

THE DIATESSARON OF TATIAN

A PRELIMINARY STUDY

BY

J. RENDEL HARRIS,

FORMERLY FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
AND NOW PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LANGUAGES IN HAVERFORD COLLEGE
PENNSYLVANIA.

LONDON:

C. J. CLAY AND SONS,

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,

AVE MARIA LANE.

1890

PREFACE.

THE following notes are an attempt to meet the needs of students who are commencing the study of the relation of the re-discovered Harmony of Tatian to the early texts and versions of the New Testament. For such an important and far-reaching enquiry we are not likely to have too many helps by the way. Those who read German will enjoy Zahn's masterly study of the question; but in view of the published Arabic version of Tatian's Harmony, there is much in Zahn that needs to be re-stated; those who do not read German will be obliged to use Hemphill's little book, which contains some of the principal facts about Tatian and his work, but does not profess to offer anything that is new. There is certainly room for one more short introductory tract on the subject. I cannot but believe that we are on the border of a new era in the criticism of the origin of the Gospels, and that before long the obscurity which hangs over the primitive texts will in great measure disappear; the multitude of possible hypotheses is in process of rapid reduction; there is an enormous heap in the critical threshing-floor, it is true; but we may live to see the chaff and corn fly asunder.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. TATIAN	1
II. THE MSS. UPON WHICH THE ARABIC TRANSLATION OF TATIAN'S HARMONY IS BASED	5
III. HISTORICAL NOTICES OF THE DIATHESSARON	9
A. Doctrine of Addai	9
B. Eusebius	10
C. Epiphanius	11
D. Rabbula	12
E. Theodoret	13
F. Bar-Ali	13
G. Bar-Bahlul	14
H. Dionysius Bar-Salibi	14
I. Gregory Bar-Hobneus	15
J. Ebed-Jesu	16
K. A scholiast in Ev. 72	16
IV. QUOTATIONS FROM THE DIATHESSARON	17
A. Doctrine of Addai	17
B. Aphraates	19
C. Ephrem	22
V. THE RELATED HARMONY OF VICTOR OF CAPUA	25
VI. APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO THE GOSPELS FOUND IN THE DIA- THESSARON	27
VII. COMBINATIONS AND AMPLIFICATIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE HARMONY	35
VIII. TRACES OF THE DIATHESSARON IN THE MSS. OF THE GREEK AND LATIN GOSPELS	42
IX. TEXTUAL RELATIONS OF THE TATIAN HARMONY	50
X. UNSOLVED PROBLEMS	59
APPENDIX ON CODEX W ⁴	62

THE DIATESSARON OF TATIAN.

BY

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

I. TATIAN.

THE present tract offers itself as a study of the work of a famous Church writer of the second century, whose direct influence over the men of his day must have been very great, if we may judge from the circle of holy acquaintance in which he moved, and the disciples that attached themselves to his teaching; and whose indirect influence over the Church at large by means of the edition of the Gospels which he brought out, to say nothing of his other works, remains still an uncalculated factor of which we can hardly say less than that it must have been wide-spread, since it outlived for centuries the excommunication with which the Church visited both the man and his writings. But, while we may feel safe in regarding Tatian as one of the leading Christians of the second century, we cannot say that we know much of the details of his personal life. There is nothing that operates more powerfully as an 'oblivious antidote' in the consciousness of the early Christian centuries than an excommunication; and, while in modern times heresy has often been the passport to biographical honor and a certain measure of dignity, there is hardly a case of the kind in the early days; for one can hardly dignify with the name of history the scanty and often misleading notices which are found in the pages of Epiphanius and other writers on the primitive heresies, nor can we accuse these writers of the fault of excessive charity towards doubtful characters.

What we know about Tatian is, then, briefly as follows: he was

¹ I suppose Mr Hemphill to mean something of this kind when, in his *Diatessaron*, p. ix., he says that Tatian's "influence for good had outlived itself".

a native of Assyria (by which we are to understand, in all probability, the country east of the Tigris) who came to Rome in the days of Justin Martyr. In those times the search for truth was commonly accompanied by the outward and visible sign of a pilgrim's staff; and Tatian's long outward journeyings are no inapt representation of the visits which his enquiring mind made to the various schools of Greek philosophy. He went through dry places, seeking rest and finding none. The solemn assemblies of the philosophic seemed to him to be a mere dogmatizing of one against another, and a crude venting of transitory fancies. Rhetoric was worse than philosophy, a mere hireling taking sides for a fee; and as for poetry its chief end seemed to be to glorify the amours of the gods and to secure the corruption of the soul.

We shall probably be right in referring the conversion of Tatian to Christianity to the influence of Justin, whom he met in Rome. Not only did he accept Justin as his teacher in the new faith, and imitate, in his presentation of Christianity, the method of Justin, which of itself suggests that the influence of Justin goes back into the first stages of his Christian life; but the terms in which he describes his conversion are parallel to Justin's own experience. Precisely as Justin was led by his instructor to make a careful study of the Hebrew Scriptures, so Tatian affirms that he lighted on certain barbaric writings too old to be compared with the opinions of the Greeks and too divine to be compared with their errors; and from the study of these writings he at length came to find within himself the principle of truth which he had sought without in so many quarters: and it shews something of the struggle through which he had passed, when we find him saying that, when we dig for the hidden treasure of the kingdom, we may indeed be covered with dust, but we secure it as our lasting possession.

The Address to the Greeks, the only one of Tatian's works which has survived besides the Harmony of the Gospels, gives many suggestions of the writer's experience; and although some of the methods which he employs are very foreign to our time, and some of his points sound oddly enough in the nineteenth century (as for instance when he refuses to believe a philosophy—say that of Anaxagoras—which maintains the sun to be a red-hot mass, and the moon an earth), we can readily forgive the defect of his

physics, when he tells us that the chief business of man is to seek for what we once lost, to unite the soul with the Holy Spirit, and to strive after Union with God. Nor is it to be wondered at that a man who expresses himself in this language of the Mystics should have shewn tendencies of an ascetic character, since every mystic is at some part of his career an ascetic, and in the early Church it often happened that the whole of the Christian life was made the arena of the spiritual athlete, in which he combated the foes that he found in his flesh. So that we need not be surprised that Tatian abandoned the use of wine and of flesh-meats, and that he denounced marriage, and that he wrote a treatise on the teachings of our Lord concerning Perfection.

The early fathers affirm that, as long as Tatian was under Justin's influence, no extravagance was found in him deserving of censure; and they are probably right in referring the more formal development of his views to the later part of his life. His fellowship with Justin was unbroken up to the close of Justin's earthly career; and when the machinations of the cynic philosopher Crescens were employed to revenge upon the Christian teacher the denunciation of his vile life, Tatian was, as he himself tells us, exposed to the same danger as Justin: so that we may be sure that Tatian never was excommunicated by his teacher. After Justin's death, Tatian became a prominent leader of Christian thought. Amongst his pupils were Rhodon, of whose writings some fragments are preserved, and no less a personage than Clement of Alexandria. We may conjecture that his intercourse with the latter is to be assigned to the return of Tatian to his native country Assyria by way of Greece¹. The extreme asceticism of Tatian is condemned by Clement in his writings, which is another indication that in his later life he must have become more pronounced in his views: and we may therefore say that Tatian became an Encratite (as the Ascetics of that day were named) after his return to the East, and (which is perhaps involved in the preceding term) a Gnostic. Certainly he must have accepted so much of Marcion's views as concerns the belief in a

¹ The language of Clement of Alexandria is as follows (*Strom.*, i. 1): "of these blessed men, one was in Greece, the Ionian; the other in Magna Grecia; another of these from Coele Syria, and one from Egypt: and others in the East of whom one was born in the land of Assyria, and the other a Hebrew from Palestine." He is generally understood in these last cases to refer to Tatian and Theodotus.

Demiurge, and the distinction between the Good God and the Just God, for he interpreted the sentence, "Let there be light," as a prayer made by some lesser being, some struggling Ajax of an inferior deity, to the Supreme God. He also took an extreme view with regard to the salvability of Adam, and is condemned by the fathers for not recognising that, so far from Adam being the representative lost soul, we ought rather to believe that, where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: an argument which Irenæus did not seem, in giving it, to realize as capable of an application beyond the immediate subject. We shall shew by-and-by that all of these views, or nearly all,—celibacy, disuse of wine in the Eucharist and elsewhere, Gnostic distinction of God, non-salvability of Adam,—are commented upon by Ephrem in the exposition which he made of the Tatian Harmony; and, since no personal allusion is made to Tatian throughout Ephrem's work, we can form some idea of the hold which his principles must have taken in Mesopotamia, for his work remained in circulation long after he was dead and his errors are discussed anonymously.

We may now proceed to the discussion of the Diatessaron, Tatian's Gospel-harmony, and we may observe that this work had been to all appearances lost at a very early date. At least the historical notices which we have of it are all early except those in a few Syrian writers. No attention had been paid to the Arabic codex brought by Assemani to the Vatican library more than a century and a half ago, which was said to contain a version of the Diatessaron. But as soon as Ephrem's commentary on it was made accessible in a Latin translation by Mössinger, and it was recognized that the early Syrian father Aphraates quoted it extensively, it became possible for Zahn to make a critical study of the Diatessaron and to attempt to reconstitute a part of the text mainly from Ephrem's commentary assisted by the homilies of Aphraates. Remarkable as a successful attempt at textual reconstruction, it yet gives but an imperfect idea of the text of the Diatessaron: it contains only about one-fifth of the whole work, and even that in a most fragmentary and disjointed condition, while the textual accuracy of a large portion is doubtful and tentative. This is not said in disparagement of Zahn's wonderful work, but to correct a misapprehension which seems quite current, that he has practically reconstituted the entire text. This opinion is embodied in the elaborate paper in Smith and

Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, where it is stated that he has recovered and "printed the text in detail."

On the other hand, for textual criticism, Zahn's text, as far as it goes, is far more valuable than the Arabic version. In the former we have the primitive, in the latter a reformed text. A slight comparison will make this quite clear. Tatian's original Syriac text agreed in great part with the Curetonian Syriac (*Sc.* of Zahn), and evidently preceded the Peshito (*P.*) or reformed Syriac text. This is shewn by Zahn. It is a disappointment to find that, in the case of the Arabic version, the passages where there was a substantial difference between *Sc.* and *P.* have been altered to conform to the latter. It is impossible to say exactly at what time this was done, and whether in the Syriac original or in the Arabic version. It seems, however, probable that, after the Peshito had become the authoritative text, fresh copies of the Diatessaron were made to agree with it, probably long before the ninth century, when the Syriac MS. from which the Arabic version was made, was written by a pupil of Honain.

A second textual change, also to be regretted, consisted in the omission of a large proportion of the passages introduced by Tatian into the Gospel narrative, which were either wholly apocryphal or adapted from some other Gospel passage. Most of these have disappeared from the Arabic version, probably by a process of gradual elimination, but those that still remain in Zahn's fragments are sufficient proof that their number in the original text was considerable¹.

II. THE MSS. UPON WHICH THE TEXT OF THE DIATHESSARON IS BASED.

The Diatessaron of Tatian has been preserved to us in an Arabic version of which two MSS. are now in Rome; the text of these MSS. has been published by Agostino Ciasca, a well-known Orientalist and one of the guild of Scriptorum connected with the Vatican library². One of these MSS. has long been known as

¹ The obliteration of the Israelitish character of the Gospels as shewn, e.g., by the omission of the words "in Israel," "among the Israelites" &c., as noticed by Zahn, is not to be found in the Arabic version.

² *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice*. Nunc primum ex duplici codice edidit et translatione latina donavit P. Augustinus Ciasca ord. Erem. S. Augustini, Biblioth. Ap. Vat. Scriptor, Romae, 1888.

existing in the Vatican library; while the other has recently been brought from Egypt, and is now in the possession of the Museo Borgiano at the College of the Propaganda. From these Arabic MSS., which are in close textual relation with one another, Ciasca produces an edited text which may confidently be taken to represent the Tatian Harmony in the form of its first Arabic appearance, and he accompanies this text with a translation, designedly expressed, as far as might be done, in the terms of the Clementine Vulgate. It must be admitted that this method of text transference is somewhat misleading: the assumption being made that the original text of Tatian underlies the Arabic, it would be more reasonable to connect it with those earlier Latin versions, whose critical relations with the text of Tatian are certainly extremely close, by means of an apparatus criticus, even if no attempt was made to employ their modes of expression in the translation of the Arabic. It is true that Ciasca's edition does not pretend to be a critical one, and consists merely of text and translation without prolegomena, excursuses or foot-notes, mainly in order to avoid delay in the publication.

Denoting the two MSS. from which the Arabic text is taken by the signs *A* and *B* we collect the following data concerning them from the published accounts: and first in regard to MS. *A*, which, because of its completeness, forms the basis of the text though it is but carelessly written. It is not a little strange that this MS. should have waited so long for an editor, when it was definitely described more than 150 years ago by Stephen E. Assemani in the Catalogue of the Vatican Arabic MSS. (*Mai, Vet. Script. Nov. Coll.* iv. 14), amongst which it bears the number XIV., as being the very Diatessaron of Tatian. For Assemani quotes its colophon as follows: "*In fine fol. 123 hæc a librariis adnotata reperies: Explicit auxilio Dei sacrosanctum Evangelium quod ex quatuor Evangelis collegit Tatianus, quodque Diatessaron vulgo dicitur. Et laus Deo.*" It was described with equal clearness by Joseph S. Assemani (who brought it to the Vatican library) in his *Bibl. Or.* i. 619, as *Tatiani Diatessaron seu quatuor Evangelia in unum redacta*. The MS. consists of 123 leaves of paper, written probably in Egypt, by a hand judged variously to be of the twelfth or probably of the fourteenth century. The book, especially in the earlier part, is in a bad state of preservation: one leaf is missing after fol. 17, and another after fol. 117. By a curious misunder-

standing on the part of Assemani, it was believed for a long while that this MS. commenced with the Gospel of Mark, instead of beginning, as tradition affirms of the Tatian Harmony, with the fourth Gospel. Thus, according to Assemani, the introduction stood as follows: *Exordium primum Evangelii ex Marco. Dixit Initium praedicationis Jesu Christi*: and, although the Gospel of John follows immediately upon this, the tendency of the words quoted was to obscure the identification of the text with Tatian. It was however suggested by Ciasca, in a preliminary pamphlet published some time ago¹, that the words were the gloss of a scribe, directing the reader to commence the Harmony, much in the same way as in modern churches the preface is made, "Here beginneth" in reading the lesson. According to Ciasca the words should therefore run: *Incipe exordium Evangelii ejus ex Marco. Dic: Initium evangelii Jesu Christi, Filii Dei*. This explanation turns out not to be perfectly correct, but the conjecture was verified, in so far as the statement was made that the prefixed words were not a part of the Harmony, by the recovery of the second MS. (*B*), which has them in a slightly different form at the close of a prologue to the Harmony and detached from the text. This at once suggests that the MS. *A* is, in some of its details, subordinate to, and a later form than that of *B*, a supposition which the following consideration confirms. The early tradition concerning Tatian emphatically asserts that his Harmony did not contain the genealogies of our Lord as found in Matthew and Luke. These genealogies are, however, found in the Vatican text. A reference to the text of *B* shews them, not indeed in the text, but as an appendix to the Harmony, that is to say, in the first stage of the process of insertion. Such an observation, while it establishes to a certain extent the subordinate character of the text of *A*, and vindicates the identification of the text of the Harmony with that of Tatian, awakens at once our suspicion as to the state of preservation of the text itself. It is very unlikely that MSS. which shew the absorption of such considerable interpolations (which were probably made as an appendix in their Syriac ancestor) should have remained free from those lesser and almost unconscious adaptations by which the text of a Biblical MS. is

¹ *De Tatiani Diatessaron Arabica Versione*. Cod. Vat. decimum quantum descripsit, etc. A. Ciasca, Paris, 1883. (Extract from Pitra's *Analecta Sacra Spicil. Solesm.* Vol. iv. p. 465 sqq.)

continually conformed to the received texts of the time in which it is written. We must be prepared, therefore, to find accretions and omissions in the transmitted text of the Harmony as received from the Arabic copies.

