

Harvard Divinity School

---

Harmonistic Readings in the Old Syriac Gospels

Author(s): George Howard

Source: *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 73, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1980), pp. 473-491

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Harvard Divinity School

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1509736>

Accessed: 12-10-2016 14:15 UTC

---

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).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



*Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge University Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Harvard Theological Review*

## HARMONISTIC READINGS IN THE OLD SYRIAC GOSPELS

George Howard

University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602

There are two extant copies of the Old Syriac gospels, the *evangelion da-mepharreshe*. One, the Curetonian Codex (=C), was discovered by William Cureton and edited by him in 1858.<sup>1</sup> It dates to the middle or later part of the fifth century. The other, the Sinaitic Codex (=S), was discovered by Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis and her sister Mrs. Margaret Dunlop Gibson at St. Catherine's monastery on Mount Sinai.<sup>2</sup> It dates to the later part of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century. Both MSS have a number of lacunae. In combination, however, they preserve most of the text of the four gospels. Although they are not identical their agreements are sufficient to show that they belong to the same translation. S is generally thought to preserve the original text better than C. C, however, sometimes preserves older readings than S.

A notable feature of the Old Syriac gospels is their harmonistic readings, that is, the text of one gospel often agrees with that of another against its own Greek. It is generally thought that these readings were caused by the influence of the Syriac Diatessaron of Tatian. Tatian, a native of Assyria, came to Rome in the middle of the second century and became a disciple of Justin Martyr. About

<sup>1</sup>*Remains of a Very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, Hitherto Unknown in Europe* (London, 1858). The definitive edition of the text with introduction and notes is the two volume work: F. Crawford Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* (Cambridge, 1904).

<sup>2</sup>It was first edited by R. L. Bensly, J. Rendel Harris, and F. C. Burkitt, *The Four Gospels in Syriac transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* (Cambridge, 1894). The definitive publication came later in: Agnes Smith Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion da-Mepharreshe . . .* (London, 1910).

172 he left Rome for the Euphrates Valley and is said to have founded the sect of Encratites. He died only a few years later. Sometime either shortly before leaving Rome or after returning to Mesopotamia he constructed a harmony of the gospels in which the texts of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were woven together into a continuous narrative.<sup>3</sup>

Some think that the Diatessaron was composed before the Old Syriac translation<sup>4</sup> and argue that the translators of the Old Syriac were influenced by the wording of the Diatessaron as they translated. Others think that the Old Syriac was composed before the Diatessaron<sup>5</sup> and argue that harmonistic readings crept into the Old Syriac text during the course of transmission under the influence of the Diatessaron. The fact that S and C contain harmonistic readings in different amounts and sometimes in different places supposedly suggests either that these readings were there in the original translation and were slowly eliminated,<sup>6</sup> or that they were absent in the original and were slowly added, all under the influence of Tatian's harmony. In either case our two

<sup>3</sup>The original language of the Diatessaron has been the cause of endless debate. If Tatian made his composition after his departure from Rome (ca. 172) he probably made it in Syriac, although Kraeling argues that it was composed in Greek even if it was written in Mesopotamia. See Carl H. Kraeling, *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura* (London, 1935) 15–18. If Tatian wrote it while he was in Rome he could have made it in Greek, Syriac, or Latin. For the latter see F. C. Burkitt, "The Dura Fragment of Tatian," *JTS* 36 (1935) 257–58. Many hold that it was written in Greek and was soon translated into Syriac. Among others see Adolf von Harnack, "Tatian's Diatessaron und Marcion's Commentar zum Evangelium bei Ephraem Syrus," *ZKG* 4 (1881) 494–95; *Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1897) 1. 289; H. J. Vogels, *Die Harmonistik von Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis* (TU 36; Leipzig, 1910) 45–46; M.-J. Lagrange, "L'ancienne version Syriaque des Évangiles," *RB* 29 (1920) 326; Adolf Jülicher, "Der echte Tatiantext," *JBL* 43 (1924) 166. Others think that the evidence points to a Syriac original. Notable among these are A. Baumstark, "Das griechische Diatessaronfragment von Dura Europos," *OrChr* 32 (1935) 250; Arthur Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac* (Louvain, 1951) 12; G. A. Weir, *Tatian's Diatessaron and the Old Syriac Gospels. The Evidence of MS Chester Beatty 709* (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1969) xiv–xv.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Burkitt, *Ev. da-Meph.* 209, 210; Vööbus, *Studies*, 16.

<sup>5</sup>Most recently Weir, *Tatian's Diatessaron and the Old Syriac Gospels*, xxii–xxiii.

<sup>6</sup>Vogels believed this to be the case. Upon his observation that C had more harmonistic readings than S and under the belief that C was older than S, he held that the history of the Old Syriac text was a process in which Tatianisms were eliminated. See H. J. Vogels, *Die altsyrischen Evangelien in ihrem Verhältnis zu Tatians Diatessaron* (BSt 16/5; Freiburg im Breisgau, 1911) 8.

witnesses are supposed to represent different stages of one or the other of these processes.

