N. Peter Joosse

An Introduction to the So-Called Persian Diatessaron of Īwānnīs 'Izz al-Dīn of Tabrīz: the testimony of John 2: 1-11 (the wedding at Cana)[1]

I. General Introduction

The unique manuscript (Florence Laurentian Lib. XVII (81)) of the Persian Harmony of the Gospels has been described very briefly by S. E. Assemani[2] in 1742, and again by Italo Pizzi in 1886.[3]

In 1943 a preliminary announcement concerning the manuscript was made by Giuseppe Messina.[4] Messina gave an elaborate discussion of the stylistic features (*e.g.* conflated readings), and of the evidence bearing on the history of the Persian manuscript and its translator. He also presented the complete text

---

1 This article was initiated during the season 1997/98 when the present author was staying at the NIAS (Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences – Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences – Wassenaar, The Netherlands) as a Fellow-in-Residence, participating in the theme-group on Tatian's Diatessaron. The article was finished at the *Orientalisches Seminar* of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität in Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

2 Cf. B. M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford 1977), p. 17 who refers to Assemani's *Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae et Palatinae codicum Mss. orientalium catalogus* (Florence 1742), p. 59.

3 *Cataloghi dei codici orientali di alcune biblioteche d'Italia*, iii (Florence 1886), p. 301; cf. also G. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano, i Introduzione; ii Testo e traduzione*, Biblica et orientalia N. 14 (Rome 1951), p. xiii.

4 *Notizia su un Diatessaron Persiano tradotto dal siriaco*, Biblica et orientalia N. 10, (Roma 1943); cf. B. M. Metzger, "Tatian's Diatessaron and a Persian Harmony of the Gospels," *JBL* 69 (1950), pp. 261-280; idem, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, New Testament Tools and Studies IV (Leiden 1963), pp. 103-120, especially p. 103; idem, *Early Versions*, pp. 17-19, p. 17; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Persian and Arabic Gospel Harmonies," *Studia Evangelica, Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957* (TU 73), edd. K. Aland, F. L. Cross, J. Daniélou, H. Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnik (Berlin 1959), pp. 793-810, p. 793; cf. also the following articles by Higgins: "The Persian Gospel Harmony as a witness to Tatian's Diatessaron," *JThS* 3 (1952), pp. 83-87; "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Arabic and Persian Harmonies," *Studies in New Testament Language and Text. Essays in honour of George D. Kilpatrick*, ed. by J. K. Elliott (Leiden 1976), pp. 246-261; "Luke 1-2 in Tatian's Diatessaron," *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 193-222.

and translation of one of the chief colophons.[5] Eight years later Messina made the text available with an Italian translation and an extensive introduction.[6] Information provided by the colophon mentioned earlier tells us that the manuscript, which contains 128 numbered folios, was copied in the year 1547 by a Jacobite priest, Ibrāhīm ben Shammas ʿAbdullāh, in the city of Ḥiṣn Kaif on the Tigris River, from an original probably from the thirteenth century.[7] This earlier Persian Diatessaron appears to have been translated from a Syriac model by a Jacobite layman of Tabrīz who calls himself Īwānnīs ʿIzz al-Dīn (literally: »John, Glory of the Religion«). Messina found reasons to believe that Īwānnīs did not create a completely new harmony, but that he based his work on two slightly divergent harmonies already existing in Syriac.[8]

The Persian Harmony is divided into four main divisions, containing respectively 71, 61, 60, and 58 chapters. Each chapter has a separate header. The compiler has indicated the four gospels by giving them short abbreviations: M, S, L, and Y.

When the sequence is compared with the Arabic Diatessaron, only few sections are found in the same order, and these may be explained on the basis of coincidence.[9] The Wedding at Cana (John 2: 1-11) in the Persian Harmony (I: 23) can be found *between* John 1: 38a-51, Math. 9: 9 *and* Math. 4: 23-25, whereas in the Arabic Diatessaron it is placed in the middle of chapter 5 *between* John 1: 35-51, Luke 4: 14a *and* Luke 4: 14b, et cetera.

So in both harmonies, the Arabic and the Persian, the Wedding at Cana has been positioned before the Sermon on the Mount, but in different places.

The Persian Harmony begins with Mark 1: 1 and not with John 1: 1. Tatian, on the testimony of Dionysius bar Ṣalībī, began his Diatessaron with John 1: 1.[10] Moreover, the Persian Harmony contains the Matthaean and Lucan genealogies of Jesus, which, according to Theodoret of Cyrrhus in his "Treatise

---

5 There are four colophons present in the manuscript: (1): f. 16ʳ, l. 9-17; (2) f. 123ᵛ, l. 3-124 ʳ, l. 5; (3) f. 124ᵛ; (4) f. 130ʳ.

6 For the full title, cf. note 3 *supra*. Unfortunately, in his edition Messina omitted the commentaries on the text of the harmony which are present in the Florence Codex (cf. p. xvi).

7 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. xviii-xxi.

8 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. xxi f.

9 Cf. Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 18.

10 Cf. *Dionysii Bar Salibi, Commentarii in Evangelia*, edd. A. Vaschalde, Vol. II, pt. 1, CSCO 95 [Syri 47] (Louvain 1931), p. 173; cf. also W. L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron. Its creation, Dissemination, Significance, & History in Scholarship*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. XXV (Leiden-New York-Köln 1994), p. 59.

on Heresies," were omitted by Tatian.[11] Therefore, as far the external framework is concerned, the Persian Harmony seems to manifest no relationship with Tatian.

Baumstark attached great value to the Persian Harmony. He even considered it »sehr vielfach der schlechthin beste Überlieferungszeuge (Tatians)«.[12] Baumstark was led to this judgment by his collation of the first quarter of the harmony against the other harmonies.[13]

As a rule of thumb he used the following formula: where the Persian offers a reading which differs from the Peshitta, the original text of Tatian has been preserved.[14] His collation is printed as an appendix in Messina's edition.[15] Baumstark considered the Persian Harmony to be far more valuable than the Arabic Diatessaron whose divergences from the Peshitta are much less numerous.[16]

Metzger on the other hand acknowledged that the Persian Harmony has no relationship with Tatian's Diatessaron as far as its external framework is concerned, but he emphasized its value for the textual criticism of the gospels. According to Metzger, this value lies in the presence of many unmistakable Tatianic readings which are embedded within the Persian text. Metzger is of course right in his judgment of the Persian Harmony. It has in fact little to do with the Diatessaron tradition, but it is a veritable *Fundgrube* for Tatianic materials.

These Tatianisms show a close similarity with readings preserved in both Eastern and Western witnesses to the Diatessaron.[17] In order to exhibit this feature of the Persian Harmony, Metzger composed a list of about one hundred variants which he compared with Eastern and Western witnesses of the Diatessaron. Several of these readings Metzger commented upon in great detail in order to stress their great significance for the Diatessaron-*Forschung*.[18]

---

11 Cf. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Compendium haereticarum fabularum*, Migne *PG* 83, pp. 335-556, especially pp. 371f.

12 Quoted in Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, p. vii.

13 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. xcvii-cxi: Lezioni tazianee nel c. I dell' Armonia Persiana (da uno schedario di Anton Baumstark).

14 For the oversimplificated rule of thumb applied by Baumstark and his pupil Peters to the Arabic Harmony, cf. N. P. G. Joosse, *The Sermon on the Mount in the Arabic Diatessaron* (Amsterdam 1997), pp. 48-55; idem "In Search of Tatianic Patchwork in the Text of the Arabic Diatessaron," *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* T. LI, Z. 2 (1998), pp. 105-113; idem "An Introduction to the Arabic Diatessaron," *OrChr* 83 (1999), pp. 72-129, especially pp. 120-23; see also Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 253.

15 pp. xcvii-cxi.

16 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, p. xxxiii; Higgins, *The Persian and Arabic Gospel Harmonies*, p. 795.

17 Cf. Metzger, *Chapters*, p. 120.

18 Cf. Metzger, *Chapters*, pp. 109-118.

Messina noted that the Persian Harmony contains passages which betray knowledge of the Protoevangelium of James in its Syriac and Ethiopic versions.[19] Furthermore, in a number of passages in the Persian Harmony Messina detected Hebraisms and not Syriacisms.[20] From this he argued that the Protoevangelium, an infancy gospel usually dated to the first half of the second century, was one of the sources of the Persian Harmony and also of Tatian's Diatessaron.[21] The author of the Syriac Harmony underlying the Persian translation must have used the Protoevangelium[22] and another gospel written in Hebrew which

19 Cf. Metzger, *Chapters*, p. 105; S. Pines, "Gospel Quotations and Cognate Topics in 'Abd al-Jabbār's *Tathbīt* in Relation to Early Christian and Judaeo-Christian Readings and Traditions," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* (JSAI) 9 (1987), pp. 195-278, esp. p. 204.
20 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lxxxi-lxxxiv.
21 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lii-lxxxiv; idem, "Lezioni apocrife nel Diatessaron Persiano," *Biblica* 30 (1949), pp. 10-27; Metzger, *Chapters*, pp. 105-06; Pines, *Gospel Quotations*, p. 204.
22 This is, for instance, supposed in the case of the text of Lk. 1: 44b (NA): ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου, »the babe in my womb leaped for joy«. The text of the Persian Harmony (text and translation in: Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. 12-13) reads here: »divenne molto esultante questo bambino, che è nel mio seno, e adorò quel bambino, che è nel tuo seno.« The text of the Protoevangelium Jacobi (edition: E. de Strycker S. J., *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* (Bruxelles 1961), p. 118) has: Ἰδοὺ γὰρ τὸ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐσκίρτησεν καὶ εὐλόγησέν σε, which is translated with (p. 119): »car voici que le (fruit qui est) en moi a tressailli et t'a bénie«. In the apparatus of de Strycker, the following observations are made:
    ιδου γαρ το Z c^P Ti Syr^{ac} Georg Bar: το γαρ BIR Pos [Arm^{ab} Aeth]
    post εμοι add. βρεφος CDF^b Arm^{ab}, item post εσκίρτησεν Bar
    post εσκίρτησεν add. εν τη κοιλια μου ADEH Syr^c Arm^{ab} Aeth,
    postea add. εν αγαλλιάσει DF^b Georg Aeth
    και ... σε Z c^P Ti Syr^{ac} Georg Bar: om. R Arm^{ab} [Aeth].
Information about the specific addition is provided by B. M. Metzger, *Chapters*, p. 105: »One of the most remarkable of these characteristics is the presence of nearly a score of passages which betray knowledge of the Protoevangelium of James. Thus, to cite only one example, the Persian text at I, 3 presents Lk. 1: 44 with a remarkable addition. Elisabeth addresses Mary as follows (in Messina's translation): 'Divenne molto esultante questo bambino, che è nel mio seno, *e adorò quel bambino, che è nel tuo seno.*' The italicized matter is paralleled in the Protoevangelium in its Syriac and Ethiopic versions.« Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, p. xxxix, also discussed the matter: »si trattava di Lc 1, 44 in M I 3, p. 13, in cui si fa dire ad Elisabetta: «Divenne molto esultante questo bambino, che è nel mio seno, *e adorò quel bambino, che è nel tuo seno*». Pensavo al Protevangelo di Giacomo, ma non poteva dare indicazioni precise; perchè, avendo consultato gli Evangeli apocrifi del Tischendorf, vi trovai una espressione estranea al testo di Luca, di cui dirò in seguito, non però quella che si trovava nell' Armonia persiana. Nè miglior fortuna ebbi confrontando la recensione siriaca dell' apocrifo. Finalmente, leggendo la recensione etiopica della stessa opera, trovai proprio quello che cercavo. Ivri si ha: «esultò il fianciullo nel mio seno con gaudio ed esultanza, *e adorò quello che è nel tuo seno*». Il testo è identico nell' etiopico e nell' Armonia persiana; l'unica differenza è che il persiano, seguendo il suo costume, invece di servirsi del pronome, si servì del nome; invece di *eum* ha «*quel bambino*».
It is not quite clear how far Metzger's conclusion »The italicized matter is paralleled in the Protoevangelium in its Syriac and Ethiopic versions« will bring us. The Syriac version published

