

NOTES AND STUDIES

AN ARMENIAN DIATESSARON?

THE writer of this study tries to carry further a hint thrown out by Dr Armitage Robinson in his *Euthaliana* of 1895. Dr Robinson remarks (p. 73) that 'One fact which seems to stand out distinctly after the perusal of these puzzling statements (i. e. the traditions of early Armenian Fathers about their version of the Bible) is that the earliest attempts at translating the Scriptures into Armenian were based on Syriac codices'. He further supposes (p. 75) that when trustworthy Greek codices were brought from Constantinople (c. A.D. 420), 'the earlier translation from Syriac codices was not altogether cast aside, but was made the basis of a careful revision'.

He then tests this hypothesis and adduces numerous passages from the Gospels and Paulines which reveal an Old Syriac base. I long ago was convinced that he proved his thesis.

We possess two codices, the Sinai and Cureton MSS, of an Old Syriac version of the separate gospels. They have been edited by Prof. Burkitt, and are referred to as *S C*. We also have some knowledge of the Syriac Diatessaron, mainly from the old Armenian version of Ephrem's commentary, but also from the works of Aphrahat (c. 340), of Ephrem who cited it in his genuine works, of Marutha, and others.

The question arises: was the Armenian pre-Vulgate version of the Gospel an Armenian version of the Syriac Diatessaron, or was it a version, perhaps more than one version, of the Syriac separated gospels?

When we examine the citations of the Gospels in early Armenian Fathers, we chance on many not taken from the Armenian Vulgate which has held the field since about A.D. 700. We find, moreover, many of these discrepant texts identically given in two or more writers, who wrote in different places and times. Two writers who agree in citing a text identically, when it is not in the Vulgate, must have used in common some lost text of the N.T.; and a comparison with the Armenian Vulgate suggests that they are older texts which never underwent the careful revision suggested by Dr Armitage Robinson. In them there seems to lie before us an older translation, just as in Cyprian and other early Latin Fathers we recognise the *vetus Itala* which preceded Jerome's Vulgate. Fortunately Latin codices going back behind the Latin Vulgate remain to us. So do Syriac MSS preceding the Peshitta. But of the old Armenian version no MSS survive. We can only reconstruct it from citations.

Let E signify the Armenian version of Ephrem's commentary on the Syriac Diatessaron, T signify that Diatessaron itself, A Aphrahat's Syriac text, A² the Armenian version of the same, Arm. 1 the hypothetical pre-Vulgate Armenian version of the Gospel or Gospels, probably made from Syriac, Arm. 2 the existing Vulgate.

Now it has been assumed by Dr Theodor Zahn in his work on the Diatessaron, by Dr Armitage Robinson and other scholars, that the Gospel citations in E represent T. This assumption is largely illusory. In a vast number of cases, where we can check them, they can be shewn to be citations of a lost version; they may, of course, represent T, but not necessarily; *prima facie* they can no more claim to represent it than the *codex Fuldensis* and Arabic which turn Tatian into Latin Vulgate and into Peshitta can do so.

Examples will establish this. The first we adduce shews that the Armenian translators of A and E were prepared to force upon the two Syriac Fathers, whom it was their task to translate, a loose and pleonastic text with which they were familiar. For it will not be contended that five of the Armenian Fathers and translators of the fifth century concurred by accident or inspiration in an identical translation of such a kind. They would then have rivalled the seventy translators of the Hebrew Scriptures, who, though locked into separate rooms by a Ptolemy, nevertheless arrived at an identical translation of their original. In the following pages the first column contains Arm. 2, the second Arm. 1:—

Arm. 2.	Arm. 1.
EXAMPLE I. Mt. xi 28 ekaykh arh is amenayn wastakealkh ev berhnavorkh ev es hangutzitz zdzez	A ² 335 ekaykh arh is <i>ashchatealkh</i> <i>ev</i> wastakealkh <i>ev oykh unikh</i> <i>zberhins tsamuns</i> ev es hangutzitz zdzez
i. e. venite ad me omnes laborantes et onerati et ego requiescere faciam vos	i. e. venite ad me fatigati et labo- rantes et qui habetis onera gra- via et ego requiescere faciam vos

Here Parisot 758 renders A thus: 'Venite ad me qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos.' This is the Greek text; and the periphrastic text of A² is not the work of the translator; for almost the same peculiar rendering recurs in E 117,¹ in Agathangelus 221, in the Arm. version of Cyril *Catecheses* i 1, in Lazar of Pharp's Epistle (Venice ed. 1891, p. 675).

¹ E 117 has *ekaykh arh is wastakealkh ev ashchatealkh and hangutsanem* (i. e. 'facio'), but E 127 has *ekaykh arh is amenayn ashchatealkh*.

Zahn, p. 150, cites Sasse's prolegomena to Aphraates, p. 28: 'Solet enim verbum archetypi simplex duobus verbis synonymis reddere'. This is generally true of all Armenian versions, but not of Arm. 2, which here as elsewhere has been arrived at by elimination of elements not in the Greek codices, by retention of just what they involved and no more, and by retranslation wherever they demanded it.