In the following pages we will present evidence to call these views into question. Briefly, we will show that some of the harmonistic readings in the Old Syriac correspond to the Diatessaron and some do not. We will then show that harmonistic readings existed in Christian literature before the time of Tatian and that some of the harmonies in this literature agree with those in the Old Syriac.

For the text of the Diatessaron we will cite only the quotations found in Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron (=EC). This is the clearest and most certain witness to Tatian's harmony. About three-fifths of the original Syriac of this work was published in 1963 by Dom Louis Leloir.<sup>7</sup> The text is from a MS acquired by Sir Chester Beatty and dates to about the fifth or sixth century. Occasionally where the Syriac is nonextant we will cite the Armenian version in the Latin translation of Leloir (= vEC).<sup>8</sup> All other witnesses to the text of the Diatessaron will be avoided.<sup>9</sup> They suffer from certain defects which impair their value for reconstructing the original text of the Diatessaron. Included in them are the scriptural quotations in Ephraem's other works and in other early Syriac fathers. It is not always clear whether a father is quoting the Diatessaron or some form of the Old Syriac. Especially since the researches of Vööbus must caution be used in this area.<sup>10</sup> In a more thorough investigation into the Diatessaron our conservative approach would perhaps be unwarranted. In the present discussion, where only a sounding of readings comparing the Old Syriac with the Diatessaron is to be taken, our conclusions

<sup>7</sup>Louis Leloir, *Saint Ephrem; Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant; Texte Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709)* (Dublin, 1963).

<sup>8</sup>Leloir, *Saint Ephrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant, Version Arménienne* (CSCO 137, *Scriptores Armeniaci 1*; Louvain, 1953; Latin trans. 145, *Scriptores Armeniaci 2*; Louvain, 1964).

<sup>9</sup>For a recent review of the witnesses see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament, Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford, 1977) 10–25.

<sup>10</sup>See especially chap. 3 in Vööbus, *Studies*, 25–45. The great collection of quotations of early Syriac fathers and the attempted reconstruction of the Diatessaron by Urbina must be viewed with caution since it uses early Syriac sources without sufficient discrimination. Ignatius Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangelium Syrorum, et exinde excerptum Diatessaron Tatiani* (Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. Series VI; Madrid, 1967). Cf. the critical review of this work by Robert Murray, "Reconstructing the Diatessaron," *HeyJ* 10 (1969) 43–49.

should necessarily be based only on the surest witness to Tatian's text.

We will begin with a list of examples of harmonistic readings in the Old Syriac which are supported by the Diatessaron. In Matt 8:4 the text of SC lacks a correspondent to ὄρα, "see," in accordance with Luke 5:14 and is supported by Tatian in EC 12.22 (Leloir, 96). The lack of a correspondent to μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ in S Matt 12:45 is supported by Luke 11:26 and EC 11.5 (Leloir, 54). The reading of S Matt 14:24, "the sea was stirred up against them," touches base with John 6:18 and EC 12.7 (Leloir, 80) against the Greek Matthew. In Luke 8:10b the lack of a correspondent to τοῖς λοιποῖς and the reading of "it is said to them" agree basically with Matt 13:13 and EC 11.11a (Leloir, 60). "The Pharisees" in SC Luke 11:51 agrees with EC 10.7a (Leloir, 42) and is harmonistic with Matt 12:24. In Mark 2:28 the order of S, Sabbath/son of man, is in harmony with Matthew and Luke and is supported by EC 13.4 (Leloir, 104). The reading "with him" rather than τῷ Ἰησοῦ, "with Jesus," in S Mark 9:4 agrees with Matt 17:3, Luke 9:30 and EC 14.5 (Leloir, 116. See also 14.11, p. 122). The reading of S Mark 10:5 "Moses because of the hardness of your heart permitted you" is in agreement with Matt 19:8 and EC 14.18 (Leloir, 130). In each of these cases the Syriac text harmonizes in some respect with the reading of another Gospel against its own Greek and is supported in the harmony by the reading in the Diatessaron.

Now we will cite examples where the text of the Old Syriac harmonizes with another gospel and is unsupported by the Diatessaron. In Matt 3:17 the reading of SC, "you are my son," agrees with Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22 against vEC 9.1 (Leloir, 85). The reading of SC Matt 13:32, "greater than all herbs," agrees with Mark 4:32 against EC 11.20 (Leloir, 68). The reading of "sea" in S Matt 14:22 is harmonistic with John 6:17 against EC 12.6 (Leloir, 80).<sup>11</sup> The reading "concerning him" in the C text of Matt 16:20 harmonizes with Mark 8:30 against EC 14.3 (Leloir, 114). The lack of a correspondent to τί ἐπι ὑστερῶ in S Matt 19:20 agrees with Luke 18:21 and the majority text in Mark 10:20 against EC 15.3

<sup>11</sup>It is possible that Ephraem has abbreviated the quotation at this point, as he occasionally does. See Hamlyn Hill, *A Dissertation on the Gospel Commentary of S. Ephraem the Syrian* (Edinburgh, 1896) 19. His inclusion of other details (i.e., "they embarked in the boat"), however, suggests that Ephraem is quoting the full text.

