecansque kai $\delta$ غóuєvos ("et deprecans" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39.

3 per visum èv ópáuartı ("in visu" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 9,10. Manetti (both mss.) put visionem without per.
3 ferme $\dot{\omega} \sigma \mathrm{si}$ ("quasi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,39.
3 dicentemque kai elmóvta ("et dicentem" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See ibid. Manetti put ac dicentem.
4 ac kai (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is virtually unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti substitutes timidusque effectus for timore correptus.
4 Quid est Ti zoto ("Quis es" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering is, again, virtually unsupported by Greek mss., and may reflect a harmonisation with Act. 9,5 or 26,15 . Cf. Annot. The rendering quid est was adopted by both Valla Annot. and Manetti.
4 coram deo èvémiov toũ $\theta$ हoũ ("in conspectu dei" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. on Act. 7,10. The same substitution occurs at vs. 31 (1519). This change, again, was anticipated by Manetti.
5 Ioppen eis 'ló $\pi \pi \eta \eta$ ("in Ioppen" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 8,27.
 change occurs at Act. 10,32; 11,13 (both in 1519). For Erasmus' use of accerso instead of accersio, see on Act. 4,18.
5 Simonem $\Sigma i \mu \omega v \alpha$ ("Simonem quendam" $V$ g.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of tiva, as in codd. A B C and some later mss., which could have been influenced by the indefinite pronoun in тivi $\sum i \mu \omega \nu 1$ ßupoeĩ of $A c t .9,43 ; 10,6$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. K E. The same change was made by Manetti.
6 diuersatur $\xi$ हvi $\zeta$ ETal ("hospitatur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs in vs. 32 . The verb diuersor has a more solid classical pedigree than bospitor. At Act. 28,7 (1519), Erasmus tried tractauit bospitio. In rendering aùi ǐoual, he substitutes diuersor for maneo at $M t .21,17$, and for moror at Lc. 21,37 (1519). However, he retains bospitor at Act. 21,16, for $\xi \in v i \zeta \omega$. Cf. Valla Elegantiae IV, 82; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 262, 11. 516-520, where bospes and bospitium are defined in terms of private hospitality, without financial reward.
6 cui $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ ("cuius" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ). Erasmus is slightly more literal here.
6 Hic dicet tibi, quid te oporteat facere oũtos

find this sentence in any of his Greek mss. at Basle, or in cod. 69 (though at a later date the phrase was inserted into cod. $69^{\mathrm{mg}}$ ). Prompted by the text of the late Vulgate, he probably arrived at his Greek wording by a conjecture, modelled on Act. 9,6 , which has kai $\lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \theta$ ǹ-
 In the lower margin of his cod. 2816 is found an alternative version, taken from Act. 11,14:
 $\sigma \omega \theta \eta \dot{\sigma} \eta$ Øoì kai mãs ó olkós $\sigma o u$, a reading which is found in several other late mss. In 1527 Annot., after finding that the sentence was omitted in the Complutensian Polyglot, Erasmus expressed his opinion that these words (i.e. of the late Vulgate) had been taken from Acts ch. 9. Nevertheless, his conjectural reconstruction of the text remained in the Textus Receptus. Manetti omitted this sentence.
7 illi $\tau \tilde{\omega}$ Kopv $\lambda^{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\varphi}$. Erasmus' translation is the same as the Vulgate, though the latter follows a Greek text substituting aủtư, as found in $\mathbf{~}^{74} \kappa$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti accordingly had Cornelio.
7 famulos $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu$ oiкєтడ̃v ("domesticos" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., Erasmus suggests, rather more literally, famulorum. He retains domesticus elsewhere to render oikiakós (Mt. 10,25, 36), and oikeios (Gal. 6,10; Eph. 2,19). At several passages he substitutes famulus for both puer and seruus, in rendering maĩs and oikétns. The word famulus occurs in the Vulgate N.T. at Hebr. 3,5 alone, to render $\theta_{\varepsilon p \alpha ́}{ }^{2} \omega \omega \nu$ (changed by Erasmus to minister). At the present passage, famulus is more suitable, as in classical Latin domestici could also refer to other members of the centurion's own family.
7 religiosum $\varepsilon \dot{J} \sigma \in \beta \tilde{\eta}$ ("metuentem dominum" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the paraphrastic rendering adopted by the Vulgate, and suggests using pium. His substitution of religiosum is in accordance with Vulgate usage in vs. 2 . Manetti made the same change.
7 sibi adhaerebant пробкартєрои́vт $\omega \nu$ aủт ("illi parebant" Vg.; "sibi cohaerebant" 1516). See on Act. 5,36 for Erasmus' use of adbacreo. In Annot, he suggests assisto or inserxio, observing that while other soldiers obeyed ("parebant") the centurion, this particular group was continually with him to act as his assistants. Manetti tried secum perseuerabant.




















${ }^{8}$ Quibus quum narrasset omnia, misit illos Ioppen.
${ }^{9}$ Postridie vero facientibus illis iter et appropinquantibus ciuitati, ascendit Petrus in superiora domus, vt oraret, circa horam sextam. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Et}$ quum esuriret, voluit gustare cibum. Parantibus autem illis, irruit super eum mentis excessus. ${ }^{11}$ Et videt coelum apertum, ac descendens ad se vas quoddam velut linteum magnum, quatuor initiis alligatum, summitti e coelo in terram, ${ }^{12}$ in quo erant omnia quadrupedia terrae bestiaeque et reptilia et volatilia coeli. ${ }^{13}$ Et facta est vox ad eum: Surge Petre, macta et vescere. ${ }^{14}$ Ait autem Petrus: Nequaquam domine, quia nunquam edi quicquam commune vel immundum. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ vox rursus iterum ad eum: Quae deus purificauit,

12 tert. $\kappa \alpha 1 \tau \alpha A-C D^{b} E: \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha_{1} \tau \alpha D^{*}$

8 Ioppen $B$-E: in Ioppen $A \mid 9$ Postridie ... iter B-E: Postero autem die iter illis facientibus $A$ | domus B-E: om. $A \mid 10$ cibum $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ irruit $B-E$ : cecidit $A \mid 11$ videt $A^{c} B$-E: vidit $A^{*} \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ ad se $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ initiis $A^{*} B-E$ : intiiis $A^{c} \mid$ alligatum $A^{c} B-E$ :om. $A^{*} \mid$ summitti $A^{*} B$-E: summiti $A^{c} \mid$ e $B-E$ : de $A \mid 12$ terrae bestiaeque et reptilia $B-E$ et serpentia terrae $A \mid$ 13 macta et vescere $B-E$ : occide et manduca $A$ | 14 Nequaquam $B-E$ : Absit $A$ | edi quicquam $B$-E: manducaui omne $A \mid$ vel $E$ : et $A-D \mid 15$ rursus iterum $B-E$ : iterum secundo $A$

8 Ioppen gis $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ 'lómitinv ("in Ioppen" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . See on Act. 8,27.$
 autem die" Vg.; "Postero autem die" 1516). Erasmus uses postridie six times in Acts (for
 at Act. 20,7, 21,8, and in 1519 at Act. 10,9, 24; 20,15; 28,13 - but nowhere else in the N.T. Elsewhere, he has postero die, at all seven occurrences of Ėmaúpiov in the Gospels. The word postridie nowhere occurs in the Vulgate. The use of postridie is covered in Valla Elegantiae II, 10; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 298, 11. 495-497.
 ("iter illis facientibus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The only purpose of this change is to achieve symmetry
with the following words, appropinquantibus ciuitati. Manetti preferred itinerantibus illis.
9 in superiora domus हैтì tò $\delta \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ ("in superiora" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus offers greater precision here. Manetti had made the same addition.
10 gustare cibum $\gamma$ घúcooolaı ("gustare" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus probably regarded it as clearer, and in better style, to supply an object, although some Latin authors use this verb without adding cibum.
 change is comparable with Vulgate usage at Lc. 1,12, timor irruit super eum. Cf. the replacement of cado by illabor at Act. 11,15, and by incido at Act. 19,17 (1519). See on Iob. 11,32 for such changes.

11 videt $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon \check{\imath}$ ("vidit" 1516 Lat. text = Vg.). Erasmus more accurately conveys the present tense. See Annot.
11 ac kal ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
11 ad se $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ aútóv (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\$ 9^{74}$ K A B C E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. It might be supposed that later scribes could have added the phrase Ém' oútóv from the previous verse, in order to harmonise with Act. 11,5. However, a deliberate harmonisation could have been expected to make use of the preposition of $x \mathrm{pl}$, as found at the latter passage, rather than $\varepsilon$ हrí. If, on the other hand, the words are genuine, it is possible that a few early scribes might have omitted them, either by accident, or by deliberate abbreviation of the text. Manetti put super eum.
11 alligatum $\delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \mu$ évov kaí (omitted in 1516 Lat. text $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{7074} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B C ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and fourteen later mss., possibly reflecting harmonisation with Act. 11,5. Erasmus again follows cod. 2815, supported on this occasion by cod. $\mathrm{C}^{* v i d}$ and more than 400 of the later mss., including cod. 1. The reading of cod. 2816 is $\delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{v} \eta \nu$ kaí, agreeing with ó $\theta$ óvŋ $\nu$ (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 488-90). See Annot. The version of Manetti had ligatum et.
11 e coelo ("de coelo" $1516=$ Vg.). These words are an explanatory addition, modelled on Act. 11,5. Manetti omitted this phrase.
12 terrae bestiaeque et reptilia Tñs $\gamma$ ñs kai т $\dot{\alpha}$ Onpió koi tò épтtetó ("et serpentia terrae" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). This is yet another example of the incompletely revised state of much of the 1516 Latin rendering, conflicting with both the Greek text and Annot. The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having kal épmetà tins $\gamma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$ (omitting kal tà Onpía), as in $7^{74}$ א A B $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr vid }}$ and three later mss. In a further twenty
 Y $\mathrm{\eta}$ s. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and about 375 other late mss. The reading of cod. 2816 is Tñs $\gamma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$ Kai tò éptetà kaì tà Onpía (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 490-5). See Annot. The question here, once more, is whether the longer reading represents a harmonisation with the passage at Act. 11,6, or whether the shorter reading of the earlier witnesses was a deliberate "rationalisation" of
the text, to remove the imagined redundancy of $\theta$ npia (on the grounds that these creatures were already included under тETpómTOס $\alpha$ ) and to provide a tighter logical balance between
 toũ oúpovovi. The word reptilis is also substituted for serpens at Rom. 1,23, following the example of the Vulgate at Act. 11,6. Usually Erasmus reserves serpens, more specifically, for ö 1 ıs. However, he retains serpens for غ̇pтtetóv at lac. 3,7. Manetti put terrae et ferae ac reptilia.
13 macta $\theta$ ũ $\sigma 0 v$ ("occide" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Similar substitutions occur at Mt. 22,4; Lc. 15,23 (both in 1519); Act. 11,7. Erasmus selects a verb which neatly combines the required connotations of "kill" and "sacrifice". See Annot.
13 vescere $\varphi \alpha ́ \gamma \varepsilon$ ("manduca" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at $L c$. 15,16 (1519); Act. 11,7; Rom. 14,2-6, 20; 1 Cor. 8,13 (1519). On manduco, see on loh. 4,31.
14 Nequaquam $M \eta \delta \alpha \mu \omega ̃ s$ ("Absit" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus finds a clearer equivalent to the Greek word. The same substitution occurs at Act. 11,8. The same change further occurs, in rendering in $\lambda \in \omega$ s at Mt. 16,22. Erasmus elsewhere retains absit for $\mu \grave{\eta} \gamma^{\text {Évoito. See Annot. This change }}$ was anticipated by Manetti.
14 edi モ̌ $\varnothing \propto \gamma \circ v$ ("manducaui" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
14 quicquam $\pi \tilde{\alpha} v$ ("omne" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The indefinite pronoun, quicquam, is more suitable, after the preceding nunquam. Manetti's solution was to replace nunquam omne by nibil vnquam.
14 vel $\eta$ ( ("et" 1516-27 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of kaj , as in $39^{45} 74 \mathrm{~K}$ A B and a few later mss. The Greek text of Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1,2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. CD E. The version of Manetti had aut.
15 rursus iterum $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda ı v$ ék $\delta \varepsilon \cup \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho o u$ ("iterum secundo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 9,9. Erasmus substitutes rursus alia vice at Mt. 26,42 (1519). See Annot. At passages where $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{k}} \delta_{\text {eut }}$ gipou (or tò $\delta \varepsilon u ̛ T \varepsilon \rho \circ v$ ) is not preceded by $\pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda ı v$, Erasmus replaces secundo by rursus or rursum: at Act. 11,9; Hebr. 9,28; Iud. 5, following the example of the Vulgate at Ioh. 9,24. Manetti's version was iterum ex secundo.
15 Quae "A ("Quod" late Vg.). The late Vulgate reading is probably the result of a scribal alteration within the Latin tradition, having no Greek mss. in support. It may have been
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tu communia ne dixeris. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem factum est tertio. Et rursum receptum est vas in coelum. ${ }^{17} \mathrm{Et}$ dum apud sese haesitaret Petrus, quaenam esset visio quam vidisset, ecce viri qui missi erant a Cornelio, percontati de domo Simonis, astiterunt ad ianuam. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ euocato quopiam interrogabant an Simon qui cognominaretur Petrus, illic haberet hospitium. ${ }^{19}$ Petro vero cogitante de visione, dixit spiritus ei: Ecce viri quaerunt te. ${ }^{20}$ Surge itaque et descende, et vade cum eis, nihil haesitans, propterea quod ego misi illos. ${ }^{21}$ Descendens autem Petrus ad viros, qui missi erant a Cornelio ad ipsum, dixit: Ecce ego sum ille quem quaeritis. Quae causa est propter quam venistis? ${ }^{22}$ Qui dixerunt: Cornelius centurio, vir iustus ac timens deum, et testimonium habens $a b$ vniuersa gente Iudaeorum, oraculo admoni|tus



16 rursum $B-E:$ statim $A \mid 17$ apud sese $B-E$ intra se $A \mid$ quaenam $B-E$ : que nam $A \mid$ 18 cognominaretur $B-E$ : cognominatur $A \mid 19$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ viri $B-E$ : viri tres $A \mid$
20 haesitans, propterea quod $B$-E: dubitans, quia $A \mid 21$ qui ... ipsum $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ ille $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 22$ ac $B$-E: et $A$
designed to harmonise with commune, in the singular, later in the verse.
15 communia ne dixeris $\mu \dot{\eta}$ коívou ("commune ne dixeris" late Vg.). As indicated in Annot., the plural is required, to agree with the Greek relative pronoun earlier in the verse. The same point had been made by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti put ne commune duxeris.
16 tertio $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime}$ it tpís ("per ter" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Act. 11,10. In Annot., Erasmus criticises the Vulgate rendering, and suggests ad ter as a better alternative. He accordingly included the passage among the Soloecismi,
arousing Stunica to defend the Vulgate wording on the grounds that it was more literal: see Erasmus Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 C-D. The Vulgate expression was also criticised in Valla Annot.

16 rursum тód $\lambda ı v$ ("statim" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, eủӨús, as in $\boldsymbol{p l}^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B C E and a few later mss. In ${ }^{7}{ }^{45}$, the word is completely omitted. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. (D) and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Although there is a theoretical possibility of harmonisation with Act. 11,10, it is also
possible that an early scribe objected to mó $\lambda \lambda$ on the grounds that it appeared repetitious after the use of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$ in $A c t$. 10,15, and hence omitted or altered the word. Further, the variant,
 this adverbial sense elsewhere in Acts, and hence could be considered alien to the style of the book. See Annot., suggesting the use of rursus, which was the rendering adopted by Manetti.
 Erasmus sometimes retains intra from the Vulgate, while substituting sese for se: at Mt. 9,3, 21; 16,7; Mc. 2,8; 6,51 (1519). Twice he uses apud sese for troòs éoutoús, at Mc. 9,10; 14,4. On sese, see further on Iob. 7,35. Manetti had intra se ipsum.
17 quaenam ti ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{a} v$ ("quidnam" Vg.). Erasmus associates quaenam more closely with visio, a feminine noun. The Greek could be understood in either sense.
 ("inquirentes domum" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6.
18 euocato quopiam $\phi \omega v \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \tau$ es ("cum vocassent" Vg.). The substitution of euoco also occurs at Mc. 3,31 (1519), in a similar context of calling someone from outside a house. Erasmus adds an object, for the sake of clarity. See on Iob. 6,7, regarding quispiam.
18 an \&i ("si" Vg.). See on Iob. 9,25.
18 qui cognominaretur ó émıка入оúusvos ("qui cognominatur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus attempts a more Latin sequence of tenses, following interrogabant. Manetti put qui vocabatur.
19 vero 8 ' ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,26.

19 évevuounévou. Erasmus took this reading from cod. 2815, supported by cod. 2816 and only a few other late mss. Another reading, סıevevuovyévou, is found in cod. 1 and nearly all other mss.
19 viri ävסpes ("viri tres" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of tpeis, as in $7^{74} \aleph$ A C E and some later mss. Cod. B has Súo. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816* (in cod. 2816 ${ }^{\text {oorr }}$, tpeĩs is added between the lines). Manetti similarly omitted tres.
20 baesitans Siaxpivóuevos ("dubitans" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at

Mt. 14,31 (1519) in rendering $\delta$ ı$\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$. At Act. 11,12, by contrast, Erasmus converted baesito into addubito in 1516, reverting to baesito in 1519.
20 propterea quod סıótı ("quia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. on Act. 8,11.
21 qui missi erant a Cornelio ad ipsum toùs àme$\sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \mu \varepsilon ́ v o u s ~ a ̉ m o ̀ ~ т о u ̃ ~ K o p \nu \eta \lambda i o u ~ т \rho o ̀ s ~ a \cup ́ T o ́ v ~$ (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In 1516, Erasmus followed his cod. 2815 and the Vulgate in omitting this clause, in company with cod. $2816^{*}$ and most other mss., commencing with \{pasvid $74 \times$ A B CD E. Then in 1519 , he added the clause to his text and translation, saying in Annot., that he found it in several ("nonnullis") Greek mss. It roughly corresponds with the wording of cod. 3 , though this ms. omits toũ, while cod. 1 offered toùs à $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \lambda \mu \varepsilon \dot{v} \nu$ Ous úmò кориŋ $\lambda$ iou mpòs aúroús, and cod. $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ has
 omitting mpòs cưTóv. The extra clause survived into the Textus Receptus, supported by relatively few late mss., probably having originated as an explanatory marginal note. Manetti omitted these words.
21 ille quem óv ("quem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The added pronoun eases the transition from sum.
$22 a c$ кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti put atque.
22 et testimonium babens $\mu \alpha \rho т и p o u ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s ~ т \varepsilon . ~$ In 1516-19, Erasmus added kai before $\mu \alpha \mathrm{p}$ TUроú $\mu \varepsilon v o s$, apparently without any Greek ms. support. All his usual mss. omit kai here. Manetti had et testimonio probatus.
22 oraculo admonitus est éxp sum accepit" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 2,12; Hebr. 11,7, comparable with the Vulgate's use of admonitus at Mt. 2,22. At Hebr. 8,5, Erasmus has oraculo responsum est. See Annot. on Mt. 2,12, where he argues that responsum misleadingly implied that it was a reply to a previous question. Manetti tried oraculum accepit. The spelling épX $\eta \mu \alpha \sigma_{i \sigma \theta \eta}$ in 1527 was a misprint. In attempting to correct it, the printer of the 1535 edition created the further misprint,

 See on Ioh. 1,33, and Annot. See on Act. 4, 18 for the Vulgate use of accersio. Manetti put vt accersiret.
22 audiret $\alpha$ ákoṽoar ("audire" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 . The same change was made by Manetti.
 દ̇ $\xi \dot{\varepsilon} v 1 \sigma \varepsilon$.



 סè Kopví入ios j̃v пробסокஸ̃v aủtoús,
















abs te. ${ }^{23}$ Intro vocatos igitur eos, recepit hospitio.

Sequenti vero die Petrus profectus est cum illis, et quidam ex fratribus Ioppensibus comitati sunt eum. ${ }^{24}$ Postridie vero introierunt Caesaream. Porro Cornelius expectabat illos, conuocatis cognatis suis ac necessariis amicis. ${ }^{25} \mathrm{Vt}$ autem factum est vt introiret Petrus, obuiam progressus ei Cornelius, ac procidens ad pedes, adorauit eum. ${ }^{26}$ Petrus vero erexit eum, dicens: Surge, et ego ipse homo sum. ${ }^{27}$ Et colloquens cum illo, intrauit, et offendit multos qui conuenerant, ${ }^{28}$ dixitque ad illos: Vos scitis, non esse fas viro Iudaeo coniungi aut accedere ad alienigenam: sed mihi ostendit deus, ne quem communem aut immundum dicerem hominem, ${ }^{29}$ quapropter et incunctanter veni accersitus. Interrogo ergo, quam ob causam accersistis me? ${ }^{30} \mathrm{Et}$ Cornelius ait:


23 Intro vocatos igitur $B$ - $E$ : Introducens ergo $A \mid$ vero $B$ - $E$ : autem $A \mid$ Petrus $B$ - $E$ : surgens $A \mid$ Ioppensibus $D E$ : ab Ioppe $A$, ab Ioppensibus $B C \mid 24$ Postridie $B$ - $E$ : Post $A \mid$ Porro Cornelius $B-E$ : Cornelius vero $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ et $A \mid 25 \mathrm{Vt}$ autem factum est vt $B-E$ : Et factum est cum $A \mid$ obuiam progressus $B$ - $E$ : obuius venit $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ pedes $B-E$ : pedes eius $A \mid 26$ erexit $B-E$ : eleuauit $A \mid 27$ offendit $B-E$ : inuenit $A \mid 28$ non esse fas $B-E$ : quomodo abominatum sit $A \mid 29$ incunctanter $B-E$ : sine contraadictione $A$ (sic)

23 Intro vocatos عícka入є $\sigma$ á $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ ("Introducens" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). Greek aorist. The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant such as عi$\sigma \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$, found in cod. D. See Annot., where Erasmus also suggests using inuitatos, which happens to be the rendering which had been adopted by Manetti.

23 igitur oưv ("ergo" 1516 = late Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,62. Manetti had et.

23 vero $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("autem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti made the same change.

23 Petrus ó Пétpos ("surgens" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text substituting ávaotás, as found in $\mathbf{P}^{74 v i d}$ K A B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In codd. C E and some later mss. is a combination of both readings, to produce ávaocó̀s ò Пє́тpos. Manetti also put Petrus.
23 Ioppensibus rãv ámò "lómтns ("ab Ioppe" $1516=$ Vg.; "ab Ioppensibus" 1519-22). The reading of 1519-22 looks like a printer's error, failing to omit the redundant $a b$, perhaps
through misunderstanding a correction marked in a copy of Erasmus' 1516 edition. On Ioppensibus, see on Act. 6,9.
24 Postridie vero kai $T$ ñ èmaúpiov ("Altera autem die" Vg.; "Post vero" 1516). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant having $\mathfrak{n}$ ס $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ émaúpıov, as in $\$ 7^{74} \mathrm{NABCDE}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See on Act. 10,9 regarding postridie. at the present passage, the choice of word is partly governed by Erasmus' desire to avoid repetition of sequenti from vs. 23 . On the removal of altera, see on Ioh. 1,29. Manetti had et altera die.
24 introierunt हl $\sigma \tilde{j} \lambda \theta_{0}$ ("introiuit" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text having $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \tilde{\sim} \lambda \lambda \in \varepsilon v$, as in codd. B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., this time commencing with $39^{74}$ A E. Another plural form, eioñ $\lambda \theta a v$, is found in codd. $\mathbb{K}$ C.
 vero" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,16.
24 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on loh. 1,25 .
 ("Et ... cum introisset" Vg.; "Et ... cum introiret" 1516 Lat.). Erasmus' rendering, in 1519, is more accurate. The variant kai $\delta^{\prime} \dot{E}$ in 1516 seems to be a printer's error, arising from the fact that in cod. 2815 the first letter of ' $\Omega s$ is placed in the margin, in red ink (as frequently practised in this ms. at the beginning of a new section), so that the remaining letter was misread as a compendium for koi. However, the 1516 Greek text was more correct in its insertion of Toũ before $\varepsilon$ íce $\lambda \theta$ Eiv, following cod. 2815 , with the support of $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \aleph$ A B C E and about 350 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The reading of sixty-one further late mss. is toũ हौ $\lambda \in$ हiv. Erasmus' omission of toũ in 1519 (contrary to the reading of cod.3), was supported by fifty-nine other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 497-500), and this was the reading which remained in the Textus Receptus. Manetti put et factum est, vt introiuit.
25 obuiam progressus ouvavtióoxs ("obuius venit" $1516=$ late Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus retains occurro for this verb at $L c .9,37 ; 22,10$, while substituting occurro for obuio at Hebr. 7,1, 10. Manetti had obuiauit.
$25 a c($ ( et " $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25 .

25 pedes toùs móסas ("pedes eius" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate addition is supported by only a few late mss. Manetti also omitted eius.
25 adorauit eum тробєкúvnбEv. Erasmus retains eum from the late Vulgate, corresponding with the addition of cuitov in cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$.
 See on Ioh. 2,19; 4,35.
27 colloquens $\sigma v v o \mu ı \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("loquens" Vg.). Erasmus elsewhere uses colloquor for $\delta \mu \mathrm{i} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ at $A c t$. 20,11, and for $\sigma u \lambda \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega$ at $M t .17,3 ; M c .9,4 ;$ Act. 25,12, following the example of the Vulgate at $L c .4,36$.
27 offendit EÚpiokel ("inuenit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at $M c .13,36 ; 14,37$, 40; 2 Cor. 9,4. See also on reperio at Iob. 1,41.
 abominatum sit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., Erasmus also suggests $v t$ nefas est, and complains that the Vulgate choice of wording would have made Peter appear uncivil to his hearers. The use of nefas was also proposed here by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti put quomodo abominabile sit.
28 ne quem ... dicerem $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon ́ v o \alpha ~ . . . ~} \lambda$ é $\gamma$ glv ("neminem ... dicere" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33, for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti's version was $v t$ neminem ... dicerem.
29 quapropter $\delta$ ó ("Propter quod" ${ }^{\mathrm{Vg}}$.). Erasmus uses quapropter a total of fifty times in the N.T., four of which are introduced in 1519. Usually this is to render $\delta$ ó, and occasionally $\delta 10$ тt $\varepsilon \rho$, סiati, and סiò toũto. In the Vulgate N.T., the word occurs only at Act. 20,26; 1 Cor. 8,13; Hebr. 3,7; 6,1; 2 Petr. 1,10, while $\delta 16$ is rendered by propter quod or ideo.
29 et koi (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is virtually unsupported among the Greek mss.
29 incunctanter duvavtippítws ("sine dubitatione" Vg.; "sine contraadictione" 1516, sic). Erasmus' rendering in 1519, though not exact, is more suited to the context. He does not elsewhere use incunctanter in the N.T. His preference for contradictio in 1516 may be compared with the Vulgate rendering of $\alpha v$ avtipp ${ }^{2}$ tos at Act. 19,36 (contradici non possit). See Annot,, where he suggests citra contradictionem. For the removal of sine, see on Ioh. 8,7.

29 accersistis $\mu \in \tau \in T \in\{\mu \psi a \sigma \theta E$ ("accersitis" Vg. 1527). Erasmus' rendering follows the tense of the earlier Vulgate.









 vos $\beta$ upot́ws $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ Өá $\lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha v$, ôs $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$




 $\theta \varepsilon \circ$ ũ.

Die abhinc quarto vsque ad hanc horam, sedebam ieiunus, et hora nona precabar in domo mea, et ecce vir stetit ante me in veste splendida, ${ }^{31}$ et ait: Corneli, exaudita est deprecatio tua, et eleemosynae tuae in memoria habitae sunt coram deo: ${ }^{32}$ mitte ergo qui eant Ioppen, et accerse Simonem qui cognominatur Petrus: hic diuersatur in aedibus Simonis coriarii iuxta mare, qui simul atque venerit loquetur tibi. ${ }^{33}$ Confestim ergo misi ad te, et tu bene fecisti qui adueneris. Nunc ergo omnes nos, teste deo, adsumus vt audiamus omnia quaecunque tibi praecepta sunt a deo.

30 $\omega \rho a s$ A-D: $\omega p \eta s E$

30 Die abhinc quarto $B-E$ : Abhinc quarto die $A \mid$ sedebam ieiunus $B-E$ : ieiunans eram $A \mid$ precabar $B$-E: orans $A \mid$ splendida $B-E$ : splenda $A \mid 31$ deprecatio $B-E$ : oratio $A \mid$ coram deo $B-E$ : in conspectu dei $A \mid 32$ qui eant $B$ (ital) $C$ - $E$ : in $A \mid$ accerse $B$-E: accersi $A \mid$ diuersatur $B-E$ : hospitatur $A$ | aedibus $B$-E: domo $A$ | qui ... tibi $B-E:$ om. $A \mid 33$ qui adueneris $B-E$ : veniendo $A \mid$ teste deo $B$-E: in conspectu dei $A \mid$ alt. deo $B$-E: domino $A$
 ("A nudiusquarta die" late Vg .; "Abhinc quarto die" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus explains that he wishes to avoid giving the impression that Cornelius fasted and prayed throughout the four days, as he understands the Greek expression as meaning "four days ago". The wordorder given in Annot. is Quarto abbinc die, which corresponds exactly with the rendering suggested by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti had $a$ quarta ... die.

30 sedebam ieiunus et hora nona precabar ${ }^{n} \mu \eta \nu$
 mevos ("orans eram hora nona" Vg.; "ieiunans eram et hora nona orans" 1516). In the Greek text of his 1516-27 editions, Erasmus has $\tilde{\pi} \mu \eta \nu$, with a rough breathing ( $=$ "I was sitting"), while acknowledging in Annot. that some mss. had $\eta \mu \eta \nu$ ( $=$ " $I$ was"), as found in codd. 1 and 2815.

Valla Annot. also had the rough breathing here. It is questionable whether the change to a smooth breathing in his 1535 Greek text was deliberate, as there is no corresponding change in his Latin rendering. The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant omitting $v \eta \sigma \tau \varepsilon u ́ \omega v$ kaí, as in那74 ${ }^{7}$ A B C and eleven later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1 (2816) and 450 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte $500-3$ ). $73^{50} \mathrm{~A}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}$ E include $v \eta \sigma T \mathrm{E}^{\prime} \omega \nu$ but vary as to the surrounding words. According to one ingenious theory, the words $\nu \eta \sigma \tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu$ kai were a later addition, designed to encourage the practice of fasting before baptism. However, the omission of these words causes a serious dislocation to the sense of the passage, making the preceding
 ("at, or until, this hour I was praying at the ninth hour"). This provides some grounds for
supposing that the words v $\eta \sigma \pi$ evi $\omega v$ kai might have been omitted either by accidental error or by early editorial interference with the text, in order to harmonise with vss. 1-3, where no reference was made to fasting. With regard to the Latin translation, the replacement of oro by precor here is comparable with similar substitutions in 1516 at Mt. 5,44, and in 1519 at $M t$. 23,14; Lc. 1,10; 18,10; Act. 14,23; 21,5; Iac. 5,17: cf. on precatio at $A c t$. 1,14. The rendering which Erasmus adopted in 1516 closely resembled the wording of Valla Annot,, which had eram ieiunans et nona hora orans, and Manetti similarly put eram ieiunans et bora nona orans.
30 splendida $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi m \rho \tilde{̣}$ ("candida" $V g$. .; "splenda" 1516). Erasmus, in 1519, provides a more accurate rendering, denoting the brightness of the garment rather than a specific colour. The spelling splenda in 1516 is a misprint. A similar substitution of splendidus occurs at lac. 2,2; Ap. Iob. 19,8, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Ap. Iob. 22,1, 16. Erasmus further puts splendidus for albus at $L c$. 23,11, and for praeclarus at Iac. 2,3. He retains candidus at $A$ p. Iob. 15,6, in rendering this Greek word. See Annot. This change was anticipated by Manetti, whereas Valla Annot. suggested putting clara.
31 deprecatio $\grave{1}$ ì $\pi$ poosux See on Act. 1,14.
 memoratae sunt" Vg.). Erasmus wishes to avoid the connotation that Cornelius' deeds were "narrated" in the presence of God: see Annot. This change of rendering was proposed by Valla Annot. Cf. Erasmus' substitution of memor esset for memorari at $L c .1,54,72$, and of recordabor for memorabor at Hebr. 8,12, following the example of the Vulgate at Hebr. 10,17.
31 coram deo Évémiov toũ $\theta$ Eoũ ("in conspectu dei" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 7,10; 10,4. Manetti also had coram deo, but placed it before commemoratat.
32 mitte ergo qui eant ménuov oưv ("Mitte ergo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 7,14 for other additions after mitto.
32 Ioppen eis ’lómitiv ("in Ioppen" 1516 = Vg.). See on Act. 8,27.
 The same change occurs at Act. 10,5; 11,13 (1519). See on Act. 4,18.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 6.

32 aedibus oikị̆ ("domo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 4,34. The same substitution occurs at Act. 11,11.
32 qui simul atque venerit loquetur tibi òs mapaYєvóuєvos $\lambda \alpha \lambda$ ñбधı $\sigma 01$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Yet again, the hasty revision of the Latin rendering for the 1516 edition is seen from a lengthy discrepancy with the Greek text. The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{45} 74 \mathrm{~N}$ B and seventeen later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and about 450 other mss., commencing with codd. CD E (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 503-5). At first sight, the additional words might appear to be a harmonisation with Act.
 the word mapayevóusvos in vs. 32 has no connection with the later passage. In vs. 32 , the apparent awkwardness of os, which could be mistaken as relating to Simon of Joppa rather than Simon Peter, makes the longer reading a lectio difficilior, which could account for some scribes wishing to omit the clause. See also Annot. The version of Manetti had is cum venerit loquetur tibi.
33 qui adueneris тараүєvó $\mu \mathrm{\varepsilon vos}$ ("veniendo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .). Greek aorist. Erasmus finds a more idiomatic turn of phrase to follow bene facio. The substitution of aducrio in rendering mapayivoual occurs also at Act. 17,10; 23,35; 24,24 , in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 5,21, 25; 9,39; 28,21. In Matthew-Mark, Erasmus prefers to put accedo (at Mt. 2,1; 3,1, $13 ; M c .14,43$ ), but in rendering the same Greek word in Luke, John, and Acts, at sixteen passages, he is content to retain venio. Manetti put accedens.
33 teste deo évćtriov toũ $\theta \varepsilon \frac{1}{}$ ("in conspectu tuo" $V \mathrm{~g}$.; in conspectu dei" 1516). The Vulgate corresponds with the Greek variant, èvळ́mाóv oov, found in cod. D* virtually alone. See Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered by coram te.
33 vt audiamus ákoũoaı ("audire" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, and see Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
33 deo (2nd.) тoũ $\theta$ हoũ ("domino" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant substituting toũ kupiou, as in $\mathbf{7}^{45 v i d} \boldsymbol{N}$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\mathbf{7}^{74} \mathrm{D}$. The version of Manetti also had deo.
${ }^{34}$ Avoí̧as $\delta$ ह̀ Пétpos tò $\sigma \tau o ́ \mu \alpha$, eftrev,

 ย̇v $\pi \alpha v t i$ étvel ò poßoúuevos aủtòv каì












 ๆ̀ $\mu$ हĩ

${ }^{34}$ Aperiens autem Petrus os, dixit: Re ipsa comperio, quod non sit personarum respectus apud deum, ${ }^{35}$ sed in quauis gente qui timet ipsum et operatur iustitiam, is acceptus est illi. ${ }^{36}$ Sermonem quem misit deus filiis Israel, annuncians pacem per Iesum Christum, hic est omnium dominus - ${ }^{37}$ ipsi nostis, de quo sermone fama diuulgatum fuit in tota Iudaea, rumore primum orto a Galilaea, post baptisma quod praedicabat Ioannes, ${ }^{38}$ vt Iesum Nazarenum vnxerit deus spiritu sancto et virtute, qui obambulauit benefa|ciendo

39 пueis $B$-E: vueis $A$
34 os $B$-E: os suum $A \mid \operatorname{Re}$ ipsa $B$-E: In veritate $A \mid 35$ ipsum $B$-E: eum $A \mid$ is $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ 36 Sermonem $B$ - : Sermo $A \mid 37$ de quo sermone $B-E$ : quod $A \mid$ Ioannes $A$-C $E$ : Iohannes $D \mid 38$ obambulauit $B$-E: pertransiit $A \mid 39$ et in regione $B$-E: in regione $A$

34 os tò $\sigma$ тóuc ("os suum" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate may reflect the addition of aúroũ, as in codd. ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ A C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., including P $^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{~B}$ D.
$34 \operatorname{Re}$ ipsa 'Em' ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \lambda \theta$ हiass ("In veritate" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) This is comparable with Erasmus' use of $r e$ vera for obvtos at 1 Cor. 14,25. At Mc. 12,14, 32; Lc. 20,21 (all in 1519), Erasmus puts cum veritate for in veritate, in rendering the same Greek phrase. At Act. 4,27, he retains vere.
34 comperio кот $\alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v o \mu \alpha 1$ ("comperi" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate as to the tense of the verb. Manetti (Pal Lat 45) substituted percipio.
34 quod non sit öt oủk est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod non est.
34 personarum respectus apud deum троб由тто$\lambda \eta$ йтins $\delta$ © $\theta$ ós ("personarum acceptor deus" Vg.). Erasmus renders this Greek wording in
exactly the same way as he treats Rom. 2,11 ( $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \pi 0 \lambda \eta \psi i \alpha \alpha \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tilde{\theta} \theta \varepsilon \tilde{q})$ : cf. also $E p h$. 6,9; Col. 3,25; Iac. 2,1; 1 Petr. 1,17, at all of which passages, he replaces acceptio by respectus. He regarded the use of acceptio and acceptor as poor Latin style in such a context, although the words do occur in classical Latin. See Annot. on Rom. 2,11. The phrase personarum respectus was suggested by Valla Annot, in commenting on the latter passage.
35 quauis $\pi \alpha v \mathrm{ti}$ ("omni" ${ }^{\text {Vg.). }}$. A similar substitution occurs in thirteen other places, whereas quauis is never used in the Vulgate N.T. See Annot. The passage is understood by Erasmus as referring, not to every nation in the world, but to "any nation".
35 qui timet ipsum ... is acceptus ó $甲 о ३ о$ и́uevos aútòv ... סєктós ("qui timet eum ... acceptus" $1516=$ Vg. mss.; "deum" for "eum" Vg. 1527). Erasmus adds is, to provide a smoother connection with the preceding relative clause, and consequently has to change eum to ipsum to refer back to deus. Manetti followed the
earlier Vulgate, except that he replaced qui by quicunque.
36 Sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("Verbum" Vg.; "Sermo" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,1.
36 quem $8 v$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\chi^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A} \mathrm{B}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by : $7^{74} \boldsymbol{\aleph}^{*}$ C D E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In Annot., Erasmus suggests that the relative pronoun was removed by a "reader" who was offended because the word made the sentence appear incomplete. Manetti had quod, agreeing with verbum.
 retains deus from the late Vulgate, though it is omitted in Annot., lemma. The added word is not explicitly supported by the Greek text.
 on Iob. 1,33.
37 de quo sermone fama diuulgatum fuit тò $\gamma$ £Vó$\mu \varepsilon v o v$ रं $\tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ ("quod factum est verbum" Vg.; "quod fama diuulgatum fuit" 1516). By using this paraphrased wording, Erasmus seeks to clarify the link between $\lambda$ óyov in vs. 36 and ¢ $\tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ in vs. 37: see Annot. He elsewhere substitutes diuulgo for diffamo in rendering $\delta 1 \propto \varphi \eta \mu i \zeta \omega$ at Mt. 9,31; Mc. 1,45, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt. 28,15.
 vniuersam Iudaeam" Vg.). See on Act. 5,34. Manetti put per totam Iudaeam.
37 rumore primum orte d̉ṕ̧duॄvov ("incipiens enim" Vg.). Erasmus again paraphrases, rumore being a further interpretation of $\dot{\rho} \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$. The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having ớp $\wp \dot{\alpha}-$ $\mu \mathrm{EvOS} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, as in ${ }^{3}{ }^{74}$ A D. Some mss. also had
 a few later mss. As usual, Erasmus followed cod. 2815, which here happens to be supported by the earliest of the surviving mss., $\boldsymbol{7}^{\mathbf{4 5}}$, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot. It has been argued that $\alpha p \xi \alpha$ $\mu \varepsilon \nu \circ s$ is a lectio difficilior, and hence more likely to be original, because later scribes would probably alter it to agree with the neuter gender of the preceding words to $\gamma \in v O ́ \mu \in \nu O \nu$ คं $\tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$. However, certain scribes who found $\alpha \rho \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in v o v$ in their exemplar might well have been tempted to substitute $\alpha p \xi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu v o s$, influenced by the strong resemblance of this passage to $L c$. 23,5, where the enemies of Jesus describe him as

ámò Tท̃ラ Г $\alpha \lambda 1 \lambda \alpha i \alpha s$. Manetti had incipiens without enim.
37 baptisma тò $\beta$ ámтıб $\mu \alpha$ ("baptismum" Vg.). See on Act. 1,22. Manetti made the same change.
37 praedicabat ėкท́pu§єv ("praedicauit" Vg.). Erasmus, for once, is less accurate in substituting the imperfect tense here.
38 vt lesum Nazarenum vnxerit ' Inooũv tov
 a Nazareth, quomodo vnxit eum" Vg.). The Vulgate is more literal. Erasmus changes the word-order, to achieve a smoother sequence. Another example of the use of $v t$ with the subjunctive, in rendering $\omega$ s, will be found at Act. 20,20. On Nazarenus, see on Ioh. 1,45. The reading $N \alpha \zeta \alpha \rho^{\prime} \theta$ is not derived from Erasmus' usual mss. of Acts, although it is found in $\aleph$ BCDE and many later mss., in conformity with the spelling of the name offered by cod. 2 in most passages of the Gospels. At the present verse, codd. $1,2815,2816$, in company with ${ }^{77^{74 v i d}} \mathrm{~A}$ and most later mss., have Na̧apÉт (cod. 2816 also has oủtụ for aútóv). In Annot., Erasmus cites the reading ôv EैXpioev aútóv (cf. cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr) }}$. On this passage, see also the discussion in Erasmus Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 150, 11. 772-782. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he substituted Cbristum for Iesum.

38 obambulauit $\delta \stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\varepsilon v}$ ("pertransiit" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Act. 8,4 for other substitutions for pertranseo. In 1516, obambulo occurs only once, at 1 Petr. 5,8 , as a substitute for circumeo (rendering $\pi \varepsilon \rho ı \pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \omega$ ). Then in 1519, Erasmus introduced the word at Mc. 6,6, for circumeo (rendering $\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ ), and at $M c .12,38$, for ambulo (rendering $\pi \varepsilon \rho ı \pi \not \subset \tau \varepsilon \in \omega$ ). Erasmus was fond of words beginning with ob- : e.g. oberro, obfirmo, obiurgo, obnitor, oborior, obsequor, obsigno, obsisto, obtego, obtempero, obtestor, obticesco, obtingo, obtorqueo, obtrecto, obtrectatio, obtrectator, obturbo, obturo, obuenio, obuerto, and even a few words which were not used by classical writers, such as obtenebro, obuelo, and obuincio. Several of these words occur sporadically in the Vulgate O.T., but only obtempero and obturo in the Vulgate N.T.
39 et (1st.) $\tau \varepsilon$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by cod. 2816 and a few other late mss. See on Act. 1,1, and Annot. The version of Manetti also had et.
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Hierosolymis, quem occiderunt suspensum in ligno. ${ }^{40}$ Hunc deus suscitauit tertio die, et exhibuit eum vt manifestus fieret ${ }^{41}$ non toti populo, sed testibus prius ad hoc delectis a deo nimirum nobis, qui comedimus ac bibimus vna cum illo, posteaquam resurrexit a mortuis. ${ }^{42}$ Et praecepit nobis vt praedicaremus populo ac testificaremur, quod ipse sit ille qui constitutus erat a deo iudex viuorum ac mortuorum. ${ }^{43}$ Huic omnes prophetae testimonium ferunt, quod remissionem peccatorum accepturus sit per nomen eius quisquis crediderit in eum.
${ }^{44}$ Adhuc loquente Petro verba haec, cecidit spiritus sanctus super omnes qui audiebant sermonem. ${ }^{45} \mathrm{Et}$ obstupuerunt hi qui ex circuncisorum genere credebant, quotquot venerant cum Petro, quod et in gentes donum

39 Hierosolymis $B$ - $E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid 41$ toti $B-E$ : omni $A \mid$ prius ad hoc delectis $B$ - $E$ : praeordinatis $A \mid$ nimirum $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ comedimus $B-E$ : manducauimus $A \mid$ ac $D E$ : et $A-C \mid$ vna $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ posteaquam $B-E$ : postquam $A \mid 42$ vt praedicaremus $B-E$ : praedicare $A \mid$ ac testificaremur $B-E$ : et testificari $A \mid$ alt. ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 43$ ferunt $B$ - $E$ : perhibent $A$ | quisquis $B-E$ : omnis qui $A \mid 44$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 45$ ex circuncisorum genere credebant $B$ - $E$ : erant ex circumcisione fideles $A$

39 Hierosolymis èv "lepovo $\alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$ ("Hierusalem" Vg.; "in Hierusalem" 1516). See on Act. 1,8. The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\dot{\varepsilon} v$, as in codd. B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by $3 \mathbf{7}^{74} \aleph$ A C E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
39 quem 0 . $v$. In codd. 2815 and 2816, the reading is őv kaí, as in most other mss. Erasmus may have been influenced by the Vulgate in omitting kaí, but it is also possible that he or the compositor misread cod. 2815, in which koí is represented by a compendium: the same textual phenomenon may have been responsible for the omission of kai at Act. 17,18. The omission at the present passage does have some support among other late mss. The text of cod. 1 has kai, omitting $\delta v$.

39 suspensum крєцд́áбхттєs ("suspendentes" Vg.). Greek aorist.
40 tertio трітŋ ("tertia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,29.
40 exbibuit $\varepsilon$ है $\delta \omega k \varepsilon \nu$ ("dedit" Vg.). Cf. on Act. 1,3 . The Vulgate is more literal here, while Erasmus translates according to the context.
40 vt manifestus fieret ${ }^{2} \mu \varphi \propto \vee \tilde{\eta} \gamma \in v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \propto 1$ ("manifestum fieri" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
41 toti mavti ("omni" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 8,2.
41 prius ad boc delectis тоі̃s трокєХєıротоиクHévors ("praeordinatis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This may be compared with the substitution of delectus for ordinatus in rendering Xeıpotové $\omega$ at 2 Cor. 8,19. Erasmus also replaces praeordino
by ordino at Act. 13,48 ( $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ), and by praeparo at Act. 22,14 (1519, for прохєıрі弓оиаı). On the other hand, at 1 Petr. 1,20, he substitutes praeordino for praecognosco in rendering $\pi \rho \circ$ $\gamma i v \omega ́ \sigma k \omega$. See Annot., where Erasmus refers to the root meaning of $\chi \varepsilon$ ротоvé $\omega$, in terms of a popular vote by a show of hands. Accordingly, at Act. 14,23, he ventures to translate $\chi$ еıротоvé $\omega$ by suffragiis creo (for constituo), in the context of appointing elders. On deligo, see also on Act. 1,2.
41 nimirum nobis ग̀̀uĩv ("nobis" $1516=V g$.). See on Iob. 13,23.
41 comedimus $\sigma u v £ \Phi \alpha ́ \gamma \gamma \circ \mu \varepsilon v$ ("manducauimus" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
41 ac кai ("et" 1516-22 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
41 vna cum illo aủTఱ̃ ("cum illo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,22 for other additions of vna. Manetti had cum eo.

41 posteaquam $\mu \mathrm{E}$ ód ("postquam" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution also occurs at $L c .2,22$ (1519), following the example of the Vulgate at $M c$. 14,28; Act. 27,27. At Lc. 14,29, however, Erasmus replaces posteaquam by postquam. See also on Iob. 6,23.

42 vt praedicaremus ... testificaremur кпрv́ $\propto ı ~ . . . ~$
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,33. Manetti made the same change.
$42 a c$ (twice) kai ("et" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti had ac ... et.

42 quod ipse sit ille qui constitutus erat ớtı đن̉тós
 est" Vg.). On the removal of quia, see on Iob. 1,20. Erasmus adds ille, so as to provide an antecedent for qui. His substitution of erat is more questionable, as the subjunctive esset might have been expected after his use of sit earlier in the sentence. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except in putting quod for quia.
43 testimonium ferunt $\mu \alpha \rho$ тטpoũ $\sigma v$ ("testimonium perhibent" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,7. Manetti had testificantur.
43 quod ... accepturus sit $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon i ̃ v ~(" a c c i p e r e " ~ V g) . ~.$. See on Ioh. 1,33 for Erasmus' preference for avoiding the infinitive. However, his substitution of the future tense could be understood as implying that the Christian believer does not immediately receive the remission of his sins. Cf. Annot. This is similar to his treatment of $\sigma \omega 0 \tilde{\eta}^{2} \alpha$ at $A c t .15,11$, where his use of the
future participle implies that salvation is future rather than an already accomplished fact. Manetti preferred vt ... recipiant.
43 quisquis crediderit пóvта тòv mıoтtúovta ("omnes qui credunt" Vg.; "omnis qui crediderit" 1516). Erasmus' rendering is more accurate, in converting plural to singular: see Annot.

44 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,1. Here Erasmus rightly distinguishes from $\rho \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \sigma \alpha$ earlier in the verse. Manetti made the same change.
45 bi qui ex circuncisorum genere credebant of ék $\pi \varepsilon p I t o \mu \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$ miбtoí ("ex circumcisione fideles" Vg.; "hi qui erant ex circumcisione fideles" 1516). At Act. 11,2, and also as recommended in Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus retains qui erant ex circuncisione for oi ék mepıто $\mu \tilde{s}$, and also similar expressions at Gal. 2,12; Col. 4,11; Tit. 1,10. In his rendering of the present verse, going beyond what was proposed in Annot., he seeks to make two improvements on the obscure Vulgate wording: to replace fideles by the verb credo (to avoid the misunderstanding that these were simply devout Jews, rather than Jews who were Christian believers), and to find a rendering for ék тєрıтоиŋ̃ラ which did not require the use of a second verb. However, at Act. 16,1, he retains Iudaeae fidelis to refer to the mother of Timothy, without sensing the same need to clarify the nature of her "faith".
45 quotquot ő ooı ("qui" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant, oi, apparently found in cod. B alone. Manetti put quicunque.
45 quod ... effusum esset ötı ... ékкદ́XUTaı ("quia ... effusa est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 for the removal of quia. The change of gender is required by the change from gratia to donum: see below, and see also Annot. The version of Manetti had quod ... effusa esset.
45 gentes tò ${ }^{\text {ध }} \theta \cup \eta$ ("nationes" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Lc. 21,24 (1519); Act. 22,21 , in accordance with the usual practice of the Vulgate at other passages in rendering the plural of this word. See Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.

45 donum í $\delta \omega \rho \varepsilon \alpha ́ \quad(" g r a t i a " V g.) . ~ E r a s m u s ~$ makes the same substitution at Act. 11,17, reserving gratia mainly for Xápıs and for other Greek expressions meaning to give thanks. See Annot.
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 $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \nu, \tau \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \sigma ı \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho X \alpha i ̃ s ~ k \alpha \theta ı \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \nu$
spiritus sancti effusum esset. ${ }^{46}$ Audiebant enim illos loquentes linguis ac magnificantes deum. Tunc respondit Petrus: ${ }^{47}$ Num quis prohibere potest quominus aqua baptizentur hi qui spiritum sanctum acceperunt sicut et nos? ${ }^{48}$ Et iussit eos baptizari in nomine domini. Tunc rogauerunt eum, vt remaneret aliquot dies.

11Audierunt autem apostoli et fratres qui erant in Iudaea, quod et gentes recepissent sermonem dei. ${ }^{2}$ Quumque ascendisset Petrus Hierosolymam, disceptabant aduersus illum qui erant ex circuncisione, ${ }^{3}$ dicentes: Ad viros praeputium habentes introisti, et edisti cum illis. ${ }^{4}$ Petrus autem rem ab initio repetens, exposuit illis ordine, dicens: ${ }^{5}$ Ego eram in ciuitate loppe orans, et vidi raptus extra me visionem, descendere vas quoddam ceu linteum magnum, quatuor initiis emissum
 $A B^{*} C^{*} \mid$ оvоноті $B-E:$ оуоці $A$

46 ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 48$ domini $B$-E: Iesu Christi $A \mid$ remaneret $B-E$ : maneret $A$
11,1 sermonem $B-E:$ verbum $A \mid 2$ Quumque $B-E$ (Cumque $B-D$ ): Cum autem $A \mid$ 3 Ad ... edisti $B-E:$ Quare introisti ad viros praeputium habentes, et manducasti $A \mid 5$ ceu $B-E$ : velut $A \mid$ quatuor $B$-E: quattuor $A$

46 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
$46 \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \cup v o v^{v} \tau \omega v$. The spelling $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda v v o u ́ v-$ $\tau \omega v$, as if to form a future participle, was introduced in 1522 , probably through a printer's error, influenced by the proximity of $\lambda \alpha \lambda$ oúv$\tau \omega v$ earlier in the same sentence. The correct form of the present participle was $\mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \nu v o ́ v-$ $\tau \omega v$, as found in 1516-19 and in virtually all mss. For other examples of incorrect treatment of verbs ending in $-v v \omega$, see on Act. 6,1.
47 Num quis Mítı ("Numquid ... quis" Vg.). See on Iob. 3,4, and Annot.
47 quominus aqua baptizentur tò ü $\delta \omega \rho$... Toṽ
 zentur" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus explains his
interpretation of the grammatical link between ú $\delta \omega p$ and $\beta a \pi r 1 \sigma 0 \eta ँ v a$ here. However, the literal rendering of the Vulgate is preferable, as the Greek word-order strongly suggests that $\hat{u} \delta \omega \rho$ is the object of $\kappa \omega \lambda \hat{u} \sigma \alpha$. The misspelling $\beta \alpha \pi т 1 \sigma т \tilde{v} v a 1$, introduced in 1516 , lingered in the text of 1519-22 despite being corrected in the 1519-22 catchword. On quominus, see on Act. 8,36.

48 domini toũ kupíou ("Iesu Christi" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant substituting 'Inooũ Xpıбтоũ, as in 3 $3^{74}$ § A B E and some later mss. The Greek text of Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816* and many other late mss. (in
cod. $2816^{\text {corr, }}$ incoũ xplotoũ is added between the lines). Another large section of the late mss. has toũ kupíou 'Inซoũ, as followed by Manetti, who put domini Iesu.
48 remaneret ह̇тाนะіva৷ ("maneret apud eos" late Vg.; "maneret" 1516). The late Vulgate addition of apud eos has almost no Greek support apart from cod. D (mpós cưtoús). In
 maneo at Act. 21,4; 28,12, 14; 1 Cor. 16,7; Gal. 1,18 , and even substitutes maneo for remaneo at Act. 15,34. Manetti substituted permaneret.
 the accusative is more commonly used to express duration of time. Erasmus substitutes the accusative at Mt. 4,2; 20,6 (1522); Mc. 1,13; Act. 16,18; 21,7; Gal. 1,18, but quite often retains die or diebus. At Act. 25,6 (1519), he substitutes diebus for dies.
 niam ... receperunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 for the removal of quoniam, and on Ioh. 1,19 for the use of the pluperfect tense. Manetti had quod ... receperant.
1 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ ó yov ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,1.
2 Quumque kà öтะ ("Cum autem" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text
 thirty later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and more than 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 508-11). Manetti put Et cum.
3 Ad ... babentes introisti ötı Прòs ... éxovtas عioj̃ $\lambda \theta$ es ("Quare introisti ad ... habentes" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). As pointed out in Annot., the Vulgate seems to have treated ötı as an interrogative (or followed a text having t ). That this is a possible use of o T I is seen, for example, at Mc. $9,11,28$, but these instances have a preceding verb which implies a question, namely $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \in \rho \omega$ Tád. The Vulgate word-order is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{45} 7$ vidid $\aleph$ A D and some later mss., placing eioñ $\lambda \theta$ es after öтl (though $\mathfrak{\beta}^{45}$ B substitute Eloj̄ $\lambda \theta \varepsilon v)$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti's version was quod ad ... babentes introiuisti.
3 edisti $\sigma u v \varepsilon_{\varphi} \propto \gamma ६ s$ ("manducasti" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 4,31.
4 Petrus autem rem ab initio repetens áp $\oint \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon v o s$


Erasmus resorts to paraphrase here, interpreting
 In 1516, Erasmus extensively rewrote the translation of this chapter, from verses 4 to 18 , comprising Peter's speech at Jerusalem, accompanied by barely a line of comment in Annot. Correspondingly, this section was only lightly revised in 1519. For comparison, there are sixty-three changes by the 1516 edition in vss. 4-18, but only nine changes in vss. 19-30. Erasmus' purpose appears to have been to provide a version which differed in vocabulary and style from the description of the same events which was given in ch. 10. One unfortunate consequence of this display of linguistic copia was that a number of verbal parallels between the two passages in the Greek text are lost in the Latin rendering.
4 exposuit $\varepsilon$ ह́єтiөєто ("exponebat" Vg.). The Vulgate is more accurate in rendering the imperfect tense here. Erasmus retains exponebat at Act. 28,23 for the same Greek word.
4 ordine $\kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \xi \tilde{n} \varsigma$ ("ordinem" Vg.). Erasmus, in this particular, is more precise, denoting the manner in which Peter gave his account. Manetti put per ordinem.
5 raptus extra me èv ékotáoes ("in excessu mentis meae" late Vg .). Erasmus adopts a similar rendering at Act. 22,17, vt raperer extra me for
 stupore mentis). However, at Act. 10,10, in the same context, he retained the more literal mentis excessus from the Vulgate. Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate, in putting in excessu mentis, without meae.
5 descendere кaтаßaĩvov ("descendens" Vg.). The Vulgate, again, is more literal. At Act. 10,11, Erasmus retained descendens.
5 cen ఉs ("velut" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at several other passages, for velut, sicut, tanquam, and $v t$. The word ceu does not occur anywhere in the Vulgate. At Act. 10,11, Erasmus retained velut. The use of ceu is briefly covered in Valla Elegantiac II, 36; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 327, 11. 316-328.
 at Act. 10,11, Erasmus retained summitti. Elsewhere, he substituted demitto for summitto in rendering $\chi \propto \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ at Mc. 2,4; Act. 27,17 (1519), and in rendering каөi $\eta \mu \mathrm{l}$ at $L c$. 5,19 (1519). Manetti, less accurately, had veniens here.








 Фબvท̀ ék סzutépou ėk toũ oủpavoũ, "A

 $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \eta$ ämavta घis tòv oủpavóv. ${ }^{11}$ Kai


 $\mu 0$ т



e coelo, et venit vsque ad me. | ${ }^{6}$ In
LB 480 quod quum intendissem oculos, animaduerti et vidi quadrupedia terrae et bestias et reptilia et volatilia coeli. ${ }^{7}$ Audiui autem et vocem, dicentem mihi: Surge Petre, macta et vescere. ${ }^{8}$ Dicebam autem: Nequaquam domine, quia nihil commune aut immundum vnquam introiuit in os meum. ${ }^{9}$ Respondit autem mihi vox rursum $e$ coelo, Quae deus mundauit, tu ne communia dixeris. ${ }^{10}$ Idque accidit tertio, et rursum omnia subducta sunt in coelum. ${ }^{11}$ Et ecce extemplo tres viri praesto aderant in aedibus in quibus eram, e Caesarea missi ad me. ${ }^{12}$ Dixerat autem mihi spiritus, vt congrederer cum illis, nihil haesitans. Porro comitati me sunt et sex fratres hi. Et ingressi sumus in domum viri: ${ }^{13}$ isque retulit

## 

6 bestias $B$ - $E$ : feras $A \mid 8$ nihil commune aut immundum $B$ - $E$ : commune aut immundum nihil $A \mid 9$ dixeris $B-E$ : feceris $A \mid 11$ praesto $E$ : presto $A-D \mid 12$ haesitans $B$ - $E$ : addubitans $A \mid$ hi $B-E$ : isti $A$

5 e ék ("de" Vg.). This change, at least, was consistent with Erasmus' translation of Act. 10,11. See on Ioh. 2,15.
6 quum intendissem oculos àrevioas ("intuens" Vg.). Greek aorist. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 13,9 (1519). See also on Act. 1,10.

6 animaduerti кøтєvóouv ("considerabam" Vg.). The verb animaduerto, which is used occasionally in the Vulgate O.T., is similarly substituted at Lc. 6,41 (1519); Act. 27,39. In other contexts, Erasmus retains considero for котаvoé $\omega$. The Vulgate is more accurate in using the imperfect tense here.

6 bestias $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ O A pióa ("feras" 1516). A similar substitution of fera for bestia occurs at Mc. 1,13 (1519); Iac. 3,7. In Annot. on the latter passage, Erasmus mentions that fera is the true meaning ("proprie significat ..."). At most ocurrences of Onpiov, however, he retains bestia from the Vulgate.

7 macta et vescere $\theta \tilde{\mathrm{u}} \sigma 0 \mathrm{v}$ kà $\dagger \alpha ́ \gamma \varepsilon$ ("occide et manduca" Vg.). See on Act. 10,13.
8 Dicebam $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ ITrov ("Dixi" Vg.). The Vulgate is more strictly literal as to the tense. See on Ioh. 1,30.
8 nibil commune aut immundum vnquam $\pi \tilde{\sim} v . .$. oúס́́trote ("commune aut immundum nunquam" Vg.; "commune aut immundum nihil vnquam" 1516). The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \nu$, as in $\boldsymbol{p}^{45 v i d ~} 74 \times$ A B D E and some later mss. As usual, Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In theory, $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \nu$ could have been inserted to harmonise with $\mathrm{Act} .10,14$. However, it is possible that a scribe might have omitted $m \tilde{a} \nu$ because of the following negative, oủס́zтотє. Cf. the omission of $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \nu$ by cod. C at 1 Iob. 2,21, from the clause ó $\tau 1$ TIõ̃ $\psi E$ Ũ $\delta \circ S$

9 mibi $\mathrm{\mu O}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission has the support of $\mathbf{3}^{4574} \aleph A B$ and a few later
mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In this instance, the longer reading cannot be seen as a straightforward harmonisation with Act. 10,15, which has a different expression, $\pi$ тpòs cu่tov, placed in a later position in the sentence. Manetti used the word-order secundo mihi vox.

9 rursum ék $\delta \varepsilon \cup t \in ́ \rho o u$ ("secundo" ${ }^{\text {Vg. }}$.). Erasmus uses rursum at only one other passage to render this Greek phrase, at Ioh. 9,24 , following the Vulgate. See on Act. 10,15. Cod. 2815 has $\delta \varepsilon u-$ TEpa, apparently unsupported by other Greek mss. Erasmus, or his assistants, recognised this as an error, and corrected it from cod. 1 and the Vulgate (the phrase is completely omitted in cod. 2816).
$9 e$ ék ("de" Vg.). See on Iob. 2,15.
9 Ék<Óápıos. In cod. 2815 is found the spelling Ék $\alpha \theta \alpha \rho \varepsilon$ (formed from $k \alpha \theta \alpha i p \omega$ rather than к $\alpha \theta \alpha \mathrm{pi} \zeta \omega)$, with support from a few other late mss. In the 1516 edition, this became the
 $\sigma \varepsilon v$, while cod. 2816 has ékatópios as found in most other mss. Incidentally, Erasmus retains a discrepancy of the Vulgate in rendering кat $\alpha-$ píh $\omega$ by purifico at Act. 10,15, but by mundo at the present passage.
9 communia dixeris koivou ("commune dixeris" Vg.; "communia feceris" 1516). See on Act. 10,15 regarding communia. Manetti made the same change.
 tem factum est" Vg.). At the parallel passage, Act. 10,16, Erasmus was content to retain the Vulgate rendering of the same Greek phrase. See on Act. 7,40, regarding the use of accido.
10 tertio $\varepsilon \pi i l$ tpis ("per ter" Vg.). See on Act. 10,16 , where the same substitution occurs.
10 rursum omnia subducta sunt $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı \nu$ d́veo $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha}-$ $\sigma \theta \eta$ âtravta ("recepta sunt omnia rursum" late Vg.). The earlier Vulgate, which has recepta sunt rursum omnia, reflects a different Greek
 found in $7^{7 \text { 7rid }} \times A B D$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The word-order of his translation has more to do with classical Latin style than the Greek text. On subduco, see on Iob. 5,13. Manetti proposed iterum attracta sunt omnia.

11 extemplo $\mathfrak{E} \xi \propto u T \eta ̃ s$ ("confestim" Vg.). At other passages, in rendering $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \times u T \eta \pi \varsigma$, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using confestim, mox, protinus, or statim. A similar variety of usage is found in
 word extemplo is not found elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T.

11 praesto aderant $\dot{\text { ĖTé }} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{T} \eta \sigma \alpha v$ ("adstiterunt" Vg.; "presto aderant" 1516-27). This change is comparable with the Vulgate use of praesto esse for mapєivaı at Act. 24,19. At Act. 10,17, Erasmus retained astiterunt in a similar context.
11 aedibus in quibus tท̀v oikiav हैv रु ("domo in qua" Vg.). See on Act. 4,34. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 10,32 (1519).
 peías ("missi a Caesarea" Vg.). Erasmus imposes his own Latin word-order, postponing the verb. Manetti preferred a Cesarea ad me missi.
12 Dixerat $\mathfrak{E T \pi \varepsilon}$ ("Dixit" Vg.). See on Iob. 2,22.
12 mibi spiritus $\mu$ оו тò $\pi v \varepsilon \tilde{u} \mu \alpha$ ("spiritus mihi" Vg.). The Vulgate word-order is supported by $33^{4574} \times \mathrm{ABD}$ and a few later mss., which have tò mveṽ $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$ nol. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti made the same change.
12 vt congrederer $\sigma u v \in \lambda \theta$ Eiv ("vt irem" Vg.). Erasmus uses congredior at only one other passage, $M t .1,18$, in the context of Joseph and Mary. The suitability of the word at the present passage is doubtful, as it implies to meet with someone rather than to travel or go with them.
12 baesitans Sıaxpivóuevov ("addubitans" 1516). Erasmus does not elsewhere use addubito. See on Act. 10,20.
 ("Venerunt autem mecum" Vg.). Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using comitor in the parallel passage at Act. 10,23, to render $\sigma u v \varepsilon_{\rho} \mathrm{X}$ oract, and also at $\operatorname{Act.}$ 20,4 to render ovvÉmoual. He further introduces comitor at Act. 18,18; 1 Cor. 10,4. On porro, see on Iob. 8,16. Manetti had Mecum autem ... venerunt.
12 bi oưtol ("isti" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 7,4.
 Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect the substitution of $\delta \varepsilon$ for $\tau \varepsilon$, as found in $7^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B D and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss.,

















nobis, vt vidisset angelum domi suae, qui astitisset ac dixisset sibi: Emitte viros Ioppen, et accerse Simonem cognomento Petrum, ${ }^{14}$ qui tibi ea dicturus est, per quae serueris et tu et vniuersa domus tua. ${ }^{15}$ Quum autem exorsus essem sermonem, illapsus est spiritus sanctus in illos, quemadmodum et in nos fuerat illapsus initio. ${ }^{16}$ Veniebat autem in mentem quod dixerat dominus: Ioannes quidem baptizauit aqua, caeterum vos baptizabimini spiritu sancto. ${ }^{17}$ Proinde si par donum dedit illis deus, quemadmodum et nobis quum credidissemus in dominum Iesum Christum: ego porro quis eram, qui possem obsistere deo?

13 viros $B$-E: viros aliquos $A \mid$ accerse $B$ - $E$ : accersi $A \mid 14$ serueris $B$ - $E$ : saluus fias $A \mid$ 16 caeterum $B-E$ : coeterum $A \mid$ baptizabimini $A B D E$ : baptazabimini $C$
including codd. 1 and 2816. His adoption of refero may be compared with Act. 15,27, where he retains the Vulgate use of this verb to render $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \propto \gamma \gamma \dot{\ell} \lambda \lambda \omega$. Elsewhere, he retains narro at
 $\gamma$ '́ou๙ı, and ék $\delta \iota \eta \gamma$ ह́ouaı. Manetti put Narrauit vero.
$13 v t \pi \omega ̃{ }^{2}$ ("quomodo" Vg.). Erasmus nowhere else uses $v t$ to render $\pi \tilde{\omega} s$. Usually he retains quomodo. It is as if he had read $\dot{\omega}$ for $\pi \tilde{\omega} s$ when rendering this passage (cf. $L c .24,6$ ). In a similar context at Act. 9,27, he retained narrauit ... quomodo ... vidisset in rendering $\delta$ i $\eta \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \propto$ то ... тน̃ऽ ... єโరє.
 sua" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at $L c$. 19,5 (1519); Pbm. 2. At Act. 10,30, the parallel passage, Erasmus retains in domo mea for èv tũ oïkw цоч.
13 qui astitisset ac dixisset $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta$ ह́vt $\alpha$ к $\alpha l$ eỉmóvт $\alpha$ ("stantem et dicentem" Vg.). Greek aorist. On $a c$, see on Iob. 1,25. Manetti put stantem ac dicentem.
13 Emitte Aדо́бтєı入ov ("Mitte" Vg.). Erasmus similarly attempts greater precision by
substituting emitto at thirteen other passages in rendering the same Greek verb, and also
 passage, he retains mitto for ómoort́ $\lambda \lambda \omega$ at Act. $10,8,17,20$, as also at vs. 11 of the present chapter. In the Vulgate, emitto is comparatively rare. On emitto for dimitto, see on Act. 9,30.
13 viros ävסpas (Vg. omits; "viros aliquos" 1516). The Vulgate omission is supported by 37 $3^{74}$ ※ A B D and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. There is a question here of whether the presence of $\alpha v \delta p o s$ represents a harmonisation with Act. 10,5, or whether its absence from other mss. reflects a harmonisation with the more strictly parallel passage at Act. 10,32 , where the word is not part of the Greek text.
13 Ioppen घis ’lómדף $v$ ("in Ioppen" Vg.). See on Act. 8,27.
13 accerse $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{T} \pi \varepsilon \mu \psi \propto ı$ ("accersi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same change occurs at Act. 10,5, 32 (1519). See on Act. 4,18.
 pov ("qui cognominatur Petrus" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 15,22, 37 (both in 1519). At Lc. 22,3; Act. 12,25 (both in 1519), Erasmus tried cui cognomen est (erat). However, he retains qui cognominatur for oेs ėтıка入єitqa at Act. 10,5, 32.
 ("loquetur tibi verba" Vg.). Erasmus usually retains verbum for $\rho \tilde{n} \mu \alpha$. Probably he regarded it as redundant here because of the presence of $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$. A similar deletion of verbum occurs at vs. 16. However, he keeps verba with loquor at e.g. Ioh. 3,34; 8,20; 14,10; Act. 10,44; 13,42.

14 per quae Èv oits ("in quibus" Vg.). See on lob. 3,21 for the instrumental use of $\mathrm{E} v$.
14 serueris $\sigma \omega \theta$ خion ("saluus eris" Vg.; "saluus fias" 1516). See on lob. 3,17. Manetti put saluaberis.
14 et tu et $\sigma \dot{\text { ò }}$ kai ("tu et" Vg.). Erasmus' addition of $e t$ before $t u$ does not have explicit support from the Greek text. At Act. 16,31, in a similar remark to the Philippian jailer, no such addition is made.
15 exorsus essem ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{p} \xi \alpha 00 \theta \alpha 1$ ("coepissem" Vg.). See on Act. 1,22.
15 sermonem $\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon$ iv ("loqui" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). The Vulgate is more literal here. Possibly Erasmus wished to avoid giving the impression that the Holy Spirit descended on Peter's audience at the very first word which he spoke. In ch. 10, the descent of the Spirit is not mentioned until Peter reached the point in his sermon at which he speaks of faith and the remission of sins, by which time he had already spoken at least 180 words.
15 illapsus est ह̇דṫteeoe ("cecidit" late Vg.). See on Act. 8,16; 10,10, and also on Iob. 11,32.
15 in Ėn' $^{\prime}$ ("super" Vg.). Erasmus no doubt regarded in as a more suitable preposition with illabor. Cf. on lob. 7,44. At other passages referring to the coming of the Holy Spirit, he retains super (Act. 10,44; 19,6), while at Act. 1,8 he even substitutes super for in.
15 illos aútoús ("eos" Vg.). The use of illos is more appropriate for marking the contrast with the subsequent nos.
15 quemadmodum $\omega \sigma \pi \varepsilon p$ ("sicut" Vg.). In the Epistles, with very few exceptions, Erasmus consistently renders $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ by quemadmodum, but in the Gospels this substitution is only
found at Mt. 5,48; 6,2, 5; 12,40. Occasionally, at other passages, he makes a similar substitution when rendering $\dot{\omega}$ s and $\kappa \alpha \theta \omega \dot{s}$.
15 fuerat illapsus (Vg. omits). Erasmus adds this to complete the sense, without explicit Greek support.
15 initio $\mathfrak{e v} v$ dáp $X \tilde{n}$ ("in initio" Vg.). At Hebr. 1,10, Erasmus has in initio for in principio. However, he may have regarded initio on its own as more in keeping with classical style. Manetti put in principio here.
16 Veniebat ... in mentem épvíoonv("Recordatus sum" Vg.). This substitution does not occur elsewhere. Erasmus usually retains recordor in the Gospels, and memor sum in the Epistles, in rendering this Greek verb.
16 quod dixerat dominus toũ ¢ $\grave{\eta} \mu \alpha$ тоs кupiou
 Erasmus probably considered this to be distinct from other references to the "Word of God", which generally refer to the Gospel, whereas it here referred more specifically to one of the sayings of Jesus. Manetti followed the Vulgate, but substituted $v t$ for sicut.
16 caeterum vos $\mathfrak{\text { úpeĩs }} \boldsymbol{\delta \varepsilon}$ ("vos autem" Vg.). At Act. 1,5 , in the same context, Erasmus retained vos autem. See on Act. 6,2 for his use of caterum elsewhere.

17 Proinde si घi ouvv ("Si ergo" Vg.). The only other place in the Gospels and Acts where Erasmus uses proinde is at Mt. 6,14, for $\gamma \dot{\alpha}$ p. In the Epistles, he uses the word at twenty-one passages, in rendering oũv and $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \varepsilon$. It does not occur in the Vulgate. See Valla Elegantiae II, 50; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, $A S D$ I, 4, pp. 302-3, 11. 641-3.
 gratiam" Vg.). Erasmus here gives a more accurate rendering of toos. On donum, see on Act. 10,45. Manetti tried parem gratiam.
17 quemadmodum $\omega$ ("sicut" Vg.). See on vs. 15.
 dimus" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,19, for Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect tense.
17 porro $\delta \hat{\varepsilon}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $p^{74} \aleph$ A B D and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
17 obsistere deo $\mathrm{K} \omega \lambda$ ũनवı tòv $\theta$ ө́v ("prohibere deum" Vg.). A similar substitution of obsisto
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 каl Avtioxeías，$\mu \eta \delta \varepsilon v i ̀ ~ \lambda \alpha \lambda o u ̃ v t e s ~ t o ̀ v ~$ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v, ~ \varepsilon i ̉ \mu \grave{~ \mu o ́ v o v ~ ’ l o u \delta \alpha i o ı s . ~}{ }^{20}$ ग̄ $\sigma \alpha v$ סé tives $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi$ aủtãv $\alpha$ ãvరpes Kúmpiol kai Kupquaĩoi，oittives eiఠe $\lambda \theta$ óvtes eis＇Avti－














${ }^{18} \mathrm{His}$ autem auditis obticuerunt，et glorificauerunt deum，dicentes：Igitur et gentibus deus poenitentiam concessit ad vitam．
${ }^{19}$ Et illi quidem qui dispersi fuerant ex afflictione quae orta fuerat ob Ste－ phanum，perambulauerunt vsque ad Phoenicen et Cyprum et Antiochiam， nemini loquentes sermonem illum，nisi solis Iudaeis．${ }^{20}$ Erant autem quidam ex eis viri Cyprii et Cyrenenses，qui quum introissent Antiochiam，loque－ bantur ad Graecos，praedicantes domi－ num Iesum．${ }^{21}$ Et erat manus domini cum eis，multusque numerus creden－ tium conuersus est ad dominum．${ }^{22}$ Per－ uenit autem rumor ad aures ecclesiae， quae erat Hierosolymis，super his，et miserunt Barnabam vt iret ad Anti－ ochiam．${ }^{23}$ Qui quum peruenisset et vidisset gratiam dei，gauisus est，et hor－ tabatur omnes vt proposito cordis per－ seuerarent adhaerere domino：${ }^{24}$ nam erat vir bonus ac plenus spiritu sancto et fide．Et addita est multa turba

## 

19 ex afflictione $B-E$ ：a tribulatione $A \mid$ orta $B-E$ ：facta $A \mid$ ob Stephanum $B-E$ ：sub Stephano $A \mid$ ad $B-E$ ：om．$A \mid$ sermonem illum $B-E$ ：verbum $A \mid 20$ Cyrenenses $B-E$ ：Cyrenaei $A \mid$ praedicantes $B$－$E$ ：euangelizantes $A \mid 22$ rumor $B-E$ ：sermo $A \mid$ his $B-E$ ：istis $A \mid$ vt iret $B-E$ ： vsque $A \mid 23$ perseuerarent adhaerere $B$－$E$ ：perseuerent adherere $A \mid 24$ nam $B$－$E$ ：quia $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A$
occurs at 1 Thess．2，16．Cf．also on Act．8，36． Erasmus elsewhere uses this verb to render

18 autem $\delta \underline{\varepsilon}$（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission， on this occasion，is unsupported by Greek mss． Manetti changed the construction to bec autem cum audissent．
18 obticuerunt ท̊ $\sigma u ́ X \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$（＂tacuerunt＂Vg．）． Erasmus does not elsewhere use obticesco in the N．T．He retains taceo for $\grave{\dagger} \sigma u \times \alpha ́ \zeta \zeta \omega ~ a t ~ L c . ~ 14,4, ~$ though it is more commonly used for rendering $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ and $\sigma_{l} \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ．As is frequently found， Erasmus gives preference here to a word which
was familiar to him from Plautus and Terence． Possibly he had in mind that taceo was more appropriate to contexts where the sense is＂to become quiet＂，whereas obticesco did not imply that Peter＇s audience had earlier reacted in a noisy manner to his speech．See on Act．10，38 for other words beginning with ob，favoured by Erasmus．
18 Igitur＂Apaye（＂Ergo＂Vg．）．See on Iob．6，62． 18 deus poenitentiam concessit ò $\theta$ हòs $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \in T \alpha \dot{-}$ volav $\varepsilon$ ह$\delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \nu$（＂poenitentiam dedit deus＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate word－order does not seem to have Greek ms．support．In 1527 Annot．，

Erasmus suggests that the Vulgate lacks ad $v i$ tam, though the words are found in the Vulgate column printed in that edition, positioned after deus. He uses concedo elsewhere only at Hebr.
 lar context of granting repentance, Erasmus retains the verb do at Act. 5,31; 2 Tim. 2,25.
19 Et illi quidem Kaì of $\mu$ ỳv oũv. Erasmus did not find kai in any of his mss. The word may have been added by conjecture, based on the wording of the Vulgate. Another possibility is that the symbol $\mathrm{K} \eta$ in the margin of cod. 1 (representing the Greek section number, 28), at this point, may have been mistaken by one of Erasmus' assistants as a marginal variant, as the way in which it is written makes it resemble the word Kai. Manetti substituted Qui ergo.
 tione" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 16,21 regarding afflictio. Erasmus prefers ex here because the afflictio was the cause rather than the agent of this dispersion of the Christians.
19 orta fuerat $\gamma$ Evouévns ("facta fuerat" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on loh. 1,17.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) $\operatorname{In}$ Annot., Erasmus objects that sub conveys the sense of "in the reign of", clearly inappropriate in the present context.
19 vsque ad हैं $\omega$ ( ("vsque" $1516=$ Vg.). In vs. 22 , by contrast, Erasmus deletes vsque from vsque $a d$, and similarly deletes vsque at Act. 23,23 (both in 1519). Another variation on this theme was the substitution of Betbleem vsque at Lc. 2,15, and Atbenas vsque at Act. 17,15 (both in 1519). Manetti also put vsque ad.
19 sermonem illum tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On sermo, see on Iob. 1,1. By adding illum, Erasmus conveys the sense of the Greek article, that this was the word of the Gospel, rather than just any word.
20 Cyrenenses Kupquaĩoı ("Cyrenaei" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at $M c$. 15,21, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Lc. 23,26; Act. 6,9; 13,1.
20 ad trpós ("et ad" Vg.). The Vulgate addition is based on a Greek text having kal mpós, as in $\mathbf{1 7}^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ A B and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by $\aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{DE}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti similarly omitted $e t$.
 ciantes" Vg.; "euangelizantes" 1516). See on

Act. 5,42. Manetti had put euangelizantes, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition, and the same verb was recommended by Valla Annot.
22 rumor ó $\lambda$ óyos ("sermo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution occurs also at $L c$. 5,15; 7,17 (both in 1519). Cf. also Erasmus' use of rumor for ¢ं $\tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ at Act. 10,37.
22 bis aưT $\omega$ v ("istis" $1516=$ Vg.). Cf. on Act. 7,4. Manetti also had $b i$ s.
22 vt iret $\delta 1 \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon i v$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{V}$ g.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ A B and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. D E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The use of $\delta_{\text {IE }} \lambda \theta$ Eiv with ${ }^{\text {E }} \omega$ s is consistent with Luke's style at $L c .2,15 ;$ Act. 9,$38 ; 11,19$, but may have been deliberately omitted by some scribes who thought that it was superfluous after $\hat{\xi} \xi-$ $\alpha \pi \sigma \sigma t \in \lambda \lambda \omega$. Manetti, more literally, put vt transiret.
22 ad ${ }^{\varepsilon \prime} \omega$ ("vsque ad" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on vs. 19. Manetti put vsque in.
23 vt .... perseuerarent adbaerere $\boldsymbol{\pi} \rho \circ \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \in \mathfrak{v}$ ("permanere in" Vg.; "perseuerent adherere" 1516). This addition of adbaerere creates a much stronger rendering of $\pi p \circ \sigma \mu \varepsilon v \omega$, possibly somewhat more emphatic than required by the Greek text. The Vulgate's use of in has limited support from cod. B and a few later mss. Erasmus elsewhere introduces perseucro at 1 Tim. 5,5, following the example of the Vulgate at Mt. 15,32. He further replaces permaneo by perseuero when translating $\varepsilon$ éti $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ at $A c t$. 13,43 , and in rendering è $\mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \omega$ at Act. 14,22 (both in 1519). However, he retains permaneo for several other compounds of $\mu \dot{k} v \omega$, and in rendering $\delta ı \alpha \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \omega$ at 2 Petr. 3,4 he substitutes permaneo for perseuero. See Annot., and on permaneo see further on Act. 21,10. Manetti had $v t$... permanerent in.
 Vg.). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss. See Annot.
24 nam ötı ("quia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution, in rendering oftl, occurs at eight other passages. At a further seven passages in the Epistles, nam replaces quoniam. At the present passage, Manetti put quoniam.
$24 a c$ kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
24 addita est $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \in \geqslant \eta$ ("adposita est" $V$ g.). See on Act. 2,41.






 Xpiotiovoús.
${ }^{27}$ 'Ev taútaıs $\delta$ ह̀ taĩs ग̀mépaıs кат-









 $\lambda \alpha v t \varepsilon s$ тро̀s toùs трєбßutépous סià Xeipòs Bapváßa kaì $\Sigma a u ́ \lambda o u$.
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domino. ${ }^{25}$ Profectus est autem Barnabas Tarsum, vt quaereret Saulum, ${ }^{26}$ quem quum inuenisset, perduxit Antiochiam. Accidit autem vt annum totum consuetudinem agerent cum ea congregatione, docerentque turbam multam, et discipuli cognominarentur primum Antiochiae Christiani.
${ }^{27}$ In his autem diebus superuenerunt ab vrbe Hierosolymorum prophetae Antiochiam, ${ }^{28}$ surgensque vnus ex eis nomine Agabus, significabat per spiritum, famem magnam futuram in toto terrarum orbe, quae accidit sub Claudio Caesare. ${ }^{29}$ Discipuli autem prout cuique suppetebat, proposuerunt in subsidium mittere habitantibus in Iudaea fratribus, ${ }^{30}$ quod et fecerunt, mittentes ad seniores per manum Barnabae ac Sauli.

12Eodem autem tempore iniecit Herodes rex manus vt affligeret quosdam de ecclesia. ${ }^{2}$ Occi|dit LB 482

25 Tarsum $B-E$ : Tharsum $A \mid 26$ Accidit autem vt $B-E$ : Et $A \mid$ consuetudinem ... docerentque $B-E$ : conuersati sunt cum ecclesia et docuerunt $A \mid$ et ... Christiani $C-E$ : ita vt cognominarentur primum Antiochiae discipuli Christiani $A$, et discipulos cognominarent primum Antiochiae Christianos $B \mid 27$ vrbe Hierosolymorum $B-E$ : Hierosolymis $A \mid 28$ surgensque $B-E$ : et surgens $A \mid$ toto terrarum orbe $B$ - $E$ : vniuerso orbe terrarum $A \mid$ accidit $B$ - $E$ : facta est $A \mid 29$ subsidium $B-E$ : ministerium $A \mid 30$ manum $B-E$ : manus $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$
12,2 Ioannis $A B E$ : Iohannis $C D \mid 3$ gratum esset $B-E$ : placeret $A \mid$ perrexit $B$ - $E$ : apposuit $A$

25 Barnabas ó Bapvó $\beta \alpha{ }^{\circ}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{4574} \mathrm{~N}$ A B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
26 Accidit autem vt ... consuetudinem agerent
 conuersati sunt" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate rendering is a simplification, unsupported
by Greek mss. Cf. on Act. 1,21, and Annot. The version of Manetti put At factum est dum conuersarentur.
26 cum ea congregatione 7 ñ t̉kk $\lambda$ noía ("in ecclesia" Vg.; "cum ecclesia" 1516). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text adding $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} v$ before $\tau \tilde{\eta}$, as found in $7^{74} \times \mathrm{N}$ B E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See on

Act．5，11 regarding congregatio，and also Annot．， where he omits ea．Manetti＇s version（both mss．）omitted these words．
26 docerentque kai סıסá乡a1（＂et docuerunt＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus＇use of the imperfect sub－ junctive follows on from the earlier construction with $v t$ ：see above．See also Annot．On－que，see on Ioh．1，39．Manetti had et docerent．
26 et $\tau \varepsilon$（＂ita vt＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The Vulgate rendering lacks Greek support．See also Annot． The version of Manetti put just $v t$ ．
26 discipuli cognominarentur ．．．Cbristiani хp $\quad$ 品 $\alpha$ tíaxı ．．．toùs $\mu \alpha 0 \eta$ tà̀s Xpiotiavoús（＂cog－ nominarentur ．．．discipuli Christiani＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ；＂discipulos cognominarent ．．．Christi－ anos＂1519）．The Vulgate word－order is closer to the Greek，but not in keeping with classical Latin style．See Annot．，where Erasmus suggests discipulos vocarent Cbristianos．Manetti proposed lucrarentur discipulos Cbristianos（＂they gained Christian disciples＂），radically altering the sense and omitting Antiochiae．
27 vrbe Hierosolymorum＂Ієробо入úru $\omega$（＂Hiero－ solymis＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act． 1,8 ．
28 surgensque ávaotàs 8 ह́（＂et surgens＂ 1516 Lat．$=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，39．Manetti put surgens autem．
28 toto $\delta \lambda \lambda \nu$（＂vniuerso＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act． 5,34 ．Manetti made the same change．
 rarum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The word－order terrarum orbis is also used by Erasmus at Act．17，6； Ap．Iob．12，9（1519）．Elsewhere，he follows the Vulgate practice of putting orbis terrae and orbis terrarum．The same change，again，was made by Manetti．
 See on Act．7，40．
28 Caesare Kaioxpos（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by $\exists^{45} 74 \times A B D$ and a few later mss．Erasmus follows his cod．2815， supported by cod．E and most of the later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．The presence of this additional name is consistent with Luke＇s usage at $L c$ ． 2,$1 ; 3,1$ ，when referring to the emperors Augustus and Tiberius．Manetti made the same addition．
29 cuique suppetebat ŋütopeĩtó tis（＂quisque habebat＂Vg．1527）．Erasmus finds a more vigo－ rous and accurate replacement for the colourless rendering offered by the Vulgate．He introduces
suppeto only once elsewhere，at 1 Tim．5，16
 $\eta$ Ủторєĩтo was derived from cod．1，supported by relatively few other late mss．In Erasmus＇ cod． 2815 the text had घن่ாopeĩto，as found also in codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．
29 subsidium סıakoviav（＂ministerium＂ 1516 $=V$ g．）．Usually Erasmus retains ministerium from the Vulgate．The present context required a word expressing some form of practical assist－ ance，rather than the act or office of ministry． Cf．on the replacement of ministro by suppedito at Act．20，34．See Annot．on the present passage， where Erasmus also suggests suppeditationem．
30 manum xeipós（＂manus＂ 1516 Lat ＝Vg．）． The use of the plural by the Vulgate does not have explicit Greek ms．support，and was no doubt influenced by the fact that both Barnabas and Saul are mentioned here．At Act．15，23， Erasmus retains the plural rendering of Xépós． Manetti also had manum at the present passage．
30 ac kai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
12，1 iniecit $\varepsilon$ हाँ $\varepsilon$ ß $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon v$（＂misit＂Vg．）．See on Iob．7，44．
3 videns autem kai i $\delta \dot{\omega} v$ ．Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering，though the latter reflects the substitution of $i \delta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu \delta \dot{\xi}$ ，as found in $¥^{45} 74 \times$ A B E and some later mss．Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2815，supported by cod．D and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816. Manetti had et videns．
3 quod ${ }^{\text {Ot } \mathrm{T} \text {（（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on } \text { Iob．} 1,20 .}$ Manetti also had this change．
3 gratum esset àpєotóv ÉのTı（＂placeret＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．6，2（placitum）．The use of placitum was given as an alternative rendering in Annot．
3 perrexit пробध́धєто（＂apposuit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Elsewhere，in rendering this expression of Luke，Erasmus retains adizio at $L c .3,20 ; 19,11$ ， but substitutes rursus for addo at $L c .20,11,12$ （1519）．In the present context，pergo is more suitable，in the sense of＂proceed＂or＂advance＂．
3 comprebendere $\sigma \cup \lambda \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon i v ~(" a p p r e h e n d e r e " ~$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．11，57．Erasmus wishes to distinguish from $\pi$ má $\zeta \omega$ in the following verse． See Annot．The version of Manetti had vt apprebenderet．
3 erant గั $\sigma \propto 0 v$（＂Erat＂Annot．，lemma）．It appears from Erasmus＇note on this word that he found the singular form of the verb，erat，in some


































dies azymorum). ${ }^{4}$ Quem quum etiam apprehendisset, posuit in carcerem, tradens quatuor quaternionibus militum asseruandum, volens post pascha producere eum populo. ${ }^{5} \mathrm{Et}$ Petrus quidem seruabatur in carcere. Caeterum precatio fiebat sine intermissione ab ecclesia ad deum pro eo. ${ }^{6}$ Quum autem producturus eum esset Herodes, in ipsa nocte dormiebat Petrus inter duos milites, vinctus catenis duabus, et custodes ante ostium custodiebant carcerem. ${ }^{7}$ Et ecce angelus domini astitit, et lumen refulsit in habitaculo, percussoque latere Petri excitauit eum, dicens: Surge velociter. Et exciderunt catenae de manibus eius. ${ }^{8}$ Dixit autem angelus ad eum: Praecingere et subliga soleas tuas. Et fecit sic. Et dicit illi: Circunda tibi vestimentum tuum, et sequere me. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{Et}$ exiens sequebatur eum, et nesciebat quod verum esset quod fiebat per angelum, sed putabat se visum videre. ${ }^{10}$ Quum autem praeterissent primam ac secundam custodiam, venerunt ad portam ferream, quae ducit in ciuitatem, quae vitro aperta est eis. Et exeuntes processerunt vicum vnum, et continuo discessit angelus ab eo. ${ }^{11}$ Et Petrus ad se reuersus, dixit: Nunc scio vere, quod miserit dominus angelum suum, et eripuerit me e manu Herodis, et ex omni expectatione

12,7 єाधबтך $A$ C.E: $\alpha \pi \varepsilon \sigma т \eta ~ B$

4 asseruandum $B-E$ : ad custodiendum $A \mid$ pascha $B-E$ : pasca $A \mid 5$ Caeterum precatio $B$ - $E$ : oratio autem $A \mid$ sine intermissione $B$-E: sinie ntermissione $A \mid 6$ dormiebat Petrus $B$-E: erat Petrus dormiens $A \mid$ catenis $C-E$ : cathenis $A B \mid 7$ exciderunt $B$-E: ceciderunt $A \mid$ catenae $C-E$ : cathenae $A B \mid 10$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 11$ e $B-E$ : $\operatorname{de} A \mid$ ex $B-E$ : $\operatorname{de} A$
copies of the late Vulgate. However, the Vulgate column of the 1527 N.T. has Erant, which is
also found in Froben's Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514.

3 ๆ $\mu$ épar. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 in omitting the article, supported by $7^{45 v i d} \mathcal{K}$ B 0244 and some later mss., including cod. 1. Most mss., commencing with codd. A D E, have ai † $\mu \mathrm{m} \rho \alpha \mathrm{al}$, as in cod. $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ (in cod. $2816^{*}$, గֹ $\sigma \alpha \nu$ ... $\dot{\alpha} \zeta \dot{u} \mu \omega \nu$ is omitted).
4 etiam kai ( Vg . omits). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. other than cod. D, and is probably merely a matter of translation.
4 posuit हैधعто ("misit" Vg.). Again, Erasmus finds a more precise alternative to the ubiquitous mitto of the Vulgate. His substitution of pono is consistent with Vulgate usage at e.g. Mt. 14,3; Act. 4,3; 5,18. Cf. on Ioh. 3,24.
4 tradens $\pi \alpha p \alpha \delta 0$ ús ("tradensque" Vg. 1527). Erasmus follows the more accurate rendering of the earlier Vulgate.
4 asseruandum фu入áooEvv aủtóv ("ad custodiendum" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg.). In leaving aU'Tóv untranslated, Erasmus follows the late Vulgate, which corresponds with the omission of this word in cod. D. See on Act. 9,24 for a similar substitution of adseruo in rendering таратпр $\rho \in$, and on Act. 7,53 for substitutions of seruo for custodio. Manetti substituted vt ipsum custodirent.
5 Caeterum precatio пpooeuxì $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("oratio autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .). On caeterum, see on Act. 6,2, and for precatio, see on Act. 1,14.
 ("erat Petrus dormiens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Although the Vulgate is more literal, Erasmus wishes to avoid the clumsy construction of erat with the present participle: see on Ioh. 1,28.
7 हाँ no sense, and must be a misprint.
7 axciderunt $\mathrm{e} \xi \in \operatorname{E} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \circ \mathrm{v}$ ("ceciderunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more accurate, following the example of the Vulgate at several passages of the Epistles, as well as at Act. 27,32. For other changes involving cado, see on lob. 11,32.
 $\tau \tilde{\nu} \chi \varepsilon เ \rho \omega \tilde{\nu}$. Erasmus' rendering retains the Vulgate word-order, though this is supported only by cod. D, which transposes aútoũ after XElp$ั \nu$. Manetti also kept this word-order, contenting himself with replacing eius by suis.
8 autem te. Again Erasmus keeps the Vulgate wording, even though this may have been based on the substitution of $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta}$, as found in
codd. B D E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., this time commencing with $7^{74}$ N A. In Manetti, the sentence accordingly began with Et ait.
8 subliga Útió $\delta \eta \sigma a 1$ ("calcia te" Vg.). Erasmus does not use subligo elsewhere in the N.T. At Mc. 6,9; Epb. 6,15, he retains calcio to render the same Greek verb. See Annot. The passage was discussed in Erasmus Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 150, 11. 783-792.
8 soleas tà $\sigma \alpha v \delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda{ }^{\lambda} \alpha \alpha$ ("caligas" late Vg.). This change is comparable with the substitution of solea for calciamenta in rendering $\dot{\text { undó}}{ }^{\circ} \eta \mu \alpha$ at Act. 13,25 (1519). In Annot. on the present passage, Erasmus recommends sandalia, consistent with Vulgate usage at Mc. 6,9.
8 dicit $\lambda_{\hat{\xi} \gamma \varepsilon 1}$ ("dixit" Vg.). The tense of the Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss.
 See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... est.
9 sed putabat $\mathfrak{e} \delta$ ókel $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("Existimabat autem" late Vg .). Elsewhere, Erasmus sometimes replaces existimo by the passive of video, in the Epistles, but retains existimo at $L c .19,11 ; 24,37$; Iob. 20,15; Act. 26,9. At other passages, he generally follows the Vulgate in using puto and video to render this Greek verb. On sed, see on Iob. 1,26. Manetti substituted putabat autem.
 euntes" $V \mathrm{~g}$.). Erasmus here follows the example set by the Vulgate at Act. 17,23. Elsewhere, he retains transeo.
10 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. $1,25$. Manetti made the same change.
10 in eis ("ad" Vg.). This substitution marks a small distinction between Eis and $\xi \pi \mathrm{i}$, which was rendered by ad earlier in the sentence.
10 processerunt $\pi p \circ \sigma \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \mathrm{ov}$. This reading seems to have been taken from cod. 1, with support from only a few other late mss., apart from cod. D, which has mpooĩ $\lambda \theta \propto v$. The reading of codd. 2815 and 2816 is $\pi \rho \circ \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ v$, as found in most other mss., corresponding more closely with the Vulgate use of processerunt. Manetti used precesserunt.

 Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti had quod misit ... eripuit.
11 e ... ex ék ("de ... de" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 2,15.
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 ámò тĩs ’lou סוét $\rho \mid \beta \in v$.
plebis Iudaeorum. ${ }^{12}$ Reque perpensa venit ad domum Mariae, matris Ioannis, qui cognominatus est Marcus, vbi erant multi congregati et orantes. ${ }^{13}$ Quum pulsasset autem Petrus ostium vestibuli, processit puella, vt subauscultaret, nomine Rhode: ${ }^{14}$ et vt agnouit vocem Petri, prae gaudio non aperuit vestibulum, sed introcurrens renunciauit stare Petrum ante vestibulum. ${ }^{15}$ At illi dixerunt ad eam: Insanis. Illa autem affirmabat sic se habere. At illi dicebant: Angelus eius est. ${ }^{16}$ Petrus autem perseuerabat pulsans. Quum autem aperuissent, viderunt eum, et obstupuerunt. ${ }^{17}$ Quum innuisset autem eis, mota manu vt tacerent, narrauit illis quomodo dominus eduxisset ipsum de carcere. Dixit autem: Nunciate lacobo et fratribus haec. Et egressus abiit in alium locum. ${ }^{18}$ Porro vbi diluxit, erat turbatio non parua inter milites, quidnam accidisset Petro. ${ }^{19}$ Herodes autem quum requisisset eum, nec inuenisset, examinatis custodibus iussit eos duci, descendensque a Iudaea Caesaream, ibi commoratus est.

12 тробєихонеvol $A$ B D E: тробяихоияvvol $C$

12 Ioannis $A B D E$ : Iohannis $C \mid 13$ ostium $B-E$ : ad ostium $A \mid 17$ Quum innuisset $B-E$ (Cum innuisset $B-D$ ): Innuens $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ : se $A \mid 18$ Porro vbi diluxit $B-E$ : Facta autem die $A \mid$ 19 nec $B$-E: et non $A \mid$ examinatis $B-E$ : inquisitione facta de $A \mid$ Caesaream $B-E$ : in Caesaream $A$

12 Reque perpensa $\sigma u v i \delta \omega \dot{v} \tau \in$ ("Consideransque" Vg.). Greek aorist. Cf. Erasmus' substitution of $r$ intellecta for intelligentes at Act. 14,6 (1519). See also Annot., where he observes that the Vulgate rendering makes domum the object of considero. For the use of perpendo, see further on Iob. 11,50. Manetti put et considerans.
13 Quum pulsasset ... Petrus kpov́oavtos ... toũ ПЕ́тpou ("Pulsante ... eo" Vg.). Greek aorist.