EXAMPLE 2. Mt. iii 15 *zi ayspês wayel é mez lnul zamenayn ardaruthiun* E 41, 42 *zi katarestzukh zardaruthiuns amenayn. So Elisaeus and Agath, §§ 410 and 591.*
 i.e. Sic enim decet nos implere omnem iustitiam i.e. ut impleamus iustitiam omnem

The citation in E, Elisaeus, and Agath. follow direct on the words *sine modo* or *permitte nunc* as Moesinger renders; Zahn notes that this abridgement of the text, constant in E, is 'sonst nicht bezeugt'. However, Elis. and Agath. also witness to it; so, here too, their verbal coincidence with E proves that the latter, *prima facie* at any rate, only reproduces Arm. 1, and not Tatian. Note that they both render $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ not literally by *lnul* = *implere*, but by *katarel* = *perficere* or *consummare*. Arm. 2 here corrects the less literal Armenian equivalent. It also adopts the order of the Greek $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\nu$ instead of $\delta\iota\kappa.\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu$ of A 1.

EXAMPLE 3. Jn. v 28 *ekestzé zamanak yorum amenekhin or i gerezmans kaytzen luitzen dzayni nora ev ekestzen artakhs* A² 254 *ekestze zamanak . . . me-rhealkh luitzen zdzayn ordvoy mardoy év eltzen i gerezmanatz iureantz. So A² 265 and Arm. Marutha, p. 17, of the Acts of Persian Martyrs, Valarshapat, 1921.*
 i.e. veniet tempus in quo omnes qui in monumentis sint audient vocem eius et venient extra i.e. veniet tempus . . . mortui audient vocem filli hominis et exibunt de monumentis suis

Parisot 366 renders A 'Veniet hora . . . quando mortui audient vocem Filii hominis . . . et egredientur de sepulcris suis'. The entire structure of Arm. 1 varies from the T-R and Arm. 2; and note the use of *eltzen* = *exibunt* for *ekestzen artakhs* = *venient extra*.

The verbal identity between A² and the Arm. Marutha in this passage suffices to shew that A² is not rendering A, although it agrees with A in its peculiar order of words; a remarkable coincidence.

Arm. Marutha, p. 17, has *Filii Dei* for *Filii Hominis*, both equidistant from *eius*, and it omits *suis*. But these differences are negligible. The manner in which Arm. Irenaeus twice cites the verse is this, V xiii 1:—

'Veniet hora in qua omnes mortui qui in sepulchris sunt audient vocem Filii Hominis et exibunt extra', but V xxxvi (*deest* Lat.):— 'Veniunt dies in quo (singular!) mortui qui in sepulchris sunt audient vocem Filii hominis et resurgent.'

It looks as if the translator of Irenaeus was accustomed to the form of text given in A² and Arm. Marutha, for he uses in the first citation the tell-tale *eltzen artakhs = exhibunt extra*, where Arm. 2 has *ekestzen artakhs = venient extra*. The last word is necessary after *ekestzen*, but superfluous after *eltzen = exhibunt*; so it was probably inserted in the text by a late scribe familiar with Arm. 2. Secondly, the translator omits *de monumentis* which offended Irenaeus's Greek. Thirdly, to suit the Greek he inserted 'qui in monumentis sunt' (I use the words of Latin Iren.) earlier in the sentence, where they also come in Arm. 2. But note that instead of rendering them, as does Arm. 2, by *or 'i gerezmans Kaytzen*, as he would surely have done had he possessed Arm. 2, he renders *de suo* by *or 'i shirimsn en*. Thus Arm. 2 corrects Arm. 1 in one way, the translator of Irenaeus in another. How *resurgent* came to be substituted in Irenaeus V xxxvi I cannot say. It stands in codex *b* of him, and may represent a Greek variant which stood in the margin of a codex used by the Armenian translator. In this second citation *omnes* is omitted as it is in A and Marutha.

Thus the testimony of Arm. Iren., though scanty, confirms our conclusion that A² does not here so much translate A, though A had the same text, as quote Arm. 1. This last text was clearly his standard, just as King James's version is for English Protestants and the Douai Bible for Roman Catholics.

EXAMPLE 4. Mt. xxi 44	ev yoyr	E 193	ev yoroy weray anktzi manrestzé ev hosestzé zna
	weray anktzi hosestzé zna		
i. e. et super quem ceciderit conteret eum			i. e. et super quem ceciderit confranget et conteret eum
		A ² 7	ev yoroy weray ankanitzi na manrestzé zna

Probably Arm. 1 had both synonyms according to the principle noticed above (no. 1) by Sasse. Both survive in E 193; A² kept *manrestzé = confranget* alone, perhaps influenced by the Syriac text of Aphrahat which he was translating and which has but one equivalent of *λεκμήσει*, for Parisot 18 renders the Syriac 'Super quem vero ceciderit conminuet eum'. The authors of Arm. 2, who eliminated pleonastic synonyms, kept the rival equivalent *hosestzé* which I render *conteret*. Here, again, the question arises why E and A² pitched on the same equivalent *manrestzé* unless it existed in a version familiar to both of them.