μύρον, “ointment” in agreement with Matt 26:9 (MSS) against EC 17:13 (Leloir, 202). In Luke 8:5 the reading of SC “to sow” rather than “to sow his seed” agrees with Matt 13:3 and Mark 4:3 against EC 11.12 (Leloir, 62).<sup>12</sup>

The examples presented in the lists are only samples of harmonistic readings. There are literally hundreds of such harmonies scattered throughout the gospels, as Vogels’ tally shows.<sup>13</sup> Due to the limitations on our ability to isolate true Tatianic readings it is impossible to tell how many of these harmonizations are due to Diatessaronic influence. Furthermore, we must remember that neither MSS S or C preserves the Old Syriac translation in every detail and the same is true of Chester Beatty MS 709 for the Diatessaronic quotations. All of these MSS have been susceptible to the vicissitudes of transmission and to a degree reflect modifications of their originals. But if the samples listed above are any indication of what actually caused the harmonizations in the Old Syriac we must face the fact that not all were caused by the Diatessaron.

As long ago as 1904 Burkitt toyed with the notion that inner-Syriac assimilation was the cause of some harmonies. In the synoptic pericope of the Rewards of Discipleship, those who leave land and families for Christ’s sake are said to receive “a hundredfold” according to Mark 10:30, “a hundredfold” with a few witnesses reading “manifold” (including B and Origen) according to Matt 19:29, and “manifold” with D and some other Western witnesses reading “sevenfold” according to Luke 18:30. Burkitt, citing Moesinger’s text, includes into this latter reading the Diatessaron. The SC text of Luke, on the other hand, reads “a hundredfold” and is thus harmonistic with Mark and some witnesses of Matthew against the Diatessaron. Burkitt says:

Here again we may conjecture that the *Ev. da-Mepharreshe* and the Diatessaron originally differed. But it is possible in this particular case that the text of S and C has been assimilated to S. Mark (or S. Matthew). Certainly no authorities except S and C have *an hundredfold* in S. Luke, but it would be somewhat strange to find in our Syriac MSS examples of harmonistic corruption, not in agreement with the Diatessaron text, but contrary to it.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup>Weir suggests that the inclusion of τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ (zr’ h) in the Diatessaron was possibly “due to the movement of the Syriac gospel text toward P, i.e., does not go back to Tatian.” *Tatian’s Diatessaron and the Old Syriac Gospels*, 319.

<sup>13</sup>See Vogels, *Die altsyrischen Evangelien*, 71–140.

<sup>14</sup>Burkitt, *Ev. da-Meph.*, 194–95.

There are in fact a number of readings in S and C which agree with the S or C text of a parallel account against the corresponding Greek. In these cases it can be argued that a harmony was made by inner-Syriac assimilation.

An example is Mark 2:24 and Matt 12:2, in the pericope of Plucking Grain on the Sabbath. The Marcan text reads: *ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν*, "See what they are doing on the Sabbath." The S text reads: *lmn' tlmtydk 'bdyn bšbt'*, "Why do your disciples work on the Sabbath?" The difference is caused by the lack of representation for *ἴδε* in the S text, which changes the force of *τί*. The Matthean text reads: *ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθηταί σου ποιοῦσιν*, "Behold your disciples are doing." The S text of Matthew reads: *lmn' tlmtydk 'bdyn*, "Why do your disciples work?" (C reads: *mn' 'bdyn tlmtydk*.) The S texts of Mark and Matthew clearly have an affinity against the Greek texts. The Armenian version of Ephraem's commentary is unsupportive of this harmony: *Nunc ecce discipuli tui operantur in die sabati*, "Now behold, thy disciples do on the Sabbath day" (vCE 5. 23, Leloir, 52). In this instance there is strong probability that the harmonistic reading is nothing more than an inner-Syriac assimilation of one gospel text to another.

On the other hand, there are passages where harmonistic readings in the S text correspond to parallel synoptic Greek texts against their S texts. An example is S Matt 14:22 where the Syriac corresponds to Greek John 6:17 against the S text of John<sup>15</sup> and is unsupported by the Diatessaron. In this case neither Tatian nor inner-Syriac assimilation is the cause of the reading.

If we examine the gospel texts of the pre-Tatianic church fathers we will find that such harmonistic tendencies existed long before Tatian's work and must be explained on a different basis than Diatessaronic influence. In some instances pre-Tatianic harmonistic readings are contained in the Old Syriac. We therefore conclude that some harmonistic readings in S and C are from forces at work in the early church before Tatian.

In recent times several investigations into harmonistic quotations from early church writings have appeared.<sup>16</sup> Three that are of note

<sup>15</sup>The C text of John reads: *l'br' dymt'* and thus agrees with S Matthew. But this is certainly a revision to the Greek against the original preserved in S.

<sup>16</sup>There are of course many older studies into this problem as well. See William Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876) 90–106, 136–37, 185–87;

are by Köster, Bellinzoni, and Kline.<sup>17</sup> Their work suggests that certain harmonistic tendencies in the early writings point to the use of written documents containing harmonistic passages from the gospel tradition. In the following discussion we will rely on the lists of harmonistic passages accumulated by them in order to show the relationship of early harmonistic readings to the Old Syriac translation.

