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1. Prologue

The purpose of this article, which is of preliminary nature, is to present a renewed survey of quotations of the Gospels which can be observed in Ephrem the Syrian’s works. A word of explanation is necessary why a “renewed” survey should be done.

Although still today the view that the Diatessaron of Tatian was originally compiled in Syriac is predominant among Syriac scholars, I myself have come to a different conclusion, i.e., that Tatian compiled the Diatessaron in Greek. The implication of this conclusion is that the Diatessaron could have been translated into Syriac in the third century or even later. Furthermore, thanks to the series of studies published by U.B. Schmid, it is now clear that the so-called Western branch of the Diatessaron has actually nothing to do with Tatian’s Diatessaron. Thus at least practically, the only witness that can be consulted for the study of Tatian’s Diatessaron is the famous commentary, attributed to Ephrem the Syrian, of the Gospel harmony, preserved in its entirety in Armenian and in most parts also in Syriac, the original
language of the commentary\(^6\).

However, a question arises here: why did Ephrem, who was known to be very keen on what was orthodox in the Christian church, use the Diatessaron which had been compiled by such a renowned heretic as Tatian? To put the question differently, was Ephrem aware that the Gospel harmony he used for his commentary had been compiled by Tatian? or was he simply unaware of it? And if the latter is the case, was the Syriac Gospel harmony in question transmitted with Tatian as the name of its compiler? or was it transmitted anonymously? To my knowledge, such questions have hardly been posed so far.

This article, then, intends to present a survey of quotations of the Gospels which can be observed in Ephrem the Syrian’s works, in order to see what Gospel text(s) Ephrem did mainly consult for his works. It is hoped that this investigation will enable us to see what Gospel text(s) Ephrem the Syrian did mainly use, and thus to understand the more precise significance of the Syriac Gospel harmony for Ephrem himself. The word “mainly” should be stressed in this context, as will be made clear later.

Mention must be briefly made here of earlier studies on the subject. In 1901 Francis C. Burkitt published his monograph on the subject\(^7\), on which more will be said later. Louis Leloir, on his part, published a vast collection of Ephrem the Syrian’s quotations of the Gospels, but without any analysis\(^8\). In 1983 George A. Egan published a collection of quotations of the Gospels as well as their analysis\(^9\), but the basis of Egan’s analysis is, unlike the standpoint of this article, the understanding that Syriac is the original language of the Diatessaron, and that the transmission of the Diatessaron includes the so-called Western branch; furthermore, the focus of Egan’s analysis is different from that of this article.

The only earlier study that can serve as a basis for the investigation of this article is Burkitt’s monograph, although it should be clear that its focus is different from that of this article, because one of the important problems for Burkitt was whether Ephrem’s authentic works attest readings peculiar to the Peshitta or not, a problem which does not specially concern us here.

In any case, as a renowned scholar with great precision Burkitt examines in detail 48 passages of the four Gospels, and comes to the following conclusion, which merits to be cited at some length\(^10\):

“On the 48 passages quoted and discussed in the preceding pages must rest the decision as to what text of the Gospel was used by S. Ephraim. For my own part, I cannot think that the occasional coincidences of language with the Peshitta against the Sinai Palimpsest and the Curetonian, amounting to eight in all, are of a character to suggest the actual use of the Syriac Vulgate [= Peshitta]. Most of them occur in

\[\text{Referecnes}\]

6 Edmund Beck, one of the best twentieth-century experts of Ephrem the Syrian, expresses some doubt on the authenticity of the commentary: see E. BECK “Der syrische Diatessaronkommentar zu Jo. I 1-5”, OC 67 (1983), pp. 1-31, especially at p. 31. However, as the most scholars accept the authenticity of this commentary, here I follow the majority’s opinion.


10 Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 55-56.
passages which otherwise present notable coincidences with the Sinai Palimpsest or the Curetonian, or else differ widely from all known Syriac texts of the Gospel.

Against these are to be set at least three times as many agreements of S. Ephraim with S [i.e., Sinai Palimpsest] or C [i.e., Curetonian] against the Peshitta, some of them of most striking and unmistakable character. ...

There are not wanting also marked differences between S. Ephraim and these MSS [i.e., S and C], and these differences suggest that it was not the Old Syriac version of the Four Gospels, the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, that S. Ephraim was using, but the Diatessaron.”

Clearly the last quoted passage is Burkitt’s real, substantial conclusion which is of prime importance for our investigation.

And it is precisely here that, if any, a contribution can be made by this investigation, because Burkitt could not consult the aforementioned Syriac commentary of Ephrem, which remained undiscovered in his time, and which we can now consult. In other words, the purpose of the investigation of this article is to see whether the aforementioned conclusion of Burkitt still stands today or not.

For our investigation, only the Ephrem’s works edited and published in the CSCO series are consulted11; thus the basis of this investigation is still narrower than that of Burkitt’s. However, one does not need to be exhaustive for such an investigation, because normally the Gospels that one uses do not change easily; generally speaking, people tend to be conservative on such a matter. Thus if, based on the investigation of some of Ephrem’s authentic works, one can see what Gospel text(s) Ephrem himself did mainly use, one will be allowed to suppose that the situation is doubtless the same also for other works of

---

Ephrem not included in the investigation. This is why the word “mainly”, stressed above, is important.