EXAMPLE 5. Mt. iii 15. In Arm. Ephrem Arm. com. in Gen. p. 93 :
 vlg. there is no corresponding ibrev mkrtezav, asé, tér mer,
 text, but *a* and *g* of the *vetus Itala* loys bazum i *dshurtz* anti *phay-*
 have 'Et cum baptizaretur lumen ingens circumfulsit (*g* magnum fulgebat) de aqua'.
lér; i. e. cum baptizaretur lumen
 magnum de aquis fulgebat.

Here, as the coincidence with the Old Latin shews, we have the full text of Arm. 1 which E 43 cites fragmentarily thus: *i phayliun lusoyn* or *linér* 'i weray *dshurtz* = 'in fulgorem luminis quod fiebat super aquas', where the Armenian words italicized are in a literary connexion with the Com. in Gen., inexplicable unless the translators of it and of E both used Arm. 1. There is no reason to suppose that the two translators were the same person.¹

EXAMPLE 6. Mt. xv 19 'i srté E 63 and A² 321 'i *srti linin* [ame-
 elanen chorhurdkh čarkh E 63 and A² 321 'i *srti linin* [ame-
 i. e. ex corde egrediuntur cogita- i. e. in corde fiunt [omnes] cogita-
 tiones malae tiones malitiae

Parisot 730 renders A 'In corde sunt cogitationes malae', so the concordance of E and A² is not, as Zahn notes, decisive for 'malitiae', which as the equivalent read in Arm. 1. It needs explaining, however, how Arm. 1 could independently have thrown up a reading so close to E and A, but unknown elsewhere.

EXAMPLE 7. Jn. v 22 ev oč ethé E 151 hayr zokh oč dati
 hayr dati zokh
 i. e. et non quod Pater iudicat ali- i. e. Pater neminem iudicat
 quem

A² 220 and 429 have the same text as E except that A² 429 transposes and reads 'zoč okh'. But the differences from Arm. 2 are of order and structure of sentence; just such small differences as would weigh in sifting out Latin and Greek texts. The example again enables us to judge how general was the influence of Arm. 1 over E and A².

EXAMPLE 8. Mt. xxii 39 = Mc. E 194, A² 20 &c. *merdsavor* kho
 xii 31 = Lc. x 27 *zēnker* kho
 i. e. τὸν πλησίον σου i. e. τὸν πλησίον σου

EXAMPLE 9. Mt. i 25 ev oč gitér E 23, 25, 26 In sanctitate habita-
 zna minčev tsnav zordin iur bat cum ea donec peperit primo-
 zandranik genitum et sumpsit eam
 i. e. et non cognoscebat eam donec *srbutheamb* *bnakér* *ēnd* nma min-
 peperit filium suum primogeni- čev tsnav zandranikh ev arh zna
 tum.

¹ [There is no reference to the Baptism of our Lord in the corresponding place of the original Syriac of Ephrem's Commentary on Genesis (ed. Rom. Syr. Lat. i 82). F.C.B.]

I have not met with this text so fully cited as in E, but in a homily printed among the Armenian works of Ephrem, Venice 1836, iv p. 27, we find 'ĕnkalay yowséph zmariam ev *bnakér ĕnd srboyn pahpanutheamb*', i. e. 'accepit Joseph Mariam et *habitabat cum sancta* in tutela'.

The words italicized echo E, and prove that the translator of the homily had a biblical text identical with that which E cites.

Zahn notes that *primogenitum* without *filium* was a Tatianic reading. It here appears as the reading of Arm. 1.

EXAMPLE 10. Jn. xix 36 ὅστων οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ.

Arm. vlg. 'oskr nora mí phshrestzi', i. e. 'os eius ne frangetur'.

A² 346 'oskr mí *bektzi 'i nma*', i. e. 'os ne conteratur in eo'.

E 259 'oskr nora oĕ *bekav 'i nma*', i. e. 'os eius non contritum est in eo'. Parisot, p. 527, renders A 'os non comminuetur in eo'.

Here A² is formally citing the text, for it introduces the words with 'Tum etiam praecepit'; but Ephrem is only narrating what happened. Hence change of tense. Note that Arm. 1, i. e. E and A², and Elis. use the verb *bekānem*, which for distinction I render by *contero*, whereas Arm. 2 uses *phschrem*, which for the same reason I render by *frango*. They are synonyms. The addition *in eo* comes also in the Peshitto. As it is not in the Greek Arm. 2 drops it out, but Arm. 1 had it. Elis. 291 has nearly the same text as A² and E: 'oskr nora mí *bekānitzi*', 'os eius ne conteratur', but omits the *in eo*. Both in Elis. and in E *nora* seems the addition of a scribe familiar with Arm. 2. Arm. 1 had 'i nma = *in eo*, which made it superfluous. Elis. has *nora* with E, but *mí* with A².

