The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1924

NOTES AND STUDIES

TATIAN'S DIATESSARON AND THE DUTCH HARMONIES.

DR D. PLOOIJ, of Leyden, published early last year, in English, a study of the mediaeval Dutch Harmony known as *Het Leven van Jezus*, which raises the question of the value of that curious work as an authority for the text of Tatian's Diatessaron.[1] Dr Plooij's study publishes no new texts, but he gives four useful photographs of the Liège MS from which in 1835 G. J. Meijer of Groningen edited *Het Leven van Jezus*, and he brings forward a number of points which he considers to establish the critical value of the text. His conclusions will be found on pp. 67, 68. 'The Old Latin Diatessaron is not a Harmony made up from portions of the Latin Gospels, but is an independent translation from the Syriac.' 'The Old Latin Gospels have been influenced largely by the Latin Diatessaron.' 'The Latin Text underlying L (the Liège Harmony) shews unmistakeable marks of identity with the Text of Ephrem's Commentary.' These are very formidable statements and their cogency can only be estimated after a general consideration of the evidence and a careful evaluation of the relative weight of its several parts. I shall therefore leave Dr Plooij, and proceed to a fresh statement from my own point of view.

The authorities from which our ideas of Tatian's Diatessaron are derived are the following :—

(1) *Ephraim's Commentary*. This is extant only in Armenian. It is quoted by the pages of Moesinger's Latin translation (1876), but the most accurate representation of the Gospel quotations in it is to be found in Appendix X to J. Hamlyn Hill's translation of the Arabic Diatessaron, in which Dr Armitage Robinson has arranged the quotations in an English translation made by him direct from the Armenian in the order of the Arabic Harmony.

With the quotations in Ephraim's Commentary may be associated

[1] *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron*: The Liège MS of a mediaeval Dutch Translation, a Preliminary Study by Dr D. Plooij, with an Introductory Note by J. Rendel Harris. Leyden, Sijthoff, 1923.

the occasional Gospel quotations in Ephraim's other works and in the Homilies of Aphraates and other early Syriac writers. They will be found gathered together in my *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* ii 107–160.

(2) *The Arabic Diatessaron* (A). This is the elaborate Harmony published by Ciasca (1888), of which English translations have been made by J. Hamlyn Hill (1894) and H. W. Hogg (1897). I quote from Mr Hill's book mainly because it contains Dr Robinson's Appendix, mentioned above. This Arabic Harmony is translated direct from the Syriac, but the Syriac from which it was translated was a revision in which the wording had been almost entirely assimilated to the wording of the Peshitta or Syriac Vulgate.

(3) *Codex Fuldensis* (F). This is the well-known codex of the Vulgate N. T., prepared for and corrected by Victor of Capua in A.D. 546, whose annotations and signature (and the blot which he made in signing his name) are still to be seen in the book. The Gospels are given not separately but in a Harmony, in which the order of Tatian is very generally followed, but the wording is that of the Latin Vulgate.

(4) *The Dutch Harmonies*, and particularly the Liège MS (L). L is a codex written about 1300, and contains a Harmony of the Gospels very similar in order to the Codex Fuldensis (F). The Dutch translation may have been made from the Latin about the middle of the thirteenth century (*Plooij*, p. 65).

Besides L there is a MS at Stuttgart (S), similar in general arrangement to L, but it seems to be an independent translation, as the Dutch is different and it keeps closer to the wording of the Latin Vulgate. A fragmentary MS in the Cambridge University Library (C) agrees in general with S, but sometimes approaches L. Dr Plooij does not doubt that L is the most interesting of these Dutch texts, and so far as I have been able to judge this really is the case. Besides Meijer's edition of 1835, both L and S have been printed side by side in full by J. Bergsma, *Bibliotheek van middelnederlandsche Letterkunde* 54, 55, 61 (1895–1898).

I quote F, L and S by the chapters into which they are divided.

When we compare the Arabic, the Dutch and the Fulda texts together it is at once evident that they fall into two classes, the Arabic on the one side, and all the rest on the other. They often agree all together, and where they do so, no doubt they preserve the arrangement of Tatian's mosaic. But elsewhere A and F differ seriously, and where they do so L (and its near relation S also) almost always goes with F. We ask, therefore, which of the two branches of transmission most resembles the arrangement of the ancient Syriac Diatessaron? The decisive factor in this question will be the evidence of Ephraim, and the answer is not doubtful. The Arabic order is the order of Ephraim's

Commentary, and therefore it is the Arabic which is unaltered, and the Western texts that are peculiar. The evidence is best shewn in a Table: in the centre are short catchwords describing fifteen sections in the order that Ephraim refers to them, Moesinger's pages and the chapters of A are given on the left and the chapters of F and L on the right.

Moes. pp.	*Arabic*		*Fuld.*	*Liège*
52 ff	v 22–32	Marriage at Cana.	46	57
57	v 43	*Impleta sunt tempora* (Mk. i 15 &c.).	18	28
58	vi 5–22	John's disciples baptize.	21	32
,,	vi 46, vii 9 [1]	James (*sic*) the Publican called.	20 [1]	31 [1]
59	v 44–vi 4	Call of Peter.	19	29 f
59 f	vii 11–24	Paralytic healed.	55	68
61	vii 31–36	'Sons of the Bride-chamber.'	57	71
61 f	vii 37–viii 2	Disciples pluck corn-ears.	69 f	86 f
62–73	viii 26–xi 3	Sermon on the Mount.	23–44	35–50
74	xi 4	Centurion's servant.	48	59
,,	xi 17	Widow of Nain.	50	62
,,	xi 24	'Foxes have holes.'	52	64 f
75	xi 32	Storm on the Lake.	53	66
,,	xi 38	'Legion.'	54	67
76 ff	xii 7 ff	Jaïrus's daughter.	61	75

It is clear that Ephraim's order is the order of the Arabic, or very nearly so. Ephraim and A put the Marriage at Cana before the call of Peter and the Sermon on the Mount, F and L put it after. Ephraim and A put the healing of the Paralytic and the disputes about Sabbath observance before the Sermon, F and L put them after—a long way after, in fact, for in F and L the Paralytic comes just before the story of Jaïrus's daughter and the disputes about the Sabbath some way after that. In other words, for this part of the Gospel story the Arabic preserves the Old Syriac mosaic, while F and L agree in another order which is not the order of the Old Syriac mosaic.

