

real in, and revealing God as love, may we not conceive God Himself as organic social personality? May not the one life of the personal God be expressed in the manifold personal life of Father, Son and Spirit and the different personal life of Father, or Son, or Spirit be realised in the common life of the personal God? As individuals in society form an organic unity, so may we conceive Father, Son, and Spirit each as personal, yet one in the personal God. (v) This ideal of society as organic would surely command a more august authority over selfish individualism, if we could vindicate the contention that it is the earthly shadow of the heavenly substance of the triune God. Should not the Christian Church realise that ideal more fully than any other human society can? If the Christian fellowship did realise the common life of each in all, and all in each, there would surely be given to it a clearer vision of, a closer communion with, and a greater resemblance to the Triune God. Is it too bold a suggestion that we have had revealed in history the difference of Father, Son, and Spirit, but the revelation of the unity of God in Father, Son, and Spirit waits the consummation when all saints are one, even as Father, Son, and Spirit are one God?

A. E. GARVIE,

DR. VOGELS ON THE OLD SYRIAC GOSPELS.

In the first number of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* for 1912, there is a review of my edition of the Old Syriac Gospels by Dr. Hugo Gressmann, which, though highly favourable and sympathetic as regards my own work, makes this observation (p. 161), "Aber eben so wichtig wie die Auslassungen sind die Auffüllungen, ja noch wichtiger, denn die Auffüllungen, die allerdings im *sin*

weniger zahlreich sind als im *cur*, erheben den Einfluss des Diatessarons über jeden Zweifel.

“But the amplifications (i.e., in the Sinai text of the Syriac Gospels) are quite as important as the omissions; yes, even more important, for the amplifications, which are certainly less numerous in the Sinai text than in the Cureton one, prove the influence of the Diatessaron without the slightest doubt.”

Soon after I had read this, a book on the Old Syriac Gospels by Dr. H. J. Vogels, of Düsseldorf, came into my hands, published in 1911. It contains a list of harmonistic readings, that is, of words or passages in the text of the Old Syriac Gospels, which, in the writer's judgment, are taken from Tatian's *Diatessaron*, and are no less than 1605 in number. If that opinion were founded on sound principles this would indeed settle the question of the supposed priority of Tatian's Harmony to the version represented in the *Sinai Palimpsest*. But a close examination of Dr. Vogels' list has convinced me that most of his conclusions are vitiated by radically false assumptions.

I. He has totally failed to make allowance for a very common grammatical peculiarity of the Syriac language, viz., the introduction of pronouns and pronominal suffixes in every possible and conceivable place. For instance, wherever the word “disciples” occurs in the Gospels, with one solitary exception, the possessive pronoun “his” is attached to it in the form of a suffix, giving us the word תלמידיהו. Without this superabundance of pronouns no translation of the Gospels would have been acceptable to the Syrian peoples, for it would simply not have been Syriac. Yet the author gives us 156 examples of this phenomenon, and tries to show that they have been borrowed from one of the other Gospels, that is to say, are harmonistic.

II. In a few instances such as Matthew viii. 27 the author

points out that S (Sinai) has $\delta \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$, "the wind," like Mark iv. 41, instead of $\omicron\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$, "the winds." He has evidently never tried to read a Syriac palimpsest. If he had done so, he would have awoke to the fact that the plural of a Syriac word is often represented by two dots over one of its letters, and that by a curious economy of trouble, or of ink, this is often effected by a duplication of the single dot which distinguishes a *resh* from a *daleth* ܐ becoming ܐ̇. When a second rather heavy writing has been imposed on the top of a text several centuries earlier than itself, it is only natural to expect that we may meet with words which are apparently in the singular, though really in the plural. We cannot read a second dot over the ܐ̇ because it is under a thick stroke of the upper script, and though we may strongly suspect it to be there, we must not report what we cannot see. Instances of this, which may have misled Dr. Vogels, occur in 10 verses, viz., Matthew viii. 26, 27; xi. 16; xiii. 11; xv. 19; Mark ii. 24; iv. 15; v. 23; Luke ix. 16; xxi. 27.

