



BRILL

---

Review

Reviewed Work(s):

Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels, Aligning the Sinaiticus,  
Curetonianus, Peshîttâ & Harklean Versions

by George Anton Kiraz

Review by: T. Baarda

Source: *Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 39, Fasc. 4 (Oct., 1997), pp. 405-414

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1560978>

Accessed: 25-05-2020 15:52 UTC

---

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).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Brill* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Novum Testamentum*

heißt Eduard Schwartz und nicht anders (S. 355). Theodor von Zahn hat seinen Aufsatz nicht 1988 erscheinen lassen, sondern, wenn er wirklich im Band 9 der ZKG steht, 1885).

E. GÜTING

GEORGE ANTON KIRAZ, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels, Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshittâ & Harklean Versions*, Volume I, *Matthew*, l-xxxv, 454 pp., 7 Plates; Volume II, *Mark*, 257 pp., Volume III, *Luke*, 514 pp., Volume IV, *John*, 375 pp., *New Testament Tools and Studies Volume XXI/1-IV*, Leiden, Brill, 1996, ISBN 90 04 104194, NLG 820,00.

The publication of these four volumes, for which the editor adopts the abbreviation CESG, is one of the great happenings of 1996. Not only the author but also the publishers deserve the gratitude of the scholarly world for this splendid *magnum opus*. It deserves a place in the libraries of all universities and theological departments and it cannot be missed in the personal libraries of students and scholars who are interested in the areas of Syriac studies and the Syriac versions in particular. The work has been dedicated to Sebastian P. Brock, whose initial idea of a comparative edition of the Syriac Gospels was carried out in this work. It is amazing that this rather "simple" idea had not come up earlier in the study of the Syriac Gospels.<sup>1</sup> Of course, some scholars had already offered for small parts of the texts synopses of the various texts, sometimes with an alignment of texts one under another, sometimes side by side in columns. One may mention here A. Merx<sup>2</sup> who in his learned three volumes commentary on Ms. S has often presented the texts of the various Syriac translations in columns or in the form of alignment. To a certain extent the time was now ripe for such a huge undertaking, due to the fact that an editor was available who had already a great experience in using computerized programs for Syriac, George Anton Kiraz. Still one can only admire the speed with which the work was performed, between 1992 and 1995.

### *The Witnesses*

The edition provides a complete registration of the texts of S, C, P and H, where they are available. This implies that we have in each verse at least the two complete witnesses, P and H (in this order), preceded by both S and C (in this order), or respectively S and C alone. As to the Old Syriac Gospels, the text of S is taken from the edition of Lewis (1910),<sup>3</sup> that of C from Burkitt (1904).<sup>4</sup> The Peshitta was presented in the form of the edition of Pusey & Gwilliam (1901).<sup>5</sup> One should have expected that the edition of White (1778)<sup>6</sup> would have been taken as source, but its unreliability urged the editor to use a very early Ms. Vat. Syr. 268 whose text was prepared for the CESG by A. Juckel (in some cases the text of this manuscript has been replaced by Vat. Syr. 267 or Bibl. Laurenz. Plut. 1.40, but this is made clear by brackets). Moreover, Juckel presented a most interesting and helpful introduction to the Harklean text,<sup>7</sup> in which he makes clear that a critical edition of the Harklean is one of the urgent tasks in Syriac studies. One can understand why, due to the short time in which this work has been achieved, there was no opportunity independently to make a new examination of the Curetonian Manuscript and the Sinaitic Palimpsest. So it is reasonable that Kiraz took the editions of 1904 and 1910 as point of departure.

*The Choice of Texts*

The edition does not include the Greek text for comparison as was done by M.E. Gudorf,<sup>8</sup> but this is not a necessity for the average textual critic who has critical editions of the Greek text at his desk. Moreover, the edition does not present the Syriac patristic quotations as is the case in the editions of B. Aland and A. Juckel. The editor is aware of the importance of such patristic quotations, but has omitted them on purpose.<sup>9</sup> He correctly abandons the remnants of the Syriac Diatessaron, in view of the poor state of the reconstructions of this harmony.<sup>10</sup> One may regret the fact that the editor did not include the Syro-Palestinian Lectionary version. One of the arguments is that it is written in a different dialect, but the main argument is that Sy<sup>pal</sup> was an independent translation from the Greek, which has no clear place in the development of the Syriac textual tradition. However, one cannot rule out the possibility that the translator of this Lectionary text had access to the Syriac traditions, and therefore could be a witness to the earlier developments of the Syriac Gospel text.<sup>11</sup> The advantage of adding the text of Sy<sup>pal</sup> is that scholars would have an easy access to a text that is not found in all libraries.<sup>12</sup> The limitation to the four texts—S, C, P and H—is, however, defensible. The work in its present form is, indeed, a most important tool for the study of the text of the Gospels and of the stages of the textual development of the Syriac Gospel text.

