

D. Plooij - 1927

TRACES OF SYRIAC ORIGIN OF THE OLD-LATIN DIATESSARON ¹⁾

The origin of the Old-Latin Diatessaron is still a matter of dispute. Until quite recently the assumption that the original Diatessaron was a Greek composition and that the Old-Syriac Harmony on one side, and the (Old-)Latin version on the other, were more or less free translations, was looked upon as axiomatic. It is true that nearly half a century ago Zahn argued in favour of a Syriac original translated about A.D. 500 from Syriac into Latin ²⁾, but he found no approval, and since it was shown first by himself and then by Vogels, that behind the Vulgate form of the Codex Fuldensis lies an Old-Latin Harmony of which only scanty traces were preserved, and since Vogels proved that the Harmony was the first attempt to clothe the Gospel in Latin dress, a Syriac original seemed to be excluded.

In 1923 however the present writer published, in a preliminary study ³⁾, the results of an examination of the text of a mediæval Dutch Harmony preserved in a Liège Ms. as a Flemish "Life of Jesus". The text of this Harmony seemed to show undoubtedly, that it was translated from a pre-vulgate text, prior not only to Victor's Codex Fuldensis but also to the Old-Latin Gospels, all of which more or less betrayed influence of the Old-Latin Harmony. And the Old-Latin Harmony itself contained a number of Syro-Latin readings and of Syriasms, which seemed to prove that it was translated not from a Greek original,

¹⁾ The present study is a somewhat enlarged form of a paper read in the Amsterdam Academy on April 11th, 1927.

²⁾ *Forschungen*, Tl. I, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, Erlangen, 1881, S. 238, 310 ff.

³⁾ *A primitive Text of the Diatessaron*, by Dr. D. Plooij with an introduction by Dr. J. Rendel Harris, Leyden, 1923.

but from the Syriac. This thesis was strengthened in another study published in 1925¹⁾, in which there was adduced a good number of new instances all pointing in the same direction. The Liège Text affords frequent close parallels to unique readings of the Old-Syriac Diatessaron, in Aphrahat, Ephrem and the Old-Syriac Gospels, parallels for which no Greek evidence is extant, and which by themselves would suggest some direct relation between the Syriac and the Old-Latin tradition. Besides these parallels however there are cases found first in the Liège Text and afterwards discovered also in the Old-Latin Gospels in which the wording of the Old-Latin (resp. mediæval Dutch) seemed to be explicable only as a literal translation of a Syriac idiom. I cannot reproduce here the cases pointed out in the studies quoted above, but I may be allowed to mention one very interesting and convincing case discovered by Rev. Phillips in the Old-Latin Gospel tradition:

In John xii. 13 the Arabic Diatessaron translates τὰ βῆλα τῶν φοινίκων by 'heart (or pith) of the palm'. This 'heart' is the word **ܠܒ** which the Pešitta uses in Lev. xxiii. 40 in rendering the Hebrew *kappoth*, for which the Targum uses the reduplicated form *lulab*. The same use of the word *lb* is found in the Aethiopic *Book of Jubilees*, in the Apocryphal Story of Jeremiah in Arabic and in a few cases more, for which cf. the *Bulletin of the Bezan Club* for Nov. '26 and April '27. It is clearly a genuine Semitic, if not originally Syriac, use of the word. Now Rev. Phillips has drawn attention to the fact that whilst the Vulgate renders the word βῆλα by *ramos*, the Old-Latin codd. *a b e ff* render it as *flores*, and the cod. Usanianus (*r*) as *medullas palmarum*. This means that the Old-Latin translators had before them the Semitic and not the Greek word, and seems convincing evidence of a Syriac origin of the Old-Latin Harmony²⁾. This is only one instance clearly illustrating the unexpected confirmation which the thesis has found in remote

¹⁾ *A further study of the Liège Diatessaron*, Leyden, 1925.

²⁾ For further references cf. the notes of Rev. Phillips, Dr. Rendel Harris, Dr. van Wijngaarden and the present writer in the *Bulletin of the Bezan Club*, nr. IV.

quarters, and whatever the ultimate result of the investigations may be, the new facts fully account for the interest which they have aroused and for the vivid discussion which has ensued.

Dr. Dibelius¹⁾ has expressed some regret that the attention of scholars has been directed mainly to the problem of the origin, whether Greek or Syriac, of the Old-Latin Diatessaron and suggested that it would be preferable to try a reconstruction of the Old-Latin text on the base of the Liège Harmony. But it cannot be emphasised too strongly that for this purpose our evidence, even since the discovery of the Dutch text, is wholly insufficient. What we possess of evidence in Latin is limited to very scanty remnants and to a number of vocables which the Dutch translator incorporated in his work (*turbeeren* = *turbare* etc.). A retranslation of the Dutch text into Latin, even with the help of survivals of the Old-Latin in the Old-Latin and Vulgate Gospels, in some Capitularia and in the Comments of Zachary, would provide us only with an artificial text, all the more misleading, because it would make us believe that we possessed really trustworthy evidence. In many single cases we are certainly able to recover the Old-Latin wording, but we are far from being able to reconstruct anything like a complete text. The present evidence however, until a real Old-Latin copy comes to light, can be used mainly as a means of reconstructing the history of the Diatessaron in the West.

A fortiori we must confess that a reconstruction of the Greek Diatessaron is equally impossible. It was a plan of the late Prof. Preuschen, which his death has frustrated. But even when the very existence of a Greek original was less open to serious doubt, the attempt could only have resulted in an entirely artificial product. It seems useful to remind ourselves that, whilst of the Syriac Diatessaron as well as of the Latin Harmony complete texts have been transmitted, though in more or less revised form, and also both of the Old-Syriac and of the Old-Latin Harmony fragments have been preserved, not a single line of a Greek Diatessaron has been transmitted to us²⁾. The ar-

¹⁾ *Theol. Lit. Ztg.*, 1927, Nr. 5 (for March 5).

²⁾ Cf. Zahn, *Forsch.*, I. S. 26 ff., and Rendel Harris, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, London, 1890, p. 16 ff.

guments for the existence of a Greek original are derived mainly from its Greek name and from the fact that late Syriac tradition speaks of Tatian the Greek as its author. But *διατεσσάρων* is a musical term in the same category as *harmony*, *concordia* and *accord*, and it is inconceivable that this term like other Greek words of the same kind, *συμφωνία*, *κithάρα* etc. could not be simply transliterated into Syriac. Moreover the term, according to Eusebius' letter to Carpianus, was not an invention of Tatian at all: it was Ammonius' *Synopsis* which bore this name, and a *Synopsis* – of Ammonius or of somebody else – must have preceded the *Harmony*. If Eusebius had really known a Greek *Diatessaron*, he would have mentioned it in his letter to Carpianus nor would he have spoken of Tatian's work as vaguely as he actually does in the wellknown passage in *H. E.* iv. 29, 6. (συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς τὰ διατεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν). If Eusebius had seen a Greek copy of the Tatianic *Harmony* he could scarcely have been ignorant about the method in which the Gospels had been interwoven.

