

On the Punctuation of John I.3-4 in the Old Church.

In his article "Zur Interpunktion von Joh 1,3.4" (1) Eberhard Nestle, the well-known New Testament editor and scholar begins with the following words: Eine monographische Untersuchung dieser Frage und im Zusammenhang damit die nach dem richtigen Text dieser Verse wäre eine sehr lehrreiche Aufgabe, and ends with the statement: Ein ganz interessantes Stück Geschichte der Exegese hängt da an einem einzigen Komma oder Punktum.

To the best of my knowledge the monograph suggested by Nestle has never been written; however, Zahn already, in his commentary on the Gospel of John collected a great amount of patristic evidence concerning the different possibilities of punctuation (2), and in 1955 I. de la Potterie gave a fuller survey of the history of the question from the days of the Early Church until the 20th century (3).

Zahn and de la Potterie agree in listing the following four possibilities:

- I. ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν (οὐδὲν), ὃ γέγονεν. Ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν.
- II. ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν, ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ. Ζωὴ ἦν.
- III. ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν. Ὁ γέγονεν, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν.
- IV. ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν. Ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ζωὴ ἦν. (4).

What has been most discussed in recent research is the distribution of punctuations nos. III and IV as against the "new" punctuation, no. I.

As far as this discussion is concerned, I shall confine myself to referring to the article by de la Potterie, mentioned already (where also references to further literature can be found), and to John Mehlmann's short article "A Note on John I,3" in the Expository Times from 1955/56 (5). The evidence found in the works of St. Jerome has been discussed by John Mehlmann and I. de la Potterie in Verbum Domini, 1955 (6) and by Father Langkammer in the Biblische Zeitschrift, 1964 (7). As for the theological context into which the discussion of what might - in brief - be called the "long" and the "short" version of John 1,3 belongs, I should finally like to quote M. F. Wiles, who in his book "The Spiritual Gospel" (8) comments upon this question in the

following way: "John I.3 declared of the Logos that 'all things were made through Him and without Him was not anything made'. Orthodox writers emphasised the full meaning of the word 'all'. The majority of Gnostics interpreted it as referring only to the supra-cosmic Pleroma and denied any reference to our created world. Against them Irenaeus insists with great force that 'all things' must include this world of ours. Heracleon, on the other hand, allowed the reference to be to the created world, but excluded the Aeons from its scope. Here again the orthodox insisted that the text gave no justification whatever for such an exception, and in fact the words of St. Paul in Col. i.16 expressly include such supra-human spiritual powers. The strength of the orthodox case, therefore, lay in insisting on the fullest possible meaning for the word 'all'. This Origen is prepared to do fearlessly. He avoids having to include evil and sin in that which was created through the Logos by claiming that evil has no substantial existence; it is neither an original nor a permanent element in the creation and, in contradistinction to the good, it is to be classed among 'the things that are not'; it is therefore by definition excluded from the category of 'all things'. He does, however, include the Holy Spirit amongst the 'all things' created through the Logos. This assertion is regularly refuted by later writers. The horror of any suggestion of such an interpretation seems to have been largely influential in determining the punctuation finally adopted in the text of the Gospel itself. 'Without Him was not anything made that was made' seemed a better safeguard against such interpretations than the more unqualified assertion. It made clear that the passage was concerned with all created things and not with all things absolutely" (9).

I shall leave out the discussion as to whether Arian or Gnostic theology is the main stumbling block provoking these considerations, and, on the whole I shall now leave aside punctuations nos. I, III, and IV, as this article is intended to be concerned with punctuation no. II, more specifically.

I. de la Potterie comments upon this punctuation in the following manner: De vreemde punctuatie II komt zelden voor. Gewoonlijk wordt er voor geciteerd EPIPHANIUS (Ancor. 75 ...). Daarbij moet nog gevoegd worden GREGORIUS VAN NYSSA (Contra Eunomium I (uitg. W. JÄGER, Berlijn, 1921, I, 110, 3-5, 12-13; PG, 45, 344, C-D)(10), and in his concluding remarks he accordingly states: De punctuatie II ... komt maar een paar keren voor in het Oosten (bij EPIPHANIUS en GREGORIUS VAN NYSSA) en kan men verwaarlozen (11).

If this punctuation has been disregarded by de la Potterie, it has even been ridiculed by scholars from Theodore of Mopsuestia to B. F. Westcott.

Thus Theodore in his commentary on the Gospel of John says:

אנשיה דה סבא ביה
 מוהא. דחלדוהו, למ אפלא נרא סהה סב
 דמקא כוס. מוה דה אפלא דכאנו למ דסו. אפלא
 דה לא מקא דמקא סהה: א סהה גהה סהה
 דכאנו אפלא. אפלא סהה דמקא נרא סהה
 דלפ: דמקא כה דלפ סהה: סהה: דכאנו
 דסו: סהה מקא דכאנו ד אפלא דסו: דחלדוהו,
 אפלא נרא סהה כה סב דכאנוהו, סהה. דלפ
 דה ד אפלא דסו סהה דכאנוהו סהה. סהה
 דמקא סו, דה דלפ דסו דכאנו. לא סהה
 אפלאהו סהה אפלא דכאנו. אפלא דלפ
 דכאנוהו, סהה: אפלא נרא כוסו סהה, דחלדוהו. (12).

Quidam ita hunc textum legerunt: Sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est "in ipso", id est, eorum quae per ipsum facta sunt. Qui autem non esset ridiculum, si ita loquendo evangelista, nos rem novam et hominibus ignotam docere intenderit? Vel obvius quisque et de obvio quoque idem asserere potuisset; scilicet: "Sine ipso factum est nihil eorum, quae per ipsum facta sunt." Nam quilibet vel de quolibet idem potest dicere, cum appareat de quovis rem quamcumque perficiente non aliud dici posse quam: "Eorum quae per ipsum facta sunt, nihil sine ipso factum est" (13).

And Westcott comments on Epiphanius' use of the verses in question in the following way: Epiphanius in his 'Ancoratus' (c. LXXV) written in 374 A. D., after quoting the passage according to the old punctuation (c. LXXIV),

goes on to say that the words have been used by some to derogate from the honour of the Holy Spirit. The true way of reading the passage is, he continues, All things were made through Him, and without Him was nothing made that hath been made in Him. Nothing can be said for this division of the words, and it may be fairly concluded that Epiphanius is simply hazarding a hasty judgment. (14).