The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant substituting aủtoũ for roũ חÉtoou, supported by 7 $^{74} \mathrm{KABD}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti changed the wordorder, having Cum autem Petrus ... pulsasset.
13 ostium $\operatorname{tinv}$ Ө́́pav ("ad ostium" 1516 Lat. $=$ late Vg .). As indicated in Annot., the Vulgate
preposition，ad，is redundant．It was similarly omitted by Manetti．
13 vestibuli тои̃ тu入へ̃vos（＂ianuae＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus objects to the tautologous appearance of ＂door of the entrance＂：see Annot．，where he prefers to explain the Greek expression in terms of a forecourt having an outer gateway． He makes a similar substitution at $M t .26,71$ ； Act． 12,$14 ; 14,13$（1519），while retaining ianua at $L c .16,20 ;$ Act． 10,17 ．At Mc．14，68，he puts vestibulum for atrium（ $\pi$ pooú $\lambda ı 0 v$ ）：see Annot． ad loc．Stunica defended the Vulgate rendering here：for Erasmus＇reply，see his Apolog．resp．Iac． Lop．Stun．，ASD IX，2，p．152，ll．793－800．
13 vt subauscultaret ப́tா๙кoũסal（＂ad videndum＂ late Vg．，and some Vg．mss．）．Erasmus＇trans－ lation，meaning to listen secretly，was an attempt to convey the prefix $\dot{\text { úm－more precisely．See }}$ Annot．Earlier mss．of the Vulgate had ad audiendum．The late Vulgate rendering lacks Greek ms．support．Manetti put vt videret．

14 vt agnouit ह̇דıүvoṽ $\alpha$（＂vt cognouit＂Vg．）． See on Ioh．8，43．
14 vestibulum（twice）tòv $\pi \cup \lambda \omega ̃ v \alpha ~ . . . ~ т о U ̃ ~$ $\pi \cup \lambda \omega ̃ v o s$（＂ianuam＂Vg．）．See on vs． 13.
14 renunciauit ádтণ́ $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon\llcorner\lambda \varepsilon v$（＂nunciauit＂Vg．）． Erasmus here again aims at greater precision in rendering the compound verb．He makes a similar substitution at Mt．8，33；14，12（1519）； 28，8，10，11；Mc．16，10，13；Lc．7，22；14，21 （1519），in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt．2，8；11，4；Mc．6，30．This substitution also occurs in rendering duvary $\varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ at Mc．5，14． Elsewhere，Erasmus often follows the Vulgate in using nuncio and annuncio．

15 At illi（2nd．）of ס́́（＂Illi autem＂Vg．）． Erasmus prefers the alternating sequence，at ．．． autem ．．．at ．．．autem，which was more symmetrical， but still repetitive．Manetti put ipsi vero．
16 aperuissent ${ }^{\alpha} v o i \xi \propto \chi \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$（＂aperuissent ostium＂ late $V$ g．）．The late Vulgate addition lacks explicit Greek support．Manetti omitted ostium．
17 Quum innuisset кaтабєíбаs（＂Annuens＂Vg．； ＂Innuens＂1516）．Greek aorist．The distinction here is that annuo means to nod the head， whereas innuo can include beckoning with the hand．Inconsistently，Erasmus retains annuo for kotacsic at Act．21，40（cf．also Act．13，16； 19，33）．See Annot．

17 mota manu Tñ̃ Xeıpi（＂manu＂Vg．）．Erasmus adds an extra verb，to prevent the absurd
misinterpretation＂to nod with the hand＂．See Annot．
17 illis ou＇roĩs（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{~}^{45 v i d} 74$ vid $\mathcal{K}$ A and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．，com－ mencing with codd．B D E．
17 ipsum aútóv（＂eum＂Vg．；＂se＂1516）．As elsewhere，Erasmus prefers to use ipse in re－ ported speech，when referring back to the speaker．
17 Dixit autem $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ ITte $\delta^{\delta} \dot{\varepsilon}$（＂dixitque＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant， $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ ítév $\tau \varepsilon$ ，as in鲑 ${ }^{45}$＊A B E．Erasmus follows cod．2815， supported by cod．D and most later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti put Dixit vero．
 autem die＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．On porro，see on Iob． 8，16．Erasmus does not elsewhere use dilucesco in the N．T．，though it is comparable with his substitution of illucesco at $L c .22,66$（1522）．He puts quum dies ortus esset at Act．16，35（1519）． For Erasmus＇removal of facio at many other passages，see on Ioh．1，15．He retains facio in rendering similar Greek expressions at $L c .6,13$ ； Act．23，12．

18 turbatio non parua tápoxos oủk ó入íyos （＂non parua turbatio＂Vg．）．Erasmus follows the Greek word－order more literally．

18 accidisset Petro ò ПÉтpos éү́́veto（＂factum esset de Petro＂late Vg．）．A comparable sub－ stitution occurs at Mc．5，16（1519）；Act．7，40， following the example of the Vulgate at Mc．9，21．See on Act．7，40，and also Annot．， where Erasmus speculates on the existence of a superstitious belief that Peter might have been changed into some other form by magical arts．Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate in putting de Petro factum esset．
19 nec kai $\mu \eta$（＂et non＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．2，16．Manetti had cum non．
19 examinatis ơvorkpivas（＂inquisitione facta de＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．4，9．Erasmus uses inquisitio at Act．24，8，to replace iudico，in rendering the same Greek verb．In the present context，a transitive verb is required．Manetti， possibly by conjecture，substituted the future participle，interrogaturus．

19 Caesaream eis тìv Kaxıópeıãv（＂in Caesa－ ream＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．8，27．
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${ }^{20}$ Erat autem Herodes infensus Tyriis ac Sidoniis. At illi vno animo venerunt ad eum, et persuaso Blasto, qui praeerat cubiculo regis, petebant pacem, eo quod aleretur regio ipsorum annona regia. ${ }^{21}$ Statuto autem die Herodes vestitus veste regia, sedit pro tribunali, et contionabatur ad eos. ${ }^{22}$ Populus autem acclamabat: Vox dei, et non hominis. ${ }^{23}$ Confestim autem percussit eum ange|lus domini, eo quod non dedisset gloriam deo: et erosus a vermibus, expirauit. ${ }^{24}$ Porro sermo domini crescebat ac multiplicabatur. ${ }^{25}$ Barnabas autem et Paulus reuersi sunt Hierosolymam, expleto ministerio,


20 Herodes infensus $B-E$ : iratus $A \mid$ ac $D E$ et $A-C \mid$ vno animo $B-E$ : vnanimes $A \mid$ petebant $B-E$ : postulabant $A \mid$ annona $B-E$ (ital): annona $A$ (rom.) | 23 erosus $B-E$ : consumptus $A \mid$ 24 Porro sermo $B-E$ : Verbum autem $A$ ac $B-E$ et $A$

20 Herodes ó 'Hpळ́ $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by 2774 ${ }^{74}$ A B D and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including cod. 1 (cod. 2816 has just $\eta \mathrm{\eta} \rho \omega \dot{\delta} \eta$, omitting d). Manetti made the same change.

20 infensus $\theta$ u $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha \chi \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("iratus" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus discusses in Annot. the derivation of the Greek verb from $\theta u \mu$ ós and $\mu o ́ x \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$, , and decides that the Vulgate rendering is too tame, but that Valla's suggestion of acerbe pugnans is too strong: see Valla Annot. At Hebr. 3,10, 17, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using infensus to render $\pi \rho o \sigma o \chi^{\ominus i} \zeta \omega$.
20 ac каi ("et" 1516-22 = Vg.). See on Iob, 1,25. Manetti also had ac.
20 Eisovions. The 1516 edition, more correctly, had the spelling oi $\delta \omega$ vious from cod. 2815, supported by cod. 2816 and nearly all other mss. (including cod. 3). The spelling oidovions is found in cod. 1.

20 vno animo ó $\mu 0$ Oufuaסóv ("vnanimes" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is consistent with Vulgate usage at

Act. 18,12; 19,29. Usually Erasmus follows the Vulgate in rendering this Greek word by wnanimiter. At Rom. 15,6, he substitutes vnanimiter for vnanimes, while replacing idem sapio by vnanimes in rendering tò aủtò $\varphi p o v e ́ \omega$ at 2 Cor. 13,11; Pbil. 2,2. He retains vnanimes for ónóqpoves at 1 Petr. 3,8.
 super cubiculum" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus generally follows the Vulgate in using praesum
 $13,7,17,24$, he substitutes praesum for praepositus. At Act. 8,27, where the Greek text has ös गัv Ėmi with a genitive, Erasmus replaces qui erat super with quem praefecerat. In 1516, his Greek text had tòv koitธ̃va from cod. 2815, apparently without any other Greek ms. support. The restoration of toũ koitw̃vos in 1519 was supported by cod. 3 and virtually all other mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In 1522, there was a further development, as Erasmus now decided to place his former reading, tò $v$ kort $\tilde{v} \alpha$, in the margin beside his Greek N.T. text. The probable reason for this was that he had found this reading in the text of the Aldine Bible, but
was unaware of the extent to which that edi－ tion was dependent on his own first edition of 1516．See on Iob．8，36．This was the first Greek marginal note in the book of Acts in the 1522 edition．
20 petebant h่тoũvto（＂postulabant＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Act．3，14，regarding postulo．Erasmus no doubt sensed that the demeanour of the Tyrians and Sidonians was that of supplicants，seek－ ing a favour rather than demanding what was theirs by right．Erasmus＇cod． 2815 had ⿹勹̉Toũv here，without other ms．support．He or his assistants supplied the correct reading from codd． 1 and 2816.
20 quod aleretur regio тò тр́́pecooal ．．．тìv $\chi$ б́pov（＂quod alerentur regiones＂Vg．）．The Vulgate may reflect the substitution of tòs x $\omega$ pas for $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ X $\omega$ pav，exhibited by cod．D virtually alone．See Annot．
20 ipsorum $\alpha$ ỦTũv（＂eorum＂Vg．）．Erasmus prefers the reflexive pronoun，referring back to the subject of the sentence．See Annot．The version of Manetti omitted the pronoun．
20 annona regia àmò tñs $\beta \alpha \sigma ı \lambda ı \kappa n ̃ s ~(" a b ~ i l l o " ~$ Vg．）．In Erasmus＇rendering，annona is in italics， to show that it is an explanatory addition：the word was widely used in classical Latin to denote the national corn supply．See Annot．， and also Valla Elegantiac IV，35．Manetti put a regia．
21 év $\delta \varepsilon \delta v \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mathcal{V} O S$ ．Erasmus took this form of the verb from his cod．2815，apparently unsuppor－ ted by any other Greek mss．，which all have èv $\quad$ రưánusvos．
22 Vox dei Өєoũ paví（＂Dei voces＂Vg．）．As suggested in Annot．，the Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting $\Phi \omega v a i$ for $\varphi \omega v \dot{\prime}$ ，though this seems to be found only in cod．$D^{*}$ ．In 1516， Erasmus had the word－order $\varphi \omega v \dot{\eta} \theta_{\text {ooũ，both }}$ in his text and in Annot．，based on his cod． 2815 and supported by most other late mss．In his Greek text of 1519 ，the change to $\theta_{\varepsilon 0} \tilde{u}$ $\phi \omega u$ ń was possibly prompted by cod． 3 （though
 and no iota subscript：cf．$\varphi \omega \nu \tilde{\pi} \theta^{\theta} \circ$ ũ in cod． 2816）with support from $7^{74}$ \＆A B E and many later mss．，but without any corresponding change in Annot．The version of Manetti was dei voce，apparently taking the Greek word as a dative，$\varphi \omega \nu \tilde{\eta}$ ．The latter reading corresponded with a suggestion later offered by Stunica，and which was rejected by Erasmus in 1522 Annot．
as well as in his Apolog．resp．Iac．Lop．Stun．， ASD IX，2，p．152，II．801－811．
23 gloriam $\delta \delta \delta \xi \alpha v$（＂honorem＂Vg．）．Erasmus is more accurate here，following the example of the Vulgate e．g．at $L c$ ．17，18；Iob． 9,$24 ;$ Ap．Ioh． 11，13；16，9．See Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
 （＂consumptus a vermibus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Eras－ mus＇choice of the verb，erodo，is well－suited to the context，implying a gradual eating away： cf．Pliny Naturalis Historia 12，96．See Annot． The version of Manetti（PaL Lat 45）put assumptus a vermibus．
24 Porro sermo ò ס̀̇ $\lambda o ́ y o s$（＂Verbum autem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．Regarding porro，see on Iob．8，16， and for sermo，see on Iob．1，1．Manetti had At verbum．
24 domini $\frac{\text { toũ } \theta \text { өoũ．The discrepancy between }}{}$ Erasmus＇Greek and Latin texts remained through all five editions．The only Greek support for the Vulgate rendering，domini，seems to come from cod．B，which has toũ kupiou．
$24 a c$ kai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
25 Paulus Пaũ入os（＂Saulus＂Vg．）．Erasmus de－ rives Пaũخos from his cod．2815，supported by only a few other late mss．It is clearly inconsistent with Luke＇s usage in Acts，where the name Saul is used（in most Greek mss．）at every passage up to Act．13，9，and then always Paul from that point onwards，except in reporting Paul＇s ac－ counts of his conversion in ch． 22 and 26．The Vulgate was based on a Greek text having $\sigma \alpha \tilde{v} \lambda o s$, as found in codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．See on Act．13，7，below．Manetti also had Paulus here．
25 Hierosolymam вis＂lepouб $\alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$（＂ab Hiero－ solymis＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek text replacing eis either by átó，as in codd．D E and about ninety later mss．，or by $\hat{\varepsilon} \xi$ as in $7^{74} \mathrm{~A}$ and seventy－five later mss．Of these，more than a hundred add eis AvtióXetov，while a further twenty－four mss．substitute eis Avtió－ Xeicv．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd． 1,2816 and about 280 other mss．，this time commencing with codd． NB （see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 513－15）．In Annot．，he never－ theless expresses doubt as to whether $\mathrm{E}^{\prime}$ is correct（＂haud scio an perperam＂）．The main difficulty of is＇＂Epouvax $\eta \mu$ is that the following aorist participle，$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \nu T \varepsilon s$ ，implies that Saul and Barnabas had already completed their
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 кả̛кєïӨ 1.

assumpto et Ioanne，cui cognomen erat Marcus．

13Erant autem quidam in eccle－ sia quae erat Antiochiae，pro－ phetae ac doctores，Barnabasque et Simon qui vocabatur Niger，et Luci－ us Cyrenensis，et Manahen qui erat Herodis tetrarchae collactaneus，et Saulus．${ }^{2}$ Quum autem illi sacrifi－ carent domino，ieiunarentque，dixit spiritus sanctus：Segregate mihi Bar－ nabam et Saulum in opus ad quod accersiui eos．${ }^{3}$ Quumque ieiunas－ sent et orassent，imposuissentque eis manus，dimiserunt．${ }^{4} \mathrm{Et}$ ipsi quidem emissi a spiritu sancto， abierunt Seleuciam，et inde naui－ gauerunt in Cyprum．${ }^{5} \mathrm{Et}$ quum essent Salamine，annunciauerunt

25 Ioanne $A B E$ ：Iohanne $C D \mid$ cui cognomen erat $B-E$ ：qui cognominatus est $A$
13，1 ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ Barnabasque $B-E$ ：et Barnabas $A \mid$ collactaneus $A C-E$ ：a puero famili－ aris $B \mid 2$ Quum autem illi sacrificarent $B-E$（exc．Cum pro Quum $B-D$ ）：Ministrantibus autem illis $A \mid$ ieiunarentque $B$－$E$ ：et ieiunantibus $A \mid 3$ imposuissentque $B$－$E$ ：et imposuissent $A \mid$ 5 essent Salamine B－E：venissent Salaminam $A$
ministry at Jerusalem，in which case they would now be expected to return to Antioch from Jerusalem．Looking solely at the strength of ms． attestation，and taking no account of the sur－ rounding context，the reading eis＂Izpovo $\alpha \lambda$ n＇$\mu$ is to be preferred，but the variety and complexity of the explanations which are thought necessary， in order to account for that reading，tend to remove any confidence that it could possibly be correct．Manetti put in Hierusalem．
25 et（2nd．）kai（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omis－ sion is supported by $7^{74} \times A B D^{*}$ and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd． $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most of the later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816.

25 cui cognomen erat tòv ध̇mıк入クӨ́́vта（＂qui cognominatus est＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．Cf．Lc．22，3 （1519）where the same phrase is substituted
 See on Act．11，13．Manetti had qui Marcus cognominabatur．

13，1 quidam tives（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by ${7 \exists^{74}}^{71}$ A B D and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with cod．E and most later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti made the same change．

1 ac kaí（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25． Manetti also had ac．

1 Barnabasque＂o тє Bapváß $\alpha$（＂in quibus Barnabas＂Vg．；＂et Barnabas＂1516）．The Vulgate corresponds with the substitution of evv ols for $\delta \tau \varepsilon$ ，found only in cod．D．The version of Manetti put et Barnabas，as found in Erasmus＇ 1516 edition．

1 Simon qui $\sum i \mu \omega v$ ．This spelling of the Greek name，found in all five editions of Erasmus， but not among the Greek mss．，looks like a conjecture based on the late Vulgate．Virtually all mss．，including those which Erasmus usually consulted，read $\sum \cup \mu \varepsilon \omega \dot{v} v$ ．This is acknowledged
in a half－hearted manner in 1519 Annot．（＂in nonnullis exemplaribus Graecorum，scriptum erat Simeon＂）．The omission of $\delta$ was possibly not intended by Erasmus：if the text had originally been typeset as $\sum u \mu \varepsilon \omega \dot{\nu} \delta$ ，Erasmus or one of his assistants may have written $\Sigma i \mu \omega \nu$ in the margin of the proof－copy and carelessly struck a line through $\sum u \mu \varepsilon \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\delta}$ instead of just through $\sum u \mu \varepsilon \omega v$ ，so that the compositor incor－ rectly deleted $\delta$ from the text．
1 collactaneus oúvtpopos（＂a puero familiaris＂ 1519）．As explained in 1522 Annot．，Erasmus felt that collactaneus was technically more appro－ priate to a freedman，i．e．a former slave，and hence in 1519 he had put the paraphrased rendering a puero familiaris．However，in the 1522 Latin rendering，inconsistent with 1522 Annot．，he had second thoughts and reverted to the Vulgate wording．The inconsistency was remedied in 1527 Annot．
2 Quum ．．．illi sacrificarent $\lambda$ हєtoupyoúvt $\omega v$ ．．．人ủtũv（＂Ministrantibus ．．．illis＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Erasmus＇choice of rendering is of doubtful suitability．At Rom．15，27，he retains ministro， while substituting sacra perago at Hebr．10，11， in rendering the same Greek verb．At 2 Cor． 9，12，he retains ministerium for $\lambda$ eitoupyia，but replaces obsequium by sacrificium at Phil．2，17， and by officium at Pbil．2，30．Manetti substituted Ministrantibus ．．．ipsis．
2 ieiunarentque kai $\nu \eta \sigma \tau e v o v^{2} \omega \omega$（＂et ieiunanti－ bus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The subjunctive follows on from Erasmus＇change of construction earlier in the verse．On que，see on Ioh．1，39．Manetti put ac ieiunantibus．
2 dixit $\mathfrak{E l} \pi \varepsilon$（＂dixit illis＂late Vg．）．The late Vul－ gate addition is supported by cod．E，apparently alone．Manetti substituted ait，omitting illis．
 complains of the omission of iam for $\delta \dot{\eta}$ ，yet in his own rendering he did not add this word． Manetti added autem，as if to render $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ rather than $\delta \mathfrak{\eta}$ ．See on Act．15，36．
2 Barnabam et Saulum Bapvó $\beta \alpha \nu$ kà tòv Eaũ $o v$（＂Saulum et Barnabam＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate reversal of word－order has negligible Greek support．Manetti had the same word－ order as Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate．
2 accersiui t тробкék $\lambda \eta \mu \propto ı$（＂assumpsi＂Vg．）．The Vulgate rendering would have been more suit－ able for $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} \omega$ or one of its compounds， but no mss．offer such an alternative at the
present passage．In Annot．，Erasmus also sugges－ ted aduocaui．Manetti put vocaui．
3 Quumque ieiunassent et orassent Tóte v ทбтєu่－ баvtes kai тpooev乡́ánevol（＂Tunc ieiunantes et orantes＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．Manetti（Pal．Lat． 45）preferred Tunc cum ieiunassent ac orassent．
3 imposuisentque кai émı日Evtes（＂imponentes－ que＂ Vg ．；＂et imposuissent＂1516）．Greek aorist． On que，see on lob．1，39．Manetti put et ．．． imposuissent．
 The Vulgate corresponds with the addition of oủroús，found in cod．E virtually alone．Manetti omitted the pronoun．
4 emissi éктєцధӨ́́vtes（＂missi＂Vg．）．See on Act．11，13．
4 et inde кákкĩ̈єv $\delta \dot{\text { É．The Erasmian Greek text }}$ derived this improbable reading from cod． 1 ， with support from only a few other late mss． Codd． 2815 and 2816 had ékeĩ $\ell \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ，as found in most of the later mss．The Vulgate wording corresponds more closely with ékeîév $\tau \varepsilon$ ，as found in many other mss．，commencing with $7^{74}$ א A B C E．
$4 \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \in \varepsilon \pi \lambda_{\varepsilon} \in \sigma \sigma v$ ．This reading apparently has no ms．support，and was possibly an unintentional change．Erasmus＇codd．1，2815， 2816 and most other mss．have $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon u \sigma \alpha v$ ．
 A similar addition of in before Cyprum occurs at $A c t .15,39$ ．Erasmus probably felt that it was incorrect to omit the preposition before the name of a large island：cf．on Act．8，27．
5 quum essent Salamine $\gamma \varepsilon v \delta \mu \varepsilon v o l ~ \& \nu \nu ~ \sum \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu i v v 1$ （＂cum venissent Salaminam＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）． Erasmus is more acccurate here．A similar sub－ stitution occurs at 2 Tim．1，17，putting quum esset Romae for cum Romam venisset．See Annot．
 Vg．）．Erasmus＇Greek text here corresponds with an interlinear correction in cod． $2816^{\text {com }}$ （in cod．2816＊，it was кaтín $\gamma$ ¢єi入ov）．A more correct form of the aorist tense would have
 in cod．D）．However，in codd．1， 2815 and most other mss．，the Greek text has the imperfect tense，катiny $\gamma \in \lambda \lambda 10 v$ ．The substitution of an－ nuncio for praedico also occurs at Act．15，36； 17，13，in accordance with Vulgate usage at other passages，with the result that Erasmus uses annuncio for all seventeen instances of котवүYє $\lambda \lambda \omega$ in the N．T．
 т $\omega \nu^{\prime}$ lou
 Máqou, eũpóv tiva háyov Yevסotipo-



















 ${ }^{12}$ тóte í íciv ó ávOúmatos tò $\gamma \varepsilon$ Yo-
 Tñ $\delta i \delta \alpha \times \tilde{n}$ Toũ kupiou.
 pou of mepi tòv חaũ $\lambda o v$, $\mathfrak{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \nu$
sermonem dei in synagogis Iudaeorum: habebant autem et Ioannem ministrum. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Et}$ peragrata insula vsque ad Paphum, inuenerunt quendam magum pseudoprophetam Iudaeum, cui nomen erat Bariesu, ${ }^{7}$ qui erat cum proconsule Sergio Paulo viro prudente. Hic accersitis Barnaba et Saulo, desiderabat audire sermonem dei. ${ }^{8}$ Resistebat autem illis Elymas magus, sic enim interpretatur nomen eius, quaerens auertere proconsulem a fide. ${ }^{9}$ Saulus autem qui idem Paulus, repletus spiritu sancto, intentis in eum oculis, ${ }^{10}$ dixit: O plene omni dolo et omni versutia fili diaboli, inimice omnis iustitiae, non desinis inuertere vias domini rectas. ${ }^{11}$ Et nunc ecce manus domini super te, et eris caecus non videns solem vsque ad tempus. Et confestim cecidit in eum caligo ac tenebrae, et circumiens quaerebat qui se manu ducerent. ${ }^{12}$ Tunc proconsul quum vidisset quod acciderat, credidit, admirans super doctrina domini.
${ }^{13}$ Quum autem a Papho soluisset Paulus, qui cum eo erant, venerunt

13,10 $\delta \iota \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \varphi \omega \nu A^{c} B-E: \delta เ \varepsilon \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \varphi \omega \nu A^{*} \mid$ Xeip tou $A^{c} B-E$ : Xeipou $A^{*}$

5 sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid$ Ioannem $A B E$ : Iohannem $C D \mid 6$ peragrata insula $B-E$ : cum perambulassent insulam $A \mid 7$ Saulo C-E: Paulo $A B \mid$ desiderabat $B-E$ : desyderabat $A \mid$ sermonem $B$-E: verbum $A \mid 8$ quaerens $B$-E: querens $A \mid 9$ idem $B$-E: et $A \mid$ intentis in eum oculis $B$-E: intuens in eum $A \mid 10$ versutia $B-E$ : fallacia $A \mid$ inuertere $B$-E: subuertere $A \mid$ 11 ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 12$ quod acciderat $B$ - $E$ : factum $A \mid$ admirans $C$ C: ammirans $A B \mid$ 13 soluisset Paulus, qui cum eo $C$-E: soluissent ii qui cum Paulo $A B$

5 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v$ ("verbum" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
5 ministrum ভ́mๆpétๆv ("in ministerio" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant, eis $\delta_{1 a x o v i \alpha v,}$ found only in cod. E. Alternatively, the original Vulgate rendering was in ministrum,
altered by later scribes who misunderstood the construction (cf. in filium at Act. 7,21). Manetti also had ministrum.
6 peragrata insula $\delta 1 \varepsilon \lambda \theta o ́ v \tau \varepsilon s$... тท̀v v $̃ \sigma 0 \nu$ ("cum perambulassent vniuersam insulam" Vg.; "cum perambulassent insulam" 1516). See on

Act. 8,4. Erasmus retains perambulo for $\delta 1$ ¢́p $\mathrm{Xo} \mathrm{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ at Lc. 19,1; Act. 11,19; 15,41; 18,23; 20,2. The conversion from active to passive is also found at Act. 13,14 (1519); 14,24, following the example of the Vulgate at Act. 19,1. The Vulgate is based
 as in $\mathbf{y}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B CDE and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti put cum insulam ... perambulassent, omitting vniuersam.
6 quendam tiva ("quendam virum" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having ávopo tiva, as in $\mathbf{7}^{74} \&$ A B C D and a few later mss.,
 cod. 2815, again supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti made the same change.
6 Bariesu Bapınooũv ("Barieu" late Vg.). The late Vulgate spelling is devoid of Greek ms. support. In Annot., Erasmus speculates that $\dot{\mathscr{L}}$ orvoun was not part of the original text, though this is the reading of most of the mss., commencing with $3^{77^{4}} \mathrm{~N}$ A B C E, with some divergence as to whether the name should end in -ouv ( ${ }^{455 i d} \mathrm{~A}$, with codd. 1 and 2815), -ous (codd. B C, with cod. 2816), oov ( $\mathbf{7}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ ), or -ovav (cod. D ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ ). Manetti put Barisus.
7 Saulo $\sum \alpha$ Ũ $10 v$ ("Paulo" 1516-19 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate is suported here by only a few late Greek mss. See on Act. 12,25. Manetti also put Saulo.
7 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
8 illis «ưtoĩs ("illi" Annot., lemma). The 1527 Vulgate column has illis, as found also in the Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514. Manetti preferred eis.
9 idem kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus renders according to the context, replacing the overliteral Vulgate translation.
9 intentis ... oculis kà ó Ttevíaxs ("intuens" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Greek aorist. See on Act. 7,55.
10 versutia $\dot{\rho} \alpha \delta ı o u p y$ ias ("fallacia" $1516=V g$.). In rendering the similar Greek word, mavoupyía, Erasmus also substitutes versutia for astutia at 2 Cor. 11,3, and for nequitia at Epb. 4,14; he further replaces nequitia by versutia in rendering mounpia at 1 Cor. 5,8 . However, in rendering Úrókpiols at Mc. 12,15, he replaces the sole Vulgate N.T. instance of versutia with simulatio. Cf. Annot. He removes fallacia from the N.T.,
replacing it by deceptio at Mt. 13,22; Col. 2,8, and by seductio at Hebr. 3,13, in rendering ámórtך. The word fallacia does occur in classical usage.

10 inuertere $\delta \iota \alpha \sigma$ тр́́ $\omega \nu$ ("subuertere" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The spelling $\delta$ เєoтpé $\varphi \omega \nu$ in the 1516 Greek text is a printer's error, corrected in the errata. The same substitution of inuertere occurs also at Gal. 1,7(1519), in rendering $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \sigma т \rho \varepsilon ́ q \omega$. Erasmus retains subuerto for $\alpha v \alpha т \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$ at 2 Tim. 2,18; Tit. 1,11. In Annot., he also suggested using deprauare. Manetti substituted non cessas subuertens for non desinis subuertere.
11 Xeip toũ. Erasmus' codd. 1, 2815 and 2816 all had just $\chi$ zíp here, omitting toũ. It appears that, in 1516, either he or an assistant conjectured that toũ should be added before kupiou, but the intended correction was misread and became Xeĩpou. This was changed in the 1516 errata to become Xeip toũ, a reading which survived into the Textus Receptus despite being supported by relatively few mss.
11 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti's version (both mss.) omitted et tenebrac.
11 qui se manu ducerent Xepaycorós ("qui ei manum daret" Vg.). In Annot., lemma, the Vulgate is said to have darent for daret. However, in the Froben Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514, together with the 1527 Vulgate column, the reading is daret. The singular form of the verb lacks Greek ms. support, and Erasmus' substitution of manu ducerent is more accurate. Valla Annot. had already suggested such a change. Manetti put manuducentem.
12 quod acciderat tò $\gamma$ Eyovós ("factum" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 7,40. Manetti proposed quod factum fuerat.

13 Quum autem ... soluisset Paulus qui cum eo erant Avax $\theta \dot{v} v t e s$ סè ... ol mepl tòv Пaũخov ("Et cum ... nauigasset Paulus et qui cum eo erant" Vg. 1527; "Cum autem ... soluissent ii qui cum Paulo erant" 1516-19). The Vulgate addition of $e t$ before qui does not seem to have explicit Greek ms. support. Erasmus' substitution of soluo for nauigo occurs also at Act. 16,11; $20,3,13 ; 21,1,2 ; 27,12 ; 28,10$, recognising that the verb duóy $\omega$ means to put to sea rather than merely to travel by sea. He similarly removes nauigo in translating $\dot{\alpha} \pi \pi 0 \pi \lambda$ ह́㇒ at Act. 14,26 (see ad loc.). He retains nauigo for ảvó $\gamma \omega$ just once, at Act. 28,11. The Vulgate nowhere
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甲ท́tov. ${ }^{21}$ кव̉ккĩ




Pergen Pamphyliae. Ioannes autem digressus ab eis, reuersus est Hierosolymam. ${ }^{14}$ Caeterum ipsi peragratis regio|nibus, a Perga venerunt AntioLB 486 chiam Pisidiae, et ingressi synagogam die sabbatorum, sederunt. ${ }^{15}$ Post lectionem autem legis ac prophetarum miserunt principes synagogae ad eos, dicentes: Viri fratres, si quis est in vobis sermo exhortationis ad plebem, dicite. ${ }^{16}$ Surgens autem Paulus et manu silentio indicto, ait: Viri Israelitae, et qui timetis deum, audite. ${ }^{17}$ Deus populi huius delegit patres nostros, et populum in altum extulit, quum essent incolae in terra Aegypti, et brachio excelso eduxit eos ex ea: ${ }^{18}$ et circiter quadraginta annorum tempus, mores eorum sustinuit in deserto. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{Ac}$ deletis gentibus septem in terra Chanaan, sorte distribuit eis terram eorum. ${ }^{20}$ Et post haec annis circiter quadringentis quinquaginta dedit iudices vsque ad Samuelem prophetam. ${ }^{21} \mathrm{Et}$ exinde postulauerunt regem, deditque illis deus Saul filium Cis virum de tribu Beniamin, annis quadraginta. ${ }^{22}$ Et amoto illo,

[^8]13 Ioannes $A B E$ : Iohannes $C D \mid$ digressus $B-E$ : discedens $A \mid 14$ Caeterum ... Perga $B-E$ : Illi vero pertranseuntes Pergen $A \mid 15$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 17$ delegit $B-E$ : elegit $A \mid$ in altum extulit $B-E$ : exaltauit $A \mid$ brachio $B-E$ : in brachio $A \mid 18$ circiter $B-E$ : per $A \mid 19$ Ac $B-E$ : Et $A \mid$ 20 Samuelem $B-E$ : Samuel $A \mid 21$ deditque $B-E$ : et dedit $A$
uses soluo in this sense. In Annot., Erasmus argued that the expression of $\pi \varepsilon \rho i$ was just a figure of speech, meaning Paul himself, but the Vulgate rendering, in this instance, makes better sense of the passage. A similar problem arises over oi mepi tòv Пaũク $\lambda \frac{0}{}$ at Act. 21,8. Stunica, with good reason, objected to Erasmus'
treatment of this point: for Erasmus' reply, see his Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 152, ll. 812-819. Manetti had Cum vero ... nauigassent qui cum Paulo erant.

13 digressus àmox ${ }^{2}$ pịoas ("discedens" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist. For Erasmus' use of
digredior，see on loh．12，36．He retains discedo
 put cum ．．．recessisset．
14 Caeterum ipsi aủtol $\delta$ ©́（＂Illi vero＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）．On caeterum，see on Act．6，2．Erasmus uses $i p s i$ to refer back to the subject of the previous sentence，perhaps thinking that illi might be misunderstood as implying a contrast with eis．Manetti substituted Ipsi autem．
14 peragratis regionibus a Perga $\delta_{\text {İe }}$ Aóvtes àmò
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The rendering given by the Vulgate has no justification among the Greek mss．On peragro see on Act．8，4．See also Annot．
15 ac kai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob． 1,25 ． Manetti also had ac．
16 silentio indicto кaтaбєíのas（＂silentium indi－ cens＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．See Annot．The version of Manetti put just annuens．
17 populi ．．．populum toũ $\lambda \alpha o$ õ ．．．tòv $\lambda \alpha$ óv （＂plebis ．．．plebem＂Vg．）．See on Act．2，47，and Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
17 buius toútou（＂Israel＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant，such as toũ＇lopaǹ $\lambda$ ， found in cod．B virtually alone．However，the reading toútou＇lopari入 is found in $\mathbf{7 B}^{74} \mathrm{KA}$ C D and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by cod．E and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．See Annot．The version of Manetti deleted Israel， but placed buius before populi．
17 delegit $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \in \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \xi \varsigma \propto$ тo（＂elegit＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．1，2．
17 in altum extulit $\Psi \Psi \omega \sigma \in \nu$（＂exaltauit＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）At Lc． 10,15 （1519），Erasmus substitutes elata es without adding in altum．Cf．his sub－ stitution of extollo at $L c$ ．14，11；18，14； 1 Petr．5，6 （all in 1519）．Elsewhere，he retains exalto for this Greek verb at several passages．
17 brachio $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta \rho o x i o v o s$（＂in brachio＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）Erasmus produces a more natural Latin expression by omitting the preposition．Manetti preferred cum brachio．
18 circiter $\dot{\omega}$（＂per＂ 1516 Lat．$=V$ g．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting $\dot{\omega} \varsigma$ ，as in codd．D E alone．

19 Ac kai（＂Et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25．
19 deletis gentibus кळөE $\lambda \omega \nu$ 的 $\varphi \eta$（＂destruens gentes＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．Erasmus retains destruo for kaӨalpéف at Lc．12，18；Act．19，27．

Elsewhere，he follows the Vulgate in using deleo for $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i \varphi \omega$ at Act．3，19；Col．2，14；Ap．Iob． 3，5．

20 Et post baec annis circiter quadringentis quin－
 （＂quasi post quadringentos et quinquaginta annos，et post haec＂ Vg ．）．On the use of circiter， see on Ioh．1，39．The Vulgate reflects a different
 тevtinkovid，kai $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ тaũта，as found in 879 ${ }^{74}$ A B C and twenty later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．D ${ }^{\text {cort }}$ E and about 430 of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816 （see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 515－18）．The reading adopted by Erasmus could be considered a lectio difficilior because of the apparent discrepancy which it produces with 1 Rg．6，1，for which a variety of possible reconciliations have been offered by later com－ mentators．The variant offered by $3^{74}$ and others，in removing one difficulty，introduces even more serious problems．At first sight，the variant appears to imply that the＂division of Canaan by lot＂lasted for 450 years，a chrono－ logical impossibility．If，on the other hand，the 450 years have to be taken as overlapping with the forty years in the wilderness，as well as including an unspecified length of time for the sojourn in Egypt，it may be questioned whether it is at all probable that the Apostle Paul（or Luke，his reporter）would have deliberately chosen such a confusing way of presenting Jewish chronology．Further，this variant creates an anomaly by leaving the period of the judges without any indication of its duration，whereas the periods before and after the judges are assigned a definite number of years．See Annot． The version of Manetti had et post bec，quasi post quadringentos quinquaginta annos．
20 Samuelem La See on Act．3，24．
21 deditque kai $\varepsilon$ é $\delta \omega \mathrm{KEv}$（＂et dedit＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on loh．1，39．Manetti substituted et ．．． prebuit．
21 deus ó $\theta$ zós（Vg． 1527 omits）．The late Vulgate omission is supported by only a few late Greek mss．

21 Beviauiv．The spelling Beviauinv in 1516－19 was not found in the mss．which Erasmus usually consulted．Although it has support from a few other late mss．，it may have been a misprint．















suscitauit illis Dauid vt esset rex, cui testimonium reddens dixit: Inueni Dauid filium Iesse, virum secundum cor meum, qui faciet omnes voluntates meas. ${ }^{23}$ Huius e semine, deus ita vt promiserat, adduxit Israeli seruatorem Iesum, ${ }^{24}$ quum ante praedicasset Ioannes ante faciem introitus eius baptismum poenitentiae Israeli. ${ }^{25}$ Quum autem impleret Ioannes cursum, dixit: Quem me arbitramini esse? Non is sum ego, sed ecce venit post me cuius non sum dignus soleam pedum soluere. ${ }^{26}$ Viri fratres, filii generis Abrahae, et qui inter vos timent deum, vobis


22 vt esset rex $B-E$ : in regem $A \mid$ reddens $B-E$ : perhibens $A \mid$ Iesse $E$ : Iessae $A-D \mid 23$ ita vt promiserat $B-E$ : iuxta promissum $A \mid$ Israeli seruatorem $B-E$ : Israel saluatorem $A \mid 24$ introitus $B-E$ : aduentus $A \mid 25$ impleret $C-E$ : implesset $A B \mid$ is $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ soleam $B$ - $E$ : calciamenta $A \mid 26$ Abrahae $B$-E: Abraham $A \mid$ inter vos $B-E$ : in vobis $A$

22 vt esset rex Els $\beta \propto \sigma i \lambda E \alpha$ ("regem" Vg.; "in regem" 1516). Erasmus gives the sense of the Greek preposition more accurately. Manetti put in regem, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
22 cui む кai ("cui et" Vg. $1527=$ Vg. mss.). Erasmus' imprecision in not providing a rendering for kai may have been caused by his use of a printed Vulgate edition, such as the Froben edition of 1491, in which et was omitted. The word was similarly absent from Manetti's translation.
22 testimonium reddens $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \cup p \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha{ }^{2}$ ("testimonium perhibens" $1516=$ Vg.). See on $I o b .1,7$; 5,33. Manetti had testificatus.
23 Huius e semine, deus toútou ơ Өeòs átrò toũ $\sigma$ тt́p While the Vulgate accurately represents the Greek word-order, Erasmus probably wished to remove any ambiguity, in case a reader might suppose the pasage to refer to "this man's God" rather than "this man's seed". Manetti put $A b$ buius semine ... deus.
 dum promissionem" Vg.; "iuxta promissum"
1516). Erasmus retains secundum promissionem at $2 \mathrm{Tim} .1,1$. The reason for change at the present passage may have been partly to interrupt the sequence of sibilants, and partly to avoid repetition of secundum from the previous verse. A similar substitution of iuxta for secundum occurs frequently elsewhere, especially in the Epistles, following Vulgate usage e.g. at Mc. 7,5; Act. 3,22; Rom. 16,25.
23 adduxit ग̄ $\gamma \propto \gamma \varepsilon$ ("eduxit" Vg.). Erasmus discerns that the Vulgate rendering is unsuited to the context, which requires a verb meaning to bring or to provide. Manetti tried deduxit.
23 Israeli $т \tilde{\varphi}$ 'lopaí $\lambda$ ("Israel" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,31. Manetti put ipsi Israel.
23 seruatorem Iesum $\sigma \omega \tau \eta ̃ p \alpha$ 'In $\sigma 0 u ̃ v$ ("saluatorem Iesum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,42 for the substitution of seruator. In 1516 Annot., Erasmus shows awareness of two different readings among his mss., owtךpiav (found in codd. 1 and 2815 , along with $\$^{74}$ and most later mss.) and $\sigma \omega T \tilde{\eta} p \alpha$ (as in cod. $2816^{*}$ ), both omitting 'Inooüv. The reading which was printed in his text, $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \tilde{p} \rho{ }^{\prime} \mid \eta \sigma o u ̃ v$, corresponded with cod. $2816^{\text {corrt }}$, supported by
codd. א A B C (D) E (contrary to $\mathrm{N}^{27}$ ) and some later mss. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus expressed his opinion that the original reading was $\sigma p \alpha \mathfrak{w}$ ( $=\sigma \omega \tau \tilde{j} \rho \alpha$ ' $1 \eta \sigma o u ̃ v$ ), which an "inattentive or even a partly-blind scribe" ("parum attentus scriba aut lusciosus etiam") could have misread as $\sigma \omega$ tnpiav ( $\sigma p 1 \alpha v$ ), owing to the abbreviated manner in which these words were often written in Greek mss. In support of this view, it could be added that Paul's sermon might have been expected to mention the name of Jesus at this point, rather than leaving it until ten verses later, when speaking of the resurrection. Further, the reference to the seed of David earlier in vs. 23 would seem to require fulfilment by the arrival of a person rather than just the abstract concept of salvation. A mention of Jesus in vs. 23 would also provide a clearer antecedent for aútoũ in vs. 24. However, all these arguments could also be taken as a demonstration that $\sigma \omega \mathrm{T} \eta \mathrm{pi}$ iov is a lectio difficilior in its immediate context, and hence more likely to be correct. In this case, the process of transcriptional error worked in the opposite direction, and some scribes misread an original $\sigma p ı \alpha v$ as $\sigma p \alpha i v$. If $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i \alpha v$ were original, this would then provide a better explanation for the reference to "this salvation" in vs. 26
 more naturally with owtnpiav rather than $\sigma \omega \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho \alpha$ in vs. 23. Manetti, accordingly, put salutem, omitting Iesum. The passage was further discussed in Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 208 E-209 A.

24 quum ante pradicaaset t трокпрú avtos ("prae- $^{2}$ dicante" Vg.). Greek aorist. In all five editions, 1516-35, the Greek word is misspelled as тpoкирท́รavtos, which has no ms. support and was undoubtedly caused by a printer's error. The correct spelling is cited in Annot., тpoкпри́乡avtos. Erasmus gives a more accurate rendering: cf. Act. 3,20. Manetti here had cum ... predicasset, without ante.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus here follows the example of the Vulgate at 1 Thess. 2,1; 2 Petr. 1,11, though he substitutes ingressus for introitus at 1 Thess. 1,9 (1519). He generally reserves aduentus to render mapovaía.
24 Israeli $\uparrow \tilde{\omega}$ ’lopaín ("omni populo Israel" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text
 B CD E and some later mss. Cod. A has тavti

T ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \operatorname{lop} \alpha \dot{\eta} \lambda$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. The phrase $\pi \alpha v \tau i$ at Act. 4,10. On Israeli, see on Iob. 1,31. Manetti put ipsi Israel, as in the previous verse.
25 autem impleret $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \varepsilon$ ह̇T $\pi \lambda$ njpou ("impleret autem" Vg., "autem implesset" 1516-19). Erasmus gives a more correct Latin word-order. Manetti had Vt autem impleuit for Cum impleret autem.
25 o 'lwávons. In cod. 2815 the article is omitted, in company with many other mss., commencing with $37^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C D E. In most of the later mss., the article is included. Erasmus or one of his assistants added it from codd. 1 and 2816, or perhaps by simple conjecture.
25 cursum tòv $\delta$ Sónov ("cursum suum" Vg.). The added pronoun of the Vulgate does not have explicit Greek support. Manetti similarly omitted suum.
25 dixit ${ }_{\xi} \lambda_{\varepsilon} \gamma_{\varepsilon}$ ("dicebat" Vg.). The Vulgate is more accurate in rendering the Greek imperfect tense here.
25 esse? Non Elval; oư ("esse, non" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus criticises the late Vulgate punctuation on the grounds that Luke would have written $0 . v$ rather than tiva, earlier in the sentence, if that had been the intended interpretation.
25 is sum $\varepsilon$ दi íl ("sum" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus adds is, to complete the sense of the elliptical Greek expression.
25 soleam tò Ú úó $\delta \eta \mu \alpha$ ("calciamenta" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 12,8. Erasmus usually retains the Vulgate use of calciamenta, though at the present passage he is literally accurate in converting plural to singular. Manetti substituted corrigiam calciamentorum suorum, which looks like a harmonisation with Mc. 1,7; Lc. 3,16.
26 Abrahae 'A $\beta$ pád $\mu$ ("Abraham" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus does not consistently introduce this spelling of the genitive case. He retains the indeclinable form, Abrabam, at Mt. 1,1; 22,32; Mc. 12,26; Lc. 20,37; Act. 3,13; 7,32. However, in the Epistles, he invariably uses Abrabae for both the genitive and dative cases. Sometimes he uses a declinable form of the dative, Abrabamo rather than Abrabae: Mt. 3,9; Lc. 1,55; 3,8 (all in 1527), and once the accusative Abrabamum, at $L c .3,8$ (1527). Manetti had $A b r a e$.
 on lob. 15,24 , and also Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
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sermo salutis huius missus est. ${ }^{27} \mathrm{Qui}$ enim habitabant Hierosolymis, et principes eorum, quum ignorarent illum, et voces prophetarum quae per omne sabbatum leguntur, condemnato eo impleuerunt, ${ }^{28}$ nullaque causa mortis inuenta petierunt a Pilato vt interficerent illum. ${ }^{29}$ Quumque consummassent omnia quae de eo scripta erant, depositum de ligno posuerunt in monumento. ${ }^{30}$ Deus autem suscitauit eum a mortuis, ${ }^{31}$ qui visus est per dies multos, his qui simul ascenderant cum eo a Galilaea Hierosolymam, qui sunt testes eius apud plebem. ${ }^{32}$ Et nos vobis annunciamus, quod eam repromissionem quae ad patres facta est, ${ }^{33}$ deus adimpleuerit filiis illorum, nimirum nobis, resuscitato Iesu, sicut et in psalmo primo scriptum est: Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te. ${ }^{34}$ Quod autem suscitauit eum a mortuis, iam non amplius reuersurum in corruptionem,
 $B-E: \gamma \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon v \circ \mu \varepsilon \nu \eta \cup A$

26 sermo $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid$ missus $B-E$ : missum $A \mid 27$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : Hierusalem $A \mid$ condemnato eo $B-E$ : iudicantes $A \mid 28$ nullaque $B-E$ : et nulla $A \mid$ inuenta $B-E$ : inuenta in eo $A \mid$ interficerent $E$ : interficeret $A-D \mid$ illum $B-E$ : eum $A \mid 31$ a $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid$ apud $B-E:$ ad $A \mid 32$ quod ... patres $B-E$ : eam quae ad patres repromissio $A \mid 33$ deus adimpleuerit $B-E$ : quod hanc deus adimpleuit $A \mid$ nimirum $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ 34 corruptionem $A-C E$ : corrruptionem $D$

26 sermo ... missus est ó $\lambda o ́ y o s ~ . . . ~ \alpha ́ ̉ \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \alpha \lambda \eta ~$ ("verbum ... missum est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,1.
27 Hierosolymis èv 'Iepoua $\alpha \lambda \eta$ ’ $\mu$ ("Hierusalem" 1516 = Vg.). See on Act. 1,8.
27 eorum $\alpha \cup \mathfrak{T} \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("eius" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with a Greek variant, $\alpha \cup \cup T \eta \pi s$, found in cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {*vid }}$ alone. Manetti also had eorum.
 ("hunc ignorantes" Vg.). Greek aorist. The Vulgate is more literal in using bunc. Erasmus prefers to use illum, to refer back more remotely to Jesus, who had last been mentioned,
indirectly, in vs. 25. Manetti's rendering was cum bunc ignorassent.
27 condemnato eo kpivavtes ("iudicantes" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist. On condemno, see on Ioh. 3,17. Manetti put iudicassent, apparently taking voces prophetarum as the object of this verb.
28 nullaque causa mortis inuenta kai $\mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \mu i \alpha v$ aitíav Өavótou eúpóvtes ("et nullam causam mortis inuenientes in eo" late Vg.; "et nulla causa mortis inuenta in eo" 1516). Greek aorist. The late Vulgate rendering corresponds with the addition of $\dot{\varepsilon} v$ aủtê, found in cod. D
virtually alone. Manetti had cum nullam causam mortis inuenissent, omitting in eo.
28 interficerent ${ }^{\alpha}$ 'valpe $0 \eta \pi v a n$ ("interficeret" 151627). As pointed out in Annot., the Greek verb permits either of these renderings. Manetti preferred interimeret.
28 illum củtóv ("eum" $1516=$ Vg.). This change is mainly for stylistic variety, in view of the use of eo twice in the words which precede and follow this clause. Manetti put ipsum.
 cod. 2815, supported by relatively few other late mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and nearly all other mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \aleph$ A B C D E, the spelling is $\pi \alpha{ }^{2} v \tau \alpha$.
29 depositum kaөє $\lambda$ óvtes ("deponentes eum" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti changed this to deposuerunt.
 Vg.). The late Vulgate addition corresponds with $\varepsilon$ ยै $\theta \eta \kappa \propto \nu$ ๙U'Tóv, found in cod. 2816 but apparently in hardly any other mss.
30 autem $\delta$ é ("vero" Vg.). On this occasion, Erasmus decides that $\delta$ é marks a contrast rather than merely a continuation. Manetti made the same change.
30 mortuis vekpã̃ ("mortuis tertia die" Vg.). The Vulgate addition appears to be unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti again made the same change as Erasmus.
31 a ómó ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 3,16. Since Jerusalem was regarded as "higher" than Galilee, the preposition de (= "down from") was regarded inappropriate by Erasmus, especially when accompanied by a verb meaning to go up. See on Act. 9,8. The same change was made by Manetti.
31 Hierosolymam हis "lepovo $\alpha \lambda \lambda_{\mu} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,8 .
31 qui (3rd.) oi̋tives ("qui vsque nunc" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text adding axpi $v u ̃ v$, as in cod. D. Some mss. also add just $v u ̛ v$, as in $39^{4574}$ ( $X$ ) A C. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, this time supported by codd. B E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti also omitted vsque nunc.
31 apud $\pi$ ро́s ("ad" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 22,15: cf. on Act. 2,29.
32-3 quod eam repromissionem quae ... facta est ...

 repromissio facta est: quoniam hanc ... adimpleuit" late Vg.; as Vg., but putting "quod" for "quoniam" 1516). Erasmus alters the Latin to achieve a more natural word-order. For another change of word-order involving repromissio, see Act. 26,6. On quod for quoniam, see on Ioh. 1,20. The spelling yєүદvouévŋŋ in 1516 is a misprint.

33 illorum, nimirum nobis $\propto \cup \cup T \omega ̃ \nu ~ \mathfrak{~} \mu \mathrm{\mu iv}$ ("vestris" late Vg.; "illorum nobis" 1516). The late Vulgate rendering is supported by one eighth-century Greek ms. (cod. $\Psi$ ). Earlier mss. of the Vulgate have nostris, reflecting the substitution of $\eta \mu \omega \tilde{\omega} \nu$, as in 1974 $^{74} \mathrm{~A} B \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and one later ms. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and about 450 later mss., including codd. 1 and (2816): see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 518-19. See also Annot. This is a passage where later textual critics, albeit with reluctance, have accepted that the combined testimony of the Vulgate and the earliest available mss. is probably the result of scribal error, and that aút $\omega \nu$ $\dagger \dot{\eta} \mu i v$, as found in Erasmus' text, is authentic. On his use of nimirum, see on Ioh. 13,23. Manetti put ipsorum, nobis.
33 resuscitato lesu ávaбтiñoxs 'I $\eta \sigma 0$ ṽv ("resuscitans Iesum" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti put cum resuscitasset Iesum.

33 primo трผ́тب ("secundo" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus claims that he has restored the "genuine reading" ("germanam restituimus scripturam") from the evidence supplied by certain patristic writers, especially Jerome. The motive for this change is that, although the quotation in this verse comes from what is now known as Ps. 2,7, the first two Psalms were formerly combined together as one, by ancient commentators. Erasmus' conjecture turns out to have the support of cod. D, but no other Greek mss. In the mss. which he consulted (he does not say whether Greek or Latin), he found that some supported secundo while others omitted it. In fact, very few Greek mss. testify to complete omission of the word, other than $3{ }^{45 v i d}$, which substitutes toĩs $\psi a \lambda \mu$ оĩs. His codd. 1, 2815 and 2816 all had סeutíp, as in $\mathbf{3 月}^{74} \times \mathrm{K}$ B C E and nearly all the later mss., though with some variations as to word-order.
34 iam non amplius $\mu \eta \kappa \varepsilon ́ \tau 1$ ("amplius non iam" Vg.). Erasmus' Latin word-order is more natural: cf. on Ioh. 6,66. In Manetti's version (Pal Lat. 45), it is non amplius, omitting iam.
















 Tis èkסınү $\mathfrak{\eta} T \alpha 1$ úpĩv.




ita dixit: Dabo vobis sancta Dauid fidelia. ${ }^{35}$ Ideo et alias dicit: Non permittes vt sanctus tuus videat corruptionem. ${ }^{36} \mathrm{Nam}$ Dauid quidem quum suae aetati inseruisset, consilio dei dormiuit, et appositus est ad patres suos, viditque corruptionem. ${ }^{37}$ At is quem deus suscitauit, non vidit corruptionem. ${ }^{38}$ Notum igitur sit vobis viri fratres, quod per hunc vobis remissio peccatorum annunciatur: ${ }^{39}$ et ab omnibus a quibus non potuistis per legem Mosi iustificari, per hunc omnis qui credit, iustificatur. ${ }^{40}$ Vide | te ergo ne superue-
$39 \delta_{1 k \propto ı} \omega \theta \eta v a ı A B D E: \delta ı k \alpha ı \theta \eta v a ı C \mid 41$ niat vobis quod dictum est in prophetis: ${ }^{41}$ Videte contemptores et admiramini et euanescite, quia opus operor ego in diebus vestris, quod non credetis, si quis enarrauerit vobis.
${ }^{42}$ Egressos autem e coetu Iudaeorum rogabant gentes, vt sequenti sabbato loquerentur sibi verba. ${ }^{43}$ Soluto autem coetu,

35 permittes ... videat $B$ - $E$ : dabis sanctum tuum videre $A \mid 36$ aetati inseruisset, consilio $B-E$ : generationi ministrasset, voluntate $A \mid$ viditque $B-E$ : et vidit $A \mid 37$ At is quem $B$ - $E$ : Quem vero $A \mid 39$ per legem $B-E$ : in lege $A \mid$ per hunc $B-E$ : in hoc $A \mid 41$ admiramini $C$ - $E$ : ammiramini $A B \mid$ euanescite $B-E$ : disperdimini $A \mid$ quod $B-E$ : opus quod $A \mid 42$ Egressos ... Iudaeorum $E$ : Egressis autem e coetu Iudaeis $A-D \mid$ verba $B-E$ : verba haec $A$

34 dixit єi้p $\quad$ кєv, öтl ("dixit, Quia" Vg.). See on lob. 1,20. Manetti had dixit quod.

35 Ideo et סı̀̀ kai ("ideoque et" Vg.). The doubled conjunction of the Vulgate, -que and $e t$, is unsupported by Greek mss., though a few have $\delta$ ıótı kai, as in $37^{74} \leqslant$ A B. The version of Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
 follows the earlier Vulgate rendering. Manetti put in alio psalmo.
35 permittes $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \varepsilon \iota$ ("dabis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate is more literal. Erasmus does not elsewhere use this rendering of $\delta i \delta \omega \mu$, but here translates according to the context.

35 vt sanctus tuus videat tòv Ö $\sigma$ เóv oou í ĩiv ("sanctum tuum videre" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33 , for avoidance of the infinitive. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
36 Nam Dauid quidem $\Delta \alpha \beta i \delta \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \gamma$ र́ap ("Dauid enim" Vg.). The only explicit support for the Vulgate omission of quidem ( $\mu \dot{v} v$ ) is provided by cod. D. It is possibly only a matter of translation, as the Vulgate treats $\mu \dot{v} \nu$ үóp in a similar way at Rom. 5,$16 ; 1$ Cor. 5,$3 ; 11,18$; 12,8; 2 Cor. 9,1 (cf. also Act. 23,8; Hebr. 6,16, where there is ms . variation as to the presence or absence of $\mu \varepsilon ́ v)$.
 т $\dagger$ 'बos ("in sua generatione, cum administrasset"
late Vg.; "cum suae generationi ministrasset" 1516). This substitution of aetas also occurs at Mt. 24,34; Lc. 21,32 (1519); Act. 14,16 (1519); Eph. 3,5, 21. Erasmus also puts aetas for tempus at Act. 15,21 (1519). At twelve passages (especially in the Gospel of Luke, in 1519), he substitutes natio, consistent with Vulgate usage at Phil. 2,15. Elsewhere, he retains generatio. He introduces inseruio also at 2 Cor. 11,8; 1 Tim. 6,2, in rendering $\delta 1 \times k o v i \alpha$ and $\delta o u \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$. More directly comparable is his use of tempori seruientes at Rom. 12,11 (1519). See Annot. The version of Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he replaced sua by propria.
36 consilio тñ ... ßоЧ $\overline{\text { ñ ( }}$ (voluntati" Vg.; "voluntate" 1516). Erasmus punctuates differently from the Vulgate, taking consilio dei with dormiuit rather than with inseruiset. see Annot. This substitution of consilium is in keeping with Vulgate usage at all other passages where $\beta$ ou $\lambda_{n}$ occurs.
36 viditque kai єlס ("et vidit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ). See on Ioh. 1,39.
37 At is quem öv 8 é ("Quem vero" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus conveys the contrast with $\mu \dot{k} v$, used in the previous verse.
38 quod ${ }^{\text {Ott }}$ ("quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
39 at ab kal àmó ("ab" Vg.). In $\mathrm{N}^{27}$, the verse commences at ${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{V}$ toút $\varphi$, but since this could lead to a misunderstanding of Erasmus' division of the sentence, the versenumbering of other editions (e.g. Tischendorf, Von Soden) has been adopted at this point. The Vulgate follows a Greek text omitting koí, as in $37^{74} \mathrm{NA} \mathrm{C}^{*}$ D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., on this occasion commencing with B C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ E. The version of Manetti put ab omnibus annuntiatur for adnuntiatur, ab omnibus.
39 a quibus $\check{\omega} v$ ("quibus" Vg .). Erasmus makes this small addition for reasons of Latin style and clarity.
 тoútc ("in lege ... in hoc" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus takes $\varepsilon v$ in an instrumental sense. See on Ioh. 3,21.
41 euanescite á $\varphi \alpha v i \sigma \theta \eta t \varepsilon$ ("disperdimini" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more accurate here. He similarly introduces euanesco for $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha{ }^{2} i \zeta \omega$ at Iac. 4,14, and also in rendering óqaviouós at Hebr. 8,13. This verb occurs in the Vulgate at

Lc. 24,31, for ä́pavtos, where Erasmus substitutes subduco. See Annot.
41 quod $\check{\text { ¢ ( ("opus quod" }} 1516$ Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate was probably based on a text having êpyov 8 , as found in $\mathbf{7}^{74} \times \mathrm{NB} \mathrm{B} \mathrm{C}$ and some later mss., including cod. $2816^{\mathrm{corr}}$. Erasmus derived $\dot{\varphi}$ from cod. 2815, supported by cod. $1^{\text {corr }}$ and only a few other late mss., harmonising with Hab. 1,5. However, in cod. $2816^{*}$ and most other mss., commencing with codd. D E, the text has õ, again omitting éprov, and this may also have been the reading of cod. $1^{*}$. Manetti substituted cui.
41 credetis mıбтeúonte ("creditis" Vg. 1527, and some Vg . mss.). Erasmus adopts the earlier Vulgate rendering, as did Manetti.
42 Egressos autem e coetu Iudaeorum rogabant
 illis rogabant" Vg.; "Egressis autem e coetu Iudaeis rogabant gentes" 1516-27). The Vulgate is based on the substitution of $\alpha \cup \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ for $\hat{\varepsilon} k$
 E日v 097 and some later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815 , in company with codd. 1,2816 and most other late mss. Other variants also exist (cf. Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 521-3). In Annot., Erasmus further mentions the ambiguity as to whether $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ 'lou $\alpha \alpha i \omega v$ is connected with
 $\sigma u v \propto \gamma \omega \gamma \tilde{\eta} s$ (as rendered in 1535). Manetti's version was Exeuntibus autem de synagoga Iudeis, eos rogabant.
 haec" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.$) . In Annot., by saying "Quidam$ addunt ...", Erasmus seems to imply that there were also some Greek mss. which omitted this phrase, as well as some which added it. What he meant, perhaps, but did not say, was that there were other mss. which substituted tov $\lambda$ óyov, as in cod. 2816. His codd. 1 and 2815
 other late mss. The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\tau \alpha u ̃ \pi \alpha$, found in many mss., commencing with $\mathbf{7}^{74}$ \& A B C D E 097 ${ }^{\text {id }}$.
 $\gamma$ ñs ("Cumque dimissa esset synagoga" Vg.). Erasmus probably reasoned that, since the synagogue was technically a building, it was inappropriate to speak of it as being "dismissed", and that hence $\sigma v v o \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{y}$ should in this instance be understood as referring to the people who assembled there, rather than the
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sequuti sunt multi Iudaei et religiosi proselyti Paulum ac Barnabam, qui adloquentes suadebant eis vt perseuerarent in gratia dei. ${ }^{44}$ Sequenti vero sabbato pene vniuersa ciuitas conuenit ad audiendum sermonem dei. ${ }^{45}$ Videntes autem turbas Iudaei, repleti sunt zelo, et contradicebant his quae a Paulo dicebantur contradicentes, ac loquentes blasphemias. ${ }^{46}$ Tunc sumpta fiducia Paulus ac Barnabas dixerunt: Vobis oportebat primum loqui sermonem dei, sed quoniam repellitis illum, et indignos vos iudicatis aeterna vita, ecce conuertimur ad gentes: ${ }^{47}$ sic enim nobis praecepit dominus: Posui te in lucem gentium, vt sis salus vsque ad extremum terrae. ${ }^{48}$ Audientes autem gentes, gauisae sunt, et glorificabant sermonem domini, et crediderunt quotquot erant ordinati ad vitam aeternam. ${ }^{49}$ Diuulgabatur
 C-E: om. A B

43 proselyti $B$-E: aduenae $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ adloquentes $E$ : alloquentes $A-D \mid$ perseuerarent $B$-E: permanerent $A \mid 44$ ad audiendum sermonem $B-E$ : audire verbum $A \mid 45$ ac $C-E$ : et $A B \mid$ loquentes blasphemias $C-E$ : blasphemantes $A$, conuiciantes $B \mid 46$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ sermonem $B$-E: verbum $A \mid$ illum $B-E$ : illud $A \mid 47$ salus $B$-E: in salutem $A \mid 48$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 49$ Diuulgabatur $B$-E: Disseminabatur $A$
building itself. Manetti followed the Vulgate, but put soluta for dimissa.
43 Iudaei et religiosi proselyti $\tau \omega ๊ \nu$ 'lou $\delta \alpha i \omega v$ kai $\tau \omega ̃ \nu \sigma \varepsilon \beta \circ \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \lambda u ́ t \omega \nu$ ("Iudaeorum et colentium deum aduenarum" late Vg.; "Iudaei et religiosi aduenae" 1516). Erasmus usually retains multi with an accompanying genitive, as at Lc. 1,16; Iob. 6,66; 19,20; Act. 4,4; 18,8; 19,18; 26,10, but removes it at Mt. 3,7; Ap. Ioh. 8,11 (1519). Cf. on Act. 15,17, for his treatment of caeteri when accompanied by a genitive. The substitution of religiosus for colens deum is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 13,50; cf. Erasmus' substitution of religiosus for colens at Act. 17,4, 17. On proselytus, see on Act. 6,5. See also Annot., where Erasmus renders as
religiosorum and proselytorum, as had been suggested by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti had the same as the late Vulgate, except that he replaced et with atque.
43 ac кai' ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
43 adloquentes $\pi p \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \lambda 0$ ũvtes ("loquentes" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus uses the form alloquat Act. 21,40; 28,20, and also in 1516-27 at the present passage. The substitution of this verb for loquor is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 28,20.
 = Vg.). See on Act. 11,23 for this substitution.
44 vero $\tau \varepsilon$. Erasmus retains vero, not discerning that the Vulgate is probably based on a Greek
text having $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ，as in $\mathbf{3 p}^{74} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A C D and some later mss．His own Greek text follows cod． 2815 ，supported by codd．B E and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti replaced sequenti vero with et sequenti．
44 ad audiendum ơkoũo๙l（＂audire＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．1，33 for Erasmus＇avoidance of the infinitive．Manetti had $v t$ ．．．audiret．
44 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v$（＂verbum＂ $1516=$ Vg．）． See on Iob．1，1．
 Greek text was replaced in the 1516 errata by a further misspelling，$\zeta \tilde{\eta} \lambda o v$ ．
45 contradicentes ac ờvti入éyoutes kal（Vg．omits； ＂contradicentes et＂1516－19）．The Vulgate omis－ sion is supported by $\boldsymbol{F}^{74}$ § A B C and about ninety later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．D 097 and about 380 of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816 （see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 524－6）．In Annot．， however，he expresses some hesitancy as to the correctness of his Greek text．Manetti put aduersantes et．
45 loquentes blasphemias $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \mu о$ ũvтes（＂blas－ phemantes＂ 1516 ＝Vg．；conuiciantes＂1519）．A comparable substitution，of proloquor blasphe－ miam，occurs at Mt．26，65，and blasphema loquor at Act． 18,6 （both in 1522）．The words blasphemo， blaspbemia，and blasphemus do not occur in classical Latin literature．Erasmus＇preference for conuicior in 1519 is matched by similar sub－ stitutions at Mc．3，28（1519）；15，29；Lc．22，65 （1519）；Act．18，6（1519 only）．Other phrases which he adopted were conuicia dico at Mc．3，29； Lc．12，10；23，39（both in 1519），conuiciis afficio at 1 Cor． 4,13 ；Ap．Ioh．13，6；16，11（both in 1519），and conuiciis incesso at 2 Petr．2，10．Else－ where，he also uses contumeliosus，male audio， male dico，maledico，male loquor，maledicta congero， maledictis afficio，maledictis insector，obnoxius male－ dicentiae esse．The result was that Erasmus retained blasphemo at just five passages out of thirty－five： at Mt．9，3；Iob．10，36；Act．26，11；Ap．Ioh．16，9， 21．See also on Act．6，11，regarding $\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \mu \alpha$ ． Valla Elegantiae VI，52，defined conuicium as being maledictum contumeliosum（see also Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，p．239， Il．865－866）．

46 sumpta fiducia таррךбı $\alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o!~(" c o n s t a n-~$ ter＂Vg．）．At Act．26，26，rendering the same Greek verb，Erasmus replaces constanter with libere（cf．on Act．2，29）．Similarly he replaces
constantia with libertas in rendering mappnoia at Act．4，13．On his use of fiducia，see on Act． 9,28 ．In Annot．，he also suggests sumpta audacia． Manetti preferred confidenter agentes．
46 ac kal（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．1，25．
46 sermonem ．．．illum tòv $\lambda$ óyov ．．．aưróv （＂verbum ．．．illud＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，1． Manetti had verbum ．．．ipsum．
$46 \varepsilon \in \pi \varepsilon เ \delta \grave{\eta} \delta \varepsilon$ ．The omission of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in 1516－19 was probably accidental，though the same omis－ sion is found in $\mathrm{K}^{*} B \mathrm{D}^{*}$ and a few later mss． Another ancient variant was émè̀ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, found in $39^{45} 74$ C．In 1522，Erasmus reverted to the reading found in all his mss．，supported by $\boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }}$ A $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most later mss．

46 aeterna vita тท̃s $\alpha i \omega v i ́ o u ~ \zeta \omega \tilde{j} s$（＂aeternae vitae＂Vg．）．As recommended in Valla Annot．， Erasmus prefers the more common Latin usage in constructing dignus and indignus with the ablative，rather than the genitive．Manetti put vita aeterna．
 nobis＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reproduces the Greek word－order．
47 т $\varepsilon$ ध $\eta$ кк人．This spelling，found in all five editions，is an arbitrary correction，or mis－ reading，unsupported by mss．Erasmus＇mss．all had té日eika．
47 lucem $甲 \tilde{s}$（＂lumen＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，7． Erasmus harmonises this quotation with the Vulgate rendering of $1 s .49,6$ ．
47 gentium $\varepsilon \theta v \omega ̃ v$（＂gentibus＂Vg．）．Cf．lux hominum at Ioh．1，4．Erasmus is more literal here，and again coincides with Is．49，6．Manetti likewise has gentium．
47 salus eis owtipiov（＂in salutem＂ 1516 $=V g$ ．）．This time，Erasmus is less literal，but still in harmony with the Vulgate rendering of Isaiab 49，6．
48 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v$（＂verbum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on loh．1，1．
48 ordinati тетаүиźvoı（＂praeordinati＂Vg．）． Erasmus is more accurate here．See Annot．，and see also on Act．10，41．
49 Diuulgabatur סıефЕ́peto（＂Disseminabatur＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．10，37．In 1519 Annot．， Erasmus speculates that $\delta 1 \varepsilon \sigma \pi \varepsilon i p \in T 0$ underlay the Vulgate rendering．He also suggested that an alternative rendering might be differebatur or dispergebatur．Manetti had deferebatur，but inserted this after domini．
 $\chi \omega \dot{p a s} .{ }^{50}$ oi $\delta \dot{\text { é }}$ 'louסaĩol mapద́tpuvav Tàs $\sigma \varepsilon \beta$ ouévas $\gamma u v a i ̃ k \alpha s ~ k \alpha i ̀ ~ t a ̀ s ~ \varepsilon u ̉-~$
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 $\sigma u v \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ т $\omega \tilde{\nu}$ ’louסaí $\omega v$, каi $\lambda \alpha-$






 рои̃vтi тஸ̃ $\lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$ тท̃s Xápıtos $\alpha$ Útoũ,


 ñoav oưv toĩs ’louסaiols, oi $\delta$ ह̀ $\sigma$ ouv



autem sermo domini per vniuersam regionem. ${ }^{50}$ Iudaei vero extimulauerunt mulieres religiosas et honestas, et primos ciuitatis, et excitauerunt persequutionem in Paulum ac Barnabam, et eiecerunt eos de finibus suis. ${ }^{51}$ At illi excusso puluere pedum suorum in eos, venerunt Iconium. ${ }^{52}$ Porro discipuli replebantur gaudio et spiritu sancto.

14Factum est autem Iconii vt simul introirent synagogam Iudaeorum, et loquerentur sic, vt crederet Iudaeorum simul et Graecorum copiosa multitudo. ${ }^{2}$ Qui vero increduli erant Iudaei, concitauerunt et corruperunt animos gentium aduersus fratres. ${ }^{3}$ Multo igitur tempore demorati sunt fortiter agentes praesidio domini, qui testimonium perhibebat sermoni gratiae suae, dabatque vt signa et prodigia fierent per manus eorum. ${ }^{4}$ Diuisa est autem multitudo ciuitatis: et quidam quidem stabant a Iudaeis, quidam vero $a b$ apostolis. ${ }^{5}$ Quum autem factus esset impetus gentium pariter ac Iudaeorum vna cum principibus suis, vt vim adferrent

49 sermo $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 50$ vero extimulauerunt $B-E$ : autem concitauerunt $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 51$ illi $B-E$ : ille $A \mid$ suorum $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ Iconium $B-E$ : in Iconium $A \mid 52$ Porro discipuli $B-E$ : Discipuli quoque $A$
14,1 Iconii $B$ - $E$ : in Iconio $A \mid$ Iudaeorum $B$ - $E$ : Iudeorum $A \mid 2$ erant $B-E$ : fuerunt $A \mid$ 3 fortiter $B$ - $E$ : fiducialiter $A \mid$ praesidio domini $B-E$ : in domino $A \mid$ sermoni $B$ - $E$ : verbo $A \mid$ dabatque vt $B-E$ : dabat $A \mid$ fierent $B-E$ : fieri $A \mid 4$ stabant a $B-E$ : erant cum $A \mid \mathrm{ab} B-E$ : $\operatorname{cum} A \mid 5$ gentium $B-E$ : Gentilium $A \mid$ prius ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ vna $B-E$ :om. $A \mid$ vim adferrent $B-E$ : contumeliis afficerent $A$

49 sermo ó $\lambda$ óyos ("verbum" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,1.

50 vero $\delta \varepsilon$ ("autem" $1516=$ Vg.). This change appears to be for little other reason than to
avoid the repetition of autem from the previous verse. See on Ioh. 1,26.

50 extimulauerunt тара́тpuvav ("concitauerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses the more
vigorous extimulo only once elsewhere in the N.T., to replace excito in rendering $\delta_{1 \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon i p \omega}$ at 2 Petr. 3,1. Manetti, less accurately, tried contaminauerunt.
50 ac каí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti substituted atque in.
51 illi ("ille" 1516). The use of the singular in 1516 is a misprint.
51 suorum củt $\omega$ ( (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=V g$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{70^{7}} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ A B C and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. D E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti replaced pedum with de pedibus suis.
51 Iconium eis 'lkóvov ("in Iconium" 1516). In 1516, Erasmus similarly adds in before place names at Act. 16,11 ( 1516 only); 20,14, 15; 2 Tim. 4,10 (1516 only). See on Act. 8,27, for his more usual practice of omitting such prepositions.
52 Porro discipuli of 8 k̀ $\mu$ ât $\eta$ tai ("Discipuli quoque" 1516 Lat. $=V \mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting $\tau \in$ for $\delta \dot{E}$, as in codd. A B and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., this time commencing with $8^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ C D E. This was rendered by Manetti as Discipuli vero.
14,1 Iconii Ev 'Ikoví ("in Iconio" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,21 for Erasmus' use of the locative. In 1527 Annot., he mentions that one of his Latin mss. also had Iconii. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 16,2 (1519). Manetti had also made this change. Stunica sought to defend the Vulgate use of a preposition here, answered by Erasmus in his Apolog. resp. Iac Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, pp. 152-4, 11. 820-829.
1 sic oütcs ("ita" Vg.). Erasmus frequently renders $\omega \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ by ita $v t$ and adeo $v t$, but since the text here has oütos $\mathbf{\omega} \sigma t \varepsilon$, he prefers sic, $v t$. Manetti also had sic, but placed this before loquerentur.
1 simul et $\tau \varepsilon$ кaí ("et" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1.
2 increduli erant $\dot{\alpha}$ àre|toũvtes ("increduli fuerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' use of the imperfect tense is better suited to the sense of continuity implied by the present participle.
2 concitauerunt غ̇тท่Yघlpov ("suscitauerunt" Vg .). At Act. 13,50, the only other N.T. passage where ह̀meץєip occurs, Erasmus retains excito from
the Vulgate. He generally reserves suscito for
 in the context of raising the dead. See also Annot.
2 corruperunt ṫécókwoav ("ad iracundiam concitauerunt" Vg.). This is the only N.T. passage where kakó $\omega$ cannot have its normal sense of "afflict", as indicated in Annot. The verb employed by Erasmus more effectively transmits the required degree of malice. Manetti put ad iracundiam ... prouocauerunt.
2 animos tàs $\psi u x \alpha_{s}$ ("animas" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Hebr. 10,38. At the present passage, in accordance with the context, Erasmus wished to convey the sense of $\Psi v \times \eta$ as being "mind" rather than "soul".
3 fortiter agentes $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \eta \sigma 1 \alpha$ ̧̌́nevol ("fiducialiter agentes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 9,27.
3 praesidio domini $\begin{gathered}\mathrm{E} i \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{T} \tilde{\omega} \\ \text { кupí } \varphi \text { ("in domino" }\end{gathered}$ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 12,24, 27; Lc. 11,19 (all in 1519), in rendering

3 qui testimonium perbibebat ... dabatque (1516: dabat) Tఢั $\mu \alpha р т \cup р о и ̃ v t 1 ~ . . . ~ \delta І \delta o ́ v t ı ~(" t e s t i m o-~$ nium perhibente ... dante" ${ }^{\mathrm{Vg} . \text {.). Erasmus avoids }}$ the sequence of present participles. He probably intended, in 1516, that et should have been inserted before dabat. Manetti interpreted more freely as testificante ... quod dabat.
3 sermoni т $̣$ 入óy $\omega$ ("verbo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on lob. 1,1 .
3 vt signa ... fierent $\sigma \eta \mu E i ̃ \alpha ~ . . . ~ Y i v \in \sigma \theta \propto 1 ~(" s i g n a ~$ ... fieri" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 for the avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti made the same change, except that he placed fierent at the end of the sentence.
4 stabant a ... ab ก̃ $\sigma \alpha v$ ouvv ... oúv ("erant cum ... cum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus finds a more idiomatic rendering, conveying the sense of "give support to".
 See on Ioh. 12,20. Manetti also made this change.
5 pariter ac $\mathrm{T} \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ каí ("et" Vg.; "pariter et" 1516). See on Act. 1,1.
5 ona cum óvo ("cum" $1516=V g$.). See on Act. 1,22.
5 vim adferrent $\dot{\text { ú } \beta \text { pí }}$ 人ı ("contumeliis afficerent" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . Erasmus is content to use$ contumeliis afficere at Mt. 22,6; Lc. 11,45 (1519); 18,32; 1 Thess. 2,2, in rendering this Greek verb.

кaì $\lambda 1 \theta \circ \beta \circ \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha 1$ aủtoús, ${ }^{6} \sigma u v i \delta o ́ v t e s$
 ovias $\Lambda u ́ \sigma т \rho \alpha \nu$ каì $\Delta \varepsilon ́ \rho \beta \eta \nu$, каì тìv
 $\mu \in v o l$.
${ }^{8}$ Kaí tis a̛vì̀p ẻv $\wedge$ úatpois ádúva-
 коi入ías $\mu \eta$ тро̀s $\alpha$ ủtoũ úm



 $\sigma T \eta \theta_{1}$ ह̉गi toùs móठas $\sigma 0 u$ óp $\theta$ ós. kaì











ac lapidarent eos, ${ }^{6}$ re intellecta, confugerunt ad ciuitates Lycaoniae Lystram et Derben et finitimam vndique regionem, ${ }^{7}$ et ibi praedicabant euangelium.
${ }^{8} \mathrm{Et}$ quidam vir Lystris debilis pedibus sedebat, claudus ab vtero matris suae, qui nunquam | LB 490 ambulauerat. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{Hic}$ audiuit Paulum loquentem. Qui intuitus eum et videns quod fidem haberet, fore vt saluus fieret, ${ }^{10}$ dixit magna voce: Surge in pedes tuos rectus. Et exiliit, ambulabatque. ${ }^{11}$ Turbae vero quum vidissent quod fecerat Paulus, sustulerunt vocem suam Lycaonice, dicentes: Dii in specie hominum descenderunt ad nos. ${ }^{12}$ Et vocabant Barnabam, Iouem: Paulum vero Mercurium, quod is esset dux sermonis. ${ }^{13}$ Sacerdos autem Iouis, qui erat ante ciuitatem illorum, tauros et coronas ad vestibula afferens, cum turbis

5 alt. ac $B$ - $E$ : om. $A^{*}$, et $A^{b} \mid 6$ re intellecta $B-E$ : intelligentes $A \mid$ finitimam vndique $B-E$ : vniuersam in circuitu $A \mid 7$ praedicabant euangelium $B$ - $E$ : euangelizantes erant $A \mid 8$ ab $B-E$ : ex $A \mid 9$ fore $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 10$ in $B-E$ : super $A \mid$ exiliit, ambulabatque $B-E$ : exiliuit, et ambulabat $A \mid 11$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A \mid$ sustulerunt $B$ - $E$ : leuauerunt $A \mid$ in specie hominum $B$ - $E$ : similes facti hominibus $A \mid 12$ quod is esset $B-E$ : quoniam ipse erat $A \mid$ sermonis $C$ - $E$ : verbi $A B \mid$ 13 autem $B-E$ : quoque $A \mid$ ad vestibula $B-E$ : ante ianuas $A$

However, in Annot., he argues that the context implies physical violence rather than insulting words. Manetti achieved a similar effect by adopting iniuriis afficerent.

5 ac (2nd.) kai ("et" 1516 catchword = Vulgate). See on Iob. 1,25 . The line of text in the 1516 translation omits $e t$, but the catchword at the foot of the page includes it. Manetti also had ac.

6 re intellecta סuviסóvtes ("intelligentes" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Greek aorist. See Annot., and cf. Erasmus' use of re perpensa at Act. 12,12.

6 finitimam vndique regionem tìv $\pi \varepsilon \rho(\chi \omega \rho \circ v$ ("vniuersam in circuitu regionem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 2,10. In Annot., Erasmus queries the Vulgate addition of vniuersam. This word corresponds with the addition of $\overline{0} \lambda \eta \nu$ in codd. D E. Manetti put totam in circuitu regionem.
 $\mu \varepsilon v O$ ("euangelizantes erant" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 5,42 regarding praedico, and see also on Ioh. 1,28 for Erasmus' avoidance of auxiliary verbs with the present participle in Latin. At this point the late Vulgate adds Et commota est omnis multitudo in doctrina corum: Paulus
autem et Barnabas morabantur Lystris, as noted in Annot. This addition is supported by codd. D E, but the widely divergent wording which they offer suggests that one or both of these mss. may have been retranslated from the Latin, at this passage. Erasmus adheres to his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and virtually all other mss. The passage was also discussed in his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 209 B-E.

8 debilis ásúvatos ("infirmus" Vg.). Erasmus elsewhere follows the Vulgate in using debilis to render ơvóxттpos at $L c .14,13,21$. He reserves infirmus mainly for rendering áaөevéc and $\dot{\alpha} \alpha \sigma \varepsilon v ท ่ s$, referring to sickness rather than physical disability.
$8 a b \varepsilon \kappa$ ("ex" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The same substitution occurs at Lc. 1,15 (1519), but Erasmus retains claudus ex vtero at Act. 3,2 to render the identical Greek expression.
9 audiuit ${ }^{n}$ Kove. Erasmus' translation retains the perfect tense of the Vulgate, though the
 as found in $7^{74}(\boldsymbol{\aleph}) \mathrm{A} D \mathrm{E}$ and many later mss., including cod. 2816. The imperfect tense of Erasmus' Greek text followed cod. 2815, in company with codd. B C and many later mss., including cod. 1.
9 quod ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

9 fore vt saluus fieret toũ $\sigma \omega \theta \tilde{\eta} v a 1$ ("vt saluus fieret" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus uses fore, foret, forent some eighteen times in the N.T., including eight instances of fore $v t$, a construction which does not appear to be used anywhere in the Vulgate. On the use of fore, see Valla Elegantiae I, 26; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 256, Il. 352-356. Manetti had $v t$ saluaretur.
$10 \phi \omega \nu \tilde{\eta}$. In 1527 Annot., Erasmus cites the addition of $\sigma 01 \lambda \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ èv tũ óvómatı toũ kupiou 'Inooũ Xpiotoũ from the Complutensian Polyglot, which is also found in codd. C D (E) and some later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by ${77^{74} \aleph A B}^{*}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.

10 in ÈTr ("super" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus made a similar change, in 1516, at Act. 26,16, but in 1519 he reverted to the earlier Vulgate rendering, super pedes, at that passage. He also retains super
pedes at $A p$. Ioh. 11,11. For the substitution of in for super, see on Ioh. 7,44.
10 exiliit $\eta \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$ то ("exiliuit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Both these spellings of the perfect tense exist in classical Latin
10 ambulabatque kגi терıето́тel ("et ambulabat" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39 .

11 vero $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("autem" $1516=V g$.). In this context, the Greek particle does not require the adversative sense which the Vulgate attributes to it.

11 sustulerunt ĖTñ̃pơv ("leuauerunt" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,35. Manetti's choice was eleuauerunt.
 ("similes facti hominibus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This substitution may be compared with Erasmus' use of sub specie for év óuotん́uarı at Rom. 8,3 (1519). In rendering ó $\mu$ oio $\omega$, he follows the Vulgate at six passages in using assimilo, as also rendered in Annot. on the present verse. He retains simile factum est at Mt. 22,2. For his frequent avoidance of facio elsewhere, see on Ioh. 1,15 .
 ipse erat" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 for the removal of quoniam. Erasmus replaces ipse, because aúrós does not refer back to the subject of the sentence.

12 sermonis toũ $\lambda$ óyou ("verbi" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,1. Manetti made the same change.
13 autem $\delta$ ह́ ("quoque" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting $\tau \varepsilon$, as in f $^{74} \aleph$ A B C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. D (E) and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti substituted At sacerdos for Sacerdos quoque.
13 illorum $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{v} \nu$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \aleph A B C^{*} D$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. $C^{\text {corr }} E$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put eorum.

13 ad vestibula Éтì toùs mu $\lambda \tilde{\omega} v a s$ ("ante ianuas" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) See on Act. 12,13, and Annot., where Erasmus also suggests ad fores. Manetti had ad ianuas.

13 turbis тоĩs ő $\chi \lambda$ ors ("populis" Vg.). See on Iob. 6,2, and Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
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 ध́тоínoe tòv oủpavòv кaì тìv $\gamma \tilde{\eta} \nu$ каi




 Ú\&toùs סiסoùs kai kaıpoùs карттофópous,

 $\mu o ́ \lambda i s ~ k a t \varepsilon ́ t a \sim u \sigma a v ~ t o u ̀ s ~ o ̋ x \lambda o u s ~ t o u ̃ ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~$ $\theta$ úgiv aủtoĩs.
volebat sacrificare. ${ }^{14}$ Quod vbi audierunt apostoli Barnabas et Paulus, conscissis vestibus suis insilierunt in turbam, clamantes ${ }^{15} \mathrm{ac}$ dicentes: Viri, cur ista facitis? Nos quoque iisdem quibus vos, obnoxii malis sumus homines, annunciantes, vt $a b$ istis vanis conuertamini ad deum viuum, qui fecit coelum et terram et mare et omnia quae in eis sunt, ${ }^{16}$ qui in praeteritis aetatibus sinebat omnes gentes ingredi viis suis. ${ }^{17}$ Quanquam non expertem testimonii se ipsum esse sinebat, dum beneficia conferret, de coelo nobis dans pluuias ac tempora fructifera, implens cibo et laetitia corda nostra. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ haec dicentes, vix compescuerunt turbas, ne sibi immolarent.

14,13 $\eta \theta \in \lambda \varepsilon B-E: \eta \theta \varepsilon \lambda \circ \sim A$

14 conscissis vestibus $B-E$ : concissis tunicis $A \mid$ insilierunt $B$-E: exilierunt $A \mid$ turbam $B$ - : turbas $A \mid 15$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ cur ista $B-E$ : quid haec $A \mid$ Nos ... sumus $B-E$ : Et nos mortales sumus similes vobis $A \mid$ istis $B-E$ : his $A \mid 16$ aetatibus $B-E$ : generationibus $A \mid 17$ esse ... conferret $B-E$ : sinebat bene faciendo $A \mid$ nobis $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ laetitia $D E$ : leticia $A$, laeticia $B C$
 in the plural, came from cod. 2815, with support from cod. $D$ and some later mss., including codd. 1 and (2816). In 1519, Erasmus restored $\eta \quad \theta \in \lambda \varepsilon$, by reference to cod. 3 , supported by most other mss., as well as the Vulgate. See Annot.
 suis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For the use of the rough breathing, introduced in 1519, see on Iob. 2,21. Here, the use of a reflexive pronoun is intended to make clear that these were the clothes of the apostles, rather than of the crowd. Erasmus similarly substitutes vestis for tunica at Act. 16,22 (1519). He prefers to reserve tunica for x ıt $\omega v$, or for the singular ínóriov. Manetti replaced conscissis tunicis by vestimenta absciderunt et.
 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, $\varepsilon \xi \xi \pi n \dot{\delta} \delta \eta \sigma \alpha v$, found in $7^{74} * A B C C^{*} D E$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. Corr and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot., and on Act. 16,29 below. The same change was proposed by Valla Annot.
14 turbam tòv ö́X خov ("turbas" $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus, more accurately, gives the singular form of this word: see Annot. A similar change occurs at Act. 19,35. Manetti made the same substitution.
15 ac кai ("et" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25. This change, again, was previously adopted by Manetti.
15 cur ti ("quid" 1516=Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.

15 ista ... istis $\tau \alpha$ ṽta ... Toútcuv ("haec ... his" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses iste here to convey disapproval. Manetti's version had boc... bis.
15 Nos quoque каi it $\mu$ еі̃ ("Et nos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 5,27.
15 isdem quibus vos obnoxii malis sumus dцoıo-
 vobis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). As Erasmus points out in
 mortality, and he suggests rendering by iisdem obnoxii sumus passionibus. Cf. Iac. 5,17 (1519), where he substitutes similiter obnoxius affectionibus for similis nobis passibilis, in rendering the only other N.T. occurrence of the Greek word. Valla Annot. rendered as similes vobis patibiles, while Manetti put similiter passibiles vt vos sumus.
 ("vobis ... conuerti" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with a Greek variant substituting úuiv
 but it may be merely a matter of loose translation. For Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, see on $I o b .1,33$. Manetti made the same change.
15 kaì $\operatorname{Tr} v \gamma \eta \pi v$. This phrase was omitted by cod. 2815*, but Erasmus added it in the margin of the ms. (in a note which is now only partly visible, owing to later trimming of the pages), after consultation of codd. 1 and 2816.
15 et mare kal $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha v$ ("mare" Vg. 1527). See on Act. 4,24. Manetti's version (both mss.) omitted these words.
16 aetatibus $\gamma$ हveaĩs ("generationibus" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Act. 13,36.
16 sinebat elacé ("dimisit" Vg.). See on Iob. 11,48. Valla Annot. preferred permisit.
16 viis suis taĩs dooĩs ("vias suas" Vg.). By contrast, Erasmus uses ingredior viam at Iud. 11. See Annot., and also Valla Annot., where viis suis had already been recommended.
17 Quanquam кaitorye ("Et quidem" Vg.). Erasmus makes the same change at Hebr. 4,3 ( 1516 only), in accordance with the example of the Vulgate at Ioh. 4,2. Manetti substituted Atqui.
17 expertem testimonii ảuáptupov ("sine testimonio" Vg.). Erasmus uses expers at three other passages to express a negative word: expers honoris for ätripos at Mt. 13,57, expers intelligentiace for áoúvetos at Rom. 1,31, and expers rationis for $\alpha \lambda$ oyos at Iud. 10. This may be compared with the Vulgate use of expers sermonis iustitiae
at Hebr. 5,13 in rendering ärmépos $\lambda$ íyou סikalooúvns (where Erasmus substitutes rudis for expers). See on Ioh. 8,7, for Erasmus' treatment of other Greek words commencing with the negative $\dot{\alpha}$-. See also Annot.
17 se ipsum éautóv ("semet ipsum" Vg.). Erasmus frequently retains the Vulgate usage of semet, vosmet, etc., while sometimes substituting se, or sese. Cf. on Iob. 7,35.
17 esse sinebat '̊ $\varphi \tilde{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon v$ ("reliquit" Vg.; "sinebat" 1516). Erasmus regarded the expression, "to leave oneself", as being unnatural in Latin, though relinquo was the normal rendering for áqinul in other contexts. Cf. on Iob. 11,48 for his occasional adoption of sino for this Greek verb. By using sino here, he makes no distinction from eilare in the previous verse. In Annot, he suggests passus est esse.
17 dum beneficia conferret $\alpha \gamma \alpha 0$ oтоıũv ("benefaciens" Vg.; "bene faciendo" 1516). Usually Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using benefacio. His change here may have been intended to mark a distinction between "benefits", conferred from heaven, and "good works", performed on earth.
17 nobis $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \mathrm{iv}$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=V \mathrm{Vg}$.) The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{P l}^{74} \aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus drew his reading from cod. 2815, in company with cod. 2816**id and some other late mss. However, codd. 1, $2816^{600 r f}$ and most other mss., commencing with $\mathbf{P}^{45} \boldsymbol{N}^{*}$ B C (D) E, have Úuiv, corresponding with vobis in Manetti's translation.
17 ac кaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
17 nostra $\dagger \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \omega \nu \nu$ ("eorum" late Vg .). This reading of the late Vulgate is devoid of Greek ms. support. Earlier Vulgate mss. have vestra, based on a Greek text having úpüv, as in $\boldsymbol{K}^{*}$ B C D E and many later mss., including cod. 1. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, this time supported by $7^{744 \mathrm{xid}} \aleph^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{A}$ as well as cod. 2816 and most of the later mss. Manetti also put nostra.
18 baec taũta ("hoc" Vg. 1527). Erasmus follows the more accurate rendering of the earlier Vulgate, as did Manetti.
18 compescuerunt катє́тهuaб人 ("sedauerunt" Vg.). Erasmus uses compesco once elsewhere, at Act. 27,43, to render $\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{u} \omega$. He retains sedo in rendering катабт $\varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ at Act. 19,35, 36. The reason for his change here is that the root meaning of the Greek verb is not merely to "quieten" but to "prevent" or "cause to cease".
 'Ikoviou 'louסaĩol, kai meía $\alpha$ vtes tous
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${ }^{19}$ Superuenerunt autem quidam $a b$ Antiochia et Iconio Iudaei, qui quum persuasissent turbis, ac Paulum lapidassent, extraxerunt eum e ciuitate, existimantes illum mortuum esse. ${ }^{20}$ Circundantibus autem eum discipulis, surrexit et intrauit ciuitatem. Ac postero die profectus est cum Barnaba Derben. ${ }^{21}$ Quumque euangelizassent ciuitati illi, ac docuissent multos, reuersi sunt Lystram et Iconium et Antiochiam, ${ }^{22}$ denuo confirmantes animas discipulorum, exhortantesque vt perseuerarent in fide, et quod per multas afflictiones oporteat nos intrare in regnum dei. ${ }^{23}$ Et cum suffragiis creassent illis per singulas ecclesias presbyteros, precatique essent cum ieiuniis, commendauerunt eos domino in quem crediderant. ${ }^{24}$ Peragrataque Pisidia venerunt in Pamphyliam, ${ }^{25}$ et quum loquuti essent sermonem Pergae, descenderunt in
$19 \delta \varepsilon$ A C-E: om. $B \mid 24 \eta \lambda \theta$ ov B-E: $\eta \lambda \theta \varepsilon v A$

19 qui quum persuasissent $C-E$ (exc. cum pro quum $C D$ ): et persuasis $A$, persuasisque $B \mid$ Paulum lapidassent $C-E$ : lapidato Paulo $A B \mid$ illum $B-E$ : eum $A \mid 20$ surrexit et $B-E$ : surgens $A \mid$ Ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ Derben $B-E$ : in Derben $A \mid 21$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 22$ perseuerarent $B$ - $E$ : permanerent $A \mid$ afflictiones $B-E$ : tribulationes $A \mid 23$ precatique essent $B-E$ : et orassent $A \mid$ ieiuniis $B-E$ : ieiunationibus $A \mid 24$ in $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 25$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A$
 records a lengthy alternative reading: $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$

 found in his codd. $3,2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ vid, in company with cod. 69 and many other late mss., and with partial support from codd. C D E. His N.T. text followed cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, $2816^{*}$ and most other mss., as well as the Vulgate, except that in 1519 he temporarily omitted $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ after $\varepsilon \pi \pi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 v$.

19 qui quum persuasissent turbis каi твía $\frac{1}{}$ TES toùs öx $=V_{g}$.; "persuasisque turbis" 1519). By using the
construction with quum, Erasmus breaks up the sequence of participles, while retaining an active sense both for тeíoवvтes and the following $\lambda_{1} \theta_{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu t E s$. In 1519 Annot., he records another



 cod. 3. A similar wording, but adding ${ }^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ after àmootĩval, is found in codd. 69 and $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$, in company with cod. $C$ and many later mss.

19 ac Paulum lapidassent kal $\lambda ı \theta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \tau e s$ tòv Пaṽخov ("lapidantesque Paulum" Vg.; "ac lapidato Paulo" 1516-19). Greek aorist. See the
previous note．Manetti put lapidauerunt Paulum atque．
19 extraxerunt eum Éroupov（＂traxerunt＂Vg．）． Elsewhere，Erasmus retains trabo for $\sigma$ Úpo at Iob．21，8；Act．8，3；17，6；Ap．Iob．12，4．His addition of eum is a clarification．
 Vg．）．See on Act．7，58．Manetti substituted extra vrbem．
19 existimantes vouicoutes（＂aestimantes＂Vg．）． See on Act．2，15．Manetti had ac ．．．putabant．
19 illum aủtóv（＂eum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．This change is for stylistic variety，in view of the use of eum in the clauses which precede and follow this． Manetti put ipsum．
20 surrexit et åvaơtás（＂surgens＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Greek aorist．Manetti put surrexit ipse et．
20 Ac кai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，25．
20 postero die $\uparrow$ ñ Ėmaúpiov（＂postera die＂Vg．）． See on lob．1，29．
20 Derben eis $\Delta \epsilon_{\rho} \beta \not \beta \eta$（＂in Derben＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Act．8，27．Erasmus similarly omits in before Derben at Act．16，1．
21 ac кai（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh． 1,25 ． Manetti put cum．
22 denuo confirmantes émiotnpiłovtes（＂confir－ mantes＂Vg．）．Erasmus does not add denuo at the other three occurrences of $\bar{E} \pi I \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \zeta \omega$ （Act．15，32，41；18，23），nor is it needed here， though it is permitted by the context as this was the second visit to Lystra．Manetti preferred confortantes，which he placed after discipulorum．
22 exhortantesque каil $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha к \propto \lambda о$ ũvtes．Erasmus found this reading in his cod．2815，supported by cod． C and a few later mss．In codd．
 codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．，commencing
 with no added conjunction．
22 vt perseuerarent è̉ $\mu \mathrm{e} v \in ⿺ 𠃊 ⿴ 囗 十 一$（＂vt permanerent＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．11，23．
 oportet＂Vg．）．See on lob．1，20．Manetti had quod ．．．oportet．
22 aflictiones $\theta \lambda i \psi \varepsilon \omega v$（＂tribulationes＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．16，21．
23 cum ．This spelling is not consistent with the usual practice，in 1535 ，of putting quum for this conjunction．The cause，no doubt，was the
proximity of the ablative suffragiis，though cum cannot be understood as a preposition here，in view of the sentence structure．Another example is found at Act．15，9（see ad loc．）．
23 suffragiis creassent xєьротоvñoavтes（＂con－ stituissent＂Vg．）．See on Act．10，41，and also Annot．See further Valla Elegantiae IV，70，speak－ ing of suffragia in the context of electing a magistrate or pope（cf．Erasmus Parapbr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，p．320，11．144－146）．
23 precatique essent $\pi p \circ \sigma \in \cup \xi \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu v o l$（＂et orassent＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act． $10,30$.
23 ieiuniis vпбтetiov（＂ieiunationibus＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．A similar substitution occurs at Act． 27,9 ，consistent with Vulgate usage at all other N．T．instances of $\eta \eta \sigma \pi \varepsilon l_{\alpha}$ ．The word ieiunatio does not occur in classical Latin．Manetti anticipated Erasmus in this change．
23 crediderant $\pi \varepsilon \pi 1 \circ \tau \varepsilon u ́ k є เ \sigma \propto \nu$（＂crediderunt＂ Vg．）．Erasmus recognised this as the Greek plu－ perfect tense，and renders accordingly．Manetti made the same change．
 סíav（＂Transeuntesque Pisidiam＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．See on Act．8，4，regarding peragro．Manetti put et cum Pisidiam pertransissent．
$24 \pi \lambda \theta o v$ ．The reading $\eta \lambda \theta \varepsilon v$ in 1516 is gram－ matically impossible，and must be considered a misprint．
24 in Pamphyliam eis Пapqu入iov（＂Pamphy－ liam＂1516）．The removal of the preposition in the 1516 rendering was incorrect，as Pamphylia was a region rather than a town：see on Act． 18，27．
25 quum loquuti essent $\lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\prime} \sigma \alpha{ }^{2}$ tes（＂loquentes＂ Vg．）．Greek aorist．Manetti had cum ．．．dixissent．
25 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov（＂verbum domini＂ Vg．；＂verbum＂1516）．On sermo，see on Ioh．1，1． The Vulgate is based on a Greek text adding toũ kupiou，as in codd．\＆A C and some later mss．In $7^{74} \mathrm{E}$ and cod． $2816^{\text {conr }}$ ，toũ $\theta$ हoũ is added．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．B D and most of the later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816＊．See Annot．The same change was made by Manetti．
25 Pergac év Пépyn（＂in Pergen＂Vg．）．See on Iob． 4,21 for Erasmus＇use of the locative．He retains the late Vulgate word－order in placing Pergae after sermonem，contrary to the rendering offered in Annot．The version of Manetti put in Perge．
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vrbem Attaliam，${ }^{26}$ et inde soluerunt Antiochiam，vnde erant traditi grati－ ae dei in opus quod compleuerunt． ${ }^{27}$ Quum autem venissent et congregas－ sent ecclesiam，retulerunt quaecunque fecisset deus secum，et quod aperuisset gentibus ostium fidei．${ }^{28}$ Commorati sunt autem illic multum temporis cum discipulis．

15Et quidam qui descenderant a Iudaea，docebant fratres：Ni－ si circuncidamini secundum morem Mosi，non potestis esse salui．${ }^{2}$ Quum orta ergo seditio et disceptatio esset non exigua Paulo ac Barnabae aduer－ sus illos，statuerunt vt ascenderent Paulus et Barnabas et quidam alii ex illis，ad apostolos ac presbyteros Hierosolymam，super hac quaestione． ${ }^{3}$ Illi ergo deducti ab ecclesia，per－ transibant Phoenicen et Samariam， nar｜rantes conuersionem gentium，et

27 ouvarayoutes C－E：ouvayoutes $A B$

25 vrbem B－E：om．$A \mid 27$ quaecunque $B$－E：quanta $A \mid 28$ Commorati $B$－E：Morati $A \mid$ illic multum temporis $B$－E：tempus non modicum $A$
15，1 esse salui $B-E$ ：saluari $A \mid 2$ Quum orta $B-E$（Cum orta $B-D$ ）：Facta $A \mid$ seditio et disceptatio esset $B-E$ ：seditione et disceptatione $A \mid$ Paulo $B-E$ ：cum Paulo $A \mid$ prius ac $B-E$ et $A \mid$ illis $A^{c} B-E$ aliis $A^{*} \mid$ alt．ac $B-E$ et $A \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ in Hierusalem $A \mid$ quaestione $B-E$ ： questione $A \mid 3$ adferebant $B$－E：gignebant $A$
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．From 1516 Annot．，lemma，it appears that the Vulgate edition which Erasmus was then using had Italiam，a scribal error within the Latin tradition，which is exemplified by the Froben Vulgate of 1491．Erasmus included this in the Loca Manifeste Deprauata．His reason for adding vrbem was perhaps to prevent any future confusion being caused by misreading or mis－ hearing the place－name．Other additions of $v r b s$ occur at Mt．11，21；Mc．10，46（1519）；Act．25，1 （1519）．See also on Act．1，8 regarding vrbs Hierosolymorum．This is comparable with his
addition of ciuitas at several other passages：see on Act．8，26．
 At the three other N．T．occurrences of व⿴囗十 $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \omega$ ，Erasmus retains nauigo（Act． 13,$4 ; 20,15$ ； 27，1）．For his more frequent substitution of soluo for nauigo when rendering ávó $\gamma \omega$ ， see on Act．13，13．Manetti，inadequately，put venerunt．

27 ouvajayóvtes．The reading ouvójoutes in 1516－19 may have arisen from misreading the text of cod．2815，which has ouvaГаүóvtes，
the first gamma being placed in the margin and rubricated.
27 quaecunque ö $^{2} \alpha$ ("quanta" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 4,23. Manetti made the same change.
27 secum $\mu \in \mathrm{T}^{\prime}$ aủt $\tilde{\nu} \nu$ ("cum illis" Vg.). See on Act. 9,39. Manetti altered this to cum eis.
27 quod öts ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change is found in Manetti.
28 Commorati sunt סiḱtpßßov ("Morati sunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 25,14 (1519). See on Ioh. 11,54, and Annot. This change, again, was anticipated by Manetti, though he positioned the verb at the end of the sentence.
28 illic Ekkeĩ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by K ABCD and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815 , in company with cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot. The rendering offered by Manetti was $i b i$.
28 multum temporis Xpóvov oủk biiyov ("tempus non modicum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For Erasmus' dislike of modicum, see on Ioh. 7,33.
15,1 qui descenderant катє $\lambda$ Өóvтєs ("descendentes" Vg.). Greek aorist.
1 a ámó ("de" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 21,27 (1519), in accordance with Vulgate usage of a Iudaea at Act. 12,19. The Vulgate usually renders árró by $a$, when referring to movement away from a place. There was also the risk, at the present passage, that de Iudaea, docebant might be misunderstood as meaning that that they taught "concerning Judaea".
1 Nisi ó $\tau 1$ 'Eà $\nu \mu \eta$ ("Quia nisi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20 for the omission of quia. Manetti put quod nisi.
1 M $\omega \sigma$ ह́cs. Erasmus would have found this spelling in both codd. 2815 and 2816. Most mss. have M $\omega$ üのย̇డs at this point, as in cod. 1. See on Act. 3,22.
1 esse salui $\sigma \omega \theta \tilde{\eta} v \propto a$ ("saluari" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 3,17.
2 Quum orta ... esset $\gamma \in v o \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta{ }^{2}$ ("Facta" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,17.
 ("seditione" Vg.; "seditione et disceptatione" 1516). The Vulgate reflects the omission of kai $\sigma u \zeta \eta T \eta \dot{\sigma} \in \omega \varsigma$, as in $7^{74} \mathrm{E}$. These words were restored by Erasmus from cod. 2815, a variant which was found also in cod. 2816 but in few
other mss. See also Annot. The more widely attested text here is $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \varsigma$ kai $\zeta \eta \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, as found in cod. 1 and nearly all other mss., commencing with $\aleph$ A B C (D). The latter reading was supported by Valla Annot., where the suggested rendering was seditione et quaestione. Manetti similarly put seditione ac questione.
2 exigua ỏ $\lambda i \gamma \eta$ s ("minima" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 19,23, in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 27,20. Erasmus further substitutes exiguus for modicus in rendering ó $\lambda$ íyos at Act. 19,24; Iac. 3,5; 4,14; and also in rendering ó $\lambda_{1} \gamma$ ótiotos at $M t .8,26 ; 14,31$, and uıkpós at lob. 12,35 (1516 only). At Act. 20,12, he puts mediocriter for minime, in rendering $\mu \varepsilon т p i \omega s$. See also Annot. on the present passage. Manetti here put parua.
2 Paulo T $\tilde{\sim}$ Пaú $\lambda \omega$ ("cum Paulo" 1516). The addition of cum is redundant, in view of the following use of aduersus, and it also produces a discrepancy with the dative case of Barnabae.
$2 a c$ (twice) kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
 to be no more than a misprint.
2 illis aủt $\omega$ v ("aliis" 1516 Lat. text = late Vg. and some Vg. mss.). Erasmus corrected aliis to illis in the 1516 errata, probably discerning that aliis had arisen by an error of transcription within the Latin tradition. The late Vulgate rendering is devoid of Greek support. In Annot., Erasmus suggested putting eis, as had been proposed by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti had ipsis.
2 Hierosolymam єis 'Iєpovo $\alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" 1516 = Vg.). See on Act. 8,27.
3 Phoenicen tìv Фoıvikŋv ("Phoenicem" late Vg. $=$ Annot., lemma). In Annot., Erasmus argued against the late Vulgate spelling (found for example in the Froben edition of 1491, but not in the 1527 Vulgate column), which made the name appear to be derived from poinv $\xi$ rather than poivikn.
3 adferebant ${ }^{\text {Emoiouv ("faciebant" Vg.; "gigne- }}$ bant" 1516). For the avoidance of facio, see on Iob. 1,15 . The temporary use of gigno here in 1516 may be compared with similar substitutions at Rom. 16,17; Iac. 3,12 (1519).
3 mã̃o. This was omitted by cod. 2815*, supported by a few other late mss. Erasmus restored it in cod. $2815^{\mathrm{mg}}$ (now partly cropped), with the help of codd. 1, 2816 and the Vulgate.





















fratribus. ${ }^{4}$ Quum autem venissent Hierosolymam, suscepti sunt ab ecclesia et $a b$ apostolis ac presbyteris, annunciaueruntque quaecunque deus fecisset cum ipsis. ${ }^{5}$ Surrexerunt autem quidam de factione Pharisaeorum, qui crediderant, dicentes quod oporteret circuncidere eos, ac praecipere vt seruarent legem Mosi.
${ }^{6}$ Conueneruntque apostoli ac presbyteri, vt dispicerent de hoc negocio. ${ }^{7}$ Quum autem magna disceptatio fuisset, surgens Petrus dixit ad eos: Viri fratres, vos scitis quod ab antiquis diebus deus inter nos elegit, vt per os meum audirent gentes verbum euangelii, crederentque. ${ }^{8}$ Et qui nouit corda deus, testimonium praebuit illis, dans illis spiritum sanctum sicut et nobis, ${ }^{9}$ nihilque discreuit inter nos et illos, cum fide purificauerit

4 ac presbyteris $B$-E: et senioribus $A \mid$ ipsis $B-E$ : illis $A \mid 5$ ac praecipere vt seruarent $B$ - $E$ : praecipere quoque seruare $A \mid 6$ ac presbyteri, vt dispicerent $B$ - $E$ : et seniores videre $A$ | hoc negocio $B$ - $E$ : verbo hoc $A \mid 7$ fuisset $B$-E: fieret $A \mid$ inter nos $B$ - : in nobis $A \mid$ vt per os meum $B$-E: per os meum, vt $A \mid$ crederentque $B$-E: et crederent $A \mid 8$ praebuit $B$-E: perhibuit $A \mid 9$ nihilque $B$-E: et nihil $A$

4 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.
4 presbyteris $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \cup \tau \in \rho \omega \nu$ ("senioribus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In the book of Acts, Erasmus makes this substitution at five further passages in 1519 (Act. 15,6, 23; 16,4; 20,17; 21,18), following the practice of the Vulgate at Act. 14,23; 15,2 and several passages of the Epistles, to designate those who held the office of "elder" within the church. He retained senior for the Jewish elders or for those who were simply "old". He neglected to introduce presbyter at Act. 11,30; 15,22. See Annot., citing the support of Valla Annot. for this change.
 ciantes" ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ g.). Greek aorist. The Vulgate may reflect the substitution of $\alpha \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \varepsilon$ i $\lambda \alpha \nu T \varepsilon s$, found in cod. D*.
4 quaccunque ö $\sigma \alpha$ ("quanta" Vg.). See on Act. 4,23.