More important, and certainly more interesting is the fact that the prologue of the Arabic *Diatessaron* in the Borgia Ms. speaks of the *Harmony* as a work of Tatian 'the Greek'. Under this name and qualification the *Harmony* certainly was not known from the beginning. Neither the *Doctrine of Addai* nor Aphrahat nor Ephrem ever mention the name of the author of the 'Gospel' used by them nor do they call it by the name 'Diatessaron'. It is simply: the Gospel. It is only since the work was condemned, that its author was named and at the same time stigmatized as a heretic. Burkitt has drawn attention to the remarkable fact that "the Syriac-speaking Church preserved no tradition about 'Tatian'; they only identified the author of their *Diatessaron* with the Tatianos about whom Eusebius had written. On the other hand, they had no doubt as to who brought the Gospel to Edessa. It was Addai" ¹⁾. Burkitt's suggestion as to the identity of the two names is probably right. But at all events, it is clear that the qualification of Tatian as a 'Greek' can be explained only as a *scholarly* remark dating from a

¹⁾ *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1924, January, p. 130.

time when both his Apostleship and his excommunication had been forgotten. He was known only as the author of the "Address to the Greeks" and as the skilful composer of a Harmony which had lost both its apostolic aureole and its heretic doom. Accordingly the note that it was Tatian 'the Greek' who wrote the Diatessaron, has no bearing at all on the language in which it was originally written. The only really important argument in favour of a Greek original, is the fact that in a distinct group of Greek Mss. Tatianic readings occur. On this question more presently ¹).

However, the thesis that, somehow, a Greek Diatessaron is at the back of both the Latin and the Syriac tradition has been the common opinion and it is so still with the exception of Lietzmann, (who not only accepted the thesis of a Syriac original but brought independent arguments in favour of it), Dr. Rendel Harris, Rev. Phillips and a few others, so that the theory of a Syriac original will need very sound credentials before being taken into consideration at all. Not only would it change fundamentally our views of the history of the text of the Gospels; it would have also unexpected consequences with regard to the history of the Church and of dogma both in East and West; and we should be compelled to concede to Tatian an influence far greater than we have been accustomed to admit.

It is, of course, impossible to give on the present occasion a complete review of the recent discussion which the question has raised. But I may be allowed to quote Baumstark whose opinion as a Syriac scholar may stand for many others. In a review in *Oriens Christianus* which as far as I know has not yet appeared, but of which he has kindly sent me an advance print, Baumstark says (S. 195): "Für eine sprachlich syrische Grundlage jenes Diatessaron's beweisen aber derartige sachliche "Syriasmen" (Baumstark means syro-latin readings), so gross ihre Zahl auch sein möchte, natürlich nicht in das Mindeste,

¹) Lately the Greek origin has been defended by Pott in his posthumous Introduction to Preuschen's Translation of *Tatian's Diatessaron*, Heidelberg, 1926, S. 25 ff. I do not think that his argument will be found convincing.

da sie sich auch unter der Voraussetzung gleichmässiger Abhängigkeit einer lateinischen und einer syrischen Version von einem griechischen Original vollauf erklären. Hier wären nur unbedingt sichere sprachliche "Syriasmen" beweisend, Wendungen des mittelniederländischen Wortlautes, die nicht anders als durch eine lateinische Vermittelung bestimmter spezifisch syrischen Wendungen oder Ausdrücke sich verständlich machen lassen. Ich verkenne nun keineswegs dasz P. manches beigebracht hat, was auch in diesem Sinne auf der ersten Blick völlig schlagend zu sein scheint. Es ist mir jedoch, nicht zuletzt von liturgiegeschichtlichem Gebiete her, allzusehr die Tatsache vertraut, wie leicht Endergebnisse vollkommen unabhängiger Entwicklungslinien sich derartig zu berühren vermögen, dasz man, wenn man jene Entwicklungslinien nicht künnte, mit der grössten Bestimmtheit ein in der einen oder andern Richtung verlaufendes direktes Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zwischen den Endpunkten annehmen würde. Das mahnt methodisch zu alleräusserster Vorsicht".

I need not say that I fully agree with Baumstark's warning with regard to the necessity for the utmost caution. As a matter of fact I myself not only began my study of the Dutch text with the conviction that a Greek original was at the back of the tradition, but, when the facts seemed to point in another direction, I felt very sceptical about what those facts seemed to say. The theory of Zahn to which we have already referred, seemed not only in itself rather incredible, but as he had in mind a Latin translation made from the Syriac in the fourth or fifth century, his theory was unable to solve the problem that the Old-Latin Diatessaron has influenced the text of the Old-Latin Gospels from the very beginning, and accordingly must be at least two centuries older than his theory would allow. Accordingly an early Greek text seemed to be unavoidable!

But the facts would not yield to the theory, so the theory had to yield to the facts. We must however be perfectly clear as to what the theory of a Syriac origin of the Old-Latin Harmony involves and what it does not involve. It does not involve that a Greek Harmony never existed. As a matter of fact there are some traces of the existence of an early Harmony before Tatian.

I do not believe that in our Greek textual tradition much has been preserved of such an archaic Harmony. Whatever harmonistic traces occur in our Greek texts, they are — all of them it seems — Tatianic in origin. But both in the text of Justin and in that of Marcion, are harmonistic readings which need to be explained. They suggest the existence of a very early Harmony or a Synopsis probably for liturgical use, which may have been the prototype of Tatian's Harmony. But these are for the present mere speculations without any real basis of actual facts, or rather, the facts are insufficient for really useful debate.

On the other hand if the thesis of a Syriac original of the Old-Latin Diatessaron is accepted, it does mean that neither the Latin nor the Syriac tradition requires the assumption of a Greek Diatessaron for its explanation; that accordingly the origins of the Latin Church were much more closely connected with the Syriac-speaking Christians than with the Christians of Greek tongue; and that, if the existence of a Greek Harmony is to be proved, the proof must be found elsewhere than in the Syriac or the Latin Diatessaron tradition.

What is necessary first is a solid basis of textual facts, clearly stated and satisfactorily explained. Beyond doubt large unexplored fields lie open for the labourer and a good harvest is waiting for him who enters into the work. For the present I shall confine myself to pointing out two or three remarkable facts illustrating the relation between the Old-Latin and the Syriac with respect to the Greek. It has been said that selected cases do not prove the general thesis. Well, if so, we shall have to wait for a good while before anything can be said at all, for a complete collation of all texts, or even a complete collation of the Liège Harmony alone will take years. And even then we shall have nothing but fragments, unless in the meantime a complete Old-Latin text comes to light. At present our work is a kind of excavating; we are digging out fragments, outlines of foundations, traces of early strata. I wonder how Vogels, who is quite familiar with our kind of work, can speak of the Dutch text in this somewhat depreciating way: "Freilich, die Suche nach Tatianlesarten im Bergmatestext gleicht einer Jagd auf Eichhörnchen,

die man bald einzeln bald nesterweise in ihren Verstecken aufstöbern muss. Sechzehnder gibt es hier nicht zu erlegen" ¹⁾. I do not know what in this hunting-field Vogels would call "Sechzehnder". We would expect a remark of this kind from the average theologian, but not from a textual critic as my Bonn colleague Vogels undoubtedly is. Vogels will have found from his own studies on the Palatine Gospels, that it is just in this sort of forest that one may be out to get snapshots of squirrels and unexpectedly start some big game. As a matter of fact, the apocryphal additions and alterations in Tatian's work amounted probably to very little. When we find in the *Pepysian Harmony* the Light at the Baptism, this is probably one of the most remarkable apocryphal additions in the Tatianic texts. Yet its presence in the Pepysian text is important not so much for its intrinsic value, as for the fact that it represents a reading quite familiar in the East, but extremely rare in the West. Sticking to the simile of excavation I should say: a fragment of a dated inscription, or a brick bearing the name of the builder is worth quite a corner of the excavated building itself. When in a late Version or in some Vulgate Ms. a reading turns up bearing the clear mark of Eastern origin, its value is not determined by its more or less startling contents, but by its textual history.

