THE PHILOXENIAN GOSPELS AS RECONSTRUCTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF PHILOXENOS OF MABBUG¹

J. EDWARD WALTERS

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ABSTRACT

This study presents the data for the text of the Philoxenian version for various Gospel passages as those texts can be reconstructed from the citations of Philoxenos. Several trends of translation technique become evident within the Philoxenian version: lexical changes for more “accurate” translation, attempts at more accurate and consistent translation of verb tense, lexical omissions and additions based on the Greek text, and alterations in the Syriac word order to reflect the

¹ This project began as my M.A. thesis project directed by J.W. Childers: J. Edward Walters, “The Philoxenian Gospels as Reconstructed from the Exegetical Writings of Philoxenos of Mabbug,” M.A. thesis (Abilene Christian University, 2009). I am grateful to Dr. Childers for chairing my thesis committee and for introducing me to textual criticism, to Syriac, and to Philoxenos. I also want to thank the other members of my thesis committee, Curt Niccum and Frederick Aquino, for their helpful suggestions in moving this project forward. And finally, I am grateful to guest editor Dr. David Michelson both for his encouragement and interest in my work, and to Dr. Andreas Juckel for his helpful comments and suggestions for improving my original thesis into the present publication.

Greek. This translation technique confirms what is known about Greek-to-Syriac translation technique in the sixth-century during which there was an intentional movement toward a more word-for-word translation. This technique was still in flux throughout the sixth-century until the creation of the hyper-literal Harclean version in the early seventh-century.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Philoxenos' Theological Motivation for the Translation Project

Philoxenos, bishop of Mabbug (d. 523),² is most well-known for the New Testament translation project that he sponsored in the first decade of the sixth century.³ Though his chorepiscopus, Polycarp, carried out the work of the translation, the new version produced has become known as the Philoxenian version.⁴

² For the most comprehensive introduction to Philoxenos, see André de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbug: sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie* (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1963). For a more recent survey, see David Michelson, "Practice Leads to Theory: Orthodoxy and the Spiritual Struggle in the World of Philoxenos of Mabbug (470–523)" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University, 2007).

³ According to the subscriptions of the Harclean version, the version was produced "in the year 819 of Alexander the Macedonian" (i.e. 507/8 CE). For the Syriac text and English translation of one such subscription, see William H.P. Hatch, "The Subscription of the Chester Beatty Manuscript of the Harclean Gospel," *HTR* 30, no. 3 (Jul. 1937), 149–150.

⁴ Despite the fact that this version bears the name of Philoxenos, he did not carry out the actual translation. Tradition holds that the translation was carried out by Philoxenos' chorepiscopus, Polycarp. The attribution of the project to Polycarp is found in a letter of Moshe of Aggel. See I. Guidi, *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei* 4/2 (1886), 404. Cf. Sebastian Brock, "The Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem" in *New Testament Textual Criticism. Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*, eds. E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 325, n. 2. Though A. Mingana points out that there is a discrepancy in the tradition because another manuscript seems to suggest that Philoxenos carried out the translation himself. A. Mingana, "New

Philoxenos sponsored this new translation because, in his opinion, the translators of the Peshitta had made errors, both intentional and accidental in their representation of the Greek text. This oft-cited passage serves as Philoxenos' explicit reasoning for the creation of a new translation:

ܠܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 [ܥܡܪܐ] ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ
 ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ.⁵

Thus when those who were of old applied themselves and translated the scriptures, whether by their will or as a result of ignorance, they erred in many [regards], not only in the things that are taught concerning the economy of the flesh, but also in the rest of the scriptures because of these other ways of thinking. And it was because of this that now we have taken the trouble⁶ to translate the Holy Scriptures of the new covenant again from Greek into Syriac.

Moreover, in his discussion of the translation of Heb 5:7, we see even more explicitly that Philoxenos' desire for a new translation is fueled by the christological debates of the fifth- and sixth-centuries. He argues that the Peshitta's rendering of the phrase "in the days of his flesh" (ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ) was influenced by Nestorianism.⁷ Thus, the study of the Philoxenian version cannot be removed

Documents on Philoxenos of Hierapolis, and on the Philoxenian Version of the Bible," 9th series, vol. 19 (1920), 149–160.

⁵ André de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog, Commentaire du prologue johannique* (Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 14,534) CSCO 380 (*versio*) and 381 (*textus*), *Scriptores Syri* 165, 166 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1977), 53. Hereafter CPJ.

⁶ S. Brock uses this translation for the phrase ܥܡܪܐ and notes that this word is "frequently found in colophons of sixth-century MSS referring to the sponsors who had the MSS copied," in "The Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem" in E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 329.

⁷ CPJ, 53.

from the context in which it was conceived and created. However, the post-Chalcedonian christological debate is not the only context that shaped the text of the Philoxenian version.

1.2 Greek-to-Syriac Translation Technique in the Sixth-Century

It has been well-established that there was a significant change in Syriac-to-Greek translation technique taking place between the fifth- and seventh-centuries. This change in technique, characterized by Sebastian Brock as a move toward a more “word-for-word” translation technique and away from a “sense-for-sense” technique,⁸ applies to works of Greek authors being translated into Syriac⁹ and to translations of the Bible.¹⁰ Thus, just as we must

⁸ Brock has a number of articles in which he takes up this topic. See especially Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity,” in *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies XX* (Durham, 1979), 69–87, repr. in Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984); *idem.*, “Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek,” *Journal of the Syriac Academy III* (1979): 1–17, repr. in Brock, *Syriac Perspectives*; *idem.*, “Limitations of Syriac in Representing Greek,” in B. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 83–98; *idem.*, “Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac,” in A. Dietrich, *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), 80–108, repr. in Brock, *Syriac Perspectives*; and *idem.*, “Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique,” in *III Symposium Syriacum 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalum, 1983): 1–14.

⁹ On this type of project, see D. King, *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria: A Study in Translation Technique* (Louvain: Peeters, 2008).

¹⁰ There has been some debate as to the role that the Philoxenian version played within this history. B. Aland argues that there was a particular strand of translation technique beginning with the Philoxenian version and ending with the hyper-literal Harklean version, and that some authors writing in the period between the production of these texts used the Philoxenian version for citations in works they were translating. B. Aland, “Die Philoxenianisch-Harklensische Übersetzungstradition,” *Le Muséon* 94.3–4 (1981), 321–383; however, R.B. ter Haar Romeny disagrees with Aland’s conclusion, arguing that the Philoxenian translation project

consider the context of the christological controversies of the fifth- and sixth-centuries when making observations about the Philoxenian version, so must we also consider the context of the changing Greek-to-Syriac translation technique taking place concurrently with its production.¹¹ However, any attempt to compare the text of the Philoxenian version to other Scripture translation projects in order to determine the relationship between those texts is hindered by a glaring problem: the Philoxenian version does not actually exist as a text.

1.3 The Philoxenian-Harclean Problem

When Joseph White published the manuscript that he claimed to be the Philoxenian version,¹² it seemed that there was finally an answer to the problem of the precise relationship between the Philoxenian and Harclean versions.¹³ We know from subscriptions of the Harclean version that Thomas of Harkel used the Philoxenian version in his own translation work, so when White's manuscript was published, it seemed to be a prime candidate because it is a Syriac biblical text with copious detailed marginalia

was not necessarily the first such translation project and, moreover, that authors writing after Philoxenos translated Biblical quotations for themselves rather than consulting the "authoritative" Philoxenian version. Bas ter Haar Romeny's response to Aland's article, "A Philoxenian-Harclean Tradition? Biblical Quotations in Syriac Translations from Greek," in Wout Jac. van Beekum, Jan Willem Drijvers and Alex C. Klugkist, *Syriac Polemics: Studies in Honour of Gerrit Jan Reinink* (Louvain: Peeters, 2007), 59–76.

¹¹ For example, the translated works of Cyril of Alexandria must be taken into account because, as D. King argues, these translators "shaped Philoxenos' reading and theology," King, "New Evidence on the Philoxenian Versions of the New Testament and Nicene Creed," *Hugoye* 13.1 (2010): 9–30.

¹² J. White, *Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana cum interpretatione et annotationibus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1778).

¹³ For a survey of the history of modern scholarship concerning the Philoxenian version, see D. King, *Syriac Versions*, 281–289; for more information on the Harclean version, see A. Juckel, "Introduction to the Harklean Text," in G.A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels, Vol. 1: Matthew* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2002), xxxi–lxxxii.

that could represent Thomas' original notes correcting the Philoxenian text. The debate over whether or not White's text was actually the versio philoxeniana persisted for nearly two-hundred years, with scholars arguing both sides, until Sebastian Brock finally resolved the question once and for all. By comparing Scripture citations from Philoxenos' *Commentary on the Prologue of John* with the corresponding texts in both the Peshitta and the Harclean version, Brock concluded that the Philoxenian version is lost, save for the citations found in the writings of Philoxenos.¹⁴

Thus, the task stands before us now to attempt to reconstruct as much as possible of the text of the original Philoxenian version by examining the writings of Philoxenos, finding his Scripture citations, applying the appropriate methodology for discerning accurate citations, and providing support for the unique readings that may stand as the only surviving witness of a long lost biblical text. The present study is limited to the text of the Gospels,¹⁵ though the following criteria are applicable for the remaining documents of the NT as well.

2. METHOD

For a project of this kind, it is necessary to establish and employ methodologies both for discerning accurate citations of Scripture in patristic works and for concluding that a reading does in fact represent the text of the Philoxenian version. First, with respect to patristic citation methodology, it is not necessary to construct here an entire set of guidelines because other scholars have already

¹⁴ Brock, "The Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem," 341. For more evidence of text of the Philoxenian version, see J. Gwynn's discussion of the the possible Philoxenian version of the minor catholic epistles: J. Gwynn, "The Four Minor Catholic Epistles" in *Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005); *idem.*, *The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version hitherto unknown* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co., 1897; repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1981 and Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005); and for the Pauline corpus, see the volumes of the critical edition of the Syriac New Testament already in print: B. Aland and A. Juckel, eds., *Das Neue Testament in Syrischer Überlieferung, Die Paulinischen Briefe, 3 Vols.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991, 1995, 2002).

¹⁵ More specifically, this study is limited to Matthew, Luke and John because Philoxenos almost never cites the Gospel of Mark.

proposed such guidelines,¹⁶ nor is it necessary to recount what these scholars have said. Instead, we will offer here only the guidelines that are most applicable to the case of Philoxenos.

2.1 Works of Philoxenos Considered

One very important criterion for determining the accuracy of patristic citations is that of the genre of writing because, generally speaking, patristic authors are more likely to cite Scripture accurately in exegetical works and in theological treatises than they are in other styles of writing. Philoxenos was a prolific author, and his surviving works testify to the breadth of writing style: exegetical commentaries, theological treatises, homilies, ascetic instruction, and letters to various individuals and groups. Any attempt to reconstruct the text of the Philoxenian version must begin with the exegetical and theological materials. This is not to suggest that the other works are not possible repositories of Philoxenian readings; it is just more likely that Philoxenos would have been more careful about the wording of his Scripture citations in the works that deal specifically with arguments about Scripture. Thus, the present project began with the Gospel citations in Philoxenos' two exegetical commentaries: the *Commentary on the Prologue of John (CPJ)*¹⁷ and the partial *Commentary on Matthew and Luke (CML)*.¹⁸ Once these citations were gathered, they were compared with

¹⁶ See especially G. Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism," *ANRW* 26.1 (1992): 256–262; and C. Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," *NovT* 47, no. 4 (2005): 313–343.

¹⁷ See n. 4 above.

¹⁸ J.W. Watt, *Philoxenos of Mabbug: Fragments of the Commentary on Matthew and Luke*, CSCO 392 (*versio*) and 393 (*textus*), *Scriptores Syri* 171, 172. (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1978). Because of the transmission history of many of the fragments of *CML*, some have questioned its usefulness in reconstructing the text of the Philoxenian version. However, one MS (British Museum Add. 17126 = Watt's MS A) dates to the lifetime of Philoxenos (510/11 CE) and can thereby be considered a viable witness for citations without the danger of later scribal assimilation to more familiar texts. Moreover, de Halleux argues that this manuscript could be a product of the scriptorium at Mabbug sponsored by Philoxenos, *Philoxène*, 144–145.

citations of the same verses that occurred in the other works of Philoxenos that met an additional external criteria: date of composition.

More specifically, when using the writings of Philoxenos to determine accurate Philoxenian citations, we must distinguish between works that pre-date and those that post-date the NT translation project and use them accordingly.¹⁹ Thus, Philoxenos' theological treatise on the Trinity²⁰ was written after the project was completed and therefore may be considered as a possible source for Philoxenian readings, but Philoxenos' most extensive surviving work, *The Discourses*,²¹ was written earlier in Philoxenos' career and cannot be considered a reliable source. The writings of Philoxenos that post-date the translation project, but do not meet the genre criteria, may be used as reference for additional support, but unless they include explicit discussion of the wording of a particular text, it is too tenuous to base an argument for authentic Philoxenian readings on these writings. Thus, the present study makes use of Philoxenos' *Letters to the Monks of Senoun (LMS)*,²² to compare citations that also occur in Philoxenos' other works, but it does not rely on any citations that occur only in *LMS*.

2.2 Criteria for Assessing Citations

Now that we have discussed "external" criteria for accurate Scripture citations in Philoxenos' works, we may now turn to a brief discussion of "internal" criteria. The first, and most reliable, criterion is that of explicit discussion of the wording of a text. Philoxenos offers such explicit discussions for only a precious few verses, but it is precisely these passages that give us some insight into the kinds of revisions in which Philoxenos was most

¹⁹ The two commentaries *CPJ* and *CML* were most likely being written concurrently with the translation project.

²⁰ A. Vaschalde, *Philoxeni Mabbugensis: tractatus tres de trinitate et incarnatione*, CSCO 9 (*versio*) and 10 (*textus*), *Scriptores Syri* 9, 10 (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1955).

²¹ E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Discourses of Philoxenos*, 2 Vols (London: Asher & Co., 1894).

²² A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog: Lettre aux moines Senoun*, CSCO 231 (*versio*) and 232 (*textus*), *Scriptores Syri* 98, 99 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1963).

interested.²³ This criterion is the only one that can provide absolute certainty that we have the unique Philoxenian reading, but there are other criteria that can provide a high degree of certainty for other verses.

A second internal criterion for accurate Philoxenian citations is multiple occurrences of a citation in the same form. If a citation in Philoxenos' works contains a variant from the reading of the Peshitta and that variant is attested in another citation elsewhere, we can conclude with a high degree of certainty that this reading represents the text of the Philoxenian version. However, when a citation occurs multiple times in different forms, this criterion is not necessarily helpful.²⁴

The third internal criterion is an expressed intent to cite without an explicit discussion of the wording. This intent can be expressed with either the Syriac citation marker ܠܡ or with some kind of introductory formula like ܟܬܒܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ("[Someone] said") or ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ("it is written"). As with many patristic authors, this criterion does not provide absolute certainty. That is, Philoxenos displays a varied use of such introductory markers. However, my research in the Philoxenian Gospels shows that Philoxenos' use of these introductory formulae are *generally* reliable enough to be considered part of the argument for whether or not a citation is accurate.²⁵ However, there is one additional problem with the use of these introductory formulae: Philoxenos uses them with equal frequency with unique citations from the Philoxenian version and citations that are equivalent to the Peshitta reading. Thus, while these formulae are reliable for a high probability of accuracy, they

²³ In the present study, see the discussion below of Mt. 1:1 and 1:18. However, Philoxenos also explicitly discusses the translation of Rom 1:3, Heb 5:7, and Heb 10:5. See de Halleux's discussion of these passages in *Philoxène*, 123–124.

²⁴ For a prime example of this, see the discussion of Lk 1:35.