2. Ephrem’s quotations of the Gospels reexamined

In his monograph Burkitt made the following “List of the Genuine Writings of S. Ephraim”:

PROSE WRITINGS:
(1) The Commentary on Genesis and Exodus Ed. Rom. iv 1-115, 194-235
(2) The Homily on our Lord Lamy i 145-274, Lamy ii pp. xxi-xxiii
(3) The fragments of the Homily on Joh I 1 Lamy ii 511-516
(4) The fragments of the Treatises addressed to Hypatius against False Doctrines Overbeck 21-73
(5) On the Fear of God, or De Misericordia Divina Overbeck 105-112
(6) Letter to the Monks in the Mountains Overbeck 113-131

METRICAL WORKS (including both “Hymns” and “Homilies”):
(7) ‘Sermones Exegeticci’ on Adam, etc. Ed. Rom. v 318c-330
(8) ‘Sermones Exegeticci’ on Jonah Ed. Rom. v 359d-387a
(9) De Nativitate (see below, no. 26) Ed. Rom. v 396-436
(10) Sermones Polemici i-vi Ed. Rom. v 437 ad fin.
(11) De Fide adv. Scrutatores lxxvii Ed. Rom. vi 1-164
(12) De Libero Voluntatis Arbitrio iv Ed. Rom. vi 359a-366
(13) ‘Paraeneticæ,’ no. i Ed. Rom. vi 367-369b
(14) ‘Paraeneticæ,’ no. xx Ed. Rom. vi 450d-451f
(15) ‘Paraeneticæ,’ nos. lxxv, lxxvi Ed. Rom. vi 555f-561
(16) De Paradiso Eden (see below, no. 21) Ed. Rom. vi 562-598
(17) ‘De Diversis Sermones,’ no. ii Ed. Rom. vi 603-604e
(18) ‘De Diversis Sermones,’ no. iv-xii Ed. Rom. vi 608c-629b
(20) On Julian the Apostle Overbeck 3-20
(21) De Paradiso Eden (supplement to no. 16) Overbeck 339-354
(22) The Carmina Nisibena (see below, no. 25) Bickell’s Edition
(23) Hymni Azyromorum Lamy i 567-636
(24) De Crucifixione Lamy i 637-714
(25) Sermo de Reprehensione i Lamy ii 332 [sic]-362 [sic]

12 Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 24-25, partially modified and numbered afresh (for the part of “metrical works”) in order to facilitate the reference. The editions mentioned in the list are the following:
Bickell = G. Bickell (ed.), S. Ephraemi Syri carmina Nisibena, Lipsiae: Brockhaus, 1866
Overbeck = J. J. Overbeck, S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta, Oxonii: Ex typographo Clarendoniano, 1865
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(26) Hymni de Nativitate (supplement to no. 9) Lamy ii 501-510
(27) Hymns on Fasting, Virginity, etc. Lamy ii 647-678 [sic], 685-694, 718-814
(28) Sermones Rogationum, nos. III, V-X Lamy iii 37-44, 65-114
(29) Hymns on the Confessors Lamy iii 643-696
(30) on Abraham Kidunaya and on Julian Saba Lamy iii 741 [sic]-936"

Referring to the aforementioned more recent editions of these texts, the list can be redrawn as follows (NA = not available in the CSCO series):

(1) Tonneau, CSCO 152, pp. 3-121, 122-155 (= Ed. Rom. iv, p. 226c)
(2) Beck, CSCO 270, pp. 1-53 (= Lamy i, col. 274)
(3) NA
(4) NA
(5) NA
(6) Beck, CSCO 334, pp. 28-43. However, Beck, the editor of the text, considers it unauthentic13; thus this text is excluded from the reexamination presented below.
(8) Beck, CSCO 311, pp. 1-40
(10) Beck, CSCO 169, pp. 1-212 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 560 = finis)
(11) Beck, CSCO 154, pp. 3-271
(13) Beck, CSCO 198, pp. 84-87
(14) Beck, CSCO 198, pp. 49-50, 51
(15) Beck, CSCO 198, pp. 70-75
(16) Beck, CSCO 174, pp. 1-53
(17) Beck, CSCO 198, pp. 130-133
(20) Beck, CSCO 174, pp. 71-91
(21) Beck, CSCO 174, pp. 51-70
(22) Beck, CSCO 218, pp. 1-83 (= Bickell, pp. 1-55); Id., CSCO 240, pp. 1-137 (= Bickell, pp. 56-145)

13 See Beck, CSCO 335, pp. x-xi.
With this list as a conversion table, so to speak, we have to check the quotations of the Gospel. According to Burkitt’s description, the quotations are as follows:

“S. MATTHEW.”