III. There are cases in which the author has misread a Syriac word. For instance, in John i 27, he says that C S (that is, Cureton and Sinai), omit $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$. The Cureton text has there ܐܢܢܐ ܫܘܢܐ ܠܐ, "I am not worthy," while the Sinai text has contracted the $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ into the verb; and gives us ܐܢܢܐ ܫܘܢܐ ܠܐ, the last word being a short way of saying ܐܢܢܐ ܫܘܢܐ. It is therefore quite a mistake to say that both MSS. omit $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$.

In Matthew xi. 10 also Dr. Vogels says that S omits $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$, not perceiving that $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ is contained in the word ܡܫܕܪܢܐ "I have sent," which is a contraction for ܡܫܕܪ ܐܢܢܐ.

There are other cases where the Syriac text has been misread. In Matthew x. 3 we have not $\Sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma \delta\acute{\omicron} \textit{Kananaios}$, *Simon the Canaanite*, but $\Sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma \delta\acute{\omicron} \textit{Zηλωτης}$, *Simon the Zealot* (ܩܢܝܐ).

We are told that in Matthew xi. 24 S omits *ὕμιν*. But no mention is made of the word *σοι*, which is used instead of it.

In Matthew xxi. 23 we read + CSP *αὐτῶ* post *λέγοντες*. No word in the Sinai MS. represents *αὐτῶ* after *λέγοντες*.

In Matthew xxiv. 28 the translation is not considered correct because *τὸ πτώμα* is translated by פּנרָא which, according to the *Thesaurus*, is its primary meaning, as used in Leviticus vii. 24 and 1 Samuel xxxi. 12 of the Peshitta.

In Mark i. 32 *νόσοις ποικίλαις* is considered a translation of בְּקוֹרְהוֹנָא קְשִׁיָּא. בְּקוֹרְהוֹנָא would surely have been better rendered by *σκληροῖς* than by *ποικίλαις*.

In Mark vi. 6 *κύκλω* is not omitted. It is surely included in the Syriac word מְתַכְרָא.

In Mark vi. 53 the Sinai text has not *ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν γεννησαρ*, but *ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν γεννησαρ*.

In Mark viii. 10 the Sinai text has not *καὶ ἦλθεν* but *καὶ ἦλθον*. It cannot therefore have come from Matthew xv. 39.

In Mark x. 21 and Luke ix. 10 we are told that SP (Sinai and Peshitta) add *πάντα* before *ἄσα*, the words being כּל לְדָם. But surely כּל מוֹדָם is a very good translation of *ἄσα*. *Ἄσα* contains the idea of *πάντα* and *מוֹדָם* without would be quite inadequate.

In Mark xi. 9, the Sinai text has the word *ὠσαννά*, אֹשַׁעְנָא, as in Westcott and Hort's text. Yet the author says that it has *εἰρηνη*.

In Mark xii. 12, the word *עליהון* is translated *περὶ αὐτῶν*, though the *πρὸς αὐτούς* of WH would have been a more faithful rendering. Both *עליהון* and *πρὸς αὐτούς* imply hostility.

In Mark xv. 21, the author translates נְבֵרָא as *ἄνθρωπον*. It stands for *ἄνδρα*; and it is quite idiomatic Syriac for the Greek *τινα*. If it had been from Matthew xxvii. 32, it would surely have been בְּרִנְשָׁא *ἄνθρωπον*.

In Luke xi. 26 the Sinai text has not *ἑπτὰ πνεύματα*.

IV. In several cases a Syriac word has been quite properly used to represent two different Greek ones, the two being synonyms. When we compare one Greek text with another Greek text it is right that we should notice these cases; but with a translation we must always remember that some languages have a much richer vocabulary than others. Compare, for example, the Arabic lexicon with the Hebrew one, or the Greek with the Latin. The Revisers of our English New Testament fell into precisely the same mistake as Dr. Vogels has done, the pedantic one of thinking that a Greek word must always be rendered by the same English equivalent; and for that reason they sacrificed the supreme virtue of a good literary style, and secured the failure of their own work as a substitute for the less exact Authorised Version in the affections of all English-speaking nations.

I shall give a few examples.

