

PROFESSOR ZAHN ON TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.

THE results of Dr. Zahn's investigations of which an account was given in the last article on this subject are, as will have been seen, in great measure independent of enquiries into the origin of the Diatessaron of the Syrian church, its authorship and its sources. We have strong evidence for the remarkable fact of a Harmony of the Four Gospels having held in the Syrian church, down to the time of Theodoret in the fifth century, a position equivalent to that of the Gospels themselves in other churches, being read in public worship, treated and quoted as "Scripture," but apparently existing only in Syriac, and consequently all but unknown in the Greek and Latin churches. The fact that, nevertheless, it was transferred into the Latin form which was discovered by Victor of Capua, and is preserved in the Codex Fuldensis, has some light thrown upon it by some interesting facts which are brought to bear on the subject by Dr. Zahn's comprehensive learning. From the recent researches of Dr. Kihn, we know that at the very date of Victor of Capua, the African Junilius who, about 545-552 A.D., was *Quæstor sacri palatii* at the Court of Justinian, translated into Latin for Primasius, Bishop of Adrumetum, in Africa, whom he had met at Constantinople, an outline of an introduction to the Scriptures by the Syrian Nestorian Paul, a disciple and a teacher of the school of Nisibis. Primasius, it seems, had "made it his business to enquire at Constantinople who among the Greeks was distinguished as a theologian; to which Junilius replied that he knew one Paul, a Persian by race, who had been educated in the school of the Syrians at Nisibis, where theology was taught by public masters in the same systematic manner as the secular studies of grammar and rhetoric were expounded elsewhere."¹ Ten years

¹ See Dr. Salmon's art. on Junilius in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography."

before, Cassiodorius was planning with the Roman Bishop Agapetus the establishment at Rome of a theological school after the model of those which had formerly existed at Alexandria, and then existed at Nisibis. Still more remarkable are some observations of Gennadius of Marseilles, in his continuation of St. Jerome's book *De Viris Illustribus*. He explains the omission of some Syrian writers from that book on the ground of St. Jerome's lack of knowledge of Syriac, while there seems little doubt that Gennadius himself was either acquainted with the Syriac originals of certain works which he describes, or that he had some Syrian scholar at hand by whom they were translated to him. In other words, we have a positive instance of Syriac works which were unknown to Jerome being known to a Western writer living between his date and that of Victor. It would seem that one consequence of the Nestorian controversies was to arouse a greater interest respecting the Syrian church, and to increase the intercourse between that church and the West. It is unnecessary to dwell on the report of Isaac of Amida coming to Rome at the beginning of the fifth century, or of some monks who were sent to Rome by Syrian bishops in 495 A.D. But at all events, as Dr. Zahn observes, Syrians were at that time to be met everywhere in the East. Syrian monks settled in Egypt, in Sinai, in Palestine, and in Constantinople; and many a Latin Christian after the days of St. Jerome must have stayed at these places, and may have conversed with the Syrians in Greek. "There appears, therefore," he adds, "no improbability in the conclusion that in the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth, century, some Latin writer, on the basis of Tatian's Syriac Diatessaron and of St. Jerome's Latin version of the Gospels, may have prepared the Harmony which has been preserved from oblivion by Victor." Thus a circumstance which might at first seem to be peculiarly difficult to reconcile with the specially Syrian history

of the Diatessaron does but supply another historic coincidence in favour of the supposition. An interesting relic, moreover, of a Greek Harmony, clearly akin to the Syriac Diatessaron, but with considerable abbreviations and modifications, has been preserved in a work published in 1523 by Ottmar Nachtigall, or, as he styled himself, Luscinus. The Greek original which Luscinus used has been lost, and its very existence has been doubted. But it is clear from the correspondence between Luscinus's Harmony and the Diatessaron that the former could not have been independent of the latter, and equally clear that his Greek original was not derived from the Diatessaron through Victor's Latin version. There are also clear traces of an Arabic reproduction of the Diatessaron, the text of which is preserved in the Vatican library; but which has not yet been duly examined.