²⁵ Of those 61 uses of ܠܡ found in *CPJ* and MS A of *CML*, 59 of them (96.7%) occurred with an accurate citation of either the Philoxenian version or the Peshitta. Similarly, Philoxenos' use of other introductory formulae is relatively reliable: 28 of 33 (84.8%) citations that include such formulae are accurate citations of either the Philoxenian version or the Peshitta. For more on Philoxenos' use of these introductory formulae, see Chapter 4 of my thesis; Walters, "The Philoxenian Gospels," 126–130.

are not reliable for distinguishing between readings of the Philoxenian version and the Peshitta. Thus, Philoxenos' use of introductory formulae may be used to an extent to determine the text of the Philoxenian version, but it should not be the *only* criterion upon which one bases the argument for a unique Philoxenian reading.

A fourth criterion is the relationship of the text found in the citation to the texts of the Peshitta and the Harclean version. Following Zuntz' original claim that the Philoxenian version was a "halfway house" between the Peshitta and Harclean version²⁶ and Brock's conclusion in support of this claim,²⁷ it is reasonable to assume that unique Philoxenian readings will, in various ways, resemble aspects of both texts. That is, some readings of the Philoxenian version will agree with the Peshitta over and against the Harclean version, and some readings that make revisions to the Peshitta text will agree with the revisions found in the Harclean version.²⁸ We know that Thomas of Harkel made use of Philoxenos' translation in his own work, so it is reasonable to conclude that citations that differ from the Peshitta but agree with the Harclean version have a high probability of representing the text of the Philoxenian version.²⁹

A final internal criterion for determining an accurate Philoxenian citation is the translation technique of Philoxenos as established in other citations determined to be accurate. In other

²⁶ G. Zuntz, *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*, British Academy Supplemental Papers, no. 7 (London: The British Academy, 1945).

²⁷ Brock, "The Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem," 341.

²⁸ For example, while the Philoxenian version frequently matches the Harclean version in rearranging the Syriac word order to match Greek word order, it also consistently differs from the Harclean version on the addition of the possessive -ܐܝܬܐ to represent a form of the Greek pronoun αὐτοῦ.

²⁹ In such cases, is not necessary to argue that Philoxenos or Polycarp were the *originators* of such unique readings as they may have known of these revisions from other translation projects. But we are concerned here only with determining the text of the Philoxenian version, and originality is not a criterion for accurate Philoxenian citations.

words, if there is a unique reading that occurs only once and does not meet the above criteria, we may ask the question: Does this revision match the kind of revisions found in other Philoxenian citations? Or, if the revision does not match another citation, we may also ask: Based on the revisions found in other Philoxenian citations, is it reasonable to conclude that the Philoxenian version might have included this reading? This criterion is highly tenuous and should be used only with the utmost care and a fair dose of skepticism, but that does not mean that it cannot be applied in some instances.

3. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Based on the criteria outlined above, the present study seeks to present the unique readings of the Philoxenian version (Ph) that can be reconstructed based on the accurate Scripture citations in the works of Philoxenos. The text of these citations is presented along with the corresponding texts of the Peshitta (P) and Harklean version (H).³⁰ For reference, the Greek text (G)³¹ is also included for each citation. The use of brackets [] around a word indicate that there is some question about the inclusion of that word within the text of Ph. The discussion following the verse will indicate the reasons for uncertainty.

³⁰ The texts of P and H presented in this study are those found in G. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshitta and Harklean Versions*, 4 Vols (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004), though the Philoxenian readings were also compared with the textual variants listed in P.E. Pusey and G.H. Gwilliam, eds. *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1901); repr. as *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum: The Fourfold Holy Gospel in the Peshitta Syriac Version with Critical Apparatus* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2003).

³¹ The Greek text shown is that of the 27th edition of Nestle-Aland. However, where applicable I have included textual variants from the Greek tradition.

3.1 Philoxenian Gospel of Matthew

1:1

ܡܬܝܬܝܐ ܡܝܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܝܢ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܬܪܥܡܠܐ ܠܥܬܐ P

ܡܬܝܬܝܐ ܡܝܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܝܢ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܠܥܡܬܐ ܠܥܬܐ Ph

ܡܬܝܬܝܐ ܡܝܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܡܝܢ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܠܥܡܬܐ ܠܥܬܐ H

G βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ

The text of Matthew 1:1 presented above is one of the few readings that we may attribute to the text of the Philoxenian version with absolute certainty because Philoxenos explicitly discusses the deficient translation of this passage as found in the text of the Peshitta and proposes his own translation. Philoxenos cites this passage six times: three of the six include the entire verse³² and the other three contain the first half of the verse.³³ Philoxenos expresses an intent to cite with the citation marker ܡܠ (in both of the full length citations that include the text of Ph.³⁴ In the third citation that contains the whole verse, Philoxenos provides the text of the Peshitta version, which he introduces with the phrase, “[These things] now stand in the Syriac [version, i.e., the Peshitta]” (ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܬܪܥܡܠܐ).³⁵ In his discussion of this verse, Philoxenos argues that the translation of P is inadequate because the Greek word γενέσεως should be translated as ܠܥܡܬܐ rather than ܡܬܪܥܡܠܐ.³⁶ Brock asserts that Philoxenos’ motivation behind this revision is “manifestly christological,” because “in his polemic against the Antiochene theologians, [Philoxenos] wishes to associate the *genesis* of these passages with John 1:14.”³⁷ Whether or not Philoxenos was aware of another translation using ܠܥܡܬܐ rather than ܡܬܪܥܡܠܐ is not clear; but it is clear that the Philoxenian translation shows a preference for words built from the stem ܠܥܡܬܐ

³² CPJ 41.10–11; 42.18–20; 49.17–18.

³³ CPJ 47.13; 50.11–12; 52.12–13.

³⁴ CPJ 41.10–11; 49.17–18.

³⁵ CPJ 42.18–20.

³⁶ CPJ 41–43. It also appears that Philoxenos made a mistake in his understanding of the meaning of the Greek words involved, Brock, “Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem,” 328.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 329.

rather than words built from ܐܠ, as evidenced by Matt 1:1 as well as the next passage.³⁸

1:18

ܐܠ ܕܥܡ	×	ܕܥܡ	×	ܕܥܡܐܠ	×	ܕܥܡܐܠ	ܦܐ ܡܐܠܐ	P		
ܐܠ	×	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡܐܠ	ܦܐ ܕܥܡܐܠ	×	×	Ph	
ܐܠ ܕܥܡ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡܐܠ	ܦܐ ܕܥܡܐܠ	×	×	H		
ܕܥܡ	×	×	ܥܡܐܠ	×	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	×	ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡܐܠ	P
ܕܥܡ	×	×	ܥܡܐܠ	×	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	×	ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡܐܠ	Ph
ܕܥܡ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܦܐ	ܥܡܐܠ ܡܐܠܐ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܦܐ ܕܥܡ	ܕܥܡܐܠ	H
ܕܥܡܐܠ	ܕܥܐܝ	ܦܐ	ܕܥܐܝ	×	×	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	P		
ܕܥܡܐܠ	ܕܥܐܝ	ܦܐ	ܕܥܐܝ	×	×	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	Ph		
ܕܥܡܐܠ	ܕܥܐܝ	ܦܐ	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܡܥܬܐܪ	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	ܕܥܥܐܝܐܪ	H		

G Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν. μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου

Philoxenos cites all or part of Matt 1:18 twelve times,³⁹ and he introduces two of these citations with introductory formulae: ܡܥܬܐܪ ܐܡܪ (“And Matthew said”)⁴⁰ and -ܐ ܥܦܐ (“[He] wrote that...”)⁴¹. The discussion of Matt 1:1 above also applies to 1:18 as Philoxenos mentions both verses as examples of the inadequacy of the Peshitta translation.⁴² Yet again, Philoxenos argues that the word ܐܠ should be removed from the translation and replaced by ܕܥܡ.⁴³

³⁸ Outside the Gospels, we also see the preference for ܕܥܡ words in Romans 1.

³⁹ Full: CPJ 41.11–14; 43.4–7; 44.12–15; Partial: CPJ 41.20–21; 42.20–21; 43.24–25; 47.14; 50.12–14; 52.13–14; 120.1–2; 227.5–6; 236.11–12.

⁴⁰ CPJ 47.14; 50.12–14.

⁴¹ CPJ 236.11–12.

⁴² CPJ 42–43.

⁴³ Zuntz also found this revision in the text of Matt 1:18 in *Tractatus Tres* and commented that this word choice was “one of philosophical rather than of biblical flavour,” *The Ancestry of the Harklean Version*, 45. It is interesting, however, that Zuntz does not comment on the possible theological connotations of this lexical change.

Ph included ܠܚܝܬܝ and Philoxenos simply reverted to the Peshitta reading ܠܡܥܕ in one citation by accident, but this seems unlikely because the two readings occur within just a few lines of each other. However, whether or not the use of ܠܡܥܕ is an accident, it is reasonable to conclude that the text of Ph reads ܠܚܝܬܝ for two reasons: 1) Philoxenos cites the full verse with this reading twice; and 2) this reading is also found in H. The text of H moves the phrase ܡܥ in an attempt to match the word order of the Greek text by rendering τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν as ܡܥ ܠܚܝܬܝ ܠܡܥ ܡܥ, and this word order also occurs once in Ph.⁴⁹ However, in the other two full citations and in an additional partial citation of this verse, Philoxenos cites the word order of P: ܡܥ ܠܚܝܬܝ [ܠܡܥ] ܡܥ[ܝ].⁵⁰ Only one of the four citations includes ܠܡܥ, and it is the same citation that matches the reading found in H. So, in three citations, Philoxenos includes the word order of P, but in one citation his wording matches that of H exactly. There is also some question as to whether or not the text of Ph includes the prefix -ܝ in this phrase. The three citations that match the Peshitta word order also include the -ܝ, but the citation that matches the text of H does not include it. The various forms of the citation of this verse and the fact that Philoxenos does not explicitly discuss the wording as he does with the previous citations make it difficult to ascertain which form of this verse represents the text of Ph. However, it seems most likely that the text of Ph read ܠܚܝܬܝ ܡܥܝ ܠܡܥ ܡܥ because it matches the word order of the Greek text and because the text of H also includes this reading. The variations in the other citations may be explained by accidental reversion to the Peshitta wording (placement of ܡܥ) and inconsistent citation habits with regard to particles/participles (inclusion of ܠܡܥ and -ܝ). Unlike the previous two citations discussed above, the precise wording of this verse was

⁴⁹ CPJ 227.7–8.

⁵⁰ CPJ 41.15–16; CPJ 41.21–22; and (partial) CPJ 236.13–14. It is also worth noting that both word orders appear in two citations of this verse found in the Syriac translation of Cyril of Alexandria's work *Apologia Duodecim Capitulorum contra Theodoretum*, King, *Syriac Versions*, 396. The Peshitta word order is also retained in two citations from *Tratatus tres* (236.38; 268.28–29); however, both of these are partial citations that begin with the phrase in question and this may affect the word order of the citation.

not as crucial to Philoxenos, so it is not surprising that his citations are varied slightly.

1:23

ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܕܝܢ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	×	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	P
ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܕܝܢ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	×	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	Ph
ܐܠܗܐ	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܕܝܢ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	×	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	ܕܠܗܐ	H
ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܕܝܢ	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	P
ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܐܝܬܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	ܐܝܬܐ	Ph
ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	×	ܡܬܥ	ܐܝܬܐ	H

G ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.

The portion of this citation that is a quote from Isa. 7:14 is identical in the texts of P and Ph. However, the text immediately following this quotation is different. Philoxenos quotes this verse five times, and three of those five citations include the whole verse.⁵¹ Moreover, one of the three full citations also includes 1:22,⁵² which is indicated as a citation with the marker ܡܬܥ. Based on the length of this citation and the use of the citation marker, we may reasonably conclude that Philoxenos is quoting from a particular text in this verse and not from memory. The text of Ph appears to reflect a word-for-word translation of the Greek phrase ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον with the Syriac phrase ܐܝܬܐ ܡܬܥܐܝܬܐ. In addition to the change in word order, the text of Ph also uses ܡܬܥ (Aph.—“to explain, translate”) instead of ܡܬܥܐܝܬܐ (“to interpret, translate”) as the translation of the Greek word μεθερμηνευόμενον.⁵³ All three full citations of this verse also

⁵¹ Full: *CPJ* 46.6–8; 56.15–17; 42.13–14; Partial: *CPJ* 44.7; *CPJ* 47.19–20.

⁵² *CPJ* 56.14–17.

⁵³ This translation choice may have been part of a broader translation movement in the fifth and sixth centuries because both forms also exist in the Syriac translation of the works of Cyril of Alexandria (ܡܬܥܐܝܬܐ in *Scholia de Incarnatione Verbi* and ܡܬܥܐܝܬܐ in Epistle 39; King, *Syriac Versions*, 398. This reading is also found in the citation of this verse from *Tratatus tres* (169.4).

include the temporal preposition ܚܕ, likely an attempt to emphasize that this verb is a participle. However, the translator of H has omitted it, so this appears to be a reading unique to Ph.

2:1

ܚܠܐ ܡܬܝܝܡ ܚܕܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܠܫܐ ܕܚܕܐ x ܕܡܥܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܐ ܚܐ P
 ܚܠܐ ܡܬܝܝܡ ܚܕܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܠܫܐ ܕܚܕܐ x ܕܡܥܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܐ ܚܐ Ph
 ܚܠܐ ܡܬܝܝܡ ܚܕܐ ܕܥܡܡܐ ܠܫܐ ܕܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܥܐ x ܦܐ ܚܐ H

ܡܠܬܐ x ܡܠܬܐ ܦܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ x P
 ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܐ ܡܠܬܐ x ܦܐ Ph
 ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܐ ܡܠܬܐ x ܦܐ H

G Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλέεμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδοὺ μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

Philoxenos cites this verse fully twice⁵⁴ and partially on two other occasions.⁵⁵ Two of the citations (one full length and one partial) contain the citation marker ܠܐ.⁵⁶ In the full length citation that contains the citation marker ܠܐ, it stands in the place of the post-positive particle ܦܐ. However, in the other full length citation, Philoxenos includes ܦܐ after ܚܐ. The Greek text includes δέ as the second word in the sentence, so it is likely that the text of Ph included ܦܐ, but that Philoxenos has simply replaced the particle with ܠܐ in one citation. It is interesting that the translator of Ph has not transposed the order of ܕܡܥܐ ܡܠܬܐ as the translator of H has done in order to reflect the Greek word order. However, all three citations of this verse that contain this portion of the text retain the same word order as P.⁵⁷

There is some question about the two revisions in the second half of the verse: the addition of ܦܐ and the placement of the verb ܡܠܬܐ. One full length citation contains the wording equivalent to the text of P,⁵⁸ but the other full length citation contains the

⁵⁴ CPJ 43.12–14; 44.17–18.

⁵⁵ CML 4.19–20; CPJ 43.25–26.

⁵⁶ CPJ 43.12–14; 43.25–26.

⁵⁷ As does the one citation of this verse in *Tractatus tres* 265.14–15.

⁵⁸ CPJ 44.17–18.

translator of Ph. Moreover, it is safe to assume that the second half of the verse (beginning with **ܣܡ**) is an accurate reflection of both P and Ph because Philoxenos' citation agrees with the virtually identical texts of P and H.⁶²

With regard to the first half of the verse, the text of Ph extends the contraction **ܐܡܪ** to the phrase **ܐܡܪ ܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** and moves the verb **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** to the position immediately following this phrase in order to provide a word-for-word translation of the Greek wording **ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεῖς**. The word **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** is placed in brackets in the presented text above because while it does not appear in Philoxenos' citation, it is not necessary to conclude that the text of Ph omitted **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**. In the text of *CPJ*, there is a **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** where the **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** would stand. It is strange that **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** appears at this position in the sentence, as it usually appears near the beginning of a citation. However, the replacement of a conjunction with **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** need not necessarily be considered a definitive omission. As seen in Matt 2:1, Philoxenos sometimes replaces post-positive conjunctions with the citation marker **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**. This, in addition to the fact that the Greek text includes **γὰρ** here and both P and H contain **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**, allows us to conclude reasonably that the text of Ph likely included **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**.

