

help. For example, in *Apocr.* iv 2, p. 177 l. 10, where it is shewn to be partly due to St Paul's affection that he identifies himself with the dead in 1 Thess. iv, we read οὕτω γάρ τις φιλέταιρος ποιεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ τῶν ὁμοστοίχων ἀγαπῶν τὴν συγγένειαν. Turrianus (*adv. Magd.* ii 13, p. 208) quotes this as οὕτω γάρ τις φιλέτερος, καὶ τῶν ὁμοστοίχων ἀγαπῶν τὴν συγγένειαν δοκεῖ. May we not take the suggestion from δοκεῖ, and instead of the clumsy ποιεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ, emend to some such phrase as ποιεῖν δοκεῖ? I can make no attempt to discuss here the question of emendation in passages where there is no authority to suggest it.

T. W. CRAFER.

I. THE DIATESSARON IN THE SYRIAC ACTS OF JOHN.

IN the January number of the JOURNAL I attempted to shew that the Syriac *Acts of John* is no translation from Greek but an original Syriac document, and that the writer of the Acts made use of Tatian's Harmony. I venture to hope that the evidence adduced in support of these opinions will have proved convincing to Syriac scholars.

Two passages were reserved for separate consideration, as involving an arrangement of the Gospel narratives markedly different from that found in the late Arabic version of the Diatessaron which we possess. The first of these which I shall consider comes on pp. 38-39 of the Syriac text, 34-35 of Dr Wright's translation. It describes the first miracle of feeding the multitudes and that of the walking on the water. The corresponding matter in Diat. Arab. comes in xviii 22-xix 13. It will be well to exhibit our passage with reference to the account as given in the Arabic.¹

Diat. Arab.	Gosp.
xviii 22 ^a	Mk. vi 33
22 ^b -25 ^a	Jn. vi 2 ^b -5 ^a
25 ^b	Mk. vi 34 ^b
26	Lk. ix 11 ^b
27	Mt. xiv 15 ^a

Acts of John.

And when He was teaching *in the desert* (cf. Mk. vi 31 = Mt. xiv 31; *but also Lk. ix 10 in C*²), and

¹ I avail myself of the Gospel references given by Mr. Hamlyn Hill in *The Earliest Life of Christ*. I shall refer to the Curetonian and Sinaitic MSS of syr. vt. as C and S respectively. When Prof. Burkitt is quoted the reference will be to his *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* unless otherwise indicated.

² Ciasca's Arabic Diatessaron xviii 21 is equally silent as to Bethsaida, so that we may conjecture that C here reproduces the text of Tatian¹ (Burkitt ii p. 292).

Diat. Arab.	Gosp.	<i>Acts of John.</i>
		the day had inclined to <i>dip</i> (Lk. ix 12), ¹ after the sick had been healed and the lepers cleansed, and the lame walked, and (the eyes of) the blind were opened (cf. Mt. xv 30-31, which introduces the miracle of feeding the four thousand), and the time was short (cf. Mt. xiv 15, Mk. vi 35 ^b),
28	Mk. vi 36	
29-30 ^a	Mt. xiv 16-17 ^a	
30 ^b -34	Jn. vi 5-9	and there was no bread but three ² (sic) loaves of barleymeal (Jn. vi 9).
xviii 35	Lk. ix 13 ^b	
36	Jn. vi 10	
37	Mk. vi 40	
—	—	And He commanded the multitude to sit down (Mt. xiv 19);
38	Mt. xiv 18	and He gave orders (cf. Mt. xiv 18),
39	—	and they brought Him these loaves [<i>Diat. Arab. similarly inserts after Mt. xiv 18, 'and when they had brought them'</i>];
39-40 ^a	Mt. xiv 19 } = Mk. vi 41 }	and He looked up to heaven, and blessed, and brake (Mt. xiv 19),
—	—	and gave to them (cf. Jn. vi 11),
40 ^b	Mt. xiv 20 ^a	and they ate, and left over, and were satisfied.
41-42	Jn. vi 12-13	—
43	Mt. xiv 21	And those that ate and were satisfied, and carried away, and went to their homes, were four ³ thousand (Mt. xv 38; Mk. viii 9), besides women and children (Mt. xiv 21; xv 38).
44	Mt. xiv 22 } = Mk. vi 45 }	And He sent us away, that we might go into a ship,
45-49	Jn. vi 14-18	and He stayed behind on the dry land (cf. Mk. vi 47). And when the sun had set (cf. Mt. xiv 23, Mk. vi 47, Jn. vi 16)
50	Mt. xiv 24	and it was dark (Jn. vi 17), the sea rose against us (Jn. vi 18) ⁴ ,
xix 1	25	and we were tossed about (cf. Mt. xiv 24) all night. And in the fourth watch of the night, this Jesus . . . came unto us, walking on the sea (Mt. xiv 25),
2	Jn. vi 19 ^a	—
—	—	and we were afraid (Jn. vi 19 ^b);
3	Mt. xiv 26	and when one of the 'disciples, my companions, saw (this) (Mt. xiv 26),
4	27	—
5	28	he said to Him: Lord, if it be Thou, command me to come unto Thee upon the water (Mt. xiv 28).

¹ The Syriac is *ܕܝܚܝܒ* و *ܕܝܚܝܒ*. The verb 'to dip' is uncommon in the sense it bears here, but quite idiomatic; it is actually the word used in C at Lk. ix 12.

² On p. 17 (15) of these Acts there is a shorter passage which deals with the same miracle: there it is said that there were *five* loaves of barleymeal.

³ So in the other passage (p. 17). In both places the later MS, B, has corrected the number to 'five thousand'.

⁴ Compare St Ephraim's Commentary (Moes. p. 137): 'Quum igitur in navi sederent et vento in ea agitentur et mare contra eos commotum insurgeret, venit Dominus,' etc.

Diat. Arab.	Gosp.	<i>Acts of John.</i>
6	29	And Jesus said unto him : Come. And he walked and was coming (<i>B</i> , went) unto Him (Mt. xiv 29). ¹
7-8	30-31	—
9	32	And our Lord Jesus came and entered into the ship (Mt. xiv 32). ²
xi 35	Mk. iv 39 ^a	And there was a great quiet (سوء). ³
36	40	—
37	Lk. viii 25	And these multitudes were astonished and said: Who is this, pray, that the winds and the sea He commandeth and they obey Him ⁴ (Lk. viii 25).
xi 38	Lk. viii 26	And when Jesus had come to the land of the Gadarenes (cf. Mt. viii 28; Lk. viii 26)
vii 10	Mt. iv 24	they brought to Him all those that were ill with divers ⁵ infirmities, and demoniacs and the paralysed, and lunatics and the lame, and He healed them all (Mt. iv 24).

