



---

Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch

Author(s): George F. Moore

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1890), pp. 201-215

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4617126>

Accessed: 21/03/2010 15:32

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

TATIAN'S DIATESSARON AND THE ANALYSIS  
OF THE PENTATEUCH.\*

BY PROF. GEORGE F. MOORE.

THE great majority of modern Old Testament scholars regard the Pentateuch as a composite work. An author, who, according to the prevailing hypothesis, lived after the rebuilding of Jerusalem, set himself to write the history of his people from the earliest times at least to the death of Joshua, with special attention to the history of religion and the origin of the sacred institutions and customs. His sources were not original, but were the writings of others, who, at different times and from different points of view, had attempted the same task before him. A modern literary man in such a case would have digested these earlier narratives, formed his own conception of the progress of the history, and his own judgment of its several moments, made his own plan, and written the whole story over, from his own point of view and in his own fashion. The author of the Pentateuch — to call him a 'redactor' arises from and gives rise to a misapprehension of his aim — went to work in a very different way. He cut up and pieced together his sources in such a way as to make a single continuous narrative. Where he found parallel accounts of the same event, his procedure was determined by circumstances. If they were too diverse to be combined, he treated them as accounts of different events, and incorporated both, usually in different places. If they were substantially identical, he used one and dropped the other. In the greater number of cases, however, he wove them ingeniously together, so as to preserve every detail which was found in either of them, and yet avoid striking repetitions. What he adds *de suo* consists chiefly of those modifications of phrase or of fact which were necessary to fit and cement his fragments together, or of matter substantially from one of his sources, which for some reason was impracticable in its original shape. Thus out of three or four histories he makes one

\* Read in December 1889.

continuous history of the origins of the Israelitish people and its religion — a composite *Tora*.

It is not infrequently urged against this theory that such a way of making a book is unheard of. Such a "crazy patch-work," as an American scholar lately called the analysis, is without a parallel in literature. The layman who knows nothing of Oriental literature takes this assertion for a self-evident fact, and of itself sufficient to stamp the theories of the critics as not only false, but absurd. This easy method with critics, however effective with the common man, especially when spiced with a little sarcasm, has one serious defect; its premise is false. Literature furnishes examples enough of every procedure which criticism ascribes to the author of the Pentateuch. I wish here to direct special attention to one work, which offers a most striking and complete parallel to the hypothesis of composition from documents, and which is therefore most instructive to the critic of the Pentateuch — the Diatessaron of Tatian.

This harmony of the Gospels was made after the middle of the second century, whether in Syriac or Greek, scholars are not agreed. The internal evidence seems to me to favor the former alternative. It was for several generations the Gospel of a large part of the Syrian church, and is quoted simply as such. The Doctrine of Addai, a work, in its present form, of the fourth century, carries its use back to the apostolic age, assuming that it was the original form in which the church in Edessa received the Gospel. After the beginning of the fifth century, however, there came a change. Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa (411–435), ordered that the churches of his diocese should be supplied with copies of the Separate Gospels, and that they should be read. A few years later, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus (423–457), found the Diatessaron in use in two hundred churches in his diocese — one in four of the whole number. He sequestered them, and replaced them by copies of the Gospels of the Four Evangelists. These names are not without significance. They are the opposite of "Composite Gospel," the common name for the Diatessaron. The title of Matthew in the Curetonian fragments, which puzzled Cureton, and of which Bernstein proposed a wholly untenable explanation, expresses this contrast; it is "The Separate Gospel, Matthew." The Arabic translation, made by a Nestorian scholar in the eleventh century, shows that the Composite Gospel maintained itself to a much later time in private, if not in ecclesiastical use.

Until recently this Harmony of the Gospels has been known only from the much altered and interpolated Latin Harmony of which Victor of Capua discovered a copy in the sixth century, and from a commentary on it by Ephraim the Syrian, which is preserved in Armenian, and was published in 1836 (in Latin translation in 1876). From these sources Zahn, in 1881, reconstructed the Diatessaron with what, under the circumstances, must be regarded as conspicuous success. It has long been known that an Arabic harmony bearing the name of Tatian existed in the Vatican Library. A specimen of it was printed by Lagarde, from a copy by Ciasca, in 1886. In 1888, Ciasca edited the whole from two MSS — the Vatican Codex Arab. XIV, and a manuscript lately acquired by the Museum Borgianum. That in its structure — not in the text, as we shall see hereafter — this translation represents the long-lost Diatessaron, there is no reason to doubt. We are now able, therefore, to study its composition in a way which, from the nature of his materials, we could not so well do in Zahn's reconstruction.

