

earliest evidence we possess of a literary use of St Benedict's Rule.¹ The probable date of the composition of the Rule lies between 520 and 540; it is interesting to find that by 560 and 570 copies had penetrated to southern Gaul and north-western Spain. But it is not until a considerably later date that there is evidence of its being in use in either country as the rule of life of any monastery.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

A SIDE-LIGHT ON THE METHODS OF TATIAN.

IN St Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron (Moesinger, pp. 140-147) the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman (Jn. iv) is followed by the cleansing of the leper in Galilee (Mt. viii 2-4; Mk. i 40-45; Lk. v 12-16). Then comes the healing of the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem (Jn. v). This order is also found

caritatis, ne novum aliquod forte scandalum surgentes inducant. Dicit enim Scriptura: *Quicquid tibi non vis, alii non feceris.*

Cf. B. 61: Caveat abbas ne aliquando iam de alio noto monasterio monachum ad habitandum suscipiat sine consensu abbatis eius aut literis commendatitiis; quia scriptum est: *Quod tibi non vis fieri, alio non feceris.*

On this text see Note in *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1910, p. 283; the significant point here is its use in the two Rules in illustration of the same context.

(2) F. 37, of the abbot: *faciens se ab omnibus, eo quod vitia oderit, plus amari.*

This seems to be made up of the two pieces of advice which St Benedict gives to the abbot in c. 64 'Oderit vitia, diligit fratres'; and 'studeat plus amari quam timeri';—which are themselves taken verbally from different places in St Augustine.

(3) In the chapter on silence (F. 29) the same two texts are used as by St Benedict in the Ninth Degree of Humility.

The Rule of Ferreolus is fundamentally one of the Lerins series, being based on those of Caesarius and Aurelian; but it is considerably enlarged, and the above points of contact with St Benedict were introduced by him. I think they prove that he knew St Benedict's Rule.

¹ Here again I have to differ from Dom Besse, and even from Mabillon (*op. cit.* p. 56): I see nothing in the Rule of Aurelian c. 550 (*Cod. Regularum*) that suggests an acquaintance with that of St Benedict. On the other hand (once more against Besse, p. 55), I believe that St Benedict knew, and in places used, the Rules of Caesarius; but any discussion must stand over till my edition of the *Regula*, with the Sources, is published.

Dom Chapman has directed my attention to c. xxvii of the *Vita Fulgentii Ruspensis* (*P. L.* 65, 143), written, perhaps by Ferrandus the Deacon, at any rate within a few years of Fulgentius's death, 533. He raises the question whether certain turns of expression in this passage, describing St Fulgentius as abbot of his monastery, do not bespeak an acquaintance with St Benedict's Rule. The words 'ut neminem puro nomine clamitaret' do recall St Benedict's 'puro appellare nomine' (c. 63); but they hardly justify any definite conclusion. The other resemblances are vague and doubtful.

in the Arabic Diatessaron. Ephraim's remarks on the second of these miracles contain nothing, taken by themselves, which leads us to suspect that in the text on which he is commenting any other Gospel incident has been identified or combined with the account given in Jn. v. The only points which attract attention are (1) that his copy of the Diatessaron contained the verse which tells of the moving of the water by an angel, and (2) that in quoting our Lord's words to the infirm man he seems to confuse them with those addressed to the paralytic at Capernaum (Mt. ix 6; Mk. ii 11; Lk. v 11). He cites the words thus (Moes. p. 146): 'Surge, tolle grabbatum tuum et *vade*': 'Sta in pedibus, sume grabbatum tuum, et *vade in domum tuam*': 'Is qui me sanavit, dixit mihi: Surge, tolle lectum tuum et *vade*.'