On the authority not only of de la Potterie, but also of the 5th century bishop of Mopsuestia and the 19th century New Testament scholar it might thus seem appropriate to consign this punctuation to oblivion. The reason why I have nevertheless considered it a justifiable subject of an article, is the fact that this reading can be traced at any rate about one generation further back than seems hitherto to have been noticed in New Testament scholarship.

Before turning to the evidence by which this statement can be substantiated it seems natural to mention that in addition to Theodore two further indirect witnesses to the reading in question are already listed in Tischendorf's apparatus criticus, viz. Ambrose, the well-known bishop of Milan ab. 400, and Theophylactus, the archbishop of Achrida in Bulgaria ab. 1100. When these authors - as well as Theodore - are not listed by de la Potterie as supporting the reading no. II, this is presumably due to the fact that neither Ambrose nor Theophylactus chooses this punctuation as his own; they must, however, be quoted as indirect witnesses of the reading, as they refer to it explicitly, and, incidentally, even if they do not choose it as the correct one, unlike Theodore they give it a positive valuation.

Ambrose discusses the question in his De fide, book III, that was presumably written in the year 380, in the following way: Plerique enim docti et fideles sic pronuntiant: Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil, quod factum est, alii sic: Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil, deinde pronuntiant quod factum est et subiungunt in ipso, hoc est: Quidquid autem 'factum' est in ipso. Quid est 'in ipso', apostolus docet dicens: In ipso enim et sumus et vivimus et movemur et alibi: Omnia in ipso creata sunt (15).

Theophylactus discusses the question in his Enarratio in Evangelium Joannis. Having rejected the use of the verses made by the Pneumatomachoi to the effect, that the Holy Spirit is a creature (16), he points out that his own punctuation is no. I, and then he adds:

Οἶδα δὲ παρὰ τινι τῶν ἁγίων οὕτως ἀναγνωσθὲν τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο· Καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν, ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ· εἶτα ἐνταῦθα στίξας, ἤρξατο τοῦ ἐφεξῆς, Ζωὴ ἦν· καὶ οἶμαι ὅτι οὐδὲ αὕτη ἡ ἀνάγνωσις ἔσφαιται, ἀλλὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁρθοῦ νοήματος ἔχεται. Καὶ οὗτος γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος ὁρθοδόξως ἐνόησεν, ὅτι χωρὶς τοῦ Λόγου οὐδὲ ἓν ἐγένετο, ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ. Πάντα γὰρ ὅσα γεγόνασιν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν ἐν αὐτῷ, τῷ Λόγῳ φημί, χωρὶς αὐτοῦ οὐ γεγόνασιν. Εἶτα ἀπὸ ἄλλης ἀρχῆς· Ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων (17).

As has appeared, the representative(s) of this reading are anonymous in these texts, and of course it cannot be precluded that both Ambrose, Theodore and Theophylactus might refer to either Epiphanius or Gregory of Nyssa, so that in a way the attestation would not have been made any broader by these references (18). On the other hand this is unprovable, and, of course, any indirect and anonymous witness ought to be heard, as well as others.

We shall return to the context of the quotation from Ambrose a little later on, as the considerations in De fide concerning John 1,3.4 might be of interest for our attempt to determine the provenance and historical setting of reading no. II. For the moment it should just be noted, that Ambrose draws attention to the fact that in reading no. II it might be necessary to supplement the punctuation given by Zahn and de la Potterie (corresponding to the one found at any rate in Theodore and Epiphanius), as it appears in Ambrose that his authority on this reading makes a pause, presumably a full stop, after οὐδὲ ἓν, so that the following four words would constitute an independent phrase, meaning: "What was made, is (or: was made) in Him", the verb in the second clause being supplied from the context.

Concerning Ambrose's Latin paraphrase it might be just as adequate to say that the relative quidquid has

taken the meaning of an indefinite pronoun: "anything", "everything". In that case the passage is conceived of as one sentence - needing only one verb. In Greek, however, the punctuation presupposed by Ambrose must be as follows: ἐγένετο οὐδέ ἔν. "Ο γέγονεν, ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ζωὴ ἦν.

Maybe we might call this punctuation no. II B, as it has in common with punctuation no. II, as given by Zahn and de la Potterie, the full stop before Ζωὴ ἦν, but differs in the preceding punctuation, as it presumes a full stop after οὐδέ ἔν.

This will be of some importance to our subsequent line of argument, and it is obvious that it is of importance in a wider perspective, as this means that any short quotation ending with οὐδέ ἔν would not necessarily point in the direction of readings no. III and IV (19), but might belong to the II B-group.

We have so far been concerned with authors that did not take us further back in history as compared with the well-known witnesses, Epiphanius and Gregory. Before we turn to the evidence that opens up the possibility of getting beyond this limit of time it should be added to this survey of the witnesses of reading no. II (and II B, incidentally) from the time of Epiphanius and onwards, that in his article mentioned above John Mehlmann states about Theodoret of Cyrus that "once he seems even to begin v. 4 with Ζωὴ ἦν (Eranistes, dial. II, PG, lxxxiii.109B)", whereas the quotations of John 1,3 in Theodoret's works according to Mehlmann seem otherwise to represent reading no. III/IV or no. I (20).

If it is correct to suppose, as does Mehlmann, that Theodoret does at one time use the rare punctuation, but is otherwise a representative of other possibilities, I can add that this seems to be parallel to what is true of Severian of Gabala. In the Greek homilies that must be attributed to Severian, in one case (PG 56,455) it seems evident, and in one case (PG 56,431) it is probable, that he uses the "new" punctuation (no. I). In three cases (PG 56,457. 505; 60,769) he has quotations ending with οὐδέ ἔν or οὐδέεν, and here as in so many corresponding cases it is difficult or even impossible to decide whether this be the "old"

reading (no III/IV) or a shortened quotation of the "new" form (no. I) or even what we have termed punctuation no. II B.

In one case however - as in Theodoret - there seems to be no doubt that he does testify to the rare punctuation, viz. in a quotation in the 5th Armenian homily edited by Aucher (21). The passage in question runs as follows:

Ամենայն ինչ նովաւ եղեւ, եւ առանց նորա եղեւ եւ ոչինչ
որ ինչ եղեւն. նովաւ կեանք էր: Ասաց, թէ քան է, եւ կո-
չեաց աստուած, եւ թէ առ աստուած էր, եւ անուանեաց արա-
րիչ. յորջորջէ եւ կեանք, զի որ արարիչն է, ապաքէն եւ
կենարար է. չմարթի, թէ արարիչ իցէ, եւ կենդանական զաւ-
րութիւն արարածոց չտայցէ: Կեանք էր, քանզի զկենդանական
եւ զլուսաւորիչ շնորհս ունի. զի որ ինչ հաստատեսցի, կե-
նաց կարաւտ է, եւ կենդանութեան լուսոյ. եւ ոչ ի լոյս
(լինի) վայելել առանց կենաց. վասն այնորիկ ի նոյն յարէ,
թէ կեանք էր, եւ կեանքն էր լոյս մարդկան: (22).

