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 Iṣo’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’iṣo’, 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:

Wêmêsta’lă, daḥmōn emar mattai d’hău lam dethiledh bāh men ruḥā hu dh’qudhăša, kadḥ lă “dhakēl ilīdh (h)wā, w’lā emar hău dethb’ṭen bāh. w’thūbh hău dethiledh bāh, ella lāu menāh.³ Methall’līn gēr t’nān harāṭīqo, wabh’hāi d’bhāh l’mel’t’hā allāhā maqq’phīn līlīdhūthāhā. kēmāth allāh ābhāh ethiledh. ellā nēd’h’un, d’hu kadh hu ēwangelasta l’el emar, d’menāh lam ethiledh iṣo’. d’mēthq’rē m’siḥāh, mabh’h’t’hā l’hōn dēn hāi d’men ruḥā hu dh’qu-dhăša, en gēr men ruḥā hu dh’qudhăša mel’t’hā allāhā, mādhēn ‘bhūdhā hu w’lāu ‘abhōdhā (h)ū. w’thēhde b’hōn harṣīqās daryānō, tubh hāi dethiledh bāh m’bhāṭ’lă l’hāi d’thēladh b’rā dh’bhārken

¹ [See note at the end of this article.—Ed.]
² Mārozāyā apesqōpā daḥl’dhatta dhāṭhōr.
³ Cf. Budge, Book of the Bee, p. 87, 5.
sîmā, en gēr ethiledh bāh, aikan ’thūdhā dh′thūbh tēlādh: t′rēn mādhēn maulādhē l′hadh bātnā sārkā, mādhēn hāi dethiledh bāh, ḥ′lāph hāi dethbaṭṭan bāh sîmā.... ’h′rānē dh′maulādhē lām lakh′thābā h′tayānāiṭh mēthiseph, b′dhuḥk hān a′bhodhūthā; a(i)kh hāi dh′manou auledh nutphāṭā dh′meṭrā wadh′sār. ḥ′lādhk dhēn: m′yaldānūṭhā, t′nān dhēn: ḥ′lāph hāi dhēt′bhēdh sîmā, hāi dhethiledh bāh, h. men ruha dh′qudhūṣā ethg′bhel bāh. ... ’h′rānē, w′bhaṭṇā lām men t′rēn meṣṭāmās, men dekhṛ h′men neq′bthā, w′meṭṭul dhabh′ṭhultā khadh ethbaṭṭnāth, lā ḫeṣṭāth ḫāṣṣa neṣṣāyā, zādhqāṭḥ hāi d′bhāh emar w′lāu hāi d′menāḥ. kēmāth d′menāḥ w′bhāh ethg′bhel balḥādh, w′lāu ḫph men gabṛhā::

’h′rānē dha(i)kh k′yādhā lām ’ebhrāyā sîmā, dh′lā m′pharrēs zabhēnē men ḥ′dhdhēh, ella emar ḥd′baṭṭh hān a(i)kh ḡa′bhar, w′lāh′bhar a(i)kh dh′baṭṭh dhēn, w′lāh′rāhūn a(i)kh d′qā[y]em, w′lāh′nā a(i)kh t′rāhūn, mṛṭṭul ḫnā h′lāph d′nēmar hāū d′mehthehd menāṇā: sām hāi dethiledh bāh:: ḥ′rānē, dh′hāu lām ḡphaṭṣeq men ’ebhrāyā l′suryāyā: ṣahleph., w′sām h′lāph hāi dhethb′ṭen bāh, hāi dhethiledh:: dyāṯāsārōn dhēn āmar, dh′hāu lām dethiledh bāh men rūḥā hu dh′qudhūṣā, mēl′thā dh′lait ’lē(i)h puṣṣākhā, w′sākhā, w′maulādhē dh′bhāh, lān′sībūṭhā w′gh′bhūṭhā dh′hāu bārmāṣā qāre, dhabh′ghau marb′ā menāḥ ethp′reṣ, ṣphēn “dhakhīlē lā ilīdh (h)wā::

I refrain from taking up the space of this JOURNAL by translating the whole passage. It contains a resume of different answers given to the question, why the word etzziledh is used in place of ethbe/en. 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. i he says : Bēth pāḡē dēnːː nāśn palṣath ṣrḥāṭh phāṭṣeq(u). ’h′rānē; r′bh′ath ṣbhīlē. ’h′rānē, bēth pāḡē dēn. h. bēth te’nē phakkhiṭhā w′maitēn saḥdūthā men dyāṭāsārōn, w′men pārṣagānā yamāyā, b′ṣarbā dh′zakkāyōnā hau z′ṭ or b′qamṭhā paghrānāiṭ kēṭh w′ruḥnāiṭ. s′lēq lām l′pāḡē dh′neḥze li′ṣō. hai dhabh′suryāyā thēṭṭā pakkīṭhā. ḳ translate as follows : Bēth pāḡē, some translate “dividing of the roads,”4 others “four fold way.” Others, bēth pāḡē 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 pāḡē 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.” 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 bê khadh bê bhêhaila allahayâ kâtheb hâ nuhâhârâ dh'êrê'yânê 'aqêhdh'wângâlibon d'mârqsos:: qadhmâyâth e'llâthâ dh'kâthbbêh lêwângâlion. mattai w'yôhanân men tre'sar (h)wau. w'mârqsos dên w'ilùqâ men sahbîn. têtyânos dên talmidheh dh'êröstinos pilisôphâ w'sâhđâ. gabbî men arb'âthaïhôn ewangelastê, w'hallef w'säm ewangelion. waq'râi(hi) d'ya'tâsârôn, h. dam'hâll'té, w'al allâhûteh dham'êsîhâ là akhtebeh, wâl'hânâ phâshqêqêm mâr(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 Šalibi (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 nusara, which Zahn (loc. laud. p. 46) traces back to Efraim's commentary on the Diatessaron, is found again in the commentary of Išô'dad to Matthew ii. 23.6 ba(r)th qâlâ hâdhâ dh'nâshrajê neteq're. lait bakhôthâbêh b'tâbb'hâ w'galyâ (h)i dh'men kul p'rôs amîra ; wellâ aîkan methhašâh (h)wâ b'hâh ewanglâstâ a(i)kh dâph b'sâh'dwâthâ h'rânyâthâ dh'mâite men k'tôbbêh, b'tam k'tôbbêh saggê'ebhadh(u) b'seb'hê m'sâh'l'hê, w'ghâd'hâsâ dâph'h hâdhâ 'amhôn ethâbb'lath. ewangalâstâ d'hên men tâibûthâ dh'ruhâ yadh'hâh w'sâmâb:: tübh nurbâ bh'ebhrâyâ. nesôr methq're. wethqaryâth q'rîthâ nàsrâth. h. nurbâ bai gêr dêša'yâ dh'nâphrâ lam nurbâ men 'eqârech. bh'ebhrâyâ. nesôr k'tôb'hâ. dh'methpaššaq hadlîthâ. w'nâsrâth h'dh'ñata. w'nâsrâyûthâ hadlîthûthâ. lau metțul d'hadlîthâ (h)u yulpânèh dham'êsîhâ : 'al hâdhê q'rîthêh n'bhiyûthâ bhaš'mâ hânâ. ella metțul dh'hadlîthûthâ

6 [Συκομορέα (codd. -μωρεά), Lu. xix. 4, so rendered in Peshitto by a popular etymology.]
6 Cf. also BB. as cited in Payne Smith, s.v. col. 2444.
GOTTHEIL: QUOTATIONS FROM THE DIATESSARON.

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.

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 Hebraeus 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.