The author proposed to himself to make out of the four Gospels a single continuous narrative of the doings and teachings of Jesus, a life of Christ in the words of the evangelists. His sources divided themselves into two groups, John and the Synoptics. The latter so often presented identical parallels, that, to avoid repetition, extensive omissions were necessary. In the Fourth Gospel the parallels to the Synoptics are so few that almost the whole Gospel could be incorporated in his work. A count shows that of John *ca.* 847 verses out of 880 are found in the Diatessaron, or over 96 per cent. Of Matthew, on the other hand, *ca.* 821 verses out of 1071, or 76.5 per cent; of Mark, 340 out of 678, or a fraction over 50 per cent; and of Luke, 761 out of 1151, or 66.2 per cent. The chief difficulty in combining John with the other three Gospels was, of course, chronological. Zahn finds that the author disposed the *Hauptmassen* of his material in conformity to the scheme of the Fourth Gospel. I do not feel sure that this is the case. It seems to me, on the contrary, that he follows substantially the order of Matthew, and brings in the various journeys and feasts of John as best he can. This is, however, not a question of primary importance for my present purpose. The disposition of this earliest Life of Christ has an interest of its own, and I have made an analytical table of contents by means of which it can readily be compared with other harmonies and with modern Lives

of Christ; but I am here concerned only with the composition of the work.

Where the author found in one of the Gospels matter not contained in any of the others, as is the case with the greater part of the Gospel of John, he had only to find the appropriate place to bring it in; a problem of disposition purely. In this he was guided partly by the order of the Gospel itself; partly by similarity of situation or of content to passages in the other Gospels.

Where he had two accounts of the same event which were so diverse that they could not be combined, he placed them side by side. Thus, the narratives of the birth of Jesus in Matthew and Luke present insuperable difficulties to the harmonist. Tatian gives Luke's account complete, including the adoration of the shepherds, the presentation in the Temple, and the return to Nazareth (ii. 1-39); then, with the words "After this," he introduces the account of the appearance and adoration of the Magi, the flight into Egypt, and the return and establishment in Nazareth, from Matthew (ii. 1-23). It would be impossible to set the two narratives in a light in which the conflict between them would appear more glaring. At the end of chapter i. Joseph and Mary, with the child, return to their home in Nazareth; in the first words of chapter ii., we read that *after this* Magi came from the East to Jerusalem seeking the new-born King of the Jews; they are directed to Bethlehem, journey thither and do homage to him, and go their way. Joseph, still in Bethlehem, is warned in a dream of Herod's purpose, escapes to Egypt, and only after the death of Herod, and because he is afraid to return to his home in Judea, takes up his abode in Nazareth. The case is the more noteworthy, because the author might have removed the most striking contradiction by ending his extract from Luke at verse 38 instead of verse 39. That he did not do so is evidence of the conscientiousness with which he used his sources. The example is instructive for the Old Testament critic. We are often told that if the Redactor of the Pentateuch had found in his sources irreconcilable contradictions of this sort, he would not have left them unreconciled; but would, by conformation or by omission, have given unity to his narrative. The inference is, that the contradictions which we find are all in our own imagination. The premise and inference are groundless. The author of the Pentateuch put Gen. ii. 4-iii. alongside of Gen. i., as little concerned about the difficulty of reconciling the order of creation in the two pieces as Tatian when he

put the visit of the Magi after the return of the holy family to Nazareth. He meant above everything else to embody in his work all that his sources gave him. The same aim, with the same results, can be seen in Ibn Hisham's Life of Mohammed, which excellently illustrates the growth of a book by supplement.

Where, on the other hand, the accounts which he found in his sources were not in themselves conflicting, but were set in a different connection, or ascribed to a different time in Jesus' ministry, our author does not, like many modern harmonists, think that the same thing was done twice, but makes his choice. The cleansing of the Temple is put by John in the earliest, by the Synoptics in the last, period of Jesus' public work. Tatian follows the latter, though he uses the account of John as largely as that of Matthew in relating the transaction. So in regard to the healing of the blind man at Jericho, where there is a difference among the Synoptics as to whether the miracle took place when Jesus was entering or leaving the city, and whether there was one blind man or two, the author treats the question with more freedom than many modern scholars, who are disposed to find here two distinct miracles.