The second MS. of the Harmony (*B* of Ciasca) was presented in 1886 to the Borgian Museum by Halim Dos Gali, a Copt in communion with the Catholic Church. It consists of 355 leaves of paper, and is referred to the 14th century: the first part of the book is occupied with a prefatory dissertation on the Gospels; the Tatian Harmony being found on foll. 96^b—353. From the prologue to the Harmony, as well as from a note at its closing page, we obtain the following important information:

1. That the Harmony is the work of Tatian, called Diatessaron, or Quaternary:

2. That it was translated from Syriac into Arabic by a certain Abulfaraj¹, or, as the scribe calls him with fuller name, Abulfaraj Abdullah Ben-at-tib:

3. That the copy used by Abulfaraj was a Syriac MS. made by the hand of 'Isa ben Ali Almottabbe^b a disciple of the celebrated Abu Zaid Honain ben Ishaq.'

This Honain was a famous Syrian physician and writer in medicine, who died in the year 873, and whose headquarters were at Bagdad, at the court of the Khalifs. He was noted as a literary leader and as the head of a school of translators from Greek into Syriac and into Arabic which was very important in the development of Arabic culture. Since Almottabbe^b was his disciple, we can hardly place the translation of the Diatessaron into Arabic earlier than the end of the ninth century. Further, the date of the death of Abulfaraj is given by Bar-hebraeus as A.D. 1043. The copy which he used was therefore less than 150 years old. The Diatessaron had seen 700 years of Syriac life before its translation into Arabic; and we can readily infer that the Syriac at the time of translation must have been in many points altered from its original cast. Still, the comparison with the collateral evidence is sufficient to justify us in our belief that we have here substantially the work of Tatian.

¹ To be distinguished from the later and more famous Abulfaraj (Gregorius Bar-hebraeus, A.D. 1226—1286).

III. HISTORICAL NOTICES OF THE DIATESSARON.

From what has been said, it will be seen that, in describing the MSS. from which Ciasca's text is made, we have been careful to avoid the assumption that the text of the Arabic Harmony is necessarily and at all points identical with that of the Diatessaron of Tatian. For, even if we accept the Harmony as Tatian's on the ground of its general agreement with the traditional Tatian, we are obliged to note in the MSS. themselves a tendency to change in the most striking Tatian characteristics; and further, since the Harmony is substantially a New Testament MS., it is impossible that it could have remained in circulation without being affected by the same causes which were in operation to change the form of every successive recension of the New Testament into agreement with the latest recension of all.

But this assumed liability to change, while it may be regarded theoretically as inevitable, requires to be carefully estimated by the practical comparison of the Arabic form with such portions as may be current in earlier periods, or with other Harmonies which may be traced back into the same root with it. This requires a study, in the first place, of the general descriptions given by the earlier fathers of the Diatessaron as known, more or less completely, to them; and, secondly, of the portions of the text of the New Testament current in early patristic writings which with any degree of probability are assumed to be derived from or closely related to the Harmony.

We begin with the chronological notices of the Harmony. The first of these is, we believe, found in the apocryphal Syriac work known as the *Doctrine of Addai*, a tract best known on account of the correspondence which it contains between the Lord Jesus Christ and Abgar Uchomo the king of Edessa.

A. *Doctrine of Addai* (beginning of III. cent.).

Phillips.
Doct. Add. c. 35, 15-17. "Moreover, much people day by day assembled and came together for prayer and for the reading of the Old Testament, and the New, the Diatessaron¹. And they believed in the resurrection of the dead."

¹ *Diatessaron* is clearly the reading of the St Petersburg MS. of the *Doctrine of Addai*; though the British Mus. MS. has the unintelligible *Ditornon*, while the Armenian, connecting with what follows, makes the people believe in the Trinity. The wide-spread corruption indicates antiquity for the true reading.

From this curious apocryphal history of the founding of the Church of Edessa, we are entitled to infer that, at the time of its composition, the use of the Diatessaron was so habitual in that city that the writer of the legends had no idea of the prevalence of any other custom at an earlier time: for, if the idea had been present to him of the circulation of any such earlier gospel, he would not have made his apostles and primitive teachers gather the people together to the hearing of the Diatessaron. But this writing must be assigned to a very early period: it was translated into Armenian in the fifth century; the St Petersburg MS. of the work belongs to the sixth century, while the British Museum MS. may be even earlier; and it was translated into Greek for Eusebius in the earlier part of the fourth century. We cannot, therefore, assign it to a later date than the close of the third century: and, since a large part of a century must be allowed for the growth of the tradition in the Church as to the use of the Harmony by the apostolic men who brought Christianity to Edessa, we are obliged to regard the passage quoted above as evidence for the circulation of the Diatessaron in Edessa at a time very soon after that of its composition. We may verify this by another consideration. In the original document there stood these words of Addai: "Blessed are ye that have believed in me, not having seen me: and, because ye have so believed in me, the town in which ye dwell shall be blessed and the enemy shall not prevail against it for ever." Now it seems almost certain that such predictions could hardly have been referred to the Lord in the time immediately following the year A.D. 217, when Edessa was devastated by the Romans; and perhaps this date may be an inferior limit to the time of production of the Doctrine of Addai, and, *à fortiori*, to the date of production of the Diatessaron. This takes us back to the time of Tatian himself.

E. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV. 29, 6 (A.D. 264—340).

Ὁ μέντοι γε πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ὁ Τατιανὸς συνάφειν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν ὃ καὶ παρὰ τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται.

"The former leader of the Encratites, Tatian, composed somehow a kind of combined and concurrent gospel and called it the Diatessaron, a work which is still circulated in some quarters."

It is not quite easy to tell how much acquaintance, on the part of Eusebius, with the text of the Diatessaron may be inferred. His language seems to imply a want of approbation of Tatian's method, but has been interpreted to mean total ignorance of his work¹. If the last were the true interpretation, it would not only militate strongly against the existence of a Greek Diatessaron, but would require us to believe that the Diatessaron in Syriac was circulated entirely, or almost entirely, in the Euphrates Valley, for Eusebius could hardly have been unacquainted with a Syriac book commonly current in Palestine. Of one thing we may be certain; that in the time of Eusebius the Diatessaron was already under censure and in process of elimination from the Churches; otherwise he could not speak of its being *still* circulated in some quarters. And, if under censure in the time of Eusebius, it looks as if this were the result of an indiscriminating antagonism to Tatian's writings generally; for it is not easy to see why a simple harmony of the Gospels should provoke hostility, even if an occasional apocryphal sentence be found therein. There is hardly any period in the history of the Church when some one has not been combining or harmonising the narratives of the four Gospels: nor would the Church normally visit such efforts with censure.

C. *Epiphanius, Heresies*, 46, 1. (A.D. 320—402.)

λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι,
ὅπερ κατὰ Ἑβραίους τινὲς καλοῦσι.

"They say the Diatessaron Gospel owes its origin to Tatian, some people call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews."

What Epiphanius means, by suggesting an identification between the Diatessaron and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is not very plain. The confusion may have arisen, (*α*) by a reflection that since the Encratites used the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and Tatian had joined himself to them, his Syriac compound Gospel must be the same as theirs; or (*β*) because Tatian may have made use of passages found in the Gospel of the Hebrews, so that the transference of the singularities of that Gospel invited a misunderstanding as to the nature of the Har-

¹ According to Lightfoot (*Cont. Rev.*, 1877, p. 1136; *Essays on Supernatural Religion* 1889, p. 278): "It is not ignorance of the contents, but disparagement of the plan of Tatian's work, which the expression of Eusebius implies."

monised Gospel on the part of superficial readers; or (γ) it may mean nothing more than that one Syriac (or Hebrew) Gospel was mistaken for another, which was current in some neighboring region of the East. Of these alternatives the second stands without support; no passage which tradition assigns to the Gospel of the Hebrews having been clearly demonstrated to be absorbed in the Harmony: the third alternative seems hardly a strong enough explanation: the first is, however, an adequate hypothesis for the facts of the case; nor would it be inconsistent with our second hypothesis, viz., the use of the Hebrew Gospel in the Harmony, if such use could be clearly proved. If Tatian made his harmony after he joined the Encratites, he would be very likely to transfer something from their favorite text; but this point is not yet clear; the Harmony, as we have it, is singularly free from anything bordering on Gnostic Asceticism.

D. *Rabbula*, Canons of Edessa (A.D. 412—435).

Zahn quotes from amongst the Canons of Rabbula, bishop of Edessa, the following rule:

"Let the presbyters and deacons have a care that in all the churches there be provided and read a copy of the distinct Gospel"
(ܠܟܠܟܕܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܝܬܐ).

This distinct Gospel is the antithesis to the compiled Gospel, and the Canon is an enforcement of the same rule which we shall presently find Theodoret putting in operation, viz. the expulsion of the Diatessaron and the introduction of the separate Gospels. This is the reason why, in the Syriac Gospels of Cureton, the first gospel is marked with the singular title, "Distinct Gospel of Matthew"; and not, as Cureton imagined, because it was in any way detached in historical development from the other Gospels. The use of the expression shows that the Cureton copy (the MS., not the Version) is an antidote to another gospel which was current when it was written. The fact that the Diatessaron was really a Church Lectionary comes out also from the fact that the Arabic Version still presents it to us as divided into 55 sections, for the Sundays and chief feasts of the Ecclesiastical year, much in the same way as the Pentateuch is divided by the Jews.

E. *Theodoret, De fab. haer.* (A.D. 453.)

Οὗτος τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν εὐαγγέλιον, τὰς τε γενεαλογίας περικόψας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα γεγεννημένον τὸν κύριον δείκνυσιν. ἐχρήσαντο δὲ τούτῳ οὐ μόνοι οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου συμμορίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἐπόμενοι δόγμασι, τὴν τῆς συνθήκης κακουργίαν οὐκ ἐγνώκοτες, ἀλλ' ἀπλούστερον ὡς συντόμῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ χρησάμενοι. εὗρον δὲ ἀγῶ πλείους ἢ διακοσίας βίβλους τοιαύτας ἐν ταῖς παρ' ἡμῖν ἐκκλησίαις τετιμημένας, καὶ πάσας συναγαγὼν ἀπεθέμην καὶ τὰ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεισήγαγον εὐαγγέλια.

"He (Tatian) composed the so-called Diatessaron by cutting out the genealogies and whatever goes to prove the Lord to have been born of the seed of David according to the flesh. And this work was in use not only among his own party but even amongst those who follow the tradition of the Apostles, who used it somewhat too innocently as a compendium of the Gospels, without recognising the craftiness of its composition. I myself found more than 200 copies in reverential use in the churches of my diocese, all of which I removed, replacing them by the Gospels of the four Evangelists."

Theodoret was bishop of Cyrus on the Euphrates, and his diocese included about 800 churches¹. If we assign a single copy of the Gospels to each church, we find one fourth of the churches reading the Diatessaron. So that in the neighborhood of the Euphrates and beyond that the Harmony must in earlier times than Theodoret have been substantially the one Gospel accepted for church use. No such phenomenon presents itself elsewhere. For once, the proverb that "a prophet is without honor in his own country" was completely falsified. But then Tatian spent most of his time in travel and in the West.

F. *Bar-ali, Glossary.* (A.D. 885.)

Payne Smith, *Thesaurus*, i. 869. "*Diastarsun* (otherwise *Diakutrun*): the Gospel which is the Diatessaron, made by Titianos, the compiled Gospel. A gospel made, in a general sense, on the sense of the four Evangelists (God's blessing be upon them!). It contains neither the natural nor the traditional genealogy

¹ Theod., *Ep.* 113.

of our Lord Christ: and he who made it (Titianos) has on that account been anathematised."

G. *Bar-Bahlul* (latter half of Xth century).

A Syriac lexicographer of this time and name gives us the following notice: "*Diatessaron*, that is to say, the Gospel compiled from the four Evangelists."

In this there is no reference to the author; so that, in strictness, Bar-Bahlul ought not to be quoted amongst the historical authorities for Tatian's work. The sentence above given is taken from the oldest MS. of Bar-Bahlul's work, dated 1214 A.D.¹ Later MSS. however, quoted in Payne Smith's *Thesaurus* (p. 870), add the sentence, "and this was composed in Alexandria and was made by Tatian the Bishop." These words are taken from a notice of Dionysius Bar-Salibi or from Bar-Hebraeus to whom we shall presently refer, and it will not be necessary to explain twice over the confusion into which the lexicographers have fallen.

The name "the compiled Gospel," which is probably the old Syriac twin-term with *Diatessaron*, suggests acquaintance on the part of Bar-Bahlul with the book itself: and the more so, since, as Zahn² has pointed out, he uses the corresponding term, "the distinct Gospel," to describe the Gospel of Matthew. For he says (on Matth. xxvii. 16) that in this passage "This Bar-abba is called Jesus. So it stands written in the distinct Gospel." The Curetonian text is missing at this point, or we should probably be able at once to verify the gloss which gives a well-known and remarkable ancient reading ("Jesus Bar-abba or Jesus who is called Messiah?").

H. *Dionysius Bar-Salibi* († later than 1207 A.D.).

In his Commentary on the Gospels³, he writes:

"Tatian, the disciple of Justin the Philosopher and Martyr, selected from the four Gospels and patched up and made a Gospel and called it *Diatessaron*, that is to say, the Compiled: and this work Mar Ephrem commented on. Elias of *Salumia*, who is also called Aphthonius, made a Gospel on the model of the *Diatessaron*

¹ MS. Socin., I.

² *Tatian*, p. 103.

³ Assemani, *Bibl. Or.*, i. 57; II. 159.

which Ammonius had made, to which Eusebius alludes in the introduction to the Canons which he gave to the Gospel. But Elias sought for that Diatessaron and could not find it, and so he made another, taking it for his model. And Elias finds fault here and there with the Canons of Eusebius, and points out errors in them, and with good reason. The copy which Elias made is not easy to come at."

The writer distinguishes three Diatessarons, all of which were until recently supposed to be lost. The first is Tatian's, of which he speaks somewhat scornfully as if he were drawing his information from Eusebius, but at the same time adding the important information which he could not have derived from Eusebius, that Ephrem had made the text of the harmony the groundwork of a Commentary. This information is of the highest value, and has been verified by the recovery of the actual commentary of Ephrem.

The second harmony is the one mentioned by Eusebius as the work of Ammonius of Alexandria. Bar-Salibi knew little of it, and we hardly know more: it may, however, some day be found.

The third, that of Elias of *Salamia*, is, I believe, only known from this passage. Even in the time of Bar-Salibi, it was rare to find a copy.

I. *Gregory Bar-Hebraeus* († 1286).

Bar-Hebraeus, in an introduction which he makes to his Scholia on Matthew¹, writes as follows:

"When Eusebius of Caesarea saw the confusion which Ammonius of Alexandria had made in the Gospel, that is the Diatessaron, the compiled Gospel whose beginning is, 'In the beginning was the Word,' and Mar Ephrem has expounded it; he preserved the four Gospels in the integrity of their form, but pointed out the agreement of the words by Canons written in red."

The language shews that this is derived from Eusebius and Dionysius Bar-Salibi: only the writer confounds two of the Diatessarons mentioned by Bar-Salibi, and describes Tatian's as though it were that of Ammonius, while he makes a further blunder in raising the author of the Harmony to the Episcopate.

¹ Assemani, *Bibl. Or.*, i. 57.

J. *Ebed-Jesu* (beginning of cent. XIV).

This writer describes correctly the Harmony of Tatian, whose labors he makes the model of his own: but he falls into an apparent confusion between Tatian and Ammonius, into which he may have been led by Bar-Hebraeus. The passages in which he refers to the Diatessaron are as follows:

Maï, *Script. vet. nov. Coll.*, x. 191: "When Tatian, a certain philosopher, had comprehended intellectually the meaning of the utterances of the Evangelists, and had fixed in his mind the object of their divine work, he collected from the four of them that admirable work which he called the Diatessaron, in which, while following most carefully the right order of the words and deeds of the Saviour, he did not add a single sentence of his own."

Cf. also Assemani, *Bibl. Or.*, III. 1, 12: "The Gospel which an Alexandrian of the name of Ammonius collected (he is also called Tatian) and named it the Diatessaron."