*The alignment*

In a comparison of the four, three or two witnesses one can apply the method of using adjacent columns, but this method is only useful if all the witnesses are complete. Since the Old Syriac texts have many and sometimes long lacunae<sup>13</sup> this method would hardly have been appropriate, for it would have caused a lot of blank columns. Therefore, Kiraz has applied the much better method of aligning the witnesses<sup>14</sup> which also had been applied by B. Aland & A. Juckel in their magisterial edition of the Syriac texts.<sup>15</sup> This alignment is a most splendid help for scholars, for it gives a clear insight into the relation between the four witnesses. Let me offer an example from John 14:26 (in translation):

S:	She,	the-Spirit,	however,	the-Paraclete,	x	x	x
C:	...	....	...	....	...	....	....
P:	He,	x	however,	the-Paraclete,	the-Spirit	of-holiness,	that-one,
H:	He,	x	however,	the Paraclete,	the Spirit-	holy,	that-one,
S:	whom	will-send	to-you	my-Father	in-my-name,		
C:	...	....	...	my-Father	in-my-name,		
P:	whom	[is-]sending	x	my-Father	in-my-name.		
H:	whom	will-send	x	the-Father	in-the-name	of-mine.	
S:	She	will-teach-you	every-thing.	She	will-remind-you		
C:	She	will-teach-you	every-thing	x	x		
P:	He	will-teach-you	everything,	and-He	will-remind-you		
H:	He	will-teach-you	all-these-things.	and	will remind-you		
S:	all	what-	x	I am-saying	x		
C:	x	x	x	I'm saying	to-you.		
P:	all	what-	x	I am-saying	to-you		
H:	all-these	things,	those that-	I-will-say	to-you.		

*The alignment as a tool*

This example gives a good impression of the various texts in relation to each other. The dots indicate that the Curetonian text has a lacuna, whereas the x denotes the fact that the pertinent text does not correspond to the other texts in the comparison. As to their relative importance with respect to the Syriac tradition of this verse and its possible contribution to the constitution of the Greek text, we may observe the following.

1. The passage given above illustrates the early Syriac tendency to use the feminine in the case of the holy Spirit, whereas P and H follow the later custom to use the masculine wording (pronoun, verb) for the Spirit. This is an inner Syriac development which may shed light on the dogmatic history in early Syria.

2. With respect to Ms. C it must be admitted that it is poorly transmitted.

- a) First of all, it shows a lacuna in C in the first line and the first part of the second (indicated by dots).
- b) Then it shows also a parablepsis fault in the same manuscript in lines 3 and 4 (indicated by crosses): it suggests that the model of this manuscript read also "every thing (that)" [instead of "all what" as found in S and P]. Of course, one cannot rule out that the parablepsis existed already in a Greek text underlying this Syriac version. We find, in fact, the omission of καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα also in Greek Λ (= 039), 0141, 1241 [πάντα ἢ πάντα] in Old Latin b and m (= Speculum) and Vulgate J [omnia ἢ omnia]. Merx has suggested that the omission in C presents us with the original text,<sup>16</sup> wrongly so in my view. It is rather a copyist's error that could be made by various copyists independently, in the Greek, Latin, and Syriac tradition of the text.
- c) C agrees with S and P in the reading "my Father" (H = Greek ὁ πατήρ), which may have been derived from a Greek source, cf. the Greek D and 041<sup>c</sup>, Old Latin d, Bohairic Mss. (B D<sub>1</sub> N), Sahidic Mss. (85 D P<sup>2</sup>) and Eusebius.<sup>17</sup>
- d) Moreover C agrees with S and P in reading "I am saying" for εἶπον. It also agrees with P and H in maintaining ὑμῖν (contra S, b c e ff<sup>2</sup> l m r aur, Eusebius and Cyril).