Table 1<sup>18</sup>

A comparison of the synoptic parallels shows several variations between Matthew and Mark/Luke. The first important variant is Matthew's conditional particle *ἐάν*, which is absent in Mark and Luke. Second is the inverted order of Matthew in the reading of *τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσει* against *κερδήσαι/κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον*. Third is the inversion of Matthew to Mark in the reading of *τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ* against *καὶ ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*. Luke in this instance agrees with the order of Matthew but employs *ἑαυτὸν* instead of *τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ* and has the doublet *ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς*.

The text in Justin is striking in that it is a mixture of elements in Matthew and Luke. Justin's *ἄν* corresponds to Matthew's *ἐάν*; his reading of *τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσει* corresponds to Matthew's order; and his use of *τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ* instead of *ἑαυτὸν* agrees with Matthew in wording and order. On the other hand, Justin's *ἀπολέση* agrees with one part of the Lucan doublet, *ἀπολέσας*, against *ζημιωθῆ* found in Matthew. Clement of Alexandria basically presents the same situation except for his lack of *ἄνθρωπος*.

The S (C) text of Luke is harmonistic with Matthew in much the same way. It includes the Matthean "if" particle; the Matthean order of *τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσει*, and a literal rendition of Matthew's *ψυχὴν*. It concludes with the Lucan doublet in an inverted order (*nhsr* = *ζημιωθείς*; *pnwbd* = *ἀπολέσας*).

Moritz von Engelhardt, *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers* (Erlangen, 1878) 335–45.

<sup>17</sup>Helmut Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin, 1957); A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden, 1967); Leslie L. Kline, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (SBLDS 14; Missoula, 1975). Kline is mainly interested in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, but cites harmonizations from earlier writings as well.

<sup>18</sup>Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 74; Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 89–90.

Unfortunately Ephraem's commentary fails to cite the Diatessaron at this point. Regardless of Tatian's reading, however, we can see that a harmonistic text made up of Matthean and Lucan elements existed early in the second century, before Tatian, and is now reflected in the S text of Luke.

Table 2<sup>19</sup>

The synoptic parallels show some notable variations. Each uses a different word for "better." Matthew employs *ἵνα* where Mark has *μᾶλλον εἰ* and Luke has *εἰ*. Matthew uses *κρεμασθῆ* where Mark and Luke have *περίκειται*. Luke has *λίθος μυλικός* where Matthew and Mark have *μύλος ὄνικος*, and has an inverted order to Matthew and Mark in reading *λίθος μυλικός περίκειται* against *κρεμασθῆ* / *περίκειται μύλος ὄνικος*. Very important is Matthew's *καταποντισθῆ* against Mark's *βέβληται* and Luke's *ἔρριπται*. Matthew adds *τῷ πελάγει* against Mark and Luke. Luke, on the other hand, includes the final clause: *ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίση κτλ.*, against Matthew and Mark.

The text in *1 Clement* is a mixture of the three synoptics. Beginning with a different word for "better" he uses *περιτεθῆναι*, which is closer to Mark and Luke than Matthew; his order, of course, is Mark's against Luke. He next uses *καταποντισθῆναι* in agreement with Matthew against Mark and Luke. He concludes with an additional clause corresponding to Luke, in a different metaphor according to MSS LSK; in the same metaphor according to MSS AC.

The C text of Luke, and to a lesser degree the S text, presents a similar mixture of the synoptics. S and C begin by following Luke's "if," and Luke's order of *λίθος μυλικός περίκειται*. They employ *τιγ'*, "should be hanged," in agreement with Matthew's *κρεμασθῆ* against Mark, Luke and *1 Clement*.<sup>20</sup> C agrees with Matthew and *1 Clement* in reading *καταποντισθῆ* / *καταποντισθῆναι* by his wording *wmtb'* "and he be sunk/ drowned." S and C together agree with Mark, Luke and *1 Clement* in reading *εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* (*bym'*) against Matthew's *ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης*. They conclude in agreement with Luke and *1 Clement* (MSS) by reading: "rather than that he should offend one of these little ones."

<sup>19</sup>Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 17–19.

<sup>20</sup>For *περίκειται* in Mark, S uses *rimy'*.

We are again left without witness to the Diatessaron in Ephraem's commentary. However, we can see that a harmonistic text existed long before Tatian which is now partially reflected in the Old Syriac to Luke.

Table 3<sup>21</sup>

The relationship between Matthew and Mark is close. The differences are *ιδού* in Matthew, *ἴδε* in Mark; *ὅστις* in Matthew, *ὅς* in Mark; *γάρ* in Matthew and some MSS of Mark but absent in some others in Mark; and *τοῦ πατρός μου* in Matthew, *τοῦ θεοῦ* in Mark. Luke is quite different from Matthew and Mark. He has no correspondent for *ιδού/ἴδε*; in place of *ὅστις/ὅς γάρ ἄν* he reads *οὗτοί εἰσιν*. He reads *τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ* against *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου/τοῦ θεοῦ* in Matthew and Mark, has the additional words *οἱ . . . ἀκούοντες*, and an inverted order for *ποιούντες*, which corresponds to Matthew's and Mark's *ποιήση*.

