HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Reexamining Ephrem the Syrian's Quotations of the Gospels
Author(s)	Toda, Satoshi
Citation	Journal of the Graduate School of Letters, 12, 1-18
Issue Date	2017-02
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/jgsl.12.1
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/64754
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	12_01_toda.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Journal of the Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University
Vol. 12; pp. 1−18, February 2017

Reexamining Ephrem the Syrian's Quotations of the Gospels*

TODA Satoshi

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[1]. 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[2]. Thus at least practically[3], 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[4] and in most parts also in Syriac[5], the original

*Abbreviations:
CSCO = Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium
OC = *Oriens Christianus*

1 See my article "Eusebius and Syriac Literature", *Parole de l'Orient* 36 (2011), pp. 515-524, especially pp. 516-519.

2 This point is stressed by U.B. SCHMID, "The Diatessaron of Tatian". in: B.D. EHRMAN & M.W. HOLMES (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2. ed. (New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents, 42), Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013, pp. 115-142. Schmid himself admits that the Latin Gospel harmony attested in the so-called Codex Fuldensis (published by E. RANKE, *Codex Fuldensis. Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo*, Marburgi & Lipsiae: N.G. Elwert, 1868) can be, in one sense or another, a descendant of Tatian's Diatessaron, but I am strongly sceptical; it is well known that, according to the praefatio of Victor, the bishop of Capua, which figure at the begininng of the Codex Fuldensis, Tatian "compaginated one Gospel out of four (unum ex quattuor conpaginaverit evangelium)" and gave to it the title "diapente" (RANKE, *op. cit.*, p. 1). In my view, this difference (i.e., between Diatessaron and diapente) seems to suggest that the "diapente" is not a straightforward descendant of Tatian's Diatessaron.

3 I say here "practically", because the so-called Arabic Diatessaron (or rather, Arabic Gospel harmony) is still not in a position to be critically used for any textual investigation; for this see P. JOOSSE, "An Introduction to the Arabic Diatessaron", *OC* 83 (1999), pp. 72-129.

4 Edition of the Armenian version: L. LELOIR (ed.), *Saint Ephrem. Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant. Version arménienne* (CSCO 137), Louvain: Imprimerie orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1953, and its translation: L. LELOIR (transl.), *Saint Ephrem. Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant. Version arménienne* (CSCO 145), Louvain: Durbecq, 1954.

5 Rediscovered in the latter half of the twentieth century and published by L. LELOIR (ed.), *S. Ephrem. Commentaire de*

©2017 by the Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University
TODA Satoshi: jsattoda@let.hokudai.ac.jp
10.14943/jgsl.12.1

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

l'Evangile concordant. Texte syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709), Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1963. Now its second edition should be consulted: L. LELOIR (ed.), *S. Ephrem. Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant. Texte syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709). Folios Additionnels*, Leuven/Paris: Peeters, 1990.

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.

7 F.C. BURKITT, *S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel. Collected and Arranged* (Texts and Studies, 7.2), Cambridge: University Press, 1901.

8 L. LELOIR, *L'Evangile d'Ephrem d'après les oeuvres éditées. Recueil des textes* (CSCO 180), Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1958.

9 G.A. EGAN, *An Analysis of the Biblical Quotations of Ephrem in "An Exposition of the Gospel" (Armenian Version)* (CSCO 443), Lovanii: Peeters, 1983.

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 unmistakeable 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 consulted[11]; 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

11 The reason of this principle is that authenticity or inauthenticity of the following works, evaluated notably by the editor of most of them, Edmund Beck, *the* specialist of Ephrem's works in the second half of the twentieth century, can be regarded as beyond question; at least, I, who am no specialist of Ephrem at all, am unable to question Beck's evaluation. Here are the works consulted in this investigation: R.-M. Tonneau (ed. & transl.), *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum commentarii* (CSCO 152 (text) & 153 (translation)), Louvain: Durbecq, 1955; E. Beck (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de fide* (CSCO 154 (text) & 155 (translation)), Louvain: Durbecq, 1955; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra haereses* (CSCO 169 (text) & 170 (translation)), Louvain: Durbecq, 1957; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de paradiso & contra Julianum* (CSCO 174 (text) & 175 (translation)), Louvain: Durbecq, 1957; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de nativitate (Epiphania)* (CSCO 186 (text) & 187 (translation)), Louvain: Durbecq, 1959; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de ecclesia* (CSCO 198 (text) & 199 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1960; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Carmina Nisibena (erster Teil)* (CSCO 218 (text) & 219 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1961; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de virginitate* (CSCO 223 (text) & 224 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1962; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Carmina Nisibena (zweiter Teil)* (CSCO 240 (text) & 241 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1963; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de ieiunio* (CSCO 246 (text) & 247 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1964; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Paschahymnen* (CSCO 248 (text) & 249 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1964; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermo de Domino nostro* (CSCO 270 (text) & 271 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1966; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermones I* (CSCO 305 (text) & 306 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1970; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermones II* (CSCO 311 (text) & 312 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1970; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen auf Abraham Kidunaya und Julianos Saba* (CSCO 322 (text) & 323 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1972; Id. (ed. & transl.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermones IV* (CSCO 334 (text) & 335 (translation)), Louvain: Secr. du CSCO, 1973.