Matthew v. 26, Luke xii. 59. Here the word *λεπτόν* instead of *κοδράντην* need not come from Luke xii. 59. The words are absolutely synonyms, for *λεπτόν* means the fourth of a farthing; and *κοδράντης* the fourth of a Roman *as*. As our Lord doubtless meant the smallest coin that His hearers knew, ܠܘܡܫ = $\frac{1}{2}$ may surely stand for either of them.

Only very fine hair-splitting could show us much difference between

Supposed Syriac.	Greek.
Matthew xii 25	<i>διανοήματα</i> and <i>ἐνθυμήσεις</i> .
Matthew xv. 35	<i>κελεύω</i> • „ <i>παραπέλλω</i>
Matthew xx. 18	<i>θανάτω</i> „ <i>εἰς θάνατον</i>
Matthew xxiii. 25	<i>πίναξ</i> „ <i>ποροψίς</i>
Mark vi. 46	<i>ἀπολύω</i> „ <i>ἀποτάσσομαι</i>
Luke viii. 45	<i>τίς μου ἤψατο</i> ; and <i>τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου</i> ;
Luke xi. 48	<i>μαρτυρεῖτε</i> „ <i>μάρτυρες ἔστε</i>
Luke xi. 51	<i>ἀμήν</i> „ <i>ναί</i>
Luke xvii. 2	<i>συμφέρει</i> „ <i>λυσιτελεῖ</i>

In Luke iv. 40 the Syriac is said to mean *ἔφερον* when it ought to be *ἡγαγον*. But I submit that ܐܘܢܝܢ is a much better rendering of *ἡγαγον* than it would be of *ἔφερον*, of which the equivalent is ܐܘܢܠܘ from the Afel of ܒܠ

In John xviii. 10 *ἐλκυσεν* and *ἀπέσπασεν* both represent the same idea of "drew" [his sword] and in Matthew xxvi. 51, Mark xiv. 47, the same Syriac word ܫܡܫܘܫܐ is used as in this passage. Probably it is the best rendering of the Greek in all three cases.

V. By far the largest number of verses which Dr. Vogels has judged to be harmonistic are those where the Syriac words follow the order natural to a Semitic language, instead of being placed in the exact sequence of the Greek. The translator wished to give his countrymen a version which should be clear, intelligible and pleasant to them, because natural and idiomatic. It never occurred to him that in Matthew xix. 6 any one would expect him to say *σὰρξ μιὰ* instead of *μιὰ σὰρξ*. In the English versions we have "one flesh," although the Greek text says "flesh one." When we translate German into English we do not put our verbs at the end of the sentences, nor do we put the objects of our verbs also near the end of our sentences. Nor do we make the opposite arrangement when we translate English into German. A few instances of this perverse ingenuity must suffice: they are perhaps necessary to make my meaning clear.

(1) Matthew xiv. 19 Syriac *καὶ ἐκλάσεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς*. Greek text *καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους*.

(2) Mark i. 27, Syriac *καὶ ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις*. Greek text *καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει*.

(3) Luke iii. 3, Syriac *καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*.

Greek, *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περιχώρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων.*

This is surely elaborate trifling, which produces nothing but pedantic lumber. To explain the reason why the Syriac translator has not followed the Greek sequence of words, we need not search in (1) Mark vi. 41, (2) Luke iv. 36 and (3) Mark iii. 1. It will be sufficient if any of my readers will try to translate the Greek into Syriac according to the ideas of Dr. Vogels; and I shall be surprised if he is pleased with the result. Yet of these cases there are no less than 139 examples, which we are asked to consider harmonistic. We have found 23 in Matthew, 49 in Mark, 65 in Luke, and 2 in John.

VI. There are single words and phrases which Dr. Vogels calls harmonistic, i.e., we are to consider them as interpolations in the correct text, although they are also to be found in exactly the same place in the text of Westcott and Hort. I certainly think that every word, which stands in such a text, whether it appears between brackets or not, could never have been accepted by these great scholars, even doubtfully, unless it had a considerable amount of Greek MS. evidence in its favour. Is it not then very unjust to cite the presence of such words and passages in a Syriac version as evidence of harmonising?