2:6

ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ P
ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ Ph
ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ H

ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ P
ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ Ph
ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ H

G καὶ σὺ βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

⁶² The only difference being the addition of **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ** in H. This is a consistent revision found in H but not in Ph. Brock also asserts that this is true of the distinctions between the Philoxenian and Harclean recensions of the Syriac Euthalian material. Brock, "The Syriac Euthalian Material," 129.

Philoxenos quotes this verse only once,⁶³ but he expresses an intent to cite by introducing this citation with the phrase ܠܡܢ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ (“a statement in the Gospel”) and including the citation marker ܠܡ. The texts of Ph and H add the word ܠܡܢ, perhaps in an attempt to render more accurately the Greek phrase γῆ Ἰουδα. However, there is a textual variant in the Greek witnesses that could account for the lack of this word in the text of P. Some Greek witnesses read τῆς Ἰουδαίας rather than γῆ Ἰουδα.⁶⁴ Thus, the most likely explanation for the presence of the word ܠܡܢ in Ph and H is that their *Vorlagen* included the word γῆ. The text of Ph also omits the verb ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ and adds the enclitic second person pronoun ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ following ܠܡܢ, perhaps in an attempt to reflect the Greek word order that places the second person singular verb εἶ after ἐλαχίστη. Moreover, the translator of Ph has chosen to translate the Greek word ἡγεμῶν with the Syriac word ܠܡܢܝܬܐ (‘leader, ruler, governor’) rather than ܡܠܟܐ (‘king’).

3:15

ܠܡܢ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ x ܠܡܢ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ P
 ܠܡܢ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ x ܠܡܢ [ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ] ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ Ph
 ܠܡܢ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ H

G ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι
 πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην.

Philoxenos cites this verse twice, though one of them is a partial citation.⁶⁵ The reading in brackets above is uncertain because only one of the two citations contains this part of the verse and it contains two minor variations that are difficult to resolve confidently: the citation of this verse adds the proclitic -ܐ to the word ܠܡܢ and omits the conjunction ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ that immediately follows ܠܡܢ in the texts of P and H. It is possible that both of these variations are accidental and that neither is actually the reading of Ph. However, it is also possible that the translator of Ph attempted to render the phrase οὕτως γὰρ not with the literal ܕܡܬܠܟܬܐ but with ܠܡܢܝܬܐ. However, as the text of Ph tends to

⁶³ CPJ 42.5–8.

⁶⁴ The witnesses that attest to this variant are D^{pc} it sy^{s.c.p.}

⁶⁵ CPJ 215.2–3; Partial: CML 22.10–11.

reflect a more word-for-word translation, it is unlikely that the text of Ph actually omits ܬܢܝܢ. Philoxenos' citation of this verse also substitutes the word ܚܕܐܢܝܐ for the word ܚܕܐܢܐ as a translation of δικαιοσύνη.⁶⁶ Because *CPJ* is generally more reliable than *CML* and because H also includes ܚܕܐܢܝܐ, it is reasonable to conclude that this was the reading of Ph as well. Moreover, Brock notes that this precise lexical change is characteristic of the citations evident in the Syriac Euthalian materials.⁶⁷

10:17

ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ P
ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ Ph
ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ H

G παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς.

Philoxenos does not include the first phrase of this verse in his only citation,⁶⁹ but he does introduce the citation with the marker ܡܠܝܟܐ. Although the translator of H revises the text of P in a number of places, there is only one revision in the text of Ph. The translator of Ph changed the form of the verb ܡܠܝܟܐ (plural participle) to ܡܠܝܟܐ (third person imperfect plural). It is likely that the translator made this change to reflect the future tense of the Greek verb παραδώσουσιν. However, it is not clear why the translator added the second person plural pronoun (functioning as the direct object) to the end of the verb. Generally, the translators of Ph and H attempt to match the Greek word order, but in this case, the word order of the text of P better resembles the Greek παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς. Once again, we should not regard the omission of ܬܢܝܢ as a variant of the text of Ph because Philoxenos has placed the citation marker ܡܠܝܟܐ in the position of ܬܢܝܢ in the

⁶⁶ However, the partial citation of this verse in *CML* reads ܚܕܐܢܐ.

⁶⁷ Brock, "The Syriac Euthalian Material," 128. Though, as King points out, the mid seventh-century Syriac translation of Severus' *Ad Nephalium* reverts to the usage of ܚܕܐܢܐ; King, *Syriac Versions*, 399.

⁶⁸ The brackets indicate that the word is not in the citation taken from Philoxenos' writings but should be considered part of the text of Ph.

⁶⁹ *CPJ* 127.23–24.

citation, and we have already seen that this is not indicative of an omission in Ph.

10:21

ח	לע	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	P
ח	לע	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	Ph
ח	לע	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	H

אין און און P

אין און און Ph

אין און און H

G Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς.

The text of this verse as cited by Philoxenos⁷⁰ omits the conjunction **אין**, though we should not consider this to be an actual omission from the text of Ph. This is most likely an accidental omission, though it could be a stylistic choice for the context of the citation. The primary revision found in the text of Ph is the omission of the third person plural possessive ending from **אוןאון**, leaving the word **און**. This is likely an attempt at word-for-word translation because there is no possessive pronoun here in the Greek text.

11:27

אין	אין	אין	x	אין	P
אין	אין	אין	x	אין	Ph
אין	אין	אין	אין	אין	H

G καὶ ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

Although this citation is rather short,⁷¹ there is good reason to conclude that it reflects the wording of Ph. The variant in question here is the change of the verb **אין** (“to choose”) from **אין** (perfect participle) to **אין** (imperfect) in order to reflect the subjunctive mood of the Greek verb βούληται. We may

⁷⁰ CPJ 127.24–25.

⁷¹ CPJ 180.26–27.

reasonably conclude that this reading represents the text of Ph because Philoxenos includes the citation marker ܡܠ, other citations from Ph demonstrate an attempt to translate the tense of Greek verbs more accurately,⁷² this reading is attested in one of Philoxenos' other later works,⁷³ and the variation is also found in H.

16:18

ܡܢܐܡܢܐ ܠ ܕܒܥܝ ܠܚܝܬܐ × ܕܝܠ ܡܢܠܚ ܠܠܐ ܠܡܐ ܕܠܐ P
ܡܢܐܡܢܐ ܠ ܕܒܥܝ ܠܠܚܝܬܐ × ܕܝܠ ܡܢܠܚ ܠܠܐ ܠܡܐ ܕܠܐ Ph
ܡܢܐܡܢܐ ܠ ܕܒܥܝ ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܠ ܠܠܚܝܬܐ ܡܢܠܚ ܠܠܐ ܠܡܐ ܕܠܐ H

G καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾧδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.

In Philoxenos' citation of this verse⁷⁴ two out of three variations from the text of P agree with the text of H. The later translators have exchanged ܠܠܐ for ܠܠܐ and altered the demonstrative pronoun from the feminine ܠܡܐ to the masculine ܠܡܐ to match this change. This revision appears to be a revision aimed at a more "accurate" translation of πέτρα. P. Hill asserts that ܠܠܐ "unambiguously means 'rock,' whereas ܠܠܐ may mean 'stone' or 'rock,'" as well as other elliptical meanings such as "column," "stone vessel," and "idol."⁷⁵

The most interesting variation in the text of Ph in this passage, however, is the change from ܠܚܝܬܐ ("gates") to ܠܠܚܝܬܐ ("bars [of iron]"). This variant is interesting because it seems that Philoxenos preserves a reading found in the Diatessaron that is not found in either P or H. Brock⁷⁶ and Murray⁷⁷ argue that Tatian included the word ܠܠܚܝܬܐ based on an early Christian interpretation of Psalm 107:16 regarding the descent of Christ to hell after his death. In this interpretation, the ܠܠܚܝܬܐ are the bars of Sheol that Christ has

⁷² See discussion of 3:12 above.

⁷³ *LMS* 70.3. This citation also adds ܐܡܐ as a translation of the Greek article ὁ.

⁷⁴ *CPJ* 128.15–16.

⁷⁵ Hill, "Matthew 16:18 in the Philoxenian Version," 7.

⁷⁶ Brock, "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," 95–98.

⁷⁷ R. Murray, "The Rock and the House on the Rock," *OCP* 30 (1964): 341.

broken down in order to defeat death and harrow Hell.⁷⁸ The reading ܡܚܠܐ (Gr. *μοχλοι*) is not listed as a textual variant in the apparatus of NA²⁷ or Pusey and Gwilliam's critical Peshitta text, so it is unlikely that the translator of Ph simply kept this reading from the base P text or translated it from the Greek *Vorlage*. Moreover, it is also worth noting that Philoxenos also uses ܡܚܠܐ in his citation of this verse in *LMS*.⁷⁹

There are several possible explanations for the occurrence of this reading in the text of Ph: perhaps Philoxenos had access to a copy of the Diatessaron; perhaps the variant reading existed in the Peshitta text of Philoxenos (and Polycarp); or perhaps Philoxenos knew of the interpretive tradition of Psalm 107 and agreed with it to the extent that he was willing to include the reading in his version. Or, perhaps it is a combination of these factors. Hill concludes that it is possible that the Greek *Vorlage* of Ph included *μοχλοι* as a gloss and that the translator, being aware of the interpretive tradition, chose to include this reading against the text of P.⁸⁰ Given the fact that the text of Ph generally represents an attempt to translate the Greek text more literally, it seems that this is the best explanation for the existence of the reading in Ph. Thus, the fact that Philoxenos includes ܡܚܠܐ in his text lends support to the theory of Murray and Brock that this was in fact a strong interpretive tradition.

⁷⁸ Brock, "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," 96. However, P. Hill argues that ܡܚܠܐ may not have been the original reading of the Diatessaron but rather a gloss by Ephrem based on the interpretive tradition mentioned above. Hill, "Matthew 16:18," 8.

⁷⁹ *LMS* 77.23–24. The text of this citation is identical to the text presented above except that it uses the extended possessive clause ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܚܠܐ as found in H as opposed to ܠܚܝܬܐ.

⁸⁰ Hill, "Matthew 16:18," 10.

19:28

×	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲉⲕⲓ	ⲛⲁⲕ	ⲓⲛⲁⲕ	ⲙⲁⲕⲁ	ⲁⲛⲁ	ⲉⲙⲓ	ⲓⲛⲁⲕ	×	×	×	P
×	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	[ⲉⲕⲓ	ⲛⲁⲕ	ⲓⲛⲁⲕ	ⲙⲁⲕⲁ	ⲁⲛⲁ]	ⲉⲙⲓ	ⲓⲛⲁⲕ	×	×	×	Ph
ⲉⲙⲓ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲉⲕⲓ	ⲛⲁⲕ	ⲓⲛⲁⲕ	ⲙⲁⲕⲁ	×	ⲉⲙⲓ	ⲓⲛⲁⲕ	ⲁⲛⲁ	ⲙⲁ	ⲟⲩ	H
ⲟⲩⲁⲓⲥ	ⲁ	ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲟⲩⲥ	ⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲓⲁ	ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲓⲥⲁ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓⲥ			P
ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲁ	ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲟⲩⲥ	ⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁ	ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲓⲥⲁ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓⲥ		Ph
ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲁ	ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲟⲩⲥ	ⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁ	ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲁ	×	ⲉⲙⲓⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ			H
×	ⲉⲙⲓⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁ	×	ⲉⲙⲓⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁ	ⲓⲙⲁⲓⲥ	ⲁ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲁⲕ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	×	ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲛⲁ		P
×	ⲉⲙⲓⲁⲑⲟⲩⲁ	×	ⲛⲥⲓⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲓⲙⲁⲓⲥ	ⲁ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲁⲕ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	×	ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲛⲁ		Ph
ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲙⲁⲓ	ⲁ	ⲛⲥⲓⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲓⲙⲁⲓⲥ	ⲁ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲁⲕ	ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲙⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲛⲁ		H
	ⲁⲕⲓⲙⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁⲩⲁ	ⲓⲙⲁⲓⲥ									P
	ⲁⲕⲓⲙⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁⲩⲁ	ⲓⲙⲁⲓⲥ									Ph
	ⲁⲕⲓⲙⲁⲕⲁⲓ	ⲛⲥⲓⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲥⲓⲁⲟⲩⲁⲓⲥ									H

G ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθήσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

Philoxenos introduces this citation⁸¹ with the phrase -ⲓ ⲁⲩⲁⲥ (“it is written [that]”). The brackets above indicate that this citation does not include the phrase ⲉⲕⲓ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲓⲛⲁⲕ ⲙⲁⲕⲁ ⲁⲛⲁ, but this is likely the result of an adaptation based on citing context and it should not be concluded that this phrase is absent from the text of Ph. The various attempts to translate the Greek word παλιγγενεσία (“state of being renewed; experience of a complete change of life, rebirth”)⁸² result in one of the rare occasions in which none of the three witnesses agree with one another. The text of P renders the word “the new age” (ⲛⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲓ), while the translator of Ph renders the word “the rebirth” (ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲕ). The translator of Ph exchanges ⲛⲥⲓⲁ for ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁ, which can be translated idiomatically as “again.”⁸³ This appears to be an attempt by the translator of Ph to translate the Greek compound word by translating the two

⁸¹ CPJ 210.4–8.

⁸² BDAG, 752.

⁸³ Smith, CSD, 540.

words of the compound word separately. While this technique works for *πάλιν* (“again”), the translator seems to mistake *γενεσία* for a derivative of *γεννάω* (“to beget, give birth”) rather than *γίνομαι* (“to become, happen”). This explains the use of ܠܕܐ. The translator of H, on the other hand, retains the phrase ܠܝܢ ܥܡܐ but translates *γενεσία* with the Syriac word ܠܡܥܡ from ܠܡܥܡ (“to happen, become”). The differences between the readings of this variant actually provide support for the representation of the text of Ph—it shows that translators struggled with how to translate Greek words for which there was no Syriac equivalent. The next variant appears to be an attempt to correct an inconsistency in the translation of P within this verse. The Greek word *θρόνος* appears twice in this verse, and the text of P offers two translations: ܡܠܝܬܐ, transliterated from the Greek *θρόνος*, and ܡܠܝܬܐ (sg: ܡܠܝܬܐ), which also means “throne.” The texts of Ph and H, however, replace ܡܠܝܬܐ with ܡܠܝܬܐ so that the translation is consistent.

3.2 Philoxenian Gospel of Luke

1:31

ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ P
 ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ Ph
 ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ H

G καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

Philoxenos quotes this verse three times,⁸⁴ and two of the citations include the text presented above. The text of Ph omits ܕܡܥܝܬܐ most likely because γάρ does not appear in the Greek text.⁸⁵ The text of Ph includes a more literal rendering of the Greek phrase συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ (lit: “you will become pregnant in [the] belly”) by changing the phrase ܕܡܥܝܬܐ (lit: “you will receive pregnancy”) to ܕܡܥܝܬܐ (lit: “you will become pregnant in the belly”). One of the three citations⁸⁶ of this verse from

⁸⁴ CPJ 45.9–10; 45.11–12; 47.15–17.

⁸⁵ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ does appear in a citation of this verse in LMS (58.22), but it appears after, not before, ܕܡܥܝܬܐ.

