Quotations from the Diatessaron.

PROF. R. J. H. GOTTHEIL

In the last issue of this Journal (Vol. X., p. 153), my friend, Prof. Isaac H. Hall, has a short note on "A Pair of Citations from the Diatessaron." He will allow me to remark here that his attention was originally called to both quotations by myself—which, I am sure, he would have mentioned had not the fact for a moment slipped his memory. In the MS. of the Commentary of Isod'ad, I have found four different references to the Diatessaron. The MSS., which belong to the Lane Theological Seminary, are of the years 1990 and 2000 of the Greek era, respectively. In one of the MSS. the name of the author is given as Dad'isö', probably through confusion with another commentator of that name (B.O. III., p. 214). Other copies of this commentary exist in the Bodleian Library (where it was not recognized by Payne Smith, Catalogue, col. 419), in Berlin (Sachau, Kurzes Verzeichniss, No. 311), and in Cambridge University Library (Wright, Syriac Lit., p. 848).

In addition to the extract in this Journal, Vol. X., p. 153, I have the following three. I have transcribed the text in a manner intelligible to every student.

On Matthew i. 20:

Wemêstalâä, dhal'mon emar mattal d'hâu lam dethiledh bâh men ruhâ hu dh'qudhâsâ, kadh lâ "dhakel ilidh (h)wâ, w'lâ emar hâu dethb'ten bâh. w'thûbh hâu dethiledh bâh, ellâ lû menâh. Methall'lin gër t'nân harêtiqo, wabh'hâi d'bhâh l'mell'thâ allâhâ maqq'phin lîhîdhûtâhâ. kêmâth allâh êbbâh ethiledh. ellâ nedh'un, d'hu kadh hu ewangelastâ l'el emar, d'menâh lam ethiledh i'sô' d'mêthq'të m'sîhâ, mabh'thâ l'hôn dên hâi d'men ruhâ hu dh'qudhsâ, en gër men ruhâ hu dh'qudhâsâ mell'thâ allâhâ, mâdhën "bhîdhâ hu w'lâu 'âbhôdhâ (h)u. w'the'hde b'hôn harsiyâs dârûnö, tubh hâi dethiledh bâh m'bha'tlä l'hâi d'thêladh b'tâ dh'bîrken

1 [See note at the end of this article.—Ed.]
2 Mârozâyâ apesqôpâ dhahet'dhata dhêthôr.
3 Cf. Budge, Book of the Bee, p. 87, 5.
sīmā, en gēr ethiledh bāh, aikan "thīdhā dh'ṭhūbh tēlādh: t'ṛēn mādhēn maulādhē ṭḥadh baṭnā šārkā, mādhēn hai dethilehd bāh, ḥ'ḷāph hāi dethbatṭān bāh sīmā. ..."ḥrānē dh'maulādhā lam lakh-phābhā t'ṛayānāith methiṣeph, ḏ'vduhkuh man 'abḥodhūṭhā; ā(i)kh hāi dh'manou auledh nutphāṭhā dh'meṭrā wadh'ṛā. ḏ'vduhkh dēn: m'yaldaṇūṭhā, t'ṇān dēn: ḥ'ḷāph hāi dhet'bhēd sīmā, hāi dhethilehd bāh, ĥ. men ruha dh'ṛuqdhaṭhā ethg'bhel bāh. ..."ḥrānē, w'bhāṭnā lam men t'ṛēn meştammā, men dekhrā w'men neqḍ'ṭhā, w'meṭtūl dabh'ṭhultā khadh ethbatṭ'nath, lā ḥeṣṣath ḥaṣṣa neṣṣyā, zādhqāīth hāi d'bhāḥ emar w'ḷāu hāi d'menāḥ. kēmāth d'menāḥ w'bhāḥ ethg'bhel balḥōdh, w'ḷāu āph men gabhrā::