Later on in the Gospel, at the same place, between the talk with Nicodemus and the withering of the Fig-tree, F 121 and L 164 insert the story of the Woman taken in Adultery, which is absent from A (between xxxi and xxxii) and which is wholly unknown to Ephraim. Further, the story of the Sinful Woman who anointed our Lord's feet (Lk. vii 36–50) is given in A xiv 45–xv 11 between sections correspond-

[1] A vi 46 and F L have 'Matthew', A vii 9 'Levi'.

ing to Matt. xii 22 f and Lk. x 1 ff; Ephraim (*Moes.* 113 f) comments on the story between comments on Matt. xii 22 and Lk. x 1. But F and L combine this story with the meal in the house of Simon the Leper, just before the Passion, and identify the woman with Mary of Bethany, sister of Lazarus (F 138 f, L 186).

These are not new discoveries: they have been known to all scholars who have worked seriously at the Diatessaron ever since the publication of Ciasca's Arabic text. But it seems to me most important to bear them in mind, before picking out little details that sound picturesque and acclaiming them as self-evident survivals of the work of Tatian, as it seems to me that Dr Plooij does. What these serious variations in the order shew is that a very intimate connexion exists between the mediaeval Dutch Harmonies and the Harmony of Victor of Capua, preserved in Cod. Fuldensis. The divergences of Fuldensis from the united testimony of Ephraim and the Arabic have hitherto been generally regarded as corruptions, as alterations of the primitive Diatessaron, whether due to Victor of Capua himself or to some other editor of an original Greek or Syriac Harmony. But it is conceiveably possible that the agreement of F and L bears witness to a pre-Syriac form of the Harmony, something that Tatian left behind him before he returned to his native Mesopotamia. In any case the agreement of Ephraim and the Arabic does prove the unlikelihood that the peculiar recension of the Tatian Harmony found in F and L was a direct translation from the Syriac.

There is no doubt that the Arabic is intrinsically a *better* Gospel Harmony than that in Codex Fuldensis, but this rather suggests that the Arabic may be a later, improved form. Certainly the side-lights upon Tatian's methods thrown by Dom Connolly (*J. T. S.* xii 268–273) suggest that the scrupulous ingenuity of the Arabic text is not primitive: the drastic throwing together of Jn. xii, Matt. xxvi and Lk. vii 36 ff in F 138, 139, is what we should expect from what Dom Connolly has brought forward. But in this case the witness of Ephraim is definitely on the side of A and against F: it was therefore not a feature of the *Syriac* Diatessaron.[1]

Before considering the text of the Latin and Dutch Harmonies it will be useful to examine their contents. The Diatessaron, speaking generally, aims at incorporating all the significant matter of all Four Gospels into one narrative. A glance at Appendix II in Hamlyn Hill's book shews that very little indeed is omitted from the Arabic. The Genealogies are not in Ciasca's text, but each of his MSS finds a place

[1] It should not be forgotten that the identification of the 'sinner' with Mary Magdalene and Mary the sister of Martha is the official tradition of Rome, as attested by the services for July 22.

for them, and the story of the Woman taken in Adultery is absent, as it is from all Syriac versions of the Bible. But this is practically all that is missing, except St Luke's own Preface.

When we turn to F and L the case is different. The facts are as follows:—

Matthew.

xii 7 *om.* F L: this is a doublet of Matt. ix 13.

xii 22 *om.* F 62, but L 77, S 73 have 'blind and dumb', which ultimately comes from Matt. xii 22.

xiii 12 *om.* F L: a doublet of Matt. xxiv 29, where alone F L have the saying.

xv 29–31 *om.* F L: this is a characteristic Matthaean summary of healings and is given a place in A xxiii 1–2, 4.[1]

xv 39: F 90 follows Mk. viii 10 (Dalmanutha), but L 122 has Magedan.

xvi 2–4[a] *om.* F L: see on Lk. xii 54 ff.

It should be added that Matt. xii 33 is omitted in L 79, S 74, but the verse is given in F 63 and A xiv 32: this is a doublet of Matt. vii 17, 20.

It is obvious that St Matthew's Gospel was intended to be used to the full and that the intention has been very well carried out. Matt. xvi 2–4[a] ('the Face of the Sky') is the only serious omission.

Mark.

i 23–27 *om.* F: see on Lk. iv 33 ff.

iii 21 *om.* F 69, L 86: this is the verse which tells us that the family of Jesus (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ) thought Him mad. In all Western texts before the Vulgate the sense of Mk. iii 21 is quite changed,[2] but A vii 46 inserts it after Matt. xii 8 = Mk. ii 28 ('The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath') and it is added there also in *a*.

iv 36[b] *om.* F 53, L 66, i. e. F and L leave out the detail that 'other ships were with them', though they insert that Jesus was 'in the stern, on the cushion' (*ver.* 38), both details being peculiar to Mark. A xi 33, 34 has both details.

v 32 *om.* F 61, L 75, A xii 19: this is where Mark says that Jesus turned round to see who had touched Him, a statement that seems to imply want of knowledge. Note therefore that *c* and *e* omit 'to see her that had done this thing' and that W omits ἰδεῖν. (Both syr. *S* and syr. *C* are wanting here.)

vi 52, 53 *om.* F 82, L 102: but A xix 13 has *ver.* 52.

viii 22–26 *om.* F 90, L 122: this is the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida given in A xxiii 26–30.