4 ipsis aủtต̃v ("illis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change makes a clearer reference back to Paul and Barnabas, as distinct from the other apostles and the elders. This time, Manetti put eis.
 Act. 5,17.
 crediderunt" late Vg.). Erasmus or his assistants seem to have taken this reading partly from codd. $1^{\text {corr }}$ and 2816 , which had $\pi \varepsilon \pi \square \sigma t E u K o ́ t \omega v$ (omitting $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu)$. However, the reading of his cod. 2815, тєा।Ітєukotes, has the support of most other mss. Manetti similarly put qui crediderant, as in the earlier Vulgate.
5 quod oporteret öтı $\delta$ ธi ("quia oportet" Vg .). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had quod oportet.
 Erasmus, more accurately, reproduces the active sense of the Greek verb.

5 ac praecipere $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon เ \nu \tau \varepsilon$ ("praecipere quoque" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 2,11. Manetti made the same change.
5 vt seruarent тпркĩv ("seruare" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti, again, also made this change.
5 M $\omega \sigma \varepsilon \omega$. This spelling is derived from cod. 2815 , supported by $7^{45}$ A D and many later mss., including cod. 2816. The alternative, M $\omega u ̈ \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega$, found in cod. 1 , also enjoys widespread support from many other mss., commencing with $\mathbb{K}$ B C E. See also on Act. 3,22.
 keeps the Vulgate rendering, though the Vulgate was probably based on a text having
 mss. Erasmus' Greek text followed cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with \$ A D E. In Valla Annot., the passage was translated as Conuenerunt autem, while Manetti had Congregati sunt autem.
6 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti also had ac here.
6 presbyteri of трєббßútepol ("seniores" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) See on vs. 4.
6 vt dispicerent i8eĩv ("videre" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus' choice of verb is more suited to the present context than the colourless rendering offered by the Vulgate, though video de does occur in classical usage. He does not use dispicio elsewhere in the N.T. A definition of the meaning of this verb was provided by Valla Elegantiae V, 56: "dispicere est prouidere, et circumspicere mente, tanquam in omnem partem lumina mentis intendere, omniaque discernere" (abbreviated in Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 246, 1. 83). See also on Ioh. 1,33, for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti had $v t$... viderent.
6 boc negocio toũ $\lambda$ óyou toútou ("verbo hoc" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using negocium for mpãy $\mu \alpha$ at Rom. 16,2; 1 Cor. 6,1; 2 Cor. 7,11; 1 Thess. 4,6, and for mpar $\mu \alpha$ твí at 2 Tim. 2,4. At Act. 8,21, in a similar context, he uses ratio for $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ (as in the Vulgate rendering of Pbil. 4,15).
7 disceptatio $\sigma u \zeta \eta T \eta \jmath^{\circ} \sigma \varepsilon \omega S$ ("conquisitio" Vg.). Erasmus further introduces disceptatio for $\sigma u \zeta_{\zeta} \eta^{\prime}-$ tnous at Act. 15,2; 28,29, and also for mopo $̧ u \sigma \mu o ́ s$ at Act. 15,39, and for $\delta 1 \alpha \lambda 0 \gamma 1 \sigma \mu o ́ s$ at Rom. 14,1; Pbil. 2,14, consistent with Vulgate usage at 1 Tim. 2,8. Erasmus similarly removes
conquiro (for $\sigma \zeta \zeta \eta \tau \varepsilon \in$ ) at five passages in Mark, substituting disputo. At two of these passages (Mc. 9,14, 16) he temporarily substituted discepto in 1519.
7 fuisset $\gamma \varepsilon \nu о \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu\rceil \varsigma$ ("fieret" $1516=V g$.). Greek aorist.
7 quod öt1 ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
 Erasmus translates according to the requirements of the context. In adopting év $\mathfrak{f} \mu \tilde{v} v$, the text which underlay the Vulgate, he follows cod. 2815 , supported by codd. (D) E and about 300 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In more than 160 mss., commencing with $7^{74}$ * A B C, the reading is $\mathfrak{E} v$ Unĩv (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 530-2). The latter reading was followed by Manetti, with in vobis.
$7 v t$... audirent व́ккоũбal ("per os meum audire" Vg.; "per os meum, vt audirent" 1516). See on Iob. 1,33. Manetti made the same change, while altering the surrounding word-order.
7 crederentque kà mıбтะṽбळ1 ("et credere" Vg.; "et crederent" 1516). For the avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33 . On the use of -que, see on Ioh. 1,39. Manetti had et crederent, as adopted by Erasmus in 1516.
8 testimonium praebuit é $\mu \alpha \rho$ о'úp $\eta \sigma E \nu$ ("testimonium perhibuit" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus does not make this substitution elsewhere in the N.T. See on Ioh. 1,7. Manetti, as usual, preferred testificatus est.
8 illis (1st.) aỦToĩs (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss., other than cod. E. The version of Manetti also added this word.
9 nihilque kà oúdév ("et nihil" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus' codd. 1, 2815 and 2816 all had kai oúdev, in common with codd. B 0294 and some later mss. He or one of his assistants decided to adopt the more usual spelling, oú $\delta$ év, as found in $3^{74}$ א A C D E and most later mss., possibly arriving at this by conjecture.
9 cum fide purificauerit $T n ̃ \pi i \sigma \tau \varepsilon ı$ ka $\quad \alpha p i ́ \sigma \alpha s$ ("fide purificans" Vg.). Greek aorist. See Annot. This provides another example of the inconsistent spelling of cum. Here the word is a conjunction, usually spelled quum in the 1535 edition. The ablative case of the adjacent word, fide, caused cum to be mistaken for a preposition. See on Act. 14,23. Manetti put cum fide ... purificasset.
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corda illorum. ${ }^{10}$ Nunc ergo quid tentatis deum, vt imponatur iugum super ceruices discipulorum, quod neque patres nostri neque nos portare potuimus? ${ }^{11}$ Sed per gratiam domini Iesu Christi credimus nos saluos futuros, quemadmodum et illi.
${ }^{12}$ Tacuit autem tota multitudo, et audiebant Barnabam ac Paulum narrantes, quae deus aedidisset signa et prodigia inter gentes per ipsos. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{Et}$ postquam conticuissent, respondit Iacobus, dicens: Viri fratres, audite me. ${ }^{14}$ Symeon narrauit quemadmodum primum deus visitauerit, vt sumeret ex gentibus populum in nomine suo: ${ }^{15}$ et huic consonant verba prophetarum, sicut scriptum est: ${ }^{16}$ Post haec reuertar, ac rursus aedificabo tabernaculum Dauid, quod collapsum est, et diruta eius instaurabo: et erigam illud, ${ }^{17} \mathrm{vt}$ requirant qui reliqui sunt homines, dominum, et omnes gentes super quas
$13 \mu \in D E: \mu \circ \cup A-C \mid 16 \tau \eta \nu \delta \alpha \beta \iota \delta C-E: \delta \alpha \beta ı \delta A B$
12 ac $B-E$ et $A \mid$ quae $B$-E: quanta $A \mid$ aedidisset $B$-E: fecisset $A \mid 14$ Symeon $B$-E: Simon $A \mid$ visitauerit $B-E$ : visitauit $A \mid 16$ ac rursus aedificabo $B-E$ : et reaedificabo $A \mid 17$ quas $C-E$ : quos $A B$

9 illorum $\alpha \cup ̉ T \tilde{v} v$ ("eorum" Vg.). For once, Erasmus eschews stylistic variety: his use of illorum matches his retention of illos earlier in the verse.
 See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti preferred ad imponendum.

11 domini kupíou ("domini nostri" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate addition lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti omitted nostri.
11 Christi Xpiotoũ. This was omitted in codd. 1, 2815 and 2816, along with X A B E and most of the later mss., together with earlier copies of the Vulgate. Erasmus or an assistant restored the word, possibly by a conjecture based on the late Vulgate, or through consultation of
a ms. such as cod. 69 which contains Xpıoтоũ, with support from codd. C D and a few later mss. This reading persisted into the Textus Receptus. Manetti omitted Cbristi.

11 nos saluos futuros $\sigma \omega \theta \tilde{\eta} v a a^{\prime}$ ("saluari" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering, typically, avoids the use of the infinitive (see on Iob. 1,33), but by using the future participle he introduces a different doctrinal emphasis. The aorist tense of the Greek verb could also have been understood as implying that the salvation of which Peter spoke was already put into effect (cf. Rom. 8,24; Eph. 2,5, 8; 2 Tim. 1,9), and was not solely a future event. A similar problem arises over Erasmus' treatment of $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} v$ at Act. 10,43: see ad loc.

12 tota $\pi a ̃ v$（＂omnis＂Vg．）．See on lob．8，2．
12 ac кхi（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh． 1,25 ． Manetti made the same change．
12 quate öca（＂quanta＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．4，23．
12 aedidisset Emoin $\sigma$ vv（＂fecisset＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．2，11．
12 inter gentes év toĩs Ëधveal（＂in gentibus＂ Vg．）．See on Ioh．15，24．
12 ipsos củtũv（＂eos＂Vg．）．As elsewhere，Eras－ mus uses the reflexive pronoun to refer back to the subject．
13 conticuissent $\sigma 1 \gamma \eta \eta_{\sigma a}$（＂tacuerunt＂Vg．）．The main purpose of this substitution is to avoid repetition of tacco，used in vs． 12 to render the same Greek verb．See on Iob．13，12 for Eras－ mus＇use of the pluperfect subjunctive after postquam．
$13 \mu \varepsilon$ ．This reading of $1527-35$ may well be a misprint．The usual practice in N．T．Greek is to use the genitive case for the person who is heard，reflected here by $\mu$ ou in the 1516－22 editions，supported by most of the mss．
14 Symeon इuus由́v（＂Simon＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）．This change also occurs at 2 Petr．1，1 （1519）．At Act．13，1，by contrast，the Greek is accommodated to the late Vulgate spelling， Simon．In Annot．on the present passage，Erasmus inconsistently records the spelling as $\sum\lfloor\mu \in \omega \bar{\omega}$ ， possibly influenced by the spelling cited in Valla Annot．For further discussion of these points，see Erasmus Apolog．resp．Iac．Lop．Stun．， ASD IX，2，p．154，11．830－839．
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The subjunctive is preferred by Erasmus for a subordinate clause in reported speech，in accordance with classical Latin usage．Manetti put considerauit．
14 vt sumeret $\lambda \alpha \beta$ हiv（＂sumere＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，33．Manetti adopted $v t$ ．．．assumeret．
14 in nomine èmì т $\uparrow$ © óvóuartı（＂nomini＂Vg．）． Erasmus＇alteration here is not necessarily an improvement，as the sense＂for his name＂ rather than＂in his name＂is well suited to the context．The same consideration may have led some scribes to alter the Greek text to omit $\mathfrak{e} \pi i$ i， as in $\mathrm{P}^{74} \mathrm{KABCDE}$ ．Manetti made the same change as Erasmus．
15 consonant oup甲 $\omega v$ oũ $\sigma v$（＂concordant＂ $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ．）． This is the only occurrence of consono in the N．T．Possibly Erasmus objected to the
construction of concordo with the dative，and felt that consono was closer to the root meaning of the Greek verb．See，however，on Act．28，25， for his use of concors and concordia in rendering doúup $\omega v \circ s$ and $\sigma u \mu \varphi \dot{v} \eta \eta \sigma$ s．Manetti antici－ pated Erasmus in making this change：see on Act． 5,9 ，for another use of this verb by Manetti．
$16 a c$ kai（＂et＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Iob．1，25．
16 rursus aedificabo àvoıкoסouñow（＂reaedifi－ cabo＂ $1516=$ late Vg ．）．The verb reaedifico does not occur in classical Latin．Later in the verse， Erasmus replaces the second occurrence of reaedificabo by instaurabo：see below．
16 т $\grave{v} \nu \Delta a \beta i \delta$ ．In 1516－19，Erasmus follows his cod． 2815 in omitting tivv，in company with codd． $1,2816^{\text {cort }}$ and nearly all other mss． In cod． $2816^{*}$ ，the words $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \Delta \alpha \beta i \delta$ are omitted．In 1522，Erasmus＇sole authority for inserting $\boldsymbol{T} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ seems to have been the 1518 Aldine Greek Bible．
 decidit＂Vg．）．On collabor，see on Act．5，5． Erasmus＇choice of rendering is more suited to the fall of a building．
 Vg ．）．Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate reading：see Annot．He listed this passage among the Loca Manifeste Deprauata．Manetti also had diruta．
 Vg．）．Erasmus borrowed instauro from the Vul－ gate rendering of the parallel passage at Am ． 9，11：cf．Annot．He also introduces instauro in rendering кaтхрті渞 at Gal．6，1； 1 Petr．5，10． At the present passage，for stylistic reasons，he wished to avoid a repetition of aedifico from earlier in the verse．See above．
 $\alpha^{\alpha} v \theta \rho \omega \omega \pi \omega \nu$（＂caeteri hominum＂Vg．）．Erasmus no doubt objected to the use of the genitive case after catetri．At $L c .18,11$ ，he avoided this by substituting caeteri bomines（ol $\lambda$ оıाтol $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{\omega}} \mathrm{v}$ $d v \theta \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \omega v)$ ，following the example of the Vulgate at $A p$ ．Iob． 9,20 ，though he retains caeteri $1 .$. mortuorum at $A p$ ．Ioh．20，5．Cf．on Act．13，43，for Erasmus＇treatment of multi when accompanied by a genitive．Manetti here put ceteri bomines．
17 quas oús（＂quos＂1516－19）．Erasmus＇earlier rendering，quos，is more precise，as the Greek pronoun is masculine，agreeing with oi kotó－入oıाтol（qui reliqui sunt）．The restoration of the
 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon 1 ~ k u ́ p l o s, ~ o ̀ ~ \pi o i \omega ̃ v ~ \tau \alpha u ̃ t a ~ \pi \alpha ́ v-~$
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 $\mu$ mévous èv toĩs ảden poĩs, ${ }^{23}$ ypáquavtes


inuocatum est nomen meum: dicit dominus, qui facit haec omnia. ${ }^{18}$ Nota a seculo sunt deo, omnia haec opera sua. ${ }^{19}$ Propter quod ego censeo, non obturbandum esse illis, qui ex gentibus conuertuntur ad deum, ${ }^{20}$ sed scribendum ad eos, vt abstineant se ab inquinamentis simulachrorum, et scortatione, et suffocato, et sanguine. ${ }^{21}$ Moses enim ab aetatibus antiquis in singulis ciuitatibus habet qui ipsum praedicent in synagogis, vbi per omne sabbatum legitur.
${ }^{22}$ Tunc placuit apostolis et senioribus cum tota ecclesia, vt delectos ex sese viros mitterent Antiochiam cum Paulo et Barnaba, Iudam, cognomento Barsaban, et Silam, viros primarios inter fratres, ${ }^{23}$ missis per manus eorum literis in hanc sententiam: Apostoli et presbyteri et fratres, his qui sunt

21 кприббоитаs $A$ B D E: кир $\quad$ обоитая $C$
17 meum $B-E$ : meum super eos $A \mid 18$ seculo $C E$ : saeculo $A B D \mid 19$ censeo $B-E$ : iudico $A \mid 20$ simulachrorum $E$ : simulacrorum $A-D \mid$ scortatione $B-E$ : fornicatione $A \mid 21$ ab aetatibus $B-E$ : a temporibus $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ : se $A \mid 22$ cognomento Barsaban $B$-E: qui cognominabatur Barsabas $A$ | Silam $B$-E: Sylam $A \mid 23$ per ... sententiam $B$-E: litteris in hanc sententiam, per manus eorum $A \mid$ presbyteri $B-E$ : seniores $A$

Vulgate rendering in 1522 makes this clause refer only to gentes.
17 meum hou ह́nt' aútoús ("meum super eos" 1516). The two additional words in the 1516 rendering were an attempt at greater accuracy, but Erasmus later had second thoughts and followed the Vulgate in treating these words as redundant for translation purposes: see 1522 Annot.
17 quifacit $\delta$ тоіш̃ ("faciens" $V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\delta$, as in $2 \mathbf{7}^{74} \boldsymbol{N}^{*} \mathrm{~B}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A C D ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$.
17 omnia móvta (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ ABCD and
about twenty-five later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. 2816 and more than 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 532-7). In cod. 1 and cod. E, mávia is placed before taũta (incorrectly reported as taũт $\alpha$ пóvid $\alpha$ in Aland).

18 Nota ... sunt deo omnia baec opera sua $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ т̀े
 ("Notum ... est domino opus suum" Vg.). The Vulgate is here based on a different Greek
 Tò Êpyov ©útoũ, as found in $\mathrm{F}^{74} \mathrm{~A}(\mathrm{D})$ and one later ms. About thirty-five other mss. condense the passage into just three words, $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau_{\alpha}$ \& $\pi$ ' alwँvos, as in K B C. Other variations also exist. Erasmus follows his
cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and 340 other mss., commencing with cod. E (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 532-7). See also Annot. The version of Manetti had the same wording as Erasmus, though without baec.
19 censeo крive ("iudico" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At Act. 21,25 , which handles the same theme, Erasmus substitutes decerno for iudico, in rendering the same Greek verb. He also replaces iudico by decerno at Act. 27,1; 1 Cor. 5,3; 7,37. Elsewhere, he generally retains iudico, e.g. at Act. 16,15. Cf. Annot.
19 non obturbandum illis $\mu$ ท่ mapevox $\lambda$ हĩ тоĩs ("non inquietari eos" Vg.). Erasmus prefers to use this stronger rendering, meaning to throw into confusion, rather than merely disturbing someone's peace: see Annot. He uses obturbo once elsewhere, at Hebr. 12,15, for $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} v 0 \chi^{\lambda} \dot{e} \omega$. For his avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. Manetti substituted ne turbentur ii.
 use of the gerundive follows from the substitution of obturbandum in the previous verse. Manetti expanded the meaning as $v t$ per epistolam admoneantur.
 ("a contaminationibus" Vg.). Erasmus also uses inquinamentum for $\mu \circ \lambda$ vouoss at 2 Cor. 7,1, following the Vulgate, and for $\mu$ íaou a at 2. Petr. 2,20, replacing the Vulgate use of coinquinatio. The word contaminatio did not come into general use until late in the classical period.
20 scortatione $\boldsymbol{n}{ }^{2} \mathrm{~s}$ Topveias ("fornicatione" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). For Erasmus' removal of most instances of fornicatio in 1519, see on Ioh. 8,41.
20 suffocato тoũ דviktoũ ("suffocatis" Vg.). Erasmus more accurately renders as a singular. Manetti proposed suffocatione, both here and at vs. 29.
21 M $\omega \sigma$ ñs. Erasmus' Greek text here deserts codd. 1, 2815 and 2816 , which all have $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \tilde{\eta} s$. See on Act. 3,22.
$21 a b$ aetatibus $\varepsilon$ ex $\gamma \in v \varepsilon \omega ̃ v$ ("a temporibus" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 13,36, and Annot., where Erasmus also renders by a generationibus, which had previously been adopted by Manetti.
21 in singulis ciuitatibus habet karrò̀ mó入ıv ... ${ }^{\text {Ex }}$ 티 ("habet in singulis ciuitatibus" $V$ g.). Erasmus is closer to the Greek word-order. Manetti put babet per ciuitates.

21 ipsum ả̛tóv ("eum" Vg.;"se" 1516). As usual, Erasmus prefers the less ambiguous ipse, for referring back to the subject.
22 tota $\delta \lambda \eta$ ("omni" Vg.). See on Iob. 8,2. Manetti made the same change.
 ("eligere ... et mittere" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, for this avoidance of the infinitive. At vs. 25 , below, Erasmus keeps closer to the Greek syntax in rendering the same expression. Manetti put vt electi ... mitterentur.
 Vg .). This change of word-order ensures that the prepositional phrase is placed next to the verb to which it relates. The substitution of the reflexive pronoun, sese, is more appropriate, to convey the sense of "from among themselves". Manetti had ex eis viri.
22 cognomento Barsaban tòv èmik $\alpha$ गоúuєvov Bap $\alpha \beta \beta \tilde{a} v$ ("qui cognominabatur Barsabas" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Act. 11,13.
 mus attempts greater precision here: in Annot., he also suggests praecedentes or praeminentes. Manetti replaced viros primos by viri primarii.
22 inter fratres $\mathfrak{e v} v$ тoĩs $\alpha \delta E \lambda \phi 0 i ̃ s$ ("in fratribus" Vg.). See on Iob. 15,24. This change had been anticipated by Manetti.
 ("scribentes per manus eorum" Vg.; "missis litteris ... per manus eorum" 1516). Greek aorist. The Greek wording, at first sight, could give the impression that Paul, Barnabas, Jude and Silas were not merely to carry the letter to Antioch but served as amanuenses for the other apostles in writing the letter. To prevent this ambiguity, Erasmus resorts to paraphrase. Manetti put cum ... scriberent.
23 in banc sententiam $\mathrm{a} \alpha \delta_{\mathrm{E}}$ ( Vg . omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{45 v i d} 74{ }^{7}{ }^{*}$ A B and one later ms. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ C D E and more than 460 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschicbte 538-40). Manetti inserted bec (= baec) before scriberent.
23 presbyteri et oi трєбßútepol каi' ("seniores" Vg.; "seniores et" 1516). On presbyter, see on Act. 15,4. The Vulgate omission of et reflects a Greek text omitting koi, as in $\boldsymbol{\#}^{3374} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ A B C D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by $\boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and (2816).







 $\pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \psi \alpha 1$ тро̀s ú $\mu \tilde{\alpha} s, \sigma \grave{v} \nu$ тоі̃s $\dot{\gamma} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta$ тоĩs

 тои̃ óvónatos toũ kupiou $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \tilde{v} v{ }^{\prime} \ln \sigma o u ̃$
 kai $\sum i \lambda \alpha v$, kai aủtoùs סià $\lambda o ́ \gamma o u ~ a ́ m-~$





 घ̈ $\rho \rho \omega \sigma \theta$.
 Avtióxeiav, kal $\sigma u v a \gamma \alpha \gamma o ́ v t e s ~ t o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \tilde{\eta}-$



Antiochiae et in Syria et in Cilicia fratribus qui sunt ex gentibus, salutem. ${ }^{24}$ Quoniam audiuimus quod quidam e nobis egressi turbauerunt vos verbis, labefactantes animas vestras, iubentes vos | circuncidi et seruare legem, quiLB 494 bus non mandaueramus: ${ }^{25}$ visum est nobis vnanimiter congregatis, delectos viros mittere ad vos, cum dilectis nostris Barnaba et Paulo, ${ }^{26}$ hominibus qui exposuerunt animas suas pro nomine domini nostri lesu Christi. ${ }^{27}$ Misimus ergo Iudam et Silam, qui et ipsi vobis verbis referent eadem. ${ }^{28}$ Visum est enim spiritui sancto ac nobis, ne quid amplius imponeremus vobis oneris, quam haec necessaria, ${ }^{29}$ videlicet vt abstineatis ab his quae sunt immolata simulacris, et sanguine, et suffocato, et scortatione. A quibus si conseruaueritis vos ipsos, bene facietis. Valete.
${ }^{30}$ Illi ergo dimissi venerunt Antiochiam, et congregata multitudine reddiderunt epistolam. ${ }^{31}$ Quam quum legissent, gauisi sunt super consolatione.

28 є $\delta \circ \xi \varepsilon A-C: \varepsilon \delta \omega \xi \varepsilon D E \mid$ чนเv $A-C: \eta \mu \nu D E$

24 e $B-E$ : ex $A \mid$ labefactantes $B-E$ : euertentes $A \mid 26$ exposuerunt $B-E$ : tradiderunt $A \mid$ 27 Silam B-E: Sylam $A \mid 28$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 29$ videlicet $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ scortatione $B-E$ : fornicatione $A$

Manetti had seniores et, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
23 in Syria et in Cilicia kotà ... इupionv kai Kı $\lambda_{ı k i}$ v ("Syriae et Ciliciae" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the use of Syriae and Ciliciae on the grounds that the locative case should not be used for names of regions. His further suggestion, that Antioch in this passage means the region of Antioch, rather than just the town of that name, corresponded with the view expressed in Valla Annot., but was not incorporated in Erasmus' published translation. See on Ioh. 4,21 for his use of the locative case elsewhere. Erasmus included this passage in the 1527 edition of the Solocismi.

24 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.
24 e nobis 色 $\mathcal{\dagger}$ ग̂ $\mu \omega ̃ \nu$ ("ex nobis" $1516=$ Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus always has the form, ex nobis.
24 egressi $̇ \xi € \varepsilon \lambda \theta$ óvtes ("exeuntes" Vg.). Greek aorist. On the various renderings of $\mathfrak{e} \xi \in \varepsilon^{\prime} p X o \mu \alpha \mathrm{l}$, see on Iob. 18,38.
24 labefactantes ả̀vaбкєuó̧ovtes ("euertentes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus uses labefacto only once elsewhere in the N.T., at Gal. 5,12 , in rendering $\alpha^{\alpha} v \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ \omega$. He retains euerto for $\kappa \alpha т \alpha \sigma т \rho \varepsilon ́ \varphi \omega$ at $M t$. 21,12, while substituting subuerto in the parallel passage at $M c .11,15$. He replaces subuerto
by euerto in rendering ékбтрє́ $\varphi \circ \mu \propto 1$ at Tit. 3,11 . Possibly he had in mind, at the present passage, that a verb meaning to "unsettle" rather than to "overturn" was better suited to the context. Here, Manetti put subuertentes.
24 iubentes ... legem $\lambda \hat{\xi}$ Yovtes ... vóuov (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission of these six words is supported by $\boldsymbol{7}^{3345 \mathrm{sid} 74} \mathrm{KABD}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. C (E) and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot. The version of Manetti had dicentes vt circuncideremini ac legem seruaretis.
24 mandaucramus $\delta_{1 \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon ı} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ("mandauimus" Vg.). For Erasmus' preference for the pluperfect, see on Iob. 1,19.
25 visum est ह$\delta \circ \zeta \varepsilon v$ ("placuit" Vg.). Erasmus retained placuit in vs. 22 . However, within the wording of the apostolic letter, visum est was consistent with vs. 28 , and more tactful than placuit. The same change was made by Manetti.
 Sóv ("collectis in vnum" Vg.). Erasmus here follows the example of the Vulgate, which uses vnanimiter for $\delta \mu 0 \theta v \mu a \delta \delta o v$ at six other passages of Acts. See also on Act. 2,1, and Annot. At the present passage, it aptly conveys the harmonious nature of the meeting which had taken place. Manetti's version was conuenientibus vnanimiter.
25 delectos viros mittere ék $\lambda \varepsilon \xi \alpha \mu \dot{\text { évous ởvópas }}$ $\pi \varepsilon \mu \psi \alpha_{1}$ ("eligere viros et mittere" $V$ g.). Erasmus keeps closer to the Greek syntax. In vs. 22 he had rendered the same Greek wording by $v t$ delectos ... viros mitterent. Manetti put vt electos viros ... mitteremus.
25 dilectis áyaтtŋтоі̃s ("carissimis" Vg.). In 1516, this substitution occurs twenty-eight times elsewhere in the N.T., mainly in the Epistles, compared with Erasmus' use of charissimus at only fourteen passages in total. Three further such changes took place in 1519. He preferred dilectus, partly, because the the Greek word was not a superlative. Manetti put catis.
26 qui exposuerunt $\pi \alpha p a \delta \varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \delta \dot{\sigma}$ ("qui tradiderunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Eph. 5,25 (1519). See on Iob. 6,64 for Erasmus' treatment of trado elsewhere.
28 ac каi ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.

28 ne quid amplius imponeremus $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\text { èv }} \pi \lambda \lambda$ ह́ov Ėnititecoar ("nihil vitra imponere" Vg.). Erasmus' use of amplius, a quasi-comparative adjective, is closer to the form of the Greek expression. He may also have disliked the use of vltra with a partitive genitive, oneris. For his avoidance of the infinitive, see on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti put vt nibil amplius ... imропететиs.

28 ن̇uiv. The reading $\dot{\eta} \mu i v$ in 1527-35, like $\varepsilon \delta \omega \zeta \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \in \circ \circ \xi$ earlier in the verse, was a misprint.
29 videlicet (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,12.
 vos" Vg.). The pronoun added by the Vulgate does not have explicit Greek support. Manetti also made this change, but postponed the verb until after fornicatione.
29 bis quae sunt immolata simulacris Ei $\delta \omega \lambda 00{ }^{\prime}$ $\tau \omega v$ ("immolatis simulacrorum" Vg .). A similar substitution occurs at $A c t$. 21,25, and also for idolothytum at 1 Cor. 8,7, 10; Ap. Ioh. 2,20 (1519). See Annot. In Manetti (Pal Lat. 45), this became imolationibus idolorum.
29 scortatione mopveios ("fornicatione" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 8,41.
29 si conseruaueritis $\delta 1 \propto$ वтПpoũvtes ("custodientes" Vg.). The substitution of conseruo is consistent with Vulgate usage at $L c$. 2,51. Erasmus alters the syntax to achieve a more natural Latin phrase, replacing the present participle with the future perfect tense.
29 vos ipsos éautoús ("vos" Vg.). By adding ipsos, Erasmus makes clear that the Greek word is a reflexive pronoun. See on $l o b .11,55$; Act. 9,34.
29 facietis $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \varepsilon T \varepsilon$ ("agetis" Vg.). The substitution of facio for ago occurs at eight other passages, in accordance with Vulgate usage elsewhere, though at ten passages Erasmus retains ago in rendering $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma$.
30 venerunt $\hat{\eta} \lambda \boldsymbol{\theta} \circ \mathrm{v}$ ("descenderunt" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $k a \pi \eta \pi \lambda \theta o v$, as in $\mathbf{P}^{33 v i d} 74 \times$ A C D and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
 Erasmus retains trado for this Greek verb at Lc. 4,17.













 $\lambda \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$ tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v ~ t o u ̃ ~ k u p i o u, ~ т \omega ̃ s ~$ モ̀ $\chi$ оט
${ }^{32}$ Iudas autem et Silas quum essent et ipsi prophetae, sermone copioso adhortati sunt fratres, confirmaueruntque. ${ }^{33}$ Commorati autem illic aliquantum temporis, dimissi sunt cum pace a fratribus ad apostolos. ${ }^{34}$ Visum est autem Silae manere ibidem: ${ }^{35}$ Paulus vero et Barnabas demorabantur Antiochiae, docentes et annunciantes cum aliis etiam compluribus sermonem domini.
${ }^{36}$ Post aliquot autem dies dixit ad Barnabam Paulus: Reuertentes iam visitemus fratres nostros per omnes ciuitates, in quibus annunciauimus sermonem domini, quomodo se habeant. ${ }^{37}$ Barnabas autem consulebat

32 Silas $B$ - $E$ : Sylas $A \mid$ confirmaueruntque $B$-E: et confirmauerunt $A \mid 34$ Silae $B$-E: Syle $A \mid$ 35 vero $B$-E: autem $A \mid$ annunciantes $B$-E: euangelizantes $A \mid$ compluribus sermonem $B-E$ : pluribus verbum $A \mid 36$ Reuertentes $C$ - $E$ : Reuersi $A B \mid$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A$

32 autem te. Erasmus' rendering reproduces the wording of the Vulgate. However, the latter reflects a Greek text substituting $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as found in $3^{30^{74}} \leqslant$ A B C E and many later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. D and another large section of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put $e$.
32 quum essent et ipsi prophetae kai aủroì $\pi \rho 0-$ Фท̃̃aı ỗvtes ("et ipsi cum essent prophetae" Vg.). By adhering too closely to the Greek word-order, the Vulgate obscures the sense. Manetti had cum et ipsi prophetae essent.
32 sermone $\lambda$ óyou ("verbo" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,1, and Annot. Here, Erasmus felt that verbum was inappropriate, as it could mean a single word, whereas the present context implied that many words were spoken. The same change was made by Manetti.
32 copioso mo $\lambda \lambda \frac{0}{}$ ("plurimo" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to plurimo partly because it is a superlative, and also because it produces nonsense when attached to verbo. On his use of copiosus elsewhere, see on Ioh. 15,8 .
 Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at 1 Thess. 5,11; Hebr. 10,25, consistent with Vulgate usage
at Hebr. 3,13. Elsewhere, at ten passages, Erasmus uses adbortor to replace obsecro, rogo, and bortor. However, he retains consolor at Act. 16,40 and ten times in the Epistles, even in places where bortor or one of its compounds would have suited the context. It appears that, at the present passage, Erasmus uses adbortor mainly for stylistic variety, to avoid repetition from vs. 31, where consolatio was used. The effect is to break the linguistic connection between $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha k \lambda \eta \sigma$ is in vs. 31 and $\pi \alpha р a k \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega$ in vs. 32.
32 confirmaueruntque kai ėmeotípigav ("et confirmauerunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,39. Manetti put ac confirmauerunt.
33 Commorati ... illic aliquantum temporis noıńoavtes $\delta \dot{k}$ xpóvov ("Facto ... ibi aliquanto tempore" late Vg .). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 18,23, in rendering the same Greek idiom. For the use of commoror in rendering $\delta_{1 a \pi \rho i} \beta \omega$, see on Ioh. 11,54. On Erasmus' avoidance of facio, see on Iob. 1,15. On illic, see on Ioh. 5,5. Manetti followed the late Vulgate, but omitted $i b i$.
33 apostolos toùs òmootóخous ("eos qui miserant illos" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of tovis átroनтiìavtas aútoús, as in
$\boldsymbol{p l}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C D and some later mss．：cf．Annot． The text of Erasmus follows cod．2815，sup－ ported by cod．E and most of the later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．The longer reading may represent an early editiorial rationalisation of the text，to resolve the apparent problem of this reference to＂the apostles＂．If the phrase referred to Paul and Barnabas，who were counted as apostles，it would mean that Jude and Silas were encouraged to go back and see Paul and Barnabas，which contradicts the earlier statement that all four of them had travelled together to Antioch．Or if，as is more likely，the phrase meant the apostles in Jerusalem，this could be misunderstood as implying that Paul and Bar－ nabas themselves were not apostles．The change from noun into verb might have been seen by an ancient editor as a convenient way of removing the perceived difficulty of the shorter text．Manetti made the same substitution as Erasmus．

 Iudas autem solus abiit Hierusalem＂late Vg．）． The Vulgate wording as cited in Annot．，lemma， substitutes manere ibi for ibi remanere，though the latter reading corresponds with the 1527 Vulgate column，as well as the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514．Erasmus uses ibidem only here and at Act．21，4，to render aúroũ，but retains $i b i$ at Act．18，19．He did not find this verse in cod．2815＊，but restored it from the margin of cod．2816，from which he wrote it into cod． $2815^{\mathrm{mg}}$（now partly cropped），under the influence of the late Vulgate．This Greek reading is supported，in varying forms by codd． $\mathrm{C} D$ and almost 150 later mss．In cod．1，a one－ line gap appears at this point．The omission of this verse is supported by almost 340 mss．， commencing with $30^{74}$ K A B E（see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 542－5）．It appears from Annot．， that Erasmus suspected that the omission was due to scribal error．The main motive for adding the verse is to provide an explanation for the later statement in vss． $40-41$ that Paul went with Silas to Syria and Cilicia．However， if Jude alone returned to Jerusalem，this would seem to contradict the implication of the plu－ ral verb，áde $\begin{aligned} & \dot{u} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v \text { in vs．33；and if Silas }\end{aligned}$ remained at Antioch in the company of Paul and Barnabas，it is strange that Antioch was not directly named in vs． 34 instead of merely putting aữoũ here and postponing the men－ tion of the city＇s name until vs． 35 ．Manetti＇s
translation ran At visum est Siloe vt ibi remaneret． Iudas autem solus abiit Hierusalem．
35 vero $\delta \varepsilon$（＂autem＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．Erasmus perceives that，if vs． 34 is included in the text， then $\delta \bar{\varepsilon}$ must be rendered as a continuative，as there is no real contrast between the actions of Paul and Barnabas and those of Silas．Manetti began the sentence with Verum Paulus．
 zantes＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．5，42．
35 aliis etiam kai $\varepsilon$ eteppov（＂aliis＂Vg．）．Erasmus is more accurate here．
35 compluribus mo入入 $\tilde{\omega}$（＂pluribus＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Act．1，3．Manetti had plurimis．
35 sermonem tò $\lambda$ дóyov（＂verbum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh．1，1．
36 Reuertentes＇Eтiotpé $\psi$ वutes（＂Reuersi＂1516－ 19）．In 1516－19，Erasmus followed his usual practice of using a past tense to render the Greek aorist．However，since the aorist par－ ticiple was contained within a proposal for future action，the Vulgate rendering was more appropriate，and hence Erasmus restored it in 1522.

36 iam $\delta \dot{y}$（Vg．omits）．Erasmus similarly intro－ duces iam for $\delta \dot{\eta}$ at $L c .2,15$ ； 1 Cor．6，20．At Mt．13，23，he renders by denique，and by sane at 2 Cor．12，1．See also on Act．13，2．
36 nostros $\dagger \boldsymbol{\eta} \omega \tilde{\nu}$（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omis－ sion is supported by ${ }^{77 \text { 7vid }}$ N A B CD E and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．Manetti likewise added nostros．
36 omnes mã̃oav（＂vniuersos＂Vg．）．See on Act．9，32．Manetti made the same change．
36 annunciauimus к $\propto$ т $\eta \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha \mu \in \nu$（＂praedicaui－ mus＂Vg．）．See on Act．13，5．This change was also anticipated by Manetti．
36 sermonem tò $\lambda$ дóyov（＂verbum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Ioh． 1,1 ．
37 consulebat $\mathfrak{k} \beta$ ßu入̀úcoto（＂volebat＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus similarly rejects volo at 2 Cor． 1,17 ，substi－ tuting in animo verso，though at both passages the Vulgate may reflect a Greek text using ßoúnoual．In Annot，he recognises that the Vulgate is here based on the Greek variant，部呟 $\lambda \varepsilon$ тo，as found in $\mathbf{7}^{74} \times$ A B C E and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815， supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．In using consulo here，he adopts a suggestion of Valla Annot．This verb is not
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vt assumerent et Ioannem, cognomento Marcum. ${ }^{38}$ Paulus autem nolebat, vt is qui defecisset ab ipsis ex Pamphylia, nec isset cum eis in opus, adiungeretur. ${ }^{39} \mathrm{Tam}$ acris autem fuit inter eos disceptatio, vt alter ab altero seiungeretur, et Barnabas quidem assumpto Marco nauigaret in Cyprum. ${ }^{40}$ Paulus vero allecto Sila profectus est traditus gratiae dei a fratribus. ${ }^{41}$ Perambulabat autem Syriam ac Ciliciam, confirmans ecclesias.

16Peruenit autem Derben et Lystram, et ecce discipulus quidam erat ibi, nomine Timotheus, filius mulieris cuiusdam Iudaeae fidelis, caeterum patre Graeco. ${ }^{2}$ Huic testimonium bonum reddebant qui Lystris erant et Iconii fratres. ${ }^{3}$ Hunc voluit Paulus secum proficisci, et assumptum

37 Ioannem $A B E$ : Iohannem $C D \mid$ cognomento Marcum $B-E$ : qui cognominabatur Marcus $A \mid 38$ is $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ nec $B-E$ : et non $A \mid$ adiungeretur $B-E$ : hic adiungeretur $A \mid 40$ Sila $B-E$ : Syla $A$ | 41 ac $B-E$ : et $A$
16,1 caeterum $B$-E: coeterum $A \mid$ Graeco $B$-E: gentili $A \mid 2$ Lystris $B-E$ : in Lystris $A \mid$ Iconii $B-E$ : Iconio $A$
used elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T., though he twice replaces cogito by consulto in rendering $\beta$ ouncúoual (Iob. 12,10; Act. 5,33). He retains cogito at Lc. 14,31; Act. 27,39; 2 Cor. 1,17, a verb which he recommends as an alternative at the present passage.
37 vt assumerent et $\sigma \cup \mu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \mathrm{Ĩv}$ ("secum adsumere et" Vg.). The Vulgate does not add secum in rendering the other three N.T. instances of this Greek verb. However, the addition of et reflects a Greek variant adding koi, as in $\boldsymbol{申}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C E and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and another large section of the later mss. For his avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33 . Manetti proposed coassumere, a verb which does not occur in classical Latin.

37 cognomento Marcum тòv ка入oúusvov Mápкov ("qui cognominabatur Marcus" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Act. 11,13.
38 nolebat, $v t$ ńsiov ... $\mu$ ' ("rogabat vt ... non debere" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus suggests that the Vulgate used rogo to mitigate the impression of disagreement between Paul and Barnabas. The Vulgate, however, also uses rogo for $\alpha \mathfrak{c} \xi 10$ o at Act. 28,22, where no such mitigation can have been intended. Elsewhere, the Vulgate uses arbitror, dignor, dignum babeo, and mereor to render this Greek verb. The real problem here is the lapse of style produced by the Vulgate construction of rogo with non debere. Manetti's version was rogabat vt non.
38 is qui tóv ("eum, qui" Vg.; "qui" 1516). In the Vulgate, eum could be understood as referring
to Barnabas，whereas Erasmus wants to make clear that the clause relates to Mark．
 the present context，Erasmus prefers a stronger verb，on analogy with＂apostate＂，as indicated in Annot．At 1 Tim．4，1 and Hebr．3，12，he also tries substituting descisco，which he recommends as an alternative at the present passage．In other contexts，he accepts that discedo is an adequate rendering of $\dot{\alpha} \varphi i \sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ．Manetti put recesserat．
38 ipsis ${ }^{\prime} \cup \mathfrak{T} \omega ̃ \nu$（＂eis＂Vg．）．The reflexive pro－ noun is substituted，to refer back to the subject， and also to avoid repetition of eis．The same change was made by Manetti．
38 ex ớrtó（＂de＂Vg．）．Cf．on Act．9，8．Where the required sense is simply＂from＂，Erasmus generally avoids the use of de．
38 nec кà̀ $\mu$ ท́（＂et non＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．2，16．
38 ．．．adiungeretur $\sigma \cup \mu \not \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \in i ̃ v ~ т о и ̃ т о \nu ~(" r e-~$ cipi＂late Vg．；＂hic adiungeretur＂1516）．In 1519，Erasmus decided that toũтov was re－ dundant for translation purposes．In vs． 37 ，he retained assumo for $\sigma u \mu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} \omega$ ．The change of verb here is merely for stylistic variety．In rendering $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} \omega \omega$ ，Erasmus further susbstitutes adiungo for accipio at Mt． $1,20,24$ ，and for assumo at Mt．12，45．Manetti used coassumeret，the same verb which he had adopted in vs． 37.
39 Tam acris ．．．fuit inter eos disceptatio，vt ह̀ $\gamma$ ह́veto ．．．торо६ибんós，$̄ \sigma T \varepsilon$（＂Facta est ．．．dissensio， ita vt＂Vg．）．Erasmus makes these changes to counteract what he regarded as an erroneous attempt by the Vulgate to dilute the severity of the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas： see Annot．On disceptatio，see on Act．15，7．For Erasmus＇avoidance of facio，see on Ioh．1，15． He retains autem from the Vulgate，though the latter reflects the replacement of ouv by $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ，as found in $3 \mathbf{N}^{45} 7^{74}$ A B D and a few later mss． Erasmus＇Greek text had ouvv，following cod． 2815，with support from codd．C E and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816.

 Vg．）．See on Ioh． 4,33 ，regarding inuicem．Erasmus similarly substituted alter ab altero at $M t .25,32$ （1519）．His choice of seiungo has the connotation of＂dissociate from＂or＂separate from＂，far stronger than the verb discedo which was euphem－ istically adopted by the Vulgate．Erasmus uses
seiungo again at 1 Tim．6，5，in rendering áqi－ $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \mathrm{l}$ ．Manetti put ipsi ab inuicem separarentur．
39 in Cyprum єis Kútтpov（＂Cyprum＂Vg．）．See on Act．13，4．
 here seeks to convey the added sense of the prefix ÉTri－．He uses the same verb to render кота入غ́yоual at 1 Tim．5，9．For Stunica＇s objection to this change，and Erasmus＇reply， see his Apolog．resp．Iac．Lop．Stun．，ASD IX，2， p．154，ll．840－848．
41 ac каí（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25． This change also appeared in Manetti＇s version．
41 ecclesias tòs ékk $\lambda$ ク $\sigma$ ios（＂ecclesias，praecipiens custodire praecepta apostolorum et seniorum＂ late Vg．，and some Vg．mss．）．In Annot．，Erasmus suggests that the late Vulgate addition was modelled on Act．16，4．The added words receive partial support from cod．$D$ ，but from no other mss．Manetti rendered this as ecclesias，ac precipiens vt precepta apostolorum et seniorum custodirent．
16，1 Derben eis $\Delta \varepsilon ́ p \beta \eta v$（＂in Derben＂Vg．）． Erasmus similarly omits in before Derben at Act．14，20（1519）．See on Act．8，27．
1 cuiusdam tivos（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \aleph$ A B C D E and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815， together with codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．See Annot．The version of Manetti made the same change．
1 Iudaeae＇lovסaías（＂viduae＂late Vg．）．Erasmus suggests in Annot．，that the late Vulgate reading resulted from a mistaken transposition of letters within the Latin tradition．He included the passage among the Loca Manifeste Deprauata．It has negligible Greek ms．support．
1 caeterum $\delta$＇́（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission， again，lacks Greek ms．support．Manetti added autem after patre．
1 Graeco＂E $\lambda \lambda$ пиvos（＂gentili＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on Ioh．12，20，and Annot．A similar change was recommended in Valla Annot．，replacing patre gentili with patris autem Graeci．
2 Lystris év＾úotpoıs（＂in Lystris＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Iob．4，21．Erasmus similarly removes in before Lystris at Act．14，8．
2 Iconii＇lkoví $\omega$（＂Iconio＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．4，21．A similar substitution of Iconii occurs at Act．14，1（1519）．
3 assumptum $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \dot{ }$（＂assumens＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．
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circuncidit eum propter Iudaeos qui erant in illis locis. Sciebant enim omnes quod pater eius erat Graecus. ${ }^{4}$ Quum autem pertransirent ciuitates, tradebant eis seruanda decreta, quae erant ordinata $a b$ apostolis et presbyteris, qui erant Hierosolymis. ${ }^{5}$ Itaque ecclesiae confirmabantur fide, et abundabant numero quotidie. ${ }^{6}$ Quum peragrassent autem Phrygiam et Galaticam regionem, vetitique essent a spiritu sancto loqui sermonem in Asia, ${ }^{7}$ profecti in Mysiam, tentabant ire in Bithyniam, et non permisit eos spi|ritus. ${ }^{8}$ Quum autem pertransissent Mysiam, descenderunt Troadem, ${ }^{9}$ et visio per noctem Paulo visa est. Vir Macedo quidam erat stans et deprecans eum, ac dicens: Profectus in Macedoniam, succurre nobis. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Vt}$ autem visum vidit, statim quaesiuimus proficisci in Macedoniam, certi facti quod vocasset nos dominus ad euangelizandum eis.




3 Graecus $B-E$ : gentilis $A \mid 4$ seruanda decreta $B-E$ : custodire dogmata $A \mid$ ordinata $B-E$ : decreta $A \mid$ presbyteris $B-E$ : senioribus $A \mid 5$ quotidie $B-E$ : cotidie $A \mid 6$ peragrassent $B-E$ : pertransissent $A \mid$ vetitique essent $B-E$ : vetiti sunt $A \mid$ sermonem $B-E$ : verbum $A \mid 7$ profecti $B-E$ : Cum venissent autem $A \mid 9$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ Profectus $B-E$ : Transiens $A \mid$ succurre nobis $B-E$ : adiuua nos $A \mid 10$ dominus $B-E$ : deus $A$

3 Graecus "E $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ ("gentilis" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,20.
4 Siettopev́outo. In cod. 2815, Erasmus had the reading èтopqúovto, also found in a few other late mss. He or his assistants were able to improve on this by referring to codd. 1,2816 and the Vulgate, restoring סiєтторєúovto, as found in most Greek mss.
4 seruanda фu $\lambda$ व́ $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon ı v ~(" c u s t o d i r e " ~ 1516 ~=~ V g) . ~.$. See on Act. 7,53. See on Ioh. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti preferred $v t$ custodirent.

4 decreta tà $\delta$ סó $\gamma \mu \propto \tau \alpha$ ("dogmata" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the use of the non-Latin word, dogmata, and observes that the Vulgate elsewhere renders as decretum (at Act. 17,7; Eph. 2,15; Col. 2,14) and edictum (at Lc. 2,1). The same point was made by Valla Annot., in favour of substituting decreta.

4 ordinata кекрıи́̌va ("decreta" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus commends decreta as a rendering of the Greek participle, but since he wishes to use decretum for סó $\gamma \mu \alpha$, he has to select a different word for kpiv. In his 1516-19
editions, he took the spelling кєкрциц'̇va from cod. 2815, with little other Greek support except cod. 2816. Valla Annot., more literally, rendered this by iudicata.
4 presbyteris $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \cup \tau \in \rho \omega \omega \nu$ ("senioribus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 15,4.
5 Itaque ecclesiae ai $\mu \mathrm{èv}$ oũv ékk $\lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha<1$ ("Et ecclesiae quidem" Vg.). See on $A c t .9,31$. Manetti had Ecclesiae vero.

6 Quum peragrassent $\delta$ Іє $\lambda \theta$ óvtes ("Transeuntes" Vg.; "Cum pertransissent" 1516). Greek aorist. Regarding peragro, see on Act. 8,4. Manetti put Pertranseuntes.
6 Galaticam regionem $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha т \kappa \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu \chi \omega \dot{\rho} \alpha \nu$ ("Galatiae regionem" Vg.). This substitution is closer to the Greek syntax, and follows the example of the Vulgate at Act. 18,23. Cf. Iudaea regio at $M c$. 1,5 (1519). Manetti anticipated this change. The spelling $\gamma \alpha \lambda_{1}$ tikinv in 1519 may have been deliberate, as it occurs again at Act. 18,23. It was not prompted by cod. 3 .
6 vetitique essent $\kappa \omega \lambda \cup \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \tau \varepsilon ร$ ("vetati sunt" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.; "vetiti sunt" 1516). The form vetiti is more correct in classical Latin. Erasmus' construction follows on from Quum peragrassent, earlier in the verse. Manetti here put soluti sunt, possibly based on a conjecture that the Greek text should read kai $\lambda u \theta \in ̇ v t e s$.
6 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v$ ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.; "verbum dei" late Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,1, regarding sermo. The late Vulgate addition of dei corresponds with roũ $\theta$ हoũ in cod. D.
7 profecti é̀ $\lambda$ Өóvtes ("Cum venissent autem" $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\delta \bar{\xi}$, as in $39^{74}$ ) A B C D E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In Acts, he more often uses proficiscor for $\bar{\xi} \xi$ -
 and $\varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon \mu$. He does not elsewhere use proficiscor for ${ }^{\text {en }}$ PXoual in Matthew to Acts, except at Mt. 2,23; 4,13. The Vulgate rendering could be understood as meaning that Paul came into Mysia and, from there, sought to enter Bithynia. Erasmus, however, by using proficiscor, hints that Paul may only have set out in the direction of Mysia, and that his attempt to enter Bithynia occurred before he arrived in Mysia. He may have made this change on the grounds that, since the Holy Spirit had forbidden them to preach in Asia, Paul would not have wished to go into Mysia, as it was part of the Roman
province of Asia. In the Peregrinatio, Erasmus gives a different, and somewhat confused, interpretation of the passage. Manetti put Cum vero in Asiam venisent, followed by a further conjectural change from Mysiam to Mediam in vs. 8: cf. on vs. 6.
7 spiritus tò $\pi v \varepsilon \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ ("spiritus lesu" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of 'Inooũ, as in ${ }^{77^{74}} \times \mathrm{A}$ B C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ D E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. (though in cod. 1 , a space is left after $\pi v \varepsilon \tilde{U} \mu \alpha)$. Manetti also omitted Iesu.

9 visa est $\omega \varphi \theta \eta$ ("ostensa est" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. The verb ostendo is more appropriate to $\delta$ eikvupl, or one of its compounds. Manetti substituted apparuit.
9 ac каi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
9 Profectus $\Delta \mathrm{I} \alpha \beta$ ás ("Transiens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Greek aorist. As in vs. 7, Erasmus' choice of proficiscor is imprecise, especially in the light of his use of the same verb again in vs. 10 to render $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi \xi \mathrm{q}$ pxoucı. At $L c .16,26$ (1519), he renders סıaßaive by transcendo, while at Hebr. 11,29, he retains transeo. Manetti put Transi.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 15,25; Mc. 9,24; Act. 21,28; 2 Cor. 6,2. At Hebr. 2,18, Erasmus puts sucurro for auxilior. However, he retains adiuuo at $A$ p. Iob. 12,16. At Mc. 9,22, he substitutes subuenio for adiuuo. In Annot. on Mt. 15,25, Erasmus makes the point that adiuuo can simply mean giving assistance to someone who is working, whereas $\beta$ O $\eta \theta$ ध $\omega$ implied coming to the aid of someone who was in danger or distress.
10 dominus ó kúplos ("deus" $1516 \mathrm{Lat} .=\mathrm{Vg}$. .). The Vulgate follows a Greek text having $\delta \theta$ $\sigma$ ós, as in $7^{274} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. D and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The same change was made by Manetti.
10 ad euangelizandum Eủ $\gamma \gamma \gamma \mathrm{E}$ रí $\sigma \alpha 0 \theta$ al ("euangelizare" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Lc. 4,18 . For Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. In Manetti's version, this became $v t$... euangelizaremus. The spelling
 ted an intention to substitute $\varepsilon \mathcal{U}_{0} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda i \zeta \in \sigma \theta \alpha$, though this does not appear to have ms. support.
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${ }^{11}$ Quum soluissemus igitur a Troade, recto cursu venimus Samothracen, et postero die Neapolim, ${ }^{12}$ et inde Philippos, quae est prima partis Macedoniae ciuitas, colonia. Eramus autem in eadem vrbe diebus aliquot commorantes, ${ }^{13}$ et die sabbatorum egressi sumus e ciuitate iuxta flumen, vbi solebat esse precatio, et sedentes loquebamur mulieribus quae conuenerant. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{Et}$ quaedam mulier nomine Lydia purpurarum venditrix ciuitatis Thyatirorum, colens deum, audiuit, cuius dominus aperuit cor, vt intenderet his quae dicebantur a Paulo. ${ }^{15}$ Quum autem baptizata esset et domus eius, deprecata est, dicens: Si iudicastis me fidelem domino esse, introite in domum meam et manete. Et adegit nos.
${ }^{16}$ Accidit autem euntibus nobis ad precationem, vt puella quaedam habens spiritum Pythonis occurreret nobis, quae quaestum magnum praestabat dominis suis diuinando. ${ }^{17}$ Haec subsequata Paulum ac nos, clamabat dicens: Isti homines serui

11 Samothracen $B-E$ : in Samothracen $A \mid 12$ commorantes $B-E$ : diuersantes $A \mid 13$ esse precatio $B-E$ : oratio esse $A \mid 14$ purpurarum venditrix $B-E$ : purpuraria $A \mid$ Thyatirorum $B-E$ : Thyathirae $A \mid 15$ adegit $B-E$ : coegit $A \mid 16$ Accidit $B-E$ : Factum est $A \mid$ precationem $B-E$ : orationem $A \mid$ quaestum $B-E$ : questum $A \mid 17$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$

11 Quum soluissemus Avax ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon}{ }^{\prime}$ tes ("Nauigantes" Vg.). Greek aorist. See on Act. 13,13.
11 igitur oũv ("autem" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $\delta \bar{\xi}$, as in $\mathbf{7}^{74} \approx \mathrm{~A}(\mathrm{D}) \mathrm{E}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., this time commencing with codd. B C.

11 Samotbracen kis $\sum \alpha \mu 0 \theta p$ ák $\eta v$ ("Samothraciam" Vg.; "in Samothracen" 1516). See on Act. 13,51 , for the 1516 addition of in. Possibly Erasmus, in 1516, overlooked the fact that Samothrace was an island and therefore did not require the preposition.

11 postero die $\tau$ ñ ... Ėmıoúrñ ("sequenti die" Vg .). Erasmus makes the same change at Act. 21,18 , but retains sequenti die at eight other


12 Pbilippos єis $\Phi_{1} \lambda i$ ímmous ("Philippis" Vg.). Erasmus' choice of the accusative is more consistent with the case of Samotbracen and Neapolim in the previous verse.
12 кo$\lambda \omega v i \alpha$. Erasmus seems to have arrived at this spelling under the influence of the Latin word, colonia, though it is supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \times \mathrm{A} \mathrm{B}^{*} \mathrm{C} D \mathrm{E}$ and some later mss.,
including cod. $2816^{* v i d}$. In most of the later mss., including codd. $1,2815,2816^{\text {corr vid. }}$, it is ко $\lambda \omega v \varepsilon i \alpha$.
12 eadem वỦTñ ("hac" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of Taútn, as in $3 \boldsymbol{p}^{74} \times$ A B C D* E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , in company with cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., including cod. 1 . In cod. 2816, $T \tilde{\eta}$ $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{y}$ is substituted for $\alpha \cup \cup T \tilde{y}$ Tท̃.
12 commorantes Siorpißovtes ("consistentes" late Vg.; "diuersantes" 1516). See on Ioh. 11,54 for commoror. For diuersor, see on Act. 10,6. In Annot., Erasmus also records the alternative Vulgate reading, conferentes. The change made by Erasmus was anticipated by Manetti.
 Vulgate may reflect a different Greek text, substituting $\delta \varepsilon ́$ for $\tau \varepsilon$, as in cod. D and a few later mss. Manetti also had et die.
 Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the use of foras as a preposition, rather than as an adverb. He accordingly listed this passage among the Soloecismi. For his reply to Stunica's defence of the Vulgate rendering, see his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 D. In Valla Annot., it was suggested that foras should be replaced with extra. The Vulgate also reflects a Greek variant substituting mú $\lambda \eta s$ for $\pi \dot{\delta} \lambda \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$, as found in $7^{74}$ ※ A B C D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put extra vrbem.
13 solebat évouíheto ("videbatur" Vg.). The Greek verb is capable of bearing both these interpretations, though in Annot., Erasmus also suggests putabatur: the latter rendering was used by Manetti.
13 esse precatio mpooquxŋ̀ єlvaı ("oratio esse" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,14.
14 purpurarum venditrix торфиро́тш 1 ıs ("purpuraria" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus wishes to make clear that the Greek word denotes a seller of purple cloth, and not merely a person involved in its manufacture: see Annot., where he cites the phrase purpurae venditrix from the Liber Nominum Hebraicorum of Pseudo-Jerome.
14 Thyatirorum Өuateipwv ("Thyatirenorum" Vg.; "Thyathirae" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus states that Thyatira is a neuter plural, whereas in the 1516 N.T. at this passage (and in all his editions at $A p$. Ioh. 1,$11 ; 2,24$ ) he treats it
as feminine singular. Manetti's version had Thiatbicorum.
14 audiuit $\eta^{\prime} \kappa о \cup \sigma \varepsilon v$. Erasmus or his assistants found this Greek variant in codd. 1 and 2816, with support from cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$ and some later mss., together with the Latin Vulgate. In his cod. 2815, the text is $\eta^{\prime} K o v e v$, imperfect tense, as also found in $3^{374} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B C D ${ }^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most of the later mss.

14 vt intenderet $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon ́ \chi \in\llcorner v$ ("intendere" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33. The same change was made by Manetti.
15 adegit тареßィव́वбवто ("coegit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At $L c .24,29$, the only other N.T. passage having тараßıá̧ouaı, Erasmus retains cogo. Elsewhere, he uses adigo for ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \alpha p \varepsilon u ́ \omega$ at Mt. 5,41; 27,32 (1519), but substitutes cogo at Mc. 15,21 in rendering the same verb. He also uses adigo occasionally for котабои入ów, $\delta$ ou $\lambda$ ó $\omega$, and тoté $\omega$. See Annot.
16 Accidit 'Eyéveto ("Factum est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 7,40.
16 precationem mpoceuxív ("orationem" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,14.
16 vt puella quaedam babens ... occurreret $\pi \alpha 1-$
 quandam habentem ... obuiare" Vg.). For Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, see on $I o b$. 1,33 . His substitution of occurro is consistent with Vulgate usage at most other passages
 Ioh. 12,18, he follows the Vulgate in using obuiam venio. At the present passage, the spelling U̇TavTñoal is exhibited by $3{ }^{4574} \times$ B C E and a few later mss., while $\alpha \pi \alpha v \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ is the reading of cod. 2815 , together with codd. A D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The use of obuio, as a verb meaning to meet, does not occur in classical Latin. See Annot., where Erasmus prefers ancilla rather than puella. Manetti put vt ... puella quedam babens ... obuiaret.
16 Pythonis Пú $\theta \omega v o s$ ("Pythonem" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $\Pi u \theta^{\circ} \omega v \alpha$, as found in $3^{77^{7}} \aleph \mathrm{ABC} \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}^{*}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. $2815{ }^{\text {corr }}$ supported by ${ }^{395} \mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (cod. 2815*vid has $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime}$ Ө $\omega$ vos). See Annot., and also Valla Annot., where múӨcuos is cited as the Greek reading.
17 ac каi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti substituted ac Siloam for et nos, reflecting
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${ }^{25}$ Katà $\delta$ ह̀ tò $\mu \varepsilon \sigma о v u ́ k T i o v ~ M \alpha u ̃-~$



dei excelsissimi sunt，qui annunci－ ant nobis viam salutis．${ }^{18} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem faciebat multos dies：sed aegre ferens Paulus，et conuersus，spiritui dixit： Praecipio tibi per nomen Iesu Chris－ ti，vt exeas ab ea．Et exiit eadem hora．${ }^{19}$ Videntes autem domini eius， quod abisset spes quaestus sui，ap－ prehensum Paulum et Silam traxe－ runt in forum ad principes，${ }^{20}$ et offerentes eos magistratibus，dixe－ runt： Hi homines conturbant ciui－ tatem nostram，quum sint Iudaei， ${ }^{21}$ et annunciant instituta quae non licet nobis suscipere，neque seruare， quum simus Romani．${ }^{22} \mathrm{Et}$ concur－ rit turba aduersus eos，ac magistra－ tus scissis vestibus suis iusserunt eos virgis caedi．${ }^{23}$ Quumque multas pla－ gas eis imposuissent，coniecerunt eos in carcerem，praecipientes custodi carceris，vt diligenter custodiret eos． ${ }^{24}$ Qui quum tale praeceptum acce－ pisset，coniecit eos in interiorem carcerem，et pedes eorum strinxit ligno．
${ }^{25}$ Media autem nocte Paulus et Silas orantes laudabant deum．Exau－ diebant autem eos，qui vincti erant． ${ }^{26}$ Subito vero terrae motus factus est

18 sed aegre ferens $B-E$ ：Tedio autem affectus $A \mid$ spiritui $A B D E$ spiritu $C \mid$ per nomen $B-E$ ： in nomine $A \mid 19$ quaestus $A C-E$（व̄stus $A$ ）：questus $B \mid \operatorname{sui} A$（exx）$B-E$ ：suus $A$（exc）｜Silam $B-E:$ Sylam $A \mid 21$ instituta quae $B$－E：morem quem $A \mid$ seruare $B-E$ ：facere $A \mid$ Romani $A E$ ： Rhomani $B-D \mid 22$ turba $B$－E：plebs $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ e et $A \mid$ vestibus $B$－E：tunicis $A \mid 23$ Quumque $B-E$（Cumque $B-D$ ）：Et cum $A \mid$ carceris $B-E$ ：om．$A \mid 25$ Silas $B-E:$ Sylas $A \mid$ Exaudiebant autem $B-E$ ：et exaudiebant $A$
the Greek k $\alpha \mathbf{i} T \tilde{\sim} \Sigma i \lambda \alpha$, ，as found in many of the later mss．

17 excelsissimi toũ Ú $\psi i ́ \sigma T 0 \cup$（＂excelsi＂Vg．）．See on Act．7，48．Manetti put altissimi．

17 nobis $\dagger$ j $\mu \mathrm{i} v$（＂vobis＂Vg．）．The Vulgate fol－ lows a Greek text having úuiv，as in $\boldsymbol{7 P}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ B（D）E and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．A C and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1
and 2816．The same change was made by Manetti．
18 multos dies $\varepsilon$ étri mo diebus＂Vg．）．See on Act．10，48．
18 sed aegre ferens $\delta 1 a \pi r o u \eta \theta$ zis $\delta \dot{́}$（＂Dolens autem＂Vg．；＂Tedio autem affectus＂1516）． In Annot．，Erasmus states incorrectly that the Vulgate elsewhere translates this Greek verb by moleste fero．In fact，moleste fero is his own substitution for doleo at Act．4，2：see ad loc．On sed，see on Ioh．1，26．
18 per nomen ẻv Tũ óvó $\mu \alpha$ тı（＂in nomine＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．5，43．
18 vt exeas $\varepsilon \xi \xi \lambda \theta \varepsilon i ̃ v$（＂exire＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，33．Manetti also had this change．
19 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Manetti also put quod．
19 abisset $\mathfrak{\text { Ė }} \tilde{\eta} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon v$（＂exiuit＂Vg．）．Similar sub－ stitutions are found at Mt．9，31；Mc．16，8． Usually Erasmus reserves abeo for ád $\pi \varepsilon ́ p \times o \mu a$. His motive at the present passage was probably to avoid further repetition of exeo，which was used twice in the previous verse．However，this change slightly detracts from the sense of the Greek，which drew an exact parallel between the departure of the＂spirit of Python＂and the departure of any further expectation of gain from that source．Manetti had exiuisset．
19 sui $\propto \cup ̉ T \omega ̃ v$（＂corum＂Vg．；＂suus＂1516，some copies）．The spelling suus in 1516 was possibly a misprint，or an error by one of Erasmus＇assis－ tants，influenced by the proximity of quaestus， not discerning that the latter is a fourth declen－ sion genitive，rather than a second declension nominative．
19 apprehensum Éтt $\lambda \alpha \beta$ ó $\mu \varepsilon v o l$（＂apprehenden－ tes＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．
19 tov $\Sigma i \lambda \alpha \nu$ ．The Erasmian text follows codd． 1 and 2816，supported by most other mss．，in restoring tóv，which was omitted by cod．2815，together with codd．C D and a few later mss．

19 traxerunt $\mathrm{\varepsilon i}^{i \lambda} \kappa \cup \sigma \alpha v$（＂perduxerunt＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus finds a stronger verb，to convey the sense that the apostles were physically dragged along rather than merely being＂led＂or＂taken＂． Manetti put attraxerunt．
21 instituta quae $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { cै } \\ \dagger\end{array}\right)$（＂morem quem＂ 1516 $=$ Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus commends the Vul－ gate for not putting mores，in the plural，which would have conveyed a different sense．See on

Act．6，14．Manetti，however，preferred mores quos．
21 seruare тоєєiv（＂facere＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．3，21 for Erasmus＇avoidance of facio in such contexts．
22 concurrit $\sigma u v \in T \varepsilon ́ \sigma T \eta$（＂cucurrit＂late Vg．）． Erasmus is more accurate here，restoring the earlier Vulgate rendering．
22 turba ó oैx入os（＂plebs＂ $1516=V \mathrm{Vg}$ ）．A similar substitution occurs at $A c t .17,8$ ．On the more frequent use of plebs to render $\lambda$ aós，see on Act．2，47．Manetti also made this change．
22 ac kal（＂et＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Iob．1，25． Manetti also had ac．
22 vestibus suis aủtヘ̃v тò inórtıa（＂tunicis eorum＂Vg．；＂tunicis suis＂1516）．See on Act． 14,14 ．This is an instance where the choice of pronoun greatly affects the meaning：did the magistrates rend their own clothes or the clothes of the apostles？Erasmus points out the ambi－ guity of the Greek，in 1527 Annot．This change was anticipated by Manetti．
23 Quumque（＂Et cum＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh．1，39．Manetti simply put cum．
23 coniecerunt ${ }^{\text {Eß }} \beta \alpha \lambda$ 人v（＂miserunt＂Vg．）．See on Iob．3，24．
23 custodi carceris $\delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \circ \varphi u ́ \lambda \alpha \kappa 1$（＂custodi＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus is more accurate here，in ac－ cordance with Vulgate usage in vss． 27 and 36. Manetti similarly added carceris．
24 coniecit $\varepsilon \beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \nu \quad$（＂misit＂Vg．）．See on Iob．3，24．
25 orantes $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon u \chi$ ó $\mu \varepsilon v o 1$（＂adorantes＂Vg．）． At all other instances of this Greek verb，the Vulgate uses oro，except for two passages where it makes use of oratio．See Annot．The same substitution was recommended in Valla Annot．

25 Exaudiebant autem غ̇mๆкрои̃ทто ס＇́（＂et audie－ bant＂Vg．；＂et exaudiebant＂1516）．The spelling ह̇тпкроои̃vто in the 1522－35 editions does not appear to be based on consultation of mss．， and may have been an error of the printer． It is doubtful whether the Vulgate rendering was based on a different Greek text，though a few late mss．do have kai émๆкро exaudio，see on Ioh．9，31．Manetti put audiebant vero．
25 qui vincti erant oi $\delta$ é $\sigma \mu \mathrm{ol}$（＂qui in custodia erant＂Vg．）．Erasmus conveys the meaning of the Greek word more precisely，consistent with Vulgate usage elsewhere，including vs． 27 of
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magnus，ita vt concuterentur funda－ menta carceris．Et statim aperta sunt omnia ostia，et omnium vincula solu－ ta sunt．${ }^{27}$ Experrectus autem custos carceris，quum videret ianuas aper－ tas carceris，euaginato gladio erat se ipsum interfecturus，existimans au－ fugisse vinctos． $\mid{ }^{28}$ Clamauit autem

29 ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ Silae $B-E$ ：Sylae $A$｜ad pedes $B-E$（ital）：ad pedes $A$（rom．）｜ 32 sermonem $B$－E：verbum $A \mid 33$ assumptis illis $B$－E：adsumptos illos $A \mid$ abluit $B$－E：lauit $A \mid$ plagas $B$－E： plagas eorum $A \mid$ domestici $C$－$E$ ：familiares $A B$
the present chapter．Manetti anticipated this change．
26 concuterentur $\sigma \alpha \lambda \in v \theta \tilde{\eta} v a 1$（＂mouerentur＂ Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at $M c$ ． 13，25；Hebr．12，26．However，Erasmus retains moueo at $L c .6,48 ; 21,26 ;$ Act．4，31，in rendering the same Greek verb，and also commoueo at Mt．24，29；Act．2，25；17，13．
26 omnium $\pi$ d́vicuv（＂vniuersorum＂Vg．）．See on Act．9，32．The same change was made by Manetti．
27 Experrectus éfutrvos ．．．yevóuevos（＂Exper－ gefactus＂Vg．）．The word é $\xi u \pi v o s$ does not occur elsewhere in the N．T．，though Erasmus occasionally uses expergiscor for Eyzip $\omega$ ，ठıo－ үpクラ change may have been to avoid giving the impression that someone deliberately woke the sleeping jailer．

27 quum videret kai iठ ${ }^{\circ} \dot{\omega}$（＂et videns＂Vg．）． Greek aorist．Manetti put et ．．．conspicatus．
 dualpeiv（＂volebat se interficere＂Vg．）．Erasmus is more accurate here，and follows the usual Vulgate practice of using the future participle to render $\mu{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ．On se ipsum，see on Iob．11，55． Manetti＇s version was se ipsum interempturus erat．
27 existimans vouiל $\omega \nu$（＂aestimans＂Vg．）．See on Act．2，15．Manetti had ratus．
27 aufugise ė̇ктtepevy＇̇val（＂fugisse＂Vg．）． Erasmus uses aufugio only twice elsewhere in the N．T．，rendering $\varnothing$ eúy $\omega$ at Mt．8，33，and ámo甲súr $\omega$ at 2 Petr．2，18．At Lc．21，36（1519） he uses effugio for exkpưy $\omega$ ，in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act．19，16； 2 Cor．11，33； 1 Thess．5，3；Hebr．2，3．At Rom．2，3，he substitutes suffugio for effugio．
 substitution occurs at $L c .3,13$ (1519); 9,3. At Ap. Iob. 2,10, Erasmus retains nibil ... timeas. See also on Ioh. 3,7, for other substitutions of $n e$.
 ("tibi mali feceris" late Vg.). Erasmus follows the Greek word-order more closely in his rendering. On his use of tibi ipsi, see on Act. 9,34. Manetti had feceris tibi mali, as in the earlier Vulgate.
29 Postulatoque aitińoas $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{\boldsymbol{E}}$ ("Petitoque" Vg.). See on Act. 3,14. Manetti made the same change.
 In Annot., Erasmus criticises the Vulgate rendering for not expressing the haste with which the jailer entered. He also suggests, among other alternatives, the use of insilio, a choice which he adopted at Act. 14,14 (1519) in rendering the same Greek verb. Valla Annot. had recommended using insilio at both passages. Manetti here tried saltibus introiuit.

29 ac kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
29 accidit Tp makes this substitution at $M c .5,33 ; 7,25$; Lc. 5,8 (all 1519), while retaining procido at Mc. 3,11; Lc. 8,28, 47, in rendering тробтiтт由. See also on Iob. 11,32.
29 ad pedes. Erasmus follows the late Vulgate in retaining this addition, commending it in Annot. as a legitimate rendering, while pointing out that it is not explicitly supported by his Greek mss. It was therefore placed in italics. There appears to be only one ms., cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$, which supports the late Vulgate wording, with тpòs toùs tóסas. Similarly at Lc. 8,47, Erasmus retains ante pedes eius, without any ms. support, but in this instance without putting it in italics. At passages where neither the Greek text nor the Vulgate had ad pedes, Erasmus did not go out of his way to insert this phrase. Manetti omitted the words.

30 productis illis тpororocyஸ̀v aủtoús ("producens eos" Vg.). Greek aorist. When using the ablative absolute construction, it is Erasmus' normal practice, in the N.T., to use illis rather than eis. cf. Act. 4,15, 18; 16,33. Manetti put eos extra producens for producens eos foras.
31 Inooũv. Erasmus here follows his cod. 2815 in company with the Vulgate, and $7^{77^{74 i d}} \boldsymbol{x} A B$ and a few later mss. In codd. 1 ,

2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. C D E, Xpiotóv is added, corresponding with the addition of Cbristum in Manetti's version. In cod. 2816, $\mathfrak{i} \mu \omega \tilde{v}$ is further added before 'Inooũv.

32 sermonem tóv גóyov ("verbum" $1516=V g$.). See on loh. 1,1.
32 et omnibus kaì $\pi a ̃ \sigma ı ~(" c u m ~ o m n i b u s " ~ V g) . ~.$. The Vulgate reflects the substitution of ouv for $k a i$, as found in $7^{(455) 74}$ ^A B C D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti also made this change.
33 assumptis illis $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\omega} v$ aủtoús ("tollens eos" Vg.; "adsumptos illos" 1516). Greek aorist. On assumo for tollo, cf. on Iob. 14,3. Manetti put apprebendens eos.
 A similar substitution of abluo, in rendering
 at Mt. 15,2; 27,24 (1519); Lc. 5,2 (1519), comparable with the Vulgate use of abluo to render
 Hebr. 10,22. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains lauo for Noúv at Ioh. 13,10; Act. 9,37; 2 Petr. 2,22; Ap. Ioh. 1,5. At the present passage, the use of abluo takes more account of the following preposition, à ádó. Manetti put lauit a plagis for lauit plagas.
33 plagas $\tau \omega \tilde{\nu} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("plagas eorum" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) The Vulgate addition is a legitimate rendering, though it is not explicitly supported by the Greek text. Manetti omitted eorum.
33 omnes domestici illius ol đủtoũ Távves ("omnis domus eius" late Vg.; "omnes familiares illius" 1516-19). The late Vulgate rendering is supported by $7^{45}$ and five later mss., which substitute ó olkos for oi, probably by harmonisation with vs. 15; cf. also cod. A, which reads of oikiol. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and about 440 other mss., commencing with 7 $^{74}$ ( $\mathbf{~ B}$ ) C D E. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 548-50). See Annot. He elsewhere retains domesticus for oikıakós at Mt. 10,25, 36, and for oikeĩos at Gal. 6,10; Eph. 2,19. The change of pronoun to illius is affected by the consideration that it refers to the same person as ipse. cf. quum esuriset ipse, et qui cum illo erant at Lc. 6,3. Erasmus is not consistent on this point. Manetti put simply omnes sui.

тòv ol̃kov $\alpha u ̛ T o u ̃, ~ т \alpha р \varepsilon ́ \theta \eta к \varepsilon ~ т \rho \propto ́ т т \varepsilon \zeta \alpha ~ \alpha \nu, ~$
 $\tau \tilde{\mu} \theta \in \tilde{\omega}$.
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domum suam, apposuit eis mensam, et exultauit quod cum vniuersa domo sua credidisset deo.
${ }^{35} \mathrm{Et}$ quum dies ortus esset, miserunt magistratus viatores, dicentes: Dimitte homines illos. ${ }^{36}$ Nunciauit autem custos carceris sermones hos Paulo, Miserunt magistratus vt dimittamini. Nunc igitur exeuntes, ite in pace. ${ }^{37}$ Paulus autem dixit eis: Caesos nos publice, indicta causa quum simus Romani, coniecerunt in carcerem, et nunc occulte nos eiiciunt? Non profecto: sed veniant ipsi, ac nos educant. ${ }^{38}$ Nunciauerunt autem magistratibus viatores verba haec. Timueruntque audito quod Romani essent: ${ }^{39}$ et venientes deprecati sunt eos, et eductos rogabant vt egrederentur e ciuitate. ${ }^{40}$ Egressi autem e carcere, introierunt ad Lydiam: et visis fratribus, consolati sunt eos, et profecti sunt.

17 Quum autem iter fecissent per Amphipolim et Apolloniam, venerunt Thessalonicam, vbi erat synagoga Iudaeorum. ${ }^{2}$ Secundum consuetudinem autem suam Paulus introiuit ad eos, et per sabbata tria disserebat eis

34 quod cum vniuersa domo sua $B-E$ : cum vniuersa domo sua quod $A \mid 35$ ortus $B-E$ : factus $A \mid 36$ sermones hos $B-E$ : verba haec $A \mid 37$ Romani $A E$ : Rhomani $B-D \mid$ profecto $C$ - $E$ : certe $A B \mid 38$ Romani $A E$ : Rhomani $B-D \mid 40$ e $B-E: \operatorname{de} A$ 17,2 suam $B-E$ : om. $A$

34 exultauit $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \alpha \lambda 1$ ãтo ("laetatus est" Vg.). Erasmus' use of the more vigorous verb, exulto, is in accordance with Vulgate usage in rendering $\alpha_{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda l^{\alpha} \alpha \omega$ and $\sigma K ı \rho \operatorname{có}_{\alpha} \omega$ elsewhere in the N.T. He reserves laetor for eúppaive at $L c .15,23,24$, 29, 32 (all in 1519), following the example set by the Vulgate at $A c t$. 2,26 etc. See Annot., where Erasmus argues that a stronger rendering is
required at the present passage. This change was anticipated by Manetti.

34 quod ... credidisset $\pi \in \pi เ \sigma T E \cup K \omega ́ s$ ("credens" Vg.; "... quod credidisset" 1516). The main point of this change was to render the Greek perfect participle by a past tense. By adding quod with the subjunctive, Erasmus legitimately
suggests that the Philippian jailer rejoiced over his faith. However, the Greek text would permit the reader to suppose that the jailer was rejoicing, not only over his faith, but also over the fact of his salvation (cf. vs. 31). The different wordorder of the 1516 rendering is dependent on the insertion of a comma after, rather than before, таvoикі.
34 cum vniuersa domo sua таvoккi ("cum omni domo sua" Vg .). For the substitution of vniuersus, see on Act. 1,8.
35 ortus esset $\gamma \varepsilon \nu 0 \mu \dot{q} v \eta$ ("factus esset" 1516 $=V g$.). See on lob. 1,17 . Manetti began this sentence with Die autem facta.
35 viatores toùs papsoúxous ("lictores" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at vs. 38. In Annot., Erasmus argues that both the lictor and the viator could be described as "bearers of rods", but that it was the viator who would be entrusted with conveying the wishes of the magistrate.
36 sermones hos toùs $\lambda$ óyous toútous ("verba haec" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,1.
 runt" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had quod miserunt.
37 indicta causa वंkवтवкрітоus ("indemnatos" Vg.). Erasmus' phrase means "without a hearing", which suits the context but is less accurate than the Vulgate. At Act. 22,25, he retains indemnatus.
 ப́mápXovtas ("homines Romanos" Vg.). Erasmus here treats $\langle v \theta \rho \dot{\omega}$ trous as redundant for the purpose of translation, but at other passages he retains bomo in such contexts: cf. bomo Romanus at Act. 22,25; bomo Cyrenaeus at Mt. 27,32 . The Vulgate leaves the Greek participle untranslated.
37 coniecerunt $\bar{\xi} \beta \alpha \lambda$ 人v ("miserunt" Vg.). See on lob. 3,24.
37 profecto $\gamma$ d́p ("ita" Vg.; "certe" 1516-19). A similar substitution occurs at Lc. 11,51 . Erasmus also follows the Vulgate in using profecto for $\alpha$ áp at $L c .11,20,48$. Sometimes, in rendering vai, he substitutes certe for $i t a$, as at Mt. 11,26; Lc. 12,5 (1519), or for etiam, as at Mt. 11,9; 15,27. Manetti, more literally, substituted enim.
37 veniant ipsi ac è̉ $\lambda$ 日óvtes $\alpha$ đ̉toí ("veniant et ipsi" Vg.). The Greek is ambiguous as to whether
 twoav. Manetti put veniant ipsi et.
 indicated in Annot., the Vulgate's use of eiicio to render both $\dot{k} \kappa \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$ is unacceptable, as the latter verb implies a degree of courtesy. This substitution is consistent with Vulgate usage at vs. 39 . The same change was made by Manetti.
38 viatores of $\dot{\rho} \alpha \beta \delta 0$ ũxol ("lictores" Vg.). See on vs. 35.
38 taũ $\tau \alpha$. This word is omitted by cod. 2815 almost alone among Greek mss. Erasmus or his assistants restored it by reference to codd. 1 and 2816.
39 eductos $̇ \xi \propto \gamma 0 \gamma o ́ v T E 5$ ("educentes" Vg.). Greek aorist.
 Vulgate makes sparing use of vrbs elsewhere in the N.T. At Act. 16,12, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using vrbs for tó $\lambda_{15}$, to avoid repetition of ciuitas from earlier in the same verse.
40 Egressi $\bar{\xi} \xi \in \lambda \theta \dot{\prime} v t e s$ ("Exeuntes" Vg.). Greek aorist.

40 e ék ("de" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$ ). The Vulgate could reflect a Greek variant, a dró, as in codd. К B and a few later mss. However, this is uncertain, as the Vulgate renders ek by $d e$ at many passages.

40 eis. Erasmus derived this from cod. 2815, with support from just a few other late mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and nearly all other mss., the preposition is mpós. In 1527 Annot., Erasmus commented that mpós would be better suited to the context. His poorly attested variant persisted into the Textus Receptus.
17,1 Quum ... iter fecissent per $\Delta 10 \delta \varepsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha v t e s$ ("Cum ... perambulassent" Vg.). This change is in accordance with Vulgate usage at $L c .8,1$, and conveys the root meaning of $\delta 10 \delta \varepsilon v^{\prime} \omega$. At several passages, Erasmus retains perambulo for $\delta_{1 \varepsilon} \rho \times{ }^{\circ}$

 and $\pi \in \zeta$ evi $\omega$, usually following the Vulgate.
2 consuetudinem ... suam tò eilwós ("consuetudinem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus adds the possessive pronoun because it is implied by the accompanying dative case of $\tau \tilde{\mu} \Pi \alpha u ́ \lambda \omega$. See Annot. It is possible that the Vulgate followed a Greek text substituting $\delta$ Пaũ $\lambda$ os for $\tau \tilde{\omega} \Pi \alpha \cup \cup \lambda \omega$, but this is found only in cod. D.

















 ${ }^{7}$ oűs ப́mo

e scripturis，${ }^{3}$ adaperiens et allegans quod Christum oportuisset pati et resurgere a mortuis，et quod hic esset Christus Iesus，quem ego，inquit，an－ nuncio vobis．${ }^{4} \mathrm{Et}$ quidam ex eis crediderunt，et adiuncti sunt Paulo et Silae，et religiosorum Graecorum mul－ titudo magna，mulieresque primariae non paucae．${ }^{5}$ Zelo autem commoti Iudaei increduli，et assumptis quibus－ dam circunforaneis viris malis，ac tur－ ba coacta，concitauerunt ciuitatem，et vrgentes domum Iasonis，quaerebant eos producere ad populum．${ }^{6}$ Et quum non inuenissent eos，trahebant Iaso－ nem et quosdam fratres ad principes ciuitatis，clamantes：Hi qui terrarum orbem conturbarunt，huc quoque vene－ runt，${ }^{7}$ quos clanculum excepit Iason： et hi omnes contra decreta｜Caesaris

3 Christus Iesus $B-E$ ：Iesus Christus $A \mid 4$ Silae $B-E$ ：Sylae $A \mid 5$ increduli $B-E$ ：non credentes $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ ad $B-E$ ：in $A \mid 6$ conturbarunt $B-E$ ：concitarunt $A \mid 7$ clanculum $B-E$ ： om．$A$
$2 e$ ámó（＂de＂Vg．）．The Vulgate rendering could be misunderstood as implying that Paul spoke＂concerning＂the scriptures，whereas his subject was the suffering and resurrection of Christ．See Annot．
3 allegans topariӨ́́nevos（＂insinuans＂Vg．）．As pointed out in Annot．，the Vulgate use of insinuo，with connotations of secrecy and under－ hand conduct，is entirely inappropriate to the context．Manetti put exponens．
3 quod ．．．oportuisset őtı ．．．ह̂סEs（＂quia ．．． oportuit＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti had quod ．．．oportuit．
3 quod ．．．esset ötı ．．．Ẽ̃тtıv（＂quia ．．．est＂Vg．）． See again on Iob．1，20．Manetti had quod ．．．est．
3 Cbristus Iesus ò Xpıotòs ’Inooũs（＂Iesus Christus＂ 1516 Lat．$=$ late Vg．）．The late Vulgate word－order is supported by cod．$E$ and a few later mss．Other variants include $\delta$ Xpiotòs $\delta$ ＇Inooũs（cod．B），and Xpiotòs＇Inooũs（ $\mathrm{F}^{74} \mathrm{~A}$ D）．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．

3 inquit．This word is italicised to show that it is an explanatory addition，marking a shift from indirect to direct speech．See on Ioh．1，20； Act．1，4；and Annot．on the present passage．
4 et religiosorum Graecorum $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu \tau \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \beta \circ \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \nu$ ＂Eス入ウ்vんv（＂et de colentibus gentilibusque＂ Vg．）．On religiosus，see on Act．13，43，and for Graecus，see on Ioh．12，20．See also Annot．The use of religiosus and Graecus here had been recommended by Valla Annot．The Vulgate follows a Greek text adding kai before＇$E \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} v \omega \nu$ ， as in $37^{74}$ A D and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．，this time commencing with codd．＊B E．Manetti＇s version was atque colentium et gentilium．
4 mulieresque $\gamma \cup v \alpha ı \kappa \tilde{\nu} \nu \tau \varepsilon$（＂et mulieres＂Vg．）． See on Iob．1，39．Manetti put ac mulierum．
4 primariae $\tau \omega ̃ \nu \pi \rho \omega ่ \tau \omega \nu$（＂nobiles＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus uses primarius once elsewhere，to render ทुүoúusvos at Act．15，22．His rendering is closer to the Greek text at the present passage．He
removes all instances of nobilis and nobilior from the N．T．，using bonestus for $\varepsilon \cup \sigma \sigma \eta \eta \mu \omega \nu$ at Mc．15，43，genere clarus for $\varepsilon u ̛ \gamma \varepsilon \cup \eta ं S$ at Lc．19，12 （1522），and summo genere natus for ઘủ Yevéotepos at Act．17，11．Manetti，with the same idea，put primariarum．
 tes＇louסoĩol，kai mpor $\lambda \alpha \beta$ ónevol（＂Zelantes autem Iudaei，assumentesque＂Vg．；＂Zelo autem commoti Iudaei non credentes，et assumptis＂ 1516）．Greek aorist．On the substitution of zelus，see on Act．5，17．In 1516 Annot．，Erasmus cites this Greek text as if it were found in more than one of his mss．（＂Graeci ．．．addunt＂）， though this word－order is supported only by cod． $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ ．What he found in his cod．2815＊
 $\theta$ Oũvtes（omitting $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha \cup \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ ），which has the support of most other late mss．，including his codd．1，2816＊（though cod． 1 omits oi before áretiӨ Oũvtes）．In the margin of cod． 2815，Erasmus wrote several words which are now only partly legible owing to later cropping of the pages when the volume was rebound： his note seems to have read

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[\zeta \eta \lambda] \text { ]ovo } \alpha v} \\
& {[\tau \varepsilon s} \\
& \text { ol I I]ou } \\
& {[\delta \propto 101] \text { kal }} \\
& {[\alpha \pi \varepsilon 1 \theta \circ] \cup v T \varepsilon S}
\end{aligned}
$$

with a mark in the text to indicate that these words should be inserted before $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \beta$ ó－ $\mu \varepsilon v \circ 1$ ，omitting the five words which followed． The word－order of this marginal note does not correspond with Erasmus＇published text，but is nearer to the wording of cod． 69 ，which reads
 （omitting каi тробл $\quad$ Ко́ $\mu \varepsilon v o i$ ）．However，Eras－ mus＇misspelling，$\zeta \eta \lambda$ оú $\sigma \alpha \nu t e s$ for $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma थ \tau \varepsilon s$ ， and addition of кaí before ámeiӨоũvtes，tend to throw doubt on the supposition that he was intending to copy cod． 69 at this point， and his note looks more like a conjectural reconstruction of the text．For comparison，the reading of $33^{74} \leqslant A B$ and some later mss．was $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha v t e s$ סè ol＇louסaĩol，kà mpoonaßó－ $\mu \varepsilon v o l$. Erasmus＇published wording offered a poorly attested variant，which remained in the Textus Receptus．Manetti put Zelantes autem Iudei increduli et ．．．assumentes．
5 quibusdam circunforaneis viris malis $\mathbf{T} \tilde{\nu}{ }^{\circ}$ óyo－ paímv tivàs ã̛ $\delta \delta$ pas movnpoús（＂de vulgo viros quosdam malos＂Vg．）．It is questionable whether Erasmus＇choice of circunforaneus is quite appropriate，as it refers to those who
itinerate from one market to another，whereas ó $\gamma$ opoĩol has a more pejorative sense，denoting those who merely loiter in the market place． Cf．Annot．The version of Manetti had malignos quosdam viros de foro．
5 ac каí（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
5 turba coacta óx入оттоท́ণ๙vtes（＂turba facta＂ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，15，for Erasmus＇avoidance of facio．
5 vrgentes domum घ̇miatávtes ．．．Tท̃ oikiọ （＂assistentes domui＂Vg．）．Erasmus rejected assisto because it could imply that the crowd helped or protected the house，whereas the context requires a verb meaning to attack or to throng： cf．Annot．For another instance where he regar－ ded assisto as inappropriate，see on Act．27，24． However，Erasmus retains assisto in the more literal sense of＂stand before＂at Iac．5，9，and substitutes it for sto at Lc． 10,40 （1519）．
5 ad Eis（＂in＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．At Act．23，15，in a similar context，the Greek has к $\alpha$ тó $\gamma \omega \pi$ mós， rendered as produco ad in both the Vulgate and Erasmus，and they both use the same phrase for $\pi \rho \circ \alpha \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega \epsilon^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ at Act． 25,26 ．
6 clamantes $\beta \mathbf{0}$ 上̃tes ötı（＂clamantes，Quo－ niam＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti had clamantes quod．
6 terrarum orbem tì̀ oikounéṽŋ（＂vrbem＂ late Vg．）．The late Vulgate reading represents a scribal corruption from orbem to vrbem within the Latin tradition．Erasmus also adds terrarum， in conformity with Vulgate usage at several other passages，to prevent such an alteration re－ curring．：see Annot．He makes a similar addition at Lc．21，26；Act．17，31；Ap．Ioh．12，9．Manetti put orbem terrarum．
6 conturbarunt ảvaбotat由́ $\sigma \alpha v \tau e s$（＂concitant＂ Vg．；＂concitarunt＂1516）．Greek aorist．Since the Greek verb is different from that which was rendered by concito in vs． 5 （ Oopußé $\omega$ ），a different rendering is now required，as duly supplied by Erasmus．However，he retains tumultum concito for ávaotarów at Act．21，38．At Gal．5，12，he replaces conturbo by labefacto，perhaps to avoid the repetition of conturbo from Gal．5，10．See Annot．on the present passage，where he also recommends commoueo．
6 buc quoque кad évӨáde（＂et huc＂Vg．）．See on Iob．5，27．Manetti had just buc，omitting et．
 ＂excepit＂1516）．Erasmus also uses excipio for suscipio at Iac．2，25，in accordance with Vulgate
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faciunt, regem alium dicentes esse Iesum. ${ }^{8}$ Concitauerunt autem turbam, et magistratus ciuitatis audientes haec. ${ }^{9}$ Et accepta satisfactione ab lasone et a caeteris, dimiserunt eos.
${ }^{10}$ Fratres vero confestim per noctem emiserunt Paulum, simul et Silam in Berrhoeam. Qui quum aduenissent, abierunt in synagogam Iudaeorum. ${ }^{11} \mathrm{Hi}$ autem erant summo genere nati inter eos qui erant Thessalonicae, qui receperant sermonem cum omni animi promptitudine, quotidie scrutantes scripturas, an haec ita se haberent. ${ }^{12}$ Et multi quidem crediderunt ex eis, et Graecae mulieres honestae, et viri non pauci. ${ }^{13}$ Quum autem cognouissent Thessalonicenses Iudaei, quod et Berrhoeae annunciatus esset a Paulo sermo dei, venerunt, et illic quoque commouebant turbas. ${ }^{14}$ Statimque tunc

9 ab $B-E$ : a $A \quad 10$ emiserunt $B-E$ : dimiserunt $A^{*}$, demiserunt $A^{c} \mid$ Paulum, simul $C-E$ : et Paulum $A$, Paulumque $B \mid \operatorname{Silam} B-E$ : Sylam $A \mid$ Berrhoeam $B-E$ : Beroeam $A \mid 11$ receperant sermonem $B-E$ : susceperant verbum $A \mid$ quotidie $B-E$ : cotidie $A \mid 13$ Berrhoeae $B-E$ : Beroeae $A$ | annunciatus ... sermo $B-E$ : annunciatum ... verbum $A$ | quoque commouebant $C-E$ : commouentes $A B$
usage at Lc. 10,38; 19,6. However, he did not add clanculum at those passages, in spite of Annot. on the present verse, where he argues that the prefix ÚTo'- should be rendered by clanculum or furtim. For his use of clanculum to render $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \alpha$, see on $I o h .11,28$. Erasmus further substitutes excipio in rendering $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} v \omega$ at
 at Mt. 10,14, and ávo $\delta \delta \dot{\chi} \chi \bigcirc \mu \alpha 1$ at Act. 28,7.
8 turbam tòv öx $10 v$ ("plebem" Vg.). See on Act. 16,22. Manetti made the same change.
8 magistratus ciuitatis toùs mo入ıтóp $x^{\alpha}$ ("principes ciuitatis" Vg.). Erasmus retained principes ciuitatis in rendering the same Greek word at vs. 6 , giving the impression that the change in vs. 8 was simply for stylistic variety. It would have been more consistent and accurate if he had also made this substitution in vs. 6.
$9 a b$ таро́ ("a" $1516=$ late Vg.). The usual rule is that the form $a b$ is used before vowels and $b$. The late Vulgate here treated the $I$ - of Iasone as a quasi-consonant.
9 a cateris т $\omega ข ~ \lambda o ı \pi \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("caeteris" Vg. 1527). Erasmus' rendering follows the earlier Vulgate in adding a second preposition, as also found in Manetti.
 Lat. text = Vg.; "demiserunt" 1516 errata). In view of Erasmus' note, recommending emiserunt, the change to demiserunt in the 1516 errata looks like a mistake: demitto would have been more appropriate for letting something down from a height, rather than for sending someone to another town. On emitto, see on Act. 9,30; 11,13. Manetti substituted miserunt.