In Aucher's Latin translation it runs: Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil, quod factum est. In ipso vita erat. Dixit, quod Verbum est, atque Deum appellavit, et quod apud Deum erat: nominavit et Creatorem; nuncupat etiam Vitam. Nam qui creator est, vivificus etiam utique est: nequit enim, ut Creator sit, quin et vitalem virtutem creaturis praestiterit. Vita erat, quia vitalem illumina- tricemque gratiam habet. Quoniam quidquid conditur, vitae indiget, et vitae lucis, neque fit ut luce sine vita fruamur. Propterea adjicit, quod Vita erat, et vita erat lux hominum (23).

As will be seen, Aucher, in the opening quotation, uses the "modern" punctuation in his edition as well as in his translation; but from the context it appears, that the author has been convinced of finding a sentence beginning with ζωή ἤν in his quotation, and we can thus say that this quotation belongs to the II/II B-group, but not to which of the two lines it must be assigned.

In terms of the history of exegesis and dogma the names Theodoret and Severian are connected with the so-called "School of Antioch". In case the reading might be taken as characteristic of or transmitted within this school-tradition, Theodore's above-quoted negative judgement would be directed to his friends, masters or pupils of that school,

but it would not be safe to give any final judgement on that possibility.

I shall now, however, turn to the evidence earlier than Epiphanius and Gregory.

In fact, the place where I first came across the punctuation in question, was one of the Armenian homilies edited by N. Akinian under the name of Eusebius of Emesa. The question of authorship for these homilies has not been settled so far (24); the third homily, however, undoubtedly belongs to Eusebius, and in this text John 1,1-3 is quoted and commented upon in the following way:

Վասն առաջին ծննդեանն ասէ. ի սկզբանէ էր բանն. եւ բանն էր առ աստուած. եւ աստուած էր բանն. սա էր ի սկզբանէ առ աստուած: Զորեքին ասէ զէրն, զի յայտ արասցէ զէականն: Իսկ վասն այլոցն արարածոց ասէ. ամենայն ինչ նովաւ եղեւ. եւ առանց նորա եղեւ եւ ոչինչ, որ ինչ եղեւ նովաւ: (25),

that is to say that these verses are quoted ending with the ἐν αὐτῷ (նովաւ), after which only reading no. II has a full stop.

Could this quotation have been framed fortuitously or by addition or omission of a clause in the actual text of the homily? I find no signs of that. The idea of an omission would presuppose that verse 4 should originally have been quoted in its entirety, and the context shows no signs of that. An addition of the ἐν αὐτῷ by a scribe or translator seems highly improbable simply because reading no. II is so rare as it has been suggested by de la Potterie a.o.

The most important evidence, however, that this reading in the Armenian homily is not due to any fortuity of transmission, can be found in two Latin homilies that testify unmistakably to the fact that this punctuation is the one known and used by Eusebius of Emesa (and it may be added, parenthetically, that whereas the Armenian evidence was not available to Western scholarship before Akinian edited the homily in 1957, the first of the Latin texts that will be quoted, might have been taken into account, as this belongs to a homily edited in 1643 by Jacques Sirmond under the name of Eusebius of Caesarea (26), which edition is the one reprinted in Migne (27)).

As will be known, the Latin homilies of Eusebius of Emesa are now available in Buytaert's edition (28). In these homilies the prologue of the Gospel of John holds a prominent place, and thus in two places we find John 1,3-4 commented upon in a way that leaves no doubt about the question whether ἐν αὐτῷ is taken to belong to the preceding or the following. The passages in question are the following: Homily III, De Fide, §§ 7ff and Homily XVI, De Hominis Assumptione I, §§ 5ff. In both cases the prologue of the Gospel of John is commented upon; The first text is rather closely related to the Armenian homily mentioned above, in so far as it urges the fact, that in John 1,1-2 ἦν is used four times about the divine. The relevant passage of the Armenian text was quoted above (29), and in the Latin homily it correspondingly says: Erat, erat, erat. In principio erat Verbum; ecce semel erat; et Verbum erat apud Deum, et iterum erat; et Deus erat Verbum, et ecce tertio erat. Hoc erat in principio apud Deum. Post quatuor has voces adhuc dubitas quod erat? (30). And then John 1,4 is quoted: Et iterum: Vita erat et vita erat lumen hominum. Si dicit evangelista (qui ex pectore dominico haurivit) Erat, et hoc frequenter, ex his, quae saepe dicta sunt, nequidem unum tenes? (31).

And finally, a little further on in the same context the "unus Nonnatus", the "unus Unigenitus" (which are Eusebius' favourite titles of the Son) is contrasted with the creatures, that are all included under the πλάττα of John 1,3: Quid opus est partibus exhibere naturam? Omnia per ipsum sunt; et nihil sine ipso; et tertio: Quod factum est, per ipsum (32).

From the last quotation, where per ipsum is taken with the preceding quod factum est, and from the above-cited quotation of verse 4 beginning with Vita erat, it is quite obvious, that Eusebius puts a full stop between ἐν αὐτῷ and ζῶν ἦν, and the same is true of the second passage mentioned, where verse 3 is given more emphasis in the following lines: Argueris vero contendens quia manet natura: Hoc erat in principio apud Deum? Putas quia unum quid ex omnibus? - Non ita est: Omnia enim per ipsum facta sunt;

non ergo unus ex omnibus est Filius, sed praecipua et inaccessibilis est natura, similis Genitori. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt; dixit semel et non tacuit, sed repetit et ait: Et sine ipso factum est nihil. Et iterum non tacuit sed dicit: Quod factum est, in ipso ut nihil suspicaret(ur) evadere posse virtutem Filii (33). Again ἐν αὐτῷ (here translated in ipso, not per ipsum as above) is taken to belong to the preceding clause, and this is confirmed again a little further on, where John 1,3 and 4 are quoted and commented upon as follows: Dicit iterum de creaturis quia omnia per ipsum sunt facta et sine ipso, factum est nihil. Quod factum est, in ipso: iterum repetit sermonem ad ipsum, ad initium. Et ait: Vita erat; et post haec interpretatur et dicit: Et vita erat lumen hominum (34).