⁸⁶ CPJ 47.15–17: ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܥܝܬܐ

Philoxenos' writings includes the wording of P (ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ). The rest of the text of this citation, however, has clearly been adapted to the author's style, as it is conflated with a portion of Lk 1:35; so this citation should not be considered part of the text of Ph. However, the citation that includes the wording of P is significant because Philoxenos includes the introductory formula ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ("But Luke says"). Thus, in his three quotations of this verse, Philoxenos provides an introductory formula only for the quotation that agrees with P. However, despite the lack of introductory formula, it is reasonable to conclude that the text of Ph contains the reading ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ because this wording appears twice in full citations in *CPJ*, it appears once in an extended citation in *LMS*,⁸⁷ and it appears in H.⁸⁸

1:35

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ P

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ Ph

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ H

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ P

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ [ܡܠܟܐ] Ph

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ H

G πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ

The Ph text of Lk 1:35 is particularly difficult to determine because Philoxenos cites this verse several times in conflicting forms, even within the same work.⁸⁹ There are five citations of this verse in Philoxenos' exegetical writings: two full⁹⁰ and three

⁸⁷ *LMS* 58.22.

⁸⁸ The Syriac translation of Cyril of Alexandria's *Epistle 39* also indicates the change in verb to ܡܠܟܐ, but it does not include either ܡܠܟܐ or ܡܠܟܐ; King, *Syriac Versions*, 422.

⁸⁹ *CPJ*, *LMS*, and *Tractatus tres* all contain multiple citations of this verse and the citations are varied in all three works.

⁹⁰ *CPJ* 211.26–28; *CPJ* 41.2–4.

partial,⁹¹ and there are two full citations of this verse in *LMS*⁹² and *Tract. tres*.⁹³ In two of the citations, Philoxenos demonstrates an intent to cite with the citation marker ܐܠ.⁹⁴ Moreover, all of the full citations are nearly identical, though their minor discrepancies make establishing portions of this verse quite difficult. All of the citations that contains the verb demonstrate a revision in the gender of the verb ܐܬܝܢ ("to come") from feminine to masculine in order to portray the Holy Spirit as grammatically masculine rather than feminine.⁹⁵ The text of Ph also adds the phrase ܐܠܗܐ ("upon you") to represent the Greek phrase ἐπὶ σέ; this too is attested in all of Philoxenos' full citations of the verse. There is some discrepancy in the Philoxenian rendering of ὕψιστος. In two citations⁹⁶ Philoxenos retains ܐܠܗܐ from P and in the other three he uses ܐܠܝܢ. However, one of the citations that uses ܐܠܗܐ is found in *CML* and the other is the partial citation that appears to be simply an allusion.⁹⁷ All of the full citations of this verse use

⁹¹ *CPJ* 41.34–24; *CPJ* 196.19; *CML* 54.12–13, though *CPJ* 196.19 is clearly an allusion.

⁹² *LMS* 39.16–17, 60.9–11.

⁹³ *Tract. tres* 236.29–237.1; 95.2–5.

⁹⁴ *CPJ* 211.26–28; *CML* 54.12–13 (This citation comes from MS A in *CML*).

⁹⁵ In early Syriac writings, the Holy Spirit is generally considered to be feminine because grammatically the word ܥܡܝ is feminine. For more on the shift within the Syriac language from a feminine to a masculine Holy Spirit, see S. Brock, "Come, Compassionate Mother..., Come Holy Spirit: A Forgotten Aspect of Early Eastern Christian Imagery," *Aram* 3 (Oxford, 1991), 249–257; reprinted in Brock, *Fire From Heaven*. Moreover, Zuntz found this revised translation in *Tractatus Tres* and noted its significance with regard to translation technique, *The Ancestry of the Harklean Version*, 43.

⁹⁶ *CPJ* 196.19; 47.15–17. The latter of these two citations is conflated with Lk 1:31 and is mentioned in the discussion of that verse above. In both 1:31 and 1:35, this citation retains readings from the text of P. However, Philoxenos has clearly adapted the wording to fit his context, so it is difficult to argue that this citation represents the text of P, particularly when there are longer citations that do not agree with the text of P.

⁹⁷ King notes that when Philoxenos alludes to this verse, his wording tends to revert to that of P rather than citing precisely the text of Ph. King, *Syriac Versions*, 424.

ܠܚܝܢ, and this is also found in the text of H. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that ܠܚܝܢ is the reading of the text of Ph.

The next three variants are extremely difficult to deal with because Philoxenos quotes this verse twice in *CPJ* and twice in *LMS* and both works contain conflicting forms of the text with regard to the following variants. The first is the question of the addition of ܐܠ in order to reflect the Greek conjunction καί. The text of H includes the addition, and two of Philoxenos' citations do as well,⁹⁸ but two of the full citations lack this word. One of Philoxenos' full length citations of this verse omits ܐܠ. Given the fact that Philoxenos includes ܐܠ twice and that it exists in the text of H, it seems that the best explanation is that it was part of the text of Ph and that Philoxenos simply forgot it in two other citations: It is easier to explain its omission in his citations than its inclusion.

Next, it is difficult to determine which form of the phrase ܐܠܗܐ ܠܡܪܝܢ/ܠܡܐ is the original text of Ph. Two of the four full citations of this verse use ܠܡܐ and the other two use ܐܠܗܐ, and once again, both readings appear in *CPJ* and in *LMS*.⁹⁹ It is tempting to assert that the reading of Ph is ܐܠܗܐ because of its prevalence in other translations of the time¹⁰⁰ and because it appears also in H. However, because the citations of Philoxenos are split and all four citations are full length citations, it is not easy to dismiss ܠܡܐ so easily.¹⁰¹ Moreover, we cannot rely on the argument that one is a "better" translation than the other. However, it is easier to explain an accidental reversion to the Peshitta reading than it is to suggest an accidental revision to a reading that also happens to occur in other versions. Thus, it seems best to conclude that the text of Ph read ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ.

There is also some question as to whether or not the text of Ph agrees with P or H with regard to the retention of the phrase ܡܡܝܢ. Two of Philoxenos' citations of this verse (one from *CPJ* and one

⁹⁸ This citation in *LMS* (60.9–11) also includes a -ܐ attached to ܐܠ.

⁹⁹ Both citations of this verse in *Tractatus tres* use ܠܡܐ.

¹⁰⁰ King notes that ܐܠܗܐ is found universally in the Syriac translations of the works of Cyril and calls Philoxenos' use of this wording "archaic." King, *Syriac Versions*, 424.

¹⁰¹ ܠܡܐ also appears in both citations of this verse in *Tract. tres*.

from *LMS*) omit ܚܕ, ¹⁰² but one retains it.¹⁰³ Moreover, to make the matter more complicated, Philoxenos' fourth full citation of this verse includes ܚܕܐ.¹⁰⁴ Of the two citations of this verse in *Tractatus tres*, one retains ܚܕ and one includes ܚܕܐ. The discrepancy could be the result of a textual variant in the Greek manuscripts used in translation: Several Greek witnesses attest to the inclusion of the phrase ἐκ σοῦ following the verb γεννώμενον (ܚܕܐ).¹⁰⁵ Although the preposition ܕ is not the common translation of ἐκ, this textual variant can explain the use of ܚܕ in the Syriac text of P. However, this does not necessarily explain why Philoxenos presents three different forms of this text. To complicate matters further, ܚܕܐ is also a variant reading in the Peshitta tradition.¹⁰⁶ It could be argued that the ܚܕܐ reading is the text of Ph because it is a better translation of the Greek phrase, but this does not explain the use of ܚܕ in multiple citations. Based on the text critical axiom that the reading that best explains the others is the best reading, it seems that the best explanation is this: the Greek *Vorlage* used in making Ph included the Greek phrase ἐκ σοῦ, which the translator (correctly) revised from P's ܚܕ to ܚܕܐ;¹⁰⁷ the single occurrence of ܚܕ in Philoxenos' citation is an accidental reversion to the reading of P; and the two omissions of the phrase are accidental omissions.

The final revision of this verse in the text of Ph is far more easy to establish with confidence than the previous three. The text of Ph demonstrates a revised word order of the final phrase by placing the verb before the direct object. This alteration is likely an attempt to reproduce the Greek word order κληθήσεται υἱός

¹⁰² *CPJ* 211.26–28; *LMS* 60.9–11.

¹⁰³ *CPJ* 41.2–4.

¹⁰⁴ *LMS* 39.16–17.

¹⁰⁵ The witnesses that attest to this reading are C* Θ¹ 33 pc a c e vg^{cl} Ir^{lat} Tert Ad Epiph.

¹⁰⁶ Pusey and Gwilliam, *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum*, 322.

¹⁰⁷ Though, it is possible that the version of P with which the translator was familiar used ܚܕܐ.

θεοῦ. All of the full citations of this verse in Philoxenos' writings and the text of H also include this revised word order.¹⁰⁸

1:42

ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܐܡ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ	P
ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܐܡ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ	Ph
ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܐܡ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ	H

G εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξὶν καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου

Philoxenos introduces this citation and expresses an intent to cite with the phrase ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ (“It is written that she [Elizabeth] said...”).¹⁰⁹ The variation in question is the omission of the preposition ܕ in the final word of the phrase (ܡܠܝܬܐ or ܡܠܝܬܐ). The text of P is translated “Blessed is the fruit that is in your womb,” with the initial ܕ functioning as a relative pronoun and the preposition ܕ specifying the location of the fruit. However, there is no preposition in the Greek text to represent ܕ because it uses the genitive phrase ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου (“the fruit *of* your womb”). By removing the preposition ܕ, the text of Ph allows the initial ܕ to function as a genitive and renders the Greek more accurately as ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ (“the fruit of your womb”).

1:43

ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ x ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ x ܕܝܬܐ ܕ ܕܝܬܐ	P
ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ x ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ x ܕܝܬܐ ܕ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ	Ph
ܕܝܬܐ x ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ	H

G καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου πρὸς ἐμέ;

The citation of this verse¹¹⁰ contains a revised translation of the Greek word πόθεν and replaced ܕܝܬܐ (“where? whence?”) with

¹⁰⁸ Of the two citations of this verse in the Syriac translation of Cyril of Alexandria's works, one demonstrates the word order of P and the other that of Ph/H. King, *Syriac Versions*, 423–424.

¹⁰⁹ CPJ 209.7–8.

¹¹⁰ CPJ 209.8–9.

as the direct object marker ܐܠ to the word ܪܝܬܐ. It is possible, though not certain, that Philoxenos' text of the Peshitta retained this reading because the OS manuscript S also read ܡܕܝܠܐ, though Pusey and Gwilliam do not list this variant in their critical edition of the Peshitta. However, the use of this direct object marker is an orthographic variation that does not change the meaning of the phrase at all, so its inclusion in the text of Ph has no bearing on the meaning of the sentence, but there is no reason to conclude that it was not part of the text of Ph. Moreover, the text of H also retains the direct object marker. Thus, we may tentatively conclude that this wording is the text of Ph. The text of Ph also includes ܡܕܡܝܠܐ, an Aphel form of ܡܠܐ ("to make recline, to seat"), as the translation for the Greek word ἀνέκλινεν rather than ܡܕܡܝܠܐ, from ܡܠܐ ("to put, place") as found in P.¹¹⁴ The translator of H also retains this reading, so this revision was likely an attempt at a better translation.

2:14

ܡܠܐ	ܐܠ	ܡܠܐ	ܪܝܬܐ	x	x	ܡܠܐ	ܪܝܬܐ	ܐܠ	P
x	x	x	ܡܠܐ	x	ܡܡܝܠܐ	ܡܠܐ	ܪܝܬܐ	ܐܠ	Ph
x	x	x	ܡܠܐ	ܕܝܡܝܠܐ	ܡܡܝܠܐ	ܡܠܐ	ܪܝܬܐ	ܐܠ	H

G καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνῃ ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας

The revision found in this citation¹¹⁵ of Ph from the text of P may be the result of textual variation in the *Vorlagen* of these translations. The text of Ph reads ܡܠܐ ܡܡܝܠܐ ("and among people [good] will") while the text of P reads ܡܠܐ ܐܠ ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ ("and good will to/for people"). The text of Ph appears to be an attempt to accurately translate the word order of the Greek phrase ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας. The text of Ph uses the word ܡܠܐ ("will, desire, delight") as an equivalent for the Greek εὐδοκία, replacing the translation of P ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ ("good will"). The translator of H also uses the word ܡܠܐ but adds the modifier ܕܝܡܝܠܐ (from ܝܡܝܠܐ "fair, good, lovely") as a translation of the Greek prefix εὐ-. It is odd that Philoxenos' citation does not

¹¹⁴ One citation of this verse from *Tract. tres* (265.22–23) retains the reading of P here, but is otherwise identical to the text given above.

¹¹⁵ *CPJ* 57.10–11.

include a translation of this prefix. Concerning this variation, Baster Haar Romeny argues that while it could be assumed that Philoxenos is simply careless here, the differences in the translations “demonstrate the independence of the translators.”¹¹⁶ Thus, while it is possible that Philoxenos was careless in this citation and accidentally omitted a word, it is also possible that the text of Ph did not include a separate word to translate the prefix εὐ-.

2:34

ⲡⲱⲟ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲱⲙ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲗ	x	ⲓⲛⲕⲁ ⲙⲁⲥⲁⲩ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲙⲓⲥⲁ	P
ⲡⲱⲟ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲱⲙ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲗ	ⲃⲁⲗ	ⲓⲛⲕⲁ ⲙⲁⲥⲁⲩ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲙⲓⲥⲁ	Ph
ⲡⲱⲟ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲱⲙ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲗ	ⲃⲁⲗ	ⲓⲛⲕⲁ ⲙⲁⲥⲁⲩ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲙⲓⲥⲁ	H
ⲙⲓⲱⲓ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁ	ⲗⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲕⲓⲥⲱⲓ	ⲙⲓⲱⲓ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ	P
ⲙⲓⲱⲓ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁ	ⲗⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲕⲓⲥⲱⲓ	ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ	Ph
ⲛⲃⲓⲱⲓⲃⲱⲛ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁ	ⲗⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲕⲓⲥⲱⲓ	ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ	H

G καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεὼν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Μαριὰμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, Ἰδοὺ οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον

Reconstructing the text of this verse from Philoxenos’ writings is difficult because he quotes it three times, but one citation is only the first phrase,¹¹⁷ and the other two citations contain the rest of the verse (but not the first part). This is complicated further by the fact that the latter two citations differ from one another in a few regards.¹¹⁸ However, despite the fact that the citation from *CML* includes the citation marker ⲙ, the text has at least partially been adapted in the context (see previous footnote for the texts). The first phrase of the sentence includes one revised reading from the text of P: the extension of the phrase ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲗ (“to Mary”) to the longer, but equivalent in meaning, phrase ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲗ ⲃⲁⲗ. This alteration

¹¹⁶ Romeny, “A Philoxenian-Harclean Tradition?”, 67.

¹¹⁷ *CPJ* 209.12–13.

¹¹⁸ *CPJ* 220.6–7: ⲛⲕⲓⲥⲱⲓ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ ⲡⲱⲟ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲱⲙ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲗ ⲗⲓⲙⲱⲛ

CML 44.5–6: ⲓⲥ ⲁⲛⲱ ⲗⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲙⲓⲱⲓ ⲛⲃⲓⲗⲁⲗ ⲡⲱⲟ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲱⲙ ⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲱⲙ ⲙⲱⲛ

is likely an attempt by the translator of Ph to account for the presence of the Greek preposition *πρός*. One of the two citations that includes the remainder of the verse includes the citation marker ܠ in the place of ܠܡ. However, we should not conclude that the text of Ph omits ܠܡ because Philoxenos frequently replaces inconsequential words with this citation marker.¹¹⁹

There is some question about whether or not the text of Ph should read ܠܡܠܝܬܐ (with P) or ܠܡܠܝܬܐ (with H). In one citation, the text of this verse reads ܠܡܠܝܬܐ, and Philoxenos includes the citation marker in this citation.¹²⁰ However, this text is found in *CML* and the fragment that contains this text is found only in two late MSS.¹²¹ Because of the late date and scribal transmission of this text, it is more likely to have been altered (intentionally or not) to the received spelling of the Peshitta. Both citations from Philoxenos include the initial -ܐ, so it seems clear that it was included in the text of Ph. Thus, we may conclude that the text of Ph read ܠܡܠܝܬܐ.