Where two reports agree in substance, but differ in detail, our author's principle is to embody in his harmony all that is given by his sources. An interesting example is the Sermon on the Mount, in chapters VIII.-X. Matthew, as the fuller report, is naturally his principal source, but he makes a place for all that is peculiar to Luke. The Beatitudes are given, with the exception of the last, just as they stand in Matthew; but they are followed by the Woes, which in Luke form the pendant to them; and so throughout. The author has, however, not merely combined the reports of Matthew and Luke; he has also incorporated in his Sermon on the Mount a number of sayings of Jesus which are found in the Gospels in other connections. Thus the saying, "With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again," which in Matthew and Luke is connected with the warning "Judge not that ye be not judged," brings to mind the passage in Mark where the same proverbial expression has a different application, "Take heed what ye hear, for with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you; and more shall be given to you. I say unto those who hear: He that hath, to him shall be given, and he that hath not, from him shall be taken away what he might have." Thus the bringing together of sayings on the same subject, or containing the same figure,

of which the longer discourses of Jesus in the Synoptics supply abundant examples, is here carried a step further.<sup>1</sup>

Two or more parallel accounts of the same event are usually interwoven with great ingenuity, and often still greater intricacy, so as to preserve every detail found in any one of the sources, and yet avoid repetitions and hard transitions. As an illustration, take the storm on the Sea of Galilee and the scene following with the demoniac, Mark iv. 35 ff., with the parallels in Matthew and Luke.<sup>2</sup>

Mr 4 35a. And he said to them that day at evening, ' Let us go over  
 Lu 8 22b to the other side of the lake. ' And he sent away the multi-  
 Mr 4 36a tude. ' And Jesus embarked in the boat, he and his disciples ; '  
 Lu 8 22a and there were with them other boats. ' And there arose in  
 Mr 4 36b the sea a great commotion of tempest and wind, ' and the  
 Mt 8 24a boat was near being swamped by the immense waves. ' But  
 Lu 8 23b Jesus was asleep on a cushion in the stern of the boat. ' And  
 Mr 4 38a his disciples came and woke him, and said to him, Master,  
 Mr 8 25 save us ; behold, we perish. ' And he arose, and rebuked the  
 Lu 8 24b winds and the raging of the water, ' and said to the sea, Be  
 Mr 4 39b-41a still, and be thou rebuked. And the wind was still, and there  
 was a great calm. 40 And he said to them, Why are ye  
 so fearful ? Why have ye no faith ? And they feared with  
 Lu 8 25b-27a a mighty fear, ' and were amazed ; and said one to another,  
 Seest thou who this is, who commands even the winds and  
 the waves and the sea, and they obey him ? 26 And they  
 went on, and came to the country of the Gadarenes, which  
 is over against Galilee. 27 And when he went out of the  
 Mr 5 2b boat to land, ' there met him from among the tombs ' a man  
 Lu 8 27b in whom was a devil of long time ; and he ware no clothes,  
 Mr 5 3b 4a nor lived in a house, but among the tombs. ' And no man  
 was able to bind him with chains ; for as often as he was  
 bound with chains and fetters, he broke the chains, and severed  
 Lu 8 29b the fetters, ' and he was driven by the devil into the desert ; '  
 Mr 5 4b 5a and no man was able to tame him. 5 And all the time, by  
 night and day, he was among the tombs and in the mountains,

<sup>1</sup> Observe also how in chapter XLVI., Luke xxii. 35-38 is interpolated in the Johannean Farewell Discourse, between John xiv. 31 a and b.

<sup>2</sup> This passage is given in a literal translation. In the second example, The Baptism of Jesus, I have followed the English version as closely as possible, in order to illustrate the effect of such composition in the familiar words of the Gospels.