It has seemed worth while to put these things clearly, because it is necessary to realize exactly what we are after. Now with regard to the general objections of Baumstark. He is of course quite right in suggesting that Syro-Latin readings would be easily explained by the assumption of a common Greek origin, on one side for the Latin, on the other for the Syriac. This has been the explanation which everybody, myself included, accepted as axiomatic. But it will not explain the long list of characteristic, often very slight variants, which occur only in the Syriac and in the Latin tradition without any trace of them being extant in the Greek also. It is too easy to declare this as merely accidental. We have to bear in mind that explanation by accident is no explanation at all, but merely a *testimonium paupertatis*.

Besides these readings there is another series, equally Syro-

¹⁾ *Theol. Revue*, 1926, Nr. 11, Kol. 494 f.

Latin, which are found also in the Greek. But their Greek attestation occurs in a quite distinct group of Mss.: first of all Codex Bezae, then the Ferrar-group, in some passages the Washington Codex, the Koridethi Gospels and a few minuscules of Von Soden's Apparatus. For those that are acquainted with the characteristics of these Mss. it is clear that their peculiar readings can be used only with great caution as witnesses for the Greek text. Codex Bezae has already been suspected of syriacizing by Chase, and convicted of latinizing by Rendel Harris; the Washington Codex is so much under Latin influence that Vogels has called it in some parts a twinbrother of the Old-Latin Palatinus, the Ferrargroup has been shown by Rendel Harris to be of Syriac ancestry; the Koridethi text has been located by Streeter in Caesarea. There is reason therefore for extreme caution before using the Syro-Latin readings of these witnesses as evidence for a Greek text. It is safe, I think, to say that the Syro-Latin element in these texts, so far from giving an explanation, itself requires one; we may be sure too that the Syro-Latin element in these Mss. is not in every case of the same origin. Even the Greek Sinaiticus contains a good number of readings of this kind which hitherto have not been satisfactorily accounted for.

All these facts then can scarcely bear the assumption of a Greek Diatessaron. This is certainly the case with exclusively Syriac readings like that in John i. 8 where only L goes with the Old-Syriac. The Greek text is:

ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός

The Vulgate:

sed ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine.

L. (p. 25¹⁹) reads exactly as the Syriac: *mar hi was getuge van din lichte, sed erat testis de lumine*; Sy^{cur}: ܠܡܢܐ ܠܠܐ ܠܡܢܐ ܐܡ (cf. *A Further Study*, p. 52 f.)

Another instance of the same kind in John iv. 39 where L. (p. 115¹⁸) reads:

om dis wyfs ghetugnesse die seide,

exactly the reading of Sy^{cur}:

because of the testimony of that woman who was saying,
instead of the Greek

διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης

(cf. *A Further Study*, p. 58).

I quote these instances because these readings are not simply accidental variants but stylistic alterations. They remind us of Eusebius' saying about Tatian's redaction of the Pauline epistles¹⁾ based, by the way, only on hearsay information, *φασίν*, as is also in all probability his knowledge about the Diatessaron. In cases like these to speak of accident would be on the same line as speaking of the Homeric Epos as a merely accidental arrangement of letters and lines! If direct dependence of the Latin on the Syriac is rejected, a better explanation must be given instead.

Baumstark's second objection deserves close attention. Comparative study of religions has taught us to be very cautious with regard to parallels, and their derivation from some supposed common origin. But the case is different here. Baumstark speaks of lines of evolution which we do not know. Here however we are in the position of being able, at least in a considerable number of instances, to follow all the stages of the evolution. I would refer to just one example, that of the parastrophic formula (which I have discussed in *A Further Study* p. 49) "*took and led*" instead of the simplex "*led*"²⁾. Not once or twice, but in all the nine or ten independent cases where the formula occurs we find it not only in L. and Ephrem, but also in the Old-Syriac Gospels and the Arabic Diatessaron representing the Syriac tradition, and in Zachary and the *Pepysian Harmony* as representatives of the Latin branch. In some cases the Old-Latin Gospels also are represented. Accordingly we cannot speak of the ends only of different lines as known to us: we can follow the lines all along, right up to the very point of bifurcation.

¹⁾ *Hist. Eccl.* IV, 29.6: τοῦ δὲ ἀποστόλου φασὶν τολμήσαι τινὰς αὐτὸν μεταφράσαι φωνὰς ὡς ἐπιδιορθούμενον αὐτῶν τὴν τῆς φράσεως σύνταξιν.

²⁾ I may correct my statement l.l. about Lk. iv, 29, where I thought the formula did not occur in the Syriac as in L. 97¹⁰. As a matter of fact it occurs there also in Ephrem, *Comm.*, p. 129.

Baumstark speaks, in connection with the arguments brought forward in favour of a Syriac origin of the Latin Diatessaron, of "manches das auf den ersten Blick schlagend zu sein scheint": We can only hope that Syriac scholars may be willing to give their attention to the problem, and determine the substantial value of these "striking first impressions" for it is mainly on the linguistic evidence that the decision in this case depends.

It is, however, not only on the part of Syriac scholars that a friendly warning has been extended to the present writer but the Germanists also have admonished him to caution. Prof. Frings of Bonn has written an exceedingly important review¹⁾ of my first study (really an independent study of the Germanist problems of the Dutch Harmony and its allies). It is satisfying to find that his conclusions with regard to the priority and independent position of the Liège Text, as compared with its allies S, H, etc., square entirely with the results obtained by my researches. His acute remarks lead him however to the conclusion that a new edition of the Liège Text is necessary and that: "alle Erörterungen der Theologen unnütz seien bevor diese grosse germanistische Vorarbeit geleistet ist". This was really somewhat disappointing for the "Theologen" who had believed that their study of the Liège Text and its family had contributed a little to elucidate a fascinating problem. As a matter of fact the mediæval Dutch is not so difficult as to be forbidden ground for any but a specialist, and in doubtful cases the help of my colleagues De Vooys and Van Ginneken has always been at my disposal. Moreover the difficulties of the Dutch coincide very seldom with those difficulties of textual criticism with which we are concerned.

The critics I have quoted are by no means the only ones whose opinion deserves attention, but this may suffice for denoting the widespread feeling of scepticism with regard to the thesis of a Syriac origin of the Latin Diatessaron, and may justify the attempt to put the question as clearly as possible in a few typical instances, hoping that both Syriac scholars and Germanists may

¹⁾ In: *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, 1926, Nr. 5—6, kol. 150—155.

be willing to put them to the test. It does not matter which theory will prevail, the only thing is to find the theory that is right. I only hope that the objection may not be repeated that the instances are merely selected cases. We have no other choice: and it really does not matter. The main thing is not to collect all instances, though the accumulative force of such evidence is certainly strong, but to explain the origin and to find the history of the texts.