I find instances of this in Matthew iv. 17 *Μετανοεῖτε*, ix. 19 *ἠκολούθει*, xii. 11 [*ἐσται*], xv. 27 [*γάρ*], xix. 20 *Ταῦτα πάντα*, xx. 18 [*θανάτῳ*], xx. 23 [*τοῦτο*] ante *δοῦναι*. Mark ii 22 [*ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέου εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοῦς*], Mark v. 2 [*εὐθύς*], xv. 10 [*ο ἀρχιερεῖς*], Luke vi. 38 *μετρηθήσεται*, viii. 13 *οὔτοι*, viii. 52 *γάρ* ante *ἀπέθανεν*, xi. 17 *ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα*, xx. 27 *λέγοντες*, xxiv. 36 [*καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, εἰρήνη ὑμῖν*].

xxiv. 12 [*Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα· καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός*].

The Syriac translator often supplied a word, and specially a proper name instead of *αὐτός*, to make his meaning clearer, or to avoid ambiguity. He also sometimes left out a proper name, such as *Ἰησοῦς*, at the beginning of a phrase, because he had just written it near the end of the phrase preceding it, for euphonistic reasons. We may be sure that he never dreamt that after the lapse of seventeen centuries he would be called on to account for this. I have found 35 instances of a word being added to make the meaning clearer; and 16 instances of words being omitted simply to avoid an unpleasant tautology.

VIII. The author seems to have no perception of linguistic style. I have found 57 cases in which he makes no allowance for a Syriac idiom which is not pronominal. But I object still more to those cases in which he ignores a Greek idiom, such as the suppression of an important word, which the mind of the reader is expected to supply. This is impossible to reproduce in Syriac. There are really few other languages, if any, which would tolerate it. Therefore the insertion of any such suppressed word ought not to be attributed to harmonistic influences. For example, in Luke xi. 17, the Syriac says: *καὶ οἶκον ἐπὶ οἶκον μερισθεὶς πίπτει*, and in Mark xii. 38 *φιλοῦντων* before *ἀσπασμούς*. See also *βάλλουσω* in Mark ii. 22.

Even the well-known grammatical rule of the Greek language, by which a substantive in the neuter plural takes a singular verb, is set up as a standard which the Syriac translation ought to follow. The Syriac maintains its independence by taking a plural verb, and we are told that in such cases its text is harmonistic. For an instance of this, see Mark v. 10, Matthew xi. 16.

IX. Dr. Vogels also gives instances that are too trifling to notice. Early translators of the Gospels probably did not realise the supreme importance of their text; they

looked forward to the speedy return of the Christ, and so failed to see that the Evangelist's autographs would be held very sacred for over 2,000 years. To the Syriac one it was a matter of no moment whether he put *καὶ εἰ* or *εἰ δὲ* at the beginning of a verse such as Luke xi. 18.

Many of the above details may seem trifling. They are so, but they have been put forward seriously in order to decry the value of the Old Syriac Gospels, by a scholar who, I cannot help thinking, was prejudiced, inasmuch as he has tried to support a preconceived theory, the theory that the Old Syriac Version is post-Tatian and the Sinai MS. is later than the Curetonian one. In many cases he counts the same example twice; for instance, in Matthew viii. 22, Mark x. 46, xi. 13, Luke xxii. 17.

I do not deny that there are a few passages in the Old Syriac Gospels which might lead us to suppose that they have crept there from a Harmony. Of these I subjoin a list, only premising that they possibly may not have been in the original second-century translation, though they are in the fourth-century copy of it which I found on Mount Sinai. Of this question others will be more impartial judges than I am.

Apparent interpolations of single words.

Mark xiv. 63, τότε, xvi. 1 μύρα καὶ before ἀρώματα.

Luke viii. 22, ἐκείνων after ἡμερῶν, viii. 40 πολλὸς after ὄχλος, ix. 17 πλήρεις, xx. 14 δεῦτε before ἀποκτείνωμεν, xxii. 39 λεγόμενον before ὄρος, xxii. 47 πολλὸς after ὄχλος, xxii. 71 ἴδε after μαρτυρίας; John xii. 3 ἀλάβαστρον before λίτραν, xiii. 38 δὶς after ἀλέκτορα.