In this passage the words 'and there was a great quiet' to 'and they obey Him' have evidently been brought in through confusion from the earlier miracle of stilling the storm; but the verses (Mk. iv 39 and Lk. viii 25-26) which make up the passage appear also in close connexion in the Arabic Harmony (xi 35-38). That the stilling of the storm is in its right place in Diat. Arab. is attested by Ephraim (Moes. pp. 74-75). The concluding words from Mt. iv belong to yet another context.

We turn back to the account of feeding the multitudes. Most of the circumstances are collected from the different accounts of the feeding of the *five* thousand, much as we find them in Diat. Arab., though in a condensed form. But the healings which precede the miracle are from St Matthew's account of the *four* thousand (Mt. xv 30 f), and in two separate contexts the older MS of the *Acts of John* gives *four* thousand as the number fed. The reading 'five thousand', which the later MS has in both passages, must be rejected as a palpable emendation. It is wholly improbable that a scribe should twice have made the unnatural mistake of connecting the four thousand with the five loaves in an account where almost all the details so clearly belong to the miracle of feeding the five thousand. It is equally improbable that the author himself twice wrote 'four' by mistake. The question

¹ For the reading see *J. T. S.* viii 259.

² For the reading see *J. T. S.* loc. cit.

³ This is the reading of Pesh. in Mk. iv 39. syr. vt. is wanting here; but in Mt. viii 26 and Lk. viii 24 all authorities have 'calm', ܠܫܘܢܐ.

⁴ For the reading, which agrees in a striking manner with syr. vt. against Pesh., see *J. T. S.* loc. cit.

⁵ *B*, 'stubborn,' which is the reading of syr. vt. : Pesh. has 'divers'. See *J. T. S.* viii p. 260.

arises: Did Tatian describe both miracles of feeding the multitudes, or were the two reduced to one?

The silence of Ephraim's Commentary on the subject of the second miracle and of the subsequent discourse on the leaven of the Pharisees, in which our Lord alludes to both miracles (Diat. Arab. xxiii 1-25), forced Zahn to omit these passages from his reconstruction of the Diatessaron text.¹ Having finished with Jn. v 46 [the passage which in Diat. Arab. (xxii 54) immediately precedes the second miracle and the discourse on the leaven], Ephraim goes on with the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mk. viii 22 = Diat. Arab. xxiii 26), which in the Arabic comes just after the discourse on the leaven.² We might have expected from Ephraim some comment on the latter discourse even though he had thought it unnecessary to speak of the second miracle.

If we turn now to Aphraates, we find in *Hom.* xxi 5 the following: 'Elisha satisfied a hundred men from a little bread; and Jesus satisfied *four* thousand from *five* loaves, besides women and children.' This surely is a significant statement in view of the fact of its double occurrence in the *Acts of John*.³

We turn next to Solomon of Başra. He is a rather late writer (saec. xiii); but in a work entitled *The Book of the Bee*⁴ he has culled information from a variety of Syriac sources, some of which go back ultimately to the fourth century, and even to the Old Syriac and the Diatessaron itself. Thus his first chapter is clearly based upon Aphraates (*Hom.* xvii 7). On p. 91 he gives us an Encratite explanation of the locusts eaten by St John the Baptist which probably took its rise from a reading in the Diatessaron.⁵ On p. 94 we are told that

¹ See *Forschungen zur Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons* i. pp. 161-162, 258.

² In the transition from Jn. v 46 to Mk. viii 22 there is no indication of any gap in the text under comment. One passage is dovetailed into the other quite naturally. 'Si autem propter miracula *crediderunt* (sc. Moysi), licet ignorantes, Moyses responsum dedit pro Christo, quod oporteat ei *fidem* habere propter ipsius signa et miracula (Jn.). Iuxta gradum *fidei* caeco sanatio contigit, ut Dominus oculos invisibiles et visibiles ei daret' (Mk.) &c. (Moes. p. 152). There would be perhaps a certain temptation for the harmonist to bring together the two cures, of the sick man at Bethesda (Jn. v), and of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mk. viii).

³ I do not consider that the evidence from Ephraim's Commentary and this passage of Aphraates is put out of court by the circumstance that elsewhere both these writers shew themselves acquainted with the fact that there were two miracles, for they were both familiar with the 'Separate' Gospels as well as with the Diatessaron.

⁴ Ed. Budge. References will be to the pages of Dr. Budge's English translation.

⁵ See Rendel Harris *Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron* p. 17. According to Isho'dad the Diat. said: 'His meat was honey and milk of the mountains.' Dr. Rendel Harris emends this to 'milk and honey of the mountains'. Isho'dad goes on to give various explanations which he has read. One of these changes 'locusts' into a like-sounding word meaning a sort of root,

'Bar-Abba was called Jesus'. This comes from the 'Evangelion da-Mepharreshe', or Old Syriac, as Bar Šalibi (possibly Solomon's immediate authority) had observed a century earlier. On p. 94 again, the purple robe put upon our Lord is said to have been a present to the Maccabees 'from the emperors of the Greeks'. This is also found in Bar Šalibi, who may have got it from St Ephraim.¹

Now on p. 92 (*Book of the Bee*) we find, in the course of a short notice of our Lord's miracles, the following passage: 'He wrought miracles, healed the sick . . . He satisfied five thousand with five loaves and there remained twelve basketfuls; and with seven loaves and two fishes He satisfied four thousand (men), besides women and children, and there remained seven basketfuls. And some writers say that our Lord satisfied *forty* thousand men and women and children with *five* loaves.'

The coupling of the *two* fishes with the seven loaves may be a mere slip; but what were the *data* that enabled 'some writers' to compute that the women and children, if counted in, would swell the number of those fed with *five* loaves to *forty* thousand? There is no obvious reason why the five thousand should have been multiplied by eight. But suppose that some writer has found it stated somewhere (perhaps in a copy of the Diatessaron itself) that *four* thousand were fed with five loaves, and the explanation is obvious. He is perplexed, looks about for a means of reconciling the statement with the narrative in Mt. xiv and Mk. vi, and hits upon the emendation 'forty' for 'four' (*arb'in* for *arb'â*), accounting for the odd thirty-five thousand by the inclusion of the women and children.