It is furthermore obvious from more than one of the Eusebian passages quoted that he scans the verse, as was suggested in the quotation from Ambrose, that is: punctuation no. II B is clearly the one which is known and used by Eusebius of Emesa. Concerning the date of the Eusebian homilies, it must be said, that they cannot be dated with any absolute certainty, but so much can be suggested, that he must be assumed to have left the stage of history about 360, and that the productive period of his life must have been the 330's, -40's and -50's, and thus we can say that these texts presumably take us about a generation further back, as compared with Epiphanius and Gregory of Nyssa.

Can anything more be said of the provenance and historical and theological setting of this reading?

So far, Eusebius of Emesa is the oldest witness of the punctuation in question. To which setting does that take us? Biographical details do not seem to point to any distinct solution. Probably Edessene by birth, educated by Patrophilus of Scythopolis and Eusebius of Caesarea, and in Antioch and Alexandria as well (35), his education, as far as biblical topics are concerned, might have acquainted him with a confusion of Old Syriac texts, Caesarean variants and Antiochian and Alexandrian versions. However, the quotations in his homilies translated into Armenian, as I hope to have demonstrated convincingly in the above-mentioned monograph, in many cases bear the distinct stamp of an Old Syriac version.

Omnis res per illum facta est, quia per illum condita sunt opera, secundum illud apostoli: Per ipsum fecit mundos. Et sine ipso nec una (res). Idem est. Et illa res quae facta est per eum, et illa vita est, et illa vita est lux hominum, quia per ortum eius defecit error qui antea (erat) (40).

In his preface Leloir comments upon the punctuation found in the manuscript and on his own rendering of the quotation of John 1,3.4 in the following way:

Le texte du manuscrit syriaque est reproduit avec la plus grande fidélité possible; en matière d'accentuation notamment, et de ponctuation, devant la grande difficulté, ordinairement, à reconnaître ce qui est de première et ce qui est de seconde main, j'ai transcrit ce que j'ai trouvé dans le manuscrit. L'effet de cette servilité est parfois bizarre; ainsi pour *Jean* i. 3-4, où le syriaque (cfr p. 6, l. 2) a un point, et après ܡܝܢܐ, *quae facta est*, et après ܡܝܢܐ, *per eum*. La présence, ensuite, d'un ܐ, *et*, semble indiquer qu'Éphrem finissait le membre de phrase après *per eum*; j'ai donc traduit: *Et illa res quae facta est per eum, et illa vita est*; mais cette option ne me donnait évidemment aucun droit de modifier le texte dans un sens qui répondît à mon opinion. (41).

Ortiz de Urbina, however, in his edition of the "Vetus Evangelium Syrorum", translates into Spanish as follows: Y todo cuanto era, era en El. Y El era la vida, y esta vida era luz de los hijos del hombre (42).

I find Ortiz de Urbina's translation the better one, in so far as by supplying the second "era" he gives the "per eum" a reasonable place in the context, which does not seem to be the case in Leloir's translation, and as we have seen, Ortiz de Urbina's translation corresponds to the way, in which Ambrose understands this reading, and to Eusebius of Emesa's scanning of the verse, in other words: punctuation no. II B.

In any case the crucial "and" of the Syriac original of Ephraem's commentary seems to me to indicate quite clearly, that Ephraem, like Eusebius, places the full stop between ἐν αὐτῷ and ζωὴ ἥν.

According to the registration, made by Leloir (43), of biblical quotations in other Ephraem texts, John 1,3 is quoted four times. In three cases, however, he only quotes the first clause of the verse, and in the fourth case (44)

As was suggested above, this quotation seems to be of no relevance to the question as to how Ephraem reads the beginning of John 1,4, as it contains only the sentence: "and that (48) life was the light of men" and is concerned with the Manichaeian attempt to read "the Primal Man" into this verse by reading "man" in the singular instead of the plural.

To my mind, however, there are two remarkable features to be noticed about this quotation. Firstly - as suggested already - it seems to me that the context in which it appears deserves further consideration for our purpose of determining the origin of reading no. II, and secondly one feature combines the text with the quotation of John 1,4 in the commentary on the Diatessaron, viz. the above-mentioned use of the demonstrative pronoun ܐܠܡ ("that life", *illa vita* (Leloir), *esta vida* (Ortiz de Urbina)); and it seems to me fair to say at least, that this use of the demonstrative pronoun seems most natural on the background of a reading that gives the notion of life as emphatic a place in the preceding clause, as does the reading: "He was Life", even if, of course, it must be admitted that also another construction would allow the repetition of the word life with a demonstrative pronoun.

When looking for the background and source of a reading in Ephraem, it is of course natural to turn to the Diatessaron and the Old Syriac text tradition. Concerning these it seems to me that Vööbus has convincingly demonstrated that in this text tradition the original reading, as far as the first part of verse 3 is concerned, is the "short" version ending with ܐܠܡ ܝܗܘܐ (49).

As to the Syriac tradition it should be mentioned further that F. C. Burkitt in an article from 1903 (50) examined a number of Syriac Bible manuscripts in The British Museum and found that a number of rather old manuscripts do have a point after the ܐܠܡ. According to Burkitt this seems to be the so-called "sâmkâ", "a small stop", as he calls it, and he takes that - together with the additional punctuation evidence provided by the manuscripts in question - to mean that early Syriac biblical

manuscripts support the reading of Westcott and Hort, that is no. IV in de la Potterie's numbering (51).

As far as my knowledge and my possibility of examining the Syriac evidence has enabled me to go, I must say, that only to the extent that Ephraem is still accepted as the (or a) principal witness of the Diatessaron (52) can it be maintained that the reading with a demonstrative pronoun is the reading of the Diatessaron. By way of conclusion at this point, it might be said, at any rate, that this assumption is given fairly strong support by the fact that the pronoun is found in Ephraem in both his commentary and his refutation. We shall leave that point, as far as the actual occurrence of the demonstrative pronoun is concerned; by way of summing up, it should be added that concerning our principal question - that of punctuation, the material from Ephraem along with what additional evidence we have submitted: from Eusebius of Emesa primarily, and from later Antiochenes does unmistakably point to Syria as the place of origin of the reading we have named no. II B, and makes it highly probable that it belongs to the Syriac Diatessaron.