Mt 8 28b,    ' and no man could pass by that way. ' And he cried and cut  
 Mr 5 5b-7a    himself with stones. 6 And when he saw Jesus from afar, he  
                   ran and fell down before him, 7 and cried with a loud  
 Lu 8 28b     voice, ' What have we to do with thee, Jesus, Son of the  
 Mr 5 7b     Most High God? ' I adjure thee by God that thou torment  
 Lu 8 29a-33a me not. And Jesus commanded the unclean spirit to come  
                   out of the man. And he had been a long time in bondage to  
                   it. 30 And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? He an-  
                   swered him, Legion; because many devils had entered into  
                   him. 31 And they besought of him that he would not com-  
                   mand them to depart into the abyss. 32 And there was  
                   there a herd of many swine, feeding on the mountain; and  
                   the devils besought of him that he would give them  
                   leave to enter into the swine. ' And he gave them leave.  
                   33 And the devils went out of the man, and entered into  
                   the swine, etc.

This is not an unfair illustration of the method of the author. Where there are four sources, as, for example, in the narrative of the baptism and temptation of Jesus, the interweaving is still more complex.

Mt 3 13        Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to  
 Lu 3 23        be baptized of him. ' And Jesus was about thirty years of  
 Jo 1 29-31     age, and was supposed to be the son of Joseph. ' And John  
                   seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of  
                   God which taketh away the sin of the world. 30 This is he  
                   of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred  
                   before me, for he was before me. 31 And I knew him not;  
                   but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am  
 Mt 3 14 f.     I come baptizing with water. ' And John forbade him,  
                   saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou  
                   to me? 15 Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be  
                   so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.  
 Lu 3 21a     Then he suffered him. ' And when all the people were bap-  
 Mt 3 16b     tized, Jesus also was baptized. ' And he went up straightway  
                   out of the water, and the heavens were opened unto him. '   
 Lu 3 22a     And the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the likeness of  
 Mt 3 17     a dove; ' and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my  
 Jo 1 32-34    beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. ' And John bare  
                   record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven, like

a dove, and it abode upon him. 33 And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. 34 And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God. <sup>1</sup> And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan. <sup>1</sup> And immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness <sup>1</sup> to be tempted of Satan; and he was with the wild beasts. <sup>1</sup> And he fasted forty days and forty nights, <sup>1</sup> and in those days he did eat nothing; <sup>1</sup> and he was afterward ahungered. 3 And the tempter came to him, and said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. 4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. 5 Then the devil taketh him up into the Holy City, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple. 6 and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. 7 Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. <sup>1</sup> And the devil took him up into a high mountain, and showed unto him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time. 6 And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of it, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. 7 If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine, etc.

Lu 4 1a  
 Mr 1 12  
 Mr 1 13b  
 Mt 4 2a  
 Lu 4 2b  
 Mt 4 2b-7

Lu 4 5-7

The most hair-splitting analysis of the Pentateuch seems sober in comparison with this Composite Gospel. It is, to use Prof. Mead's figure, a patch-work, crazier than the wildest dreams of the critics. And yet I think no one will read it, especially in a Semitic language, without feeling that the author has succeeded beyond what we should have thought possible in making a unity of it.

It must be borne in mind, too, that this patch-work was made, not of indifferent historical writings, but of the sacred books of the Christian church; that it was meant to take the place of the Gospels; that it accomplished its end so successfully that it almost completely superseded the separate Gospels in the public use of a considerable part of

the Syrian church; that it was apparently only under influences from without that it was banished from the use of these churches in the fifth century. Aphraates and Ephraim are acquainted, indeed, with the separate Gospels; but it is certainly within the bounds of possibility that, if the Syrian church had been left to itself, without constant contact with the greater church to the West, the knowledge of the separate Gospels might in the end have been lost, even among the learned. The parallel to the history of the Pentateuch would then have been complete.

The way in which the author treats his sources deserves somewhat more detailed notice. I have incidentally referred above to the extensive omissions. These amount to more than one fourth of the whole; if we take the Synoptics alone, to about one third. Most of the omitted matter is from the parallels in the Synoptic Gospels; and the author has taken great pains that no fact, no detail in the relation of a fact, should be lost. The one conspicuous omission which is not of this sort is already remarked upon by the fathers. Tatian excluded both the genealogies of Jesus. Whatever may have led him to omit these documents, the fact is a striking testimony to the freedom of his attitude toward the sources. If they had had for him strictly canonical authority, it is not likely that he would have ventured to suppress them in a book intended for church use.