1 chap. iii 17 Ed. Rom. v 545A, vi 16c
2 v 39 Bickell, p. 72124
3 ix 17 Ed. Rom. v 538c
4 xi 19 Lamy ii 747
5 xiv 28ff. Overbeck 27
xv 27 Ed. Rom. vi 585d, & see on Mk vii 28
xvi 2, 3 see on Lk xii 54-56
6 xvi 18 Overbeck 352
7 xvi 19 Lamy i 267
8 xvii 12f. Overbeck 114
9 xvii 22 Bickell, p. 72168
10 xxi 3 Ed. Rom. iv 108f.
11 xxi 40, 41 Lamy i 253
12 xxii 13 Bickell, p. 84230
13 xxiii 8 Ed. Rom. v 491b
14 xxvi 13 Lamy i 257
15 xxvii 46 Ed. Rom. v 558a

S. MARK.

16 chap. iv 39 Lamy i 263
17 vii 28 Lamy i 163

14 It should be clearly understood that these fragmented references of Beck’s edition (CSCO 223) show that Lamy’s edition is, compared with Beck’s, quite lacunose, omitting arbitrarily some strophes etc. It is evident that Lamy’s edition is not trustworthy.
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(18) vii 33  Lamy i 171
(19) xii 42  Bickell, p. 91

S. LUKE.

(20) chap. ii 30  Lamy i 259, 261
(21) ii 34  Lamy i 267
(22) ii 36  Lamy iii 813
(23) iv 29  see on Matt iii 17
(24) vi 29  see on Matt v 39

(25) vii 41-43  Lamy ii, p. xxii f.
(26) ix 62  Overbeck 127
(27) xii 49  Overbeck 124, 126
(28) xii 54-56  Ed. Rom. v 320B
(29) xiv 31  Ed. Rom. v 487A

(30) xv 4 f.  see on Matt xviii 12f.
(31) xviii 31, 32  Overbeck 127
(32) xxii 43  Lamy i 233, 665; Nis. 59-229
(33) xxiii 38  Lamy i 667
(34) xxiii 43  Lamy i 667, 669

S. JOHN.

chap. i ff.  Ed. Rom. vi 62A, 63B
(35) i 1  Lamy ii 513
(36) i 3  Ed. Rom. iv 18E
(37) i 3f.  Lamy ii 513, 515
(38) i 14  Lamy ii 743
(39) iii 34  Lamy i 267

(40) vi 52  Ed. Rom. vi 102F
(41) xii 2  Lamy i 255
(42) xiii 5  Lamy i 657
(43) xiv 23  Lamy i 273
(44) xv 1  Lamy ii 359
(45) xvi 11  Ed. Rom. iv 37F
(46) xvii 11  Ed. Rom. vi 122C

---

16 Although mentioned in Burkitt, op. cit., p. 27, Burkitt examines these passages not in the main discussion, but in the Appendix I (“S. Ephraim’s Quotations from the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel”, pp. 59-65); because of the complexity of the discussion, they are not dealt with in this article.
Thus these passages should be discussed one by one.

(1) Mt 3,17

Ed. Rom. v 545A is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 169, p. 189 l. 12:

Das ist mein Sohn und mein Geliebter. (Beck, CSCO 170, p. 168)

Ed. Rom. vi 16c is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 154, p. 34 l. 18:

Dieser ist mein Sohn und mein Geliebter. (Beck, CSCO 155, p. 25)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 28), “for ‘and my beloved’ Peshitta has ‘the beloved’ in accordance with the Greek ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, but is the reading of Sinaiticus and Curetonianus”. Burkitt also says that the evidence in v 545 (instead of) is more striking, but in my view his judgement is greatly exaggerated.

(2) Mt 5,39

Bickell, p. 72,124 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 240, p. 25 l. 22:

Dem der dich auf die Wange schlägt, reiche deine andre Wange. (Beck, CSCO 241, p. 19)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 28), “a paraphrase ... omitting ‘right’ as an epithet to ‘cheek,’ in agreement with Sinaiticus and Curetonianus against the Peshitta”.

(3) Mt 9,17

Ed. Rom. v 538C, which runs as follows:

is different from Beck, CSCO 169, p. 176 ll. 13-14, which runs as follows:

Nicht tut man neuen Wein in abgenützte Schläuche. (Beck, CSCO 170, p. 156)

As Burkitt says (p. 28), both Sinaiticus and the Peshitta have ; thus here Ephrem’s quotation agrees with Sinaiticus and the Peshitta.

(4) Mt 11,19 = Lamy ii 747: NA
(5) Mt 14,28ff. = Overbeck 27: NA
(6) Mt 16,18

Overbeck 352 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 174, p. 67 l. 11:

Nicht können die Riegel der Scheol sie besiegen. (Beck, CSCO 175, p. 61)

As Burkitt says (p. 30), this text differs from both Curetonianus and the Peshitta, both of which have

(7) Mt 16,19

Lamy i 267 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 51:

Sprach er zu Simon: «Dir will ich die Schlüssel der Pforten geben». (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 52)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 30), “the Peshitta has here, in accordance with the Greek, ‘the keys of the kingdom of heaven,’ but Curetonianus has ‘the keys of the doors of the kingdom of heaven.’
Thus Ephraim’s text agrees with Curetonianus against the Peshitta”.