One supplementary observation should be made, viz. that John 1,3.4 (including the question of punctuation) is a text that seems to have been a subject of contention between the church of the 4th century and Manichaeism. As has appeared, this could be seen in Ephraem's Refutation quoted above; and also in two Latin texts the Manichaeans are introduced among the opponents that punctuate and/or interpret John 1,3.4 incorrectly.

Firstly, in the immediate context of the passage quoted above from De fide, Ambrose writes as follows: Unde nec illud verendum est, quod solent Arriani scaeva interpretaetatione componere dicentes factum esse dei verbum, quia 'scriptum est, inquiunt: Quod factum est in ipso', vita est.' - Primum intellegant, si ad substantiam divinam referunt quod factum est, Manichaeorum se quaestionibus implicari. Obiciunt enim Manichaei: Si quod in ipso factum est, vita est, est ergo aliquid, quod in ipso factum non sit et mors sit, ut duo impie inducant principia. Sed hoc damnat ecclesia. Deinde unde possunt docere sic pronuntiasse evangelistam? (53).

Secondly and finally should be quoted the following passage from Augustine's Tractatus in Johannis Evangelium :
Omnia ergo, fratres, omnia omnino per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil. Sed quomodo per ipsum facta sunt omnia? Quod factum est, in illo vita est. Potest enim sic dici: Quod factum est in illo, vita est: ergo totum vita est, si sic pronuntiaverimus. Quid enim non in illo factum est? Ipse est enim sapientia Dei; et dicitur in psalmo: Omnia in sapientia fecisti. Si ergo Christus est sapientia Dei, et psalmus dicit: Omnia in sapientia fecisti; omnia sicut per illum facta, ita in illo facta sunt. Si ergo omnia in illo, fratres carissimi, et quod in illo factum est, vita est; ergo et terra vita est, ergo et lignum vita est. Dicimus quidem lignum vitam, sed secundum intellectum lignum crucis, unde accepimus vitam. Ergo et lapis vita est. Inhonestum est sic intellegere, ne rursum nobis subrepat eadem sordidissima secta Manichaeorum, et dicat, quia habet vitam lapis, et habet animam paries, et resticula habet animam, et lana et vestis. Solent enim delirantes dicere, et cum repressi fuerint et resulsi, quasi de scripturis proferunt dicentes: Utquid dictum est: Quod factum est in illo, vita est? Si enim omnia in ipso facta sunt, omnia vita sunt. Non te abducant: pronuntia sic: Quod factum est; hic subdistingue, et deinde infer: in illo vita est. Quid est hoc? Facta est terra, sed ipsa terra quae facta est, non est vita: est autem in ipsa sapientia spiritaliter ratio quaedam qua terra facta est; haec vita est (54).

Could the evidence submitted here concerning the strife between the Christian church and the adherents of the religion of Mani be interpreted to mean that a definite reading arose out of this dispute, as it has been assumed that the transition from readings no. III and/or IV to reading no. I grew out of the contest with Arianism or Gnosticism (55)?

In my opinion it would be incorrect to draw such a conclusion. Thus it will already have appeared that we meet with different readings in the three texts mentioned, and further it will be true to say that the three authors differ rather considerably in their lines of argument against Manichaeism. Summing up very briefly, it may be said that

Ambrose opposes the dualism of the Manichaeans, and Augustine their "pantheism" or "vitalism" (if these terms be allowed about Manichaeism), whereas Ephraem turns to certain central points in their mythology and cosmology, esp. the theme of the Primal Man.

As far as the question of punctuation is concerned, Augustine quite clearly testifies to the fact that the reading of the Manichaean known to him, is no. IV, against which he himself chooses punctuation no. III (56).

Considering that they are so close in time and space, it is no wonder that the Manichaean known to Ambrose chooses the same punctuation, as does the Manichaean known to Augustine, and so there seems to be no doubt that punctuation no. IV is that of the Western Manichaeans of the late 4th century (57).

Can anything, then, be ascertained about the reading of the Eastern Manichaeans opposed by Ephraem? As has already been shown (58), it might at first sight seem that Ephraem's quotation of John 1,4 is of no relevance to the question of punctuation. However, as was shown above, the use of the demonstrative pronoun links the quotation with that given in Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron. Furthermore we have argued that from a stylistical point of view the reading with the demonstrative pronoun fits in most naturally with punctuation no. II B, and it should be added here that an examination of the line of argument seems to me to point in the same direction, as did the stylistical evidence.

Thus it seems to me that the Manichaean known to Ephraem is revealed to have argued on the basis of one of the two following assumptions: 1) Life is a being superior to the Primal Man bestowing light upon him, or 2) Life is - as identical with light - an element in or combined with the Primal Man.

Either assumption seems compatible with the doctrine of Mani. It would take us too far here to expand on the Manichaean system, and I shall therefore confine myself to a few remarks of a fairly general kind.

Attempting to apply the first of the possible basic assumptions formulated above it would seem to me relevant to refer to the figure called "Mother of Life" in Manichaean mythology. This figure is described by G. Widengren in the following way: Der Name "Mutter des Lebens" erinnert uns daran, dass wir die Namen das Erste Leben, das Zweite Leben und - wahrscheinlich auch - das Dritte Leben bereits bei "den Reinen" angetroffen haben, in jener gnostischen Bewegung, aus welcher der Manichäismus hervorgegangen ist (59).

On the mythological context of this figure Widengren further states: The word Life altogether plays an important role in Mani's writings. The highest principle of good evokes the Mother of Life ..., and after the defeat of the Primal Man a second creation is evoked, the third one of which was the Living Spirit who fills the function of a Demiurge (60), and a little later on, after having commented upon the notion of Life in Mandaeism, Widengren says: A definite mythical conception seems to be introduced into this complex of emanation ideas by the appellation "Son of Life" ..., which is met with in Mandaean literature. ... But the Son of Life ought to have not only a father, but also a mother, and actually we meet in the cosmogony given by Mani also the figure of the Mother of Life (61).

If we proceed to the other possible formulation of the Manichaean line of argument as outlined above, it would seem to me that the point of connexion is the idea of the armour of the Primal Man consisting of elements of light. Again Widengren's brief and concise description shall be quoted: Der Urmensch kleidet sich in seine Rüstung und zieht aus, um die Heerscharen der Materie, der Finsternis und der Bosheit zu bekämpfen. Diese Rüstung besteht aus seinen fünf Lichtelementen, die zusammen nicht nur seine Rüstung, sondern auch sein eigenes Wesen, sein eigentliches "Ich", seine "Seele" bilden. Man kan sie darum symbolisch auch seine fünf "Söhne" nenen. Durch die Wahl verschiedener Symbole sucht man ein Verhältnis auszudrücken, das in einer rationalen Formel logisch zu präzisieren schwierig, ja unmöglich ist. Diese Lichtelemente, syrisch: ziwānē, sind Äther, Wind, Licht, Wasser und Feuer (62).