From Ebed-Jesu's remark about Tatian's caution in compiling the harmony, we can almost infer that he used some such copy as our Arabic text gives, in which Tatianisms (if one may coin the word) have been reduced almost to zero. It is remarkable that, as Tatian's text became accommodated to the accepted versions, he himself seems to have recovered his ecclesiastical reputation.

K. *A scholion in Ev. 72* (XIth cent.).

This MS., one of the Harley Codices in the British Museum (No. 5647), has been brought forward in connection with Tatian on account of a scholion which is found on its margin over against Mt. xxvii. 49.

ἢ ὅτι εἰς τὸ καθ' ἱστορίαν εὐαγγέλιον Διαδώρου καὶ Τατιανοῦ καὶ ἄλλων διαφόρων ἁγίων πατέρων τοῦτο προσκεῖται·

ἢ ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα· τοῦτο λέγει καὶ ὁ Χρυσόστομος.

These notes (*σημειώσεις*) have provoked much comment, inasmuch as they proffered an explanation of the presence in many early copies of Matthew (at the close of c. xxvii. 49) of words describing the piercing of the Saviour's side: "But another taking a spear pierced his side and there came out water and blood."

The Annotator says that it was found so in the historical gospel of Diodorus, Tatian, and other holy fathers; and that Chrysostom says the same. The testimony is obviously incapable of verification inasmuch as neither in the Arabic nor the Armenian does the passage in John follow here. Probably it was a guess on the part of the Annotator, who referred to the Diatessaron of Tatian, as the most natural cause to explain a displacement; but his suggestion may have been quite wide of the mark. Possibly we are to understand *Διαδώρου* as a mis-read abbreviation for *διατεσσάρων* = *διαδ̄*, for we know of no historical gospel of Diodorus, although the well-known Diodorus of Tarsus wrote a commentary on the gospels, now lost. The reference of the writer to Chrysostom is probably a misunderstanding caused by a hasty reference. The writer can hardly be taken therefore as an authority for anything in Tatian. Dr Burgon, in his *Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (p. 316), has unfortunately stamped his approval too definitely on this scholium: "Not only is the testimony of the critical fact abundantly sufficient, but the proposed solution of the difficulty, in itself the reverse of improbable, is in the highest degree suggestive as well as important. The circumstance before us is *the only thing we know for certain* about the text of Tatian's (miscalled) harmony." The italics are Dr Burgon's!

IV. QUOTATIONS FROM THE DIATESSARON.

A. *Doctrine of Addai.*

Passing from the direct or indirect historical references to the Diatessaron in early writers, we ask what quotations from the Tatian Harmony may be considered as fairly identified. Naturally, our first thought will be that we should most likely find such quotations in Syriac writers, and especially in such as flourished before the edition of the Syriac Vulgate, or before that text had thoroughly established itself in public favor. For instance, we have shewn that the Doctrine of Addai makes reference to the use of the Diatessaron in the city of Edessa, and implies no knowledge of any other gospel as current in that city: and we may therefore reasonably expect that the scriptural references in the Doctrine of Addai are references to the Diatessaron. This is a matter capable of being tested: we shall show, later, traces of

remarkable apocryphal readings found in the Doctrine and in the Diatessaron. But, without referring to these, we may examine some simple Scripture references in the Doctrine of Addai, and compare them with the Harmony. Take the following passage for example:

"Abgar commanded them to give to Addaeus silver and gold. Addaeus said to him: How can we receive that which is not ours? For, lo! that which was ours have we forsaken, as we were commanded by our Lord to do: because without purses and without scrips, bearing the cross upon our shoulders, were we commanded to preach His Gospel in the whole creation."

The last words certainly contain a reference to the 15th verse of the last chapter of Mark: "Preach the Gospel to every creature," and we are sure that the last twelve verses of Mark were found in the Diatessaron, for they are in Zahn's reconstructed text, in the modern Arabic Harmony, in the old Cureton Syriac, and in other early Syriac monuments which use the Diatessaron or are related to it. There are other references of a less certain character, such as perhaps Luke xxii. 35: "I sent you out without purse and scrip," where the Diatessaron has the plural, 'purses and scrips,' just as the Doctrine of Addai.

Again, take the following passage:

"And he said to them: Because the gate of life is strait and the way of truth narrow, therefore are the believers of the truth few." Here the passage quoted is Matth. vii. 14. The text which the writer used contained therefore the sentences: "Strait is the gate and narrow the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Now the words "the gate" are omitted by a group of early authorities, and were accordingly bracketed as doubtful by both Lachmann and Tischendorf. The Diatessaron, however, has them. The present case is not so good as the previous one, because there was really no sufficient ground on which to base a rejection of the words from the text, or even a hesitation with regard to them. Several other references may be found in the Doctrine, all agreeing with the Diatessaron with sufficient closeness; nor is there any reference, so far as I know, to invalidate the hypothesis, that the Gospel of the author of the Doctrine of Addai was the harmonised Gospel of Tatian. More striking instances will be found later on.

B. *Aphraates the Persian* (c. 340 A.D.).

Aphraates of Farad, better known as Mar Yakub, was bishop of Nisibis (?) and Abbot of the convent of St Matthew near Mosul, and, according to Zahn, is one of the chief Patristic authorities for the Diatessaron.

His homilies, comprising an alphabetically ordered series of 22 sections, were written about the year 336 A.D., and a supplementary 23rd homily was added in the year 345. From these homilies we may extract large portions of the Gospel as used by Aphraates, and determine the relative order of many parts of that Gospel. The first 22 homilies are based upon the text of the Diatessaron. We may test this in various ways. In the first place, the general sequence of the narrative may be examined. Before the complete Harmony came to light, this was done by Zahn, who detected the following sequence in a summary of our Lord's sayings and doings, as given by Aphraates: against each detail we will set its place in the Diatessaron.

<i>Aphraates.</i>	<i>Diatessaron.</i>
1. Sermon on the Mount:	Ch. VIII, IX, X.
2. First case of healing (the Centurion's son):	Ch. XI.
3. Stilling of the Storm, and expulsion of the legion of devils:	Ch. XII.
4. Healing of Jairus's daughter, and of the woman with the issue:	Ch. XII.
5. Healing of two blind men:	Ch. XII.
6. Sending out of the Apostles:	Ch. XII.
7. The woman who was a sinner:	Ch. XV.
8. Of the cost of building a tower:	Ch. XV <i>fin.</i>
9. Expulsion of the devils and purifying of the house:	Ch. XVI. <i>init.</i>
10. Parables of the Sower and the treasure hid in the field:	Ch. XVI.
11. Attempt to throw Jesus headlong:	Ch. XVII.
12. Feeding of the 5,000:	Ch. XVIII.
13. The Canaanite woman:	Ch. XX.
14. Healing of the man with an impediment in his speech:	Ch. XXI.

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------|
| 15. | Healing of blind men : | Ch. XXIII. |
| 16. | Transfiguration : | Ch. XXIV. |
| 17. | Healing of the lunatic lad : | Ch. XXIV. |
| 18. | Warning not to despise these little ones : | Ch. XXIV. |
| 19. | The man with an infirmity of 38 years' standing : | Ch. XXII. |
| 20. | The rich young man receives counsel as to perfection : | Ch. XXVIII. |
| 21. | The rich man and Lazarus : | Ch. XXIX. |
| 22. | The workers sent into the Vineyard : | Ch. XXIX. <i>fin.</i> |

In every case, except No. 19, the order followed is that of the Diatessaron: observe the place occupied by the attempt of the Nazarenes to throw Jesus headlong, which is far beyond the place to which it is usually assigned by Harmonists. It certainly looks as if Zahn were right in his general statement, that Aphraates used a Harmony, and that this Harmony was that of Tatian.

But we may also take a continuous passage in Aphraates and subject it to examination. Let us take the one quoted by Zahn (p. 76), the story of the rich young man. We will place the Arabic Harmony side by side with the Homily:

<i>Aphraates.</i>		<i>Tatian: Arabic.</i>	
"What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?"	<i>Mark</i> X. 17.	18.	"Good Master, what shall I do that I may have eternal life? Jesus said unto him: Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, God.
			19. Thou knowest the commandments.
	<i>Matth.</i> XIX. 17.		If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.
The Lord said unto him: Do not commit adultery, Do not steal,	<i>Mark</i> X. 19.	18.	The young man said unto Him, What commandments? Jesus said unto him: Do not commit adultery: Do not steal, Do not kill, Do not bear false witness:
			Honour thy father and thy mother and love thy neighbour as thyself. The young man said unto him, Thus have I done, since I was
	<i>Matth.</i> XIX. 19.	20.	as thyself. The young man said unto him, All these have I kept from my youth:

<p>a boy. But what lack I? Then Jesus looked upon him lovingly and said, One other thing is lacking to thee: If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and take up thy cross and follow me. And that man, when he heard, became very sorrowful and went away gloomy to his house, because he was very rich in possessions. And Jesus</p>	<p><i>Mark</i> x. 21.</p> <p><i>Matth.</i> xix. 21.</p> <p><i>Luke</i> xviii. 23.</p> <p><i>Mark</i> x. 23.</p>	<p>What lack I yet? But Jesus, having looked upon him, loved him, and said to him; If thou wilt be perfect, one thing is lacking to thee, go, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and take thy cross and follow me. At this word the face of the youth became austere, and he went away sorrowful; for he was very rich. But Jesus seeing his sorrow, looked towards his disciples and said to them, How hard it is for those who have monies, to enter into the kingdom of God."</p>
---	---	---

said: See how hard it is for those who trust in their possessions to enter into the kingdom of heaven."

It will be observed that the order in Aphraates is closely that of the Harmony: he transposes two clauses in Matth., XIX. 21: and in the last sentence he gives "those who trust in riches," for "those that have riches," as though he had a different text to the Harmony: but this is not the case, for the reading of Aphraates is the early Western text in Mark, x. 24, which follows almost immediately in the Harmony. We may say, then, that there is a close agreement between the text of the Harmony and the text that underlies the Homilies of Aphraates. Perhaps the connection will be clearer if we draw attention to one or two singular passages. Let us compare *Diat.* xxix. = Luke xvi. 28 with the following from Aphraates: "That he may go and testify to them and so they may not sin and also may not come into this torment."

Now the Arabic Harmony has "Let him go, lest they also sin and come into this place of torment."

We observe that there must have been a primitive error in the Greek text, according to which the words ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται by a confusion with διαμαρτάνω became read "that they may not sin" as we have it in the harmony and with a correction and subsequent conflation in Aphraates. And no other evidence, as far as I know, is forthcoming for the existence of the reading.

Or take *Diat.* xxxii. = John II. 21 where we have in the

Arabic, "But he spake of the temple of his body: for when they should destroy that he would raise it in three days."

The last sentence, which is thoroughly characteristic of a Harmony for popular use, has happily escaped excision in the Arabic Harmony and is certainly genuine Tatian.

Now in Aphraates we find: "And his disciples understood that he spake of his body, in that he would, after they had broken it, raise it up in three days."

Coincidences of this kind are the best evidence of the relation between the texts in question.

C. *S. Ephrem the Syrian* (373 A.D.).

Among the later historical notices of the Diatessaron, we find the statement that Mar Ephrem commented upon the text of the Diatessaron; and this statement has been confirmed in a remarkable manner by the recovery of the very work of Ephrem to which allusion has been made.

In the year 1862, Lagarde, in issuing his text of the Apostolic Constitutions, remarked as follows, at the close of his preface: "We have not a few of the works of S. Ephrem the Syrian in an Armenian translation, published at Venice in four volumes in the year 1836, which are denounced as supposititious with a hardihood exactly proportional to the critic's ignorance of Armenian. In vol. II. 5—260, will be found a commentary upon a harmony of the Gospels, beginning with the passage John i. 1, so that it may be easily discerned upon what sort of a harmony the commentary of Ephrem was based, as I shall presently undertake to shew."

These words seem to have attracted almost as little attention as the published works of Ephrem in the Armenian dress: and yet could anything have been much more significant? A harmony of the Gospels in Syriac, and commencing with the fourth Gospel! The works of Ephrem to which Lagarde alluded were produced from the press of the Armenian monks of the monastery of S. Lazaro near Venice, to whom we are indebted for so many other early pieces, now extant only in the Armenian language.

In the year 1876, Professor George Mössinger of Salzburg re-published the commentary of Ephrem in a Latin translation which was an emendation of one made by Aucher, the editor of Ephrem, with an introductory preface shewing that the underlying

and accompanying Biblical text was the Harmony of Tatian. By the aid of this valuable work, it became possible, even for those unacquainted with the Armenian tongue, to re-construct for themselves large parts of the Tatian Harmony. We learn also, from Mössinger's collection of authorities for the statements made as to the commentary of Ephrem on the harmonised Gospels, that this work must have been current, not only in the Syriac from which the Armenian was made, but also in a Greek version, for extracts from it are current in Greek in certain mss. of the Vatican library¹. It is difficult to believe, therefore, that the commentary of Ephrem and the Diatessaron of Tatian can have wholly perished from the Syriac language, when they were once in such demand; and we cannot help suspecting that the Diatessaron may even now be lying on the shelves of our great libraries, disguised perhaps as a lectionary, especially since so many lectionaries begin with the fourth Gospel.

It was this work of Mössinger, then, that prepared the way for the valuable researches of Zahn², who by a skilful combination of this work of Ephrem with the earlier Syriac writers succeeds in restoring approximately large parts of the Tatian Harmony to their proper order and context, so that we can very nearly judge, without the Arabic Harmony, what sequence Tatian followed, what passages he omitted, and what additions his text shews when compared with later texts. According to Mössinger, we are to ascribe this work of Ephrem to the year 364 A.D., on account of reference made in it to the desolate and distracted condition of the Church of Edessa after the expulsion of their bishop Barses by the Emperor Valens in order to place an Arian bishop in the vacated see. Zahn, however, has shewn that the date of the banishment of Barses is not susceptible of such exact determination, and regards it as probable that the year 373 is a more exact date for the persecution of the Church at Edessa consequent upon the expulsion of their Bishop. We have accordingly given this date for the production of Ephrem's commentary; and the allusions to the state of Edessa under the name "this city" render it certain that the place of publication was exactly the place where we should have expected the commentary

¹ According to Assemani, *Bibl. Or.*, I. 157, in codd. Vat. gr. 663, 733, et 1190.

² Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Theil I. Tatian's Diatessaron: Erlangen, 1881.

on the Diatessaron to have shewn itself, if the most popular Bible text had been selected as the basis of the commentary. By the year 373, however, there must have been other textual influences at work. Dr Hort points out the fact of the revision of the old Syriac version of the Gospels, and the introduction of the Peshito (or Vulgate-Syriac). His words are important¹: "two facts render it highly probable that the Syriac revision was instituted or sanctioned by high authority, personal or ecclesiastical: the almost total extinction of old Syriac MSS. contrasted with the great number of extant Vulgate Syriac MSS.; and the narrow range of variation found in Vulgate Syriac MSS., so far as they have yet been examined. Historical antecedents render it tolerably certain that the locality of such an authoritative revision, accepted by Syriac Christendom, would be either *Edessa* or *Nisibis*." Now it will hardly be likely, if such a revision had gone on (completed before 350 according to Dr Hort), that no traces of it should be felt in the quotations of Ephrem; and, as a matter of fact, three times in his commentary he expressly quotes a certain "Graecus" as against the text of Tatian; in which passages he is probably referring to the Peshito which has been revised by means of the Greek, much in the same way as in his commentaries on the Old Testament he calls his authority the *Iaunâjâ* or Greek version, though he is supposed to have been unacquainted with Greek. We must be prepared, therefore, to make some allowance for this influence in our analysis of the text of Ephrem. The same cause, which we just begin to feel in Ephrem, operated finally to produce a revised text of the Diatessaron, such as we find in the Arabic version.

There is another point that must be kept in mind in handling the commentary of Ephrem: it may be shewn that Ephrem was perfectly aware of the origin of the work upon which he was occupied. For he goes out of his way to make a peculiarly unfair attack upon the Eucharites, with their bread-and-water Eucharist, in his comment on the departure of Judas from the supper-table. For he represents our Lord as dipping the bread which he gave to Judas in water, and he says²: "The Lord separated Judas from the disciples by means of the water when he gave him bread dipped in water, because he was not worthy of that bread which

¹ *Introduction to N. T.*, p. 136.