Of sentences.

Matthew ix. 7 ἦρεν τὴν κλίνην αὐτοῦ after ἐγερθεῖς.

„ x. 33 καὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ.

„ xiii. 13 μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν.

Matthew xix. 20 *ἐκ νεότητός μου.*

„ xxvi. 70 *οὐδε ἐπίσταμαι, xxvii. 28 καὶ πορφύραν.*

Luke iii. 16 *ὀπίσω μου, vi. 23 καὶ ἀγαλλίασθε.*

„ viii. 18 *καὶ περισσευθήσεται, viii. 22 μετ' αὐτοῦ.*

„ viii. 45 *καὶ λέγεις τίς μου ἤψατο.*

„ xii. 56 *καὶ τὰ σημεῖα αὐτοῦ, xvii. 36 καὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ. ὃ εἰς παραληφθήσεται καὶ ὃ εἰς ἀφεθήσεται.*

„ xx. 9 *καὶ περιέθηκεν αὐτῷ φραγμόν.*

„ xx. 23 *τί με πειράζετε;*

„ xx. 24 *ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ καὶ before εἶπαν.*

„ xxiii. 17. *εἰώθει δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς ἓνα δέσμιον κατὰ ἑορτήν.*

„ xxiii. 20. *λέγων αὐτοῖς before θέλων.*

„ xxiii. 20 *τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν; after Ἰησοῦν.*

John vi. 10 *ἐπὶ τῷ χόρτῳ.*

„ vi. 13 *ἦσαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἐσθίοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου πεντακισχίλιοι.*

„ vi. 15 *ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀναχώρησεν.*

„ vi. 19 *καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.*

„ xii. 3 *καὶ κατάχεεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀνακειμένου.*

„ xii. 12 *καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.*

„ xii. 44 *ὁ μὴ ὀμιάζων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐχ ὀμιάζει εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με.*

„ xviii. 3 *καὶ ὄχλον τοῦ λαοῦ after ὑπερέτας.*

„ xviii. 28 *καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτον after Καίαφα.*

„ xviii. 28 *παραδιδόναι αὐτὸν τῷ ἡγεμόνι.*

„ xix. 42 *ὅτι τὸ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν.*

„ xx. 1 *τῆς θύρας after ἐκ.*

I have thus accounted for 764 cases in Dr. Vogels' list of supposed augmentations, and allowing for 41 apparent interpolations, this leaves 800 cases out of the 1605 to be accounted for. These, though numerous, are not of very great import-

ance, and I think that if they were subjected to close scrutiny by an expert in Semitic idiom more skilled than myself, they would easily be accounted for as the result of Dr. Vogels' having worked on a totally false principle.

Moreover, I cannot help a few regrets that his principle is *not* a sound one. Were it true, those of us who have acquired some ease in reading Latin, Greek, Hebrew and half a dozen modern languages would be able to write these also with fluency and grace, and I should now offer a version of this article to the editors of several European magazines instead of confining myself to the EXPOSITOR.

Yet it is no concern to me personally whether the Old Syriac be, or be not, earlier than the Diatessaron. I am chiefly interested in the question as to whether its peculiar and suggestive readings, wherein it differs from early Greek codices, though often agreeing with the so-called Western text, are primitive and true.

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS.

VIII. SACRAMENTAL MEALS.

THE evidence regarding Sacramental Meals in the Mystery-Religions is both meagre and difficult to interpret. Conclusions have been drawn from one or two extant mystic formulae which go beyond the data. Thus, e.g., the Eleusinian fragment preserved by Clement of Alexandria: ¹ "I fasted, I drank the *κυκεών*," has been explained of a sacrament in which the initiated drank of the same cup as the goddess in her sorrow. This is indeed an attractive hypothesis, but it can be nothing more. A similar explanation has been given of the formula handed down by Firmicus Maternus ² and (with variations) by Clement ³: "I have

¹ Ed. Stählin, I. p. 16, 18. ² Ed. Ziegler, p. 43, 11. ³ I. p. 13, 10.