Some hermeneutical assumptions latent within the gospel apparatus of Eusebius of Caesarea

Thomas O'Loughlin, Nottingham, UK

Abstract

The presence of Eusebius's gospel apparatus (often incorrectly referred to as 'the Eusebian Canons') in the margins of so many of gospel codices, both in Greek and over the whole range of versions, is sufficient evidence of the importance of that work in the history of gospels' study. At first sight, it appears an unproblematic tool: it allows the reader to note at a glance whether a point being made in one gospel's text (sometimes as long as one of our chapters and on other occasions less than a sentence) is to be found in all four, or just three or two gospels, or nowhere else; and then, if appropriate, to find those 'parallels'. As such it is a gospel 'harmony' which preserves the integrity of each gospel, and of the four distinct gospels in that it avoids creating a fifth text, a diatessaron.

However, built into the apparatus is a series of hermeneutical assumptions about how gospel texts relate to history, how the four texts relate to one another, how the four relate to 'the gospel,' how the texts were to be read together to provide a single composite history of Jesus, an apologetic before those who would point out their mutual discrepancies (e.g. Porphyry), and what constitutes 'a parallel.' Lastly, when we compare Eusebius's assumptions with those used today (e.g. regarding 'the Synoptic Problem') we can observe the extent to which his method determined the overall shape of gospel comparison until the eighteenth century whereby there was a notional complete story of Jesus of which the four actual texts were specific redactions / perspectives.

That Eusebius wished to show how the four canonical gospels could be related to one another is so immediately obvious as not to need comment. What is not obvious, given that the parallels he provides are often not cases of verbal agreements – the underlying principle of modern synopses – are what were his assumptions when he provided parallels where this is little or no verbal similarity between sections. Moreover, we cannot a priori speak of Eusebius 'principles' in offering parallels as he offers us little guidance as to his method beyond what is contained in the *Letter to Carpianus* – however that must be our starting point because it offers more than we often imagine when we read is simply as 'operating instructions' for the apparatus.[1] The most informative passages in the letter are these:

> Through a wonderful display of skill and diligence, Ammonius the Alexandrian has left us a text which brings the four gospels into one by placing beside Matthew's gospel the related passages from the other evangelists; but this [procedure] has the effect of destroying the train of thought in the other three gospels in so far as one might seek to read them continuously.
>
> Therefore, in order that you, [Carpianus], can identify in each gospel those passages found elsewhere [among the evangelists] while saving [the integrity

> of] the text of each one of them, I have taken a hint from my predecessor yet have taken another approach.
>
> [He explains the workings of the marginalia and the tables.]
>
> Now suppose you open one of the gospels and begin reading some heading (*kephalaió*) that attracts you, and then want to know not only which of the other evangelists contain very similar things (*ta paraplésia*) but where exactly it is to be found in their gospels, then note the number identifying your pericope (*perikopes*) and then look that number up [in the tables …] ….

This is noteworthy for several reasons. Firstly, it is very often stated that the apparatus's sections go back to Ammonius and so are referred to as 'Ammonian Sections' – a confusion that seems to have its origins in Jerome's preface to the Vulgate, *Nouum opus* where he states that Eusebius followed Ammonius in the matter of the canons – but it is clear that Eusebius while recognising the value of Ammonius's labour wanted something very different.[2] Ammonius, it appears, had produced some sort of very skilful diatessaron which was viewed by Eusebius as having some serious drawbacks. First, it gave an priority to a single text, in this case Matthew's gospel, as providing the framework of 'the gospel' and as a consequence of this reduced the other three gospels to being quarries for items that could fill out *Matthew*. The text, which as a result, was read was a conflation and this appears to have troubled Eusebius. Second, this process destroyed the distinct trains of thought, what we might refer to as the narrative structure, and Eusebius believed that it was important that this be maintained intact for each of the four gospels. The significance of each in a gospel appears to have been understood by him to exist in the passage as an integral unit within a larger frame rather than in the total of all the details that could be bundled together. Moreover, when taken in conjunction with the first point, it seems clear that Eusebius does not view the text as a collection of propositions or discreet facts: the statements – some are less than sentences – are to be retained in their four narratives and are to be understood in those several narratives. Lastly, Eusebius was working with a text which he understands to have significant units of text and he wants to understand what a gospel contains by reading the text in those units. It is significant that he refers not to the numbered sections – which is how we, following Jerome's understanding of the apparatus, view his 'sections' – but to the number linked to 'the heading' (*kephalaion*) and that he expects us to read the similar passages in the other gospel. This implies is that Eusebius was working with a text which had already been divided into some sort of sense units, but more importantly for my purpose is this: he does not expect a reader to compare details, but narrative units. He appears to want those who then use his apparatus to move a whole passage to the corresponding sense unit in another gospel – and so compare sense unit with sense unit – and thus though comparison to see more deeply into the content of these passages.