(8) Mt 18,12f.

Overbeck 114: as mentioned above, this text is considered unauthentic by its editor Beck, and thus excluded from the analysis.

(9) Mt 18,22

Bickell, p. 72 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 26 l. 22:

Verzeihe deinem Bruder siebenmal siebzigmal! (BECK, CSCO 241, p. 20)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 31), “the idiomatic which is here used... is found in Sinaiticus and Curetonianus... But the Peshitta, in more literal accordance with the Greek, has ‘unto seventy times by sevens’ (دها لعصم إلهي لعدم حمد).

(10) Mt 21,3

Ed. Rom. iv 108f., which runs as follows:

Dicite eis: A Domino suo requiruntur. (TONNEAU, CSCO 153, p. 97)

To reproduce only a few words of Burkitt’s analysis of considerable length (p. 33), “for the last two words the MS actually has... in exact accordance with the Curetonian text of Matt xxi 3”.

(11) Mt 21,40f.

Lamy i 253 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 270, p. 45:

Was wird der Herr des Weinberges jenen Winzern antun? Sie sagten gegen sich selber: «Gar schlimm wird er sie vernichten und er wird den Weinberg den Winzern geben, die die Frucht zu ihrer Zeit geben werden.» (BECK, CSCO 271, pp. 45-46)

To reproduce first a few words of Burkitt’s analysis (p. 34), the passage “which appears to be intended for a real quotation is the answer of the Pharisees... But the final clause in Ephraim differs altogether both from the Syriac Vulgate [i.e., Peshitta] and the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe [i.e., Sinaiticus and Curetonianus]”. Then Burkitt suggests that the difference comes from this passage reflecting the Diatessaron, saying (p. 35): “It may reasonably be conjectured that here as in other places S. Ephraim is giving us the text of the Diatessaron”. However, this argument related to the Diatessaron is a so-called petitio principii, and thus cannot be accepted.

(12) Mt 22,13

Bickell, p. 84 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 45 l. 19:

Da man jenen Mann gefesselt hat, dessen Körper beschmutzt war. (BECK, CSCO 241, p. 35)

It is clear that this instance can hardly be regarded as a quotation, and thus any further analysis seems meaningless. One thing should be noted here, however. In Ephrem’s commentary of the Gospel harmony there is an allusion to Mt 22,13, so one might hope if one can find anything related to our investigation; but
the allusion in question consists solely in the expression of two words: ֭יָדָעַשְׁנָה, and does not render anything.

(13) Mt 23,8

Ed. Rom. v 491B, which runs as follows:

is different from BECK, CSCO 169, p. 90 l. 14, which runs as follows:

(Es hat der Wahrhaftige warnend befohlen,)
auf Erden keinen «Meister» zu haben. (BECK, CSCO 170, p. 86)

This quotation of Ephrem differs from Sinaiticus, Curetonianus and the Peshitta.

(14) Mt 26,13

Lamy i 257 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 270, p. 47:

Es wird für sie Ruf und Erinnerung sein überall dort, wo meine Frohbotschaft verkündet werden wird. (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 47)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 36), “There is no trace of this recasting of the verse either in the Peshitta or in the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, so that it is possible that Ephraim’s words are a conscious paraphrase” (italic of the last quoted word is mine, T. S.).

(15) Mt 27,46

Ed. Rom. v 558A is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 169, p. 208 l. 14:

Gott, Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen? (BECK, CSCO 170, p. 189)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 36), “For the first words Sinaiticus has לַעַל לַעַל in Matt. and לַעַל לַעַל in Mk. Peshitta has לַעַל לַעַל both in Matt. and in Mk”. Thus this quotation of Ephrem is different from Sinaiticus and the Peshitta.

(16) Mk 4,39

Lamy i 263 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 270, p. 49:

Schweig, sei stumm! (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 50)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 37), in this quotation of Ephrem “the rebuke is addressed to the wind [i.e., a feminine noun]. Sinaiticus and Curetonianus are unfortunately both missing, but the Peshitta has לַעַל לַעַל and the rebuke is addressed to the sea [i.e., a masculine noun]. ... S. Ephraim shews his independence of [i.e., from] the Peshitta”.

(17) Mk 7,28

Lamy i 163 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 270, p. 7:

Dass du sie sättigen mögest von den Brosamen, die vom Tisch der Kinder fielen. (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 7)

It is evidently an allusion to, not a quotation of, Mk 7,28; thus no further analysis of this passage is necessary.

17 Leloir, S. Ephrem. Commentaire de l’Evangile concordant, p. 56 (VI 1); Leloir’s translation of the expression is “stridor dentium” (p. 57).
Ed. Rom. vi 585D is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 174, p. 31 l. 18:

\(\textit{(Dass) die Hunde von den Brosamen ihrer Herren sich sättigen.} \) (Beck, CSCO 175, p. 29)

This is also evidently an allusion to, not a quotation of, Mt 15,27; thus no further analysis of this passage is necessary.