2 *Clement* is a mixture of these two forms. He reads *οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ποιούντες* with Luke and *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου* with Matthew.

The S text of Matthew is a combination of the same two forms. The initial reading of *hlyn 'nwn*, "these are," corresponds to Luke's *οὗτοί εἰσιν* while *kwl mn d'bd gyr šbynh d'by*, "for every one who does the will of my Father," corresponds to Matthew. The C text of Matthew, on the other hand, is an obvious attempt to correct the Syriac to the Greek by eliminating the Lucan elements.

We have no witness to the Diatessaron at this point, so we cannot know whether Tatian's harmony incorporated the mixture we find in 2 *Clement* and S Matthew. Whatever the case, there existed at the middle of the second century a harmonistic reading now reflected in the Old Syriac to Matthew.

Table 4<sup>22</sup>

There are several notable differences between Matthew and Luke. Luke speaks of "after having killed"; these words are absent in Matthew. Luke also speaks of "the one having authority" while Matthew speaks of "the one who is able." Matthew's "both soul

<sup>21</sup>Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 77–79.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, 95–99; Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 108ff.; Kline, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, 27–33.

and body” are absent in Luke. Matthew uses the expression “to destroy” (ἀπολέσαι); Luke uses “to cast” (ἐμβαλεῖν).

In *2 Clem.* 5.4, *Justin Apol.* 19.7 and *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 17.5.2 a mixture of these passages appears. *2 Clement* agrees with the Lucan ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν while Justin and the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* agree with the Matthean δυνάμενον. Otherwise they are in close harmony. All three have correspondents for the Matthean ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα, with Justin and the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* including the initial καὶ and the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* inverting the order to σῶμα/ψυχὴν. All three have a correspondent to the Lucan ἐμβαλεῖν (τοῦ βαλεῖν in *2 Clement*; βαλεῖν in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*). Finally *2 Clement* and Justin agree with Luke in reading: “after having killed.”

The S text of Matthew shows some of this same mixture by following Matthew except for the Lucan ἐμβαλεῖν, translated *lmmryw* in accordance with *2 Clement*, Justin, and the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* against Matthew’s ἀπολέσαι. It also preserves the order καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν found only in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*.

We have no clear reference to the Diatessaronic reading of this passage. The witness of *2 Clement* and Justin, however, shows that before the work of Tatian there existed a harmonistic reading now partially reflected in S Matthew.

See Table 5<sup>23</sup>

In this saying the accounts of Matthew and Luke diverge widely. Among other things, Matthew speaks of (1) Lord, Lord, (2) prophesying in the Lord’s name, (3) casting out of demons, and (4) doing many mighty works. None of these are found in Luke. On the other hand, Luke speaks of (1) eating and drinking and (2) teaching in the streets, neither of which are in Matthew. In the final section the two converge more closely. However, where Matthew has “I will confess to them” Luke has “He will speak saying to you”; where Matthew has “I never knew you,” Luke has “I do not know whence you are”; Matthew uses ἀποχωρεῖτε for “depart”; Luke uses ἀπόστητε; Matthew concludes with οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (“those who work lawlessness”); Luke concludes with πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας (“all workers of iniquity”).

<sup>23</sup>Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 80ff.; Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 22–25.

Justin quotes this passage twice in his extant works, *Apol.* 16:11 and *Dial.* 76:5. While there are differences in his two quotations, they are in basic agreement where they overlap. They present a striking harmonization of Matthew and Luke. Justin begins with Matthew's πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι and follows him through κύριε κύριε οὐ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι. He then reads with Luke ἐφάγομεν and ἐπίομεν. He agrees basically with Matthew's ἐπροφητεύσαμεν . . . ἐποιήσαμεν. In the last verse he reads ἐρῶ in agreement with Luke's ἐρεῖ and αὐτοῖς in agreement with Matthew. His ἀποχωρεῖτε/ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ corresponds to Matthew against Luke. His use of the noun ἐργάται is with Luke against Matthew, and finally his τῆς ἀνομίας is with Matthew against Luke. In all, Justin presents an intricate weaving together of the Matthean and Lucan accounts.

It is significant that the C Text of Matthew (S is nonextant) reflects most of the same harmonistic elements. It begins by reading with Matthew: "For many will say to me in that day, 'our Lord, our Lord, did we not in your name.'" At this point it reads with Luke: "eat and drink." It immediately picks up with Matthew: "and in your name we prophesied and in your name we cast out demons and in your name we did many mighty deeds." It continues with Matthew (and *Apol.* 16.11) by reading: "then," with Luke by reading "say," then with Matthew by reading "to them." The phrase, "I never knew you," is with Matthew. The last clause, "Depart from me you workers of iniquity," is closer to Matthew than to Luke, but the noun, *'bdy*, corresponds more closely to Luke's ἐργάται than to Matthew's οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι.