² Ephrem, *Concord.*, p. 221.

was given along with wine to the twelve [read *eleven*] apostles." Here, then, we have a direct attack on the Eucratites¹. But these sentences did not carry with them a condemnation of Tatian's Harmony, as some writers have supposed, for, in that case, Ephrem would have been very unlikely to have handled the book for didactic purposes. The most we can say, as a consequence of the observed blow at the Eucratites in the commentary on Tatian, is that Ephrem would have been likely to omit anything which he found in the Harmony that was capable of an Eucratite interpretation: or, in other words, the absence of such matter from the text of Ephrem would prove nothing as to the Harmony, if evidence of its existence in the Harmony were forthcoming from other quarters².

V. THE RELATED HARMONY OF VICTOR OF CAPUA.

The celebrated *Codex Fuldensis*, which is one of the earliest and best authorities for the text of the Vulgate version of the New Testament, contains its Gospels, not in the usual form, but harmonised into a single gospel; and this Harmony is stated by its author, Victor, Bishop of Capua, to have been based upon an earlier Harmony which came accidentally into his hands. The first question which suggested itself to Victor was that of the authorship of the work, for he had seen nothing of the kind before. From Eusebius' letter to Carpianus he learnt that Ammonius of Alexandria had made a connection between the Gospel of Matthew and the parallel passages of the other three Gospels, and that Eusebius had imitated this work in his table of Canons of Reference for the four Gospels. From the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius he learnt, further, that Tatian had composed a continuous Gospel which he called *Diapente* (Victor having here

¹ In the same way, in describing the marriage at Cana, he says (p. 56) that by the change of water into wine He shewed Himself the Lord of creation, and by restricting that change to things already existing, as water and wine, they might understand that the thing made was not to be gnostically despised or reprobated.

On the lost piece of money he notes that it may mean that the image of Adam is compared to a drachma. This was aimed at one of Tatian's peculiar views, the non-salvability of Adam (p. 162: cf. *Iren.*, I. 28).

² It will be seen that the facts brought forward dispose conclusively of Dr Burgon's contention, that Westcott and Hort have attached the name of Tatian to a work "which does not even pretend to be his."

made some blunder between the similar terms *Diapente*, and *Diatessaron*, "Five-in-one," and "Four-in-one")¹. Was the Harmony which he had found that of Ammonius or that of Tatian? Victor inclined to the latter, though he seems to have been perplexed at the thought of such an obviously useful and meritorious work being due to a heretic; but he evidently swallowed his scruples as to whether any good thing could emanate from Encratism, and decided for Tatian. The solution was rendered more easy by the thought that the work might have been due to the earlier years when he kept close to the side of the blessed Justin and had not yet become so extreme in his asceticism. And, further, Victor seems to have argued that, in any case, the words of his Lord were not to be visited with a censure that might have lighted upon Tatian, it being sufficient to reject and discard from the Evangelic text anything which the heretic might have added by way of commentary. Accordingly, somewhere about the year 541, Victor reconstructed the Harmony on the basis of the Vulgate, and with the help of a skilful calligraphist produced one of the most splendid manuscripts that have come down to us from the early days of the Church. The verification of Victor's ascription of the ground-work of his Harmony to Tatian turns upon the order shewn by his Vulgate text, and more especially upon the order shewn by the descriptive capitulation prefixed to the same; for example, the *Codex Fuldensis* opens with Luke i. 1—4, followed by John i. 1—5: this differs from Tatian, who seems never to have incorporated the prologue of Luke. But a reference to the table of chapters shows us as follows: *Præfatio*. I. *In principio verbum • deus apud deum • per quem facta sunt omnia*. This suggests, at once, that Victor has inserted the prologue to Luke on his own account. In the same way, we can explain the presence of the genealogy of our Lord in the *Codex Fuldensis*, which certainly found no place in the Tatian Harmony, and is not mentioned in the capitulation: for, although this gives: XXV. v. *De generationem vel natiuitate Christi*, this refers more naturally to Matth. i. 18 (*Christi autem generatio sic erat*) than to the prefixed Matth. i. 1—17, "*Liber generationis Ihesu Christi*" etc.

¹ It is certain that the text of Eusebius gives *Diatessaron*, and that Victor's book was a Gospel "made up out of four." But perhaps the volume contained the Acts.

² Hence, Lightfoot's verdict in *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 286, needs

But the verification of Victor's view demands a much closer examination; and when we place the two Harmonies (the Arabic Tatian and the *Codex Fuldensis*) we shall find, in the midst of frequent misplacement, such agreement in singular details as will furnish the strongest confirmation of the theory in question.

For example, from the thirtieth chapter of the Tatian Harmony to the end, the agreement with the capitulation of the *Codex Fuldensis* (cc. 110—182) is only thrice broken, first by the exemplar of the *Codex Fuldensis* having carried back c. 39 of the Harmony (the triumphal entry into Jerusalem) and placed it between c. 31 and 32, where it should have stood historically; secondly, by the same codex having carried the parable of the ten minae (c. 31) forward so as to place it almost immediately after the parable of the ten talents (c. 43); thirdly, by the carrying back, on the part of the same codex, of the account of the repentance of Judas, to its right place in the Gospel of Matthew.

Of the stages by which the Tatian Harmony passed over into the form in which Victor found it, we know but little: it is conceivable that there may lie between the Syriac Tatian and the Latin Victor a Greek adaptation of the Harmony, but the whole question is complicated by the fact that we do not possess the Tatian Harmony in its primitive form.

It will be seen that this agreement covers more than a third of the whole book. In the middle of the book the displacements are frequent, although it is often possible to assign a motive for them: but these displacements do not affect the argument.

VI. THE APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO THE GOSPELS FOUND IN THE DIATESSARON.

Few subjects are of greater interest in connection with the Gospels than the study of the additional matter which has attached to them in their process of transmission or of the subtracted matter which may have been separated from them and discarded.

a slight re-statement: "There can be no doubt that Victor was mistaken about the authorship: for, though the work is constructed on the same general plan as Tatian's, it does not begin with John i. 1, but with Luke i. 1, and it does contain the genealogies. It belongs therefore, at least in its present form, neither to Tatian nor to Ammonius." There is a confusion here between the Harmony which Victor found and the one which he made.

Especially in connection with the sayings and doings of our Lord, the so-called apocryphal sentences, many of which were once current in copies of the New Testament, form a collection of such importance both for His own teaching and for the knowledge of the opinions of early schools of Christian thought, that they ought certainly to be attached to the authorized scriptures in the form of an appendix. Nor should we mourn much, if, in order to find a place for them, the prefaces and appendices which are found in the modern Revised Bible were to be curtailed or excised altogether. It is a matter of very small importance whether we say, "Our father which," or "Our father who;" but no one can say that the Section found in *Codex Bezae* concerning the man whom the Lord found working on the Sabbath day is destitute of ethical or even textual importance. Certainly not the latter; for, if we could find out the quarter from whence *Codex Bezae* derived the story, we should probably have in our hands the key to a multitude of other peculiarities found in that MS. and in a group of associated texts. Now, if we ask ourselves in what directions we ought to look for the existence of apocryphal matter connected with the New Testament, especially the Gospels (we use the word apocryphal in its right sense, without any contempt), the answer would be that the principal sources are:

(1) The Gospel according to the Hebrews, of which scraps are preserved to us in the margins of sundry copies of the Gospels, and in some of the early fathers:

(2) The old-Latin and old-Syriac versions of the Gospels:

(3) The Diatessaron of Tatian.

With respect to the first, we have at present little to say: what we know of it hardly concerns the Diatessaron; nor can we as yet trace any points of contact between the two in the matter of external eccentricities. If there be any such contact, it does not lie on the surface; and we may defer the search for it until we know more about the Diatessaron.

But with reference to the other two, the connection is intimate: the text of the Diatessaron is directly affiliated with the oldest Syriac texts of the Gospels; it is a brother to the old-Syriac of Cureton, and a first cousin to the old-Latin texts. If we can succeed in restoring it to its archaic form, it will probably solve for us more than half of the yet unsolved textual riddles in the Gospels. This means that its text is what Dr Hort calls Western;

even when revised it is Western and Syrian, with hardly a trace (if there be a trace) of the importation of Alexandrian readings, and no neutral readings at all or next to none.

This is a subject which will demand close and careful attention. At present, we only refer to it in order to indicate the following conclusion as one to which we shall probably be led, viz., that the Apocryphal additions which existed in the earliest Syriac texts of the Gospels will most likely find themselves a place in the text of the Diatessaron; and, conversely, apocryphal sentences which may be found in any pair of the triad, old-Latin + old-Syriac + Diatessaron, will probably be readings of the earliest Syriac text that ever existed: and, even where only one member of the group testifies to an apocryphal addition, we may occasionally support that reading so strongly from other quarters as to demonstrate its extreme antiquity.

Let us proceed to test this matter by a succession of examples of early Diatessaron readings. We begin with Matth., xviii. 7: "It must needs be that offences come, but woe unto him by whom they come." To this sentence are prefixed in the Homilies of Aphraates the words: "It must needs be that good come and blessed be he by whom it comes." Now, there is no reference in the homily of Ephrem to either part of the passage; but Aphraates introduces it with the words, "It is written," which shews that he is quoting from his Gospel, that is, from the Diatessaron or from a Syriac text closely related thereto.

When we turn to the Arabic version, we find no trace of the added words, so that, as far as the evidence of the Arabic goes, one would be inclined to say, it can hardly be a Diatessaron reading. The passage has no place in the Curetonian Syriac nor in any other copy or version.

But, suppose we turn to the Clementine Homilies, here we find (in *Hom.* xii. 29) the following sentence: "Then Peter answered, The prophet of the truth has said, Good things must needs come, and blessed, said he, is he by whom they come: in like manner, evil things must needs come, but woe to him through whom they come." Here, again, the language carries one to a sentence in one of the Gospels; and, while we cannot assert, positively, that this Gospel is the Diatessaron in its earliest form, we can at least say that it came from the Diatessaron or from some other early and uncanonical gospel. On examining the

Arabic Version more closely, we find the verse runs: "Woe unto the world because of offences. But woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh." The Arabic has therefore a curtailed text: it has left out at least the words, "It must needs be that offences come." Does it not look as if in erasing the added sentence, "Good things must needs come, etc.," and conforming the extract to the current gospels, the corrector had gone a little farther with his work of emendation than he intended to do? The suspicion is enough to turn the scale in the question as to whether the Diatessaron was used or not.

Suppose we take, as a second example for study, the famous apocryphal saying which is so frequently quoted by Origen and the early fathers, though not found, so far as I know, in any copy of the Gospels: I mean that powerful sentence, composed of only three words, in which our Lord advises His disciples to "be good money-changers" (*Γίνεσθε δοκιμοὶ τραπεζίται*). Harnack supposed that he had found a trace of this in a sentence of Ephrem's commentary on *Luke*, XVI. 1—12, which runs as follows: "Buy for ye, O Sons of Adam, by means of these transitory things which are not yours, that which is your own, which doth not pass away." But it must be admitted that, as the passages stand, the identification or connection of one with the other is uncertain, especially in view of the early interpretation of the trustworthy banker which makes him the person who tests philosophy and tells the base metal from the true. We can therefore understand why Zahn should have said, of Harnack's reference, that it was to him unintelligible. But let us carry the matter a little further; we have shewn, in the previous section, that there is some probability that the writer of the Clementine Homilies was acquainted with the Diatessaron, or at least that he drew from a source used by the Diatessaron. Whatever may be the probability for that acquaintance bears also upon the reference of the sentence about the trustworthy bankers to the same source; for this sentence is also an apocryphon of the Clementine Homilies. Thus we find in *Clem. Hom.*, III. 61: "Thou oughtest to have given my money to the exchangers and then I at my coming should have got my own. Cast out the unprofitable servant into the outer darkness! And with good reason, 'for,' says He, 'it is thine, O man, to prove my words, as silver and money are proved among the exchangers.'" This evidently assumes the underlying sentence, "Be good money-

changers"; only the sentence is somewhat worked up after the fashion of the Homilies. It occurs, moreover, as a direct quotation in three other places of the Homilies, viz. II. 51: "with good reason said our Master, Be good money-changers"—III. 50: "And inasmuch as He said, Be prudent money-changers, it is because there are genuine and spurious words"—XVIII. 20: "For thus He spake, Become experienced bankers. Now the need of bankers arises from the circumstance that the spurious is mixed up with the genuine." So far, then, it favours Harnack's view, that the sentence was found in the Diatessaron; only it seems to locate it in the neighborhood of *Matth.*, xxv. 30.

But this is not all: we have shewn that the Gospel which was in the possession of the writer of the Doctrine of Addai was the Diatessaron of Tatian: now in the Doctrine of Addai we find the apostle addressing the people of Edessa as follows: "According as my Lord commanded me, lo! I preach and publish the Gospel, and lo! *His money do I cast upon the table before you.*" The last sentence presupposes the doctrine of the good bankers: which must therefore have been in the Gospel of the person who wrote the Doctrine of Addai.

A further curious confirmation may be found in the following consideration. We have shewn, some pages back, that Victor of Capua, in the sixth century, possessed a copy of Tatian's Harmony which he made the foundation for the Harmony of the Gospels that is contained in the famous *Codex Fuldensis*. Now, it is worthy of note that, although Victor has deserted the text of Tatian, preserving only his method and using the readings of the Vulgate in his gospel, he has in his preface shewn acquaintance with the saying about the "trustworthy bankers": for he concludes with a prayer that the Holy Spirit will impart to him the grace of discretion, whereby he may be able, like the best bankers, and according to the word of the apostle, to prove all things and follow those things which are good¹. We may be strengthened

¹ *Ut nos in veritate scripturarum suarum erudire dignetur • et discretionis gratiam tribuat • quatenus ut optimi trapezitae • omnia probemur secundum apostolum et quae sunt bona sectemur.* The connection of ideas is the same as in Origen who, in his commentary on *Matthew*, says: "It is the part of a great man to hear and fulfil that which is said, Prove all things, hold fast that which is good. Still, for the sake of those who cannot like money-changers distinguish whether words are to be held as true or false, and cannot guard themselves carefully, so as to hold that which is true and yet abstain from all evil appearance, no one ought to use for the

by this language of Victor to believe that the saying in question was a part of the Tatian Harmony which he possessed, although Victor gives us no clue as to its place in the Harmony.

Upon the whole then we see reason to believe that there stood originally in the Diatessaron the sentence in question, though we are not quite sure in what part of the Gospel it stood. Thus far then we may agree with Harnack. Two of the sentences in the Clementine Homilies are on this shewing Diatessaron quotations. It has been the fashion to refer these passages in the Clementines to an Ebionite gospel: this may be so, but in that case Tatian must have used the Ebionite gospel along with the other four, which I am extremely reluctant to believe. There are many indications that the author of the Clementines used a harmony and not a collection of gospels.

The fact is that there are more traces of such use of harmonized Gospels than people are well aware of: not only do the Clementine Homilies suggest the use of a harmony, but a similar feature shows itself in the Apostolical Constitutions. It was in consequence of his perception of this fact that Lagarde¹ was so earnest in his efforts to bring out an edition of the Arabic Harmony, such as we now possess; and was indeed only deterred from his purpose (as he has so often been hindered) by difficulties that attach themselves to Oriental printing². It becomes an interesting question, then, to examine whether any of the passages in the Clementines, or in the Apostolical Constitutions, which seem to be based on a harmonised narrative, exhibit any agreement with the Diatessaron. This enquiry we defer for the present.

A further question presents itself, as to whether the other apocryphal sayings in the Clementines are capable of being traced to a similar origin. These quotations are as follows: *Hom.* III. 55: "He said, The evil one is the tempter"—*Hom.* XIX. 2: "He said, Give no pretext to the devil." These sentences we have not yet succeeded in tracing to their source: nor have we been successful in identifying the Harmony which seems to have been used by

confirmation of doctrines any books which are not received in the Canonized Scriptures."