Messina identified with the Hebrew gospel to which Eusebius and Jerome refer.[23] Petersen, however, observed that the readings drawn from the Proto-evangelium were almost without parallel in other Diatessaronic witnesses and concluded from this that they were characteristic of the tradition behind the Persian witness, and not of the Diatessaron of Tatian.[24] Messina further showed that a number of quotations from the Old Testament[25] deviate from the corresponding text of the gospels; in these cases Messina presumed that the Hebrew Old Testament or some Targum had been quoted directly by the author of the Syriac original of the Persian Diatessaron.[26] Messina also touched upon the subject of Tatian's possible rabbinical mentality, but found absolutely no proof for it. He further remarked that the Hebraizing and rabbinical coloring did not come from Tatian himself, but was derived from a source which Tatian used, other than the four gospels.[27] This led Metzger to the conclusion that Messina, in fact, was inclined to attribute to Tatian himself the composition of the Persian Harmony. Metzger pointed out, however, that the sequence of material in the other harmonies attributed to Tatian is quite different from that of the Persian Harmony and that one also must suppose that most of the non-canonical material had been expurgated from the other extant forms of Tatian's Diatessaron. In connection with this one could pose the following questions: if Tatian, as Messina assumes, is the composer of the Persian Har-

by A. Smith Lewis looks reliable, but the Ethiopic version is said to be an unstable factor. Messina (*Diatessaron Persiano*, p. 13, n. 6) refers for the addition in the Ethiopic to Marius Chaine, *Apocrypha de Beata Maria Virgine*, CSCO, Script. Aethiopici, Tomus VII, versio (Romae-Parisii 1909; reprint: Louvain 1955), pp. 8-9: »Cum audirem vocem tuam cum me salutares exultavit infans in utero meo, cum gaudio et exultatione, eumque adoravit qui est in sinu tuo.« According to de Strycker (ed., p. 38) this edition and its Latin translation are not very dependable: »La version éthiopienne est de loin la moins fidèle des versions orientales et se rapproche parfois plutôt d'une paraphrase.« However, dr. Eva-Maria Kluge (J. W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Germany) was so kind to decipher the Ethiopic text for me and assured me that Chaine's Latin translation is correct here. Cf. also the discussion of this fragment in: Pines, *Gospel Quotations*, pp. 204-206 who apart from the text of the *Tathbīt* adds a passage in Ephraem's *Hymni in Festum Epiphaniae*, Hymn I, 18 and one in Isho'dad of Merw's Syriac *Commentary to the New Testament*.

23 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lxxxiii-lxxxiv; Metzger, *Chapters*, pp. 106-107: »This source, however, is not to be confused with the *Evanglium iuxta Hebraeos ... .*«

24 Cf. W. L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 260.

25 See also Baumstark's article "Ps.-Jonathan zu Dtn 34.6 und die Pentateuchzitate Afrahats," *ZAW* N.F. 18 (1942/43), pp. 99-111.

26 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lxviii-lxxvi; Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, pp. 260-261.

27 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lxxxii-lxxxiii: »Conosciamo vari lati della mentalità di Taziano, e abbiamo trovato nel Diatessaron persiano lezioni indubbiamente conformi al suo pensiero. Ma non abbiamo neanche il più vago accenno che Taziano abbia avuto una mentalità rabbinica; anzi, tutto quello che di lui si sa, esclude ciò. Il colorito dunque ebraizzante e rabbinizzante non è stato lui ad introdurlo nel documento nostro, ma esso deriva dalla fonte di cui egli si servì, diversa dai quattro Evangeli.«

mony, who, then, is the composer of the Arabic Harmony? And, moreover, if Tatian is also the composer of the Arabic Harmony, is it plausible to accept that he is the composer of two completely different harmonies, the Arabic and the Persian? The answer to this question should be a negative one, for Messina did not base his theory on any hard facts, but was just contributing to the »public brainstorming« which often took place in the early times of Diatessaronic research.[28] Furthermore, it seemed reasonable to Metzger to assume that Tatian, because of his supposed anti-Judaic sentiments, never would have chosen as one of his sources a document so full of hebraizing and rabbinic elements.[29]

In addition to the distinctive features already noted above, there occur in the Persian Harmony several of the traits which have been generally recognized to be Tatianic: an Encratite lack of sympathy for matrimony and an antipathy against wine.[30] One of the readings which betrays these Encratite tendencies is found in John 15: 1 (Persian Harmony IV: 31) where instead of Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή, »I am the true vine« is written من درخت میوه راستی , »I am the tree of the fruit of truth.«[31] Another example is found in Luke 2: 36 (P-H I: 6) where we can read هفت سال مانده بود بکر با شوهر خود (»she remained seven years a virgin with her husband«) whereas the Greek text reads: ζήσασα μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔτη ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς (»having lived with her husband seven years from her virginity«).[32]

An early date for the composition of the underlying Syriac model of the Persian Harmony was argued by Messina on the grounds of (1) the presence of numerous agreements with the Old Syriac and divergences from the Peshitta; and (2) the inclusion of a certain amount of non-canonical matter proving that the Harmony was composed when the New Testament canon was still fluid.[33]

Metzger considered Messina's arguments inconclusive. His objection concerning Messina's first argument was that it is generally accepted that the Peshitta did not immediately supplant all Old Syriac readings. As a refutation

---

28 The most appropriate expression »public brainstorming« was introduced to me by dr. Michael Bakker (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands).

29 Cf. Metzger, *Chapters*, p. 108. One must recall, however, that anti-Judaic authors often refer to Judaic sources.

30 Cf. Metzger, *Chapters*, p. 105.

31 Cf. R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* (Cambridge 1975), pp. 95f.; T. Baarda, "An Archaic Element in the Arabic Diatessaron? (Tᵃ 46: 1 = John xv. 2)," *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975), pp. 151-155 = T. Baarda, *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus. Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the New Testament*, edd. S. J. Noorda and J. Helderman, (Amsterdam 1983), pp. 173-177; Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 34-35; Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, p. 323, n. 1.

32 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, p. 23, n. 3 and *Notizia*, pp. 59, 96, n. 2 + Intr. ad loc.

33 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. xxvi-xxix; Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 18; *Chapters*, pp. 107-109.

of Messina's second argument, Metzger pointed to the fact that authors of a somewhat similar type of literature, namely devotional lives of Christ, did not feel themselves at all inhibited by an universally recognized canon of the New Testament from introducing into their works many incidents not contained in the New Testament.[34]

Another very early date for the Vorlage of the Persian Harmony has been proposed by the art historian C. Nordenfalk on the basis of iconography.[35] According to Nordenfalk, the miniatures present at the end of the Persian codex suggest a second-century archetype. His theory met, however, a strong opposition from other art historians,[36] and subsequently Nordenfalk modified his views concerning the early date of the model of the Persian Harmony.[37]

S. Pines[38] discussed the relation between the Persian Harmony and the *Tathbīt dalā'il nubuwwat sayyidinā Muḥammad* (The Establishment of Proofs of the Prophethood of Our Master Muḥammad), a treatise written by the tenth-century Muslim theologian 'Abd al-Ǧabbār. Pines discovered that a significant number of gospel quotations from this source were identical with, or reminiscent of, passages occurring in the Persian Harmony or the works of Ephraem Syrus. Because of this, he concluded that many, perhaps all, the passages from Ephraem's works which have a counterpart in the *Tathbīt* may be drawn from the original Diatessaron of Tatian.

Pines also came to the conclusion that the Persian Harmony was not, as assumed by Messina,[39] directly translated from the Syriac in its entirety, but in part from an Arabic version of a Syriac Diatessaron.[40] Pines may not have been too far from the truth here, for even in a small pericope as the Wedding at Cana there are already some indications that an Arabic translation may have served as an intermediate between the supposed Syriac original and the Persian Harmony.[41]

A. J. B. Higgins[42] is without a doubt one of the most prolific writers on the

---

34 Cf. Metzger, *Chapters*, pp. 107-08.

35 Cf. C. Nordenfalk, "An Illustrated Diatessaron," *The Art Bulletin* 50 (1968), pp. 119-140; Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 18.

36 Cf. M. Schapiro, "The Miniatures of the Florence Diatessaron (Laurentian MS Or. 81): Their Place in Late Medieval Art And Supposed Connection with Early Christian and Insular Art," *The Art Bulletin* 55 (1973), pp. 494-531; Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 18.

37 Cf. C. Nordenfalk, "The Diatessaron Miniatures Once More," *The Art Bulletin* 55 (1973), pp. 532-546; Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 18-19.

38 In his JSAI article of 1987 (see: note 19 *supra*).

39 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lix-lxviii.

40 Cf. Pines, *Gospel Quotations*, pp. 208-209 and 256-257,

41 Cf. *infra* under 1a (the spelling of the word »Cana«), 3a (the word for »wine«), 5b (the use of the verb »farmūdan«, »to order«), 6a (the »Arabism«).

42 For a full list of Higgins's publications see note 4 *supra*.

Persian Harmony. In his publications short collations can be found of the Persian Harmony, the Arabic Diatessaron, and other texts from both the Eastern and Western traditions. Higgins considers the Arabic and the Persian harmonies »the most valuable for the task of recovering Tatian's text«.[43] He prefers the Persian Harmony to the Arabic Diatessaron mainly because the former is a more valuable witness to the Tatianic text with regard to its numerous agreements with the text of Ephraem Syrus.[44] Higgins is convinced that the »Arabic and Persian Harmonies do not necessarily present a late and inferior text whenever they agree with the Peshitta«[45] and »that both the Harmonies preserve more old and sometimes Diatessaron readings than their agreements with the Peshitta might suggest«.[46] By holding this view he is diametrically opposed to the opinion of Baumstark and Peters.

Furthermore it has been argued that the Oxford manuscript Bodleian Pococke 241, which provided the text for the Persian version in Brian Walton's Polyglot Bible, presents a good deal of affinities with the text of the Persian Harmony.[47] However, this connection is not obvious in the pericope dealing with the Wedding at Cana.

II. Text and Comments

The Persian text given here is taken from Messina's edition. For the convenience of the reader an English translation is provided, which is rather literally in cases where this was considered essential. Deviations from the exact word order of the Persian text occur only where specific idiomatic peculiarities or clarity made it necessary to abandon Persian word order. The Persian text (P-H) has been compared to the Arabic Diatessaron (T^a), the Peshitta (Sy^p) the Harclean version (Sy^h), Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron, the Persian (WPP) and Arabic (WP) versions of the gospels in the Walton Polyglot Bible, and to four Arabic texts which are often mentioned (but hardly consulted) as certain or possible witnesses for the Diatessaron: Mss. Leiden 2376, 2377, 2378 (cf. Appendix II *infra*) and all four manuscripts of the translation of the gospels by Isaac Velasquez of Cordoba (cf. Appendix I *infra*).