Our first example will be the word "convent" in the Liège text on p. 49¹¹ used in Lk. xii. 32. The Vulgate

nolite timere pusillus grex

is the exact rendering of the Greek

μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον

with the exception only of the plural *nolite timere* (which is read also by *a b c e f f i* and by Clem. Al. μὴ φοβεῖσθε). The acc. *pusillum gregem*, read by *d e i*, is probably due to the influence of the Greek ending -ον. I have discussed this very curious rendering of the Dutch in *A Further Study* p. 29 f, 42 f. As my explanation, however, according to Vogels¹⁾, only shows "was sich mit einiger Phantasie alles hinter einem harmlosen Worte vermüthen lässt", it seems only fair to give his explanation first, in order to see whether it will explain the facts. Vogels is of opinion that the use of the word 'convent' is merely one of the "Freiheiten des Flamen", "der in seiner Heimat genug kleine und grosse Konvente fand um mit solchem Ausdruck auf Verständniss rechnen zu können". The explanation is easy, the question, however, is whether it is right. The burden of "Freiheiten" which has been laid to the Dutchman's charge, is already so heavy that it seems unchristian to increase it unnecessarily, especially as in many cases it has been shown that the charge was not justified. Vogels evidently is of opinion that the mediæval translator in this rendering of the Latin *grex*, was thinking of the monasteries of his days to which the consolation would be especially applicable. Well, we may be allowed to put the question: Is it probable that a mediæval Dutch translator of circa

¹⁾ In his review *Theol. Revue*, 1926, Nr. 11, Kol. 404.

A. D. 1200, i. e. at the time of the beginnings of preaching to laymen and of the translation of the Psalter and the Gospels into the vernacular tongue — we think of course of Lambert le Bègue and the Flemish translation of the Psalms he mentions¹⁾ — that at this time in a translation evidently intended for the benefit of lay people, a translator of Lk. xii. 32 would be thinking so exclusively of monasteries and of their members as inheritors of the Kingdom of God, that he could substitute so naively the word *convent* for *grex*? I hardly think so. And if he did, could he expect to be readily understood? Evidently not: for the scribes of S and H have altered this *convent* either after the Latin, which may have been at their disposal, or merely from Flemish purism, into *menigte* and *sameninghe*. This question deserves special attention. Though certainly the Dutch texts originate in one early Harmony of about A. D. 1200 (see the diagram in Frings' study, *Lit. Bl.*, Kol. 152), some cases of divergence seem to suggest an early revision after the Old-Latin copy used by the first translator. An Amsterdam Ms., however, evidently revising after

¹⁾ I may quote from his *Apology* preserved in the Glasgow documents the following passage, which is also important for the history of the Dutch Harmony (printed for instance by A. Fayen, in: *Compte Rendu des séances de la Commission Royale d'Histoire*, Rome 68, 1899, p. 352 f.): "Unde et ego bonis eorum studiis cooperans virginibus vitam et passionem beate virginis et Christi martyris Agnetis, omnibus vero generaliter Actus Apostolorum ritmicis concrepantes modulis, ad linguam sibi notiores a latina transfuderam, multis loco congruo insertis exhortationibus, ut videlicet haberent quo diebus festis, mundo in rebus pessimis exultante, a venenato ipsius melle sese revocare potuissent.

Et hoc est, quod preter scripti sui accusationes queritur iste, me scripturas sacras indignis aperuisse, non remorans quod predixit Dominus regnum Dei dandum genti facienti fructus eius, neque notans quod quem portabat nec manducabat puer panem discipulis suis tradidit ut illum turbe apponerent. Est preterea apud eos liber psalmodiarum cum omnibus glosulis suis et auctoritatibus eas roborantibus, in vulgarem linguam a quodam magistro flandrensi translatus. Quare de eo non queritur? Propterea forsitan quia nemo propheta acceptus est in patria sua. Ille vero magister de patria eius non fuit".

It seems to me that this important testimony deserves more attention than it has hitherto received.

the Vulgate, corrects *convent* into *herte, grex*. So it seems excluded that the Dutch translator *sponte sua* would render a Latin *grex* by a 'Dutch' *convent*, and we shall be obliged to assume that he found in his Old-Latin text *conventus*, and, as in a great number of similar cases, simply transliterated it into a 'Dutch' *convent*.

We are then, however, confronted with the task of explaining how and when this Latin *conventus* came into the Latin text as a rendering of the Greek *κοινωνία*. *Conventus* in mediæval Latin may mean as in mediæval Dutch: a monastery, and also the brotherhood living in it. Du Cange (*Glossarium*, vol. ii, 1842, col. 582 s.v. *conventus*) quotes a very remarkable passage from Ordericus Vitalis, lib. 5, p. 542: "Ut greges duorum coenobiorum permetterent adunari, Deique ad laudem sub uno Abbate et sub una regula unum conventum effici". This passage shows that in monastic language the words *grex* and *conventus* were sometimes synonymous. But even so it is inconceivable that the scribe should change the *grex* of his original. There is however another consideration which makes it very unlikely that a twelfth or thirteenth century scribe (this is, as we have already remarked, the time of the revival of Harmony use and transcription) can be responsible for the alteration: all the Harmony texts in Latin that we possess show a deliberate tendency to correct the text after the Vulgate. Ever since the sixth century Victor's Vulgate Harmony had existed, and it was not the only copy of a Vulgate text in his days. I think we may safely say that after the sixth century and certainly in the thirteenth century the reverse process — deliberate alteration of a Vulgate text — is impossible. Accordingly the word must be pre-vulgate and if so, we may say it must be early christian. The easy explanation of Vogels is unsatisfactory and we shall have to look round in early Christianity for facts to account for this variant.

I suggested in *A Further Study* p. 29 f. that *conventus* was the term for the Christian community in which the Latin Diatesaron was read, and I think we may now go a little further into the matter. If the suggestion is right, we shall find traces of the use of the word as an equivalent of *ecclesia* in, let us say, Tatianic circles. On the other hand, if we really find the word

there, this will account for the fact that in the West, where early Latin Christianity has been influenced in considerable degree by the Tatianic encratism, the word *convent* came to be used in the sense of monastery, — the celibates there, like the *b'ne q'iama* in Syria, being the real *ecclesia*¹⁾.

We have remarked that *conventus*, the equivalent in the Vulgate of the συναγωγή of the LXX and of James ii. 2, has in Latin a flavour of heresy or schism, like our 'conventicle'. In early Christian writings however συναγωγή occurs a few times as a synonym of ἐκκλησία, without any reference either to Judaism or to heresy: so in James ii. 2 (who uses ἐκκλησία in v. 14), in the Pastor of Hermas, *Mand.* xi. 9, 13, 14 and once or twice in Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus and Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*. Perhaps Zahn is right in suggesting for these cases Semitic influence (*Einleitung*, 3 Aufl., 1906 S. 67). At all events the use is extremely rare in Greek. In Latin we find *synagoga* used once, by Commodian, *Instructiones* xxiv. 11 as a synonym of *ecclesia*:

Quid in synagoga decurris saepe bifarius?
Ut tibi misericors fiat quem denegas ultro?
Exis inde foris, iterum tu fana requiris?

It may be noticed that Commodian probably is North African and this might account for his use of the word. But at all events, these are only isolated cases.