There is, however, a variant reading in the text of *CPJ* that we do not ascribe to the text of Ph. The citation from *CPJ* reads ܠܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ ("to/for Israel") rather than ܠܝܫܪܐܝܝܠܐ ("in Israel"). If the text of Ph did include the former reading, then both the translator of H and a later scribe responsible for the text of the fragment in *CML* changed the -ܝܠ back to a -ܐ. While this is certainly a possible explanation, it seems unlikely that the translator of Ph who generally corrects prepositions based on the Greek text would have translated the Greek phrase *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ* as ܠܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ. It is also possible that the scribe responsible for the MS of *CPJ* accidentally included -ܝܠ because the two previous nouns (ܠܝܫܪܐܝܝܠܐ and ܠܡܠܝܬܐ) included the prefix -ܝܠ. Thus, we conclude that the text of Ph originally read ܠܝܫܪܐܝܝܠܐ.

¹¹⁹ Though it is worth noting that in most cases Philoxenos omits a conjunction and not a pronoun.

¹²⁰ *CML* 44.5–6.

¹²¹ MSS D and E are listed as 13th century mss. See Watt, 10, for a description.

2:43

ଘଟଣା ନି ମନ୍ତ୍ରଣା ସେବା	ଅଧିକାରୀଙ୍କ ଉପସ୍ଥିତିରେ	ନୂଆଁ କର୍ମ	କରାଯାଇଥାଏ		P
ଘଟଣା ନି	କରାଯାଇଥାଏ	ଅଧିକାରୀଙ୍କ ଉପସ୍ଥିତିରେ	ନୂଆଁ କର୍ମ	କରାଯାଇଥାଏ	Ph
ଘଟଣା ନି	କରାଯାଇଥାଏ	ଅଧିକାରୀଙ୍କ ଉପସ୍ଥିତିରେ	ନୂଆଁ କର୍ମ	କରାଯାଇଥାଏ	H
					P
					Ph
					H

ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ

The citation of this verse from Ph¹²⁴ and the text of H both omit the conjunction **וְ**, presumably because there is no conjunction here in the Greek text. The conclusion that this omission is not accidental or simply a result of Philoxenos' stylistic concerns is strengthened by evidence later in the phrase that the translations of Ph and H reflect the Greek word order. Each of the later translations transposes the phrase **וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹסֵף אֶל הָאִמָּה** ("And Joseph and his mother") with the verbal phrase **וְלֹא יָדְעוּ** ("and they did not know") in order to reflect the Greek word order. However, there is some question as to what the original Greek text of this phrase actually read. The critical text of NA²⁷ reads οὐκ ἔγνωνσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ("His parents did not know"),¹²⁵ but a well attested variant reads οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ.¹²⁶ Thus, it is clear that the *Vorlagen* of P, Ph, and H attest to the latter variant reading, though the translators of Ph and H have attempted to translate the word order more precisely. It also appears that the translator of Ph has attempted to translate the third person singular ἔγνω by using **יָדָע** rather than the third person plural **יָדְעוּ**. It is unclear whether or not the Greek text behind the text of H included a singular or a plural verb, though given the systematic pursuit of word-for-word translation throughout the text of H, including verb tense and person, it can be assumed that the *Vorlage(n)* of H had the plural verb.

¹²⁴ *CPI* 209.13–14

¹²⁵ The witnesses that attest to this reading are: **Ⲛ** B D L W **ⲑ** f¹ 33. 579. lat sa

¹²⁶ The witnesses that attest to this reading are: A C Ψ 0130 f¹³ it bo^{pt}.

3:23

G καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσεί ἐτῶν τριάκοντα,
ὧν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ
D ἦν δὲ Ἰησοῦς ὡς ἐτῶν [τριάκοντα] ἀρχόμενος ὡς
ἐνομίζετο εἶναι υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ

¹³¹ CML 53.5: 𐎠𐎢𐏁𐎧𐎡𐏁𐎣 𐎠𐎩𐎥𐎴𐎡𐏁

In Philoxenos' commentaries there are six citations of this verse, though only one contains the whole verse, and this full citation is the only one found in *CPJ*.¹³² The text of Philoxenos' citation begins with the word ܐܠܗܐ, so we cannot conclude whether or not the text of Ph omitted ܐܠܗܐ and included -ܐ at the beginning of the verse as the text of H. The texts of Ph and H have added the phrase ܠܒܪܝܬܐ ('beginning'-a participle of ܠܒܐ) after ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ, most likely as an attempt to render the Greek participle ἀρχόμενος. The addition of this word, as well as the word order of all three texts, presents an interesting problem: none of the three texts reflect a word-for-word translation of the word order of the Greek text as it stands in NA²⁷. This is not surprising with regard to the text of P, but it is surprising with regard to the texts of Ph and H. However, there is a variant reading for this verse that could explain the variation in word order. Although the word order of the texts of Ph and H does not correspond precisely to that of D, it is much closer to its order than to that of the NA²⁷ critical text.

With the exceptions of placing the verbal phrase ܠܒܐ ܡܠܟܐ (the translation of ἦν) *after* the subject (Jesus) rather than before it, and, similarly, placing the verb ܡܠܟܐ (the translation of εἶναι) *before* the clause ܠܒܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ (the translation of ὡς ἐνομιζέτο), the word order of Ph and H is identical to that of D. Moreover, there is some question about the word order of the text of Ph with regard to the placement of ܡܠܟܐ in the text. One of the five shorter citations¹³³ renders the final phrase ܠܒܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ. The word order of this citation is precisely equal to the word order of D. This citation comes from *CML*, but it is found in the portion of the text attested by MS A and is thus quite likely to be authentic. Moreover, this quotation includes the citation marker ܠܐ. The change in word order is more easily explainable in this shorter citation, as it is more likely to have been altered to Philoxenos' style. However, either way the word order of the text of Ph is closer to the word order of D than it is to NA²⁷. Thus, it appears that there is a link between the *Vorlage(n)* of Ph and H and the text to which Codex D attests for this verse. This claim is tentative, but based on the word-for-word translation

¹³² Full: *CPJ* 41.6–8; Partial: *CML* 80.27; 81.9; 82.19–20; 84.4; 87.6.

¹³³ *CML* 80.27.

technique of the translator of H, and to a lesser but still notable degree, the translator of Ph, the claim is defensible.

3.3 Philoxenian Gospel of John

1:3

ܠܐܡܢ ܡܢܚܪܐ ܕܐܠܗ	P
ܠܐܡܢ ܡܢܚܪܐ ܡܢܚܪܐ	Ph
ܠܐܡܢ ܡܢܚܪܐ ܡܢܚܪܐ	H

G πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο

While this citation is only a short portion of the text of Jn 1:3, we may confidently attribute this text to the Philoxenian version. Philoxenos cites this portion of the verse four times,¹³⁴ and in one of the four he includes the citation marker ܠܐ.¹³⁵ Moreover, all four citations attest to the use of ܡܢܚܪܐ rather than ܕܐܠܗ.¹³⁶ Moreover, ܡܢܚܪܐ is also found in three separate citations of this verse in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, so it is clear that this reading was used in other fifth/sixth century translations.¹³⁷

1:3

ܠܐܡܢ ܕܐܠܗ ܡܢܚܪܐ	×	ܠܐܡܢ ܠܐܡܢ ܠܐܡܢ	×	ܐܠܗ ܡܢܚܪܐ	P
ܠܐܡܢ ܕܐܠܗ ܡܢܚܪܐ	×	ܠܐܡܢ ܠܐܡܢ ܠܐܡܢ	×	ܐܠܗ ܡܢܚܪܐ ܡܢܚܪܐ	Ph
ܠܐܡܢ ܕܐܠܗ ܡܢܚܪܐ	×	ܠܐܡܢ ܠܐܡܢ ܠܐܡܢ	×	ܐܠܗ ܡܢܚܪܐ ܡܢܚܪܐ	H

G οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός

In the one citation of this verse,¹³⁸ the text of Ph adds the verbal phrase ܡܢܚܪܐ ܠܐܡܢ, in an attempt to translate more precisely the Greek aorist verb ἦν. This translation style is characteristic of Ph, and the revision is retained in H, so it is reasonable to conclude

¹³⁴ *CPJ* 140.11–12; 132.13–14; 213.4–5; 241.18.

¹³⁵ *CPJ* 140.11–12.

¹³⁶ The citation of this verse in *LMS* 4.17–19 also reads ܡܢܚܪܐ ܕܐܠܗ. The OS C also contains ܡܢܚܪܐ, so it is possible that this reading was retained in Philoxenos' version of P.

¹³⁷ King, *Syriac Versions*, 430.

¹³⁸ *CPJ* 241.21–22.

that this is the reading of Ph. However, there is some question about attributing the negative particle ܐܠ at the beginning of the sentence to the Philoxenian version. Pusey and Gwilliam do not list ܐܠ as a textual variant for 1:8, and neither the Peshitta nor the Harclean version displays this reading. This evidence does not preclude the possibility that the text of Ph included ܐܠ; it simply means that there is no other external evidence to validate this reading. It is even possible that this reading was found in Philoxenos' text of P and that this variant simply was not included in the critical edition. Thus, we may tentatively conclude that ܐܠ is found in the text of Ph.

1:10

ܡܚܕܐ ܐܠ ܟ ܕܠܗܐ ܕܥܡ ܡܚܕܐ ܕܥܡ ܟ ܕܠܗܐ P
 ܕܐܠ ܡܠ ܕܠܗܐ ܕܥܡ ܡܚܕܐ ܕܥܡ ܡܚܕܐ ܕܠܗܐ Ph
 ܕܐܠ ܡܠ ܕܠܗܐ ܕܥܡ ܡܚܕܐ ܕܥܡ ܡܚܕܐ ܕܠܗܐ H

G ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω

The text of this verse is part of a lengthy citation comprised of Jn 1:10–13,¹³⁹ though there are also two other partial citations of this verse as well.¹⁴⁰ Philoxenos indicates his intention to cite with the citation marker ܠ (after ܕܠܗܐ) and introduces the citation with the phrase “the evangelist wrote and said thus concerning him” (ܕܐܡܪ ܕܥܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܕܐ ܕܐܠ ܕܠܗܐ...). As with Jn 1:8 above, the text of Ph adds the verb ܡܚܕܐ to ܕܥܡ in order to translate the verb ἦν, and the Harclean version includes this revision as well. The other variation of the text of Ph from the text of P in this verse is the replacement of the direct object pronoun ܡ- with the independent direct object ܡܠ in the final phrase of the sentence. This variation does not change the meaning of the phrase, but it does reflect the Greek word order (αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω). The Harclean version also includes this revision.

¹³⁹ *CPJ* 38.1–3.

¹⁴⁰ *CPJ* 38.10; 38.11.

1:11

× ,ܡܠܬܐ ܠ ܡܠܝܐ × ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × P
 × ,ܡܠܬܐ ܠ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × Ph
 ,ܡܠܬܐ × ܠ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ H

G εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον

Philoxenos cites this verse with the same wording on two occasions in *CPJ*, and he uses the citation marker ܠ for both.¹⁴¹ The first is part of a long quotation from Jn 1:10–13, and the second citation comes from the discussion following this quotation. The only revision in the text of Ph from P is the addition of the demonstrative pronoun ܡܠܝܬ. This addition does not necessarily conform more closely to Greek word order, but it seems to be an attempt to translate the Greek plural οἱ ἴδιοι because the Syriac ܡܠܝܬ does not reflect the plural antecedent. Although the text of H displays the pronoun ܡܠܝܬ rather than ܡܠܝܬ in order to distinguish the gender, these translations are virtually equivalent, and it appears that the translators had similar intentions.¹⁴²

1:14

ܚܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × ,ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܝܬ ܠ ܡܠܝܬ ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × P
 ܚܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × ,ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܝܬ ܠ ܡܠܝܬ ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ Ph
 ܚܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ .ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܠ ܡܠܝܬ ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ H
 ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ P
 ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ × ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ Ph
 ܚܬܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܠܝܬ H

G καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

¹⁴¹ *CPJ* 38.3–4; 38.14–15.

¹⁴² The text of H takes this concept one step further by adding ܡܠܝܬ at the beginning of the sentence to reflect the other Greek plural in the first phrase of the verse (τὰ ἴδια).

The task of determining the Philoxenian version of Jn 1:14 is extremely complex because Philoxenos quotes some portion of this verse over 50 times throughout his commentaries and his wording is inconsistent. Moreover, despite the fact that he refers to this verse so many times, Philoxenos never quotes the full verse in any one place. Thus, we are left with the task of reconstructing his wording from partial citations. Such a task is tenuous, but the high number of citations, varied though they may be, actually make such a reconstruction possible.

The inclusion of the pronoun ܐܡ at the beginning of the phrase is questionable because of the 50 citations in the commentaries that include the opening phrase only twelve have it.¹⁴³ We cannot appeal to citation markers or intent to cite in this case because Philoxenos uses the citation marker ܐܠ in citations with and without ܐܡ. The particle ܐܡ is found in the text of H, and clearly represents an attempt to represent the Greek definite article ὁ. King asserts that “most of his [Philoxenos] allusions do not allow for” the inclusion of ܐܡ.¹⁴⁴ While this is true, it is tenuous to use allusions to establish accurate citations. Moreover, as is true for the use of Greek witnesses in textual criticism, we cannot allow the sheer number of occurrences of a variant to determine the original. The fact that Philoxenos quotes Jn 1:14 so many times suggests that he was highly concerned about the interpretation of this verse, and the addition of ܐܡ emphasizes and helps to clarify the subject of the verse. Moreover, there is evidence of this same translation technique elsewhere in Ph.¹⁴⁵ Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the text of Ph also includes ܐܡ here as a translation of the Greek article.¹⁴⁶

There is some question about the word order of ܐܡܝܢ ܐܠܝܗܐ ܐܡܝܢ in Philoxenos’ citations of this verse because he frequently conforms it to the more idiomatic Syriac word order of Verb-Subject-Object, rendering the phrase ܐܡܝܢ ܐܠܝܗܐ ܐܡܝܢ. However,

¹⁴³ This reading is also found in three of the four citations containing this portion of the verse found in *Tract. tres* (120.7; 143.14–15; 239.24–25).

¹⁴⁴ King, *Syriac Versions*, 431.

¹⁴⁵ See the discussion above of Mt 2:2.

¹⁴⁶ It should be noted that none of the citations of this verse in *LMS* contains ܐܡ, but all of these citations are either allusions or very brief (usually only the opening phrase).

despite the frequency with which Philoxenos provides this wording, it may be concluded that citations with this word order are properly classified as allusions—Philoxenos is clearly referring to the language and ideas of a particular verse, but he has altered the wording to fit his own context.

Philoxenos omits the conjunction -ܐ each time he cites the portion of the text that includes ܡܫܝܚܐ, but this should not necessarily lead to the conclusion that it does not exist in Ph. Philoxenos cites this portion of the text five times, and all five of these citations begin with the word ܡܫܝܚܐ. Thus, when Philoxenos cites this portion of the verse, he is not doing so in continuation from the first part of the verse, rendering the -ܐ unnecessary.¹⁴⁷

The text ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ as opposed to ܡܫܝܚܐ is also in question because Philoxenos cites both wordings in close proximity to one another in *CPJ*.¹⁴⁸ However, Philoxenos does include the citation marker ܠܡܪ with the former wording, and this citation is longer than the citations that read ܡܫܝܚܐ, providing some evidence that the longer rendering is actually in the text of Ph. The translation ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ is a more literal rendering of the Greek word order δόξαν αὐτοῦ, but this type of revision is not characteristic of the translation technique of Ph.¹⁴⁹ However, the existence of the reading ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ among the citations of Philoxenos must be explained somehow because it is not typical of idiomatic Syriac. It has already been noted that Philoxenos quotes this verse over fifty times, so it is highly likely that the wording of this verse received more attention than other verses. Thus, it is possible that the more literal reading ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ was originally part of the text of Ph simply because of the attention that Philoxenos paid to its interpretation. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the text of Ph here reads ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ rather than ܡܫܝܚܐ.