10 Paulum, simul et tóv тє Пaũ入ov kaí ("Paulum et" Vg.; "et Paulum et" 1516; "Paulumque et" 1519). See on Act. 1,1, and Annot.
10 Berrhoeam Béppoıav ("Beroam" late Vg.; "Beroeam" 1516). Erasmus took the spelling ßéppoiav from cod. $2815^{\text {vid }}$, supported by cod. 2816 and many other late mss. In 1535 Annot., however, he cites the variations Bépoorv and Bepó $\eta$ v from the Пepi Пó $\lambda \varepsilon \omega \nu$ of Stephanus of Byzantium. Most N.T. mss. have $\beta$ Époiov, as in cod. 1.
10 aduenissent $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \nu \delta \rho^{\mu} \varepsilon \mathcal{L O}$ ("venissent" late Vg.). See on Act. 10,33, and Annot. By using aduenio, Erasmus here restores the earlier Vulgate rendering.
10 abierunt in synagogam Iudaeorum eis tivv $\sigma u v \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ ám synagogam Iudaeorum introierunt" Vg.). The late Vulgate punctuates with a comma after Iudaeorum, partly reflecting a Greek text having
 as found in $37^{74} \times \mathrm{ABD}$ and a few later mss., though introierunt corresponds more closely with $\varepsilon$ ionnt $\varepsilon \sigma \alpha$, as in cod. E. The text of Erasmus follows cod. $2815^{\text {vid }}$, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot.
 Vg.). For other instances of the removal of nobilis, see on Act. 17,4. In Annot., Erasmus partly followed Valla Annot. in arguing that the comparative adjective should be interpreted as a superlative, but see the next note.
11 inter eos qui erant $\boldsymbol{\tau} \tilde{\nu} \nu$ ("eorum qui sunt" Vg.). In 1527 Annot., Erasmus recognises that neither his rendering nor that of the Vulgate is correct, but that the sense was "more nobleminded than the Thessalonians", generosiores Thessalonicensibus. Manetti substituted eis qui existebant.
 ceperant" 1516). This substitution occurs at Mt. 18,5; Mc. 9,37; Lc. 9,48 (1519); Iac. 1,21. Erasmus retains suscipio for סéxoual at Lc. 8,13; $10,8,10 ;$ Act. 7,59, and puts suscipio for excipio at Gal. 4,14 . See on vs. 7, above. On the substitution of accipio for suscipio, see on Act. 3,21.
11 sermonem tòv $\lambda o ́ y o v$ ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
11 animi promptitudine троӨupias ("auiditate" Vg.). Erasmus also uses this phrase to render mpoourio at 2 Cor. 8,12, 19;9,2. At these other
passages, the Vulgate used prompta voluntas, destinata voluntas, and promptus animus. At 2 Cor. 8,11, Erasmus substitutes voluntas prompta for promptus animus voluntatis in rendering $\dot{\eta}$
 ent passage, he also recommends libenter and propensis animis. The problem with auiditas, as used by the Vulgate, was that in classical Latin it was frequently found in a pejorative sense. For the same reason, Erasmus thought it a suitable word to render $\pi \lambda \varepsilon o v \varepsilon \xi i \alpha$ at $E p h .4,19$ (1519). Manetti partly anticipated Erasmus' rendering, and put promptitudine without animi.
11 an $\varepsilon i$ ("si" Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,25, and Annot.
11 ËXEI. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}$ and some later mss., including cod. 1. In cod. 2816 and most other mss., it is ${ }^{2} \times \mathrm{X}$.
12 Graecae mulieres bonestae $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$ ' $E \lambda \lambda \eta v i \delta \omega \nu$
 tilium honestarum" late Vg.). In classical Latin it was common to avoid a sequence of genitive plurals. On Graecus for gentilis, see on Iob. 12,40, and Annot.
 Thessalonica" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,45, and Annot. The version of Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) had de Thessalonica.
13 quod ... annunciatus esset ... sermo óti ... кат $\eta \gamma$ Yモ́ $\lambda \eta$... ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ ("quia ... praedicatum est ... verbum" Vg.; "quod ... annunciatum esset ... verbum" 1516). For the removal of quia, see on Ioh. 1,20; on annuncio, see on Act. 13,5; and for sermo, see on Ioh. 1,1. Manetti put quod ... predicatum fuerat ... verbum.
13 Berrboeae èv Tทุ̃ Beppoiơ ("Beroae" late Vg.; "Beroeae" 1516). In cod. 2815, the text is $\varepsilon v$ $\beta$ Eppoiá, omitting $7 \tilde{n}$. This omission is virtually unsupported among the remaining mss. Erasmus or his assistants restored $T$ ñ after consultation of codd. 1 and 2816, which both have the article, though cod. 1 has the spelling Bepoiof, as in most other mss. See on vs. 10.
13 et illic quoque кảkeĩ ("et illuc" Vg.; "et illic" 1516-19). The Vulgate takes the adverb with ก $\lambda \theta 0 v$ ("came thither"), while Erasmus punctuates before kákeĩ and associates it with the following verb. Manetti put illic venerunt, omitting $e t$.
13 commouebant turbas $\sigma \alpha \lambda$ ev́ovtes toùs ốx $\lambda$ ous ("commouentes et turbantes multitudinem" Vg.; "commouentes turbas" 1516-19). The


















Paulum emiserunt fratres, vt iret velut ad mare. Silas autem et Timotheus remanserunt ibi. ${ }^{15}$ Porro qui prosequebantur Paulum, deduxerunt eum Athenas vsque: et accepto mandato ad Silam ac Timotheum, vt quam celerrime venirent ad se, profecti sunt.
${ }^{16}$ Paulus autem quum Athenis eos expectaret, incandescebat spiritus eius in ipso, quum videret simulachrorum cultui deditam ciuitatem. ${ }^{17}$ Disputabat igitur in synagoga cum Iudaeis et religiosis, et in foro quotidie cum iis qui ipsum forte adissent. ${ }^{18}$ Quidam autem Epicurei et Stoici philosophi conflictabantur cum eo, et quidam dicebant: Quid vult

14 velut $B-E$ : vsque $A \mid$ Silas $B-E$ : Sylas $A \mid 15$ Porro qui prosequebantur $B-E$ : Qui autem deducebant $A \mid$ Athenas vsque $B-E$ : vsque ad Athenas $A \mid$ mandato $B$ - $E$ : mandato ab eo $A \mid$ Silam ac $B$ - $E$ : Sylam et $A \mid 16$ simulachrorum cultui $E$ : idololatriae $A$, simulacrorum cultui $B-D \mid 17$ quotidie cum iis $B-E$ : cotidie ad $\cos A \mid$ ipsum forte adissent $C-E$ : aderant $A$, se forte adissent $B$

Vulgate follows a different Greek text, add-
 $3^{74} \times \mathrm{A} B(\mathrm{D})$ and a hundred later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, $2816^{*}$ and more than 360 other mss., commencing with ${ }^{95} \mathrm{E}$ (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 553-4). In Annot., he cites kai тapáбoovtes from cod. $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$, but rejects it as an explanatory addition. On turba for multitudo, see on Ioh. 6,2. Erasmus is more correct in rendering the plural form of the noun. Manetti's version was turbas commouentes.
14 emiserunt $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \propto \pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \varepsilon 1 \lambda \propto v$ ("dimiserunt" Vg.). See on Act. 9,30.
14 velut $\omega$ ("vsque" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). As pointed out in Annot., the Vulgate reflects a Greek
 later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by most other late mss., including cod. 1 . The word is simply omitted by cod. 2816, as in cod. D and a few later mss., together with the version of Manetti.
15 Porro qui of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("Qui autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 8,16. Manetti put Qui vero.

15 prosequebantur каӨıттడ̃vtes ("deducebant" $1516=$ Vg.). This change appears to be mainly for the sake of variety, to avoid having two compound verbs derived from duco in the same sentence. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains deduco for
 $\delta \delta \eta \gamma^{\varepsilon} \omega$, and $\chi^{\varepsilon 1} \rho \propto \gamma \omega \gamma^{\varepsilon} \omega$. On prosequor, see Valla Elegantiae V, 32; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 300, 1l. 562-565. Manetti had ducebant.

15 deduxerunt ${ }^{\eta} \gamma \propto \gamma \bigcirc 0$ ("perduxerunt" Vg.). Erasmus retains perduco in rendering this Greek verb at Act. 11,$26 ; 23,18$, and also occasionally for ávó $\gamma \omega$, $\delta \iota \alpha \sigma \omega \zeta \omega$, and mapaүivouaı. On deduco, see the previous note.

15 Athenas vsque ż $\omega$ s A $\theta \eta v \omega ̃ v$ ("vsque Athenis" late Vg.; "vsque ad Athenas" 1516). This changed position of vsque may be compared with Erasmus' use of in exteras vsque ciuitates at Act. 26,11 (1519), and also such phrases as ad hoc vsque tempus, ad eum vsque diem, ad bunc vsque diem, etc. Manetti put vsque Athenas, as in the earlier Vulgate.

15 mandato évto 1 ற̣́v ("mandato ab eo" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus suggests in Annot., that the added words of the Vulgate are an explanatory addition. There is no ms. support for $a b e o$, apart from the somewhat different reading of cod. D, mapò Maújou. Manetti also omitted $a b$ eo.
15 ac kal ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
15 celerrime $\tau \alpha ́ x$ lota ("celeriter" Vg.). As stated in 1535 Annot., the superlative is more accurate and more "Latin". In earlier editions of Annot., more provocatively, Erasmus had referred to the Vulgate use of quam celeriter as a barbarous form of speech ("Vsque adeo ne placet barbare loqui ..."). He therefore included this passage among the Soloecismi. For his reply to Lee and Stunica's defence of the Vulgate rendering, see Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 209 E; Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 E. The same change had been proposed by Valla Annot. and Manetti.

15 se aủtóv ("illum" Vg.). Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun to refer back to the giver of the command, i.e. Paul. In Manetti's version, the phrase ad illum was omitted.
16 incandescebat т $\quad \alpha \rho \omega \xi$ úveтo ("incitabatur" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus recommends irrito, a word which he retains from the Vulgate in rendering the same Greek verb at 1 Cor. 13,5. The choice of incandesco is more vivid, though it does not seem to occur in classical Latin in this metaphorical sense. Possibly Erasmus wished to avoid any confusion arising from the resemblance of incito and irrito.
16 quum videret $\theta \in \omega \rho 0 u ̃ v \tau 1$ ("videns" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects that the Greek means videnti, agreeing with $\propto^{\prime} T \uparrow \tilde{\sim}$ rather than $\pi v E \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$, and suggests that the Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant, $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \tilde{\omega} v$. The latter reading is unsupported by mss., though another variant, $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho o u ̃ v r o s$, is found in $\times$ A B E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put considerante, agreeing with ipso.
16 simulachrorum cultui deditam kळтei $\delta \omega \lambda$ ov oṽoav ("idololatriae deditam" $1516=$ late Vg., and Annot., lemma). In the 1527 Vulgate column, as also in the Froben Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514, the reading is idolatriae deditam, as found in earlier Vulgate mss. Erasmus similarly avoids the use of idolon, idolium, idolotbytum,
idolatra, and idololatria at many other passages, but retains idololatrus at Ap. Ioh. 21,8, and idolon at $A p$. Ioh. 22,15. He regarded such expressions as being alien to classical Latin, as they were hardly changed from their original Greek form. Manetti had idolatriae deditam, as in the earlier Vulgate.
17 religiosis toĩs $\sigma \in \beta$ ouévoıs ("colentibus" Vg.). See on Act. 13,43, and Annot.
 dies" Vg.). A comparable substitution occurs at Act. 5,42: see ad loc. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
17 cum iis тро̀s toús ("ad eos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' preference here for the preposition cum after disputo is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 6,9; 24,12. Cf. also on Act. 9,29. Manetti's version substituted cum quibuscunque for ad eos qui aderant.
17 ipsum forte adissent $\pi \alpha p \alpha т \cup \gamma \chi$ 人́vovtas ("audierant" late Vg.; "aderant" $1516=$ Vg. mss.; "se forte adissent" 1519). Erasmus conveys the sense of the Greek verb more precisely, while mentioning in Annot. the scribal corruption which was evident in the late Vulgate reading.
18 ס́́ (1st.). The Erasmian text here follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by cod. E and many later mss. In codd. 2815 and 2816 is found $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ koí, as in $\mathbf{7 月}^{74} \aleph$ A B D and most later mss. However, in both codd. 2815 and 2816, к $\alpha$ í is represented by a compendium, which could have been overlooked by the compositors who worked on the 1516 edition: this feature of the mss. may have given rise to a similar omission at Act. 10,39.
18 conflictabantur $\sigma v^{\prime} \epsilon \beta \alpha \lambda$ ov ("disserebant" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus interprets $\sigma u \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ in terms of verbal combat. However, he retains confero for this Greek verb at Act. 4,15, and conuenio at Act. 20,14. The reading $\sigma u v \in \beta \alpha \lambda o v$, aorist tense, conflicts with the imperfect tense of his Latin rendering, and may have arisen from a printing error, although it happens to be the reading of his cod. 2816 and some other late mss. His codd. 1 and 2815 had $\sigma u v \varepsilon \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda o v$, imperfect tense, as found in $7^{74}$ NA B E and most later mss. See also on Act. 4,15, where a similar change occurs. Manetti put conferebant.

18 Ө́́ $\lambda$ eı. Erasmus here deserts all his mss. for a reading which is supported by only a few late mss. Another poorly attested reading was found in his cod. 2816, $0 \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta$, as in cod. $\mathrm{D}^{*}$ and a few
ó бтєр
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spermologus hic dicere? Alii vero: Nouorum, inquiebant, daemoniorum videtur annunciator esse - quod Iesum et resurrectionem annunciaret eis. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{Et}$ apprehensum eum ad Martium vicum duxerunt, dicentes: Possumus|ne scire, quae sit ista noua quae a te refertur, doctrina? ${ }^{20}$ Noua enim quaedam ingeris auribus nostris. Volumus ergo scire, quidnam velint haec esse. ${ }^{21}$ Athenienses autem omnes, et qui illic versabantur hospites, ad nihil aliud vacabant, nisi ad dicendum aut audiendum aliquid noui. ${ }^{22}$ Stans autem Paulus in medio Martii vici, ait: Viri Athenienses, per omnia fere superstitiosiores vos video. ${ }^{23}$ Praeteriens enim et contemplans culturas vestras, inueni et aram in qua inscriptum erat: Ignoto deo. Quem ergo ignorantes colitis, hunc ego annuncio vobis. ${ }^{24}$ Deus qui fecit mundum et omnia quae in eo sunt: hic coeli et terrae quum sit dominus, non in manufactis templis habitat, ${ }^{25}$ nec manibus humanis colitur, indigens aliquo, quum ipse det omnibus vitam et halitum per omnia: ${ }^{26}$ fecitque ex vno

24 кuplos $B$-E: о кuplos $A$
18 spermologus $B-E$ : verbisator $A \mid$ inquiebant $B-E$ (ital):om. $A \mid 19$ ista $B-E$ : haec $A \mid$ refertur $B-E: \operatorname{dicitur} A \mid 20$ ingeris $B-E:$ infers $A \mid 21$ alt. ad $B-E:$ aut $A \mid 23$ contemplans culturas vestras $B$ - $E$ : videns simulacra vestra $A$
later mss. In codd. 1, 2815 and most other mss., it is $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \mathrm{\lambda ot}$, an optative. Cf. vs. 11, where Erasmus adopts ÉXel from cod. 2815, rather than the better supported éxol.

18 spermologus ò oтєр $\quad$ одóyos ("seminiuerbius" Vg.; "verbisator" 1516). None of these expressions, including that which Erasmus preferred, occurs in classical Latin usage. He seems to have decided that a straightforward transliteration of the Greek word was better than coining a completely new word which would obscure the meaning even further. In Annot., Erasmus also records a Vulgate variant,
seminator verborum. Manetti proposed verborum seminator.
18 inquiebant (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,20 and Act. 1,4, for such explanatory additions.
 ("quia ... annunciabat" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20.
18 eis oủtoĩs. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 in adding this pronoun before eủๆ $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda$ i $\zeta$ EтO, with only a few other late mss. in support. Many
 codd. 1 and $2816^{\text {corr }}$, supported by $37^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \mathrm{N}^{\text {corr }}$ A E, while many others altogether omit the
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pronoun, as in $\aleph^{*}$ B and cod. 2816*. Manetti omitted eis.

19 Martium vicum tòv "Apєıv mó́yov ("Ariopagum" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs in vs. 22. See Annot.
19 Possumusne $\Delta u v \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ ("Possumus" Vg.). On -ne, se on Ioh. 18,39.

19 sit ("est" Vg.). As elsewhere, Erasmus prefers the subjunctive for an indirect question.
19 ista $\alpha U ̈ T \eta$ ("haec" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The use of ista is appropriate here, in the sense of "this thing of which you have just been speaking": see on Iob. 2,18.
19 refertur $\lambda \alpha \lambda$ очц́́vך ("dicitur" $1516=V g$.). Erasmus probably thought that dico doctrinam, to "say a doctrine", was awkwardly expressed, and so changed the verb.
20 ingeris عí $\varnothing$ ¢́pets ("infers" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In other contexts, Erasmus retains infero at Lc. 5,18-19; 1 Tim. 6,7; Hebr. 13,11. Other compounds of gero which he uses are congero (see on Ioh. 18,18), regero, and suggero. The change of verb was perhaps for the sake of variety, in view of Erasmus' use of another compound of fero in the previous sentence.
 nae" Vg.). Erasmus retains aduena for this Greek verb at Act. 2,10. At the present passage he prefers to expand the meaning: see Annot. On versor, see on Ioh. 7,1.
21 nisi $\eta$ ("nisi aut" $1516=V g$.). The Vulgate, in effect, translates ${ }_{\eta}^{\eta}$ twice over. Cf. Annot. The version of Manetti put quam.
21 ad dicendum aut audiendum $\lambda \varepsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \in \stackrel{. .}{ } \mathrm{kai}$ ákoúعıv ("dicere aut audire" Vg.; "dicendum aut audiendum" 1516, omitting "ad"). See on Iob. 1,33, for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive. See also Annot., citing Valla as the source of this revised rendering, though Valla Annot. had inserted ad before audiendum. Manetti had vt dicerent vel audirent.
22 Martii vici toũ "Aptiou mó́you ("Ariopagi" Vg.). See on vs. 19.
22 fere $\omega$ ("quasi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,39, and Annot.
 stitiosos" late Vg.). Erasmus' use of the comparative adjective is more accurate here: see Annot., and also Valla Annot., where the same rendering was proposed.

23 contemplans ${ }^{2} v a \theta \varepsilon \omega p \tilde{v} \nu$ ("videns" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Erasmus finds a more precise word than the ubiquitous video of the Vulgate. From Annot., it is seen that he borrowed this rendering from Jerome's commentary on the Epistle to Titus. In rendering the same Greek verb at Hebr. 13,7, he substitutes considero for intueor.
23 culturas vestras $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \propto \tau \alpha$ Ú $\mu \tilde{\nu} \nu$ ("simulacra vestra" 1516 = Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus distinguishes $\sigma \dot{\beta} \beta \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ from $\varepsilon$ ह̂́ $\delta \omega \lambda \frac{0}{}$, as including all objects of veneration and not just "idols". His choice of cultura is again partly based on Jerome (see the previous note), though the word rarely has this sense in classical Latin. Valla Annot. had suggested not only culturas, but also cultus and delubra as possible renderings of this Greek word.
 erat" Vg.). The only ms. supporting the Vulgate

23 Quem ... bunc öv ... тои̃тov ("Quod ... hoc" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text, having $\bar{\circ}$... тои̃to, as in $\mathbf{\# 月 n}^{74} \mathrm{~K}^{*} \mathrm{~A}^{*}$ B D and three later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. $\boldsymbol{X}^{\text {corr }} A^{\text {corr }} E$ and more than 450 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 554-8). See Annot. The version of Manetti also made this change.
23 ะย̉ $\sigma \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon i ̃ t \varepsilon$. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and $2816^{\text {corrt }}$, supported by virtually all other mss. (cod. $2816^{* v i d}$ had $\varepsilon \cup \cup \sigma \varepsilon \beta \tilde{\eta} T \varepsilon$ ). In cod. 2815* is found трогкиVEĩte, in company with only one other late ms. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 557). Erasmus struck a line through троокиVEĩte in cod. 2815, and entered the correct reading in the margin of the ms., though only the first four letters of $\varepsilon \cup \cup \sigma \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon i T \varepsilon$ are now visible, owing to later trimming of the margins (the reading evoeeite attributed to cod. $2815^{\text {corr }}$ in Aland is based on a misunderstanding of Erasmus' correction).
24 кúplos. In 1516, the reading ó kúpios is without ms. support, and may have resulted from an arbitrary conjecture.
25 balitum $\pi v \circ \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu(" i n s p i r a t i o n e m " V g$.). See Annot. The word inspiratio does not exist in classical Latin.
25 per omnia кarà mávта ("et omnia" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having kai тג̀ móvita, as in $39^{74 v i d}{ }^{\text {corr }}$ A B D and a few later mss., or koi $\pi \alpha \dot{d} \tau \alpha$ as in codd. $\boldsymbol{N}^{*} \mathrm{E}$. The text













 tò $\theta$ हiov elval öpolov. ${ }^{30}$ toùs $\mu$ èv oũv xpóvous Tท̃s ỏ $\gamma v o i ́ \alpha s$ útreploìv




sanguine omne genus hominum, vt inhabitaret super vniuersam faciem terrae: praefiniitque praestituta tempora, praefixitque terminos habitationis eorum, ${ }^{27}$ vt quaererent deum, si forte palpent eum et inueniant, quamuis non longe absit ab vnoquoque nostrum. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{Per}$ ipsum enim viuimus et mouemur et sumus, sicut et quidam vestratium poetarum dixerunt: Nam huius progenies etiam sumus. ${ }^{29}$ Genus ergo quum simus dei, non debemus existimare auro aut argento, aut lapidi arte sculpto, et inuento hominis, numen esse simile. ${ }^{30} \mathrm{Et}$ tempora quidem huius ignorantiae quum hactenus dissimularit deus, nunc annunciat hominibus, vt omnes vbique resipiscant: ${ }^{31}$ eo quod statuit diem in quo iudicaturus est orbem terrarum cum iustitia,

## 

26 praefiniitque ... terminos $B$-E: definitis prastitutis temporibus et praefixis terminis $A$ | 27 palpent $B$-E: palpentur $A \mid$ et $B$-E: aut $A \mid$ absit $B$-E: sit $A \mid 28$ Per ipsum $B$-E: In ipso $A \mid$ Nam huius progenies etiam $B-E:$ Huius enim et genus $A \mid \mathbf{3 0}$ hactenus dissimularit $B$-E: dissimulasset $A \mid 31$ cum $B-E:$ in $A$
of Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
26 sanguine ainctos (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{74}$ N A B and eighteen later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. DE and 450 of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 558-9). In Annot,, Erasmus appears ambivalent as to which reading is correct. Manetti also added sanguine.
26 vt inbabitaret katoוккĩv ("inhabitare" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33. See also Annot., where Erasmus recommends using the gerundive, ad inbabitandum. Valla Annot. had similarly proposed ad inbabitandam. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus, but placed $v t$ after sanguine.
26 praefinititque praestituta tempora ópioas $\pi \rho 0-$ тетهү $\mu$ évous kolpoús ("definiens statuta tempora" Vg.; "definitis praestitutis temporibus"
1516). Greek aorist. Erasmus retains definio for dpíc $\omega$ at Lc. 22,22; Act. 2,23, while using praefinio for троopiל, at Rom. 8,29 (1519); 1 Cor. 2,7, and for ópí̧ $\omega$ at Hebr. 4,7. He does not elsewhere use the verb praestituo. In the 1516 Greek text, he had тробтетаү ${ }^{2} \dot{\nu}$ vous, following cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and nearly all other mss., but in the 1516 errata this was changed to тротетor $\mu$ évous, as found in cod. D* and only a few later mss., and as found in his Annot. from 1516 onwards: it is not clear whether he knew of ms. authority for this spelling. The form $\pi \rho o \sigma_{\alpha} \sigma \sigma-$ does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. This poorly supported variant remained in the Textus Receptus.

26 praefixitque terminos kai tàs ópo日erías ("et terminos" Vg.; "et praefixis terminis" 1516). Erasmus here provides an expanded rendering of the Greek wording: see Annot. The version of Manetti was terminorum positionem.

27 vt quaererent 丂ทTEiv ("quaerere" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33 . Manetti also had this change.
27 deum Tòv KÚpov. Erasmus keeps the Vulgate rendering, which is based on a different Greek
 and some later mss., including cod. 2816. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including cod. 1. Manetti put dominum.
27 palpent $\psi \eta \lambda \alpha \propto \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon v$ ("attrectent" late Vg .; "attractent" Annot., lemma = Vg. mss.; "palpentur" 1516). This incorrect form of the optative seems to be derived from cod. 1, with support from codd. $\mathbf{\aleph ( E )}$ and a few later mss. In cod. 2815 , it is $\psi \eta \lambda \alpha \varphi \eta \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha v$, as in $\left(\mathbf{7}^{74}\right) \mathrm{A}(\mathrm{B})$ and most of the later mss., including cod. 2816. The verb palpo is in accordance with Vulgate usage at $L c .24,39$, though at that passage Erasmus in 1519 substitutes contrecto, as found in the Vulgate at 1 Iob. 1,1 , in rendering the same Greek verb. In classical usage, attrecto tends to have pejorative connotations, implying that something is handled in a violent or a profane way. Nor is Erasmus' alternative, palpo, entirely suitable: in Annot., he follows patristic usage in applying this Latin verb to the motion of a blind man's hand, but in classical authors, it means to stroke or to caress. Manetti anticipated this change.
27 et kai ("aut" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text substituting $\eta$, as in $7^{374} \mathrm{~A}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., this time commencing with codd. K B E.
27 gvós. This word was omitted in cod. 2815, but was restored by Erasmus or his assistants from codd. 1 and 2816, with support from virtually all other mss.
27 absit ن́mápXovto ("sit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 21,8.
28 Per ipsum $\mathfrak{E v}$ aủtẹ ("In ipso" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 3,21.
28 vestratium kat' $\mathbf{~ U} \mu a ̃ s$ ("vestrorum" late Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 18,15 . See Annot. The word does not appear to have the same classical pedigree as nostras, -atis.
28 Nam buius progenies etiam Toũ $\gamma$ д̀p кal $\gamma$ ₹Evos ("Ipsius enim et genus" Vg.; "Huius enim et genus" 1516). In 1519 Annot., Erasmus mentions mss. which mistakenly substitute toútou for toũ. The reading of cod. 3 , however, was
toúthv yàp yévos. On nam for enim, see on Ioh. 3,34. In Annot., Erasmus explains that he has re-worded this quotation so that it can be metrically scanned as part of a line of verse (i.e. dactylic hexameter). Elsewhere, he uses progenies for $\gamma \in \nu \cup \eta \mu \alpha$, in conformity with Vulgate usage at $M t .3,7 ; 12,34$. Manetti put Ipsius enim genus.
29 existimare vouísevv ("aestimare" Vg.). See on Act. 2,15. In Annot., Erasmus also suggested putare, which was the rendering which had been adopted by Manetti.
29 aut (1st.) ${ }^{\text {n ( }}$ ("t" Vg. 1527). Erasmus' rendering is more accurate, following the earlier Vulgate. Manetti likewise had aut.
 artis" Vg.). From Annot, it appears that Erasmus wishes to avoid the ambiguity of sculpturae, to prevent this from being misunderstood as a genitive. However, his rendering still leaves it unclear whether arte sculpto applies solely to lapidi or to auro and argento as well.
29 inuento évӨuuñ $\sigma \varepsilon \omega s$ ("cogitationis" Vg.). This change introduces a further ambiguity. Probably Erasmus intended the noun inuento to be understood as an ablative, parallel with arte, but it could also be taken as a dative, creating a fourth category in addition to the auro, argento, and lapidi.
29 numen tò $\theta$ вiov ("diuinum" Vg.). Erasmus perhaps disliked the use of diuinum as a noun rather than an adjective, and finds a word which more aptly expresses the sense of the divine majesty or the divine nature. At 2 Thess. 2,4 , he uses numen to render $\sigma \varepsilon \beta \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$.
30 quum bactenus dissimularit Úтєрıठ́心v ("despiciens" Vg.; "cum dissimulasset" 1516). This use of dissimulo is more accurate, though it also has unwanted connotations of pretence and concealment. Erasmus' addition of bactenus is not explicitly warranted by the Greek text. See Annot. For his defence of dissimulo against objections by Stunica, see his Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 156, 11. 871-882.
30 resipisant $\mu \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ таvoeiv ("paenitentiam agant" Vg.). See on Act. 2,38.
31 orbem terrarum $\operatorname{t\eta ̀} v$ oikounév $\eta$ ("orbem" Vg.). See on vs. 6. Manetti put orbem terrae.
 Vg.; "in iusticia" 1516). A similar substitution occurs at Rom. 9,28 (1519). Erasmus takes $\dot{\epsilon} v$ in an instrumental sense: see on Iob. 3,21 .









 aỦToĩs.

18














per eum virum per quem decreuerat, fide praestita omnibus, quum | LB 504 excitarit illum ex mortuis. ${ }^{32}$ Quum audissent autem resurrectionem mortuorum, alii quidem irridebant, alii vero dixerunt: Audiemus te de hoc iterum. ${ }^{33}$ Sic Paulus exiuit e medio eorum. ${ }^{34}$ Quidam vero viri adhaerentes ei crediderunt, in quibus et Dionysius Areopagita, et mulier nomine Damaris, aliique cum eis.

18 Post haec Paulus digressus Athenis venit Corinthum, ${ }^{2}$ et nactus quendam Iudaeum nomine Aquilam, Ponticum genere, qui nuper venerat $a b$ Italia, et Priscillam vxorem eius, eo quod praecepisset Claudius, omnes Iudaeos Roma decedere, accessit ad eos: ${ }^{3}$ et quia eiusdem erat artificii, manebat apud eos et operabatur. Erat autem ars illorum texere tabernacula. ${ }^{4}$ Disputabat autem in synagoga per omne sabbatum, suadebatque Iudaeis pariter et Graecis.

## 31 тарабхшข $A$ C-E: тарабхои $B$

31 per eum virum per quem decreuerat $B-E$ : in eo viro in quo statuerat $A \mid$ quum excitarit illum ex $B-E$ (exc cum pro quum $B-D$ ): excitato illo a $A \mid 33$ e $B-E$ : de $A \mid 34$ Areopagita $B-E$ : Ariopagita $A \mid$ aliique $B-E$ : et alii $A$
18,1 Paulus digressus $B-E$ : digressus Paulus ab $A \mid 2$ omnes Iudaeos Roma decedere $E$ : discedere omnes Iudaeos a Roma $A$, omnes Iudaeos Rhoma decedere $B-D \mid 3$ tabernacula $C-E$ : aulaea $A B \mid 4$ pariter B-E: om. $A$

He may also have wished to avoid confusion between in iustitia and iniustitia: he substitutes per iustitiam at Eph. 4,24; 2 Petr. 1,1; Ap. Iob. 19,11 (all in 1519). Manetti put in iustitia.
31 per eum virum per quem $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} v$ d̉v $\delta$ pì $\bar{\omega}$ ("in viro in quo" Vg.; "in eo viro in quo" 1516). Again, Erasmus understands śv instrumentally. See on Ioh. 3,21. In Annot., he suggests using quem
rather than per quem. Manetti's version had in viro quo.
31 decreuerat $\omega$ ֹן $\sigma \varepsilon$ ("statuit" Vg.; "statuerat" 1516). Erasmus makes a similar substitution in rendering kpiva at 2 Cor. 2,1; Tit. 3,12, while following the Vulgate in using decerno to render $\pi \rho \circ o \rho i \zeta \omega$ at $A c t .4,28$. He also puts decerno in place of iudico in rendering kpive at Act. 21,25; 27,1; 1 Cor. 5,3; 1 Cor. 7,37. In Annot.,
he alternatively suggests definierat．Manetti sub－ stituted ordinauit．
31 fide praestita míттı mapaoxஸ́v（＂fidem praebens＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．See Annot．，where Erasmus explains the verb as being the equival－ ent of exhibeo．The use of praesto is in accordance with Vulgate usage at $L c .7,4 ;$ Act．16，16；19，24； 22，2；28，2．Erasmus retains praebeo at $L$ c．6，29； Tit．2，7．Further，at 1 Tim． 1,$4 ; 6,17$ ，he substitutes praebeo for praesto．The spelling mapaбxóv in 1519 is a misprint．
31 quum excitarit illum ávactíoळs aủtóv（＂sus－ citans eum＂Vg．；＂excitato illo＂1516）．Greek aorist．A similar substitution of excito occurs at eight passages in the Epistles，in rendering E $\gamma$ Eip $\omega$ ，but Erasmus is quite often content to retain suscito in such contexts．He replaces eum with illum，perhaps to emphasise the contrast with the preceding omnibus．
31 ax êk（＂a＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on Iob．2，22．
32 alii ．．．alii oi ．．．oi（＂quidam ．．．quidam＂ Vg．）．Erasmus may have disliked the juxta－ position of the similar sounding quidam and quidem，though he retains it at Act．14，4．
32 Audiemus Akovoóuєөの（＂Audiamus＂Vg． 1527）．Erasmus adopts the more accurate ren－ dering of the earlier Vulgate，as did Manetti．
33 Sic kai oṽtws．Erasmus＇rendering follows the Vulgate in leaving kai untranslated．How－ ever，the Vulgate reflects a Greek text omitting K $\alpha$ i，as in $\boldsymbol{申}^{74} \aleph$ A B D and a few later mss． Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2815，in company with cod．E and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti accordingly had ac sic．
33 e ék（＂de＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．2，15．
34 हैv ofs．Cod． 2815 adds ग $\mathrm{n} v$ ，with a few other late mss．The Erasmian text follows codd． 1 and 2816，together with nearly all other mss．and the Vulgate，in deleting this verb．
 on Ioh．1，39．
18，1 Paulus digressus X $\omega$ piotsis ó Пaṽクos（＂egres－ sus＂Vg．；＂digressus Paulus＂1516）．The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\delta$ Пaũ̉os，as in $37^{74} \mathrm{NBD}$ and four later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．A E and more than 460 later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816 （see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 560－1）．On di－ gredior，see on Iob．12，36．See also Annot．The version of Manetti had egressus Paulus．
 $=V$ g．）．See on Act．1，4，and Annot．
2 nactus súp $\omega$（＂inueniens＂Vg．）．Greek aorist． See on Ioh．2，14．

 omnes Iudaeos a Roma＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus achieves a more natural Latin word－order． On the omission of the preposition $a$ ，see on Act．1，4．Erasmus uses decedo only once else－ where in the N．T．，substituting it for discedo in rendering $\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta \alpha i v \omega$ at $M t .8,34$ ．He follows the Vulgate in retaining discedo for $\chi \omega \rho i \zeta \omega$ at Act．1，4； 1 Cor．7，15，and for rendering a variety of other Greek verbs．Manetti proposed $v t$ omnes Iudei de Roma discederent．
3 eiusdem ．．．artificii óио́теХขov（＂eiusdem artis＂ Vg ．）．Erasmus here finds a more precise term， though his motive is partly to avoid repetition of ars in the following sentence：see Annot， where he also suggests opificii．Manetti＇s version （both mss．）had eiusdem ．．．vrbis，probably result－ ing from an error of transcription．
3 Erat ．．．ars illorum texere tabernacula ${ }^{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sim$ ．．． oknvotroiol Tìv téx $u \eta \nu$（＂Erant ．．．sceno－ factoriae artis＂late Vg．；＂Erat ．．．ars illorum texere aulaea＂ $1516-19$ ）．The word scenofactoria does not exist in classical Latin．Erasmus＇ choice of aulaeum in 1516－19 was unsuitable as it meant＂curtain＂rather than＂tent＂．On tabernacula，see 1519 Annot．，and also Eras－ mus Apolog．resp．Iac．Lop．Stun．，ASD IX，2， pp．156－8，11．883－894．Manetti＇s translation of this clause was erant enim funifactoriae attis， using a non－classical term to describe them as rope－makers．
 bat＂late Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus indicates that this verse was missing in some Vulgate mss．and printed editions．His rendering of $\delta \bar{\varepsilon}$ is more precise，as the Greek makes a contrast between the fact of Paul＇s working as a tent－maker during the week，and his preaching in the synagogue on the sabbaths．The same change was made by Manetti．
4 sabbatum $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta \alpha$ वrov（＂sabbatum，interponens nomen domini Iesu＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate addition is supported only by cod．D among the Greek mss．See Annot．The version of Manetti had just sabbatum．
4 pariter et $\mathrm{t} \mathrm{\varepsilon} \ldots$ кai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．1，1．It could be argued that $\tau \varepsilon$ is already
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 тòv $\lambda$ óyov toũ $\theta$ eoũ.



${ }^{5}$ Quum venissent autem e Macedonia Silas et Timotheus, coartabatur spiritu Paulus, testificans Iudaeis Christum esse Iesum. ${ }^{6}$ Contradicentibus autem eis ac blasphema loquentibus, excussis vestimentis dixit ad eos: Sanguis vester super caput vestrum. Mundus ego posthac ad gentes vadam. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Et}$ migrans inde, intrauit in domum cuiusdam, nomine Iusti, colentis deum, cuius domus erat contigua synagogae. ${ }^{8}$ Crispus autem archisynagogus credidit domino cum tota domo sua: multique Corinthiorum audientes credebant, ac baptizabantur. ${ }^{9}$ Dixit autem dominus nocte per visionem Paulo: Noli timere, sed loquere, et ne taceas, ${ }^{10}$ propterea quod ego sim tecum: et nemo adorietur te vt affligat te, quoniam populus est mihi multus in hac ciuitate. ${ }^{11}$ Sedit autem ibi annum et sex menses, docens eos sermonem dei.
${ }^{12}$ Caeterum quum Gallio ageret proconsulem Achaiae, insurrexerunt vno animo Iudaei in Paulum, et adduxerunt

5 e $B-E: \operatorname{de} A \mid \operatorname{Silas} B-E$ : Sylas $A \mid$ esse $B-E:$ om. $A \mid 6$ ac $C-E$ : et $A B \mid$ blasphema loquentibus $C-E$ : blasphemantibus $A$, conuiciantibus $B \mid 8$ multique $B$ - $E$ : et multi $A \mid$ ac $B$ - $E$ : et $A \mid$ 9 nocte $B$ - $E$ : in nocte $A|10 \operatorname{sim} B-E: \operatorname{sum} A| 11$ sermonem $B$ - $E$ : verbum $A \mid 12$ Caeterum ... proconsulem $B$-E: Gallione autem proconsule $A$
adequately rendered by -que in suadebatque, and that pariter is therefore redundant.
$5 e$ व́̉mó ("de" $1516=V g$.). See on Act. 15,38.
5 coartabatur spiritu ouveíxeтo тஸ̃ тveú $\mu \not \subset \tau$ ("instabat verbo" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text substituting $\lambda$ ó $\gamma \omega$ for $\pi v \in \cup \cup \mu \propto \tau 1$, as in $7^{74} \$$ A B D E and twenty-three later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and about 440 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 563-5). His choice of coartor is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Lc. 12,50; Pbil. 1,23. See Annot. The version of Manetti put instabat spiritu.

5 Cbristum asse Iesum tòv Xpıoтòv 'Inooũv ("esse Christum Iesum" Vg.; "Christum Iesum" 1516). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek text having $\varepsilon$ lvaı тòv Xpıotòv 'Inooũv, as in $3^{74} \times A \operatorname{B}(D)$ and some later mss., including cod. 2816 corr. Erasmus' Greek text (apart from the misprint $\mathrm{H} \Sigma \mathrm{OY} \Sigma \mathrm{N}$ in 1516) follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and $2816^{*}$. Manetti put Cbristum lesum, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.

6 ac kaí ("et" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti also had ac.

6 blasphema loquentibus $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \eta$ оúvt $\omega v$ ("blasphemantibus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "conuiciantibus" 1519). See on Act. 13,45.
 ("excutiens vestimenta sua" late Vg.). Greek aorist. On the omission of sua, see on Iob. 13,4. Manetti's version was postquam excussit vestimenta sua.

6 postbac àmò toũ vũv ("ex hoc" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at 2 Cor. 5,16. Cf. $L c$. 5,10, where Erasmus puts posthac for ex boc iam, in rendering the same Greek expression. He retains ex boc at $L c .12,52$, while replacing it with ex boc tempore at $L c$. 22,69. See further on Ioh. 5,14. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) substituted ex nunc.
7 Iusti 'loúotov ("Titi Iusti" Vg.). The Vulgate addition corresponds with Títou 'lov́otou, as found in codd. $\mathcal{K} \mathrm{E}$ and a few later mss., or Tition 'loúotov, as in codd. $\mathrm{B}^{*} \mathrm{D}^{\text {corr. In }}$ cod. A, the reading is lovigtou, but without the preceding òvóucti. In cod. 2815*, the words óvóuati 'loviotou were wholly omitted by the scribe, but were restored in the margin by Erasmus after consultation of codd. 1 and 2816, which have 'loviotou without Títou, in company with codd. $\mathrm{B}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{D}^{*}$ and most later mss. The marginal note in cod. 2815 is now partly cropped. In Annot., however, Erasmus expresses the opinion that the name Titus was left out by scribal error ("incuria librariorum praetermissum"). The question is whether the name was omitted by haplography, caused by the resemblance of the last syllable of ovóuort and the first syllable of Títou, or whether it was added as a result of dittography, accidentally duplicating the last syllable of óvóucti, to produce ovouartitl lovotou, which in turn became ovouati titov iovatov or ovouati titiou iovatov. Manetti also had Iusti, omitting Titi.
7 contigua $\sigma$ vvouopoũ $\sigma \alpha$ ("coniuncta" Vg.). Erasmus finds a more precise rendering. The word coniunctus can bear the required meaning, but has a wider range of other connotations.
8 tota $\bar{\lambda} \lambda \omega$ ("omni" Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,2. The same change was made by Manetti.
8 multique кaì то入入оí ("et multi" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
8 audientes dakoúoxutes. In 1516, Erasmus had the present tense, dakoviovtes, from cod. 2815, in company with most other mss., commencing with $\mathbb{K}$ A B D E. Then in 1519, he put
àkoúroutç, without changing his rendering, but supported by cod. 3 , together with $37^{74}$ and many later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti's version (both mss.) had credentes, probably by another error of transcription.
8 ac kal ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti also made this change.
9 nocte tev vukti ("in nocte" 1516 only). Erasmus usually has in nocte where the Greek inserts a preposition. Manetti preferred noctu.
10 propterea quod ... sim סıótı ... घíul ("propter quod ... sum" Vg.; "propterea quod ... sum" 1516). See on Act. 8,11, and Annot. Both Valla Annot. and Manetti rendered by quia ...sum.
10 adorietur te étritjo $\sigma$ exai $\sigma 01$ ("apponetur tibi" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering makes better sense of this passage. He follows the Vulgate in using appono to render this Greek verb at Ap. Iob. 22,18, in the sense of "add". In Annot, he also suggests inuadet te, which had been proposed by Valla Annot. Elsewhere, Erasmus uses adorior only at Epb. 4,14 (1519). He included this Vulgate rendering among the Quace Per Interpretem Commissa.
10 vt affligat te toũ kakw̃oai $\sigma \varepsilon$ ("vt noceat te" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at 1 Petr. 3,13 , following the example of the Vulgate at Act. 7,19; 12,1. See Annot., where Erasmus also suggests ad aflligendum te. Valla Annot. had tried ad tibi nocendum. The wording which Erasmus adopted for his translation was anticipated by Manetti.
11 autem $\mathbf{~ \tau \varepsilon . ~ E r a s m u s ~ r e t a i n s ~ t h e ~ V u l g a t e ~ r e n d e r - ~}$ ing, though the latter reflects the substitution of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, as found in $\mathbf{7}^{74}$ - A B and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, along with codd. 1 and 2816, with support from cod. $E$ and most later mss.
11 eos aútoús ("apud eos" Vg.). Erasmus here follows a rare variant, jointly offered by his codd. 2815 and 2816 , supported also by cod. D. The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having ev aủtoiis, as found in cod. 1 and most other mss.
11 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ óyov ("verbum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,1 .

12 Caterum quum Gallio ageret proconsulem $\Gamma \propto \lambda$ -
 proconsule" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On caterum, see on Act. 6,2. The phrase ago proconsulem could perhaps, more accurately, have been ago proconsulatum. See also Annot.
$\alpha u ̉ t o ̀ v ~ E ̉ \pi T i ~ t o ̀ ~ \beta \tilde{\eta ̃ \mu \alpha, ~}{ }^{13} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o v t \varepsilon s$ öti
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eum ad tribunal, ${ }^{13}$ di|centes: Contra legem hic suadet hominibus colere deum. ${ }^{14}$ Quum autem Paulus iam pararet aperire os, dixit Gallio ad Iudaeos: Si qua iniuria esset, aut facinus malum, o Iudaei, merito vos sustinerem: ${ }^{15}$ si vero quaestio est de sermone ac nominibus et lege vestrate, vos ipsi videritis. Iudex enim ego horum nolo esse. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Et}$ abegit eos a tribunali. ${ }^{17}$ Apprehensum autem omnes Graeci Sosthenem principem synagogae percutiebant ante tribunal, neque quicquam eorum Gallioni curae erat.
${ }^{18}$ Paulus vero deinde commoratus dies multos, valedicto fratribus, abnauigauit in Syriam, comitantibus eum Priscilla et Aquila,
$14 \eta \cup A^{c} B-E: o m . A^{*}$

13 suadet $B-E$ : persuadet $A \mid 14$ Quum autem Paulus iam pararet $B-E$ (exc. Cum pro Quum B-D): Incipiente autem Paulo $A \mid 15$ quaestio est de sermone ac $B$ - $E$ : quaestiones sunt de verbo et $A$ | 17 neque quicquam $B-E$ et nihil $A$

13 dicentes $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \circ$ отes ötı ("dicentes, Quia" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had dicentes quod.
 Erasmus felt that the context required a verb meaning to urge rather than to persuade, in contrast with Act. 21,14; 26,28. See Annot. on all these. The difference of meaning is further discussed in Valla Elegantiae V, 30; Erasmus Parapbr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, pp. 290-1, ll. 323-328. The same change was made by Manetti.

14 Quum ... Paulus iam pararet $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda$ ovtos ... тои̃ Пaú入ou ("Incipiente ... Paulo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,47 regarding the removal of incipio. By inserting iam, Erasmus conveys the sense that Gallio intervened when Paul was just about to begin speaking. In Annot., he suggests quum ... aperturus esset os. Manetti began the sentence with Paulo vero os aperturo.
 $\mu \dot{\alpha} \pi$ ("Si quidem esset iniquum aliquid"
 see on Act. 9,31. His choice of iniuria is closer to the meaning of $\alpha \delta i k n \mu \alpha$, in the present context, rather than the sense of "unrighteous" or "unjust" conveyed by iniquus. However, he retains iniquitas for ${ }^{\alpha} \delta i-$ к $\eta \mu \alpha$ at Act. 24,20; Ap. Iob. 18,5. Cf. on Act. 24,15, where iniquus is replaced by iniustus. See also Annot. In the 1516 Greek text, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in omitting $\bar{\eta} v$, in company with a few other late mss. There are also some mss. which have $\mathrm{T}^{2} \mathrm{v}$ but omit the preceding ouvv, as in $37^{74} \aleph$ A B D E. The reading of codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. is ouv $\hat{\eta} v$, as restored by Erasmus in the 1516 errata. Manetti had the same as the Vulgate, except that he substituted aliquod for aliquid.

14 malum тоипро́v（＂pessimum＂Vg．）．A simi－ lar substitution occurs at Act．19，16．Cf．also Ap．Iob．16，2（1519），where sacuum ac pessimum is replaced by malum ac noxium．Erasmus is more accurate here：see Annot．This change was also made by Manetti．
14 Iudaei＇louסaĩo（＂viri Iudaei＂Vg．）．The Vulgate addition corresponds with the reading a̛vopes＇louסoĩol，found in cod．D alone．Manetti omitted viri．
14 merito к $\alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ 入óyov（＂recte＂Vg．）．Elsewhere， Erasmus retains recte for óp $\theta \tilde{\omega}$ s at $M c .7,35$ ； Lc． 7,$43 ; 10,28 ; 20,21$ ，and for $\kappa \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ at 2 Cor．11，4．At the present passage，$\lambda$ óyos denotes reasonableness rather than correctness： see Annot．The version of Manetti put secundum rationem．
 1516 Lat．＝Vg．）．The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having ל $\eta \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \iota(v)$ ，as in codd． $\mathcal{K}$ A B E and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by $77^{74}$ and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and（2816）． The same change was made by Manetti．
15 sermone $\lambda$ óyou（＂verbo＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Iob．1，1．
15 ac kai（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25． Manetti also had ac．
15 et lege kà vórou（＂legis＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate wording is unsupported by Greek mss． See Annot．The version of Manetti again made the same change as Erasmus．
15 vestrate toũ ka日＇úhũ̃s（＂vestrae＂Vg．）．See on Act．17，28，and Annot．In Manetti，this was replaced with vestra．
15 enim $\gamma \alpha$ 人p（Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by ${ }^{70^{74}} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ A B D and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod． 2815 ，in company with cod．E and most later mss．，together with codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti added the same word．
16 abegit árin่ $\lambda \alpha \sigma \varepsilon v$（＂minauit＂Vg．）．The use of mino as an active verb does not appear to have a classical precedent．The more usual form is the deponent verb，minor．Erasmus is more accurate here：see Annot，where he also suggested putting depulit．He does not use abigo elsewhere in the N．T．This verb is briefly discussed in Valla Elegantiae VI，16；Erasmus Paraphr．in Eleg． Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，p．210，11．42－47．Manetti preferred expulit．

17 Apprehensum Éтı入んßópzvol（＂Apprehenden－ tes＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．
 omission has the support of $77^{74} \aleph A B$ and four later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815， supported by codd．D E and more than 450 of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816 （see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 565－7）．Manetti put gentiles．
17 percutiebant हैTUாTov（＂percutiebant eum＂ Vg．）．The Vulgate addition does not necessarily reflect a different Greek text，as it has negligible ms．support．
17 neque quicquam kai oủס́̇v（＂et nihil＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The same substitution occurs at Mt．17，20；Mc．14，61（both in 1519）．See on Ioh．2，16．
$17 \varepsilon ย \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \nu$ ．All of Erasmus＇mss．had $\varepsilon$ ê $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \nu$ ， imperfect tense，supported by codd． $\mathcal{K} E$ and most later mss．The change of spelling to $\varepsilon$ ê $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \nu$ seems to have been an arbitrary decision，though it has support from $7^{774}$ A B and some later mss．
18 deinde commoratus ह̈тı тробนеі́vas（＂cum adhuc sustinuisset＂Vg．）．This may be compared with the substitution of maneo apud for sustineo at $M c .8,2$ ，rendering the same Greek verb．Else－ where，Erasmus reserves commoror for $\delta \iota \alpha$ т $\rho i \beta \omega$ ，
 the Vulgate in rendering $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega$ by perseuero at Mt．15，32，and by remaneo at 1 Tim．1，3． Regarding sustineo，see further on Act．20，5． Erasmus does not render ${ }^{\varepsilon} \mathrm{T} \mathrm{l}$ by deinde at other passages．
 mevos（＂fratribus valefaciens＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at vs．21．At 2 Cor．2，13， Erasmus puts dimitto，following Vulgate usage at Mc．6，46．See Annot．He uses dico vale at Lc． 9，61．At Act．21，6，rendering ơo $\pi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ ，Erasmus replaces valefacio with consaluto．The verb valefacio does not have a solid pedigree in classical Latin usage．Manetti，less accurately，put a fratribus abiens：he used the same verb for rendering ஷттото́бб $\sigma$ in vs． 21.
18 abnauigauit $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{2} \pi \lambda_{\varepsilon 1}$（＂nauigauit＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at Act．20，6（1519）． At Act．15，39，inconsistently，Erasmus retains nauigo．See Annot．
18 comitantibus eum kờ oùv $\alpha \cup \cup T \varphi \tilde{\varphi}$（＂et cum eo＂Vg．）．By adding a verb，Erasmus improves the Latin sentence structure．
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posteaquam raserat caput in Cenchreis: habebat enim votum. ${ }^{19}$ Deuenitque Ephesum, et illos ibi reliquit. Ipse vero ingressus synagogam, disputabat cum Iudaeis. ${ }^{20}$ Rogantibus autem eis vt tempore ampliori maneret apud se, non annuit, ${ }^{21}$ sed valedixit illis, dicens: Oportet omnino me festum quod instat, agere Hierosolymis, sed iterum reuertar ad vos, deo volente. Et soluit Epheso. ${ }^{22}$ Quumque descendisset Caesaream, ascendissetque et salutasset ecclesiam, descendit Antiochiam. ${ }^{23}$ Et commoratus illic aliquantum temporis, profectus est perambulans ex ordine Galaticam regionem ac Phrygiam, confirmans omnes discipulos.
${ }^{24}$ Iudaeus autem quidam Apollos nomine, Alexandrinus genere, vir eloquens, deuenit Ephesum, potens in scripturis. ${ }^{25}$ Hic erat institutus in via domini, et feruens spiritu loquebatur et docebat diligenter ea quae sunt domini, sciens tantum baptisma Ioannis. ${ }^{26} \mathrm{Et}$ hic coepit libere loqui in synagoga. Quem quum audissent Priscilla et Aquila, assumpserunt eum, atque exactius exposuerunt ei viam dei. ${ }^{27}$ Quum autem vellet ire
 $\varepsilon \pi เ \sigma \tau \varepsilon!\rho!\zeta \omega \nu A$

18 posteaquam raserat caput $B-E$ : capite raso $A \mid 21$ sed iterum $B-E$ : iterum autem $A$ | 22 Quumque $B-E$ (Cumque $B-D$ ): Et cum $A$ descendisset $D$ : peruenisset $A$-C, descendissent $E \mid 23$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid 25$ Ioannis $A B E$ : Iohannis $C D \mid 26$ atque exactius $B-E$ : et diligentius $A$

18 posteaquam raserat caput кєıpápєvos тท่v кє甲 $\alpha-$ $\lambda \eta$ v ("qui sibi totonderat ... caput" late Vg .; "capite raso" 1516). Erasmus prefers to apply this clause to Paul rather than Aquila, though the Greek is ambiguous: see Annot. The version
of Manetti here followed the late Vulgate, but omitted sibi.

18 Keyxpeaĩs. The variant $k$ ххpeais, which was used in 1516, is taken from codd. 2815,
supported by codd. $1,2816^{*}$ and some other late mss. The spelling кє $\gamma \chi$ реаïs is suggested by cod. 2816 ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ (but not cod. 3).
 liori tempore" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.) The Vulgate is closer to the Greek word-order.

20 apud se tap' aن̉тoĩs (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $8^{7{ }^{74}} \mathrm{NAB}$ and thirtyfive later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. D E and more than 410 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 567-9). Manetti put secum.
 elsewhere occasionally follows the Vulgate in using annuo for veí $\omega$, kवтهvevi $\omega$, and кवтवбвí : see on Act. 12,17.
 et" Vg.). See on vs. 18. The Vulgate reflects a
 A B D and a few later mss. In cod. E and a few later mss., the reading is ároto $\oint \dot{\alpha} \mu \mathrm{Evos}$ aU'Toĩs kai. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, along with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti replaced valefaciens et dicens by abiens ait eis: see on vs. 18.
21 Oportet... sed iterum $\Delta \varepsilon \bar{i} \ldots$... $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda 1 \nu \delta^{\delta}$ ("Iterum" Vg.; "Oportet ... iterum autem" 1516). The Vulgate omission has support from $\mathbf{7}^{74}$ \& A B E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. (D) and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. See Annot. The version of Manetti had Oportet ... Iterum autem, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
21 Et soluit kà ávín $\mathrm{X}^{0 \eta}$ ("profectus est" Vg .). See on Act. 13,13, and Annot.
 See on Act. 1,4, and Annot.
22 Quumque descendisset кхi катє $\lambda \theta \omega \dot{\prime}$ ("Et descendens" Vg.; "Et cum peruenisset" 1516; "Cumque peruenisset" $1519-22$; "Quumque descendissent" 1535). Greek aorist. The use of the plural in the 1535 rendering is a misprint.
22 ascendissetque et salutasset d̀voßòs kai à arma$\sigma$ d́ $\mu$ evos ("ascendit et salutauit ... et" Vg.). This continues from the earlier construction with quum.
22 Antiochiam Eis 'AvtióXelov ("in Antiochiam" Vg. 1527). See on Act. 8,27.
23 commoratus illic aliquantum temporis novoŋoas Xpóvov tivó ("facto ibi aliquanto tempore"

Vg.). See on Act. 15,33. Manetti substituted facto aliquanto temporis.
23 Galaticam 「 $\alpha \lambda \alpha$ тıкர่v ("Galatiam" late Vg.). Erasmus' Latin spelling follows the earlier Vulgate, preserving the adjectival form of the Greek name. For the spelling $\gamma \propto \lambda_{1 \tau t}$ ikiv in 1519, see on Act. 16,6. Manetti also had Galaticam.

23 ac kai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. This change was also made by Manetti.
 in 1516 seems to be a misprint, not supported by mss.
 ("edoctus viam" Vg.). At Rom. 2,18; 1 Cor. 14,19, Erasmus substitutes instituo for instruo in rendering the same Greek verb. However, at Lc. 1,4, after putting instituo for erudio in 1516, he reverts to edoceo in 1519. In Annot., Erasmus argues that edoceo is inappropriate as Apollos did not yet know in detail the "way of the Lord", otherwise he would not have needed the further teaching from Priscilla and Aquila, mentioned in vs. 26.
25 domini (2nd.) toũ kupiou ("Iesu" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant having toũ ${ }^{\prime}$ Inooũ, as in $7^{7{ }^{7 v i d}} \times A B(D) E$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.
26 Et bic oũtós te ("Hic ergo" Vg.). The Vulgate rendering does not appear to have Greek ms. support. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
 agere" Vg.). See on Act. 2,29.
 gentius" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This use of exactius is comparable with Erasmus' renderings of ákpı$\beta$ ó $\omega$ as exacte cognos $o$ at Mt. 2,16, and of akpp $\beta \tilde{\omega}$ s as exacta diligentia at $L c .1,3$ (1519). At Mt. 2,7, 8, he substitutes accurate for diligenter. However, at the present passage, this change to exactius loses the connection between ${ }^{2} k p ı \beta \omega{ }^{2}$
 he retained diligenter in the earlier verse. Manetti had atque diligentius.
26 dei tou $\theta \in \mathrm{ou}$ ("domini" late Vg .). The late Vulgate reflects the substitution of toũ kupiou, as found in cod. E and a few later mss. Manetti (both mss.) simply omitted the word, with support from cod. D.
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Achaiam，exhortati fratres scrip－ serunt discipulis，vt susciperent eum．Qui quum venisset，contulit multum his qui crediderunt per gratiam．${ }^{28}$ Vehementer enim Iu－ daeos reuincebat，publice，osten－ dens per scripturas，quod Iesus esset Christus．

19Factum est autem quum Apol－ los esset Corinthi，vt Paulus peragratis superioribus partibus ve－ niret Ephesum，et repertis quibus－ dam discipulis，${ }^{2}$ dixit ad eos：Num spiritum sanctum accepistis，postea－ quam credidistis？At illi dixerunt ad eum：Imo neque sitne spiritus sanc－ tus，audiuimus．${ }^{3}$ Et ait ad illos：Quo ergo baptizati estis？At illi dixerunt： Ioannis baptismate．${ }^{4}$ Dixit autem Paulus：Ioannes quidem baptizauit bap－ tismo poenitentiae，populo loquens de eo qui venturus esset post ipsum，vt crederent：hoc est，de｜Christo Iesu． ${ }^{5}$ His auditis baptizati sunt in nomine domini Iesu．${ }^{6} \mathrm{Et}$ quum imposuisset illis manus Paulus，venit spiritus sanc－ tus super eos，et loquebantur linguis， et prophetabant．${ }^{7}$ Erant autem omnes viri fere duodecim．

28 quod Iesus esset Christus $B-E$ ：esse Christum Iesum $A$
19，1 Apollos $B$－E：Apollo $A$｜repertis quibusdam discipulis $B$－E：inueniret quosdam discipulos $A \mid 2$ dixit $B-E$ ：dixitque $A \mid$ posteaquam credidistis $B-E$ ：cum crederetis $A \mid 3$ Quo $B-E$ ： In quo $A \mid$ At illi $B$－E：Qui $A \mid$ Ioannis $B E$ ：In Ioannis $A$ ，Iohannis $C D \mid 4$ Ioannes $A B E$ ： Iohannes $C D \mid$ loquens de eo $B$－$E$ ：dicens，in eum $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ se $A \mid$ de Christo Iesu $B$－$E$ ： in Christum Iesum $A \mid 5$ in $A C-E \operatorname{sub} B$

27 Achaiam єis тìv Axaíav．In 1527 Annot．， Erasmus expresses surprise at the Vulgate omis－ sion of $i n$ ，as a preposition was normally used with names of regions and countries．However，
he made no change in his own rendering． Cf．his omission of in before Pampbyliam at Act．14，24（1516 only），and before Asiam at Act． 20，18．Manetti，more correctly，put in Achaiam．
 The Vulgate omission has little direct support from Greek mss., apart from $7^{38 v i d} D$, which present a considerably altered form of text. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, with the support of codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti also added this phrase.
28 quod Iesus esset Cbristus elvaı tòv Xpıotòv 'Inooũv ("esse Christum Iesum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus produces greater clarity by this change. For his avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. In Annot., he also suggested Iesum esse Cbristum, which was the rendering preferred by Manetti.
19,1-2 repertis quibusdam discipulis, dixit Eúpढّv tivas $\mu \alpha \theta \eta$ गós, $\mathfrak{E l m e}$ ("inueniret quosdam de discipulis, dixitque" late Vg.; "inueniret quosdam discipulos, dixitque" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.). On reperio, see on Iob. 1,41. The Vulgate reflects the substitution of ev́peiv for eưp $\dot{v} v$, and the addition of $\tau \varepsilon$ after $\varepsilon$ ITt $\varepsilon$, as in $3 \overline{7}^{74 \times \operatorname{sid}} \mathcal{N}$ A B and thirteen later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. D (E) and more than 430 of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 580-2). Manetti's version was inueniret quosdam discipulos et ait.
2 Num El ("Si" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6, and Annot. The version of Manetti put an.
2 posteaquam credidistis mıoteÚcavtes ("credentes" Vg.; "cum crederetis" 1516). Greek aorist. The change to the past tense here brings a significantly different interpretation of the passage. Manetti put cum credidisent.
2 Imo 'A $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ("Sed" Vg.). Erasmus adopts the strongly adversative imo (or, more correctly, ${ }^{i m m o}$ ), at forty-five N.T. passages, including fourteen where it was introduced for the first time in 1519 , usually to replace sed or autem. It occurs in the Vulgate N.T. at Rom. 3,29; 8,34; Gal. 4,9. Manetti's version omitted the word.
2 sitne $\varepsilon \mathfrak{k i}$... éctiv ("si ... est" Vg.). See on Ioh. 18,39 , regarding $-n e$, and see Annot.
3 Et ait ad illos £ilmé $T \in$ troòs aủtoús ("Ille vero ait" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant having $\delta \delta \bar{\varepsilon} \varepsilon\left\{\frac{1}{x} \varepsilon v\right.$ as in $7^{74} \mathrm{NAE}$ and twelve later mss. Cod. B has $\mathfrak{E l \pi \in \in v} \tau \varepsilon$, omitting mpos aúroús, with eighty-seven later mss., while cod. D has $\varepsilon \frac{1}{2} \tau \varepsilon \nu \delta$, , with twenty later mss. Other variants also exist. Erasmus follows
cod. 2815 , in company with codd. 1,2816 and about 280 of the remaining later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 582-5). Manetti had aitque eis.
3 Quo ... Ioannis baptismate Eis ti ... Eis tò 'IWóvvou $\beta$ ántioua ("In quo ... In Ioannis baptismate" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In rendering $\beta \alpha \pi-$ tíb $\omega$ eis at other passages, Erasmus sometimes follows the Vulgate in using in accompanied by an ablative (in nomine at $M t .28,19 ;$ Act. 8,16; 19,5; 1 Cor. 1,13, 15), but sometimes changes to in with an accusative (Rom. 6,3; 1 Cor. 10,2). Here he attempts a different solution, omitting the preposition altogether. However, the use of quo produces an ambiguity, as it could be understood as introducing a different question, "Why were you baptized?", whereas Paul's hearers, as far as can be judged from their reply, understood him to mean "Unto which baptism were you baptized?"
3 At illi of 8 É ("Qui" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. Manetti substituted $I p s i$ vero.
4 quidem $\mu \dot{k} \nu$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{3874} \times$ A B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (cf.Act. 22,3). Manetti similarly added quidem.
4 populo $\boldsymbol{\omega} \tilde{\omega} \lambda \alpha \tilde{\sim}$ ("populum" Vg.). The Vulgate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss.
4 loquens de eo $\lambda \hat{\text { ér }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \mathrm{v}$ єis tóv ("dicens, in eum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' change has little to commend it other than simplicity. The preposition eis should preferably be taken either with $\beta \alpha \pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ or with macevi $\omega$, rather than $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \omega$.
4 ipsum ๙ủTóv ("se" 1516 only). Erasmus reverts to the Vulgate rendering in 1519, preferring to use ipsum for referring back to the earlier subject, John the Baptist. Manetti had se, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
4 de Cbristo Iesu Els tòv Xpıotòv ’Inooũv ("in Iesum" Vg.; "in Christum Iesum" 1516). On de for in, see above on loquens de eo. The Vulgate reflects the omission of Xplotóv, as in $7^{38}{ }^{34} \mathrm{~N}$ A B E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti again made the same change as Erasmus' 1516 edition.
5 in eis ("sub" 1519). See on Ioh. 5,43.
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${ }^{8}$ Introgressus autem synagogam， libere loquebatur ad tres menses， disputans et suadens de regno dei． ${ }^{9}$ Quum autem quidam induraren－ tur，nec crederent，male loquentes de via domini coram multitudine， digressus ab illis，segregauit disci－ pulos，quotidie disputans in scho－ la tyranni cuiusdam．${ }^{10} \mathrm{Hoc}$ autem factum est per biennium，ita vt omnes qui habitabant in Asia， audirent sermonem domini Iesu， Iudaei simul et Graeci．${ }^{11}$ Virtutes－ que non vulgares aedebat deus per manus Pauli，${ }^{12}$ ita vt etiam super infirmos deferrentur a corpore eius sudaria et semicinthia：et recede－ rent ab eis morbi，et spiritus mali egrederentur．${ }^{13}$ Tentauerunt autem quidam e circumeuntibus Iudaeis exorcistis inuocare super eos qui habebant spiritus malos，nomen do－ mini Iesu，dicentes：Adiuramus vos per Iesum，quem Paulus praedicat．

9 nec $B-E$ ：et non $A \mid$ quotidie $B-E$ ：cotidie $A \mid$ tyranni $A E$ ：Tyranni $B-D \mid 10$ sermonem $B-E$ ：verbum $A \mid$ Iesu $C$－$E$ ：om．$A B \mid 11$ aedebat $B-E$ ：faciebat $A \mid 12$ semicinthia $E$ ： semicinctia $A$ ，semicincta $B-D \mid 13$ e $B-E$ ：de $A \mid$ circumeuntibus $A-D$ ：circumentibus $E \mid$ Adiuramus $B$－$E$ ：Adiuro $A$

8 Introgressus Eloce入 $\theta \omega \dot{ }$（＂Ingressus＂Vg．1527）． Erasmus adopts the earlier Vulgate rendering， as did Manetti．
 loquebatur＂Vg．）．See on Act．2，29．Manetti preferred fiducialiter loquebatur．
8 ad $̇$ ह̀rí（＂per＂Vg．）．A similar substitution oc－ curs at Act．19，34；27，20．Elsewhere，in rendering ÉTil so as to convey a length of time，Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using the ablative at $L c$ ． 4，25；Act．18，20，and in using per at Act．13，31； 17,$2 ; 19,10$ ，but substitutes accusative for ablative at Act．16，18．See also on Act．10，48．
 introduced in 1522－35，was probably a printer＇s error rather than a deliberate textual change by

Erasmus．At Act．6，1，it has been noted that there are occasional manifestations of a tendency to treat verbs ending in－v́vc as if they were a contracted form of－uvé $\omega$ ．However，in that case，a different accentuation might have been expected：ह̇єкスクpuvoũvto．The correct spell－
 accordance with most of the mss．

9 nec crederent kal $\dagger$ ท่тei（Oouv（＂et non crederent＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．See on Ioh．2，16．
9 male loquentes de via domini како入оүоũvтеs Tìv $\delta$ ठठóv（＂maledicentes viam domini＂late Vg．）．This substitution of male loquor is in accord with Vulgate usage at Mc．9，39．Erasmus retains maledico at Mt．15，4；Mc． 7,10 ．He follows the late Vulgate here in adding domini，
though the Greek has just "the way": at vs. 23, more correctly, he omits domini and puts illa via (cf. also Act. 9,2).

9 digressus ámтобтás ("discedens" Vg.). Greek aorist. See on Ioh. 12,36.

9 illis aủtũv ("eis" Vg.). Erasmus uses illis, here, to refer back to Paul's opponents, as distinct from the disciples.
9 tyranni тupávoou ("Tyranni" 1519-27 Lat). The use of a capital letter in the 1519-27 Latin rendering reflected the opinion, as held e.g. by Stunica, that this was a proper name rather than literally "a tyrant". In Annot., Erasmus inclines to the view that it referred to a "great man" ("magnatis alicuius"). See also his Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stur. ASD IX, 2, p. 158, 11. 895902.

10 sermonem tòv $\lambda$ ó $o v$ ("verbum" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
10 Iesu'Iŋ $\sigma o u ̃$ (omitted in 1516-19 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $19^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B D E and some later mss., including cod. $1^{\text {*vid }}$. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815 , supported by codd. $1^{\text {corr }}, 2816$ and most other late mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
10 simul et $\mathbf{T \varepsilon}$ каi ("atque" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1. In Annot., Erasmus suggests the use of tum ... tum.
10 Graeci "E $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu \alpha s$ ("gentiles" Vg.). See on Ioh. 12,20.

11 vulgares Tò̀s Tuxoú $\sigma \alpha s$ ("modicas quaslibet" late Vg.). A similar substitution of vulgaris for modicus occurs at Act. 28,2. In Annot., Erasmus comments on the probability that modicas began as an interpretative comment on the original rendering, quaslibet, and was later interpolated into the Vulgate text, thus producing a double rendering of the same Greek word. Accordingly he included this among the Loca Manifeste Deprauata. Manetti's version substituted quascunque for non modicas quaslibet.
11 aedebat ह́ттоíєı ("faciebat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,11.
11 manus T $\tilde{\nu} \nu X \in \rho \tilde{\nu} \nu$ ("manum" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti also put manus, as in Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate.
12 infirmos toùs áoөєvoũvtas ("languidos" Vg.). See on Ioh. 11,1.

12 et (1st.) ŋ゙. Erasmus retains et from the late Vulgate, and further in Annot., he cites the Greek text as kai, which is found in a few late mss., though not in those which he ususally consulted in Basle. The earlier Vulgate, more correctly, had vel.
12 semicinthia $\sigma \eta \mu к i v \theta_{1 \alpha}$ ("semicinctia" 1516 = Vg.; "semicincta" 1519-27). This Greek variant was found in 1516 Annot., before it was introduced into the Greek N.T. text in 1519. It may have begun as an arbitrary correction, to conform with the Latin spelling. In the 1516 Greek text, more correctly, Erasmus had $\sigma 1 \mu ı k i v \theta 1 \alpha$ from cod. 2815, as in codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. Manetti's spelling was also semicinthia.
12 recederent ... egrederentur $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$...
 Erasmus keeps closer to the Greek, by maintaining the same construction throughout the verse, as one long consecutive clause.
12 morbi tà̀s vóбous ("languores" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at nine other passages in rendering vóoos. Erasmus reserved languor as a substitute for infirmitas in rendering $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha-$ кía, at Mt. 4,23; 9,35; 10,1. See also on Iob. 5,4. In Annot. on Mt. 4,23, he explains languor as being a slight or mild form of illness, whereas morbus was a more general word which covered all forms of illness or disease.
12 mali т $\dot{\alpha}$ тоипро́ ("nequam" Vg.). Erasmus removes all instances of nequam from the N.T. In Annot. on Mt. 6,23, he explains the meaning of nequam as "libidinous" rather than "wicked". Manetti preferred maligni.
 Vulgate in leaving these words untranslated. The Vulgate, however, is based on a Greek text omitting the words, as in $3^{74} \aleph$ A B D E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti inserted ab ipsis before egrediebantur.
13 e व́mó ("et de" Vg.; "de" 1516). The Vulgate probably reflects a Greek text substituting kaí for ámó, as in K A B E and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.
13 circumeuntibus. The spelling circumentibus in 1535 is clearly a misprint. Manetti had circunuenientibus.
13 Adiuramus 'Opкi弓оцєv ("Adiuro" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution
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 i̋бXuعv.
${ }^{14}$ Erant autem quidam filii Sceuae Iudaei principis sacerdotum septem, qui hoc faciebant. ${ }^{15}$ Respondens autem spiritus malus, dixit: Iesum noui, et Paulum scio: vos autem qui estis? ${ }^{16} \mathrm{Et}$ insiliens in eos homo, in quo erat daemonium malum, et dominatus eis, inualuit contra eos, ita vt nudi et vulnerati effugerent de domo illa. ${ }^{17}$ Hoc autem innotuit omnibus Iudaeis simul et Graecis, qui habitabant Ephesi: et incidit timor super omnes illos, et magnificabatur nomen domini Iesu. ${ }^{18}$ Multique credentium veniebant confitentes et annunciantes facta sua. ${ }^{19}$ Multi autem ex eis qui curiosas artes exercuerant, comportatos libros exusserunt coram omnibus: et supputatis preciis illorum, repererunt pecuniae quinquaginta milia. ${ }^{20}$ Ita fortiter crescebat sermo dei, et confirmabatur.

15 dixit $B-E$ : dixit eis $A \mid 16$ dominatus $B-E$ : dominatum $A \mid 17$ innotuit $B-E$ : notum factum est $A \mid$ incidit $B$-E: cecidit $A \mid 19$ quinquaginta $C$-E: quinquies $\operatorname{decem} A B \mid 20$ sermo $B$-E: verbum $A$
of $\delta$ pki $\zeta \omega$, as in $39^{74}$ ल A B D E and a few later mss. However, the earliest available ms., $7^{38}$, has $\begin{aligned} & \text { हैopki } \zeta \text { oukv, plural. Erasmus follows }\end{aligned}$ cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti made the same change.
14 quidam filii Sceuae Iudaei ... septem tives vioi इкєŨ̃a ’lou nomine Sceuae ... septem filii" late Vg.). The late Vulgate partly reflects a Greek text having
 (both these mss. are incorrectly said to read tives, in Aland Die Apostelgeschichte) and fifteen later mss. In $\mathbf{p}^{74} \aleph \mathrm{~A}$, the text has twes
 However, there is no Greek support for the late Vulgate transposition of Iudaei and Sceuae, or its addition of nomine. Erasmus follows
cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and more than 410 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 585-9). Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
15 malus tò тоипро́v ("nequam" Vg.). See on vs. 12. Manetti again had malignus, as in vs. 12.
15 dixit $\mathfrak{\text { fine }}$ ("dixit eis" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of aúrois, as in 7074 A B D and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put ait, omitting eis.
 ("homo in eos" Vg.). The Vulgate word-order is supported by codd. א A B and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with $7^{388 i d 74}(\mathrm{D})$ and most later mss., including
codd. 1 and 2816. The same change was made by Manetti.
16 malum tò movnpóv ("pessimum" Vg.). See on Act. 18,14. See also Annot. The version of Manetti replaced daemonium pessimum by malignus spiritus.
16 dominatus katakuplev́ơas ("dominatum" 1516 only). Erasmus' Greek text here follows cod. 2815 , supported by $7^{74} \aleph$ B and some later mss., including cod. 2816, making the participle relate to an action by the man rather than the evil spirit. In Annot., he also acknowledges the reading, katakupıeũ $\sigma \propto v$, found in his cod. 1, together with codd. A E (incorrectly treated in $\mathrm{N}^{27}$ ) and most later mss., so that grammatically it relates to the evil spirit. The spelling dominatum in Erasmus' 1516 Latin rendering may be a sign that he had at first preferred the reading kळтакирієŨб $\alpha v$.
16 eis $\alpha \cup ๋ T \omega ̃ \nu$ ("amborum" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of á $\mu р о т \varepsilon \rho \omega \nu$ ("both"), as found in $7^{74} \&$ A B D and a few later mss. (not ódupoĩv as suggested in Annot.). This reading produces an apparent inconsistency with vs. 14, where a group of "seven" persons is spoken of. Despite various attempts at explanation, it does not seem probable that the
 tép $\omega \nu$. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Other substitutions of dative for genitive, when accompanied by dominor, occur at Mt. 20,25; Lc. 22,25; Rom. 14,9. Manetti put ipsis.
 found in any of Erasmus' mss., all of which had tetpaunartı
17 innotuit È $\gamma$ évero $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ óo ("notum factum est" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 1,19.
17 simul et $\mathbf{~ t ~}$ кai ("atque" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1. Manetti put ac.
17 Graecis "E入入ךбı ("gentilibus" Vg.). See on Iob. 12,20.
 Cf. on the substitution of irruit at Act. 10,10. For other changes involving cado, see on Iob. 11,32.
 Vg .). For the use of the rough breathing, introduced in 1519, see on Ioh. 2,21. A similar substitution occurs at Lc. 23,51 (1519); Col. 3,9, following the example of the Vulgate
at Rom. 8,13 . See Annot. The phrase chosen by Manetti here was gesta sua.
19 curiosas artes exercuerunt $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \rho i ́ \rho \gamma \propto \pi \rho \alpha \xi-$ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} v \omega \nu$ ("fuerant curiosa sectati" Vg.). This may be compared with Erasmus' phrase, artem exercuerat magicam, at Act. 8,9: see ad loc., and Annot. He generally reserves sector for $\delta 1 \omega \dot{k} \omega$. Manetti proposed superflua egerant, but this did not provide an adequate explanation for the burning of the books.
19 comportatos libros $\sigma \cup v \in v e ́ \gamma к \propto \cup \tau \in \varsigma ~ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \beta i \beta \lambda o u s ~$ ("contulerunt libros et" Vg.). The substitution of comporto was probably intended to avoid the ambiguity of confero, which could have implied that they "compared" the books. Erasmus follows the Greek participial construction more closely, while switching from active to passive.
19 exusserunt $\mathrm{k} \alpha \mathrm{té}^{\prime} \propto ı 10 \nu$ ("combusserunt eos" late Vg.). The added pronoun of the late Vulgate does not have explicit Greek support. A similar substitution of exuro occurs at Mt. 3,12, in accordance with late Vulgate usage at 2 Petr. 3,10. However, Erasmus retains comburo for katakaic at Mt. 13,30, 40; Lc. 3,17; Ap. Ioh. 8,7; 18,8. The change of verb here is partly designed to avoid the repetitive sequence of verbs beginning with com-. Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate in putting combusserunt, without eos.
19 supputatis $\sigma u v \in \Psi$ ńqıбаv ("computatis" Vg.). Erasmus retains computo for $\psi \eta \varphi_{i}^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ at $L c$. 14,$28 ; A p$. Ioh. 13,18 . See the previous note on avoidance of the repetition of com-
19 repererunt $\mathrm{\varepsilon u}^{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{pov}$ ("inuenerunt" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,41.
19 pecuniae quinquaginta milia óp ${ }^{2} \operatorname{copiou}^{\mu} \mathrm{v}$ pló́סas Ttévte ("pecuniam denariorum quinquaginta milium" Vg.; "pecuniae quinquies decem milia" 1516-19). Erasmus is more precise, though the Vulgate addition of denariorum is a legitimate interpretation. In the Annot., lemma, Erasmus cites quinque milium as the Vulgate reading, and further suggests that it should be rendered quinquagies mille: this is comparable with his preference, at several other passages, for quinquies mille rather than quinque milia. See on Ioh. 6,10.
20 sermo ó $\lambda$ 'ó $\gamma$ os ("verbum" $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,1.
20 dei тои̃ kupiou. Erasmus keeps the Vulgate rendering, though this reflected a Greek text substituting toũ $\theta$ Eoũ, as in cod. E and a few later mss. Manetti had domini.
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${ }^{21}$ His autem expletis, proposuit Paulus in spiritu, transita Macedonia et Achaia, ire Hierosolymam, dicens, Postquam fuero ibi, oportet me et Romam videre. ${ }^{2}$ Missis autem in Macedoniam duobus ex iis qui ministrabant sibi, videlicet Timotheo et Erasto, ipse remansit ad tempus in Asia. ${ }^{23}$ Ortus est autem illo tempore tumultus non exiguus de illa via. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Nam}$ quidam nomine Demetrius, faber argentarius, qui faciebat delubra argentea Dianae, praestabat artificibus non exiguum quaestum: ${ }^{25}$ quibus conuocatis et iis qui similium rerum srant opifices, dixit: Viri, scitis quod ex hoc opificio quaestus nobis est: ${ }^{26}$ et videtis, et auditis, quod non solum in Ephesina ciuitate, sed pene per totam Asiam, Paulus hic persuasit et auertit multam turbam, | dicens, quod non sunt dii qui manibus fiant. ${ }^{27}$ Non solum autem haec pars nobis in periculum venit, ne reprobetur:

21 Romam $A E$ : Rhomam $B-D \mid 22$ iis qui ministrabant $B-E$ : ministrantibus $A \mid$ videlicet $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 23$ Ortus $B$-E: Facta $A \mid$ tumultus non exiguus $B-E$ : turbatio non exigua $A$ | illa $B$-E: om. $A \mid 24$ Nam ... faciebat $B$-E: Demetrius enim quidam nomine aurifaber faciens $A$ | praestabat $B$ - $E$ : prestabat $A \mid 25$ ex $B$-E: de $A \mid 26$ in Ephesina ciuitate $E$ : Ephesi $A-C$, Ephesinae ciuitatis $D$ | per totam Asiam $E$ : totius Asiae $A-D|\operatorname{sunt} A E: \operatorname{sint} B-D|$ fiant $D$ e: fiunt $A-C \mid 27$ in periculum venit $B$-E: periclitatur $A$

21 dicens $\mathfrak{c i m} \dot{\omega} \nu$ ótı ("dicens: Quoniam" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had dicens quod.
22 Missis ... duobus à वтоотвíhas ... סv́o ("Mittens ... duos" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti (Pal Lat. 45) used Cum vero duos ... misisset.
22 ex iis qui ministrabant $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$ סıaкovoúvt $\omega v$ ("ex ministrantibus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus seems to have disliked the use of ministrans as a noun rather than a verb.
22 videlicet (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on lob. 1,12.
 ("Timotheum et Erastum" Vg.). This change is dictated by the earlier adoption of the ablative absolute construction with missis. Manetti had Timotbeum atque Erastum.

23 Ortus est $\mathfrak{\text { Ej}} \mathrm{y}$ ยveтo ("Facta est" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,17.
23 tumultus tópoxos ("turbatio" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At Act. 12,18, Erasmus retained turbatio in rendering the same Greek word. Elsewhere, he follows the Vulgate in using tumultus for Өópußos at seven passages, and once in rendering óvo$\sigma$ татó $\omega$ at Act. 21,38.
23 exiguus ìiyos ("minima" Vg.; "exigua" 1516). See on Act. 15,2, and Annot. The version of Manetti had parua.
23 illa via 7 T̃s $\delta \delta \delta 0 \tilde{0}$ ("via domini" late Vg .; "via" 1516). Erasmus inserts illa to make clear that this was a reference to "the way", i.e. the precepts of the Christian faith, elsewhere described as the way of the Lord or the way of
salvation．As pointed out in Annot．，the late Vulgate use of domini is an explanatory addition． This word is unsupported by Greek mss．At vs．9，however，Erasmus retained domini in rendering the same Greek expression．
24 Nam quidam nomine Demetrius $\Delta \eta \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau 10 s$ Yáp tis óvó $\mu$ ortı（＂Demetrius enim quidam nomine＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus departs from the Greek word－order，with a slight change of meaning．On nam，see on Iob．3，34．
24 faber argentarius д́друироко́тоs（＂argentarius＂ Vg．；＂aurifaber＂1516）．In Annot．，Erasmus refers to the ambiguity of argentarius，which can sometimes denote a banker rather than a silver－ smith：cf．Valla Elegantiae IV，44；Erasmus Parapbr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae，ASD I，4，pp．224， 11．468－469；226，1．519．However，his choice of aurifaber in 1516 was not a word which was used in classical literature，where aurifex is the preferred term，as also recommended in Valla Annot．There was the further problem that both aurifaber and aurifex could be understood as meaning＂goldsmith＂，and for this reason Erasmus in 1519 substituted a phrase which was closer to the literal meaning of the Greek expression．He thereby anticipated Stunica＇s objection to the use of aurifaber：cf．Erasmus Apolog．resp．Iac．Lop．Stun．，ASD IX，2，p．158， 11．903－913．
24 qui faciebat $\pi ⿰ ⿺ 乚 一 匕 刂 \nu$（＂faciens＂ $1516=V g$ ．）． The Vulgate is more literal here．
24 delubra argentea vaoùs ápyupoũs（＂aedes argenteas＂Vg．）．This change avoids the ambi－ guity of the plural of aedes：see on Act．4，34， and Annot．
24 exiguum ȯ入íү $\eta v$（＂modicum＂Vg．）．See on Act．15，2，and Annot．
25 quibus conuocatis et iis oûs $\sigma v v a \theta p o i \sigma \alpha s$ kai toús（＂quos conuocans et eos＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．Manetti＇s version was quos vbi congregauit atque alios．
 Vg．）．Erasmus elsewhere retains ciusmodi and buiusmodi at more than twenty passages．Manetti put circa talia．
25 quod őtו（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Manetti made the same change．
25 ex（de：1516）hoc opificio quaestus nobis est ék
 （＂de hoc artificio est nobis acquisitio＂late Vg．）． On the substitution of ex for de，see on Ioh． 2，15．By using opificium for épyaoias，Erasmus
seeks to convey the connection with opifices （ép $\gamma$ ótas）earlier in the sentence．However，in Annot．，he suggests an alternative rendering，$e x$ boc quaestu nobis suppeditat rerum copia，which has the merit of consistency with other pas－ sages where épyooia is rendered by quaestus： Act． $16,16,19,19,24$ ．On the meaning of opifex and opificium，see Valla Elegantiae IV，44；Eras－ mus Parapbr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallac，ASD I，4， p．288，1l．237－238．Manetti put ex boc questu est nobis abundantia．
26 quod（1st．）őtı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． The word was omitted in Manetti＇s version．
26 in Ephesina ciuitate＇Eqźoou（＂Ephesi＂1516－ $22=$ Vg．；＂Ephesinae ciuitatis＂1527）．This is one of the relatively scarce innovations of the 1535 edition．For other additions of ciuitas， see on Act．8，26．In 1527 Annot．，Erasmus dis－ tinguishes between èv ’Eqé $\sigma \varphi$ and＇Eq́́$\sigma o v$, connecting the latter with óx $\bar{x}$ ov later in the verse．He does not update this note to take account of the further change made by his 1535 translation．
26 per totam Asiam mádons tñs Aఠías（＂totius Asiae＂ $1516-27=V g$ ．）．This further innovation in 1535 is less literal than the Vulgate rendering． Manetti put wniuersae ．．．Asiae．
26 persuasit et $\pi \varepsilon i ́ \sigma \alpha s$（＂suadens＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．For Erasmus＇perception of the dis－ tinction between suadeo and persuadeo，see on Act．18，13．
26 quod non sunt öTt oủk cỉ̄í（＂Quoniam non sunt＂Vg．；＂quod non sint＂1519－27）．See on Iob． 1,20 ．The same change was made by Manetti．
26 qui ．．．fiant oi ．．．$\gamma$ lvó ${ }^{\mu}$ evoı（＂qui ．．．fiunt＂ $1516-22=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus prefers the subjunctive for a subordinate clause within indirect speech， in accordance with classical Latin style．
 Tò $\mu$ ह́pos（＂periclitabitur nobis pars＂Vg．；＂pars nobis periclitatur＂1516）．The Vulgate word－ order closely follows the Greek，but Erasmus objected to the incorrect use of the future tense． He also removes periclitor at Act．19，40；Col．1，29 （both in 1519）．See Annot．
 redargutionem venire＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，33， for the avoidance of the infinitive．Erasmus puts redargutio for Ểey Elsewhere，he follows the Vulgate in using reprobo for ámобокıд́́ちん（cf．on Act．4，11）．
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verum etiam ne magnae deae Dianae templum pro nihilo habeatur: futurumque sit vt etiam destruatur maiestas eius, quam tota Asia et orbis colit. ${ }^{28}$ His auditis repleti sunt ira, et exclamauerunt, dicentes: Magna Diana Ephesiorum. ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Et}$ impleta est ciuitas tota confusione, et impetum fecerunt vno animo in theatrum, correpto Gaio et Aristarcho Macedonibus, comitibus Pauli. ${ }^{30}$ Paulo autem volente intrare ad populum, non permiserunt discipuli. ${ }^{31}$ Quidam autem et ex Asiae primoribus qui erant amici eius miserunt ad eum, rogantes ne se daret in theatrum. ${ }^{32}$ Alii quidem igitur aliud clamabant. Erat enim contio confusa, et plerique nesciebant qua ex causa conuenissent. ${ }^{33}$ De turba autem protraxerunt Alexandrum, propellentibus eum Iudaeis. Alexander autem manu silentio postulato, volebat rationem reddere populo. ${ }^{34}$ Quem vt cognouerunt Iudaeum esse, vox orta est vna omnium, ferme ad horas duas, clamantium: Magna Diana Ephesiorum. ${ }^{35}$ Quum autem sedasset scriba turbam, dixit: Viri Ephesii, quis enim est hominum, qui nesciat Ephesiorum ciuitatem cultricem esse magnae


32 igitur $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ plerique $B-E$ : plaerique $A \mid 34$ orta $B-E$ : facta $A$

In Annot., he suggested ne reprobemur as an alternative. Manetti substituted in redargutiones veniens.

27 verum etiam $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ каi ("sed et" Vg.). See on Ioh. 15,24, and Annot. The version of Manetti had sed etiam.
 ("in nihilum reputabitur" Vg.). The Vulgate
obliterates the link between kivסuvev́el and $\lambda 0$ $\gamma ı \sigma \theta$ ñvol. Erasmus elsewhere substitutes deputo for reputo at $M c .15,28$, following the example of the Vulgate at $L c .22,37$, and puts imputo for reputo at several passages in Romans. In the N.T., he uses reputo only in the sense of "think" or "consider", and not for "reckon" or "count as". See also Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered ad nibil reputabitur.

27 deace $\theta \in \tilde{\alpha} \mathrm{s}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. The word is also omitted from Erasmus' rendering in Annot. The version of Manetti added deac.
27 futurumque sit vt etiam destruatur $\mu \dot{\mu} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$ ıv тє каi каөवıрEíotan ("sed et destrui incipiet" Vg .). Instead of $\tau \varepsilon$, the Vulgate evidently reflects the use of $\mathbf{\delta} \dot{\xi}$, as printed in Erasmus' 1516 Greek text, following cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. (though cod. 1 has $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon 1$ for $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon v$, while cod. 2816 omits kai). His substitution of $\tau \varepsilon$ in 1519 was supported by $\boldsymbol{P}^{74} \times$ A B E and some later mss., and conformed with the Latin rendering which he had previously adopted. In 1519 Annot., he claimed incorrectly that this Greek text was followed by the Vulgate and found in most Greek mss. At the same time, he reported the existence of another variant, $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \circ{ }^{\circ} \delta \dot{E}$, which is found in cod. 3. For Erasmus' removal of incipio, see on Ioh. 4,47, and for futurum ... vt, see on Act. 2,21. Manetti translated this clause by Verum maiestas insuper sua destruenda est.
29 correpto $\sigma u v \alpha p \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu T \varepsilon s$ ("rapto" Vg.). See on Act. 6,12.
29 тoũ Пaúخou. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 in adding the article, supported by cod. 2816 and relatively few other late mss.
30 ad cis ("in" Vg.). This use of ad after intro is consistent with the practice of the Vulgate at Act. 28,8; Ap. Ioh. 3,20, as being more suited to entry into the presence of a person, rather than into a particular place. Manetti similarly put $a d$.
31 ex ("de" Vg.). As usual, Erasmus avoids the use of $d e$ in the sense of "from".
31 Asiae primoribus тธ้̃ Aбı $\alpha p \chi \omega \tilde{\nu}$ ("Asiae principibus" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). Erasmus may have felt that the title, principes, bestowed too high a status on these local officials who were subordinate to Roman authority. Cf. on his use of primores for $\pi \rho \omega ̃$ тol at Act. 25,2 (1519).
32 quidem igitur $\mu$ èv oũv ("autem" Vg.;"quidem" 1516). See on Act. 9,31. Manetti put nempe.

32 contio $\dagger$ é ékk $\lambda \eta \sigma^{\prime} \alpha$ ("ecclesia" Vg.). In Annot, Erasmus explains that the secular nature of the proceedings made ecclesia an inappropriate rendering. A similar substitution occurs at Act. 19,39 (1519); 19,40; Hebr. 12,23. Valla Annot. recommended the use of contio in his comment on vs. 40.

32 plerique oi $\pi \lambda$ sious ("plures" Vg.). Erasmus may have preferred plerique because it was less ambiguous, having in mind that plures can sometimes mean "several" rather than "most". However, he retains plures at e.g. 1 Cor. 10,5; 15,6.
$32 \sigma v v \varepsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{U} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \alpha v$. This spelling is derived from cod. 2815, with little other ms. support. Codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. have

33 protraxerunt троє $\beta$ ß $\beta \alpha \sigma v$ ("detraxerunt" Vg.). The Vulgate corresponds with $\kappa \propto \tau \varepsilon \beta$ i $\beta \alpha \sigma \propto \nu$ of cod. D*. In Annot., Erasmus speculates that the Vulgate translator mistook $\pi \rho \circ \beta 1 \beta \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ for m $\rho \circ \beta$ ó $\zeta \omega$. He also made a link with the use of $\pi \rho \circ \beta 1 \beta \alpha \zeta \omega$ at $M t .14,8$, in the sense of "instruct beforehand". In keeping with the latter interpretation, Manetti had put premonuerunt.
 rationem" late Vg.). The change of word-order makes no difference to the sense. Erasmus in effect restores the earlier Vulgate rendering. Manetti ended this sentence with rationem populo reddere volebat.
34 हாாıyvóvtcuv. In 1516, Erasmus followed his cod. 2815 in putting èmiyvóvtes, as found in cod. 1 and nearly all other mss. (cod. 2816
 in 1519 was based on cod. 3, with support from a few other late mss., producing grammatical agreement with móvitcuv ... кpa̧óvtcov later in the verse. This choice of wording persisted into the Textus Receptus.
34 orta est $̇$ モ̉ ${ }^{\prime}$ Éveto ("facta est" $1516=V g$.). See on loh. 1,17.
34 ferme $\omega$ ("quasi" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,39.
34 ad Émi ("per"Vg.). See on vs. 8.
 cum sedasset" Vg.). Erasmus is more precise here. The reading катабвíoas $\delta \varepsilon$ in the 1516 Greek text was taken from cod. 1, with support from codd. D E and a few later mss. This was corrected in the 1516 errata, from codd. 2815 and 2816. See also Annot.
35 turbam tòv öx ${ }^{2}$ ov ("turbas" Vg.). See on Act. 14,14, and Annot. The Vulgate plural lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti also had turbam.
35 bominum $\alpha \sim \theta$ pமтtos. Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering, though this reflected the substitution of $\alpha v \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi} \omega \omega \nu$, as in $37^{74}$ \& A B E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text
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 ớ $\mu \varepsilon \rho \circ v, \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon v o ̀ s ~ \alpha i t i o u ~ u ́ t r o ́ p X o v t o s, ~$ $\pi \varepsilon p i$ oũ $\delta u v \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ סoũvaı $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ T \eta ̃ s$



20Meт $\alpha$ ठغ̀ Tò $\pi \alpha u ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha 1$ tòv 0 ó-



deae Dianae, et a Ioue delapsi simulacri? ${ }^{36}$ Quum igitur his nemo contradicat, oportet vos sedatos esse, et nihil praecipitanter agere. ${ }^{37}$ Adduxistis enim homines istos, neque sacrilegos, neque contumeliosos in deam vestram: ${ }^{38}$ quod si Demetrius et qui cum eo sunt artifices, habent aduersus aliquem causam, conuentus forenses aguntur et proconsules sunt, accusent inuicem. ${ }^{39} \mathrm{Si}$ quid autem de rebus aliis quaeritis, in legitima contione dirimetur. ${ }^{40} \mathrm{Nam}$ periculum est, ne seditionis hodiernae rei fiamus, quum nulla subsit causa, vnde poterimus reddere rationem concursus istius. Et quum haec dixisset, dimisit contionem.

20Postquam autem cessauit tumultus, vocatis ad se Paulus discipulis, complexusque illos profectus est, vt iret in Macedoniam.

## 

35 deae $B$ - $E$ : om. $A \mid$ et a loue delapsi simulacri $B-E$ : Iouisque prolis $A \mid 36$ igitur $B-E$ : ergo $A \mid$ nemo contradicat $B-E$ : contradici non possit $A \mid 37$ contumeliosos in B-E: blasphemantes $A \mid 38$ conuentus $B-E$ (ital): conuentus $A$ (rom.) | forenses aguntur $A-C E$ : forenses agunses aguntur $D \mid 39$ de rebus aliis $B-E$ : alterius rei $A \mid$ contione $E$ : ecclesia $A$, concione $B-D \mid 40$ periculum est $B-E$ : periclitamur $A \mid$ nulla subsit causa, vnde $B-E$ : nullus in culpa sit, de quo $A$
20,1 complexusque illos $B-E$ : et salutatis illis $A$
follows cod. 2815, with support from cod. $\mathrm{D}^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put bomo.

35 deae $\theta$ عã $($ omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{p 7}^{74} \times$ A B D E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. However, in Annot., he omits $\theta \varepsilon a \tilde{s}$ in his citation of the passage, without any discussion of this point. Manetti similarly added deae.
35 et a loue delapsi simulacri kò toũ $\Delta$ ıотєtoũs ("Iouisque prolis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot., Erasmus justifies his explanatory addition of simulacri
by referring to the known Ephesian belief that a statue of Artemis had fallen from heaven.
 övt $\omega v$ ("Cum ... contradici non possit" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Erasmus points out in Annot., that the Greek word allows both interpretations.

36 igitur oũv ("ergo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 6,62.

36 тоút $\omega \nu$. This word was omitted in cod. 2815, but was taken by Erasmus or his assistants from codd. 1 and 2816, in company with most other mss. (though in cod. 2816, the wordorder is тоút $\omega v$ ờ $v \tau \omega v$ ).