Ephraim in his comments on the (first) miracle (Moes. pp. 132-135) has a further point of agreement with the other authorities just quoted: like them he omits all reference to the fishes.² This may be a mere coincidence; but when we know that Tatian for Encratite reasons changed the locusts which John ate into milk, it does not appear incredible that he should have got rid of the fishes upon similar grounds.

thus effecting a compromise between the Encratite reading of Tatian and the text of the separate Gospels. This is the explanation given by Solomon. It may be remarked that Aphraates seems to have preferred the orthodox reading, for in one place he says rather pointedly, 'John was eating the locusts that fly' (vi. 13).

¹ Lamy i 589.

² Cf. Moes. p. 133: 'Sed considera vim eius creatricem omnia penetrantem. Dominus paululum panis sumpsit et in ictu oculi multiplicavit. Quod homines per decem menses operoso labore faciunt et convertunt, decem digiti eius subito fecerunt.' Lower down: 'panes isti azymi quasi feminae steriles et filiis orbae per benedictiones eius creverunt et duodecim cophinorum fragmentis, quae ex eis nascebantur, multiplicati sunt.'

In the other passage in the *Acts of John* (p. 17) where the feeding of four thousand is mentioned there is a somewhat vague reference to a second miracle of feeding the multitudes. Perhaps the author has the separate Gospels in mind; but on the other hand it is quite possible that Tatian himself, after describing one miracle fully, made some such passing allusion to the fact that there had been another.

The second passage that we have to consider comes on pp. 18-19 (transl. 15-16). It deals with events from the Passion to the Ascension of our Lord. As no very useful purpose would be served by attempting to exhibit the account here given by the side of that in Diat. Arab., I will simply give the story as told in our Acts, together with the principal Gospel references, and then try to compare it with what may be gathered from the extant authorities for the original Diatessaron account.

'And after thirty-two years, after the thirty-third had commenced . . . they delivered Him to the hegemon, and scourged Him and stripped Him of His garments, and mocked Him, and spat in His face, and wove a crown of thorns and placed it on His head (cf. Mt. xxvii 26 ff), and crucified Him on the wood, and gave Him vinegar and gall to drink, and smote Him with a spear in His side¹ [Jn. xix 34; cf. Mt. xxvii 49 c (?)], and He cried out with His mighty voice (cf. Mt. xxvii 50, Mk. xv 37, Lk. xxiii 34^a) on the cross.² And when the preaching of the prophets was accomplished (cf. Jn. xix 28) the sun was darkened (Lk. xxiii 44) from the sixth hour to the ninth, and there was darkness over the whole earth on the Friday ('arābhtā); and the veil of the temple was rent (Mt. xxvii 51): and the boulders³ and rocks, which blocked up the entrances to the tombs around Jerusalem, were split, and the dead came forth and entered into the city (Mt. xxvii 52, 53), crying out with their voices; and they came and

¹ *B* adds 'and there flowed from it blood and water'. These words may have been inserted by a scribe from Jn. xix 34; but the reading differs from Pesh., which has 'and immediately there came forth' for 'and there flowed from it', while the latter reading is that given by Jacob of Serug in a Homily in which he is plainly using the Diatessaron (see below, 'Jacob of Serug and the Diatessaron'); and so the words in *B* probably belong to the original text of the Acts.

² *B* adds: 'My Father forgive them' (Lk. xxiii 34^b). The genuineness of these words will be discussed presently. On the reading 'His mighty voice' see *J.T.S.* viii 259.

³ Lit. 'wheels' (ⲙⲉⲛⲟⲩ). The meaning which the word has here may be illustrated by its use in Eccl. xii 6, where in the singular it renders ⲙⲉⲛⲟⲩ, 'a wheel (for raising water). The Syriac translator evidently missed the meaning of the passage in the Heb.—'or ever . . . the wheel *be broken* at the well'—and rendered 'or ever . . . the wheel *run* over the well', taking 'the wheel' to be a circular stone for blocking the well's mouth.

worshipped Him as He hung on the wood; and many of them are still alive. And they took Him down from the wood, and a certain man full of truth, Joseph the councillor (Lk. xxiii 50), wrapped Him in a swathe of linen, and laid Him in the tomb; and on the third day He rose from the dead; and we saw Him, and felt Him (cf. Lk. xxiv 39) and believed (cf. Jn. xx 29) and affirmed that He is the Word which became flesh and dwelt amongst us. And He ascended into heaven and sat at the right hand of His Father (cf. Mk. xvi 19); and He has given us power to give life and blessings to every one who believes in His name. And He said to us: Go forth, make disciples, and baptize them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (Mt. xxviii 19); every one that believes and is baptized shall live' (Mk. xvi 16).

In view of the evidence already produced for the use of the Diatessaron in the *Acts of John* this passage cannot fail to raise some fresh speculation as to the original Diatessaron account of the Passion. Unfortunately in the case of most of the points which arise there is not sufficient independent evidence to justify a definite view; and in what follows I wish for the most part to suggest possibilities only and not to advocate theories.

1. In the words 'My Father forgive them', *B* must, it appears to me, preserve the original reading of the Acts. It is highly improbable that a scribe, or annotator, acquainted only with the text of the separate Gospels, would have inserted this saying here, out of the Gospel order, instead of the cry from Mt. and Mk., or the other cry from Lk. (xxiii 46). But for a writer familiar with the Diatessaron it would probably have been quite natural to do so. Diat. Arab. (lii 6) puts the saying immediately before the cry in Lk. xxiii 46, thus: 'And Jesus said, My Father forgive them . . . And Jesus, crying again with a loud voice, said, My Father, into Thy hands,' &c. In Ephraim's Commentary the words are cited three times (Moes. pp. 117, 256, 265), in no case in the Gospel order. The first citation comes long before the Passion; the second in the course of a comment on the other cry ('into Thy hands', &c.); the third later still.

2. The piercing of the side is placed before our Lord's death. This is also the case in some of our best Greek MSS (including *N*, *B* and *L*), Jn. xix 34 being interpolated after Mt. xxvii 49 in the form, 'but another took a spear and pierced His side, and there came out water and blood.' Now, as Prof. Burkitt has pointed out, 'there is no [known] Syriac evidence' for this.¹ But in a Greek MS of the eleventh century there is, as is well known, a gloss opposite to Mt. xxvii 49 which says that the words 'but another took a spear', &c., followed here in 'the historical

¹ *Op. cit.* i 169.