It may be added that the Curetonian MS of the Old Syriac version has similarly at Jn. v 8, 'Arise, take up thy bed, and walk (and) *go to thy house*'. But here, again, we seem to have a mere reminiscence of the words spoken to the paralytic. On such slender evidence we should not be justified in invoking the Diatessaron, and supposing that Tatian was bold enough to identify the paralytic of Capernaum with the infirm man at Bethesda, and to combine the two accounts. Yet it appears that this is precisely what Tatian did do.

In the *J. T. S.* of July 1907 (vol. viii pp. 581 ff) I pointed out that Jacob of Serûgh († 521) sometimes made use of Tatian's Harmony, and apparently followed its order in a series of Homilies on the passion. Now in Bedjan's edition of the Homilies of Jacob there is one entitled 'On that paralytic of thirty-eight years whom our Lord healed' (vol. iv pp. 701-724). The author begins by picturing the plight of the world, sick with sin and waiting to be healed by the waters of baptism. It resembles the 'paralytic' who was waiting for the moving of the waters at Bethesda. I proceed to give in his own words an outline of Jacob's treatment of this miracle.

(p. 703) "The world resembled that sick man, who was paralysed by the sickness of which he was ailing: thirty-eight years had he been afflicted on the bed of disease, and then he was healed of his sickness. (p. 704) For he also was waiting for the moving of the waters . . . and to Siloam he had recourse and took refuge, that it might heal his disease . . . And he was waiting for the moving of the waters, that by it he might be made sound (ܕܝܫܘܥ) . . .

The waters were moved with a mystery of Baptism; and the first disease which went down was healed. The diseases of the world were surrounding that House of Kindness (*Bêth Hēsâ*), and waiting for the moving of the waters to make them whole. (p. 705) The diseased were many that were to be healed by Siloam; and each disease was healed only at a long interval. The ailments and diseases were round

about the baptism, that when the angel moved the waters they might be made whole . . . By an angel the waters were moved there; and the first who went down and bathed was healed . . .

(p. 708) He (Jesus) took away the mystery from Siloam, that it should heal no more . . . He saw the sick lying in that House of Kindness (*Bêth Hēsââ*), and waiting for the moving of the waters to heal them . . . He saw the paralytic, whose diseases had vexed him a great while; and He drew near to him to speak to him gently . . . He drew near to him then, and He asks him: 'If thou wouldst become whole (ܐܘܠܐܢ ܫܘܝܬܐ), hide it not from me' . . . (p. 709) 'Lord, I have no man to raise me up over the spring and, when the waters have moved, to throw me (ܐܘܠܐܢ ܫܘܝܬܐ¹) into it, that I may be healed. My limbs are paralysed, and to approach and push my way I am not able; and care-takers (ܢܩܝܒܐ ܕܚܝܠܐ) are not found for me to stand up on my behalf.' . . .

(p. 710) He drew near to him, and asks him, as ye have heard, if he would become whole (ܐܘܠܐܢ ܫܘܝܬܐ) of his sickness . . . 'If thou wouldst become whole, thou canst²: Thy sins are the cause of thy diseases, and they are forgiven thee (Mt. ix 2, and parallels). Arise, be made sound (ܐܘܠܐܢ ܫܘܝܬܐ) of thy disease which ails thee: lo, I have given thee the power. Thy sins are forgiven: give thy consent to the healing.' (p. 711) Albeit (these words) were spoken to the paralytic alone, (yet) the whole world received tidings of its healing . . . 'With the cord of debts thou art tied, O man, and I loose thee. I ask of thee only that thou will, and I will heal thee . . . If thou wouldst become whole (ܐܘܠܐܢ ܫܘܝܬܐ), there is a means: thy debts are forgiven: do not resist me as to thy healing.' . . .

(p. 712) He was asking him: 'If,' said He, 'thou wouldst, thou art healed . . . If thou wouldst become whole, thou canst . . . If thou wouldst, healing also is given thee.' . . .