36 praecipitanter тротєт's ("temere" Vg.). Erasmus selects a more precise rendering of the Greek word, consistent with his substitution of praecipites for proterui at 2 Tim. 3,4
 temerarium.
37 contumeliosos in $\beta \lambda \alpha \circ \varphi \eta \mu \circ$ ũvт $\alpha$ ("blasphemantes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . See on Act. 6,11; 13,45.$
37 deam tìv $\theta \varepsilon \dot{\alpha} v$. The reading tìv 日eóv in 1516 came from cod. 2815, with support from $\mathbf{P}^{74}$ \& B D D ${ }^{\text {corf }} \mathrm{E}^{*}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In 1519, Erasmus substituted $\theta$ eáv from cod. 3, supported by codd. $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}^{\text {corr }}$ and some later mss.
38 babent aduersus aliquem causam mpós tiva入óyov ÊXouov. Erasmus' Greek word-order was derived from cod. 2815, with virtually no other ms. support, but nevertheless survived into the Textus Recoptus. The reading of codd. 1,2816 and most other mss. is $\bar{z} \times 0 \cup \sigma(v)$ mpós tiva $\lambda$ óyov. Here, Erasmus' Latin word-order, following the Vulgate, is more correct than his Greek. Manetti put babent causam aduersus aliquem.
38 conuentus forenses ${ }^{\text {dryopaiol. The word }}$ conuentus is italicised in Erasmus' translation, to show that it is an explanatory addition by the Vulgate: see Annot.
39 de rebus aliis $\pi \varepsilon p i$ étép $\rho v$ ("alterius rei" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more accurate here, unless the Vulgate be thought to reflect the variant $\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha a 1 t \varepsilon \rho \omega$, found in $\left(7^{34}\right)$ B and about twenty-five later mss. His Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. א A D (E) and more than 420 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 589-92). Manetti put de aliis.
39 contione Ėkk $\lambda \eta \sigma$ ị́̆ ("ecclesia" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 32., and Annot.
 Vg .). Erasmus is more accurate: cf. his omission of possit in vs. 36. See also Annot,, where he suggested an alternative rendering, absoluetur, as had been advocated by Valla Annot. The version of Manetti had absoluatur.
40 Nam kai $\gamma$ áp ("Nam et" Vg.). Erasmus elsewhere retains the more literal nam et for kai $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$ at about ten other passages. Manetti, quite literally, put Et enim.
40 periculum est kivסuvévouev ("periclitamur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on vs. 27.
 See on Iob. 1,33 for Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive. Cf. also his avoidance of redargutio at vs. 27. Elsewhere, he generally retains accuso for this Greek verb, reserving arguo solely for $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi \chi \omega$. He also sometimes uses reus sum for ópqỉ $\omega$ and Evoxos. Manetti had ne ... arguamur.
 Xovtos ("cum nullus obnoxius sit" Vg.; "cum nullus in culpa sit" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus argues that both interpretations are possible, owing to the ambiguity of aitiou, though he omits to cite, in favour of his preferred rendering, the fact that aitiov is used as a noun in three passages of Luke: $L c .23,4,14,22$. In Manetti's version this was Cum nulla causa existat.
40 unde $\pi$ tepl oũ ("de quo" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,25. This change flows from Erasmus' previous decision that aitiou is neuter in gender. In Annot., he refers to mss. in which oũ is followed by oú, as found in his codd. 1 and 2816, in company with codd. א A B and most later mss. His omission of ou from his text was based on cod. 2815, supported by 7 $7^{74}$ D E and some of the later mss. Manetti had de qua, agreeing with causa.
40 poterimus $\delta u v \eta \sigma o ́ \mu e \theta \alpha$ ("possumus" Vg. 1527; "possimus" Vg. mss.). Erasmus renders the Greek future tense more correctly. See Annot. The version of Manetti put valeamus.
 See on vs. 32.
20,1 vocatis ad se тробка $\lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \mathrm{Evos}$ ("vocatis" Vg.). Erasmus similarly adds ad se at ten other passages in rendering this verb, in accordance with Vulgate usage e.g. at $M t$. 15,10 . See also Annot.
1 complexusque illos kai áotraбव́usvos ("et exhortatus eos, valedixit et" Vg.; "et salutatis illis" 1516). The Vulgate reflects the addition of
 and some later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In Annot., he incorrectly suggests that the text underlying the Vulgate substituted $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon v \circ$ for $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu \varepsilon v o s, ~ a n d ~}$ even affirmed his own preference for this hypothetical reading. Manetti put salutatisque.
1 тinv. This word was omitted in codd. 2815 and 2816, but was restored by Erasmus or his
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${ }^{2}$ Quum autem perambulasset partes illas, et exhortatus eos fuisset multo sermone, venit in Graeciam, ${ }^{3}$ et ibi peractis mensibus tribus, quum essent illi structae insidiae a Iudaeis soluturo in Syriam, habebat in animo, vt reuer | teretur per Macedoniam. ${ }^{4}$ ComiLB 512
 axpl $A$

3 essent $B$-E: fierent $A \mid$ structae $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ reuerteretur $C$.E: reuerterentur $A B \mid$ 4 Berrhoeensis $B-E$ : Beroeensis $A \mid$ prius ac $E$ : et $A$-D | alt. ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 6$ abnauigauimus $B-E$ : nauigauimus $A \mid 7$ Vno autem die $B-E$ : Vna autem $A \mid$ disserebat $B-E$ : disputabat $\operatorname{cum} A$
assistants from cod. 1, in company with most other mss.
2 in eis ("ad" Vg.). This change produces consistency with Vulgate usage at other passages involving travel to a country, rather than to a town. The same change was made by Manetti.
3 et ibi $\tau \varepsilon$ ("vbi" Vg.). Erasmus is a little more precise, in providing a rendering for $\tau \varepsilon$. Manetti translates this clause as et cum ibi tres menses commoraretur.
3 peractis mensibus tribus morńo $\sigma$... $\mu \tilde{\eta} v a s$ трعĩs ("cum fuisset menses tres" Vg.). Erasmus substitutes the ablative absolute construction here, for variety of style, because he wishes to
reserve quum for introducing the following subordinate clause. On perago, see on Iob. 7,14.
3 quum essent illi structae $\gamma \varepsilon v o \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta s ~ \propto \cup ̉ T น \tilde{~(" f a c-~}$ tae sunt illi" Vg.; "cum fierent illi" 1516). For Erasmus' avoidance of facio, see on Iob. 1,15. He does not use struo elsewhere in the N.T. The version of Manetti put factac sunt ei.
 Vg.). See on Act. 13,13.
 consilium" Vg.). Erasmus reserves such expressions as consilium babeo, consilium capio, and consilium ineo, for decisions which were taken jointly by several people, e.g. in rendering
$\sigma u \mu \beta$ о'̇ $\lambda_{1}$ ov $\lambda \alpha \beta o ́ v t e s$ at Mt. 28,12. Manetti's rendering was ita vt ... sententia fieret.
3 vt reuerteretur тoũ úmootpéqeiv ("vt reuerterentur" 1516-19). The singular verb is more appropriate after the earlier babebat in animo. The rendering of 1516-19 may have been a misprint. Manetti put reuertendi.
4 vsque ad Asiam äxpı тñs Aoias (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ B and just two later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, accompanied by codd. A (D) E and more than 440 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 5924). Manetti had vsque in Asiam.
4 Sopater $\Sigma \dot{\omega} \pi \alpha$ тpos ("Sosipater Pyrrhi" late Vg .). On this occasion, codd. 2815 and $2816^{\text {coorr }}$ support the late Vulgate spelling, along with a few other late mss., which have owoitartpos. Erasmus or his assistants adopted $\sigma \omega$ ©́motpos from codd. 1 and $2816^{*}$, as found in most other mss., and this is the only reading acknowledged in Annot. The Vulgate addition of Pyrrbi corresponds with múppou, added by $7^{77^{74}}$ स A B D E and some later mss. Manetti transliterated the name more exactly as Sopatros.
4 Apítopxos. The spelling Apiotapkos in 1535 appears to be a printer's error, as Erasmus retains the $-x$ - at the four other passages where this name occurs.
4 ac (1st.) кai ("et" 1516-27 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25 .
4 ac (2nd.) kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See ibid. Manetti (Pal Lat. 45) had atque.
5 троє入өо́vtes. In 1516, the reading тробE $\lambda$ 月óvtes was derived from codd. 1 and 2816, in company with codd. $\mathrm{K} \mathrm{A}^{\text {vid }} \mathrm{B}^{*} \mathrm{E}$ and many later mss. In 1519, Erasmus reverted to the reading of cod. 2815, supported by F $^{74}$ Bcorr D and another large section of the later mss. (not including cod. 3).
5 expectarunt ${ }^{\text {é }} \mathrm{Ev}$ vov ("sustinuerunt" late Vg . = Vg. 1527; "sustinebant" 1516-27 Annot,, lemma $=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.). The reading sustinuerunt of the 1527 Vulgate column was also found in the Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514. However, the Vulgate lemma of Valla Annot. had sustinebant. Valla recommended the substitution of expectabant or manebant, and Erasmus similarly offered manebant as an alternative rendering in Annot. Elsewhere, he substitutes maneo for sustineo in rendering $\mu$ év $\omega$ at $M t$. 26,38; $M c$. 14,34 , and in rendering $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ at $M c .8,2$.

See on Act. 18,18. At other passages, expecto is

 expectauerunt.
6 abnauigauimus $\grave{\xi} \xi \in \pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma \alpha \mu \varepsilon v$ ("nauigauimus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 18,18.
6 intra dies axppıs गो $\mu \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} v$ ("in diebus" Vg.). Erasmus attempts greater precision in rendering the Greek preposition. In 1516, he had axxpl from cod. 2815, supported by codd. A B and many later mss., including cod. 1: cf. vs. 9 , below. The change to axpis in 1519 corresponded with the text of cod. 3, with support from cod. 2816 and many other late mss.
 $1516=$ late Vg .). The addition of die is for the sake of clarity. A similar change occurs at Iob. 20,1 (see ad loc.), but not in rendering the similar Greek expressions at $L c .24,1$ or 1 Cor. 16,2. See Annot.
7 sabbatorum $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ ("sabbati" Vg.). See, again, on Iob. 20,1, and see also Annot. The same change was proposed by both Valla Annot. and Manetti.
 $\mu a \theta \eta T \omega \tau \nu$ ("cum conuenissemus" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having ovvn $\gamma \mu$ évov $\dagger \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ as in $\boldsymbol{7}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B D E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In Annot., he implies that the Vulgate had cum conuenissent, though this was not the reading of the 1527 Vulgate column, or of the Froben Vulgate editions of 1491 and 1514, which had cum conuenisemus. This discrepancy may have arisen through misunderstanding the text of Valla Annot., where Valla's recommendation of cum conuenisent could, at first sight, be supposed to belong to the Vulgate lemma rather than being a revised rendering. Manetti substituted discipulis ... congregatis.
7 disserebat $\delta 1 \varepsilon \lambda \hat{\lambda} \gamma$ ยтo ("disputabat cum" 1516 $=$ late Vg .). A similar substitution occurs in vs. 9 (1519). Erasmus objects in Annot., that Paul did not hold a disputation with those with whom he broke bread. This echoed a comment of Valla Annot., which advocated the same rendering as Erasmus.
7 postridie $\begin{array}{r}\tilde{1} \\ \text { Ëraúpiov ("in crastinum" Vg.). }\end{array}$ See on Iob. 1,43, regarding crastinum, and for postridie, see on Act. 10,9. See also Annot., based on Valla Annot.
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 $\mu \varepsilon т \rho i \omega s$.
autem lucernae multae in coenaculo vbi eramus congregati. ${ }^{9}$ Sedens autem quidam adolescens nomine Eutychus in fenestra, quum degrauaretur somno profundo, disserente diu Paulo magis depressus somno, decidit ex tertio coenaculo deorsum, et sublatus est mortuus. ${ }^{10}$ Quum descendisset autem Paulus, incubuit super eum, et complexus dixit: Nolite turbari: anima enim eius in ipso est. ${ }^{11}$ Quum ascendisset autem, fregissetque panem ac degustasset, diu colloquutus vsque ad diluculum, ita demum profectus est. ${ }^{12}$ Adduxerunt autem puerum viuentem, et refocillati sunt non mediocriter.

11 prius кaı C-E: om. $A B$

9 degrauaretur $B$ - $E$ : mergeretur $A \mid$ disserente $B$ - $E$ : disputante $A \mid$ magis $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ decidit $B-E$ : cecidit $A \mid$ tertio coenaculo $B-E$ : tertia contignatione $A \mid 11$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 12$ refocillati $B-E$ : consolati $A$

8 lucernae $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon s$ ("lampades" Vg.). Erasmus elsewhere generally follows the Vulgate in using lampas for $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi t \alpha{ }_{s}$, and lucerna for $\lambda u ́ X v o s$.
8 multae ikavai ("copiosae" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 22,6, in accordance with Vulgate usage at e.g. Lc. 8,$32 ; 23,9 ;$ Act. 9,23 . Erasmus usually reserves copiosus for collective nouns such as money, crowd, and fruit. See further on lob. 15,8. Manetti also had multe (= multae), but placed it at the beginning of the sentence.

8 eramus ग$\eta \sigma \alpha v$. This discrepancy between the Greek and the Latin texts remained throughout all five editions. The reading $\bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ could have been derived from cod. 1 , which is one of the few mss. to contain the word, or it could have arisen independently by a printer's error, caused by the presence of $\tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha v$ on the previous line of text. This poorly attested reading remained in the Textus Receptus. A similar discrepancy is found at Act. 21,8. At the present passage, codd. 2815 and 2816 have $\pi \mu \mu v$, supported by $\mathcal{K} A$ B D E and nearly all later mss.
 Vg.). Erasmus presumably regarded super as
unsuited to the context, as "upon" the window does not make good sense. Cf. on Ioh. 7,44.

9 quum degranaretur к夭тофєро́ $\boldsymbol{\mu \varepsilon v o s ~ ( " c u m ~ m e r - ~}$ geretur" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus here attempts greater precision in rendering the Greek compound verb: see Annot. The version of Manetti, more literally, put delatus.
 mus speculates that the Vulgate was based on a Greek variant, $\beta \alpha \rho \varepsilon \tilde{i}$, a spelling which is found in cod. D. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
9 disserente $\delta \iota \propto \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \circ \mu \varepsilon ́ v o u ~(" d i s p u t a n t e " ~ 1516$
$=$ Vg.). See on vs. 7, and Annot. The version of Manetti rendered this clause by dum Paulus vehementer disputaret.
 ("diu Paulo" 1516 = Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus says that he prefers to take $\begin{gathered}\text { eni } \\ \pi \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ o \nu ~ w i t h ~ t h e ~\end{gathered}$ following verb, кatevex $\theta$ zis, rather than with $\delta 1 \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \bigcirc \mu \dot{v} v o u$, and he punctuates his Greek text accordingly. However, in his Latin rendering of 1519-35, he applies $\varepsilon \pi \pi i \quad \pi \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ o \nu ~ t o ~ b o t h ~$ verbs, producing an unacceptable duplication.

9 depressus katevex $\theta$ Eis ("ductus" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus speculates that the original Vulgate rendering was deuectus, a reading not found in Vulgate mss. Manetti preferred deductus.
9 Úmo. This reading was taken from cod. 2815, with support from cod. D and a few later mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., it is àtó.
9 decidit हैדधбev ("cecidit" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 11,32 for other changes to cado. For dramatic effect, Erasmus makes use of this series of compound verbs with the same prefix, degrauaretur ... depressus ... decidit.
$9 e x \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha^{\prime}$ ("de" Vg.). The preposition de is acceptable here, in the sense of "down from". Erasmus' choice of $e x$ was partly a matter of stylistic variety, in view of his repeated use of de- as a prefix earlier in the sentence, and also in the following deorsum. In Annot., he substitutes $a$.
9 tertio coenaculo toũ tpıஎтéyou ("tertia contignatione" 1516 only). In Annot., Erasmus gives an elaborate definition of contignatio, a more technical rendering than that of the Vulgate. In 1519, he reverted to the Vulgate wording, despite the use of coenaculo to render a different Greek word in vs. 8.
10 Quum descendisset autem кataßàs 8 ह́ ("Ad quem cum descendisset" $V \mathrm{~V}$.). There does not seem to be any explicit Greek ms. support for the Vulgate wording here. Manetti, less accurately, used the present participle, Descendens autem.
10 eius वủtoũ ("ipsius" Vg.). This change is for stylistic variety, to avoid the repetitive character of ipsius in ipso, found in the late Vulgate. Manetti put sua.
11 Quum ascendisset $\alpha$ ảvaßás ("Ascendens" Vg.). Greek aorist.
11 fregissetque kai $k \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma s$ ("frangensque" $V g$.). Greek aorist. The omission of kai in 1516-19 was probably unintentional, although it coincides with the text of cod. B. The version of Manetti put et pane fracto gustatoque for frangensque ... gustans.
11 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
11 degustasset $\gamma \varepsilon v \sigma$ व́quevos ("gustans" Vg.). Greek aorist. This is the only occurrence of degusto in Erasmus' N.T. Elsewhere, he always retains gusto to render the same Greek verb. As in vs. 9,
he appears to be striving for literary effect by a sequence of words beginning with $d$, as in degustasset, diu ...diluculum ... demum, all of which are departures from the Vulgate rendering.
11 diu é $\varphi$ ' íkovóv $\tau \varepsilon$ ("satisque" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus usually follows the Vulgate in using multo tempore for similar Greek expressions, regarding satis as an over-literal translation in such contexts. Manetti put satis.
11 colloquutus $\delta \mu \lambda \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha s$ ("allocutus est" late Vg.). See on Act. 10,27. Manetti substituted locutus est.
11 vsque ad áxpl ("vsque in" late Vg.). As in vs. 6 , the spelling $\alpha x p$ is taken from cod. 2815, this time supported by $P^{74}$ A B C ${ }^{\text {corr }} E$ and a few later mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. $\mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}$, it is äxpis. Manetti had vsque ad, as in Erasmus and the earlier Vulgate.
11 diluculum aủyñs ("lucem" Vg.). This may be compared with Erasmus' substitution of $d i$ luculo for ante lucem in rendering öp $\theta$ poos at $L c$. 24,22 (1519). Elsewhere, he follows the Vulgate in using diluculo for öptpos, and he also uses this word to replace mane in rendering $\pi \rho \omega \mathrm{i}$.
11 ita demum oütws ("et sic" late Vg.). Erasmus' use of demum is not explicitly supported by the Greek text. In the late Vulgate, the addition of $e t$ is made necessary by the earlier insertion of est after allocutus. In Manetti, this became ac sic.
12 refocillati sunt mapek $\lambda \dot{j} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v$ ("consolati sunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus elsewhere uses refocil$l o$ for $\alpha$ duamavं $\omega$, replacing reficio at $M t .11,28$; 1 Cor. 16,18; 2 Cor. 7,13; Pbm. 20 , and replacing requiesco at Pbm . 7. He further substitutes refocillo for refrigero in rendering ovvavamav́oual at Rom. 15,32, and davau'x $\omega$ at 2 Tim. 1,16. In the present context, the meaning "console" or "comfort" is inappropriate as the young man was alive. Another reason why he wished to avoid consolor is that in classical Latin this was more commonly used as a deponent verb, having an active rather than a passive sense. He similarly removed consolor at Mt. 2,18; 5,4; Lc. 16,25; 2 Cor. 7,7, 13; Col. 2,2; 1 Thess. 3,7. However, Erasmus' choice of refocillo is of dubious merit, as it does not appear in classical Latin literature. On the Vulgate use of consolor, see on Act. 15,32.
12 non mediocriter oủ $\mu \mathrm{\varepsilon} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i} \omega$ ("non minime" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. For comparable examples of the removal of minimus,









 $\nu \eta$ 苐 $\lambda$ Өо





 ＂Ефєбо⿱，$\mu \varepsilon т \varepsilon к \propto \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \alpha т о$ тоѝs трєбßит $\varepsilon$－
 vovto тpòs aủtóv，eittev aútoĩs，${ }^{\text {Y }}$ цЕĩs
${ }^{13}$ Nos autem conscensa naui sol－ uimus Asson，inde excepturi Pau－ lum．Sic enim ordinauerat，ipse per terram iter facturus．${ }^{14}$ Quum autem conuenissemus Asson，re－ cepto eo，venimus in Mitylenem． ${ }^{15} \mathrm{Et}$ inde nauigantes，sequenti die venimus contra Chium．Postridie vero appulimus Samum，et com－ morati Trogyllii，proximo die ve－ nimus in Miletum：${ }^{16}$ proposuerat enim Paulus praeternauigare Ephe－ sum，ne tempus tereret in Asia． Festinabat enim，si possibile sibi esset，vt diem pentecostes ageret Hierosolymis．
${ }^{17}$ A Mileto autem missis Ephe－ sum nunciis，accersiuit presbyteros ecclesiae，${ }^{18}$ qui quum peruenis－ sent ad ipsum，dixit eis：Vos

13 троє $\lambda$ Өоитєs $B-E: \pi \rho 0 \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \theta$ Ovtes $A$

13 Asson B－E：in Asson $A \mid$ ordinauerat B－E：disposuerat $A \mid 14$ Asson B－E：in Asson $A \mid$
15 Postridie vero $B-E$ ：Altero autem die $A$｜Trogyllii $B$－E：Trogyllio $A \mid 16$ tempus tereret $B$－$E$ ：qua mora illi fieret $A \mid$ pentecostes $C$－$E$ ：pentecosten $A B \mid 17$ presbyteros $B$－$E$ ：seniores $A \mid 18$ ipsum $B-E$ ：se $A$
see on Act．15，2．See also Annot．The version of Manetti substituted immense．
13 conscensa naui trpoe入Өóvtes éti tò mioĩov （＂ascendentes nauem＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．In the 1516 Greek text，Erasmus followed cod． 2815 in putting тробє 1 Oóvtes，as found in codd．A $\mathrm{B}^{*} \mathrm{E}$ and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．In 1519，he took tpo€ $\lambda$ Óvites from cod．3，in company with $7^{74} \times B^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}$ and some later mss．A better translation of $\pi \rho \circ \varepsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\delta} v$ тes would have made use of praecedo， as at vs．5．For Erasmus＇use of consendo else－ where，see on Iob．6，17．Manetti preferred in nauim ascendentes．
13 soluimus àvví $\chi$ Өn $\mu \varepsilon \nu$（＂nauigauimus＂late Vg．）．See on Act． 13,13 ．
13 Asson eis titv＂Aooov（＂in Asson＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）See on Act．8，27．In Annot．，Erasmus mentions mss．having＂Thasson＂，apparently referring to his cod． 2815 which reads $\theta$ d́oov
both here and in vs． 14 ．He drew $\mathfrak{\text { anooov from }}$ cod． 2816 （cf．ä́ $\sigma \sigma o v$ in cod．1），in company with most other mss．
 turi＂Vg．）．See on Act．17，7．
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．7，44．
13 per terram iter facturus $\pi \varepsilon \zeta$ gúsiv．In Annot．， Erasmus also recommends pedestri itinere venturus or pedibus iter facturus，emphasising the apostle＇s humility in travelling on foot rather than by horse or vehicle．Manetti put $v t$ per terram iter faceret．
14 conuenissemus $\sigma \cup v \in \hat{\beta} \beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \nu$ ṅ $\mu i ̃ v$. Erasmus re－ tains the late Vulgate rendering，without explicit support from Greek mss．Manetti had nos．．． inuenisset．
14 Asson sis тìv＂Acoov（＂in Asson＂ 1516 $=V$ g．）．See on vs． 13.

14 recepto đ̛v $\alpha \lambda \alpha \beta$ óvtes（＂assumpto＂Vg．）．This use of recipio is presumably intended for stylistic variety，to avoid repetition of excipio from vs．13．Erasmus retains assumo for ${ }^{\alpha} v \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ at Act．1．2，11；Eph．6，13，16； 2 Tim．4，11．See further on Act．1，2．
14 in Mitylenem $\varepsilon$ is MıTu $\lambda \dot{\eta} \cup \eta \nu$（＂Mytilenem＂ late Vg．）．The added preposition contravenes Erasmus＇usual practice with place－names．See on Act．8，27；13，51．Manetti had Mitilenem， without in．
15 Postridie vero Tñ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ É Étépọ（＂et alia die＂Vg．； ＂Altero autem die＂1516）．On postridie，see on Act．10，9，and for vero，see on Ioh． 1,26 ．In Annot．，Erasmus suggests altero vero die．Manetti put alia autem die．
15 appulimus тарєßо́ $\lambda о \mu \varepsilon v$（＂applicuimus＂Vg．）． See on Ioh．6，21 for Erasmus＇use of appello．He retains applico for тробориi弓oual at Mc．6，53． See also Annot．
15 et commorati Trogyllii kal $\mu$ eivavtes èv Tpん－ $\gamma u \lambda \lambda i \varphi$（Vg．omits；＂et commorati Trogyllio＂ 1516）．The Vulgate is based on a text omitting каi ．．．Tp $\omega \gamma \cup \lambda \lambda i \varphi$ ，and altering the follow－
 B C E and twenty－three later mss．Erasmus follows his cod．2815，supported by cod．（D） and about 440 later mss．（see Aland Die Apostel－ geschichte 594－6）．Cod． 1 has троүи $\lambda \lambda i \omega$ ，while cod． 2816 has тpoyүu入ip．See also Annot．The version of Manetti（both mss．）had et in Troylo commorati．
15 proximo die $T n ̃ ̃$ ẻXo Vg．）．Erasmus made a similar change at Lc． 13，33（1516－19 only）．Usually he retains sequenti die for such Greek expressions：see on Act． 16,11 ．At the present passage，he wished to avoid repetition from earlier in the same verse． The Vulgate addition of et corresponds with the insertion of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ or kai，as mentioned in the previous note．See Annot．The version of Manetti had sequenti die，as in the Vulgate，but omitted et．

15 in Miletum єis Mĩŋтто⿱（＂Miletum＂Vg．）． Both in his translation and in Annot．，Eras－ mus again breaches the usual rule of omitting the preposition before town－names．See on Act．8，27；13，51．
16 praeternauigare $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda^{2} \varepsilon$ च̃ $\alpha{ }^{1}$（＂transnaui－ gare＂Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus mocks at the Vulgate rendering，enquiring how anyone could sail across（trans）a city，unless the
ship were carried in the clouds．Cf．on sub－ nauigo at Act．27，4．He also suggested using praeteruehi，which was recommended in Valla Annot．
 $\tau \rho ı \beta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha$（＂ne qua mora illi fieret＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Erasmus also removed mora in rendering Xpo－ $v i \zeta \omega$ at Mt．25，5；Lc．12，45（both in 1519）． It could be said that，at the present passage， he has left $\gamma$ モ́vŋтธal untranslated：in Annot．， more accurately，he renders as contingeret sibi terere tempus．Manetti put ne qua commoratio ei fieret．
 $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The word pentecostes is in the genitive case，reflecting the form of the Greek word，consistent with Act．2，1．
16 ageret $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \sigma_{0}$ al（＂faceret＂Vg．）．For a similar use of ago in connection with observance of a feast day，see Act．18，21．For Erasmus＇avoidance of facio，see on Ioh．1，15．
17 missis Ephesum nunciis тє́цчаs kis＂Eфєбоv （＂mittens Ephesum＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．See on Act．7，14 for the addition of nuncius．
17 accersiuit $\mu \in т \varepsilon к \propto \lambda$ ह́ $\sigma \propto$ то（＂vocauit＂Vg．）．This produces consistency with the Vulgate rendering of the three other N．T．passages where $\mu \in T \alpha-$ к $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon$ ह́ouaı occurs：Act．7，14；10，32；24，25．See also on Act．4，18．
17 presbyteros toùs трєбßutépous（＂maiores natu＂Vg．；＂seniores＂1516）．See on Act．15，4， and Annot．The version of Manetti had seniores， as in Erasmus＇ 1516 edition．

18 peruenissent тарє $\gamma$ ह́vоขто（＂venissent＂Vg．）． This change is consistent with Vulgate usage at Act．11，23．However，elsewhere in Luke and Acts，where $\pi \alpha p a \gamma i v o u \alpha 1$ is chiefly found， Erasmus usually retains venio，or sometimes aduenio，when rendering this Greek verb．At a few passages，he substitutes accedo（Mt．2，1； 3，1，13；Mc．14，43；Act．24，17）．Manetti put Vt ．．．venerunt for cum venissent．
18 ipsum ả̛דóv（＂eum et simul essent＂Vg．； ＂se＂1516）．Erasmus uses ipsum to refer back to the main subject of the sentence．The Vulgate
 as found in $\$^{74}$（A）$D^{\text {corr }}$ ，while cod．E adds óroӨuuaסóv．Erasmus follows cod．2815，sup－ ported by codd．1， 2816 and nearly all other mss．，commencing with codd．\＆B C．The version of Manetti had eum，omitting et simul essent．
 モ̇тย́ß Tòv $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha ~ X \rho o ́ v o v ~ ह ̇ \gamma \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~{ }^{19}$ Sov－

 $\pi \varepsilon ו \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu, \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \sigma u \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} \nu \omega \nu$ นol हैv














scitis a primo die quo ingressus sum Asiam，quomodo vobiscum per omne tempus fuerim，${ }^{19}$ seruiens do－ mino cum omni animi humilitate， cumque mul｜tis lachrymis et tenta－ LB 514 tionibus，quae mihi acciderunt ex in－ sidiis Iudaeorum：${ }^{20} \mathrm{vt}$ nihil suffugerim eorum quae essent in rem vestram， quin annunciarem vobis et docerem vos publice ac per singulas domos， ${ }^{21}$ testificans Iudaeis simul et Graecis， eam quae erga deum est poeniten－ tiam，ac fidem quae est erga domi－ num nostrum Iesum．${ }^{22}$ Et nunc ecce ego alligatus spiritu，proficiscor Hiero－ solymam，quae in ea obuentura sint mihi ignorans，${ }^{23}$ nisi quod spiritus sanctus per singulas ciuitates testifica－ tur，dicens，quod vincula et afflictiones me manent．${ }^{24}$ Verum nihil me mouet，
$19 \sigma \cup \mu \beta \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu B-E: \sigma \cup \mu \beta \alpha ı \nu о v \tau \omega \nu A \mid 22$ та $B-E$ ：то $A$

18 Asiam $B-E$ ：in Asiam $A \mid 19$ cumque $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ lachrymis $B-E$ ：lacrymis $A \mid 20$ vt $B-E$ ： quomodo $A \mid$ suffugerim $B-E$ ：subtraxerim vobis $A \mid$ quin $B-E$ ：quo minus $A \mid$ ac per singulas domos C－E：et domestice $A B \mid 21$ prius erga $B-E$ ：in $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ ：et $A \mid$ alt．erga $B-E$ ：in $A \mid$ 22 proficiscor Hierosolymam $B$－E：vado in Hierusalem $A \mid$ sint $B-E$ ：sunt $A \mid 23$ afflictiones $B-E$ ：tribulationes $A$
 （＂prima die qua＂Vg．）．For the gender of dies， see on Ioh．1，29．
18 Asiam हis tìv AAoiav（＂in Asiam＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）Where a country or region was mentioned as a destination of a journey，it was usual practice in classical Latin to insert a preposition （cf．on Act．18，27），but this was not necessary after a verb such as ingredior．
18 quomodo TTん̃s（＂qualiter＂Vg．）．This substi－ tution brings the translation into conformity with Vulgate usage at most other passages having $\pi \tilde{\varsigma}$ ，though Erasmus left qualiter un－ touched at Mc．5，16；Lc．12，11；Ap．Iob．3，3． At 1 Thess．2，11，in rendering $\omega$ ，he replaced qualiter with vt．
19 animi bumilitate татєєıо甲робúvךs（＂hu－ militate＂Vg．）．Erasmus makes a similar
addition at Phil．2，3；Col．2，23； 1 Petr．5，5， while at Eph．4，2 he substitutes submissio．See Annot．
19 cumque multis кai то $\lambda^{\lambda} \tilde{\omega}^{\nu}$（＂et＂Vg．；＂et multis＂1516）．The Vulgate follows a Greek text omitting то $\lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$ ，as in $37^{74} \aleph$ A B D E and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815， supported by cod．C and most later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti put ac， without adding multis．
19 ouムßóvtcuv．In 1516，Erasmus followed cod． 2815 in putting $\sigma u \mu \beta \alpha, v o v \tau \omega \nu$ ，in the present tense，supported by cod．C and only a few later mss．In codd．1，3， 2816 and most other mss．，it is $\sigma u \mu \beta \dot{v} \tau \omega v$ ．
20 vt $\dot{s}$（＂quomodo＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at Act．10，38．Erasmus prefers to use quomodo for $\pi \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ，as in vs． 18.

20 suffugerim ப்ாєбтєiخ́́ $\mu \eta \nu$ ("subtraxerim vobis" $1516=$ late Vg .). The added pronoun of the late Vulgate does not have explicit support from Greek mss. In Annot., Erasmus argues that sublrabo means to "defraud", which is unsuited to the context. At vs. 27, he retains subterfugio, in rendering the same Greek verb, while substituting subduco for subtrabo at Gal. 2,12; Hebr. 10,38. Manetti had subtraxerim, omitting vobis.
20 corum quas essent in rem vestram $\tau \omega ̃ \nu \quad \sigma \cup \mu-$ $\phi \varepsilon \rho \dot{\delta} v t \omega \nu$ ("vtilium" late Vg.). Erasmus amplifies his translation, for clarity. Elsewhere, he

20 quin toũ $\mu$ ń ("quo minus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change was for stylistic variety, as Erasmus retains quo minus in a similar context at vs. 27. See on Act. 8,36.
20 ac кai ("et" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. Manetti's version (both mss.) omitted this conjunction, possibly by an error of transcription.
20 per singulas domos кат' оіккоиs ("per domos" Vg.; "domestice" 1516-19). See on Act. 2,46, and Annot. The use of domestice in 1516-19 seems to have been influenced by the preface to Jerome's commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, as indicated in Annot., but it is not found in classical Latin literature.
21 simul et $\tau \in$ Kal ("atque" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1. Manetti substituted ac.
21 Graecis "E $\lambda \lambda \eta \sigma$ I ("gentilibus" Vg.). See on Iob. 12,20.
21 eam quace erga deum est tì̀ $\operatorname{\text {Els}}$ Tòv $\theta \in \dot{\delta} \dot{v}$ ("in deum" Vg.; "eam quae in deum est" 1516). Erasmus' rendering is clearer and more precise. On erga, see on Act. 3,25.
$21 a c$ кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. $1,25$. Manetti also made this change.
21 quae est erga tinv eis ("in" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$; "quae est in" 1516). See above on eam quae erga.

21 Iesum 'Inooũv ("Iesum Christum" Vg.). The Vulgate addition is supported by $37^{74} \mathrm{NA}$ C E, together with cod. 2816 and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. B and another large section of the later mss., including cod. 1. Manetti similarly omitted Cbristum.
22 proficiscor торєن́oual ("vado" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 7,33; Act. 16,7, regarding proficiscor. At Act. 27,3, Erasmus substitutes proficiscor for eo, but elsewhere in Acts, he generally follows
the Vulgate in rendering торєvoual by eo, abeo, vado, or iter facio. Manetti anticipated this change.
22 Hierosolymam sis 'lepovo $\alpha \lambda$ n' $\mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 8,27.
22 tó . The variant tó in 1516 is a misprint.
22 obuentura $\sigma u v a v t \mathfrak{j} \sigma o v t \alpha$ ("ventura" Vg.). Erasmus elsewhere uses obuenio only at $L c .1,9$, in rendering $\lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \alpha{ }^{\prime} v \omega$. At the present passage, the context required a verb meaning to "come upon" or "befall" rather than the colourless venio of the Vulgate.
22 sint ("sunt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus prefers the subjunctive for this indirect question, arising from the construction ignoro quae ...
23 per singulas kató' ("per omnes" Vg.). See on Act. 2,46. Manetti had just per.
23 testificatur סıauवpтúpetal ("mihi protestatur" late Vg.). The Vulgate addition of mibi corresponds with the addition of $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ in $7^{74} \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ A B C D E and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. For the removal of protestor, see on Iob. 13,21. Manetti made the same change.
23 quod ötı ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti also had quod.
23 afflictiones $\theta \lambda i \psi$ Ess ("tribulationes" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 16,21 . The late Vulgate further adds Hierosolymis here, supported by cod. D.
24 Verum $\dot{\alpha}^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ("Sed" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
24 nibil me mouet oúסॄvòs 入óyov moıoũuaı ("nihil horum vereor" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus seems to argue that the Vulgate phrase could be misunderstood as meaning "I do not fear that any of these things will happen", and that this would be in conflict with the prophecies to which Paul alluded in the previous verse, from which the apostle already knew that these things would come to pass. This passage is subject to considerable textual variation in some parts of the manuscript tradition, but the Greek text adopted by Erasmus closely corresponds with that which was probably followed by the Vulgate at this point, having the support of cod. 2815, together with cod. E and about 375 of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 597-600). Manetti resorted to sermonem floci facio ('I take no account of such talk").

























neque vita mea chara est mihi ipsi, vt consummem cursum meum cum gaudio et ministerium quod accepi a domino Iesu, ad testificandum euangelium gratiae dei. ${ }^{25} \mathrm{Et}$ nunc ecce ego scio, quod posthac non videbitis faciem meam, vos omnes per quos transiui, praedicans regnum dei. ${ }^{26}$ Quapropter contestor vos hodierno die, quod mundus ego sum a sanguine omnium. ${ }^{27}$ Non enim subterfugi, quominus annunciarim omne consilium dei vobis. ${ }^{28}$ Attendite igitur vobis et cuncto gregi, in quo vos spiritus sanctus posuit episcopos ad regendum ecclesiam dei, quam acquisiuit sanguine suo. ${ }^{29}$ Ego enim noui hoc, quod ingressuri sint post discessum meum lupi graues in vos, non parcentes gregi. ${ }^{30}$ Et ex vobis ipsis exorientur viri, loquentes peruersa, vt abducant discipulos post se. ${ }^{31}$ Propter quod vigilate, memores, quod per triennium nocte et die non cessauerim cum lachrymis

24 prius тпи $B-E: \operatorname{T\omega \nu } A \mid 26$ ס10 B-E: ס10т1 $A$
27 annunciarim $B-E$ : annunciarem $A \mid$ consilium $A B D E$ : cunsilium $C \mid 28$ igitur $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ cuncto $B-E$ : vniuerso $A \mid$ regendum $B-E$ : regendnm $A \mid 29$ hoc $B-E$ : haec $A \mid$ sint $B-E$ : sunt $A \mid 30$ exorientur $B-E$ : exurgent $A$

## 24 neque vita mea chara est mibi ipsi oủ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{E}}^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{X} \omega$

 animam meam pretiosiorem quam me" Vg .). Elsewhere, Erasmus occasionally substitutes vita for anima, at Mt. 6,25; Rom. 11,3 (1519); Phil. 2,30, but usually retains anima for $\psi \cup \times \eta$ in and vita for $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$ (and sometimes for pios and $\beta i \omega \sigma 15)$. In Annot., he complains at the inaccuracy of the Vulgate in treating ripios as a comparative adjective, and therefore included this passage among both the Soloecismi and the Loca Obscura. For his reply to Stunica's defence of the Vulgate rendering: see his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 F . On mibi ipsi, see on Act. 9,34. Manetti's rendering was nec animam meam preciosiorem me ipso existimo.

24 vt $\dot{\omega}$ ("dummodo ego" Vg. 1527). The Vulgate seems to reflect the substitution of $\varepsilon \omega \mathrm{S}$, as found in codd. $\mathbf{X}^{\text {corr }} B^{\text {corr. }}$. Manetti omitted ego, following the earlier Vulgate.
24 cum gaudio $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \chi \propto \rho \tilde{a} s$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by codd. א A B D and ten later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. C E and over 450 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 600-2). See Annot. This phrase was also added by Manetti.

24 ministerium $\operatorname{T\eta ̀v}$ סıakovíav ("ministerium verbi" late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering corresponds with the addition of toũ nóyou in cod. D. The version of Manetti
omitted verbi, in accordance with the earlier Vulgate.
24 ad testificandum $\delta ı \alpha \mu \alpha \rho т \cup ́ p \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \_$("testificari" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, for avoidance of the infinitive. Cod. 2815 has $\delta 1 \alpha \mu \alpha \rho т \dot{\sim} \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha 1$, present tense, which Erasmus or his assistants rejected in favour of $\delta 1 \propto \mu \alpha \rho т u ́ p \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha 1$, found in codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. Manetti put $v t$... testificarer.
25 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was found in Manetti.
25 posthac non oúkéti ("amplius non" Vg.). Similar substitutions of postbac for amplius occur at Mc. 9,25; Rom. 14,13. Cf. on Ioh. 5,14.
26 Stó. In 1516, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in reading $\delta$ ót 1 , supported by $37^{74} \aleph$ A B E and a few later mss. In 1519, he restored Stó, as found in codd. 1 and 2816, in company with codd. C D ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss. (not including cod. 3, which had $\delta ı \alpha \mu \alpha \rho т \cup ́ p o \mu \alpha ı$ for סiò $\mu \alpha$ ртúpouaı).
26 bodierno $\sigma \mathfrak{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \rho \circ v$ ("hodierna" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,29 , for the gender of dies.
26 quod õtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also had quod.
26 ego sum $\dot{\text { È }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\omega}$ ("sum" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of eipi, as in $78^{74} \times$ B C D E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, this time supported by cod. A and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti made the same change.
27 annunciarim ávor $\gamma \gamma$ Eindal ("annunciarem" $1516=$ Vg.). After a preceding perfect tense, Erasmus here regards a perfect subjunctive as being better style. The word-order ÚMiv toũ $\mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\alpha} v \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i ̄ \lambda \alpha a l$ is derived from cod. 2815, apparently without other ms. support. A few mss., commencing with $3^{74} \mathbf{\aleph}^{*}$ B C (D) place $\dot{U} \mu i v$ after $\theta \varepsilon o \mathrm{u}$, corresponding with the Vulgate and Erasmus' Latin version. In codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with codd. $\aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A E, úpĩv is placed after

28 igitur $\circ^{\tau} v$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{7}^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B D and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. C E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put ergo.
28 cuncto mavti ("vniuerso" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 8,2; Act. 5,34.

28 ad regendum тoוนaiveıv ("regere" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 . This change was anticipated by Manetti.
28 dei toũ $\theta$ goũ. The reading in codd. 1 and 2815, together with cod. $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., is toũ kupiou kai $\theta$ zoũ. Erasmus' text here follows cod. 2816 and the Vulgate in omitting kupiou kaí, with support from codd. $\aleph$ B and some later mss. Another variant, in 78 $^{74}$ A C ${ }^{*}$ D E and some later mss., substitutes kupiou for $\theta$ धoũ. Manetti put domini atque dei, corresponding with the text of most of the later Greek mss.
29 enim noui hoc $\gamma$ वаp olठ $\alpha$ тои̃то ("scio" Vg.; "enim noui haec" 1516). For the substitution of nosco, see on Iob. 1,33. The Vulgate is based on a text omitting ráp and roũto, as in $39^{74} \mathrm{~K}^{*} \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}$ and fourteen later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. $C^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$ and over 430 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 602-4). Manetti had enim boc scio.
29 quod ingressuri sint ótı عiซદ入єúбOvTal ("quoniam intrabunt" Vg.; "quod ingressuri sunt" 1516). See on Iob. 1,20 for the substitution of quod. On ingredior, see on Ioh. 13,27. Manetti substituted quod ... intrabunt.
29 discessum meum тìv ặqıక̌iv Mov ("discessionem meam" Vg.). The more usual word for "departure" in classical Latin was discessus. The term discessio could mean a "schism" or, more technically, a division for the purpose of taking a vote. Cf. Erasmus' substitution of defectio for discessio in rendering ámo at Act. 21,21. Manetti rendered by recessum meum.
29 graues $\beta$ 人peĩs ("rapaces" late Vg.). In substituting the more accurate graues, Erasmus was restoring the earlier Vulgate rendering: see Annot. The same rendering was recommended in Valla Annot. However, Manetti's version substituted moleste, either adverbially, or treating lupi as a feminine noun.
 $=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,17; Act. 6,9.
31 memores $\mu \nu \eta \mu \circ v \varepsilon \cup ́ o v t e s ~(" m e m o r i a ~ r e t i n e n-~$ tes" Vg.). As elsewhere, Erasmus again avoids the present participle. He retains memoria at other passages. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
 $\mu \eta \nu$ ("quoniam ... non cessaui" Vg.). See on




















 aưtòv દís тò $\pi \lambda$ oĩov.
monere vnumquenque. ${ }^{32} \mathrm{Et}$ nunc commendo vos fratres deo et sermoni gratiae ipsius, qui potens est superstruere et dare vobis haereditatem inter sanctificatos omnes. ${ }^{33}$ Argentum et aurum, aut vestem nullius concupiui. ${ }^{34}$ Imo ipsi scitis quod necessitatibus meis et his qui mecum sunt, suppeditauerunt manus hae. ${ }^{35}$ Omnia ostendi vobis, quod sic laborantes oportet suscipere infirmos, ac meminisse verborum domini Iesu, quoniam ipse dixit: Beatum est dare potius quam accipere. ${ }^{36} \mathrm{Et}$ quum haec dixisset, positis genibus suis, orauit cum omnibus illis. ${ }^{37}$ Magnus autem fletus coortus est omnium, et ruentes in collum Pauli, osculabantur eum ${ }^{38}$ dolentes, maxime ob sermonem quem dixerat, quod amplius faciem eius non essent visuri. Et deducebant eum ad nauem.

## 35 inoou B-E: inoouv $A$

31 monere $B-E$ : monens $A \mid 32$ sermoni $B-E$ : verbo $A \mid 34 \operatorname{Imo} B-E$ : sed $A \mid 35$ verborum $B-E$ : verbi $A \mid$ quoniam $C-E$ : quod $A B \mid$ dare potius $B-E$ : potius dare $A \mid 37$ coortus $B-E$ : factus $A \mid 38$ ob sermonem quem $B-E$ : in verbo, quod $A$

Ioh. 1,20, and Annot. The version of Manetti put quod ... non cessaui.
31 monere vou日et $\omega$ v ("monens" $1516=$ Vg.). In classical Latin, cesso is normally followed by an infinitive rather than a participle. See $A n n o t$. This was changed to admonens by Manetti.
31 vnumquenque Ẽva Ékaotov ("vnumquenque vestrum" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of $\dot{u} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$, as in codd. D E and some later mss., including cod. $2816^{\text {corr. }}$. Manetti omitted vestrum.

32 таратiӨquı. Erasmus here follows cod. 2815 , with hardly any other ms. support. Nearly all other mss., including codd. 1 and 2816, have

32 fratres ád $\delta \lambda$ фоi (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{74} \aleph A B D$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other
mss., commencing with codd. C E. The version of Manetti also added fratres.
32 sermoni $\uparrow \tilde{\sim} \lambda$ óy $\varphi$ ("verbo" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,1. As a result of this change, the following qui could now be seen to relate to sermoni rather than the earlier deo. Erasmus included the Vulgate construction among the Soloecismi. Against Stunica's defence of the Vulgate rendering, Erasmus argued that the Greek text would have had toũ Suvauévou rather than $\tau \tilde{\omega} \delta \cup v \alpha \mu \varepsilon ่ v \omega$ if this had been intended to relate to $T \tilde{\omega} \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\varphi}$ : see his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 E-F. See also Annot.
 The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having oiko$\delta o \mu \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mathrm{~L}$, as in $\mathbf{7}^{74} *$ A B C D E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.

See Annot. The version of Manetti adopted superedificare.
32 vobis suiv (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{7}^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B D E and a few later mss. Erasmus, as usual, follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., this time commencing with cod. C. The same addition was made by Manetti.
 mãøw ("in sanctificatis omnibus" Vg.). See on Ioh. 15,24.
33 et $\eta$. Erasmus retains the late Vulgate rendering, supported by cod. D, in conflict with his own Greek text. The earlier Vulgate had aut, while Manetti had vel.
34 Imo ipsi aủtoi $\delta$ ह́ ("sicut ipsi" late Vg.; "sed ipsi" 1516). The late Vulgate use of sicut lacks Greek ms. support. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, apparently alone. Virtually all other mss., including codd. 1 and 2816, omit $\delta E$. Erasmus' poorly supported variant remained in the Textus Receptus.
34 quod ${ }^{\text {ottı }}$ ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
34 necessitatibus meis taĩs xpsicıs pou ("ad ea quae mihi opus erant" $V \mathrm{~g}$. .). This change conforms with Vulgate usage at Rom. 12,13, and also with the Vulgate rendering of duváyк $\eta$ at 2 Cor. 6,4; 12,10, though Erasmus retains opus at passages such as Pbil. 4,16, 19. Manetti put indigentiis meis.
 runt" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus renders $\dot{U} \pi \eta$ рєté $\omega$ by inseruio (for administro) at Act. 13,36 (1519), and by subministro (for ministro) at Act. 24,23. In the present context of supplying a practical need, Erasmus evidently felt that ministro and its compounds were inappropriate: cf. his substitution of suppedito for
 9,10 , and Xop $\gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \omega$ at 1 Petr. 4,11 , and of suppedito for subministro in rendering ktrapk $\varepsilon$ e $\omega$ at 1 Tim. 5,16. Cf. on Act. 11,29, for his replacement of ministerium by subsidium (and his recommendation of suppeditationem in Annot. ad loc.). See also on Act. 24,23, regarding subministro.
34 hae aũTa1 ("istae" Vg.). See on Act. 7,4. Manetti had ipse ( $=i p s a e$ ).
35 quod ${ }^{\text {OTTI }}$ ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti here put quia.

35 verborum т $\omega \nu \lambda$ خó $\omega \nu$ ("verbi" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant,$ toũ $\lambda o ́ y o u$ or tòv $\lambda \dot{o}$ yov, as found in many late mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 1 and most other mss. (cod. 2816 has tòv $\lambda$ óyov).
35 Incoũ. This word was omitted in cod. 2815, along with cod. A ${ }^{\text {corr }}$ and a few later mss. In 1516, Erasmus, or rather his printer, mistakenly restored IHEOYN, a grammatically impossible reading, instead of 'Inooũ (which was found in codd. 1 and 2816). The error was corrected in 1519.

35 quoniam ${ }^{\text {ott }}$ ("quod" 1516-19). See on Ioh. 1,20 . Manetti had the same rendering as Erasmus' 1516-19 editions.
35 Beatum Maxóplov ("Beatius" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the inaccurate Vulgate use of a comparative adjective here. He further included this in the 1527 edition of the Solocismi. Valla Annot. and Manetti made the same change.
35 dare potius $\delta \iota \delta o ́ v a ı ı \mu a ̈ \lambda \lambda o v$ ("magis dare" Vg.; "potius dare" 1516 Lat.). Erasmus took this Greek word-order from cod. 2815, supported by relatively few other late mss. In codd. 1 , 2816 and most other mss., commencing with « A B C D E, it is $\mu \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{v}{} \delta_{1} \delta \dot{o} v a 1$. Other substitutions of potius for magis occur in fourteen other places in the N.T.
 A similar substitution occurs at Act. 23,10 (1519). See on Ioh. 1,17.

37 ruentes émıTधのóvtes ("procumbentes" Vg.). A comparable change occurs at $L c .15,20$, where Erasmus substitutes ruo for cado in rendering the same Greek verb. The word procumbo implies kneeling, or bowing down, or prostration, none of which is appropriate to this context. In cod. 2815, the reading is méoovtes, which lacks other ms. support. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and 2816, in company with nearly all other mss.
37 in éri( "super" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ). Erasmus possibly wished to avoid the ambiguity of super, in the sense of "over": see on Iob. 7,44.
 verbo, quod" $1516=\mathrm{V}$.). See on Iob. 1,1 , regarding sermo. On ob, see on Iob. 10,33 .
38 quod Öтı ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. The same change was made by Manetti.

21





 фávavtes ס̀̀ tìv Kúmpov, kal ката-


 tòv үónov. ${ }^{4}$ каì à̛veupóvtes $\mu \alpha \theta \eta$ ๆá́s,
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21Quum autem factum esset vt soluissemus auulsi ab eis, recto cursu venimus Coum, et sequenti die Rhodum, et inde Pataram. ${ }^{2}$ Et nacti nauem quae traiiceret in Phoenicen, ea conscensa 1 soluimus. $\quad{ }^{3}$ Quum autem coepisset nobis apparere Cyprus, relicta ea ad sinistram, nauigauimus in Syriam, ac venimus Tyrum. Nam huc nauis exponebat onus. ${ }^{4}$ Repertisque discipulis, mansimus ibidem diebus septem: qui Paulo dicebant per spiritum, ne ascenderet Hierosolymam. ${ }^{5}$ Et expletis diebus profecti ibamus, deducentibus nos omnibus vna cum vxoribus et filiis, donec exissemus ciuitatem: et positis genibus in littore, precati sumus. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Et}$ consalutatis nobis inuicem, conscendimus nauim: illi autem redierunt ad sua. ${ }^{7}$ Nos vero nauigatione explicita a Tyro, descendimus Ptolemaidam, et salutatis fratribus mansimus diem vnum cum illis.

[^9]21,1 aunlsi B-E: abstracti $A \mid \operatorname{Coum} A^{*} B-E$ : Choum $A^{b} \mid 3$ autem B-E: om. $A \mid$ ac $B$-E: et $A \mid$ Nam huc $B-E: \operatorname{Ibi} \operatorname{enim} A \mid 4$ Repertisque $B-E:$ Inuentis autem $A \mid 5$ littore $B E$ : litore $A C D \mid$ precati sumus $B$-E: orauimus $A \mid 6$ nauim $B$-E: nauem $A$

21,1 vt soluisemus dंvox $\theta$ ग̃val ("vt nauigaremus" Vg.). See on Act. 13,13.
1 auulsi ámootaбó́vtes ("abstracti" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) This change conforms with the Vulgate rendering of the same Greek verb at $L c$. 22,41. Erasmus' choice of auello is better suited to the reflexive sense required by the context.
1 Kãv. In 1516, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in putting $\kappa \tilde{\omega}$, as found in $7^{74} \aleph$ A B C D E and many later mss., including codd. $1^{\text {corr }}$ and 2816. In 1519, he corrected this to $k \omega$ v, following cod. 3 , with support from cod. $1^{* \text { vid }}$ and many other late mss. See Annot.

2 nacti eن́póvtes ("cum inuenissemus" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). See on Iob. 12,14.
2 quae traiiceret $\delta_{1} \propto \pi \varepsilon \rho \omega \tilde{\nu}$ ("transfretantem" V g.). A similar substitution of traiicio is found at Mt. 9,1; 14,34; Mc. 6,53, and also, in rendering סıépXoual, at Lc. 8,22 (1519). Erasmus further removes every instance of fretum for mépav, using such expressions as in viteriorem ripam. In Annot. on Mt. 9,1, he objected that, in prose authors, fretum technically meant a narrow channel of the sea, or "straits" ("mare inclusum angustiis"). See also Annot. on Mc. 5,1; Lc. 8,22. On the use of traitio,
see Valla Elegantiae III, 35; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 324, 11. 239241.

2 ea conscensa èmıß́ávtes ("ascendentes" Vg.). Greek aorist. On conscendo, see on Ioh. 6,17.
2 soluimus ảvท่ $\chi$ Ө $\ddagger \mu \in v$ ("nauigauimus" Vg.). See on Act. 13,13.
3 autem coepisset nobis apparere Cyprus duvapóvovtes $\delta$ ह̇ $\operatorname{tijv}$ Kúmpov ("apparuissemus autem Cypro" late Vg.; "coepisset nobis apparere Cyprus" 1516). Erasmus changes the construction, to improve clarity. In Annot., he argues that the Vulgate originally had aperuisemus, though the Vulgate mss. in fact have paruisemus. The reading ávapávavtes came from cod. 2815, supported by ${7{ }^{74}{ }^{74} \mathrm{~B}^{*} \text { and a few later mss., including }}^{2}$ cod. 2816. In cod. 1 and most other mss., commencing with codd. A B ${ }^{\text {cort }} C E$, it is davapavévtes.
 quentes eam" late Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti put reliquisemus, continuing from the construction with cum.
3 ac кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25 . Manetti had atque.
3 Nam buc ékeĩoc $\gamma$ व́ap ("Ibi enim" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The use of $b u c$ ("hither") would in other contexts have been a desirable change. At the present passage, in the context of unloading a cargo, the Vulgate is justified in treating ėкeior as little more than a synonym for ékeĭ ("there"). On nam, see on Ioh. 3,34.
 tura erat" late Vg .). Erasmus' rendering is closer to the Greek here.
4 Repertisque kai daveupóvtes ("Inuentis autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) See on Iob. 1,41 , regarding reperio. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text having dov-
 and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. Coorr and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put et inuentis.
4 ibidem aưroũ ("ibi" Vg.). See on Act. 15,34.
$4 \alpha v \alpha \beta \alpha i v e l v$. The reading $\alpha v \alpha \beta \alpha i v e t$ in the 1516 Greek text seems to be a misprint. It was corrected in the 1516 errata.
 original scribe at first omitted $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, but later added it above the line in an abbreviated form. The added $\delta \varepsilon$ was misread by the printer in

1516 as an apostrophe, marking the elision of
 This error was corrected in the 1516 errata.
5 vna cum oúv ("cum" Vg.). See on Act. 1,22.
 Erasmus introduces an extra verb here, to clarify the meaning and to avoid the doubled adverb. Manetti substituted vsque extra.
5 precati sumus тробєv ${ }^{\prime} \alpha \mu \in \theta \alpha$ ("orauimus" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) See on Act. 10,30 regarding precor. The spelling $-\varepsilon \cup \xi \alpha \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ was derived from codd. 1 and 2816. In cod. 2815 and most other mss., it is $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \cup \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$.
 خous ("cum vale fecissemus inuicem" Vg.). See on Act. 18,18. Erasmus does not elsewhere use consaluto in the N.T. He suggests in Annot., that the Greek underlying the Vulgate was ámota $\xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon v o l$. It is more probable, however, that the Vulgate reflects the Greek variant, $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \theta \alpha$ (from $\left.\alpha_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \pi \alpha \sigma \pi \alpha \zeta \sigma \mu \alpha \mathrm{l}\right)$, found in $7^{77^{74}} \aleph$ A B C E and a few later mss. Erasmus' text follows cod. 2815, along with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti's version was cum inuicem salutauissemus.
6 conscendimus èméß $\eta \mu \varepsilon v$ हis ("ascendimus in" late Vg.). See on Iob. 6,17.
6 nauim тो̀ $\pi \lambda$ ло̃ov ("nauem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In the Gospels, Erasmus prefers the spelling nauim for the accusative, and naui for the ablative, except for one instance of nauem at Mt. 9,1. In Acts, however, he has nauem at seven other passages, besides the present verse, and naue at Act. 27,2, 15. Both forms of the word are found in classical literature. Manetti had nauim here.
7 explicita סıavúסavtes ("expleta" late Vg.). Erasmus adopts the earlier Vulgate rendering.
7 åró. The variant ütò (sic), in 1516, makes less sense and is probably a misprint for óró.
 on Ioh. 1,29; Act. 10,48.
7 cum illis $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ aủtoĩs ("apud illos" Vg.). In 1516, Erasmus had the reading oن̀v aútoĩs from cod. 2815, apparently without other ms. support, and this motivated his substitution of cum. When he corrected $\sigma$ 'v to $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ in 1519 (as in codd. 1, 3, 2816 and most other mss.), he overlooked the need to reinstate the Vulgate use of apud. Elsewhere, he usually translates mapó by apud in such contexts. Manetti put apud eos.
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${ }^{8}$ Postridie vero nos qui eramus cum Paulo, venimus Caesaream. Et ingressi domum Philippi euangelistae, qui erat vnus e septem, mansimus apud eum: ${ }^{9}$ huic autem erant quatuor filiae virgines, prophetantes. ${ }^{10}$ Et quum permaneremus dies complures, aduenit quidam a Iudaea propheta, nomine Agabus. ${ }^{11}$ Is quum venisset ad nos, tulit cingulum Pauli, et alligans sibi pedes ac manus, dixit: Haec dicit spiritus sanctus: Virum cuius est cingulum hoc, sic alligabunt Hierosolymae Iudaei, tradentque in manus gentium. ${ }^{12}$ Quum autem audissemus haec, rogabamus et nos et caeteri qui loci illius erant, ne ascenderet Hierosolymam. ${ }^{13}$ Tunc respondit Paulus, ac dixit: Quid facitis flentes et affligentes cor meum? Ego

8 e $B-E: \operatorname{de} A \mid 11$ prius cingulum $B-E$ : zonam $A \mid$ sibi $C-E$ : illius $A B \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ dixit $B-E$ : $\operatorname{dicit} A \mid \operatorname{dicit} B-E$ : dixit $A \mid$ cingulum hoc $B-E$ : zona haec $A \mid$ Hierosolymae $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid$ tradentque $B$ - $E$ : et tradent $A \mid 13$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$

8 Postridic vero Tทุ̃ $\delta$ ह̀ émoúpıov ("Alia autem die" Vg.). See on Act. 10,9 regarding postridie. For vero, see on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti's rendering was Sequenti vero die.
8 nos qui eramus cum Paulo venimus $\mathfrak{k} \xi \in \lambda \theta$ óvtes
 Vg.). The omission of profecti from Erasmus' translation could have been unintentional. If Erasmus had written nos ... Paulo in the margin of his working copy or transcript of the Vulgate, one of his assistants or the printer might have mistakenly assumed that these words should be substituted for profecti instead of being inserted after it. In subsequent editions, Erasmus continued to leave $\varepsilon \xi \xi \varepsilon \lambda \theta$ óvtes untranslated. The Vulgate was based on a Greek text having
 Пaũ $\lambda o v$, as in $7^{74}$ \& A (B) C E and almost 180 later mss. More than sixty other late mss.
 Erasmus' Greek text followed his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and over 220 other
late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschicbte 606-8). However, his deliberate retention of the first person plural in his Latin rendering suggests that it may have been his intention to substitute $\eta \pi \lambda \theta 0 \mu \varepsilon v$ in the Greek text, even though he did not find it among the mss. which he usually consulted for his 1516 edition. This aspect of his translation was not an accidental oversight, as he reinforces venimus by nos ... eramus rather than ii qui erant. For a similar discrepancy between the Greek and Latin texts, see on Act. 20,8.

8 ingressi eí $\sigma \varepsilon \lambda \theta$ Óvtes ("intrantes" Vg.). Greek aorist. For ingredior, see on Ioh. 13,27. Manetti made the same change, but placed ingressi after septem.

8 vnuse ésk ("vnus de" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Iob. 2,15. Manetti had vnus ex.

9 трор $\uparrow \tau \varepsilon \mathcal{V}^{\circ}{ }^{2} \sigma \alpha$. The future participle, $\pi \rho о ф \eta т \varepsilon \cup \cup \sigma o v \sigma \alpha$, , in 1516, was probably a misprint.

10 quum permaneremus $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi n \mu \varepsilon v o ́ v t \omega \nu ~ . . . ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \omega ̃ \nu$ ("cum moraremur" Vg.). This substitution is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 13,43; Rom. 6,1; 11,22-3; 1 Cor. 16,8; Pbil. 1,24; Col. 1,23, though at most of these passages, Erasmus changes to a different verb. His treatment of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi!\mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \omega$ shows no particular consistency. Sometimes he retained maneo for ह̇muévc, at Act. 21,4; 28,12, 14; 1 Cor. 16,7; Gal. 1,18. At Rom. 6,1 and Pbil. 1,24, he substituted maneo for permaneo. Cf. further on Act. 11,23, regarding $\pi p \circ \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v \omega$. The pronoun $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \omega^{\nu}$ is omitted in cod. 1 and $2816^{*}$, in company with $7^{74}$ A B C and more than sixty later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, with support from $\aleph^{\text {corr }}$ E and over 400 later mss., including cod. 2816 ${ }^{\text {cort }}$ (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 608-10). Manetti substituted Nobis ... commorantibus.
10 dies complures $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \tilde{p} p a s$ m $\pi$ sious ("per dies aliquot" Vg .). Erasmus is more precise here. See also on Act. 1,3, and Annot. The version of Manetti was diebus plurimis.
10 aduenit $\kappa \alpha r \eta \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon$ ("superuenit" Vg.). Erasmus retains superuenio in a similar context at Act. 11,27, but more frequently he follows the Vulgate in using superuenio for ĖтépXo$\mu \alpha ı$ or $\varepsilon \in \varphi i \sigma \tau \eta \mu$. In rendering katépXouaı elsewhere, Erasmus sometimes follows the Vulgate in using descendo. He uses aduenio at other passages to render a variety of Greek verbs, in particular $\pi \alpha p \alpha \gamma^{\prime}$ voual and єiónpxoucı.
10 quidam Tis ("quidam vir" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition does not have explicit support from Greek mss. The word vir was omitted by Manetti and the earlier Vulgate.

 At five other N.T. passages, Erasmus retains zona (Mt. 3,4; Mc. 1,6; 6,8; Ap. Iob. 1,13; 15,6). Both zona and cingulum are solidly supported by classical Latin authors.
11 sibi aútoũ ("illius" 1516-19). The interpretation depends on whether the Greek pronoun is understood in a reflexive sense, i.e. binding his own hands and feet, or non-reflexively, binding the hands and feet of Paul. In 151619, Erasmus followed the latter interpretation, corresponding with aủtoũ in his Greek text. In 1522, he restored the Vulgate rendering, and changed oútoũ to @útoũ. See on lob. 2,21. Manetti put suas.

11 pedes ac manus tờs Xeĩpas kai toùs tóסגS ("pedes et manus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On $a c$, see on Iob. 1,25 . The Latin word-order conflicts with the Greek text, which is based on cod. 2815, supported by cod. 2816, together with cod. A and many later mss. The Vulgate word-order, retained by Erasmus' rendering, reflects a Greek text having toùs móסas koi tòs Xeípos, as in 77 $7^{7 \text { vid }} \times B C D E$ and many later mss., including cod. 1 .
11 dixit ... dicit Elte ... $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \mathrm{E}$ ("dicit ... dixit" 1516 only). This transposition of tenses in 1516 diverges from the 1491 and 1514 Vulgate editions of Froben, as well as the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. Manetti put inquit: Dicit.
11 Hierosolymae èv "Ispouva $\lambda \dot{n} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,8.
11 'louסaĩos. In all of Erasmus' mss., the reading is ol 'louסaion. The omission of the article may have been a printer's error, supported only by cod. D*.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39 . Manetti put atque ... tradent.
 таŨTん ("Quod cum audissemus" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. In Manetti's version, this was Vt autem baec audiuimus.
12 et (1st.) $\mathrm{T} \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ (Vg. omits). See on Act. 1,1. In Annot., Erasmus suggests using tum ... tum for тe kal.

12 caeteri qui of ("qui" Vg.). Erasmus inserts caeteri to amplify the contrast with nos. See Annot., where he substitutes ii qui.
13 Tunc respondit ờnekpiӨ $\eta$ тe. Erasmus retains the Vulgate rendering, though this corresponded more closely with a Greek text having тótя a $\quad$ rekpi $\theta \eta$, as found in $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{74}$ स A B C E and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815 , in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti hence put et respondit.
13 Paulus, ac dixit $\delta$ Пaũ ${ }^{2}$ os ("Paulus, et dixit" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). On $a c$, see on Iob. 1,25 . The Latin rendering reflects the addition of koi El $\pi \varepsilon v$, as found in $7^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ A E and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text omits kai elTev, following cod. 2815, supported by codd. B C and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The discrepancy between his Greek and Latin columns remained through all five editions. Manetti had just Paulus.

 toũ ỏvónatos toũ kupiou 'Iŋooũ. ${ }^{14} \mu \grave{\eta}$



 $\lambda \eta \dot{\mu} \mu{ }^{16} \sigma u v \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ каì $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$
 థె $\xi \varepsilon v 1 \sigma \theta \omega ̃ \mu \varepsilon v, ~ M v a ́ \sigma \omega v i ́ ~ t i v i ~ K u t p i ́ \varphi, ~$

 ol $\alpha$ á $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi \circ i$.
 та́vтєs тє тарєүє́vovto oi трєбßútє-



 tòv kúpiov eltóv te aủtụ, Өzapeĩs,

 TES $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \tau \alpha i ̀ ~ T O U ̃ ~ v o ́ \mu o u ~ U ́ T I \alpha ́ p X o v a l . ~$
vero non solum vinciri, sed et mori paratus sum Hierosolymis pro nomine domini Iesu. ${ }^{14}$ Quum vero illi non persuaderetur, acquieuimus, dicentes: Domini voluntas fiat.
${ }^{15}$ Post dies autem istos sublatis sarcinis conscendebamus Hierosolymam. ${ }^{16}$ Venerunt autem vna quidam ex discipulis a Caesarea nobiscum, adducentes secum apud quem hospitaremur, Mnasonem quendam Cyprium, antiquum discipulum. ${ }^{17} \mathrm{Et}$ quum venissemus Hierosolymam, libenter exceperunt nos fratres. ${ }^{18}$ Postero autem die introibat Paulus nobiscum ad Iacobum, omnesque conuenerunt presbyteri. ${ }^{19}$ Quos quum salutasset, narrabat per singula quae deus fecisset inter gentes per ministerium ipsius. ${ }^{20}$ At illi quam audissent, glorificabant dominum, dixeruntque ei: Vides frater, quot milia sunt Iudaeorum qui crediderunt, et omnes studiosi sectatores sunt legis.
$16 \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \omega \nu 1 A^{c} B-E: \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \omega A^{*} \mid 20$ еıtто te $B-E:$ єıtтоитеs $A$
13 paratus sum Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierusalem paratus sum $A \mid 14$ acquieuimus $B-E$ : quieuimus $A \mid 15$ conscendebamus Hierosolymam $B$ - $E$ : ascendebamus in Hierusalem $A \mid$ 16 Venerunt autem vna $C-E$ : Conuenerunt autem $A B \mid 18$ presbyteri $B-E$ : seniores $A \mid 19$ inter gentes $B-E$ : in gentibus $A \mid 20$ glorificabant $B-E$ : magnificabant $A \mid$ studiosi sectatores $B-E$ : aemulatores $A$

13 vero $\gamma$ óp ("autem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with the variant $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, apparently found only in cod. E. Erasmus would have done better to have restored the rendering of earlier Vulgate mss., having enim, as adopted by Manetti.
13 vinciri $\delta \varepsilon 0 \eta ̃ \nu \propto 1$ ("alligari" Vg.). This alteration is solely for variation of style, to avoid repetition of alligo from vs. 11. See on Ioh. 18,24.
13 paratus sum Hierosolymis eis ‘Iepovoaגう̀ $\mu$ Ėтoíh ${ }_{\varsigma}$ êx $\chi$ ("in Hierusalem paratus sum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' change of Latin wordorder is designed to connect mori and paratus sum more closely. On Hierosolymis, see on Act. 1,8. Manetti had in Hierusalem mori paratus sum.

13 pro nomine Útièp toũ ỏvónaтos ("propter nomen" Vg.). This substitution is in accord with Vulgate usage e.g. at Act. 5,41; 9,16; 15,26, and was also made by Manetti.
 $\mu$ évou $\delta$ è̀ oủtoũ ("Et cum ei suadere non possemus" Vg.). Erasmus is closer to the Greek meaning. See on Act. 18,13, regarding persuadeo, and Annot. A similar change occurs at Act. 26,28(1519). Erasmus placed the present passage among the Soloecismi. This provoked an objection from Stunica, who thought that the Latin tradition could have been subject to scribal error at this point: for Erasmus' reply, see his Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 397 F-398 A. In Valla Annot., the suggested rendering was
cum autem non persuaderetur, while Manetti had et cum ei non persuasissemus.
14 acquieuimus ŋ̀ouxáбơusv ("quieuimus" 1516 $=$ Vg.). Elsewhere, in rendering ग̀ $\sigma u \chi \alpha \not \subset \omega$, Erasmus retains taceo at $L c$. 14,4 , while substituting obticesco at Act. 11,18: see ad loc. He may have felt that quiesco, if taken literally, produced an element of contradiction, as those who have just been described here as "keeping quiet" immediately find something further to say.
15 sublatis sarcinis ád $\pi 0 \sigma k \varepsilon \cup \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l$ ("praeparati" Vg.). The word sarcina occurs in the Vulgate at $L c .11,46$, as an alternative for onus in rendering фортíov. It can also refer to a pack or bundle of belongings: cf. Annot. The Greek text of Erasmus is here based on cod. 2815, with very little other ms. support. It would have been preferable, in this instance, if he had retained the Vulgate rendering, and substituted ÉTrı $\begin{gathered}\text { KEvaoád- }\end{gathered}$ $\mu E v o i$ from codd. 1 and 2816, in company with $3 \beta^{74} \mathbb{N}^{\text {corr }}$ A B E and most later mss. His poorly attested variant remained in the Textus Receptus.
15 conscendebamus ảveßaivouev ("ascendebamus" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,17. This change is for stylistic variety, as Erasmus was content to retain ascendo in vs. 12. Cod. 2815 has àvo ßaivousv, present tense, corrected by Erasmus or his assistants from codd. 1 and 2816.
15 Hierosolymam Eis 'lepovo $\alpha \lambda$ ń $\mu$ ("in Hierusalem" 1516 = late Vg.). See on Act. 8,27. Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate in putting Hierusalem without in.

16 Venerunt autem vna quidam $\sigma u v \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta_{0}$ 人 $\delta$ غ̀ кaí ("Venerunt autem quidam" late Vg.; "Conuenerunt autem quidam" 1516-19). On vna, see on Act. 1,22. Erasmus seeks to convey the added nuance of the Greek prefix, $\sigma u v$-. However, the collocation of vna quidam produces an infelicity of style. Manetti's version was Quidam vero ... veniebant.

16 Mnasonem Mváowvı ("Iasonem" late Vg.). The late Vulgate corresponds with 'láowvi of cod. §. The 1516 Greek text followed cod. 1 in putting $\mu \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, with support from cod. B and a few later mss. In the 1516 errata, Erasmus restored $\mu \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma \omega 1$ from codd. 2815 and 2816, in company with $\boldsymbol{申}^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \mathrm{A}$ C E and most later mss. See Annot.
18 Postero autem die $\boldsymbol{T}$ ก̃ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ étriov́oñ ("Sequenti autem die" Vg.). See on Act. 16,11.
18 conuenerunt тарє $\gamma$ ह́vovto ("collecti sunt" Vg.). Erasmus does not elsewhere use conuenio
for this Greek verb, which is more commonly rendered by accedo, aduenio, or venio. Manetti had affuerunt.
18 presbyteri oil $\pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \beta u ́ t \varepsilon \rho o l ~(" s e n i o r e s " ~ 1516 ~$ $=$ Vg.). See on Act. 15,4.
 $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 15,24.
19 ipsius aủtoũ ("illius" Vg. 1527). Erasmus adopts the earlier Vulgate rendering. Manetti preferred suum.
20 glorificabant ṫס̧̧́́a̧ov ("magnificabant" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at eight other passages, mainly in Luke, though Erasmus retains magnifico for all eight N.T. instances of $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \propto \lambda u ́ v \omega$. The only passage where he keeps magnifico for $\delta \circ \zeta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ is at $A p$. Ioh. 15,4 , this being a book which he revised less thoroughly. See also on Ioh. 12,23, and Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.
20 dominum tòv kúplov ("deum" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, tòv $\theta$ eóv, as in $\mathbf{F}^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B C E and some later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , supported by cod. D and most later mss.
20 є\{тTóv te. In 1516, Erasmus adopted ciדmóvtes from cod. 2815, in conflict with his Latin rendering but supported by codd. C D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. In 1519, he followed cod. 3 and the Vulgate in substituting $\varepsilon$ €ाтóv $\tau \varepsilon$, supported by $33^{74} \aleph$ A B E and some later mss.
20 Iudaeorum 'lovסaicu ("in Iudaeis" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having èv toĩs 'louסoious, as in codd. A B C E and twenty-eight later mss. The word is simply omitted in cod. $X$ and cod. $2816^{*}$, but is replaced by $\tau 0 i{ }^{2}{ }^{\prime}$ louסaious in $39^{74}$, and by èv Tñ 'louסaio in cod. D. The text of Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , supported by codd. $1,2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ and more than 420 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 610-12). Manetti put inter Iudeos.
20 studiosi sectatores $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \tau \alpha i$ ("aemulatores" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution of sectator occurs at Act. 22,3 (1519) and 1 Cor. 14,12, consistent with Vulgate usage at Tit. 2,14. At Gal. 1,14, Erasmus puts studiosus. The word aemulator has the connotation of an "imitator" rather than a zealous disciple: cf. Erasmus' retention of aemulator at 1 Petr. 3,13 , for $\mu \mu \eta \tau \eta{ }^{\prime}$, elsewhere rendered imitator.













 ह̇т

 тòv каì торveíav. ${ }^{26}$ то́тє ó Паũخоs тара-





${ }^{21}$ Audierunt autem de te, quod defectionem doceas a Mose, omnes qui inter gentes sunt Iudaeos, dicens, non debere eos circuncidere filios, neque secundum instituta viuere. ${ }^{22}$ Quid est ergo? Omnino oportet conuenire multitudinem. Audient enim te venisse. ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Hoc}$ ergo fac quod tibi dicimus. Sunt nobis viri quatuor votum habentes super se. ${ }^{24}$ His assumptis purifica te cum illis, et impende super illis, vt radant capita: et sciant omnes quod quae de te audie|runt, nihil sunt, sed

26 єкт $\lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma \sigma v$ B-E: $\varepsilon \mu \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma w \mathcal{A}$

21 omnes $B-E$ : eorum $A^{*}$, eos $A^{*} \mid$ inter gentes $B-E$ : in gentibus $A \mid$ sunt $A^{*} B-E$ : sunt omnes $A^{c} \mid$ filios $B-E$ : filios suos $A \mid$ instituta viuere $B-E$ : consuetudines ambulare $A \mid$ 24 purifica $B-E$ : sanctifica $A \mid$ super $B-E:$ in $A \mid$ sciant $E$ : scient $A-D \mid$ nihil $B-E$ : falsa $A \mid$ 25 immolata $B$-E: imolata $A$ | scortatione $C$ - $E$ fornicatione $A$, stupro $B$

21 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also made this change.
21 defectionem ámootaбíav ("discessionem" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at 2 Thess. 2,3. Erasmus chooses a stronger word, more suited to the Greek expression: see Annot. Cf. also on Act. 15,38 regarding deficio, and on Act. 20,29 for discessio.

21 omnes qui ... sunt toùs ... Távitas ("eorum qui ... sunt ${ }^{\text {" }} 1516$ Lat. text $=$ Vg.; "eos qui ... sunt omnes" 1516 errata). The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\pi d v \tau \alpha s$, as in $77^{74} \mathrm{AD}^{*} \mathrm{E}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows
cod. 2815, supported by codd. $\mathcal{K}$ B C $D^{\text {corr }}$ and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The rendering offered in the 1516 errata is also advocated in Annot., which comments on the Vulgate's avoidance of the double accusative after doceo. Manetti put eos ... qui sunt.
 "in gentibus" 1516). See on Ioh. 15,24 . Manetti had ex gentibus.

21 Iudaeos 'louסג夭íous ("Iudaeorum" Vg.). See above, on omnes. In the 1516 Latin text, the combination of eorum qui and Iudacos yielded a grammatically impossible rendering. Manetti
made the same change, but placed the word before qui sunt.
21 filios Tà tékva ("filios suos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate addition does not have explicit Greek support, though it is a legitimate interpretation.
 "consuetudines" 1516). See on Act. 6,14, and Annot.
21 viuere тєрıтаттєiv ("ingredi" Vg.; "ambulare" 1516). Erasmus' removal of the original metaphor, "to walk", is clearer but less accurate. Cf. his substitution of versor for ambulo at Rom. 8,1, 4; 2 Cor. 4,2; 1 Thess. 4,1; 2 Thess. 3,11; Hebr. 13,9 (all in 1519). Elsewhere in the Epistles, he generally retains ambulo. Manetti put ambulent.
22 Quid est ergo tí oưv évדו ("Quid ergo est" Vg.). Erasmus' Latin word-order is less literal, but is consistent with Vulgate usage at Lc. 20,17 . He follows the Greek word-order at 1 Cor. 14,15, 26, where he has quid igitur est for quid ergo est.
22 Omnino móvt由s ("vtique" Vg.). The same substitution occurs at Lc. 4,23 (1519); Act. 28,4; 1 Cor. 5,10 (1519); 9,10; 16,12; and omnino is further introduced at Act. 18,21; 1 Cor. 9,22, ensuring consistency at all occurrences of mớvtos, except at Rom. 3,9, where oú móvtos is rendered by nullo modo. Erasmus reserves vtique for $\alpha v v$ (see on Ioh. 4,10), and once for vai, at Lc. 7,26. The Vulgate uses omnino for such

 change was anticipated by Manetti.
 Erasmus is more precise here: cf. on aduenio at vs. 10. Manetti, more literally, had quod veneris.
24 purifica te $\dot{\alpha} \gamma v i \sigma \theta \eta t ı$ ("sanctifica te" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 11,55, and Annot.
24 super ém" ("in" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 3,10. Erasmus may have felt that the expression impende in should relate to the thing which was purchased, whereas impende super was more suitable for referring to the person on whose behalf the purchase was made. However, his chosen phrase was not without ambiguity.
24 sciant $\gamma \nu \omega ̃ \sigma l$ ("scient" $1516-27=V g$.). The future tense of the Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, $\gamma v \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma$ vtal, found in $\boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B C D E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text, together with his 1535 Latin rendering, follows
cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. The same change was made by Manetti.
24 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also put quod.
24 nihil oúסév ("falsa" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here: see Annot. The version of Manetti made the same change.
25 decernentes kpívavtes ("iudicantes" Vg.). See on Act. 15,19, where Erasmus preferred censeo.
25 ne quid buiusmodi obseruent, nisi vt $\mu \eta \delta$ ह̀v
 Vulgate corresponds with the omission of these Greek words in $\boldsymbol{p y}^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B and six later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. D, together with cod. 2816 and about 400 later mss., and also receiving partial support from codd. C E and around twenty later mss. which substitute toioũto for toioũtov (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 612-15). In cod. 1, غi $\mu \grave{\eta} \varphi \cup \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ वútoús is omitted through homoeoteleuton. Manetti put vt ipsi nibil tale seruent.
 se" Vg.). This change is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Lc. 12,15. Cf. Erasmus' substitution of caueo for deuito at 2 Tim. 4,15, and for custodio at 2 Petr. 3,17 and 1 Iob. 5,21, in rendering the same Greek verb. He also uses caueo for mpooś $\chi \omega$ in Matthew and Luke, and for $\beta \lambda$ ह́тT $\omega$ in Mark. Elsewhere, he follows the Vulgate in using abstineo for d́rTéX anticipated this change, though he placed the verb at the end of the sentence.
25 et (1st.) TE (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission corresponds with the text of $77^{74} \mathrm{D}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by $\aleph$ A B C and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
25 bis quae sunt immolata simulacris tò ... єiठ $\omega \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ Outov ("idolis immolato" Vg.). See on Act. 15,29 . Manetti put bis que idolis imolantur.
25 a sanguine tò $\alpha$ I $\mu \alpha$ ("sanguine" Vg.). Erasmus inserts an extra preposition into his rendering, for the sake of clarity.
25 scortatione mopvelav ("fornicatione" 1516 = Vg.; "stupro" 1519). See on Iob. 8,41.
26 postero ÉXouÉvñ ("postera" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,29.
 $\omega \sigma I v$ is a misprint.
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 tas, ह̀maúcovto túmtovtes tòv Пaũ入ov.




${ }^{27}$ Dum autem septem dies iam pene essent expleti, hi qui ab Asia erant Iudaei, quum vidissent eum in templo, conturbarunt totum populum, et iniecerunt ei manus, ${ }^{28}$ clamantes: Viri Israelitae, succurrite. Hic est ille homo qui aduersus populum et legem et locum hunc omnes vbique docet, insuper et Graecos induxit in templum, et prophanauit sanctum locum hunc. ${ }^{29}$ Viderant enim Trophimum Ephesium in ciuitate cum ipso, quem existimauerunt quod in templum introduxisset Paulus. ${ }^{30}$ Commotaque est ciuitas tota, et factus est concursus populi: et apprehensum Paulum, protrahebant e templo, statimque clausae sunt fores. ${ }^{31}$ Quaerentibus autem illis eum occidere, nunciatum est tribuno cohortis, quod tota conturbata esset Hierosolyma. ${ }^{32}$ Qui statim assumptis militibus ac centurionibus, decucurrit ad illos. At illi quum vidissent tribunum ac milites, cessauerunt percutere Paulum. ${ }^{33}$ Tunc accedens tribunus apprehendit eum, et iussit alligari catenis duabus, et interrogabat quisnam esset, et quid fecisset. ${ }^{34}$ Alii autem aliud clamabant

## 

$27 \mathrm{ab} B-E: \operatorname{de} A \mid$ conturbarunt totum $B-E$ : confuderunt omnem $A \mid 28$ hunc $B$-E: istum $A \mid$ 30 statimque $B-E$ et $\operatorname{statim} A \mid$ fores $B-E$ : ianuae $A \mid 31$ Quaerentibus $B-E$ : Querentibus $A \mid$ conturbata esset $B$-E: confunderetur $A \mid 32$ prius ac $B-E$ et $A$ | At illi $B$-E: Qui $A$ | alt. ac $B-E$ et $A$ |
 ("consummarentur" Vg.). Erasmus renders है $\mu \in \lambda-$ $\lambda o v$ more accurately. In rendering $\sigma u v \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$, he retains consummo at Mc. 13,4; Lc. 4,2, 13; Hebr. 8,8, while substituting finio at Mt. 7,28, and perficio at Rom. 9,28.
$27 a b$ ảmó ("de" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Act. 15,1. Manetti put ex.
27 conturbarunt ouvéXeov ("concitauerunt" Vg.; "confuderunt" 1516). A similar substitution occurs at vs. 31 (1519), where conturbo replaces
confundo in rendering ouyxúv. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains confundo for this Greek verb at Act. 2,6; 9,22; 19,32. At other passages, he uses conturbo for тар $\alpha$ бow at Act. 16,20; Gal. 5,10, and for $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha ד o ́ \omega$ at Act. 17,6 (1519). See Annot., where Erasmus suggests confundebant or conturbabant, in the imperfect tense. Manetti had confuderunt, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.

27 totum mávica ("omnem" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 8,2. See Annot., where Erasmus also recommends substituting turba or multitudo for
populum, in rendering ő $X \lambda$ оऽ, a change which he later puts into practice at vs. 35. Manetti put turbam in the present verse.
28 succurrite $\beta \circ \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} т \varepsilon$ ("adiuuate" Vg.). See on Act. 16,9, and Annot. The subjunctive, $\beta \circ \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \tau \varepsilon$, adopted in 1519, 1527 and 1535, has little ms. support, but appears to have been deliberately chosen. In 1516, $\beta \circ \eta \theta \varepsilon i t \varepsilon$ was taken from cod. 2815, in company with codd. $1^{\text {corr }}, 2816$ and most other mss., and this was the reading which remained in Annot.
28 ille bomo ó ävopemos ("homo" Vg.). Erasmus inserts ille to convey the significance of the Greek article, that this was not just "a man". See Annot.
28 docet $\delta 1 \delta$ ó́ $\sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ ("docens" Vg.). Erasmus removes the present participle here, for the sake of clarity and good style. Manetti made the same change.
28 Graecos "E $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu \alpha \alpha_{\text {("gentiles" Vg.). See on }}$ Iob. 12,20.
28 prophanauit кekolvwke ("violauit" Vg.). This may be compared with Erasmus' substitution of prophano for violo in rendering $\beta \varepsilon \beta \eta \lambda$ ó $\omega$ at Mt. 12,5; Act. 24,6 (1519), and in rendering $\phi \theta$ síp $\omega$ at 1 Cor. 3,17. See Annot. The version of Manetti had polluit.
28 bunc toũtov ("istum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 7,4.
29 existimauerunt évóuļov ("aestimauerunt" Vg.). See on Act. 2,15. Manetti also made this change.
29 quod ${ }^{\circ}$ tı ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti similarly put quod.
30 factus est concursus éý̇veto ouvסpoun่ ("facta est concursio" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using concursus for $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \circ \varphi{ }^{\prime}$ at
 Although the word concursio exists in classical Latin, it is less suitable in the context of a crowd gathering together. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
30 apprehensum $̇$ érı $\lambda \alpha \beta$ ß́úuvoı ("apprehendentes" Vg.). Greek aorist.
 ífpoũ ("trahebant eum extra templum" Vg.). At several other passages, Erasmus is content to use trabo to translate the same Greek verb. Elsewhere, he substitutes protrabo for detrabo at Act. 19,33 in rendering $\pi \rho \circ \beta 1 \beta \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega$ (see ad loc.), and retains protrabo for $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon i v \omega$ at Act. 20,7.

At the present passage, he renders according to the context. His previous change to apprehensum made the pronoun, eum, superfluous: the Vulgate is more literal here. On his substitution of $e$ for extra, see on Act. 7,58. Manetti put extra templum trabebant, omitting eum.
30 statimque kal घu' $^{\prime}$ é $\omega$ ("et statim" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39.
30 fores ai $\theta$ úpal ("ianuae" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At Iob. 20,19 , referring to the doors of a private house, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in rendering the same Greek word by fores, and at Ioh. 20,26, by ianuae. Similarly at other passages he retains ianиa.
31 illis (Vg. omits). Erasmus adds the pronoun, to supply a subject for quaero.
31 quod ... conturbata esset ठ̊Tı ... ovүкéXuTơ ("quia ... confunditur" Vg.; "quod ... confunderetur" 1516 ). See on vs. 27 regarding conturbo. On the removal of quia, see on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quod ... confunditur.
 See on Act. 1,8.
$32 a c$ (twice) $k \alpha i(" e t$ " $1516=V g$.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti used -que and ac here.
32 decucurrit кณтє́ $\delta \rho \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ("decurrit" late Vg.). Erasmus adopts the more accurate perfect tense of the earlier Vulgate. Manetti had accurrit.
32 At illi ol $\delta$ é ("Qui" $1516=$ Vg.). In 1516, Erasmus or his assistants omitted $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, under influence from the Vulgate but apparently without any Greek ms. authority. In 1519, he reinstated the missing particle (supported by cod. 3 and most other mss.), and amended his translation accordingly. Manetti put bi vero.
 the Vulgate wording, although this reflected the substitution of tóte éryioars, as in $\aleph$ A B D E and many later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. For this reason, Manetti changed the translation to Cum autem ... appropinquasset.
33 iussit éké入evą ("iussit eum" late Vg.). The late Vulgate addition does not have explicit Greek support. Manetti similarly omitted eum.
33 quisnam $\tau i s{ }^{\alpha}{ }^{\alpha} v(" q u i s " V g$.). Elsewhere, in rendering tis ápa, Erasmus substitutes quisnam for quis at Lc. 22,23 (1519), and for quis putas at Mt. 24,45; Mc. 4,41; Lc. 12,42 (1519). He
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22
 ákoúvaté uou tñs tpòs úpãs



in turba．Et quum non posset certum cognoscere prae tumultu， iussit duci eum in castra．${ }^{35} \mathrm{Et}$ quum venisset ad gradus，contigit vt portaretur a militibus propter vi－ olentiam turbae．${ }^{36}$ Sequebatur enim multitudo populi clamans，Tolle eum．
${ }^{37} \mathrm{Et}$ quum coepisset induci in castra Paulus，dicit tribuno：Licetne mihi loqui ad te？Qui dixit：Graece nosti？${ }^{38}$ Nonne tu es ille Aegyp－ tius，qui ante hos dies tumultum concitasti，et eduxisti in desertum quatuor milia virorum sicariorum？ ${ }^{39}$ Dixit autem Paulus：Ego sum homo quidem Iudaeus Tarsensis， non obscurae Cilicum ciuitatis ci－ uis．Rogo autem te，permitte mihi loqui ad populum．${ }^{40} \mathrm{Et}$ quum ille permisisset，Paulus stans in gradibus annuit manu ad plebem：et magno silentio facto，alloquutus est lingua Hebraea，dicens：

22 Viri fratres et patres，audite meam，qua nunc apud vos vtor， excusationem．${ }^{2}$ Quum audissent au－ tem quod Hebraea lingua sibi loquere－ tur，magis praestiterunt silentium．Et



37 dixit $B-E$ ：dixit ei $A \mid 39$ Dixit autem $B$－E：Et dixit ad eum $A \mid$ Tarsensis $B$－E：Tharsensis $A$｜non obscurac Cilicum $D E$ ：Ciliciae non obscurae $A-C$
22，1 meam ．．．excusationem $B-E$ ：quam ad vos nunc reddo rationem $A \mid 2$ sibi loqueretur $C-E$ ： loqueretur sibi $A B \mid$ praestiterunt $B$－E：prestiterunt $A$
generally retains quidnam for $\tau i \not \approx \nu$ and $\tau i \neq \alpha p \alpha$ ． Manetti anticipated this change．

35 violentiam тìv $\beta$ íav（＂vim＂Vg．）．At other passages in Acts，Erasmus retains vis in rendering this Greek word．In the present context，violentia better conveys the undisciplined aggression of the crowd．

35 turbae toũ öx入入ou（＂populi＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．6，2，and also on vs． 27 above．The same change was made by Manetti．
37 Licetne El $\varepsilon \xi \xi \in \sigma \tau 1$（＂Si licet＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．18，39．
37 Loqui єimeĩv（＂loqui aliquid＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects the addition of $T$ ，as in $\boldsymbol{p}^{74 v i d} \times \mathrm{A}$

B E and many later mss．Another variant is found in cod．D，reading $\lambda \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ but without ti．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．Manetti put dicere．
37 dixit ${ }^{\varepsilon} \varphi \eta$（＂dixit ei＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）． The late Vulgate addition lacks explicit Greek support．The words dixit ei were completely omitted by Manetti＇s version（both mss．）．
38 ille ¿̀（Vg．omits）．As usual，Erasmus conveys the sense of the Greek article，as the Latin rendering could otherwise mean＂an Egyptian＂， rather than the well－known Egyptian to whom the tribune referred．
39 Dixit autem $\mathfrak{l l} \pi \varepsilon$ ס́́ $^{(\text {（＂Et dixit ad eum＂} 1516}$ Lat．$=$ Vg．）．The Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss．，though a few late mss．substitute t $\varepsilon$ for 8 é．Manetti made the same change as Erasmus．
 sum quidem＂Vg．）．Erasmus wishes to place bomo next to quidem，to retain the emphasis of the Greek text．
39 Tarsensis Taposús（＂a Tarso＂Vg．；＂Tharsen－ sis＂1516）．Erasmus is more precise here．See on Ioh． 1,45 ，for his preference for the adjectival form of town－names．See also Annot．The version of Manetti similarly had Tharsensis．

 ciuitatis＂Vg．；＂Ciliciae non obscurae ciuitatis＂ 1516－22）．In 1516，Erasmus confined himself to substituting obscurus for ignotus，a small improve－ ment of accuracy．Then in 1527，he decided to remove the ambiguity as to whether Kı $\mathrm{Alkins}^{2}$ was to be taken with Tapoeús or with ró入ems． A similar substitution of Cilicum occurs at Act． 6，9（1519）：see on Ioh．1，45．See also Annot．In Manetti＇s version，this was rendered by Cilicie non ignobilis ciuitatis．
39 ciuis то入ítทs（＂municeps＂Vg．）．In Annot．， Erasmus objects to the Vulgate rendering，as being a mistranslation，and suggests that it arose as an attempt to avoid the collocation of two closely related words，ciuitatis and ciuis． At Lc．15，15 and 19，14，the Vulgate renders mo入ítns by ciuis．The same change was made by Manetti．
39 ס $\varepsilon$ oov．The reading oou $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in 1516 cor－ responds with the text of cod．2816．The word $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ is omitted in cod．1，while cod． 2815 has $\delta \varepsilon ́ ~ \sigma o u$, as in most other mss．

40 alloquиtus est пробєфผ́vєı．In his Greek text， which has the imperfect tense，Erasmus follows cod．2815，with many other late mss．However， his Latin rendering follows the Vulgate，which corresponds with the Greek aorist，прогє甲 $\omega$－ $\nu \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ，supported by codd．1， 2816 and many other mss．，commencing with $\boldsymbol{p}^{74}$ ※ ABDE． Manetti put locutus est．
22，1 meam，qua ．．．vtor，excusationem pov тท̃s ．．． ámo入oyías（＂quam ．．．reddo rationem＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．This change is comparable with Erasmus＇ use of excuso for $\dot{\alpha}$ वто入оүध́ou＾ı at Rom．2，15， as also used by the Vulgate at 2 Cor．12，19． Sometimes he replaces rationem reddo with pro me respondeo（Act．25，8），or pro me dico（Act．26，1， 24）．In Annot．on the present passage，he also suggests defensio．The point here is that Paul was expected not merely to give an＂account＂of his actions，but to defend himself against the accusations which had been made．However， Erasmus retained rationem reddo at Act．19，33， where the speaker was intending to make a verbal attack on Paul，rather than a defence．See also on Act．24，10．Manetti changed this to me in bac ．．．defensione．
1 nunc apud vos T Toòs úpãs $\nu \tilde{\sim} v$（＂ad vos nunc＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．2，29，regarding apud． The Vulgate is closer to the Greek word－order． The reading $v u ̃ v$ seems to be an arbitrary cor－ rection by Erasmus or his assistants．Although some late mss．do have vũv，the mss．which he usually consulted in 1516 all had vuvi，as found in most other mss．Manetti put presenti ad vos．
2 quod ठ́тı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Erasmus follows cod． 2815 in omitting 7 ñ after oitl，apparently without other ms．support． Manetti similarly had quod．
2 sibi loqueretur троб甲 $\omega v$ हĩ củtoĩs（＂loqueretur ad illos＂late Vg．；＂loqueretur sibi＂1516－19）． Following classical usage，Erasmus substitutes a reflexive pronoun to refer back to the earlier subject．The present tense，$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varphi \omega v \varepsilon i=1$ is in accordance with codd．3， 2816 and the earlier Vulgate，supported by codd．D E and only a few later mss．（though cod． 2816 had éautoins
 imperfect tense，as in cod．2815，together with cod． 1 and most other mss．In Manetti＇s version， this was ad eos loqueretur．
 is found the word－order $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma x \circ v ~ \mu a ̃ \lambda \lambda o v$ ， but his printed Greek text follows codd． 1 and
























dicit: ${ }^{3}$ Ego quidem sum vir Iudaeus, natus in Tarso Ciliciae: caeterum educatus in hac ciuitate ad pedes Gamalielis, institutus accurate in patria lege, sectator dei, sicut et vos omnes estis hodie: ${ }^{4}$ qui hanc viam persequutus sum vsque ad mortem, alligans ac tradens in carceres viros pariter ac mulieres, | ${ }^{5}$ sicut et princeps sacer- dotum mihi testis est, et totus seniorum ordo: a quibus etiam epistolis ad fratres acceptis Damascum pergebam, adducturus et illos qui illic essent vinctos Hierosolymam, vt punirentur. ${ }^{6}$ Accidit autem mihi iter facienti et appropinquanti Damasco circiter meridiem, vt subito de coelo circunfulguraret me lux multa, ${ }^{7}$ cecidique in solum, et audiui vocem dicentem mihi: Saul, Saul, quid me persequeris? ${ }^{8}$ Ego vero respondi: Quis es domine? Dixitque ad me: Ego sum Iesus ille Nazarenus, quem tu persequeris. ${ }^{9}$ Et qui mecum erant, lumen quidem viderunt,

3 in Tarso B-E: Tharsi $A \mid$ caeterum $A^{c} B$-E: om. $A^{*} \mid$ hac $A^{c} B$-E: ea $A^{*} \mid$ ad $B$-E: secus $A \mid$ Gamalielis $B-E$ : Gamaliaelis $A \mid$ patria $B$-E: paterna $A \mid$ sectator $B-E$ : aemulator $A \mid 4$ prius ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 5$ prius et $A^{c} B-E$ : om. $A^{*} \mid$ testis est $B$ - $E$ : testimonium reddit $A \mid$ seniorum $C$ - $E$ : presbyterorum $A B \mid$ tert. et $B$-E: etiam $A \mid$ Hierosolymam $B$-E: Hierusalem $A \mid 8$ vero $B$-E: autem $A$

2816, in company with most other mss., and the Vulgate.
2 dicit $\varphi \eta \sigma \ldots=$ ("dixit" Vg.). Erasmus is more literal here. Manetti put ait.
3 quidem $\mu \in ́ v(V g$. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \aleph \mathrm{KBDE}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti made the same change.
3 in Tarso ${ }^{\text {Et } v}$ Tapow̃ ("Tharso" Vg.; "Tharsi" 1516). Usually Erasmus prefers the locative case: see on Iob. 4,21. Valla Annot. suggested both Tharsi and in Tharso, while Manetti had in Tharso.

3 catetrum educatus ávocte 0 paunévos 8 '́ ("nutritus autem" Vg.; "educatus" 1516 Lat. text). On caeterum, see on Act. 6,2. Erasmus elsewhere retains nutrio in the context of the nurture of very young children. In the present context, referring to Paul's religious education, he chooses a more suitable verb. However, the problem is sometimes solved by punctuating differently and connecting Gamaliel with the following
 paunévos. Manetti simply put nutritus, omitting autem, and without punctuation.

3 bac Taútṇ ("ista" Vg.; "ea" 1516 text). See on Act. 7,4.

3 ad mapá ("secus" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 4,35.
3 institutus $\pi \varepsilon \pi \alpha \_\delta \varepsilon \cup \mu$ évos ("eruditus" Vg.). Cf. on Act. 18,25. Erasmus retains erudio for $\pi \alpha ı \delta \varepsilon \cup \cup \omega$ at Act. 7,22; Tit. 2,12; Hebr. 12,10.