These texts are presented and translated here for the first time. Occasionally a reference to the Arabic gospel texts Lar (= P. de Lagarde (ed.), *Die vier*

---

43   Cf. Higgins, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 259.
44   Cf. Higgins, ibid., p. 259.
45   Cf. Higgins, ibid., p. 257; idem, *Luke 1-2*, p. 195.
46   Cf. Higgins, ibid., p. 259; idem, *Luke 1-2*, p. 195.
47   Cf. Metzger, *Early Versions*, p. 19; also Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, pp. lxxxv-xcii.

Evangelien arabisch, aus der Wiener Handschrift herausgegeben) and AB 43 (= Arabic Bible 43, Cambridge, n. d.) can be found.

The title of the pericope dealt with below reads in the Persian Harmony: چون آب را شراب کرد در قاطنه جلیل , »When He made water wine in Qāṭnah of Galilee.« The header of Walton's text (WPP) is slightly different: گردانیدن مسیح آب را شراب در عروسی قاطنه , »The Messiah made water wine at the wedding of Qāṭnah.«

John 2: 1

1a ودر سیوم روز

1b شد عروسی در قاطنه جلیل

1c ومادر عیسی أنجا بود

1a And on the-third day

1b [there] was a wedding in Qāṭnah of Galilee

1c and the-mother of Jesus was there.

1a The text »and on the third day« differs from that in WPP (روز سوم, lit. »the third day«), which may reflect the Syriac expression (Sy^p, Ephraem-Comm., cf. T^a).

1b P-H has the verb + noun (شد عروسی) at the beginning of the clause and closely follows the Syriac (ܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܐ) or the Arabic (کانت دعوة) con-struction. In WPP the verb has been placed at the end of the sentence (عروسی شد) which is more conform to the Persian idiom.

The word عروسی (*'arūsī*) has the meaning of »nuptials«, »marriage-feast«, or simply »wedding«. It reminds us of the Arabic term عرس (*'urs*), »marriage«, »wedding-feast«, found in many Arabic versions, which is a fine, alternative, reproduction of Syriac ܡܫܬܘܬܐ. T^a, however, reads in all manuscripts دعوة, »feast«, »invitation«, which likewise is an accepted rendering of Syriac ܡܫܬܘܬܐ, (cf. Sy^p.h, Ephr.-Comm.), cf. *Thesaurus*, II, col. 4350.

The spelling of the geographical name قاطنه (Qāṭnah, cf. also WPP) is derived from an Arabic or Syriac source, viz. قاطنة / قطنا or ܩܛܢܐ. Surprisingly, P-H deviates from Sy^p in omitting »a city« before »Galilee«, which is found in WPP: شهر.

1c P-H and WPP have the order »and the mother of Jesus there was« which agrees with T^a(A) and Sy^p, but this might be idiomatic in Persian. In the Greek text (and so in T^a(BEO) and Sy^h) the verb is placed at the beginning of the clause.

John 2: 2

وعیسی وشاگردان خود 2

در عروسی خوانده شدند

2 And Jesus and his disciples

were called/invited to the-wedding.

2 The Persian text (cf. WPP) has no equivalent for Greek καί = Sy^{p.h} ܘܐܦ =
Arabic T^a ايضا. P-H reads »and his disciples«, whereas WPP has »with the
disciples«.

The Persian verb (cf. also WPP) is used in the *pluralis*, cf. Sy^p, T^a (ABEO).
The verb خواندن has the meaning »to call« or »to invite«. The same ambiguity
is found in the Arabic verb دعا and in the Syriac verb ܩܪܐ, but nota bene
Syriac ܙܡܢ, »to invite« in Ephraem. The Persian differs from the Syriac »were
invited to the wedding-banquet«, but the post-position of the verb is idiomatic.

John 2: 3

شراب کم شده بود 3a

مادر عیسی گفت 3b

شراب ندارند 3c

3a The-wine had become insufficient.

3b The-mother of Jesus said:

3c wine they have not.

3a Both P-H and WPP read for »wine« شراب (*šarāb*), cf. T^a.[48] One might
think of dependency on an Arabic text, the more so because the Persian could
easily have used another term, for instance می (*mai*), see WPP in 3c. The fact
that it occurs also in WPP might suggest that both P-H and WPP go back to a
Syriac text with ܚܡܪܐ, »wine« (Sy^p, Sy^h, Ephraem).
3b P-H omits an initial conjunction (cf. WPP: و = Sy^p).

The genitive construction »(the) mother of Jesus« occurs in P-H and WPP
(instead of »his mother« as in Sy^p, Ephraem, T^a). P-H reads merely »said«,

---

48 Cf. T^a John 2: 3 (ABEO), 2: 9 (EO), 2: 10 (ABEO).

without an indirect object (»to him« in Greek, cf. Sy^h, or »to Jesus«, Sy^p, Ephr., T^a) in contrast with WPP: بعیسی, »to Jesus«.

3c The reading »not they have« (ندارند) is in agreement with the Greek text: οὐκ ἔχουσιν, but it is also possible that it is a reproduction of the Syriac (ܠܒܐ ܠܗܘܢ) or the Arabic (لیس لهم) construction. Remarkable in WPP is that it does not read شراب (cf. *supra* under 3a) here, but می (*mai*).

John 2: 4

او گفت **4a**

چرا میگویی ای مادر **4b**

هنوز وقت نرسید **4c**

4a He said:

4b why do you say [so], o mother,

4c yet time [hour] did not arrive.

4a P-H omits the initial conjunction καί (so Sy^p, T$^{a(A)}$ and the majority of Greek manuscripts; cf. BEO: ف). P-H also omits αὐτῇ in contrast to WPP (بدو, »to her«) and all other texts.

   P-H reads او, »he« (cf. Greek D) instead of ὁ Ἰησοῦς = ܝܫܘܥ Sy$^{p.h}$ = WPP ایسوع = T^a ABEO = عیسی.

4b In contrast to the usual text »what (is) to me and to you« (so also Sy$^{p.h}$, Ephr.-Comm.), which is also reflected in WPP: چه کار داری با من, »what is your business with me«, »what do you want«, P-H has the very unusual rendering چرا میگویی, »why do you say [so]«, which in fact is a harsh and rather agressive expression.

   »O mother« instead of the ordinary »o woman« (so WPP: ای زن) contrasts sharply with the preceding words. Therefore, it may be seen as a »soothing« of the apparently harsh expression چرا میگویی.

4c The only difference – apart from the idiomatic inversion – is that P-H (in contrast with WPP: وقت من) reads وقت »the time« (or: »the hour«), without the possessive pronoun.

   The Arabic word وقت is also found in Isaac Velasquez's text (cf. Appendix I). The reading of the Arabic Diatessaron is far more interesting here, because it introduces the interrogative particle (ا) at the beginning of the clause. This

particle occurs mainly in negative questions.[49] The particle is followed by لم +
imperfect (apocopate), which has the function of the perfect tense. However,
the usage of لم (instead of لا) with the imperfect designating the present (»has
not come my hour?«) is contrary to classical usage, and due to hypercorrection[50]:
in his desire to use classical forms and avoid those of MA, the author or scribe
overshoots the mark and utilizes features peculiar to the language of prestige
(CA) even in positions which demand forms found equally in the lower language
(MA), thus using features in an overly-correct manner.[51] Marmardji in his
edition of the Arabic Diatessaron proposes to change the wording الم تجي,
»n'est-elle pas venue?« into لم تجئ (particle; with following apocopate: »not«,
»not yet«) = ܠܐ ܚܙܕܠ ܐܬܕܬ, »n'est pas encore venue«. Apparently, Mar-
mardji does not want to maintain the interrogative sentence of the Arabic
text, because the Greek text does not seem to support it. In fact, the Greek
οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου, adequately rendered in Syriac with ܠܐ ܚܙܕܠ ܐܬܕܬ
ܚܒܚܕ, Sy[p] and Ephraem, supports the positive sentence. However, in one of
Ephraem's comments (V: 2, Syr. 38: 17) we find an indication that the »interro-
gative« interpretation was acceptable in Syriac exegesis: ܠܐ ܚܒܚܕ ܐܬܕܬ
ܐܬܕܬ ܡܐ ܕܝ ܗܘܐ ܚܒܚܕ, »not yet has come my hour, that is: yes, it has
come«. The explanation suggests that the phrase could be understood as a
question.[52] It is, therefore, most likely that the Arabic translator understood it
as such.

John 2: 5

5a مادر بخدمتگاران گفت

5b آنچه بفرمايد چنين كنى

5a The-mother said to the-servants:

5b whatever he commands, so do.

5a P-H reads »the mother« instead of »his mother« against all other witnesses,
and also against WPP: مادر عيسى, »the mother of Jesus«.

49　Cf. Joshua Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic*, 3 vols. (Louvain 1966-67), II, p. 297; § 193;
　　cf. there n. 6.

50　*a-lam* may also have been employed by the author/scribe to avoid confusion with the inten-
　　sifying interjection *a-lā*, »truly«, »verily«.

51　Cf. Blau, *Grammar*, II, p. 304; § 203.

52　Cf. L. Leloir, *Le témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron*, (CSCO 227; Subsidia 19), Louvain,
　　1962, pp. 112 f.

5b The reading انچه, »whatever«, »that what« is also found in Sy[h]: ܡܕܡ ܕܐܟ (Sy[p], Ephraem-Comm.: ܡܕܡ ܕ). Sy[h] is an attempt to render ὅ τι ἄν in a literal way. Here WPP has هرچه, »everything that«.

The Persian text has the verb فرمودن, »to order«, »to command«, which may presuppose a Syriac model (ܐܡܪ, cf. Sy[p.h]), but interpreted in the Arabic sense,[53] cf. Persian امر which has also the meaning of »order«, »command«. The verb امر, »to order« can be found in the Arabic versions of Velasquez (MA, BM) and in Lar-WP.[54] However, in the Persian text of WPP (بگوید) we have the usual verb »he says« in agreement with قال (= Syriac ܐܡܪ) as found in Velasquez (MB, L), Leiden Mss. 2376, 2377, 2378, AB 43). Contrary to WPP (بشما), P-H omits the pronoun »to you«.

The Persian Harmony further presents us with an addition: چنین, »so«, »thus«, which is absent from WPP and does not occur in the Syriac sources and T[a], but one may compare the initial - ف, »so«, »thus« found in the Arabic versions Leiden Ms. 2378 and AB 43, which may have the same meaning.

John 2: 6

6a وبود آنجا حوضهای سنگین شش

6b برای وضو یهودیان نهاده بودند

6c وهر یکی دو سه پیمانه می گنجید

6d وخلق در بزمگاه نشسته بودند

6a And there were fonts of stone, six

6b for the-sacred ablution of the-Jews they were placed

6c and each one could contain two, three measures

6d and the-people were sitting in the-banqueting-house.

