

the restitution of Tatian's work involves the general framework and order of pericopae, and while there remain a number of difficulties and debatable points much progress has been made. Some salient variant readings have also been isolated, especially in cases where the harmonist seems to have laid under contribution non-canonical passages. The specific wording within pericopae, however, has proved less amenable for analysis. It is with this aspect of the problem that the work of the seminar has been particularly concerned.

The reasons for this difficulty lie in the related facts that, in the first place, we have little trace of Greek amongst the many witnesses to the various harmonies current within the church, and that, in the second place, it is highly probable - or at least a number of Diatessaronforscher have practised in this way - that traces of the wording of the original are to be discerned in the ancient versions. We are generally working then at one remove at least from the original: which raises peculiar difficulties.

This introductory paper will no doubt appear to say much that is obvious and on the other hand to adduce a great deal of minute detail by way of illustrating general points from particular traditions. Yet both these features are deliberate, and are intended to highlight the pitfalls which await the researcher in this field. If any progress is to be made such guidelines are necessary. We shall attempt to see what problems faced any harmonist in the pericope under consideration, and on the other hand what problems face the researcher today as he attempts to supplement the information of the harmonies from related versional traditions. This might, in its turn, help us to reassess the value and likelihood of success of attempts to find harmonistic traces in the Greek tradition.

The pericope with which the seminar has dealt for several years is that of the Temptation of Jesus. There is no major problem of order connected with this; it must stand, and always does, at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. There is no Johannine material for the harmonist to consider and no trace, so far as I know, of any Johannine influence in the traditions we are considering. Within the pericope, however, there is a clear difference of order which must be resolved, namely that of the latter two of the three temptations. Matthew without variation gives the temptation to cast himself down in second place and that to worship Satan last. In Luke however, the majority of witnesses

give the temptation to worship before that to cast one's self down. The Latin tradition (in mss. b c f g l q r - but not in e → and in the work of Ambrose) has the Lucan order accommodated to the Matthaean. The order of Ephraem's commentary suggests that the Matthaean order was followed in the Diatessaron, but the Lucan order is referred to by Ephraem in close proximity to his extended comments on the temptations, and in another work. *cf. Barmann?*

The Marcan reference to the temptation is brief and distinct from the other Synoptics in lacking the detailed accounts of the specific temptations; but it contains a reference to the presence of the wild beasts and the ministry of angels. Here the options present themselves either to place the wild beast clause before the temptations as part of the general privation and defencelessness of Jesus, or to link it with the angel clause, perhaps as a sign of <sup>(inclusion of humanity)</sup> Paradise restored! <sup>with the mission of the Son!</sup> Both alternatives are known within the harmony tradition.

Further options facing the would-be harmonist are the choices between specific differences of the evangelists Matthew and Luke. These can be readily traced in a synopsis. They concern the form of the citations of scripture made by Jesus in his reply to the tempter, and some other matters. The statement of the tempter in his offer of the kingdoms of the world seems to have been open to a number of variations, but since these are known to us in the Old Syriac tradition and the commentary of Ephraem they may be due to Tatian; nevertheless, analogous variation is known in the Pseudo-Clementines which are more likely to be contemporary with Tatian's activity than dependent upon it.

As well as additional material the harmonist is faced with the choice of historic presents, as in much of the Matthaean account against the preterites of Luke's story. In some traditions, the "Satan" is substituted for "the Devil". This may be due to the influence of Matt. 4.10 where no variation is found in this mode of address to the tempter. It is most widespread in the related ~~one~~ oriental ~~the~~ versions, but has Greek and Latin support sporadically. Direct evidence however that it was influential upon the harmony traditions seems to be lacking.

Quotations from scripture are another point at which there were probable differences among the evangelists. These too present options but are more likely to be given in the fullest form - a harmonization which can take place through

scribal processes which have no immediate relation to <sup>making a harmony</sup> harmonization, but stem from a desire to give scriptural references in their fullest form. Such development may be seen in Mark 10.17 and Ephesians 5.21: in these cases the history of the LXX text itself may have played a part.