3 accurate като̀ áákpißeıov ("iuxta veritatem" Vg.). This may be compared with Erasmus' substitution of accurate for diligenter at Mt. 2,7, 8, in rendering ákpıßó $\omega$ and ákpı $\beta$ w̃s. In Annot. on the present passage, he also suggests exacta ratio and rigor as replacements for veritas here, similar to his use of exacte in rendering ákpıßów at Mt. 2,16, exacta diligentia for ókpı $\beta$ ผ̃s at Lc. 1,3 (1519), and exactius for ákpıß́qoтepov at Act. 18,26 (1519): see ad loc. The preference of Valla Annot. was for iuxta diligentiam, while Manetti tried secundum certitudinem.
3 in patria lege тоũ matpథ̂ou vó $\mu \circ$ ("paternae legis" Vg.; "in paterna lege" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus distinguishes between paternus as referring to Paul's own father, and patrius as meaning "ancestral". Cf. on Act. 28,17.
3 sectator $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega T \eta)^{\prime}$ ("aemulator" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 21,20.
3 dei тоũ $\theta$ عoũ ("legis" Vg.). The Vulgate implies a Greek variant, toũ vópov, found in one late ms . See Annot. The version of Manetti also had dei.
4 ac (1st.) kal ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti put atque.
4 carceres $\varphi$ U $\lambda$ ккќs ("custodias" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at $L c .21,12$, but Erasmus retains custodia at Act. 8,3; 12,10; Ap. Ioh. 18,2. Manetti's version had custodiam.
4 pariter ac тє kai ("ac" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1.
5 et (1st.) кaí (omitted in 1516 Lat. text $=V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. Erasmus uses the 1516 errata to correct his rendering. See Annot.
5 testis est $\mu \alpha \rho$ Tupeĩ ("testimonium reddit" 1516 $=$ late Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,7, and Annot. The version of Manetti, as usual, had testificatur.
5 totus seniorum ordo mãv тò mpeoßutépiov ("omnes maiores natu" Vg.; "totus presbyterorum ordo" 1516-19). Erasmus' further change in 1522, reverting to seniorum, contradicts his Annot. See also on Act. 5,21; 15,4. On totus, see on Ioh. 8,2. Manetti put omnes senes.
5 etiam kaí ("et" Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,36. Manetti omitted the word.
 tolas accipiens ad fratres" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti put susceptis epistolis.
5 adducturus et illos qui illic essent $\alpha \xi \omega \nu$ kaì Toùs
 turus etiam illos qui illic essent" 1516). Erasmus is more literally accurate here: see Annot.
5 Hierosolymam Eis 'lepouoanh'川 ("in Hierusalem" Vg.; "Hierusalem" 1516). See on Act. 8,27.
6 Accidit éyéveto ("Factum est" Vg.). See on Act. 7,40.
6 mibi iter facienti et appropinquanti $\mu$ оו торєu-
 quante" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering follows the grammatical form of the Greek sentence. On iter facio, see on Act. 17,1. Manetti's version was dum irem ac ... appropinquarem.
6 circiter meridiem тєрi $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu \beta \operatorname{cí}^{\alpha} \nu$ ("media die" Vg.). Erasmus aims at greater precision here. At Act. 26,13, he uses die medio in rendering a different expression, ท̀ jú́pas $\mu$ н́oŋns.
 fulsit" Vg.). See on Act. 9,3, and Annot. The version of Manetti had $v t$... circunfulsit.
6 multa ikavóv ("copiosa" Vg.). See on Act. 20,8.
 Vg.). Greek aorist. In the parallel passage, at Act. 9,4 (1519), Erasmus preferred collabor (cf. also Act. 15,16). At Act. 26,14, however, where the verb is $k \not \approx \alpha \pi i \pi \tau \omega$, he retains decido. See Annot.
7 solum tò है $\delta \propto q \circ$ ("terram" Vg.). In the parallel passages at Act. 9,4 and 26,14, Erasmus retains terra for $\gamma \tilde{\eta}$. In Annot. on the present passage, he points out that $\varepsilon$ है $\delta \propto \propto \circ$ can refer both to a rocky surface ("saxeum") and also to a wooden floor ("ligneum"). A comparable substitution is made in rendering $\varepsilon \delta \alpha \propto i \zeta \omega$ at Lc. 19,44: see Annot. ad loc.
7 Saul, Saul $\Sigma \alpha o u ́ \lambda, \sum \alpha o u ́ \lambda$ ("Saule, Saule" Vg.). See on Act. 9,4, and Annot.
8 vero $\delta$ '́ ("autem" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus prefers to assign a continuative sense to the Greek particle here. See on Iob. 1,26.
8 ille ó (Vg. omits). Although Erasmus quite often adds ille to convey the significance of the Greek article, he does not do so at any other occurrence of the phrase Iesus Nazarenus.
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et exterriti sunt: vocem autem non audierunt eius qui loquebatur mecum. ${ }^{10}$ Dicebam autem: Quid faciam domine? Dominus autem dixit mihi: Surge, ac vade Damascum, et ibi tibi dicetur de omnibus quae ordinata sunt tibi vt facias. ${ }^{11}$ Et quum non viderem prae gloria luminis illius, per manum deductus a comitibus qui erant mecum, veni Damascum. ${ }^{12}$ Ananias autem quidam, vir pius, secundum legem, testimonio probatus omnium illic habitantium Iudaeorum, ${ }^{13}$ veniens ad me et astans, dixit mihi: Saul frater, recipe visum. Et ego eadem hora recepto visu, vidi illum. ${ }^{14}$ At ille dixit: Deus patrum nostrorum praeparauit te, vt cognosceres voluntatem suam, et videres id quod iustum est, et audires vocem ex ore eius: ${ }^{15}$ quia eris testis illi apud omnes homines, eorum quae vidisti et audisti. ${ }^{16}$ Et nunc quid contaris? Exurge et baptizare et ablue peccata tua inuocato nomine domini. ${ }^{17}$ Factum est autem

12 เov

10 mihi $B-E$ : ad me $A \mid$ Surge, ac $B-E$ : Surgens $A \mid$ ordinata ... facias $B-E$ : te oporteat faeere $A$ (sic) | 11 per $C-E$ : ad $A B \mid 12$ testimonio ... Iudaeorum $B$ - $E$ : testimonium habens ab omnibus habitantibus Iudaeam $A \mid 13$ eadem $B-E$ : eodem $A \mid 14$ praeparauit $B-E$ : praeordinauit $A \mid$ id quod iustum est $B-E$ : iustum $A$

9 et exterriti sunt коì ếцроßoı éyモ̇vovтo (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $39^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B and forty-six later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1 , 2816 and more than 410 later mss., besides
 Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 615-17). In Annot., Erasmus also renders as Et territi sunt, while Valla Annot. proposed et terrefacti sunt, and Manetti et perterrefacti sunt.
10 Dicebam autem eftrov $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("Et dixi" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,30 for this substitution of the imperfect tense. Manetti had Dixi autem.
10 dixit mihi $\pi \rho o ́ s ~ \mu \varepsilon$ ("dixit ad me" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This change seems to be merely for
stylistic variety, as Erasmus retains ad me in vs. 8. Cf. on Iob. 4,15. Erasmus' omission of $\varepsilon$ elme before $\pi \rho o ́ s \mu \varepsilon$ is supported only by cod. 2815 and a few other late mss., harmonising with Act. 9,6. In Manetti, this was rendered as inquit mibi.
10 Surge, ac Avaotás ("Surgens" 1516 = Vg.). Greek aorist. On this occasion, Erasmus avoids the inaccurate present participle by converting it to an imperative.
10 ordinata sunt tibi tétok $\tau \alpha i \operatorname{\sigma ol}$ ("te oporteat" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. ). In the parallel passage at Act. 9,6, rendering $\delta \in \mathbb{i}$, Erasmus retains oporteat from the Vulgate. Here his change of rendering is more appropriate to the different Greek verb, тódoow.

In 1519 Annot., he cites mss. which substitute
 סєĩ Toiñ $\sigma \alpha 1$ (as in codd. 3, 2816*vid) for $\pi$ €pi
 shorter variants, which have the support of only a few late mss., probably arose from harmonisation with Act. 9,6. Manetti put statutum est.
10 vt facias moıñסa1 ("facere" Vg.; "faeere" 1516, sic). On Erasmus' avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33 . Manetti made the same change.
11 gloria Tñs $\delta$ ógns ("claritate" Vg.). See on Ioh. 5,41, and Annot.
 manum deductus" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At Act. 9,8 , Erasmus substitutes manu for ad manus in rendering the same Greek verb. The expression ad manum duco does not appear to be favoured by classical authors. Manetti's version had manu deductus.
11 comitibus qui erant mecum $\tau \tilde{\sim} v \sigma^{\sigma} \operatorname{vó}^{2} v T \omega v$ $\mu o \mathrm{o}$ ("comitibus" Vg.). Erasmus amplifies the rendering, to convey the exact meaning of the Greek phrase.
12 pius $\varepsilon \mathcal{J} \sigma \varepsilon \beta$ ñs ( $V \mathrm{Vg}$. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{7}^{74} \mathrm{~A}$. Erasmus follows
 cod. E and many later mss. In codd. $1^{\text {conr, }}, 2816$ and many other mss., commencing with $\aleph$ B, the reading is $\varepsilon \dot{v} \lambda \alpha \beta{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} s$, which Erasmus also cites in Annot. The version of Manetti put religiosus, consistent with the usual rendering of E $\dot{J} \sigma \varepsilon \beta$ ǹs elsewhere in Acts.
12 testimonio probatus uaptupoúuevos ("testimonium habens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 6,3. This change was anticipated by Manetti, though with a different word-order.
12 omnium illic babitantium Iudaeorum ن́mò
 omnibus cohabitantibus Iudaeis" late Vg.; "ab omnibus habitantibus Iudaeam" 1516). The change from cobabito to babito is in accordance with the reading of earlier Vulgate mss.: see also Annot., where Erasmus further reports an interlinear variant from cod. 2816 ${ }^{\text {corr }}$, adding two words ( $\varepsilon \nu \delta \alpha \mu \propto \sigma \kappa \omega)$ after катоוкоúvt $\omega \nu$, in company with many other late mss. His omission of $\mathrm{E} v \delta \alpha \mu \alpha \sigma \kappa \widetilde{\sim}$ from his text was based on cod. 2815 , supported by codd. 1, 2816* and many other mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ B E. In the 1516 edition, Erasmus' adoption
of ioviaíav (and Iudaeam), rather than iovסai$\omega \nu$, was based on cod. 2815, this time apparently with no support from other Greek mss. Manetti put ab omnibus Iudeis ... qui in Damaso babitant.
13 astans Ėmı $\quad$ cớs ("stans" Vg. 1527). Erasmus' rendering is more accurate, agreeing with the earlier Vulgate and Manetti.
13 Saul โooú入 ("Saule" Vg.). See on Act. 9,4.
13 recipe visum ... reccpto visu, vidi $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} v \dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi o v$
 The substitution of recipio visum is consistent with the Vulgate rendering of Act. 9,12, 18. However, the presence of sis after ${ }_{\alpha} v^{\prime} \hat{\beta} \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi \alpha$ here suggests that the Vulgate's use of respicio in both parts of this verse is more appropriate than the alternative which Erasmus adopted. Cf. Annot., where he also proposes attolle oculos.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At Act. 26,16, rendering the same Greek verb, Erasmus retains constituo. Cf. on Act. 10,41 regarding трохєрротоиє $\omega$, and see Annot. The spelling тровхєip $\sigma \propto a t o$ is found in codd. $1^{* \text { vid }} 2815^{\text {*vid }}$, with little other ms. support. Most mss. have троєхєірібवто, the spelling which was cited in Annot. and found in codd. $1^{\text {conr, }} 2815^{\text {cort }}$ and 2816. For Edward Lee's objections to the removal of praeordino here, together with Erasmus' reply, see the Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 210 B-D.
14 suam वÚtoũ ("eius" Vg.). Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun to refer back to the subject of the main verb. The same change was made by Manetti.
14 id quod iustum est tò סíkoıv ("iustum" $1516 \mathrm{Lat}=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . The reading tó is taken from$ cod. 2816, apparently without other ms. support. The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having tòv Sikoıov, as found in virtually all mss., including codd. 1 and 2815, cited in Annot.
15 illi $\alpha \cup \cup T T \tilde{T}$ ("illius" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering is closer to the Greek here, though a few late mss. have aútoũ.
15 apud $\pi$ тós ("ad" Vg.). See on Act. 2,29. Manetti had $e i$.
16 contaris $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda \varepsilon a s$ ("moraris" Vg.). The verb which Erasmus uses here is a variation of cunctor. Cf. Mt. 24,48, where he puts cunctatur in the translation, but contatur in Annot. For the removal of moror, see on Ioh. 11,54.
16 domini той kupiou ("ipsius" Vg .). The Vulgate follows a Greek text substituting aủtoũ,











 $\sigma \omega \nu$ Tג̀ in






 ккì коvioptòv $\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda$ óvt $\omega v$ घis tòv đóǵpa,



quum essem reuersus Hierosolymam, et orarem in templo, vt raperer extra me, ${ }^{18}$ et viderem eum dicentem mihi: | Festina et exi velociter HieroLB 522 solymis, quoniam non recipient testimonium tuum de me. ${ }^{19}$ Et ego dixi: Domine, ipsi sciunt quod ego pertrahebam in carcerem, et caedebam in singulis synagogis eos qui credebant in te. ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Et}$ quum funderetur sanguis Stephani testis tui, ego quoque assistebam et assentiebar morti illius, et custodiebam vestimenta interficientium illum. ${ }^{21}$ Et dixit ad me: Vade, quoniam ego ad gentes procul mittam te.
${ }^{22}$ Audiebant autem eum vsque ad hoc verbum, atque sublatis vocibus, dicebant: Tolle de terra hominem istiusmodi, non enim phas est eum viuere. ${ }^{23}$ Vociferantibus autem eis, et proiicientibus vestimenta, et puluerem iactantibus in aerem, ${ }^{24}$ iussit tribunus induci eum in castra, et imperauit eum flagris examinari, vt sciret propter quam



17 Hierosolymam B-E: Hierusalem $A$ | 18 Hierosolymis $B-E$ : ex Hierusalem $A$ | 19 pertrahebam $B-E$ : eram concludens $A$ |caedebam in singulis synagogis $B-E$ : cedens per synagogas $A \mid 21$ procul $B-E$ : longe $A \mid 22$ atque.. dicebant $B-E$ : et leuauerunt vocem suam, dicentes $A \mid$ hominem istiusmodi $B-E$ : huiusmodi $A \mid 23$ vestimenta $B-E$ : vestimenta sua $A$
 follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti made the same change.
17 quum essem reuersus... et orarem $\mu \mathbf{1}$ Útrootpé$\psi \alpha v \pi 1$... kai тробधUXoúsvou hou ("reuertenti mihi ... et oranti" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti put dum ... reuerterer atque ... orarem.
 lem" Vg.; "Hierusalem" 1516). See on Act. 8,27. Manetti put Hierusalem, omitting in.
17-18 vt raperer extra me, et viderem $\gamma \in v \in \dot{\theta} \theta \alpha_{1}$ $\mu \varepsilon$ ẻv ék mentis, et videre" Vg.). See on Act. 11,5. For
the avoidance of the infinitive, see on Iob. 1,33. Cod. 2815 replaces $\mu \mathrm{E}$ with $\mu \mathrm{O}$, a poorly supported variant which Erasmus or his assistants corrected with the help of codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti's rendering was vt fierem in stupore mentis et viderem.
18 eum aủtóv ("illum" Vg.). There seems little reason for this change, as it does not assist the reader in identifying the person to whom the pronoun refers, i.e. the Lord. Manetti preferred ipsum.
18 Hierosolymis é $\xi$ "epouga入خ̀ $\mu$ ("ex Hierusalem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 1,8 . Manetti substituted extra Hierusalem.

19 quod ${ }^{\text {Ötl }}$ ("quia" Vg.). See on Act. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
19 pertrabebam in carcerem, et caedebam $\tilde{\eta}_{\mu} \mu \nu$
 carcerem, et c(a)edens" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.; "carcere" for "carcerem" Vg. 1527). See on Ioh. 1,28 for Erasmus' avoidance of the Vulgate construction. Elsewhere, he uses pertrabo only for катабо́po at $L c$. 12,58.
19 in singulis synagogis кatà tàs $\sigma v v a \gamma \omega \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} s$ ("per synagogas" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on $A c t .2,46$.
20 ego quoque kai aútós ("ego" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. In Annot., he renders by et ipse.
20 assistebam $\Pi_{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ Eqєбтஸ́s ("astabam" Vg.). One motive for this substitution is that assisto implies a more active involvement than merely standing by. At vs. 13, in a different context, he retained asto for the same Greek verb. See Annot.
 Vg.). A similar substitution of assentior occurs at Rom. 1,32; 1 Cor. 7,12-13. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests using comprobo, a rendering which he adopted at $L \varepsilon .11,48$ (1519). Inconsistently, in a similar context, he retains consentio at Act. 8,1. The point of this change is that consentio could have been misunderstood as implying that Paul's permission was required before Stephen could be stoned to death.
20 morti illius Tที̃ dávaıpéval aủtoũ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $37^{74} א$ A B E and six later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , with codd. 1, 2816 and more than 450 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 617-19). See Annot. The version of Manetti put neci suat.
20 davalpoúvtav. The misspelling ávoipoúv$\tau \omega v$ in 1519 arose from a faint or damaged $-\alpha$ - in the preceding 1516 edition, which was misread by the typesetters of the second edition.
 on Act. 10,45. The same change was made by Manetti.
21 procul $\mu \times x \rho \alpha ́ v$ ("longe" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). This substitution also occurs at Mt. 8,30; Eph. 2,17. Erasmus makes a similar change in rendering $\dot{\alpha}_{\text {anéx }} \mathrm{\omega}$ at $M t$. 15,8, and puts procul for a longe and de longe in rendering uakpó $\theta \varepsilon v$ and móppo$\theta \varepsilon v$ at seven passages. Sometimes he also substitutes $e$ longinquo or eminus, but elsewhere he retains longe. These changes appear to be mainly
for stylistic variety. The word procul does not occur in the Vulgate N.T., though in the O.T. it is used quite frequently. Manetti again anticipated this change.
22 atque кai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,25.

 dicentes" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus changes the grammatical structure, producing a less literal rendering. At Act. 14,11, he was content with sustulerunt vocem suam ... dicentes. For the removal of leuo, see on Iob. 4,35. Manetti put vocem suam extulerunt.
22 bominem istiusmodi Tòv toıÕ̃TOV ("huiuscemodi" late Vg. $=$ Vg. 1527; "huiusmodi" 1516 $=$ late Vg., and Annot., lemma). The reading buiusmodi is found in the Sacon Vulgate edition of 1513, but buiuscemodi in the Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514 as well as the 1527 Vulgate column. By inserting hominem, Erasmus aimed to prevent the misunderstanding that the indeclinable buiusmodi (or istiusmodi) referred to terra rather than to Paul: see Annot., where he also offered the more literal rendering, talem, which had been adopted by Manetti.
22 ка0 codd. $1^{\text {vid }}$ and 2816 in putting $\kappa \alpha \theta \tilde{\eta} \kappa \in \nu$, as found in most other mss., commencing with
 1519 conformed with the spelling given in 1516 Annot., as found in cod. 2815 and many other late mss. (but not including cod. 3).
23 pırtóvicuv. In 1516, the Erasmian text more correctly had pimtoúvtov, as found in codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. The spelling -óvtav, adopted in 1519, is found in codd. 3 and 2815, with support from cod. (D) E and some later mss.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate addition of a pronoun does not necessarily reflect a different Greek text, although cuitüv is added in cod. E. See on Iob. 13,4; Act. 7,58, where similar changes occur.
24 et imperauit eum flagris examinari $\mathfrak{\varepsilon i m} \mathrm{\omega}^{2}$
 et torqueri eum" $V \mathrm{~g}$.). The Vulgate omission of any equivalent for simiov (or simas as found in some mss.) is not supported by Greek mss. The substitution of flagrum is for stylistic variety, to avoid repetition from flagellare in vs. 25. Erasmus retains flagellum for $\varphi p o \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda 10 v$ at Ioh. 2,15. His substitution of examino for caedo
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causam sic acclamarent ei. ${ }^{25}$ Et quum astrinxisset eum loris, dixit astanti sibi centurioni Paulus: Num hominem Romanum et indemnatum licet vobis flagellare? ${ }^{26}$ Quo audito, centurio accessit ad tribunum, et nunciauit ei, dicens: Quid facturus es? Hic enim homo Romanus est. ${ }^{27}$ Accedens autem tribunus dixit illi: Dic mihi, num tu Romanus es? At ille dixit: Etiam. ${ }^{28}$ Et respondit tribunus: Ego multa summa ciuitatem istam comparaui. At Paulus ait: Ego vero et natus sum. ${ }^{29}$ Protinus ergo discesserunt ab illo, qui eum fuerant examinaturi. Tribunus quoque timuit postquam resciuit quod Romanus esset, et quod vinxisset eum. ${ }^{30}$ Postero autem die volens scire certum, qua ex causa accusaretur a Iudaeis, soluit eum a vinculis, et iussit principes sacerdotum conuenire, totumque concilium, ac deductum Paulum sistebat coram illis.



25 Romanum E: Rhomanum $A-D \mid 26$ Romanus $A$ E: Rhomanus $B-D \mid 27$ Romanus $E:$ Rhomanus $A-D \mid 28$ ciuitatem istam comparaui $B$-E: ciuilitatem hanc consecutus sum $A$ | At $B-E$ : Et $A \mid$ vero $B-E$ : autem $A \mid 29$ fuerant examinaturi $B-E$ : torturi erant $A \mid$ Romanus $A E$ : Rhomanus $B-D \mid$ alt. quod $A C-E$ : quia $B \mid 30$ principes sacerdotum $B$-E: pontifices $A \mid$ totumque $B-E$ et omne $A$ | ac $B-E$ : et $A$
and torqueo gives a more accurate interpretation of the meaning. A similar change occurs in vs. 29 (1519), where the Vulgate inconsistently has torqueo without adding caedo. Erasmus listed the use of torqueo, in the present verse, among
 occurs in 1516 in both the Greek text and Annot., and again d̀ $v \in \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \xi \in v$ in vs. 29. This has no ms. support and looks like an arbitrary correction by Erasmus or his assistants: cf. the substitution of $\mu \alpha \sigma \pi \mid \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ for $\mu \alpha \sigma \pi i \zeta \varepsilon \varepsilon$ in
vs. 25. The altered rendering offered in Annot. is dato mandato vt flagris ecaminarent eum. Manetti put dicens vt flagellis cederetur ac torqueretur.
25 Num El ("Si" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6. In Annot., Erasmus suggests substituting $A n$.
$25 \mu \alpha \sigma t i \zeta \operatorname{lv} v$. In 1516, the substitution of $\mu \alpha \sigma \tau i \xi \varepsilon 1 v$ seems to be a conjecture: see on vs. 24.
26 Quid "Opa ti. Erasmus follows the Vulgate in leaving oip $\alpha$ untranslated. The Vulgate,
however, was based on a Greek text which lacked opo, as in $7^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B C E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text followed cod. 2815, supported by cod. D and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti therefore put Vide quid.
26 facturus es मé $\lambda \lambda$ हıs тоוєiv ("acturus es" Vg.). Erasmus was content to retain acturi sitis at Act. 5,35. Manetti put acturus sis.
26 Romanus 'Pwuaĩos ("ciuis Romanus" Vg.). The Vulgate again inserts ciuis in vs. 29, no doubt to prevent the misunderstanding that Paul was literally from Rome, but without explicit authority from the Greek text. Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
27 num $\varepsilon$ í ("si" late Vg.). See on Act. 1,6.
28 ciuitatem $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ то入ı $\tau \varepsilon i \alpha v$ ("ciuilitatem" 1516 $=$ late Vg .). In substituting ciuitas, Erasmus restores the original Vulgate reading. See Annot., where he takes issue with the preference of Valla Annot. for ciuilitas. In classical Latin, ciuilitas does not mean the "rights of a citizen".
28 istam taút $\eta$ ("hanc" $1516=V g$.). The use of istam conveys the sense of "the citizenship to which you have just referred".
28 comparaui ékinóánךv ("consecutus sum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) Cf. on Act. 1,18; 8,20, where Erasmus substitutes paro in rendering the same Greek verb. See also Annot. Cod. 2815 has the variant, $\mathfrak{e} \pi$ Ioı $\eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, without other Greek support, an error which Erasmus and his assistants avoided by referring to codd. $1,2816$.
28 At $\delta \varepsilon$ ("Et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more accurate here. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) substituted Paulus vero for Et Paulus.
28 vero $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ("autem" $1516=V \mathrm{~g}$.). Erasmus prefers to take the second $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta}$ as a continuative. See on Iob. 1,26.
29 qui ... fuerant examinaturi $\mu$ е́ $\lambda$ 入ovtes ... àve Tג́Цॄıv ("qui ... torturi erant" $1516=$ Vg.). See on vs. 24 for the substitution of examino, and

29 quod (twice) ôtı ("quia" Vg.; "quod ... quia" 1519). See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti had quod in both places.
29 Romanus "P $\omega \mu \boldsymbol{1} 0$ ("ciuis Romanus" Vg.). See on vs. 26. Manetti omitted ciuis.
29 vinxisset गnv ... $\delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \kappa \omega \bar{s}$ ("alligasset" Vg.). See on Iob. 18,24. The reading $\delta \in \delta \varepsilon \operatorname{coss}_{s}$ in 1516 is apparently not found in any mss., and may
have arisen by error. It was copied by the Aldine edition of 1518 , which in turn led to the reappearance of this variant in the margin of Erasmus' 1522-35 editions. Manetti substituted ligauerat.
30 Postero autem die тiñ $\delta \bar{E}$ Ėmaúpiov ("Postera autem die" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,29.
30 certum tò व̇o $\sigma \propto \lambda$ és ("diligentius" Vg.). This substitution is in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 21,34; 25,26. Cf. Annot. The version of Manetti put diligenter.
30 a vinculis á àd $\tau \tilde{\omega} \omega \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \omega ̃ \nu$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by 7 $^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ A B C E and forty-one later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and about 420 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 619-21). The same change was made by Manetti.
30 principes sacerdotum toùs ápxıрpeĩs ("sacerdotes" Vg.; "pontifices" 1516). There does not seem to be any Greek support for ispeis, which was the implied text underlying the Vulgate rendering. The use of pontifices in 1516 is in accord with Vulgate usage in John and Hebrews. A similar substitution of pontifex occurs at Mt. 2,4; Lc. 3,2 (1519); Act. 23,5. For discussion, see Annot. on Mt. 2,4. Manetti had pontifices, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
30 totumque kai ö $\lambda$ ov ("et omne" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on lob. 8,2. Manetti put atque omne.
30 ac kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,25.
30 deductum катаүवүต́v ("producens" Vg.). Greek aorist. This use of deduco is more accurate, and consistent with Vulgate usage at Act. 23,28. However, at Act. 23,15, Erasmus retains produco for katóy. At Act. 23,20, for the sake of variety, he substitutes educo. The verb produco is more suitable for rendering mpoó $\gamma \omega$, as at Act. 12,6; 16,30; 25,26.
30 sistebat $\begin{aligned} & \text { ËOTn } \sigma \varepsilon \nu \\ & \text { ("statuit" Vg.). Elsewhere, }\end{aligned}$ Erasmus retains statuo for iotnui at several passages, e.g. at Act. 4,7; 5,27; 6,6. In rendering the related verb, mapiotinu, he follows the Vulgate in using sisto at $L$ c. 2,22, and substitutes sisto for assisto at Act. 27,24.
30 coram illis als aủtoús ("inter illos" Vg.). This is a more appropriate choice of preposition, taking eis as equivalent of év'́miov or èvavtiov, etc., frequently rendered by coram at other passages. Cf. coram eo for aủTü at Act. 23,33 (1519), and see on Act. 7,46. Manetti had inter ipsos.

23Atevioas $\delta$ ह̀ ó Пaũ入os тب̃ $\sigma u v$ -
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23Intentis autem oculis in concilium, Paulus ait: Viri fratres, ego omni conscientia bona conuersatus sum coram deo vsque in hodiernum diem. ${ }^{2}$ Princeps autem sacerdotum Ananias praecepit astantibus sibi, vt percuterent os eius. ${ }^{3}$ Tunc Paulus dixit ad eum: Percussurus est te deus, paries dealbate. Et tu sedes iudicans me secundum legem, et contra legem iubes me percuti? ${ }^{4}$ Et qui \| astabant,

23,1 $\sigma u v e 1 \delta \eta \sigma \varepsilon 1 A^{c} B$-E: $\sigma u v \varepsilon \delta \eta \sigma \varepsilon 1 A^{*}$
23,1 coram deo $B$-E: ante deum $A \mid 3$ Percussurus est $B$-E: Percutiet $A \mid$ sedes iudicans $B$-E: sedens iudicas $A$ | 4 Summo sacerdoti $B-E$ : Summum sacerdotem $A \mid 6$ Sadducaeorum $A-C E$ : Saducaeorum $D \mid 7$ hoc $B-E$ : haec $A \mid$ ac Sadducaeos $B-E$ : et sadduceos $A \mid 9$ angelus $B$-E: angelum $A$

23,1 Intentis autem oculis in 'Ateviơos ס'́ ("Intendens autem in" late Vg.). Greek aorist. See on Act. 7,55. Manetti put At Paulus in concilium intendens.
1 coram deo Tஸ̃ $\theta \varepsilon \tilde{\sim}$ ("ante deum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 7,46.

2 vt percuterent тט́тTтєIv ("percutere" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 . The same change was made by Manetti.
3 Percussurus est Túmtcıv ... मé $\lambda \lambda \varepsilon 1$ ("Percutiet" 1516 = Vg.; "Percutiat" late Vg., and Annot., lemma). Erasmus is more accurate here. His use
of the future participle in rendering $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ is in accordance with the usual practice of the Vulgate. In Annot., he complained of those Vulgate copies which had percutiat, as this turned the statement into a curse or imprecation. The Vulgate column of his 1527 N.T., however, had Percutiet. On this subject, see further his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 210 D-F; Apolog. adv. Stun. Blasph. et imp., LB IX, 362 B-F.
3 sedes iudicans $\kappa \alpha ̛ \theta \theta \eta \eta$ крiv. $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is again closer to the Greek. The Vulgate transposition of the construction is unsupported by mss. Manetti also put sedes ... iudicans.
4 Summo sacerdoti Tòv ápxıepéa ("Summum sacerdotem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar alteration occurs in vs. 5, and at Iac. 3,9 (1519). Erasmus consistently constructs maledico with the dative, as practised by the Vulgate at $M t .15,4 ; M c .7,10$; Lc. 6,28; Ioh. 9,28. Manetti, as usual, preferred pontificem.
5 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20, and Annot.
5 pontifex esset éotiv ápxıepeús ("princeps est sacerdotum" Vg.). See on Act. 22,30. Manetti's version (both mss.), by another transcriptional error, omitted Dixit ... sacerdotum.
5 Principi"Apxovta ("Principem" Vg.). See on vs. 4 for the use of the dative after maledico.
6 quod ötı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti made the same change.
6 Pharisaei Фapıбaiou ("Pharisaeorum" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, $\Phi_{\alpha-}$ ploaic $\omega$, as in $7^{74} \times$ A B C and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.
7 hoc тои̃то ("haec" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate use of the plural lacks Greek support.
7 ac кגi ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). In cod. 2815* the words kal $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \sigma \alpha \delta \delta$ oukai $\omega \nu$ were omitted, in company with many other late mss. There are also many late mss., including cod. 2816, which contain the missing words. Another large section of the mss., commencing with $\aleph$ ABCE, and including cod. $1{ }^{\text {corr, }}$, has kal $\sigma \alpha \delta \delta \delta 0 u k \alpha i \omega \nu$,
 After consulting his mss., Erasmus wrote a correction in the margin of cod. 2815:
kaì [T $\omega \tau$ ]
$\sigma \alpha \delta \delta[$ ouk $\alpha$ i]
$\omega \nu$

The square brackets here indicate where a later binder has severely cropped the leaves of the ms. There is hence a degree of uncertainty as to whether the margin included the word $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$, though there must originally have been ample space for it to have been written above the letters -oukaí- (also now missing) of $\sigma \alpha \delta \delta \delta u-$ koícuv. Manetti similarly put ac.
7 dissecta est $\varepsilon \sigma X^{i} \sigma \theta \eta$ ("soluta est" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus suggests that the Vulgate reflects a different Greek verb, $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\prime} \theta \eta$, though this has no ms. support. At Act. 14,4, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using diuido for $\sigma x i \zeta \omega$, in a similar context. For another use of disseco, see on Act. 2,3. At the present passage, Manetti put diuisa est.
 ("Saducaei autem" Vg. 1527; "Sadducaei enim" Vg. mss.). The Vulgate omission of quidem possibly reflects Greek mss. which omitted $\mu \varepsilon v^{\prime} \nu$, such as cod. B and a few later mss. However, it could also be just a matter of translation: see on Act. 13,6.
8 resurrectionem ơvóaбтaбiv ("resurrectionem mortuorum" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss.
9 quum surrexissent ${ }^{2} v \alpha \sigma \sigma$ व́dvтеs ("exurgentes" late Vg.). Greek aorist. A similar substitution of surgo for exurgo occurs at Mc. 10,1; 14,60; Act. 26,30; Eph. 5,14. Erasmus retains exurgo for
 Rom. 15,12, and occasionally uses exurgo for غ́yEip $\omega$ and $\alpha{ }^{2} v \alpha \beta \alpha i v \omega$.
9 scribae de factione үрациатєĩs тои̃ $\mu$ épous ("quidam" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, tivés, as found in $7^{74}$ A E and a few later mss. A few other mss., commencing with
 үрациотті̇s. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and some other late mss. In many other late mss., of is added before $\gamma \rho \propto \mu \mu \propto т \varepsilon i s$. Manetti's rendering was scribae de parte.
9 depugnabant $\delta 1 \varepsilon \mu$ ̛́X Xovto ("pugnabant" Vg.). Erasmus uses depugno to distinguish $\delta$ (a$\mu \alpha ́ x o \mu a ı$ from $\mu \alpha ́ x o \mu a r ı$. He makes a similar substitution in rendering $\theta$ пnplouaxé $\omega$ at 1 Cor. $15,32$.
9 Quod si $\varepsilon$ l $\delta E^{\prime}$ ("Quid si"Vg.). The Vulgate rendering is affected by the omission
 Si autem.




 $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \mu \beta \circ \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu$.
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ne repugnemus deo. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Et}$ quum magna seditio coorta esset, veritus tribunus ne discerperetur Paulus $a b$ ipsis, iussit milites descendere et rapere eum de medio eorum, ac deducere eum in castra.
${ }^{11}$ Sequenti autem nocte assistens ei dominus, ait: Bono animo esto Paule. Vt enim testificatus es de me Hierosolymis, sic te oportet et Romae testificari. ${ }^{12}$ Facto autem die collegerunt se quidam ex Iudaeis, et deuouerunt se dicentes, neque esuros se neque bibituros, donec occiderent Paulum. ${ }^{13}$ Erant autem plures quam quadraginta viri qui hanc coniurationem fecerant, ${ }^{14}$ qui accesserunt ad principes sacerdotum ac seniores et dixerunt: Deuotione deuouimus nos ipsos, nihil gustaturos, donec occidamus Paulum. ${ }^{15}$ Nunc ergo vos, significate tribuno et concilio, vt cras producat illum ad nos, tanquam aliquid certius cognituros de eo. Nos vero priusquam appropinquet, parati sumus interficere illum. ${ }^{16}$ Quum autem audisset filius sororis Pauli insidias, venit et intrauit in castra, nunciauitque Paulo.
 15 кal $B$-E: ouv $A$

9 ne ... deo. $B$-E: num ... deo? $A$ | 10 coorta $B$-E: facta $A \mid 11$ Hierosolymis $B$-E: in Hierusalem $A \mid \operatorname{Romae} A E$ : Rhomae $B-D \mid 12$ esuros se $B-E$ : manducaturos $A \mid 13$ plures $C-E$ : plus $A B \mid$ viri $B-E$ (ital): viri $A$ (rom.) | 14 ac $B-E$ et $A \mid 15$ significate $B$ - $E$ : notum facite $A \mid$ et concilio $B-E$ : cum consilio $A \mid$ appropinquet $B-E$ : appropiet $A$
 "num repugnemus deo?" 1516). In 1527 Annot., Erasmus speculates that this clause was added from Act. 5,39. However, at that passage, the
 which is sufficiently different to rule out a straightforward process of harmonisation between the two passages. The Vulgate omission
is supported by $\boldsymbol{F}^{74} \aleph \operatorname{ABCE}$ and fifteen later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and about 450 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 623-5). Manetti added ne deo repugnemus.

10 seditio $\sigma$ Tááccos ("dissensio" Vg.). This substitution is partly for stylistic variety, to avoid
repetition of dissensio from vs. 7, and also in accordance with Vulgate usage at Act. 15,2; 19,40; 24,5.
10 coorta esset $\gamma \in v o \mu e ́ v \eta s$ ("facta esset" 1516 $=$ Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 20,37 (1519). See on Ioh. 1,17.
10 veritus $\varepsilon \cup ̉ \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \theta$ eis ("timens" Vg.). Greek aorist. This word was omitted from Manetti's version (both mss.).
11 Bono animo esto Өápoceı ("Constans esto" Vg.). See on Ioh. 16,33. Manetti put confide.
11 Paule Паũ入s (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $3^{74} *$ A B C ${ }^{*} E$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, together with cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti made the same change.
$11 V t$ む́s ("Sicut" Vg.). Often Erasmus retains sicut for $\dot{\omega}$, but at the present passage he probably wished to avoid the sequence sicut ... sic.
11 Hierosolymis eis ' Iepovo $\alpha \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" 1516 = late Vg.). See on Act. 1,8 .
12 Facto yєvouévins ("Facta" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29 , for the gender of dies.
12 exuros se фळץะіัท ("manducaturos" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,31.
13 plures $\pi \lambda$ Eíous ("plus" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar substitution occurs at Act. 24,11 (1519). Erasmus is closer to the grammatical form of the Greek expression: cf. his substitution of plures for amplius in vs. 21. Manetti made the same change.
13 wiri. This word was added by the late Vulgate. Erasmus puts it in italics, to indicate that it is an explanatory addition.
 principem sacerdotum" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate use of the singular is unsupported by Greek mss., and is probably an internal Latin corruption. Manetti had ad pontifices.
14 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti also had ac.
14 nos ipsos Éoutoús ("nos" Vg.). See on Iob. 11,55; Act. 9,34.
15 significate Ė $\mu \varphi \alpha v i \sigma \alpha T \varepsilon$ ("notum facite" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In Annot. on this verse, Erasmus further suggests using indico, a change which he puts into practice in vs. 22 in rendering the same Greek verb. At vs. 19, by contrast, he substitutes
significo for indico in rendering ${ }^{\prime} \pi \sigma^{\prime} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$. He further uses significo to replace adeo at Act. 24,1 (1516-19 only); 25,2, 15 (both in 1519). On the removal of notum facio, see further on Act. 1,19.
15 et kaí ("cum" 1516 Lat. = Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a different Greek reading, $\sigma u ̛ v$, as found in virtually all mss., including those which Erasmus usually consulted. In 1516, he correctly had oúv in his Greek text, but inconsistently in Annot., he cited kat and et as his preferred reading, while complaining that Lyra had mistakenly quoted cum ("male legerit"). In 1519, his Greek text was made to conform with the change which he had introduced in 1516 Annot., but his 1519 Annot. now acknowledged that several Greek mss. supported cum.

15 cras $\alpha u ̋ p i o v ~(V g . ~ o m i t s) . ~ T h e ~ V u l g a t e ~ o m i s-~$ sion is supported by $7^{38 v i d} 74 \times$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1,2816 and most other late mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti similarly added cras.
15 producat к $\alpha \tau \propto \alpha ́ \gamma \eta$ ("adducat" Vg. 1527). Erasmus adopts the earlier Vulgate rendering.
15 ad nos $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ † $\dagger \mu a ̃ s ~(" a d ~ v o s " ~ V g.) . ~ E r a s m u s ~$ again follows his cod. 2815, this time supported by cod. 2816 and relatively few other late mss. The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $u$ ữ ${ }^{5}$, found in cod. 1 and most other Greek mss.: this reading is acknowledged in Annot. The version of Manetti here also had ad nos.
 turi" Vg.). It is doubtful whether the Vulgate reflects a different Greek text. Although, in Annot., Erasmus cites the variant $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda$ дovtes, this is found in hardly any mss., and not in those which he usually consulted
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). In 1519, Erasmus removes all instances of appropio: substituting appropinquo here and at Iac. 4,8, and putting accedo at Lc. 10,34; 12,33. The verb appropio does not occur in classical Latin. Manetti made the same change.
16 Quum autem audisset đ̊́xoúoxs סé ("Quod cum audisset" Vg.). Erasmus probably wished to remove the ambiguity of the Vulgate expression, as to whether quod here meant "but" or "which". Manetti similarly had Cum autem ... audisset.






















 tòv veavíav, $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha s$ $\mu \eta \delta \varepsilon v i$ ék-

${ }^{17}$ Accersito autem Paulus ad se vno ex centurionibus ait: Adolescentem hunc abduc ad tribunum: habet enim quod renunciet illi. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{Et}$ ille quidem assumens eum, duxit ad tribunum, et ait: Vinctus Paulus accersitum me, rogauit vt hunc adolescentem perducerem ad te, habentem aliquid quod loquatur tibi. ${ }^{19}$ Apprehensa autem tribunus manu illius, secessit cum eo seorsum, et percontatus est illum, Quid est quod habes significandum mihi? ${ }^{20}$ Ille autem dixit: Iudaei conspirarunt vt rogarent te vti crastino die educeres Paulum in concilium, quasi aliquid certius inquisituri sint de illo: ${ }^{21}$ tu vero ne morem gesseris illis. Insidiantur enim ei ex eis viri plures quadraginta, qui se ipsos deuouerunt, ne vel edant vel bibant, donec interficiant eum: et nunc parati sunt expectantes, vt promittas. ${ }^{22}$ Tribunus igitur dimisit adolescentem, praecepitque ei, ne cui effutias, inquiens, quod haec indicaueris mihi.

17 єхघı $A$-С: $\varepsilon \varphi \eta D E$
18 loquatur $B-E$ : loqueretur $A \mid 21$ vt promittas $B-E$ : promissum tuum $A \mid 22$ praecepitque $B C D^{b} E$ : praecipiens $A$, praecaepitque $D^{*} \mid$ inquiens $B-E$ : om. $A$
 ("Vocans ... vnum" Vg.). Greek aorist. On accerso, see on Act. 4,18. Manetti put vnum ... aduocans.
17 abduc àmó ${ }^{\alpha} \propto \gamma \varepsilon$ ("perduc" Vg.). Erasmus wishes to distinguish from perduco, rendering ar $\gamma \omega$ in the following verse. Cod. 2815 has ártay $\epsilon$, supported by codd. $\kappa$ B and a few later mss., a reading which Erasmus or his assistants rejected in favour of codd. 1 and 2816, which had órmóyoye in company with $77^{74} \mathrm{ACCE}$ and most of the later mss. Manetti had adduc.
 little sense in the context, and lacks Greek support. It is almost certainly a printer's error,
influenced by the occurrence of $\underset{\text { 关 }}{\eta} \eta$ on the line above.

17 quod renunciet T о $\alpha \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ("aliquid indicare" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, for avoidance of the infinitive. In vs. 18, however, Erasmus retains aliquid in rendering a similar Greek expression.

18 accersitum me, rogauit $\pi \rho о \sigma к \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon v o ́ s ~ \mu \varepsilon$
 Vulgate omission of vocans, which was inserted before rogauit in earlier Vulgate mss., is unsupported by Greek mss. On accerso, see on Act. 4,18. The personal pronoun, $\mu \varepsilon$, can be taken with either тробка $\lambda \varepsilon_{0} \mu a 1$ or éphtáco, owing to ambiguity in the Greek
word-order. Manetti's version was aduocatum me rogauit.
$18 v t$... perducerem ở $\gamma \alpha \gamma \varepsilon i v$ ("perducere" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti put vt ... adducerem.
18 quod loquatur $\lambda \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ ("loqui" Vg.; "quod loqueretur" 1516). See again on Ioh. 1,33.
 Xeıpós ("Apprehendens ... manum" Vg.). Greek aorist.
19 percontatus est $\mathfrak{E} \pi T \cup v \theta$ óveto ("interrogauit" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6.
19 significandum $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha a$ ("indicare" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, again, for the avoidance of the infinitive. On significo, see on vs. 15.
20 Iudaci conspirarunt of 'lovסaĩol $\sigma u v$ É日evto ("Iudaeis conuenit" Vg.). Erasmus is closer to the grammatical form of the Greek expression. This use of conspiro is in accordance with the Vulgate rendering of Ioh. 9,22 . Manetti put Iudei conuenerunt.
20 vt rogarent toũ ép $\omega$ т $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha 1$ ("rogare" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti's choice was ad rogandum.
20 vti óthes ("vt" Vg.). Erasmus uses the archaic form, $v t i$ for $v t$, at only two other passages, 1 Cor. 7,35; Hebr. 6,18. Its use here appears to be solely for the avoidance of repetition.
20 crastino die oűpıov ("crastina die" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,29. Manetti substituted cras.
20 educeres катоүó $\gamma \eta$ ग̧s ("producas" Vg.). This change is merely for stylistic variety, as Erasmus retained produco for karór $\gamma \omega$ in vs. 15. Manetti's version had producatis, in the plural.
$20 \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda$ ovtes. In cod. $2815^{\text {corr vid }}$ the reading is $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, as found in $\boldsymbol{P}^{74}$ A B E and forty later mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and almost 130 other late mss., it is $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda$ ovta. Both of these variants would refer to the tribune. In cod. $K^{*}$ and thirty-five later mss., the spelling is $\mu \dot{\text { É }} \lambda \lambda 00$, neuter, which would refer to the Sanhedrin. The variant adopted by the Erasmian text, $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda$ оит $\frac{1}{5}$, has the support of more than 160 of the later mss., though Erasmus or his assistants could easily have arrived at this reading by a conjecture based on the Vulgate wording. Other variants having significant support in-
 $\mu E ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu t \varepsilon 5$, refer to the Jews. (See Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 625-7).
 This idiomatic classical expression, meaning to gratify someone's wishes, is not found elsewhere in Erasmus' N.T. He retains credo for $\pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$ at a number of passages. On morem gero, see further Valla Elegantiae IV, 104; Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 278, 1l. 960961.

21 plures $\pi \lambda$ sious ("amplius quam" late Vg.). Cf. Erasmus' substitution of plures for plus in vs. 13. He retains amplius, however, at Act. 4,22; $\mathbf{2 5 , 6}$, in a similar sense. Manetti preferred plures quam here.
21 se ipsos éautoús ("se" Vg.). See on Ioh. 11,55; Act. 9,34.
21 ne vel edant vel bibant $\mu \eta \tau \varepsilon$ фаүєі̃ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \varepsilon$ тाहĩv ("non manducare, neque bibere" Vg.). On the avoidance of infinitives, see on Ioh. 1,33 . On edo, see on Iob. 4,31. Manetti put neque manducare neque bibere.
 ("promissum tuum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Although the Vulgate is closer to the form of the Greek, Erasmus wishes to make clear that the promise had not yet been given. At Act. 1,4, to "await the promise of the Father" meant to await the fulfilment of a promise which had already been made. Manetti, more literally, put promissionem abs te.
22 praecepitque ei $\pi \alpha \rho \propto \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha s$ ("praecipiens ei" 1516 = late Vg.). Greek aorist. In Annot., Erasmus also renders by iussitque. Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate in omitting ei.

22 effutias inquiens Ék $\lambda \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha \leadsto$ ("loqueretur" Vg.; "effutias" 1516). Erasmus understands the infinitive here as being the equivalent of the imperative, and substitutes a more idiomatic verb, effutio, meaning to blurt out or babble. In Annot., he further suggests effero or patefacio. On inquiens, see on Ioh. 1,20.
22 quod ${ }^{\text {ott }}$ ("quoniam" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,20, and Annot. This change was also made by Manetti.
22 indicaueris mihi ėveథávıoas $\pi \rho o ́ s ~ \mu \varepsilon$ ("nota sibi fecisset" Vg.). The Vulgate takes the preceding ék $\kappa \lambda \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha 1$ more literally as an infinitive, and hence converts the second verb into indirect speech, for grammatical consistency. See Annot. On indico, see on vs. 15. Manetti put sibi manifestasset.








 ÉXovoav tòv тútov toũtov. ${ }^{26} \mathrm{~K} \lambda \alpha$ úठios
 рєiv. ${ }^{27}$ Tòv $\alpha ้ ้ \delta \delta \rho \alpha$ тои̃тоv $\sigma u \lambda \lambda \eta \varphi \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v \tau \alpha$












${ }^{23} \mathrm{Et} \mathrm{\mid} \mathrm{accersitis} \mathrm{duobus} \mathrm{quibusdam}$ centurionibus, dixit: Parate milites ducentos, vt eant Caesaream, et equites septuaginta, et lancearios ducentos, a tertia hora noctis. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Et}$ iumenta praebete, vt impositum Paulum, saluum perducant ad Felicem praesidem, ${ }^{25}$ scriptis literis in hanc formam: ${ }^{26}$ Claudius Lysias potentissimo praesidi Felici salutem. ${ }^{27}$ Virum hunc comprehensum a Iudaeis, quum iam esset interficiendus ab eis, superueniens cum exercitu, eripui, cognito quod Romanus esset: ${ }^{28}$ volensque scire causam ob quam accusarent illum, deduxi eum in concilium eorum. ${ }^{29}$ Quem comperi accusari de quaestionibus legis ipsorum, nullum dignum morte aut vinculis habentem crimen. ${ }^{30} \mathrm{Et}$ quum indicatum esset mihi de insidiis quas parauerant illi Iudaei, protinus misi eum ad te, praecepto dato etiam
 $A C-E: \mu \eta \delta \in \nu \delta \varepsilon B \mid 30$ ато $B-E: \cup \pi т о$

23 quibusdam $A^{c}$ B-E: om. $A^{*} \mid$ Caesaream B-E: vsque ad Caesaream $A \mid 26$ potentissimo $B-E:$ optimo $A \mid 27$ Romanus $A$ E: Rhomanus $B-D \mid 28$ ob $B-E$ om. $A \mid$ accusarent illum $B$ - : obiiciebat illi $A$

23 accersitis тробко入є $\sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s(" v o c a t i s " ~ V g) .$. See on Act. 4,18. Manetti rendered this by conuocatis.
23 quibusdam tıvás (omitted in 1516 Lat. text $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{794}$ and a few later mss. In codd. $\times \mathrm{B}$, tivás is inserted before סúo. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. A E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti similarly added quibusdam.
23 dixit $\mathfrak{E T \pi \varepsilon \nu}$ ("dixit illis" Vg.). The added pronoun of the Vulgate lacks explicit support from Greek mss., though it is implied by the context. Manetti had inquit, which he placed after Parate.

23 Caesaream ṫ ${ }^{\text {ns }}$ Kaıoxpeías ("vsque Caesaream" Vg.; "vsque ad Caesaream" 1516). See on Act. 11,19.

 other than cod. A.
24 praebete тарабтĩбaı ("praeparate" Vg.). See on Act. 1,3, for Erasmus' treatment of тарібт $\eta \mu \mathrm{elsewhere} .\mathrm{In} \mathrm{Annot.}$, exbibeo to render this verb.
 Vg.). Greek aorist.
24 perducant $\delta 1 \alpha \sigma \omega \sigma^{\circ} \omega{ }^{\prime}$ ("perducerent" $V g$.). Erasmus understands the verb as being part of
the tribune's speech, whereas the Vulgate use of the imperfect subjunctive assigns the verb to the accompanying narrative. Manetti translated more literally as saluent.
24 praesidem Tòv $\mathfrak{\dagger} \gamma \xi \mu \dot{\sigma} v \alpha$ ("praesidem. Timuit enim ne forte raperent eum Iudaei et occiderent: et ipse postea calumniam sustineret, tanquam accepturus pecuniam" late Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus states that these additional words are not found in any Greek mss., and ventures his opinion in 1516-19 Annot., that this was the result of an oversight by Greek scribes ("opinor obliuione"). Edward Lee seized upon this, with a view to proving the unreliability of the Greek mss.: for Erasmus' reply, see his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 211 A-C. From 1522 Annot. onwards, Erasmus retracted his earlier suggestion and noted the absence of these words from other Vulgate copies, as well as the fact that the added sentence is not found in the homilies of Chrysostom. The late Vulgate reading is supported by $\$^{48}$ and four later mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 627-9). Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and nearly all other mss. Manetti rephrased the additional sentence as Timebat enim ne Iudei forte eum raperent atque occiderent: vt ipse postea calumniam sustineret quasi pecuniam accepturus.
 ei epistolam" late Vg.). Greek aorist. The late Vulgate addition of $e i$ is unsupported by Greek mss. Manetti continued with ac scripsit epistolam.
25 in banc formam Teppéxouoov tòv túmov toũtov ("continentem haec" Vg.). Erasmus is closer to the sense of the Greek text here. The Vulgate rendering would correspond with the substitution of táסe for tòv tútov toũtov, but this is supported by only two late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 629-32). Manetti's version was hoc exemplar continentem.
26 potentissimo тч̃ кротібтч ("optimo" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). At Lc. 1,3 and Act. 26,25, Erasmus retains optimus, while at Act. 24,3 (1519) he substitutes praestantissimus. In Annot. on the present passage, he suggests that крátiotos here has more to do with power than virtue. See also Annot. on Lc. 1,3.
27 quum iam esset interficiendus kò̀ $\mu$ ह́ $\lambda \lambda$ оvта avacıpiiotal ("et incipientem interfici" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,47. Valla Annot., commenting on Act. 27,10, suggested that the present passage should be rendered et iamiam interficiendum, or more loosely as quem videbam interfectum iri.

Manetti substituted atque ... interficiendum. The spelling davopeîotal in 1516-19 is a misprint.
27 quod ... esset o̊ See on Iob. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... est.
28 ob quam accusarent illum $\delta_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ ñ $v$ èvek $\dot{\lambda} \lambda$ ouv ๙ủTตั ("quam obiiciebant illi" Vg.; "quam obiiciebat illi" 1516). This substitution is in accordance with Vulgate usage at at Act. 19,38; 23,29; 26,2, 7. See on Act. 19,40. The Vulgate omission of ob is supported by only a few late mss., which omit $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ '. In Manetti's rendering, this was quam ei obiciebant.
29 comperi Eṽpov ("inueni" Vg.). A similar change occurs at $L$ c. 23,22 (1519); Act. 24,12, 18. For Erasmus' frequent substitution of reperio for inuerio, see on Ioh. 1,41.
29 nullum $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ ("nihil vero" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text adding $\delta \dot{E}$, as in $19^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B E and some later mss. Erasmus added $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon}$ in his 1519 edition, following cod. 3, but without adjusting his Latin translation. Then in 1522, he reverted to $\mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \nu$, as printed in 1516, following cod. 2815 along with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Erasmus, more accurately, uses the adjective nullum, to show the connection with the subsequent crimen. Manetti put ac nibil.
30 indicatum esset mihi unvu日eions ... $\mu \mathrm{o}$ ("mihi perlatum esset" Vg.). This substitution accords with Vulgate usage in rendering the same Greek verb at Iob. 11,57; 1 Cor. 10,28. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) opened this sentence with Relatis autem mibi insidiis viro a Iudeis machinandis, confestim.
 (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission may reflect a different Greek text, substituting $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi$ đن̇T $\tilde{v}$, as in codd. א A E and about twenty-five later
 omitting the other three words, is found in $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \mathrm{~B}$ and seventeen later mss. Erasmus in 1516 had Útió for d́ríd, following cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and more than 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 632-5). His change to dmó in 1519 has no ms. support prior to the 16 th. century, and is probably either an error or an arbitrary conjecture.
30 praecepto dato $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha s$ ("denuncians" Vg.). Greek aorist. On the substitution of pracipio, see on Act. 4,18.
30 etiam kai ("et" Vg.). See on Ioh. 6,36.


${ }^{31} \mathrm{Oi} \mu \mathrm{èv}$ oữv $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau i \omega ̃ \tau \alpha 1$ katà tò $\delta ı \alpha т \varepsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v$ đỦtoĩs，àv $\alpha \lambda \alpha \beta$ óvtes tòv





 $v 1, \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma t \eta \sigma \alpha v$ кai tòv Пaũخov aủtụ．


 घ゙甲 $\eta$ ，ठ̊т
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 §ато каттүүоре̃v ó T＇є́ptu



accusatoribus，vt quae habent aduer－ sus eum，dicant apud te．Vale．
${ }^{31}$ Milites vero iuxta quod sibi iniunctum erat，receptum Paulum duxerunt per noctem Antipatridem． ${ }^{32}$ Postero autem die dimissis equiti－ bus vt cum eo irent，reuersi sunt in castra．${ }^{33}$ Qui quum venissent Caesa－ ream，ac tradidissent epistolam prae－ sidi，statuerunt coram eo et Paulum． ${ }^{34}$ Quum legisset autem praeses，et interrogasset ex qua prouincia es－ set，et cognouisset quod ex Cilicia， ${ }^{35}$ Audiam te，inquit，quum accusa－ tores quoque tui aduenerint．Iussit－ que in praetorio Herodis custodiri eum．

24Post quinque autem dies des－ cendit princeps sacerdotum Ananias cum senioribus et Tertullo quodam oratore，qui adierunt praesi－ dem contra Paulum．${ }^{2}$ Et citato Pau－ lo，coepit accusare Tertullus，dicens： Quum in multa pace agamus per te， et multa recte gerantur in populo hoc per tuam prouidentiam，${ }^{3}$ et semper

30 єррんбо B－E：еррんоөє $A$


30 Vale $B-E$ ：Valete $A \mid 31$ Antipatridem $B-E$ ：in Antipatridem $A \mid 33$ ac $B$－$E$ ：et $A \mid$ coram eo $B-E$ ：ante illum $A \mid 34$ prius ex $B-E$ ：de $A \mid$ alt．ex $B-E$ ：de $A$ 24，1 adierunt ．．．Paulum C－E：significauerant praesidi de Paulo $A B \mid 2$ populo $A-C D^{*} E$ ： op $D^{b}$

30 quate babent aduersus eum tà $\pi$ тós aủtóv （Vg．omits）．The Vulgate omission reflects a Greek text substituting oúroús，as in codd． K A and a few later mss．In cod．B and a few others，the text is mpòs aútóv，omitting Tó．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by cod． E and most of the later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti＇s version had just aduersus eum．

30 Vale ย̆pp $\omega \sigma$（＂Valete＂1516）．In earlier mss． of the Vulgate，as well as in codd．A B，the word
 1516 was derived from cod．2815，in company with cod． 1 and many other late mss．In 1519， Erasmus corrected this to $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{\rho} \omega \sigma$ o，following cod．3，supported by N E and most of the later mss．，including cod．2816．Manetti had Vale here．

31 iuxta karód ("secundum" Vg.). See on Act. 13,23.
31 quod sibi iniunctum erat tò $\delta 1 \propto \tau \varepsilon \tau \propto \gamma \mu$ ц́vov aỦToĩs ("praeceptum sibi" Vg.). Erasmus frequently distinguishes between praecipio, with reference to instructions given to the disciples, and a variety of other verbs referring to commands which were given in a secular context: cf. on Ioh. 8,5. The same distinction was maintained by the Vulgate, e.g. translating $\delta ı \propto т \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ by impero at $L c .17,9$, for orders given to a servant, but by praecipio in the following verse, for instructions received by the disciples. See further on Act. 7,44 regarding the use of dispono and ordino for this Greek verb. Erasmus elsewhere substitutes iniungo for praecipio in rendering $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ at Mt. 1,24, and for impero in
 Manetti put id quod sibi ordinatum fuerat.
31 receptum á̛v $\alpha \lambda \alpha \beta o ́ v t \varepsilon s$ ("assumentes" Vg.). Greek aorist. For recipio, see on Act. 1,2.
31 Antipatridem eis тìv Avtımorpi $\delta \alpha$ ("in Antipatridem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 8,27, and Annot. The version of Manetti similarly omitted in.
32 Postero autem die $\mathbf{T n ̃} \delta \dot{\text { è }}$ ह̇Tớ́pıov ("Et postera die" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29. Manetti put Postera autem die.
32 in Eis ("ad" Vg.). This change is consistent with Vulgate usage of in castra at five other passages in Acts. Manetti also had in.
$33 a c$ кaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti put atque.
33 coram eo $\alpha u ̉ T \tilde{\varphi}$ ("ante illum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. coram illis for sis oútoús at Act. 22,30, and coram deo for $\tau \tilde{\tilde{\omega}} 0 \in \tilde{\sim}$ at Act. 23,1 (1519). See further on Act. 7,46. The word aủTũ was omitted in cod. 2815*, apparently without other ms. support. Following codd. 1 and 2816, Erasmus wrote it into the margin of the ms. The change of rendering was anticipated by Manetti.

34 praeses $\delta$ ग$\dagger \gamma \varepsilon \mu \omega ้ \nu$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \aleph A B E$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1,2816 and most other late mss. Manetti also made this change.
34 ex (twice) ék ... á̛roó ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 2,15.
34 cognouisset TruӨ́́ $\mu$ vios ("cognoscens" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti made use of persuasus,
apparently reading $\pi \varepsilon 1 \theta \dot{f} \mu \varepsilon v O \varsigma$, as found in a few mss.
34 quod Ótı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
35 quoque кai (late Vg. omits). The late Vulgate omission is supported by only a few late Greek mss. Earlier Vulgate mss. add et before accusatores, and it was so rendered by Manetti.
35 aduenerint тарळүย́vตvtaı ("venerint" Vg.). See on Act. 10,33.
24,1 senioribus $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \beta \cup \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu$ ("senioribus quibusdam" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, трєбßutép $\omega \nu$ tivÑv, as found in $3^{77^{74}} \times A B E$ and sixty-seven later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and about 400 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 635-7). Manetti likewise omitted quibusdam.
 ("significauerant praesidi" 1516-19). In 1522, Erasmus decided that the Vulgate rendering was, after all, to be preferred, though he does not restore adeo at Act. 25,2, 15. See on Act. 23,15 regarding significo, and see Annot. The version of Manetti substituted presidi apparuerunt.
1 contra Paulum kaтג̀ toũ Пaú入ou ("aduersus Paulum" Vg.; "de Paulo" 1516-19). At Act. 25,2, in a similar context, Erasmus substitutes de Paulo in 1516, but makes no further change in his later editions. At Act. 25,7, he introduces aduersus Paulum in rendering the same Greek phrase. The change to contra at the present passage hence appears to be mainly for stylistic variety. See Annot.
 $\nu \omega \nu$ ("multa corrigantur" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect a Greek variant, $\delta 10 p \theta \omega \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime}(\omega \nu$ то ${ }^{2} \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \gamma เ \nu \circ \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \nu$, though this is found in only a few late mss. In a few other mss., commencing with $37^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B E, $\delta ı o p \theta \omega \mu \alpha{ }^{7} \tau \omega \nu$ $\gamma ı v o \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega v$ is found without по $\lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu$. Erasmus' Latin rendering retains multa from the Vulgate, but his Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot.
 The Vulgate omission lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti put inter banc gentem.
$3 \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \square$. The variant $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau 1$ in 1516 is taken from cod. 2815, supported by a few other late mss. In codd. $1^{\text {corr }}, 2816$ and most other mss., it is móvtru.






 $\pi \rho \omega \tau 0 \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu \tau \varepsilon \tau \eta \pi \tau^{\tau} \tau \nu \nu \alpha \zeta \omega \rho \alpha i ́ \omega \nu$






 ávakpivas $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ d v t \omega \nu ~ t o u ́ t \omega \nu ~ ह ̇ \pi ा \gamma-~$



et vbique comprobamus praestantissime Felix, cum omni gratiarum actione. ${ }^{4}$ Sed ne diutius te detineam, oro te, vt audias nos paucis pro tua humanitate. ${ }^{5}$ Nacti enim sumus virum hunc pestiferum et concitantem seditionem omnibus Iudaeis in vniuerso orbe, et autorem sectae Nazarenorum, ${ }^{6}$ qui etiam templum prophanare conatus est: quem et apprehensum voluimus secundum legem nostram iudicare. ${ }^{7}$ Sed superueniens tribunus Lysias, cum magna vi eripuit eum e manibus nostris, ${ }^{8}$ iubens accusatores eius ad te venire: | ex quo
nibus istis cognoscere, de quibus nos accusamus eum. ${ }^{9}$ Adiecerunt autem et Iudaei, dicentes haec ita se habere.


3 comprobamus praestantissime $B-E$ : suscipimus optime $A \mid 5$ sectae $C-E$ : seditionis sectae $A$, factionis $B \mid 6$ prophanare $B$-E: violare $A \mid 7$ Sed superueniens $B$ - $E$ : Superueniens autem $A$ | e $B-E$ : de $A \mid 8$ ex $B-E:$ a $A$

3 comprobamus $\dot{\alpha} т т о \delta \varepsilon \chi o ́ \mu \in \theta \alpha$ ("suscipimus" $1516=$ Vg.). At Act. 15,4; 18,27; 28,30, Erasmus retains suscipio, in the context of receiving a person. In Annot. on the present passage, he argues that the verb means to approve, on analogy with the use of ơmоסохй at 1 Tim . 1,$15 ; 4,9$ (1519), where it is rendered by amplector and approbo respectively.
3 praestantissime крátiote ("optime" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on Act. 23,26 regarding potentissimo, and Annot. The change of superlative here is partly for stylistic variety. Manetti put optime $d u x$.
 diutius autem" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26. Manetti's version was ne autem ... pluribus.
4 detineam $\varepsilon$ हүко́тть ("protraham" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus renders this Greek verb by praepedio, impedio, obsisto, and interrumpo, at Rom. 15,22 (1519); Gal. 5,7; 1 Thess. 2,18;

1 Petr. 3,7. He uses protrabo at Act. 19,33; 20,7; 21,30, in the sense of "draw out". See Annot. His point, in effect, is that in classical Latin, protrabo is not used in the sense of causing delay to a person. At other passages, he uses detineo solely to render $\mathrm{k} \alpha \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{\chi} \omega$, generally following the Vulgate. Manetti tried obtundam.
4 te (2nd.) (Vg. omits). Erasmus supplies an object for oro.
4 vt audias nos paucis ákoũбaí $\sigma \varepsilon$ ị $\mu \tilde{\nu} \nu$ $\sigma u v$ tó $\mu \omega$ ("breuiter audias nos" Vg.). Erasmus adds $v t$ to complete the grammatical construction after oro. There was no need, however, for him to drop breuiter, as the phrase breuiter audio has good classical precedents. Cf. his substitution of paucis for in breui at 1 Petr. 5,12, rendering $\delta i^{\prime} \dot{b} \lambda i \gamma \omega v$. Possibly he feared that breuiter might be misunderstood as meaning "soon". Manetti put vt nos ... breuiter audias.

4 bumanitate émाııккị ("clementia" Vg.). Cf. Erasmus' substitution of bumanus for modestus at Tit. 3,2; 1 Petr. 2,18 in rendering émıєारis. At 2 Cor. 10,1 , he replaces modestia with mansutudo, in rendering émıéкєía, while retaining modestia at Phil. 4,5 . See also Annot. The word clementia has more to do with mercy than with moderation, and is unsuitable in the present context. Manetti, with less plausibility, substituted probitate.
5 Nacti enim sumus évóvites $\gamma$ व́p ("Inuenimus" Vg.$)$. The Vulgate reflects the omission of $\gamma$ 'q́, but with hardly any Greek ms. support. On nanciscor for inuenio, see on Ioh. 12,14.
5 virum bunc Tòv a̛vס ${ }^{2} \rho \alpha$ тoũTov ("hunc hominem" Vg.). Erasmus usually follows the Vulgate in rendering âv $\theta$ p $\omega$ tos by bomo, and $\alpha v{ }^{2} \dot{\rho} \rho$ by vir. At Act. 19,37, however, he retains bomo for duvíp. See Annot.
5 et (1st.) kai (Vg. 1527 omits). The late Vulgate omission has minimal Greek ms. support. Manetti had $e t$, as in the earlier Vulgate.
5 seditionem oróasv ("seditiones" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, otáoets, as in $39^{74} \mathrm{NABE}$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, $2816^{\text {vid }}$ and most other late mss.
5 autorem тр $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ тобто́rnv ("autorem seditionis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus is more accurate here: see Annot. The same omission was proposed by Valla Annot. and by Manetti's translation.
 Elsewhere, Erasmus usually reserves factio for the Sadducees and Pharisees, at Act. 5,17; 15,5; 23,9. See on Act. 5,17, and Annot.
6 prophanare $\beta_{\mathrm{E}} \beta \eta \lambda \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha 1$ ("violare" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 21,28, and Annot. The version of Manetti had polluere, the same verb which he used at Act. 21,28.
 seven words was absent from codd. 1, 2815 and $2816^{*}$, in company with $\mathbf{i n}^{74}$ \& A B and about 270 later mss., together with some mss. of the Vulgate. In 1516, Erasmus decided that the words had been omitted from Greek mss. by scribal carelessness ("omissa librariorum incuria"), and he therefore restored them to the N.T. text from the margin of cod. 2816, supported (with minor variations) by cod. E and more than 200 later mss., together with the late Vulgate (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 637-47, though this work incorrectly states
that cod. 2815 contains the passage). He placed a symbol in the margin of cod. 2815, to indicate where the extra words were to be inserted. A similar reference to the marginal reading of cod. 2816 is found in Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, $L B$ IX, 211 C-E, in which he also offers the excuse that he did not have so many Greek mss. available for the Acts of the Apostles as he did for other N.T. books. His published N.T. text made one deviation from cod. $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$,
 Since $\kappa \in \lambda \lambda^{u} \omega \nu$ is not found in any mss. prior to the 16th. century, this was probably a conjecture (by either Erasmus or his assistants) based on the late Vulgate use of iubens. In 1522 Annot., he withdrew his earlier opinion, and now argued that the section could have been compiled later than the original, using material from Act. 23,10, 27 (and 30). For a similar change of mind in 1522 , regarding a textual problem, see on $A c t$. 23,24. Manetti included this disputed passage in his translation.
7 Sed superueniens $\pi \alpha \alpha \rho \in \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} v \delta_{\dot{E}}$ ("Superueniens autem" $1516=$ late Vg. and some Vg. mss.). See on Iob. 1,26. Manetti began with Lysias autem ... superueniens.
7 magna vi то $\lambda \lambda \tilde{\pi}$ ) $\beta$ ías ("vi magna" late Vg. and some Vg. mss.). Erasmus' rendering follows the Greek word-order.
$7 \varepsilon$ ék ("de" $1516=$ late Vg. and some Vg. mss.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
8 iubens $\kappa \varepsilon \lambda \in U \cup \omega v$. See above, for this conjectural reading. Among the mss. which include this sentence, nearly all have $k \varepsilon \lambda e u ́ \sigma \alpha s$ at this point.
8 ex quo $\pi \alpha \rho$ ' oũ ("a quo" $1516=V g$.). Cf. on Act. 9,13.
8 inquisitione facta ávoakpivas ("iudicans" Vg.). This substitution follows the example of the Vulgate at Act. 12,19. Elsewhere, Erasmus sometimes prefers examino: see on Act. 4,9. In Annot., he also suggests interrogo, as used by the Vulgate at Lc. 23,14; 1 Cor. 9,$3 ; 10,25,27$. Cf. also interrogationem babeo at Act. 28,18.
9 бuvé白vto. Erasmus here follows cod. 2815, supported by relatively few other late mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\aleph$ A B E, the text has $\sigma u v e \pi_{t} \theta \in v t o$. Erasmus' choice survived into the Textus Receptus.
9 ol. The article is omitted by cod. 2815, supported by a few other late mss. Erasmus or his assistants restored the missing word, cither by reference to codd. 1 and 2816 or by conjecture.
 ๙ủtoũ тои̃ ท่ $\gamma \varepsilon \mu$ о́vos $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ⿺ 辶$, ＇Ек то入－












${ }^{10}$ Respondit autem Paulus，quum annuisset ipse praeses，vt diceret：Ae－ quiore animo pro me ipso causam dico，quum sciam te multis iam annis iudicem fuisse genti huic，${ }^{11}$ qui pos－ sis cognoscere，quod non plures sunt mihi dies quam duodecim，ex quo as－ cendi adoraturus Hierosolymam：${ }^{12}$ et neque in templo compererunt me cum aliquo disputantem，aut concursum facientem turbae，neque in synagogis， neque in ciuitate，${ }^{13}$ neque probare possunt ea de quibus me accusant． ${ }^{14}$ Confiteor autem hoc tibi，quod iuxta

## 10 vevoautas $B$－E：vevaoutos $A$

10 quum annuisset ipse praeses $B-E$（exc．cum pro quum $B-D$ ）：annuente sibi praeside $A$｜ Aequiore ．．．huic $B-E:$ Ex multis annis te esse iudicem fuisse genti huic cum sciam aequiori animo pro me respondeo $A$（exc aequiore pro aequiori $A^{c}$ ）｜ 11 plures $B-E$ ：plus $A \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ ：in Hierusalem $A \mid 13$ quibus $B-E$ ：quibus nunc $A$

10 quum annuisset ipse praeses veúađvtos $\alpha \cup ̉ T 0$ ũ Toũ ท̀ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \varepsilon \mu$ óvos（＂annuente sibi praeside＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Greek aorist．The reading veúgovtos in 1516 appears to be no more than a misprint． The following word，aútoũ，came from cod． 2816，with hardly any other ms．support．The Vulgate followed a Greek text having $\alpha \cup \cup T \sim ̃$ for oútoũ，as in codd．1， 2815 and virtually all other mss．See Annot．The version of Manetti put cum ei preses annuisset．
10 vt diceret $\lambda$ éyelv（＂dicere＂Vg．）．See on Ioh． 1,33 ．Manetti made the same change．
10 Aequiore animo ．．．dico，quum sciam ．．．buic＇ $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}$
 वंто入оүoũ $\alpha{ }^{\circ}$（＂Ex multis annis te esse iudi－ cem genti huic sciens，bono animo pro me satisfaciam＂late Vg．；＂Ex multis annis te esse iudicem fuisse genti huic，quum sciam，aequi－ ori animo pro me respondeo＂ 1516 Lat．text）． Erasmus radically transposes the Latin word－ order，partly so that qui possis in vs． 11 might not be so far separated from its antecedent． This is a questionable change，as it detracts from the courteous impression given by the Greek wording，which deliberately places Felix in the position of honour，mentioning him at the beginning of the speech，followed by Paul＇s reference to himself in a secondary position．

However，Erasmus achieves greater simplicity and clarity．Other points arising from this sen－ tence are discussed separately，below．
10 Aequiore animo єن̉Өuиóтєроv（＂bono animo＂ Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant， عúणú $\mu \omega$ ，as in $7^{74}$ ※ A B E and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．See further on Act．27，36，regarding eṽӨunos．See also Annot．In Valla Annot．，the use of alacrius was recommended here，while Manetti＇s choice was animosius．
10 pro me ipso tà тері égađutoũ（＂pro me＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) ．See on Act．9，34．In 1516$ Annot．， Erasmus originally cited the text as having tò $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ é $\mu \alpha u t 0 u ̃$, though this may have been a mistake as it was not found in his usual mss． or in Valla Annot．In Annot．，Erasmus rendered this phrase by pro mea causa，while Valla proposed quae de me ipso sunt．Manetti，on the other hand， put causam meam agam for pro me satisfaciam．
10 causam dico ${ }^{\alpha}$ тто入оүои̃ $\alpha$（＂satisfaciam＂ Vg．；＂respondeo＂1516）．Erasmus is more accu－ rate in using the present tense in his rendering． The same wording was recommended by Valla Annot．，while giving rationem reddo as an alter－ native．Erasmus uses causam dico again at Act． 26，2，replacing defendo．His use of respondeo at
the present passage in 1516, and also in Annot., is consistent with his substitution of respondeo for rationem reddo at Act. 25,8. At Act. 26,1, 24, he puts pro me dico, still rendering the same Greek verb. The Vulgate expression, satisfacio, is unsuitable, as it implies that Paul was seeking to make amends. See also on Act. 22,1.
10 quum sciam ${ }^{\text {ÉTIO }}{ }^{\prime} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ s$ ("sciens" Vg.). Erasmus wishes to avoid the present participle. Manetti had Cum ... nossem.
 multis annis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A comparable substitution of multo iam tempore occurs at $L c .23,8$ (1519), to achieve a more idiomatic expression (cf. the Vulgate use of iam temporibus multis at Lc. 8,27). In Manetti's version, this was ex plurimis annis.
10 iudicem fuisse ővta ... kpıtท่̣v ("esse iudicem" late Vg.; "esse iudicem fuisse" 1516). This is another passage where Erasmus' 1516 edition betrays the haste of its preparation. In his working copy of the Vulgate, or in a transcript of his translation, Erasmus perhaps wrote fuisse between the lines, or in the margin, without properly scoring through the word esse. Later, either his amanuensis or the compositor failed to see that the word esse was now redundant. His change to the perfect tense, though less literal than the Vulgate, is required by the context, which refers to the past as well as the present. Manetti put iudicem ... extitisse.
11 qui possis $\delta u v a \mu \not ́ v o u ~ \sigma o u ~(" P o t e s ~ e n i m " ~$ Vg.). Erasmus is closer to the Greek construction, retaining this section as a subordinate clause. Manetti had cum ... possis.
11 quod Őtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. This change was also made by Manetti.
11 plures $\pi \lambda$ sious ("plus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 23,13. Manetti also had plures.
11 quam $\eta$. The insertion of $\eta$ in Erasmus' text was possibly a conjecture based on the Vulgate, as the word is not in the mss. which he usually consulted. The existence of an erasure, or a small blemish, in the text of cod. 2815 at this point, may have led Erasmus, or an assistant, to believe that something was missing. Most Greek mss., commencing with $3^{74} \times \mathrm{A}$ B E, omit . Erasmus' doubtful reading persisted into the Textus Receptus.
11 adoraturus тробкuvj$\sigma \omega \nu$ ("adorare" Vg.). The Vulgate infinitive corresponds more closely with mpookuvĩoan, found only in cod. E
and a few later mss. Manetti preferred ad adorandum.
11 Hierosolymam ${ }^{\text {है }}$ "l $\varepsilon p \circ v \sigma \alpha \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus could, more precisely, have substituted Hierosolymis: cf. Iob. 4,21. His choice of the accusative is connected with the preceding verb, ascendo, rather than adoro, and is hence closer to the Greek variant eis 'lepovo $\alpha \lambda \eta$ n $\mu$, as found in $17^{74}$ \& B E and some later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Erasmus' Greek text followed cod. 2815 and most other late mss.

12 compererunt єưpov ("inuenerunt" Vg.). See on Act. 23,29.

12 mó $\lambda ı v$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 in omitting $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ before $\pi$ ó $\lambda เ \nu$, supported by cod. 1 and a few other late mss.
13 possunt $\mu \varepsilon$ ठúvavtal ("possunt tibi" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant, substituting Súvavtaí ool, as found in $\boldsymbol{p}^{74 v i d} \times$ A B E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text here follows cod. $2816^{*}$, supported by most other
 while cod. $2816^{\text {corr }}$ adds $\sigma 01$ after $\delta$ úvavial. His cod. 2815, with other late support, has $\mu \mathrm{O}$ Súvavtai. In Annot., he offers a fuller rendering, exbibere me possunt, but in his Latin N.T. he retains probare possunt from the Vulgate, leaving $\mu \varepsilon$ untranslated. Manetti similarly omitted the pronoun.
13 ea de quibus mepi ${ }^{\omega} v$ ("de quibus" Vg.). Erasmus adds ea to complete the sense, providing an antecedent for quibus. Manetti made the same change, but inserted ea before probare.
13 me accusant катпүopoũбi Mou ("nunc me accusant" 1516 Lat. = late Vg., and Annot., lemma; "me nunc accusant" late Vg. $=\mathrm{Vg}$. 1527). The 1516 rendering corresponds with the text of the Froben Vulgate edition of 1491, but the word-order me nunc accusant is found in the Froben Vulgate of 1514 and the 1527 Vulgate column. Erasmus' omission of vũv before катпүорои̃б! is derived from cod. 2815, supported by only a few other late mss. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text adding $\nu \tilde{v} \nu$, as found in codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \mathrm{E}$, or vuvi as in codd. $א$ A B and some later mss. See Annot. The version of Manetti had nunc me accusant, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
14 iuxta kơтó ("secundum" Vg.). See on Act. 13,23, and Annot.
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viam quam vocant haeresim, sic colo patrium deum, credens omnibus quae in lege et prophetis scripta sunt, ${ }^{15}$ spem habens in deum, fore, quam et hi ipsi expectant, resurrectionem mortuorum, iustorum simul et iniustorum. ${ }^{16}$ Quin in hoc et ipse studeo sine offendiculo conscientiam habere erga deum et erga homines semper. ${ }^{17}$ Post annos autem plures accessi, eleemosynas exhibiturus in gentem meam, et oblationes, ${ }^{18}$ in quibus compererunt me purificatum in templo, haud cum turba, neque cum tumultu. ${ }^{19}$ Quidam autem ex Asia Iudaei, quos oportebat apud te praesto esse et accusare, si quid haberent aduersum me: ${ }^{20}$ aut hi ipsi dicant, si quid deprehenderunt in me iniquitatis, quum stem in concilio, ${ }^{21}$ nisi de vna hac voce qua

14 colo patrium deum $B$-E: seruio patrio $\operatorname{deo} A \mid 15$ fore $B-E$ :om. $A \mid$ mortuorum $B$ - $E$ : futuram $A \mid 16$ Quin in hoc $B-E:$ In hoc autem $A \mid 17$ accessi $B-E$ : accersi $A \mid$ exhibiturus $B-E$ : facturus $A \mid 19$ praesto $C$ - $E$ : presto $A B \mid 21$ nisi $A C-E$ : aut $B \mid$ hac $B$ - $E$ : hac solummodo $A$

14 viam tìv ó óóv ("sectam" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus understandably objects to the Vulgate rendering as a mistranslation. Elsewhere, secta is reserved for aipeors. Erasmus listed this passage among the Quae Per Interpretem Commissa. Valla Annot. and Manetti also proposed this change.
14 vocant $\lambda$ é $\gamma$ 〇ovolv ("dicunt" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 10,2; 13,55; Mc. 12,37; Col. 4,11; Hebr. 9,2, 3, in accordance with Vulgate usage of voco at Mt. 2,23.
 Tఱ̃ $\theta \varepsilon \tilde{\sim}$ ("deseruio patri et deo meo" late Vg.; "seruio patrio deo" 1516). See on Act. 7,42, regarding colo. Erasmus uses patrius elsewhere only at Act. 22,3 (1519). The late Vulgate substitution of patri et deo meo has little support among the Greek mss., and in Annot., Erasmus suggests that it was the result of scribal error. He placed this passage among the Loca Obscura, as well as in the 1519-22 editions of the Loca Manifeste Deprauata. In his Greek text, the
addition of $\tau \tilde{\omega}$ before $\theta \varepsilon \tilde{\omega} \tilde{\text { is }}$ not derived from any of his usual mss., and does not appear to enjoy any other ms. support. The same variant is repeated in Annot. It may have been influenced by the reading $\tau \tilde{\tilde{0}} \theta \in \tilde{\omega} \tau \tilde{\sim} \pi \alpha т \rho \varphi \omega \mu \nu O U$ Valla Annot. The rendering suggested by Valla was paterno deo, while Manetti had deo patri inseruio.

15 fore ... resurrectionem ởváó $\alpha \alpha \sigma I v \mu \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon l v$ Êסeơoll ("resurrectionem futuram" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 14,9, for the use of fore.
15 mortuorum vєкрผ๊̃ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is supported by 3974 A B C and twenty-seven later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. E and more than 440 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 649-51). Manetti made the same change.
15 simul et тє каí ("et" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1. Manetti put atque.
15 iniustorum ádikcv ("iniquorum" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Rom. 3,5;

1 Cor. 6,1, 9; 2 Petr. 2,9., consistent with Vulgate usage at Mt. 5,45; Lc. 18,11; Hebr. 6,10; 1 Petr. 3,18. The same change, again, was made by Manetti's version.
16 Quin in hoc et èv toútw ס́s ("In hoc et" Vg.; $^{\prime}$ "In hoc autem et" 1516). See on Ioh. 8,17. The Vulgate reflects a Greek text substituting kai for $\delta \delta$, as found in $7^{74}$ § A B C E and a few later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. However, his rendering would correspond more closely with a Greek text having év toútu $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ koú, found in just a few of the later mss. Manetti put In boc autem.
 any of his usual mss., which all had Excov, in company with most other late mss. However, Ex $\chi$ Elv is found in some mss., commencing with
( $7^{74}$ ) K A B C E. Possibly Erasmus, or one of his assistants, arrived at ÊXeav by conjecture, based on the Vulgate wording and grammatical considerations, as happened at a number of other passages. This textual choice remained in the Textus Receptus. Manetti substituted vt ... babeam.
16 erga (twice) mpós ("ad" Vg.). See on Act. 3,25.
 è̉ $\lambda \eta$ นooúvas ... $\mu$ OU ("elemosynas ... meam, veni" Vg.). On accedo, see on Act. 10,33. The spelling accersi in 1516 completely alters the meaning, and is probably a misprint. The Vulgate follows a Greek text in which тарєүєvó $\mu \eta \nu$ is transposed after $\mu \mathrm{O}$, as in $3 \mathrm{~B}^{74} \mathrm{\aleph}^{*} \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{C}$ and a few later mss. In codd. $\mathcal{X}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{E}$, mape $\gamma \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ is placed after тробфор́́s, and in cod. A this verb is altogether omitted. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.
17 exbibiturus тоı'ŋ́ $\sigma \omega v$ ("facturus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. on Erasmus' use of exbibeo at Act. 1,3, and praesto at Ioh. 7,19.
17 oblationes тробфорás ("oblationes et vota" Vg.). There is no explicit Greek support for the Vulgate addition. Manetti similarly omitted et vota.
18 compererunt eũpov ("inuenerunt" Vg.). See on Act. 23,29.
18 baud oủ ("non" Vg.). Erasmus uses baud fourteen times in the N.T., as an alternative for non. The sequence baud ... neque at the present passage may be compared with baud ... nec at

2 Petr. 1,8. In the Vulgate N.T., the word occurs only at 1 Tim. 6,7, in the phrase baud dubium.
18 tumultu $\theta$ opú $\beta$ Ou ("tumultu. Et apprehenderunt me, clamantes et dicentes: Tolle inimicum nostrum" late Vg.). In 1527 Annot., Erasmus mentions this long addition as being absent from three Latin mss. which he consulted. The added words lack Greek support, nor were they included in Manetti's rendering.
19 autem $\delta \varepsilon$. This particle is not found in any of Erasmus' usual mss. at Basle, or in most other late mss. In theory, he could have found $\delta \varepsilon$ in mss. which he consulted in England, as the word is attested by $\boldsymbol{申}^{74} \aleph$ A B C E and many later mss. (while cod. 69 has $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu)$. Alternatively, it is quite possible that he or one of his assistants deliberately inserted $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, by yet another conjecture based on the wording of the Latin Vulgate. Although he observed in 1522 Annot. that Chrysostom omitted $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, and in 1527 Annot. that the word was omitted in the Complutensian Polyglot, Erasmus continued to offer an interpretation of the passage that was dependent on the inclusion of $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in the text. Manetti omitted the word.
20 si quid eil Tı. As at vss. 11, 16, 19 of this chapter, probably by a further conjecture, Erasmus' Greek text again departs from his usual Greek mss., in favour of a reading which more closely resembled the Latin Vulgate. The reading of cod. 2815 is $\tau 1$, in company with $\boldsymbol{P}^{74} \times$ A B C E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The wording of Erasmus' text survived into the Textus Receptus. Manetti omitted si, in accordance with most of the Greek mss.
20 deprehenderunt $\mathrm{\varepsilon}^{\sim} p o v$ ("inuenerunt" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at Mt. 1,18; $L c .23,2$, taking $\varepsilon \cup \dot{p} l \sigma \mathrm{~K} \omega$ as the equivalent of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha-$ $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha{ }^{\prime} v \omega$. The Vulgate is more literal. Manetti had inuenerint.
21 nisi ï ("aut" 1519). In 1516-19 Annot., Erasmus argued that the Greek text underlying the Vulgate was $\varepsilon i \mu$ ', and that $\eta$ ì should be rendered by aut. On the basis of this opinion, he substituted aut in the 1519 edition of his translation. In 1522 Annot., he retracted his earlier view and accepted that $\eta$ in could sometimes be rendered by $n i s i$, so that he now restored the original Vulgate rendering.
21 vna bac uiỡs Toútns ("vna hac solummodo" $1516=$ Vg.). The additional Vulgate emphasis lacks explicit Greek support. Manetti put bac wna.

 $\dot{U}^{\prime} \varphi^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \mu \tilde{\mu} \nu$.









 бท 'louסaía, $\mu \varepsilon т \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \psi а т о ~ т o ̀ v ~ \Pi а u ̃ \lambda о v, ~$


clamaui inter eos stans, De resurrectione mortuorum, ego iudicor hodie a vobis.
${ }^{22}$ Auditis autem his, Felix distulit illos, certo sciens quae | ad eam viLB 530 am attinebant, dicens: Quum tribunus Lysias descenderit, pernoscam causam vestram. ${ }^{23}$ Iussitque centurioni, vt custodiret Paulum, sineretque eum relaxari, et ne quem ex illius familiaribus vetaret subministrare ei, aut adire eum. ${ }^{24}$ Post aliquot autem dies quum aduenisset Felix cum Drusilla vxore sua, quae erat Iudaea, accersiuit Paulum, et audiuit ab eo fidem, quae est in Christum. ${ }^{25}$ Disputante autem illo de


22 certo $B-E$ : certissime $A \mid$ quae ... attinebant $B-E$ : de via hac $A \mid$ pernoscam causam vestram $B-E$ : audiam vos $A \mid 23$ vt custodiret $B-E$ : custodire $A \mid$ sineretque eum relaxari $B-E$ : et habere requiem $A \mid$ ne ... vetaret $B$ - $E$ : neque Iudaeis suis prohiberet $A \mid 24$ Christum $B$ - $E$ : Christum Iesum $A$

21 clamaui '̇kékpa̧๙. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1, 2816 and the Vulgate, with support from $39^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \leqslant$ A B C and some later mss. His cod. 2815 had the aorist tense, Eḱ $\rho \alpha \xi \alpha$, as found in cod. E and most later mss.
21 De ótı Mepí ("Quoniam de" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti had quia de.
22 Auditis autem bis, Felix distulit illos 'Akoúoas
 autem illos Felix" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a
 ס $\Phi \tilde{\eta} \lambda 1 \xi$, as in $7^{74} \times$ A B C E and (with minor variations) by about twenty-five later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and about 420 other late mss., with the exception that nearly all mss. read
 $\beta \propto \lambda \varepsilon$, while cod. 1 has $\varphi i \lambda \eta \xi$, and $\operatorname{cod} 2815$ ¢i $\lambda_{1} \xi$, for $\varphi \tilde{\eta} \lambda_{1} \xi$ (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 651-4). The form $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon$ is not found in any mss. prior to the 16 th. century, and is probably another conjecture. Manetti put Cum autem Felix bec audisset, eos distulit.
22 certo ó́rpı $\beta$ ź $\sigma$ тepov ("certissime" $1516=$ Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus argues that the comparative
adverb should not be translated literally here, and renders by exacte. Elsewhere, he sometimes retains a comparative in contexts where it is superfluous to the sense, e.g. citius at Ioh. 13,27, celerius at Hebr. 13,23, but cito at 1 Tim. 3,14, all rendering tóx ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{ov}$. Valla Annot. suggested using certius or exploratius, of which Manetti preferred certius.
 ó8oũ ("de via hac" 1516 = late Vg.). Erasmus is more precise than the Vulgate here, in conveying the sense of tó, though in Annot. he puts just eam viam. Cf. qui ad illum attinebant for oi map' aútoũ at Mc. 3,21. Valla Annot. suggested putting quae sunt de via, while Manetti had just de via, as in the earlier Vulgate.
22 pernoscam סıaүvஸ́бou๙ı ("audiam" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus attempts a more exact rendering of the Greek compound verb. Manetti put discernam.
 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus again conveys more fully the sense of the Greek expression. As before, the Vulgate leaves tó́ untranslated. Manetti's version was inter vos.
 2815, supported by cod. E and only a few later mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., commencing with $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{744}$ \& A B C 093, it is $7 \tilde{\omega}$ ध́катоита́ $\overline{p X \eta .}$
23 vt custodiret тпрєĩ $\sigma$ O» ("custodire" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,33, for the avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti preferred $v t$... seruarent.
23 Paulum tòv Maṽخov ("eum"Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a Greek variant, substituting ©útóv, as in $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \times$ A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 093 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti made the same change, but inserted Paulum before seruarent.
 habere requiem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 regarding the avoidance of infinitives. The change to relaxor is comparable with the substitution of relaxatio for requies at 2 Cor. 2,13 (1519); 7,5; 2 Thess. 1,7, and for remissio at 2 Cor. 8,13 , all rendering the same Greek word. In rendering ơvecols, Erasmus maintains a higher degree of consistency than usual. He retains requies for ávómavois and като́ттаvoıs. See Annot., where he renders by relaxationem. Manetti put atque requiem baberent.
23 et ne quem ... vetaret kà $\mu \eta \delta$ ह́v $\alpha$... к $\omega \lambda$ ứєıv ("nec quemquam ... prohibere" Vg.; "et neque ... prohiberet" 1516). A similar use of ne quem is found at Act. 10,28. On the substitution of veto, see on Act. 8,36. For the avoidance of the infinitive, see on Ioh. 1,33. See also Annot. In Manetti's version, this was rendered by et vt neminem ... prohiberent.
23 ex illius familiaribus $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu$ iठí $\omega \nu$ ๙ỦToũ ("de suis" Vg.; "Iudaeis suis" 1516). Erasmus' addition of familiaribus was an appropriate clarification. In the 1516 edition, the strange rendering, Iudaeis, matched an equally strange Greek text, substituting iovסaicuv for i i í $\omega v$. However, Erasmus' usual mss. all had idí $\omega v$, and no pre16th. century ms. is known to contain the reading iou $\delta \alpha i \omega \nu$. Nor was there any conceivable motive for Erasmus to have resorted to conjectural emendation at this point. It appears that the compositor misread cod. 2815, and when Erasmus' assistant came to read the proofs, he made the Latin rendering agree with the mistaken Greek text, without rechecking the Greek ms. When the N.T. sheets for the 1516 edition had been printed, and Erasmus focused his attention on finalising
the text of the Annot., he noticed the discrepancy between his printed Greek text and the ms. from which the Annot. were compiled. Instead of comparing all his sources at this point, he made the unsafe assumption that his printed Greek text must have corresponded with the text of one or more of his mss., and unhesitatingly affirmed that lou $\delta \alpha i \omega \nu$ was found in several Greek codices ("in nonnullis Graecis codicibus"), while adding that he preferred isicu because it agreed with the Vulgate. Manetti put propriorum suorum.
23 subministrare ÚTTクpEteiv ("ministrare" Vg.). Erasmus makes a comparable substitution of subministro in rendering $\delta$ ıaкové $\omega$ at 2 Cor. 3,3,
 with Vulgate usage at Col. 2,19. See further on Act. 20,34, regarding ப்ாாПрєтéc
 omits). The Vulgate is based on a Greek text
 C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. 093 and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put ad eumque accedere.
24 quит aduenisset $\pi \alpha \rho \propto \gamma \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$ ("veniens" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti had accedens.
24 vxore sua $т \tilde{1}$ үuvaıxi $\alpha u ́ t o u ̃ . ~ E r a s m u s ' ~$ Greek text here follows cod. 1 and the Vulgate, supported by $7^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{E}$ and some later mss.
 B C ${ }^{\text {corr }}$, together with cod. 2816), or $T \tilde{1}$ iסía yuvaril $\alpha$ 'utoũ (codd. $\aleph^{\text {corr } A) . ~ C o d . ~} 2815$ had just $T \tilde{\pi} \eta$ uvariki, as in cod. $C^{*}$ and most of the later mss.
24 accersiuit $\mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon ́ \mu \psi \propto \tau \circ$ ("vocauit" Vg.). See on Act. 4,18 . This use of accerso brings consistency with vs. 26 , as well as Act. $10,5,22,29 ; 11,13$. At Act. 25,3 (1522), Erasmus finally substitutes accerso for iubeo perduci, ensuring that this Greek verb was rendered consistently throughout the book of Acts. It does not seem that he made any distinction of meaning between $\mu \varepsilon \tau \propto \pi \varepsilon \mu-$ то $\mu \alpha ı$ and $\mu \in \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon_{0} \mu \alpha$. The same change was made by Manetti.
24 Cbristum Xpıбтóv ("Christum Iesum" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the addition of 'Inooũv, as found in $7^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ (B) E 093 and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and many other mss., commencing with codd. $\boldsymbol{N}^{\text {corr }}$ A $\mathrm{C}^{\text {vid }}$. Manetti altered this to Cbristo Iesu.
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 ко́入ouv aủtóv, ${ }^{3}$ aitoúuevol Xápiv кат'





iustitia et temperantia et de iudicio futuro, tremefactus Felix respondit: In praesentia abi: caeterum opportunitatem nactus accersam te ${ }^{26}$ - simul et illud sperans fore, vt pecunia sibi daretur a Paulo vt solueret ipsum, propter quod et frequenter accersens eum, loquebatur cum eo. ${ }^{27}$ Biennio autem expleto, accepit successorem Felix Porcium Festum. Volens autem gratiam praestare Iudaeis Felix, reliquit Paulum vinctum.

25Festus ergo suscepta prouincia, post triduum ascendit Hierosolymam ab vrbe Caesarea. ${ }^{2}$ Significaruntque illi princeps sacerdotum ac primores Iudaeorum de Paulo, et rogabant eum ${ }^{3}$ postulantes fauorem aduersus eum, vt accerseret eum Hierosolymam, insidias tendentes vt interficerent eum in via. ${ }^{4}$ Festus autem respondit, vt seruaretur quidem Paulus Caesareae, se vero breui illo

25 caeterum opportunitatem $B$-E: oportunitatem autem $A \mid 26$ illud B-E: om. $A \mid$ vt solueret ipsum $B$-E: om. $A \mid 27$ praestare $B$-E: prestare $A$
25,1 ab vrbe $B-E:$ a $A \mid 2$ Significaruntque $B-E$ : Audieruntque $A^{*}$, Adierunt $A^{c} \mid$ illi princeps $B-E$ : eum principes $A \mid$ ac primores $B$-E: et primates $A \mid$ de Paulo $B-E$ : aduersus Paulum $A \mid$ 3 accerseret $C$-E: reiiceret $A B \mid$ Hierosolymam $B-E$ : in Hierusalem $A \mid 4$ Caesareae B-E: in Caesarea $A \mid$ vero $B$-E: autem $A$ | illo C-E: om. $A$, alio $B$

25 temperantia ÊYkpoctrías ("castitate" Vg.). At the three other N.T. occurrences of this Greek word, Erasmus substitutes temperantia for continentia at Gal. 5,23, and for abstinentia, twice, at 2 Petr. 1,6. Elsewhere, he retains castitas for $\dot{\alpha} \gamma v \mathrm{E} i \alpha$ at $1 \mathrm{Tim} .5,2$, and substitutes it for sobrietate in rendering $\sigma \omega \varphi p o \sigma v i v \eta$ at 1 Tim. 2,9, 15. Manetti put continentia.
25 In praesentia Tò vũv Eै̌xov ("Quod nunc attinet" Vg .). Erasmus simplifies the translation, probably disliking the use of attineo without ad. Manetti offered the more cumbersome impresentiarum ( $=$ impraesentiarum), a rendering which he also used at Act. 27,22.
25 abi top\&v́ou ("vade" Vg.). Erasmus retains vado for торєúoucı at eight other passages in

Acts: see on Act. 20,22 and Iob. 7,33. Manetti put proficiscere.
25 caeterum opportunitatem nactus k๙ıpòv $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \omega$ ' ("tempore autem opportuno" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.; "oportunitatem autem nactus" 1516). Erasmus is more accurate here, unless it be thought that the Vulgate was following a Greek variant
 uses opportunitatem nactus again at 1 Cor. 16,12 in rendering evikolpte $\omega$. Manetti rendered this by oportunitate captata.
25 accersam $\mu \varepsilon т \propto к \propto \lambda \notin ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha ı ~(" a c c e r s i a m " ~ V g) .$. See on Act. 10,5.
26 simul et $\alpha \mu \alpha \delta \bar{\alpha}$ кodi. Erasmus takes $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ from cod. 2815, with hardly any other ms. support. It is omitted in codd. 1,2816 and nearly all
other mss., commencing with § A B C E 093 (in cod. $2816^{*}$, kai was also omitted, but it was inserted between the lines in cod. $2816^{\text {corn rid }}$ ). His poorly attested variant persisted into the Textus Receptus. Manetti had simulac here.
26 illud sperans fore vt $\mathfrak{E} \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega \nu$ ötı ("sperans quod" late Vg.; "sperans fore vt" 1516). On fore, see on Act. 14,9.
26 sibi aủTü ("ei" late Vg.). Erasmus uses the reflexive pronoun to refer back to the main subject, Felix. The same rendering was used by Manetti.
 in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by א A B C E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. 1 and most other late mss.
 put $v t$ ipsum dimitteret.
 See on Act. 10,5.
 ("cum venisset in prouinciam" Vg.). Erasmus finds a more vigorous verb than the over-used venio of the Vulgate, though a phrase such as prouinciam ingressus would have been more literally accurate.
1 ab vrbe ámó ("a" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 14,25.
 ("Adieruntque eum" Vg.; "Audieruntque eum" 1516 Lat. text). The 1516 errata offer the correction Adierunt, which was probably intended to be Adieruntque, as in the Vulgate. See on Act. 23,15. In 1519 Annot., Erasmus speculates that the Vulgate may reflect a different Greek text, having évecúx $\eta \sigma a v$ : cf. èvétuXov at vs. 24. Manetti changed the word-order, putting Pontifices autem ... ei ... apparuerunt.
2 princeps sacerdotum ó àpxıepєús ("principes sacerdotum" 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . The Vulgate is$ based on a Greek text substituting oi dépxıереǐs, as in $\left(7^{77^{7}}\right) \times$ A B C E and many later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and many other late mss. As mentioned above, Manetti had Pontifices.
2 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti put atque.
2 primores oi $\pi \rho \omega ̃$ Tol ("primi" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$; "primates" 1516). The substitution of primores also occurs at Mc. 6,21; Lc. 19,47 (for principes); Act. 28,17.

