



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



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 Greek¹. 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 Diatessaron². Thus at least practically³, 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 Armenian⁴ and in most parts also in Syriac⁵, 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 beginning of the Codex Fuldensis, Tatian "compaginated one Gospel out of four (unum ex quattuor compaginaverit 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 orientale 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*

language of the commentary⁶.

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 subject⁷, 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 analysis⁸. In 1983 George A. Egan published a collection of quotations of the Gospels as well as their analysis⁹, 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 length¹⁰:

"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 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

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 unauthentic¹³; 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 follows¹⁵:

“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:

ܠܗ ܠܒܢ ܗܝ ܐܝܢ ܐܝܢܐ.

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:

ܠܗ ܠܒܢ ܗܝ ܐܝܢ ܐܝܢܐ.

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

To reproduce Burkitt's analysis (p. 28), “for ܐܝܢܐ (‘and my beloved’) Peshitta has ܠܗ (‘the beloved’) in accordance with the Greek ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, but ܐܝܢܐ is the reading of Sinaiticus and Curetonianus”. Burkitt also says that the evidence in v 545 (ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ instead of ܐܝܢܐ) 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:

ܕܡܢ ܕܝܠܐ ܠܗ ܥܠ ܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ.

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:

ܠܗ ܠܒܢ ܗܝ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ.

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

ܠܗ ܠܒܢ ܗܝ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ.

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

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

ܠܗ ܠܒܢ ܗܝ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ.

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

ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ.

(7) Mt 16,19

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

ܠܗ ܠܒܢ ܗܝ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ.

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.’

(8) Mt 18,12f.

(9) Mt 18,22

צדקת אלהים. צדק צדק לך ה' אלהים.

To reproduce Burkitt's analysis (p. 31), "the idiomatic **𐤀** which is here used ... is found in Sinaiticus Curetonianus ... But the Peshitta, in more literal accordance with the Greek, has 'unto seventy times by ns' (**ܠܚܕܝܬܐ ܠܥܒܕܝܐ ܩܕܝܡܐ ܥܕܕ ܥܕܕ**)".

എന്നിവിടെ എന്തെങ്കിലും

അതിനാൽ നമുക്ക്

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

[illegible]

(12) Mt 22,13

.Kam putha nitya .Kitha nadi ,nath

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: **ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ**¹⁷, and does not render anything.

(13) Mt 23,8

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

ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ

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

ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ

(*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:

ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ

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:

ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ

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 **ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ** in Matt. and **ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ** in Mk. Peshitta has **ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ** 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:

ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ

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 **ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ** 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:

ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ ܠܐ ܡܬܪܥ

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 LEOIR, S. *Ephrem. Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant*, p. 56 (VI 1); Leloir's translation of the expression is "stridor dentium" (p. 57).

حَلَقَهُمْ مِنْ فَتَحَهُمْ سَعَىٰ أَعْمَالِهِمْ
(Dass) die Hunde von den Brosamen ihrer Herren sich sättigen. (BECK, CSCO 175, p. 29)

(18) Mk 7,33

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

(19) Mk 12,42

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

(20) Lk 2,29.30 (N.B. Lk 2,29 was not discussed in BURKITT)

Lk 2,29: **עַתָּה מְעַלְמִי אֲנִי מְעַלְמִי**
Entlass du deinen Diener jetzt in Frieden! (BECK, CSCO 271, p. 48)

For Lk 2,30, Burkitt's brief comment "This agrees both with Sinaiticus and the Peshitta" will suffice.

Sin.¹⁸: .חַסְדֶּךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ כְּשֶׁנִּכְרַמְתָּ לָנוּ
Now my Lord, let your servant go in peace, as you have said¹⁹.

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.

(26) Lk 9,62

(27) Lk 12,49

(28) Lk 12,54-56

הנהגתו של השר לא הייתה אלא דוגמה למה שחשבו עליהם
הממשלה, והוא לא היה אלא דוגמה למה שחשבו עליהם.

.ליטא נאמ, וואס אין א געווענליכע ליטא איז נישט
 אומאנגענוג.

(29) Lk 14,31

חשב דאס אס נח תלמי. מאסר און לחש למ. חס חלמ אס נח סח.

הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֶחָד מֵהַמְּלָכִים יָקִים מִלְחָמָה לְעַד מִלְחָמָה אֶחָד מֵהַמְּלָכִים אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמָעַל
 Die Schrift sagt: «Wer von den Königen, der aufbricht um Krieg zu führen mit
 einem andren König, seinem Genossen» (BECK, CSCO 170, p. 80)

(30) Lk 17,31, 32

(32) Lk 22,42-44

- Lk 22,42

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:

ܡܢ ܕܝܪ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܐܘܫܬܬܚܬ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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:

ܕܐܢܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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:

ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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

ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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

ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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:

ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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 ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ in Sinaiticus and Curetonianus".

(41) Jn 12,2

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

ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ.

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

As Burkitt notes, Sinaiticus has in Jn 12,2 ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܓܘܬܐ²⁸. The Peshitta, on the

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

other hand, has **ܕܝܡ ܠܡܥܠܐ ܠܫܝܬܐ**²⁹.

(42) Jn 13,5

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

ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ

*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 **ܕܡܠܟܐ** ‘in a washing-bason,’ but Sinaiticus and Aphraates have **ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ** ‘in a dish for washing.’ This is evidently the text known to Ephraim”. However, such an argument based on one word **ܡܠܟܐ** 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:

ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ

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 **ܡܠܟܐ** ‘we will make.’ The other MS of Aphraates (Wright’s B) has **ܡܠܟܐ** ‘we make’ with the Peshitta. Curetonianus, on the other hand, has **ܡܠܟܐ** ‘I come’ and **ܡܠܟܐ** ‘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 **ܡܠܟܐ** 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 **ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ** “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:

ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ

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 **ܡܠܟܐ**, where the Peshitta has **ܡܠܟܐ**, but both Sinaiticus and the Peshitta have **ܡܠܐ** ‘judgement’ not **ܡܠܐ** ‘his judgement’”. However, the distinction between **ܡܠܟܐ** and **ܡܠܐ**, and between **ܡܠܐ** and **ܡܠܐ**, 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.

257 1/2 100 100

பெருந்தேவன்

To reproduce Burkitt's analysis (p. 54), "the Peshitta has ܐܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ 'Holy Father, keep them,' whie Sinaiticus has ܐܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ 'My holy Father, take (and) keep them.' ܕܥܠܝܐ 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".

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

אברהם דאנא דמא מאלה אל מהם.

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 **ܐܠܝܢ ܠܥܠܡ**, 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.

As Burkitt says, here the reading of Ed. Rom. vi 16f does not reproduce that of the manuscript, on which one reads ܪܫܐܢܐ ܪܫܐܡܠܐ (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.

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.

(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.