It is however entirely different in the East. Epiphanius says (*Haer.* xxx. 18) that the Ebionites call their communities not ἐκκλησία, but συναγωγή, i. e. **Ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲛⲓⲁ**. In Mt. xviii. 17 Sy^{sin} uses **ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲛⲓⲁ** for the Greek ἐκκλησία. This can only mean that **ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲛⲓⲁ** was the official term for the Christian Church. It is scarcely admissible to regard (with Burkitt in *Ev. Da-Meph.*, II, 275) the use of the word here "as denoting not the Holy Church but some less august assembly". It is a pity that Mt.

¹⁾ On this subject I have made some remarks in the *Ztsch. f. d. Neutest. Wiss.*, 1923, S. 7. See further in an article on the Celtic ascetes by Louis Gougaud: *Mulierum Consortia*, étude sur les syneisaktisme chez les ascètes celtiques, in *Eriu*, the Journal of the School of Irish learning, Dublin, p. 147—156, to which Prof. van Hamel drew my attention.

xvi. 18 is not preserved in Sysⁱⁿ. But both verses are extant in the Palestinian Lectionary ed. Lewis and Gibson, which reads **ܕܚܝܐ** not only in Mt. xviii. 17 but also in Mt. xvi. 18 where there cannot be a shadow of doubt as to the solemn meaning. That it has really been in common use is shown by the Syro-Palestinian fragments edited by Land in his *Anecdota Syriaca*, Vol. IV, where it is not only used in Mt. xviii. 17 but in four other, not Biblical passages; for instance **ܕܚܝܐܐܢ ܕܠܡܢܐ** is simply: "the people in the Church".

That the use of the word, however, is not confined to the Syropalestinian Church is shown not only by the instance of Sysⁱⁿ, but also by the inscription of the Marcionite Church in Lebaba and by the Baptismal Creed of the Aethiopic Church.

The earliest inscription of a Christian Church we possess is that found by Le Bas and Waddington at Deir-Ali (Cf. *Inscr. Grecques et Latines recueillies en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*, Vol. III, 1870, p. 582 f. nr. 2558):

ϢϢϢϢϢϢ ϢϢϢϢϢϢϢϢ ϢϢϢ(ϢϢ)
 ΛΕΒΑΒΩΝ ΤΟΤ Κ(υριο)Υ ΚΑΙ C(ωτη)Ρ(ος) ΙΗ(σου) ΧΡΗCΤΟΤ
 ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑ ΠΑΤΑΟΤ ΠΡΕCΒ(υτερου) || ΤΟΤ ΔΧ ΕΤΟΤC

Harnack who discusses this inscription, dating from A. D. 318/19 in his book on Marcion, 1 Aufl. S. 263 f., rightly observes that the designation of a Church as *συναγωγή* is "doppelt auffallend bei den Judenfeindlichen Marcionitischen Christen". But it is explainable by the Syriac usage of **ܕܚܝܐܐܢ** and the Marcionites must have been very influential in Syria, or Ephrem would not have been so intent on opposing them.

In the Aethiopic *Statutes of the Apostles* there is preserved a very archaic form of a Baptismal Creed which Von der Goltz has done into Greek thus: πιστεύω . . . εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν συναγωγὴν, μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. I have argued l. l. that the addition *μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν* must be secondary and that the original form only contained a profession of faith in the Holy Gathering. At the same time I remarked that the original language can scarcely have been Greek. The foregoing facts suggest a Syriac origin, which in

connection with other facts (cf. *Bulletin of the Bezan Club*, nr. IV, p. 18) is quite probable¹⁾.

To conclude:

- 1° The word *conventus* in the Liège Diatessaron is not of mediæval but of early Christian origin;
- 2° its original as a name for the Christian Church is not in the Greek *συναγωγή* which is very rarely used in this sense and where it is so used in early writings is suspect of being under Syriac influence;
- 3° its Syriac equivalent is found widely spread in early Eastern Christianity as denoting the Holy Church. That it was used by Tatian may be gathered from the testimony of *Sysin*. The Greek *συναγωγή* in the Marcionite Church inscription can be explained only as a translation from the Syriac.

¹⁾ Later the word seems to have acquired the connotation of forbidden assemblies, cf. *the Aethiopic Didascalia*, ed. and translated by Th. P. Platt, London, 1834, p. 103:

"XI. That it is unlawful for Christians to enter the Assemblies of the Heathens. neither associate with the assemblies of the Gentiles. ... It behoves the faithful to separate themselves from the assemblies of the wicked", thus developing a meaning similar to that in orthodox Latin circles. In the Syriac *Didascalia* the combination as in the Aethiopic Creed is found in cap. ix (ed. Achelis u. Flemming p. 44, Syriac of Lagarde p. 36): „Hört dies also auch Ihr Laien, du auserwählte Kirche Gottes, zwar auch das frühere Volk ist Kirche (ܐܬܪܐ) genannt worden, ihr aber sei die katholische heilige und vollkommene Kirche, das königliche Priestertum, die heilige Versammlung (ܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ). Cap. xiii (p. 70 of Achelis, p. 58 Lagarde): „Belehrung an das Volk dass es an der Versammlung der Kirche eifrig teilnehmen soll (ܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ). das Volk dass es beständig in der Versammlung der Kirche sei (ܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ) sei und sich nicht zurückhalte, sondern dass es fortwährend versammelt sei (ܡܠܟܐ), dass niemand die Kirche (ܐܬܪܐ) vermindere, indem er keine Versammlung besucht (ܡܠܟܐ)". The word is used also of Gentile and Jewish "congregations" (ACH. p. 71, LAG. p. 59: "Sie (the Gentiles) kommen beständig zusammen (ܡܠܟܐ) und ebenso auch die ohne Grund so genannten Juden feiern einen Tag nach je sechs und versammeln sich in ihren Synagogen (ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ)".

It may be that we did not expect this result, but I do not see how it can be avoided. For a more detailed history of the word *conventus* in the West the new Du Cange will possibly furnish us with the necessary material. Perhaps we may find one link in *Sermo* xii of Caesarius Arelatensis quoted by Du Cange, Vol. II, s. v. *conventus*: quia vos ad audiendas lectiones divinas video ad conventum fratrum vel ad ecclesiam fideliter accurrere.

We proceed to another instance:

The Liège Diatessaron omits Mt. i, 25, the Greek of which runs thus:

καὶ οὐκ ἐγινώσκεν αὐτήν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν¹⁾.

The Vulgate is:

et non cognoscebat eam donec peperit filium suum primogenitum et vocavit nomen eius Jesum.

The omission in L is scarcely accidental. The Strassburg Ms. (S) gives as usual a literal rendering of the Vulgate:

ende en becander niet tote si gebaer haren eersten gebornen sonē ende hiet sinen name Jhesus.

There has been extant however a different rendering in mediæval Dutch as may be seen from Maerlant's *Rymbybel* which reads here (ed. David, II p. 392 l. 21. 185):

Hi trouwedse na der wet sede
Ende bleef met hare in suverhede.

We should be inclined to see in this rendering merely a poetical paraphrase if we did not notice that the text of Ephrem and of the Curetonian Syriac reads exactly as Maerlant:

et sumpsit eam (in uxorem) et in sanctitate habitavit cum ea.

We notice also that not only the second verse but also the first of Maerlant correspond exactly with the Syriac and represents the Tatianic view of the casusposition as we shall see presently.