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"[12]:

"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 Exegetici' on Adam, etc. Ed. Rom. v 318C-330
(8) 'Sermones Exegetici' on Jonah Ed. Rom. v 359D-387A
(9) De Nativitate XIII (see below, no. 26) Ed. Rom. v 396-436
(10) Sermones Polemici LVI Ed. Rom. v 437 ad fin.
(11) De Fide adv. Scrutatores LXXXVII Ed. Rom. vi 1-164
(12) De Libero Voluntatis Arbitrio IV Ed. Rom. vi 359A-366
(13) 'Paraenetica,' no. I Ed. Rom. vi 367-369B
(14) 'Paraenetica,' no. XX Ed. Rom. vi 450D-451F
(15) 'Paraenetica,' 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
(19) 'De Diversis Sermones,' no. XVIII Ed. Rom. vi 654F ad fin.
(20) On Julian the Apostate 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 Azymorum 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
Ed. Rom. iv/v/vi = *Sancti patris nostri Ephraem Syri opera omnia quae exstant Graece, Syriace, Latine, in sex tomos distributa. Syriace et Latine*, vol. 1/2/3, Romae: Ex typographia Vaticana, 1737/1740/1743
Lamy i/ii/iii = Th.J. LAMY (ed.), *Sancti Ephraem Syri hymni et sermones*, vol. 1/2/3, Mechliniae: Dessain, 1882/1886/1889
Overbeck = J.J. OVERBECK, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta*, Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1865

(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 unauthentic[13]; thus this text is excluded from the reexamination presented below.
(7) BECK, CSCO 198, pp. 113 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 318) -130 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 326), 87 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 327) -93 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 329)
(8) BECK, CSCO 311, pp. 1-40
(9) BECK, CSCO 186, pp. 1-12 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 402), 19 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 402) -98 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 436)
(10) BECK, CSCO 169, pp. 1-212 (= Ed. Rom. v, p. 560 = finis)
(11) BECK, CSCO 154, pp. 3-271
(12) BECK, CSCO 198, pp. 4-10 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 363) (Sermones I & II), 32 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 364) & 42 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 364) -43 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 365) (Sermo III), 15 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 365) -17 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 366) (Sermo IV)
(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
(18) BECK, CSCO 198, pp. 58-65 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 612) (Sermones IV & V), 12 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 613) -15 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 615) (Sermo VI), 54 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 615) -58 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 618) (Sermo VII), 133 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 618) -136 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 620) (Sermo VIII), 76 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 620) -81 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 624) (Sermones IX & X), 66 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 624) -69 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 627) (Sermo XI), 81 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 627) -84 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 629) (Sermo XII)
(19) BECK, CSCO 305, pp. 12-49 (= Ed. Rom. vi, p. 687 = finis)
(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.

(23) BECK, CSCO 248, pp. 1 (= Lamy i, col. 569) -14 (= Lamy i, col. 593), 19 (= Lamy i, col. 595) -41 (= Lamy i, col. 635)
(24) BECK, CSCO 248, pp. 42 (= Lamy i, col. 637) -55 (= Lamy i, col. 663), 72 (= Lamy i, col. 665) -77 (= Lamy i, col. 673), 55 (= Lamy i, col. 673) -72 (= Lamy i, col. 713)
(25) BECK, CSCO 305, pp. 1 (= Lamy ii, col. 335) -12 (= Lamy ii, col. 361)
(26) NA
(27) BECK, CSCO 246, pp. 16 (= Lamy ii, col. 647) -33 (= Lamy ii, col. 677); ID., CSCO 223, pp. 1 (= Lamy ii, col. 773) -3 (= Lamy ii, col. 777), 5 (= Lamy ii, col. 779) -11 (= Lamy ii, col. 785) etc.[14]
(28) NA
(29) NA
(30) BECK, CSCO 322, pp. 1 (= Lamy iii, col. 749) -87

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[15]:

"S. MATTHEW.