3. As to Ms. S—cf. 2c—it must be said that its beginning strikes the reader as unusual; apart from the inversion in the first line, the omission of τὸ ἅγιον is unattested elsewhere. Does S indicate a different Greek model? I found a similar inversion in Old Latin e: "Spiritus paracletus san<ct>us quem pater mittit. . ."<sup>18</sup> Another witness that I encountered is the Persian Harmony, where we read "Then the Spirit Paraclete, the holy Spirit, whom. . ."<sup>19</sup> But I have not found any other witness for this variation (neglected by Tischendorf and Von Soden),<sup>20</sup> but it is exactly the alignment of Kiraz that brings out clearly the difference and thus invites the reader to seek for a solution.<sup>21</sup> Unfortunately S has not the support of C, because the latter has a lacuna here.

4. P agrees with S C in reading "my Father" (cf. 2c). It also reads "(is) sending" instead of the future πέμψει (= S H). It has also "I (am) saying" (= S C) instead of εἶπον (v.l. εἶπω). Further it has the Syriac equivalent (lit. "Spirit of holiness") of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, but as we have seen above replaces the feminine verbal forms into masculine forms. So through the alignment procedure we can easily recognize the fact that P shares some of the characteristic elements of the Old Syriac, but at the same time provides an attempt to create an "up to date" revision of the older text.

5. H shows itself to be a most literal translation of the underlying Greek text. For example, it reads ܠܘܬܘ ܘܘܝ ܠܘܬܘܝ, to make clear that the Greek has an adjective, "holy." It has "the Father," omitting "my" of P and S C. It also has its ordinary rendering of the separate pronoun "in the name of mine" (ܡܘܢ = ܡܝܢܝ). It also renders ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ in the plural form ("all these things"), and at the end of the verse "all these-them *whatever* [ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ]", which presupposes a text ܕܫܐ (instead of ܕܝ)<sup>22</sup> and the addition of ܕܝ.<sup>23</sup> Both these variants occur in Greek 291 and 1375, and seem to underlie the Latin tradition. This is in concord with the verb ܘܘܠܘܝܘܬܐ (= ܘܘܠܘܝܘܬܐ in White's text), the imperfect tense (= fut.), which reflects the Aorist subjunctive. In the edition of White the reader at once sees that there is a marginal reading in H, namely ܕܝܘܠܘܝܘܬܐ (= ܕܝܘܠܘܝܘܬܐ). In the edition of Kiraz these marginal notes are omitted in the text, but one finds a survey of the notes in the extensive introduction of Juckel<sup>24</sup> and there is also the marginal note to our verse. I would suggest that in future editions Kiraz is able to create a symbol to denote that there is a marginal note in H which the reader will find in Juckel's survey.

In the first line one might perhaps consider the possibility that H was meant to read "He, however, the Paraclete is the holy Spirit," but the translation given agrees with the perception of the text by White: "Ipse autem Paracletus, Spiritus Sanctus, quem. . ."

From this survey on John 14:26 one may understand how important this edition of Kiraz is. One does not only see the process of textual tradition in the Syriac witnesses at a single glance, but the reader is also challenged to compare the textual tradition of the Greek text of the Gospels. So the alignment of the Syriac texts will be a useful tool for textual critics in the future.