There is thus little doubt that we have before us a Syrian Diatessaron which has played a considerable part in the history, not only of that church, but of other churches. Dr. Zahn proceeds to discuss, as a distinct question, what was its origin, and what was its relation to the Gospels themselves. There could, it would seem, be no reasonable doubt, in view of the unanimous tradition on the subject, that it was the work which Tatian is known to have composed. He is the only person in the ancient church who is said to have written a work of this kind—that of Ammonius of Alexandria having been, as Dr. Zahn conclusively shews, entirely different in character; and we have the explicit testimony of Theodoret that the Diatessaron he found current in his Syrian diocese was regarded as the work of Tatian. Professor Overbeck, in order to raise a doubt as to the force of this evidence, is driven to the objection that Theodoret is not a pure representative of Syrian tradition, and consequently that Syriac writers of the middle ages afford the earliest distinct evidence in the

Syrian church of the connexion of Tatian's name with the Harmony. Considering that Theodoret, who was born in Antioch, became bishop of Cyrrhus in 420, and did not die until 457, he must be regarded as at least as good a witness to the Syrian tradition on the subject as could be needed; and that such an objection should be raised is a strange instance of the special pleading with which the results of these investigations are resisted by writers who dislike what they call their "apologetic" tendency. To suppose that Tatian the Assyrian wrote a work called the Diatessaron which has entirely disappeared; and that some one else, no one knows who, wrote another work, also called the Diatessaron, which was in use in the Syrian church and was regarded as Tatian's by a learned Syrian bishop, would be in violent contradiction with the primary rule of practical reasoning, that two causes should not be assumed to exist when one is sufficient. The only reasonable question is whether the Syrian Harmony, as preserved in Ephraem's work, is marked by features inconsistent with the accounts which have reached us of Tatian's work; and it is observable that, notwithstanding a few points of difficulty, this is not, so far as we are aware, maintained by any critic of repute, of whatever school. It seems recognized on all hands that there is nothing in the internal evidence incompatible with the *primâ facie* probability that the work, as we can now restore it, is substantially Tatian's.

Dr. Zahn, however, is not content with this broad and general argument, but in the third section of his work, after presenting us in the second with a reconstruction of the text, he proceeds to enquire what evidence this text itself affords respecting the origin of the Diatessaron. This part of his work is not less interesting than the first, and what Professor Overbeck says in disparagement of it may with better reason be said in its praise, that it reads like a romance. Exception may, indeed, as it seems to us,

fairly be taken to some of the conclusions involved in it, or at all events to the decisiveness of the evidence in their favour; but the case is so complete as it stands that we will endeavour in the first place simply to state it, as presented by Dr. Zahn, and will afterwards consider the objections which present themselves. He begins by enquiring whether the text of the Diatessaron can be shewn to bear any relation to the only two Syriac versions of the Gospels which can have had any connexion with it—the Curetonian Syriac and the Peshito. He assumes that the former of these two versions is the older—a point, however, which Professor Holtzmann, in Pünjer's very useful *Theologischer Jahresbericht* for 1881 (p. 40) describes as still a disputed question among specialists. But if it can be shewn that there is a connexion between the Syriac text of the Diatessaron and that of any Syriac version of the Gospels, and if it can be concluded from such a connexion that the one text was dependent on the other, there is great force in Dr. Zahn's argument that the Harmony would have been drawn from the Gospels, and not the text of the Gospels from the Harmony. If, indeed, the Harmony were the older document, it is possible that the memory of a translator might in many instances preserve almost unconsciously the old phrases; but he would hardly do so when they diverged from the original on which he was working.

Now Dr. Zahn next adduces carefully tabulated instances of the relation between his texts under the following heads:—First, cases in which the Diatessaron agrees, both in substance and expression, with the Curetonian version, as against the Peshito and almost all other tradition; secondly, cases in which it also agrees with the Curetonian against the Peshito, but with the countenance of important Western witnesses, such as Codex D. and MSS. of the Italic version; thirdly, cases in which it agrees with