EXAMPLE 11. Lc. i 45 katarumn E 17 katarumn amenayn banitzn
asatzelotzs nma or eghen ĕnd nma

i. e. τελείωσις τοῖς λεγομένοις αὐτῇ i. e. τελείωσις πάντων τῶν λόγων οἱ
ἐγένοντο αὐτῇ

E 17 paraphrases where Arm. 2 is quite literal. Cyril xii 26 has same reading as E 17, but substitutes *or eghen* as if *γενομένοις* had stood for *λεγομένοις*. Here S also has a relative clause: 'A fulfilment for those things that were spoken with her', as also all Latin texts. One (ff) has 'omnia quae dicta sunt': in no other source is added the word 'all'. Arm. 1 clearly had 'amenayn banitzn or'.

EXAMPLE 12. Lc. xxiii 46 παρατίθεμαι. Arm. 2 renders *avandem* = I deposit. E 254 and Cyril *yandsn arhnem*, 'I hand over to'. Agath. and Elis. use, however, *dnem* = *pono*, as if there had been another source known to them using that equivalent. Anyhow E takes its equivalent from a text he had in common with the translator of Cyril.

EXAMPLE 13. Jn. iii 8 τὸ πνεῦμα (ᾧπου κτλ.). Arm. vlg. renders *hoghm* = wind; but E 189, Cyril i 3 use *hugin* = the Spirit. Agath.

225 renders *Spiritus Sanctus*. Clearly all three used a common Gospel text in which stood *hōgin*.

EXAMPLE 14. Jn. i 1 και ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

E 5 twice cites thus 'inkhn bann ér arh astuats', i. e. αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Whatever the Syriac word was which is rendered by 'inkhn = αὐτός, Ephrem in his ignorance of the Greek text attached importance to it, for he comments 'Et ne verbum absque interpretatione sineret adiecit inkhn verbum erat apud Deum, quibus praedicavit . . . subsistentiam (inkhnuthiun) verbi'.

At first sight then *inkhn* here is a translation of a Syriac word in Ephrem's citation of Jn. i 1 and cannot otherwise be explained. Yet it stood in Arm. 1, for the Armenian translator of Eusebius *H. E.* i 1 equally reads *ev inkhn bann* etc., shewing that Arm. 1 had the addition.¹ If therefore E uses *inkhn* and *inkhnuthiun* to render Ephrem's Syriac he does so because he cites from Arm. 1. Elsewhere the Armenian translator of Eusebius *H. E.* regularly uses a gospel text of some kind which he shared with E, and which contained pleonastic additions to the text which the Greek lacks; e. g. in Lc. xxi 20 (Eusebius *H. E.* iii 7) it reads 'Ierusalem circumdatam obsessam exercitu'. Here 'obsessam' *pashareal* is witnessed in Arm. Eus. and in the pseudo-Ephremic Tract *De Interpretatione Evangelii*, as also is *haseal é* 'has arrived' for *merds é* of Arm. 2 = 'is near'. Both readings are due to Arm. 1.

EXAMPLE 15. Mt. xxiv 20 ya-E 214 yaghôths katzekh ev
ghôths katzékhh zi mi linitzi chndretzékhh zi mi linitzi
i. e. Orate ne fiat i. e. Orate *et petite* ne fiat

Pseudo-Ephrem in Arm. version, vol. ii 323 has same as E 214.

Here no other text adds *et petite*. The translators of ps.-Eph. and of E clearly had in common Arm. 1, and derive the addition from it. The Syriac Tatian never had it.

EXAMPLE 16. Lc. viii 46 zôruthiun E 81, 83 virtus magna abiit de me
el yinén zoruthiun bazum gnatz yinén.
i. e. virtus exiit de me Elis. identically. Even if he had
read E, I see no reason why he
should ferret out a text in a con-
text which does not suggest it.

E and Elis. not only agree in using the epithet *bazum*, but also *gnatz = abiit*. Arm. 2 substitutes *el = exiit*, and omits *bazum* as unwarranted by the Greek.

[¹ No doubt in both cases the Armenian is a literal rendering of the Syriac *hū mellhā* (so all Syriac renderings of Jn. i 1, including Eus. *H. E.* i 1). F.C.B.]

EXAMPLE 17. Mt. v 17 ne putate quoniam veni solvere legem aut prophetas : non veni solvere sed adimplere E 64, A² 28 non veni solvere legem et prophetas sed (+ stabilire et A²) consummare (+ eas A²). So Eznik, Cyril iv 33 and x 18, and others.

Parisot 58 renders A 'non veni solvere legem et prophetas sed eos adimplere'. The added 'stabilire' *hastatel* in A² is a characteristic Arm. pleonasm. Arm. 1 was evidently full of them. Arm. 2, as usual, renders πληρῶσαι literally by *lnul*. Arm. 1, whose authors had not access to Greek texts, used *katarel* = *perficere* or *consummare*. Eznik, however, who was a Greek scholar, changes to *lnul* in his citation, though in other respects he cites Arm. 1.