When John 1,4 is drawn into such speculations, it seems to me that in both cases the notion of "Life" has been given such an emphasis as an expression of a being superior to the Primal Man or of the nature or "ego" of this figure that this use of the phrase quoted from John 1,4 points to a preceding statement of "life" as being identified with a divine being, Logos, as is the case in punctuation no. II B (whether the Syrian Manichaeans should be supposed to have read this clause: "He (viz. the Logos) was Life" or "Life was (or: is)"), whereas it seems more difficult to combine this emphasis with the reading used by the Western Manichaeans, where life is understood as a predicate of "what was made (in him)".

It would take us too far here to expand on the place that is assigned to Jesus in Manichaean writings (63). Only a few remarks on the textual problem in connexion with Mani's and his disciples' use of the New Testament should be given.

In the first place it should be noted that it need not be considered particularly surprising that a different reading should have been chosen by Western and Eastern Manichaeans, respectively. The capacity for adaptation to given circumstances is a well-known characteristic of Manichaeism, and this may presumably have included the willingness to use the bible text as found in a certain place and at a certain time, at any rate assuming that it should not belong to the rejected parts of the Bible or be in flagrant inconsistency with Mani's doctrine.

Secondly, it appears e.g. from Epiphanius' Panarion and from Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings that the prologue of the Gospel of John belongs to the texts debated with Manichaeism (64). In the part of Panarion concerned with Manichaeism, however, John 1,3.4 are not quoted, neither are these verses listed in Alfarić's survey of bible texts used by the Manichaeans (65), and thus, as far as my knowledge goes, no additional evidence of the Manichaean punctuation(s) of these verses can be supplied.

On the bible text used by Mani himself and his disciples in Syria and Mesopotamia two general statements

shall be quoted, viz. those of Waldschmidt/Lentz and C. Peters.

The first-mentioned authors give the following verdict: Wie uns Hr. Prof. Rahlfs gütig belehrt, hat um 200 die syrische Übersetzung des NT vorgelegen; jeder Zweifel dass Mani aus ihr schöpft, scheint uns ausgeschlossen zu werden, wenn wir die Epitheta, mit denen Jesus in H benannt wird, mit denen der persischen Originale aus Turfan vergleichen (66), and C. Peters in his book on the transmission of the Diatessaron states "dass die Gestalt des Evangeliums, die Mani kannte, die tatianische Harmonie war" (67).

It would take us too far here to refer to more detailed studies, on which the verdicts quoted and corresponding statements are based. By way of example I shall only refer to Baumstark's demonstration of the fact that the Diatessaron is the source of gospel quotations in the Manichaeian Psalms edited by Allberry (68).

On the basis of what has been adduced, one must admit, I believe, that no definite proof of what was Mani's punctuation in John 1,3.4 can be given under the present textual conditions. By way of conclusion, however, it seems to me justifiable to say that even if the way in which Mani himself and his first disciples in Syria and Mesopotamia read John 1,3.4 cannot be substantiated by textual evidence that is beyond doubt, we believe to have rendered it probable that in combining the general estimation of what was the Gospel of Mani with our analysis of the line of argument in Ephraem and his Manichaeian opponent, we have found additional evidence here to support our theory that punctuation no. II B did in fact belong to the Diatessaron.

We shall abstain from any attempt to counterbalance the deprecation of reading no. II by Theodore of Mopsuestia and B. F. Westcott and confine ourselves to the factual statement that to Ephraem and Eusebius of Emesa this reading (or rather its relation: no. II B) seems to have been a suitable vehicle to be used against Manichaeism and other heresies in preaching the Christian doctrine of who was the true life and the true light.

Notes:

1. ZNW 10, 1909, p. 262-264.
2. Das Evangelium des Johannes ausgelegt von Theodor Zahn, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. IV, quoted here from the 3/4th edition, 1912, p. 706-709: Excurs I: Die Satzabteilung 1,3.4.
3. I. de la Potterie: De punctuatie en de exegese van Joh 1,3.4 in de traditie, Bijdragen 16, 1955, p. 117-135.
4. In this survey I have combined Zahn and de la Potterie, in so far as the latter, in no. I and II, leaves out the comma before δ , and Zahn does not list the variant reading $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$, as de la Potterie does in I. In the following I refer to the four possibilities under the numbers used by Zahn and de la Potterie.
5. P. 340-341.
6. J. Mehlmann: De mente S. Hieronymi circa divisionem versuum Jo 1,3s, p. 86-94; I. de la Potterie: De interpunctione et interpretatione versuum Joh. I,3-4, p. 193-208.
7. H. Langkammer: Die Zugehörigkeit des Satzteiles δ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu$ in Joh 1,3.4 bei Hieronymus, Bibl. Zeitschr. NF 8, 1964, p. 295-298.
8. Cambridge, 1960.
9. Op. cit. p. 102f.
10. Op. cit. p. 119 with n. 12. It should be noted that "110" in the reference to Jaeger's edition is a misprint for "116".
11. Op. cit. p. 130.
12. Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in evangelium Johannis Apostoli, ed. J.-M. Vosté, CSCO 115, 1940, p. 25f.
13. Transl. Vosté, CSCO 116, 1940, p. 17.
14. The Gospel according to St. John. The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes by B. F. Westcott, London 1908, p. 29.
15. De fide III, 6,43, ed. O. Faller, CSEL 78, 1962, p. 123.
16. Cf. the quotation above, from M. F. Wiles.
17. PG 123, 1145.
18. To the plural in Ambrose: "alii" may be quoted what is said by O. Faller, the editor of the text, in his prolegomena: Denique animadverti oportet Ambrosium aliorum auctorum sententiam saepe adiectivo plerique vel alii introducere, etsi unum tantum auctorem in animo habet (op. cit. p. 13), and the same might be true of the "quidam" in Theodore, whereas Theophylactus uses the singular.
19. For this point of view cf. e. g. de la Potterie, op. cit. p. 118f.
20. Exp. Times 67, 1955-56, p. 340.
21. Severiani sive Seberiani Gabalorum episcopi Emesensis homiliae nunc primum editae ... per P. Jo. Baptistam Aucher, Venice 1827.
22. Op. cit. p. 196.