Maerlant has known the Dutch Diatessaron as I pointed out in *A primitive Text*, p. 31. Accordingly not finding any other source for Maerlant's rendering (Comestor has a similar para-

¹⁾ I doubt very much whether it is right to omit πρωτότοκον as spurious.

phrase but too different in wording: *accipiens sponsam in uxorem cum virgine virgo permansit*) we are justified, I think, to regard the lost verse of L as Maerlant's source. It is important to notice that this Tatianic rendering: *et in sanctitate habitabat cum ea*, extant only in the Old Syriac and in Maerlant, is wanting not only in Greek but in the whole of the rest of the Latin tradition, in spite of its obvious doctrinal value. It would be interesting to know whether more traces of the same rendering are extant in mediæval Dutch.

The first part however of Maerlant and the corresponding renderings in the Syriac deserve special attention. The Greek says:

καὶ παρέλαβεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

In connection with the angel's message in vs. 20 this can only mean that Joseph who had married Mary, did not send her away but took her with him. In Maerlant however Mary is Joseph's bride and he marries her after the angel has so instructed him. That is also the meaning of vs. 24 in Comestor: the angel has bidden Joseph *'ut acciperet eam in conjugem'* and Joseph obeys the command: *'accipiens sponsam in uxorem cum virgine virgo permansit'*. We notice the expressions *acciperet in conjugem* and *accipiens in uxorem*, and shall come back to them presently. Zachary of Besançon is of the same opinion: he explains his Vulgate text: *noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam*, in his note (Migne, *P. L.* vol. 186, col. 71 C), said to be taken from Rabanus, thus: *tale est hoc ac si dicat: Accipe tibi in conjugem Mariam sponsam tuam*. And he explains vs. 24 (in col. 72 B): *Accepit igitur eam ad nomen conjugis*.

This is the Tatianic view. Ephrem explaining the Diatessaron rendering of Mt. i. 24f says (Moes. p. 25): "In sanctitate habitabat cum ea. Praepostere dicta sunt verba. Nam prius *sumpsit eam* et postea *habitavit cum ea in sanctitate*; sed ita legitur: *Habitavit cum ea in sanctitate et sumpsit eam*." Ephrem evidently means to say that what was done first is said last. Joseph took (i.e. married) Mary first and in his further life lived purely with her. Accordingly the *παρέλαβεν* of the Greek is understood as married. This agrees with the Old-Syriac and the Pešitta. In vs. 20 the Cureton-Syriac (and

the Harclensis) read ܡܚܒܐ, the Sinaitic and the Pešitta ܡܚܒܐ. In vs. 24 all Syriac versions (Harcl. included) read ܡܚܒܐ. Both these words mean simply to take but are used constantly for to marry. We see how obvious and simple the process was in Syriac, but when we find the same exegesis in the West we shall have to ascribe this to Tatianic influence, especially as the Vulgate *dimittere* in vs. 19 is evidently contrary to the Tatianic view. These views of his are widely responsible for textual variation and there is a great confusion in the texts between the words *sponsa* or *uxor* said of Mary, but Tatian himself is quite consistent: he says *sponsa* before, *uxor* after the message of the angel. Accordingly Sy^{cur} and Liège read in vs. 20 instead of *γυναῖκα*: *desponsatam*; in vs. 24 Sy^{cur} reads instead of *τῇ γυναικί αὐτοῦ* 'Mary', a reading which, conflated with the original text, is found in sah boh *r*² and in N^c. In Lk. ii. 5 instead of the conflate reading: *τῇ μεμνηστευμένη αὐτῷ γυναικί*, Sy^(c) reads only Mary his wife.

We found in Zachary and in Comestor the expression *accipere in conjugem (uxorem)* and Maerlant makes it probable that also Liège in Mt. i. 24 read originally: *nam Marien te wive*, instead of: *nam Marien met hem*.

Mindful of Frings' warning against rash and groundless reasoning I consulted our fellow-member Prof. Van Ginneken as an expert of mediæval Dutch and asked him whether in mediæval Dutch the expression: *wif nemen* or *te wive nemen*, is the only possible rendering of the Vulgate: *uxorem ducere*, *nubere*, etc. He replied: "that *uxorem ducere* should be translated by *wif nemen*, *te wive nemen* is conceivable; but that this should be the only form, I see no reason at all. It would be equally possible to translate: *te (huis)vrouwe nemen*, *huwen*, *trouwen*". I may add that the Strassburg Ms. sometimes uses *bruden*, and also the literal rendering *wif te huus voeren*, the *heimführen* of the German parallel texts.

Well, the Liège Text uses always, without any exception *wif nemen* or *te wive nemen*. For this exclusive use the Dutch idiom does not account. Let us compare the Syriac, and consult the table on the opposite page.

	GREEK	VULG.	OLD-LAT.	SYCUR	SYSEN	SYSES	L	HARCL.
t. 5. 32	γαμήσῃ	<i>duxerit</i>	<i>k + capi p. uxorem</i>	לַאֲרֹמָה	נָשָׂא	לַאֲרֹמָה	45 ⁶ <i>nemt</i>	נָשָׂא (conjungitur)
t. 19. 9	γαμήσῃ	<i>duxerit</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	139 ⁹ <i>nemt</i>	נָשָׂא
t. 19. 9	γαμῶν	<i>duxerit</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	139 ⁹ <i>nemt</i>	נָשָׂא
t. 19. 10	γαμήσῃ	<i>nubere</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	139 ¹⁰ <i>wyf te nemene</i>	נָשָׂא
t. 22. 24	ἐπιγαμβρεύσει	<i>ducit</i>	<i>ff: accipiat</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁷ <i>nemen</i>	נָשָׂא
t. 22. 25	γάμῃ	<i>uxore ducta</i>	<i>d: nubat</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁸ <i>nam en wyf</i>	נָשָׂא
t. 22. 30	γαμοῦσιν	<i>nubent</i>	<i>e: accepta uxore</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
t. 24. 38	γαμοῦντες	<i>nubentes</i>	<i>d: nubens</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
c. 6. 17	ἐγάμυσεν	<i>duxerat</i>	<i>a: nupsisset</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	215 ¹⁵ <i>om. — (S: brudende)</i>	נָשָׂא
c. 6. 18	ἔχεν τὴν γυν.	<i>habere uxorem</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	99 ¹⁸ <i>hadde ghenomen</i>	נָשָׂא
c. 10. 11	γαμήσῃ	<i>duxerit</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	97 ¹⁵ <i>nemene .. wyf</i>	נָשָׂא
c. 10. 12	γαμήσῃ	<i>nupsarit</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
c. 12. 19	λάβῃ τὴν γυν.	<i>accipiat-ux.</i>	<i>k: nubet</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
c. 12. 20	ἐλάβεν γυν.	<i>accepit ux.</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
c. 12. 21	ἐλάβεν αὐτὴν	<i>accepit eam</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
k. 14. 20	γυν. ἔγχευ	<i>uxorem duxi</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁹ <i>nam</i>	נָשָׂא
k. 16. 18	γαμῶν	<i>ducit</i>	<i>a: nubit</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	171 ¹⁴ <i>ic hebbe wyf genomen</i>	נָשָׂא
k. 16. 18b	γαμῶν	<i>ducit</i>	<i>d: nubens</i>	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
z. 20. 28	λάβῃ-τὴν γυν.	<i>accipiat-ux.</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
z. 20. 29	λάβῃ γυν.	<i>accepit ux.</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא		נָשָׂא
z. 20. 30	ἐλάβεν αὐτὴν	<i>accepit illam</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁹ <i>nam</i>	נָשָׂא
z. 20. 31	ἐλάβεν αὐτὴν	<i>accepit illam</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁹ <i>nam</i>	נָשָׂא
z. 20. 34	γαμοῦσιν	<i>nubunt</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁹ <i>namen wyf</i>	נָשָׂא
z. 20. 35	γαμοῦσιν	<i>nubunt</i>		נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	נָשָׂא	173 ¹⁹ <i>namen wyf nemen</i>	נָשָׂא