Again we are without witness to the reading of the Diatessaron at this point. We see, however, that there existed a harmonistic text before Tatian's work which is now reflected in the C text of Matthew.<sup>24</sup>

Table 6<sup>25</sup>

The text of Justin is a combination of Matthew and Luke. At the beginning he reads παντί with Luke and τῷ with Matthew. τὸν

<sup>24</sup>Bellinzoni cites this same basic harmonization in Origen (*Contra Celsum* 2.49 [Koetschau, 1; GCS, 171]; *In Evangelium Joannis* 32.11 [Preuschen, 4; GCS, 443], and Pamphilus (*Apologia pro Origene* 5 [PG 17. 572f.]). See Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 24.

<sup>25</sup>Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 80–82.

*βουλόμενον* is synonymous with Matthew's *τὸν θέλοντα* against Luke's *αἴροντος*. He reads *δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε* with Matthew against Luke's *αἴροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει*. His reading of *δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν* is with Luke against Matthew's *ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς ἀδελφούς ὑμῶν μόνον*. The final three words, *τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε* are closer to Matthew than to Luke.

The S text of Luke is a similar, though not identical, mixture. *wlmn d* is perhaps a little closer to Matthew than Luke. The reading of *wlmn dšb'* "and to the one who wishes," agrees with Matthew and Justin against Luke. "That he should take what is yours" agrees with Luke's *αἴροντος*. The rest of the passage is basically in agreement with Luke and with Justin except for Justin's *τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε*.

Ephraem's commentary fails to cite these verses, so we are without witness to the Diatessaron. Nevertheless, it is clear that before Tatian there existed a harmonistic reading of Matthew and Luke which is now partially reflected in the S text of Luke.

By the lists of passages presented above we have shown three things. First, we have shown that sometimes where the Old Syriac gospels contain harmonistic elements the same elements are found in Tatian's harmony as quoted by Ephraem in his commentary on the Diatessaron. From this one can argue that the work of Tatian influenced either the composition or the transmission of the Old Syriac text in the matter of harmonization.

Second, we have shown that sometimes where harmonistic elements exist in the Old Syriac they are unsupported by Tatian's harmony. While our copies of the Old Syriac and Ephraem's commentary have undergone changes in the course of their transmission and thus do not perfectly represent the original documents in either case,<sup>26</sup> it appears that not all of the harmonistic readings in the Old Syriac are traceable to Tatian's work.

Finally, building upon the investigations of others on the gospel text as it appears in the early patristic writings, we have shown that harmonistic tendencies existed in pre-Tatianic times. In some cases the very harmonistic elements that appear in writers of the first half of the second century and even in the second half of the first appear also in the Old Syriac.

<sup>26</sup>For the fate of Tatian's text before Ephraem's work, see A. Baumstark, "Zur Geschichte des Tatiantextes vor Aphrem," *Or Chr* 8 (1933) 1-12.

It has been suggested that written pieces of harmonistic material from our canonical gospels were used in the early church, especially by Justin and his disciples. Bellinzoni says:

Justin and his pupils apparently used the synoptic gospels as their primary source and composed church catechisms and *vade mecums* by harmonizing material from the synoptic gospels as described above. . . . It must, however, be emphasized that there is absolutely no evidence that Justin ever composed a complete harmony of the synoptic gospels; his harmonies were of a limited scope and were apparently composed for didactic purposes.<sup>27</sup>

Bellinzoni argues that harmonies such as those found in Justin gave rise in time to systematic harmonistic corruption in gospel MSS and that Tatian, a disciple of Justin, in whose school harmonies were commonplace, simply carried to completion what his teacher had started, in that he harmonized the entirety of the four gospels into one continuous narrative.<sup>28</sup>

The evidence we have presented in this paper adds a new dimension to the problem. Some harmonies, much like those found in Justin and Tatian, go back to a time prior to both of these and are characteristic of the gospel text in the very earliest patristic period. Again the harmonies found in Justin are short citations from the gospels giving the appearance of ad hoc preparation for catechetical use. The work of Tatian is a continuous harmony of the four gospels. The Old Syriac, on the other hand, is neither of these. Rather it is a complete translation of the four *separate* gospels incorporating harmonistic readings. The fact that the translators chose to render the four gospels separately suggests that they did not intend to compose a harmonized account of the life of Jesus. The nature of the harmonistic readings in the Old Syriac should be considered in this light.

It has long been known that the Old Syriac is of great antiquity and value. It is possible that MSS S and C preserve, though imperfectly, an ancient form of the separate gospels in which their texts were closer together in wording than they appear in modern editions of the Greek NT used today. If this is true the Old Syriac is a valuable witness to an early stream of gospel tradition that deserves careful attention.