EXAMPLE 18. Lc. xix 42. Eusebius *H. E.* iii 7 cites εἰ ἔγνωσ καὶ γε σὺ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου· νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβῃ ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. Arm. 2 reads 'Ethe gitêir du goné yavurs yaysmik zchaghaghuthiunn kho, baytz ayžm tsatsketzav yeresatz khotz', which involves τὴν instead of τὰ πρὸς. But Arm. Eusebius reads 'ethé ér gitatzeal kho zór chaghaghuthean kho, ayl tsatsketzav na yačatz khotz', a very different text which may be rendered in ungrammatical Latin, thus 'si erat cognitum tui diem pacis tuae sed abscondita est illa ab oculis tuis'. E 184 renders identically 'ethé gitatzeal ér kho goneay zórs zays kho'. This is a truncated citation omitting *pacis* and *ab oculis tuis*, but adding *goneay* which answers to γε. E 207 again cites the verse, partly in the same way as E 184 and Arm. Eus., partly as Arm. vlg.; for it takes *ethé gitêir du goné* and *yeresatz khotz* from Arm. 2, and the rest from Arm. 1 (the other two sources). Arm. 2 alone renders νῦν. ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν is rendered 'from thy presence' or 'from thy face' in Arm. 2 and E 207, but as 'from thine eyes' in Arm. Eus.

There can be no doubt that the reading of Arm. Eus. and E 184 is the older, though Arm. 2 has made an inroad on the citation at E 207; yet there too is involved, as in E 184 and Arm. Eus., the characteristic rendering 'hunc diem pacis tuae' (as Moesinger renders), instead of 'in hac die quae ad pacem' of the Greek and other sources, and of *SC* as well. Note that *C* (not *S*) reads 'But peace hath been hidden from thine eyes', along with E 207 'Sed abscondita est pax a facie tua'.

Here, again, we discern a common Gospel text behind the translator of Eusebius and E.

EXAMPLE 19. Jn. xxi 3. The words ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίασαν οὐδέν are rendered by Elisaeus thus: νύκτα ὄλην ἐκοπίασαν ἐπίασαν οὐδέν. Here is imported into the citation a reminiscence of Lc. v 5. At first sight this looks like a vagary; but in a tract 'on the Resurrection' ascribed to Ephrem and printed p. 61, vol. iv, of his *paralipomena*

armena, the very same reading recurs as a rendering of Jn. xxi 3. We cannot explain the coincidence except by supposing them to be quoting from a common document. It is curious, but probably a mere coincidence, that the first hand in \aleph here reads *ἐκοπίασαν* for *ἐπίασαν*.

EXAMPLE 20. Lc. i 29 *χαίρε κεχαριτωμένη* is rightly rendered in Arm. 2 by 'urach ler berkread'. In A² 273, E 49, and in the pseudo-Ephremic tract already referred to in Example 7, and read in *Op. Arm. Ephremi* iv 14, we read instead 'oghdschoyn end khez ðrhneald 'i kanays' which means 'salus tecum benedicta in mulieribus'.

Parisot renders the Syriac text of A 418 thus, 'Pax tibi, benedicta inter mulieres'. There can be no doubt that these three Armenian writers had the text in a common document, and A² used it when he had to translate the corresponding Syriac. Here, then, as elsewhere, A² primarily represents not A but Arm. 1.

EXAMPLE 21. Eznik's (p. 277) handling of Mt. xix 16-18, Mc. x 17, Lc. xviii 18, is as follows:—

'Et legisperito qui interrogavit illum, Quid faciens (= *ποιήσας*) ut vitam eternam heres possideam, ait, Mandata legis scis? Et interrogans iterum, Quae mandata? Ait, Ne adulteres, ne fureris, ne occidas'.

Note that in A 927 (Parisot) we have the same rare order as in Eznik, 'Non moechaberis; non furtum facies', and as in the old Latin codices *b, e, l, g*. Secondly, in E 169 we have the comment '*Interrogavit* dominum de lege', the same word *ehartz* being used as in Eznik, whereas in Matthew we only read *πίσας; φησίν*. Lastly, both Eznik and E make out the youth to be a lawyer; for E writes 'hic legisperitus venerat ut quasi ex lege erudiretur'. E uses *ðrinavor*, Eznik *ðrinakan* for 'lawyer'. We might suppose that Eznik had an Arm. Diatessaron in his hands; at least the common use of *ehartz* and *ðrinakan* hints at such a conclusion. But here, as elsewhere, the language of Arm. 1 has been adopted both by Eznik and by E.

What was this common text? We may assume on the principle of the economy of causes that it was the Syriac base, as Dr Armitage Robinson aptly termed it, of the existing Armenian Vulgate.