[1] The verses are added as a footnote or gloss at the end of L 121.

[2] See the full discussion in *J. T. S.* xvii 10 f.

viii 32 *om.* F 91, L 124 ('speak the word openly'): this is given in A xxiii 42 in wording which agrees with *k* and syr. *S*.

ix 30 *om.* F 94, L 131: given in A xxiv 48.

ix 49 f ('salted with fire', F 96): *om.* L 133 but not S 123.

xv 25 ('the *third* hour') *om.* F 168, L 227, and A li 2, i.e. the statement of Jn. xix 14 that it was the *sixth* hour is preferred.

Besides these a very large number of the so-called 'picturesque details' of Mark's narrative are not inserted, e.g. Mk. i 36, ii 2, iii 9–11, x 32[a], x 50, xi 23[b], though nearly all appear in their place in the Arabic. There was evidently no great effort made in the recension represented by F L to include all the material of Mark.

Luke.

iii 24–33 *om.* F L,, i.e. that part of the Lucan Genealogy which is parallel to, though different from, Matthew's.

iv 33–36 *om.* F 49, i. e. F omits altogether the story of the demoniac in the Synagogue of Capernaum, told in Mk. i 23 ff, Lk. iv 33 ff, but omitted in Matthew: it is given in L 60, S 58, and in A vi 41 ff.

iv 44 *om.* F L: given in A vi 35.

vi 39 ('can the blind lead the blind?'): this Saying is omitted by F L from the great Sermon and only given in what corresponds to Matt. xv 13 (F 85, L 112). But the Arabic gives it in both places (A x 17, xx 37).

vii 1–9 (= Matt. viii 5–13): in F 48, L 59 the story of the Centurion's boy is wholly told from Matthew (except Lk. vii 10), but in A xi 4 f, 7 f, the characteristic Lucan details appear, and they are also referred to by Ephraim 74.

vii 36–38: in F 138, L 186, where the Lucan story of the 'woman that was a sinner' is combined with the anointing of Jesus by Mary just before the end, the opening verses of the Lucan version are naturally omitted.

viii 1–3 *om.* F 71, L 89. A note at the end of L 89 points out that Lucas 'continuert' (i. e. as we say, 'introduces') the Parable of the Sower by these verses. The passage is given in the text of S 85, and in A xvi 19–21.

x 26–27 *om.* F 129, L 173, A xxxiv 25 ff. This omission is owing to the fact that all branches of the Diatessaron, including Ephraim 194 f, combine the Parable of the Good Samaritan with the Answer about the Great Commandment in Jerusalem.

xi 36. No attempt is made to represent this peculiar variant of Matt. vi 23 in F 37, L 45. It is added in A ix 50, but in a text agreeing with syr. vg, not with the curious text of syr. *S*.

xi 53 f and the beginning of xii are omitted by F and L, but appear in A xli 16–20, placed at Jerusalem in the last days in the context of Jn. xii 36.

xii 54–57 *om.* F L. Neither form of the Saying about the Weather has a place in F or L, neither that in Lk. xii 54–57, found in all MSS, nor that in Matt. xvi 2^{b}, 3, omitted in the best Greek MSS and in the Old Syriac. Both forms are combined in A xiv 37–40.[1]

xvii 7–10 *om.* F 122, L 165, but it is inserted at this point in A xxxiii $11–15^{a}$. It is also given in L 162 (not in F 119).

xxii 27–30 *om.* F 113, L 154, but it is inserted in S 145. In A xliv 31–33 the words are given, but in the context of F 155.

xxiv 12 *om.* F L and in A liii, but of course it might be considered that Jn. xx 3–10 was equivalent.

Here it seems likely enough that the omission of Lk. viii 1–3, xii 54–57, xvii 7–10 and xxii 27–30 is due to carelessness on the part of the original Harmonist. Such detached passages are more likely to have been left out in the first edition of a Harmony than to have been dropped at a subsequent revision.

John.

i 29–31. In F 16, L 25, *ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi* is added to *ecce agnus dei* in the section corresponding to Jn. i 36 ff: otherwise Jn. i 29–31 is unrepresented in F and L. In A iv 30, v 5, both Jn. i 29 and i 36 are represented.

ii 12. In F 22, L 33, and in A vi 36, the only equivalent of this verse is Matt. iv 13.

iii 35 *om.* F 21: L 32 omits *deus uerax est . . . loquitur* (*vv.* $33^{b}–34^{a}$), also *enim* (*ver.* 34^{b}) and *filium* (*ver.* 35). Clearly the common original of F and L was here defective.

iv 43–45 *om.* F 88, L 115, although in F and L Jn. v 1 ff follows continuously.

vi 1–6 is not represented in F 81, but L 100 has words representing vi 5 and 6.

vii 44 *om.* F 130, L 174.

viii $20–21^{a}$ *om.* F 132, L 176.

xiii 2–3 om. F 155, not L 207.

xiv 14 *om.* F 158, L 210.

xix 5. Nearly all the Johannine details of the Passion are included in F L, but xix 5 (Pilate's *Ecce homo!*) is left out.

Note that Jn. vii 40–43 is added after Matt. xii 23 in L 77, S 73, as well as in its proper place (L 174, S 168), but not in F 62 or in A.

It is evident that in St John, as in St Matthew, an attempt was made

[1] So also in Ephr. *Rom.* v 320 B (see *Ev. da-Meph.* ii 134).

to represent all the contents. The omission of vii 44 and of viii 20 is very curious, as the note of place in viii 59 is preserved.

This is the most convenient point to examine one or two peculiarities in the Latin text of F, and of that underlying L, which call for notice.