The above list is highly instructive. It shows with complete clearness the continual agreement of the Dutch and the Syriac. The most usual word used in Syriac is ܬܝܬܝܬ, *to take*; once in Sycur and twice in the Pešitta ܬܝܬܝܬ, equally meaning *to take*, is used instead. In Mt. xxii. 24 the Old-Syriac, evidently wishing to render ἐπιγαμβρεύσει by a different word uses ܬܝܬܝܬ . . . ܬܝܬܝܬ, but the Pešitta keeps to the natural ܬܝܬܝܬ. That ܬܝܬܝܬ is really the vernacular word is clearly shown by the Harclensis, who — wanting to render the Greek with a painstaking exactness — uses ܬܝܬܝܬ, conjungitur; but sometimes (Mk. x. 12; Lk. xiv. 20; Lk. xvi. 18) falls back on the native usage and writes ܬܝܬܝܬ. We may be sure that in those passages where the Greek Gospels use λαμβάνειν (Mk. xii. 20 sq.; Luk. xx. 28 sq.) they reproduce the original Aramaic.

The Liège Text has always the rendering accipere uxorem or in uxorem ¹⁾. This cannot be accidental, as is shown clearly by the twin translations of L, which in several cases give different renderings instead. We might think, as Prof. Symons remarked, of a personal idiosyncrasis of the translator, who having once chosen the expression, sticks to it consistently; but this is excluded by the fact, first that he uses the expression where the Latin in agreement with the Greek has habere uxorem viz. in Mk. vi. 18. Here the Dutch has like the Syriac *nemene wyf*. And secondly by the fact that traces of the early Latin rendering have been preserved in the Old-Latin: in Mt. xxii. 24 ff¹ reads accipiat l. ducat, in Mt. xxii. 25 e reads accepta uxore l. uxore ducta. The most interesting case however is Mt. v. 32 in k. The second part of this verse is omitted in Mt. v. 32 by Codex Bezae, k a b. In Mt. xix. 9 by a considerable number of witnesses. I can explain the omission only as due to the belief that any second marriage was essentially

¹⁾ Prof. Wensinck has remarked in the discussion that in Syriac there is also found the construction with ܬܝܬܝܬ. It is quite possible that this construction has left its trace in the *te wive nemen* of L and in the *in uxorem accipere* of Zachary and Comestor, but as the construction is also Latin, no stress can be laid on this coincidence.

condemned as carnal lust, and so a case like that presupposed in the omitted clause must *eo ipso* be excluded. The scribe of *k*, however, has read the omitted clause in his Latin text for he writes thus:

*praeter causam fornicationis facit
uxorem capi mechari*

I have restored the stichometry which, according to the dots in *k*, the scribe found in his original. It is clear that he wanted to write:

*praeter causam fornicationem facit
eam mechari.*

But he found evidently in his original (or in the Latin text he was using at the same time) the addition

*et qui dimissam
uxorem capit adulterat.*

He overlooks however a line and has written *uxorem capi* when he sees that he is wrong and that the second part of the verse is to be omitted altogether. He leaves the *uxorem* but cancels *capi*. The mistake is instructive for two reasons: first because it shows that the Old-Latin (we may say now the Old-Latin Diatessaron) had here the expression *uxorem capere* which we are discussing; secondly because we find in the omitted clause the addition *uxorem*, after *dimissam*, as in L:

ende so wie dat wyf neimt die en ander ghelaten heeft.

I think the proof is conclusive. To speak of accident here is to give up scholarly research. We must leave a margin for accident even in scholarly work, but here it seems precluded. If the thesis of a Syriac origin of the Old-Latin Diatessaron is rejected, we are justified in asking for one that better accounts for the facts, but we cannot accept that from accident.

One instance more may be given. It will show that the problems are more complicated still, though the fundamental solution has been found.

In John vii. 35 the Jews are discussing the question wither

Jesus is going that they will not be able to find him. They suggest that he will possibly go "to the διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων in order to teach the Ἑλλήνες". We are not now concerned with the question as to what is the meaning of the Fourth Gospel in this passage. It is the Latin translation of the Vulgate which puzzles us. The Vulgate reads:

numquid in dispersionem gentium iturus est et docturus gentes?

Accordingly Ἑλλήνες is rendered by *gentes*. In John xii. 20 Ἑλλήνες is rendered as *gentiles* in Vg. and the Syro-phoenician woman (Mk. vii. 26) is also called *gentilis*. The Liège text renders John vii. 35 by *heidene* and *heidene volk*. In John xii. 20 it has a curious reading which states that they were "vremde liede ... die nin behoerden tin yodschen volke", foreign people ... not belonging to the Jewish nation. This looks more like a rendering of *alienigenae*, ἀλλοφυλοὶ and should certainly be compared with the Pešitta where Acts x. 28 is rendered as ܐܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܢܝܢܐ, "a foreign man who is not a son of his race." We leave this for the present, only remarking that we cannot say that the rendering *gentilis* is such an obvious one. In both passages of the Gospel of John it seems that Jews are meant, and not Gentiles; they are evidently Greek Jews from the Diaspora, the so-called Hellenists. Even if pagan Greeks were meant, the rendering *gentilis* is not a matter of course. In the Pauline Epistles even when "Jews and Greeks" are contrasted clearly as "Jews and Gentiles", the Vulgate, with only two or three exceptions (Gal. ii. 3; I Cor. x. 32; xii. 13) uses *graeci* and not *gentiles*. In this as in other respects, the Latin tradition of the Acts is decidedly on the side of the Gospels as distinct from the textual tradition of the Paulinae. In Acts the rendering is generally *gentilis*, and *graeci* is in the Vg. an exception.

Accordingly we are justified in putting the question: where and when was the contrast Jew-Greek felt as the contrast Jew-Pagan in such a degree that the word Greek became simply a synonym for Pagan? The answer cannot be doubtful: it began during, and persisted after the Maccabaeon wars, when a strong reaction

against the peaceful and afterwards forcible invasion and infiltration of Greek civilization arose in the religious and nationalist circles of the Jewish people. Hellenism menaced not only old national customs and traditions but also the religion of the chosen people, and since that time "Ἕλλην" and "Ἑλληνισμός" are equivalents of 'Pagan' and 'Paganism' in Palestinian Aramaic and in Syriac generally. A convincing instance is furnished by the comparison of the Syriac translation of II Macc. (ed. Lagarde) with the Greek:

II Macc. vi. 8: εἰς τὰς . . Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις, sy.: ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ.

II Macc. vi. 9: μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικά, sy.: ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ.