"ḥrānē dhā(i)kh 'yādhā lam 'ebhrāyā sīmā, dh'lā m'pharreš zabnē men ḥ'ḍhāḍhē, ella emar ḥ'ḍhātiḥdā ā(i)kh ḏa'dbhar, w'ḍḥa'b'ḥar ā(i)kh ḥaṭ'ḥiḥdā, ḡ'wāeth'rniḥo ā(i)kh ḍ'qā[y]em, ḡ'wānā ā(i)kh t'ṛaiḥon, metṭūl hānā ḥ'ḷāph d'nēmar hāu d'meṭhilehd menāḥ: sām hāi dethilehd bāh:: "ḥrānē, ḍ'ḥau lam ḍ'phaṣṣeq men 'ebhrāyā l'suryāyā: ṣaḥleph., w'sām ḥ'ḷāph hāi dhethb'ṭēn bāh, hāi dethilehd:: dyāṭāsārōn dēn āmar, ḍ'ḥau lam dethilehd bāh men rūhā hu ḍ'ṛuqḍhā, meṭ'ṭhā dh'laṭ (i)ḥ puśśakhir, ṭ'maktā, ḡ'maulādhā dh'bhāḥ, lan'sibhūṭhā ḡ'gh'bhilūṭhā ḍ'ḥau barnāṣā qāre, dhabh'g'haub marb'ā menāḥ ethp'ṛēṣ, āphēn "ḍhakhēl lā iliḍh (h)wā::

I refrain from taking up the space of this Jōrnāl by translating the whole passage. It contains a resume of different answers given to the question, why the word ethiiledh is used in place of ethb'ṭēn. Towards the end we read, “The Diatessaron says: This one who is born in her is from the Holy Spirit, a word without doubt, etc. The 'birth in her' he calls the conception and formation of that man who in her womb was elected, though he was not yet born.”

In his commentary on Matthew xxi. 1 he says: Bēth pāgēh dhēn::. nāsin paḷśath 'urṛḥaṭhā phaṣṣeq(u). ā(i)kh dh'ḥuṭhā ṭ'ḥuṭhā ṭ'ḥuṭhā. ā(i)kh, bēth pāgēh dhēn. ĥ. bēth te'nē phakkhiḥāṭhā w'maitēn sahdūṭhā men dyāṭāsārōn, w'men paṛṣagnā yaunāyā, b'ṣarbā dh'zakkāyōnā hau z'ōr b'quaṃṭhā paghrāṇāṭa kēth w'rūḥānāīṭa. s'leq lam ṭ'phāgēh dh'neḥze līsō. hai dhabh'suryāyā thēttā pakkihtā. I translate as follows: Bēth pāgēh, some translate “dividing of the roads,” others “four fold way.” Others, bēth pāgēh is equivalent to “the place of insipid figs.” They adduce testimony from the Diatessaron and from the Greek copy in the story of that Zaccheus, small spiritually and physically. He climbed the ḫaghe in order that he might see

Jesus, that (tree) which in Syriac is called "insipid fig tree." Bar 'Ebhraya (ed. Spanuth, p. 45, 20) has almost the same words, without, however, the reference to the Diatessaron.

The commentary on Mark commences as follows: tübh be khadh be bh’haila allâhâyä kâtheb ʾnâ nuhhuârâ dh’kor’yañe ʾasqê dh’wângalîon d’mârqos: qadhamâyath ʾell’thä dh’kathbêh lêwangalîon. mattai w’yoḥanan men tre’ser (h)wa. w’mârqos dën w’lûqä men ʾsbh’in. teṭŷano dën talmidhêh dh’yostinos pilîsophâ w’sâhî. gabbi men arb’âthaibôn ewangelastë, w’hallef w’sâm ewangalîon. waq’râi(hi) d’yaṭasårôn, h. dam’hall’tê, w*al allâhûtheh dham*šiḥa lâ akhtub, w’l’hânä phâsh’qeḥ mär(i) Aphrim; i.e.:”

“Again, with the help of God, I write an explanation of the difficult ideas of the Evangelium of Mark. First, reason of his writing the Evangelium. Matthew and John were of the twelve; Mark and Luke of the seventy. Tatian, disciple of Justin the Philosopher and Martyr, selected from the four Evangelists, and combined [them] and composed [one] Evangelium. He called it Diatessaron, i.e. Composite. In regard to the Divinity of the Messiah he did not write. This Mâr(i) Afrim commentated.”