The wording of F is that of the Latin Vulgate: it is, in fact, one of the leading authorities for it, having a text akin to the Codex Amiatinus, i.e. to the Cassiodorian tradition. What the character of the text was in its immediate ancestor, that is to say in the MS discovered by Victor of Capua, is not very easy to determine.

The wording of L, the Liège Harmony, is a very vigorous and lively Dutch. The mediaeval dialect in which it is couched has to an English ear a much more homely sound than the modern classical language. The very glosses have an informal, friendly look: 'blasphemie agin the Holy Ghost, that's perseverance in sins'[1]—this kind of language gives the impression of a free, unconventional treatment of the text. But most of this is the effect of language, what would be got by putting the Authorized Version into dialect. As a matter of fact the Dutch is a fairly faithful rendering of a Latin text which differed very little from that of the Vulgate. It needs proof that this Latin was different from that of Cod. Fuldensis itself. It sounds quaint and delightful to read about the Jewish Popes ('die yoedsche papen') and the Jewish Bishops ('beschope'), but the first term only corresponds to *pontifices* and the second to *principes sacerdotum*. For all critical purposes we must only take account of the underlying Latin.

Whatever the earlier text of the Latin Diatessaron may have been, it is clear that in the final forms in which we have it the text has been assimilated to the Vulgate. Therefore no critical argument can be drawn from readings of F or L which only imply the wording of the Vulgate. This sounds like a truism, but Dr Plooij does not seem to me to bear it in mind. On pp. 47–52 of his book he has an elaborate Note on Jn. vi 15, the starting-point of which is that F has *fugit* and L 'ontflo hi' to render ἀνεχώρησεν. There is in this verse a well-known various reading φεύγει for ἀνεχώρησεν, and it is obvious that F and L 'support' φεύγει. But among the comparatively few witnesses for φεύγει is the Latin Vulgate.[2] In other words F and L present the current text of their age and country. The reasons which led St Jerome to retain the Old Latin *fugit* in this passage do not immediately concern us; the point is, that he did so and thereby made *fugit* the only current reading in this verse throughout Latin-speaking lands. Whatever the text of the MS Victor of Capua found may have been, *fugit* came into

[1] 'Blasphemie iegen den heilegen gheest dats perseuerancie in sunden' L 79.

[2] The list is ℵ* *a ff* vg syr.*C* (NB. *not* syr.*S* or Diat. *Arab*).

cod. Fuldensis as a matter of course, along with the rest of the pure Vulgate text, and the same may be said of the Latin ancestor of L, whether it was a direct descendant of F or of the ancestor of F.

Another instance of the same sort of thing, which has even taken in Dr Rendel Harris, occurs in L 48, corresponding to Lk. xi 8. In F 41 this begins with *dico uobis*, as in Wordsworth and White's critical text of the Vulgate and as in the Greek and the English. But L prefixes 'And he that stands without, he will remain shouting and knocking on the door'.[1] How vivid, how picturesque! Where did the mediaeval Dutch Harmonist get this striking addition? The answer is that he got it from the contemporary, mediaeval Latin Vulgate, which prefixes *et ille si perseuerauerit pulsans* to Lk. xi 8, in agreement with the Old Latin *ffilm* and *r* (hiant *ae*). Even if this picturesque addition, modelled of course on Lk. xiii 25, be due to Tatian in the first instance, a mediaeval Harmony would be likely to have it in any case, for the addition is found in most MSS of the Vulgate, including the Amiatinus itself.

In the above instance L under the influence of the later Vulgate text presents a reading to us unfamiliar, while F being in the wording of the early Vulgate has not got the reading. The reverse occurs in F 124, L 168, A xxxiii 38 = Matt. xxi 31. The evidence of Ephraim 191 makes it clear that the Old Syriac Diatessaron had the 'Western' reading ὁ ἔσχατος, but A xxxiii 38 having been assimilated to the text of the Peshitta has 'The first'. F 124, agreeing as usual with the better MSS of the Vulgate, has *nouissimus*, but L 168, in agreement with the majority of the later MSS of the Vulgate, has 'dirste', i.e. 'The first'. It is in accordance with general probability that the original text of Tatian had here 'The last one', so that F happens here to represent it correctly while L does not, but no significance attaches to this because the reason for the reading of F and of L is in each case the Vulgate text with which they were in contact.

The only way that it seems to me we can learn anything securely about the text of F's immediate ancestor is by examining the very few passages where owing to some accident of transcription it does not follow the Vulgate at all. Five of these may be discussed here.[2]

1. Lk. xix 28 = F 139 (end), L 187 (beginning), A xxxix 18.

[1] Dr. Harris (*Plooij* p. 2) remarks on this: 'When the midnight visitor in the Gospel parable "continues knocking and shouting" to his sleepy and unwilling friend, we not only see the action more vividly, but we also make connection with the attached moral . . . that to him that *knocketh*, it shall be opened.'

[2] The insertion of Jn. viii 55 between Jn. vii 29 and 30 in F 105, L 143 has some Latin support elsewhere, and must have arisen through some fault of a scribe rather than from the ingenuity of a harmonist. The verse is given again in its place in Jn. viii.

After the story of the anointing of Jesus at a supper (combined in F and L with the story of the Sinful Woman, Lk. vii 39–50) all three forms of the Harmony make Jesus proceed to Jerusalem. In L and A here follows the Entry with the cry of Osanna, in F it is put earlier, but Ephraim 207 makes it clear that here L and A preserve the true order of the Diatessaron, a fact which should be remembered when the relation of L to F is being considered. In any case Lk. xix 28 is inserted at this point in F L and A; but in F it is so isolated, being sandwiched between Lk. vii 50 and Jn. xii 20, that it seems to have not been identified by Victor of Capua, and so to have escaped assimilation to the Vulgate text. It runs thus:

Et his dictis abiit ascendens Hierosolymam.[1]

The Greek is καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰσ Ἰεροσόλυμα. There are three forms in which this text is transmitted,

(i) retains ἔμπροσθεν and has a full stop after 'Jerusalem': so all Gk. MSS (exc. D) lat. *f*-vg syr.vg and A xxxix 18.[2]

(ii) substitutes δέ for ἔμπροσθεν, so that there is a stop after ἐπορεύετο, and the rest of the verse goes with *ver.* 29: so D *e* and syr. *S C.*

(iii) omits ἔμπροσθεν but keeps the stop after 'Jerusalem': so F with (*a*) *c ffi l q r s.* All these have *abiit* for ἐπορεύετο except *a*, which has *ibat* (with *d*). *b* has lost a leaf here.