¹⁴⁷ Moreover, P. J. Williams asserts that the presence or absence of -ܐ should not reflect whether or not there is a καί in the Greek Vorlagen. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 149–159.

¹⁴⁸ *CPJ* 239.7–9; 240.24–25.

¹⁴⁹ Aside from this citation, there are eighteen occasions for which we have the text of Ph in which the translation of H replaces an enclitic possessive pronoun with the independent possessive particle, and in all eighteen cases the text of Ph agrees with P against H.

Philoxenos quotes the final phrase of the verse three times, and each time he uses ܠܝܝܠ rather than ܠܕܝܠܐ to render ἀληθείας. This reading is one of the few cases in which the text of Ph agrees with one of the OS texts (in this case, C) over and against the text of P. Pusey and Gwilliam do not list ܠܝܝܠ as a variant, though it is possible that the Peshitta text with which Philoxenos was familiar retained ܠܝܝܠ from the text of the OS, though this must remain uncertain. However, it is not necessary to conclude that Philoxenos' text of P included ܠܝܝܠ, as it is likely a lexical revision by the translator of Ph to offer a more accurate translation. The text of H also includes ܠܝܝܠ rather than ܠܕܝܠܐ, adding further support to the case that the text of Ph read ܠܝܝܠ as well.

1:15

ܝܕܒܐ	×	ܕܝܘܢܐ	ܐܡ	×	ܐܡ	ܝܘܢܐ	×	ܠܡܐ	ܡܠܬܐ	ܡܡܐ	ܦܐܠܐ	P
ܝܕܒܐ	ܐܡ	ܕܝܘܢܐ	ܐܡ	ܡܐܕܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	ܝܘܢܐ	ܕܐ	ܠܡܐ	ܡܠܬܐ	ܡܡܐ	ܦܐܠܐ	Ph
ܝܕܒܐ	ܐܡ	ܕܝܘܢܐ	ܐܡ	ܡܐܕܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	ܝܘܢܐ	ܕܐ	ܠܡܐ	ܡܠܬܐ	ܡܡܐ	ܦܐܠܐ	H
×	×	ܡܐ	ܐܡ	ܡܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	×	ܡܡܐ	×	ܡܠ	ܠܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	P
ܠܡܐ	ܡܡܐ	×	×	ܡܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	ܡܡܐ	ܡܐ	×	×	ܠܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	Ph
ܠܡܐ	ܡܡܐ	ܡܐ	×	ܠܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	ܡܡܐ	ܡܐ	×	×	ܠܡܐ	ܠܡܐ	H

G Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν λέγων, Οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον, Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.

Philoxenos quotes the full version of 1:15 twice¹⁵⁰ and cites phrases of the verse twice as well.¹⁵¹ In one of the two full citations, Philoxenos provides the citation marker ܠܝܝܠ.¹⁵² While there are minor variations among Philoxenos' quotations, they are similar enough to confidently attribute the reading above to the text of Ph. There are several additions within the text of Ph that appear to be the result of providing a more precise translation: the addition of the temporal preposition ܕܐ to the participle ܝܘܢܐ, the addition of the verbal phrase ܡܐܕܡܐ as a translation of ἦν, and the addition of the pronoun ܐܡ as a literal translation of the Greek definite article ὁ so that the Greek text ὁ ὀπίσω μου is rendered ܝܕܒܐ ܐܡ

¹⁵⁰ CPJ 231.13–15; 242.16–17.

¹⁵¹ CPJ 242.2; 242.22–23.

¹⁵² CPJ 241.13–15.

1:16

κ	$\times$	μ	ν	ω	P
κ	$\times$	μ	ν	ω	Ph
κ	$\times$	μ	ν	ω	H

G ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν
καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος

Philoxenos' commentaries contain one full¹⁵⁴ and two partial¹⁵⁵ citations of this verse. The revisions are slight: the text of Ph replaces ܐܠܗܐ with the virtually identical ܐܠܗܐ, both derivatives of the verb ܐܠܗ. It is also interesting to note that while H also uses ܐܠܗܐ, Ph retains the possessive suffix -ܐ found in P order to reflect the use of the Greek αὐτοῦ whereas the text of H uses the extended ܐܠܗܐ. The text of Ph also provides the extended form of the first person plural pronoun ܐܡܢܐ. Philoxenos quotes this precise wording on two different occasions, and one of the citations includes ܐܡܢܐ, so it is reasonable to conclude that this is the wording of Ph.¹⁵⁶

1:17

1. $x \times x$ Թծալթո քս Կիւ ԾաւԹԻԻ ԴԵԾ Խ ԴԾԾԽԽ ԿԽ P
 2. Կիւ քս Թծալթո $x \times$ ԾաւԹԻԻ ԴԵԾ Խ ԴԾԾԽԽ ԿԽ Ph
 3. Կիւ¹⁵⁷ քս Թծալթո $x \times$ ԾաւԹԻԻ ԴԵԾ Խ ԴԾԾԽԽ ԿԽ H

¹⁵³ Jn 1:8,10.

¹⁵⁴ *CPI* 245.5.

¹⁵⁵ *CPJ* 245.20–21; 245.27

¹⁵⁶ This word is marked with an asterisk and obelus in the Harklean tradition to denote Thomas's insertion of a word not found in his Greek *Vorlagen*. For the explanation of these sigla, see Juckel, "Introduction to the Harklean Text" in G. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels, Vol. 1: Matthew*, xxxiii–xxxv.

κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας P

κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας Ph

κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας H

G ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο

Philoxenos provides two quotations of this verse, and both reflect the wording found above.¹⁵⁷ In order to provide a word-for-word translation of the Greek ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, the text of Ph inverts the word order of κ_ας and κ_ας and moves the particle ρ_α.

1:33

κ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας x ρ_α κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας ρ_α κ_ας P

κ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας x ρ_α κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας ρ_α κ_ας Ph

κ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας ρ_ας x ρ_α κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας ρ_α κ_ας H

x κ_ας κ_ας δ_ας κ_ας x x κ_ας ρ_ας ρ_ας P

κ_ας κ_ας x δ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας x x ρ_ας ρ_ας Ph

κ_ας κ_ας x δ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας ρ_ας x ρ_ας ρ_ας H

κ_ας κ_ας κ_ας x x ρ_ας κ_ας κ_ας P

κ_ας κ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας ρ_ας κ_ας κ_ας κ_ας Ph

κ_ας κ_ας κ_ας ρ_ας ρ_ας κ_ας κ_ας κ_ας H

G καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ

Philoxenos cites this verse only once, but he quotes the whole verse.¹⁵⁸ The text of Ph omits the pronoun κ_ας and replaces it with ρ_ας. The change in meaning in this phrase is not drastic, though it is likely an attempt by the translator of Ph to render more literally the Greek prepositional phrase Ἐφ' ὃν. It appears also that the text of H attempts to render this phrase even more literally with the phrase ρ_ας ρ_ας. Thus, the translation of this phrase is an

¹⁵⁷ CPJ 245.6–7; 246.27–28.

¹⁵⁸ CPJ 216.8–11.

example of the intermediary status of the translation of Ph between P and H. The text of Ph also alters the word order of the phrase **𐤒𐤓𐤀 𐤒𐤔𐤓𐤕** to read **𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤓𐤀**, which more accurately represents that of the Greek τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον. The translator of Ph also adds the verbal phrase **𐤌𐤓𐤔𐤓𐤕** as a translation of ἐστίν.

1:34

𐤒𐤌𐤕𐤓	𐤓𐤓	x	x	𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤓	P
𐤒𐤌𐤕𐤓	𐤕𐤓	x	𐤌𐤓𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤓	Ph	
𐤒𐤌𐤕𐤓	𐤕𐤓	𐤓𐤓	𐤌𐤓𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤓	H	

G καὶ γὰρ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

In the citation of this verse,¹⁵⁹ the text of Ph adds the verbal phrase **𐤌𐤓𐤔𐤓𐤕** in order to reflect the presence of the Greek verb ἐστίν. This type of revision is characteristic of the translation technique of Ph, and the text of H also displays this translation, so it is reasonable to conclude that this revision represents the text of Ph.

3:16

𐤔𐤔𐤕 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓	x	x	𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤌𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤓𐤓 𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤓	P
𐤔𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓	x	x	𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤌𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤕 [𐤕𐤓𐤓] 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓	Ph
𐤔𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓	𐤓𐤓	𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤌𐤕𐤓 𐤔𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤓𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤓	H	

G οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν

There are three full citations of this verse in Philoxenos' writings.¹⁶⁰ All three citations lack the conjunction **𐤕𐤓𐤓**, though it is not necessary to assume that it is missing from the text of Ph because one of the citations includes **𐤒𐤓** in the place of **𐤕𐤓𐤓**,¹⁶¹ and the omission is likely accidental or the result of adaptation to Philoxenos' citation context. All three citations of this verse demonstrate a change in the verb from **𐤔𐤔𐤕** to **𐤔𐤓𐤓**. Despite the fact that the spelling of these words differs significantly, **𐤔𐤔𐤕** is a defective form of **𐤔𐤓𐤓**. Thus, it appears that this revision is an

¹⁵⁹ *CPJ* 216.11–12.

¹⁶⁰ *CML* 74.5–6; 78.11–12 (both in MS A); *LMS* 28.15–17.

¹⁶¹ Though the citation in *LMS* contains **𐤒𐤓** where **𐤕𐤓𐤓** would stand.

attempt by the translators of Ph and H to render more literally the perfect tense of the Greek verb ἔδωκεν.¹⁶² All of Philoxenos' citations of this verse conclude with the addition of the word ܡܢܗܠܐ ("on account of it [i.e. the world]").¹⁶³ However, it is not necessary to conclude that this word was included in the text of Ph because each citation ends here and does not continue on to include 3:17. Thus, the inclusion of ܡܢܗܠܐ is likely an attempt to "resolve" the verse and make it coherent as a self-contained thought.

3:28

ܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ P
 ܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ Ph
 ܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ H

G οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου

Philoxenos only quotes the second half of this verse,¹⁶⁴ but the portion that he does quote reflects revisions characteristic of other citations from Ph. The text of Ph replaces the verb ܡܢܗܠܐ with the verbal phrase ܡܢ ܕܡܢܗܠܐ. The text of H also includes this reading, though it adds the pronoun ܡܢ to reflect the presence of the Greek definite article. The text of Ph also replaces ܡܢܗܠܐ with the verbal phrase ܡܢܗܠܐ, which seems to be a more accurate translation of the Greek participle ἀπεσταλμένος. Once again, the text of H reproduces the variant reading found in Ph, though it replaces the first person singular pronoun ܡܢ with the verb ܡܢܗܠܐ in the final phrase.

¹⁶² Though it is also worth noting that ܡܢܗܠܐ also appears in OS C and in the citation of this verse in the Syriac translation of Cyril, so it is possible that Philoxenos inherited this reading. King, *Syriac Versions*, 437–438.

¹⁶³ Including the three citations mentioned above and three additional citations found in *Tract. tres*.

¹⁶⁴ *CPJ* 216.13–14.

3:31

x	am	h	h	h	h	h	x	h	h	h	am	P
,mohu	x	h	h	h	h	h	[h x]	h	x	am	Ph	
,mohu	x	h	h	h	h	h	x	h	h	x	am	H

G Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν·

In the brief citation of this verse,¹⁶⁵ the text of Ph and the text of H omit the conjunction **h**, likely because there is no conjunction in the Greek text. In the final phrase, the text of Ph replaces the verbal enclitic **am** with the verb **,mohu** as a translation of ἐστίν, and the text of H also reflects this revision. In addition to these two revisions which seem to fit the translation technique of Ph, this quotation also reads **h** (“heaven”) rather than **h** (“above”). Without external validation, either from its inclusion in the text of H or a second citation with the same wording, it is tenuous to conclude that the text of Ph actually read **h**. And while it is possible that that Philoxenos (or the translator of Ph) thought that **h** was a better translation in this context than **h**, this does not seem likely as **h** is the more “literal” translation of ἄνωθεν. Thus, it seems more likely that this is a mistake of memory or an adaptation by Philoxenos and should not be considered part of the text of Ph.

3:33

x	am	h	h	h	h	h	P
,mohu	x	h	h	h	h	h	Ph
,mohu	x	h	h	h	h	h	H

G ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστίν

Philoxenos’ quotation of this verse is only a portion of the longer verse,¹⁶⁶ but the translation technique in this brief citation is consistent with that of Ph elsewhere. The text of Ph replaces **am** with **,mohu** as a translation of the Greek word ἐστίν at the end of the verse. The text of H also retains this reading, so it is reasonable to conclude that this is the text of Ph.

¹⁶⁵ *CPJ* 216.21.

¹⁶⁶ *CPJ* 216.22–23.

5:34

ܡܠܟ ܠܝܟ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܠܝܟ ܕܡܝܢ ܠܝܟ ܠܝܟ ܠܝܟ P
 x ܠܝܟ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܠܝܟ ܕܡܝܢ ܠܝܟ x ܠܝܟ Ph
 ܡܠܟ ܠܝܟ x ܠܝܟ ܕܡܝܢ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܠܝܟ x ܠܝܟ H

 ܠܝܟ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ x x ܠܝܟ ܠܝܟ P
 ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ x ܡܠܟ ܠܝܟ ܠܝܟ Ph
 ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܠܝܟ x ܠܝܟ ܠܝܟ H

G ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε.

The text of 5:34 in Philoxenos' citation¹⁶⁷ is nearly identical to the text of P, though the difference between them is enough to justify categorizing this verse as a citation of Ph. The revision in word order of ܠܝܟ ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܡܠܟ is inconsequential, and because it is not reflected by H or by the Greek text, there is little evidence to demonstrate that the actual text of Ph reflected this reading. However, because the text of Ph frequently demonstrates a revision toward the Greek word order, the possibility remains that the *Vorlage* of the text of Ph had the word order λέγω ταῦτα. It is also possible that Philoxenos simply made a mistake with regard to the placement of ܡܠܟ in this citation, but even if this is a mistake, there is evidence of another revision characteristic of Ph at the end of the verse. The text of Ph changes the verb from ܠܝܟ to ܠܚܝܬܝܟܝܢ (from ܠܝܟ, Ethp: 'to be delivered') and revises the voice of this verb from active to passive in order to render literally the Greek passive verb σωθῆτε. The text of H also includes this reading.

¹⁶⁷ CPJ 242.12–14.

[illegible]

Philoxenos quotes this verse only once,¹⁶⁹ but he includes the citation marker ܐܠ. As he often does, Philoxenos places ܐܠ in the position of the post-positive conjunction, so although the citation does not include ܝܬܝ, we should not necessarily conclude that it was omitted from the text of Ph. It is possible that the omission of ܐܠܬܝܬܝܬ in the text of Ph was intentional because the Greek word οὐπω carries the meaning of the Syriac phrase ܐܠܬܝܬܝܬ. Thus, it is possible that the text of Ph represents an attempt at a word-for-word correspondence and omitted ܐܠܬܝܬܝܬ. This explanation is supported by the fact that the texts of P, Ph, and H all display a longer form of this text including a form of the verb ܐܬܝܬܝܬ (“to give”). This appears to be a result of a textual variant, as several witnesses include the phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον δεδομένον.¹⁷⁰ Thus, the text of Ph (ܠܠܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܐ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܝܬܝ ܐܠ, ‘For the Holy Spirit had not been given’) represents a translation of the variant reading. The text of Ph also includes a revision in the gender of the verb ܐܬܝܬܝܬ from feminine to masculine in order to represent the Holy Spirit as male, not female.¹⁷¹

¹⁷¹ See the discussion of this aspect of Syriac translation technique in Lk 1:35.