the Curetonian against the Peshito simply in the expression, or in the form of the translation; fourthly, cases in which it agrees with the Peshito against the Curetonian in matter or form; fifthly, and lastly, cases in which it presents a text independent of both the ancient Syriac versions. From this elaborate comparison, he considers that two results follow with equal certainty: first, that the Syriac Diatessaron exhibits an intimate relationship with the Curetonian version, and secondly that its author possessed a knowledge, which was independent of all Syrian translations, of the Greek text of the Gospels. This second conclusion explains not only the cases in which the text of the Diatessaron is independent of the two Syriac versions, but those also in which it seems to desert the Curetonian for the Peshito; for in the latter class of cases, the change is always a nearer approach to the Greek original. This being the case, it is concluded that the author of the Diatessaron must have been a Syrian who was acquainted with Greek, and that he adopted the simplest and most obvious means for his purpose. He employed as the basis of his work the existing Syriac version of the Gospels—namely, the Curetonian, but compared that version throughout with a copy of the Greek Gospels, the text of which in cases of divergence he preferred, and from which he translated directly. These two texts, however, were closely allied, and their relationship with a third text is distinctly marked. The Curetonian Syriac is more nearly related to Codex D and the oldest Italic manuscripts than to *Σ* and B, and this is perhaps in a still higher degree the case with the Greek text which was employed.

From the texts used in the composition of the Diatessaron we pass to the general arrangement of the work, and to the principles on which its author seems to have acted. Without going into details, which Dr. Zahn discusses with his usual fulness and care, it will be sufficient for

our present purpose to notice the main characteristics to which he draws attention. The author appears to accept fully the essentially historical character of the whole substance of the four Gospels, and he exhibits an apprehension of the difficulties which, on that supposition, must be encountered by any such work as he was composing. But, says Dr. Zahn (p. 260), "he has not been overcome by these difficulties, because he adopts no superstitious attitude towards his sources; and he has thus been saved from many follies by which the harmonistic work of later times has been made ridiculous. . . . Where he has to deal with a formal contradiction, he decides in favour of one Evangelist against the other, and he appears to recognize no difference in relative credibility between the four witnesses. For instance, whereas St. Matthew speaks of two blind men at Jericho, and St. Luke narrates the healing of one blind man before the entrance into Jericho, he gives St. Mark the preference over both. He has adopted his scheme of the course of the public work of Jesus . . . principally from St. John. Between the first and third Passover after the baptism of Jesus, a period of two years work is passed. The starting point, the Passover which marks the division between the two years, the division of the second year into two unequal portions by the feasts of Tabernacles and of the Dedication, and the visits to Jerusalem on the occasions of those feasts—in a word, his whole chronological framework has been taken from St. John. But in respect to St. John, no less than to the Synoptics, he goes on the assumption that, whether from ignorance of the historical relation of the facts, or with a view to substantial connexion and instructive appropriateness, each Evangelist has often chosen to arrange events in some other order than that of time. This will be felt to be natural by every one who shares those general assumptions of the author which have just

been mentioned. Yet one is surprised by the boldness with which, on the basis of this insight into the freedom of the composition of the Gospels, the evangelical history is constructed. In this Harmonist himself there is not a little of the freedom which he assigns to the Evangelists.¹ . . . It may be observed that a difference is so far made between the Evangelists that the text of St. John is almost completely adopted, perhaps with the sole exception of Chapter iv. 46-54; next in completeness comes that of St. Matthew, while St. Luke and St. Mark are much more incompletely represented. Moreover the peculiar passages taken from the two latter Evangelists are treated with far less regard to their original connexion. All this may very conveniently be perceived from the index of passages at the close of this volume. The disciples of the Apostles take their place after the Apostles, in accordance with the order observed in those Western witnesses with which the text of the Diatessaron exhibits the closest connexion."²

Notwithstanding, however, this bold method of procedure, the Diatessaron, in Dr. Zahn's opinion, does not exhibit any peculiar doctrinal views or any divergence from the common faith of the ancient church. It is indeed evident, as he says, that the judgment of the East Syrian church was quite favourable on this point; but he goes so far as to maintain that the contrary judgment of Theodoret was extremely perverse. The author has, it is true, sometimes obliterated the Jewish character of the Gospel history by the omission of a few words, but there is nothing anti-

¹ For instance, the cleansing of the Temple, in John ii. 14-22, is regarded as the same event which, according to Matthew xxi. 12 sqq. Mark xi. 15 sqq. and Luke xix. 45 sqq. occurred at a later period. In this narrative St. John is in substance almost exclusively followed, but in respect to the historical position of the occurrence the Synoptics are preferred.