6a The clause opens in a quite unusual way with the verb بود, which would normally have been positioned at the end of the clause following Persian idiom. Moreover, the singular form is given here instead of the plural بودند (cf. 6bd). An explanation for these phenomena can be found by looking more closely at the potential *Vorlage(n)* of the Persian harmony. For instance, in T[a]

---

53 For a similar problem: cf. Joosse, *Sermon*, p. 163, n. 301.

54 Cf. T. Baarda, *The Wedding at Cana in the Gospel of Barnabas* (unpublished article) for the usage of the verb »to order«. Baarda shows that the verb »chomando« has been used instead of λέγει (Syr. ܐܡܪ), which could mean that the Italian text ultimately goes back to an Arabic text composed with the help of another Semitic text (a Syriac version?).

we also find the verb in the singular (کان) and positioned at the beginning of the clause. But the Syriac tradition (Sy$^{p.h}$, cf. Ephraem-Comm.) presents us with ܐܝܬ ܗܘܘ, »there were« (at the beginning of the clause, but in the plural). Here the Persian text could have been translated from the Arabic. This may strenghten the conviction that, besides a Syriac text, the Persian translator also used Arabic models: possibly the Arabic Diatessaron and/or other Arabic translations of the separate gospels.[55]

WPP offers a quite different rendering: وبدانجا طشتها بود از سنگ, »and there were bowls of stone«. WPP omits the numeral »six« against the Syriac texts.

6b P-H (so WPP) presents us with the reading وضو, »sacred ablution«. The Syriac tradition (Sy$^{p.h}$, Ephraem-Comm.) reads ܬܕܟܝܬܐ, »cleansing«, »purification«. T^a (A-E-O) offer طهور, »cleansing«. T^a (B) has طهر, »purity«. The root و-ض-ء can also be found in one of our Arabic versions (Velasquez): لیتوضا به, »to perform ablution with it«.

6c In contrast with other witnesses P-H omits the conjunction »or« between the numerals »two« and »three«.

6d The addition is quite interesting. It is not found in the Arabic and Syriac tradition. It is also omitted in WPP. In the narrative it is assumed that there were other guests present at the marriage in Cana, but they are not explicitly mentioned here.[56]

John 2: 7

7a یشوع بدیشان گفت

7b پر کنید این حوضها از آب

7c وپر کردند لب بلب

7a Jesus said to them:

7b fill these fonts with water

7c and they filled them to the-edge.

7a P-H agrees with most witnesses in omitting a conjunction »and« as found in Mss. B-E-O of T^a. WPP rephrases the sentence »Jesus commanded ...«

---

55 That this is also Pines's conviction we may gather from his *Gospel Quotations*, pp. 195-278, especially pp. 256-257, cf. also Joosse, *Sermon*, pp. 36-38; idem, *Introduction*, p. 109.

56 We may refer for this to the expansion in Sy^n John 2: 9: »and when they saw this what happened, they were amazed«.

which may ultimately go back to the Syriac reading ܐܡܪ (see above under clause 5b: »say« > »order«).

7b The addition این, »these« could be explained through the Syriac ܗܠܝܢ (Sy^{p.h}). It is also present in the Arabic gospel text of Velasquez: هذه.

7c P-H offers the reading لب بلب, »to the edge«, »to the brim« (literally: »lip on lip«), cf. WPP: مالامال, »heaped«, »brimful«.

John 2: 8

8a –

8b ... وبدهيد سرور مجلس را

8c آورده اند [Read: آوردند]

8d وبسرور مجلس داده اند [Read: دادند]

8a –

8b ... and give them to the-master of the-feast

8c they brought them

8d and to the-master of the feast they gave them.

The text of clause 8a and the beginning of clause 8b have been left out in P-H.
8a This omission came perhaps into being under the influence of clause 7a *supra*: یشوع بدیشان گفت, »Jesus said to them«. One could also think of a parablepsis error caused by ܠܚܠ ... ܡܚܒ, but this would presuppose a Syriac text as »Vorlage«. An inner-Persian omission could also be reckoned among the possibilities (for instance بر کشید ... پر کردند).
8b P-H has only the second part of the clause. So it does not have a rendering for Sy^p: ܐܘܠܚ, »draw, pour out« (Sy^h: ܗܠܕ, »draw out«) and Arabic Diatessaron اخرجوا, »bring out« (A) or اغرفوا, »ladle out« (B-E-O). P-H and WPP read »give« instead of the usual »bring« (cf. for instance *date* instead of *ferte* in Old Latin e).
8c P-H (so WPP) omits a conjunction.
Moreover, P-H has two verbs: آورده اند »they have brought« and داده اند »they have given« for Syriac ܐܘܬܝܘ. Despite this double translation P-H agrees more with the Syriac than with the Arabic text. WPP offers the wording: ایشان فرمان بردند, »they executed the command«, which may approximate T^{a(A)} وفعلوا, »and they did«. The Arabic manuscripts B-E-O omit the clause.
8d We have already noted the double translation (see above ad 8c), but apart

from this addition P-H also explicitly mentions that they gave it بسرور مجلس,
»to the master of the feast«, an addition not found elsewhere. However, P-H
omits the expression in the next verse.

John 2: 9

9a آن آب که شراب شد چشید

9b ونمی دانست از کجا بود

9c ساقیان می دانستند زیرا ایشان از آب پر کرده بودند

9d خواند سرور مجلس داماد را

9a That water that had become wine he tasted

9b and he did not know where it came from

9c the-cup-bearers knew that, for they had filled them (= the fonts) with
water

9d the-master of the-feast called the-son-in-law.

9a P-H which added »the master of the feast« in clause 8d, omits it here. It is
found in WPP (وچون سرور مجلس), which apparently follows the Syriac (محد
ܐܢܐ ܣܥܕܬܟ ...) which is the usual reading. But remarkably enough, WPP
leaves out »the water that had become ...«, and reads »of that wine«, and adds
after از ان شراب چشید, »tasted of that[57] wine«, the following phrase: عظیم
خوش طعم بود, »[that] was of real sweet [or: excellent] flavour [or: taste][58]«,
which reminds us of a specific reading that is found in the Arabic manuscript
Leiden 2378: »that had become *the sweetest [or: the choicest]* of wine«.
ونمی دانست از کجا بود **9b**. This phrase is a good rendering of both the Syriac
and Arabic texts.
9c Instead of »the-servants« (so WPP: چاکران) P-H reads ساقیان, »the-cup-
bearers«.
   The word می (*mī*) is a particle prefixed to Persian verbs generally indicating
the present or preterite imperfect tense.[59]
   P-H and WPP read »had filled« (= Sy^p, Sy^h: محد) instead of »had drawn«.
9d P-H and WPP present us here with the word داماد, »son-in-law« or »the-

---

57   The Arabic version Ms. Leiden 2378 has the reading »their wine«.

58   The root طعم is also found in Arabic Ms. Leiden 2378 in the sense of »to taste«.

59   Cf. F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, new reprint, (Beirut 1975),
     p. 1357.

newly-married«. The explanation is that Arabic الختن (so T[a], Leiden 2376-77) and Syriac ܚܬܢܐ (Sy[p.h], Ephraem-Comm.) have the meanings »son-in-law« and »bridegroom«.[60]

John 2: 10

10a وبدو گفت

10b هر کسی اول شراب نیك بیاورد

10c چون خلق مست شوند آنگه شراب بد بیاورد

10d تو نگهداشتی شراب نیك تا اینساعت

10a And to him he said:

10b Usually they serve the good wine first

10c when people become drunk, they serve the-bad wine

10d but you kept the-good wine until this hour.

10a The wording of P-H matches that of the Arabic (وقال له) and of the Syriac (ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ).

10b P-H presents us with the verb »to bring« (cf. Sy[p], Ephraem-Comm.: ܐܢܫ ܡܚܬ ܠܘܩܕܡ ܚܡܪܐ ܛܒܐ, cf. the Arabic versions Lar and WP). In the Persian the verb can also have a second meaning »to present« as in the case of the Arabic Diatessaron: كل انسان انما يقدم اولاً الشراب الجيد (cf. Sy[h], cf. the Arabic versions Leiden 2376-77). WPP presents us with a remarkable reading here: »at a wedding and a banquet first the good wine they drink«.

10c P-H has »the-bad wine« instead of the Syriac ܗܘ ܕܒܨܝܪ/ܐܝܟ, »the one that is poor« or T[a]: ما] هو دون [بل, «[with] what is beneath [it]«, cf. Ephraem-Comm.: ܒܣܝܐ, »the-mean [wine]«. P-H offers the addition »he brings« (cf. T[a], cf. Arabic versions Lar, WP, and Leiden 2378: فآتيت »you brought«). P-H adds a verb which is identical to the verb in clause 10b: بیاورد. P-H adds (against WPP) that *the people* (خلق) will become drunk (cf. *homines* in Vg E R Old Latin a f q).

10d P-H omits a conjunction, cf. WPP: و; cf. T[a(B)]. P-H moreover reads تا, الى الآن, »until this hour«, cf. WPP: تا این ساعت.[61] T[a] offers here اینساعت [او].

---

60 The Arabic version Leiden 2378 has the reading الصهر, »the son-in-law«, but Velasquez, Lar, WP have »the bridegroom«: العروس; AB 43 العريس.

61 See also Old Latin e and l: »usque (in) hanc horam«.

»until now«. The Persian expression could be nothing more nor less than a reproduction of the Syriac ܠܗܫܐ .

WPP presents us with a interrogative clause: »why (چرا) did you preserve the good wine until this hour?«

John 2: 11

11a اینست اول شگفت که عیسی کرد

11b در قاطنه جلیل

11c قوت خدا آشکار کرد

11d وشاگردان او بدو ایمان آوردند

11a This is the-first wonder that Jesus performed

11b in Qāṭnah of Galilee

11c the-power of God he made manifest

11d and his disciples believed in him.

11a P-H has the reading شگفت (*shigift, shiguft*), »wonder«, »miracle« whereas the text of the Arabic Diatessaron offers الآية, »sign«, »mark«, »wonder« (so Arabic versions Lar, WP, Leiden Ms. 2378; Leiden Mss. 2376-77, AB 43: likewise, but *pluralis*), cf. the Syriac ܐܬܐ, »sign«, »mark«, »token«. P-H explicitly speaks of a miracle, which reminds us of the use of »miraculum« in some western texts (cf. the Venetian, Pepysian, and Liège harmonies). However, one has to keep in mind that both the Syriac and the Arabic texts have the connotation »miracle«. Therefore, it is quite likely that the Persian word in P-H (cf. also WPP: معجزه) is merely a rendering of either of these words. The wording »first miracle« agrees also with that of Sy^p: ܐܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ and T^a: الآية الاولى. The relative construction in P-H and WPP: که عیسی کرد, »that Jesus did«, is likewise in agreement with that in Sy^p (ܕܥܒܕ ܝܫܘܥ) and T^a (التي فعل ايسوع).

11b P-H is in agreement with the Syriac sources: ܩܛܢܐ ܕܓܠܝܠܐ and T^a: بقاطنة الجليل (cf. clause 1b *supra*).