The Gospels do not present the events of Jesus' life in the same order. Not only has John a scheme of his own, but the order of Matthew differs from that of Luke. A connected narrative can only be made by the freest transposition. We find this on every page of the Diatessaron. Luke iv. 1 f. 5-7, e.g. is in chap. iv; 13-22<sup>a</sup> in v. (14<sup>b</sup>, 15 also in vii); 23-30 in xvii; 42<sup>b</sup>, 43 in vii; 44, 31-41 in vi. The conversation with Nicodemus is carried over with the account of the cleansing of the Temple which precedes it to the last period of Jesus' ministry, and so on. Not only are passages transposed as wholes, to bring them into connection with their parallels in other Gospels, but in working together the details of the parallel narratives of any given doing of Jesus, or the reports of any saying, the most complicated transposition of verses, fragments of verses, and single phrases is constantly necessary. There is another cause of transposition, of which I will speak later; namely, the use of words or verses taken from their original connection to form the bridge be-

tween different sources or passages where the transition would otherwise be too hard.

The author has added nothing which was not contained in his sources, and has changed them as little as possible. Yet he was frequently compelled, in order to make a passable connection or transition, to supply or omit an explicit subject, to substitute different particles of transition, and sometimes to make the connection in his own words. Thus, in a case already referred to, he joins Matt. ii. 1 to Luke ii. 39 by substituting for the words "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the King," simply, "After this." Mark iii. 14 relates the choice of twelve disciples. After Luke vi. 13 ff. it could only find a place by making it read, "These twelve he chose," etc., by which means it is made to resume the preceding, instead of introducing, as it does in the original, the list of the twelve. Matt. xii. 32 ff. is made possible alongside of Mark iii. 28 ff., by prefacing it with the words, "He said again." Such cases are very common. A joint is often made, as I have said above, by taking a verse or a phrase quite out of its original connection, or by cutting through one of his sources in such a way as to make the last words serve as a transition to something different from what originally followed. Thus Luke iv. 38 tells us that Jesus, on going out of the synagogue, went into Simon's house, where Simon's mother-in-law lay ill of a fever, etc. The author puts in here the calling of Matthew, and makes it fit thus: "And when Jesus went out of the synagogue, ' he saw a man whose name was Matthew, sitting among the publicans; and he said to him, Follow me, and he arose, and followed him. ' And Jesus came into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John. ' And Simon's mother-in-law was ill," etc. (Luke iv. 38<sup>a</sup>, Matt. ix. 9<sup>b</sup>, Mark i. 29, Luke iv. 38<sup>b</sup>f.). In Luke vi. 27 we read, "I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you," etc. The introductory phrase is used by Tatian to connect Luke vi. 24-27 with Matt. v. 13, so that it runs, "I say unto you which hear, Ye are the salt of the earth," etc. In such ways a reasonably smooth connection is made between passages originally wholly unrelated to one another. It should be said that this is, in one way, much easier to do in a Semitic language than it would be in English or in Greek. A similar harmony of the Greek Gospels would involve far more extensive changes in grammatical structure, in order to fit the bits together. But in

Syriac, where a simple paratactic structure is the rule, the members of what would in Greek be a complex sentence stand side by side, each complete in itself, and the sentence may be divided after almost any of its clauses without destroying it.

There is one thing in which the Arabic Diatessaron which we have in our hands differs notably from the Pentateuch. The sources from which the composite narrative is made up are distinguished by diacritical signs — M for Matthew, R for Mark, Q for Luke, H for John. In the Borgian manuscript these signs are generally lacking, so that the text runs on unbroken. The prologue, however, shows that it is derived from a copy which had these signs. In the Vatican MS they are employed throughout, though often erroneously. Ciasca is of the opinion that the original had no such signs, but that they have been added by later hands. This seems to me very unlikely. It would be a work of the greatest difficulty, and of no practical utility, to add these signs to a text originally devoid of them, and attain even a tolerable degree of correctness. On the other hand, it is very natural that they should be dropped by later copyists as useless. I am inclined to think, therefore, that the author distinguished his sources by such signs in the original composition of the Diatessaron. If this be true, does it not outweigh all the analogies we have observed to the composition of the Pentateuch? Must we not say that we have indeed dismemberment, rearrangement, but no real composition, so long as every fragment bears the name of its own Gospel? As to the latter point, any one can easily convince himself that the Diatessaron is meant to read smoothly, with grammatical and psychological connection, right over these divisions; and in the public reading of the book in church it is not to be supposed that the sense was broken, every half dozen words sometimes, by the names of the Evangelists. The diacritical signs are there for the use of the learned, not for practical purposes. For the church, therefore, it was a composite work, as truly as the Pentateuch. But why are the signs there at all, if the author designed a real Composite Gospel? Any one who is familiar with Moslem tradition will be at no loss for the answer. It is the *'Isnād*. The tradition of the life and sayings of Jesus went back to certain men who had a personal knowledge of the things they handed down, — Matthew, Peter, John, — or otherwise stood at the source of Christian tradition, as Paul. The second and third Gospels were traced, in this interest, to Peter and Paul. Tatian, therefore, names