(1) chap. iii 17	Ed. Rom. v 545A, vi 16C
(2) v 39	Bickell, p. 72_{124}
(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) xviii 12f.	Overbeck 114
(9) xviii 22	Bickell, p. 72_{168}
(10) xxi 3	Ed. Rom. iv 108f.
(11) xxi 40, 41	Lamy i 253
(12) xxii 13	Bickell, p. 84_{230}
(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.

15 BURKITT, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27, partially modified for clarity's sake. Numbering is mine (T. S.).

(18) vii 33	Lamy i 171
(19) xii 42	Bickell, p. 91_{36}
S. Luke.	
(20) chap. ii 30	Lamy i 259, 261
(21) ii 34	Lamy i 267
(22) ii 36	Lamy iii 813
iii 22	see on Matt iii 17
(23) iv 29	Lamy i 613; Bickell, p. 59_{205}
vi 29	see on Matt v 39
(24) vii 14	Bickell, p. 72_{180}
vii 34	see on Matt xi 19
(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
xv 4 f.	see on Matt xviii 12f.
(30) xvii 31, 32	Overbeck 127
(31) xviii 13	Overbeck 28
(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[16]
(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.

(47) xix 30 Lamy i 229

(48) xx 24 Ed. Rom. vi 16F"

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:

ܗܢ ܒܪܝ ܕܪܚܝܡ ܗܘ.

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:

ܗܢ ܒܪܝ ܘܪܚܝܡܝ ܗܘ.

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

To reproduce Burkitt's analysis (p. 28), "for ܘܪܚܝܡܝ ('and my beloved') Peshitta has ܪܚܝܡ ('the beloved') in accordance with the Greek ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, but ܘܪܚܝܡܝ is the reading of Sinaticus and Curetonianus". Burkitt also says that the evidence in v 545 (ܒܪܝ ܕܪܚܝܡ instead of ܘܪܚܝܡܝ) is more striking, but in my view his judgement is greatly exaggerated.

(2) Mt 5,39

Bickell, p. 72124 is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 25 l. 22:

ܠܡ ܡܚܐ ܠܗ ܕܡܫܠܡ ܠܟ ܥܠ ܦܝܣܟ ܝܡܝܢܐ ܗܒ ܠܗ ܐܦ ܐܚܪܬ.

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:

ܠܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܚܕܬܐ ܒܚܡܪܐ ܥܬܝܩܬܐ.

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

ܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܚܕܬܐ ܒܚܡܪܐ ܥܬܝܩܬܐ.

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

As Burkitt says (p. 28), both Sinaiticus and the Peshitta have ܚܡܝ; 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:

ܠܐ ܠܗ ܟܘܠ ܣܟܪ ܕܫܐܘܠ ܕܢܚܛܘܗ ܕܒܪܝܐ ܠܐ ܢܟܠ ܠܗ.

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 ܫܥܪ ܕܡܘܬܐ.

(7) Mt 16,19

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

ܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܠܫܡܥܘܢ ܐܢ ܒܥܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܬܠ ܠܟ ܦܬܚܐ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ.

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_{168} is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 26 l. 22:

ܥܕܡ ܠܐܚܝܟ ܥܕ ܫܒܥ ܙܒܢ ܘܥܕ ܫܒܥܝܢ ܙܒܢ ܫܒܥ ܙܒܢ ܥܕ ܫܒܥ ܙܒܢ.

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

To reproduce Burkitt's analysis (p. 31), "the idiomatic ܙܒܢ 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' (ܥܕ ܫܒܥ ܙܒܢ ܫܒܥ ܘܫܒܥ ܠܥܒܕ ܗܟܢܐ)".

(10) Mt 21,3

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

ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܪܝܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܒܥܐ ܠܗ.