23. Op. cit. p. 197.
24. I hope to have done this in a monograph to be published very soon. (Parenthetically I may mention that the conclusion I have arrived at is that out of the 13 homilies in question the first 8 are due to Eusebius of Emesa, whereas the author of the last 5 is Severian of Gabala.)
25. N. Akinian (ed.): Die Reden des Bischofs Eusebius von Emesa, *Handes Amsorya* 71, 1957, col. 115f, 1.246-251.
26. Eusebii Pamphili Caesareae in Palaestina Episcopi opuscula XIIII nunc primum in lucem edita studio et opere Iacobi Sirmondi S.I. Presbyteri, Paris 1643.
27. PG 24,1047-1208.
28. E. M. Buytaert (ed.): Eusèbe d'Emèse: Discours conservés en latin I-II, *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* 26-27, Louvain 1953-57.
29. Cf. above p. 8.
30. Ed. Buytaert, vol. I, p. 85.
31. L. cit.
32. Op. cit. p. 86.
33. Ed. Buytaert, vol. I, p. 367.
34. Op. cit. p. 367f.
35. Cf. E. M. Buytaert: L'héritage littéraire d'Eusèbe d'Emèse, Louvain 1949, p. 61ff.
36. Thus in his article mentioned, p. 118, n.5 he gives the following statement: Voor het Diatessaron van Tatianus, cfr F. C. Burkitt, *The Syrian interpretation of S. John I 3.4*, JTS, 4 (1903), 436-438; E. Nestle, *Zur Interpunktion von Joh I,3.4*, ZNW, 10 (1909), 262-264. Hieruit blijkt dat de punctuatie I, die aangegeven werd in de uitgaven van Sievers en Gwilliam, zeker verkeerd is. De oud-nederlandse vertaling (uitg. Plooi) heeft de punctuatie III, met heel de syrische traditie. De recentere arabische vertaling daarentegen (uit. Marmardji) heeft de lezing I.
37. L. Leloir (ed.): S. Ephrem: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant, CSCO 137, p. 5. The dittography that Leloir reproduces in his edition, because it is found in the principal manuscript, has been disregarded in the quotation above.
38. Transl. Leloir, CSCO 145, p. 4.
39. L. Leloir (ed.): Saint Ephrem: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant, Chester Beatty Monographs 8, Dublin 1963, p. 4-6.
40. Transl. Leloir, op. cit. p. 5-7.
41. Op. cit. p. VII.
42. Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia, Series VI. Vetus Evangelium Syrorum et exinde excerptum Diatessaron Tatiani. Editionem curavit Ignatius Ortiz de Urbina S.I., Madrid 1967, p. 4.
43. Cf. L. Leloir: L'Evangelie d'Ephrem d'après les oeuvres éditées, CSCO 180, 1958.

44. Cf. Leloir, op. cit. p. 98, no. 613.
45. C. W. Mitchell: S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan, I-II, 1912-21, vol. I, p. 121-122.
46. Here Mitchell's translation "the" is misleading, in so far as it does not appear from this translation that the Syriac text has a demonstrative pronoun. In his index of biblical allusions, however, the quotation is translated correctly, and it is noted that the demonstrative pronoun is found neither in the Old Syriac (here represented by syc), nor in the Peshitta-version (Mitchell, op.cit. vol. II, p. CLVII). On this question cf. below.
47. Transl. Mitchell, op. cit. vol. I, p. XC.
48. On this translation cf. n. 46.
49. Cf. esp. A. Vööbus: Researches on the Circulation of the Peshitta in the Middle of the Fifth Century, CBU 64, Pinneberg 1948, p. 35ff. Cf. also his Investigations into the Text of the New Testament Used by Rabbula of Edessa, CBU 59, Pinneberg 1947, and L. Leloir: Le Témoignage d'Ephrem sur le Diatessaron, CSCO 227, 1962, p. 73f. The brief survey of the most important witnesses, given here by Leloir, will be quoted in its entirety, even though his conclusions concerning Ephraem are not acceptable as has appeared: Les éditions, soit de la syp, soit de Z, ponctuent différemment d'Ephr syr-arm: Et sine ipso nec unum quid factum est quod factum est. In ipso vita fuit (syp). Ephr syr-arm, tout comme Agath 364, 18 (mais non 210, 5, selon du moins la ponctuation adoptée dans l'édition de Venise), Chrys-arm (3/0), Cyr (1/0), terminent la phrase a nec una (res) (ou nec unum quid factum est). De même Ta, Πρὸς Ἑλλήνας 1917, Dne, Dtos, et tous les témoins anciens jusqu'au quatrième siècle. Sur cette question, cfr MEPH, II, p. 139, et de la POTTERIE, De interpunctione. Il n'est pas possible de décider, d'après le seul Ephr-arm, si Ephr lisait: Quod factum est per ipsum, vita erat, ou: Quod factum est, per ipsum vita erat. La ponctuation même de syriaque est ambiguë; vu cependant la présence d'une copule (et illa vita est) après per eum, il est plus probable qu'Ephr rattachait per eum à ce qui précède, non à ce qui suit.
50. F. C. Burkitt: The Syriac Interpretation of S. John i 3-4, JTS 4, 1903, p. 436-438.
51. Only, Westcott and Hort leave out the comma.
52. Against the very high estimation of the Armenian translation of Ephraem's commentary as a Diatessaron-witness, generally held in the first decades after its appearance, such reservations as voiced by e.g. C. Peters may be quoted: Wesentlich geringere Bedeutung, als ihm früher im allgemeinen beigegeben wurde, kommt für die Rekonstruktion der originalen Gestalt des Diatessaron einem Zeugen zu, der zwar auf den ersten Blick den Anschein erwecken könnte, als eigne ihm ein ganz hervorragender Wert, der aber doch nur unter strengster Beobachtung bestimmter methodischer Regeln zu dem genannten Zwecke herangezogen werden darf. Es ist dies der Kommentar Aphrems des Syrsers zum Diatessaron (C. Peters: Das Diatessaron Tatians. Seine Überlieferung und sein Nachwirken im Mor-

gen- und Abendland sowie der heutige Stand seiner Erforschung. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 123, Rome 1939, p. 94). A. Vööbus, also, after treating the Arabic and Persian Diatessaron, is content to call the lemmata of the commentary "a note-worthy aid" adding: The quotations here and there have undergone certain modifications. Restraint is needed in view of the nature of these passages as far as their use goes for textual studies (A. Vööbus: *Early Versions of the New Testament*, PETSE 6, Stockholm 1954, p. 9f).