his sources, precisely because the whole weight rests on their names ; just as Ibn Hisham, in his *Life of Mohammed*, gives us in all cases the names of the persons from whom and through whom a given relation has come to him. The case was wholly different with the Pentateuch. The analogy of the whole historical literature of the Old Testament gives us the right to assume that the sources which the compiler wove together were anonymous. Even if the name of the author of any one of these sources, or of all of them, had been known, however, he stood in no such relation to the facts he narrated as one of the companions of the Prophet to Moslem tradition, or one of the evangelists to the Christian tradition of the life of Jesus. The compiler of the Pentateuch, therefore, had no reason to distinguish by name the sources from which he made up his history, even if he was in a position to do so. The same consideration may explain why Tatian keeps closer to his sources than the author of the Pentateuch. It is a fair question, however, whether the original Diatessaron followed them as exclusively as the text we have. The latter has been systematically revised after the Syrian Church Bible, and *exotica* once contained in it may have been removed in that process. In fact, it can be shown with much probability that this is the case.

I have touched here on another point in resemblance between the Diatessaron and the Pentateuch. Both were, at a time long subsequent to their origin, subjected to a thorough recension of the text. The original Syriac text of the Diatessaron no doubt resembled the so-called Curetonian, more than the Peshitto, whatever view we take of the relation of the one to the other. The Syriac from which our Arabic was translated in the eleventh century was substantially the Peshitto. I say substantially, for there are a considerable number of readings which differ from that version, without showing any definite resemblance to any other type of Syriac text. I have not collated Ciasca's text with the Peshitto, except in a few passages ; but in my reading of it for the purpose of investigating the composition of the book I have incidentally remarked several variants. In Mark vii. 26, e.g. the Syrophenician woman is said to be from Emesa. Matt. xvii. 25, in answer to Jesus' question from whom the kings of the earth take tribute, reads: "Simon said to him, From the strangers. Jesus said to him, Then the sons are free. Simon said to him, Yes. Jesus said to him, Do thou also give to them, as a stranger ; and, lest it make them trouble, go to the sea," etc. Matt. xxiii. 34 reads :

“Therefore behold I, the wisdom of God, send unto you prophets,” etc.<sup>3</sup> I do not reckon the many places where the text has been slightly modified in favor of a better connection, or where a conflation, perhaps unintentional, has taken place. After making allowance for these, there still remain variations from the common Peshitto text, such as those given above.

Every Old Testament scholar who examines the Diatessaron will doubtless ask himself the question: If this Composite Gospel had come down to us as the Pentateuch has, without diacritical signs to distinguish one source from another, the original sources themselves having been lost, should we be able, by the methods which we have applied to the Pentateuch, to decompose it, and to reconstitute its elements? We could not fail to discover its composite character by the same marks by which we recognize this in the case of the Pentateuch. No matter how closely parallel the sources, no matter how ingenious the mosaic, the lack of homogeneity in conception will appear. The narrative does not go straight to its end, but doubles on itself; there are incongruities, if not contradictions; doublets, joints, and seams; in short, all the signs by which we can in literary composition distinguish a patch-work from whole cloth. I have called attention to the conflict in which the two narratives of the infancy stand. The same thing may be observed in other instances. Thus, in chap. XVIII. we read, from Mark vi. 20, that Herod feared John, knowing him to be a pure and holy man; and watched over him, and heard much from him, and did it, and obeyed him willingly. In the very next words, however, from Matthew, we learn that he wished to kill him, and was only restrained by fear of the people; and then again, from Mark, that when Herodias demanded John's head, Herod was very sorry. In the same chapter we have, Mark vi. 16, Herod said to his servants, “This is John the Baptist, whom I beheaded; he is risen from the dead,” and a little later, Luke ix. 9, “Herod said, John I have beheaded, but who is this, of whom I hear these things?” In chap. XII. at the beginning, we read, from Matt., “Jesus embarked in the boat, and crossed over and came to his own city”; but in the next words, from Luke viii. 38, we are still in the country of the Gadarenes: “And the man out of whom he had cast the demons asked that he might remain with him,” etc. Instances could be mul-