#### *Neglect of some corrections of Lewis*

Mrs. Lewis, at the beginning of her edition, p. iii, has given some *errata* that have not found a place in Kiraz's publication. In Mt 26:1, ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ is given in the Sinaiticus (in agreement with C and P) according to Lewis's text, but in her *errata* she says that one should drop ܢ. In Mk 5:18, Kiraz reads ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ, lit. "he of the demon," with Lewis' text, but in her *errata* she says that one should read here ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ, "he of his demon." The Peshitta also has a suffix, but has the plural, "he of his demons" (ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ). Of course, I am not able to check whether Lewis was right with these proposals, but these later corrections have apparently escaped the scrutiny of Kiraz. Apart from these *errata* there are also the "Notes on Remarkable Passages" in the edition of Lewis (xiv-xxxv) that should be taken into consideration. For example, Kiraz prints the text of Lewis: ܐܝܘܕܘܬܐ, "Destroy" (impt. pl.), but in her notes (xxix) she writes, "I have just a suspicion that we should read ܐܝܘܕܘܬܐ (sing.)," referring to the different variants of the verb in Isho'dad's commentary on Acts in the Rendel Harris Ms. and the Mingana Ms. There are also places where one is puzzled by the Notes of Lewis. In the edition of Bensley (a.o.) John 11:2-6 is—apart from a few words—left blank. In her 1896 translation,<sup>25</sup> Lewis seems to be able to read the whole passage. Only in verse 2, she renders "Now Mary is she who washed the feet . . . whose brother was Lazar who was sick." Burkitt's text (1904) gives the following text of vs. 2: "Now Mary is she that washed the feet [of Jesus and wiped them with her hair;] the brother of her was the Lazar that was infirm."<sup>26</sup> In her edition, Lewis prints the text of S as follows (in translation): "Now Mary was that one who washed the feet [of Jesus]. The brother of that one was the Lazar who was sick" ([of Jesus] being printed as an interlinear addition). Kiraz takes over that text of Lewis (even with the note that "of Jesus" is superlinear in Cod.). Now, in the "Notes" mentioned above Lewis discusses the bracketed words [ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ ܡܝܢܝܢܝܘܬܐ] as presented by Burkitt (following the text of the Peshitta): she writes, "In 1905 I thought there was an illeg-





have preserved Old Syriac readings.<sup>35</sup> One might, however, suggest that in a new edition of CESG some of the variants in P will be registered in the Notes. They may be taken from Allgeier's lists<sup>36</sup> and from the apparatus of Pusey and Gwilliam. We may mention here a few variants in John 1. V̄s. 5: ܩܡܘܫܐ] add. ܩܡܘܫܐ 8\* 17 = C; vs. 12: ܩܡܘܫܐ] ܩܡܘܫܐ, 10 = C; vs. 13: ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ 10 14 36 37 and 8\* 21\* = C,<sup>37</sup> for this singular form cf. Old Latin b, Irenaeus (bis), Tertullian (bis); vs. 14: inversion "as the glory of" 14 = C;<sup>38</sup> vs. 19: ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ, Phillipps & 14 36 41; vs. 25: ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ Phillipps & 9 = C; vs. 26 *om.* "John answered (and)," 36 = C; *ibid.*: "I am baptizing" + "you" 36 = H (sub asterisco); vs. 30: ܩܡܘܫܐ] ܩܡܘܫܐ Phillipps & 11 17 (21\*); ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ] ܩܡܘܫܐ 37 = S C; vs. 35: ܩܡܘܫܐ] ܩܡܘܫܐ 36 = C; vs. 42: add. ܩܡܘܫܐ (said to him) 10 40 = S C; *om.* ܩܡܘܫܐ 14 (after ܩܡܘܫܐ) = S[C]; vs. 46: ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ 9 14 = H; vs. 51: add. subject "Jesus" Phillipps & 1 9 17 40 41 cf. 4<sup>c</sup> 12<sup>c</sup> 21\*, cf. Old Latin e. Despite the uniform tradition of the Peshitta there are left many traces of other and older traditions in the manuscripts.<sup>39</sup>

### *The notes on the Sinaitic Syriac*

In some cases Kiraz adds notes to the Old Syriac readings to make clear that what the Codex actually reads needs correction.<sup>40</sup> Following Lewis' text he prints in some cases the corrected reading; in others he mentions the correction in the note. For example in Mark 1:29 he prints as the text of S the name ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ (= Lewis; Bensly and Burkitt: ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ), and in his note he repeats this form of the name, with the remark "*sic* in Cod." Burkitt, however, printed the name as S gives it, and makes a note: S (*sic*), for ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ (. . .). What Burkitt makes explicit Kiraz leaves to the ingenuity of the reader. In Mk 7:30 Kiraz prints ܩܡܘܫܐ (= Lewis) and observes that the Codex reads ܩܡܘܫܐ. The question arises whether one should prefer to follow the Codex. One should be reminded of the observation of Burkitt (II, 53-54 concerning ܩܡܘܫܐ for ܩܡܘܫܐ in Lk 4:17, where Kiraz retains ܩܡܘܫܐ) that we have here a defective spelling. In some cases Kiraz changes his system and does not follow Lewis's text, for example in Jn 20:31, where the Codex (ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ) is followed, and not the correction of Lewis (ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ). One may ask whether it would be advisable always to present the text of the Codex and offer the correction in the notes.