11c قوت خدا اشکار کرد, »(the) *power* of God he made manifest [= manifested]«.[62] The Arabic Diatessaron exhibits the common reading واظهر مجده, »he mani-

---

62 Cf. Messina, *Diatessaron Persiano*, p. cx; here Messina is referring (quoting from Baumstark's »schedario«) to the Liège and Venetian harmonies, Maximus Taur. sermo 9 (PL 57, 550 A), Missale Gothicum, praef. Vigiliae of the Epiphany et cetera.

fested *his glory*«, cf. the Syriac ܘܐܚܘܝ ܫܘܒܚܗ. The Arabic version of Velasquez reads واظهر قدرته, »and he manifested *his power*«. WPP reads: وعظمتش را دانستند, »and they learned about his magnificence«.

11d P-H gives the wording وشاگردان او بدو ایمان آوردند, »and his disciples they showed [literally: »they brought«] belief in him«. The verb آوردن, »to bring« might seem a little bit out of place here, but since antiquity it is a collocation of frequent occurrence in the Persian language.[63] Moreover, we should observe here that the function of آوردن is merely that of an auxiliary verb. So there is no need to translate it. Therefore, the phrase may be rendered as »they believed in him«.

III. Conclusion

We decided to choose a small pericope such as the Wedding at Cana (Jn. 2: 1-11) because it has the advantage that, as a kind of microcosm, it gives us a keen insight into the particulars and difficulties of a very complicated tradition.[64]

A disadvantage was that the Old Syriac sources could not be consulted here. The only Syriac texts we had at our disposal were Sy^p, Sy^h, and in several cases Ephraem's *Commentary*. Therefore, we could not deduce sufficient relevant information from the text to reconstruct the Syriac »Vorlage« of the Persian Harmony.

Comparing the Persian Harmony to these Syriac texts, to the four manuscripts of the Arabic Diatessaron and the other Arabic gospel texts, we reach the conclusion that P-H often reflects the Syriac texts, for instance in case of 1a; 3c; 5b; 7a; 7b; 8c; 9b; 9c; 10b; 11a; 11b. In 5b the Persian text may presuppose a Syriac model, but interpreted in the Arabic sense.

In 3a and 6a the Persian text may have been translated from an Arabic text. In case of 1b and 9a P-H differs from both the Arabic Diatessaron and the Syriac sources. In 6d and 8d there are additions which are not found in the Arabic and the Syriac tradition. Where the Persian text is in conformity with the manuscripts of the Arabic Diatessaron, it is more than once with Ms. A: 1c; 7a, cf. 8c. The agreement of P-H with the other Arabic gospel texts is rather limited. Although Ms. Leiden 2378 (in my view the only one of the

---

63 Compare for instance the German construction »jemandem Glauben entgegenbringen«.
64 Other parts of P-H (e. g. John 1-5 and Matthew 5: 1-7: 29) were studied in the same manner. These parts were also compared to the Arabic Diatessaron and the various Syriac sources. The results were more or less the same. The pericope John 2: 1-11 therefore gives us a good insight into the overall tradition.

three Leiden manuscripts which is actually based on a Syriac model; cf. Appendix II *infra*) presents us with a very interesting reading in 9a.

Likewise, we are not able to find any evidence for the presence of Tatianic readings within this text. Although P-H remains an interesting and often startling witness with regard to Diatessaronic research, in the future one should consider to use it solely as a secondary witness because it has in fact little to do with the Diatessaron tradition itself.

APPENDIX I:
The Arabic Text of Isaac Velasquez of Cordoba

In 946 A. D. a certain Isḥāq ibn Balashk, or Balishak (Isaak Velasquez) of Cordoba, Spain made a translation of the four gospels[65] which is preserved in four complete manuscripts,[66] and a short fragment[67] that contains the prologue to the gospels.

Velasquez's gospel text was used by the famous Andalusian Muslim scholar Ibn Ḥazm who quoted from it in his *Kitāb al-faṣl fī'l-milal wa'l-ahwā' wa'l-niḥal.*

65 Isaac Velasquez of Cordoba may at least have translated the text of Luke as becomes clear from the prologue to this specific gospel. His name is omitted from the remaining prologues; but cf. G. Graf, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur bis zur fränkischen Zeit (Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts). Ein Literarhistorische Skizze* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1905), p. 27: »Übersetzt wurde es (sc. das Lukasevangelium, und natürlich ebenso die andern) im Jahre 946 von Isḥâq b. Bališak (so vokalisiert) al-Qurtabî.« That Isḥāq also translated the other gospels is not so »natürlich« as Graf wants us to believe and for the time being this remains to be seen.

66 1) Ms. MA = München Aumer ar. 238 (1394 A. D.); 2) Ms. MB = München Aumer ar. 234 (1492 A. D.); 3) Ms. BM = British Museum ar. christ. 13, add 9061 (14th or rather 15th century or even later); 4) Ms. L = Ms. Cathedral of León, ACL n° 35, Spain (1137 A. D.) – cf. I. Guidi, "Le traduzioni degli Evangelii in arabo e etiopico," *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, serie IV, vol. IV, parte 1a: Memorie (Roma 1888), pp. 5-37, especially pp. 28 ff.; H. Goussen, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur der Mozaraber* (Leipzig 1909), pp. 12-13; G. Graf, *CGAL*, I, p. 167. A study of the language employed in Ms. München Aumer ar. 238 has been written by K. Römer, *Der Codex Arabicus Monacensis Aumer 238*, dissertation (Leipzig 1905), continued in: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 19 (1905-06), pp. 98-125 (incomplete). Ms. München Aumer ar. 238 has also been registered by P. Sj. van Koningsveld, "Andalusian-Arabic Manuscripts from Christian Spain: A Comparative Inter-cultural Approach," *Israel Oriental Studies* XII (1992), pp. 75-110, especially p. 98, but it is surprising to learn that van Koningsveld does not mention Velasquez as the author. Moreover, he does not pay attention at all to the second München manuscript and neglects to record the Léon and London manuscripts.

67 Ms. LEIP = Leipzig Univ. or. 1059 B (Tischendorf xxxi B, earlier than the 9th century); cf. F. Taeschner, "Die Monarchianischen Prologe zu den vier Evangelien in der spanisch-arabischen Bibelübersetzung des Isaak Velasquez nach der Münchener Handschrift cod. arab 238," *OrChr* 32 (1935), pp. 80-99.

It is commonly accepted that its »Vorlage« is a Latin text. According to G. Graf the Arabic text seems to reveal a close relationship to the Spanish Vulgate texts Codex Cavensis (C) and Codex Toletanus (T) of respectively the ninth and the tenth century.[68] According to A. Baumstark, it is clear that the »Vorlage« of Velasquez's translation of the gospels was strongly influenced by the Latin *Vulgata*, but essentially its Latin text must have preserved many Old Latin features. In his view the underlying (hypothetical!) Old Latin text of Velasquez's »Vorlage« must have been very close to the text of the original Syriac Diatessaron, for the Arabic text is said to contain hundreds and hundreds of Old Latin readings of a specific Syriac-Latin character which to a large extent have preserved Diatessaronic textual elements.[69] This could perhaps be true for some parts of the text, but it needs to be said here that the supposed Syriac coloration is almost or rather completely absent from the pericope on the Wedding at Cana. It should be noticed that this is the case in all four of the Velasquez manuscipts. Moreover, Baumstark's theory does not seem to be the result of original thinking. It is an exact copy of the hypothesis which D. Plooij developed in the early 1920s concerning the sources of *The Liège Diatessaron* or the *Liège Life of Jesus*. Plooij held that the Dutch text had been translated from an Old Latin Harmony which in its turn was translated directly from a Syriac text which was unaffected by the standard medieval Vulgate-type harmony *(Codex Fuldensis)*, and which ultimately reached back to the primitive Diatessaron of Tatian.[70] Plooij's hypothesis was challenged by C. C. de Bruin, who pointed to medieval exegetical sources for the Dutch text such as the *Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria* or to a subgroup of glossed Harmony manuscripts.[71] However, De Bruin never published a study to support his view. In a recent study Den Hollander and Schmid convincingly proved that De Bruin's view was justified. They showed that the *Glossa Ordinaria* was the most important source for *The Liège Diatessaron*.[72]

---

68 Cf. Graf, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur bis zur fränkischen Zeit*, p. 27; cf. Baumstark, *Markus Kap. 2*, p. 227 (For a full title: note 69 *infra*).

69 Cf. A. Baumstark, "Das Problem der Bibelzitate in der syrischen Übersetzungsliteratur," *OrChr*, 3rd series 8 (1933) = whole series 30, pp. 208-225; *ibid.*, "Neue orientalistische Probleme biblischer Textgeschichte," *ZDMG* 89 (1935), pp. 89-118, especially 107-109; *ibid.*, "Markus Kap. 2 in der arabischen Übersetzung des Isaak Velasquez veröffentlicht und unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Zusammenhangs mit dem Diatessaron gewürdigt," *OrChr*, 3rd series 9 (1934) = whole series 31, pp. 226-239; cf. also C. Peters, *Das Diatessaron Tatians*, (OrChrA 123), Roma, 1939, pp. 175-177.

70 Cf. A. den Hollander and U. Schmid, "Middeleeuwse bronnen van het Luikse «Leven van Jezus»," *Queeste* – Tijdschrift over Middeleeuwse Letterkunde in de Nederlanden 6 (1999), pp. 127-146, p. 143.

71 Cf. Den Hollander and Schmid, *Middeleeuwse bronnen*, p. 143.

72 Cf. Den Hollander and Schmid, ibid., pp. 142-143.

Peters called Baumstark's study on Mark 2 of the Velasquez text a »vorbild-liche Arbeit«.[73] However, one should treat Baumstark's article with some prudence, for Baumstark is completely mistaken in cases where he states that a specific variant reading does not occur in manuscripts of the Latin *Vulgata*.[74] For example, in eight major cases (f, g, i, n, o, cc, mm and nn) where, according to Baumstark, there was no support from the Vulgate, Vulgate readings actually exist.[75] We shall now compare these cases with WW (= J. Wordsworth/H. White, *Novum Testamentum*, Oxford, 1889-1898): **f** = + Jesus; WW: erat + ihs, in 5 Vulgate Mss. (including E, H^1, Q); **g** = *om.* patefacientes; WW: omission also in Vulgate Ms. G; **o** = vade; WW: ambula: uade, in Vulgate Ms. B; **cc** = filii sponsi; WW: in 3 Vulgate Mss. (G, M, Q)[76]; **mm** = + discipuli tui; WW: + discipuli tui, in 12 Vulgate Mss. (including B, G, H^1, K, L, M, O, Q, V, X, Z); **nn** = + eis; WW = + eis, in 2 Vulgate Mss. (+ eis, in G; + eis facere, in Q).

i and **n** = according to Baumstark both remissa sunt (cf. T^n: syn di vergheven according to Lk. 5: 23: ἀφέωνται). The Arabic reads غفرت لك in both cases which of course represents dimittuntur instead of remissa sunt. This is a standard formula in Arabic (see also T^a ix: 35 = Mt. 6: 12; ix: 37 = Mt. 6: 14; ix: 38 = Mt. 6: 15 and x: 13^c = Lk. 6: 37^c) from which serious authors hardly deviate. In a word, the specific rendering reflects a tradition and on that account a laudible principle of translation. Baumstark's option is therefore clearly invalid. Of the eight major cases Baumstark has put forward, which would have preserved an Old Latin reading »im Gegensatz zu aller Vulg.-Überlieferung«, six have a parallel in one or more Vulgate manuscripts. In the remaining two (similar) cases Baumstark mis-interpreted the data and as a logical consequence drew the wrong conclusion. It should be added that in four of the six cases under consideration here we are dealing with an omission or an interpolation, which are not the best examples to illustrate interdependency, that is kinship revealing relations. Preparing a text-critical edition of the Velasquez text is certainly not advisable.[77] The manuscripts MB-L are strongly accommodated to the Latin Vulgate and present us with more or less

---

73 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, p. 176.