(18) Mk 7,33

Lamy i 171 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 9:

Er spuckte auf seine Finger und legte sie in die Ohren des Tauben. (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 10)

Here Burkitt’s analysis is quite detailed, and he quotes Sinaiticus and the Peshitta, both of which differ, as Burkitt himself shows, from this quotation of Ephrem, and also he mentions the so-called Arabic Diatessaron. However, for the aforementioned reason this “Arabic Diatessaron” cannot be referred to. Thus what remains from Burkitt’s analysis is that, here again, Ephrem’s quotation is different from Sinaiticus and the Peshitta.

(19) Mk 12,42

Bickell, p. 9136 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 240, p. 54 l. 22:

Den Pfennig und den Heller der Witwe liess er wuchern. (Beck, CSCO 241, p. 44)

It is evidently an allusion to, not a quotation of, Mk 12,42; thus no further analysis of this passage is necessary.

(20) Lk 2,29,30 (N.B. Lk 2,29 was not discussed in Burkitt)

Lamy i 259 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 48. Each verse is presented separately:

Lk 2,29:
Entlass du deinen Diener jetzt in Frieden! (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 48)

Lk 2,30:
Siehe es sahen meine Augen dein Erbarmen. (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 48)

For Lk 2,30, Burkitt’s brief comment “This agrees both with Sinaiticus and the Peshitta” will suffice. As for Lk 2,29, the Sinaiticus and the Peshitta run as follows respectively:

Sin.18: Now my Lord, let your servant go in peace, as you have said19.

Pesh.20: Now my Lord, let your servant go in peace according to your word.

One can clearly see that, although using the same words as Sinaiticus and the Peshitta, Ephrem’s quotation differs greatly from both in word order; it looks like as if it came from memory.

(21) Lk 2,34

Lamy i 267 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 50:

Dieser ist gesetzt zum Fall und zur Auferstehung. (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 51)

This agrees, except for some slight differences in word order, with both Sinaiticus and the Peshitta. Here Burkitt argues rather lengthily so as to create an impression that “we have in this quotation an omission of the words ‘of many in Israel’ influenced by the Diatessaron” (p. 40), but the attempt seems to me futile.

(22) Lk 2,36
Lamy iii 813 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 322, p. 25:

Wie gleicht doch der Reine der Reinsten, die sieben Tage lang zusammen mit dem Manne war! (BECK, CSCO 323, p. 29)

According to Burkitt’s analysis (p. 41), in the Peshitta “Hanna the prophetess had lived seven years with a husband, but Sinaiticus alone among MSS and versions makes it into seven days only, and in so doing is followed by Ephraim”. However, whether the relationship between Sinaiticus and Ephrem’s quotation is such (i.e., the reading of Sinaiticus followed by Ephrem) or not remains hypothetical; to put it differently, we are not certain whether, at Ephrem’s time, the story “seven days” instead of “seven years” was written down or simply in the air.

(23) Lk 4,29
Lamy i 613 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 248, p. 29:

Als man ihn herabwarf von der Spitze des Berges. (BECK, CSCO 249, p. 23)

However, it is evident that this is an allusion to, not a quotation of, Lk 4,29, and the story itself is different; thus no further analysis of this “quotation” is necessary.

Bickell, p. 59

As man ihn herabwarf von der Spitze des Berges. (BECK, CSCO 249, p. 23)

However, it is evident that this is an allusion to, not a quotation of, Lk 4,29, and the story itself is different; thus no further analysis of this “quotation” is necessary.

Burkitt argues that this view that Jesus was actually thrown over the cliff by the people of Nazareth is taken in Ephrem’s Commentary on the Gospel Harmony; this point cannot be checked, as the rediscovered Syriac Commentary does not contain the relevant passage.

(24) Lk 7,14
Bickell, p. 72

Jesus aber rief den toten Jüngling: O Jüngling! (BECK, CSCO 241, p. 20)

Stressing the repetition of the word ‘Youth, youth!’, Burkitt argues: “Thus Ephraim’s reading was that which was alone familiar to Aphraates, and we may safely conjecture that it stood in the Diatessaron. But it is not the reading either of the Peshitta or of Sinaiticus”. However, in addition to the fact that, as said above, mentioning the Diatessaron in such a conjecture is itself a petitio principii, one can say that using the same word twice sounds less literary than colloquial; furthermore, Beck’s translation, as

---

21 The text as it figures in BURKITT, Ephraim’s Quotations, p. 40 is:  דודאאלא דודאאלא י뮬 יאל יאל
indicated above, shows a different interpretation. In any case, the following, which is also admitted by Burkitt, should be noted: the reading of this “quotation” is not that either of the Peshitta or of Sinaiticus. (25) Lk 7,41-43 = Lamy ii, p. xxii f.: NA
(26) Lk 9,62

Overbeck 127: as mentioned above, this text is considered unauthentic by its editor Beck, and thus excluded from the analysis.
(27) Lk 12,49