A more subtle matter was raised in those cases where there are close verbal equivalences, whether with the same vocabulary or with differing words. The most striking instance in the first category is in the word lithos (vs 3 of both Matthew and Luke), its number and its construction within the whole sentence. The original text seems to ~~be~~ have plural number in Matthew, singular in Luke, and to give the noun within the final clause <sup>as</sup> ~~are~~ subject of the verb in Matthew, but as the indirect object of the imperative eipe in Luke. We find permutations of these possibilities in the text tradition of both gospels. The putative Lukan form has encroached on Matthew in the Syriac, Old Armenian and Georgian versions: the Matthaean form has been substituted in D, some three lectionaries, and in three Old Latin mss. (including d) in Luke, while the plural dative is found in one Old Latin, <sup>in</sup> two Bohairic mss., in the Old Georgian version in two citations by Augustine, and in the commentary of Ephraem (extant here only in Armenian). It is no doubt enigmatic, in the light of the use made of the Oriental versions in Diatessaronforschung by some scholars that harmonization should reveal itself in both directions here in both the Old Armenian and the Georgian fields.

More complexities still are found where the evangelists use differing vocabulary; the most striking cases are Matt. 4.1 anēchthē and its parallels ekballe<sup>6</sup> and ēgeto, and Matt. 4.8 = Lk. 4.5 (Matt. paralambanei, Lk. anagagon). I have drawn upon the Armenian and Georgian traditions to illustrate this since the Old Armenian has been used by Lyonnet to demonstrate the hypothesis of a Diatessaron tradition in that stage of the version, while Molitor in his Synopsis Latina and in his later study based on Ortiz de Urbina's repertorium of Diatessaric materials in Syriac (Oriens Christianus Bd. 53) has implied that the Old Georgian stands in a direct line of descent from Tatian's work (a position already taken by Baumstark and, in a modified form, by Voöbus).

of Mt 4.1 and its parallel

In the recorded harmony traditions, the Western representatives give

a passive form of verbs meaning to lead, with the exception of the Papyrus Harmony with the active "ledd hym". On the contrary, the Eastern harmonies give active verbs: only one adaptation by Ephraem (not in his commentary) gives a passive form.

For the Armenian, we have passive forms in Lk and Mt; but in spite of the differences in the Greek, the same verb varem is used. A distinct verb is used in Mk, and in the active. This follows the Greek syntax: but the picture is complicated when we look at the other verses, for the same verb hanem "to pull/to draw", which renders ekballei in Mk. 1.12, renders paralambanei in Mt. 4.8 (in the Old Armenian) and anagagon in Lk. 4.5. in the so-called Armenian vulgate. We have only Armenian vulgate data for the other verses and their verbs. The two occurrences of paralambanein in Mt. 4.5 & 8 are both rendered by the asyndetic coblocation of the verbs arnum adzem (= in the third person, "he took, he led"). adzem renders ēgagen at Lk. 4.9. Rendering of the single Greek verb by a double verb is known in the Old Syriac (Lk. 4.1 led him out and drove him out; Ss: Mt. 4.5 took him and brought him; Ss Sc: Lk. 4.5 took and brought him; Ss). The asyndeton is an Armenian feature however. It is not known in any extant Syriac of Ephraem however (the commentary on the concordant gospel is not extant in Syriac at this point): but the Armenian version of the commentary on which we must rely has in the three respective places vareac han ("he led, he drew") or han vareac ("he drew he led"); adz han ("he took, he drew"); adz han. An element of paraphrase seems to characterize much of these data. The influence of a Syriac original seems clear in the case of the Armenian version of Ephraem; but is by no means evident in the Armenian separated gospels. We have to exercise great caution in utilizing these for Diatessaric evidences.