12:26

ܠܐܡܢ ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܢ x ܝܕܥܐ ܠܕܡܪܝܢ x ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ P
 ܠܐܡܢ ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܢ ܝܕܥܐ x x ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ P^h
 ܠܐܡܢ ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܢ x x ܐܡܢ [ܕ ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ] H

 ܠܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ x x x x x ܕܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ P
 ܠܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܐܡܢ ܥܕܐ x ܕܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ P^h
¹⁷²[ܠܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ] ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ x ܥܕܐ [ܠܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ] H

G ἔὰν ἐμοὶ τις διακονῇ, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω, καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ καὶ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται· ἔὰν τις ἐμοὶ διακονῇ τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ

In the citation of this verse from *CPJ*,¹⁷³ the text of Ph inverts the word order of the phrase ܝܕܥܐ ܠܕܡܪܝܢ in P. While this is essentially an inconsequential revision, the text of Ph matches the Greek ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω. Moreover, the text of Ph inverts the order of the phrase ܕܡܪܝܢ ܥܕܐ in order to reflect more accurately the Greek text. The text of H also displays this revision. The phrase ܐܡܢ ܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ in the text of Ph is not found in the text of P, but the text of H retains this reading (with the exception of ܐܡܢ). Thus, the text of Ph appears to be an attempt at a more word-for-word translation of the Greek text.

14:2

ܠܝܕܥܐ ܠܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ P
 ܠܡܪܝܢ ܠܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ P^h
 ܠܡܪܝܢ ܠܥܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢ H

G ὅτι πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν

¹⁷² The brackets in the Harclean text here, as found in the *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*, denote that these words are ineligible in the primary manuscript used for the Harclean text (Vat. Syr. 268), and that these words come from Vat. Syr. 267. G. Kiraz, "Introduction to the CESG," in idem., *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels, Vol. 1: Matthew*, xxv.

¹⁷³ *CPJ* 210.9–12.

14:3

In this citation,¹⁷⁶ the text of Ph reflects the inverted word order of the phrase, **ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁ** in order to conform it to the Greek εἰμι ἐγώ. This reading is also found in the text of H.

16:12

P	×	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ
Ph	×	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ
H	×	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ
P	×	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ
Ph	×	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ
H	×	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ	ሙሉ ስጦታ ሲሰጥ

G ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν
ἅρτι

Philoxenos' exegetical writings contain three full citations of this verse, and all three include citation markers.¹⁷⁷ The three citations are not identical, but they demonstrate a high level of similarity. All three of Philoxenos' citations read **ܐܬܝܬܐ** rather than the infinitive

¹⁷⁴ *CPI* 210.12.

¹⁷⁵ King, *Syriac Versions*, 456.

¹⁷⁶ *CPJ* 210.13–14.

¹⁷⁷ *CML* 9.12–13; *CPJ* 159.1–3; 178.9–11.

ܡܚܡܝܢ found in P and H. All three quotations also include ܡܚܡܝܢ rather than ܡܚܡܝܢ as found in H. Indeed, the three quotations from Philoxenos are in perfect unison until the final phrase. Two of the quotations agree with the text of P with regard to content and to word order (ܡܚܡܝܢ ܡܚܡܝܢ),¹⁷⁸ and one of the quotations agrees with the word choice of H but reverses the order (ܡܚܡܝܢ ܡܚܡܝܢ).¹⁷⁹ We are not able to appeal to the authority of one commentary over and against the other, however, as each reading appears in *CPJ*. It seems that the most obvious answer is to allow majority to rule and to assume that the text of Ph agrees with the text of P. However, this explanation does not account for the fact that the text of H displays the variant reading that would be dismissed if Ph agrees with P.

There are also a few possible explanations for the difference between the texts. It is possible that the text of Ph included the reading ܡܚܡܝܢ, but Philoxenos accidentally reverted back to the text of the Peshitta two of the three times he wrote this verse. After all, there is no major christological issue at stake in this change in translation, so it could be assumed that Philoxenos could quite easily forget that this word had been changed. Moreover, it is possible that a scribe altered (intentionally or not) the text of any of the three citations to conform it to the more familiar text. Despite the fact that both disputed words are included above in brackets to illustrate some amount of uncertainty, it seems more likely that the text of Ph originally read ܡܚܡܝܢ because this best explains the use of the same word in the text of H.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ *CML* 9.12–13; *CPJ* 178.9–11.

¹⁷⁹ *CPJ* 159.1–3.

¹⁸⁰ Brock asserts that Jn 16:12–13 “excellently illustrates Ph’s intermediary position” between P and H, “Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem,” 331.

[illegible]

Philoxenos quotes this verse four times with two full¹⁸¹ and two partial citations.¹⁸² The text of Ph, along with the text of H, places ܡܐ before the verb ܠܕܝܢ, reflecting the placement of *δέ* in the Greek text. Two of the four citations of this verse in Philoxenos include this reading;¹⁸³ one omits the conjunction altogether;¹⁸⁴ and one replaces ܡܐ with ܠܡܢ.¹⁸⁵ However, Pusey and Gwilliam also list this word order as a textual variant for the Peshitta, so while we can safely conclude that this is the word order of Ph, we cannot conclude that this word order was revised by the translator of Ph.

The text of Ph also demonstrates the translation **חלל חלל** in place of the shorter phrase **חלל**. Philoxenos quotes this portion of the text twice, and both times he uses the longer phrasing.¹⁸⁶ This is likely an attempt to produce a word-for-word translation of the Greek, but the fact that the text of H includes **חלל** complicates this explanation because the text of H is generally more accurate with respect to word-for-word translations than the text of Ph. It is also possible that this translation is the result of textual variation in the Greek *Vorlagen*. The critical text of NA²⁷ reads ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, but several MSS replace ἐν with εἰς.¹⁸⁷ The slight difference of

¹⁸² *CPI* 178.11–12; *CML* 3.20–21.

¹⁸³ *CPI* 159.3–4; 178.11–12.

¹⁸⁴ *CML* 3.20–21. This citation is quite short and should probably be considered an allusion. Thus, there is no need to postulate that the text of Ph omitted **ⲡⲓ**.

¹⁸⁵ *CML* 9.12–13.

¹⁸⁶ *CML* 9.12–13; *CPJ* 159.3–4.

¹⁸⁷ The variant is attested by codices A and B and a few vulgate mss. Moreover, this variant was included in the text of NA²⁵ as noted by the symbol † in the textual apparatus. Thus, the text of the witnesses for this variant are ancient enough to have been found in a Vorlage used by the translator of Ph.

nuance between these words could certainly cause a translator to replace the preposition ܐܠܝܬܐ with ܕܠܐ, which, like εἰς, carries the connotation of ‘to, toward’ rather than ‘in.’ Thus, we conclude that the text of Ph provides support for an established textual variant not found in the other Syriac versions. Moreover, it appears that the translator of H had access to a *Vorlage* that included ἐν and subsequently corrected the text of Ph.

16:28

ܠܐ ܕܝܟܐ ܠܠܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܥܥ ܕܐܬܐ ܠܠܠܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܢ ܕܡܥܥ P

ܠܐ ܕܝܟܐ ܠܠܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܥܥ ܕܐܬܐ ܠܠܠܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܢ ܕܡܥܥ Ph

ܠܐ ܕܝܟܐ ܠܠܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܥܥ ܕܐܬܐ ܠܠܠܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܢ ܕܡܥܥ H

ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܕ P

ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܕ Ph

ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܕ H

G ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφήμι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα

Philoxenos displays his intent to cite this verse with the citation marker ܐܠܝܬܐ.¹⁸⁸ The texts of both Ph and H omit the preposition ܕܠܐ in the first phrase of this verse. It is possible that this revision is the result of textual variation in the Greek *Vorlagen*. The NA²⁷ critical text words the opening phrase ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, but several witnesses replace παρὰ with the preposition ἐκ.¹⁸⁹ It is possible, then, that ܕܠܐ is a translation of παρὰ from the Greek *Vorlage* of the text of P,¹⁹⁰ and, likewise, that the Greek *Vorlagen* of Ph and H read ἐκ rather than παρὰ. This explains the absence of ܕܠܐ in these “word-for-word” translations. However, it is not necessary to conclude that this revision is the result of a textual variant. It is also possible that the translators of Ph and H simply omitted ܕܠܐ and allowed ܥܢ to represent παρὰ. In the final phrase of this verse, both Ph and H omit ܕܠܐ. The inclusion of this phrase

¹⁸⁸ CPJ 238.6–8.

¹⁸⁹ This variant is attested by codices B, C*, L, and Ψ, as well as a few others later mss. This variant was included in the text of NA²⁵ as noted by the symbol † in the textual apparatus.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. John 1:1 for an example of ܕܠܐ translated from παρὰ.

in the text of P is likely the result of the idiomatic Syriac grammatical feature known as the pleonastic dative, which emphasizes the subject of a verbal phrase by adding a personal pronoun to the preposition -ܐ. The translators of Ph and H omitted this phrase for the sake of literal translation of the Greek word order.

17:11

×	ܐܠܗܐ	ܕܡܠܝܟܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	ܕܡܠܝܟܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	P
×	ܐܠܗܐ	ܕܡܠܝܟܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	ܕܡܠܝܟܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	Ph
ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܕܡܠܝܟܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܕܡܠܝܟܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	ܕܥܠܡܐ	H
×	×	ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	P
×	×	ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	×	ܐܠܗܐ	Ph
ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ	H

G πάτερ ἄγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.

In Philoxenos' only citation of this verse,¹⁹¹ the text of Ph uses ܐܠܗܐ rather than ܐܠܗܐ. It was common in early Syriac to add the first person (sg. or pl.) possessive ending to titles, such as ܐܠܗܐ ("lord") and ܐܠܗܐ ("father"). However, it is not necessary to conclude that these endings reflect a possessive pronoun in the Greek *Vorlagen* of these texts.¹⁹² J.P. Lyon notes, however, that idiomatically the word ܐܠܗܐ by itself implies the translation "my father."¹⁹³ If Lyon's assertion is correct, then it appears that the translators of Ph and H have changed ܐܠܗܐ to ܐܠܗܐ in order to note the absence of a possessive pronoun, despite the fact that the opposite appears to be true. The texts of Ph and H both include the conjunction ܐܠܗܐ in the final phrase of the verse, but the text of P omits it. This discrepancy is likely based on a textual variant in the Greek tradition—the inclusion of καὶ in the phrase ἐν καθὼς [καὶ] ἡμεῖς.¹⁹⁴ Based on the existence and attestation of this variant, it

¹⁹¹ CPJ 210.14–15.

¹⁹² Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 23–24.

¹⁹³ Lyon, 135–136.

¹⁹⁴ This variant is attested by P¹⁰⁷, codices B, Θ, and several other later mss and versions.

translation ܦܬܘܪ. The existence of ἐσμέν in the Greek *Vorlagen* of Ph and H is the best explanation for the existence of ܦܬܘܪ.

17:24

ܐܢ ܠܚܐ	×	ܝܕܝܢܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	P
ܐܢ ܠܚܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	Ph
ܐܢ ܠܚܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ	H
ܐܢ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	P
ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	Ph
ܐܢ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	H
ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	P
ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	Ph
ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ	×	H

G πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ καῖκεῖνοι ὥσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ, ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι ὅτι ἡγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου

Philoxenos quotes this verse twice in *CPJ*, but only one citation contains the whole verse.¹⁹⁸ As seen above in the discussion of 17:11, it is not necessary to consider the possessive pronoun on the first word ܠܚܐ as a reflection of the existence of a possessive pronoun in the Greek *Vorlagen*. The citation of this verse shown above omits the third person plural pronoun ܡܡܬܐ and adds the virtually equivalent phrase ܕܡܡܬܐ. It is possible that the text of Ph included this reading. If it is original, it seems that this variation is an attempt to translate more accurately the Greek relative pronoun ὃ in the absence of the third person plural pronoun in the Greek text. The text of P renders the Greek phrase ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ (“where I am”) with the phrase ܠܚܐ ܝܕܝܢܐ (“the place that I [am]”). In order to be more true to the word order of the Greek text, the text of Ph renders the phrase ܠܚܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܠܚܐ (“where I am”), so that the pronoun comes after the verb as it is in Greek. And again, the text of Ph replaces the third person singular pronoun ܐܢ with the phrase ܠܚܐ ܠܚܐ in order to more accurately translate the Greek relative pronoun ἣν.

¹⁹⁸ Full: *CPJ* 210.22–25; Partial: *CPJ* 59.19–20.

and additions based on the Greek text, and alterations in the Syriac word order to reflect the Greek.

4.1.1 Lexical Changes for more Accurate Translations

The most well known lexical revision in the Philoxenian version is the replacement of words built from the stem ܐܠ in Matt 1:1 and 1:18.²⁰¹ In both of these passages, Philoxenos replaces a word built from ܐܠ with the word ܠܕܡ (“becoming, birth”).²⁰² Given his opposition to “Nestorianism,” it is not surprising that Philoxenos demonstrates a strong concern for the language used in reference to Jesus’ birth.²⁰³ In particular, Philoxenos seems to be concerned that speaking about the birth of Jesus might suggest that there was a change in the nature of Christ that might lead the reader to a dyophysite Christology. Thus, this lexical change is likely best explained by Philoxenos’ preference for the incarnational language of the prologue of the Gospel of John in which the word “becomes” (ܠܕܡ) flesh.²⁰⁴ This seems to be the most likely explanation considering how formative Jn 1:14 is in Philoxenos’ concept of the Incarnation, as evidenced by the fact that he quotes some portion of Jn 1:14 over fifty times throughout the commentaries.

²⁰¹ These verses are considered together here because Philoxenos explicitly cites both in relation to the same translation issue, *CPJ*, 41–42.

²⁰² However, Philoxenos does not replace every occurrence of the word ܐܠ with regard to Jesus’ birth. Philoxenos cites Matt 1:20 four times, and three of the citations include the word ܐܠܗܝܐ as a translation of the Greek γεννηθέν. The fourth citation replaces ܐܠܗܝܐ with ܕܡܝܐ, but this substitution appears to be the result of Philoxenos’ adaptation to his writing context rather than an intentional translation change. And again in Matt 2:2, Philoxenos retains the use of the word ܐܠܗܝܐ in reference to Jesus.

²⁰³ However, the case of Matt 1:1 is particularly intriguing because although the word ܡܕܝܢܐ is built from the root ܐܠ, the meaning of the word in this context (“descendants, generations”) has nothing to do with Jesus’ birth.

²⁰⁴ Cf. Brock, “Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean Problem,” 329.