Gospel of Diodorus and Tatian'. On this Mr Hamlyn Hill observes: 'As no such person or Gospel is known, Diodorus may be a mistake for Diatessaron.'¹ The MS in question is cod. 72 of the Gospels (Brit. Mus. 5647). That it came from the East, having belonged at one time to a certain Michael, Metropolitan of Başra, may perhaps count in favour of the view that the gloss contains an element of truth. On the other hand, Ephraim certainly places the incident after the death (Moes. p. 259). But his reference to it is followed by the remark: 'This was done that they might know that He was alive after death,' which seems to shew that the other alternative was present to his mind.² This inference may be strengthened by another consideration. In Jn. xix 34 the order 'blood and water' has overwhelming Greek and other MS testimony;³ but in the interpolation in Mt. the order appears to be always 'water and blood'. Now Ephraim uses both orders. In Moes. p. 260 we find 'exiit sanguis et aqua'; but on p. 245, 'mysterium aquae et sanguinis ex latere Christi'; and in *Carm. Nisib.* xxxix 7, 'there came out from Him water and blood.' It is possible, therefore, that some copies of the Diatessaron had the interpolation, while in others it was corrected into agreement with the 'Separate' Gospel. We shall see later on that Jacob of Serug, in a Homily in which he makes considerable use of the Diatessaron, evidently quotes from a text (whether of Diat. or of the separate Gospels) in which the order was 'water and blood'. We have already seen that he read 'and there flowed from it' with MS *B* of *Acts of John* against Pesh., which has 'and immediately there came forth'.

3. The precise statement that 'the sun was darkened from the sixth hour to the ninth, and there was darkness over the whole earth on the Friday'⁴ is somewhat striking. Nor does it stand alone: Ephraim (Moes. p. 215), in a comment on Lk. xxi 36, writes: 'Alii dicunt ad solos apostolos haec dicta esse, ut si *feria sexta*⁵ *sol defectura sit*, confortarentur.'

Now Dr James has incidentally pointed out (*J.T.S.* vii 566 f) two other passages in which the 'arūbhā' is mentioned in connexion with the darkness. The first of these is in the very ancient Greek (Leucian)

¹ *Earliest Life of Christ* p. 249.

² Cf. Rendel Harris *The Diatessaron of Tatian* p. 51.

³ So Pesh. Unfortunately syr. vt. is not extant at this place.

⁴ 'Arūbhā': this is the regular Syriac word for 'Friday', *pace* Dr James (in *J.T.S.* vii 567); cf. Mk. xv 42, where Pesh. renders παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶ προσάββατον by 'the evening of the arūbhā, which is before the Sabbath'. *S* has no equivalent of παρασκευή, but says simply, 'and it was on the Sabbath.' 'Arūbhā' has nothing to do with the idea of 'preparation', and hence Prof. Burkitt rightly renders 'Friday' when the word occurs in syr. vt. as a translation of παρασκευή.

⁵ No doubt the word in the original Syriac was 'arūbhā.

Acts of John (Bonnet *Act. Apost. Apocr.* II i 199): And when on the Friday (τῆ ἀποβάρῳ) He was hung (on the cross), at the sixth hour of the day there came darkness over all the earth . . . And (He) said, 'John, unto the multitudes down below in Jerusalem I am being crucified, and pierced with lances and reeds, and vinegar and gall is given Me to drink.'

In translating ἀποβάρῳ by 'Friday' I have adopted Hilgenfeld's conjecture—which Dr James seems to accept,¹ and which I feel sure is correct—that the word is simply a transliteration of ערבתא (*'arūbhtā*). Hilgenfeld further suggested that the word was taken from a Hebrew Gospel; and certainly its juxtaposition with the mention of the darkness renders it highly probable that the writer of the Leucian Acts is borrowing from a Semitic original. *'Arūbhtā* means primarily 'evening', 'sunset', being derived from ערב 'to grow dark', 'set' (of the sun). The play upon the double meaning of the word ('sunset' and 'Friday') is met with more than once in Syriac writers, as we shall see; but the pun is not actually made in every case: it is sometimes hinted at or referred to (cf. the passage in the Syriac *Acts of John* above, and the remark of Ephraim), as if the writer had in mind some well-known context in which it stood. Let us examine the passage in the Leucian Acts more closely.

It has two other coincidences with the Syriac Acts: (1) the piercing of the side is apparently placed before the death—if indeed this is done intentionally in either set of Acts; and (2) it is said that our Lord was given 'vinegar and gall' to drink. It might be supposed that the author of the Syriac Acts is here copying from the Leucian. But I do not think that this is the case, for an orthodox writer—as our author undoubtedly was—who had the Gospel narrative before him would scarcely go out of his way to copy such a meagre account of the Passion as that in the Greek Acts, one, moreover, in which the events described are mentioned with the sole purpose of saying that they did not happen to the real but only to the docetic Christ. Further, the peculiarities of the Syriac account are not confined to the matter which it has in common with the Greek.

Can we find any connecting link which will account for these coincidences? In the first place, it now seems probable that the writer of the Syriac Acts was familiar with the Diatessaron. And we know that in the Diatessaron it was said that the drink, or one of the drinks, offered to Christ on the cross was 'vinegar and gall'.² We have seen also that Ephraim speaks in his Commentary of the failing of the sun as having taken place on Friday (*feria sexta*); that there is some reason

¹ *J. T. S.* loc. cit.

² Cp. Ephraim's Commentary (Moes. p. 245): 'And they gave Him to drink vinegar and gall.'

to suppose that he was acquainted with the interpolation which placed the piercing of the side before our Lord's death; and that this addition may have found a place in some copies of the Diatessaron. This suggests the possibility that Tatian and the author of the Leucian Acts may have used a common source. Here then comes in Hilgenfeld's suggestion that the passage in the Greek Acts is based upon the Hebrew Gospel. We know for a fact that the Diatessaron contained matter drawn from apocryphal Gospels. There are two clear coincidences with the *Gospel of Peter*, viz. the cry of woe uttered by the people as they returned from Calvary,¹ and the words spoken by the young man to the women at the tomb (*Peter* c. 13): 'He is risen and gone away thither, whence He was sent.' Compare Aphraates (xx 11; Wright, p. 385)—'And those angels said to Mary, He is risen and gone away to Him that sent Him'—where he is probably quoting from the Diatessaron.² In common with the Hebrew Gospel, the Harmony had an account of a light on Jordan at our Lord's baptism. The employment of this Gospel by the author of the Leucian Acts as well as by Tatian would well account for at least two of the coincidences in the Greek and Syriac *Acts of John*.