74 Cf. Baumstark, *Markus Kap. 2*, p. 229.

75 I am much obliged to Prof. dr. August den Hollander (University of Amsterdam, The Nether-lands) and dr. habil. Ulrich Schmid (Gütersloh, Germany) for subjecting Baumstark's article to a closer investigation with regard to the Latin and presumed Old Latin readings.

76 Cf. Baumstark, *Markus Kap. 2*, p. 237: »das auch noch einige Vulg.-Hss. bewahrt haben [sic!]«.

77 Contra Baumstark, *Neue orientalistische Probleme*, 109: »Die Bedeutung der Übersetzung des Velasquez ist aber eine derartige, daß als Grundlage ihrer endgültigen Verwertung eine kritische Ausgabe auf Grund des ganzen (...) verzeichneten handschriftlichen Materials uner-läßlich sein wird.«

literal translations of the Latin text. Manuscript BM is a mixed text with a very limited text-critical value. A more promising enterprise would be an edition and translation of manuscript MA, which once belonged to the famous orientalist Johann Albrecht Widmannstetter (Nellingen [Blaubeuren] 1506 – Regensburg 1557). The manuscript is dated to August 1394 A. D. and was copied by an anonymous scribe from a manuscript which was completed in March and November 1145 A. D. in the North-African (Moroccan) city of Fez (in the circles of Andalusian Christians who were banished to Morocco) by the deacon Abū ʿUmar ibn Yuwān ibn ʿAišūn who wrote it for a person called Ibrahīm ibn Ḫair. Manuscript MA deviates from the standard Latin Vulgate text quite clearly and often offers interesting variant readings. However, Baumstark's judgment that the text of MA contains hundreds and hundreds of Old Latin readings of a specific Syriac-Latin character is far from convincing.[78] The Syriac influence on the Arabic text is in fact rather limited. One would even be tempted to question the occurrence of any Syriac influence at all were it not for the fact that the Arabic text sometimes evokes the pretence of a possible Syriac origin.[79] But for instance, in the many cases where, according

---

78 But Baumstark, *Markus Kap. 2*, p. 230: »Beweisend für einen Zusammenhang mit dem Diatessaron ist im Raume abendländischen Evangelientextes endlich immer wieder in allerhöchstem Grade die Berührung mit syrischem. Hier liegen nun die Verhältnisse gerade in Mk. 2 allerdings von vornherein besonders ungünstig *[sic!]*, weil Syrᶜ für das gesamte Markusevangelium fehlt und in Syrˢ von Mk.1 44 bis 2 21 eine Lücke klafft, so daß für beinahe volle drei Viertel des Textes nur Peš. zum Vergleiche zu Gebote steht, in der ja das mit dem Diatessaron zusammenhängende Gut altsyrischer Überlieferung durch die Überarbeitung nach einem griechischen Normaltext des 5. Jahrhunderts stark zurückgedrängt ist.«

79 Cf. Baumstark, *Neue orientalistische Probleme*, p. 108. In Lk. 4: 9 the Arabic text reads على صخرة البيت (upon the rock of the house) for Vulgate *super pinnam templi* (on the pinnacle of the temple), which may point to a clerical error viz. Syriac ܟܐܦܐ (stone, rock, column) instead of ܟܢܦܐ (outer part, wing, pinnacle). Cf. Tᵃ: على طرف الهيكل (on the pinnacle of the temple). However, بيت (house; Syriac ܒܝܬܐ = also temple!) instead of هيكل (temple) is also rather awkward. It reminds us for instance of Lk. 6: 48ᵃ (Mt. 7: 24ᵇ) = Tᵃ x: 45 (Ms. B): »he shall be like the wise man, who built his house (بنا بيتًا), and dug and deepened, and laid the foundations on a rock (على صخرة)«. But could it be the case that the Arabic translator remembered the text of Lk. 6: 48 while he was working on Lk. 4: 9? Cf. for instance also Velasquez, Ms. L: Mt. 7: 24: بنى بيته على صخرة (he built his house on a rock). In the second fragment (pp. 108-109), Baumstark introduces the reading »populus qui« in Mt. 4: 16 in the Vulgate text of Ibn Ḥazm which is rendered as كل من (everyone who, whoever) in the text of Velasquez (Ms. MA). Baumstark explains this as follows: »was sich nur daraus erklärt, daß dem von diesem übersetzten altlateinischen Text eine Korruptel des in Syrᶜᵘʳ vorliegenden syrischen ܥܡܐ ܕ (das Volk, das) in ܟܠ ܕ (was auch immer) zugrunde lag.« This would, however, be highly unlikely, for ܟܠ ܕ would not lead to a translation كل من, but to من (وكل من, but to من كل though!). Apart from this, there is no reason to assume that Ms. MA had a(ny) Vulgate text as its direct model; it is in fact the only Velasquez manuscript that differs considerably from the Latin Vulgate (*sed* cf. Ms. L: الامة which gives an exact rendering of the Latin Vulgate). The solution of these riddles could perhaps be found in the medieval Latin exegetical tradition. However, any Syriac influence may be explained by the

to Baumstark, the text of Velasquez is in agreement only with the Liège Diatessaron,[80] the possibility may also exist that their common source is not a Syriac text, but for example a medieval exegetical source like the *Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria*. Moreover, we should not forget that Velasquez finished his translation of the gospels in the year 946 A. D., whereas manuscript MA is dated to 1394 A. D. Between the two texts lies a gap of 448 years. The original text of Velasquez (represented by the manuscripts MB-L), which according to me reflects the standard Latin Vulgate text, may have been altered at various points in the course of its tradition. Therefore, the most plausible inference is that the text of manuscript MA may likewise have undergone considerable changes during the long interval of nearly five centuries, i. e. a certain influence by medieval exegetical sources in the Latin language. Consequently, it may not come as a surprise that this new situation [Vel. (MA) = (T^a) = T^n ≠ Syr., Vel. (MA) = (T^a) = T^n = Lat.^{ex}] will lead to a completely different description of textual tradition. It will reject both Plooij and Baumstark's theories and rehabilitate De Bruin's views on the subject (the latter is due to the profound study of Den Hollander and Schmid).

We already made an effort to refute some of Baumstark's major variant readings above. A thorough study of all the variant readings given by Baumstark and a comparison of these variant readings with medieval Latin exegetical sources (glossed Harmony manuscripts seem to be irrelevant in this specific case) would certainly clarify the opaque situation in which the text presently finds itself.[81] However, the purpose of this appendix is not to scrutinize Baumstark's article. Although I need to emphasize it again here that there are proper causes to doubt the existence of a Syriac model behind Isaac Velasquez's

eventuality that the copyist of Ms. MA used other Arabic translations of the gospels (which to some extent may have preserved a Syriac coloration) to control and correct his work.

80 Cf. Baumstark, *Markus Kap. 2*, p. 230.
81 The variant readings given by Baumstark are far from convincing. His strong plea for a Syriac background of the Arabic text seems to be a self-fulfilling prophecy which is prompted by D. Plooij's hypothesis regarding the *Liège Diatessaron*. Den Hollander ("Het Luikse «Leven van Jezus». Een Nederlandse evangelienharmonie uit de dertiende eeuw," *Queeste* – Tijdschrift over Middeleeuwse Letterkunde in de Nederlanden 6 (1999), pp. 99-111, p. 105, note 37) remarked the following: »Plooij wees in de tekst van het Luikse Leven van Jezus tevens meerdere voorbeelden van 'syriasmen' aan. Anderen hebben later aangetoond dat de voorbeelden meer Plooij's enthousiasme illustreerden dan een eventuele Syrische oorsprong.« It may be not too far from the truth to state that also Baumstark's examples of Syriacisms in Mk. 2 may be the product of fervent enthusiasm and wishful thinking. That Baumstark drew heavily upon the work of Plooij also becomes clear from "The Baumstark-archive," a collection of over a thousand index cards (slips) in Baumstark's handwriting (curators: Den Hollander and Schmid; present location: Free University of Amsterdam), cf. for the account of Den Hollander and Schmid with regard to the archive: H. Ariëns, "Elke snipper is waardevol," *Akademie Nieuws. Nieuwsbrief van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen over de Akademie en de Akademie-instituten*, Twaalfde jaargang, nr. 56: februari 2000, pp. 2-6.

Arabic translation of the gospels. Baumstark's student Curt Peters adhered the same working method as his teacher and assumed Syriac (instead of Greek) models behind the Leiden manuscripts 2376 and 2377 (see Appendix II *infra*). One may want to query this assumption as well.

(1a) The Text of **Ms. MA = München Aumer 238 (A. D. 1394)** of Jn. 2: 1-11

The Wedding at Cana

(1) وفي اليوم الثالث صنع عرس بكنعان جلجال وكانت بها ام يسوع حاضرة (2) فدعي يسوع وتلاميذه الى العرس (3) فلما عجزهم الشراب قالت ام يسوع له ليس عندهم شراب (4) فقال لها يسوع ما لي ولك ايتها المراة لم يتدان وقتي (5) فقالت امه للخدمة افعلوا ما امركم به من شيئ (6) فكان عندهم ست جرات رخام موضوعة يعد فيها الما ليتوضا به اليهود على حال سنتهم وكانت تحمل كل جرة من الكيل الذي يدعى ماطرش اثنين او ثلاثة (7) فقال لهم يسوع املوا هذه الجررما فملوها الى افواهها (8) فقال لهم يسوع استقوا منها الان واذهبوا به الى صاحب المجلس فذهبوا به (9) فلما ذاق المقدم الما الذي كان صار خمرا ولم يعلم من اين كان وعلم ذلك الخدمة الذين تولوا سوق الما فدعا صاحب المجلس العروس (10) وقال له انما السنة عند اهل الصنيعات ان يسقوا الشراب الطيب اولا فاذا طاب القوم سقوا من غيره وانت ابقيت الشراب الطيب في الاخر (11) فهذا اول العجايب التي فعلها يسوع بكنعان في جلجال واظهر قدرته وامن به تلاميذه .