Overbeck 124 & 126: as mentioned above, this text is considered unauthentic by its editor Beck, and thus excluded from the analysis.
(28) Lk 12,54-56

Ed. Rom. v 320, which runs as follows:

Das Angesicht der Erde und des Himmels versteht ihr (zu deuten). Wann es Hitze geben wird und wann Regen, und das schöne Wetter prophezeit er. (BECK, CSCO 199, p. 113)

While admitting that “this stanza is not a quotation”, Burkitt, by the analysis of this “mixed paraphrase of Matt xvi 2,3 and Luke xii 54-56”, tries to show that this passage does not derive from Sinaiticus or Curetonianus, nor from the Peshitta, thus suggesting as an argumentum e silentio that it does derive from the Syriac Diatessaron. However, this argumentum e silentio does not stand, because Ephrem could have written these words simply from memory; in Burkitt’s discussion this possibility is not duly taken into consideration.
(29) Lk 14,31

Ed. Rom. v 487, which runs as follows:

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 45), “this is quite different both from the Peshitta and from Sinaiticus and Curetonianus ... But as the quotation is expressly introduced for the sake of the word בֶּן, which means his ‘fellow’ or ‘comrade’ (though in this case used of an enemy), it is evident that the word must have stood in Ephraim’s text. In Lk xiv 31 Sinaiticus and Curetonianus both have בֶּן, while the Peshitta has לָא בֶּן”.
(30) Lk 17,31, 32

Overbeck 127: as mentioned above, this text is considered unauthentic by its editor Beck, and thus excluded from the analysis.
(31) Lk 18,13 = Overbeck 28: NA
(32) Lk 22,42-44

- Lk 22,42
Lamy i 665, which runs as follows:

\[ \text{Er sprach: »Nicht mein Wille geschehe, sondern dein Wille!»} \] (BECK, CSCO 249, p. 59)

In the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe and the Peshitta, Lk 22,42 reads as follows:

- Ev. Meph.\(^{22}\): \textit{Not my will be done, but yours}.\(^{23}\)
- Pesh.\(^{24}\): \textit{Not my will, but yours be done.}

It seems that, compared with these, Ephrem’s quotation, which lacks the expression \textit{wollen}, is less literary than colloquial.

- Lk 22,43

Lamy i 233 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 270, p. 35:

\[ \text{So steht auch geschrieben, das ihm ... ein Engel erschien, indem er ihn stärkte.} \] (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 36)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 47), in this passage, “Curetonianus and Ephraim agree in omitting ‘from heaven’ after ‘angel,’ against the Peshitta and all other authorities, except a few patristic quotations (including Arians and Caesarius of Nazianzus). Wherever therefore Curetonianus and Ephraim got their common text of this passage, it was not from the Peshitta”. However, it is of course possible that each of them, Curetonianus and Ephraim, independently omitted the expression “from heaven”, because normally it is evident that the angel comes from heaven.

- Lk 22,44

Bickell, p. 59\(^{25}\) is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 7 l. 7:

\[ \text{Sein Schweiss wurde zu Blutstropfen.} \] (BECK, CSCO 241, p. 5)

In the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe and the Peshitta, Lk 22,44 reads as follows:

- Ev. Meph.\(^{25}\): \textit{And his sweat was like drops of blood}.\(^{26}\)
- Pesh.\(^{27}\): \textit{And his sweat was like drops of blood}

Ephrem’s quotation, which lacks \textit{only}, is almost the same as the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe and the Peshitta.

(33) Lk 23,38

The expression attested in Lamy i 667 (strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 248, p. 74 l. 1) is \textit{Happy art thou, O tablet!} (Burkitt’s translation: “Happy art thou, O tablet!”). It is evident that this is simply an

\[ \begin{align*}
22 & \text{BURKITT (ed.), Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, vol. 1, p. 400.} \\
23 & \text{WILSON, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 634.} \\
24 & \text{PUSEY \& GWILLIAM (eds.), \textit{Tetraeuangelium}, p. 458.} \\
26 & \text{WILSON, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 634.} \\
27 & \text{PUSEY \& GWILLIAM (eds.), \textit{Tetraeuangelium}, p. 458.}
\end{align*} \]
allusion to, not a quotation of, Lk 23,38; thus no further analysis of this passage is necessary.

(34) Lk 23,43
Lamy i 667 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 248, p. 73 l. 26:

\[\text{Von dir [i.e., Golgotha] aus öffnete der Schächer Eden, um einzutreten. (Beck, CSCO 249, p. 59)}\]

Lamy i 669 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 248, p. 74 l. 20:

\[\text{Da nahm dich [i.e., Schächer] unser Herr und versetzte dich nach Eden (Beck, CSCO 249, p. 60)}\]

It is evident that these passages are simply allusions to, not quotations of, Lk 23,43; thus no further analysis of these passages is necessary.