The other writer quoted by Dr James who couples the darkness with Friday is Solomon of Baṣra, who, as we have seen, sometimes preserves very early traditions. He writes: 'As regards the name *'arūbhtā*, it was not known until this time [i. e. the time of the Passion], but that day was called the sixth day. And when the sun became dark, and the divine care also set (*'erbath*) and abandoned the Israelitish people, that day was called *'arūbhtā*.' This explanation is probably a pure fancy; but it may have been a very early one. It evidently rose out of the pun on the double meaning of *'arūbhtā*; but it does seem further to imply that the inventor of the etymology was acquainted with a Gospel text in which the mention of Friday came in connexion with the three hours of darkness.³

4. What was our author's authority for the statement that the dead came to worship Christ on the cross? He is on the whole a sober writer, and seems here to be telling the Gospel story as it was known to him. It is not obvious what motive could have prompted an orthodox

¹ See Burkitt i 413, note on Lk. xxiii 48; and *Gosp. of Pet.* c. 7.

² See Robinson *The Gosp. acc. to Peter* p. 29. It is probable that the Diat. had other features in common with *Peter*: see the next *Note*.

³ Compare Ephraim (Lamy i 695): 'Three days are counted to Christ, as to Jonah. Lo, there is the *'arūbhtā* whose light set (*'arabh*) from the people', &c. The same statement will meet us in Jacob of Serug in a Homily in which it is certain that he is using the Diatessaron (see the next *Note*, on 'Jacob of Serug and the Diatessaron').

writer to set down in prose such a glaring perversion of St Matthew's Gospel,—unless indeed he had found it in some authorized text.¹

5. The words 'and we felt Him and believed' may be a confused reminiscence of Lk. xxiv 39 (Diat. Arab. liv 4) and Jn. xx 29 (Diat. Arab. liv 22); but as they stand they forcibly remind us of the well-known passage in Ignatius of Antioch (Smyrn. 3), which, as St Jerome informs us, was found in the 'Nazarene' Gospel: 'When the Lord came to Peter and those with him, He said: 'Take hold, feel Me, and see that I am not an incorporeal demon. And straightway *they touched Him and believed*, being convinced by His flesh and by His Spirit.'² I see no objection to supposing that this passage was used by Tatian; it would have furnished him with a plausible pretext for omitting the mention of the broiled fish in Lk. xxiv 42.³

6. The account of the Ascension with which the passage closes has already been discussed (see *J. T. S.* viii 257) in connexion with a similar account on p. 4 of these Acts. It was seen that the command to baptize (Mt. xxviii 19) is brought into close connexion with the Ascension, which is described in the language of Mk. and Lk. combined, the arrangement being in close agreement with that found in the Arabic Harmony.

II. JACOB OF SERUG AND THE DIATESSARON.

JACOB of Serug died in 521. In the first volume of his *Homilies*, published by Bedjan in 1905,⁴ there are three on Baptism. The second of these treats of the baptism of our Lord; and it seems clear that Jacob either has the Diatessaron before him as he writes or is very familiar with its contents. On p. 174, and again on p. 179, he alludes to a fire between the banks of the Jordan. Pp. 183-185 are taken up

¹ We shall presently find something very similar in Jacob of Serug's account of the crucifixion.

² Westcott *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* eighth ed. p. 467.

³ 'The use of ܕܝܒܠ "devil" [in *S* and *C* at Mt. xiv 26, and in *S* at Mt. vi 49] as an equivalent for $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$ ', writes Prof. Burkitt, 'has a curious echo of the famous saying of our Lord quoted by Ignatius and taken according to Jerome from the "Nazarene" Gospel. . . . It is obvious that the saying goes back to a Semitic origin and that the original word corresponding to $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$ was ܕܝܒܠ . The same may be said of $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ in Lk. xxiv 39' (*op. cit.* ii 281). But, since it is probable on independent grounds that Tatian used the Hebrew Gospel, is it not a legitimate conjecture that 'devil' was the reading of the Diat. in the same passages as in syr. vt., and that Tatian was influenced in his choice of the word by the passage which Ignatius quotes?

⁴ A second volume appeared in 1906.

Jacob enables us, with the help of Ephraim's commentary and, in part, of Victor of Capua's Latin Harmony (*Codex Fuldensis*), to make some interesting corrections in the Arabic order. Jacob's order, checked as far as may be by the existing authorities, is as follows:—

(1) p. 566. Judas's repentance is placed after the trial: 'And He went forth to die with evil-doers, Himself having done no evil. Then Judas, that lamp which went out in the midst of its fellows, repented and was ashamed of the wickedness he had done.' This arrangement is supported by Ephraim (Moes. p. 239) and Diat. Arab.

(2) p. 569. Lamentations of the women on the way to Calvary.

(3) p. 570. Christ is nailed to the cross. The robbers are not mentioned here; but it is implied later on that they were crucified simultaneously with our Lord.

(4) p. 571. Enumeration of instruments prepared on Calvary: nails for the hands and feet; a lance; gall, or wormwood (Jacob says it was to be eaten; but he is influenced by Ps. lxix 21, which he quotes), and vinegar.¹ The word 'lance' (لانس) is that used by St Ephraim to describe the weapon with which our Lord's side was pierced (Lamy i 621). The Peshitta has 'spear' (سيف). The only drink given to Christ of which St Ephraim makes mention in his commentary is 'vinegar and gall' (Moes. p. 245). It is probable that in the Diatessaron this was the only drink offered on the cross, for in a Homily on the Good Thief (Bedj. ii p. 442) Jacob says that the 'gall and vinegar' were held out on a reed. On pp. 571 and 572 Jacob says that 'they had given Him wine to drink as He was setting forth', but that He would not drink it (cf. Mt. xxvii 34, Mk. xv 23) because it was not prophesied of Him that He should drink wine. The gall and vinegar, however, He took in accordance with Ps. lxix 21. Neither in Diat. Arab. nor in Ephraim's commentary is there mention of any drink offered before the actual crucifixion.

(5) p. 572. The parting of the garments and casting lots.