The conclusion to be drawn from this seemingly insignificant variation is now obvious and important. The ancestor of cod. Fuldensis was in Latin and had a 'European' text. There is no evidence except in Latin for the intermediate reading by which ἔμπροσθεν is dropped but the stop at Jerusalem is retained.

The rendering of L 187 *init.* ('The next day afterwards Jesus went Jerusalem-wards') is too free to enable us to guess whether it represents *abiit* or the *praecedebat* of the Vulgate.

2. Lk. ix 11 (*sic*)[3] = F 119 (end), L 162 (end), A xxxii 23.

Between the story of the Pharisee and the Publican and the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus L inserts Lk. xvii 7–10, a passage left out altogether in F and inserted elsewhere (xxxiii 10 ff) in A. But immediately before the story of Nicodemus there comes both in F and A and in L a combination of Matt. xxi 17, Mk. xi 11, and Lk. ix 11: the latter verse, being so far from its context, was left unrevised in F. It runs:

[1] Ranke (p. 125) actually identifies it with Matt. xx 17 (*sic*, Ranke has '27' by a misprint).

[2] Syr.vg has 'went forth forward' for ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν, 'went forth' (or 'went out') being a legacy from the Old Syriac. The Syriac for 'forward' is literally 'before him', and the Arabic took 'he went out before himself' to mean 'he went out at his ease', i.e. 'without hurrying', using the idiomatic phrase *'ala risleh*. There is nothing here in the Arabic beyond a rather free rendering of the Peshiṭta.

[3] In Ranke (p. 105) by a misprint '19' is put for '9'.

Et sciens turba quod exiit extra ciuitatem secuti sunt eum, et suscipiens eos quibus necessaria erat cura sanabat.

A has 'And all the people, because they knew the place, came to Him and He received them; and those that needed healing He was healing'.

It may be remarked in passing that this is a very good instance of the way in which the mosaic of Tatian often has been very well preserved: this verse keeps its place both in F and A, though so isolated from its context that Ranke identified it wrong and both our Arabic MSS assign it to Matthew. It should be further noticed that neither F nor A has here the clause that says Jesus was speaking to them of the Kingdom of God. L 162 has the same mosaic as F and A, but it inserts a free rendering of Jn. vii 53 in front of Lk. ix 11: so also S 153.

It would be confusing here to exhibit the various Latin renderings of this verse, for the sentence in F does not come very close to any of them. In fact the sentence looks to me more like one constructed with Lk. ix 11 in mind than a formal extract. The nearest is *e* (*qui necessariam habebant curam curabat*), but F is neater than this. I should judge from this verse that the ancestor of F, i.e. the MS Victor of Capua found, was a rendering in Biblical style, but not always a direct mosaic of fragments of the Latin Bible.[1]

3. Mk. xii 37 = F 142.

This verse is inserted in A xl 31 after Matt. xxiii 5^a, where it is followed by Mk. xii 38, and so back into the main stream of the Matthaean denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees. But in F by some accident of transcription it comes in after Matt. xxiii 7 (after *rabbi*), and so has escaped revision from the Vulgate.[2] It runs:

Et omnis populus libenter audiebant eum.

It is perhaps worth notice in passing that *c e* and *k*, representing the African text, have *illum* and put *libenter* later. But all Latin Biblical texts here have *multa turba*, while *omnis populus* really implies the λαόσ of Lk. xix 48, xxi 38. Here again the older Latin text of 'Tatian' is not a literal mosaic, but an adaptation.

It is therefore important to repeat that *omnis populus* does not occur in any Biblical text of Mk. xii 37. If the influence of the Diatessaron on Latin Biblical texts had been as great as Dr Plooij wishes us to infer I should have expected at least one of our Old-Latin texts here to have agreed with the text of F.

4. Lk. xxii 39 = F 159.

Secundum consuetudinem in montem Oliueti.

[1] Something therefore like the long Biblical extracts in the Verona fragments of the Latin *Didascalia*.

[2] The phrase from Mark is left out in L 190, but is given here in S 185, C 28 *v*.

So the Old Latin *a b d e ff i l q* and *f*, but the Vulgate codices all have *Oliuarum*. This verse is an isolated phrase from Luke inserted between Jn. xiv and xv.[1]

'5. Lk. xii 49, 50 = F 109, L 149.

Nescitis quia igne ueni mittere in terra, et quid uolo nisi ut accendatur? Baptismum habeo baptizari, et quomodo turbor usque dum perficiatur.

nescitis quia F = G (*b*) *e ff l*] *om.* rell. ignem rell. terram rell.
nisi ut F = ℵ T V W vg.*cl*] nisi *l* vg.wordsw., si *b ff i q r* 𝔓*J M O Q Y Z, sic r_2 D R 𝔓^{mg}, si iam *d*, ut *f*
et quid . . . accendatur] *om. e*
baptismum F = *d e l*] baptisma rell. habeo F = *c ff i l q*] *pr.* autem rell.
turbor F = *b e ff i l q r*] coartor *f* vg, urguor *d*, anxior r_2
usque dum F = rell.] quoadusque *e*, donec *f*, ut *i**
perficiatur F = rell.] consummetur *d r* r_2.