(sic MS - according to BURKITT, p. 32)

is almost identical with TONNEAU, CSCO 152, p. 114 l. 16, which runs as follows:

ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܪܝܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܒܥܐ ܠܡ.

(sic prima manu, lege ܠܗ - according to the ed.)

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 ܕܡܪܝܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ 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:

ܡܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܒܥܠ ܟܪܡܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܟܪܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܝܢ ܢܦܫܗܘܢ.
ܒܝܫ ܒܝܫ ܢܥܒܕ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܪܝܢ ܘܢܬܠ ܐܬ ܟܪܡܐ ܠܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܢܬܠܘܢ ܠܗ ܦܪܝܬܗ ܒܥܕܢܗ.

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 [underlined, T. S.] ... 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_{230} is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 45 l. 19:

ܕܐܬܝܘ ܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܕܐܚܝܕ ܘܡܫܚܐ ܗܘܐ.

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: ܫܢܝ ܒܟܝ[17], and does not render anything.

(13) Mt 23,8

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

ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܢ ܡܪܝܐ.

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

ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܢ ܡܠܦܢ.

(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:

ܕܗܝ ܠܗ ܠܡܐ ܕܒܟܠ ܐܬܪ ܐܢܐ ܒܫܪܝܪ ܐܬܟܪܙ ܗܘ ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܗ ܕܥܡ ܒܢܝ ܐܢܫ.

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:

ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ ܠܡܐ ܫܒܩܬܢܝ.

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 ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ in Matt. and ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ in Mk. Peshitta has ܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܗܝ 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:

ܫܟܘ ܠܟ ܘܬܬܟܡ.

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 ܠܝܡܐ ܘܬܟ 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:

ܕܬܣܒܥ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܙܘܥܝ ܡܢ ܦܬܘܬ ܕܡܢ ܦܬܘܬ ܕܒܢܝ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܦܠܘ.

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:

ܕܢܦܠܘܢ ܡܢ ܦܬܘܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܗܘܢ ܣܒܥܝܢ ܟܠܒܐ ܕܢܣܒܥ

(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:

ܘܐܦܠ ܒܨܒܥܘܗܝ ܒܐܕܢܘܗܝ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܘܫܕܪ ܒܐܕܢ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܡܪ.

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. 91$_{36}$ is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 54 l. 22:

ܠܦܫܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܡܠܬܐ ܫܒܩ ܠܡܫܩܠ ܒܪܒܝܬܐ.

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: ܗܫܐ ܠܟ ܠܥܒܕܟ ܒܫܠܡ ܫܠܚܢܝ.

Entlass du deinen Diener jetzt in Frieden! (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 48)

Lk 2,30: ܐܡܪ ܠܟ ܥ̈ܝܢ ܚܙܝ ܒܪܚܡܝܟ.

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]: ܗܫܐ ܡܪܝ ܫܕܪ ܠܥܒܕܟ ܒܫܠܡ ܐܝ ܟܡܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ.

Now my Lord, let your servant go in peace, as you have said[19].

Pesh.[20]: ܗܫܐ ܡܪܝ ܫܕܪ ܠܥܒܕܟ ܒܫܠܡ ܐܝ ܟܡܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܟ.

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:

---

18 F.C. BURKITT (ed.), *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. 1, Cambridge: University Press, 1904, p. 254; A.S. LEWIS (ed.), *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1910, p. 126.

19 E. Jan WILSON, *The Old Syriac Gospels. Studies and Comparative Translations*, vol. 2: *Luke and John*, Louaize (Lebanon): Notre Dame University, and Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003, p. 398 (partially modified, T. S.).

20 Ph.E. PUSEY & G.H. GWILLIAM (eds.), *Tetraeuangelium sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum versionem*, Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1901, p. 328.

ܗܘ ܕܡ ܣܝܡ ܠܩܝܡܬܐ ܘܠܩܝܡܬܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܝܢ.[21]

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:

ܐܝܟ ܕܡ ܫܦܝܪ ܫܦܝܪ ܥܡ ܒܥܠܗ ܒܬܠ ܫܒܥ ܫܢܝܢ ܒܚܕ ܥܡ ܒܥܠܗ.

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:

ܕܐܬܠܩ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܪܝܫ ܛܘܪܐ ܕܐܪܒܝܠ.