² "Namely in Cod. D and several Italic MSS., Matthew, John, Luke, Mark (see on this point Scrivener, *Cod. Cantabrig.* p. xxx.). In the Curetonian Syriac the order is Matthew, Mark, John, Luke."

catholic in preferring to represent Jesus rather as the Saviour of the world than as the promised Redeemer and Judge of Israel; and, at all events, "there are no indications that, out of hostility to Judaism, the author refused to recognize the roots of Christianity in Israel." Theodoret, indeed, regarded it as the most conspicuous evidence of the heretical view and purpose of the author that he omitted the genealogies. But Dr. Zahn urges that this omission is at least consistent with a precisely opposite purpose. By some heretical sects the genealogies were regarded as shewing that our Lord was the son of Joseph after the flesh, instead of testifying simply to the fact of his being the heir of the house of David, and the Gentile church of the second century preferred to base our Lord's claims as a son of David upon the fact of Mary's being of the royal house. It is certainly curious, in connexion with this point, that the Diatessaron, together with the Curetonian version, in Matthew i. 19, instead of "Joseph her husband, being a just man," apparently by the omission of \acute{o} and $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, gives the meaning "Joseph being a just man," thus avoiding any statement that he was Mary's husband. Similarly the Curetonian version, in the 20th verse, in place of "Mary thy wife" has "Mary thy betrothed"; and it is doubtful whether the words "thy wife" were in Ephraem's text; while both the Curetonian and the Diatessaron substitute for our text in Matthew i. 25, the emphatic phrase, *Sancte habitabat cum ea*. Moreover, as Ephraem especially notes, the last clause of Matthew i. 24 was in the Diatessaron placed after verse 25, "He dwelt in sanctity with her until she brought forth her first born son, and took her unto him." Ephraem's observation is: "*Præpostere dicta sunt verba. Nam prius sumpsit eam, et postea habitabat cum ea in sanctitate; sed ita legitur: 'habitavit cum ea in sanctitate, et sumpsit eam.'*" There is certainly force in Dr. Zahn's observation that "by this alteration of

order it is as distinctly as possible expressed that Mary did not become Joseph's lawful wife until after the birth of Jesus. The Evangelist exhibits an exactly opposite purpose in his mode of narration. The very point which was essential was that Mary should be Joseph's lawful wife when she gave birth to her son, in order that He might appear among his people as Joseph's son, and therefore as David's. It is not therefore by any divergence of belief in respect to the nature of the person of Jesus that this post-humous Evangelist is distinguished from the four original Evangelists, but simply an unmistakable divergence in his view of the historical assumptions which are essential to such a belief."

Such, then, as deduced by Dr. Zahn from his reconstructed text, were the qualifications and the purpose of the author of the Diatessaron. "He stands on the basis of the Catholic Rule of Faith, and is under the influence of the views which partially prevailed about the middle of the second century, in opposition to representations of Jesus as mere man. With all pious regard towards the gospels of the Catholic Church, he appears as a man of bold genius, and he exhibits in particulars extremely original and ingenious conceptions. He is equally master of the Syrian language, in which his work was written, and of the Greek, in which, no less than in Syriac, he read the Gospels. His Greek text of the Gospels, in this point just like that which was the foundation of the Syrian version he used, was as wild in its character as that which, according to all our witnesses, was presented by most of the MSS. of the second century. At a later period, in the commencement of the third century, his work was introduced into Edessa as a book of the Gospels for use in public worship. Who was the man?"

The reader will at once perceive how completely all the circumstances thus brought together fit into the obvious

reply. Uniform tradition, from the oldest time, points to Tatian the Syrian, the disciple of Justin Martyr. Dr. Zahn proceeds to investigate critically what we know of Tatian's life, and seems to succeed in clearing up some doubtful points respecting it; and the result is the following sketch of his career, with approximate dates. He was born about 110 A.D. in Assyria—that is east of the Tigris; between A.D. 135 and 155 he travelled in the Greek and Roman world as far as Rome, made himself master of Greek culture, and became known as an author while still a pagan. About the year 155 he was converted to Christianity in Rome, became acquainted with Justin, was attacked by Crescens and wrote his *Address to the Greeks*. He held a distinguished position as a learned member of the Church in Rome until Justin's death in 165; but after his master had died he published, in the same city, some heretical works. About the year 172 or 173, when rather more than sixty years old, he went back to Mesopotamia, where he may well have lived for another decade, during which he could have produced the work by which his memory was preserved in the Syrian church. Dr. Zahn's investigations seem to have inspired him with something like an affection for the hero of his story, and he does his best, not without some success, to minimize Tatian's heresy. There can be no doubt, from the statement of Irenæus, that he maintained heretical opinions which, in respect to asceticism, resembled those of Saturninus and Marcion, and the so-called Encratites, and, in respect to gnostic speculation, resembled Valentinus's doctrine of æons. But statements, of which the earliest occurs in Eusebius, representing him as having been the founder of the sect of Encratites are shewn by Dr. Zahn to be open to serious criticism; and it is urged in conclusion that "he never belonged to any sect, and never founded a sect, least of all in Mesopotamia." He simply held peculiar opinions, which were of an hereti-