I do not understand how these verses have escaped revision, but it is evident that they have done so and that they present a normal 'European' text. L 149 agrees entirely with F. It has: 'Ende wetti nit dat ic en vir hebbe bracchtt in ertrike. ende wat willic el dan datt berne? Ic hebbe noch toverlidene en doepsele. ende hoe sere sal ic gheturbeert moten syn eert overleden sal werden.' That is to say 'And wot ye not that I a fire have brought on earth, and what will I else than that it burn? I have yet to endure a baptism, and how bitterly shall I be perturbed ere it shall be endured.' The Stuttgart MS (S) has the same interpretation in almost the same words.

It should be noticed here that in Lk. xvi 11, a verse which occurs immediately before this passage, F (and S) read *quod uestrum est* in accordance with a well-known various reading in Vulgate MSS (= B^c D E K* Q X* Z* *gat q* r^2), but L has 'deeulike rikheit' (i. e. 'the eternal riches').

This is the most convenient place to add a few notes upon the Table of Capitula prefixed to F. The first and obvious remark to be made is that this Table of the 182 chapters into which the Harmony is divided has not been revised to agree with the Vulgate, or indeed with the text

[1] 'Berch van oliveten' in L 213 might, I suppose, stand for either reading. There immediately follows in L 214 'Ic ben die gewarege wyngart', corresponding to *ego sum uitis uera* (Jn. xv 1), a rendering on which Dr Plooij lays great stress (pp. 58, 70), because it agrees with those Syriac quotations of the passage that speak about 'the Vineyard of truth' (see *Ev. da-Meph.* ii 143). But as in the only other place where 'Vine' occurs in the Gospel, viz. Matt. xxvi 29 (and parallels), L 206 has 'van wyngards vrochte' for *de hoc genimine uitis*, no stress at all can be laid on this curious coincidence. Dr Plooij notices this rendering of Matt. xxvi 29, but does not seem to see its significance.

of which it professes to be an Index. No doubt it was simply copied out almost unchanged from the old codex that Victor found.

The Gospel-text implied in these Capitula is just what would be expected from the preceding paragraphs, *viz.* an Old-Latin text of the same type as *b* and *ff*, but at the same time marked by a number of words and phrases that are not found in any Biblical version. 'African' phraseology is noticeably absent, but there are one or two passages that seem to shew the influence of the Vulgate. The results of a pretty thorough examination of the Capitula may be analysed as follows:—

(i) *Non-Biblical expressions.* VIII. infugatus (Matt. ii 13) LV. subreguli (Jn. iv 46) LXVII. proelium (Lk. xiv 31) LXXV. uadit dormitu (Mk. iv 27) LXXVII. ciues indignati (Matt. xiii 54) CVIIII. mercennarios (Matt. xx 1) CXXII. de iudice duro (Lk. xviii 6) CLVIII. pauefiat cor (Jn. xiv 27) CLVIIII. baiulet (Lk. xxii 36).

(ii) *Old-Latin expressions.* XXXVIII. de indumento (Matt. vi 25, Lk. xii 23)[1] LXVIIII. iuxta mare (Matt. xiii 1) CLVII. ut uos uentilet (Lk. xxii 31).

(iii) *Expressions agreeing both with European texts and the Vulgate.* LI. foueas (Matt. viii 20, Lk. ix 58) LVI. conuiuium (Lk. v 29) XCVII. substantiam . . . deuorauit (Lk. xv 30) CIIII. similitudinem (Lk. xiii 6), also XVCI and CVI (Lk. xv 3, *not* vg) CLX. palmites (Jn. xv 1, 4 ff).

(iv) *Vulgate readings.* LII. increpauit (Matt. viii 26) LXII. Behelzebub (Matt. xii 24) LXV. exprobrare (Matt. xi 20) LXXVI. sagena (Matt. xiii 47, also *d*).

In (iv) the most significant is *Behelzebub*, with final *b*, as all Old-Latin texts end the name with *l*. The Dutch Harmonies have *Belsebuc*. The other three might really be expressions not found in the Old-Latin, but afterwards independently used by Jerome.

One final point demands separate treatment, although some of the evidence has been given already. Dr Plooij, in his study of L, assumes that it, with the other Dutch Harmonies, is not a direct descendant of the Codex Fuldensis. I am of that opinion myself, but in view of the close agreement of F and L in their arrangement, coupled with the often paraphrastic renderings of the Latin found in the Dutch text, it is desirable to collect the passages that do indicate that L is rather the great-nephew than the grandson of F.[2]

[1] This is the only expression that might be claimed as 'African' (= $k^1/_1$): it is more significant that *indumentum* occurs in $g^2/_2$, a half-Vulgate MS that is known to have some connexion with the 'Diatessaron'.

[2] The following illustrates the free paraphrastic style of L. In F 121, L 163–4, both texts give the story of the Woman taken in Adultery ([Jn.] viii 1–11).

In the first place F begins with Lk. i 1–4 (St Luke's Preface), followed by Jn. i 1 ff; L, like all other known forms of the Diatessaron, leaves out Lk. i 1–4 altogether and begins at once with Jn. i 1. This is however not decisive, for a passage like the Preface to Luke might be supplied or dropped at the beginning according to the taste of an editor. More cogent are the passages noticed above, where L preserves passages or details of passages which do not appear at all in F. They are:—

L 32 and F 21 have different omissions in Jn. iii 33^{b}–35.

L 60 (with S 58) has Lk. iv 33–36 = Mk. i 23–27: F 49 omits.

L 77 (with S 73) combine Matt. xii 22 with Matt. ix 32 f: F 62 has no detail taken from Matt. xii 22.

L 100 preserves details from Jn. vi 5, 6: F 81 has nothing from Jn. vi earlier that *ver.* 7.

L 122 has Magedan, which may come from Matt. x 39 or the *O. Latin* text of Mk. viii 10: F 90 has Dalmanutha (Mk. viii 10, vg.).