Cf. also Act. 19,31, where primores is substituted for principes in rendering Aøıópxou. Erasmus retains primi ciuitatis at Act. 13,50. He uses primas for ăpX ${ }^{\circ} \omega$ at $M t .9,18,23$, for $\mu \varepsilon \gamma 1 \sigma \tau a ̃ v e s$ at Mc. 6,21, and for пр $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ тos at Act. 28,7. Manetti substituted primates, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.
2 de Paulo катф̀ тои̃ Пaú入ou ("aduersus Paulum" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 24,1.
3 fauorem Xápıv ("gratiam" Vg.). This is the only instance of fauor in Erasmus' N.T. At Act. 24,27, he retained gratiam praestare, and introduces ob gratiam at Act. 25,16 (1519), both with reference to favour shown by the Roman governor. In Annot., Erasmus justifies the substitution of fauor here, on the grounds that this is in a judicial context ("fauorem iudicis").
3 accerseret $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \psi \eta)^{\prime} \alpha 1$ ("iuberet perduci" Vg.; "reiiceret" 1516-19). See on Act. 4,18; 24,24. Manetti put transmitteret.
3 Hierosolymam eis Itepovo $\alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$ ("in Hierusalem" $1516=$ late Vg.). See on Act. 8,27. Manetti had in Hierosolimam.
4 vt seruaretur quidem Paulus тпреі̃öaı tòv Maünov ("seruari quidem Paulum" late Vg.). See on Iob. 1,33, for avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti's version was vt Paulus ... seruaretur, omitting quidem.
4 Catsareace év Kaıoxpélọ ("in Caesarea" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . See on Act. 10,1.$
4 vero $\mathbf{\delta B}^{\boldsymbol{E}}$ ("autem" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
4 breui ह̇v $\tau$ cóx́si ("maturius" Vg.). Erasmus similarly substitutes breui for velociter at Rom. 16,20 , in rendering the same Greek phrase. Elsewhere, he retains cito at $L c .18,8 ; A p$. Iob. 1,1; 22,6, and velociter at Act. 12,7; 22,18. In rendering $\tau \propto \chi$ é $\omega$ s, he substitutes breui for cito at 1 Cor. 4,$19 ;$ Phil. 2,19, 24. The word maturius does not occur elsewhere in the Vulgate N.T., though it is well established in classical usage. The use of a comparative adverb, however, is not explicitly warranted by the Greek text. Manetti preferred celeriter.
4 illo (omitted in $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "alio" 1519). The choice of alio ("in another direction") gives an opposite sense from illo, which in this context refers to Caesarea. The information given in vs. 6 makes clear that Festus did not make any other journeys before visiting Caesarea. The use of illo in an adverbial sense is also found at Lc. 21,2 (1516 only, for EkEI).
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profecturum．${ }^{\text {s }}$ Qui ergo inter vos， inquit，potentes sunt，vna nobiscum descendant：et si quod est in hoc viro crimen，accusent eum．${ }^{6}$ Demoratus autem inter eos diebus amplius quam decem，descendit Caesaream：et postero die sedit pro tribunali，iussitque Paulum adduci．${ }^{7}$ Qui quum perductus esset， circunsteterunt eum qui ab Hierosoly－ mis descenderant Iudaei，multa et grauia crimina intendentes aduersus Paulum， quae non poterant probare：${ }^{8}$ Paulo pro se respondente，quod neque in legem Iudeorum，neque in templum， neque in Caesarem quicquam peccasset． ${ }^{9}$ Festus autem volens gratificari Iudaeis， respondens Paulo，dixit：Vis Hierosoly－ mam ascendere，et ibi de his iudicari apud me？${ }^{10}$ Dixit autem Paulus：Ad tribunal Caesaris sto，vbi me oportet iudicari．Iudaeis nullam iniuriam feci， sicut et tu melius nosti．${ }^{11}$ Si enim no－ cui，ac dignum morte aliquid feci，non recuso mori．Si vero nihil est eorum de quibus hi accusant me，nemo po－ test me illis donare．Caesarem appello．

## 25，11 $\mu$ ои $B-E: \mu о 1 A$

5 vna ．．．et $B$－E：descendentes simul $A$｜hoc $B$－E：om．$A \mid 6$ diebus $B$－E：dies $A$｜iussitque $B$－E：et iussit $A \mid 7$ Hierosolymis $D E$ ：Hierosolyma $A$－C｜ 8 Iudeorum $E$ ：Iudaeorum $A-D \mid$ 9 gratificari $B$－E：rem gratam facere $A \mid 11$ ac $E$ ：aut $A-D$

5 inter vos év Ưuiv（＂in vobis＂Vg．）．See on Iob．15，24．
5 inquit $\Phi \eta \sigma 1$（＂ait＂Vg．）．Erasmus usually fol－ lows the Vulgate in retaining ait，but may have felt that inquit was more appropriate when used in parenthesis．Manetti＇s version（both mss．） omitted the word．
5 mna nobiscum descendant et $\sigma$ үүкатаßávтes （＂descendentes simul＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Greek aorist． See on Act．1，22，and Annot．The version of Manetti（Pal Lat．45）put simul descendant $v t$ ．
 crimen＂ 1516 Lat．$=\mathrm{Vg}$. ．）The Vulgate reflects
the substitution of átotiov for toúte，as in codd．א A B C E and forty later mss．In cod． $2816^{\text {corr }}$ and sixty－ight other late mss．， the reading is toút $\varphi$ वै́тото⿱亠乂，Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， $2816^{*}$ and about 350 other late mss．（see Aland Die Apostelgeschicbte 654－6）．Manetti had in viro boc．

6 diebus tinépas（＂dies＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Cf．on Act．10，48．
6 amplius quam $\pi \lambda$ हious $\eta$＂（＂non amplius quam octo aut＂Vg．）．The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having oú $\pi \lambda$ eíous $\mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{K} \dot{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{\eta}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ，
as in（ $\boldsymbol{7}^{74} \mathrm{\aleph}$ B）A C and a few later mss． Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．In 1527 Annot．，he substitutes $\pi \lambda$ eíovas for $\pi \lambda \varepsilon i-$ ous，supported by $\beta^{74} \mathrm{~B}$ and a few later mss．
6 postero die $T \tilde{n}$ Ĩ ÉTớpıov（＂altera die＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，29．
6 iussitque éké入 $\lambda \in \cup \sigma \varepsilon$（＂et iussit＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．1，39．Manetti put ac iussit．
7 Hierosolymis àmò｀epoooдиúuんv（＂Hieroso－ lyma＂ $1516-22=V g$ ．）．A similar substitution occurs at Mt．4，25（1519）．Cf．on Act．1，8．The same change was made by Manetti．
7 multa et grauia crimina ．．．quae mо入入̀ kal $\beta \alpha \rho \varepsilon ́ \alpha ~ \alpha i т ı \alpha ́ \alpha \mu \alpha т \alpha$ ．．．$\alpha$（＂multas et graues causas ．．．quas＂Vg．）．Cf．a similar substitution of crimen for causa in rendering aitiov at $L c$ ． 23，14， 22 （1519），and aitia at Act．25，18， 27 （1522），comparable with Vulgate usage in ren－ dering $\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ at Act．23，29；25，16．However， Erasmus usually retains causa for airía else－ where．On the use of crimen，see Valla Elegantiae IV，58；Erasmus Parapbr．in Eleg．Laur．Vallae， ASD I，4，p．242，Il．942－944．The spelling人itiáuaita comes from cod．2815，supported by codd． $1^{\text {corr，}}, 2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ and many other late mss． In codd． $1^{\text {＊vid }}, 2816^{*}$ and most other mss．， commencing with 7 $^{74}$ א A B C E，it is $\alpha i T 1 \omega \prime \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ ．Manetti anticipated the change made by Erasmus，except that he further sub－ stituted $a c$ for $e t$ ．
7 intendentes $\varphi$ épovtes（＂obiicientes＂Vg．）． Cf．the substitution of crimen intendo for causam defero in rendering aitióv étrıф́́p $\omega$ at vs．18，and crimen intento for accuso in rendering
 Erasmus selects a less emotive word than the Vulgate，but nevertheless one that was an estab－ lished classical idiom in a legal context．Manetti had afferentes．
7 aduersus Paulum kaтò тои̃ Пá̛̀خou（Vg． omits）．The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{P}^{74} \times$ A B C and a few later mss．Cod．E has т $\tilde{\sim}$ Пळú $\lambda \omega$ ．Erasmus follows cod．2815， in company with codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．The same change was made by Manetti．

8 Paulo pro se respondente ámo入оүou $\frac{1}{v i v o u ~ đ u ̉-~}$ Toũ（＂Paulo rationem reddente＂late Vg．）．Eras－ mus retains the Vulgate use of Paulo，as being clearer in the context．However，the Vulgate probably followed a different Greek text，having

тои̃ Пaú入ou ámonoyou B C and some later mss．；similarly cod．E has тои̃ $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ Пaú入ou ámo入oyounévou．Erasmus＇ Greek text follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．On the use of respondeo，see on Act．24，10，and for axcusatio，see also on Act．22，1．Manetti put cum ipse ．．．defenderet．
 （＂Quoniam neque ．．．peccaui＂Vg．）．The Vulgate is more literal here，as Erasmus changes direct to indirect speech．Manetti＇s rendering was se neque ．．．peccasse．
9 gratificari Iudaeis toĩs ’louסגiors ．．．xápıv
 Vg．；＂rem gratam facere Iudaeis＂1516）．Erasmus retained gratiam praestare at Act．24，27 for vir－ tually the same Greek expression．This change is for the sake of stylistic variety．
10 wbi oũ（＂ibi＂late Vg．）．Erasmus，in effect， restores the earlier Vulgate reading，which was also adopted by Manetti．
10 nullam iniuriam feci oủס̇̀v ŋウסikŋ $\sigma \alpha$（＂non nocui＂Vg．）．This substitution is consistent with Vulgate usage at Mt．20，13；Act．7，27，and was partly designed to avoid repetition of nocui， which is used for the same Greek verb in vs． 11. Manetti put iniuriatus non sum．
10 et kai（Vg．omits）．Erasmus is more accurate here．
10 ह̇Ttiyıvఱ́okels．In cod．2815，Erasmus found $\gamma i v \omega \dot{\sigma} k e 15$ ，supported by cod．C and only a few later mss．He or an assistant took the better attested reading，èmiץiv由́rkeıs，from codd． 1 and 2816，in company with most other mss．
11 ac кaí（＂aut＂1516－27 Lat．＝Vg．）．The Vul－ gate rendering corresponds with $\eta$ ，as found in cod．E and a few later mss．，though it is probably merely a matter of translation．Manetti also made this change．
11 eorum de quibus ${ }^{2} \nu$（＂eorum quae＂Vg．）． Erasmus similarly uses de to replace an in－ ternal accusative after accuso at Act．28，19，fol－ lowing Vulgate practice at Act．23，29；24，8， 13. For an even longer expansion of $\dot{\omega} \nu$ ，see vs． 18. Another example occurs at Act．26，2．Cf．eorum in quibus at Act．26，16．Manetti anticipated this change．
$11 \mu \mathrm{ou}$ ．In 1516，Erasmus has $\mu \mathrm{ot}$ from cod． 2815，with support from only a few other late mss．
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 ${ }^{18}$ тepi oũ $\sigma$ tä́svtes ol katŕyopol, oủ-






${ }^{12}$ Tunc Festus cum consilio colloquutus, respondit: Caesarem appellasti? Ad Caesarem ibis.
${ }^{13}$ Et quum dies aliquot transacti essent, Agrippa rex et Bernice descenderunt Caesaream salutaturi Festum. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{Et}$ quum dies complures ibi commorarentur, Festus regi retulit causam Pauli, dicens: Vir quidam est relictus a Felice vinctus, ${ }^{15}$ de quo quum venissem Hierosolymam, significarunt mihi principes sacerdotum et seniores Iudaeorum postulantes aduersus illum sententiam. ${ }^{16}$ Quibus respondi: Non est Romanis consuetudo ob gratiam donare aliquem hominem vt pereat, priusquam is qui accusatur praesentes habeat accusatores, locumque defendendi accipiat de crimine. ${ }^{17}$ Quum ergo huc conuenissent, sine vlla dilatione, sequenti die sedens pro tribunali iussi adduci virum. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{De}$ quo quum stetissent ac|cusatores, nullum crimen intendebant super hisce rebus, de quibus ego suspicabar: ${ }^{19}$ sed quaestiones quasdam de sua superstitione habebant aduersus eum, et de quodam Iesu defuncto, quem affirmabat Paulus viuere. ${ }^{20}$ Haesitans autem ego de huiusmodi quaestione, dicebam,



14 commorarentur $B-E$ : morarentur $A \mid 15$ significarunt mihi $B-E$ : adierunt me $A \mid$ sententiam $C-E$ : cognitionem $A B \mid 16$ Quibus $B-E$ : Ad quos $A \mid$ Romanis $A E$ : Rhomanis $B-D \mid \mathrm{ob}$ gratiam C-E: om. $A B \mid 18$ intendebant $B-E$ : intentabant $A$

12 colloquutus $\sigma \cup \lambda \lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha s$ ("locutus" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here, in rendering the Greek compound verb. See on Act. 10,27. This change was also made by Manetti.
13 salutaturi ơ $\sigma \pi \alpha \sigma o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l ~(" a d ~ s a l u t a n d u m " ~$ Vg.). Erasmus gives an exact equivalent for the grammatical form of the Greek participle. Manetti ended the sentence with Festum salutatum.

14 complures $\pi \lambda$ ríous ("plures" Vg.). See on Act. 1,3.
14 commorarentur $\delta$ เย́т $\rho \upharpoonright \beta \in \nu$ ("morarentur" 1516 Lat. = late Vg.). See on Act. 14,28 regarding commoror. The discrepancy between Erasmus' plural rendering and the singular Greek verb remained through all his editions. His Latin translation, like the Vulgate, reflected a different Greek text, $\delta$ iétplßov, found in $3 \boldsymbol{\beta}^{74} \aleph \mathrm{~A}$ (B)

C E and many later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and many other late mss. The rendering of Manetti was commorati sunt.
14 retulit causam Pauli ávé $\theta$ exo Tò̀ кaтd̀ tòv Пaũ $\lambda o v$ ("indicauit de Paulo" Vg.). Cf. the use of confero for duationuı at Gal. 2,2, in both Erasmus and the Vulgate. On indico, see on Act. 23,15.
 The verb derelinquo, used by the Vulgate, is more suitable for contexts which require the meaning "abandon". The incorrect spelling, - $\varepsilon$ ци́vos in 1522-35 appears to be an error of
 at Act. 27,17 (1522-35).
 हis "lepooó $\lambda v \mu \alpha$ ("cum essem Hierosolymis" Vg.). Either interpretation is possible.
15 significarunt mibi èveqávı $\alpha \alpha v$ ("adierunt me" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 23,15. Manetti put manifestauerunt.
15 sententiam סiknv ("damnationem" Vg.; "cognitionem" 1516-19). At 2 Thess. 1,9; Iud. 7, Erasmus retains poena from the Vulgate. In 1516-19 Annot., he explains his preference for cognitio here on the grounds that it would have been inappropriate for the Jews to demand a penalty before Paul's case had been duly heard. However, in response to criticism, he compromised by substituting sententia in 1522, accepting that vs. 16 implied that the Jews saw a court hearing as no more than a pretext for obtaining the penalty which they sought against Paul.
16 Quibus mpòs oús ("Ad quos" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Elsewhere, Erasmus frequently retains ad after verbs of speech: cf. on Ioh. 4,15; Act. 22,10. Manetti made the same change.
16 respondi àmeкрî̀ $\eta$ v. In 1516, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in using the incorrect ámexpi $\theta$ n, in the third person, apparently unsupported by other mss.
16 Non Stil Ouk ("Quia non" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod non.
16 ob gratiam donare X $\alpha$ pí $\epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ ("damnare" late $\mathrm{Vg} .=\mathrm{Vg} .1527$; "donare" $1516-19=$ Annot., lemma, and Vg. mss.). The reading donare is found in the Froben Vulgate of 1491, but damnare in his edition of 1514 and the Vulgate column of the 1527 N.T. At Act. 3,14 and 25,11, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in rendering the same Greek verb by dono without ob gratiam.

See Annot, where Erasmus explains the meaning as in gratiam alicuius donare. In Valla Annot., donare and gratificari were offerred as possible renderings, while Manetti preferred donandi.
16 vt pereat eis $\alpha \pi \omega \dot{\lambda} \mathrm{Elo} \mathrm{\alpha v}$ (Vg. omits). The
 Vulgate omission is supported by $7^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B C E and thirty later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1,2816 and more than 430 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostel. geschichte 656-7). In Annot., he also suggested in perniciem or in interitum. Valla Annot. proposed either in perditionem or in interitum, of which Manetti preferred in perditionem.
$16 \pi$. This word was omitted in cod. 2815, apparently without other ms. support. Erasmus or an assistant restored the text by consultation of codd. 1 and 2816.
16 ÉXoı. In 1516, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in putting é E El, supported by cod. 2816 and a few other late mss.
 da crimina quae ei obiiciuntur" late Vg.). The late Vulgate paraphrase of this passage has no explicit Greek support. Manetti made the same change.
17 sequenti die 7 ñ $\mathfrak{\xi} \xi \tilde{n} \varsigma$ ("in sequenti die" Vg. 1527). Erasmus adopts the more literal rendering of the earlier Vulgate, as did Manetti.
18 nullum crimen oú $\delta \varepsilon \mu i \alpha v$ aitíav ("nullam causam" Vg.). See on vs. 7, and Annot.
18 intendebant $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi$ ) $\varphi \in \rho \circ v$ ("deferebant" $V g$.; "intentabant" 1516). See on vs. 7, and Annot. The verb intento, here used in 1516, is found elsewhere only at Rom. 8,33.
18 super bisce rebus de quibus $\tilde{\omega}^{\nu}$ ("de quibus" Vg.). Cf. on vs. 11, and Annot. The version of Manetti put eorum de quibus.
18 suspicabar $\mathbf{\text { Útevóouv ("suspicabar malum" }}$ late Vg.). Some Vulgate mss. have malam (agreeing with causam), reflecting a Greek text adding mounpáv, as found in $7^{77^{74}} \mathrm{AC}^{*}$ and some later mss. A few others have movnpá (codd. $\mathrm{K}^{*}$ $\mathrm{C}^{\text {corr) }}$ ) or $\pi$ munpã (codd. $\boldsymbol{\aleph}^{\text {corr }}$ B E). Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. See Annot. In Manetti's version, malum was similarly omitted.
19 sed quaestiones $\zeta \eta \tau \eta \dot{\prime} \mu \propto \tau \alpha \delta^{\delta ́}$ ("quaestiones vero" ${ }^{\text {Vg. }}$.) Erasmus felt that $\delta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon}$ should be taken in an adversative rather than a continuative sense. Manetti substituted Inquisitiones vero.




















 a̋६ıv Өavátou aủtòv meтpaxéval, kai







 aitias $\sigma \eta \mu \tilde{v} v a$.
num vellet ire Hierosolymam, et ibi iudicari super istis. ${ }^{21}$ Paulus autem quum appellasset, vt seruaretur Augusti cognitioni, iussi seruari eum, donec mitterem eum ad Caesarem. ${ }^{22}$ Agrippa autem dixit ad Festum: Volebam et ipse hominem audire. Cras, inquit, audies eum. ${ }^{23}$ Postero autem die quum venisset Agrippa et Bernice cum multo apparatu, et introissent in auditorium cum tribunis et viris principalibus ciuitatis, iubente Festo adductus est Paulus. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Et}$ dicit Festus: Agrippa rex et omnes qui simul adestis nobiscum viri, videtis hunc hominem de quo omnis multitudo Iudaeorum interpellauit me et Hierosolymis et hic, acclamantes non oportere eum viuere amplius: ${ }^{25}$ ego vero comperi nihil dignum morte eum admisisse. Caeterum cum is ipse appellasset Augustum, statui mittere eum: ${ }^{26} \mathrm{de}$ quo quid certum scribam domino, non habeo. Quapropter produxi eum ad vos, et maxime ad te, rex Agrippa, vt examinatione facta, habeam quod scribam. ${ }^{27}$ Iniquum enim mihi videtur, mittere vinctum, et crimina de quibus accusatur non significare.

23 alt. tךs $A$-C: tois $D E \mid 24 \beta \alpha \sigma_{\imath} \lambda_{\varepsilon v} B-E: \beta \alpha \sigma ı \lambda \varepsilon u s ~ A$

25 Caeterum ... appellasset $B$ - $E$ : Ipse autem hoc appellante $A$ | statui $B$ - $E$ : iudicaui $A$ | 26 Quapropter $B$-E: Propter quod $A \mid$ alt. ad $B$ - $E$ : apud $A \mid$ examinatione $B$ - $E$ : interrogatione $A \mid 27$ crimina de quibus accusatur $C$ - $E$ : causas eius $A B$

20 num єi ("si" Vg.). See on Act. 1,6.
20 super $\pi \varepsilon \rho 1$ ("de" Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus retains iudico de at Act. 23,6; 24,21; 25,9. The change here is merely for stylistic variety, in view of the use of de earlier in the verse. The
phrase iudico de is a common idiom in classical Latin.

21 Paulus autem quum appellasset toũ $\delta \grave{\text { ® }}$ Пaú入ou ह̇דাk Greek aorist.

21 mitterem $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \psi \omega$ ("mittam" Vg.). Erasmus substitutes a more classical sequence of tenses, following appellasset and iussi. Manetti made the same change.
23 Postero autem die Tñ̃ oũv ėtraúpiov ("Altera autem die" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29. Manetti put Sequenti autem die.
 ambitione" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus also suggests multa ostentatione. The word ambitio can occasionally carry this meaning in classical Latin authors, but apparatus was more widely used for this purpose. Cf. Erasmus Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae, ASD I, 4, p. 298, 11. 520-523: "Pompa est quaedam ostentatio apparatus, qui circumfertur".
23 тñs $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \varepsilon \omega 5$. The reading toĩs $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \varepsilon \omega s$ in 1527-35 looks like a misprint, by attraction to the preceding datives, toĩs ... oṽøl.
 untranslated, Erasmus follows the late Vulgate: the omission is supported by just a few late Greek mss.
24 dicit $\uparrow \eta \sigma I v$ ("dixit" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering is more accurate here, in giving the present tense. Some copies of the late Vulgate have dicit, but the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514, as well as the 1527 Vulgate column, all have dixit. Manetti substituted ait.
$24 \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu . . . \mu \mathrm{Ol}$. Cod. 2815 has a different word-
 without other ms. support. Erasmus or his assistants probably regarded this as unnatural, and followed the Vulgate word-order, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss.
 solymis petentes" late $\mathrm{Vg} .=$ some $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$. mss.). See on Act. 1,1, regarding $\tau \varepsilon \ldots$ koi. There is no Greek support for the late Vulgate addition of petentes (or petens in some earlier $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$. mss.). The same change was made by Manetti.
$24 b i c$ eved́ $\delta \delta$ (late Vg. omits). The late Vulgate omission lacks authority from Greek mss. The word bic was added by the earlier Vulgate, and Manetti.
 Vg.). The Vulgate word-order reflects a Greek text having aúròv $\theta$ avátou, as in codd. A B C E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , supported by cod. K and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. As it happens, the word-order morte eum is found in some copies
of the late Vulgate, including the Froben edition of 1491. Manetti had ipsum ... morte.
 toútou ह̇тIк $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \propto \mu \dot{v} v o u$ ("ipso autem hoc appellante, ad" Vg.; "Ipse autem hoc appellante" 1516). Greek aorist. The Vulgate punctuates differently, taking ad Augustum with mitto rather than with appello. In the 1516 translation, if the nominative Ipse was intentional, it would have to refer to Festus rather than to Paul, but it is more likely to be a misprint.
25 statui ëxpıva ("iudicaui" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. on Act. 15,19 regarding other substitutions for iudico.
 omission is supported by $7^{74}$ A B C and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put ipsum.
26 Quapropter סís ("Propter quod" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 10,29.
26 produxi $\pi \rho \circ \dot{\gamma}$ yoyov ("adduxi" Annot., lemma; "perduxi" Vg. 1527). In adopting produxi, Erasmus returns to the earlier Vulgate rendering, which was also followed by Manetti.
26 ad (2nd.) Emi ("apud" 1516). The change to apud in 1516 is merely for stylistic variety, in view of the fact that ad has been used to render $\varepsilon \varphi^{\prime}$ just a few words earlier. Erasmus restored the Vulgate rendering in 1519. Cf. Annot.
26 examinatione $T$ ग̃s d́vaxpícews ("interrogatione" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$. . Cf. Erasmus' substitution of examino for interrogatione in rendering ávoxpive at Act. 28,18 (1519). See on Act. 4,9, regarding examino. He retains interrogo for ávaxpiva at $L c .23,14$. This change was anticipated by Manetti.
26 quod Tl ("quid" Vg .). This change is partly for the sake of varying the style, as Erasmus retained quid for Tl earlier in the verse. Manetti preferred aliquid in both places.
27 Iniquum ${ }^{\text {ä }}$ 人oyov ("Sine ratione" Vg.). See on Iob. 8,7 for Erasmus' removal of sine. See also Annot. The version of Manetti had Absurdum.
27 crimina de quibus accusatur tàs kat' aủtoũ aitias ("causas eius" $1516-19=\mathrm{Vg}$. mss.; "causam eius" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate use of the singular lacks Greek support. See on vs. 7 regarding crimen. Erasmus renders kat' aútoũ more intelligibly. Manetti put eius causas.
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26Agrippa vero ad Paulum ait: Permittitur tibi loqui pro temet ipso. Tunc Paulus extenta manu pro se dicebat: ${ }^{2}$ Super omnibus de quibus accusor a Iudaeis, rex Agrippa, existimo me beatum, qui causam dicturus sim apud te hodie: ${ }^{3}$ quum tu maxime sis gnarus earum quae apud Iudaeos sunt, et consuetudinum et quaestionum. Quapropter obsecro te, vt patienter me audias. ${ }^{4}$ Itaque vitam quidem meam, quam egi ab adolescentia, quae $a b$ initio fuit in gente mea Hierosolymis, nouerunt omnes Iudaei, ${ }^{5}$ qui prius nouerant me ab initio, si velint testimonium ferre: quod secundum exquisitissimam sectam nostrae religionis vixerim Pharisaeus. ${ }^{6}$ Et nunc ob spem repromissionis quae ad patres nostros facta est a deo, sto iudicio subiectus, ${ }^{7}$ ad quam duodecim tribus nostrae instanter nocte et die colentes deum


26,1 pro se dicebat $B-E$ : coepit pro se dicere $A \mid 3$ Quapropter $B-E$ : propter quod $A \mid$ te $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 4$ Hierosolymis $B-E$ : in Hierosolymis $A \mid 5$ ferre $B-E$ : perhibere $A \mid$ exquisitissimam $B-E$ : certissimam $A \mid 6$ ob spem $E$ : in spe $A$, fretus spe $B-D \mid 7$ instanter $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ colentes deum $B-E$ : seruientes $A$

26,1 pro se dicebat ótтє入оүєĩto ("coepit rationem reddere" Vg.; "coepit pro se dicere" 1516). Similar substitutions of the imperfect tense, for coepio with the infinitive, are found at $M c .5,18$; Lc. 15,28. On pro se dicebat, see on Act. 24,10. Manetti substituted se defendebat.

2 Super Пєpi ("De" Vg.). Cf. on Act. 25,20.
2 de quibus ... existimo $̄ v . . . \eta^{\eta} Y \eta \mu \alpha ৷$ ("quibus ... aestimo" Vg.). See on Act. 25,11, regarding $\tilde{\omega} \nu$, and on Act. 2,15 for existimo. See also Annot. The passage was further discussed in Erasmus Epist. apolog. adv. Stun., LB IX, 398 A-C. The version of Manetti put de quibus ... puto.
2 me éncuutóv. In his 1516 Greek text, Erasmus followed cod. 2815 in putting $\varepsilon$ £autov, with
support from cod. 2816 but hardly any other mss. This was corrected in the 1516 errata, either by conjecture or by reference to cod. 1.
2 qui causam dicturus sim apud te bodie $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$
 cum sim defensurus me hodie" Vg.). Regarding causam dico, see on Act. 24,10. The Vulgate reflects a different Greek word-order, êmi ooũ
 cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. A few other mss., commencing with
 ámолоүєiodal. Erasmus here follows his cod. 2815, both in his N.T. text and Annot., apparently supported by relatively few other late mss. Manetti put cum bodie coram te sim me defensurus.

3 quum tu maxime sis gnarus earum $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{1} \quad \tau \sigma$
 omnia" Vg.). Erasmus does not elsewhere use gnarus in the N.T. In one respect, he is less accurate than the Vulgate as he leaves $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \omega \nu$ untranslated. See Annot., where he complains of the discrepancy between the neuter gender of omnia and the two feminine nouns which immediately follow. For this reason he included the passage among the Soloecismi. Edward Lee defended the Vulgate partly on the grounds that it could have been altered by a later scribal error: for Erasmus' reply, see his Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, $211 \mathrm{~F}-212 \mathrm{~B}$. The version of Manetti substituted maxime cum omnia ... noweris.
3 et consuetudinum et quaestionum $\dot{\eta} \theta \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon$ каi $\zeta \eta \tau \eta \mu$ d́t $\omega v$ ("consuetudines et quaestiones" Vg.). See on Act. 1,1 regarding te ... kai. See also Annot. In Manetti, this was rendered by consuetudines inquisitionesque.
3 Quapropter $\delta$ óó ("propter quod" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 10,29.
3 te cou (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathbf{7 P}^{74}$ A B E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. C and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti also made this change.
3 vt... audias ákoũ $\sigma a 1$ ("audias" $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$.). Erasmus' addition of $v t$ is consistent with the construction usually adopted by the Vulgate after obsecro and rogo elsewhere. Manetti used the word-order $v t$ me patienter audias.
 ("Et quidem vitam" Vg.). See on Act. 9,31 for Erasmus' treatment of $\mu \in \dot{E} \nu \mathcal{O}^{\circ} v$. Manetti had Vitam quidem.
 iuuentute" Vg.). Erasmus expands the phrase to obtain a more classical idiom. This substitution of adolescentia in rendering veórns also occurs at Mc. 10,20, in accordance with Vulgate usage at 1 Tim. 4,12. Erasmus retains iuuentus at Mt. 19,20; $L c$. 18,21. Manetti rendered this by qualis a iunentute fuerit.
$4 \gamma \varepsilon \nu 0 \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \nu$. Cod. 2815 adds $\mu$ oı, unsupported by other mss. Erasmus' text here follows codd. 1 and 2816.

4 Hierosolymis èv "lepoco入únous ("in Hierosolymis" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 4,21. Manetti's version (both mss.) incorrectly had a Hierosolimis.

5 qui prius nouerant троүıшفбкоиtes ("praescientes" Vg.). Erasmus avoids the present participle. For his preference for the pluperfect, see on Ioh. 1,19. He retains praescio (or praescisco), in the sense of divine foreknowledge, at Rom. 8,29. Elsewhere, he substitutes ante agnosco (ante cognosco in 1516) at Rom. 11,2, pracordino at 1 Petr. 1,20, and praemoneo at 2 Petr. 3,17. In Manetti's version, this was rendered as cum me superius precognouerint.
5 testimonium ferre $\mu \alpha$ ртире̃iv ("testimonium perhibere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,7. Manetti preferred testificari.
5 quod ... vixerim ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{T}$ ו ... vixi" Vg.). See on loh. 1,20.
 $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . Cf. on Act. 22,3 regarding accurate.$ In Annot., Erasmus also suggests using exactissimus and diligentissimus.
5 өp $\quad$ oksias. The itacism $\theta$ pnokias, in the 1516 Greek text, was drawn from cod. 2815. It was corrected in the 1516 errata.

"fretus spe" 1519-27). This is one of the few changes introduced in 1535. In Annot., Erasmus also suggests de spe, in accordance with Vulgate usage in rendering mepi $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta o s$ at Act. 23,6; 26,7.
6 repromissionis quat ... nostros $\tau \mathfrak{\eta} s$ mpòs tov̀s matepas émayरe入ias ("quae ... nostros repromissionis" ${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$.). Erasmus finds a more natural Latin word-order. In Manetti's version, this was repromissionis que a deo patribus facta est.
7 ad quam eis ${ }^{\circ} \nu($ (in qua" Vg.). Erasmus provides a rendering which is closer to the Greek, and which sits more comfortably with the following verb, peruenio (or with deuenio, in the Vulgate). Manetti had in quam.
7 instanter ह̀v Éx $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission lacks Greek ms. support. See Annot., where Erasmus also interprets as acriter or assidue. The latter rendering had been adopted by Manetti.
7 et kai ("ac" Vg.). Usually this change is in the opposite direction, substituting ac for $e$ t. Erasmus retains nocte ac die or die ac nocte at ten other passages. Manetti here put die noctuque.
7 colentes deum $\lambda a$ atpeŨov ("seruientes" 1516 $=$ late Vg.). See on Act. 7,42. Erasmus adds deum to provide an object for colo. See Annot. The version of Manetti had inseruientes.
























 тí̧ııv. ${ }^{15}$ Éy

sperant se peruenturas: de qua spe accusor, rex Agrippa, a Iudaeis. ${ }^{8} \mathrm{Cur}$ incredibile iudicatur apud vos, si deus mortuos suscitat? ${ }^{9}$ Et ego quidem existimabam me aduersus nomen Iesu Nazareni multa repugnando facturum, ${ }^{10}$ quod et feci Hierosolymis: et multos sanctorum ego carceribus inclusi, a principibus sacerdotum potestate accepta: et quum occiderentur, detuli sententiam. ${ }^{11}$ Et per omnes synagogas fre|quenter puniens, eos compelleLB 534 bam blasphemare, et amplius insaniens in eos, persequebar etiam in exteras vsque ciuitates. ${ }^{12}$ Quarum rerum studio quum irem Damascum cum autoritate et permissu principum sacerdotum, ${ }^{13}$ die medio, rex, in via vidi e coelo supra splendorem solis circunfulsisse me lumen et eos qui mecum faciebant iter. ${ }^{14}$ Quum autem omnes nos decidissemus in terram, audiui vocem loquentem ad me, ac dicentem Hebraica lingua: Saul, Saul, quid me persequeris? Durum est tibi contra stimulos calcitrare. ${ }^{15}$ Ego autem dixi: Quis es domine? At ille dixit: Ego sum Iesus quem tu persequeris.

## 13 лаитротпта $A$-C E: $\lambda \alpha \mu \tau \rho о т \eta \tau \alpha D$ | оиv $C-E: \sigma \eta \nu A B$

9 repugnando facturum $B$-E: contraria agere $A \mid 10$ detuli $B-E$ : retuli $A \mid 11$ puniens, eos $E$ : puniens eos, $A-D$ | etiam in exteras vsque $B-E$ : et vsque in exteras $A \mid 12$ Quarum rerum studio $B-E: \operatorname{In}$ quibus $A \mid$ quum $B-E(\operatorname{cum} B-D): \operatorname{dum} A \mid$ autoritate $B-E$ : potestate $A \mid 13$ et eos $B-E$ eos et $A \mid 14$ ac dicentem B-E: om. $A$

7 se peruenturas $\kappa \alpha{ }^{2} \alpha \nu \tau \eta \pi \sigma \alpha 1$ ("deuenire" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive. The substitution of peruenio is consistent with Vulgate usage at Act. 16,1. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains deuenio for кatavTó $\omega$ at Act. 18,19, 24; 28,13, but substitutes peruebo at Act. 27,12.

7 rex Agrippas a Iudaeis ßaбı $\lambda \varepsilon \underset{\text { Ũ Aүpitma, }}{ }$ útiò $\tau \omega ั v$ 'louסaínv ("a Iudaeis, rex" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text, having úmò ’louסai $\omega v$, $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \varepsilon$ ũ, as in $\$$ B C E and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815.

Most other late mss., including codd. 1 and 2816, support cod. 2815 in the word-order, and in adding A $\mathrm{A} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mathrm{i} \pi \mathrm{T} \pi \alpha$, but omit $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$. The same change was made by Manetti.
8 Cur tí ("Quid" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25.
8 vekpoús. Cod. 2815 had vekpóv, without other ms. support. The Erasmian text here follows codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss., together with the Vulgate.
9 existimabam Erasmus, unusually, renders the Greek aorist
by the imperfect tense, having more regard for the context than literal accuracy. Cf. on Act. 10,37, praedicabat. Manetti followed the earlier Vulgate, in putting existimaueram.
 ti人 $\pi \rho \tilde{\jmath} \xi \alpha 1$ ("debere multa contraria agere" Vg.; "multa contraria agere" 1516). Cf. Tit. 2,8, is qui repugnat for $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \bar{\xi} \dot{\varepsilon} v a v t i \alpha s$. See on Iob. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti substituted oporteret multa contraria operari.
 The Vulgate may reflect a Greek text having èv甲U later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, along with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss., in omitting the preposition.
 Erasmus restores the Vulgate rendering. Cf. Annot.
11 épuaivóuevos. The Erasmian text avoids the variant offered by cod. 2815, èkraıvóuєvos, which has little other ms. support.
 ("vsque in exteras" Vg.; "et vsque in exteras" 1516). Erasmus, more accurately, provides a rendering for k i. Manetti had vsque ad exteras.
12 Quarum rerum studio èv oils kai ("In quibus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Cf. another addition of res at Act. 25,18, and see Annot. By leaving kai untranslated, Erasmus here follows the Vulgate, but the latter reflects a Greek text omitting Kdi, as in $\mathbf{F F}^{74}$ A B C E 096 and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.
12 quum irem topevónevos ("dum irem" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) Elsewhere, Erasmus often retains dum from the Vulgate.
 In 1519, this substitution occurs in fifteen places in the three synoptic Gospels, but only here in Acts. In 1516, this substitution occurs only at Mt. 7,29: see Annot. ad loc., where Erasmus distinguishes between ékovaia and $\delta^{\prime} v a \mu$ Is. The word autoritas is not used anywhere in the Vulgate N.T.
13 medio $\mu \hat{\xi} \sigma \eta$ ns ("media" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,29, for the gender of dies.
13 rexs in via vidi $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \in \mathrm{U}$, кatò $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ósòv عiరov ("in via vidi, rex" Vg.). Erasmus follows the word-order of cod. 2815 , apparently without
support from other mss. The Vulgate is based
 as in codd. 1, 2816 and virtually all other mss. Manetti put in via, o Rex, ... vidi.
13 e coelo oúpavóOev ("de coelo" Vg.). This is comparable with Erasmus' frequent substitution of $e$ for $d e$ in rendering tek: see on Ioh. 2,15. Manetti conveyed the same meaning with celitus (= caelitus), though this was rare in classical literature.
13 et eos kai toús ("eos et" 1516). The changed word-order displayed here by the 1516 edition is unlikely to have been Erasmus' deliberate choice.
13 faciebant iter ropevouévous ("simul erant" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here. On facio iter, see on Act. 17,1. Manetti substituted proficiscebantur.
14 Quum autem omnes nos decidissemus $\pi \alpha ̛ ́ v T \omega \nu$
 cum decidissemus" Vg.). Erasmus attains a more natural Latin word-order, but Manetti even more so, with Cum autem nos omnes in terram decidissemus.
14 loquentem ad me, ac dicentem $\lambda \alpha \lambda 0$ ũo $\alpha \nu$
 "loquentem ad me" 1516 Lat.). On the use of ad, see on Act. 22,10. The Vulgate follows a Greek text substituting $\lambda \dot{\lambda} \xi \quad$ ovo $\alpha \nu$ mpós $\mu \varepsilon$ (as in $\mathbf{7}^{74}{ }^{74}$ A B C 048096 and thirty-four later mss.), $\lambda e y o v i \sigma n s$ trós $\mu \mathrm{E}$ (as in cod. E and twenty-two later mss.), or $\lambda a \lambda 0$ ũ $\sigma \alpha \nu$ тpós $\mu \varepsilon$ (as in thirty-five of the later mss.). Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and about 360 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgescbichte 660-2). Manetti had mibi dicentem.
14 Saul, Saul $\Sigma \alpha_{0} u ̛ \lambda, ~ \Sigma \alpha o u ́ \lambda ~(" S a u l e, ~ S a u l e " ~$ Vg.). See on Act. 9,4.
14 stimulos kEvtp ("stimulum" Vg.). Erasmus, more accurately, gives a plural rendering.
15 At ille o $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta}$ ("Dominus autem" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text which adds kúpios, as in $7^{74}$ \& B C E 096 and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti put Ipse autem.
15 Iesus 'İooũs ("Iesus Nazarenus" Vg. 1527). The late Vulgate addition is a harmonisation with Act. 22,8, corresponding with the addition of $\delta$ Na $\omega_{\omega}$ paios in cod. 048 and a few later mss.








 Tòv $\theta \varepsilon o ́ v, ~ т о \tilde{u} \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon i ̃ v ~ \alpha u ̉ t o u ̀ s ~ \alpha ̛ ̉ ~ q \varepsilon \sigma ı v ~$


 Tท̃̃ oủpavị́ ỏтTน




 тoútwv $\mu \varepsilon$ oi 'louסaĩol $\sigma u \lambda \lambda \alpha \beta$ о́ $\mu \varepsilon v o l$



${ }^{16}$ Sed exurge et sta super pedes tuos. Ad hoc enim apparui tibi, vt constituam te ministrum ac testem et eorum quae vidisti et eorum in quibus apparebo tibi, ${ }^{17}$ eripiens te a populo et gentibus, in quas nunc te mitto: ${ }^{18}$ vt aperias oculos eorum, vt conuertantur a tenebris ad lucem, et a potestate satanae ad deum, vt accipiant remissionem peccatorum et sortem inter eos qui sanctificati sunt per fidem quae est erga me. ${ }^{19}$ Vnde rex Agrippa, non fui inobediens coelesti visioni, ${ }^{20}$ sed his qui sunt Damasci primum et Hierosolymis et per omnem regionem Iudaeae, deinde et gentibus annunciabam, vt poenitentiam agerent, et conuerterentur ad deum, opera facientes digna his qui resipuissent. ${ }^{21} \mathrm{Hac}$ ex causa Iudaei me in templo comprehensum tentauerunt interficere. ${ }^{22}$ Auxilium igitur nactus dei, vsque in hodiernum diem sto,


16 super pedes tuos $B-E$ : in pedibus tuis $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 17$ a $B-E$ : $\operatorname{de} A \mid$ populo $A^{c} B-E$ : populis $A^{*} \mid 18$ aperias oculos $B-E$ : aperiantur oculi $A \mid$ alt. a $B-E$ : de $A \mid \operatorname{erga} C-E$ : in $A B \mid$ 20 deinde $B$-E: om. $A \mid$ opera ... resipuissent $B-E$ (exc. iis pro his $B C$ ) digna poenitentiae opera facientes $A \mid 21$ comprehensum $B-E$ : comprehenso $A \mid$ interficere $B-E$ : iniicere manus $A$
 pedes tuos" late Vg.; "in pedibus tuis" 1516). See on Act. 14,10. In 1519, Erasmus returns to the earlier Vulgate reading, which had also been adopted by Manetti.
16 ac каí ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti made the same change.
16 et (2nd.) $\boldsymbol{\tau} \varepsilon$ (Vg. omits). See on Act. 1,1.
16 eorum in quibus $\omega^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \mathrm{v}$ ("eorum quibus" Vg.). Cf. on Act. 25,11.
$17 a$ èk ("de" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 8,23.
17 populo тoũ $\lambda \alpha 0 u ̃$ ("populis" 1516 Lat. text
$=$ late Vg.). The late Vulgate rendering lacks

Greek support, and is corrected in the 1516 errata. See Annot., where Erasmus further alludes to a variant which substitutes $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu$ 'lou $\delta \alpha i \omega \nu$ for тои̃ $\lambda \alpha 0$ ũ. He derived this idea from Valla Annot., though Valla's comment could also be interpreted as referring to the addition of $\tau \omega \nu$ 'lou $\delta \alpha i \omega \omega$ after toũ $\lambda \alpha 0 \tilde{\text {, }}$, which is found in a few late mss. In both Valla and Erasmus, this variant is only cited by its Latin equivalent. Valla Annot. and Manetti both put populo for populis.
17 nunc vũv ("nunc ego" Vg.). The Vulgate here lacks Greek ms. support. The reading, $v \mathrm{U} v$, adopted by Erasmus' Greek text, is not
found in any of his mss., nor those of Valla, and appears to be a conjecture partly based on the Vulgate wording. This reading, though found in comparatively few late mss., remained in the Textus Receptus. Most Greek mss., including those of Erasmus, have é $\gamma \omega$ © instead of $v \tilde{v} v$, corresponding with ego in Manetti's version.
17 te mitto $\sigma \varepsilon$ ámooté $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ("mitto te" Vg.). The Vulgate word-order is supported by some Greek mss., commencing with ( $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{74}$ ) $\mathcal{N}$ A B (C)
 future tense, following cod. 2816, with some support among the later mss. (cod. 1 has $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \ell \lambda \tilde{\omega} \quad \sigma \varepsilon$ ). However, the catchword of the preceding page of the 1516 edition had a ${ }^{2}$ roote $\lambda \lambda \omega$, and this reading was restored in the 1516 errata, following cod. 2815 and most
 The use of $\sigma \varepsilon$ dтобтe $\lambda \tilde{\omega}$ was reflected in Manetti's version, te mittam.
18 vt aperias oculos àvoî̧aı ỏ $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu$ oús ("aperire oculos" $V \mathrm{Vg}$; "vt aperiantur oculi" 1516). See on Iob. 1,33 , for avoidance of the infinitive. Valla Annot. had already proposed vt aperias oculos, while Manetti put vt oculos ... aperias.
$18 a$ (2nd.) ("de" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus produces consistency with a tenebris earlier in the verse. Manetti made the same change.
18 eos qui sanctificati sunt toĩs $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma 1 \alpha \sigma \mu$ évols ("sanctos" Vg.). Erasmus is more precise here, distinguishing á $\gamma \dot{1} \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ from äy 10 . Manetti substituted sanctificatos.
18 erga kls ("in" 1516-19 = Vg.). See on Act. 3,25.
19 inobediens àmei日ńs ("incredulus" Vg.). A similar substitution occurs at $L c .1,17$ (1519); Tit. 3,3, and also in rendering $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \epsilon \theta \dot{\hat{\prime}} \omega$ at 1 Petr. 3,20.
20 per omnem $\mathfrak{i l s} \pi \alpha \pi \sigma \alpha v$ ("in omnem" Vg.). Erasmus finds a more natural Latin expression, to replace the over-literal Vulgate rendering. The same change was made by Manetti.
20 deinde et kai ("et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus' addition of deinde places a greater emphasis on the last item of the list, namely the spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles, and balances the earlier use of primum. Cf. the addition of denique at Act. 1,8 . Manetti put $a c$.
20 opera facientes digna bis (iis: 1519-22) qui
 oovtas ("digna poenitentiae opera facientes"
$1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) . On resipisco, see on Act. 2,38.$ Erasmus retains dignus poenitentiae at $L c .3,8$, but substitutes qui deceant poenitentiam at $M t$. 3,8. See Annot. The version of Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he substituted agentes for facientes.
21 Iudaei me $\mu \mathrm{E}$ oi 'louסđĩo ("me Iudaei" Vg.). Erasmus again changes the word-order to improve the Latin style. His cod. 2815 omitted oi, in company with $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{*} \mathrm{~B}$ and a few later mss. Erasmus or his assistants inserted the word into the text from codd. 1 and 2816, supported by cod. $\aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A E and most later mss. Manetti had Iudei in templo me, omitting cum essem.
 templo" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the insertion of ôvta before $\dot{\varepsilon} v$, with support from $3^{74} \aleph \mathrm{E}$ and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, this time accompanied by codd. A B 048 as well as codd. 1, 2816 and most of the later mss.
21 comprebensum $\sigma \cup \lambda \lambda \alpha \beta \delta \mu \varepsilon v o l$ ("comprehenso" 1516). The use of the ablative in 1516 turns the phrase me in templo comprebenso into the ablative absolute construction, but this prevents it from forming a satisfactory indirect object for initicere manus, which follows shortly afterwards. Manetti put comprebenderunt atque.
21 tentaucrunt ĖTelpãvto ("tentabant, volentes me" late Vg .). The Vulgate use of the imperfect tense is more accurate. However, the late Vulgate addition of volentes me lacks Greek ms. support. Manetti placed tentabant at the end of the sentence, omitting volentes me.
21 interficere $\delta 10 \chi$ elpioactal ("iniicere manus" 1516). In Annot., Erasmus advocates initicio manus, as adopted in 1516, based on the root meaning of the Greek verb. In 1519, however, he restores the Vulgate rendering. At Act. 5,30, where the same Greek verb occurs, he retains interimo from the Vulgate. This was rendered by Manetti as capere et interficere.
22 Auxilium igitur nactus Ėmкoupias oũv $\tau \cup x \dot{\omega}^{\circ}$ ("Auxilio autem adiutus" Vg.). Erasmus elsewhere uses nanciscor to render Eúpiokw at six passages, and also in the phrase opportunitatem nanciscor in rendering кळıрі̀v $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ at Act. 24,25 and Eủkatpéc at 1 Cor. 16,12. At the present passage, no doubt, Erasmus sensed a degree of repetition in the Vulgate expression ("assisted by help"), and chose a more suitable verb.
$\mu \alpha р т \cup р о и ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s ~ \mu ı к р \tilde{~ т \varepsilon ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~} \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$,




 है $\theta v \in \sigma$.



 кро́тібтє $Ф \tilde{\eta} \sigma \tau \varepsilon, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ zías ка̀ $\sigma \omega$ -










testificans tum paruo tum magno, nihil aliud dicens, quam ea quae prophetae praedixerant futura esse, et Moses, ${ }^{23}$ an passurus fuerit Christus, an primus ex resurrectione mortuorum lumen annunciaturus sit populo et gentibus.
${ }^{24} \mathrm{Haec}$ autem quum pro se diceret, Festus magna voce ait: Insanis Paule: multae te literae ad insaniam conuertunt. ${ }^{25}$ Et Paulus: Non insanio, inquit, optime Feste, sed veritatis et sobrietatis verba eloquor. ${ }^{26}$ Scit enim de his rex apud quem et libere loquor. Latere enim eum nihil horum arbitror. Neque enim hoc in angulo gestum est. ${ }^{27}$ Credis rex Agrippa, prophetis? Scio quod credis. ${ }^{28}$ Agrippa autem ad Paulum ait: Modica ex parte persuades mihi vt fiam Christianus. ${ }^{29}$ Et Paulus ait: Optarim a deo,

22 tum paruo tum $B$-E: et paruo et $A \mid$ aliud $B-E$ : praeterea $A \mid 23$ passurus fuerit $B$ - : passibilis $A \mid 24$ literae $B-E$ : litterae $A \mid 26$ apud $B-E:$ ad $A \mid$ hoc in angulo $B-E$ : in angulo quicquam horum $A \mid 28$ Modica ... Christianus $B$-E: In modico suades me christianum fieri $A \mid 29$ ait B-E:om. $A \mid$ a $B$-E: om. $A$
$22 \mu \alpha \rho т \cup р о u ́ \mu \varepsilon v \circ \varsigma$. This reading conforms with cod. 2816, supported by cod. E and some later mss. In codd. 1 and 2815, in company with most other mss., it is $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \cup \rho o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$, which Erasmus probably considered to be an incorrect spelling. At Act. 6,3, the form $\mu \alpha$ ptupourévous is found in virtually all mss., and $\mu \alpha \rho т$ тиpoú $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ at Act. 10,22; 22,12.
22 tum paruo tum magno $\mu ⿺ 𠃊 \rho \tilde{\sim}$ тє к $\alpha \dot{l} \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$ ("minori atque maiori" Vg.; "et paruo et magno" 1516). See on Act. 1,1 regarding $\tau \varepsilon$... kaí. In five passages of the Apocalypse, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in putting such phrases as pusilli et magni, rendering the same Greek words. At the present passage, Erasmus removes the Vulgate's inaccurate use of comparative adjectives. Manetti put paruo ac magno.

22 aliud ćkтós ("extra" Vg.; "praeterea" 1516). Erasmus seems to have been suspicious of the construction extra ... quam, though a similar usage is found in Cicero and Livy.
22 praedixerant $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda\langle\lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ ("locuti sunt" late Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus uses praedico, in the sense of "predict", as a rendering of $\pi \rho \circ \varphi \eta \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$ and тровiтог. Here he translates more freely, having regard to the context, and perhaps disliking the combination of loquor with the accusative and infinitive construction. Manetti had dixerunt.

22 M $\omega \sigma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. The reading $\mu \omega u ̈ \sigma \tilde{\eta} s$ in 1516-27 was based on cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other mss. See on Act. 3,22.

23 an ... an ei ... ci ("si ... si" Vg.). See on Ioh. 9,25.
23 passurus fuerit $\pi \alpha 0 \eta$ тós ("passibilis" 1516 $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate term passibilis does not exist in classical Latin, and since it could be understood as meaning "able to suffer", it does not suit the context. The alternative rendering which Erasmus adopted, meaning "would suffer", is also unsatisfactory, although it provides symmetry with annunciaturus later in the sentence. In Annot., he more accurately proposes an pati debuerit ("whether he ought to suffer"): cf. Act. 17,3 , where Paul argued from the scriptures that it was "necessary" for Christ to suffer ( $\varepsilon$ ( $\delta \varepsilon 1$ таөєĩ).
 nunciaturus est" Vg.). The subjunctive follows on from the earlier adoption of an.
24 autem $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ (Vg. omits). Erasmus is more accurate here.
 ("loquente eo et rationem reddente" Vg.). The Vulgate rendering corresponds with a Greek
 found only in cod. E. As usual, Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and virtually all other mss. On pro se dico, see on Act. 24,10. Manetti's version was Cum ... pro defensione sua dixisset.
24 ait $\varepsilon \neq \eta$ ("dixit" Vg.). The purpose of this change is solely for stylistic variety, as Erasmus wished to use dico in rendering áтодоүध́ouaı earlier in the sentence. The same change was made by Manetti.
25 Et Paulus ò סé. Erasmus' rendering follows the late Vulgate. However, the Vulgate reflects a different Greek text, adding Пaũ $\lambda 0$, as found in $7^{74}$ § A B E and some later mss. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss.
26 apud mpós ("ad" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 2,29.
 stanter loquor" Vg.). See ibid. Manetti preferred confidenter loquor.
26 boc in angulo ${ }^{\text {en }}$ 人 $\gamma \omega v i \not ̣$... toũto ("in angulo quicquam horum" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect the substitution of тI тоútav for тоũto, but such a reading is not found among the Greek mss.: see Annot. In cod. 2815* the whole clause oú $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ É $\sigma$ tiv
ċv $\gamma \omega \operatorname{cí}^{\prime} \alpha$... Toũto was omitted, but Erasmus restored it in the margin of the ms . (now heavily cropped), following codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti put boc in angulis.
27 quod őtı ("quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti also had quod.
28 ait ${ }_{\xi}^{\varepsilon} \varphi \eta$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by ${ }^{37^{74}} \mathbb{N}$ A B and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. E and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. The same change was made by Manetti.
28 Modica ex parte 'Ev ỏ $\lambda i ́ \gamma \varphi$ ("In modico" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus makes a similar change in vs. 29 , to remove an ambiguity. For his dislike of modicus elsewhere, see on Iob. 6,7; 7,33. See also Annot., where he alternatively suggests aliquantulum. In his opinion, the sense was that Agrippa felt only slightly moved by what he had heard of the Christian faith, and Erasmus therefore disagreed with the rendering proposed by Valla Annot., parum abest quin, which implied a much stronger sense of attraction.
28 persuades mibi $\mu \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon i \theta \varepsilon ı s$ ("suades me" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). A similar change occurs at Act. 21,14. See also on Act. 18,13. In Annot., Erasmus cited the alternative rendering offered by Valla Annot., persuadeas me, following on from Valla's construction with quin. Manetti put me ... suades.
28 vt fiam Christianus Xpıorıavòv үєvéo $0 \propto 1$ ("christianum fieri" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 1,33 , for avoidance of the infinitive. See also Annot., citing the rendering fieri Cbristianum from Valla Annot.

29 ait £ $\pi \varepsilon v$ (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{7 \text { 7vid }} \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ A B and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss., as well as by the Greek text cited in Valla Annot. The rendering proposed by Valla was dixit, as reported in Erasmus Annot. The version of Manetti had inquit.
29 Optarim Eư $\nless \alpha \mu \eta v$ ởv ("Opto" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate here, in rendering the Greek optative. Valla Annot. suggested either optarem apud deum (cited incorrectly as optarim apud deum by Erasmus Annot.) or votum facerem deo. Manetti had Orarem vtique deum.
29 a deo т $\tilde{\omega}$ $\theta \varepsilon \tilde{c}$ ("apud deum" Vg.; "deo" 1516). At 2 Cor. 13,7, by contrast, Erasmus renders $\varepsilon U ̈ X O \mu \alpha ı ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ t o ̀ v ~ \theta \varepsilon o ́ v ~ b y ~ o p t o ~ a p u d ~$
 $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon}, ~ \alpha ̉ \lambda \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ kai mávtơs toùs ákoúovtás $\mu \circ \cup \sigma \eta ́ \mu \varepsilon \rho \circ v, \gamma \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \propto ৷$ toloútous, ótroĩos




 $\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\jmath} \lambda$ ous $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o v t e s ~ o ̋ t i ~ O u ̉ \delta e ̀ v ~ \theta a v o ̛ ́-~$
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 Souv tóv TE Пaũ入ov kaí tivas été-



non solum modica ex parte, verum etiam magna: non te modo, sed omnes etiam qui me audiunt hodie, esse tales, qualis ego sum, exceptis vinculis his. ${ }^{30}$ Et haec eo loquuto, surrexit rex ac praeses et Bernice et qui assidebant eis. ${ }^{31} \mathrm{Et}$ quum secessissent, loquebantur inter se dicentes: Nihil morte aut vinculis dignum facit homo iste. ${ }^{32}$ Agrippa autem Festo dixit: Dimitti poterat homo hic, si non appellasset Caesarem.

77 Postquam autem decretum est, vt nos nauigaremus in Italiam, tradiderunt et Paulum et quosdam alios vinctos centurioni, nomine Iulio, cohortis Augustae. ${ }^{2}$ Conscensa autem naue Adramyttina nauigaturi iuxta loca Asiae, | LB 536

32 єтєєкєк入ךто B-E: єтıкєк $\lambda \eta$ то $A$
27,2 $\alpha \delta \rho \alpha \mu \cup \tau т і \nu \omega ~ A C-E: \alpha \delta \rho \alpha \mu \cup \pi т \tau เ v \omega B$

29 non ... magna $B-E$ (vt non ... magna $B$ ): et in modico et in magno $A \mid$ te modo $B-E$ : tantum te $A \mid$ omnes etiam $B$ - $E$ : etiam omnes $A \mid$ me $B-E$ : om. $A \mid$ esse $B$ - $E$ : fieri $A \mid 30$ ac $B$ - $E$ : et $A$ 27,1 Postquam $B-E$ : Vt $A \mid$ vt nos nauigaremus $B-E$ : nobis nauigare $A \mid$ vinctos $B-E$ : carcerarios $A \mid 2$ iuxta $B-E:$ ad $A$
deum. See also the previous note regarding Annot. and the renderings of Valla Annot. and Manetti.
29 non solum ... verum etiam kaì ... kaí ("et ... et" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.; "vt non solum ... verum etiam" 1519). Erasmus' later rendering produces better sense, in this context. His addition of $v t$, in 1519, has no corresponding change to the subjunctive, later in the sentence. In Annot., Erasmus cites the rendering siue ... siue from Valla Annot.
29 modica ex parte $\varepsilon^{\text {Ẻ }}$ ỏ $\lambda i ́ \gamma \omega$ ("in modico" 1516 $=$ Vg.). See on vs. 28 . In Annot., Erasmus suggested aliquantulum, while citing the alternative rendering, parum, from Valla Annot.
29 magna $\hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ то $\lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ("in magno" $1516=V g$.). This change follows from Erasmus' insertion
of the feminine noun, parte. In Annot., he prefers to render by multum, also citing multum abest from Valla Annot. The version of Manetti substituted in multo.
29 te modo uóvov $\sigma$ ह́ ("tantum te" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus similarly introduces modo at Hebr. 12,26. Elsewhere, he retains non tantum at Ioh. 11,52; 12,9; 13,9; 17,20; Rom. 4,23; 1 Ioh. 2,2, and sometimes uses tantum to replace solum. In Annot. on the present passage, he prefers te tantum. Manetti put solum te.

29 sed omnes etiam $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кaì móvtos ("sed etiam omnes" $1516=$ late Vg.). The changed word-order, sed omnes etiam, seems to be mainly for the sake of stylistic variety, having regard to the earlier phrase, verum etiam magna. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains the sequence sed etiam
at Act. 27,10; 2 Cor. 8,21; 1 Iob. 2,2, and also introduces it at Rom. 4,24. In Annot. on the present passage, he suggests sed et omneis (or sed et omnes in 1516).
29 me rov (omitted in 1516 Lat. $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. See also Annot. The same change was made by Manetti.

29 esse үevéoӨal ("fieri" $1516=$ Vg.). Both renderings are possible.
29 ego kở ${ }^{\prime} \dot{(" e t ~ e g o " ~ V g .) . ~ F o r ~ o n c e, ~ t h e ~}$ Vulgate is more precise.
30 baec eo loquuto таũta हỉmóvtos aủtoũ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by א A B and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti rendered this as cum ipse bec dixisset.

30 surrexit àvéotך ("exurrexit" Vg.). See on Act. 23,9.
30 ac kai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. This change was also made by Manetti.
31 inter se mpòs ờ $\lambda \lambda$ ŋ́ $\lambda$ ous ("ad inuicem" Vg.). See on Iob. 4,33.
31 dicentes $\lambda \varepsilon ́ y o u t e s$ őtı ("dicentes: quia" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put dicentes quod.
 Vulgate reflects the addition of $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$, as in $37^{74} \aleph$ A and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by cod. B and most later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti similarly omitted quid.

31 facit $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \varepsilon ı ~(" f e c i t " ~ V g.) . ~ E r a s m u s ' ~ r e n-~$ dering of the present tense is more accurate. Manetti substituted operatus est.
32 'A үрітттas ... oũtos. This section was omitted in cod. $2815^{*}$ by the error of homoeoteleuton, but was later restored in the lower margin, in a hand resembling that of Erasmus, corresponding with the text of codd. 1 and 2816. This marginal note was damaged during rebinding.
32 єттєкє́к $\lambda \eta$ то. The reading étiкє́к $\lambda \eta$ то in 1516 may have been derived from codd. 1 and 2816, with support from cod. A and a few later mss. This spelling could also have been affected by a difficulty in deciphering cod. 2815, in which the second $-\varepsilon$ - is blotted.
27,1 Postquam ' $\Omega$ s ("Vt" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,9.

1 decretum est '̇kpiOn ("iudicatum est" Vg.). See on Act. 15,19 (under censeo). See also Annot.
1 vt nos nauigaremus toũ ớтотт入غĩ $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \tilde{\alpha} s$ ("nauigare eum" late Vg.; "nobis nauigare" 1516). See on $I o b .1,33$, for avoidance of the infinitive. The Vulgate's change of pronoun is unsupported by Greek mss. In this and several other particulars in this verse, the Vulgate appears to reflect a different textual tradition. Manetti put nos ... nauigare.
1 tradiderunt et Paulum $\pi \alpha p \varepsilon \delta i ́ \delta o u v$ tóv $\tau \varepsilon$ Пaũ $\lambda o v$ ("et tradi Paulum" Vg.). The Vulgate rendering would suggest the substitution of
 found in any mss. Manetti had Paulum ... tradiderunt.
1 et quosdam alios vinctos kaí Tıvas ėtépous $\delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \omega ่ \tau \alpha s$ ("cum reliquis custodiis" Vg.; "et quosdam alios carcerarios" 1516). In another departure from the usual Greek text, the Vulgate leaves tivas untranslated. See Annot. The rendering adopted by Erasmus in 1519 was exactly what had been recommended in Valla Annot. The substitution of carcerarius in 1516, and vinctus in 1519 , also occurs at vs. 42 . The use of custodia for "prisoner" is not found in the earlier Latin authors. This was rendered quosdamque alios vinctos by Manetti.
2 Conscensa autem naue émißávtes $\delta \dot{\text { è }} \pi \lambda$ oí $\omega$ ("ascendentes autem nauem" Vg.). Greek aorist. On conscendo, see on Iob. 6,17. Manetti put Nauem vero ... ascendentes.
2 Adramyttina Aठpauvtтıvஸ̃ ("Adrumetinam" late Vg.). This Greek spelling was taken from cod. 2816. Several variations exist among the
 many other late mss.; $\alpha \delta \rho \alpha \mu v \tau ו \nu \tilde{\varphi}$ is found in cod. 3, and $\alpha \delta \rho \alpha \mu \mu \cup \tau \eta \nu \tilde{~ i n ~ c o d . ~ 1, ~ b u t ~ m o s t ~}$ have $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \mu u \tau t \eta v \underset{\sim}{c}$. See Annot. The spelling $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \rho \propto \mu \cup \pi \tau เ v \tilde{\sim}$ in 1519 was probably a misprint, caused by misreading the previous edition of 1516. Manetti's version had Atramitinam.

2 nauigaturi $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda$ оvtes $\pi \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ \nu$ ("incipientes nauigare" late Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,47. Manetti substituted vt nauigaremus.
 ("circa Asiae loca" Vg.; "ad loca Asiae" 1516). In cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss., there is no preposition between $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \pi v^{2}$ and toús, producing what is undoubtedly a lectio difficilior. In a few mss., commencing with ( $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{74}$ ) \& A B, eis is inserted
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soluimus, perseuerante nobiscum Aristarcho Macedone Thessalonicensi. ${ }^{3}$ Sequenti autem die appulimus Sidonem. Et Iulius humaniter tractato Paulo, permisit vt ad amicos profectus, ab illis curaretur. ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Et}$ inde quum soluissemus, subnauigauimus iuxta Cyprum, propterea quod essent venti contrarii. ${ }^{5}$ Et pelagus quod est contra Ciliciam et Pamphyliam, emensi, peruenimus Myram, quae est Lyciae. ${ }^{6}$ Et ibi nactus centurio nauem Alexandrinam, nauigantem in Italiam, imposuit nos in eam. ${ }^{7}$ Et quum multis diebus tarde nauigaremus, vixque deuenissemus contra Gnidum, prohibente nos vento, adnauigauimus Cretae iuxta Salmonem. ${ }^{8}$ Et vix praeterlegentes illam, peruenimus in locum quendam qui vocatur Pulchri Portus, cui vicina erat ciuitas Lasaea.
${ }^{9}$ Multo autem tempore peracto, et quum iam esset periculosa nauigatio,

## 7 ßpaбuтinoouvtes A-C: $\beta$ paбitinoouvtes D E $\mid 9$ ovtos A B D E: outos C

4 iuxta $B-E$ : om. $A \mid 5$ quod ... Pamphyliam B-E: Ciliciae et Pamphyliae $A \mid$ emensi $A^{c} B-E$ : emersi $A^{*} \mid 6$ nactus $B-E$ : inueniens $A \mid$ imposuit $C$ - $E$ : transposuit $A B \mid 7$ vixque $B-E$ : et vix $A \mid$ Salmonem $A C-E$ (Salmonē $A$ ): Salmonen $B \mid 9$ iam esset periculosa $E$ : iam non esset tuta $A$, esset iam periculosa $B-D$
before toús, corresponding with the interpretation preferred by Erasmus in 1516. His changed rendering in 1519 treats $\pi \lambda \lambda$ eiv as the equivalent
 "past" or "beside" a place. However, the latter interpretation is undermined by the fact that in vs. 6 the ship does not merely sail along the coast of Asia Minor, but puts into port. The insertion of $\varepsilon$ is could be seen as an early scribal attempt to alleviate what was thought to be a grammatical difficulty. Manetti put per loca Asie.
 mus similarly substitutes soluo for tollo in rendering $\dot{\alpha} v \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$ at vss. 4 and 21 , and ailp $\omega$ at vs. 13. See on Act. 13,13. Manetti had deducti sumus.

3 appulimus катт́X $\cap \eta \mu \in \nu$ ("venimus" late Vg.). See on Iob. 6,21, regarding appello. Manetti put nauigauimus.
3 Et Iulius bumaniter tractato Paulo pi $\lambda \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega$ -
 ("Humane autem tractans Iulius Paulum" Vg.). Greek aorist. The substitution of et for autem is more accurate. Both bumane and bumaniter occur in classical usage, with a similar meaning, though bumaniter was the more 'Ciceronian' of the two. Manetti's version was Cum autem Iulius Paulum bumane tractaret.
3 vt ... profectus, ab illis curaretur порєuӨ'́vта,
 Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33, for avoidance of infinitives. For proficiscor, see on Act. 16,7; 20,22. The

Vulgate expression curam sui agere, "to take care of himself" does not convey the required sense, which is to obtain hospitality from others. Manetti (Pal. Lat. 45) put vt ... proficisceretur, et curam sui ageret.
4 quum soluissemus ảvox $\begin{aligned} & \text { éveres ("cum sustu- }\end{aligned}$ lissemus" Vg.). See on Act. 13,13. Manetti substituted delati.
4 subnauigauimus iuxta Cyprum Úтєєтגєט́бauєv тìv Kúmpov ("subnauigauimus Cyprum" 1516 $=$ late Vg.). Erasmus perhaps wished to avoid the unwanted, and absurd, implication that the ship literally sailed "underneath" Cyprus: cf. his substitution of praeternauigare for transnauigare at Act. 20,16, and Annot. ad loc. The word subnauigo is a literal rendering of the Greek verb, but it does not occur in classical literature.
5 quod est contra Ciliciam et Pamphyliam tò
 et Pamphyliae" 1516 Lat. $=$ Vg.). Erasmus' rendering is consistent with Vulgate usage in vs. 7, contra Gnidum. Cf. contra for ớvtikpú at Act. 20,15. Manetti followed the Vulgate, except that he replaced $a t$ by $a c$.
5 emensi $\delta 1 \propto \pi \lambda \lambda \cup \cup^{\sigma} \alpha \cup \tau \varepsilon s$ ("nauigantes" Vg.). Greek aorist. For Erasmus' treatment of nauigo, see on Act. 13,13; 14,26; 18,18. He may also have objected to giving this verb a transitive sense, on the grounds that it was not used in this way in the earlier prose authors.
5 peruenimus $\kappa \alpha ד \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ("venimus" Vg.). On peruenio, see on Act. 8,5. In Annot., Erasmus suggested deuenimus, borrowing from Valla Annot. The version of Manetti put delati sumus, probably reflecting the substitution of $\kappa \propto \tau \eta \chi^{\theta} \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu$, as found in many late mss.
5 Myram eis Múpo ("Lystram" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of $\wedge \dot{\prime} \sigma \tau p \alpha v$ for Múpa, as in 7 $^{74}$ (A). Cod. B has the incorrect spelling, Múppa. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, together with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss., also corresponding with the Greek text cited in Valla Annot. See also Erasmus Annot., and the Peregrinatio, where he suggests that Lystram is a scribal corruption. The same change was made by Manetti.
6 nactus $\varepsilon$ úp $\omega$ ("inueniens" $1516=V g$.). Greek aorist. On nanciscor, see on Iob. 12,14. Manetti put cum ... inuenisset.
$6{ }^{\text {A }} \mathrm{A} \lambda_{\varepsilon \xi} \alpha_{v} \delta$ pivov. This spelling is in accordance with cod. 2816 and most other mss.

In codd. 1 and 2815 was the less correct $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \xi \alpha \nu \delta \rho \tilde{\eta} v o v$.
6 imposuit $\varepsilon v \in \beta$ ßißacev ("transposuit" 1516-19 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). This is comparable with the Vulgate
 10,$34 ; 19,35 ;$ Act. 23,24. More frequently, impono is used for $\varepsilon \pi \pi ı \tau i \theta \eta \mu \mathrm{l}$. Manetti had just posuit.
$7 \beta p \alpha \delta \cup \pi \lambda<0 u ̃ v t e s$. The spelling $\beta p \alpha \delta!\pi \lambda 0-$ OŨvTES in $1527-35$ is probably only a printer's error.
7 vixque кà $\mu \dot{\text { ólıss ("et vix" } 1516=V g \text {.). See }}$ on Ioh. 1,39. Manetti put ac vix.
7 тробєడ̃ขтоऽ. The Erasmian text here follows codd. 1 and 2816, correcting another misspelling found in cod. 2815, тробі $\tilde{\nu}$ тоя.
$7 \Sigma \alpha \lambda \mu \omega \nu \eta \nu$. This spelling is derived from cod. 1, as codd. 2815 and 2816 both have $\sigma \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \omega \dot{\nu} \nu$.
8 praeterlegentes $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu O l$ ("iuxta nauigantes" Vg.). Cf. the substitution of praeterlego for lego at vs. 13 , rendering the same Greek verb. However, unlike lego, which occurs in classical usage in the sense of sailing along a coast, the verb praterlego does not exist in classical Latin. Erasmus may have wished to avoid using lego in such a context because of possible confusion with its more common meaning, to "read".
8 peruenimus $\eta \lambda \lambda 0 \mu \varepsilon v$ ("venimus" $V g$.). This is the only passage where Erasmus puts peruenio for épXoual, and it would have been preferable if he had left venio unaltered. For his occasional use of peruenio for котє́рхои๙, тараүіроиаı and katavtó́w, see on Act. 8,5; 20,18; 26,7, respectively.
8 Pulcbri Portus K $\alpha \lambda$ oùs $\Lambda_{ı} \mu \varepsilon ́ v a s$ ("Boniportus" Vg.). The substitution of pulcher for bonus, in rendering ка入ós, also occurs at Mt. 13,45 (1519); Lc. 21,5, in the sense of "beautiful". See Annot. on Mt. 13,45 and on the present passage. The word pulcher nowhere occurs in the Vulgate N.T., though it often appears in O.T. usage.

8 vicina é $\gamma \gamma$ ús ("iuxta" Vg.). See on Act. 9,38.
8 Lasaea ^aбoxía ("Thalassa" Vg.). The Vulgate reading is unsupported by Greek mss., of which the nearest variant is 'A入 $\alpha \sigma \sigma \sigma$, found only in cod. A. See Annot. This passage was assigned by Erasmus to the Loca Manifeste Deprauata. Manetti's version (both mss.) had Lasca, probably by an error of transcription.
 $\lambda o u ̃ s ~(" c u m ~ i a m ~ n o n ~ e s s e t ~ t u t a " ~ 1516=V g . ; ~ ;$
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quod iam ieiunii quoque tempus prae－ terisset，admonebat eos Paulus，${ }^{10}$ dicens eis：Viri，video quod cum iniuria multo－ que damno，non solum oneris et na－ uis，sed etiam animarum nostrarum futura sit nauigatio．${ }^{11}$ Centurio autem gubernatori et nauclero magis credebat， quam his quae a Paulo dicebantur． ${ }^{12}$ Et quum aptus portus non esset ad hybernandum，complures ceperunt con－ silium soluendi illinc，si quo modo possent peruecti Phoenicen illic hy－ bernare．Is est portus Cretae spectans ad africum et ad chorum．${ }^{13}$ Aspirante autem austro，rati se propositi com－ potes，quum soluissent Asson，prae－ terlegebant Cretam．${ }^{14}$ Verum haud multo post \｜coortus est contra ipsam

12 avax $\theta \eta \operatorname{lon} A B D E: \alpha v a x \theta \eta \nu \alpha C$
9 quod ．．．praeterisset $E$ ：etiam quod ieiunium iam praterisset $A$ ，ob id quoque quod iam viltra tempus sustinuissent inediam $B-D \mid 10$ multoque $B-E$ ：et multo $A \mid 12$ hybernandum $B-E$ ： hyemandum $A \mid$ ceperunt $B-E$ ：statuerunt $A \mid$ Phoenicen $A C E$（Phoenicē）：Phoenicem $B \mid$ hybernare $B-E$ ：hyemare $A \mid 14$ Verum ．．．est $B-E$ ：Non post multum autem misit se $A$
＂cum esset iam periculosa＂1519－27）．Erasmus is closer to the form of the Greek expression． This change was anticipated by Manetti，who put cum iam periculosa esset．
9 quod iam ieiunii quoque tempus prateteriset $\delta 1 \dot{\alpha}$
 quod ieiunium iam praeterisset＂late Vg ．；＂etiam quod ieiunium iam praeterisset＂ 1516 ；＂ob id quoque quod iam vltra tempus sustinuissent inediam＂1519－27）．The late Vulgate rendering corresponds with the omission of kai by cod． 1 and a few other late mss．In 1535 Annot．， Erasmus retracts his earlier interpretation，and argues that $\nu \eta \sigma \pi$ elo refers to a particular season of the year，rather than that the sailors and passengers were hungry through fasting．

9 admonebat eos Tapinvel（＂consolabatur eos＂ late Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus also recommends using hortor，a suggestion which he puts into practice in his rendering of the same Greek verb at vs．22．Elsewhere，he uses admoneo for

reserves consolor for $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu v \theta$ éoual and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ $k \propto \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ ．The rendering admonebat was tacitly borrowed from Valla Annot．
10 quod ．．．futura sit nauigatio ÓTı ．．．$\mu^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \in \mathfrak{L v}$
 nauigatio＂${ }^{\text {Vg．}}$ ．）See on Iob．1，20 regarding the use of quod，and on Iob．4，47 for the removal of incipio．See also Annot．Less literally，Valla Annot．made use of the construction fore vt ．．． nauigetur，omitting quoniam，while Manetti sub－ stituted quod ．．．nauigaturi sumus．
10 multoque kai то入入ग̃ラ（＂et multo＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{V}$ g．）．See on Iob．1，39 regarding que．Valla Annot．proposed replacing iniuria et multo damno with iactura et magno detrimento．Manetti changed et multo to ac multo．
10 фóptov．Erasmus took this spelling from cod． 2815 ，supported by cod． 2816 and relatively few other late mss．In cod． 1 and most other mss．，it is poptiou，as in Valla Annot．
11 EkcróvtapXos．This form of the word was derived from cod．2815，supported by
cod． 2816 and many other late mss．Most mss． have ékotovt $\alpha$ pXIS，as in cod． 1.
12 bybernandum ．．．bybernare тарахєєцабíav ．．．тарахєıй́⿱宀八九（＂hyemandum ．．．hyemare＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The same substitution of byberno occurs at 1 Cor．16，6（1519）and Tit．3，12．At Act．28，11，Erasmus retains hyemo．Both verbs have a solid classical pedigree．In Annot．on 1 Cor．16，6，Erasmus argues at length that hyemo sometimes has the connotation of enduring a harsh winter climate，though he accepts that it can also be used synonymously with byberno．
12 complures of $\pi \lambda$ sious（＂plurimi＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus is more accurate here．A similar substitution occurs at Act．28，23．See also on Act．1，3．Other instances of removing an unwanted superlative are found at Iob． 15,$8 ;$ Act．15，32．Manetti had plures．
 consilium＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．Erasmus finds a more idiomatic expression，which he also uses at $M t$ ． 12,$14 ; 22,15$ in rendering $\sigma v \mu \beta \circ \cup ̛ \lambda ı \nu \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \omega$ ． Manetti preferred consilium inierunt．
12 soluendi dvox $\begin{aligned} & \pi \\ & \nu \quad \text { van（＂nauigare＂Vg．）．See on }\end{aligned}$ Ioh． 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive．On soluo，see on Act．13，13．Manetti＇s rendering was $v t$ ．．．navigarent．
12 illinc кđ̊keî̀ev（＂inde＂Vg．）．Erasmus fre－ quently removes inde in the synoptic Gospels： all twelve occurrences in Matthew，six out of eight in Mark，and three out of five in Luke， almost always substituting illinc．The Vulgate here reflects a Greek variant，substituting ékễ̂ev
 and some later mss．，including cod． 2816. Erasmus＇Greek text follows cod．2815，together with cod． 1 and most other late mss．Manetti substituted exinde．
 Greek aorist．For Erasmus＇treatment of this Greek verb elsewhere，see on Act．26，7．This is the only instance of peruebo in his N．T．：cf．on
 had profecti．
12 illic（Vg．omits）．Erasmus adds this adverb by way of explanation．
12 Is est portus $\lambda_{1} \mu \dot{́ v} \boldsymbol{v} \alpha$（＂portum＂Vg．）．Erasmus begins a new sentence，for greater simplicity．
12 spectans $\beta \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \mathbf{T} \mathbf{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha$（＂respicientem＂$V \mathrm{~g}$ ．）．Else－ where，Erasmus uses specto for $\theta$ exoural at $M t$ ． 6，1；23，5（1519），and for $\theta \in \omega \rho \in \omega$ at Mt．27，55； Mc．12，41；15，40，47，in accordance with Vulgate
usage at $L c .23,35$ ．For topographical purposes， specto is more widespread in classical usage than respicio．For Erasmus＇treatment of respicio at other passages，see on Iob．1，36．
13 rati סó̧avtes（＂aestimantes＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．The verb reor occurs only once elsewhere， at $L$ c． 2,44 （1519），as a substitute for existimo． On other substitutions for aestimo，see on Act． 2，15．Manetti put existimantes．
13 se propositi compotes Tフ̃s $\pi \rho 00$ É $\sigma \in \omega \varsigma$ кekpartn－ kévaı（＂propositum se tenere＂Vg．）．Erasmus offers a more appropriate rendering，having regard to the context．The construction with compos is analogous with the classical idiom compos voti，meaning to be granted the fulfilment of one＇s wish or prayer：see Valla Elegantiae III， 34.
13 soluisent äpavtes（＂sustulissent＂Vg．）．Cf． on vs．2．The Greek verb does not occur in this sense elsewhere in the N．T．
13 Asson＂A $\sigma \sigma o v$（＂de Asson＂Vg．）．In Annot．， Erasmus argues that Assos was the destination rather than the point of departure：cf．Act． $20,13,14$ ．However，owing to the absence of any preposition in the Greek text，others have taken the word to be $\alpha \sigma \sigma o v$ ，a comparative adverb meaning＂nearer＂．Manetti similarly omitted de．
13 praeterlegebant $\pi \alpha \rho \overline{ } \lambda^{\prime} \dot{y} \gamma \mathbf{\circ}$ тo（＂legebant＂ $\mathrm{Vg}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ．）． See on vs． 8.
14 Verum baud multo post $\mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime}$ où mo入̀ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ （＂Non post multum autem＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．24，18，concerning baud．Erasmus＇use of multo post is comparable with his substitution of paulo post for post pusillum at Mc．14，70， though he retains post multum at $M t .25,19$ ，and post pusillum at Mt．26，73；Lc．22，58．It may be thought that he wished to avoid the postpone－ ment of autem so late as fourth word in the sentence．However，he retains non pro eis autem at Iob．17，20，and non pro nostris autem at 1 Iob． 2，2，and further substitutes non scriptum est autem at Rom． 4,23 ，and ob id ipsum autem at Phil．2，18（1519）．Manetti＇s solution was Non autem post multum．
 On coorior，see on Iob．1，17．The use of this verb is less accurate，though it suits the context， whereas the reflexive expression，misit se，is more appropriate to a human subject，as at Iob． 21，7．At Mt．4，6（1519），Erasmus substitutes the more vivid praecipita to for mitte te．Regarding
äveuos tupmviкós, ó ка入оúnevos Eủpo-




















ventus typhonicus, qui vocatur Euroaquilo. ${ }^{15}$ Quumque correpta esset nauis, nec posset obniti vento, data naue flatibus, ferebamur. ${ }^{16} \mathrm{In}$ insulam autem quandam deuecti, quae vocatur Clauda, vix potuimus obtinere scapham. ${ }^{17}$ Qua sublata adiutoriis vtebantur, subcingentes nauem: timentes ne in Syrtim inciderent, demisso vase, sic ferebantur. ${ }^{18}$ Quum autem vehementi tempestate iactaremur, sequenti die iactum fecerunt, ${ }^{19}$ ac tertio die nostris manibus armamenta nauis proiecimus. ${ }^{20}$ Porro neque sole neque syderibus apparentibus ad complures dies, et tempestate non exigua imminente, iam ablata erat spes omnis salutis nostrae. ${ }^{21}$ Quum autem multa iam esset inedia, tunc stans Paulus in medio eorum, dixit: Oportebat quidem, o viri, audito me non soluere a Creta,

## 

15 nec $B$-E: et non $A \mid$ obniti vento $B$-E: conari in ventum $A \mid 16$ insulam $E$ insululam $A-D \mid 17$ demisso $B-E$ : summisso $A \mid 19$ ac tertio $B-E$ et tertia $A \mid$ nostris $B$-E: suis $A$ | proiecimus $B$-E: proiecerunt $A \mid 21$ Quum autem $B-E$ (Cum autem $B-D)$ : Et cum $A$
his avoidance of mitto for other instances of $\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$, see on Iob. 3,24. Manetti substituted se ... immisit.

14 Euroaquilo Eủpok入úס $\omega v$. In Annot., Erasmus poses the question whether the text might originally have been Eúpookú̀ $\lambda \omega$, corresponding with the Vulgate wording. A similar variant, Eupakú $\lambda \omega v$, is found in $\boldsymbol{7}^{74}{ }^{*} A^{*}$, but not in any of the later mss. In cod. B ${ }^{\text {corr, this }}$ becomes Eùjuvk $\lambda \dot{\prime} \delta \omega v$. Erasmus' Greek text follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and about 460 other late mss. (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 665-8). Manetti transliterated the Greek word as Euroclydon.
15 correpta ouvaptaotévtos ("arrepta" Vg.). See on Act. 6,12.
15 nec kai $\mu \mathfrak{\prime}$ ("et non" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on loh. 2,16. Manetti had ac ... non.
 nari in ventum" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus finds a more idiomatic rendering. The verb obnitor does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. He retains conor for тєıрá̧ $\omega$ at Act. 24,6. In Annot., he also suggests renitor. Manetti put resistere ... vento.
16 In insulam vnoiov ("In insululam" 151627). In 1516-27, the use of the diminutive form was more precise, but in 1535 Erasmus restored the Vulgate spelling, perhaps recognising that insulula does not occur in classical Latin.
16 deuecti ப́тобрацо́vтеs ("decurrentes" Vg.). Greek aorist. Like peruebo in vs. 12, deuebo occurs nowhere else in Erasmus' N.T. His choice of verb on this occasion is not entirely appropriate, as $\dot{\text { Un}} \boldsymbol{\pi o t p e ́ X} \boldsymbol{X}$ means to run past or below, rather than to come to land. An
alternative would have been to replace in insulam deucti by insulam praeteructi，comparable with the use of praeternauigare at Act．20，16．
16 Clauda K入aúס $\eta v$（＂Cauda＂Vg．）．The Vul－ gate reflects a Greek variant，K $\alpha$ ü $\delta \alpha$ ，found in $37^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{B}$ and one later ms．The reading of cod．B is explicitly noted in 1535 Annot， based on information which was no doubt furnished to Erasmus by Sepulveda in 1533－4： cf．Ep．2873．A few other mss．，commencing with codd． $\boldsymbol{K}^{*} \mathrm{~A}^{\text {rid }}$ ，have K $\lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \delta \alpha$ ．Erasmus adhered to the reading of cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss． Manetti also had Clauda．
 vix＂Vg．）．The Vulgate word－order corresponds with the Greek variant $i^{\sigma} \chi \dot{\cup} \sigma \sigma \mu \in v ~ \mu \dot{\partial} \lambda i s$ ，found in $20^{74} \mathrm{KAB}$ and a few later mss．Erasmus again follows cod． 2815 and most later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti changed the sense of the clause by putting vix in scapha contineri potuimus．
$17 \beta$ on $\theta$ eiols．The reading $\beta$ on $\theta$ siós in 1535 is supported by a few late mss．，but it seems more likely to be a printer＇s error．Most other N．T． instances of Xpáoual are accompanied by the dative case．

17 subcingentes ن́to弓んんvvúvtes（＂accingentes＂ Vg．）．Erasmus uses a verb which more closely resembles the Greek word，though in classical usage sucingo does not seem to be found in the technical sense required by the present context， i．e．to＂undergird＂．The spelling ímo弓んuvivtes in $1522-35$ is probably only a printer＇s error： cf．kekpuyévos at Ioh．19，38（1522 only），and
 a doubled consonant has in the same way been incorrectly reduced to a single letter．In 1516－
 from cod． 2815 in company with most other mss．Manetti made a similar change，putting succingentes．
17 demisso X $\alpha \lambda$ áo $\alpha v \tau e s ~(" s u m m i s s o " ~ 1516 ~$ $=\mathrm{Vg}$.$) ．In translating the same Greek verb，$ Erasmus makes this substitution at $M c .2,4$ ，and similarly puts demitto for mitto at Act．27，30 （1522）．He also puts demitto for submitto in rendering к $\alpha \theta$ in $\mu$ at $L c .5,19$（1519），and in rendering $\beta \circ \lambda i \zeta \omega$ at Act． 27,28 （1519）．Cf．on Act．6，11，regarding ن́то入 $\alpha \mu \beta \dot{v} v \omega$ ．
18 Quum autem vebementi tempestate iactaremur

autem nobis tempestate iactatis＂late Vg．）． Erasmus uses the imperfect subjunctive to convey the continuous sense of the Greek present participle．His substitution of vebe－ mens is comparable with his replacement of valde by vehementer in rendering $\sigma \varphi \dot{o ́}^{\circ} \rho \alpha$ at Mt．17，6； 26,22 （1519），in accordance with Vulgate usage at Mt．17，23；Ap．Iob．16，21；and in rendering $\lambda i \alpha \nu$ at Mt．2，16； 2 Tim．4，15， following Vulgate usage at Mt．27，14．How－ ever，Erasmus retains ventus validus for âvenos ígxupòs at Mt．14，30，and valde for $\sigma \varphi o ́ \delta p \alpha$ at seven passages．
19 ac кai（＂et＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Ioh． 1,25 ． The same change was made by Manetti．
19 tertio die $\boldsymbol{T}$ ñ трítn（＂tertia die＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． See on Iob．1，29．
19 nostris manibus ．．．proiecimus aútóxelpes ．．． Éppiq๙uev（＂suis manibus ．．．proiecerunt＂ 1516 Lat．$=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．As pointed out in Annot．，the Vulgate is based on a Greek text which substi－ tutes Éppiyav for Éepi ${ }^{3} 3^{7 v i d i d}$ A B C and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，in company with codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．Manetti＇s version was propriis manibus ．．．proiecimus．
 autem sole＂late Vg．）．Erasmus prefers a con－ tinuative sense for $\delta$ É，in the present context． Manetti put neque sole vero．
20 ad $\begin{gathered}\text { èit } \\ \text {（＂per＂Vg．）．The construction ad dies }\end{gathered}$ is not common in Erasmus＇N．T．，occurring
 12，10（тро̀s díyas ìmépas）．
20 complures $\pi \lambda$ eiovas（＂plures＂Vg．）．See on Act．1，3．
21 Quum autem multa iam esset inedia то $\lambda \lambda$ ग̃s סé àortías úmapxoúons（＂Et cum multa ieiuna－ tio fuisset＂ $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ．；＂Et cum multa iam esset inedia＂1516）．This time，in contrast with vs． 20 ，Erasmus decides that $\delta \varepsilon \varepsilon$ has an adversative sense．His substitution of iam esset is more in keeping with the present tense of the Greek participle．See on Act．14，3，for Erasmus＇removal of ieiunatio for $\nu \eta \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ ía．He does not elsewhere use inedia except at $A$ ct． 27,9 in 1519－27：see ad loc．See also Annot．The version of Manetti had Vebementi autem fame existente．
21 soluere àvóy $\varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha 1$（＂tollere＂Vg．）．See on vs．2，and Annot．In Valla Annot．，the suggested rendering was proficisci．Manetti replaced non tollere by $n e$ ．．．nauigassetis．





 Mウ̀ фоßоũ, Паũ $\lambda \varepsilon$, K $\alpha i \sigma \alpha \rho i ́ \sigma \varepsilon ~ \delta \varepsilon i ̃ ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-~$
 Tส̛́vtas toùs $\pi \lambda$ ह́ovtas $\mu \varepsilon T \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma 0 u ̃ .{ }^{25} \delta 1 o ̀$
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nec accersere nobis iniuriam hanc et iacturam. ${ }^{22}$ Et nunc hortor, vt bono animo sitis. Iactura enim animae nulla erit ex vobis, sed tantum nauis. ${ }^{23}$ Astitit enim mihi hac nocte angelus dei cuius sum ego, quem et colo, ${ }^{24}$ dicens: Ne timeas Paule, Caesari te oportet sisti. Et ecce donauit tibi deus omnes qui nauigant tecum. ${ }^{25}$ Propter quod bono animo estote viri. Credo enim deo quod sic erit quemadmodum dictum est mihi. ${ }^{26}$ In insulam autem quandam oportet nos eiici.
${ }^{27}$ Sed posteaquam quartadecima nox superuenit, nauigantibus nobis in Adria circa medium noctis, suspicabantur nautae apparere sibi aliquam regionem: ${ }^{28}$ qui et demissa bolide repererunt passus viginti, ac pusillum inde digressi, rursumque demissa bolide repererunt passus quindecim: ${ }^{29}$ timentesque ne in aspera loca inciderent, de puppi iactis ancoris quatuor, optabant diem oriri. ${ }^{30}$ Nautis vero quaerentibus fugere
 opyuas $A B$

21 nec accersere nobis $B-E$ : at lucrifacere $A \mid 22$ lactura $B-E$ : Amissio $A \mid$ vobis, sed tantum $B-E$ : nobis, praeterquam $A \mid 23$ quem et colo $B-E$ : et cui seruio $A \mid 27$ Adria $B-E$ : Hadria $A \mid$ 28 demissa $B$ - $E$ : summissa $A \mid$ prius repererunt $B-E$ : reppererunt $A \mid$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ rursumque demissa $B-E$ : et rursum iacta $A \mid$ alt. repererunt $B-E$ : inuenerunt $A \mid 29$ oriri $B$ - $E$ : fieri $A$

21 nec accersere nobis кEp $\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha i$ TE ("lucrique facere" Vg.; "at lucrifacere" 1516). Erasmus elsewhere retains lucrifacio and lucri facio at 1 Cor. 9,19-22; Pbil. 3,8; Iac. 4,13 (lucrum facio); 1 Petr. 3,1, that is, for all instances of керסaiva in the Epistles. At the present passage, he probably wished to avoid the apparent contradiction of winning or profiting by adverse circumstances: cf. Annot. See also on Act. 4,18. In Manetti's version, this was rendered as atque ... lucrati fuissemus.
22 bortor mapaivẽ ("suadeo" Vg.). See on vs. 9 for $\pi \alpha p \alpha v \varepsilon \in \omega$. In rendering $\pi \alpha p a k \alpha-$ $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using
bortor at Act. 11,23, and further substitutes hortor for rogo at Act. 27,33-4; 1 Cor. 16,12; and for obsecro at Eph. 4,1. He reserves suadeo for $\pi \varepsilon \theta \omega$, ${ }^{\alpha} v \alpha \pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$, and $\sigma u \mu \beta o u \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \omega$. See also Annot. The same substitution was made by Manetti.

22 vt bono animo sitis úhã̃s घủӨuमeĩv ("vobis, bono animo esse" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive. Since Erasmus attaches $\dot{U} \mu \tilde{\sim} S$ to $\varepsilon \cup \cup Ө u \mu \varepsilon ́ \omega$, the Greek pronoun does not need to be separately translated as it is included in sitis, whereas the Vulgate attaches úlỡs to the preceding verb, mapaıvé $\omega$. Manetti anticipated this change.

22 Iactura व́ттоßо入ŋ́（＂Amissio＂ $1516=V g$ ．）． This substitution removes the distinction of meaning between $\alpha$ बтоßо $\lambda_{\eta}$ and $\zeta \eta \mu i \alpha$, which was rendered by iactura at the end of the previous verse．A better solution would have been to render $\zeta \eta \mu i \alpha$ in vs． 21 by damnum，as at vs． 10.
22 animae nulla $\Psi \cup X \tilde{j} \varsigma o^{\prime} \delta \varepsilon \mu i ́ \alpha$（＂nullius ani－ mae＂Vg．）．In the Vulgate rendering，oúס $\varepsilon \mu i \alpha$ ， nominative，has been treated as oú $\delta \varepsilon \mu i \alpha \varsigma$ ，geni－
 However，oúdenios is found in only a few late mss．Manetti had Nulla ．．．anime．
22 vobis $\dot{u} \mu \omega ̃ \nu$（＂nobis＂ 1516 Lat．＝late Vg．）． The presence of nobis in some copies of the late Vulgate，including that of Froben in 1491， indicates that this is not merely a misprint of Erasmus＇ 1516 translation，although it lacks Greek ms．support．The Froben Vulgate of 1514 and the Vulgate column of Erasmus＇ 1527 N．T． have vobis．
22 sed tantum $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{ }$（＂praeterquam＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）． Erasmus perhaps objected to praeterquam，in this context，on the grounds that it could be understood as implying that the ship might ＂lose its life＂．Absurdities and obscurities of this kind，whether real or imagined，motivated many of the changes which Erasmus made in the Latin translation．
23 Tñ vUKTì Taútņ．This word－order was de－ rived from cod． 2815 （which also incorrectly had $v \cup K T \tilde{\eta}$ for $v U K T i)$ ，supported by only a few other late mss．In codd．1， 2816 and most other mss．，commencing with $\mathbf{7}^{74} \aleph$ A B C，the order is Toútnn Tñ̃ vukti．Erasmus＇poorly attested reading continued in the Textus Receptus，though without any effect on the meaning．
 Vg．；＂et cui seruio＂1516）．See on Act．7，42，and Annot．
24 sisti mapaбTñval（＂assistere＂Vg．）．Prob－ ably Erasmus wished to avoid the unwanted connotation that Paul would＂assist＂Caesar： cf．on Act．17，5（vrgentes）．On sisto，cf．also on Act．22，30．
25 quod（2nd．）ÖTı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．Manetti also made this change．
26 eiici غ̇ктєббモĩv（＂deuenire＂Vg．）．Erasmus finds a more vigorous word，better－suited to a ship being driven ashore by a storm，though at vs． 29 he follows the Vulgate in using incido for the same Greek verb．Manetti（both mss．）
put incedere here，possibly an error of tran－ scription for incidere．
27 medium noctis $\mu$ ह́бov Tñs vuktós（＂mediam noctem＂Vg．）．A similar substitution occurs at Mt．25，6（1519）；Mc．13，35，but Erasmus retains media nocte，etc．，at Lc． 11,$5 ;$ Act．16，25； $20,7$.
28 demissa bolide（1st．）ßо入ía $\alpha$ vtes（＂submitten－ tes bolidem＂late Vg．；＂summissa bolide＂1516）． Greek aorist．See on vs． 17 regarding demitto．
28 repererunt（twice）घũpov（＂inuenerunt ．．．in－ uenerunt＂Vg．；＂reppererunt ．．．inuenerunt＂ 1516）．See on Ioh．1，41．
28 ópyulás（twice）．The spelling ópyuós in 1516－19 has some late ms．support and may have been deliberate，but it was not sup－ ported by those mss．which Erasmus usually consulted．
$28 a c \delta$ ह́（＂et＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，25．
28 digressi $\delta ı \alpha \sigma T \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sim \tau e s(" s e p a r a t i " ~ V g.) . ~ S e e ~$ on Ioh． 12,36 for digredior．The verb separo does not have the meaning＂move away＂in classical Latin．
28 rursumque demissa bolide kai $\pi \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \nu$ ß० $\lambda i \sigma \alpha \nu-$ TEs（Vg．omits；＂et rursum iacta bolide＂1516）． The Vulgate omission is supported by only a few late mss．For the use of iacio in 1516， cf．Annot．，where deiicio is adopted in Erasmus＇ explanation of the Greek verb．The substitution of demitto in 1519 produces consistency with the first part of the verse．Manetti put ac bolide iterum submissa．
29 timentesque $甲 о$ ои́ú $\varepsilon$ voí $\mathbf{\tau \varepsilon}$（＂Timentes au－ tem＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a Greek variant， substituting $8 \dot{\varepsilon}$ for $\tau \varepsilon$ ，as in $\boldsymbol{P}^{74} \mathbf{N}$ and some later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．A B C and most of the later mss．， including codd． 1 and 2816．Manetti had et timentes．
29 inciderent ékाtéowalv（＂incideremus＂Vg．）． The Vulgate is based on a Greek text having Ék $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，found in 7 $^{74}$ A B C and most later mss．，including cod．2816．Cod．$\$$ has ép－ $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon v$ ．Erasmus follows cod．2815，this time supported by cod． 1 and relatively few other late mss．
29 iactis ancoris ṕiqovtes órүкúpas（＂mittentes ancoras＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．For the substitution of iacio，see on Ioh．3，24．Manetti＇s rendering was ancoris proiectis．
29 oriri $\gamma \varepsilon v \in ́ \sigma \theta \alpha l$（＂fieri＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．See on Iob．1，17．

 трผ́pas $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda$ óvtco $\alpha$ ảyкúpas èkтєiveiv,
























e naui, quum demisissent scapham in mare, sub praetextu velut e prora ancoras extensuri, ${ }^{31}$ dixit Paulus centurioni et militibus: Nisi hi in naui manserint, vos salui fieri non potestis. ${ }^{32}$ Tunc absciderunt milites funes scaphae, et passi sunt eam excidere. ${ }^{33} \mathrm{Et}$ quum dies inciperet apparere, hortabatur Paulus omnes sumere cibum, dicens: Dies hic decimus quartus est, quod expectantes | ieiuni permanetis, nihil accipientes: ${ }^{34}$ propter quod hortor vos, vt sumatis cibum: hoc enim ad salutem vestram pertinet: quia nullius vestrum capillus de capite cadet. ${ }^{35}$ Et quum haec dixisset, sumpto pane gratias egit deo in conspectu omnium, et quum fregisset, coepit edere. ${ }^{36}$ Porro animis iam recreatis omnium, sumpserunt et ipsi cibum. ${ }^{37}$ Eramus vero vniuersae animae in naui ducentae septuaginta sex. ${ }^{38}$ Et satiati cibo, alleuabant nauem, eiicientes triticum in mare. ${ }^{39}$ Quum autem dies esset, terram non agnoscebant: sinum vero quendam animaduerterunt, habentem littus:


30 prius e $B-E$ : de $A \mid$ demisissent $C$-E: submisissent $A B \mid 33$ prius dies $B-E$ : lux $A \mid$ apparere $B-E$ : fieri $A$ | Dies ... quod $B$-E: Quartodecimo die hodie $A$ | 34 vestram $B$ - $E$ : nostram $A$ | 35 edere $B-E$ : manducare $A \mid 36$ Porro ... ipsi $B-E$ : Animaequiores autem facti omnes, et ipsi sumpserunt $A \mid 38$ alleuabant $B$ - $E$ : alleuiabant $A \mid 39$ esset $B$ - $E$ : factus esset $A \mid$ littus $B E$ : litus $A C D$

30 e ék ("de" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15. Cf. further on praetexo at Ioh. 15,22. Manetti
30 quum demisissent $\chi \propto \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ v T \omega \nu$ ("cum misissent" Vg.; "cum submisissent" 1516-19). See on vs. 27.