(p. 716) Our Lord says: 'Thy debts are forgiven, my son, be of good heart' (cf. Mt. ix 3) . . . The head and chief of physicians visited the paralytic, and forgiveness of debts He held out (and) gave to him with healing. In the beginning of His healing He first visited that festering sea of sins; for it is the cause of all diseases . . . 'Thy debts are forgiven,' He said to him that was paralysed . . . Sins He forgave him, from which also the sickness was sprung, that by forgiveness he might be made sound (ܐܘܠܐܢ ܫܘܝܬܐ) before the healing. (p. 717) The Good Physician bound up the soul before the body, that it first might become whole which was (first) sick . . . 'Be of good heart, thy debts are forgiven' (Mt. ix 3), He was saying to him; and they that

¹ Lit. 'That they should throw me.'

² Thus far Jn. v 1-7: except that the sick man is called a 'paralytic'.

heard doubted of His forgiveness. The people saw Him, that He drew near to him that was paralysed; and the multitudes thronged to look upon Him, what He would do. It was the festival that assembled the people to Siloam, and a holy day, on which every one is idle from work. And as the crowds were thronging each other to look upon Him (cf. Mk. ii 2), every man's ear was bent to hear what He would say to him; (p. 718) and the priests were filled with envy and rage at His healing, and the scribes were making an uproar with their arguments to snare Him; and they were blaming Him because that He had promised forgiveness of sins, (saying); 'Who is this that lo, He boasts of that which is not His? It is God's alone,' say they, 'to forgive sins (Mk. ii 8, Lk. v 21): why does this man promise to forgive, whereas he is not able?' . . . They confessed 'that He who forgives is also God; and seeing that our Lord forgave sins, it is manifest that He is God . . . He promised to forgive sins to him that was paralysed; and the scribes objected against Him, that He is not God, neither does He forgive. And that He might shew them that He is both a forgiver and God, He wrought an open sign before them and put them to shame. He saw their mind (Mt. ix 4, and parallels), that it was doubting concerning the forgiveness . . .

(p. 719) 'O ye gainsayers, who have denied the truth with your questionings, whether is easier, that I should forgive debts, or that I should heal? I have authority both to forgive and to heal' (cf. Mt. ix 5-6, and parallels) . . . Our Lord said to him: 'Take up, O man, thy bed and walk.' . . . The voice of the Son stimulated the paralytic, and he left his sufferings, and freed of disease he took up his bed to walk. And the man of sufferings was made sound (ⲓⲁⲗⲏ), (and) arose . . . and without pain he was going about among the multitudes. . . .

(p. 720) The festival was made great by a new sign, full of wonder; and the multitudes were thronging to look upon him that was healed . . . They (the scribes) saw that the paralytic was carrying his bed among the multitudes; and they drew near and were blaming and reviling him with their blasphemies: 'Why dost thou carry thy bed on the Sabbath?' They were saying to him: 'Let not the holy day be abused by thy work.' . . . (p. 721) 'It is not lawful for thee to take up thy bed' (Jn. v 10), they were saying to him. And he turned to answer them gently: 'He that commanded the disease and it fled from my limbs, He also commanded me, and I have taken up my bed to walk. . . . The diseases of my limbs were not keeping Sabbath, and how do ye force me to keep it?' . . .

(p. 722) Jesus triumphed both by forgiveness and by healing; for the open sign proclaimed among the multitudes that He is the Son of

God. It shewed that He is Lord of the Sabbath and of Siloam, and that He has authority to forgive sins, likewise to heal."

Follows an exhortation to sinners to receive health from the Divine Physician.