L 207 has Jn. xiii 2–3: F 155 omits.

In all these six places the Arabic has the passages exactly, or almost exactly, in the same place as L, so that the natural inference is that L has them by inheritance, not by adoption from the Gospel text.

The case of Lk. xvii 7–10 is somewhat different: this is omitted in F 122, L 165 (the Withered Fig-Tree), but is given in A xxxiii $11–15^{a}$; it occurs in L 162 (after the Pharisee and the Publican), but not in F 119 or A xxxiii 21. Here therefore we may suppose that the Latin Diatessaron really omitted the passage, but that it has been added in L by some editor who noticed that these words had no place.

In Lk. xvi 11 F 109 has a peculiar reading (*uestrum*), found in some other Vulgate MSS, while L 149 has the better reading (*uerum*), which is also the reading of the O. Latin.

Besides these readings, all of which create a presumption that L is not derived directly from F, there are at least two major variations between L and F in order. The Entry into Jerusalem with the Ass and the cries of Osanna is given in L 187 and A xxxix 19 ff at the latest possible moment, after the Cleansing of the Temple and the

F prefixes to it [Jn.] vii 53 *et reversi sunt unusquisque in domum suam*: L does not have this verse here but prefixes 'When Jesus had spoken this word He went out of Bethany', [Jn.] vii 53 having been already used in L 162 in these words 'Ende en ighewelc ghinc thus wert van den ghenen die daer versament hadden gheweest' (i. e. 'And each one went house-ward of those who there had been assembled'). On the other hand, while F 130 ends with Jn. vii 52, L 174 adds to it *ver.* 53 in these words 'Ende alse dat gesproken was so schit igelic van den andren . ende elec ghinc te sire herbergen wert' (i. e. 'And when that was spoken each parted from the other, and each went to their habitations'). There is no question here of various readings: the Dutch sentences represent the same Latin.

disputes with the Chief Priests and the Raising of Lazarus. In F 117 it comes much earlier, before the Cleansing and the disputes and the story of Lazarus. That the order of L and A is primitive appears from the fact that it is the order of Ephraim 207 f. If L were a direct descendant of F, how could L have been corrected to agree exactly with the Eastern tradition?

The other case is not quite so clear, for this time it is L that goes against the Eastern tradition. According to Ephraim 221 Judas Iscariot was not worthy of the bread *with wine* which was given to the other Apostles. In agreement with this in F 157[a] and A xlv 12 ff Judas does not eat the Eucharist at all, for he has already gone out. In L 206, on the other hand, the whole of Jn. xiii is put after the Eucharist, so that Judas does eat of it. The evidence of A and of Ephraim tells us that F and not L has here preserved the true order of the Diatessaron, but be that as it may it is not likely that L is here a direct descendant of F.

It is time now to sum up these investigations and to form one or two general conclusions. The textual tradition of the 'Diatessaron' falls into two well-defined branches, the Eastern and the Western. On the one side are Ephraim and the Arabic Harmony, on the other Victor of Capua's edition (preserved in cod. Fuldensis) and the Dutch Harmonies. In cases of difference between these two main divisions there is very little cross-voting, only just sufficient to shew that the Dutch Harmonies are not directly derived from Victor's edition. Characteristic of the Western form is a series of omissions, apparently due to oversight, not to dogmatic or literary considerations, and on the whole a less elaborate system of mosaic.

In a small number of passages the text of cod. Fuldensis has not been assimilated to the Vulgate. These passages may be taken to preserve unchanged the text of the immediate ancestor of F, that is to say of the text of the Diatessaron which Victor of Capua happened to find. Their wording is similar to that of Old-Latin MSS of the 'European' family, and in one instance at least (Lk. xii 49, 50) these Old-Latin readings of F reappear in L. The common ancestor of F and L, therefore, was a Latin Diatessaron, not a Greek or Syriac text, and its cast of language was similar to that of the 'European' MSS. This seems to me to disprove Dom Chapman's ingenious conjecture (*Early Hist. of Vg. Gospels* p. 79) that Victor's MS was a Greek Diatessaron, a theory to which I was inclined to give a too hasty assent, and further it seems to shew that it was Victor who first assimilated the Old-Latin Diatessaron to a Vulgate wording. When and how the Latin ancestor of L was assimilated to the Vulgate we

cannot tell: perhaps it was a gradual process, not quite completed even in the MS from which the Dutch Harmony was first made.

The fact that the ancestor of cod. Fuldensis was an Old-Latin Harmony makes it quite likely that Zahn has given too late a date to it. 'Not earlier than 500' is Zahn's opinion, but an Old-Latin codex might be as old as 400 or 300 A. D.

Thus the result of our investigation has been to push back the Latin Harmony to an age comparable with St Ephraim and the rest of the Syriac evidence. Which form was the older, the Western or the Eastern, the Latin or the Syriac? The Syriac in its earliest form we know to have played its part at the very beginnings of Syriac Christianity. It is commonly supposed to have been introduced by Tatian himself, when he went back to his native 'Mesopotamia', i. e. it can be traced back to about A. D. 170. On the other hand, as I have pointed out in the course of this investigation, the Latin form of the Harmony is on the whole rougher and cruder, while the Syriac form has the characteristics of a 'second edition, revised and enlarged'. No direct evidence for the Diatessaron in Greek has appeared.

Here we must leave scientific deduction. But I should like to conclude with a couple of conjectures. It has been sometimes said that the Diatessaron was the last of the Gospels, the last attempt to gather together all the Gospel material as a substitute for Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Is it not equally possible that it was never a rival at all to the Gospels themselves, but was the first of the versions?