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_{205} is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 6 ll. 17-19:

ܕܐܬܠܩ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܪܝܫ ܛܘܪܐ ܕܐܪܒܝܠ. ܦܪܚ ܒܐܘܝܪܐ.

Als man ihn vom Berg warf, flog er durch die Luft. (BECK, CSCO 241, p. 5)

However, it is again 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_{180} is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 27 ll. 3-4:

ܥܠܡܐ ܥܠܡܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܝܘܢܩܐ ܡܝܬܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܗ.

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

Stressing the repetition of the word ܥܠܡܐ '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: ܗܘ ܕܡ ܣܝܡ ܠܩܝܡܬܐ ܘܠܩܝܡܬܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܝܢ.

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 320B, which runs as follows:

ܕܐܬܐ ܕܐܡ ܒܫܡܝܐ ܘܒܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܢܬ ܝܕܥ ܠܡܦܫܩ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܡܛܪܐ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܫܪܒܐ ܘܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܐܡ ܒܫܡܝܐ ܘܒܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܢܬ ܝܕܥ ܠܡܦܫܩ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܡܛܪܐ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܫܪܒܐ ܘܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܐ

is different from Beck, CSCO 198, p. 117, which runs as follows:

ܕܐܬܐ ܕܐܡ ܒܫܡܝܐ ܘܒܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܢܬ ܝܕܥ ܠܡܦܫܩ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܡܛܪܐ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܫܪܒܐ ܘܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܐܡ ܒܫܡܝܐ ܘܒܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܢܬ ܝܕܥ ܠܡܦܫܩ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܡܛܪܐ ܘܠܡܬܝ ܙܒܢ ܫܪܒܐ ܘܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܐ

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 487A, which runs as follows:

ܡܬܐ ܫܘܐ ܚܠܐ ܥܡ ܚܪ ܠܡܥܒܕ ܠܗ ܥܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܡ ܫܠܝ ܚܕܐ

is slightly different from Beck, CSCO 169, p. 82, which runs as follows:

ܡܬܐ ܫܘܐ ܚܠܐ ܥܡ ܚܪ ܠܡܥܒܕ ܠܗ ܥܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܚܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܡ ܫܠܝ ܚܕܐ

Die Schrift sagt: «Wer von den Königen, der aufbricht um Krieg zu führen mit einem andren König, seinem Genossen» (Beck, CSCO 170, p. 80)

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 ܡܬܐ 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 ܫܘܐ ܚܠܐ, while the Peshitta has ܡܬܐ ܚܠܐ".

(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:

ܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܟ ܕܢܗܘܐ ✣

is almost identical with BECK, CSCO 248, p. 73, which runs as follows:

ܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܟ ܕܢܗܘܐ

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]: ܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܝܠܟ.

Not my will be done, but yours[23].

Pesh.[24]: ✣ܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܝ ܐܠܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܕܢܗܘܐ

Not my will, but yours be done.

It seems that, compared with these, Ephrem's quotation, which lacks the expression ܐܠܐ, is less literary than colloquial.

- Lk 22,43

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

ܕܐܦ ܟܬܝܒ ܕܐܬܚܙܐ ܠܗ ܡܠܐܟ ,ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܠܗ ܕܡܚܝܠ ܠܗ.

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 Arius 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_{229} is strictly identical with BECK, CSCO 240, p. 7 l. 7:

ܗܘܬ ܥܪܩܗ ܐܝܟ ܛܝܦܐ ܕܕܡܐ.

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]: ܗܘܬ ܥܪܩܗ ܐܝܟ ܛܝܦܐ ܕܕܡܐ ܕܥܠ.

And his sweat was like drops of blood[26].

Pesh.[27]: ܗܘܬ ܥܪܩܗ ܐܝܟ ܛܝܦܐ ܕܕܡܐ

Ephrem's quotation, which lacks ܐܝܟ 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 ܐܝܬܝ ܟܬܒܐ(Burkitt's translation: "Happy art thou, O tablet!"). It is evident that this is simply an

22 BURKITT (ed.), *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. 1, p. 400.

23 WILSON, *op. cit*., p. 634.

24 PUSEY & GWILLIAM (eds.), *Tetraeuangelium*, p. 458.

25 BURKITT (ed.), *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. 1, p. 400.

26 WILSON, *op. cit*., p. 634.

27 PUSEY & GWILLIAM (eds.), *Tetraeuangelium*, p. 458.

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:

ܡܢܟ ܠܕܪܝ ܦܬܚ ܣܟܠܐ ܥܕܢ ܠܡܥܠ.