(6) p. 574. The inscription: given variously as 'This is the King of the Jews' and 'This Jesus is the King of the Jews'. It was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. It is called a 'tablet', **فول** (i. e. *πιττάκιον*), the Diat. and syr. vt. word for *ἐπιγραφή* in Lk. xxiii 38: Pesh. has 'writing', **كتاب** (see Burkitt *op. cit.* i 411, ii 138).

(7) p. 580. The 'robbers'. Christ was bound to the cross with robbers [see no. (3), above].

(8) One of the 'robbers' repents.

p. 581. The penitent 'robber' reads on the 'tablet' (here spelt

Cf. vol. i p. 500: 'Unless they give me vinegar and gall to drink the prophecy is devoid of meaning.'

١٥٤) 'This is the King': 'but with or without the writing He would have been confessed as Master and Lord of the *Garden of Eden*.'¹ Jacob uses the word 'robber' (سارق) throughout. The two criminals are called 'evil-doers' in *S* at Mt. xxvii 38 (Gr. λησται), and by *S*, *C*, and Pesh. at Lk. xxiii 32, 39 (Gr. κακούργους). At Mt. xxvii 38 and Mk. xv 27 Pesh. has 'bandits' (سارقين, i. e. λησται); but at Mk. xv 27 *S* has 'robbers', and we may infer from Jacob's repeated use of this word that it was that employed in the Diatessaron.

p. 582. 'He hangs on the wood and gives *the Garden* to Faith; and because it believed that He was able to give, straightway He gave.'

The darkness, which follows here in Diat. Arab. and Ephraim's commentary, is not mentioned by Jacob till after the death; but it is said then that it took place from the sixth to the ninth hour, and that the death was at the ninth hour.²

The order of events thus far agrees with Diat. Arab. Ephraim in his commentary speaks of the repentance of the thief on the right hand before the offering of the vinegar and gall. But we need not conclude that Diat. had that order. It is quite natural that, having said that the two men were crucified with Christ, he should go straight on to speak of the repentance of one of them.

(9) p. 584. The death: 'He cried out with the voice, and left His Spirit in the hand of His Father' (cf. Lk. xxiii 46; Diat. Arab. lii 7; Moes. p. 254).

(10) p. 584. Splitting of the rocks, trembling of the mountains (cf. Ephr. Moes. 257), earthquake. Here the darkness is mentioned; and Jacob seems to imply a reading in Diat. to the effect that the sun was darkened and again shone forth³; cf. Ephr. (Moes. 257): 'Tres horas sol obtenebratus est, et postea denuo luxit.'⁴ The same reading is implied in Lamy i 695 and 697. Also Jacob says repeatedly that the darkness took place 'at noon' (p. 584), or 'in the middle of the day' (pp. 591-

¹ Paradise is constantly referred to in this Homily as 'the Garden', and two or three times as 'the Garden of Eden'. In Bedj. vol. ii, beginning on p. 428, there is a Homily on *The Robber on the Right Hand*. At the end (p. 446) we read as follows: 'Amen, O man, He was saying to him, Believe and affirm that with me thou shalt be *in the Garden of Eden*.' This is a well-established Diatessaron reading (see Burkitt ii 138, 304) at Lk. xxiii 43: Pesh. has 'Paradise'.

² So also Aphraates xii 6-7.

³ In another Homily (vol. i p. 500) Jacob quotes the O. T. in support of this idea: 'Unless the sun be darkened and (again) shine at the crucifixion, why was it said "there shall be light at the time of evening"?' (Zech. xiv 7).

⁴ From this point it seems clear that Jacob has Ephraim's commentary before him. There are several coincidences of thought and language; but he is not merely dependent on the commentary, for he presently gives us information about the Diat. which cannot be gathered directly from Ephraim's work.

592, 603); cf. *Gosp. of Peter*, cc. 5 and 6, which has both these peculiarities.

(11) p. 586. 'The dead came forth that they might chant praises to Him with Hosannas.' Compare with this the striking passage in the *Syriac Acts of John* p. 18 (transl. 16): 'and the dead came forth and entered into the city crying out with their voices; and they came, and worshipped Him as He hung on the wood.' Was there not some foundation for this in the Diatessaron?

(12) pp. 588-589. The piercing of the side with a 'lance' (on this word see above). The reading of Jn. xix 34 here given is worthy of notice, since it differs from that of Pesh. and agrees in part with that found in the later MS (B) of the *Acts of John*.

Jacob: ܐܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ.
'And they pierced His side, and there flowed from it water and blood.'

Acts of John, A and B: ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ

B+ ܐܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ.

'And they struck Him with a spear in His side, (B+) and there flowed from it blood and water.'

Pesh.: ܐܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ

ܐܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܥܘܠܡ.

'But one of the soldiers struck Him in His side with a spear, and straightway there came forth blood and water.'

The evidence of syr. vt. is lost. Ephr. (Moes. p. 260) has: 'exiit sanguis et aqua.' Elsewhere Ephraim has the order 'water and blood'. On p. 589 Jacob repeats the order 'water and blood', and also the word ܥܘܢ; 'flowed': 'Water and blood, for the forming of spiritual babes, flowed from the side of the Living One who died to quicken Adam . . . water flowed that He might declare that He was even dead, and blood flowed that again He might teach that He was alive when dead'¹ (cf. Ephraim's comment on the words 'exiit sanguis et aqua': 'et hoc factum est, ut scirent Christum post mortem vivere'). The agreement between the *Acts of John* and Jacob in reading 'and there flowed from it' is curious; while the order 'water and blood', found also in Ephraim, suggests the influence of the interpolation in Mt. xxvii 49, in which it is all but invariable.

(13) p. 592. 'The light set (*arabh*) on the Friday (*arubhtá*) that it might teach who was the Light.' See above, the discussion of similar statements in *Acts of John* and other writings.

¹ The same order is twice given in vol. i p. 162, and in vol. ii p. 227 we read: 'The Son of God put on a body, and made to flow from it water and blood.'

(14) p. 593. Joseph (of Arimathaea) begs the Body and lays it in a tomb in a garden. There is no mention of Nicodemus, who in Diat. Arab. is coupled with Joseph (cf. Jn. xix 39), nor is he referred to in Ephraim's commentary. In *Cod. Fuld.* Nicodemus helps to take the Body from the cross, but Joseph alone lays it in the tomb.