### *The notes on the Curetonian Syriac*

The same system is applied in the case of the Curetonian Syriac.<sup>41</sup> One is sometimes left with the question why a note has been inserted. For example, in Lk 12:55 we find both in C and S ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ; in the note Kiraz observes only for C: "*sic* in Cod." The word is clear in the edition of Cureton, and reprinted in Burkitt's text. Burkitt observes in a note: "ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ C S (*sic*), also in Ephr. v. 320 B." In his *Introduction* (II, 134) Burkitt deals with this "somewhat rare word" but finds it established by the fact that it is in both Ephraem and SC. He notes the fact that Lewis had earlier reconstructed the S-text as ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ, cf. P H, but later on had presented the reading ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ, which is also in her edition. So the text of C is unproblematic, and supported also by S which turned out to have the same reading. The note of Kiraz is therefore unnecessary in this case. In Lk 8:8 the spelling ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ instead of ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ (S P H) is annotated with the remark "end of line in Cod.," following Burkitt (I, 288 app.) as if this explains the different spelling. Since this spelling is found elsewhere in C (Burkitt II, 48: "Lk viii 8 and a few other places")<sup>42</sup> one may think that this *aphairesis* of the initial ܩ is merely a question of a difference of spelling. Kiraz correctly notes that C sometimes writes ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ instead of the feminine form ܩܡܘܫܐܩܡܘܫܐ, Mt 11:23; 20:21 (bis: "*sic* in note"), but why does he

omit a similar note in Jn 4:10, where we twice read ܕܘܥܘܢ instead of ܕܘܥܘܢ? These may be copyists' errors (Burkitt, II, 42), but one cannot exclude the possibility that these phenomena belong to a different dialectical system (one may compare other Aramaic dialects for similar phenomena). In Lk 2:51 Kiraz notes "sic in Cod." with respect to the reading of C (ܡܠܬܐ) where P and H render ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς with "in her heart," but why should he do so, when S has the same rendering in Mk 11:23 and Lk 2:19 "in her heart" (without a note!)?<sup>13</sup>

I will conclude my observations on the magnificent work of Kiraz. My remarks are not meant as a criticism of this splendid *magnum opus*. They are merely a tribute to express my respect and gratitude to the editor and the others who have contributed to this huge work. We have before us now a most helpful tool for the study of the Syriac Gospel tradition. Therefore, we are greatly indebted to the composer of this Syriac "Tetraevangelium" in which the history of Syriac Bible translation takes shape in a most handy format. I hope that many scholars and students of Syriac studies can afford to acquire this important work. It is meant as a tool, but it is more than that. It may become a source for a renewed interest in the study of the Syriac Gospels.

T. BAARDA

<sup>1</sup> A. Bonus, *Collatio Codicum Lewisiani rescripti Evangeliorum Sacrorum Syriacorum cum Codice Curetoniano*, Oxford 1896, may be seen as a first attempt to give a complete survey of the variants between the Sinaitic Gospels (S), the Curetonian Gospels (C) and the Peshitta (P).

<sup>2</sup> A. Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Texte*, II:1, Matthaeus, Berlin, Reimer, 1902, 61, 132-134, 195, 296; II:2, Markus und Lukas, Berlin, Reimer, 1905, 236, 268, 293, 314, 433f., 447f., 469, 486, 526f., 316; *Johannes*, Berlin, Reimer, 1911, 56-57, 70-73, 86, and *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> A.S. Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion da-Mepharreshê, being the Text of the Sinai or Syro-Antiochene Palimpsest* (. . .), London, Williams and Norgate, 1910.

<sup>4</sup> F.C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels* (. . .), I-II, Cambridge, University Press, 1904.

<sup>5</sup> P.E. Pusey & G.H. Gwilliam, *Tetraevangelium Sanctum iuxta simplicem Syrorum versionem ad fidem codicum* (. . .), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1901.

<sup>6</sup> J. White, *Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana e codd. mss. Riddleianis* (. . .) *nunc primum edita*, I, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1778.