¹ *Ap. Const.*, p. vii.: *si evangeliorum in margine nomina adscribo, non ideo auctorem ex evangelio suo hausisse credo, legit enim illa ni fallor harmoniam e quatuor evangelis concinnatam.*

² Lagarde at first wished to publish the Arabic text, at Ciasca's request, but relinquished the plan after giving a specimen in the *Götting. gelehrte Anzeigen*.

the author of the Clementines in other passages than those quoted.

The "trusty banker" is also found in the second book of the Apostolical Constitutions: the passage is as follows: "To the priests alone has injunction to judge been made, for it has been said unto them, 'Judge righteous judgment'; and again, 'Be tried money-changers'.....; and in another place, 'Why of your own selves judge ye not that which is right?' Become therefore like cunning money-tellers, for as these condemn the false coins, and appropriate the tested money, in the same way the bishop must hold to the unblameable, and heal or cast away the blameable."

The question then arises as to whether the author of this part of the Constitutions used the Tatian Harmony, for he certainly quotes the famous saying as part of the Scripture. The hypothesis is an inviting one, in view of the fact that a number of the quotations in the Constitutions seem to be harmonized; upon examination, however, we are unable to detect a sufficient agreement between these quotations and the text of the Arabic Harmony to warrant us in saying that the text of Tatian has influenced that of the Constitutions.

Our third instance of apocryphal addition to the Gospel narrative is taken from *Diat.* c. XXXI. = Mark x. 51: "Jesus said unto him: What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto Him: My Lord and Teacher, that thou shouldst open my eyes, and *that I may see thee.*" A more exquisite gloss, if it be a gloss, it would be difficult to imagine. One can understand how the revision of the Diatessaron came to spare it. Suppose we enquire, then, as far as possible into the origin of the reading; there is every reason *à priori* to regard it as coming from the earliest form of the Diatessaron, or even from a preceding Syriac version; but confirmation seems wanting. Nothing of the kind is found in the extract which Zahn gives from Ephrem on the passage: nor is there anything from Aphraates: further, the Curetonian Syriac is wanting in this part of *Mark*. When, however, we turn to the parallel passage in *Matthew* (xx. 32), we find the Curetonian Syriac reads: "They say unto him, Our Lord, that our eyes may be opened and we may see thee." Furthermore in the still more closely parallel passage in *Luke* (xviii. 41), the Curetonian Syriac has a like reading: "What wishest thou I should do to thee? He said to him, My

Lord, that my eyes may be opened, and I may see thee." So that there must have been something of the kind current in the earliest Syriac, and in all probability the quotation in the Diatessaron should be regarded as an adaptation of *Luke*, rather than of *Mark*, especially as the rest of the narrative in the Diatessaron (except the next verse) is taken entirely from *Luke*. Moreover, when we turn to Ephrem (p. 181), we find something which suggests the same reading. "The Lord, seeing that his inward eyes were illuminated, while the outer eyes saw nought, made these as open as the other, in order that *He might be visible and manifest to him*." Here again we are brought to the same apocryphal appendix. So that a careful study of the collateral testimony confirms our belief that the apocryphal passage of the Arabic Version may be carried back to the earliest form of the Harmony.

Our next illustration of an apocryphal saying in the Diatessaron is taken from *Luke*, XXIII. 48. The verse in the Arabic follows on *Matth.*, XXVII. 54, thus: *Matth.*, XXVII. 54, "Truly this was the Son of God. *Luke*, XXIII. 48, And all the multitudes, who had come together to the sight, seeing what had happened, returned beating their breasts." So far, there is nothing that differs from our current texts; but, when we turn to the Doctrine of Addai, we find the following passage, in which the connection of ideas needs to be carefully studied: "Unless those who crucified Him had known that He was the Son of God, they would not have had to proclaim the desolation of their city nor would they have brought down Woe! upon themselves." Now, we may detect in this passage a reference to the passage which the Diatessaron quotes from *Matthew*; but there is nothing in what follows in the Arabic Harmony which suggests an allusion to the desolation of the city, or an imprecation upon or lamentation over themselves. Suppose we turn to the Curetonian Syriac: here we have: *Luke*, XXIII. 47... "Truly this man was just. And all those which were assembled there, and saw that which was done, were smiting upon their breast and saying, Woe to us, what is this! Woe to us for our sins."

Here we have the connection which was wanting in the Arabic Harmony; and the same reading is found in the celebrated old-Latin Codex of St Germain, which reads: "Woe unto us, the things which are done to day for our sins: for the desolation of

Jerusalem hath drawn nigh." Taking this with the Curetonian passage, we can restore the whole of the sequence which is found in the Doctrine of Addai. But that Addai took it from the Diatessaron and not from the old-Syriac is evident, not only from what we know of its text from its own allusions to the Diatessaron, but also from the fact that it does not say, "This was a just man," as all mss. do in *Luke*, but, "This was truly the Son of God," as it runs in *Matthew*. We can therefore restore the missing sentences to the Diatessaron, and, if any doubt remained in our minds, it would be dispelled by turning to Ephrem's Commentary on the Harmony (pp. 245, 246): "*Woe unto us, woe unto us, this was the Son of God...When the sun of righteousness had appeared, purifying the lepers and opening the eyes of the blind, by that light the blind men did not recognise that the king of the city of Jerusalem had come. But when the natural sun had failed them, then by the darkness it became transparent to them that the destruction of their city had come. The judgments of the ruin of Jerusalem, saith he, are come.*"

The present case has the special interest that, although the Arabic version furnished no clue to an omission, the old-Syriac and old-Latin with Ephrem and the Doctrine of Addai enable us to restore the matter of the missing sentence with perfect confidence.

Over and above the Apocryphal additions properly so called there are a number of glosses due to Tatian himself and added by way of explanation; sometimes they seem to contain matter of tradition which he had gathered outside of written sources. We will examine a few of these passages in order to get an idea of the method employed by Tatian and of the liberty which he allowed himself in his combinations.

VII. COMBINATIONS AND AMPLIFICATIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE DIATESSARON.

One of the first things that will strike the reader of the Arabic Harmony as translated by Ciasca is the occurrence of numerous apocryphal sayings and sentences, and the suggestion which the text gives of the excision of other similar sayings and sentences, now no longer apparent. These additions range from the smallest glosses, frequently only single words (which may be mere expressions of a translator's freedom), up to whole sentences of foreign and interpolated matter. For example, take the following in-

stances, which have, as far as I know, not the slightest attestation elsewhere:

In Mc. vii. 26 it is added that the Syrophenician woman was a Gentile from the city of Emesa: "*et illa mulier erat gentilis ex Hemesen Syriac.*" It is possible that the addition is due merely to a local tradition current in the neighborhood where the Diatessaron was written: and patristic students will recall a somewhat similar statement in the Clementine Homilies (ii. 19) where Peter speaks of the same woman as follows:

"There is amongst us one Justa, a Syro-Phoenician, by race a Canaanite, whose daughter was oppressed with a grievous disease. And she came to our Lord crying out, and entreating that He would heal her daughter. But He, being asked also by us, said 'It is not lawful to heal the Gentiles, who are like unto dogs on account of their using various meats and practices, while the table in the kingdom has been given to the sons of Israel.....For she being a Gentile and remaining in the same course of life, He would not have healed her had she remained a Gentile, on account of its not being lawful to heal her as a Gentile.'"

What one notices in this Clementine extract is that the writer has apparently extra-evangelic information about the Canaanite, viz. her name, and that the point which he wants to get over is the fact of her being a Gentile; now certainly this might have been taken from the current gospels, but it seems to me very likely that he may have got it from the Tatian Harmony in which it is given especial prominence; in which case it would be reasonable to infer that there stood originally in the Harmony also the name Justa. For otherwise both the Clementines and the Harmony are working up a common tradition; but even then the tradition gave her name, as well as her place of abode; and Tatian in expanding his narrative for Syriac readers would have been as likely to add the one as the other.

Another curious addition will be found in Matt. xxvi. 47: where after describing the approach of the crowd with lanterns and torches, and swords and staves, sent by the chief priests, &c., it is added:

"And with them there was a man of the Romans."

What is the reason of this addition? Was it to explain the presence of the soldiery? Or is it an anticipation of the young man in the linen garment? Most likely it is the former: as the term

"Romans" is the natural Syriac equivalent for soldiery. Certainly there seems no other textual evidence forthcoming to support it. So in Matt. XVI. 12 we are told that they understood "that they should beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees *which he called bread.*" Such instances of unsupported glosses, which are certainly Tatianisms, give us greater confidence in affirming a similar statement for certain similar passages in Ephrem, as for example, where at the end of Mc. VII. 10 "He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death" is added the sentence "he that blasphemeth God, let him be crucified"; or in John I. 47 where Nathanael is spoken of by Ephrem as "*a true Scribe, an Israelite, in whom is no guile*"; although these glosses do not any longer stand in the Arabic text. The same thing may be true of Aphraates who gives Matt. V. 5 as "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the land *of life.*"

With these unsupported glosses, then, the Tatian Harmony must have been thickly sprinkled; we are not bound, however, to infer that they stood in the Gospels which he used. Such additions as John XXI. 6, "They could not draw the net for the multitude of fishes *which had come into it*"; or John XXI. 12, "Knowing that it was the Lord. *But he did not appear to them in His own form,*" are just the sort of additions which one might expect from a free hand, occupied in transcribing a continuous gospel for Church use. The last gloss is perhaps due to Mark XVI. 12 (*ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*), and so is of critical importance. These glosses then are for the most part what we may call unattested in the text of the N.T.; and singly attested amongst the authorities for the Harmony. When we pass to those which have a greater degree of attestation in the Harmony, we are the less able to speak confidently with regard to their non-attestation in the N.T.: because we shall find that there is some unknown nexus between the text of the Western authorities for the N.T. and the text of the Harmony. The surer we are of a Diatessaron reading, the more likely we are to find it in Western attestations, whatever may be the reason for the coincidence.

Some of these better attested readings are very interesting: for instance in Luke VII. 14 Ephrem gives "*Young man, young man, I say unto thee, arise,*" while in Mark V. 41 Aphraates expressly says "He called her twice and said to her, *Maid, maid*".

¹ Hence the corruption in Codex Bezae: λέγει αὐτῇ πάλιν, θαύματα κτλ.

also." The combined evidence betrays a tendency to reduplication in our Lord's mode of address, similar to what we find in the rest of the Gospel (e.g. *Simon, Simon*; and *Martha, Martha*), although the Arabic does not preserve the trait. The reading turns up also in Codex Bezae and one or two early Latins.

In Matt. xiv. 32 the N.T. gives us, without any sensible variation, the words: "When they were come into the ship, the wind ceased." The Arabic has "And when Jesus had drawn nigh, he ascended into the ship, himself and Simon, and immediately the wind ceased"; compare with this Ephrem's text, "When the Lord had come and had ascended the ship along with Peter"; and it is easy to see that the Harmonist had to expand the narrative for his hearers, in order that they might more clearly see that, when Jesus came on board, Peter was not left outside.

In John iv. 7 for the common reading "Give me to drink," the Harmonist, as shewn by Ephrem and the Arabic, must needs complete the sentence and write "Give me water to drink"; the addition marks a tendency to expansion of the statements of Scripture and is not due to the fact that Tatian was an Euphratite. W. B. De Hart maintain in the view of this and similar passages that "the evidence which has recently come to light as to his (Nestor's) disciple Tatian's Diatessaron has shewn that Tatian habitually abridged the language of the passages which he combined." It seems to me that for a Harmony the tendency is all the other way. A few more cases of the kind may be given with advantage.

Luke iv. 29. "And he folded the book and gave it back to the minister and went away and sat down."

Mark i. 34. "And all the city was gathered together at the door of Jesus."

Luke vi. 8. "He saith to the man with the withered hand, 'Stand forth into the midst of the *synagogue*.'"

All of these are Tatianisms, taken almost at random from the pages. Do they look like habitual abbreviation? Or take Matt. v. 29. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing in the *tareem*?" which shews that the birds were sold for eating, or the next verse, where the emphatic word (*ἄρα*) in the sentence "The hairs of your head are all numbered," is brought out by the rendering "For so far as relates to you, even the hairs of your head, &c." Or in Luke x. 32 where the feeling of motion which the Greek

puts into the words "Mary sat at Jesus' feet" (*πρὸς τοὺς πόδας*) is expressed in the Arabic by "Mary coming sat at the feet of the Lord," and in Ephrem by "Mary came and sat." The evidences of this tendency are constant: and they prohibit us from regarding Tatian as an abbreviator.

Neither does the Arabic Harmony give us any encouragement in the belief that Tatian made doctrinal omissions to suit his own views: if he wrote the Harmony after he became a Gnostic he would perhaps have followed Marcion in omitting the words of Christ to the thief: "This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise."

But these words are in the Arabic and in the Armenian. It may be urged that perhaps he omitted them and that they were subsequently restored: Ephrem would be sure to do this, since in using the Harmony he rails assiduously at Marcionism and Encratism en route, comparing the Encratites to Judas who received from the Lord bread soaked in water, and with such like criticisms securing his readers from the danger of the heresy that might lurk in the Harmony: but even if we admit this we may still say the case against Tatian on the ground of tampering with the Scriptures for doctrinal ends is an unproved case. He can only be condemned on hypothesis: suppose, for instance, that the passage which occurs twice in the Clementine Homilies¹ "ye do err, not knowing the true things of the Scriptures; for this reason ye are also ignorant of the power of God" were asserted to be from the Tatian Harmony; we find no support for it in our Arabic Version, nor any trace of it in Ephrem who discusses the adjacent verses. The passage certainly has a Marcionite look about it: and there are some points of contact between the Clementine Homilies and the Tatian text, but the proof of wilful change is inadequate; and if it existed it extends only to expansions and not to omissions. The Arabic Harmony certainly encourages no such belief. But perhaps the best idea of Tatian's method would be to take a passage which seems to have come down to us without much change; say the account of the Transfiguration: Ciasca gives it as follows:

Mc. viii. 39. Et dixit illis: amen
 dico vobis: Sunt enim quidam
 hic stantes, qui non gustabunt

¹ Hom. ii. 51. Hom. iii. 50.

- mortem, donec videant regnum
Dei veniens in virtute;
Mt. xvi. 28^c. et Filium hominis
venientem in regno suo.
- xvii. 1. Et post dies sex assumpsit
Jesus Simonem Cepham, et
Jacobum et Joannem
fratrem eius et duxit
illos in montem excelsum
seorsum.
- Luc. ix. 29^a. Et dum ipsi orarent,
transfiguratus est Jesus
et factus est in speciem
alterius personae.
- Matt. xvii. 2^b. et resplenduit facies
eius sicut sol,
Luc. ix. 29^b. et vestitus eius factus
est candidus nimis velut
nix et sicut splendor fulguris
- Mc. ix. 2^b. ita, ut nihil super terram
possit sic candidum fieri.
3. et apparuerunt illi Moyses
et Elias loquentes cum Jesu.
- Luc. ix. 31^b. Et putabant tempus
adventus eius futuri, qui
complendus erat in Jerusalem,
iam advenisse.
32. Simon autem, et qui cum illo
erant, gravati erant sopore somni.
Et expergefati sunt vix, et viderunt
gloriam eius, et duos viros,
qui stabant apud illum,
- 33^a. Et cum hi coepissent discedere
ab illo, ait Simon ad Jesum
Praeceptor, bonum est, nos hic
esse;
- Matt. xvii. 4^b. si vis, faciamus hic
tria tabernacula;
- Luc. ix. 33^b. tibi unum, et Moysi
unum, et Eliae unum:
nesciens quid diceret,

- Mc. ix. 6^b. propter timorem, qui
eos apprehenderat.
- Matt. xvii. 5^a. Adhuc eo hoc dicente,
et mox nubes lucida
obumbravit eos:
- Luc. ix. 34^b. et cum vidissent Moysen
et Eliam intrantes in nubem,
iterum timuerunt.
- Mt. xvii. 5^b. Et audita est vox de nube,
dicens: Hic est Filius meus
dilectus, quem elegi: ipsum
audite.
- Luc. ix. 36^a. Et cum audiretur haec
vox, inventus est Jesus solus.
- Mt. xvii. 6. Et audientes vocem discipuli
prae timore, qui apprehenderant
eos, ceciderunt in faciem suam.
7. Et accessit Jesus, et tetigit eos,
et dixit: Surgite, nolite timere.
8. Et levantes autem oculos suos,
viderunt Jesum sicut erat.

