

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.¹ In the MS. of the Commentary of Išo'dad,² 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'išō', 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 :

W^emešta'lā, dhal^mmōn emar mattai d^hhāu lam dethiledh bāh men ruḥā hu dh^qqudhšā, kadh lā ^edhakēl ilidh (h)wā, w^elā emar hāu dethb^tten bāh. w^ethūbh hāu dethiledh bāh, ellā lāu menāh.³ Methall^elin gēr tⁿnān harāṭiqo, wabh^hhāi d^bbhāh l^mmell^tthā allāhā maqq^phīn lilidhūthāh. kēmāth allāh ābhāh ethiledh. ellā nedh^uun, d^hhu kadh hu ēwangelastā l^eel emar, d^mmenāh lam ethiledh išō' d^mmethq^rrē m^ssiḥā, mabh^hthā l^hhōn dēn hāi d^mmen rūḥā hu dh^qqudhšā, en gēr men ruḥā hu dh^qqudhšā mell^tthā allāhā, mādhen ^ebhidhā hu w^elāu ābhōdhā (h)u. w^etheḥde b^hhōn harsiyās daryānō, tubh hāi dethiledh bāh m^bbhaṭṭ^elā l^hhāi d^tthēladh b^rrā dh^bbhārken

¹ [See note at the end of this article. — ED.]

² Mārozāyā apesqōpā dhah^edhatta dhāthōr.

³ Cf. Budge, *Book of the Bee*, p. 87, 5.

sīmā, en gēr ethiledh bāh, aikan 'ethīdhā dh'thūbh tēladh : t'rēn mādhen maulādhē l'hadh baṭnā šārkā, mādhen hāi dethiledh bāh, ḥ'lāph hāi dethbaṭtan bāh sīmā. . . ḥ'rānē dh'maulādhā lam lakh'thābhā t'rayānāith methīseph, b'dhukh man 'abhodhūthā ; ā(i)kh hāi dh'manou auledh nuṭphāthā dh'metrā wadh'ešār. b'dhukh dēn : m'yaldānūthā, t'nān dēn : ḥ'lāph hāi dhet'ebhedh sīmā, hāi dhethiledh bāh, h. men ruha dh'qudhšā ethg'bhel bāh. . . ḥ'rānē, w'bhāṭnā lam men t'rēn meštammaš, men dekhrā w'men neqb'thā, w'meṭṭul dabh'thultā khadh ethbaṭt'nath, lā ḥeššath ḥašša nešāyā, zādhqāith hāi d'bhāh emar w'lāu hāi d'menāh. kēmāth d'menāh w'bhāh ethg'bhel balḥōdh, w'lāu āph men gabhrā:.

ḥ'rānē dhā(i)kh 'eyādhā lam 'ebhrāyā sīmā, dh'lā m'pharreš zabhnē men ḥ'dhādhē, ella emar l'dha'thīdh ā(i)kh da'bhar, wal'dha'bhar ā(i)kh dha'thīdh, w'lath'raihōn ā(i)kh d'qā[y]em, wal'hānā ā(i)kh t'raihōn, meṭṭul hānā ḥ'lāph d'nēmar hāu d'methiledh menāh : sām hāi dethiledh bāh: ḥ'rānē, dh'hau lam d'phaššeq men 'ebhrāyā l'suryāyā : šaḥleph., w'sām ḥ'lāph hāi dhethb'ṭen bāh, hāi dethiledh: dyātāsārōn dēn āmar, d'hau lam dethiledh bāh men rūḥā hu dh'qudhšā, mell'thā dh'lait 'elē(i)h puššākhā, w'sākhā, w'maulādhā dh'bhāh, lan'sībhūthā w'gh'bhilūthā dh'hau barnāšā qāre, dhabh'ghau marb'ā menāh ethp'reš, āphen 'dhakhēl lā ilidh (h)wā:.