<sup>7</sup> A. Juckel, "Introduction to the Harklean Text," in: G.A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, I, *Matthew*, xxxi-lxxxii.

<sup>8</sup> Gudorf adds the text the 26th edition of "Nestle-Aland" at the bottom of the page, cf. M.E. Gudorf, *Research on the Early Syriac Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Diss., Chicago, 1992, 42-194.

<sup>9</sup> Kiraz, "Preface," in: Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, I, *Matthew*, xi-xii.

<sup>10</sup> It would have been a disaster if he were to have used the reconstruction of I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangelium Syrorum et exinde excerptum Diatessaron Tatiani*, *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensis* Ser. VI, Madrid 1967; cf. my *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage, I: Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel*, Diss. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam 1975, *passim*.

<sup>11</sup> He correctly refers to the article of Matthew Black, "The Palestinian Syriac Gospels and the Diatessaron," in: *Oriens Christianus* 36 (1941), 101-11. It is my experience that there are many readings that seem to be related to the Peshitta and Old Syriac tradition.

<sup>12</sup> I think especially of the 1899 edition of A.S. Lewis & M.D. Gibson, *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels*, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., 1899.

<sup>13</sup> For a survey of the parts of the text preserved in S and C see the description of the manuscripts by G.A. Kiraz, "Introduction to the CESH," in: Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, I, *Matthau*, xvii-xxx, resp. xxii-xxiii (S) and xxiv (C).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Kiraz, "Alignment Methodology," in: Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels* I, *Matthau*, xxvii-xxx.

<sup>15</sup> *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, Vol. I: B. Aland (& A. Juckel), *Die grossen katholischen Briefe*, ANT 7, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1986; Vol. II: B. Aland-A. Juckel, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, Teil 1, *Römer- und 1. Korintherbrief*, ANT 14, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1991; Vol. II, *Die paulinischen Briefe*, Teil 2, *Korintherbrief, Galaterbrief, Epheserbrief, Philipperbrief und Kolosserbrief*, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1995. The same procedure is applied in M.E. Gudorf, *Research* (see n. 8).

<sup>16</sup> Merx, *Johannes*, 382: "Es liegt Addition vor, die in Syrsin noch nicht durch ein καί verbunden ist, welches erst in Pesch eintritt."

<sup>17</sup> C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* I, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1872, 905, app., mentions besides Eusebius (Marc. 170, 171) also Gaudentius.

<sup>18</sup> A. Jülicher, W. Matzkow, K. Aland, *Itala*, IV. *Johannesevangelium*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1963, 162.

<sup>19</sup> G. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, Rome, Pont. Istituto Biblico, 1951, 322 (IV:30).

<sup>20</sup> H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, II, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913, 462.

<sup>21</sup> Merx, *Johannes*, 382f., seems to think that S may have preserved here an old tradition, referring to the weird text of Greek Ν\* which he thinks to have been a half-way correction of an older text.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Θ 1 28 138 270 291 348 477 565 1216 1375 1582, cf. quaecumque It (e: quae), Vulg.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. ἀν εἶπω, D 041 291 489 1219 1321 1346 1354 (1355) 1375 2145. Cf. dixero It (f: dixi), Vulg.

<sup>24</sup> Juckel, Introduction to the Harklean text, in Kiraz, CESH Vol. I, lii-lxxxii; our text on p. lxxxii. One wonders whether the unexpected reading of H (ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛ) is correct, for in Juckel's introduction one finds ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛ.

<sup>25</sup> A.S. Lewis, *A Translation of The Four Gospels from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest*, London, Clay & Sons, Cambridge University Press, 1896, 97.

<sup>26</sup> Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, I, 488 (tr. 489).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Kiraz, "Introduction," in: CESH I, xxii.

<sup>28</sup> Blass refers to A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexzte zu den Evangelien* III, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1896-1897, 156f.; Resch mentions Epiph. Haer. 65,6 [613B] (ἀποστελῶ), Haer. 68,11 [412C] (ἀποστελλῶ), Ancor. 69 [74A] (δῶσει); Eusebius, In Isa. 32,15 [VI, 321] (ἀποστελῶ). He assumes that it is an extra-canonical variation.

<sup>29</sup> Von Soden, *Schriften* II, 461, does not mention any variation here, despite his knowledge of both manuscripts.