The above passage affords an instructive study in the combination of the several documents. Under Luke ix. 29^a we see the words 'transfiguratus est Jesus' introduced from Matt., while the rest of the clause shews, (1) the change of singular to plural (dum ipsi orarent), and a free translation of ἐγένετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον.

In Luke ix. 29^b the text has taken up 'nimis' from Mark and perhaps 'velut nix' from the same source, while the ἐξαστράπτων of Luke has been combined with ὡς τὸ φῶς of Matt., by the aid of Matt. xxviii. 3 into 'et sicut splendor fulguris.'

In Mc. ix. 2^b the allusion to the 'fuller' is dropped: but it is to be noticed that the Harmony here has the support of D, X, the Peshito, and the old Latins *a*, *b*, *i*. The omission is clearly Western.

It reads οὕτως with many early authorities.

In Mc. ix. 3 we have by error 'illi' where we should have the plural; the reading is unsupported.

Luke ix. 31^b furnishes us with remarkable variations, which can however be traced to their origin; a reference to the Ethiopic

text shews us the evidently conflated text "*gloriam eius quam oportet fieri in Hierosolyma et exitum eius quoque*," from which it is obvious that *ἐξόδον* has been read as *δόξαν*¹. Further the 'putabant' comes from the preceding words *ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον* and the sentence was completed by 'tempus adventus eius futuri' to explain 'gloriam' and by adding 'iam advenisse' at the close.

In Luke ix. 34 in accordance with the best Western interpretation the persons who enter into the cloud are Moses and Elias; the Curetonian Syriac agreeing therewith by saying "and when they saw these, that they enter into the cloud."

In Matt. xvii. 5^a we find substituted from Luke *ὁ ἐκκληλεγμένος* for *ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*; and a reference to Ephrem shews that there once stood at the end of the verse the words 'et vivetis.' These have disappeared in the Arabic.

Finally in Matt. xvii. 8 we have the addition of 'sicut erat' which is perhaps from I John iii. 2; and must be due to Tatian. This would make an early authority for, and evidence of the diffusion of that epistle.

At all events we see from the foregoing that hardly a word is dropped by Tatian which could have been introduced; and that he does not hesitate to gloss his text from other Scriptures besides the Gospels, as well as from his own handiwork, where anything was needed to complete the sense or clarify the meaning, appears from many passages. Thus the Harmony is a commentary on Scripture as well as Scripture: and no unworthy commentary.

We see again the assimilation of the Tatian texts and the Western texts, one to the other. It may be regarded as certain that the restored Tatian text is one of the earliest forms of what are known as Western authorities.

VIII. TRACES OF THE DIATESSARON IN THE MSS. OF THE GREEK AND LATIN GOSPELS.

The chief point of uncertainty, with regard to the origin and circulation of the Tatian Harmony, lies in the direction intimated by the heading which we attach to this chapter. Was the Harmony written in Greek and translated into Syriac? and, if so, had it any Greek currency? Or was it purely and only a Syriac book? Harnack maintains strenuously that the Diatessaron is

¹ An exactly similar error may be found in the Greek of the Acts of Perpetua, c. xix.

properly a Greek document, and even goes so far as to discount the researches of Zahn, by which so much was done to shew the influence of the Diatessaron on the churches of Mesopotamia. Without engaging ourselves, at the present time, in this problem further than to say that the two positions are not mutually exclusive, we propose to approach the more simple question, as to whether any traces of the Diatessaron can be found in the actual Greek texts which have come down to us, leaving the question as to how they came there to be decided after we have proved that they exist. Whether in the proof we have armed Harnack with valid arguments wherewith to strengthen his somewhat uncertain attack, or whether we have disarmed Zahn of any of the forcible conclusions which follow from his analysis of the early Syrian fathers, will be a question for speculation after we have assured ourselves of certain preliminary facts. Now, the facts are these: It is indisputable that, in certain notable mss. of the Greek Gospels, there are found sporadic traces of readings which cannot be easily paralleled from any other source than the Tatian Harmony. Of this we shall give some striking examples.

a. *Codex W^a.*

In the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, there are preserved, between two plates of glass, a number of fragments of an uncial ms. of the Gospel of Mark, which were discovered in the binding of a copy of Gregory Nazianzen by Mr White of Trinity College Library who pointed them out to the librarian of the University (Henry Bradshaw ὁ μακαρίτης). The ms. may be referred by its handwriting to the ninth century, and has many points of interest, as for example, that the Eusebian canons are given in harmony at the foot of the page, while the Eusebian sections are set on the margin. But the most remarkable feature of all is a unique reading in the text itself, according to which we have as follows: Mark vii. 33: "He (Jesus) spit *upon his fingers* and put them into the ears of the deaf man and he touched the tongue of the man with the impediment in his speech" (ἐπτύσεν εἰς τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὰ ὦτα τοῦ κωφοῦ καὶ ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης τοῦ μογγιλάλου).*

Compare with this the following from the Arabic Harmony: Mark vii. 33: "and spitting *upon his fingers* he put them into his ears and touched his tongue, etc." No other evidence is forth-

coming for this eccentric reading, the Curetonian Syriac being deficient; but, even if the latter text were extant and shewed the reading in question, it would scarcely weaken our belief that the passage came from the Diatessaron: the only alternative being, that it stood not only in the Diatessaron, but in an earlier Syriac before the Diatessaron¹. And, when we remember that the Greek MS. is furnished with musical notes and was very likely itself written for lectionary use, there is nothing strange in its absorbing a sentence which, originally, was commonly read in the churches.

β. Codex Algerinae Peckover.

This MS., numbered 561 Evv. in the New Testament Catalogue, was described in the *Amer. Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (Dec. 1886) as containing a remarkable text which awakened suspicions of a genealogical connection with the famous Ferrar-group. By the kindness of my friend, the owner of this MS. (Miss Algerina Peckover of Wisbech, England), I was able to collate it pretty thoroughly, twice; and in the course of the study I lighted upon a singular reading which, from the negative evidence of every critical apparatus, I decided to be unique in the New Testament, although I had some suspicion that it had distant relation with the Curetonian Syriac. The passage was as follows: *Matth.*, xvii. 26: "Of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? Of their own children or of the aliens? Peter saith to him: Of the aliens. Jesus said to him, *Then are the children free? Simon said, Yes. Jesus saith to him, Then do thou also give, as being an alien to them. But that we do not offend them go to the sea and cast a hook and take the first fish that cometh up, and when thou hast opened his mouth thou shalt find there a stater lying, etc.*" The important parts of the Greek text being as follows: ἀράγε ἐλευθεροί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί; ἔφη Σίμων· καὶ λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· δός οὖν καὶ σὺ, ὡς ἀλλότριος αὐτῶν.

Now let us compare with this the following passage from the Arabic Harmony: *Matth.*, xvii. 25: "Simon saith to him, From aliens. Jesus said to him: Then the children are free. Simon saith to him, *Yea. Jesus said to him: Then do thou also give to them as being an alien: but lest they be brought into straits, go*

¹ Cf. what is said on p. 17, touching the relations of the Harmony to the Ferrar-group.

to the sea and cast a hook, and having opened the mouth of the fish that first comes up, thou shalt find a stater."

It is evident that both of these writers, of the Arabic Harmony and of the Greek Gospel, have taken something from a common source.

That which is eccentric in the modern Harmony must certainly be taken from the primitive Harmony, the Arabic from the early Syriac; that which is eccentric in the Greek looks as if it had a Syriac origin; the abrupt change from Peter to Simon is sufficient to suggest this. Furthermore, there are, in the Old-Latin texts, suspicious indications which look as if, at one time, something had stood there corresponding to our Codex and the Old-Syriac, at the close of the story, "Thou shalt find *there* a stater lying," where these texts read either "there" or "in him," and are supported in the reading by the Curetonian Syriac.

It is within the bounds of possibility, then, that the Codex to which we have referred has been affected by the text of a Diatessaron, possibly a Syriac Diatessaron.

The question at once arises as to whether any further coincidences with the Harmony can be found in Ev. 561: the answer is not easily given; for the Tatian text is, as we have shewn already, a Western text, and is therefore hardly capable of identification, where it has influenced other copies, because of its similarity to other Gospels of the Old-Latin or Old-Syriac type. We might, for example, at first sight be tempted to say that when, at the close of *Matth.* VIII. 13, the MS. adds the words from *Luke*, "and the centurion returned to his house in that very hour and found him in sound health," that these are the very words which follow in Tatian. But the suggested inference would prove too much, for there are many MSS. which have the same assimilation of the texts of the two gospels. Certainly it is nothing peculiar to the MS. in question, and the difficulty is one that will recur: how are we to distinguish between a reading that is purely Tatian's and one that is Western, as we shall proceed to shew that Tatian's text generally was?

γ. Relation of the Tatian Harmony to the Ferrar Group.

The lost MS. which Professor Ferrar attempted to restore from the combined texts of the group designated by the numbers

13—69—124—346 is well known to be a very early text and as eccentric as it is early. It is perfectly alive with assimilations of the Gospels to one another, and misplacements of the matter contained are common. And the singular conflate readings which it contains shew that at least two types of text are present in it, of which one has been used to correct the other. It becomes interesting therefore to see whether any of these singularities are due to the Tatian Harmony. The following cases of agreement should be noticed:

Matt. ix. 35. The Arabic Harmony adds: *et multi sequebantur eum*: with the support of the Ferrar group and the Uncials **Σ** **Λ** (**Σ** om. *multi*). The reading is certainly not original; but it is a very natural one to arise in a Harmony.

Matt. xiv. 24. The Arabic Harmony reads: "Navicula autem pluribus stadiis a terra distabat"; with the support of the Ferrar-group and of almost all the versions but not the Latin, nor any uncial except B. The question is whether this reading is the original or derived from John vi. 19. If the latter it probably came by way of Tatian.

Mark vii. 33. It may be maintained that the curious reading which we noted in W⁰ and the Harmony was in the ancestry of the Ferrar-group, which now stands: *ἐπέβαλε τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ*, where we have only to interchange *ἐβαλε* and *πτύσας* to get the Harmony reading.

Luke ix. 29, where the Harmony reads "Et dum ipsi orarent" the Ferrar-group gives *καὶ ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοῖς*, not indeed in Luke where it has the usual text, but in Mark ix. 3 where it expands the text as follows: *καὶ ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοῖς μετεμορφώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἑμπροσθεν αὐτῶν*.

A comparison with the Harmony shows that the Ferrar text has been emended from the Harmony, for it has not only the curious change to the plural, but also the necessary insertion of *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* which does not belong to the text.

In the same account (the Transfiguration) the Ferrar-group gives us for *νεφέλη φωτεινὴ*, *νεφέλη φωτός* (Matt. xvii. 5). Now this reading is obviously a Syriasm; and as such it appears no doubt in the Tatian Harmony, although Clasca gives us 'nubes lucida': for it is also the reading of the Curetonian Syriac, and according to Tischendorf, of some passage of Ephrem. The

only Greek authorities for it besides the Ferrar contingent (13—124—316) are 209, 238 and a few others. It is reasonable to refer the reading to Syriac influence, and this, taken with what has preceded, means Tatian influence.

In Mark ix. 28 the Harmony gives: "Et cum introisset Jesus in domum, accesserunt discipuli ejus etc.," where the word *accesserunt* has been borrowed from Matthew xvii. 19 to complete the account, the Matthew text being *Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταί*. Now the Ferrar text in Mark has made precisely the same completion as the Harmony and like the Harmony has changed the participle of Matthew into a verb, so as to read *προσῆλθον αὐτῷ*: nor is this all; the Harmony for *ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν* has *interrogantes eum, dicerunt illi*; and accordingly the Ferrar text gives *ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν, λέγοντες*. The addition is probably due to the text in Matthew (*εἶπον*). No other evidence exists for it beyond one or two cursives. It seems reasonable to suppose this is not a mere accidental coincidence in assimilation.

In Luke xvi. 21 the text of Aphraates certainly added the words "and no man gave unto him" to the passage where Lazarus desired to "fill his belly" (so Aphraates, by assimilation to the story of the Prodigal) "with crumbs from the rich man's table."

Now the Ferrar text has not altered *χορτασθῆναι* into agreement with Tatian, but it has added the words *καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ*. The authorities for this change are very slight (a stray cursive or Latin MS.:) in the absence of any early Western attestation we may perhaps say this reading too is a Tatianism¹.

In Luke xxiv. 40 the Harmony has "ostendit eis manus et pedes et latus": a reading which is apparently compounded of Luke xxiv. 40 and John xx. 20. Now if we turn to John xx. 20 in the Ferrar text, we shall find the verse run

ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ.

There is some ground for believing this reading also (which has no other Greek support and only that of one Latin Vulgate MS.) to be a Tatian reading.

From the above passages we see a strong probability that the

¹ On the other hand note that there is a converse assimilation in Luke xv. 16 where *χορτασθῆναι* has been substituted for *γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ*. Dr Hort holds that *χορτασθῆναι* is the primitive reading. But as no one can deny that the words "no man gave unto him" in Aphraates are from Luke xv., it seems reasonable to affirm that the previous words came from the same source.

Ferrar text has been influenced by Tatian, either by a Greek rendering of Tatian or by Syriac corrections.

Now if this could be proved, then, without arguing in a circle, we could carry back some curious passages in the Ferrar text to Tatian, where the Arabic Harmony shews no direct signs of them.

For example; at the close of Luke xxiv. 43 the Ferrar text adds (i.e. 13—346) *καὶ λαβὼν τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*. In this it has the support of Cod. 561 which we have detected in one palpable Tatianism and the Old Syriac which Tatianizes eternally; so that we may with a bold face claim the reading for Tatian. Not indeed for Tatian's MSS. but for himself: for the only other support consists of late Latin and two late Greek uncials KII. It must therefore follow further that late Western texts at all events shew some traces of Tatianism.

A similar singular reading in Ferrar is John xx. 16 where there is added the words

καὶ προσέδραμεν ἄψασθαι αὐτοῦ.

This reading is supported by *S^a* and scanty late Latin and Syriac testimony. The Ferrar text here is attested by 13—346. I conjecture this reading to be added by Tatian as a preface to "Noli me tangere."

In Luke vii. 45 the Harmony (c. 15) reads

"Osculum tu mihi non dedisti."

But that something more stood here is evident from Ephrem who gives "Osculum unum salutationis tu mihi non dedisti."

Now it is significant that Cod. A with Cod. 346 (Ferrar) read *ἀγάπης* after *φίλημά μοι*. The Curetonian Syriac however has no addition to the text. Nevertheless from the conjunction of Ephrem and the other two, we may very well imagine the Tatian text had here a word answering to the Greek *ἀγάπης*. No doubt other instances of the kind may be forthcoming; and the suspicion of Tatianizing in the Ferrar group becomes a key to explain the origin of numerous singular early readings. The difficulty consists in the determination of a Western reading from a Tatian reading proper, not by any means an easy thing. But it may be very fairly maintained that where there are found in a copy of the Gospels any assimilations or additions of a harmonistic nature and when there are also found the same conjunctions in an actual harmony, it is at least an open question whether the

harmony in question may not claim to be the author and origin of some at least of the variants.

For example when in transcribing Mark xvi. 14 the Harmonist gives

Et obliti sunt discipuli eius panem sumere

where the words *discipuli eius* are added from the parallel narrative in Matt. xvi. 5 (but, as so often happens in the Arabic Tatian, without any marginal explanation of their origin); and when we find the same addition made in the Ferrar group, in D and one or two others; it is not inconceivable that the Harmony is answerable for them.

Again, when in the Arabic we find

Matt xvi. 8^a. *Sciens autem Jesus, dixit eis: Quid cogitatis intra-
ros, modicæ fidei.*

Mark viii. 17^b. *et solliciti estis quia, etc.*

it is not surprising that the Ferrar group should read in Mark τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὀλιγόπιστοι although the last three words are not considered to form a part of the true text of Mark.

Where the Arabic gives Mark ix. 28 as follows: *Et cum introisset Jesus in domum accesserunt discipuli eius et inter se et illum interrogantes eum, etc.* with the words προσῆλθον αὐτῷ adapted from Matt. xvii. 19, the Ferrar text reads καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κτέ.