(15) p. 600. The Jews ask for a guard. *They (or the soldiers) roll the stone to the tomb's mouth and seal it.*¹ There can be little doubt that this was so in the Diatessaron. Ephraim (Moes. 266) puts the rolling and sealing of the stone together, and implies that both alike were precautionary measures to prevent the Body from being stolen: 'Lapis sigillo firmatus appositus est, ut custodiret illud lapidem, cuius sigillo fideles custodiuntur.' His point is that this was a futile proceeding.

This may help to account for an otherwise perplexing reading in Pesh. at Mt. xxvii 60: 'and *they rolled* a great stone and *cast* it over the door of the sepulchre and *departed*.' The italicized verbs are plural, though those preceding are all singular, and the only possible subject is 'Joseph'.² Evidently we have here another example of the use of apocryphal material by Tatian: he doubtless got the idea that the stone was placed by the Jews, or soldiers, from the *Gospel of Peter* c. 8.

We now get some further light on the Diatessaron—Tatian's method of dealing with the angels at the tomb. In Diat. Arab. all the Gospel accounts are represented. First we have St Matthew's 'angel' sitting on the stone; then St Mark's 'young man' inside the tomb; then St Luke's 'two men' suddenly appearing inside the tomb; and lastly St John's 'two angels' appearing to Magdalene. But *Cod. Fuld.* omits St Mark's 'young man', and apparently makes only *one angel* speak to Magdalene. Tatian, if we may trust Jacob of Serug, seems to have concluded from the Gospel accounts that there were in all three angels at the tomb, one outside and two inside (cf. Ephraim [Lamy i 683] who says that 'three angels at the tomb' witnessed the resurrection). He identified St Mark's 'young man' with St Matthew's 'angel', and St John's 'two

¹ This statement is repeated on pp. 616, 633.

² In the Arabic account of the burial the above words from Mt. xxvii 60 are placed after Jn. xix 42, which is given thus: 'And they left Jesus there because the sabbath had entered in, and because the tomb was nigh at hand.' The word تركوا, 'they left,' presupposes the use of the verb حدد in the Syriac copy before the Arabic translator. If قام ('laid': Gr. ἔθηκεν) had stood there, as in S and Pesh., we should have expected وضعوا in the Arabic. The use of حدد instead of قام suggests that the person, or persons, who buried the Lord departed at once, and fits in perfectly with the view that Tatian made the Jews, and not Joseph, place the stone over the tomb.

angels' with St Luke's 'two men'. When the women (including Magdalene) arrive they see an angel outside (Mt.); then *two angels* appear and enter the tomb *and stand one at the head and one at the feet* (Lk., Jn.), and speak with the women (Lk.); then the women depart, and through fear tell no one (Mk.; so Diat. Arab.); then another Mary (not Magdalene) comes, sees the empty tomb, tells Peter and John, and is afterwards addressed by the *one angel*¹ who is without. This Mary is identified by Ephraim, and apparently by Jacob, with the Blessed Virgin. She speaks with Jesus in the garden, and then goes and tells the disciples that she has seen the Lord. The following is a summary of Jacob of Serug's treatment of the narrative:—

(16) p. 604. *An angel* rolls away the stone (Mt. xxviii 2), before the arrival of the women (p. 605).

(17) p. 606. Then *angels* enter the tomb and *stand one at the head and one at the feet*. This is taken from St John's account of Magdalene at the tomb, Jn. xx 11^b–12 being placed in connexion with (or instead of) Lk. xxiv 4–7. Ephraim in his commentary does not speak of the visit of the women, but he evidently refers to it in the words 'lapis super quem angelus sedit' (Moes. p. 266). P. 607. The *angels* shew the women the empty tomb (as the one angel and the young man in Mt. and Mk.).

(18) p. 607. Mary (nowhere called Magdalene by Jacob) stands by the tomb. P. 608. While *the angel* (so *Cod. Fuld.*, see above) is speaking with her she hears the footsteps of 'the Son' behind her² (Jn. xx 11 ff). Jacob here passes over Mary's arrival at the tomb, and her announce-

¹ Jacob is quite explicit as to the one angel (cf. next note). It is true that Aphraates (xx 11) makes 'angels' speak to Mary at the sepulchre, and this in a passage where he is using the Diatessaron account. But it is reasonable to suppose that he is here confusing the account given in Jn. xx 12 with that in Diat.

² The passage in Aphr. referred to in the last note is as follows:—'And those angels said to Mary: *He is risen and gone away to Him that sent Him*' (cf. the words spoken by the angel to the women in the *Gospel of Peter* c. 13). Now in Jn. xx 12 the angels say nothing to Mary about the resurrection; they ask 'Why weepst thou?' and as soon as she has answered she turns and sees Jesus. It is clearly then to the Diatessaron account (copied from the *Gospel of Peter*) that Jacob refers when he says (pp. 607–608): 'The Lord of Eden rose from the grave and remained in the garden; He sought and found what He had lost, and *returned to His place*. Mary was standing, and the watcher (i.e. angel) was speaking with her *and announcing to her concerning the resurrection* with a loud voice. *While the angel was speaking with her* she turned round; and this is a wonder, why she was turning round. Why did she leave that conversation (~~of~~) of that angel and cut short his word?' Bedjan's text has 'her word'; but two of his four MSS have 'his word', and this seems to be required by the context; it is repeated a little further on that Mary turned 'while the angel was speaking with her'.

ment to and the arrival of Peter and John, but this is told in the next Homily. On p. 609 we have the words: 'In *the Garden of Joseph*¹ He shewed Himself to the Blessed (woman)': no doubt the B. V. M. is meant.

(19) p. 617 (next Homily). Mary comes on Sunday to the tomb (Jn. xx 1). Jn. xx 1 is omitted by Diat. Arab. and *Cod. Fuld.*,² but Ephraim has it (Moes. p. 267). Mary relates to Peter and John: 'they have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him' (Jn. xx 2).

Ephraim's (and, apparently, Jacob's) identification of this Mary with the Mother of our Lord makes it certain that in the Diatessaron she was not called Magdalene. The reason for this may be gathered from Diat. Arab. Magdalene was one of the women who went first to the tomb; and Diat. Arab. concludes the account of the visit with Mk. xvi 8: 'and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid.' We may feel fairly confident that this verse stood in the Diatessaron also rather than Mt. xxviii 8 or Lk. xxiv 9. Tatian would have felt the difficulty of reconciling either of the latter verses with Jn. xx 2. It would obviously be preferable to follow Mk. xvi 8, which says that the women did not tell any one, and to regard the announcement spoken of in Jn. xx 2 as the first intimation the disciples received of the resurrection. But since Mary Magdalene was one of the women who did not tell the news, it became necessary to change her identity in the Jn. narrative. This was probably done by merely omitting 'Magdalene'.