The 'Gospel', the Corpus of writings which the sense of the Church had selected, especially at Rome, in the very generation when Tatian lived and worked, consisted of four Greek books. Such a selection was a practical assertion that these books were in some way 'inspired'. A few years after Tatian had departed to the East a Greek writer in the West, St Irenaeus, is found asserting the mysterious and providential significance of the quadruple number or these apostolic books, so that to cut and pare them into a single framework might seem hazardous at so late a date as 160 or 170, especially in Rome. But during the very same period a great change was coming over the Roman Church; it was ceasing to be a community of Greek-speaking persons and becoming more and more a community of Latin-speaking persons. Except the writings of Hippolytus, Tatian's own Address to Greeks is the latest important Greek work written by a Christian domiciled in Rome. In what form should these Latin-speaking Roman Christians hear the 'Gospel'?

The question was soon answered once for all, probably through the action of the Christians of Roman Carthage. Latin-speaking Christians were to have the Gospel, the whole Gospel, all the Gospels, in their native tongue. The sacred, inspired, apostolical Greek text might

continue to be read from time to time, at certain services, but the full text of all Four Gospels was turned into Latin and soon—we do not know quite how soon—it was used in worship.

May not the original Diatessaron, the first Harmony of the Gospels ever made, have been a Latin Epitome for Latin Christians, who as yet had nothing but the Greek original? If this was so, many difficulties disappear. It explains the absence of any direct trace of the Diatessaron in Greek. It explains, moreover, the absence of references to the Diatessaron in the literature of the Christian West and the rarity of surviving copies. The particular usefulness of the work had soon come to an end, for within thirty years, perhaps less, all Four Gospels were available in Italy in Latin. The work did not altogether perish, but copies were seldom made. When they were made, no doubt the wording was always more or less assimilated to the current text of the Latin Bible.

It may further be asked whether there is any valid reason for regarding Tatian as the compiler of this original Latin Diatessaron. We do not know that Tatian was interested in Latin-speaking Christianity, or even that he was familiar with the Latin language. That Tatian had anything to do with any ancestor of Codex Fuldensis, or that such a Harmony was known in the West as *Diatessaron*, is not an immemorial tradition; it is nothing more than a conjecture made by Victor of Capua on the strength of a passage in Eusebius. The MS found by Victor was anonymous, and he had no traditional evidence for connecting it with the name of Tatian. All the tradition that connects Tatian with the Diatessaron relates to the Diatessaron in Syriac, or is most easily so interpreted. Eusebius never seems to have seen the work himself.

We know from Epiphanius (*Haer.* xlvi 1) that Tatian spent the latter part of his life in his native 'Assyria', i. e. no doubt Osrhoene, the country round Edessa. Here he found, or founded, a Syriac-speaking Christian community. At Edessa itself there may have been some Greek culture, but elsewhere the only language used was Syriac, and even in Edessa Syriac was on a social equality with Greek, for it was the language of an independent royal State. Some two hundred years later we find this Syriac-speaking Church, which had Edessa as its centre, using the Diatessaron almost to the exclusion of the Four Gospels, and the literary tradition identifies its author with the Ṭaṭianos of whom Eusebius speaks.

The weight of evidence—or rather the absence of evidence to the contrary—suggests that the Four Gospels had not been translated into Syriac when Tatian came back to the East. Here therefore was another great opportunity for the Diatessaron. But in putting this Harmony into Syriac Tatian did not simply translate the Latin work: it was equally easy for him to compile it anew from the original

Greek, and in so doing to introduce changes and improvements in the mosaic, such as a 'second edition' almost always presents. For some time this Syriac Diatessaron had no rival, and therefore it became to the early Syriac-speaking Christians 'the Gospel' in a way that the Latin Diatessaron never did. The Syriac Diatessaron greatly influenced the wording of the Separate Gospels for generations, while the Latin Diatessaron influenced the separate Latin Gospels much less, and in its turn was greatly influenced by them.

It seems to me that the one moment in the West when we may look for a considerable influence on the text of the Gospels from the Diatessaron was in the earliest days of what is called 'the European Old-Latin', when the Latin Gospels current in Roman Africa were being accepted and adapted for Roman and Italian use.

The other conjecture refers to the name of Tatian. The author of the 'Address to Greeks' called himself *Tatianus*, but he was an 'Assyrian' by birth, i. e. he came from the Syriac-speaking lands of Mesopotamia. What did his mother call him? What was his real name?

It is remarkable that the Syriac-speaking Church preserved no tradition about 'Tatian'; they only identified the author of their Diatessaron with the Τατιανόσ about whom Eusebius had written. On the other hand, they had no doubt as to who brought the Gospel to Edessa. It was Addai. Tradition put him into the time of the Apostles and made him one of the Seventy-two, but the 'Doctrine of Addai' tells us that what he brought to Edessa was nothing else than the Diatessaron (*D. of Addai* 36). Eusebius thought this name Addai should be spelt Θαδδαῖοσ in Greek. But why should it not be *Tatian*?

Of course Addai and Ṭaṭianos are not much alike to look at, whether we write them in Greek or in Syriac. But it is not a question of philological equivalence. Jason and Jesus, Jakim and Alcimus, Silas (i. e. *Sh'ilā*) and Silvanus, are not more different. The main elements of Addai are the doubled dental, the *a*-vowel, the long syllable at the end. Possibly it is derived from the name of the God Hadad or Dadda: possibly the Hermetic 'Thoth', spelt in Greek Τάτ, may have been regarded as a sort of equivalent, so that *Tatianus* meant 'Tat's devotee'. But as I say, it is not a question of philology or scientific comparative religion, but of almost individual caprice. In such a matter certainty cannot be looked for, but if my conjecture be adopted, I venture to think it would afford a simple solution of a historical difficulty, which is, that the Syriac-speaking Christians preserved the tradition that 'Addai' brought the Diatessaron to their land, but do not seem to have heard of 'Tatian' except from the Greek writer Eusebius.

F. C. BURKITT.