This quotation is found again, in almost the same words, in the commentary of Dionysius bar Şalibi (Wright, Syr. Lit., p. 851 a), who was created Bishop of Mar’ash in the year 1145 (B.O. II., p. 159), and that, too, in the preface to his commentary on Mark (Zahn, Forschungen, I., p. 44). It may also be worth while to note that the quotation on the margin of a MS. of the seventh century on the word nuṣārâ, which Zahn (loc. laud. p. 46) traces back to Efraim’s commentary on the Diatessaron, is found again in the commentary of Išo’dad to Matthew ii. 23: 6 ba(r)th qaḷâ hâdhê dh’nâṣrâyä nethq*rê. laît bakh’tâbbhê b’tabh’â w*galyä (h)i dh’men kul p’rös amira; wellä aikan methhâssâsh (h) wâ bhûh ewang’lastä a(i)kh dâph b’sâhîwâthä h’ránýâthä dh’tûmaite men k’thâbbhê, b’ram k’tâbbhê saggîq’ebhadh(u) b’sebhyê m*sahl’phê, w’ghâdhshä dhûph hâdhê ‘amhôn ethhâbb’lath. ewangalastä dhûn men tâbûthä dh’rûhûh yadh’hâh w’šâmâh: tübh nurbä bh’ehbrâyä. n’esôr methq’rê. wethqaryath q’rîthä nâsrâth. h. nurbä. hai gér dëṣa’yä dh’naphra’ lam nurbä men ʾeqâreḥ. bh’ehbrâyä. n’esôr k’tibhâh. dh’methpâssäq hadnîthä. w’nâṣrât h’dhatä, w’nâṣrâyû-thä hadnîthûthä. lau metṭul d’hadthûthä (h)u yulpâneh dham’šiḥâ: ’al hâdhê q’râtheh n’bhiyûtä bhaš’mâ hânä. ellä metṭul dh’hadthûthâh

6 [Συμωρέα (codd. -μωρεα), Lu. xix. 4, so rendered in Peshitto by a popular etymology.]
6 Cf. also BB. as cited in Payne Smith, s.v. col. 2444.
"thidh (h)wā dh*nethbaraš allāhā wadh*nethallāh bharnāśa dhethiledh d′lā zuwwāghā. nāṣrāyā 'ebhrāith nurbā. wan*bhiyā qārē l*māran. yaldā. a(i)kh man d*nurbā yaldā (h)u dhilānā wadh*šarkā-. men nuhhārā dh*bhar bahrīz. nurbā nāsar. nāṣrāth nurbaitā. nāṣrāyā nurbāyā. nāṣrāyūthā nurbāyūthā. hākhan ġer āmar 'ebhrāyā. hai d*naphra' deša'yā. w*nāsār men šeršau(hi).

With this compare Bar 'Ebhraya, ed. Spanuth, p. 7, 20.

There is also a notice of the Diatessaron, coming from the same time, in the Glosses of Bar Ali. See Payne Smith, col. 869, s.v.

Perhaps in the future we shall be more fortunate, and not have to depend upon such chance and stray quotations. I am privately informed of the existence of a complete copy of the Syriac Diatessaron. How true the report is we shall see in the future.

7 B.O. III., i., p. 173².
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NOTE BY PROFESSOR HALL.

Professor Gottheil is mistaken in thinking that he first called my attention to the quotations from the Diatessaron which I published in the JOURNAL for 1891 (pp. 153-155). The reference in Bar Hebræus on Matthew (ed. Spanuth, p. 8) I had been acquainted with for several years, having come across it while working on the Williams manuscript in 1884 or 1885. As regards the passage in the Commentary of Isho'dad, I was indebted to Professor Gottheil, not for my knowledge of its existence, — of which I was previously aware, — but for showing it to me and letting me read it in a manuscript then in his hands. I did not imagine any claim of priority of discovery; and in printing the extract afterward from a manuscript in my own possession, it did not occur to me that an acknowledgment was due him. — ISAAC H. HALL.