In Luke xix. 22 the Arabic has

*Dixit ei dominus eius: De ore tuo iudico serve nequam, negli-
gens, fiducia destitute.*

It is needless to say that this did not all come from Luke: *fiducia destitute* may perhaps be traced to Matt. xxv. 30 (ἀχρεῖον) and is certainly represented by the Curetonian 'qui non fidelis'; *negligens* is from Matt. xxv. 26 (ὀκνηρε); and it is only reasonable to assume that the explanation *dominus eius* is from the same source: but this addition is made by the Ferrar group as well as the Curetonian text. Does not this throw Ferrar's origins into the neighbourhood of Tatian?

In Mark xiv. 13 we find:

Mark xiv. 13^b. *Ite intrate civitatem.*

Luke xxii. 10^b. *et introeuntibus vobis, etc.*

In view of this conjunction, is it a thing to be astonished at

that the Ferrar text should carry into Mark the words

εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν?

The same thing happens in the following case:

Mark xiv. 63^b. *Milites autem, percutientes genus eius, dicebant:*

Matt. xxvi. 68. *Prophetiza nobis, Messia, quis est, qui te percussit?*

and the Ferrar text gives us in Mark *προφῆτευσον + ὦν Χρίστος τίς ἐστιν ὁ παΐσας σε.*

These instances will suffice to shew that the conjunctions of passages in the Tatian Harmony are a sufficient cause of many assimilations in the Ferrar text; it will probably be urged in reply that the same thing would be true of any text which had made rational assimilations of connected passages: this is perfectly true; and the only thing to be remembered is that we have also a singular concurrence in queer readings which put the two texts in question side by side and invited the explanation which we have suggested.

The transposition of the famous passage in Luke (xxii. 43, 44) to Matt. by the Ferrar group has little light thrown on it by the Harmony. While it is certain that Tatian had this passage, the Harmony in its present state presents it in the proper connection in Luke.

Those persons who hold the Calabrian or South-Italian origin of the Ferrar group will find no difficulty in the supposition that a Tatian Harmony strayed into the hands of Victor of Capua in the sixth century.

IX. ON THE RELATION OF THE TATIAN TEXT TO THE WESTERN NON-INTERPOLATIONS.

One of the most important questions in connection with the textual criticism of the N. T. is that of the so-called Western non-interpolations. These passages are practically nine in number, and the peculiarity of the textual evidence is this, that an important and early group of witnesses do not recognize their existence, and upon the faith of this group of witnesses (chiefly Old-Latin texts) Dr Hort excludes them from the representation which he gives of the original text of the Gospels, although for convenience he retains them provisionally within double brackets. Of these nine passages, one is in the Gospel of Matthew, and the remaining eight at the close of the Gospel of Luke.

Now it is of the highest importance for us to be able to

determine how the original Tatian text stands with regard to these interpolations; for we have shewn reason for believing that the Tatian text is in the main a Western text, according to Dr Hort's classification: and not only a Western text in general, but where it can be come at, a Western text of the highest antiquity.

Let us then examine these nine passages with care, and see what light they throw upon the origin of the Tatian text.

The first of them adds in Matt. xxvii. 49 the words

ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην.....αἶμα

and on the faith of an anonymous Scholion in Ev. 72 it has been maintained that this glaring transposition (as it certainly seems to be) from the Gospel of John (xix. 34) was found in the consecutive Gospel of Tatian.

Now certainly it is just such a mistake as a Harmonist might be guilty of, and there is no reason why such a mistake, once made, should not be widely propagated. It is, however, almost impossible to believe that the Scholion can be correct, since the Arabic version gives the passage in John without any sign of displacement, and the Armenian text, as we get it from Ephrem, certainly places the piercing of our Lord's side after His death. And although we have not the old Syriac text to help us, we may reasonably hesitate to believe that the primitive Syriac harmony shewed any trace of such a dislocation. The only way to defend such a position would be to shew that Ephrem has corrected the error: now this might be maintained in the following way: first, by shewing that a comparison of Ephrem's text with the Arabic displays several displacements of the order, evidently on the part of Ephrem; secondly, that the quotation in Ephrem is accompanied by the remark "This was done that they might know that he was alive after death," which shews that the question as to whether a living or a dead body had been pierced was in the mind of Ephrem. But the evidence is insufficient to establish the case. The proof that Tatian's New Testament contained the passage in connection with Matthew is not yet forthcoming.

Let us now go on to examine the eight passages in Luke which are obviously from one origin, either by omission or insertion, as the classified attestation will shew: the simplest way will be to present the variants in tabular form:

- α. Luke xxiv. 3. [τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ]
 D a b e ff rhe om. Syr. vt. Tat. arab. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. rell. habent.
- β. Luke xxiv. 6. [οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε ἀλλὰ ἡγέρθη]
 D a b e ff rhe om. Syr. vt. Tat. arab. rell. habent.
- γ. Luke xxiv. 12. [Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος.....γέγονεν]
 D a b e rhe om. ff. Syr. vt. rell. habent.
- δ. Luke xxiv. 36. [καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν]
 D a b e ff rhe om. Syr. vt. rell. habent.
- ε. Luke xxiv. 40. [καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς
 τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας]
 D a b e ff rhe syr. vt. om. rell. habent.
- ς. Luke xxiv. 51. [καὶ ἀνεφέρτε εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν]
 D a b e ff rhe om. rell. habent. Syr. vt. deest.
- ζ. Luke xxiv. 52. [προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν]
 D a b e ff rhe om. Tat. arab. rell. habent: Syr. vt. deest.

The last passage is Luke xxii. 19, 20 which we will turn to presently.

Now in examining the foregoing table, the following points must be noticed, viz. that under (γ) no evidence is forthcoming with regard to the Harmony, because the passage in Luke could not be quoted, even if it were known to the Harmonist, being only an abbreviation of the fuller account in John which the Harmony gives. Under (δ) we observe that in the Arabic the passage runs

John xx. 19. ...venit Jesus et stetit in medio eorum *et dixit eis: Pax sit vobiscum:*

Lue. xxiv. 36. ego sum, nolite timere

37. et ipsi conturbati et conterriti &c.

Now it is obviously impossible to tell whether the words italicised belong to John or to interpolated Luke, since they stand precisely in the right place for either supposition. We therefore leave it an open question for the present.

Precisely the same thing happens under (ε) for although the Arabic Harmony has the verse it has it in such a form that although it comes in due sequence in the narrative from Luke (xxiv. 36—49) it betrays the use of John's Gospel, at least in part, for it reads "Et cum hoc dixisset, ostendit eis manus et pedes et latus," which is John xx. 20 with a slight modification.

The same difficulty arises under 5, where the Harmony gives Luke xxiv. 51. *Et dum benediceret illis, divisus est ab eis, et ascendit in caelum*

Mc. xvi. 19. *et sedit a dextris Dei.*

Now the words underlined might equally well be the first part of the verse quoted from Mark, which verse, as far as concerns us, is not a later addition to that Gospel since the Harmonist was certainly acquainted with the last twelve verses of that Gospel.

Now the survey of these seven passages shews us, that where we have the evidence of the Arab. Harmony and of the Old Syriac, they stand together, and thus give us with sufficient clearness the evidence of the original Tatian text. The same thing comes out when we examine the remaining passage (Luke xxii. 19, 20) as we shall see presently. Now the presumption is that the same agreement between the two authorities holds in the remaining cases; i.e. that we may regard the Arabic Harmony as concurring with the Syriac in (δ) where we have the clear evidence of the Syriac version: and perhaps in (ζ) where we have the fairly clear evidence of the Arabic, although the text of the last may have been subject to change. Leaving this last passage out, the evidence would shew that the Archaic Tatian text was generally under the influence of the so-called Western non-interpolations; and since these interpolations are obviously the work of a single hand, to prove the influence in one case for such an early text as Tatian used would be to practically prove it for Tatian all round. We see it, however, not in a single case, but in a number of cases, and some of these as (α) (β) are perfectly decisive. The case (ε) where the Old Syriac is with the non-interpolating Latins is the only clear contrary case. And this is probably due to the fact that the Syriac text, like the Ferrar archetype, carried the passage in question over into John instead of taking it back into Luke: but the Curetonian text of this part of John is missing. Now here we have two important facts which demand an explanation; first, how does it come about that such a notably Western text as that of Tatian furnishes no clear support to the non-interpolating early Western texts; and secondly how does it happen that the Harmony which apparently knows the interpolations as anterior to itself furnishes the very material to explain the origin of the interpolations? By the last question we mean this, that Dr Hort holds the interpolation (δ) in the gospel of Luke to be due to

John xx. 19 which evidently precedes the passage from Luke in the Harmony, and similar explanations may be made for (ε) and (ς).

The solution of this perplexity seems to lie in the following direction; THERE MUST HAVE BEEN A PREVIOUSLY EXISTING HARMONY, PROBABLY A HARMONY OF THE PASSION-GOSPELS, which Tatian used, AND WHICH HAS ALSO BEEN USED AS A REVISING FACTOR IN THE ANCESTRY OF ALL TEXTS OF THE GOSPELS EXCEPT THE NON-INTERPOLATING WESTERNS. Such a supposition explains the reading (α): it shows why Tatian gives the reading (β) although he has already quoted the passage in Matt. (xxviii. 6) from which the interpolation was made: it explains why the Harmony does not give us (γ) Luke xxiv. 12, for though this stood in the earlier Harmony it was not suited (in Tatian's idea) to be used along with the passage in John of which it is an obvious epitome. The other cases are perfectly lucid in view of the hypothesis made; only we have to notice that the Old Syriac has not been influenced by the Harmony in Luke xxiv. 10, but perhaps it may have been so in John xx. 20.

Now let us turn to the remaining passage Luke xxii. 19, 20. Here the words

τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον... ἐκχυννόμενον

are omitted by Dabeffirhe.

The Old Syriac reads τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν and makes a transposition in the remaining part of the narrative so as to make the Eucharistic order more natural. Now the Tatian Harmony agrees closely with the Syriac in this: that it quotes nothing from the interpolated section except the words which correspond to the following sentence

καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

This is sufficient agreement to shew that the Tatian Harmony was not constructed without a knowledge of the interpolation: but since the interpolation is only partially used in Tatian, and is itself of a harmonistic character, we may reasonably refer it, as before, to a previously existing Harmony, which has evidently taken it from 1 Cor. xi. 24, as we may also see from the language of Aphraates whose text stood καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, δοῦντες ἐν ἀνέρχεσθε which has an additional adaptation from 1 Cor., which must have stood in Tatian if not in

Pre-Tatian, and it is also seen from the omission of *διδόμενον* by the Curetonian Syriac, so furnishing a closer agreement with the text of 1 Cor. xi. 24. The close agreement between the Old Syriac and Tatian may seem to support the theory of Baethgen that the former is actually based upon the latter. And certainly they are very closely related; but in one or two places the Old Syriac seems to shew an acquaintance with the interpolated passages beyond what we can trace at present in Tatian; and the simplicity of the theory offered to account for the interdependence of Tatian and the Old Syriac may be thought to have given it an undue weight.

Perhaps we may sum up the matter as follows: the early N.T. texts divide on certain notable readings into non-Western interpolators and Western non-interpolators: the text of Tatian is naturally Western, but it has followed in part a previously existing Harmony of the Passion from which the interpolating MSS. have drawn their peculiar accretions: and hence it appears amongst the interpolating MSS. as if supporting their evidence when it is in reality explaining it away. Whether this previously existing Harmony, which we may call 'Pre-Tatian,' was in Greek or not, is an interesting question: since it gives us *ἀνεφέρετο* in Luke for the *ἀνελήμφθη* of Mark, from which the interpolator borrowed, we may incline to the belief that this Pre-Tatian was not a Greek work: most likely, then, as in the case of Tatian proper, it was a Syriac work. Now it is precisely in Syriac that we find the Harmonies of the Passion-gospels so frequent.

We may now return to the famous scholion in Ev. 72 which attributes to Tatian the interpolation in Matt. xxvii. 49. It will be very difficult to explain the reading as anything else than a careless harmonistic error; and since we have shewn that no trace of it can be found in the evidence for the Tatian Harmony, while the evidence for its being a Western non-interpolation is very strong, we may refer it to the Passion-Harmony which Tatian used: and this perhaps explains the reference of the Scholiast, while it carries the error back into the earliest times.

The assumed Passion-Harmony will explain also why Justin so positively refers the words "Do this in remembrance of Me" to the gospels. Even in Aphraates the words carry the marks of their origin in 1 Cor., for he gives "Do this in remembrance of me, as often as ye meet together"; which is the best evidence we

have for the primitive Tatian text. Now Justin's gospels shew the harmonization of the passage in 1 Cor. with the Gospels *before the time* of production of Tatian's Harmony.

But the supposition suggests even more than this: if the existence of the Tatian Harmony is evidence for the antiquity of the Gospel of John, the existence of an early stage of textual growth, marked by a Harmony of the Passion-Gospels or at least by the existence of the passages called "Western non-interpolations" as anterior to the time of Tatian, presupposes the existence of the matters harmonized at a very early time indeed. Thus the existence of Tatian's Harmony is momentous evidence for

- (i) the antiquity of the four Gospels,
- (ii) of the Acts of the Apostles,
- (iii) of the first Epistle to the Corinthians,

and perhaps of some other portions of the New Testament of which we find traces in Tatian or pre-Tatian. Let us explain this a little more at length. We can easily see that the four Gospels being necessarily anterior in date to the time of Tatian, must be *long anterior* to the period mentioned. And we see it in three ways: first, because it is unreasonable to quibble over a passage which seems to be quoted by Justin from St John's Gospel, as to whether it be really the Johannine text, or the Johannine theology in the air and in embryo, when we find that the disciple of Justin harmonizes four Gospels of which St John's is one; secondly, when we find that prior to the Tatian Harmony there was an earlier Harmony containing portions of the four Gospels, and this Harmony was used by Justin; so that the question of the antiquity of the four Gospels is removed by at least one more generation than was required in order to make Tatian's Harmony possible, and thirdly, whether the pre-Tatian Harmony existed or not, the various readings which were caused by the interpolations existed before Tatian, and these readings being of a harmonistic nature, the case for the priority of the Gospels stands as it did before; for a reading in Luke is not going to be expanded from John or Mark except on the hypothesis that these Gospels exist in a form from which borrowing is practicable: so far-reaching is the evidence to be derived from the elementary lesson which Dr Burgon conveyed in one of his writings, in his own forcible manner: "Have you not yet found out, sir, that all various readings are early?" To which we append the further question, "Have

you not found out yet that all harmonistic readings prove that the passages harmonized are earlier than the early readings?"

And as we have said, the evidence which we draw attention to is not confined to the four Gospels. Pre-Tatian used the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Tatian, if we may judge from Ephrem, inserted the account of the death of Judas from the Acts of the Apostles. Pre-Tatian used the last twelve verses of St Mark; and just as we argued from Tatian's use of the four Gospels to their use by Justin, so we are able to infer from Tatian's use of the last twelve verses that Justin used them. It does not depend merely upon the inference that Justin used pre-Tatian; it is well known that Justin used a passage which has been held by many to be a part of the last twelve verses; accordingly Dr Hort places at the head of the Patristic Greek evidence for these verses the name of Justin, bracketed and queried, thus—(? Justin). And he argues as follows:

"The Greek Patristic evidence for xv. 9—20 perhaps begins with Justin (*Ap.* I. 45) who interprets 'Ραβδὸν δυνάμεως ἐξαποστελεῖ σοι ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ (Ps. cx. 3) as predictive τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ ὃν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν. On the one hand it may be said that the combination of the same four words recurs in v. 20: on the other that they were natural and obvious words to use, and to combine, and that v. 20 does not contain the point specially urged by Justin ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ...ἐξελθόντες (cf. *Ap.* I. 39, 49) which is furnished by *Le.* xxiv. 47 ff., *Acts* i. 4, 8. On both sides the evidence is slight, and decision seems impossible. It should be added, however, that the affinity between Justin's text and that of Irenaeus (see below) leaves the supposition of a reference to v. 20 free from antecedent improbability as regards textual history." Happily for us, the Arabic Harmony is still able to throw some light on the question; the changes through which it has passed have not been sufficient to remove all its ancient characteristics; when we turn to the text of Ciasca we find

Luc. xxiv. 25. Et ipsi, adorantes eum, regressi sunt in *Jerusalem* cum gaudio magno:

33. et omni tempore erant in templo laudantes et benedicentes Deum. Amen.