(35) Jn 1,1 = Lamy ii 513: NA

(36) Jn 1,3
Ed. Rom. iv 18E, which runs as follows:

\[\text{is almost identical with Tonneau, CSCO 152, p. 23 ll. 19-21, which runs as follows:}
\]

\[\text{Dixit enim de illo evangelista: Quia omnia per eum facta sunt et sine eo nihil quidem factum est. (Tonneau, CSCO 153, p. 17)}\]

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 48), “this exactly agrees with the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe as represented by Curetonianus, but the Peshitta has καὶ πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, i.e. ‘all was through Him’ (following the Greek πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο), instead of καὶ πάντα σιν. The rendering of Curetonianus and Ephraim is also found in the Syriac Theophania i 24”.

(37) Jn 1,3f. = Lamy ii 513-515: NA

(38) Jn 1,14 = Lamy ii 743: NA

(39) Jn 3,34
Burkitt quotes the passage “Lamy i 267”, the Syriac tenor of which is as follows:

However, these words could not be found in Lamy i 267; thus it is impossible to reexamine the passage in question.

(40) Jn 6,52
Ed. Rom. vi 102f is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 154, p. 170 ll. 7-8:

\[\text{Wie kann dieser seinen Leib uns geben! (Beck, CSCO 155, p. 146)}\]

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 51), “This is a mere allusion ... At the same time it agrees in giving the order found in the Peshitta against ὄνομα in Sinaiticus and Curetonianus”.

(41) Jn 12,2
Lamy i 255 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 46:

\[\text{Während Martha sich im Dienst abmühte. (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 47)}\]

As Burkitt notes, Sinaiticus has in Jn 12,2 ἴδρυμα κατί οὕτῳ ὁ παρθένος ἐτέλεσε. The Peshitta, on the
other hand, has ἀλλὰ ἴσως ἀκριβώς 29.

(42) Jn 13,5

Lamy i 657 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 248, p. 51 ll. 17-18:

Unser Herr reinigte den Körper der Brüder im Becken, das ein Symbol der Eintracht ist. (Beck, CSCO 249, p. 41)

According to Burkitt (p. 52), “for εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα in Joh xiii 5 the Peshitta has ἐκ λιθίων ‘in a washing-bason,’ but Sinaiticus and Aphraates have ἐκ λαβάθων ‘in a dish for washing.’ This is evidently the text known to Ephraim”. However, such an argument based on one word ἐκ does not suffice to show that Ephrem really consulted so-and-so written Gospel text. And as this passage is not a quotation, no further analysis of it is necessary.

(43) Jn 14,23

Lamy i 273 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 53:

Wer mich liebt, zu dem kommen wir und werden bei ihm Wohnung nehmen. (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 54)

According to Burkitt (p. 52), “The one MS of Aphraates (Wright’s A) agrees with Ephraim and with Sinaiticus in having ἔρχομαι ‘we will make.’ The other MS of Aphraates (Wright’s B) has ἐρχόμεθα ‘we make’ with the Peshitta. Curetonianus, on the other hand, has ἐρχόμεθα ‘I come’ and ἐρχόμεθα ‘I will make’ … I have but little doubt that the true reading of the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe is given in Curetonianus, and the reading of the Diatessaron is given in Sinaiticus, in Aphraates and in Ephraim”. The agreement of this quotation with Sinaiticus is remarkable, to be sure, but to argue like Burkitt that the reading ἐρχόμεθα is that of the Diatessaron is too far-fetched, given that the reading in Aphraates is disputed among the manuscripts.

(44) Jn 15,1

The expression attested in Lamy ii 359 (strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 305, p. 10) is the vineyard of truth”. Evidently it is an allusion to Jn 15,1 and by no means a quotation, since Jesus’s saying in Jn 15,1 “I am the vine of truth” is not the same as “the vineyard of truth”. And in any case such an impressive expression can simply be memorized without consultation of any written document; thus it does not provide any useful insight concerning our investigation. Furthermore, Burkitt’s attempt to connect this expression to the Diatessaron (pp. 53-54) seems to me unconvincing.

(45) Jn 16,11

Ed. Rom. iv 37F is strictly identical with Tonneau, CSCO 152, p. 45 ll. 3-4:

De iudicio eius, inquit, quia principis mundi huius est iudicium. (Tonneau, CSCO 153, p. 34)

According to Burkitt (p. 54), “Here Sinaiticus agrees with Ephraim in having μακράς μέθοδος, where the Peshitta has μακρὰς μέθοδος, but both Sinaiticus and the Peshitta have μακρὰς ‘judgement’ not μακρὰ ‘his judgement’”. However, the distinction between μακρὰς and μακρὰς, and between μακρὰς and μακρὰς, seems to me to be too minute and thus not to be so meaningful as Burkitt suggests; both expressions are virtually the same.

(46) Jn 17,11

Ed. Rom. vi 122C, which runs as follows:

is almost identical with BECK, CSCO 154, p. 195 l. 12, which runs as follows:

Mein Vater, nimm und bewahre sie! (BECK, CSCO 155, p. 171)

To reproduce Burkitt’s analysis (p. 54), “the Peshitta has ‘Holy Father, keep them,’ while Sinaiticus has ‘My holy Father, take (and) keep them.’ had of course to be dropped in making a 5-syllable verse, and its omission leaves just five syllables both in Sinaiticus and in the Peshitta. It is therefore significant that Ephraim should give the reading of Sinaiticus and not of the Peshitta”.