Given the way that Eusebius's work has been usually been understood, this presentation of the Eusebius's intentions raises an immediate question: did the actual mechanism that he then set out in margins promote such comparisons of passages or, in its detail, encourage other ways of interpreting the gospels and other views about where meaning resides in these four texts? In effect, did Eusebius's work contain its own negation in that while seeking to allow the reader to find related passages, it

generated the view that 'the gospel' is a composite text made up all the details from the other three around the spine of *Matthew* - the mechanism generating the very thing that Ammonius produced and from which Eusebius wished to distance himself. This paper is a contribution towards answering that question by taking three examples of related passages. All three examples involve *John* because, as is recognised in the apparatus, that gospel is least like that of *Matthew*, and consequently such examples are of greater value in seeking out hermeneutical assumptions relative to this question.

Example 1: *John* 1:1-14

Examining how Eusebius approaches the prologue to *John*, however we might delimit the extent of the prologue,[3] is an appropriate first case because it is a passage that would not find any parallels in any synopsis produced using modern textual assumptions. However, as these fourteen verses are analysed by Eusebius, they are broken into five sections, all but one of which have parallels in the other gospels. This fact in itself should alert us to any facile description of Eusebius's work as a textual harmony.

John 1:1-5 forms Eusebius's Section 1 for which we are told seek corresponding passages using Canon [Table] 3. There we find this complex set of relationships:

Mt [section] 1 = *Lk* [section] 14 = *Jn* [section] 1

But the same table relates those section of *Mt* and *Lk* to two further sections in the Johannine prologue:

Mt [section] 1 = *Lk* [section] 14 = *Jn* [section] 3
Mt [section] 1 = *Lk* [section] 14 = *Jn* [section] 5

This is virtually a declaration by Eusebius that *Jn* 1:1-14 is a passage that he believes must be read as a unit of text and perceived in its totality as equivalent to the whole of the Matthaean genealogy and the whole of the Lukan genealogy. So texts that are seen as very different in terms of content (ignoring the discrepancies between *Mt* and *Lk*) and 'theological' approach are presented as somehow equivalent within Eusebius's exegetical vision.

These passages read thus:[4]

Mt 1:1-16	*Lk* 3:23-38	*Jn* 1:1-5 * followed by 1:9-10 * followed by 1:14
An account of the genealogy of Jesus the Messiah, the son of David, the son of Abraham, Abraham was the father of Isaac, … and Jesse the father of King David. And David was the father of Solomon by the wife of Uriah,	Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his work. He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph son of Heli, … son of Seth, son of Adam, son of God.	In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being in him was life, and the life was the light of

… and Josiah the father of Jechoniah and his brothers, at the time of the deportation to Babylon. And after the deportation to Babylon: Jechoniah was the father of Salathiel, … and Jacob the father of Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born, who is called the Messiah.		all people. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it. * The true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world came into being through him; yet the world did not know him. * And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth.

The first 'gap' in the text of *John*, as we have just read it, is our verses 6-8 and this becomes Eusebius's second section, which is also to be linked to other passages using the third canon table. This translates to *Mt* 3:1-2 and *Lk* 3:1-2 and the linkage that Eusebius makes is apparently straightforward: just as *Jn* turns from the 'background' of Jesus to the appearance of John the Baptist at verse 6, so that is the cue to note the point in *Mt* and *Lk* when the Baptist enters the narrative. The first point to note is that if that is the case, then surely there is a case for linking these verses of *Jn* to all four gospels (i.e. Table 1) in that Mark also has description of the advent of the Baptist (*Mk* 1:1-8). However, pursuing those sections of *Mk* we find that they relate to *Jn* 1:23 and to other passages in *Mt* and *Lk*. Taking the evidence together allows us to see that Eusebius makes a distinction between the fact of John the Baptist coming as the forerunner of the Christ and the content of John the Baptist as 'the voice crying in the wilderness' fulfilling a prophecy.[5] This subtle distinction between the appearance of the man and his message is confirmed when we actually look at Canon [Table] 3 as we are directed in the margin of *Jn* at 1:6. We find:

Mt [section] 7 = *Lk* [section] 6 = *Jn* [section] 2
Mt [section] 7 = *Lk* [section] 6 = *Jn* [section] 25

This complex indicates that Eusebius sees the two verses (1:6-8) in the prologue as linked in context with the later statement in *Jn* 3:23 that describes John the Baptist's actual work of baptizing which has the effect of adding a detail – indeed an item of geographical precision[6] – to the information about John the Baptist that is contained in *M*t and *Lk*. However, it should be notes that here, in pointing out this additional detail, the apparatus serves not to produce a harmonized text of one or other narrative but to allow the reader to gather additional information: it could be described as more 'an exegetical aid' that 'a textual aid.'

Mt 3:1-2	*Lk* 3:1-2	*Jn* 1:6-8

		followed by 3:23
In those days John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness of Judea, proclaiming, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near."	In the fifteenth year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, and Herod was ruler of Galilee, and his brother Philip ruler of the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias ruler of Abilene, during the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness.	There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. He came as a witness to testify to the light, so that all might believe through him. He himself was not the light, but he came to testify to the light. * John also was baptizing at Aenon near Salim because water was abundant there; and people kept coming and were being baptized

Having interrupted the narrative for the information on John the Baptist, section 2, Eusebius returns to the main 'story line' of the prologue which, as we have seen he presents as the Johannine equivalent of the genealogies in *Mt* and *Lk*. This set of related narratives is next interrupted by the fourth section of *Jn* (1:11-3):

> He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him. But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God, who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God.

This is marked as belonging to the tenth canon table, and as such is item that is found only in *Jn*. So this is part of the Johannine narrative but a point that is not made in either the accounts of *Mt* or *Lk*. Here an item in *Jn* is highlighted, but it is not one that could be used to harmonize with either of the genealogies and while it fills out the picture of Jesus theologically, it does not add to the text of any other gospel.

Eusebius having made the point about something unique in *Jn*, by identifying section 4 as belonging to canon 10, then resumes the narrative where we have (at least) two distinct perspectives in the canonical gospels: the genealogies in *Mt* and *Lk* and the christological hymn in *Jn*. The user of the apparatus is not expected to conflate these accounts but to see the list of forebears in *Mt* and *Lk* as a praise of the Christ, while understanding the passage in *Jn* as relating to a divine providential plan running through the whole of human history (*Lk*) and the history of Israel (*Mt*). However, the most significant aspect of Eusebius may be his silence on the discrepancies between the two genealogies: they are simply assumed to be equivalent to one another while be

equally equivalent to *Jn* 1:1-14. The reader is expected to read all three, so differing, texts as a single message belonging to 'the one gospel' of Jesus.[7]

Example 2: *John* 4:46b-54.

This example is chosen because it selects an item from the gospels in a way very similar to way we today would divide the text into stories – and so it allows Eusebius's work to be seen by contrast. These verses in *Jn* as seen as a unit – as they are in modern synopses[8] – and to find their related sections through the third canon table, thus:

Mt [section] 64 = *Lk* [section] 65 = *Jn* [section] 37

Which read:

Mt 8:5-10	*Lk* 7:1-9	*Jn* 4:46-54 (only part of verse 46)[9]
When he entered Capernaum, a centurion came to him, appealing to him and saying, "Lord, my servant is lying at home paralyzed, in terrible distress." And he said to him, "I will come and cure him." The centurion answered, "Lord, I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; but only speak the word, and my servant will be healed. For I also am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this,' and the slave does it." When Jesus heard him, he was amazed and said to those who followed him, "Truly I tell you, in no one in Israel have I found such faith.	After Jesus had finished all his sayings in the hearing of the people, he entered Capernaum. A centurion there had a slave whom he valued highly, and who was ill and close to death. When he heard about Jesus, he sent some Jewish elders to him, asking him to come and heal his slave. When they came to Jesus, they appealed to him earnestly, saying, "He is worthy of having you do this for him, for he loves our people, and it is he who built our synagogue for us." And Jesus went with them, but when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to say to him, "Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; therefore I did not presume to come to you. But only speak the word, and let my servant be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes,	Now there was a royal official whose son lay ill in Capernaum. When he heard that Jesus had come from Judea to Galilee, he went and begged him to come down and heal his son, for he was at the point of death. Then Jesus said to him, "Unless you see signs and wonders you will not believe." The official said to him, "Sir, come down before my little boy dies." Jesus said to him, "Go; your son will live." The man believed the word that Jesus spoke to him and started on his way. As he was going down, his slaves met him and told him that his child was alive. So he asked them the hour when he began to recover, and they said to him, "Yesterday at one in the afternoon the fever left him." The father realized that this was the hour when Jesus had said to him, "Your son will live." So he himself believed, along with his whole household. Now this was the second sign that Jesus did after

	and to my slave, 'Do this,' and the slave does it." When Jesus heard this he was amazed at him, and turning to the crowd that followed him, he said, "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith."	coming from Judea to Galilee.

This is a very good case of comparing sense units without any attention to the differences in detail. Read as such the similarities between *Jn* and the other gospels is highlighted, and any divergences that might distract attention deriving from an overly literal reading or a desire to cross-examine the text for veracity are ignored. However, the more significant divergence about the movements of Jesus (i.e. this incident in *Jn* takes place after a trip to Jerusalem, see *Jn* 2:13) and so of the time-line of Jesus' ministry are also passed over by Eusebius's non-identification of 4:54 – which makes clear the direction of Jesus' travel – as an item unique to *Jn*. Since the apparatus, unlike the modern synopsis, is not simply a paralleling of texts / narratives but of the message of the four evangelists, this failure to draw attention to a significant different between *Jn* and the others serves to create an impression of their similarity at the expense of noting their differences.

Example 3: *John* 5:1-23.

*J*n 5:1-18 forms as clearly a defined narrative unit in *Jn* as any: it is the story of a healing in Jerusalem that becomes the basis for a debate about the Sabbath and the Son's authority on the Sabbath. Likewise, with the exception of the phrase 'Stand up, take your mat and walk, we would not see this miracle as having a parallel in the other gospels: we study the story of 'the healing of the paralytic" are a piece of the triple synoptic tradition, without reference to *Jn*.[10] Moreover, since the overall aim of Eusebius was to show that all four gospels proclaim one message, this is a good instance of his relating the four to each other.

Eusebius, because his method is fundamentally one of comparisons, *a definitione*, does not identify the unit of text as 5:1-18, nor the subsequent bundles of sayings on the Son's authority (5:19-30) but rather a body of text (5:1-23) which is then broken into two sections: 38 which is to be read using the first canon, and 39 which is identified as being found only in *Jn* (i.e. canon 10). But it would appear that he saw 38 and 39 forming a narrative, before the saying move on to another theme. That this sectioning led to rather strange delimitation of narrative units in the subsequent tradition cannot be blames on Eusebius, but the mere fact of his sectioning where it occurs cannot but be seen as reflecting something that is happening *within the text* – and to that extent later readers cannot be said to be simply mistaken.[11] Eusebius believes that these sections are related

Mt 70 = *Mk* 20 = *Lk* 37 = *Jn* 38

and we would read them thus:

Mt 9:1-8	*Mk* 2:1-12	*Lk* 5:18-26	*Jn* 5:1-10
And after getting into a boat he crossed the sea and came to his own	When he returned to Capernaum after some days, it was reported that he	Just then some men came, carrying a paralyzed man on a bed. They were	After this there was a festival of the Jews, and Jesus went up to