I shall not elaborate on that discussion here; only, it may be added that even if this restrictive view on the value of Ephraem's commentary as a witness to Diatessaron-readings may be true in a number of cases, as long as we are concerned with the Armenian translation, to my mind this statement must be balanced with the assumption that where a reading has support in the Syriac text, or where the Syriac original and the Armenian translation can be used for mutual criticism, it must be assumed with a very high degree of probability that we are in possession of a genuine Diatessaron-reading.

It may be added that Leloir gives a corresponding verdict in his book: *Doctrines et méthodes de S. Ephrem d'après son commentaire de l'évangile concordant* (CSCO 220, Louvain 1961, p. 8): Le Diatessaron de Tatien a donc été commenté par Ephrem, dont le témoignage doit être considéré, jusqu'à découverte d'un témoin plus ancien et plus sûr, comme inégalé. We may refer to the same work, p. 14ff for a detailed - if still provisional - weighing of the value of the Syriac text and the Armenian translation as witnesses to the Diatessaron, their mutual relationship, the deviations between them etc.

53. Ambrosius: De fide III, 6, 41ff, ed. O. Faller, CSEL 78, p. 122f. Immediately after this passage follows the statement quoted above p. 4.
54. Augustinus: Tractatus in Johannis Evangelium I, 16, ed. R. Willems, CChL 36, p. 9f.
55. Cf. above p. 2f.
56. Cf. M. Comeau: *Saint Augustin exégète du quatrième évangile*, Paris 1930, p. 75ff. Incidentally, it is stated correctly by Comeau that in this tractatus Augustine is quite clearly opposing Manichaeism on the basis of a Neo-Platonic use and understanding of vita.
57. Ambrose's own choice of reading does not appear from the passage quoted above from his De fide; he only refers to plerique docti et fideles choosing punctuation no. I, and - as discussed above - alii choosing punctuation no. II B. It might be added that in his Explanatio Psalmi 36, which is an often quoted text on the question of the punctuation of John 1,3.4 - not least because of Ambrose's information that reading no. I is that of "Alexandrini quidem et Aegyptii", it seems to me that Ambrose primarily argues to the effect that reading no. IV does not necessarily strengthen the Arian case (the Manichaeans are not mentioned here), but may be understood in an "orthodox" way in the light of the context and of such scriptural passages as John 3,21; Ps. 118 (117), 21, and esp. 1. John 1,1f (Ambrosius: Explanatio Psalmorum XII, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 64, Wien 1919, p. 98f). M.-E. Boismard finds the two Ambrose-texts considerably at variance

(cf. M.-E. Boismard: *Le prologue de Saint Jean, Lectio Divina* 11, Paris 1953, p. 27 with n. 9, and his recension of J. Gennaro: *Exegetica in Prologum Joannis*, RB 61, 1954, p. 312). The evaluation of the interrelation between the two texts depends to a great extent on how the word pronuntiasse in the above quotation is understood. In case it is interpreted in a wide sense and belonging to what precedes, it seems unnecessary to assume any great discrepancy between the two texts, as the sentence with pronuntiasse would then just express the idea that the evangelist could not have thought and spoken of two "principia" or of quod factum est as referring to the divine substance. If pronuntiasse is taken to refer to the following discussion of punctuation - thus in fact bearing the meaning: punctuate (cf. the use in the Augustine-text quoted), one must admit that there is a difference between the two texts, as punctuation no. IV would then be rejected explicitly in De fide. Even in that case it seems to me unnecessary to reverse the traditional dating, as does Boismard. If the traditional dating is preserved, the relation between the two Ambrosian utterances might be the following: In 380 (the time of composition of De fide III according to O. Faller (in his prolegomena to the edition, CSEL 78, p. 8^{ff})), while referring to punctuations no. I and II B as possible and orthodox readings (cf. above), Ambrose voices misgivings about - or even rejection of - punctuation no. IV because of the possibility of reading Arianism into it; at the end of 394 (on the dating of the Explanatio Psalmorum XII cf. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte ... III*, p. 517, and Petschenig, CSEL 64, p. 91), however, he maintains that punctuation no. IV does not necessarily have to be interpreted in an Arianizing manner. Such a relationship between the two texts and between the line of thought in an author at two times separated by 14 years seems to me to be quite natural and to need no reversing of date so as to place De fide "à un moment où la Vulgate avait acquis un renom indiscuté" (Boismard, *Le prologue ...*, p. 27, n. 9). Any further discussion on the original reading of the Vulgate and the punctuation(s) chosen by Jerome, on the whole, would, however, take us too far here and shall be passed over (on that question cf. the works mentioned already, by J. Mehlmann, *I de la Potterie*, and M.-E. Boismard).

58. Cf. above p. 13f.
59. G. Widengren: *Mani und der Manichäismus*, Stuttgart 1961, p. 53.
60. G. Widengren: *Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism* (King and Saviour II), UUA 1946:3, p. 15f.
61. Op. cit. p. 16. Incidentally, it should be mentioned that in the same work Widengren gives very useful information on the speculations in the system of Manichaeism on "Life" and related or derived notions and mythologems such as - besides "Mother of Life" - "Tree of Life", "House of Life" etc.
62. Op. cit. (n. 59), p. 54.
63. On that question might be referred to such general works on Manichaeism as those by Puech (H.-C. Puech: *Le Manichéisme*, Paris 1949, cf. esp. p. 81f) and Widengren (op.

- cit. (n. 59), cf. p. 43.75 p.p.), and more specifically to E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz: *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, APAW 1926, no. 4, A. Böhlig: *Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus*, Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte 15, 1960, p. 41-61, and J. P. Asmussen: *Xu-āstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965, p. 205ff (where, esp. on p. 208f, references to further literature are given).
64. Cf. e.g. Epiphanius: *Panarion*, ed. K. Holl, GCS 37, Leipzig 1933, 66, 64, p. 103ff.
65. P. Alfarc: *Les écritures manichéennes II*, Paris 1919, p. 161ff. In Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings John 1,3 is in fact quoted a few times, but without the final clause so as to give no hint to the question of punctuation here.
66. Op. cit. p. 34.
67. Op. cit. (n. 52), p. 127.
68. A. Baumstark: recension of C.R.C. Allberry: *A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II*, OC 36, 1941, p. 117ff, cf. esp. p. 120 (other references can be found in the chapter on Manichaean literature in the work by Peters mentioned in the previous note).