cal character; and when, after Justin's death, he had thus incurred the reproach of heresy, Rome and the West became distasteful to him. To so stern and passionate a character, such a reproach must have been specially offensive, and he was not a man likely to retract his errors. It was more natural that he should seek a refuge in his native country, where he could serve the cause of Christianity, but retain his peculiarities. To the last, the old pride with which he had boasted to the corrupt Greek and Roman world of his barbarian origin, and of the superiority of barbarian learning, may have remained within him, and may have asserted itself with renewed strength when he found himself reputed a heretic in a church of Greek culture. In a country still heathen, there would be no occasion for putting forward his peculiar views. He might wish simply to bring to the knowledge of his own countrymen, in the most favourable form, the Gospel to which he had submitted himself. A man who had been perplexed by the *προβλήματα* presented by the Old Testament, and one of whose heretical works had treated of them, would be likely to be sensible of the similar problems presented by the four Gospels, and might readily entertain the idea of offering his fellow Syrians a form of the Gospel in which such difficulties would be avoided. "It was," says Dr. Zahn, "a bold conception; but Tatian was a bold man. The general arrangement of the book, the marks it bears of an historical eye and of frequent ingenuity in details of construction, are fully worthy of Tatian. The simultaneous use of the oldest Syrian version of the Gospels and of a Greek MS. corresponds to the circumstances of his life. The character of the Greek MS. which was used by the author of the Diatessaron suits no period better than that of Tatian, and its intimate relationship with the *Itala* is specially intelligible if Tatian brought his MS. from Rome about the year 172. Lastly, if according

to *The Doctrine of Addai* the Diatessaron served as the Gospel in the earliest period of the Church of Edessa, that is the very time at which Tatian must have composed the Diatessaron if he composed it at all. But that he did so, can no longer be reasonably doubted."

Such is the interesting story of the Diatessaron and its author which Dr. Zahn has constructed; and although it may require modification in a few points of consequence, it has cast a new light upon the subject, and in several of its main elements is likely to hold its ground. The eminent scholar de Lagarde, Professor of the Eastern Languages in Göttingen, in a review of Dr. Zahn's book in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, for the 15th and 22nd of March of this year, says he regards it "as proved that the Harmony explained by Ephraem was not composed in Greek but in Syriac; that its author was Tatian the Syrian, of whom we possess a Greek work in defence of Christianity, which is the most interesting of all the Apologies; . . . that in respect to his teaching Tatian did not deserve the reproach of heresy, and that about the year 160 of our era he was in full manhood. This," he adds, "is gain sufficient;" and he withdraws opinions he had expressed in his editions of the Apostolic Constitutions and of the Clementines, to the effect that the citations in them were not drawn from our four Gospels, but from some kind of Gospel-harmony. This may be regarded as an indication of the effect which these investigations are likely to produce in clearing away vague speculations respecting the late origin or recognition of the four Gospels. It will be impracticable for the future to dispute the source of Justin Martyr's quotations; and when we find the Gospel of St. John not only recognized, but made the chronological framework of a Harmony by Justin's disciple, it does not seem too much to say with Dr. Zahn, though it has made some of his rationalistic critics rather angry, that "opinions respecting

the origin of St. John's Gospel, such as have been expressed by Baur, must seem simple madness (*wahnsinn*)."