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:

ܐܥܠ ܡܢ ܡܫܝܚܢ ܕܝܢ.

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:

ܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܒܗ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܘܠܗ ܠܐ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܡܕܡ.

is almost identical with Tonneau, CSCO 152, p. 23 ll. 19-21, which runs as follows:

ܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܒܗ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܘܠܗ ܠܐ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܡܕܡ.

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 ܟܠ ܒܗ ܐܬܥܒܕ, i.e. 'all was through Him' (following the Greek πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο), instead of ܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܒܗ ܐܬܥܒܕ. 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:

ܟܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܐ ܐܠܗܝ ܗܘ ܐܦ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ.

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:

ܐܝܟ ܢܬܠ ܠܢ ܗܢܐ ܦܓܪܗ.

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 ܦܓܪܗ ܠܢ ܢܬܠ in Sinaiticus and Curetonianus".

(41) Jn 12,2

Lamy i 255 is strictly identical with Beck, CSCO 270, p. 46:

ܒܕܡܪܬܐ ܕܥܡ ܫܘܬܦ ܒܫܡܫܬܗ.

Während Martha sich im Dienst abmühte, (Beck, CSCO 271, p. 47)

As Burkitt notes, Sinaiticus has in Jn 12,2 ܒܕܡܪܬܐ ܕܥܡ ܫܘܬܦ ܒܫܡܫܬܗ[28]. The Peshitta, on the

28 Burkitt (ed.), *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. 1, p. 494.

other hand, has ܒܝܬ ܡܪܚܨܐ ܕܪܓܠܘܗܝ[29].

(42) Jn 13,5

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

ܡܪܢ ܐܬܪ ܫܘܒܚܗ ܕܓܘܫܡܐ ܕܐܚܐ ܕܡܗܝ ܠܚܕܐ ܡܠܬ ܚܝ.

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 ܒܟܝܢܐ 'in a washing-bason,' but Sinaiticus and Aphraates have ܒܐܬܪ ܕܡܝ ܕܣܝܡ 'in a dish for washing.' This is evidently the text known to Ephraim". However, such an argument based on one word ܕܡܝ 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:

ܡܢ ܕܚܒ ܐܬܐ ܠܘ. ܘܠܘܬܗ ܢܥܒܕ ܡܫܟܢܐ.

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 ܢܥܒܕ 'we will make.' The other MS of Aphraates (Wright's B) has ܥܒܕܝܢ 'we make' with the Peshitta. Curetonianus, on the other hand, has ܐܝܬ ܐܢܐ 'I come' and ܐܥܒܕ '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 ܢܥܒܕ 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 ܟܪܡܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ "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:

ܐܡ ܕܝ ܪܡ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܥܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܥܠܡ ܗܢ.

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 ܕܝܢܗ, where the Peshitta has ܕܕܝܢܐ, but both Sinaiticus and the Peshitta have ܕܝܢ 'judgement' not ܕܝܢܗ 'his judgement' ". However, the distinction between ܕܝܢܗ and ܕܕܝܢܐ, and between ܕܝܢ and ܕܝܢܗ, 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:

29 PUSEY & GWILLIAM (eds.), *Tetraeuangelium*, p. 550.

ܐܒܐ ܩܕܝܫ ܢܛܘܪ ܐܢܘܢ

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

ܐܒܐ ܩܕܝܫ ܢܛܘܪ ܐܢܘܢ

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

To reproduce Burkitt's analysis (p. 54), "the Peshitta has ܐܒܐ ܩܕܝܫ ܡܛܪ ܐܢܘܢ 'Holy Father, keep them,' whie Sinaiticus has ܐܒܐ ܩܕܝܫ ܢܛܘܪ ܡܛܪ ܐܢܘܢ 'My holy Father, take (and) keep them.' ܡܛܪ had of course to be dropped in making a 5-syllable verse, and its omission leaves just five syllables both in Sinaticus 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:

ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܟܠ ܐܬܬܓܡܪ ܐܡܪ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ.

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 ܐܬܓܡܪ ܐܡ, 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 ܬܐܘܡܐ ܕܐܝܣܪܝܠ (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.