(47) Jn 19,30

Lamy i 229 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 270, p. 34:

Wie er ja gesprochen hat: «Alles ist vollbracht». (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 34)

Burkitt argues (p. 55) that “Neither Sinaiticus nor Curetonianus is here extant, ... but the Arabic Diatessaron (lii 4) and the Armenian vulgate have ‘Everything has been finished.’ The Peshitta has only , so that here again Ephraim appears to be following the Diatessaron.” However, it has already been pointed out above that arguing on the basis of the “Arabic Diatessaron” is not valid.

(48) Jn 20,24

As Burkitt says, here the reading of Ed. Rom. vi 16f does not reproduce that of the manuscript, on which one reads (strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 154, p. 35 l. 16). However, to discuss Ephrem’s quotation of the Gospel (s) on the basis of the form of such name is not pertinent, since such name can be learnt simply by hearing without having recourse to any written document.

3. Result of the reexamination

Before summarizing the result of the reexamination, one thing should be reminded. In the course of the above discussion, Burkitt’s conjecture in favor of the Diatessaron has been repeatedly criticized. The point of this criticism is the following: although Burkitt advanced his conjecture of this kind each time by arguing, after discussion on the “quotation” concerned, that recourse to the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe or the Peshitta does not enable to fully explain the passage in question, he does not fully take into consideration the possibility that, when quoting a passage of a Gospel, Ephrem did not check any written document, but simply mentioned the “quotation” from memory. Needless to say, even then some peculiar expression deriving from a specific version of a Gospel (or the Gospels) can come out of Ephrem’s mouth; yet we have to imagine also another possibility that, when quoting from memory, Ephrem used not the exact word(s) but something similar to it. Conjecture in favor of the Diatessaron is of course not prohibited, but it should be advanced only at the end of the discussion once for all, after duly taking into consideration the possibility of confusion because of quoting from memory. This was not done by Burkitt.

The result of the reexamination presented in this article can be summarized as follows. Among the 48 passages discussed by Burkitt, the following cases should be excluded from the evaluation, i.e.:

(a) cases where the comparison could not be made because of non-availability (NA) of the duly edited text, viz. nos. (4), (5), (25), (31), (35), (37), (38);

(b) cases where, because of the different view of the (new) editor on the problem of authenticity, the
quotation in question has been excluded from the analysis, viz. nos. (8), (26), (27), (30); and
(c) cases where the “quotation” in question cannot actually be considered quotation, viz. (12), (17),
(19), (23), (33), (34), (42).

Thus among the remaining passages discussed by Burkitt and reexamined in this article,
(d) there are cases where Ephrem’s quotation goes together with the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe (i.e.,
Sinaiticus and/or Curetonianus) against the Peshitta, viz. nos. (1), (2), (7), (9), (10), (36), (41), (43), (46);
(e) there is also a case where Ephrem’s quotation goes together with the Peshitta against the
Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, viz. no. (40);
(f) there are also cases where Ephrem’s quotation agrees with both the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe
and the Peshitta, viz. nos. (3), (20), (21), (32), (45);
(g) there are also cases where Ephrem’s quotation differs from both the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe
and the Peshitta, viz. nos. (6), (13), (14), (15), (18), (28), (29);
(h) there is also a case where Ephrem’s quotation differs from the Peshitta and the passage in question
is lacking in the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, viz. no. (16);
(i) there is also a case where the passage of quotation in question is lacking in both the Evangelion da-
Mepharreshe and the Peshitta, viz. (47);
(j) there are also cases where the possibility of oral transmission (and not transmission by written
documents) should be considered, viz. (22), (24), (32), (44), (48); and lastly,
(k) there are also cases where the way Burkitt’s discussion is presented is not correct, viz. nos. (11),
(39), (42).

How can we summarize such results, or to put it differently, is it really possible for us to summarize
such diverse results into a consistent and uniform conclusion? My view is quite negative on this point. In
other words, the fact that Ephrem’s quotations of the Gospels show such wide variety of results strongly
suggests that in reality Ephrem did not have any specific Gospel text specially favored by himself. And if
this is the case, it also suggests that in Ephrem’s time, in the fourth century, at least no predominant text
(translation, in actual fact) of a Gospel (or the Gospels) existed in Syriac.

If anyone still argues that the Gospel text of Ephrem was that of the Syriac Gospel harmony on which
he composed that famous commentary, that person will have to demonstrate that, in all the aforementioned
48 passages, Ephrem’s quotation ultimately derives from the text of that Gospel harmony; but so far no
scholar starting from Burkitt has provided such a complete demonstration, and I think none will be able to
provide it in the future.

And if the Syriac Gospel harmony was not Ephrem’s specially favored Gospel text, why did he use it
to compose his famous commentary? and how are we to understand this Syriac Gospel harmony more
precisely? These are the next questions to be dealt with elsewhere.