Marc. xvi. 20. Et, inde egressi, praedicaverunt ubique &c.

Here then we have the evidence for the missing ἀπὸ Ἱερου-

αἰῶν; it is even possible that the very words stood in the Tatian-sources; at all events they are sufficiently implied in the word *inde* which still stands in the Arabic. Dr Hort may therefore remove the query from the name of Justin in the tabulated evidence for the last twelve verses.

On the other hand, this is not inconsistent with his theory that the verse to which Justin alludes is made up out of passages in Luke and Acts, for we have shewn reason to believe that Justin drew the verses from a Harmony earlier than Tatian. Our hypothesis satisfies all Dr Hort's criticisms, and in establishing the antiquity of the last twelve verses of St Mark as a literary product (for of course we have not proved authorship), we have *a fortiori* established the antiquity of the Gospels out of which the last twelve verses were compounded (e.g. the words in Luke xxiv. 13 sqq. which may have been epitomized in Mark xvi. 12 etc.).

If this reasoning is valid, it will be seen to involve a very high antiquity for many of the New-Testament books. And indeed the argument might have been strengthened; for it may well be true as we have suggested, that the primitive Harmony, the nucleus of Tatian's, was itself a Syriac work: and the supposition of a translation is one more step that requires time in the observed processes of change¹.

Nor is the argument for antiquity confined to the Gospels; for there are other touches in Tatian which suggest the use of the Apostolic Epistles: we have not dwelt on them because it encumbers an argument to burden it with doubtful matter. Still it is conceivable that when in his account of the Transfiguration Tatian says that the disciples "saw Jesus as He was," that his thought might have been coloured by I John iii. "We shall see Him as He is."

I have also detected an alteration of text which seems to have been made under the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In Luke xxii. 43 the words *γέροντος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ* are replaced

¹ It may not be amiss at this point to draw attention to a curiously confident passage in Dr B. Davidson's book on the *Canon of the Bible*, p. 99. "Whatever may be said about Justin's acquaintance with this Gospel (i.e. the Gospel of John) its existence before 110 A.D. is incapable either of decisive or probable shewing. The Johannine authorship has receded before the tide of modern criticism and though this tide is arbitrary at times it is here irresistible."

by "Et cum timeret": and it may perhaps be that the words came from a passage in Heb. v. 7 where our Lord is said to have poured out "strong crying and tears," and to have been "heard for His pious fear" (εὐλαβείας which the Latins give as 'pro metu,' 'a metu' amongst other renderings). Now we know sufficient of Tatian's method to enable us to say that he never omitted anything in the shape of a historical detail which might serve to give completeness to his story; hence it seems likely that the 'cum timeret' is from Hebrews: and if he carried that over he certainly took the 'tears' also from Hebrews at the same time; and this brings us to the reading καὶ ἔκλαυσε which Epiphanius accuses the orthodox of subtracting from the text of the Gospel.

The main body of the passage Luke xxii. 43, 44 may very well have been found not only in Tatian but in Pre-Tatian, for the allusion of Justin to the θρόμβοι αἵματος in his Dialogue with Trypho (c. 103) is distinctly from the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων or Memoirs of the Apostles, which is the same term as he uses in previous quotations from Pre-Tatian, though it must not be limited to any such composition.

The importance of the study of Tatian for the knowledge of the New Testament in the middle of the second century is certainly very great.

X. UNSOLVED PROBLEMS.

It will be seen by what precedes that there is a great deal of work to be done in connection with the Arabic Harmony, and it is beset with difficulties. To begin with, in the determination of the missing Syriac of Tatian, we must be careful to remove all those readings of the Arabic version which are either due to a translator's liberty of speech or to erroneous reading of his copy. When, for example, we find in Luke iv. 19 the words "praedicare malis remissionem," although at first sight it might appear to be an ancient Greek reading of ἀμαρτωλοῖς for αἰχμαλώτοις, a closer examination will shew that the translator read **ܕܐܝܠ** as **ܕܝܕ**. And in the same way it is conceivable that the gloss in Mark vii. 26, "ex Hemesen Syria," may have arisen out of a corrupt transcription of Συρηφοίνισσα. At all events we must be prepared for such cases.

Again when Clusca gives us in Matt. xxiii. 24 "ornantes

camelum," there must be some mistake either in the Arabic or in the translation; and in fact if we correct Ciasca's *ونردرون* to *ونردون* which is only a transposition of a couple of adjacent letters we get the ordinary reading, which no doubt stands for the primitive Syriac *ܠܚܡ* as in the Curetonian text. So when the Arabic gives *Betharrahmat* for the name of the pool of Bethesda, this only means that there has been a translation made of the Syriac *ܠܚܡ ܕܒܬܝܫܬܐ*; and the Arabic name is the same as that found in the Curetonian.

When we have succeeded in replacing the Arabic text, as far as possible, by the primitive Syriac out of which it was developed, our next step will be to determine the nature of the Greek text from which the Syriac translation was made.

We shall readily detect that it was a Greek text in which disintegrating textual influences had been busy. Some of the changes made are mere trifles as when in Matt. iii. 10 the Harmony followed by the Old Syriac gives "Ecce securis ad radicem, &c.," which involves the reading of *ἡδη* as *ἰδε*. But others are much more serious: let us examine for instance:

Mark ix. 15: "et cum vidissent homines Jesum, recesserunt, et prae gaudio properantes, salutarunt eum." Here the ordinary text is *ἐξεθαμβήθησαν, καὶ προστρέχοντες ἡσπάζοντο αὐτόν*.

The words 'prae gaudio' evidently arise from reading *προσχέροντες* (= *προσχαίροντες*) in the Greek: and the old Latins shew the influence of the same text: D reading *προσχέροντες* and *c ff* "i k *gaudentes* which *b* disguises as *cadentes*. This error is very important from a critical point of view, inasmuch as it could not have passed into the Western text from a Syriac harmony: it must have been earlier than the Harmony. Again in Luke xxi. 35 "ipsa enim tanquam ictus percussit omnes &c."; here it is tolerably clear that *παγίς* (written of course in uncials) has been confounded with *πληγή*. Further than this it is also likely that *ἐπεισελεύσεται* has been read as *ἐπισαλεύσεται*.

Such readings shew that the text upon which Tatian worked had serious errors of transcription in it. Let us take one more instance; in Luke xxii. 11 we find along with other changes from the usual text, the words "et fames et pestilentiae et commotiones; terrôres ac pavores erunt." The last words are a misreading for *φόβητρά τε* which has been taken as *φόβοι τέρατά τε*, a

reading actually preserved in Cod. A, a MS. whose text has affinities with Tatian. The Syriac of the error is preserved in the Peshitto, **ܟܪܝܡܐ ܟܪܠܐ**, and it must have stood so in Tatian; but we cannot say that the error originated in the Syriac; it is clearly an error made in a Greek text.

But what Greek text was this? an ordinary Western copy? and did Tatian write his work originally in Greek and then translate it into Syriac; or was his earliest edition a bilingual in the style of Codex Bezae with line for line translation? And whether in Greek or in Syriac, did it exercise any reflex influence upon the current texts, and if so, what are the characteristics of this influence in extant copies? All of these questions are at present involved in great obscurity. But they will, we may hope, be resolved before long; the solution would be much expedited if we could recover an early copy of the Syriac Tatian; and such a prospect is by no means unreasonable. But even if the recovery of such a text should be delayed indefinitely, we ought not to despair of the results which may be attained by an honest criticism working on the materials that are already accessible.

APPENDIX ON CODEX W¹.

THE prominence into which this MS. is thrown by the coincidences between its text and the Tatian harmony renders it advisable that its text should be printed in full: we have accordingly given a transcription and photographic reproduction of the fragments. The size of the various pieces can be estimated by means of the attached scale of inches which has been photographed along with the MS. The accents and reading signs we have not transcribed.

From the appearance of the MS. and an examination of the contents of the separate pages it would seem that we had here a part of the outside double leaf of a quaternion and a complete inside leaf, the two intermediate leaves being lost.

Mark vii. 3.

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ [ΙΕΔ] Ν
 ΜΗ ΠΥΓΜΗΝΙΨΟΝΤΑ [ΙΤΑΣ
 ΧΕΙΡΑΣ ΟΥΚ ΕΘΙΟΥΣΙΝ ΚΡΑ]
 ΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΣ [ΙΝ]
 ΤΩΝ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΝ [ΚΑΙ]

ⲡ	ⲗ	ⲟ	ⲡ
ⲉⲟ	ⲗⲉ		ⲣⲛⲓ

Mark vii. 6, 7.

> ΠΟ]ΡΡΩΔ ΠΕΧΕΙΑ ΠΕΜΟΥ · ΜΑ
 > ΤΗ]Ν ΔΕ ΕΒΟΝΤΑΙ ΜΕΔΙΔΑΣ
 > ΚΟ]ΝΤΕΣ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΙΑΣ ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ
 Μ]ΑΤΑΙΩΝ · ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΥΣ
 ΞΕ]ΣΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΩΝ

Mark vii. 30—36.

ΜΟΓΓΙΛΛΟΥ.

κ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ ΕΞΕΛΗΛΥΘΟΣ·
 03 [Κ]ΑΙ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΞΕΛΘΩΝ ΑΠ[Ο Τ]Ω
 ΟΡΙΩΝ ΤΥΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΣΙΔΩΝΟΣ·
 ΗΘΕΝΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑΝ
 ΤΗΣ ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑΣ ΑΝΑΜΕ[ΣΘ]Ν
 ΤΩΝ ΟΡΙΩΝΤΗΣ ΔΕ [ΚΑΠΟΛΕ]
 ΩΣ + ΚΑΙ ΦΕΡΟΥΣΙΝ ΑΥΤΩ
 ΚΩΦΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΜΟΓΓΙΛΛΟΝ·
 ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ
 ΙΝΑ ΕΠΙΘΗ[ΤΑΣ] ΧΕΙΡΑΣ + Κ
 ΕΠΙΛΑΒΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΑΠΟ
 ΤΟΥ ΟΧΛΟΥ ΚΑΤΙΔΙΑΝΕΠΤΥ-
 ΣΕΝΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΔΑΚΤΥΛΟΥΣ ΑΥ-
 ΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΒΑΛΕΝΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΩΤΑ
 ΤΟΥ ΚΩΦΟΥ· ΚΑΙ ΗΨΑΤΟ
 ΤΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΜΟΓΓΙΛ-
 ΛΟΥ + ΚΑΙ ΙΝΑ ΒΛΕΨΑΣΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ
 ΟΥΝΟΝ ΑΝΕΣΤΕΝΑΞΕΝ ΚΑΙ
 ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ + ΕΦΘΑΘΟΕΣ
 ΤΙΝ ΔΙΑΝΥΧΟΝΤΙ + ΚΑΙ ΔΙΕΥΘΕΩΣ
 ΗΝ ΟΙΧΘΗΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΔΙΑΚΟ-
 ΔΙΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΜΟΓΓΙΛΛΟΥ ΕΛΥ-
 [ΘΗΘΕΣ ΜΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ]
 ΕΛΑΛΗΘΡΩΣ + ΚΑΙ ΔΙΕΣΤΕΙΛΑΤΟ

ϕ	δ	ζ	ϕ
οε	ςγ	μου	ρζ
οε			

Mark vii. 36—viii. 4.

αὐτοῖς ἰνα μὴ δένι λέγωσιν
 ὅς ἐστιν ὁ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσώτε-
 ρως ἐκ κήρυξον καὶ πᾶν
 ὅς ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁ υἱοῦ
 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πάντα ποιεῖ τοὺς
 κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν·
 καὶ τοὺς ἀλαλοῦς λαλεῖν·
 ἕνεκεν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμέραις
 πᾶν πολλοῦ οὐλοῦ [συνάχ]-
 θέντος καὶ μνηχόντων
 τὴν φαγῶσιν προσκαλεσα-
 μένος τοὺς μαθητάς· λέ-
 γει αὐτοῖς πλάγχθοντες
 μετὰ τὸν οὐλον ὅτι ἡ ἡμέ-
 ρα τρεῖς προσμένου-
 σι μοὶ καὶ οὐκ ἔχωσιν τι
 φαγῶσιν καὶ [ἐὰν] πολλοὶ
 ἐσθῶ αὐτοὺς σὺν ἡμῖν οἱ
 υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ἐκ]λυθὲν
 ταῖς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· τινες γάρ
 αὐτῶν μακροθεν ἡκού-
 σιν καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν λέ-
 γοντες· μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·

Mark viii. 4—10.

ποθεν τοῦ τοῦ δυνῆσαι
 ταῖς χορτασαῖς δεδρῶ
 ἐπερμιῶς· καὶ ἐπὶ ῥῶτα
 αὐτοῦ ποσοῦς ἐχέτε αὐτοῦς
 οἱ δὲ εἶπον· ἑπτὰ καὶ [πα]
 ρηγεῖς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπε
 σεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ ἰδὼν
 βὼν τοῦς ἑπτὰ αὐτοῦς· εὐ
 χαρίσθης αὐς· ἐκλάσεν καὶ
 ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐ
 τοῦ ἵνα παραθῶσιν καὶ·
 παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ·
 καὶ εἰχον ἰχθὺς λίγα· κ
 αὐτὰς ἐλάσας· εἶπεν πα
 ράβηται· ἐφάγον δὲ καὶ
 ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἰδὼν
 περὶ σσεύματα κλάσματῶ
 ἑπτὰ πύριδας· ἦσαν δὲ
 οἱ φάγοντες ὥς τετρακίς
 χίλιοι· καὶ ἀπελῦσεν αὐ
 τοῦς· καὶ ἐμβάσει
 θεῶς ἐς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶ
 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ· ἡλ[θεν
 εἰς τὰ μερὴ δαλμανοῦ θα·

ρ
 οζ κτ' η' ρεα
 ρεβ

Mark viii. 11—16.

καὶ ἐξηλθόντες οἱ φαρισαῖοι
καὶ ἡρᾶντος συζητεῖν
αὐτῷ· ζητοῦντες παρὰ
τοῦ σημεῖου ἀπο τοῦ οὔρου
πειράζοντες αὐτόν· καὶ
ἀναστὰς ἀστῶπνι αὐ
τοῦ λέγει· τῇ γενεᾷ

οὐκ ἄρτις σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ·
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· εἶδο
θῆκεται ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῇ
σημεῖον· καὶ ἁφ' ἑαυ

τοῦ σὺν βασιλεὺς ἐστὶ
πλοῖον ἀπὸ ἡθέρης ἐστὶ
πέραν· καὶ ἐπελάθοντο
οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν
ἄρτους· καὶ ἐμνησάμην
τοιοῦ κεῖχρον μεθ' αὐτῶ

ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ· καὶ διέ
στελλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων· ο
ρατε καὶ βλέπετε αὐτοῦς
ζυμῆς τῶν φαρισαίων
καὶ τῆς ζυμῆς ἡρώδου·

[Καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους
λέγοντες, ὅτι ἄρτους

ψ	Δ	Ω	ψ
οη			
οθ	pmθ		pεr
π			pεΔ
			pεe

Mark ix. 2.

[καί μετὰ]

Μ[εράς ἐξ ἑπαρά] λαμβανέσις
 τὸν πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον
 καὶ Ἰωάννην· καὶ ἰδὼν
 γεῖα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ
 κατὰ ἰδανμόνους· καὶ
 μεταμορφοῦται ἐμπρός

π	δ	ω	π
πς			
πζ	ςζ		ροα
	ςη		ροβ

Mark ix. 7, 8.

μοῦ ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐνεξέλε
 ἑμὴν· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ·
 καὶ ἐγὼ ὥς περιβλεψάμε
 νοί· οὐκ ἔτι [οὐδὲν αἶδον]
 εἰμὴν μόνον· καὶ ἰδὼν