<sup>3</sup> But Matt. xxiv. 8, “haec omnia initium sunt *inundationum*” (p. 73), is Ciasca's error. The Arabic has *dolorum*.

tiplied almost indefinitely. Of a different kind are cases like this, from chap. iv. Matt. iii. 13, Jesus comes to John to be baptized, 14, but John forbids him. In the Diatessaron, Luke iii. 23, John i. 29-31 are wedged in between these two verses of Matthew, with the consequence that the words "But John forbade him" have no connection with the preceding. Examples of doublets are also numerous. The *Vox clamantis* is given in chap. iii. from Matthew, and in iv. from John. The call of the first disciples by the sea is told twice, with verbal parallels: "I will make you fishers of men" (chap. v.), and, "Henceforth you shall catch men unto life" (chap. vi. — observe the added words). Overlapping is common, as e.g. in chap. xxix. near the beginning, Luke xviii. 30 and Mark x. 30<sup>b</sup>. An example where substantially the same thing is told three times is in the beginning of chap. xxxix., the words of Jesus about the anointing in Bethany. But it is especially in the account of the appearances of the angels to the women after the resurrection, and the appearances of the risen Lord, that the unwillingness to omit anything has led to a confusing multiplication of details, in which the composite character is most plainly seen.

There is not, as far as I see, any one of the phenomena on which we rely in the Pentateuch to prove the composite character of a text, which is not abundantly illustrated in the Diatessaron. And the indirect demonstration which this fact gives of the correctness of our method is complete. That some of these phenomena could in individual cases be explained in some other way, or, if need were, explained away, does not affect this in the least. One simple hypothesis explains them all; and the correctness of this hypothesis receives the strongest support from the actual case before us, in which we see that the same phenomena have arisen from composition.

Whether we should be able to analyze the Composite Gospel with as much success as we have had in the Pentateuch, is another question. We may answer confidently, that we should not. If we had the Diatessaron in Greek, we should be able to take out the portions which belong to the Fourth Gospel almost as completely and surely as we can P in the Pentateuch. But the remainder would be more stubborn. No doubt we should observe differences, such as the Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of God; no doubt we should note characteristic expressions, such as the ever recurring "straight-way" of Mark; we should discover differences of conception as well

as of language. But we should lack any such external criteria as we have in the relation of J E or D or P to the history and the prophets. The Gospels are the product of one age, of one circle; they have a common basis of evangelic tradition; and their relation to one another is a problem which criticism has not satisfactorily solved, even with the separate Gospels to work on. The problem is more like that of the composition of one of the chief sources of the Pentateuch — say P or D — than that of the primary analysis, but is even more complex. Something, no doubt, would be possible; but the irresolvable remainder would be very large. Analysis cannot do everything. That it has done as much as it has in the Old Testament is due to the peculiarly favorable circumstances under which the problem is there presented. The Homeric scholar, the critic set down to a Composite Gospel like this, has a task with which far less can be done. In the Pentateuch itself there is a limit, and it may be narrower than we think. But even if what can with reasonable certainty be established by the analysis were far less than we believe it to be, it would not alter the fact that the Pentateuch is a composite work, any more than our inability to resolve the Synoptic element in the Diatessaron would prove that that work was not composite.

In conclusion, I repeat that a thorough study of this book will be very profitable to Old Testament critics and to their opponents. For an answer to a good many of the common arguments against the analysis, it will be sufficient, as I have tried to show, to refer to Tatian.<sup>4</sup>

A convenient synopsis of the contents of the Arabic Diatessaron and of Ephraim's Commentary is to be found in Hemphill, S., *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, London. 1888. An appendix subjoins the *capita* of the Latin Harmony, from Ranke's *Codex Fuldensis*.