But we are left in a dilemma; for as many as eight of our examples are either attested by A to have been elements in his Gospel text, which we know to have been a Syriac Diatessaron, or, if not, yet to be such texts as have been reckoned by scholars to be of Tatianic origin. Nevertheless all eight, like the other thirteen, stood in Arm. 1. However, the eight belong primarily to Arm. 1, and are morticed and adjoined thereto. If we assign them to an Armenian Diatessaron, then Arm. 1 would claim Tatianic influence as to eight parts out of the twenty-one, and a Gospel of vague origin and antecedents as to the other thirteen

parts. And that is a lame conclusion. The eight champions, as we may call them, of Tatian, are examples 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21, *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*.

In the above pages I have scarcely appealed to the Homilies on the Transfiguration and the Passion attributed to the fifth-century Armenian historian Elisaeus, because Dr Burkitt has argued very cogently that their author had read E, so that such undoubted citations of Tatian as they have in common with E may have been copied from E, and therefore afford no independent testimony to the existence of an Armenian Diatessaron.

But his argument, though it invalidates some evidence which formerly struck me as cogent, is compatible with our supposing that, in addition to having read E, he was also acquainted with Tatian's work in an Armenian dress. Some indeed have argued that if the Armenians had not used a diatessaron they would not have troubled themselves to translate a Syriac commentary on it; but I do not find that argument conclusive.

Is there then reason, apart from citations that Elisaeus may and probably did take direct from E, for thinking that he used an Armenian T? Up and down his homilies there are narrative passages which he introduces with 'he says' or 'it says', the formula with which Armenian Fathers usually introduced a citation of Scripture. Let us take some of these and see if they bear signs of T. Here is one from p. 291:—

'There came, he says, Joseph, a man just, noble in nature and rich in the world, towards men in secret, but toward God openly. He not only is not found in their deeds of wickedness, but also not in the counsels of their impiety. But now mark the man's courage; in a time when everyone was united and were in rebellion against God, he alone armed himself secretly with weapons of virtue, and took his brigade of the forces of faith. He was valorous in himself. . . .

For it was a fearsome spot and an awestricken hour, and risk of death for him who dared to say that in righteousness died the man. . . .'

Nay, the Gospel writer in no small degree relates the man's bravery, but does so in terms vigorous and loud:—

'(p. 292) There came, he says, Joseph of Arimathea. He dared, entered to the judge, and asked for the body of Jesus.'

We have to compare the above with the Arabic, which runs:—

'There came a man named Joseph, rich (and) a counsellor, of Arimathea, a city of Judaea, who was a good man and upright, and a disciple of Jesus, who concealed himself being afraid of the Jews; but he had not consented to the counsel and deeds of the accusers and was looking for the kingdom of God.

'This man then came and went into Pilate, and requested of him the body of Jesus. . . .'

The passage of Eliseaus, like the Arabic, is a mosaic of Gospel texts, and the initial phrase 'he says' indicates that he has some document or other open before him. Let us arrange the two together clause by clause and put Eliseaus in Greek in the first column and the Arabic (also in Greek) in the second, numbering the clauses of each :—

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. ἦλθεν Ἰωσήφ Mc. 43 | 1. ἦλθεν Mc. 43 |
| 2. ἀνὴρ . . . δίκαιος Lc. 50 | 1B. ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ Lc. 50 |
| 3. εὐσχήμων (? noble in nature)
Mc. 43, or ? βουλευτής | 4. πλούσιος
(βουλευτής Lc. 50 = Mc. 43)
(ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν
Ἰ. Ιουδαίων Lc. 51) |
| 4. πλούσιος Mt. 57 | 2. ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος Lc. 50 |
| 5. κεκρυμμένος Jn. 38 | ?6. (μαθητῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Jn. 38) |
| 6. προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ
θεοῦ (? towards God openly)
Mc. 43 or Jn. 38 μαθητῆς
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ | 5. κεκρυμμένος διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν
Ἰ. Jn. 38 b |
| 7. οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος
τῇ βουλή καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν
Lc. 57 | 7. οὗτος κτλ. Lc. 51 |
| 8. of their impiety | 8. of the accusers (not in Gospel
text) |
| 9. ἦλθεν Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμ. Mc. 43 | 9. οὗτος προσελθὼν Lc. 52 |
| 10. τολμήσας Mc. 43 | 10. omit |
| 11. εἰσῆλθε πρὸς Πιλάτον Mc. 43 b | 11. εἰσῆλθε πρὸς Πιλάτον Mc. 43 b |
| 12. Καὶ ἤγγαστο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰ. Mc.
43 b | 12. Καὶ ἤγγαστο κτλ. Mc. 43 b |

The reference of Mc. xv 43 to 'the Gospel writer' at first sight pins us down to the use of the separate Gospels which no doubt Eliseaus knew of, just as the translator of the commentary on T knew of them ; but it might equally mean a diatessaron. He cites otherwise than the Vulgate, using the past indicative *ekn* for the participle *ekhal*, 'arimatsetzi = Arimathean' for 'or yarimatheayn ér' = 'who was from Arimathea', and 'judge' *datavor* instead of 'Pilate'.