Nevertheless, we are inclined to think that two objections raised by Professor Overbeck, in the review already quoted, are well founded. Without disputing the close relation which has been shewn to exist between the text exhibited in the Diatessaron and that of the Curetonian Syriac, he observes that it is explicable by another alternative, which Dr. Zahn does not appear to have duly considered. The relationship may arise, not from the one having been employed in the other, but from both having been based on the same original text or type of text. That which we obtain from Moesinger's edition of Ephraem is, it must be remembered, a Latin version of an Armenian version of a Syriac version of a Greek original, and we cannot therefore apply the test of actual verbal agreement. Professor Overbeck's observation seems also a just one, that Dr. Zahn does not offer us any comparison, or at least any sufficient comparison, of the Syriac quotations of Aphraates with the Curetonian text. We can only judge by the agreement shewn to exist between the Curetonian and the Diatessaron in sense and general form of expression; and agreement in these respects—at all events in the former respect—alone can hardly, it would seem, establish anything more than the use of the same original text. The point, it will be seen, is of considerable consequence in its bearing on the history of the translation of the Gospels in the Syrian church. Dr. Zahn observes justly that, if his theory be true, we are furnished with a fixed chronological point in that history. If Tatian wrote his Diatessaron in Mesopotamia soon after 172, and employed for his purpose that translation of the complete Gospels of which we possess a portion in the Curetonian Syriac, "this translation must have been produced . . . not later than about 150 A.D.—not in Edessa, where at that time the Church did

not exist, still less to the east of it, but on the west of the Euphrates." Such a view must be allowed to be consistent with the facts Dr. Zahn has established; but it does not seem to be necessarily required by them. To put a possible case, which retains a great part of his hypothesis: If Tatian, when he returned about the year 172 to Mesopotamia, brought with him from Rome Greek MSS. akin to the Italic version, why should not the Syrian Diatessaron, framed by himself out of the four Gospels, have become current in one part of Syria, and a translation of the four Gospels themselves have become current in another part? Might he even not have been the author both of the translation and of the Harmony? The enquiry, moreover, however interesting in relation to the history of the Syrian church, is not of material importance in relation to the larger questions to which Dr. Zahn refers. There is no longer any doubt that all four Gospels existed in full, and substantially as we now have them, in the time of Tatian, and therefore of Justin Martyr, and this, as Professor de Lagarde says, is "gain sufficient."

The other point on which Dr. Zahn seems to us to have pressed his case too far, and on which Professor Overbeck's criticisms appear well founded, is in his argument respecting the absence of all indications of heretical views in Tatian's composition of the Diatessaron. Putting out of question the disputable point of the genealogies, and allowing that, even if there are some traces of apocryphal additions to the Gospels,¹ they are, as Dr. Zahn says, in the proportion of but one to a thousand, still Dr. Overbeck may have good reason in asking whether the mere design of such a work was not in itself somewhat heretical in character. We have quoted, above, Dr. Zahn's own account of the

¹ As, for instance, the account of the light which shone on the Jordan during our Lord's Baptism, which is also a peculiarity in Justin Martyr's references to the Gospels.

manner in which Tatian dealt with the sacred text—his freedom from any “superstitious attitude towards his sources,” his lack of any scruple in overriding one Evangelist in favour of another, whenever there seemed to him “a formal contradiction” between them; “the surprising boldness with which the gospel history is constructed,” the fact that this Harmonist—this *nachgeborener Evangelist*, as Dr. Zahn is led to call him (p. 267)—assumes “not a little of the freedom which he assigns to the Evangelists themselves.” But what would Irenæus have been likely to say to such treatment of those four Gospels which he regarded as not less permanent, and essential to the nature of things, than the four quarters of the heavens or the four cherubim? Is it not conceivable, after all, that Eusebius, in his *οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως*, may have meant to say—whether he had actually seen the Diatessaron or not—that he could not understand how a man could treat the four Gospels in such a “bold” manner? We are certainly disposed to think that it would add a touch of consistency to Dr. Zahn’s own view of the history, and would be much more in conformity with the undoubted judgment of Tatian’s contemporaries, if we regarded the Diatessaron as being itself a result and an evidence of the very presumption and self-assertion attributed to him by Irenæus. It may be, as Dr. Zahn says, that he did not go so far as to become the actual founder of a new heretical sect. But such a reconstruction of the gospel history as Dr. Zahn has described might well be the work of a man who, as Irenæus describes him, became “puffed up with the idea of his superiority to others, and established his own type of school.” His Diatessaron embodied in a single narrative so large a proportion of the text of the four Gospels that it might serve some useful purposes, and might naturally be deemed convenient for public reading in church. As Theodoret says, it was recommended by its brevity.