(20) p. 618 ff. Peter and John came to the tomb (as in Jn. xx 3 ff).

(21) p. 623. Departure of Peter and John. Mary's conversation with the angel is not given here, probably because it was spoken of in the preceding Homily.

Jacob of Serug's use of the Diatessaron bears out the suspicion raised by the *Acts of John* that a considerable amount of re-editing had taken place before the copy was produced from which our Arabic version was made. Both Jacob and the Acts leave the further impression that

¹ Here we have another striking coincidence with the *Gospel of Peter*: cf. *Peter* c. 6: 'And he took the Lord, . . . and brought Him into his own tomb which was called the *Garden of Joseph*.' St. John, who alone mentions the garden, gives no hint that it belonged to Joseph.

² At this point *Cod. Fuld.* shews plainly that the text of the underlying Harmony has been clumsily altered. The departure of the women is given in the words of Mt. xxviii 8: 'currentes nuntiare discipulis eius.' Then, without any mention of Magdalene, follows immediately Jn. xx 2: 'currit ergo et uenit ad Simonem Petrum,' &c. If for Mt. xxviii 8 we substitute (with Diat. Arab. liii 8) Mk. xvi 8—'and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid'—and then (with Ephraim and Jacob of Serug) introduce Jn. xx 1, we get the well-connected and very attractive arrangement which I believe was that of the Diatessaron.

Tatian incorporated into his Harmony traditions drawn from non-canonical sources rather more freely than is generally supposed. I have spoken for convenience of his copying from the *Gospel of Peter*. This presupposes a somewhat earlier date for that work than some scholars are ready to allow. But I have no wish to exclude the view that there may have been an early Pilate document which was the source of matter common to Justin Martyr and *Peter*,¹ and that this may also have been used by Tatian. The following list of probable coincidences between the Diatessaron and *Peter* may prove useful:—

(1) *Peter* c. 5. 'And it was noon, and darkness covered all Judaea.' Cf. Jac. Serug. Bedj. ii 584: 'day fled and night entered in and stood in the midst of the noonday.' P. 591: 'in the middle of the day darkness descended and covered the earth.' Cf. pp. 592, 603.

(2) *Peter* c. 6. 'Then [i. e. after Christ was taken down from the cross] the sun shone, and it was found the ninth hour.' Cf. Ephraim's Com. on Diat. (Moes. 257): 'tres horas sol obtenebratus est, et postea denuo luxit.' Cf. Lamy i 695, 697 (Ephr.); Jac. Ser. ii 584 (continuing the sentence quoted above—'and night entered in and stood in the midst of the noonday'): 'that it might fill the place thereof (i. e. of the day) until it revived and came to its place'; and i 500: 'unless the sun be darkened and (again) shine at the crucifixion, why was it said "there shall be light at the time of evening"?'

(3) *Peter* c. 6. 'His own tomb which was called the *Garden of Joseph*.' Cf. Jac. Ser. ii 617: 'in the Garden of Joseph He shewed Himself to the Blessed (woman).'

(4) *Peter* c. 7. 'Woe for our sins: for the judgement and the end of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh.' Cf. Aphraates p. 271; *Addai* p. 27; Ephr. (Moes.) 245, 246. For full texts see Burkitt i 413.

(5) *Peter* c. 8. The Jews and soldiers *roll the stone to the tomb's mouth* and seal it. Jac. Ser. ii 600, and compare Ephr. (Moes.) p. 266. See under no. (15), above.

(6) *Peter* c. 13. 'For He is risen *and gone away thither, whence He was sent*.' Aphr. p. 384; Jac. Ser. ii 607. See notes to nos. (15) and (18), above; and Burkitt i 527.

The free use of the Diatessaron by a writer so late as Jacob of Serug is very instructive as shewing that the efforts of Rabbula (died 435) and Theodoret to get rid of the Harmony were attended with only partial success. There can be little doubt that Tatian's work continued to be employed by scholars as an aid to the comparative study of the Gospels long after its public use in Church had been interdicted. A careful examination of the numerous Gospel quotations in Jacob's writings will be a necessary undertaking on the part of those

¹ So Stanton *The Gospels as Historical Documents* Part I p. 103.

engaged in research on the subject of the Diatessaron. Mr Burkitt, in his edition of the old Syriac Gospels has set us a model of the method to be followed in such investigations, and has supplied us with a number of clues which make it comparatively easy to detect whether a Syriac writer who quotes to any extent from the Gospels is using the Peshitta, syr. vt., or the Diatessaron. With the help of his book I think it can easily be shewn that Jacob of Serug used both Pesh. and Diat. very freely, in the way no doubt that fourth-century writers used syr. vt. and Diat. It is improbable that syr. vt. survived in use so long after Rab-bula's revision; so that, when Jacob gives us a reading which differs from Pesh. and yet appears not to be due merely to metrical considerations or to paraphrase, we may generally conclude that it is drawn from a copy of the Diatessaron, whether or no it agrees with the Old Syriac.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

ON AN APOSTOLIC TRADITION THAT CHRIST WAS BAPTIZED IN 46 AND CRUCIFIED UNDER NERO.

I. *Victorinus, Alexander of Jerusalem and the 'exemplaria apostolorum'.*

THERE is a well-known puzzle in St Irenaeus, where that Father declares that our Lord reached an age between 40 and 50, resting his statement on an appeal to 'the Presbyters who had seen John face to face'. It cannot be doubted that it is to the book of Papias that St Irenaeus is referring, and I hope to shew in a second article that it is not impossible to discover what Papias really said upon the subject, and how St Irenaeus's mistake arose.

But before directly approaching this point, it is necessary to deal with the support which St Irenaeus's view may be supposed to obtain from certain consular dates reported in a fragment published by Muratori, by which the birth of Christ is placed in A.D. 9, His baptism in 46, His death in 58, thus implying an age of 49 years. The authority for these dates is given as the *exemplaria apostolorum*, which might well stand for the *Exegeses* of Papias. Von Dobschütz has preferred rather to refer their tradition to the first century, and to represent it as a rival in antiquity and authority to the chronology given by St Luke. I hope the present article will establish that it belongs rather to the opening