The relation of the Old Syriac to the Western text is of interest in this respect. Westcott and Hort found the Western text to be

<sup>27</sup>Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 141.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, 141-42.

the earliest that they could fix chronologically. Their description of it included the following:

But its most dangerous work is "harmonistic" corruption, that is, the partial or total obliteration of differences in passages otherwise more or less resembling each other. Sometimes the assimilation is between single sentences that happen to have some matter in common, more usually however between parallel passages of greater length, such especially as have in some sense a common origin.<sup>29</sup>

The harmonistic readings in the Western text as well as other of its readings bring it into close relationship with the Old Syriac. It has been held that the Western element as a whole in the Old Syriac is due to the influence of the Diatessaron. But Weir has convincingly argued against this view. He found forty-two Western readings in S (thirty-one in C) which are not shared by EC and this appears "to rule out the Diatessaron as the source of the Western element in the Old Syriac."<sup>30</sup> Rather, he posits a Greek text of a Western complexion as the basis for both the Diatessaron and the Old Syriac translation.

If this is correct we could say that early in the second century there existed a widely used harmonistic text of the gospels. It might be more correct to say, however, that early in the second century alternate forms of the tradition, one divergent and one harmonized, coexisted in collateral lines of descent. For the present writer the question of when the harmonized form arose is of intriguing significance.

<sup>29</sup>B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek. Introduction and Appendix* (New York, 1882) 124–25. Vogels, who investigated the harmonistic element in Codex Bezae, found it so harmonistic that he concluded that a harmony stood behind it. Vogels, *Die Harmonistik*, above, n. 3.

<sup>30</sup>Weir, *Tatian's Diatessaron and the Old Syriac Gospels*, 365.

TABLE 1  
 Samples of Harmonistic Readings in Patristic Quotations Supported by the Old Syriac

|                   | <b>Mark 8:36</b>   | <b>Luke 9:25</b>   | <b>Justin<br/>Apol. 15.12</b>   | <b>Clem. Alex.<br/>Strom. 6.14.112.3</b>  | <b>SC Luke</b>   |
|-------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Matt 16:26</b> | τί γάρ<br>ἀφελήσεται<br>ἄνθρωπος<br>ἐάν<br>τὸν κόσμον ὅλον<br>κερδήσῃ<br>τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν<br>αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ | τί γάρ<br>ἀφελῆται<br>ἄνθρωπος<br>κερδήσας<br>τὸν κόσμον ὅλον<br>ἐαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας<br>ἢ ζημιωθείς | τί γάρ<br>ἄφελῆται<br>ἄνθρωπος<br>ἂν<br>τὸν κόσμον ὅλον<br>κερδήσῃ<br>τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν<br>αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ | τί γάρ<br>ὄφελος<br>ἐάν<br>τὸν κόσμον<br>κερδήσῃς,<br>φῃσι,<br>τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν<br>ἀπολέσῃς | mn' gyt<br>n' tr<br>br' nis'<br>'n<br>'lm' kllh<br>nqh'<br>wnpsh<br>nhsr<br>wnwbd (-C) |

TABLE 2

|                  | <i>Mark 9:42</i>  | <i>Luke 17:2</i>   | <i>I Clement 46:8</i>  | <i>SC Luke</i>   |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| <i>Matt 18:6</i> | συμφέρει αὐτῷ<br>ἕνα<br>κρεμασθῆ<br>μῦλος οὐκικός<br>περὶ τὸν<br>τράχηλον αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ<br>καταποντισθῆ<br>ἐν τῷ πελάγει<br>τῆς θαλάσσης | καλὸν ἔστιν αὐτῷ<br>μᾶλλον εἰ<br>πέρικεῖται<br>μῦλος οὐκικός<br>περὶ τὸν<br>τράχηλον αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ<br>βέβληται<br>εἰς<br>τὴν θάλασσαν | κρείττον ἢν αὐτῷ<br>περικεῖται<br>μῦλον<br>καὶ<br>καταποντισθῆναι<br>εἰς<br>τὴν θάλασσαν<br>ἢ<br>ἕνα *τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν<br>μου<br>διαστρέψαι* (LSK) | ῥᾱῃ ἠω' lh<br>'lw<br>ῥῆγ' dḥmῖ<br>tly'<br>bšwḡh<br><br>wmib' (wšd' -S)<br><br>bym'<br>'w<br>dnksl (nksl -S)<br>lhd mn<br>hlyḡ z 'wḡ' |

\*τῶν μικρῶν μου  
σκανδαλίσαι\* (AC)

TABLE 3

|                      |   |                     |   |                  |   |                       |   |                  |   |                  |   |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|
| <b>Matt 12:49-50</b> | ιδού ἡ μήτηρ μου<br>καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου<br>ὅστις γάρ<br>ἂν ποιήσῃ<br>τὸ θέλημα<br>τοῦ πατρὸς μου | <b>Mark 3:34-35</b> | ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου<br>καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου<br>ὡς * γὰρ<br>ἂν ποιήσῃ<br>τὸ θέλημα<br>τοῦ θεοῦ | <b>Luke 8:21</b> | μήτηρ μου<br>καὶ ἀδελφοί μου<br>οὐτοὶ εἰσιν οἱ<br>τὸν λόγον<br>τοῦ θεοῦ<br>ἀκούοντες καὶ<br>ποιούντες | <b>2 Clement 9.11</b> | ἀδελφοί μου<br>οὐτοὶ εἰσιν οἱ<br><br>ποιούντες<br>τὸ θέλημα<br>τοῦ πατρὸς μου | <b>S Matthew</b> | hlyn 'nwn<br>'my w 'hy<br>kwl mn<br>d 'bd gyr<br>šbwnh<br>d 'by | <b>C Matthew</b> | h ' 'my<br>wh ' 'hy<br>kl- -- mn<br>d 'bd gyr<br>šbwnh<br>d 'by |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|