town. And just then some people were carrying a paralyzed man lying on a bed. When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the paralytic, "Take heart, son; your sins are forgiven." Then some of the scribes said to themselves, "This man is blaspheming." But Jesus, perceiving their thoughts, said, "Why do you think evil in your hearts? For which is easier, to say, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, '*Stand up and walk*'? But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" — he then said to the paralytic — "*Stand up, take your bed and go to your home*." And he stood up and went to his home. When the crowds saw it, they were filled with awe, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to human beings.	was at home. So many gathered around that there was no longer room for them, not even in front of the door; and he was speaking the word to them. Then some people came, bringing to him a paralyzed man, carried by four of them. And when they could not bring him to Jesus because of the crowd, they removed the roof above him; and after having dug through it, they let down the mat on which the paralytic lay. When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the paralytic, "Son, your sins are forgiven." Now some of the scribes were sitting there, questioning in their hearts, "Why does this fellow speak in this way? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?" At once Jesus perceived in his spirit that they were discussing these questions among themselves; and he said to them, "Why do you raise such questions in your hearts? Which is	trying to bring him in and lay him before Jesus; but finding no way to bring him in because of the crowd, they went up on the roof and let him down with his bed through the tiles into the middle of the crowd in front of Jesus. When he saw their faith, he said, "Friend, your sins are forgiven you." Then the scribes and the Pharisees began to question, "Who is this who is speaking blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?" When Jesus perceived their questionings, he answered them, "Why do you raise such questions in your hearts? Which is easier, to say, 'Your sins are forgiven you,' or to say, '*Stand up and walk*'? But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" — he said to the one who was paralyzed — "I say to you, *stand up and take your bed and go to your home*." Immediately he stood up before them, took what he had been lying on,	Jerusalem. Now in Jerusalem by the Sheep Gate there is a pool, called in Hebrew Bethzatha, which has five porticoes. In these lay many invalids — blind, lame, and paralyzed. [*Verse Omitted*].[12] One man was there who had been ill for thirty-eight years. When Jesus saw him lying there and knew that he had been there a long time, he said to him, "Do you want to be made well?" The sick man answered him, "Sir, I have no one to put me into the pool when the water is stirred up; and while I am making my way, someone else steps down ahead of me." Jesus said to him, "*Stand up, take your mat and walk*." At once the man was made well, and he took up his mat and began to walk. Now that day was a sabbath. So the Jews said to the man who had been cured, "It is the sabbath; it is not lawful for you to carry your mat."

	easier, to say to the paralytic, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, '*Stand up and take your mat and walk*'? But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" — he said to the paralytic — "I say to you, *stand up, take your mat and go to your home*." And he stood up, and immediately took the mat and went out before all of them; so that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, "We have never seen anything like this!"	and went to his home, glorifying God. Amazement seized all of them, and they glorified God and were filled with awe, saying, "We have seen strange things today."	

The Johannine narrative then continues for a further thirteen verses (5:11-23) which is identified by Eusebius as a section (39) without parallels.

What is significant is that here we have an even more pronounced case of 'ignoring the discordant details' than in previous example. The timing, location, dramatis personae, actual action of Jesus, and the theological reflection of what we find in *Jn* is completely different to the others: yet on the basis of the single more-or-less common element – the words of Jesus: 'Stand up, take your mat and walk' – Eusebius draws them together. While we might see this as no more than his desire to show that the four do proclaim one gospel, that is not a sufficient explanation since most of the sections (i.e. those listed in canon tables 2 to 10) do not have this quality. So why link the healing related in *Mt*, *Mk*, and *Lk* (which would be an ideal candidate for Canon 2) with the historically distinct healing unique to *Jn* (an ideal candidate for Canon 10)? The answer lies in Eusebius's Christology: these miracles are united in that the statement 'Stand up, take your mat and walk' is to be seen as a declaration of the Son's authority, and possibly also invoking a related theme in Eusebius of his highlighting the opposition between Jesus and the Jews. Thus what distinguishes Eusebius's agenda from that of today is no merely differing assumptions about the nature of the four texts and their inter-relationships, but that his work is fundamentally an act of theological exegesis. We do not end up with a mosaic of details – as we might expect from a textual diatessaron – but a theological mosaic such that the Jesus who heals in *Mt*, *Mk*, and *Lk* is to be understood in the manner that he is portrayed in

Jn. We do not end up with a single story of Jesus but with four differing stories, but with a single Christology.