Apparatus

1 الثلث : الثاني MB ∥ 3 عجزهم : عجز MB L , له : ليسوع MB ∥ 4 يتدانا : يتدان MB ∥ 5 افعلوا ما امركم به من شيئ : كل ما يقوله لكم افعلوه MB , كلما يقوله لكم افعلوه L ∥ 6 فكان عندهم : وكان عندهم بها MB L , ماطرش : مطرش , MB اثنين او ثلاثة : اثنين وثلاثة MB L ∥ 7 الجرر : الجرار L ∥ 8 واذهبوا به : واذهبوا به MB ∥ 9 كان صار : صار MB L , خمرا : خمر L ∥ 10 العروس : بالعروس , العروس : العروس L MB , في الاخر : للاخر MB ∥ 11 فهذا : فهذه MB , بكنعان في جلجال : بكنعان جلجال MB

Translation

(1) And on the third day there was prepared a wedding in Kanʿān Ǧilǧāl and there was the mother of Jesus present. (2) And Jesus and his disciples were called/invited to the wedding. (3) And when the wine was lacking them, the mother of Jesus said to him: there is not with them wine. (4) So Jesus said to her: what is to me and to you, o woman. My time has not drawn near. (5) So

his mother said to the servants: do anything he orders you. (6) And there
were placed with them six marble jars in which the water was made ready so
that the Jews (could) perform ablution with it according to their customary
procedure. And every jar held of the measure that is called *māṭarash* two or
three. (7) So Jesus said to them: fill these jars with water. And they filled them
up to their mouths. (8) And Jesus said to them: draw from them now and take
it to the master of the party and they took it. (9) And when the chief tasted
the water that had become wine, and he did not know from where it came.
But these servants who were in charge of conveying the water knew. So the
master of the party called the bridegroom (10) And he said to him: (yet) the
habitual practice with members of the banquet is that they are given to drink
the good wine first. And when the people become cheerful, they are given to
drink something different. But you preserved the good wine in the last. (11)
And this is the first of the miracles which Jesus did in Kanʿān in Ǧilǧāl and he
manifested his power, and his disciples believed in him.

(1b) The Text of **Ms. BM = British Museum Add. 9061** (post 15th century) of Jn. 2: 1-11

The youngest of the four manuscripts ascribed to Isaak Velasquez of Cordoba
is rather different from the others with respect to the pericope on the Wedding
at Cana. The text, presented in this manuscript, contains some additions and
not a few omissions, while often a deviating choice of words has been chosen.
Though, for a large part it agrees here with or approximates the text of the
oldest Munich manuscript (MA), or it gives a text that is a combination of the
text of MA and the León manuscript (L), the latter being even older than MA.
But sometimes it also follows the reading of the second Munich manuscript
(MB), which, according to Graf and Baumstark,[82] is a secondary version.
Remarkable is the similarity between BM and MB in verse 4: لم يتدانا, the
particle *lam* followed by the apocopate and the verb written with a final *alif*[83]
which is contrary to the rules and regulations of classical Arabic.

   In verse 11 both manuscripts again have the same reading: هذه instead of
هذا in MA-L. The text of manuscript BM appears to represent a secondary
version. It exhibits a mixed form, which, with respect to the Wedding at Cana
(it is different elsewhere!), is based primarily on MA-L, but has preserved also

---

82   Cf. Baumstark, *Markus Kap. 2*, p. 227.
83   In fact, it is the final *alif* of the indicative or the conjunctive which the scribe erroneously
     added to the apocopate. But it is normally spelled as *alif maqṣūra bi-ṣūrat ʾal-yā* represented
     by *alif*.

some characteristic readings of MB.[84] However, one cannot completely exclude the possibility that BM, where it differs from MA-L as well as from MB, has preserved an older stratum of the text. It is, however, more likely that BM has in these cases been influenced by other, non-Velasquezian, Arabic gospel texts, or even that it is a rather free and paraphrastic revision of Velasquez's text. Of course one cannot attach much text-critical value to this text.

(1) وفي اليوم الثالث عرس رجل بكنعان في جلجال وكانت ام يسوع حاضرة (2) فدعا يسوع تلاميذه الى العرس (3) فلما عجزهم الشراب قالت ام يسوع له ليس عندهم شراب (4) فقال لها يسوع ما لي ولك ايتها المراة لم يتدانا وقتي (5) فقالت امه للمتولين الخدمة افعلوا ما امركم به (6) فكانت عندهم ست جرر رخام يعد فيها الماء ليتوضي به اليهود على حال سنتهم وكانت تحمل كل جرة من الكيل الذي يدعى مطراش اثنين او ثلاثة (7) فقال لهم يسوع املوا هذه الجررماء فملوها الى افواهها (8) فقال لهم يسوع استقوا منها واذهبوا به الى صاحب المجلس فذهبوا به (9) فلما ذاق المقدم الماء الذي كان خمرا ولم يدر خبره وعلم ذلك السايقون الذين كانوا تولوا سيقان الماء قال للعروس (10) اما السنة عند اهل الصنيعات ان يسقوا الشراب الطيب اولاً فاذا طاب لهم يسقوا من غيره وانت خالفت السنة وابقيت الاشرف في الاخر (11) فهذه كانت اول عجايب يسوع بكنعان في جلجال واظهر قدرته وامن به تلاميذه.

Translation

(1) And on the third day was a wedding of a man in Kanʿān in Ǧilǧāl and the mother of Jesus was present. (2) And Jesus called his disciples to the wedding. (3) And when the wine was lacking them, the mother of Jesus said to him: there is not with them wine. (4) So Jesus said to her: what is to me and to you, o woman. My time has not drawn near. (5) So his mother said to (those) in charge of the work: do what he orders you. (6) And there were with them six marble jars in which the water was made ready so that the Jews (could) perform ablution with it according to their customary procedure. And every jar held of the measure that is called *miṭrāsh* two or three. (7) So Jesus said to them: fill these jars with water. And they filled them up to their mouths. (8) And Jesus said to them: draw from them and take it to the master of the party and they took it. (9) And when the chief tasted the water that had become wine, and he was not fully acquainted with it. But those in charge who were entrusted with conveying the water knew. He said to the bridegroom (10)

---

84 Cf. Baumstark, *Markus Kap.* 2, p. 233: »Eine sekundäre Bearbeitung der Übersetzung des Vel., vielleicht dieselbe, wie in Ar. 234 in München, was ja unschwer festzustellen wäre, liegt nach Ausweis des den Text von Lk. 22₅₆ bis 23₂ bietenden Faksimiles bei Goussen, S. 30 in der Hs. des British Museum vor.«

(yet) the habitual practice with members of the banquet is that they are given to drink the good wine first. And when the wine tastes good to them, they will be given to drink from something different. And you broke the habitual practice, and you preserved the noblest (wine) till the last. (11) And this was the first of Jesus' miracles in Kanʿān in Ǧilǧāl and he manifested his power, and his disciples believed in him.

APPENDIX II: Other Arabic Versions of Jn. 2: 1-11

The Arabic gospel manuscripts Leiden 2376 and 2377 were extensively studied by Curt Peters; in an article written in 1936,[85] he compared both the Leiden manuscripts with the Leningrad manuscript D 226, and demonstrated their close relationship. In this article, Peters gave excerpts of the pericopes Mt. 1, 18-25; Mt. 5, 23-45; Mk. 12, 1-12; Lk. 4, 1-13 and Jn. 19, 28-42 from Leiden Ms. 2377, followed by an apparatus with the variant readings of the other two manuscripts, and a second, more critical, apparatus with Diatessaronic witnesses. Peters reached the conclusion that the three manuscripts were related to a Syriac and not to a Greek model. With this Peters contradicted the opinion of I. Guidi.[86]

According to Peters, the Leiden manuscripts contained numerous Tatianic readings which were confirmed by an Old Syriac *Vorlage*.[87] He considered the influence of the Κοινή text as relatively small, especially with respect to Leiden Ms. 2377. In the text of this specific manuscript the original Syro-Arabic wording was preserved to a very large extent. Therefore, he preferred it to the other Leiden manuscript and the Leningrad manuscript. However, Peters acknowledged that this situation was not consistently the case. Sometimes Ms. 2377 had to a greater extent, been influenced by the Κοινή text, in which case Ms. 2376 often showed the »unrezensierten Wortlaut«.[88] The relation between

---

85 Cf. Peters, "Proben eines bedeutsamen arabischen Evangelientextes," *OrChr*, 3rd series 11 (1936) = whole series 33 (1936), pp. 188-211.

86 Cf. Guidi, *Le traduzioni*, pp. 6 ff.

87 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, p. 51: »... als Übersetzung einer *alt*syrischen Vorlage, hat aber – in seinen verschiedenen Zeugen in verschiedener Stärke *[sic!]* – eine Überarbeitung nach dem griechischen Text der Κοινή erfahren.« Peters' reasoning is hard to understand. Does he hold the view that not only the Old Syriac text(s), but that also the Arabic texts directly have undergone the influence of the Κοινή? And how, in all the world, is it possible to measure to what extent these texts were revised under the influence of the text of the Greek Κοινή? Moreover, Peters introduces the term Κοινή without defining it, and therefore makes a cluster of ideas dependent on a phantom. With which Greek text(s) are we in fact dealing here?

88 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, pp. 51-52. Again (cf. the preceding note) Peters' reasoning is

the Mss. 2376 and 2377 was described by Peters as analogous to that of the Sinaitic and Curetonian texts of the Vetus Syra. In a later article[89] Peters returned to the subject of the impossibility of a Greek background of the Leiden manuscripts and for that reason he opposed B. Levin who stated in his dissertation[90] that the gospel text of the Leiden group was merely »eine sprachliche Korrektur« of the Greek-Arabic gospel text found in the manuscripts Vat. Borg. arab. 95 and Berlin 1108.

(2) The text of **Ms. Leiden Or. 2376 (Or. 225 Scaliger)**[91]: A. D. 1179

(1) وفي اليوم الثالث كان عرس في قانا الجليل وكانت ام يسوع هناك (2) ودعي يسوع وتلاميذه الى العرس (3) فلما عازهم خمر قالت ام يسوع له ليس لهم خمر (4) قال لها يسوع ما لي ولك يا مراة حتى الان لم تاتي ساعتي (5) فقالت امه للخدام كل ما قاله لكم من شئ افعلوه (6) وكان هناك اجاجين ستة من حجارة موضوعة لتطهير اليهود يسعن مكيالين او ثلاثة (7) فقال لهم املوا الاجاجين ما فملوها (8) فقال لهم انزجوا الان وقدموا لراس التكا فقدموا (9) وكما ذاق رييس التكا الماء الذي صار خمر ولم يكن علم من اين هو فاما الخدام الذين استقوا الما فكانوا يعلمون فدعا ريس التكا للختن (10) وقال له كل انسان انما يقدم الخمر الجيد اولا فاذا تملوا حينيذ الدون فاما انت فابقيت الخمر الجيد حتى الان (11) هذه اول الايات التي صنعها ايسوع في قانا الجليل واعلي مجده فامن به تلاميذه .

Translation

(1) And on the third day there was a wedding in Qānā of Galilee and the mother of Jesus was there. (2) And Jesus and his disciples were called/invited to the wedding. (3) And when wine was lacking them, the mother of Jesus

quite hard to follow when he states that Leiden Ms. 2377 should be preferred (»... sichert ihr zwar einen unverkennbaren Vorrang«) to Leiden Ms. 2376. However, sometimes he holds the view that Ms. 2376 should be preferred because it has to a lesser extent been influenced by the Greek text of the Κοινή (cf. Peters' rule of thumb on page 52: Arabic text = Κοινή = »entwertet«). We should not adhere to Peters' reasoning here and give preference to a specific manuscript, but treat both manuscripts equally and without prejudice.

89 Cf. Peters, "Von arabischen Evangelientexten in Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Leiden," *Acta Orientalia* 18, pp. 124-137, especially pp. 131-135.

90 Cf. B. Levin, *Die griechisch-arabische Evangelien-Übersetzung Vat. Borg. ar. 95 und Ber. orient. oct. 1108* (Uppsala 1939), p. 3, n. 2.