I refrain from taking up the space of this JOURNAL by translating the whole passage. It contains a resumé of different answers given to the question, why the word *ethiledh* is used in place of *ethb'ṭen*. 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 pāghē dhēn: nāšīn palšath 'urhāthā phaššeq(u). ḥ'rānē ; r'bhā'ath š'bhilē. ḥ'rānē, beth pāghē dhēn. h. bēth te'nē phakkīhāthā w'maitēn sahdūthā men dyātāsārōn, w'men paršagnā yaunāyā, b'šarbā dh'zakkāyōnā hau z'ōr b'qaumthā paghrānāitā kēth w'rūḥānāitā. s'leq lam l'phāghē dh'nehze lišō'. hai dhabh'suryāyā thēttā pakkīhtā. I translate as follows: *Bēth pāghē*, some translate "dividing of the roads,"⁴ others "four fold way." Others, *bēth pāghē* 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 *phāghe* in order that he might see

⁴ Cf. Bar Ali in Payne Smith, s.v. col. 493.

Jesus, that (tree) which in Syriac is called "insipid fig tree."⁵ Bar 'Ebhryā (ed. Spanuth, p. 45, 20) has almost the same words, without, however, the reference to the Diatessaron.

The commentary on Mark commences as follows: tūbh bē khadh bē bh'haila allāhāyā kātheb 'nā nuhhārā dh're'yānē 'asqē dh'wāngalion d'mārḡos.· qadhmāyath 'ell'thā dh'kathbēh lēwāngalion. mattai w'yōhanān men tre'sar (h)wau. w'mārḡos dēn w'lūqā men šabh'in. ṭeṭyānos dēn talmīdhēh dh'yostinos pilisōphā w'sāhdā. gabbi men arb'āthaihōn ewangelastē, w'hallet' w'sām ewangalion. waq'rāi(hi) d'yāṭāsārōn, ḥ. dam'hall'ṭē, w'al allāhūtheh dham'sīhā lā akhteḥ, wal'hānā phašš'qēh mār(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 Mār(i) Afrim commentated."

This quotation is found again, in almost the same words, in the commentary of Dionysius bar Ṣalibi (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 *nuṣārā*, 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 qālā hādhē dh'nāšrāyā nethq'rē. lait bakh'tābhē b'ṭabh'ā w'galyā (h)i dh'men kul p'rōs amīra; wellā aikan methḥaššāḥ (h)wā bhāh ewang'lastā a(i)kh dāph b'sāhdwāthā 'h'rānyāthā dh'maite men k'thābhē, b'ram k'thābhē saggiē 'ebhadh(u) b'šebhyē m'sahl'phē, w'ghādhšā dhāph hādhē 'amhōn ethḥabb'lath. ewangalastā dhēn men ṭaibūthā dh'rūhā yadh'āh w'sāmāh.· tubh nurbā bh'ebhryā. nešōr methq'rē. wethqaryath q'rīthā nāšrāth. ḥ. nurbā. hai gēr deša'yā dh'naphra' lam nurbā men 'eqāreḥ. bh'ebhryā. nešōr k'thībhā. dh'methpaššaq ḥadhthā. w'nāšrāth ḥ'dhatā, w'nāšrāyūthā ḥadhthūthā. lau meṭṭul d'ḥadhthā (h)u yulpānēh dham'sīhā : 'al hādhē q'rātheh n'bhiyūthā bhaš'mā hānā. ellā meṭṭul dh'ḥadhthāiṭh

⁵ [Συκομῆρα (codd. -μυρεα), Lu. xix. 4, so rendered in Peshitto by a popular etymology.]

⁶ Cf. also BB. as cited in Payne Smith, s.v. col. 2444.

*thīdh (h)wā dh°nethbarnaš allāhā wadh°nethallāh bharnāšā dhethiledh d°lā zuwwāghā. nāšrāyā °ebhrāith nurbā. wan°bhiyā qārē l°māran. yaldā. a(i)kh man d°nurbā yaldā (h)u dhilānā wadh°šarkā.·. men nuhhārā dh°bhar bahriz.⁷ nurbā nāsar. nāšrāth nurbaitā. nāšrāyā nurbāyā. nāšrāyūthā nurbāyūthā. hākhān gēr °amar °ebhrāyā. hai d°naphra° deša°yā. w°nāšār men šeršau(hi).

With this compare Bar °Ebhṛāya, 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.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, N.Y.

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.