Conclusion

This sample –inadequate though it be – allows us to see Eusebius the biblical exegete at work. While there are many cases of coincidence between his work and that of the modern synopses, it illustrates a fundamental difference. The rationale of modern works relating the gospels is a logic of sources – expressed in similar statements – intended to show textual interrelationships. For Eusebius, whether or not he believed in contact between the evangelists, source relationships are irrelevant: his concern is with the actual teaching of each as distinct narratives but with a common content, and it is this similarity at the level of teaching, literally their doctrinal similarity, that allows him to make connections where modern studies would find little commonality. The coincidence with modern research is illustrated in example 2, the difference between the approaches is seen in examples 1 and 3.

Eusebius's concern with doctrinal commonality brings before us another aspect of his work. While a glance at the history of exegesis shows that Christian memory builds up a single composite image of gospels scenes from the gospels, what is less obvious, but of more far reaching consequence for theology, is that his apparatus facilitates reading all four gospels against a common ecclesial theology: he preserved four narratives but they were to be read within a single theological, especially christological, framework – and that framework was, as a guide to reading the gospels, never explicit. The gospels as structured narratives could be used to interpret one another, passage by passage, and the apparatus was acknowledged to aid this process by identifying related passages and allowing to be conveniently found. This has been acknowledged in recent scholarship by describing the apparatus as 'the world's first hot links.'[13] But the gospels were read together within a framework which was independent of them and whose underlying assumption was that each shared a common theology,[14] Since this common stance was more like a fifth gospel – beyond the four – than a diatessaron-like composite, it ensured that there would always be a gap between what was claimed as the teaching of the gospels and what could actually be found in any or all of them by textual analysis, and this gap is, arguable, as great a legacy of Eusebius to exegesis as the apparatus itself.

---

[1] The text is taken from Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (28 edition, Münster 2012), 89*-90*. The translation is my own.

[2] On Jerome's adoption of the apparatus, see Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Harmonizing the Truth: Eusebius and the Problem of the Four Gospels,' *Traditio* 65(2010), 1-29.

[3] The delimitation adopted here is to an extent arbitrary given that I am concerned with Eusebius's attitudes to the text rather than the text itself, and this is but an essay into a much larger question.

[4] Biblical translations are taken, for convenience, from the *RSV* – I am not concerned with textual issues in this paper and it would be otiose to print them in Greek from a modern edition.

[5] On the significance of the notion of prophecy in Eusebius, see Michael J. Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in he Age of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), 87-94.

[6] This is pointed out by Eusebius in his *Onomasticon*, 'A' 'from the gospels' (R. Steven Notley and Ze'ev Safrai eds, *Eusebius, Onomasticon: A Triglot Edition with Notes and Commentary* (Leiden, 2005), 42).

[7] See Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London, 2000).

[8] See Albert Huck and Heinrich Greeven, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (Tübingen, 1981), 45-7 (which identifies the Johannine unit as 4:46-53); and Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart 1988), 113-6 (same sectioning as in Eusebius).

[9] Eusebius introduces his section exactly at the point that the pericope begins in modern synopses: '46b.'

[10] See Huck-Greeven, *Synopse*, 49-51; and although Aland, *Synopsis Quottuor*, 124-5 does bring the same texts into comparison, this does not falsify the common judgement but merely shows that the rationale of this work is precisely to maximise the number of pericopes in which there are four texts in parallel.

[11] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Division systems for the gospels: the case of the Stowe St John (Dublin, R.I.A. D.ii.3),' *Scriptorium* 61(2007), 150-64; and idem, The Biblical Text of the Book of Deer (C.U.L. Ii.6.32): Evidence for the Remains of a Division System from its Manuscript Ancestry,' *Scriptorium* 63(2009), 30-57.

[12] I am omitting v. 4 – as do all modern editions of the New Testament – but this should not be seen as a comment on the text of *Jn* used by Eusebius, simply that to include it would require a lengthy justification as would be a digression from the purpose of the this paper.

[13] The phrase comes from James O'Donnell and is cited by Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge MA, 2006), 199.

[14] This has been noted recently by Matthew R. Crawford who refers to 'the tables' – this should refer to the apparatus rather than the tables – as 'the Hermeneutical Key to a Canonical Reading of the Fourfold Gospel' in 'Ammonius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea and the Origins of Gospels Scholarship,' *New Testament Studies* 61(2015), 1-29 at 26-8.