It is seen from the above that the two sources take very nearly the same elements from the four Gospels and combine them in a mosaic nearly in the same order, both ending the story with a renewed citation of Mc. xv 43. But it is strange that the Arabic ignores *τολμήσας* of Mc. xv 43, as does the Dutch Diatessaron.

The probability of Eliseaus, who was just a pious rhapsodist, making any sort of textual harmony is slight. That his harmony should march so closely with the Arabic here is very improbable unless he had Tatian in his hands. On the whole I do not find the example convincing.

Here is another example. His homily on the Transfiguration begins :—

Elisaeus.

Dum incedebant illi in via, ait Dominus noster ad Duodecim : Quem utique dicunt de me homines quod sum.

Dixerunt illi τὰ externorum, quia alii alia putabant. Ait illis : Sed vos quid dicitis de me.

Primus incessit Petrus et dicit : Tu es Christus Jesus Filius Dei

...

Invidebant novae vitae manifestationem, appellantes eum Eliam aut Eremiam aut alium quemdam antiquorum prophetarum.

Arabic.

Mc. viii 27. And as he was walking in the way, himself and his disciples apart, he asked his disciples, saying :

Matthew, Mark. What do men say concerning me, that I, the Son of Man, am ?

He said unto them, But ye, who say ye that I am ? Simon Cephas answered, and said, Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God.

Matthew. They said unto him, Some say John the Baptist ; and some Elijah ; but others Jeremiah or one of the Prophets.

One notices in the above the common addition of *dum incedebant*. It can hardly be accidental, for it is the same addition in the same context, and should therefore go back to T, which source alone could be common to both texts.

Secondly, in Mt. xvi 14 and the parallel texts Ἰωάννην τὸν Βαπτιστὴν is omitted. Zahn notes that in E 153, 156 'an beiden Stellen fehlt Joannes Baptista', but only he adds 'durch willkürliche Abkürzung'. Yet it looks as if the omission was Tatian's.

Thirdly, Peter leapt forward or went first in answering the Lord's query. E calls him head and chief of the Apostles on this occasion, and Zahn divines that there was some epithet of the kind in Tatian's text.

Fourthly, the epithet 'ancient' of the prophets is woven into Matthew's text from Lc. ix 19. Tatian would naturally so weave it in. Points one and two are at least remarkable coincidences, if they are no more.

On p. 278 of Elisaeus's *On the Passion* we read :—

'In eodem tempore, ait, elevatus est Dominus noster super crucem. Sol obtenebratus est, velum templi scissum est usque deorsum. Terra mota est, petrae scissae sunt, monumenta aperta sunt et multi mortuorum surrexerunt et post resurrectionem Domini ingressi sunt in civitatem sanctam et apparuerunt multis.'

This is Mt. xxvii 51-53, but Matthew lacks the introductory phrase, nor does he or any source place here the darkening of the sun. It comes before His death in v. 45, 'as a darkness all over the earth'. The phrase *ἐσκορίσθη ὁ ἥλιος* is taken from Lc. xxiii 45, where it explains the general darkness, and in him also it precedes the death. The other portents here enumerated from Matthew follow the death and do not precede it.

Now in the *Teaching of Addai*, which is admittedly written from a Diatessaron, we read in the old Armenian version (I cite the Venice rendering of the text, A. D. 1868, p. 43) in Abgar's letter to Tiberius 'et, au moment où ils l'attachèrent à la croix, le soleil s'obscurcit, la terre s'ébranla et toutes les créatures s'agitèrent avec de violentes secousses'.

But the oldest text is that which the old gossip, Moses of Khoren, repeats in the same letter (in ii 153 of the critical edition of his history, Tiflis, 1913) thus: 'For also *in the time* in which they crucified him, *the sun was darkened, and the earth moved* did quake, and he himself *after three days arose from the dead and appeared to many*'.

I italicize the words which the text of Moses has in common with Eliseaeus. I cannot believe but that here in Eliseaeus and the Doctrine of Addai we have two variants of a common Tatianic text. Another variant of it is read, p. 27, of the *Doctrine*, thus:—

'Pendant qu'il était crucifié il fit obscurcir le soleil dans le firmament ; et lorsqu'il fut enterré, il se leva du sépulcre le troisième jour en ressuscitant avec lui plusieurs morts.'

It is doubtful whether there is a literary connexion between these passages and one which comes in the Dutch Mediaeval Diatessaron edited by Dr J. Bergsma, p. 259:—

'Else Jhesus aldus ane den cruce ghehangen was, omtrent den mid-daghe, so verghinc de sonne ende al de werelt was in demsternessen toter noenen,' etc.