\*Omit B b e bo<sup>pt</sup>

TABLE 4

|                   |   |                  |   |                      |   |                              |   |                                  |   |                  |   |
|-------------------|---|------------------|---|----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| <b>Matt 10:28</b> | τὸν<br>δυναμένον<br>καὶ ψυχὴν<br>καὶ σῶμα<br>ἀπολέσται<br>ἐν γέεννῃ | <b>Luke 12:5</b> | τὸν μετὰ<br>τὸ ἀποκτείναι<br>ἔχοντα ἑξουσίαν<br>ἐμβαλεῖν<br>εἰς τὴν γέενναν | <b>2 Clement 5.4</b> | τὸν μετὰ<br>τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς<br>ἔχοντα ἑξουσίαν<br>ψυχῆς<br>καὶ σώματος<br>τοῦ βαλεῖν<br>εἰς γέενναν πυρός | <b>Justin<br/>Apol. 19.7</b> | τὸν μετὰ<br>τὸ ἀποθανεῖν<br>δυναμένον<br>καὶ ψυχὴν<br>καὶ σώμα<br>εἰς γέενναν<br>ἐμβαλεῖν | <b>Ps.-Clem. Hom.<br/>17.5.2</b> | τὸν<br>δυναμένον<br>καὶ σῶμα<br>καὶ ψυχὴν<br>εἰς τὴν γέενναν<br>τοῦ πυρός<br>βαλεῖν | <b>S Matthew</b> | mn hw<br>dmškh<br>pgr'<br>wnps'<br>lmmrw<br>bgñh' |
|-------------------|---|------------------|---|----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------|---|

## TABLE 5

| <i>Matt 7:22, 23</i>  | <i>Luke 13:26, 27</i>   | <i>Justin<br/>Apol 16.11</i>   | <i>Justin<br/>Dial. 76.5</i>   | <i>C Matt 7:22-23</i>  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 22 πολλοὶ ἐροῦσίν μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· κύριε κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι                 | 26 τότε ἀφῆσθε λέγειν· ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας· | πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσίν μοι· κύριε κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας· | πολλοὶ ἐροῦσίν μοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ· κύριε, κύριε οὐ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προσεφητευσάμεν καὶ | sgy ' ' gyt n ' mtwn ly bhw ywmt ' mirn mirn l ' bšmk 'kln   |
| ἐπροφητευσάμεν καὶ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι δαίμονια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς | 27 καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ἡμῖν· οὐκ οὐδα πόθεν ἐστὶ ἀπόσπῃτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν      | δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν, καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἄποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας                             | δαίμονια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἄποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ   | w 'šlyp wbsmk 'inbyn wbsmk š 'd ' 'pqn wbsmk hyl ' sgy ' ' 'bdb hdyh 'mr lhwn dl ' mn mtwmt yd 'tkwn zlw lkwn mny 'bdy 'wl ' |

TABLE 6

*Matt 5:42,47*

τῷ  
 αἰτοῦντί σε  
 δός, καὶ  
 τὸν θέλοντα  
 ἀπὸ σοῦ  
 δανείσασθαι  
 μὴ ἀποστραφῆς,  
 καὶ ἔαν  
 ἀσπάσῃσθε τοὺς  
 ἀδελφούς  
 ὑμῶν  
 μόνον  
 τί περισσὸν  
 ποιεῖτε

*Luke 6:30,34*

παντὶ  
 αἰτοῦντί σε  
 δίδου, καὶ  
 ἀπὸ τοῦ  
 αἵροντος  
 τὰ σὰ  
 μὴ ἀπαίτει.  
 καὶ ἔαν  
 δανίσῃτε  
 παρ' ὧν  
 ἐλπίζετε  
 λαβεῖν  
 ποία ὑμῶν  
 χάρις ἐστίν

*Justin Apol. 15.10*

παντὶ τῷ  
 αἰτοῦντι  
 δίδοτε καὶ  
 τὸν βουλόμενον  
 δανείσασθαι  
 μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε.  
 εἰ γὰρ  
 δανείζετε  
 παρ' ὧν  
 ἐλπίζετε  
 λαβεῖν  
 τί καινὸν  
 ποιεῖτε

*S Luke*

wlmn  
 dš 'l lk  
 hb lh  
 wlmn dšb '  
 dnšqwl  
 dylk  
 l ' ttb 'h  
 w 'n  
 mwzypyn 'ntwn  
 lmn  
 dsbryn 'ntwn  
 dtlpr 'wn mnh  
 mn ' hy  
 ŷybwtkwn