91 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, pp. 48-62. The Leiden Mss. 2376 and 2377 belong to a specific group of Arabic gospel translations to which one may also count Vat. Borg. arab. 71, Vatican arab. 467, Asiat. Mus. Leningrad D 226 and Bodleian arab. christ. Nicoll 15 (Bodl. 299), cf. Peters, *ibid.*, p. 50.

said to him: there is no wine for them. (4) Jesus said to her: what is to me and to you, o woman. Until now my hour has not come. (5) So his mother said to the servants: everything he says to you, do it. (6) And there were there six waterpots of stone placed for the purification of the Jews containing two or three *mikyāl*. (7) So he said to them: fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them. (8) So he said to them: carry (it) out[92] now and present (it) to the head of the staff.[93] And they presented (it). (9) And when the leader of the staff tasted the water that had become wine, and he did not know[94] from where it was. As for the servants who drew the water, they knew. So the leader of the staff called the bridegroom. (10) And he said to him: every person though presents the good wine first, and when they are full[95], then the inferior. As for you, you preserved the good wine until now. (11) This is the first of the signs which Jesus did in Qānā of Galilee and exalted was his glory. So his disciples believed in him.

(3) The text of **Ms. Leiden Or. 2377 (Cod. 1571)**[96]: A. D. 1331

(1) وفي اليوم الثالث كان عرس في قانا الجليل وكانت ام يسوع هناك (2) ودعي يسوع وتلاميذه الى العرس (3) فلما عازهم خمر قالت ام يسوع له ليس لهم خمر (4) قال لها يسوع ما لي ولك يا امراة حتى الان لم تاتي ساعتي (5) فقالت امه للخدام كلما يقوله لكم من شى افعلوه (6) وكان هناك اجاجين موضوعة ستة من حجارة لتطهير اليهود يسعن مكيالين او ثلاثة (7) فقال لهم املوا الاجاجين مآ فملوها (8) فقال لهم امزجوا الان وقدموا للناس ولراس التكاة فقدموا (9) فلما ذاق رييس التكاة الما الذي صار خمر ولم يكن علم من اين هو فاما الخدام الذين استقوا الما فكانوا يعلمون فدعا رييس التكاة للختن (10) وقال له كل انسان انما يقدم الخمر الجيد اولاً فاذا تملوا حينيذ الدون فاما انت فابقيت الخمر الجيد حتى الان (11) هذه اول الايات التي صنعها يسوع في قانا الجليل واعلا مجده فامن به تلاميذه .

---

92 The form perhaps exhibits metathesis of اجزروا, »carry (it) out«, »perform (it)«.

93 For تكا one should read تكاة, »staff«, »support« (verb وكا).

94 *lam yakun ʿalima* (*plusquam* perfect) is also found in Ms. Leiden 2377.

95 Or: »when they are soaked«. The somewhat coarse rendering »when they are pissed up to their eyeballs« would fit very well here to illustrate the proper i.e. the vulgar sense of the verb ملأ V in the specific context. Thank you Prof. dr. William Petersen (Pennsylvania State University, U.S.A) for introducing me to this wonderful piece of »Americana«.

96 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, pp. 48-62, especially pp. 50-54.

Translation

(1) And on the third day there was a wedding in Qānā of Galilee and the mother of Jesus was there. (2) And Jesus and his disciples were called/invited to the wedding. (3) And when wine was lacking them, the mother of Jesus said to him: there is no wine for them. (4) Jesus said to her: what is to me and to you, o woman. Until now my hour has not come. (5) So his mother said to the servants: everything he says to you, do it. (6) And there were there six waterpots of stone placed[97] for the purification of the Jews containing two or three *mikyāl*. (7) So he said to them: fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them. (8) So he said to them: mix[98] (it) now and present (it) to the people[99] and to the head of the staff. And they presented (it). (9) And when the leader of the staff tasted the water that had become wine, (and) he did not know from where it came. As for the servants who drew the water, they knew. So the leader of the staff called the bridegroom. (10) And he said to him: every person though presents the good wine first, and when they are full, then the inferior. As for you, you preserved the good wine until now. (11) This is the first of the signs which Jesus did in Qānā of Galilee and exalted was his glory. So his disciples believed in him.

The manuscript Leiden 2378 firstly has been described by Guidi.[100] It was most probably created for a Muslim audience, for the text is written in rhymed prose *(sağʿ)* and the names of biblical persons (for instance Jesus and John) are respectively spelled ʿĪsī (more correct: ʿĪsā) and *Yaḥyā* which are the forms usually written by Muslim authors. It is not a completely new translation of the gospels into Arabic. It is said that the author might have used an already-existing Arabic translation of the gospels of minor literary value as his base. It has also been stated that from this older stratum readings of typical Tatianic origin(?) may have found their way into the new, revised, text of higher

---

97 One should observe the strange order of this sentence, which differs from Ms. Leiden 2376: »and were there water-pots placed six of stone ...«.

98 امزجوا, »mix (it)« instead of Ms. Leiden 2376 انزجوا, »carry (it) out«, »perform (it)«. The copyist of Ms. Leiden 2377 corrected the verb, but he did not notice the metathesis (cf. n. 92 *supra*).

99 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, p. 53, n. 3: »In der Hs. *Leiden 2376* fehlt die Erweiterung, die hier also schon der Korrektur nach der Κοινή verfallen ist.« On the original text of the Gospel of John, Peters (*ibid.*, p. 54) remarks: »Schon bezüglich der Erweiterung in Joh. 2, 8 wird man ernstlich zu fragen haben, ob sie nicht von Tatian in seinem Johannestext vorgefunden wurde.«

100 Cf. Guidi, *Le traduzioni*, p. 25 f.

literary pretence.[101] Peters demonstrated in great detail that the *Vorlage* of the present text must have been a Syriac text.[102] I tend to agree with Peters here, but it remains the question whether the present text or its older stratum preserved the Syriac coloration. Moreover, one cannot exclude the possibility that the present text, which now and then exhibits certain vulgarisms, is in fact the translation of minor literary value which was created for a Muslim audience. The revisor of the original text perhaps wanted to make the gospels accessible to the ordinary people not acquainted with the Christian faith and thus created a popular version which in form and style had an easy appeal to the general public of his days. From the 16th century onwards, the use of the once prestigious *saǧʿ* style became obligatory. The scribes of the specific period invariably resorted to this mode of expression, which offered them the advantage of concealing a poverty of ideas and of enhancing the quality of a text. However, the common usage of *saǧʿ* in all kinds of texts ultimately deprived these texts of any genuine literary worth.[103]

(4) The text of **Ms. Leiden Or. 2378 (Or. 561 Warn.)**[104]: A. D. 1511

(1) وفي اليوم الثالث اذ كان المعرس بالقطين مدينة بالجليل (2) وامر⟨ب⟩عيسي وحواريته مدعوون (3) وعاز المشروب قالت له ما لهم راح(4) قال لها ما لي ولك ايتها المراة ما اتت ساعتي بعد (5) قالت للعسفاء مهما فكونوا فاعلين (6) وهناك ست من حجر اجاجين وضعت لغسول اليهود ويحوين اثنين او ثلثة من غروب (7) قال لهم عيسي املوهن بالماء فاذا هم مترعون حتى العلو (8) قال اغرفوا ملآن وكونوا موتين رييس الندي فاذا هم محضرون (9) وطعم راس الشرب ماهم الذي صار رحيقا[105] وما ان كان به من العالمين وقد عرف الخادمون ما ملوا من الماء فدعا راس الشربة الصهر (10) قال كل الناس مبتديون ما جاد من المشروب فاذا تملوا ما كان الى القصوي فاتيت النفيس الى ذا من حين (11) هذا الاية الاولي التي جاء بها عيسي بقطين الجليل وكان ذا تعريف امجاده وآمن به الحواريون .

---

101 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, p. 55.

102 Cf. Peters, *Von arabischen Evangelientexten*, pp. 124-131 and 135-37.

103 Cf. article »saǧʿ« (Afif Ben Abdesselem) in: EI², Vol. 8, pp. 732-738.

104 Cf. Peters, *Das Diatessaron*, pp. 54-55. This Arabic translation of the gospels is also transmitted by Mss. Vat. arab. 17 and 18, cf. especially p. 54.

105 For this specific term, cf. S. Fraenkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden 1886; reprint: Hildesheim – New York 1982), p. 158.

Translation

(1) And on the third day then there was a wedding in al-Qaṭīn, a city in Galilee. (2) And Jesus was ordered[106] and his followers were called/invited. (3) And lacking was the drink. She said to him: there is no wine for them. (4) He said to her: what is to me and to you, o woman. My time has not come yet. (5) She said to the slaves: whatever he says to you, so do. (6) And there were six waterpots of stone placed for the washing of the Jews and they held two or three large buckets. (7) Jesus said to them: fill them with water. So when they were filling (them) until the top(?). (8) He said: ladle (it) out[107] full and bring the leader of the assembly. So when[108] they were bringing him. (9) And the leader of the drinking tasted their water that had become *the sweetest of wine*[109] and he was not among the knowing about it.[110] And the servants knew that they had filled it with water. So the leader of the drink called the son-in-law. (10) He said: all people begin with the good drink. So when they were full[111] to the maximum, you brought the costly one for this occasion(?)[112] (11) This is the first sign that Jesus brought in Qaṭîn of Galilee and his glorification was announced[113] and the followers believed in him.

---

106 Perhaps we should read here وام عيسي, »and the mother of Jesus« instead of وامر بعيسي »and Jesus was ordered«.

107 Here the manuscript is very unclear. One could also read اغرقوا or اغترفوا. The reading اغرفوا »ladle out« is also found in Mss. B-E-O of the Arabic Diatessaron.

108 The protasis begins with فاذا, »so when ...«, but the clause is lacking an apodosis, so that we may speak of a case of anacoluthon here.

109 Or: »the choicest of wine«. The text of the Persian Walton Polyglot Bible (WPP) reminds us also of this remarkable reading: »and when the leader of the party tasted *their* wine (that) was *of much esteemed sweet (or: excellent) flavour (or: taste)*«. A similar text can be found in: J. Rendel Harris, "The Encratites and the Marriage at Cana," *The Expositor* 9. ser. vol. 1 (1924), pp. 121-27, p. 123, who quotes from Ephraem's Armenian commentary upon the Diatessaron (Moesinger, p. 56): »and then he came himself, in order that he might bring *wine of the sweetest kind*«. However, the Armenian text (cf. L. Leloir, *Comm. Arm.* p. 65: 1-4) actually reads: »For that will that turned swiftly by command few (or: light) water into tasty wine (or: wine with a fine odour) is able to restore, in the final consummation, all created things into unspeakable taste.« The Syriac text (Leloir, *Comm. Syr.* p. 44: 22-25, V: 12) has: »For that will that easily (or: rapidly) changed ordinary water into excellent (ܚܡܪܐ) wine (or: the best wine of its kind), is able to finally change (-them) all creatures (= created things) into unspeakable tastes (= qualities).«

110 This phrase has been translated very literally in order to preserve the peculiarities of the Arabic construction. One might also render it with »and he did not know about it«.

111 Cf. note 95 *supra*.

112 Or perhaps: »and you brought the costly one from then on«.

113 Literally: »and his glorification was the possessor of announcement«, which can be interpreted as »and his glorification was renowned«.