For here the other portents are not mentioned, and only come later on in the usual context. What Eliseaeus and Addai have in common is, (1) the introductory formula ; (2) the darkened sun ; (3) the earthquake ; (4) the Resurrection ; (5) the verbal identity, slight it is true, but enough to establish literary connexion. They both seem to cite a common document, and Eliseaeus expressly introduces it as from a written text when he says *ait asé*. Could the document not be an Armenian version of T? And yet I do not feel quite sure.¹

To sum up. The Gospel texts in the Armenian version of Ephrem's commentary, E, wherever we can test and probe them, turn out to be

[¹ Moses of Khoren certainly uses the Doctrine of Addai elsewhere, and is probably using it here. Eliseaeus may have known it also. The Syriac does not imply more than 'at the time of the Crucifixion' (see Phillips, p. 37). F.C.B.]

citations of a document we have called Arm. 1, which the translator had in common with the translators of Aphrahat, of Cyril's *Catecheses*, of Eusebius, of Marutha, and with Agathangelus, Eznik, Lazar of Pharp, with the translators of early documents in the *Letterbook of the Patriarchs*, and with other authors. We have thus a sort of screen between our eyes and Ephrem's text, and neither his translator nor Aphrahat's renders Gospel citations *hac vice* and *de suo*. Both, whenever they recognize a text, quote it from some lost version of the Gospel which they revered much and had at their finger tips.

This is all we can say for certain. At the same time it must be acknowledged that this early version contained several texts which *a priori* we should look for in a diatessaron. Citations of the Diatessaron also seem to come in Eliseus, but some of them are most probably copied from E. Lastly, this well-established, but lost, version must have been the Syriac base of the Armenian Vulgate discerned by Dr Armitage Robinson; and almost certainly a mass of it survives in that Vulgate, the revisers having retained all they could of a version so familiar to the faithful.

In conclusion, I venture to hope that the Armenian scholars of Venice, Vienna, Jerusalem, Édschmiatsin, Paris, and other centres, where there are collections of Armenian codices, will examine them for fresh examples of the lost Syriac base of the Armenian Vulgate. Perhaps it is lurking entire in some of these libraries in the guise of an old lectionary. Some folios of it might also be recovered among the countless Gospel fragments bound up in manuscripts of all kinds. In Valarshapat alone I once counted nearly five thousand such folios all used as fly-sheets. It would be strange if a Gospel document held in such respect, and so widely diffused as late, perhaps, as 750, should have wholly perished; and a few lines of it would at once reveal whether it was a diatessaron or only an archaic form of the Separated Gospels.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

[A pathetic interest attaches to this important article, for Dr Conybeare may be said to have died in the very act of writing it. For many months he had been occupied with the pre-Vulgate quotations of the Armenian Fathers, of whose works he had so singular a knowledge, and I had had some correspondence with him on matters of detail connected with his discoveries. His MS in its revised form had at last been sent off; but we were still corresponding, when I received a telegram announcing his sudden death, in the very plenitude of his intellectual powers. An unfinished letter to me connected with the subject was actually found on his desk.

Dr Conybeare in his last letter to me had thought of sending back for his MS, in order still further to illustrate and perhaps in detail to modify it, but it has been agreed, with Mrs Conybeare's consent, to print it practically as it stood. We can now never have his completed work, but he has clearly stated the problem and done a very great deal towards indicating the solution. Is it too much to hope that some younger scholar will now prepare himself to step into the gap by becoming acquainted with the early Armenian authors, whose works alone supply us with the material for writing this unknown chapter in the history of the text of the New Testament?

However learned such a successor may become, he will never have a more passionate love of truth or a kinder heart than F. C. Conybeare.

F.C.B.]

THE PASSION OF ST CATHARINE AND THE ROMANCE OF BARLAAM AND JOASAPH.

THE legend of St Catharine of Alexandria, with her wheel—more properly her wheels—and her dove, has enjoyed a wide popularity alike in the East and in the West. In the East her name is Ecaterine (*Αικατερίνα*), a form of which no satisfactory explanation has been offered. The Latin texts of her passion have not yet been critically examined; but they are only secondary and are not likely to throw much light on the development of the story. It is otherwise with the Greek texts. Three of these were published by the Abbé Viteau in 1897, drawn from manuscripts at Paris, Rome, and elsewhere. A fourth text, the most highly developed of all, we already had in the great tenth-century collection which passes under the name of Symeon Metaphrastes (Migne *P. G.* 116, col. 275 ff). The first of M. Viteau's texts is a rude composition, written in very faulty Greek: though it tells of the wise speeches by which the saint confounded her adversaries, it makes no attempt to reproduce them. The second text fills this obvious gap by introducing grotesquely fanciful orations, full of quite imaginary Greek words, such as *σφιρμγγλιορόθμιστον*. The third, which seems to have no relation to the second, undertakes the same task in a highly intelligent manner, drawing arguments against heathenism from early sources. Finally we have the text contained in the collection of the Metaphrast, which presents us with a literary revision of the third of M. Viteau's texts.

It is evident that we have in this abundance of materials an exceptional opportunity of studying the methods of the Greek hagiographers.