<sup>30</sup> This was in fact the reading of the Diatessaron, cf. A.-S. Marmardji, *Diatessaron de Tatiën*, Beirut, Imprimerie Catholique, 1935, 156 (ch. XVI:32).

<sup>31</sup> This addition ("to know") is also found in Mt 13:11 in Ms. C. Was it once the reading in the Syriac Diatessaron?

<sup>32</sup> This word is borrowed from Mt 13:13 (διὰ τοῦτο).

<sup>33</sup> The Greek text of Mark reads: ἐκεῖνοις δὲ . . . τὰ πάντα γίνεται. The reading of S C (cf. P) also occurs in the Latin tradition of Mark: "dicitur" in b c ff<sup>2</sup> i r<sup>1</sup> ("omnia dicuntur" a q) instead of "omnia fiunt" (aur f l q). There is influence of Mt 13:13 in this form of the text. The reading is also found in the Old Latin text g<sup>1</sup> in Luke.

<sup>34</sup> Kiraz, "Introduction to the CESH," in: Kiraz, *Comparative Edition*, I, xxv.

<sup>35</sup> Kiraz, *ibid.*, xx; in note 8 he refers to the study of A. Allgeier, "Cod. Phillipps 1388 in Berlin und seine Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Pešitta," *Oriens Christianus* (III:) 7 (1932), 1-15.

<sup>36</sup> Allgeier, "Cod. Phillipps," 3-7.

<sup>37</sup> R.E. Brown (*The Gospel according to John*, I, The Anchor Bible, Garden City N.Y., Doubleday, 1966, 11) lists C among the possible witnesses of the singular form ("perhaps by the OS<sup>curr</sup>"). He was perhaps influenced by R. Bultmann (*Das Evangelium des Johannes*, KEK,<sup>17</sup> Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, <sup>10</sup>1962, 37f., n. 7) who mentions ܬܘܪܝܢܐ for C (*sic*). Bultmann may have been led by "Excurs II, Der Text von 1,13," in: Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Leipzig-Erlangen, Deichert, <sup>5,6</sup>1921, 711-714. In Cureton's edition we actually read ܬܘܪܝܢܐ (in spite of the plural relative pronoun ܕܘܪܝܢܐ). Burkitt (I, 422) corrected this reading into the plural form, which has been printed in Kiraz. There is reason to assume that the singular form was found in Ms. C.

<sup>38</sup> This variant is interesting, because it occurs also in Titus of Bostra (cf. Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangelium*, 6 [nr. 45]), in the Arabic Diatessaron, the Persian Harmony, Walton's Persian version, but also in the Sahidic and Bohairic versions (Horner, cf. also Quecke's edition of the Sahidic). It is surprising that neither Tischendorf nor Von Soden have listed this variation.

<sup>39</sup> We may refer here also to the works of A. Vööbus, who especially in his *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac* II, Louvain, Peeters, 1987, has presented much material to demonstrate the richness of variant readings in the Peshitta of the Gospels. It would be worthwhile if in the near future some scholar were able to publish a new critical edition of the Syriac Vulgate. For John 1:51 Vööbus refers to the inversion of the verbs "ascending" and "descending" in Ms. Vat. Syr. 525, which occurs also in Aphrahat's text, cf. Baarda, *Gospel Quotations*, 75 (where also the Persian Version in Walton's Polyglot and Old Latin q are mentioned as witnesses of this inversion).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Mt 21:31; 24:14; 25:17; 26:36,70 (*lege* 69); Mk 1:29; 6:18,36; 7:30,31; 14:14; 15:5,29; 16:9-20; Lk 22:16; 23:17; Jn 4:6; 7:53-8:11; 8:33; 11:2,26; 13:16; 18:14; 20:1,31.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Mt 11:2,23; 16:5; 18:7; 20:21; 22:11; Lk 2:51; 3:1,14; Lk 8:8,51,52; 10:11; 12:55; 15:22; 16:11; 19:1; 20:24; 21:21; 22:16,56,65; 23:17,19; Jn 1:35; 4:6; 7:53-8:11.

<sup>42</sup> Burkitt does not give any further reference; I could only find Mt 21:36, Jn 1:35.

<sup>43</sup> For καρδία = ܩܪܕܝܐ, cf. Acts 4:32; 1 Cor. 7:37; 2 Cor. 9:7.