II Macc. xi. 24: τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰς τὰ Ἑλληνικά μεταθήσει, sy.: ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ.

II Macc. iv. 10: πρὸς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτήρα, sy.: ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ.

II Macc. iv. 13: ἀκμὴ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ, sy.: ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܝܬܐ.

III Macc. iii. 8: Ἑλλήνας, sy.: ܡܕܢܝܬܐ.

An early instance of this meaning of "Ἕλλην" is found in Mk. vii. 26 where certainly the Syrophoenicissa is meant to be denoted as a pagan woman. Accordingly the Sinaitic Syriac reads ܡܕܢܝܬܐ (a scribal error for ܡܕܢܝܬܐ) and the Pešitta reads ܡܕܢܝܬܐ. I think we may be sure also that in Lk. iv. 26 Wellhausen is right in suggesting ܡܕܢܝܬܐ instead of ܡܕܢܝܬܐ, *χῆρα*, but not to denote 'Syrian' but 'pagan'¹⁾. This must also be the meaning in the next verse where the point is not that

¹⁾ A trace of this exegesis in the Liège Text p. 97: *butenslands*, and in Zachary, col. 238B: *exterarum gentis vidua*.

Naaman is a ܢܝܢܝܐ, a Syrian, but that he is ܢܝܢܝܐ, a Pagan.

The constant contrast in the Pauline Epistles of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἕλληγ as: 'Jew and Pagan' is a witness to Paul's Aramaic education and mother-tongue.

It may be useful to append the complete comparative list for the use of the word in Greek, Latin and Syriac. I have added also the Gothic to which Prof. Symons drew my attention. It is important because it has the Vulgate *gentilis* in the Gospels. So it is either a witness for the existence of this reading in the Old-Latin texts by which the Gothic has been influenced, or it shows that the Gothic is under Vulgate influence. If Jerome is to be made responsible for the Vulgate *gentilis* in Gospels and Acts, where did the Gothic, which shows the same difference between Gospels and Paulinae as the Vulgate, get its *gentilis* from?

The table, printed at the end of this paper, is very instructive: in one case only is Ἕλληνες rendered in the Pešitta by ܢܝܢܐ (Acts xiv. 1). In one other case where this rendering is given, Acts xvii. 4, it is qualified by the addition σεβόμενοι, which evidently excluded the translation 'pagan'. In all other cases ܢܝܢܐ is the rendering for Ἕλληνισταί evidently understood as Greek-speaking people, cf. Acts ix. 29 Peš.: ܢܝܢܐ ܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ, where Ἕλληνιστᾶς is explained by Chrysostom as: τοὺς Ἕλληνιστὰς φεγγομένους. In all cases where the word Ἕλληνες is really understood as meaning 'pagan' it is rendered by ܢܝܢܐ, ܢܝܢܐ, *gentiles*, or ܢܝܢܐ, *gentes*.

It is certainly curious that in all these instances as far as the Gospels and Acts are concerned, the Vulgate follows the Syriac very closely. With the Pauline Epistles the case is different. The contrast is so clearly marked that a different textual tradition must be assumed.

One thing however is very puzzling: we should expect to find in the Old-Latin tradition the rendering *gentilis* and in the Vulgate the more literal *graecus*. The case is just the reverse; and occurs in the Acts as well as in the Gospels. Even in

the Western Text of Acts xx. 24 we find in *d gig Luc* the rendering *græcis*, D: "Ελληνισιν. This observation deserves, I think, close attention. I do not think it is inexplicable, though for the present we simply state the fact, only mentioning that the case is not without parallel: compare for instance the beautiful rendering *gratia plena* in the Vulgate preserved from the Syriac whilst the Old-Latin *e* gives the literal *gratificata*. It shows that, though the main solution has been found — and the overwhelming evidence does not seem to admit the possibility of any other conclusion — the tradition of the Latin Gospels, especially its earliest history, is so complicated, that it still requires a research, that will be both extensive and exact.

	GREEK	VULG.	OLD-LAT.
Mc. 7. 26	Ἑλληνίς	gentilis	graeca: <i>d a b c f f² q</i>
Joh. 7. 35	(διασπ. τ.) Ἑλλήνων	(disp.) gentium	graecorum: <i>a b d e f f² l r q</i>
"	Ἑλληνας	gentes	graecos: <i>a b f f² l q</i> (eas: <i>e</i>)
Joh. 12. 20	Ἑλληνες	gentiles	graeci: <i>a b c d e f f² r s</i>
Act. 6. 1	Ἑλληνιστῶν	graecorum	graecorum: <i>h</i> ex graecis <i>d</i>
Act. 9. 29	Ἑλληνιστάς	graecis	ad graecos: <i>e p</i> gentibus: <i>c</i>
		gentibus Vg codd <i>c</i>	
Act. 11. 20	Ἑλληνιστάς Ἑλληνας δ ^{2c} δ ⁴ δ ⁵ * I ^{c1} arm.	graecos	graecos: <i>d</i>
Act. 14. 1	Ἑλλήνων	graecorum	graecorum: <i>d</i>
Act. 16. 1	πατὴρ δὲ Ἑλληνοσ	patre gentili	graeco: <i>d gig</i>
Act. 16. 3	Ἑλλην	gentilis	graecum: <i>d gig</i>
Act. 17. 4	(σεβ.) Ἑλλήνων	gentilibus	graecorum: <i>d</i>
Act. 17. 12	Ἑλληνίδων Ἑλλήνων: δ ⁵	gentilium	de grecis: <i>e gig</i>
Act. 18. 4	Ἑλληνας	Vg. codd. graecos Vg. codd. om.	graecorum: <i>d, grece: gig</i>
Act. 18. 17	Ἑλληνες	om.	graecos: <i>d e gig, grecis: h</i>
Act. 19. 10	Ἑλληνας	gentiles	graeci: <i>d e gig h</i>
Act. 19. 17	Ἑλλησι	gentilibus	graeci: <i>d gig</i>
Act. 20. 21	Ἑλλησι	gentilibus	graecis: <i>d gig</i> Luc.
Act. 20. 24	Ἑλλησιν (only cod. Bezae)	—	graecis: <i>d gig</i> Luc.
Act. 21. 28	Ἑλληνας	gentiles	graecos: <i>d gig</i>
Rom. 1. 14	Ἑλλησι	graecis	
Rom. 1. 16	Ἑλληνι	graeco	
Rom. 2. 9	Ἑλληνοσ	graeco	
Rom. 2. 10	Ἑλληνι	graeco	
Rom. 3. 9	Ἑλληνας	graecos	
Rom. 10. 12	Ἑλληνοσ	graeci	graeci atque gentilis: <i>F^{mg}</i>
1 Cor. 1. 22	Ἑλληνες	graeci	graeci
1 Cor. 1. 23	ἔθνεσιν v. l. Ἑλλησι	gentibus	graecis: Ambr.?
1 Cor. 1. 24	Ἑλλησι	graecis	gentibus: Aug.
1 Cor. 10. 32	Ἑλλησι	gentibus	graecis: Hil.
1 Cor. 12. 13	Ἑλληνες	gentiles	graeci: <i>D d e f¹ g</i>
Gal. 2. 3	Ἑλλην	gentilis	
Gal. 3. 28	Ἑλλην	graecus	
Col. 3. 11	Ἑλλην	gentilis	

[illegible]