It is perfectly plain that Jacob of Serûgh identified the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum with that of the infirm man at Bethesda; and there can be no reasonable doubt that he did so on the authority of the Diatessaron. We have seen that St Ephraim's commentary and the Arabic Diatessaron place the miracle of Bethesda immediately after the cleansing of the leper (Mt. viii, Mk. i, Lk. v). This is the very place where the healing of the paralytic comes in St Mark and St Luke. When, therefore, St Ephraim represents our Lord as saying to the infirm man, 'vade in domum tuam', it would now appear that these words are not a mere accidental reminiscence of Mk. ii 11, Lk. v 24, Mt. ix 6, but an actual survival of the account of the healing of the paralytic, which is here in its natural place, but has been mixed up with and partly displaced by another narrative. In other words, the phrase 'vade in domum tuam' is due not to St Ephraim but to the Diatessaron. And the addition in the Curetonian MS, 'arise, take up thy bed, and walk (and) go to thy house', probably had the same origin. In both the Arabic Diatessaron and Victor of Capua's Harmony (*Codex Fuldensis*) the account of the paralytic has been disengaged from that of the man at Bethesda, and given earlier (though not in the same setting). Ephraim does not comment on the healing of the paralytic as an independent incident.

One or two peculiarities which are shared by Jacob and St Ephraim may be noticed.

(1) Jacob makes the name of the pond Siloam (he uses *Bêth Hēsâ*, 'House of Kindness', rather as an epithet than a proper name). So Ephraim (Moes. p. 146): 'Si enim credunt, per aquam Siloe angelum sanasse infirmum,' &c. (cf. Jn. ix 7, 11).

(2) Jacob (Bedjan, p. 709), after quoting: 'Lord, I have no man,' &c., goes on: 'My limbs are paralysed, and to approach and push my way I am not able, and care-takers (مقدمات) are not found for me.' The expression 'care-takers' here, though somewhat peculiar, would scarcely deserve remark, were it not that St Ephraim (Moes. p. 146) actually quotes: 'Non est mihi adiutor': where Dr J. Armitage Robinson renders the Armenian, 'I have no guardian'.¹ I think it very probable that Jacob has given us the actual Syriac expression used by St Ephraim, and that the Diatessaron had ܘܠܐ ܘܢܐܘܢܐ ܘܢܐܘܢܐ, 'I have no care-taker'.

¹ Cf. Hamlyn Hill *Earliest Life of Christ* p. 355.

This Homily of Jacob of Serugh is of importance in two respects: it shews the freedom with which Tatian sometimes handled the Gospel narratives; and it suggests considerable caution in the use of the Arabic version. The Syriac recension from which that version was made was evidently one in which the original Harmony had received a certain amount of castigation other than merely textual. In the present case a narrative in which two Gospel incidents were combined has been rejected, and the two incidents have been given separately. The same thing may have occurred elsewhere,¹ with the possible result that the Arabic Harmony is a much larger volume than the original Diatessaron of Tatian.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

CURIOSITIES OF LATIN INTERPRETATION OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

CONSIDERING the natural pitfalls in the way, and the scanty equipment which many of the earliest rolls of New Testament books will have possessed in matters of accents, breathings, and punctuation, it is perhaps wonderful that blunders of translation and interpretation were not more numerous. But it may not be without interest if I jot down the details of three cases which I happen to have lit upon in the course of my own reading of the Latin fathers; and doubtless other scholars would be able to furnish their quota.

1. Jo. i 18.

μονογενῆς θεὸς [οὗ ὁ μονογενῆς υἱὸς] ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείνος ἐξηγήσατο.

The difficulty of the construction of *ἐξηγήσατο*, without an object following it, is manifest enough: and one branch of the Old Latin text—not perhaps the African, but certainly the earliest known European text—as represented by Tertullian, Novatian, and the codex Vercellensis, *a*, of the Old Latin Gospels, attempted to solve the difficulty by making *κόλπον* accusative after the verb. Sabatier has quoted none of the following passages save two from Tertullian, and of one of these he has given an unrevised text. Mr Fausset's note in his edition of Novatian in the *Cambridge Patristic Texts* is the starting-point of my list: but I have added some new references.

¹ I believe the original Diatessaron contained only one miracle of feeding the multitudes, whereas the Arabic has both (see *J. T. S.* vol. viii p. 573 ff).