



---

Quotations from the Diatessaron

Author(s): R. J. H. Gottheil

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1892), pp. 68-71

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3259080>

Accessed: 12/03/2010 15:39

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## 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.<sup>1</sup> In the MS. of the Commentary of Išo'dad,<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>e</sup>mešta'lā, dhal<sup>e</sup>mōn emar mattai d<sup>e</sup>hāu lam dethiledh bāh men ruḥā hu dh<sup>e</sup>qudhšā, kadh lā <sup>e</sup>dhakēl ilīdh (h)wā, w<sup>e</sup>lā emar hāu dethb<sup>e</sup>ten bāh. w<sup>e</sup>thūbh hāu dethiledh bāh, ellā lāu menāh.<sup>3</sup> Methall<sup>e</sup>lin gēr t<sup>e</sup>nān harāṭīqo, wabh<sup>e</sup>hāi d<sup>e</sup>bhāh l<sup>e</sup>mell<sup>e</sup>thā allāhā maqq<sup>e</sup>phīn lilidhūthāh. kēmāth allāh ābhāh ethiledh. ellā nedh<sup>e</sup>un, d<sup>e</sup>hu kadh hu ēwangelastā l<sup>e</sup>el emar, d<sup>e</sup>menāh lam ethiledh išō' d<sup>e</sup>methq<sup>e</sup>rē m<sup>e</sup>šihā, mabh<sup>e</sup>h<sup>e</sup>thā l<sup>e</sup>hōn dēn hāi d<sup>e</sup>men rūḥā hu dh<sup>e</sup>qudhšā, en. gēr men ruḥā hu dh<sup>e</sup>qudhšā mell<sup>e</sup>thā allāhā, mādhēn <sup>e</sup>bhīdhā hu w<sup>e</sup>lāu ābhōdhā (h)u. w<sup>e</sup>theḥde b<sup>e</sup>hōn harsiyās daryānō, tubh hāi dethiledh bāh m<sup>e</sup>bhaṭṭ<sup>e</sup>lā l<sup>e</sup>hāi d<sup>e</sup>thēladh b<sup>e</sup>rā dh<sup>e</sup>bhārken

<sup>1</sup> [See note at the end of this article. — ED.]

<sup>2</sup> Mārozāyā apesqōpā dhah<sup>e</sup>dhatta dhāthōr.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Budge, *Book of the Bee*, p. 87, 5.

sīmā, en gēr ethiledh bāh, aikan 'ethīdhā dh'ethūbh tēladh : t'rēn mādhen maulādhē l'hadh baṭnā šārkā, mādhen hāi dethiledh bāh, h'ēlāph hāi dethbaṭtan bāh sīmā. . . . h'ērānē dh'maulādhā lam lakh'ethābhā t'rayānāith methīšeph, b'dhukh man 'abhodhūthā ; ā(i)kh hāi dh'manou auledh nuṭphāthā dh'metrā wadh'ēšār. b'dhukh dēn : m'yaldānūthā, t'nān dēn : h'ēlāph hāi dheth'ebhedh sīmā, hāi dhethiledh bāh, h. men ruha dh'qudhšā ethg'ebhel bāh. . . . h'ērānē, w'ebhaṭnā lam men t'rēn meštammaš, men dekhṛā w'men neqb'thā, w'metṭul dabh'thultā khadh ethbaṭt'nath, lā heššath hašša nešyāyā, zādhaqāith hāi d'bbāh emar w'ēlāu hāi d'menāh. kēmāth d'menāh w'bbāh ethg'ebhel balhōdh, w'ēlāu āph men gabhrā:.

h'ērānē dhā(i)kh 'yādā lam 'ebhrāyā sīmā, dh'ēlā m'pharres zabhnē men h'ēdhādhē, 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, metṭul hānā h'ēlāph d'nēmar hāu d'methiledh menāh : sām hāi dethiledh bāh: h'ērānē, dh'hau lam d'phašseq men 'ebhrāyā l'suryāyā : šahleph., w'sām h'ēlāph hāi dhethb'ten bāh, hāi dethiledh: dyāṭāsārōn dēn āmar, d'hau lam dethiledh bāh men rūhā hu dh'qudhšā, mell'thā dh'lait 'lē(i)h puššākhā, w'sākhā, w'maulādhā dh'bbāh, 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'ten*. 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 'urḥāthā phašseq(u). h'ērānē ; r'bh'ath š'ebhilē. h'ērānē, beth pāghē dhēn. h. beth te'nē phakkīhāthā w'maitēn sahdūthā men dyāṭāsārōn, w'men paršagnā yaunāyā, b'šarbā dh'zakkāyōnā hau z'ōr b'qaumthā paghrānāitā kēth w'rūhānāitā. s'leq lam l'phāghē dh'neḥze lišō. hāi dhabh'suryāyā thētā pakkīhtā. I translate as follows: *Bēth pāghē*, some translate "dividing of the roads,"<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Bar Ali in Payne Smith, s.v. col. 493.

Jesus, that (tree) which in Syriac is called "insipid fig tree."<sup>5</sup> Bar 'Ebhṛāya (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:· qadh māyath 'ell'ethā dh'kathbēh lēwāngalion. mattai w'e'yōhanān men tre'sar (h)wau. w'e'mārḡos dēn w'elūqā men šabh'in. ṭetyānos dēn talmidhēh dh'yostīnos pīlisōphā w'sāhdā. gabbī men arb'āthaihōn ewangelastē, w'ḥalleṭ w'sām ewangalion. waqrāi(hi) d'yaṭāsārōn, ḥ. dam'ḥall'ē, w'al allāhūtheh dham'sīḥā lā akhteḥ, wal'hānā phaš'sēqēh mār(i) Afrim; *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 commented."

This quotation is found again, in almost the same words, in the commentary of Dionysius bar Ṣalibi (Wright, *Syr. Lit.*, p. 85 i 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 Iṣō'dad to Matthew ii. 23:<sup>6</sup> ba(r)th qālā hādhē dh'nāšrāyā nethq'rē. lait bakh'thābhē b'ṭabh'ā w'galyā (h)i dh'men kul p'rōs amira; wellā aikan methḥaššah (h)wā bhāh ewang'elastā a(i)kh dāph b'sāhdwāthā 'h'rānyāthā dh'maite men k'thābhē, b'ram k'thābhē saggiē 'ebhadh(u) b'šebhyē m'saḥ'phē, w'ghādhšā dhāph hādhē 'amhōn ethḥabb'lath. ewangalastā dhēn men ṭaibūthā dh'rūhā yadh'āh w'sāmāh:· tubh nurbā bh'ebhrāyā. nešōr methq'rē. wethqaryath q'rithā nāšrāth. ḥ. nurbā. hai gēr deša'yā dh'naphra' lam nurbā men 'eqāreḥ. bh'ebhrāyā. nešōr k'thībā. dh'methpaššaḡ ḥadhthā. w'nāšrāth ḥ'dhatā, w'nāšrāyū-thā ḥadhthūthā. lau meṭṭul d'ḥadhthā (h)u yulpānēh dham'sīḥā: 'al hādhē q'rātheh n'bhīyūthā bhaš'mā hānā. ellā meṭṭul dh'ḥadhthāith

<sup>5</sup> [Συκομορέα (codd. -μωρεα), Lu. xix. 4, so rendered in Peshitto by a popular etymology.]

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also BB. as cited in Payne Smith, s.v. col. 2444.

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

With this compare Bar °Ebhāyā, 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.

<sup>7</sup> B.O. III., i., p. 173<sup>2</sup>.

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.