But none the less, alike in its design and in the manner in which the design was carried into effect, it was out of harmony with the views of the Church as to the complete verity and authority of the texts of the four Gospels; and it would seem that Dr. Zahn's investigations have in this respect abundantly justified the judgment of the Fathers. For the same reason Professor Overbeck, in his turn, seems to us to press his argument too far in urging that such treatment of the Gospels indicates a period before they had definitely acquired canonical authority. There is no reason to suppose that Tatian would have felt himself restrained by any such authority; and if any argument on this point can be drawn from his conduct, it would seem significant that none but an heretical writer should have ventured, even in the latter half of the second century, to deal thus boldly with the four Gospels, and that his work should, so far as we know, have been regarded as an heretical production, as soon as its character was fully understood.

There are many other points of interest in Dr. Zahn's volume which we are sorry not to notice. There are two appendices, one on the *Evangeliarum Hierolymitanum*, and the other on *The Doctrine of Addai*. In the former, he urges the probability that a Syro-Palestinian translation of the canonical gospels had been at least commenced before Hegeppus; and in the latter, he maintains, against Professor Lipsius, that *The Doctrine of Addai*, as it has been preserved to us, is substantially the document from which Eusebius quoted in his Church History (I. 13). Into these points we cannot now follow him. But we must not part with him without observing that his book has a special claim to recognition from English readers, in consequence of the acquaintance which it shews with English scholarship, and its friendly tone towards English scholars. On p. 246, he quotes with special emphasis what he calls

“the golden words of the Bishop of Durham in the *Contemporary Review* for May 1875,” to the effect that any one who will read through Irenæus, with due care and impartiality, “will be in a more favourable position for judging rightly of the early history of the Canon than if he had studied all the monographs which have issued from the German press during the last half century.” In fact, Bishop Lightfoot’s works, Dr. Scrivener’s Introduction and numerous other publications, Dean Burgon’s work on the last verses of St. Mark, and—as the present writer may be allowed to notice with satisfaction—the Dictionary of Christian Biography now in course of publication, are all familiar to our author; and that this is no ordinary phenomenon is specially noticed by Professor de Lagarde in the review already quoted. “Dr. Zahn,” he says, “is conscientious enough to procure the works of our English fellow-labourers. In particular, I have observed with great satisfaction that reference is made to Burgon’s book on the last twelve verses of St. Mark—a treatise indescribably attractive, overflowing with bright and warm love to the Church and to science, but of course unknown in Germany”—*in Deutschland selbstverständlich unbekannt*. Professor de Lagarde’s opinion of the degree of acquaintance with the results of English scholarship ordinarily possessed by German writers is none too severe. In but few, for instance, of the many German handbooks on Church history, which always in an introductory chapter give a minute account of previous Church histories, is any notice taken of Milman’s great work, or of that of the late Canon Robertson. In the last we have seen, a second edition published this year of a very good handbook by the moderate Roman Catholic historian Professor Kraus of Strasburg, it is actually stated that no comprehensive English work on Church history has been published since that of Milner. All that he knows of Milman is a French translation of his

history of the first four centuries. Even in the last edition of the admirable Lehrbuch of Dr. Karl Hase there is a similar disregard of English works on Church history since Milner. This neglect of the work of great English scholars is really unworthy of a nation so justly proud of their thorough and comprehensive learning as the Germans, and we welcome in Dr. Zahn a singular exception to the rule. The special characteristics of English and German scholarship are eminently qualified to supplement and assist each other, and perhaps it is by a combination of the two that the great critical problems which engage attention at the present day are destined to be solved.

HENRY WACE.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

IN an article on *Christ's Use of Scripture*,¹ the present writer referred to the fact of entire passages in the three Synoptic Gospels being almost, though not quite, identical; and he advanced the opinion,—which is by no means new,—that these are extracts from an original Gospel, now lost, which was probably written in the vernacular Hebrew of the time.

One of the most remarkable of these is the account of the Temptation of our Lord. This is given by both Matthew (iv. 1-11) and Luke (iv. 1-13) in nearly the same words, but with one important difference. That difference is the order in which the temptations are arranged by the two Evangelists. They agree in placing first the temptation to use the miraculous power which Christ possessed, for the purpose of supplying his natural human hunger; but Matthew places last the temptation to purchase dominion over the world by doing homage to Satan; while Luke places last the temptation to prove the reality of his Messiahship by

¹ See pp. 101 ff.