The same is true of the Georgian. Molitor has stressed, by the italicization of the verbs in his Latin synopsis of translated Georgian separated gospels, the points where he believes that harmonized renderings show themselves and provide thereby evidence of the originally harmonistic origin of the Georgian gospels. In the parallel passages Mt. 4.1/Mk. 1.12/Lk. 4.1 he has used this device: the data however are that three compounds of the same root are used to render the three distinct Greek verbs there: but each gospel has a compound with a distinct prefix. Moreover, each presents a distinct construction, and allowing for the

fact that the Georgian verb is even more complex than the Greek verb, and is quite unrelated in structure, we can nevertheless say that the constructions used correspond very closely, to the active construction of Mark, and the passive constructions of Matthew and Luke in the Greek. Molitor himself exhibits these facts by his translations adductus-est (Mt.) eduxit illum (Mk) and conducebat[ur] (Lk.) When we look these Latin equivalents up in his Glossarium latinum-ibericum-graecum, we find that the Georgian verbs so rendered by him, are used as translations for a variety of Greek verbs, usually of the compounds of phero and ago. There seems in fact little evidence for harmony influence here, and, incidentally, little for derivation from any Armenian known to us, at this point at least.

Verbs of the same root are used to render paralambanei and anagagon at Mt. 4.8 and Lk. 4.5. In the whole ms. tradition for Luke, the same form is found as in the Adis ms. in Matthew. This might suggest a prima facie case for harmonization between the gospels at this point, but the rendering of the same verbs at Mt. vs. 5 and Lk. vs. 9 by different compounds of the same root weakens such an impression almost to the point of disappearance.

Of the other instances where M. suggests harmonization, four may be explained as v.l.l. already to be found in the model of the version. Two only are renderings which may point to a common tradition underlying the translations of Matthew and Luke. These are the rendering of pterygion of Mt. vs. 5, Lk. vs. 9 by "tower" in the Adis ms.; and in the same ms. bale in the same incident as "fall". The former rendering is shared by the Armenian (we have no data for the Old Armenian); while the latter is known in the Sinaitic Syriac of Matthew, and in Ephraem (only one instance being quoted).

These considerations suggest to me that to quote versional support for harmony readings as if it were additional evidence of harmony origin for such readings as most Diatessaronforscher since Baumstark tend to do is a very dubious procedure and demands very close scrutiny in the light of the history of both the Greek text, and of the known and hypothetical history of each version. To transform this impression into a rule or axiom requires of course the study of far more than one pericope. I have done no more than examine in addition to these data here discussed the readings mentioned by Baumstark in his article "Zum georgischen Evangelientext" which are from Mk. 1, the majority of which, cited as

"harmonistic", (as they may very well be), have much Greek mss. support and thus may not derive, directly or indirectly, from a harmony, but simply be the result of harmonization.

In textual criticism of the Greek text, we can draw upon a number of criteria established by our predecessors, as we use rational criticism to supplement the knowledge of the history of the transmission of the text (as most of us feel impelled to do at present). In the study of the versions, however, perhaps because this is not so far advanced as the study of the original text, or perhaps because the data are not in most cases so manifold and complex as those of the Greek, we tend to rely more upon the evidence of manuscripts and the datings which we find probable through dated manuscripts and dateable quotations, than upon rational criticism (although this plays a part when, for instance, the derivation of one version from another is argued on the basis of mistranslations and the like). I consider that the study of the harmony traditions must follow this pattern, and that even if we find Greek evidence, argument from internal considerations will have little contribution to make. We shall trace how the passage under consideration was in fact harmonized, and whether direct links may be found with the ascertainable work of Tatian in each instance. Discussion of the corruption of the gospel text from Tatian, or by Tatian, and even of the preservation of early text in "Tatian", must be relegated until these primary facts have been ascertained: as must the derivation of versions, or at least of the secondary and tertiary versions, from the Tatianic harmony tradition.