There is also a fascinating example of a lexical change in Matt 16:18 in which Philoxenos preserves a reading from the Diatessaron, translating $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota$ as ܡܥܠܐ (“bars [of iron]”) rather than ܡܥܬܝܬܐ (“gates”). As noted in the discussion of this verse above, one possible explanation for the use of this translation in the Diatessaron is a christological interpretation involving Ps 107 and the “bars” of Sheol. In this interpretation, the “bars” of Sheol in Matt 16:18 are the bars that cannot withstand Jesus in the harrowing of Hell. Thus, the fact that the texts of P and H do not retain this reading begs the question of why the text of Ph does. Either Philoxenos (or Polycarp) had access to a copy of the Peshitta that retained this reading (which is unlikely), or Philoxenos knew of the christological interpretation of this verse and chose to include it in his new translation.²⁰⁵

There are two examples in which the translator of Ph replaces the preposition ܐܠ (“to, for”) with the independent preposition ܕܐܠ (“to, toward”) as the translation of the Greek preposition $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$.²⁰⁶ This translation revision could be explained in one of three ways: 1) the translator has decided that ܕܐܠ is simply a better translation than ܐܠ based on the context; 2) the translator of Ph is attempting to render the Greek word order more faithfully, and the addition of ܕܐܠ represents $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in the translation; or 3) perhaps it is motivated by a concern for the consistency of the translation of prepositions. The best explanation is likely is some combination of these three factors, though the third factor is perhaps the most defensible because every time the text of P translates $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ as ܕܐܠ , the translator of Ph retains ܕܐܠ , but every time the text of P translates $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ as ܐܠ , the translator of Ph revises the text to read ܕܐܠ , and, moreover, when the text of P includes ܕܐܠ and there is no $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in the text, the translator of Ph omits ܕܐܠ .²⁰⁷

In Matt 2:6, the translator of Ph replaces two occurrences of the word ܡܠܟܐ (“king”) in the text of P with ܡܠܝܚܐ (“leader, ruler, governor”) as a translation of the Greek word $\eta\gamma\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\nu$. This appears to be a conscious attempt to retranslate the Greek because

²⁰⁵ For a fuller discussion of this reading, see the explanation for the text of Matt 16:18 given above.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Lk 2:34 and 2:48

²⁰⁷ For examples of retaining the translation of P, see Jn 1:1; 14:3; omitting ܕܐܠ , see Jn 16:28; and adding ܕܐܠ , see Lk 2:34 and 2:48.

ܠܝܬܝܢ provides a more precise translation. Matt 19:28 offers a similar attempt to render Greek words consistently. The Greek word *θρόνος* occurs twice in the verse, but the text of P uses two different words, ܡܠܝܬܐ (“throne”-transliterated from Greek) and ܡܝܬܝܐ (also “throne”). In an attempt to make the translation consistent, the translator of Ph replaced ܡܠܝܬܐ with ܡܝܬܝܐ so that both instances of *θρόνος* were translated with ܡܝܬܝܐ. Thus, we see an attempt on the part of the translator of Ph to translate Greek words more precisely and more consistently, though it is interesting to note that the text of P includes a Greek loan word and the translators of Ph and H replace the loan word with a native Syriac word.

In Luke 2:14, the translator of Ph replaces the word ܠܝܬܝܢ (which can mean “hope, trust; thought, opinion”) with ܡܝܬܝܐ (“will, desire”). This example is intriguing because the Greek word in question is *εὐδοκίας* (“good will”), and while it seems that ܡܝܬܝܐ is a better translation than ܠܝܬܝܢ, the translator of Ph does not add an adjective to ܡܝܬܝܐ to translate the *εὖ-* prefix. The texts of P (ܠܝܬܝܢ) and H (ܡܝܬܝܐ) both add adjectives, but it appears that the translator of Ph was attempting to translate *εὐδοκίας* with a one-word equivalent for the sake of matching the Greek text. Thus, we see the translator of Ph revising the translation of P in an attempt to offer a better translation and an equivalent word-for-word translation of the Greek.

Matt 19:28 is an interesting example because all three versions (P, Ph, and H) attempt to find an equivalent translation for the Greek word *παλιγγενεσία* (“state of renewal; rebirth”). The translator of Ph correctly identified the first part of the Greek word compound word as *πάλιν* (“again”) but mistakenly translated the second half of the word as a derivative of *γεννάω* rather than *γίνομαι*, thus rendering the phrase ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܝܐ (lit: “birth from the beginning,” idiomatically: “rebirth”). In this example, it is possible to see the translator of Ph attempting to retranslate Greek words “literally” when there is no Syriac equivalent.

4.1.2 Translating Greek Verbs

There are two trends in translation technique discernible in the Philoxenian version with respect to Greek verbs: replacing Syriac participles with imperfects in order to translate the Greek future

tense and adding the preposition ܐܠܝܝܢ to Syriac participles when translating a Greek participle. There are three examples of the translator of Ph retranslating Greek future tense verbs as Syriac imperfects.²⁰⁸ Brock notes that the Syriac imperfect is the characteristic translation of the Greek future tense but also notes that participles are occasionally used for the future tense.²⁰⁹ While Syriac participles can convey the same meaning as Syriac imperfects, it appears that the translator of Ph is concerned not just with meaning but with rendering the tense of the Greek verbs more precisely.

It is likely that the second trend of adding ܐܠܝܝܢ to Syriac participles²¹⁰ when translating Greek participles is done for similar reasons—that is, the translator wanted to make sure that verb tenses were translated accurately. Thus, the translator of Ph seems to demonstrate the following technique with regard to Greek verbs:

Greek future = Syriac imperfect and *not* Syriac participles
 Greek participle = Syriac participle + ܐܠܝܝܢ

Another trend in the translation technique of Ph with regard to verbs is the consistent use of the verbal phrase -ܕܠܝܢ + personal pronoun when translating forms of εἰμί.²¹¹ There are at least eighteen examples of this trend, though there are variations of how this translation is implemented depending on which form of εἰμί is being translated. However, the translator of Ph is quite consistent with this technique. The following list provides the Greek form of εἰμί and the corresponding form of -ܕܠܝܢ used in the translation. The footnote supplied offers the texts in which these examples are found.

²⁰⁸ Matt 3:12; 10:17; 11:27.

²⁰⁹ Brock, "Limitations of Syriac," 90–91.

²¹⁰ Matt 2:2; John 1:15.

²¹¹ D. King also notes this is a translation technique evident in *Quod Unus sit Christus and Responsiones ad Tiberium*, King, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 106, 117.

εἰμί	²¹² ܕܡܐ
ἐστίν	²¹³ ܡܐܕܡܐ
εἶναι	ܕܡܐ (+ context sensitive pronoun) ²¹⁴
ἐσμέν	²¹⁵ ܡܡܐܐ
ἦν	ܡܡܐܐ (usually + ܠܡܐ) ²¹⁶

Given the frequency and the consistency of the examples above, we can see that the translator of the text of Ph consistently translates forms of the Greek verb εἰμί with forms of -ܕܡܐ when the text of P translates the text in idiomatic Syriac with either the use of an absolute state noun in the predicate position²¹⁷ or the enclitic use of ܠܡܐ.²¹⁸

4.1.3 Word Order

This category includes revisions pertaining to the order of the words found in the Syriac translation and the corresponding order of words in the Greek texts. This category includes moving the particles to reflect the placement of equivalent particles in the Greek word order such as ܠܐ,²¹⁹ prepositional phrases,²²⁰ and the order of subject/verb/object phrases.²²¹ Other than the examples just provided, there are at least eight more examples of the translator of Ph changing the word order of the Syriac translation in order to make it more “literal” with respect to the word order of the Greek text.²²²

²¹² Jn 3:28; 17:24; 18:8.

²¹³ Matt 1:23; 2:2; Jn 1:33.

²¹⁴ Lk 2:6; 3:23.

²¹⁵ Jn 17:22.

²¹⁶ Matt 1:18; Jn 1:8, 10, 15 (twice). In three of the five instances ܠܡܐ is also included.

²¹⁷ See T. Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar*, trans. and ed. by James A. Crichton (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2001) § 204, 158–159.

²¹⁸ Ibid., § 299, 238–239.

²¹⁹ Matt 1:18.

²²⁰ Matt 1:20; Lk 2:14.

²²¹ Lk 1:35; Jn 12:26; 16:13.

²²² Matt 2:1; Lk 2:43; John 1:10, 15, 17, 33; 14:3; 18:8.

4.1.4 Omissions

This category refers to the instances in which the translator of Ph omits words found in the translation of P based on the wording of the Greek text. There are at least seven examples of this category, but it includes only minor omissions such as particles (ﻣﺎ 223 and ﻫﺎ 224), pronouns (relative and personal),²²⁵ and prepositions.²²⁶ This category represents a conscious effort on the part of the translator of Ph to render the Greek text more “literally” by omitting words not found in the Greek text.

4.1.5 Additions

This category overlaps with the above discussion of the translation of εἰμί as the translator of Ph frequently adds the word -ﺑﺎﺭﻙ when the meaning is merely implied in the translation of P. This category also includes prepositions and prepositional phrases,²²⁷ nouns,²²⁸ pronouns,²²⁹ and verbs.²³⁰ In addition to the examples just mentioned, there are at least seven more examples of the translator of Ph making additions to reflect the presence of words in Greek.²³¹

4.2 Implications of the Present Study for Future Scholarship

The intent of the present study has been to present the data for the unique readings of the Gospels of the Philoxenian version as reconstructed from the exegetical writings of Philoxenos. The results of this study confirm the resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean problem as concluded by Sebastian Brock: the Philoxenian version is a distinct translation from both the Peshitta and the Harclean version. Moreover, it is clear that the translation technique evident throughout the citations discussed

²²³ Lk 2:43, 52.

²²⁴ Lk 1:31.

²²⁵ Lk 1:35; 2:6; John 1:15; 3:31.

²²⁶ Jn 16:28.

²²⁷ Lk 1:35; 2:34; Jn 1:10.

²²⁸ Matt 2:6.

²²⁹ Jn 1:11; 17:22, 24.

²³⁰ Matt 2:1; Jn 1:15.

²³¹ Matt 1:23; 2:2; Lk 2:6; 3:23; Jn 1:33; 17:11

here fits well within what we already know about Greek-to-Syriac translation technique in the sixth-century: there was an intentional movement toward a more word-for-word translation, but this technique was very much still in flux throughout the sixth-century until the creation of the hyper literal Harclean version in the early seventh-century.

The reconstruction of the Philoxenian version of the New Testament is by no means completed, as the project encompasses only the Gospels. Hopefully the present project will serve as a model by which further inquiry can be made into the Philoxenian text of the NT documents outside the Gospels and as an aide in our broader understanding of sixth-century translation technique.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources for Philoxenos

De Halleux, André. *Eli de Qartamin: Memra sur Mar Philoxène de Mabbog*. CSCO 233, 234. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1963.

———. *Philoxène de Mabbog: Commentaire du prologue johannique (Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 14,534)*. CSCO 380, 381. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1977.

———. *Philoxène de Mabbog: Lettre aux moines Senoun*, CSCO 231, 232. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1963.

Vaschalde, A. *Philoxeni Mabbogensis: Tractatus Tres de Trinitate et Incarnatione*. CSCO 9, 10. Louvain: Secretariat du CorpusSCO, 1907.

Watt, J. W. *Philoxenos of Mabbog: Fragments of the Commentary on Matthew and Luke*. CSCO 392, 393. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1978.

Other Sources

Aland, Barbara and A. Juckel, eds. *Das Neue Testament in Syrischer Überlieferung, Die Paulinischen Briefe*, 3 Vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991, 1995, 2002.

———. “Die Philoxenianisch-harklensische Übersetzungstradition: Ergebnisse einer Untersuchung der neutestamentlichen Zitate in der syrischen Literatur.” *Le Muséon* 94 (1981): 321–383.

Baumstark, Anton. *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*. Bonn, 1922.

Brock, Sebastian. “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity.” Pages 69–87 in *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies XX*. Durham, 1979.

- Repr. in Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- Brock, Sebastian. *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006.
- _____. "The Christology of the Church of the East." Pages 159–179 in *Traditions and Heritage of the Christian East*. Edited by D. Afanogenov and A. Muraviev. Moscow: Izdatelstvo, 1996. Repr. in Brock, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.
- _____. "'Come, Compassionate Mother..., Come Holy Spirit': A Forgotten Aspect of Early Eastern Christian Imagery," *Aram* 3 (Oxford, 1991), 249–257; Repr. in Brock, *Fire From Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- _____. "Greek and Syriac in Late Antique Syria." Pages 149–160 in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf. Cambridge, 1994. Repr. in Brock, *From Ephrem to Romanos: Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- _____. "Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek." *Journal of the Syriac Academy* III. Baghdad (1979), 1–17. Repr. in Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- _____. "Greek Words in Syriac: Some General Features." *Studia Classica Israelica* 15. Jerusalem, 1996: 251–262. Repr. in Brock, *From Ephrem to Romanos: Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- _____. "Limitations of Syriac in Representing Greek." Pages 83–98 in *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. By Bruce Metzger. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- _____. "The 'Nestorian' Church: A Lamentable Misnomer." Pages 23–35 in *The Church of the East: Life and Thought*. Edited by J.F. Coakley and K. Perry. Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester 73:3, 1996. Repr. in Brock, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.
- _____. and M. A. Mathai Remban. *Philoxenos of Mabbug*. SEERI Correspondence Course 9. Kerala: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1989.

- Brock, Sebastian. "The Resolution of the Philoxenian/Harklean Problem." Pages 325–343 in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- . "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac." Pages 80–108 in *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*. By A. Dietrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975. Repr. in Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- . "The Syriac Background to Hunayn's Translation Techniques." *Aram* 3, Oxford, 1991. Repr. in Brock, *From Ephrem to Romanos: Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- . "Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique." Pages 1–14 in *III Symposium Syriacum 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures*. By René Lavenant. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalum, 1983.
- Burkitt, F.C. *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe. The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the Readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic Evidence*. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1901.
- De Halleux, André. *Philoxène de Mabbog: sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1963.
- Fee, Gordon D. "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism." *ANRW* 26.1 (1992): 256–62.
- Guidi, I. "La lettera di Filosseno ai monaci di Tell'adda-Teleda," *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, Serie 3 (Memorie, 1884).
- Gwynn, John. *The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version hitherto unknown*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co., 1987. Reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1981; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005.
- . *Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2005.
- Hatch, William H. P. "The Subscription of the Chester Beatty Manuscript of the Harklean Gospel," *The Harvard Theological Review* 30, no. 3 (Jul. 1937): 141–155.
- Hill, Peter A. L. "Matthew 16:18 in the Philoxenian Version." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 13, 2008. Available at URL: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol13/Hill20008.pdf>.
- Kiraz, George A. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshitta and Harklean Versions*, 4 Vols. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004.

- Lyon, Jeffery P. *Syriac Gospel Translations: A Comparison of the Language and Translation Method Used in the Old Syriac, The Diatessaron, and The Peshitto*. CSCO 548, Sub. 88. Louvain: Peeters, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Michelson, David. "Practice Leads to Theory: Orthodoxy and the Spiritual Struggle in the World of Philoxenos of Mabbug (470–523)." Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University, 2007.
- Murray, Robert. "The Rock and the House on the Rock. A Chapter on the Ecclesiastical Symbolism of Aphrahat and Ephraem." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 30 (1964): 315–362.
- Nöldeke, T. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Translated and edited by James A. Crichton. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2001.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism." *NovT* 47, no. 4 (2005): 313–343.
- Pusey, P. E. and G. H. Gwilliam, eds. *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1901. Reprinted as *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum: The Fourfold Holy Gospel in the Peshitta Syriac Version with Critical Apparatus*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2003.
- Romeny, Bas ter Haar. "A Philoxenian-Harclean Tradition? Biblical Quotations in Syriac Translations from Greek." Pages 59–76 in Wout Jac. van Beekum, Jan Willem Drijvers and Alex C. Klugkist, *Syriac Polemics: Studies in Honour of Gerrit Jan Reinink*. Louvain: Peeters, 2007.
- Smith, J. Payne, ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1999.
- Van Rompay, Lucas. "Bardaisan and Mani in Philoxenos of Mabbog's *Memre Against Habbib*. Pages 77–90 in *The Peshitta: Its Use in Literature and Liturgy: Papers Read at the Third Peshitta Symposium*. Edited by Bas ter Haar Romeny. Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 15. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Vööubs, Arthur. *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*. Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile, no. 6. Stockholm, 1954.
- . "New Data for the Solution of the Problem Concerning the Philoxenian Version," in *Spiritus et veritas: Festschrift Karl Kundzins*. Eutin: A. Ozolins, 1953.
- White, Joseph. *Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana cum interpretatione et annotationibus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1778.

- Williams, P. J. *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*. Texts and Studies, Third Series, vol. 2. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004.
- Zuntz, G. *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*. British Academy Supplemental Papers, no. 7. London: The British Academy, 1945.