30 sub practextu Tpo甲áवEı ("sub obtentu" Vg .). A similar substitution occurs at $M c .12,40$. The word praetextus does not occur in the Vulgate.
substituted occasione ... accepta.
30 velut $\dot{\omega}$ ("quasi" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,14.
30 eprora ancoras extensuri èk $\pi \rho \omega \dot{p} \alpha \varsigma^{\mu} \mu \lambda \lambda{ }^{2}{ }^{\circ} \nu-$
 ancoras extendere" late Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,47 for the removal of incipio. See also Annot. The
use of extensuri was also recommended in Valla Annot．The version of Manetti put a prora ．．． ancoras extenturi．
31 ध́котоито́ $\rho \chi \varphi$ ．Erasmus here follows cod． 2815，supported by only a few other late mss． In cod． 1 and most other mss．，it is ékoroutápx！ （the reading of cod． 2816 is indeterminate）．
 is more accurate here．See Annot．The same change was proposed by Valla Annot．and Manetti．
33 apparere $\gamma i v \in \sigma \theta \alpha ı$（＂fieri＂ $1516=V g$ ．）．Eras－ mus is less literal than the Vulgate，on this occasion，and renders according to the context． In Annot．，he also offered futurus esset，instaret， and non longe abesset as alternative renderings， or interpretations，of $\varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \nu \quad \gamma$ iveooarı．Valla Annot．preferred futura iam esset，while Manetti put futura erat．
33 bortabatur тарекव́ $\lambda \in i$（＂rogabat＂Vg．）．See on vs．22．This change was also made by Manetti．
33 Dies bic decimus quartus est；quod Teoбapeokol－
 hodie＂late Vg．；＂Quartodecimo die hodie＂ 1516）．On the gender of dies，see on Iob．1，29． Erasmus changes the construction，for the sake of clarity．Manetti substituted Quartandecimam diem bodie．
34 bortor $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \tilde{\omega}$（＂rogo＂Vg．）．See on vs． 22.
34 vt sumatis $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \pi \sim$（＂accipere＂Vg．）．See on Iob．1，33，for avoidance of the infinitive． In the previous verse，Erasmus retained the Vulgate distinction between accipio for mpoo－ $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ and sumo for $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ ．How－ ever，in this context，there is little difference of meaning between the two Greek verbs．The phrase sumo cibum is not without ambiguity， as in vss．33－4 it denotes the act of eating food， but in vs． 35 it refers only to taking the food into one＇s hands，prior to giving thanks for the food and eating it．Manetti put vt ．．． suscipiatis．
34 boc enim ad salutem vestram（nostram：1516） pertinet toũto yàp tipòs тĩ̃s Ú $\mu \mathrm{ETÉpas} \sigma \omega$－ tmpias ÚmápXEl（＂pro salute vestra＂Vg．）．The Vulgate omission has partial support from cod．1，which omits toũto $\gamma$ d́p．The use of nostram in 1516 is not based on any of Erasmus＇ usual mss．，which all have ú $_{\text {uEté }}(\alpha)$ rather than $\eta_{\dagger} \mu \in \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \propto \varsigma$ ，but both readings are widespread
within the Greek ms．tradition．Manetti＇s version was Hoc enim ad vestram salutem existit．
34 cadet $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon$ ĩtcal（＂peribit＂Vg．）．The Vulgate reflects a different Greek text，áттолєітаı，as in 27 $7^{74}$ A B C and a few later mss．Erasmus follows cod．2815，supported by codd．1， 2816 and most other late mss．This change was also made by Manetti．
35 sumpto pane kaì $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \dot{\sim}$ 人̃pтov（＂sumens panem＂Vg．）．Greek aorist．Manetti had assumpto pane．
35 edere દ̇ $\sigma \theta$ íııv（＂manducare＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．4，31．
36 Porro animis iam recreatis omnium eũもunot סè $\gamma \in \nu$ ónevoi tróvtes（＂Animaequiores autem facti omnes＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．In Annot．，Erasmus objects to the Vulgate use of a comparative adjective，and recommends bono animo as an alternative：for the latter phrase，see on Ioh． 16，33．He substitutes bono animo for animaequior in rendering $\theta \alpha \rho \sigma \in \in \omega$ at $M c .10,49$ ，but intro－ duces aequiore animo for eủӨuótepov at Act． 24，10．At Iac．5，13，he follows the Vulgate in using aequo animo for $\varepsilon \cup \cup \theta u \mu \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ．In Manetti＇s version，the present passage was rendered Omnes vero animosi facti．
36 sumpserunt et ipsi каì वủtoì трогє $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta$ оито （＂et ipsi sumpserunt＂ $1516=$ late Vg．）．The reading sumpserunt is found in some copies of the late Vulgate，such as the Sacon edition of 1513．However，the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514，as well as the 1527 Vulgate column， all have assumpserunt，as in the earlier Vulgate． Erasmus changes the word－order，so that the relationship of the ablative absolute construction with the main verb is made immediately clear． Manetti put et ipsi ．．．sumpserunt．
38 alleuabant Ėкoúøıケov（＂alleuiabant＂ 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The spelling adopted by Erasmus for this Latin verb is in accordance with classical usage．
38 eiicientes ék $\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda$ ónevol（＂iactantes＂Vg．）．Eras－ mus elsewhere retains iacto at two passages， where the sense is to throw violently，at Act． 22,$23 ; 27,18$ ．At the present passage，he wished to convey more precisely the sense of the Greek verb，as meaning＂throw out＂．
39 esset Ł́ý̇́veto（＂factus esset＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．See on Act．12，18．
39 animaduerterunt катevóouv（＂considerabant＂ Vg．）．See on Act．11，6．
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in quod cogitabant, si possent, impingere nauem. ${ }^{40} \mathrm{Et}$ quum ancoras sustulissent, committebant se mari: simul laxatis iuncturis gubernaculorum, et sublato artemone ad aurae flatum, tendebant ad littus. ${ }^{41}$ Et quum incidissent in locum bimarem, impegerunt nauem. Ac prora quidem infixa manebat immobilis: puppis vero soluebatur a vi vndarum. ${ }^{42}$ Militum autem consilium erat, vt vinctos occiderent, ne quis quum enatasset, effugeret. ${ }^{43}$ At centurio volens seruare Paulum, compescuit eos a consilio: iussitque vt qui possent natare, abiicerent se primos, et in terram euaderent: ${ }^{44}$ caeterique partim in tabulis, partim in quibusdam nauis fragmentis.

39 quod $B-E$ : quem $A \mid$ impingere $B-E$ : impellere $A \mid 40$ laxatis $B-E$ laxati $A \mid$ ad $B-E$ : secundum $A \mid$ littus $B E$ : litus $A C D \mid 41$ incidissent $B-E$ : incidissemus $A \mid \operatorname{Ac} B-E$ et $A \mid$ infixa $B-E$ : fixa $A \mid 42$ erat, vt $A B D E$ : eutrat $C \mid$ vinctos $B-E$ : carcerarios $A \mid 43$ At centurio $B-E$ : Centurio autem $A \mid$ vt qui possent natare $B-E$ : eos qui possent natare, vt $A \mid 44$ caeterique $B-E$ : vt et caeteri $A$

39 quod $8 v$ ("quem" 1516 = Vg.). Erasmus prefers to relate the following clause to littus (neuter) rather than sinum (masculine), though he acknowledges in Annot. that the Greek is ambiguous. Curiously, at Iob. 21,4; Act. 21,5; $27,39,40$, litus is found in 1516 , then changed to littus in 1519, changed back to litus in 1522-7, and changed yet again to littus in 1535, while littus remains in all five editions at $M t$. 13,2, 48. It appears that Erasmus' own view was that it should be littus, which he used consistently at all six passages in his more thoroughly revised 1519 edition, but that one of his assistants, or the printer, officiously reinstated litus four times in 1522.
39 impingere $\mathfrak{e} \xi \omega \tilde{\sigma} \alpha 1$ ("eiicere" Vg.; "impellere" 1516). The substitution of impingo is more accurate and idiomatic than the Vulgate rendering. However, it duplicates the use of impingo to represent a different Greek verb, $\bar{\xi}$ trok $\ell \lambda \lambda \omega$,
at vs. 41 (or $\boldsymbol{k \pi m} \kappa \in \lambda \lambda \omega$, as favoured by a few mss., including codd. \$ A B ${ }^{*} \mathrm{C}$, which have ETtékel $\AA \alpha v)$. Both mss. of Manetti's version have implere, which was probably a transcriptional error for impellere, the rendering adopted for Erasmus' 1516 edition.
40 laxatis iuncturis duvévtes ràs Цevktnpias ("laxantes iuncturas" Vg.; "laxati iuncturis" 1516). Greek aorist. Manetti tried vincula ... dimittentes.
40 sublato ह̇rápavtes ("leuato" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,35 (attollo), and Annot.
40 ad aurae flatum $\tau$ ñ $\pi v \in o v ́ \sigma n ̣$ ("secundum aurae flatum" $1516=$ late Vg .). In 1516 , Erasmus followed the Vulgate in attaching Tỹ̃ TVEOUOn to the following verb, kateĩ X ov, but from 1519 onwards, he relates the phrase to the preceding verb, $\epsilon \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho o v \tau \varepsilon s$, requiring a different rendering. See Annot.

41 incidissent тєрıтєбóvtes ("incidissemus" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). Erasmus more accurately casts this verb in the third-person plural, consistent with the following verb, impegerunt, as required by the Greek syntax.
41 bimarem $\delta_{1} \theta_{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma o v$ ("Bithalassum" Vg.). In Annot., Erasmus objects to the Vulgate rendering as being no more than a corrupted transliteration of the Greek word, suggesting that the original Vulgate wording was Dithalassum. He included this passage among the Loca Manifeste Deprauata. His choice of bimaris existed in classical usage, though mainly poetic (e.g. in Horace Carmina 1, 7, 2, as cited in Annot.), for a geographical feature such as the Isthmus of Corinth.
41 Ac kai ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25. The word was omitted by Manetti.
41 infixa êpeícaca ("fixa" 1516=Vg.). Erasmus finds a more emphatic word, suggesting that the prow of the ship had become embedded.
41 vndarum $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ кuнótт $\omega v$ ("maris" Vg.). The Vulgate seems to reflect a different Greek text, e.g. omitting $\tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ ku积 $\omega v$, as in codd. $\mathbf{N}^{*}$ A B and three later mss., perhaps owing to the scribal error of parablepsis. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with $\mathbf{7}^{74} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}$ and 475 later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816 (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 668-70). Manetti substituted flucturm.
42 erat É $\gamma$ éveto ("fuit" Vg.). Etasmus is less literal in rendering the Greek aorist by the imperfect tense.
42 vinctos toن̀s $\delta є \sigma \mu \omega \dot{T} \alpha$ ("custodias" Vg.; "carcerarios" 1516). See on vs. 1. Manetti made the same change.
42 סıaqúyol. Erasmus or his assistants took this reading from cod. 2816, supported by cod. 69 and relatively few other late mss. In codd. 1 and 2815, together with most other mss., it is $\delta \iota \alpha \varphi u ́ \gamma n$. Erasmus' variant remained in the Textus Receptus.
43 At centurio od $\delta$ É ÉkatóvtapXos ("Centurio autem" $1516=$ Vg. mss.; "centurio vero" late Vg.). The reading centurio autem is found in some copies of the late Vulgate, including the Froben edition of 1491, but his edition of 1514 and the Vulgate column of 1527 both have centurio vero. On at, see on Ioh. 1,26.
43 compescuit eos a consilio èkcìnvoev aủtoùs
 another instance of compesco, see on Act. 14,18.

On Erasmus' treatment of probibeo elsewhere, see on Act. 8,36 (vetat). In the present context, the use of compesco implies that the centurion did not content himself with issuing a command, but vigorously restrained his men from their intended course of action. The Vulgate omission of eos a consilio lacks Greek support. Manetti's rendering was ipsos $a b$ eo consilio prohibuit.

43 vt ... abiicerent se primos, et in terram euaderent
 ("eos ... emittere se primos et euadere, et ad terram exire" late Vg.; "eos ... vt abiicerent ... euaderent" 1516). See on Iob. 1,33, for avoidance of infinitives. The expanded rendering offered by the Vulgate is unsupported by Greek mss.: in theory, it would imply a Greek text which
 The spelling ámoppiqavtes in 1519 is a misprint. For Erasmus' treatment of verbs of throwing, cf. on Iob. 3,24. The substitution of in for ad occurs also in vs. 44, in a similar context: meaning to escape to the land, and not merely towards it. Manetti put $v t$ sese proicientes ad terram primi exirent.
44 caeterique kal tò̀s $\lambda$ गormoús ("et caeteros" Vg.; "vt et caeteri" 1516). See on Ioh. 1,39 regarding que. Manetti had ac caeteri.
44 partim ... partim oûs uèv ... oűs $\delta$ ह́é ("alios ... quosdam" ${ }^{\text {Vg..). The only other passage where }}$ Erasmus introduces partim is at Hebr. 10,33, in rendering toũto $\mu \dot{\mu} v$... тои̃то $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$. Manetti made use of quidam quidem ... quidam vero.
44 in tabulis emil $\sigma \alpha v i \sigma w$ ("in tabulis ferebant" Vg.). The Vulgate adds a transitive verb, missing the point that the Greek construction follows on from $\varepsilon \in \xi \dot{1} \dot{\varepsilon} v a l$ in vs. 43 . Manetti made the same change as Erasmus.
 $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$ ááò toũ $\pi \lambda$ hoiov ("super ea quae de naui erant" late Vg .). The substitution of in for super produces consistency with the previous phrase, in tabulis. cf. also on Iob. 7,44. The use of quibusdam provides a rendering for $\mathrm{T} \mid v \omega v$, which the Vulgate left untranslated. By substituting fragmentis for ea quae de naui erant, Erasmus introduces an element of paraphrase, to clarify the meaning. For his reply to Stunica, who objected that the ship was not necessarily broken up, see Erasmus Apolog, resp. Iac. Lop. Stun., ASD IX, 2, p. 162, ll. 972-982. Manetti had essent for erant, as in the earlier Vulgate.
 $\varepsilon ่ \pi i \operatorname{T\eta } \nu \gamma \eta ̃ \nu$.
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Et sic factum est, vt omnes incolumes euaderent in terram.

28Et quum euasissent, tunc cognouerunt quod Melite insula vocaretur. ${ }^{2}$ Barbari vero praestabant non vulgarem humanitatem nobis. Accensa enim pyra, recipiebant nos omnes propter imbrem qui imminebat, et propter frigus. ${ }^{3}$ Quum congregasset autem Paulus sarmentorum multitudinem, et imposuisset in ignem, vipera e calore prorepens, inuasit manum eius. ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Vt}$ vero viderunt barbari pendentem bestiam de manu eius, inter sese dicebant: Omnino homicida est homo hic, quem seruatum e mari, vltio non sinit viuere. ${ }^{5}$ Et ille quidem excussa vipera in ignem, mali nihil passus est. ${ }^{6}$ At illi existimabant futurum vt incenderetur, aut concideret repente mortuus. Diu autem illis expectantibus, et intuentibus nihil mali


44 tert. in $B-E:$ ad $A$
28,2 praestabant $B-E$ : prestabant $A \mid$ imbrem $C-E$ : hymbrem $A B \mid 3$ e $B-E:$ a $A \mid$ prorepens $B-E$ : cum processisset $A \mid 6$ intuentibus $B-E$ : videntibus $A$
 euaderent" Vg.). The Vulgate again implies an altered Greek wording, adding $\Psi \cup X \alpha ́ \alpha s ~ a f t e r ~$ móvios, although there is no ms. support for such a reading. Erasmus' substitution of incolumes is an attempt to alleviate the inaccuracy of the Vulgate, but is not strictly required by the Greek text. Manetti substituted saluarentur.
44 in (3rd.) ह̇ní ("ad" $1516=$ Vg.). See on in terram in vs. 43.
28,1 quum euasissent ... cognouerunt $\delta 1 \propto \sigma \omega \theta \in \nu$ TES ... ĖTTÉ $\gamma v \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ ("cum euasissemus ... cognouimus" Vg.). The Vulgate is based on a different Greek text, substituting $\varepsilon$ émé $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \varepsilon v$ for $\varepsilon \in \tau \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \alpha v$, as in $7^{74} \times \mathrm{ABC} \mathrm{C}^{*}$ and a few
later mss. In using the third person, Erasmus follows cod. 2815 , supported by cod. $C^{\text {corr }}$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. However, cod. 2816* adds ol $\pi \varepsilon p i$ tò $\pi \propto \cup ̃ \lambda o v ~ a f t e r ~ \delta i \alpha \sigma \omega \theta \varepsilon ́ v t \varepsilon \varsigma$, and cod. $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$ further adds ék тоũ mioós after maũ入ov. Manetti's rendering was cum saluati essemus ... cognouimus.
 vocabatur" late Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,20. Manetti put quod ... vocabatur.
1 Melite $\mathrm{M}_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{i t \eta}$ ("Mitilene" late Vg.). The late Vulgate spelling has minimal Greek support. The earlier Vulgate mss. have Militene, which is similarly unsupported, apart from the reading
$\mu \varepsilon \lambda_{I T \eta \prime \prime} \eta$ in cod. $\mathrm{B}^{*}$. The reading of cod. 1 was $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta ं T \eta$. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. $N$ A $\mathrm{B}^{\text {corr }} \mathrm{C}$ and most later mss., including cod. 2816. See Annot. The spelling adopted in Valla Annot. was Melita.
2 vulgarem $\tau \mathfrak{\eta} \nu \tau \operatorname{TUXOŨ\sigma \alpha v("modicam"~Vg.).~}$ See on Act. 19,11.
2 recipiebant $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\beta}$ оuto ("reficiebant" Vg.). The Vulgate elsewhere uses reficio for катартif, $\omega$ and $\alpha v a \pi \alpha \cup \cup \omega$. However, it is possible that the Vulgate originally had recipiebant, from which reficiebant was a textual corruption within the Latin tradition, in which case it may reflect a Greek variant, $\pi p o \sigma \propto v \in \lambda \alpha \alpha_{\mu} \beta \propto v o v$, in the imperfect tense, as found in cod. $\boldsymbol{K}^{*}$ and a few later mss. Cf. Annot.
2 propter (2nd.) $\delta \mathrm{I} \dot{\alpha}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported only by cod. $\aleph^{*}$ and a few later mss.
3 multitudinem $\pi \lambda \eta \pi \theta o s$ ("aliquantam multitudinem" Vg.). The Vulgate reflects a Greek text inserting TI before $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta 0 \mathrm{~S}$, as in $\mathbf{7}^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \boldsymbol{N} \mathrm{A}$ B C and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. The word aliquantam was similarly omitted by Manetti.
3 in $\varepsilon$ ह̇ri ("super" Vg.). As elsewhere, Erasmus wishes to make plain that the wood was placed on the fire, and not merely above it: see on Iob. 7,44.
$3 e$ ék ("a" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 2,15.
 $=$ Vg.). For a change, Erasmus renders the Greek aorist by a present participle, inconsistent with his usual practice. The reading $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta o u ̃ \sigma \alpha$ was taken from cod. 2815, supported by $\boldsymbol{p}^{74} \mathrm{~N}$ A B C and many later mss. In codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss., is found the variant, $\delta 1 \varepsilon \xi \mathrm{E} \lambda$ Ooũoa. Erasmus chose prorepo here, as being more appropriate to the context: the word does not occur elsewhere in his N.T. Manetti substituted progressa.
4 крєцо́дцєvov. The incorrect spelling, крєццд́$\mu \varepsilon v o v$, in 1516, is found in both codd. 1 and 2815, with little other ms. support.
4 inter sese mpòs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\dagger} \lambda$ ous ("ad inuicem" Vg.). See on Ioh. 4,33.
4 Omnino Пóvtws ("Vtique" Vg.) See on Act. 21,22. Manetti made the same substitution.
4 quem seruatum oiv $\delta 1 \alpha \sigma \omega \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v \tau \alpha$ ("qui cum euaserit" Vg.). Erasmus keeps closer to
the Greek construction. Manetti had quem ... saluatum.

4 éck ("de" Vg.). See on Ioh. 2,15. Manetti had ex.

4 viucre $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu$ ("eum viuere" late Vg.). The Vulgate adds eum in consequence of the earlier conversion from passive to active in rendering $\delta ı \sigma \sigma \omega \theta$ ย́vт $\alpha$.
5 axcussa vipera ámotivd́\}as тò Өnpíov ("excutiens bestiam" Vg.). Greek aorist. The substitution of vipera is less accurate than the Vulgate. Manetti put bestia ... excussa.
5 mali nibil oúס̇̇̀ kakóv ("nihil mali" Vg.). The change of word-order seems to be for stylistic variety, having regard to the use of nihil mali in the following verse. Elsewhere, Erasmus retains the word-order, nibil mali, in rendering
 at Act. 23,9.

6 futurum vt incenderetur aủtòv $\mu \grave{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ı v$ тiцтрабOaı ("eum in tumorem conuertendum" Vg.). On futurum vt, see on Act. 2,21. Since the verb $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu i$ can equally mean to swell or to become inflamed, the change to incendo was not strictly necessary, though the idiom employed by the Vulgate was lacking in elegance. See Annot. The spelling mimpaotar in 1516-19 conformed with codd. 1 and 2816 , supported by cod. A and a few later mss. In cod. 2815 and most other mss. (not including cod. 3), it was $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha l$, as restored to Erasmus' text in 1519. Manetti rendered as eum tumefaciendum.
6 aut $\eta$ ท̀ ("et" Vg.). Erasmus is more accurate on this point. Manetti had ac.
 $v e k p o ́ v$ ("subito casurum et mori" Vg.). Erasmus is closer to the form of the Greek expression. On concido, see on Act. 5,10. His substitution of repente is consistent with Vulgate usage in rendering $\alpha \sim \varphi \nu \omega$ at Act. 2,2, and $\varepsilon \xi \propto i \varphi v \eta s$ at Mc. 13,36. However, he retains subito for $\varepsilon \xi \alpha i \varphi-$ $\nu \eta$ s at Lc. 2,13; 9,39; Act. 9,3; 22,6, and for $\alpha \propto v \omega$ at Act. 16,26. Manetti put subito mortuum casurum.
 $=$ Vg.). Elsewhere, Erasmus usually reserves intu-
 ly retains video for $\theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$, but occasionally uses specto. His combination of intueor here with an infinitive has a Ciceronian precedent, but is otherwise not common in classical usage.

Eis $\alpha u ̉ T o ̀ v ~ \gamma i v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v, ~ \mu \varepsilon T \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o 1 ~$

























illi accidere, mutata mente dicebant eum esse deum. ${ }^{7}$ In locis autem illis erant praedia primati insulae, nomine Publio, qui nos exceptos, triduo benigne tractauit hospitio. ${ }^{8}$ Contigit autem patrem Publii febribus ac dysenteriis vexatum decumbere. Ad quem Paulus intrauit: et quum orasset, imposuissetque ei manus, sanauit eum. ${ }^{9}$ Hoc igitur facto, caeteri quoque qui habebant infirmitates in insula, accedebant, et sanabantur: ${ }^{10}$ qui etiam multis honoribus nos honorauerunt, et soluentibus imposuerunt quae necessaria erant.
${ }^{11}$ Post menses autem tres nauigauimus in naui Alexandrina, quae in insula hyemauerat, cui erat insigne Castor et Pollux. ${ }^{12}$ Et quum venissemus Syracusas, mansimus triduo. ${ }^{13}$ Inde | circunlegentes deueni-

6 illi accidere, mutata mente $B-E$ : in eum fieri, conuertentes se $A \mid 7$ tractauit hospitio $B-E$ : hospitatus est $A \mid 8$ ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid$ dysenteriis $E$ : dysenteria $A-D \mid$ decumbere $B-E$ : iacere $A \mid$ imposuissetque $B-E$ : et imposuisset $A \mid 9$ caeteri quoque $B-E$ : et coeteri $A \mid 13$ postridie $B-E$ : altero die $A \mid 14$ Romam $E$ : Rhomam $A-D$

6 illi cis aủtóv ("in eo" Vg.; "in eum" 1516). Erasmus is more accurate in rendering the Greek preposition. Manetti had in eum, as in Erasmus' 1516 edition.

6 accidere $\gamma ı v$ ónevov ("fieri" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Act. 7,40. Manetti replaced mali ... fieri by absurdum factum.
6 mutata mente $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \propto \lambda \lambda \dot{\sigma}^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 01$ ("conuertentes se" $1516=$ Vg.). Erasmus' version is clearer, though in shifting from the present to a past participle he is less accurate, especially as the following verb, dicebant, is in the imperfect tense. The implication of the Greek wording
is that as the local people went on staring at Paul, they gradually changed their minds, and one after another they began to say that he was a god. In some mss., commencing with codd. A B, the aorist participle $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda$ ó $\mu \varepsilon v O l$ is found, but Erasmus' Greek text is supported by codd. 2815 , together with $\aleph 048$ and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816. Manetti substituted commutati.
 ("principis ... Publii" Vg.). See on Act. 25,2, for the use of primas. Erasmus follows the Greek in using the dative of possession. Manetti rendered as primatis ... Poplii.

7 axceptos àva $\delta \varepsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \alpha \mu \varepsilon v o s$ ("suscipiens" Vg.). Greek aorist. For excipio, see on Act. 17,7.
7 tractauit hospitio è $\ddagger$ Évı $\sigma \varepsilon v$ ("exhibuit" Vg. 1527
= Vg. mss.; "habuit" Annot., lemma; "hospitatus est" 1516). The reading exbibuit is also found in the Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514. Elsewhere, Erasmus follows the Vulgate in using recipio hospitio at Act. 10,23, while substituting excipio bospitio at Hebr. 13,2. The 1516 rendering, bospitatus est, is mentioned with some diffidence in Annot. ("si dicere liceret"), probably because the verb bospitor is not used in a transitive sense by classical authors. Valla Annot. suggested bospitium exbibuit, in bospitio habuit, or bospitaliter babuit. The passage was further discussed in Erasmus Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei, LB IX, 212 B-C.

8 ac kaí ("et" 1516 = Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,25. Manetti likewise had ac.

8 dysenteriis סvaEvtepió ("dysenteria" 1516-27 $=\mathrm{Vg}$. .) The substitution of the plural in the 1535 rendering was unnecessary and less accurate. Valla Annot. suggested putting torminibus.
8 decumbere катакєĩन 0 aı ("iacere" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Iob. 5,6. Manetti's version was $v t$... iaceret.

8 imposuissetque émiӨEis ("et imposuisset" 1516 $=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,39. Manetti put atque ... imposuisset.

8 sanauit íव́б夭xт ("saluauit" Vg.). At other passages in Matthew-Acts, the Vulgate sometimes uses saluo to render $\sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega$, while generally using curo for $\theta \varepsilon p \alpha \pi \pi \in \dot{v} \omega$, and sano for láoual. See on Act. 4,14. It seems possible that sanauit may have been the original Vulgate rendering at the present passage, later corrupted into saluauit. The verb saluo does not exist in classical Latin: see on Iob. 3,17. The same change was made by Manetti.
9 Hoc toútou ("Quo" Vg.). Erasmus is more literal here. Manetti also made this change.
9 igitur ouvv (Vg. omits). The Vulgate may reflect the substitution of $\delta \bar{\varepsilon}$ for oviv in some Greek mss., commencing with \& A B 066. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti here put autem, evidently reading $\delta \dot{\delta}$.

9 cateteri quoque kai oi $\lambda$ गoıtoí ("et omnes" Vg.; "et coeteri" 1516). Erasmus' rendering is more accurate. Manetti rendered as et reliqui.

9 qui babebant infirmitates in insula of êxovtes
 infirmitates" Vg .). The Vulgate reflects a different
 doetevias, as in К A B 066 and a few later mss. Erasmus, as usual, follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. In Manetti's version, this was rendered as in insula infirmitates babentes.
 See on Act. 4,14.
10 soluentibus d́vccyouévors ("nauigantibus" Vg .). See on Act. 13,13.
11 ávíx $\theta \eta \mu \mathrm{Ev}$. In codd. 2815 and $2816^{*}$ is found the variant, $\bar{\eta} X \theta \eta \mu \varepsilon v$, in company with many other late mss. Erasmus or his assistants took davin $\chi$ १nucv from codd. 1 and $2816^{\mathrm{mg}}$, supported by $7^{74}$ \& A B 066 and many later mss.
11 Castor et Pollux $\Delta$ tooroúpous ("castrorum" late Vg.). As indicated in Annot., the earlier Vulgate reading was Castorum, which was also the reading recommended by Valla Annot. The use of castrorum was assigned by Erasmus to the Loca Manifeste Deprauata. In his rendering, he expands the meaning by giving the individual names of these twin deities.
12 Syracusas Eupakoúoos ("Syracusam" late Vg.). Erasmus, in effect, restores the earlier Vulgate reading. The correct grammatical form of this name is plural in both Greek and Latin. Manetti similarly had Syracusas.
 Vg.). The Vulgate addition is not explicitly supported by Greek mss. Erasmus retained $i b i$ at $A c t .12,19$, where it was similarly an explanatory addition. Manetti made the same change.
13 aflante ékriyevouévou ("flante" Vg.). Erasmus renders the Greek compound verb more precisely.
13 postridie $\delta$ evtepaĩol ("secunda die" Vg.; "altero die" 1516). See on Act. 10,9. Erasmus is less literal here. Manetti's version left this untranslated.

14 repertis eúpóvtes ("inuentis" Vg.). See on Iob. 1,41.

15 de nobis $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ т $\pi \varepsilon \rho \mathrm{i} \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is unsupported by Greek mss. The words de nobis were also inserted by Manetti.











 ह̇y
 'Іеробо入úu $\omega \nu \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \delta o ́ \theta \eta \nu$ घis tàs रeĩpas $\tau \omega ̃ \nu$ 'P $\omega \mu \alpha i \omega v$ " ${ }^{18}$ oïtives ảvaxpivavtés




 ${ }^{20} \delta \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \cup ́ T \eta \nu$ oưv $\tau \eta \dot{ } \nu$ aitía $\nu \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon к \alpha ́ \lambda \varepsilon$ $\sigma \alpha$ úpãs, ì íĩv каì $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha l \cdot$ हैvekev

prodierunt in occursum nobis vsque ad Appii Forum ac Tres Tabernas. Quos quum vidisset Paulus, gratiis actis deo, sumpsit fiduciam. ${ }^{16}$ Quum autem venissemus Romam, centurio tradidit vinctos principi exercitus. Permissum est autem Paulo, vt maneret solus cum custodiente ipsum milite.
${ }^{17}$ Post tertium autem diem conuocauit Paulus Iudacorum primores. Quumque venissent dicebat eis: Ego, viri fratres, quum nihil fecerim aduersus plebem, aut instituta maiorum, vinctus ab Hierosolymis traditus sum in manus Romanorum: ${ }^{18}$ qui quum examinassent, voluerunt me dimittere, eo quod nulla esset causa mortis in me. ${ }^{19}$ Sed contradicentibus Iudaeis, coactus sum appellare Caesarem, non quasi habeam de quo gentem meam accusem. ${ }^{20}$ Propter hanc igitur causam aduocaui vos, vt viderem et alloquerer. Propter spem enim Israelis catena
$19 \eta \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha \sigma 0 \eta \nu B-E: \eta \nu \propto \gamma \kappa \alpha \mu \eta \nu A$
15 ac $B-E$ : et $A \mid 16$ Romam $E$ : Rhomam $A-D \mid$ ipsum $D E$ se $A-C \mid 17$ Romanorum $E$ : Rhomanorum $A-D \mid 18$ examinassent $B-E$ : interrogationem de me habuissent $A \mid 19$ Sed contradicentibus $B-E$ : Contradicentibus autem $A$ | quasi habeam de $B-E$ : tanquam habens in $A$ | accusem $B-E$ : accusarem $A \mid 20$ Israelis $B-E$ : Israel $A$
 ("occurrerunt" Vg.). The Vulgate may reflect
 found in ( $\aleph$ ) A B 066 and a few later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. He uses in occursum elsewhere at Mt. 8,34; 25,1; 1 Thess. 4,17. For his use of prodeo, see on Iob. 18,38.

15 ac kaí ("et" $1516=$ Vg. mss.; Vg. 1527 omits). See on Iob. 1,25. The same change was made by Manetti.
15 Tres Tabernas Tpiผ̃ $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{L}} \beta \notin \rho \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ("tribus tabernis" Vg. 1527 = Vg. mss.). In Annot., Erasmus says that tres tabernas is found in "correct copies" of the Vulgate ("emendatis
exemplaribus"), a piece of information which he could have derived from Valla Annot. The Froben Vulgates of 1491 and 1514 as well as the Vulgate column of 1527 all have tribus tabernis. Manetti had tres tabernas here.
 Vg.). Greek aorist.
15 sumpsit ${ }^{\wedge} \lambda \alpha \beta_{\varepsilon}$ ("accepit" Vg.). Cf. on Act. 13,46 , where Erasmus uses sumpta fiducia to render mapp $\quad \sigma \quad \alpha \quad \zeta \omega$, and $M c .15,43$ where sumpta audacia is used for то $\lambda \mu \alpha ́ \alpha \omega$. Manetti put cepit (= coepit) confidere.
 venimus autem" Annot., lemma; "Cum autem venissemus" late Vg. $=\mathrm{Vg} .1527$ ). The wording
attributed to the Vulgate by Annot. seems to have been derived from the lemma of Valla Annot. The version of Erasmus follows the earlier Vulgate. Manetti had Quando autem ... venimus.
16 centurio ... Paulo ס́ ékळтóvtגрХ○ऽ ... Étreтро́rin ("permissum est Paulo" Vg.). The Vulgate follows a Greek text omitting d́ éкатóvtapXos
 т $\tilde{\sim}$ Пaú $\lambda \omega$, as in $77^{74 v i d} \propto A B 048$ vid 066 and sixteen later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and more than 400 other late mss., except that about ninety of these have отратоттеס́́pX $\varphi$ for $\sigma т р \alpha т о т е-~$ SápXn (see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 670-5). See Annot. The version of Manetti had Centurio principi militum vinctos tradidit, Paulo autem permissum est.
16 vt maneret मéveıv ("manere" 1516-27 Annot., lemma $=$ Vg. mss.; "permanere" late Vg. $=$ Vg. 1527). The Froben editions of 1491 and 1514 together with the Vulgate column of Erasmus' 1527 N.T. all had permanere. It is possible that Erasmus' citation of manere was derived from the lemma of Valla Annot., as appeared to be the case with Vt venimus earlier in the sentence. See on Ioh. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive. Manetti put vt ... remaneret.
16 solus ka0' £́ $\alpha \cup$ tóv ("sibimet" Vg.). Erasmus' rendering is clearer. In Annot., he also suggests apud semet ipsum, but he preferred solus here as he wished to use ipsum later in the sentence. Valla Annot. had suggested putting apud se ipsum or per se ipsum, while Manetti substituted apud semet ipsum.
16 ipsum c̛̉tóv ("se" 1516-22 = Vg.). Erasmus uses ipsum to refer back more clearly to the main subject.

17 Paulus ròv חॉoũ入ov (Vg. omits). The Vulgate reflects the substitution of cu'tóv, as in $37{ }^{74} \mathrm{~K}$ A B 066 and some later mss. Erasmus follows cod. 2815, supported by codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. The same addition was made by Manetti.
17 Iudaeorum primores тoùs övtos $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ 'lou $\alpha \alpha i$ i$\omega \nu \pi \rho \omega$ тous ("primos Iudaeorum" Vg.). See on Act. 25,2.
 Erasmus retains the late Vulgate rendering. The earlier Vulgate, more accurately, had Cumque conuenissent. Manetti put Congregatis autem ipsis.

17 quum nihil fecerim aduersus plebem oủס̇̀̀ évavtiov moıñơs Tஸ̃ $\lambda \alpha \omega ̃$ ("nihil aduersus plebem faciens" Vg.). Greek aorist. Manetti put cum ... nibil contrarium populo ... fecerim.
17 ฑ̀. In cod. 2815 , kaí is substituted, apparently without other ms. support. Erasmus or his assistants restored $\eta$ by reference to codd. 1 , 2816 and the Vulgate.
17 instituta $\tau 0 i ̃ 5$ ê $\theta \varepsilon \sigma 1$ ("morem" Vg.). See on Act. 16,21. Manetti preferred moribus.
17 maiorum тоĩs татрผ๐oเs ("paternum" Vg.). Cf. on Act. 22,3. Erasmus similarly substitutes a maioribus for paternarum in rendering $\mathrm{T} \tilde{\nu} \nu$ $\pi \alpha т \rho ı к \tilde{\nu} \nu$ at Gal. 1,14 (1519): in Annot. ad loc., he interprets as a patribus ac maioribus. Manetti substituted paternis.
18 quum examinassent óvookpivavtes ("cum interrogationem de me habuissent" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Act. 4,9; 24,8; 25,26. At the last of these passages, in 1519, Erasmus substituted examinatio for interrogatio in rendering ávókpioıs. Manetti put cum me examinassent.
 ("Contradicentibus autem" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,26.
$19 \eta \dot{\eta} v \gamma \gamma \kappa \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \nu$. The reading $\eta \dot{\eta} \nu \gamma \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, in 1516, seems to be a mistaken conjecture, forming an aorist middle tense instead of the aorist passive, and having no ms. support.
 T1 kबтпүор $\bar{\sigma} \sigma$ ("quasi ... habens aliquid accusare" Vg.; "tanquam habens in quo ... accusarem" 1516). Cf. on Act. 25,11, for a similar replacement of an internal accusative, and see on Iob. 1,33 for avoidance of the infinitive.

20 aduocaui тарєк $\alpha \lambda_{\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha ~(" r o g a u i " ~ V g .) . ~ E r a s-~}^{\text {. }}$ mus here treats mapaкк $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$ as equivalent to пробк $\alpha \lambda$ éouøı. Elsewhere, he frequently retains rogo for $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha к \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ : cf. on Act. 27,22. The point of rogo at the present passage is that Paul may have had to ask the Roman authorities for permission before summoning the leaders of the Jewish community. The questionable substitution of aduoco prevents such an interpretation.
20 vt viderem et alloquerer iठEĩv каì $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \lambda \bar{n}-$ $\sigma a l$ ("videre et alloqui" Vg.). See on Ioh. 1,33. Manetti had vt viderem atque alloquerer.
20 Israelis тои̃ 'l $\sigma \rho \propto \dot{\eta} \lambda$ ("Israel" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). See on Ioh. 1,31.





 $\mu \varepsilon ̀ v ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ T \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \alpha i p \varepsilon ́ \sigma e \omega s ~ T \alpha u ́ T \eta S, ~ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma т o ́ v ~$


 то $\delta 1 \propto \mu \alpha \rho т и р о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о S ~ т \eta ̀ v ~ \beta \alpha \sigma \lambda \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \alpha \nu ~ т о и ̃ ~$
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 TOU т $\pi$ òs toùs $\pi \alpha т \varepsilon ́ p \alpha s ~ \grave{~} \mu \omega ̃ \nu,{ }^{26} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \circ v$, ПорєúӨŋтт тро̀s тòv $\lambda \alpha o ̀ v ~ т о u ̃ т о v, ~ к \alpha i ~$





 ผ’oiv ákov́ $\sigma \omega \sigma$ l, kaì Tñ̃ kapסíą $\sigma u v \omega ̃ \sigma 1$,



 тóvTos, $\dot{\alpha} \pi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ v$ of 'lou $\delta \alpha i ̃ o 1, ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \eta ̀ \nu$

hac circundatus sum. ${ }^{21}$ At illi dixerunt ad eum: Nos neque literas accepimus de te a Iudaea, neque adueniens aliquis fratrum nunciauit, aut loquutus est aliquid de te mali. ${ }^{2}$ Volumus autem ex te audire quae sentias. Nam de secta ista, notum est nobis, quod vbique ei contradicitur. ${ }^{23}$ Quum constituissent autem illi diem, venerunt ad eum in hospitium complures, quibus exponebat testificans regnum dei, suadensque eis de Iesu ex lege Mosi et prophetis, a mane vsque ad vesperam. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{Et}$ quidam credebant his quae dicebantur, quidam vero non credebant. ${ }^{25}$ Quumque inter se non essent concordes, discedebant, vbi dixisset Paulus vnum verbum: Bene spiritus sanctus loquutus est per He saiam prophetam ad patres nostros, ${ }^{26}$ dicens: Vade ad populum istum, et dic: Auribus audietis, et non intelligetis: et videntes videbitis, et non perspicietis. ${ }^{27}$ Incrassatum est enim cor populi huius, et auribus grauiter audierunt, et oculos suos compresserunt: ne quando videant oculis, et auribus audiant, et corde intelligant, et conuertantur et sanem eos. ${ }^{28}$ Notum ergo sit vobis, quod gentibus missum est hoc salutare dei, et ipsi audient. ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Et}$ quum haec dixisset, exierunt ab eo Iudaei, multam habentes inter se disceptationem. ${ }^{30}$ Mansit autem
 $A \mid 28 \alpha \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \eta A-C: \alpha \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ⿺ D E$

21 literas $B-E$ : litteras $A \mid$ aliquid $B-E$ : quid $A \mid$ mali $B-E$ : malum $A \mid 22$ ex $B-E:$ a $A \mid$ sentias $B-E$ : sentis $A \mid$ ista $B-E$ : hac $A \mid 25$ vbi dixisset Paulus $B-E$ : dicente Paulo $A \mid$ Hesaiam $E$ : Esaiam $A$-D $\mid 26$ Auribus $B-E$ : Aure $A^{*}$, auditu $A^{c}$

21 aliquid $\pi$ ("quid" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Ioh. 21 mali тovnpóv ("malum" $1516=$ Vg.). Eras6,7. The same change was made by Manetti. mus treats movŋpóv as a noun rather than an
adjective，in accordance with Vulgate usage at many other passages．
22 Volumus $\dot{\alpha} \xi\llcorner 0 u ̃ \mu \varepsilon \nu$（＂Rogamus＂Vg．）．See on Act．15，38．Manetti rendered as Dignum ．．． putamus．
22 ex тара́（＂a＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Act．9，13． Manetti put abs．
22 sentias $\varphi p o v \varepsilon i ̃ 5 ~(" s e n t i s " ~ 1516=V g.) . ~ E r a s m u s ~$ prefers the subjunctive for an indirect question．
22 ista тaútทs（＂hac＂ $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$ ．）．The use of ista here conveys a note of disapproval．
22 quod ötı（＂quia＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Manetti also made this change．
23 complures $\pi \lambda$ eíoves（＂plurimi＂late Vg．）．See on Act．27，12．Manetti put plures．
23 de т $\alpha$ т $\pi \in \rho i$ í．In cod．2815，Tó is omitted， with support from \＄A B and some later mss． Erasmus＇Greek text seems to have added the word from codd． 1 and 2816，in company with most other late mss．Elsewhere，Erasmus generally follows the Vulgate rendering of tid mepí，sometimes translating simply by $d e$（as at Lc．24，19；Act．1，3；19，8；23，15），and sometimes by a longer phrase such as ea quat sunt de （Lc．22，37），quae sunt de（Act．28，31），or quae de ．．．erant（Lc．24，27）．It would therefore be incorrect to cite the Vulgate as being either for or against the omission of tod at the present passage．It is possible that the restoration of $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \rho($ here was partly influenced by an awareness of Luke＇s usage at other passages．
25 inter se трòs á $\lambda \lambda$ ń $\lambda$ ous（＂inuicem＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．4，33．Manetti put sibi inuicem．
25 non ．．．concordes doúupwvol（＂non ．．．con－ sentientes＂Vg．）．Elsewhere，Erasmus uses concors esse for tò aưTò ppoveiv at Phil．3，16； 4,2 （both 1519），replacing idem sapere and id ipsum sapere． Cf．also concordia for $\sigma u \mu \varphi \dot{\sim} \nu \eta \sigma$ at 2 Cor ． 6,15 ．He follows the Vulgate in using consentio for $\sigma \cup \mu \varphi \omega v e ́ \omega$ at Mt．18，19，and for several other Greek verbs．Manetti here substituted inconcinni，a poor choice of word，which，in classical authors，meant＂lacking elegance＂．
25 vbi dixisset Paulus єimóvtos toũ Пaú入ou （＂dicente Paulo＂ 1516 ＝Vg．）．Greek aorist．
25 Bene ótı Ka入ஸ̃s（＂Quia bene＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20．（Manetti＇s version ran vnum sermonem ．．．quem spiritus sanctus ．．．bene locutus est，as if his Greek text substituted o\％for öti）．
26 dic $\varepsilon i \pi t \varepsilon$（＂dic ad eos＂late Vg．）．The late Vulgate addition is unsupported by Greek mss．

In the 1516 Greek text，Erasmus followed cod． 2815 in reading $\mathfrak{k}$ itov．This spelling， though not necessarily the accentuation，was supported by $3^{74} \aleph \mathrm{ABE}$ and most later mss．，including codd． 1 and 2816．In the 1516 errata，he changed to the less well attested va－ riant，$\varepsilon i \pi \dot{\varepsilon}$ ，probably as a grammatical con－ jecture to conform with the frequent use of eitré at other passages：this amended reading persisted into the Textus Receptus．Manetti put dic eis．
26 Auribus＇Aкоท̃̃（＂Aure＂ 1516 text $=$ Vg．；＂au－ ditu＂ 1516 errata）．In Annot．，Erasmus further suggests auditione（quoting from Jerome＇s render－ ing of Didymus，De Spiritu Sancto），and mentions his own preference for the plural，auribus，as being more in accord with classical usage than aure．However，this removes any distinction between ókoñ̃ in vs． 26 and čoiv in vs．27．The rendering，auditu，proposed in the 1516 errata， is in accord with the Vulgate rendering of ơkoñ at Mt．13，14；Ioh．12，38，etc．，and was also used by Manetti．
 text had ${ }^{\eta} K o v \sigma \varepsilon$, singular，without ms．support， and in conflict with the Latin rendering．This was either a printer＇s error，or a conjecture， influenced by the singular of ĖToxuvon ท̀ k $\alpha p \delta i ́ \alpha$ earlier in the sentence．At Mt．13，15， where the same prophecy is quoted，Erasmus retains $\eta_{1}$ кou $\alpha \sim$ ．
27 ne quando $\mu \dot{\prime} \boldsymbol{\pi} о \tau \varepsilon$（＂ne forte＂Vg．）．See on Act． 5,39 ．Manetti made the same change．
28 quod ótl（＂quoniam＂Vg．）．See on Ioh．1，20． Manetti also had quod．
 1527－35 seems to be no more than a mis－ print．Erasmus retained $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ at $L c .1,26$ ； Act．13，26．
$29 E t$ ．．．disceptationem кai ．．．$\sigma \cup$ ク่т $\eta \sigma เ v$（＂Et ．．．quaestionem＂late Vg ）．In Annot．，Erasmus mentions that this verse is omitted in＂aliquot vetustis codicibus＂，a phrase which usually meant earlier mss．of the Vulgate．Such an omission is supported by $3^{74}$ ※ A B E 048 and seventeen later mss．The verse was in－ cluded in the late Vulgate，and in codd．1， 2815 and 2816，together with about 430 other late mss．（see Aland Die Apostelgeschichte 675－9）． On Erasmus＇use of disceptatio，see on Act． 15,7 ．Manetti included the verse，but ren－ dered the last part by babita inter cos plurima conquisitione．

 vous трòs $\alpha u ̉ T o ́ v, ~{ }^{31}$ кпрú $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ Tìv $\beta \alpha-$
 тоũ kupiou 'Inooũ, $\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ máбךs mappŋбías, ởk

Paulus biennio toto in suo conducto: et suscipiebat omnes qui ingrediebantur ad ipsum, ${ }^{31}$ praedicans regnum dei, ac docens quae sunt de domino lesu, cum omni fiducia, nemine prohibente.

ACTORVM FINIS

30 suscipiebat $B-E$ : suscipiebant $A \mid$ ipsum $B-E$ : eum $A \mid 31$ ac $B-E$ : et $A$ Subscriptio ACTORVM FINIS $D E$ : ACTA APOSTOLORVM FELICITER ABSOLVTA $A-C$

30 Paulus $\delta$ Maũ $\bar{\lambda}{ }^{\circ}$ (Vg. omits). The Vulgate omission is supported by $\mathcal{X}$ A B E and a few later mss. Erasmus follows his cod. 2815, in company with codd. 1, 2816 and most other late mss. Manetti similarly added Paulus.
30 suscipiebat à̉rteठéxeto ("suscipiebant" 1516 Lat.). The variant offered by the 1516 rendering, in the plural, was probably not intended by Erasmus. Most Vulgate copies appear to have suscipiebat here, including the Froben editions of 1491 and 1514, together with the Vulgate column of the 1527 N.T.
30 ipsum củtóv ("eum" $1516=\mathrm{Vg}$.). The reflexive pronoun, as usual, is designed to refer back to the main subject.

31 ac кai ("et" $1516=$ Vg.). See on Iob. 1,25.
31 Iesu 'Iŋooũ ("Iesu Christo" Vg.). Erasmus here follows cod. 2815, in company with cod. $\aleph^{*}$ and only a few later mss. The Vulgate reflects the reading 'Inooũ Xpıotoũ, found in $\mathbf{P}^{74 \mathrm{vid}} \aleph^{\text {corr }}$ A B E and most of the later mss., including codd. 1 and 2816.

31 nemine probibente $\alpha$ व́k $\omega \lambda$ út $\omega$ ("sine prohibitione" Vg.). This substitution of verb for noun, using the ablative absolute construction, is more in accordance with classical Latin idiom. On Erasmus' removal of sine, see on Ioh. 8,27. See also Annot. The version of Manetti had absque probibitione.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

## General Abbreviations

| * | original text of a manuscript or printed edition <br> alt. |
| :--- | :--- |
| cod., codd. | codex, codices |
| compend. | compendium, or abbreviation |
| corr | corrector, correction |
| exc. | excepto, exceptis |
| exc. | exemplaria (= some copies) |
| ital. | litteris italicis (= in italic or smaller type) |
| Lat. | Latin |
| mg. | margin |
| ms., mss. | manuscript, manuscripts |
| om. | omittit, omittunt |
| quart. | quartum |
| rom. | litteris romanis (= in roman type) |
| supp | supplement by a later scribe |
| tert. | tertium |
| vid | videtur (= the presumed wording of a poorly legible text) |
| vs., vss. | verse, verses |

The Bible
Old Testament (O.T.)

| $G n$. | Genesis | Esth. | Esther | Ioel | Joel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ex. | Exodus | Iob | Job | Am. | Amos |
| $L v$. | Leviticus | Ps. | Psalms | Ob. | Obadiab |
| Nu . | Numbers | Prv. | Proverbs | Ion. | Jonab |
| Dt. | Deuteronomy | Eccl. | Ecclesiastes | Mch. | Micab |
| Ios. | Josbua | Ct. | Song of | $N a b$. | Nabum |
| Iudic. | Judges |  | Solomon | Hab. | Habakkuk |
| Rth. | Ruth | Is. | Isaiab | Zph. | Zephaniah |
| $1,2 \mathrm{Sm}$. | 1,2 Samuel | Ir. | Jeremiab | Hgg. | Haggai |
| 1, 2 Rg . | 1, 2 Kings | Thr. | Lamentations | Zch. | Zechariab |
| 1, 2 Cbr . | 1,2 Cbronicles | Ez | Ezekiel | ML | Malachi |
| Esr. | Ezra | Dn. | Daniel |  |  |
| $N e b$. | Nebemiab | Hos. | Hosea |  |  |

New Testament (N.T.)

| Mt. | Matthew | Gal. | Galatians | Phm. | Pbilemon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mc. | Mark | Eph. | Ephesians | Hebr. | Hebreres |
| Lc. | Luke | Pbil. | Pbilippians | Iac. | James |
| Iob. | John | Col. | Colossians | 1, 2 Petr. | 1,2 Peter |
| Act. | Acts of the Apostles | 1, 2 Thess. | 1, 2 Thessalonians | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1,2, } 3 \text { Iob. } \\ & \text { Iud. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1, 2, } 3 \text { John } \\ & \text { Jude } \end{aligned}$ |
| Rom. | Romans | 1, 2 Tim. | 1,2 Timothy | Ap. Iob. | Revelation |
| 1, 2 Cor. | 1,2 Corinthians | Tit. | Titus |  |  |

Ad Placandos

Annot.
Apolog. adv. debacch. Petr. Sutor
Apolog. adv. monach. bisp.
Apolog. adv. Stun. Blasph. et imp.

Apolog. с Sanct.
Apolog. resp. Iac. Lop. Stun.
Apolog. resp. inuect. Ed. Lei
De Construct.
Epist. apolog. adv. Stun.
Loca Manifeste Deprauata
Loca Obscura
Paraphr. in Eleg. Laur. Vallae
Quae Sint Addita
Resp. ad annot. Ed. Lei
Soloecismi

ASD
Ep.

Ferguson
LB
Manetti
$\mathrm{N}^{27}$

Valla Annot.
Vg.

## Erasmus

Ad placandos eos, qui putant in sacris libris nibil neque superesse, neque deesse, quaedam excerpsimus
Annotationes in Nouum Testamentum
Apologia aduersus debacchationes Petri Sutoris
Apologia aduersus monachos quosdam bispanos
Apologia aduersus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi
Caranz Apologia contra Sanctium Caranzam
Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iac. Lopis Stunica taxauerat in prima duntaxat Noui Testamenti aeditione
Apologia qua respondet inuectiuis Eduardi Lei
De constructione octo partium orationis
Epistola apologetica aduersus Stunicam
Loca manifeste deprauata, sed ex infinitis, vt occurrebant, pauca decerpta
Loca Obscura et in quibus lapsi sint magni nominis interpretes, ex innumeris pauca decerpta
Paraphrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae
Quae sint addita in nostris exemplaribus
Responsio ad annotationes Eduardi Lei
Soloecismi per interpretem admissi manifestarii et inexcusabiles, e plurimis pauci decerpti

## Other Sources

Aland, K., et al., Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, iii, Die Apostelgeschichte, Band 1, Untersuchungen und Ergänzungsliste (Berlin and New York, 1993: vol. 20 in Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung)
Erasmus, Des., Opera Omnia (Amsterdam, 1969-)
Erasmus, Des., Opus epistolarum, ed. P. S. Allen (Oxford, 1906-1958, 12 vols.)
Ferguson, W. K., Erasmi Opuscula. A supplement to the Opera Omnia (The Hague, 1933)
Erasmus, Des., Opera Omnia (Leiden, 1703-1706, 10 vols.)
Manetti, Giannozzo, Testamentum Nouum traductum ex Greco (see p. 5, n. 8, above)
Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart, 1993: 27th edition)
Valla, Lorenzo, Adnotationes (Paris, 1505)
The Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible (see p. 4, above)

## INDEX VERBORVM

（This index，which is by no means exhaustive，offers a key to the points of vocabulary which are discussed in the commentary．）

| Greek |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ảvókpiós 469 | árто́бто入оs 149 |
| $\alpha{ }^{\circ} \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda 1 \alpha^{\prime} \omega 380$ |  |  |
| ảyárin 153 | ávovtippnitws 313 |  |
| áyatintós 367 |  | ¢ттохढр＇̇ 340－1 |
|  | व̀vatritrto 149 |  |
|  |  |  |
| dyyopaĩos 383 | đ́voatarów 383 | ápyúpiov 405 |
| órypópuатоs 245 | ه̛̉vヘтрÉ¢ $\omega 436$ | ápy ${ }^{\text {apokóтоs } 407}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {ơry }}$（ 294， 386 | ه̛vớqu૬ıı 240 | ápeठtós 264 |
|  | ăveais 461 | ápvéoűı 247 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {apti }} 116$ |
|  |  | đóplieportikós 244 |
| átikos 458－9 | ăv0pwitos 381， 455 | apXıEpsús 244， 443 |
| áSúvatos 353 | व̇víттпuı 77，267，393， 445 | ${ }_{\text {ápxoual }} 221$ |
| ${ }_{\text {\％\％}}$ \％ $6 \omega 155$ |  |  |
| व̛̇ө́pıtos 313 |  |  |
|  | व̛̃vт入ๆu๙ 47 | Aqıópx\s 409 |
| 人ivéco 234 |  |  |
| ＜ipeaıs 257 | $\alpha^{\alpha} v \omega 0 \mathrm{Ev} 37$ | むooov 483 |
| aîpo 109， 133 | ¢¢ıón 370 | $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varphi \alpha \lambda_{\text {¢́s }} 443$ |
| 人itéc 239 | ¢ттоүү£̇入入入 323－4， 333 | ふтеviくん 215－16 |
|  |  | ๙ủทท่ 415 |
| 人lıtos 411 |  | ๙ư入ท่ 119 |
| ớkớ 145 | ámávinols 496 | ๙ỦT๐บ̃ 369 |
|  | åmas 49 | ¢ญ́Toũ 35 |
| ḋкрıß́̇бтєроข 399， 460 |  |  |
|  |  | đ̊¢ínul 121，134， 355 |
| ád $\lambda$ ¢ $\theta$ ıvós 89 | \＆゙Tre入入úvف 397 | $\chi^{\alpha} p 1 \xi \backslash 5421$ |
| $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \gamma \eta \mu \alpha 365$ |  |  |
| $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{\circ} 401$ |  |  |
| $\alpha_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \grave{j} \lambda \omega \omega$ 51，149，153， 275 |  |  |
| a入入оц๙ı 236 | ¢くтоß○入ท่ 487 | axpl 211 |
| ＊$\lambda$ 入os 183 |  | axposs 273， 413 |
| dadúptupos 355 |  |  |
| ápúvouaı 274 | ámo入oyía 435 | Batús 47 |
|  | ớro入ú 189 | $\beta \alpha{ }^{\text {® }} \lambda \lambda \omega$ 41，147， 203 |
| a̛v 47， 185 | व่тотimit 297 | ßágis 235 |
|  | ${ }_{\alpha}^{\text {ámotiné }} 358$ | ßабто̧́ 201 |
|  | árrookkvơ̧ら 429 | $\beta$ アпи 269 |
|  |  | $\beta 1 \alpha 434$ |
|  |  | $\beta \lambda \alpha$ 人́б甲ワ 267 |
|  | व̇тобт̇̇入入 324 | $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \mu \varepsilon ์ \omega 349$ |

NOVVM TESTAMENTVM
$\beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi T \omega$ 216， 483
Bon日́㇒。 373
ßоилєúoual 135，369－70
ßountí 347
Bpaxús 68
үớp 43，54，381， 411
үعved́ 346－7

Yévos 391
yepovaia 257
Yev́oual 415
үivoual 17－18，279，317， 333， 412
үıvడ்ంKん 106， 153
ү $\lambda \omega \sigma \sigma$ о́коноv 139
$\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu}{ }^{\gamma}$ 412－13
үvஸ்のтทs 471
үv $\omega \sigma$ тós 219， 247
8́́ 21，101， 264
סєíkvบนı 373
סєఠนผ́тทऽ 479
Séxoual 240－1， 385
סé́ $\omega 133,185$
סท́ 337， 369
סıஷ́ 287
סıаßаívต 373

סı๙ઠ́x́XOน๙ı 281
$\delta 1 \alpha \delta i \delta \omega \mu 1251$
Sıakovía 265， 329
ס1akpive 311， 323
$\delta_{\imath} \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma$ Үoual 413
סıá入єктоs 219－20
$\delta 1 \alpha \lambda о \gamma i \zeta \circ \mu \alpha 135$

סı๙цєрі弓ん 223
סıळттЕрव́c 424



סı๙бтре́я 339

סı๙тทрย́ف 367

סıबтрiß 141,135
סıのXEıрі́ろоиаı 475
סıరaкто́s 78－9
ठí $\omega \omega$ । 149，177， 229
бıєуєіра 71－2
SiépXoua 285，317，338－9



סі́кп 467
סı́́ 313
ర10రะứ 381
$\Delta 10$ TETท̇S 410
Sóti 287
ठเผ́кん 405
סó ${ }^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbf{\alpha} 372$
סокє́ $\omega$ 65，168，331， 483
סó§a 65， 335

סuváotis 291
סفрєá 319
żớv 150， 291
\＆̇๕utoũ 91， 136
Ė $\gamma \gamma i \zeta \omega 447$
ĖYYús 67
غ̇үघípo 35，77，207， 393
غ̇ $\gamma \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ 411， 451
ह̇ $\gamma к$ ќттт 454
ध $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ краттіі́ $\boldsymbol{\alpha} 461$
๕̂סaqos 437
źOVikós 92， 141
ध日vos 92， 319
数较 268
عỉ 125,214
єiסف入óOutos 367
عipグレท 275
Eis 147，269，273， 293




Ek 33， 35
दєк $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega 489$
ध̇К $\delta$ เкย́ $\omega 274$
Exסíkクoıs 274
ยкк⿺𠃊 58
ย̇кєĩ̄ย 425

ё $\kappa$ ө $\alpha \mu$ ßоs 237
Ékкevtée 195
éкклпоía 255，279， 302－3， 409
ह́к $\lambda \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega 449$

ĖKveÚの 60－1
ÉKாímTL 331， 487
ยктт入Е́ 397
Éкттореบ́ouăı 63

ÉKтєiva 251
ÉKф́́p 256


ĖKXéco 219
ह̇ $\lambda$ 人 $\alpha$ ía 96
ह̇入é $\gamma \times \omega 111$
モ̇入 $\varepsilon \cup \theta \varepsilon \rho$ ó 103 －4


é $\mu$ ßaívo 71


غ́цтторі́а 33
ย̇นттópiov 33
غ́цтороs 33
غ̇ $\mu \varphi \propto v i \zeta \omega ~ 161,447$
épqướn 201
غ̇v 20－1，41，65， 311
évoutióov 271
Ėvరบvaนó 298
ėvỚuそのıs 391
Ėvioxúa 298－9
évvéós 295

غ่vто入ท่ 137

ध̇ $\xi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$ 191， 381
ย̇その1péc 277



ย̇ $\varsigma \propto \cup T ท ̃ ร ~ 323$
ย̇ร́́pXOน๙ı 63，187， 373，377， 493


દ́そovoía 16， 473
हॄ६uTvos 378
Eそう
白 $\xi \omega \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega 490$
धортग่ 86， 92
ย่ $\pi \propto \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i \alpha 213$
ध̇ाँáp 51,215
દ̇ $\pi \alpha ̛ v \omega ~ 42$
ध̇דaúpiov 21，27， 308
धттєүєíp 351
ย̇тєі 229

étrékeıva 280－1
ध̇тย́pXoual 215， 289
ย̇ாยрผтવ́ف 214
ĖTTi 42，95，237，293，334， 351， 402
ध̇ாıßんiva 71， 463
غ̇ாß $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ 94－5

हैтtieikeía 455


モ̇тікє！${ }^{\circ} 132$



モ̇тนนévに 321， 427




धाтı甲ดレท่s 227
ย̇mıхрí 111－12
épyáia 407
Êpyov 41
धिттєто́v 309
ÉpXoual 49，373， 481
ย̇のӨíc 50－1， 80
Ẽ $\sigma$ Xatos 146－7
ĚTl 169
єủarүモ $\lambda i \zeta \omega 263$
ย ビӨヒ́ccs 72
EỦサウ́s 288－9
EƯOu～～S 489


єúpí̄k 25，139，313， 451， 459
をบ̉甲paive 380
é¢í́ттๆй 267，323，383， 441
E̋ $\omega \varsigma$ 31， 327
らテ̃ $\lambda$ оs 257
らท入ów 271

らผvท่ 427
弓 $\omega \circ \gamma$ оvé $\omega 273$
ที 31， 110

＂Hilas 19
＇Hoatas 19
गेouxá̧ $\omega$ 326， 429
ก̃XOS 223
Өवцßéc 295
Өव́́ $\mu$ ßоs 237
Өapóz $\omega 175$

Өعĩos 391
$\theta \in ́ \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \Omega 1$
Өєратєєல́ம 246
Өء
Enpiov 322， 493
$\theta \lambda i \beta \omega 275$
ө入íwıs 173
Ө́́pußos 406
ӨрпVÉ6 171－2
Өи
Oúpa 433
$\theta$ Úん 309
iá $\mu \alpha 249$
íáoữ 246， 495
íaoıs 249
ísios 16
＇Iepoóó $\lambda u \mu \alpha 215$
＇Iepova $\alpha \lambda$ ท́～ 215
ikavós 414－15
íứт
ivatí 275
โัттๆui 443
Kんөهıpı́ $\omega 341$
к $\alpha$ ब人pi $\zeta \omega 136$
kaөi广心 129
каӨípul 321
к $\alpha$ іібт $\uparrow \mu 1265,386$
кんӨо́tı 228
каl 19，87，89， 216
kalpós 214
kaítolye 355
како入оү＇є 402
какотtoiós 185
какó 3 351， 395
к $\alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega 1247$
ka入ós 481
Ka้̛v 257
KaTớ 57，225，233，290， 342， 481
катаßаív． 287
катаßо入ท่ 179

karóry 443
катакаí 405
катव́ккєцаı 59
катохи́тTん 199
Kara $\alpha \propto \mu \beta \alpha ́ \operatorname{van} 14,145$
кат $\alpha \lambda$ віты 467
кат $\alpha \lambda \cup \cup \omega 35,267$
кот $\alpha \mu$ ย́v $\omega 217$

KatavTá́ 472

каттのTTOVÉف 275
кхтव́́p 95
катаріӨцદ́ف 219
катаббі́ 333

ката甲と́p 414
катєíS $\omega \lambda$ оs 387
катย́pХоน๙ı 285， 427
KのтебӨiん 34
KatทXéc 399
катоוкย́ 225
Ḱ̇ס́ $\rho \omega \nu 179$
кєĩนаı 165
кеıрі́а 133
kepס๙iva 486
kivסuvョú 407
kolvów 433
ко $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega 261$
ко $\lambda \cup \mu \beta \eta \eta^{\prime} \theta \rho \alpha 111$
кратт́́c 483
kpótiotos 451
крі́на 40
крíve 39，365， 392
крíris 40

$\kappa т \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha 251$
кú ${ }^{1} \xi 181$
KÚplos 44－5
K $\omega \lambda$ ú $\omega$ 293，325－6， 491
кผ́นך 289
$\lambda \alpha ́ \theta p \alpha 131$
$\lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega 176$
$\lambda \alpha \lambda_{1} \dot{\alpha} 53$
$\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ 66， 298
$\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} s 414$
入ацттро́s 315
$\lambda$ aós 67， 234
入aтрвía 168
入атрєún 279
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ 103， 458
入єıтоирүє́ผ 337
入оүі行风1 408
入óyos 13，93，211，273， 288，361，397， 419
$\lambda$ 人1סор́́ $\omega 117$
$\lambda 0$ ún 379
$\lambda \cup \pi \in \in \omega$ 172－3， 208
$\lambda$ и́тt 169
入úxvos 414
$\lambda$ úc 35，347－8
$\mu \alpha \gamma \varepsilon i \alpha \alpha 287$
$\mu \propto \gamma \varepsilon u ́ \omega 285$
$\mu$ ккрव́v 441
$\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda 0 v 423$
нартире́ $\omega$ 15，65， 265
нартирі́а 15
нартúpiov 15
$\mu \alpha \alpha_{\sigma} \boldsymbol{T} \xi 441$
$\mu$ น́xо $\quad 79$
$\mu \varepsilon \gamma \propto \lambda \varepsilon$ ĩos 225
$\mu \varepsilon \gamma \propto \lambda \cup ̛ v \omega$ 320， 429
$\mu \varepsilon ̇ \lambda \in 1 \quad 121$
$\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ 54－5
$\mu \in \dot{\nu} \nu 302,346$
$\mu \varepsilon ̇ v \omega 413$
$\mu$ عбó $\omega 87$
$\mu \varepsilon \tau<\dot{\alpha} 319$
$\mu \varepsilon \tau \propto \kappa \propto \lambda$ ह́o $\mu \propto 17$
$\mu \varepsilon т \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} v \omega$ 233， 489


$\mu \eta \eta^{\prime} 37$
$\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \omega ̃ \varsigma 309$
$\mu \eta$ кÉtı 61
$\mu \eta v$ Ú $\omega 451$
нท่тотє 262－3
นท่т1 37
дикро́v 153
uıкрós 91， 143
$\mu ı \nu \nu \dot{\jmath} \sigma \kappa о \mu \propto ı ~ 315,325$
Móvov 478
M $\omega \sigma \tilde{\pi} \varsigma 241$
vaí 130， 381
vápסos 137
veótท！ 471
vクбiov 484
vๆбтвía 357， 482
vóбๆu人 58
vóvos 58， 403
vö甲iろん 253
vธ้̃ 116
$\xi \varepsilon v i \zeta \omega 307,495$
૬npaive 163
ó 13， 28
óסós 458
öちん 133
ОікќtクS 307
oikía 251

ókvé $\omega 305$
o入iyos 359
১ $\lambda$ ok $\lambda$ npia 239
ö $\lambda$ os 97， 261
ónoӨuцaסóv 223，334， 367
ó otormot่s 355
öpoios 109
ó $\mu$ oiów 353
д $\mu \mathrm{oi} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{s}}$ 62－3
ó $\mu$ óteXVOS 393
óvápıov 139
ỏттávoual 212
òpáw 17，223， 373
ópiちゃ 250，390，392－3
őoos 249
öti 19
oủ 459
oủరeís 257
OỦKÉTI 83， 421
oưv 81， 325
－ÛTt 101
ỡтตร 185
ôx 1 os 67， 377
ó $\psi i$ ía 71
oै $\psi$ Is 89
таөŋтtós 477
T๙ıరॄบ́ 437
тaĩ 249
món $\lambda ı v 45$

Topó 251
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \alpha i v \omega 222$
тораßı̧́́оนаı 375
тора $\gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega 247$
тароүіроиаı 315，417， 429
$\pi \alpha p \alpha \delta i \delta \omega \mu$ 82－3， 367
т๙po＾véc 482
тарок $\alpha \lambda$ ह́ $\omega$ 368，415， 497
таро́кл пттоs 159
тараки́тть 199
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \omega 156$
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \circ \mu \alpha 481$
таратт $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega 417$
тара́бхб 393
тароттทрє́ 299
тароті向 382
таротчүхо́vш 387
тарахєца́ூЬ 483
$\pi \alpha \dot{\rho \varepsilon ı \mu ı ~} 85$
тарєгох $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega 365$
тарі́ттии 193，212，
305， 487
тápoikos 269
Tapo̧úva 387
таротри́vш 350－1
тарр $\eta$ тí 123，135， 229

Tỡ $96-7,175,215$ ， 261， 316
то́́बX 212
татрథ̃оऽ 437，458， 497
$\pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$ 261，263， 449
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \pi \omega 149$
$\pi \varepsilon ́ p \propto \sim 424$
тєрí 125，175，339－40， 437

тєplס́́c 133
$\pi \varepsilon р ı \pi \propto \tau \in ́ \omega$ 84，236， 431
$\pi \varepsilon \rho เ \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \cup \cup \omega 10$
терітіӨпй 193
теріхผроs 225
те́троs 27
тı̛́ちん 137， 205
тінтрпри 493
тіттт 131，141，253，
255， 437
motevic 79
miotis 239
miotós 203， 319
$\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta$ os 67
$\pi \lambda \eta$ Өưva 303
т入クро́ш 173
т入oıópıov 73， 206
т $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ oĩov 73， 206
TTVEบ̃น 223
TVOท́ 223， 389
Totén 17，31，41，87－8， 238， 359
тоі́ $v \eta 121$
то入ıта́pXŋラ 384
толıтві́ 443
то入itns 435
тоגús 165， 212
movnpia 243
movipós 403
торєט́ou๙ı 91，96，419， 462
ториеía 105
торфиро́тш入ıs 375
тотє́ 113
тоти́piov 181
$\pi \rho \tilde{〔} \xi 1 \varsigma 405$
трव́ббढ 367， 405
трєбßútepos 360
$\pi \rho \eta$ ทท่s 219
тро́́y 443
тро́ $\beta$ тои 208
троүıレஸ்бкш 471
тро日uцia 385
трооріちь 250
тротетท́s 411
тpós 229，242， 255
тробєuXท́ 217
тробะÚXํน๙ 314－15， 377
тробغхळ 286－7
тробர்入uтоs 265
тробка $\lambda$ ह́Oルаı 263

тробкартєрє́ $\omega 265$
тробко $\lambda \lambda$ áou๙ı 261
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega 348$
тробл $\alpha \mu \beta$ 人́vш 489
тробนÉvに 327， 397
тробтіттт 131， 379
тробтіӨпиі 233，256， 329
тробчо́үııv 205
троб由то भ́ттทs 316
тро́бштои 239
тро́фабıs 167， 488
трофŋтะบ́ш 135
трохєірі弓оиаı 439
трохеıротоvéడ 318－19
трผ̃тоऽ 197－8，211，
382－3， 463
$\pi т \omega x$ ós 111，138－9
$\pi \cup \lambda \omega \dot{\omega}\langle 33$
тuvӨ̛́voual 55
Tడّ̃ 248，291， 324
р́ $\alpha \beta$ si $24-5$
paß8oũxos 381
ṕqбioupyía 339
ค́ $\tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha 325$
$\sigma \alpha \lambda \epsilon \cup \cup \omega \omega$
इauapías 45
баvర่́́ $\lambda_{1}$ ov 331
бعळuTOŨ 303
бغ́ß๙бน 389
б́́ßоцаı 348
ok $\sigma v \delta \alpha \lambda i \zeta \omega 1$
oKEŨOS 297
oknvomotós 393
$\sigma$ тєīpa 306
бтєрриодо́yos 388
бт⿱㇒木𧰨0ıs 446－7
бтєрєó $\omega 239$
бuүкатачп甲i弓ん 219
ouyxpóoual 47
ouyXúva 432
बu弓そうغ்ف 361
ouそṅтnols 361
$\sigma \cup \lambda \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega 313$
$\sigma \cup \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega 387$
$\sigma \cup \mu \beta O \cup \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \omega$ 135， 299

бuน甲ép． 405
бuน甲
оטน廿ท甲i弓ん 405
oưv 221
ouvóry 133
ouvary

बuvavtác 313， 419
ouvapтá̧̌ん 267
б＇vঠєббนоs 289
ouvסроиท่ 433
ouveysíp． 77
ouvépXoual 323

बuvéx $\omega 394$
ouvoठをúف 295
ouvoui入є́ 313
бUvтe入éc 432
ouvtiӨnul 449
бuvTóん ${ }^{\circ} 454$
бúvtpopos 337
oúp 357

oфpवүі广， 43
oxiちん 445
$\sigma \chi i \sigma \mu \alpha 113$
$\sigma \dot{\sigma} \zeta \omega$ 39， 142
$\sigma \omega \tau$ ńp 53
татєєขофроби́vт 418
tápaxos 406
тव́б大ぁ 438
tóxos 463
Tє 33， 211
тпрย́డ 113
тiӨqui 165， 331
тıนáa 63， 107
tíuios 261， 420
Tís 20，433－4
T15 61，68， 257
toioũtos 407
toooũtos 68
трі́ттєуои 415
трผ่ү 80
TuYxávo 475
tútros 202
túpavvos 403
ப́ßpi弓ん 351－2
ப்ாவ் $\gamma \omega 91$
ப́trakoúa 333
ப̇Tríp 42， 428
ப́ттерорव́㇒ 391

ÚTா○ßג入入 267
ن́mod́x́xoua 383－4
ÚTroסéc 331



ÚTTOбтє́ $\lambda \lambda \omega 419$

ப́trootpéqa 289
Úттотре́х曰 484－5
úчó 341
фаขєро́ш 22， 85
q$\alpha \cup$ т $\alpha \sigma i ́ \alpha ~ 469$
фє́pん 465
poóryos 223
$\varphi$ oóvos 271
poveús 281－2
甲орє́డ 188－9
фи入акŋ́ 437
甲иえакiלん 441
甲ப入व́ббん 283， 431
甲 $\omega$ vย́డ 155， 311
фढขท் 223－4
Фడ̃ऽ 15
$\chi \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \omega \omega 485$
Xа́роүчиа 391
Xळрі३оца 467
Xápis 319，463， 465

Xєıротоvย́ 357

Хо́ртоs 69
Хрві́ 148， 423
Xрпиのтi！$\omega 311$
Xpiotós 26
Xpóvos 214
Хроvотріßє́ف 417
$\chi \omega \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\alpha} 105$
X $\omega$ рїち 393
$\psi \eta \lambda \alpha \varphi \alpha ́ \omega 391$
廿uXグ 351， 420
$\psi \omega \mu$ ív 151
డ 211
డ̃ $\mathrm{p} \alpha 65$
ఉs 17，25，31，241，273， 321
ఉ்ธEí 23， 25
డ゙ $\sigma \pi$ हр 325
ฝัTe 243

## Latin

a, ab 35, 102, 297, 304, 384
abduco 182, 448
abeo 91, 377, 462
abigo 397
abluo 379
abnauigo 397
abnego 247
abominatus 313
Abraham 343
absoluo 189, 411
abstineo 262, 431
abstraho 424
absum 206-7
ac, atque 19
accedo 315,417
acceptio 316
acceptor 316
accersio 247
accerso 247, 417, 461
accido 131, 279, 333, 379
accingo 485
accipio 66, 156, 233,
240-1, 489
accola 269
accresco 256
accumbo 149
accurate 437
accuso 411, 451
acquiesco 429
actus 405
ad 242, 251, 255, 291, 402
addo 233
addubito 323
adduco 182
adfero 359
adglutino 261
adhaereo 261
adhortor 368
adigo 375
adimpleo 167
adiungo 371
adiuuo 373
administratio 265
administro 265
admiratio 237
admoneo 311, 482
admoueo 193
adolescentia 471
adorior 395
adoro 377
adseruo 299
adsto 323
adsum 85
aduena 265,269
aduenio $85,215,315,427$
aduentus 343
aduersum 150
aduersus 293, 301
aduoco 263, 497
aedes 251
aedifico 35,363
aedo 31
aegroto 126-7
aemulatio 257
aemulator 429
aemulor 271
aequitas 391-2
aequus 264
aestimo 225-6
aetas 346-7
afficio $107,172,212,351-2$
afflictio 173
affligo 275, 395
ager 252
agnitio 106
agnosco 106
agnus 208
ago 54-5, 367, 395
alienus 115
alioqui 155
alioquin 155
aliquando 113
aliquis 61, 257
alius 149,183
allego 371, 382
alleuo 489
alligo 185
alloquor 348
alter $149,183,199$
alterutrum 275
altitudo 47
altum 215
altus 47
ambitio 469
ambo 293
ambulo 84, 236, 431
amplius $83,367,421$
an $110,115-16,181$
anima 351,420
animaduerto 322
animaequior 489
animus 175, 334, 351, 418
annona 335
annuncio 263, 337
annuo 333
ante 281
antecedo 17
anxietas 173
aperio 161
apostolus 149
apparatus 469
appareo 212, 223
appello 72
appono 329,395
apprehendo 14,137
appropinquo 447
appropio 447
apud 229,311
arbitror 168
aresco 163
argentarius 407
arguo 411
ars 285, 287
articulus 214
artificium 393
ascendo 71
aspectus 89
aspicio 24,216
asporto 201
assentior 441
assigno 305
assisto $383,441,487$
Assos 483
assumo 156
asto 193, 441
at 21
atqui 89
attendo 277
attollo 51, 133
attonitus 295
attrecto 391
audenter 229
audio 117, 297
auditus 145
auello 424
aufugio 378
augeo 256
auiditas 385
aulaeum 393
aurifaber 407
aurifex 407
ausculto 286-7
aut 31,110
autem 21, 172, 264, 483
autoritas 16, 473
baptisma 221
baptismus 221
basis 235
benedico 243
benefacio 355
beneficium 355
bestia 322, 493
bimaris 491
blasphemia 267, 349
blasphemo 349
breui 463
breuis 143
breuiter 454
buccella 151
cado 131, 141, 253, 255, 287, 297, 308, 331, 437
caeterum 21, 264
calcio 331
caliga 331
calix 181
candidus 315
cano 155
canto 155
capax 105
capio 105, 205, 298
carcer 437
carcerarius 479
carissimus 367
castellum 289
castitas 462
caueo 431
causa 411, 456, 465
-ce 213-14
Cedron 179
censeo 365
certe 381
certo 460
certum 443
cesso 263, 422
ceterum 264
ceu 321
charitas 153
cingulum 427
circiter 437
circumligo 133
circumpono 193
circunforaneus 383
circunfulgeo 294
circunfulguro 294
circunspicio 265
cito 463
ciuilitas 443
ciuis 435
ciuitas 290-1, 443
clanculum 131, 383-4
clarifico 141, 143
claritas 65
clementia 455
coartor 394
coenaculum 415
coepio 17, 470
coetus 347-8
cogitatio 391
cogito 135,370
cognitio 106, 467
cognomentum 325
cognomino 56, 325
cognosco 106
cogo 375
cohonesto 107
cohors 306
collabor 131, 253
collactaneus 337
collaudo 234
colligatio 289
colligo 133, 429
colloquor 313
colo 279, 348
comburo 405
comedo 50-1, 80
comitor 323
commemoro 315
commercium 47
comminor 247
commoror 41, 135, 368, 397
comperio 451
compesco 355, 491
compleo 167
complures 212
comporto 405
compos 483
comprehendo 14, 137, 145
comprobo 454
computo 405
concido 131, 255
concito 350-1, 383
concludo 441
concomitor 295
concordia 275
concordo 363
concors 499
concurro 267
concursio 433
concursus 433
concutio 378
condemnatio 40
condemno 39
condo 179
confero 405
confestim 323
confido 79, 175
confirmo 239
conflicto 387
conforto 298-9
confundo 432
congero 183
congredior 323
congregatio 255,279
congrego 133, 221
coniicio 41,94
connumero 219
conor 484
conquiro 361
conquisitio 361
consaluto 425
conscendo 71
consentio 261, 263, 283, 441, 499
conseruo 367
considero 265, 277, 322
consigno 75
consilium 299, 347, 412-13
consolator 159
consolido 239
consolor 368, 415, 482
consono 363
conspectus 239, 271
conspicio $17,212,223$
conspicor 24
conspicuus 41
conspiro 255, 449
constituo 165, 265
constitutio 179
consuetudo 221
consulo 135, 369-70
consulto 135
consummo 432
contaminatio 365
contemplo 389
contignatio 415
continuo 72
contio 409
contra $21,150,172$, 290, 481
contradictio 313
contristo 172-3, 208
contumelia $351-2$
contumeliosus 267
conturbo 383, 432
conualesco 299
conuenio 255, 429, 449
conuicior 117, 349
conuicium 267, 349
conuoco 263
coopto 219
copiosus 165, 414
coram 271, 281
corripio 267
corroboro 298
corrumpo 351
cotidie 233
coutor 47
crastinus 27
credo $44,79,203,319,449$
crimen 465
cultura 389
cultus 168
cunctor 439
cunctus 96-7
cur 20, 275
cura 121, 480-1
curo 246, 480-1, 495
custodia 437, 479
custodio 113, 283, 367
damnatio 467
de 33, 102, 295
debilis 353
decedo 393
decerno 365, 392
decerto 79
decido 131, 297, 437
declaro 85
declino 60-1
decretum 372
decumbo 59
deduco 386, 443
defectio 430
defendo 274
deficio 371
defigo 215-16
definio 390
degrauo 414
degusto 415
deiicio 141
delego 265
deleo 341
deligo 211-12, 318-19
demento 285
demitto 300-1, 384, 485
demolior 267
demoror 41
denarius 405
denique 215
denuntio 97, 247
denuo 37, 357
deorsum 102
deprecatio 217
deprehendo 459
depugno 445
derelinquo 121, 467
descendo 285, 287
descisco 83
desero 121
desideo 129
destruo 35, 267, 341
detineo 454
deueho 484-5
deuenio 472, 487
deuoro 34
dexter 181
diabolus 83
dico 103,458
dictum 273
dies 21, 86
diffundo 219
diiudico 245
dilectio 153
dilectus 367
diligentius 399, 443
dilucesco 333
diluculum 415
dimitto $121,134,189$,
300-1, 347-8
dirimo 411
discedo 247, 262, 340-1, 371, 393
disceptatio 361
discessio 421
discessus 421
discumbo 149
disperdo 347
dispicio 361
dispono 241, 281
disputo 301, 361, 413
disseco 223, 445
dissensio 113, 446-7
dissero 387,413
dissimulo 391
distribuo 251
diu 415
diuersor 307
diuido 251
diuinus 391
diuulgo 317
docibilis 78-9
docilis 78-9
doctus 78
dogma 372
doleo 243
dolor 169
domestice 419
domesticus 307, 379
domus 251
donec 155, 273
donum 319
dubitatio 313
dubito 311
duco 294, 297
dudum 113
dum 216
e, ex 33, 35, 283, 295, 297, 375
ecclesia 255, 279, 409
edo 51,80
edoceo 399
educo 191, 381, 436
efficio 238
effugio 378
effundo 219
effutio 449
egenus 138-9
eiicio $115,256,381,487$, 489-90
eiusmodi 407
eleuo 51
eligo 166, 211-12
emitto 301, 321, 324
enim 43
eo 81
erga 242
ergo 57, 81
erigo 35
eripio 277
erudio 437
eruo 277
Esaias 19
et $19,33,63,76-7,216$
etiam 76-7, 130, 167
euanesco 347
euangelizo 263
euenio 289
euerto 366-7
euoco 311
exactius 399
exalto 341
examinatio 469
examino $245,441-2$
exaresco 163
exaudio 117
excido 222, 331
excipio 383-4
excito 35, 393
excusatio 167, 435
execrabilis 95
execratio 95
exedo 34
exeo 187, 377
exerceo 285, 405
exhibeo 168, 212, 305
exiguus 359
exilio 236
exinde 190
existimo 225-6, 331
exordior 221
exorior 18, 267
expauesco 237
expecto 413
expergefacio 378
expergiscor 378
expers 355
expleo 167,431
expono 367
exporto 256
exsurgo, exurgo 267, 445
extasi 237
extemplo 323
extendo 251
extimulo $350-1$
extra 246, 283
extraho 357
extremus 146-7
extruo 35
exulto 380
exuro 405
faber 407
facies 239
facio $17-18,31,41,51,279$, 333, 367, 412
factio 257
factum 41, 405
fallacia 339
familiaris 337
famulus 307
fas 313
fascia 133
fauor 463
fera 322
fere 25
ferme 25
fero 109,243
festiuitas 92
festus 86,92
feteo 133
fidelis 203, 319
fides 239
fiducia 123, 229, 239, 301
fiducialiter 301
figura 202
filius 249
finitimus 225
flagellum 441
flagrum 441
flatus 223
fleo 171
flo 201
foenum 69
foetus 273
foras 246, 375
fore 353
fores 433
fornicatio 105
forsitan 47
fortiter 301
fraudo 253
fretum 424
fugio 378
futurum 227
generatio 346-7
gens 92, 319
gentilis 92, 141
gero 449
gesto 188-9
gigno 359
gloria 65, 335
glorifico 141, 143, 429
gnarus 471
Graecus 92, 141
gramen 69
gratia 319, 463, 465, 467
gratificor 465
grauor 305
grex 121
gusto 308, 415
habeo 58, 329, 408
habitator 225
haeresis 257
haesito 311, 323
halitus 389
haud 459
haudquaquam 185
haurio 31
haustrum 47
Hesaias 19
hic $15,34,41-2$
Hierosolyma 215
Hierusalem 215
homicida 281-2
homo 381, 455
honor 335
honorabilis 261
honorifico 63
honoro 63
hora 65
hortor 486
hospitium 495
hospitor 307
huc 425
huiusmodi 407
humane 480
humanitas 455
humaniter 480
hyberno 483
hyemo 483
iaceo 59
iacto 489
iactura 487
iam 59, 61, 83, 303, 337, 369, 457
ianua 333,433
ibi $58,369,425$
ibidem 369
idcirco 119
ideo 119
idololatria 387
ieiunatio 357
ieiunium 357
igitur 81, 214, 289, 302
igneus 223
ignis 223, 275
ignotus 435
ilico 72
illabor 287
ille $13,15,19$ etc.
illic 58
illinc 483
illino 111
illiteratus 245
illustris 227
illustro 143
immitto 147
immo 21, 401
immunis 98
impingo 490
impleo 167,173
impono 113, 132-3, 193, 481
imputo 408
in $20-1,65,95,237$, 273, 291
inambulo 236
incandesco 387
incendium 275
incendo 493
incipio $54-5$
incito 387
inclino 199
incola 269
incredulus 44, 475
incumbo 265
incunctanter 313
inde 483
indico 451
indigeo 148
indolesco 208
inedia 485
ineo 299
infensus 334
infernus 102
infero 389
inficior 247
infirmitas 58
infirmus 127,353
infundo 31
ingenue 123
ingero 389
ingredior 71, 152
iniicio 95,475
iniquitas 243
iniquus 396, 458-9
iniungo 453
iniuria 274-5, 396, 465
iniustus 458-9
innotesco 219
innuo 333
inobediens 475
inquieto 365
inquilinus 269
inquinamentum 365
inquisitio 455
inquit 19
inseruio 346-7
insinuo 382
inspiratio 389
instans 265
instauro 363
instituo 399,437
institutum 268
insto 67, 175, 394
insufflo 201
insulula 484
insuper 260
integritas 239
intelligo 153
intendo 216, 287, 465
inter 167, 275
interficio 475
interminor 247
interpretor 25
interrogatio 469
interrogo 55, 207, 214
interuallum 254
intra 311, 413
intro 152
introeo 152
introgredior 379
introitus 343
intueor 24, 215-16, 493
intumesco 71-2
inuado 267
inualesco 299
inuenio $25,313,451,459$
inuentum 391
inuerto 339
inuicem 51, 149, 153, 233
inuidia 271
inuiso 265,274
inungo 112
Ioannes 14-15
ipse 16, 34, 136, 303
iratus 334
irrito 387
irrumpo 379
irruo 308
is $23,34,41-2$
Israel 22-3, 214
iste $34-5,42$
ita 81, 243, 381
itaque 57, 289
iter 295, 381
iterato 37
iterum 37, 111
itidem 62-3
iudicium 40
iudico $39,365,455,468$
iustitia 391-2
iuuentus 471
iuxta 255, 342
labefacto 366-7
laedo 275
laetor 380
lamentor 171
lampas 414
langueo 126-7
languidus 127
languor 403
laudo 234
lauo 379
legatus 149
lego 149, 481
leuo 51
libere 229
libero 103-4, 277
libertas 123
liberus 103-4
licet 16
lictor 381
ligo 133, 185
linio 111
lino 111
litigo 79
littus 490
loculi 139
longe 441
loquela 53
loquor 103, 348-9, 402, 449
lucerna 414
lucrifacio 486
lumen 15
lux 15,415
macto 309
magis 423
magistratus 384
magnalis 225
magnifico 429
magnificus 225
magnus 67
maior 158, 497
maledicentia 267
maledico 117, 402, 445
maledictio 95
maledictus 95
malefactor 185
malicia 243
malus 403
mandatum 137
mando 97
manduco 50-1, 309
maneo 217, 321, 413, 427
manifesto 22, 85, 161
manifestus 22, 227
mansito 217
manus 297, 439
marsupium 139
maturius 463
medior 87
medius 21
memor 325
memoria 315
mercator 33
mercatus 33
mergo 414
merito 397
mille 69
minaciter 247
minimus 359
ministerium 265, 329
ministro $337,423,461$
mino 397
minus 155
mitto $41,147,149,272$, 324, 331
modicus 68, 91, 143, 153, 403
modo 116,478
moeror 169
moestitudo 169
moleste 243
molestia 169
momentum 214
mora 417
morbus 58, 403
moror 41, 135, 427
mortalis 355
motio 58
moueo 57, 378, 419
multiplico 303
multitudo 67
multus $67,165,212$, 348, 414
municeps 435
murmur 87
mutuo 153, 275
mutus 291
mutuus 153
nam 43, 327, 411
nanciscor 25, 139, 475
nardus 137
narro 323-4
nascor 37
natatoria 111
natio $319,346-7$
nauicula 73, 206
nauigiolum 206
nauigium 206
nauigo 339-40, 358, 397, 481
nauis 73, 206, 425
Nazarenus 27
-ne 187
ne $37,41,61,85,167$
nec 33
necdum 101
necessitas 423
nego 247
negociatio 33
negociator 33
negocium 265, 361
nequam 403
nequaquam 309
neque 31
nequitia 243
nescio 23, 31
nimirum 151
nisi 291
nobilior 383
nobilis 382-3
noceo $185,275,395,465$
nolo 61
nomen 65
nomino 56
non 459
nondum 101
nosco 23
notus 219, 247
nouissimus 146-7
num 37, 214
numen 391
numerus 95
numquid 37,51
nunc 116
nuncio 333
nutrio 436
o 211
ob 125
obambulo 317
obiicio 451, 465
obligatio 289
obnitor 484
obnoxius 355, 411
oborior 233
obscurus 435
obsequium 168
obsequor 107
obseruo 113
obsigno 43
obsisto 325-6
obstupesco 237
obtempero 87
obtentus 488
obticesco 326
obturbo 365
obuenio 419
obuiam 313
obuincio 133
obuio 375
obuius 313
occido 309
occisor 281-2
occupo 145
occurro 313, 375
occursus 496
offendo $25,81,313$
offero 193-4
offula 151
oleo 133
Oliueti 96
omnino 431
omnis $96-7,215,316$
operor 41
opifex 407
opificium 407
opinor 168
oportet 438
oppidulum 289
oppidum 71
opsonium 205
optimus 451
opus 36-7, 41, 148, 423
oraculum 311
oratio 53, 217
ordino 281, 438
ordo 257
organum 297
orior 18
oro $314-15,377$
ostendo 373
ouile 119
ouis 208
palam 84, 123, 135
pallium 189
palpo 391
paracletus 159
pareo 261
pariter 211
paro 219
partim 491
passibilis 477
passio 212
passus 269
paternus 437, 497
patior 477
patrius 437, 458
paulisper 153
pauper 138-9
pax 275
per 41, 233
perago 87
peragro 285
perambulo 338-9, 381
percontor 55,214
perditio 177
perditus 177
perduco 294, 377, 386, 448
perfero 451
perficio 173
pergo 329
periclitor 407
periculum 407
permaneo 327, 427
permitto 134, 195-6
pernosco 460
perpendo 135
perseuero 98, 327
persuadeo 396
pertineo 121
pertraho 441
pertranseo 285, 317
perueho 483
peruenio 285, 417, 472, 481
pes 263
peto 239
pigritor 305
piscina 111
placitus 264
planta 235
plebs 67, 234, 377
plenus 17, 173
plerique 409
plus 409
poculum 181
poenitentia 231
poeniteo 239-40
pono 165, 331
pontifex 244,443
pontificius 244
populus 67, 234
porrigo 251
porro 21, 101
porto 188-9
possessio 252
possideo
post 483
posteaquam 73, 319
posterus 21, 27, 308, 374
posthac 61, 395, 421
postquam 31, 73, 149, 319
postridie 308
postulo 239
potentissimus 451
potestas 16, 473
potius 423
praebeo 149, 212, 393
praeceptum 137
praecipio 97, 247, 453
praecipitanter 411
praedico 263, 337, 476
praefectus 271, 291
praeficio 291
praefinio 250, 390
pracordino 318-19, 439
praeparo 439
praepositus 271
praescio 471
praesidium 351
praestituo 390
praesto 87-8, 323, 393
praesum 334
praeterlego 481
praeternauigo 417
praetexo 167
praetextus 167, 488
precatio 217
precium 261
precor 314-15
prendo 205
presbyter 360
pressura 173
primarius 382-3
primas 463
primoris 409, 463
primus 197-8, 211
princeps 244, 384, 409, 443
prior 197-8, 211
pro 175,428
probitas 265
procedo 63, 493
procido 131, 379
proconsul 395
procul 441
procumbo 423
prodeo 63, 187
prodo 82-3
produco 443
profecto 381
proficiscor 43, 66, 91, 96, 373, 419
profunditas 47
profundus 47
progenies 391
prohibeo 293, 325-6
proinde 325
promissio 213
promissum 213
promptitudo 385
propalam 135
prope 32, 67, 304
prophano 433
prophetizo 135
propheto 135
propinquus 32
proprius 16
propter 287, 313, 428
propterea 287
prorepo 493
prorsus 253
proselytus 265
prosequor 386
prospicio 199
prosterno 131
prostitutio 105
protendo 251
protinus 72
protraho 433, 454
proximus 32, 67
puer 249
pugno 79, 445
pulcher 481
pulmentarium 205
pungo 195
purifico 136
purpurarius 375
pusillus 68, 91, 153
puto 65, 331
quaestus 407
qualiter 418
quamdiu $110-11$
quando 262-3
quandoquidem 229
quanquam 355
quantus 249
quapropter 313
quasi $17,23,25$
quatenus 228
-que 19, 25
quemadmodum 325
quia 19, 48-9
quicquid 158-9
quicunque 47, 150, 158-9, 249
quid $20,61,68,275$
quiddam 117
quidem $85,302,346$
quiesco 429
quin 101
quinam 291
quinquies 69
quis 37
quisnam 433-4
quispiam 68
quisquam 37, 257
quisquis 47
quiuis 316
quoadusque 273
quod 19
quominus 293
quomodo 324, 418
quondam 113
quoniam 19
quoque 33,63
quotquot 175
rapio 267, 321
ratio 435
reaedifico 363
recipio $66,233,385,439$
recordor 325
recte 397
recumbo 149
redargutio 407-8
reddo 103-4
redeo 289
refero 323-4
refocillo 415
refrigeratio 240
refrigerium 240
regio 289
reiicio 145,245
relaxatio 461
relaxor 461
religiosus 284, 348
relinquo 355,467
remaneo 321
reminiscor 169
renascor 37
renuncio 333
reor 483
repente 493
reperio 25
repleo 303
reprobo 245 , 407-8
reptilis 309
reputo 408
requies 461
res 316
resipisco 231
respectus 316
respicio $24,439,483$
respondeo $456-7$
responsum 311
resurgo 207
resuscito 77
reuertor 96, 289
reuincio 133
reus 411
rogo 370, 497
Romanus 134
rumor 223-4
ruo 423
rursus 21, 111, 309
sacerdos 244
sacerdotalis 244
sacrifico 337
salio 236
saltem 257
saluator 53
saluifico 39,142
saluo 39,495
Samaritanus 45
Samuel 241
sanatio 249
sanctifico 136, 475
sanitas 239, 249
sano 246,495
sarcina 429
satis 415
satisfacio 456-7
Saul 294
scandalizo 81
scandalum 81
scenofactorius 393
schisma 113
scio 23,153
sciscitor 55
scortatio 105
sculptura 391
sculptus 391
se 55
secedo 247,261
secta 257,458
sectator 429
sector 405
secum 305
secundo 309
secundum 57,342
secus 155,251
sed 21
sedeo 129
seditio 446-7
sedo 355
seduco 285
seiungo 371
seligo 166
seminiuerbius 388
senior 257,360
sententia 467
separo 487
sepono 253
sermo 13, 145, 211
sero 71
serpens 309
seruator 53
seruio 279
seruo 39, 113, 142, 283
sese 91, 311
si 125,214
sic 185
siccine 185
sicut 23,325
significo 447
signo 43
silentio 131
similis 241, 353, 407
similiter 62-3
simul 33, 211
simulacrum 389, 410
$\sin 125$
sine 98
singulatim 99
singuli 233
sino 134, 229, 355
siquidem 43,54
sisto 443,487
solea 331
solum 437
soluo 35, 339-40, 347-8,
358, 480
sonitus 223
sono 27
sonus 223
spacium 254
species 23, 353
spectatus 265
specto 17,483
spermologus 388
sperno 145
spiritus 223
splendidus 315
stabulum 119
statuo 392, 443
struo 412
stupefacio 237, 295
stupeo 237
stupor 237
stuprum 105
suadeo 396,486
sub 65
subausculto 333
subcingo 485
subduco 60-1
subito 493
subleuo 51
subligo 331
subministro 461
subnauigo 481
suborno 267
subsidium 329
subtraho 419
subuerto 339
succedo 281
succurro 373
suffragium 357
suffugio 419
summitto $267,321,485$
sumo 489
super $37,42,95,237$
superior 211
supernus 37
supero 70
superpono 132-3
supersum 70
superuenio $215,289,427$
suppedito 423
suppeto 329
supputo 405
supra 42
surgo 207, 267, 445
sursum 37, 102
suscipio $156,240-1,383-5$, 454, 463
suscito $77,351,393$
suspensus 219
sustineo 413
suus 16
synagoga 347-8
tabernaculum 393
taceo 326
tam 68
tamen 21, 87
tanquam 23, 241
tantum 478
tantus 68
tecum 30-1
temere 411
temperantia 462
tempus 65, 190
teneo 58
tero 417
terra 437
testificor 15
testimonium 15, 65
testis 15
testor 15, 241
timoratus 284
tollo 51, 109, 201, 480
torqueo 441-2
totus 97, 261
traditio 268
trado 82-3, 177, 367
traho 297, 357, 377, 433
traiicio 71, 424
trans 280-1
transeo 373
transfreto 424
transnauigo 417
transpono 481
tribulatio 173
tristicia 169
tum 127, 134-5, 211
tumultus 406
tunc 127
tunica 354
turba 67, 377
turbatio 58, 406
turbo 57
tyrannus 403
vado $91,419,462$
valde 485
valedico 397
valefacio 397
validus 485
vas 297
vaticinor 135
vehemens 485
vel $31,211,257$
velociter 463
velut, veluti 17,321
venditrix 375
venio $287,289,315,323$, 417, 419, 463, 481
verax 89
verbisator 388
verbum 13, 273
vereor 419
veritas 316
vernaculus 219
vero $21,33,40$
versor $84,135,431$
versus 290
versutia 339
verum 21,167
verus 89
vescor 309
vespera 71
vestibulum 333
vestigium 202, 269
vestimentum 149,189
vestis 149,354
vestras 391
veto 293
via 458
viator 381
vice 273
vicinus 304-5
vicis 274
vicus 289
videlicet 16
video $17,65,168,223,361$, 373, 389, 493
vincio 185
vinctus 479
vinculum 289
vindico 274
violentia 434
violo 433
vipera 493
vir 455
vis 434
visito 265,274
vita 420
viuifico 273
viuo 431
vlciscor 274
vltio 274
vltra 280-1, 367
vna 221
vnanimis 334
vnanimiter 223, 334, 367
vnctus 26
vngo 112
vniuersus 96-7, 215, 261
voco $247,311,417,458$
volo 369-70
voluntas 347, 385
vox $223-4$
vrbs 358
vrgeo 383
vsque $31,147,211$, 327, 386
vt $31,41,167,273,324$
vter 221
vterque 293
vtique $47,130,255,431$
vulgaris 403
zelus 257
zona 427


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ No account is taken here of the mistaken notion that Erasmus' Latin translation was originally compiled between 1506 and 1509: see A. J. Brown "The Date of Erasmus' Latin Translation of the New Testament" Cambridge Bibliographical Society Transactions viii (1984), pp. 351-80. Further discussion and bibliography relating to this topic will be found in the introduction to ASD VI, 1.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart, 1993: 27th edition), abbreviated as $\mathbf{N}^{27}$.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ The standard Vulgate editions used for this purpose are those of J. Wordsworth - H. J. White, et al, Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Cbristi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi (Oxford, 3 vols., 1889-1954); R. Weber, et al, Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem (Stuttgart, 1983: 3rd edition).

[^3]:    ${ }^{9}$ The use of the symbols 2815 and 2816 instead of $2^{2 \mathrm{p}}$ and $4^{\text {ap }}$ is a recent innovation, and has the advantage of avoiding confusion with codices $2^{e}$ and $4^{e}$, which contain only the Gospels and are completely different manuscripts. The use of $2^{2 \mathrm{p}}$ and $4^{2 \mathrm{P}}$ was a relic of the older system of manuscript numeration, introduced in the eighteenth century by J. J. Wettstein. The new numbers have been adopted by $\mathrm{N}^{27}$ (see n . 2) and K. Aland, et al, Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (Berlin and New York, 1994: 2nd. edition).
    ${ }^{10}$ An edition of that portion of codex 1 which contains the Gospels is provided by K. Lake Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies (Cambridge, 1902: vol. vii, 3 in Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature).

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ See J. Geerlings Family 13 (The Ferrar Group): The Text According to Jobn (Salt Lake City, 1962: vol. xxi in Studies and Documents). A complete collation of codex 69 is found in F. H. A. Scrivener An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis, ... To wobich is added a Full Collation of Fifty Manuscripts (Cambridge, 1859).

[^5]:    745vid $75 \mathrm{~N}^{*}$ and many later mss., including codd. 2 and $817^{*}$, which omit тоò énoũ. Erasmus here follows cod. 1, with support from only a few other late mss. A different wordorder, $\eta^{\gamma} \lambda$ Өov $\pi \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu o u ̃$, is found in codd. 69

[^6]:    
    15,2 фєр $A^{c} B-E:$ фєрєı $A^{*}$

[^7]:    2 Nouerat そुँ $\delta \varepsilon \iota$（＂Sciebat＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Iob．1，33．

    2 qui prodebat ठ тарабьठoús（＂qui tradebat＂ $1516=$ Vg．）．See on Ioh．6，64．

[^8]:    21 ßєvı $\alpha \mu \mathrm{v}$ C CE: $\beta_{\varepsilon \nu ı} \alpha \mu \eta \nu A B$

[^9]:     B-E: ито $A \mid \operatorname{\pi a\rho } B-E: \sigma u v A$

