THE PHILOXENIAN GOSPELS AS RECONSTRUCTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF PHILOXENOS OF MABBUG[1]

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

---

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 chorepiscopos, 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 Mabbog: sa vie, ses écrits, sa theologie* (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' chorepiscopos, 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:

ܠܗܠܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܟܕ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܣܡܘ ܩܥܡܗ ܚܟܬܐ܆
ܐܘ ܒܨܒܝܢܗܘܢ ܐܘ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ. [ܣܓܝ]
ܛܥܝܐܝܬ. ܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܦܝ ܡܠ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ
ܕܒܣܪܐ. ܐܠܐ ܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܚܠܦܬ ܗܘܠ ܡܠ
ܬܢܟܝܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ. ܡܕܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܦ ܠܢ ܗܘܐ ܗܟܐ
ܥܡܠܠܟܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܢܗܦܟ ܢܬܪܓܡ ܡܢ ܕܪܟܝܐ ܠܣܘܪܝܐܝܬ.
ܟܬܒܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܕܝܬܩܐ ܚܕܬܐ.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" (ܒܝܘܡܬܐ ܕܒܣܪܗ ܗܘܐ) was influenced by Nestorianism.⁷ Thus, the study of the Philoxenian version cannot be removed

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 Syriac[9] 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 Kulturgebeit* (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 Harclean 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 Bekkum, 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 Alexandira 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 Phiolxenus' 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 scriptorum 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 Trinity[20] 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, *Philoxéne 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 ܐܡܪ ܕ- ("[Someone] said") or ܟܬܝܒ ܕ- ("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 version[26] 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 -ܗ 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 Harclean 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

ܟܬܒܐ ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܪܗ ܕܕܘܝܕ ܒܪܗ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ   P

ܟܬܒܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܪܗ ܕܕܘܝܕ ܒܪܗ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ   Ph

ܟܬܒܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܪܗ ܕܕܘܝܕ ܒܪܗ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ   H

G βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυίδ 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 verse[32] and the other three contain the first half of the verse.[33] Philoxenos expresses an intent to cite with the citation marker ܠܡ 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]" (ܗܫܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܣܘܪܝܝܐ).[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 ܗܘܝܐ rather than ܝܠܝܕܘܬܗ.[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 ܗܘܝܐ rather than ܝܠܝܕܘܬܗ is not clear; but it is clear that the Philoxenian translation shows a preference for words built from the stem ܗܘܐ

---

[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 ܠܝܕ, as evidenced by Matt 1:1 as well as the next passage.[38]

1:18

P	ܗܟܢ ܗܘܐ x ܕܝܢ x ܡܫܝܚܐ x ܕܝܫܘܥ x ܝܠܕܗ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ							
Ph	x x ܝܫܘܥ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, x ܗܘ							
H	x x ܝܫܘܥ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ ܗܟ							

P	ܟܕ ܡܟܝܪܐ x x ܠܝܘܣܦ x ܐܡܗ ܡܪܝܡ x ܗܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܐܡܬܝ					
Ph	ܟܕ ܡܟܝܪܐ x x ܠܝܘܣܦ x ܐܡܗ ܡܪܝܡ x ܗܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܐܡܬܝ					
H	ܠܝܘܣܦ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܗܘܬ ܡܟܝܪܐ ܠܗ ܐܡܗ ܡܪܝܡ ܟܕ ܗܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܐܡܬܝ					

P	ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܡܢ ܒܛܢܐ x x ܐܫܬܟܚܬ ܢܬܚܒܪܘܢ				
Ph	ܡܕܡ ܪܘܚܐ ܡܢ ܒܛܢܐ x x ܐܫܬܟܚܬ ܢܬܚܒܪܘܢ				
H	ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܡܢ ܒܛܢܐ ܒܗ ܕܐܝܬ ܐܫܬܟܚܬ ܢܬܚܒܪܘܢ				

G Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν. μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὑρέθη 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: ܘܡܬܝ ܐܡܪ ("And Matthew said")[40] and ܟܬܒ ܕ- ("[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 ܝܠܕܐ should be removed from the translation and replaced by ܗܘܐ.[43]

---

[38] Outside the Gospels, we also see the preference for ܗܘܐ 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.

As with Matt 1:1, Philoxenos quotes the text of P and then provides his own translation.[44] Philoxenos replaces the verb ܗܘܐ at the end of the first phrase with the verbal phrase ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, likely in an attempt to better represent the Greek imperfect verb ἦν. All seven of Philoxenos' citations that include this portion of the verse include ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,[45] and this reading is retained in the text of H. Moreover, given the attention that Philoxenos dedicates to the proper wording of this verse, it is safe to assume that he would have cited this verse with great care. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the text presented above is the accurate reading of Ph.

1:20

P   ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܓܝܪ ܐܬܬܟ x ܠܟ ܗܘ x ܠܡܕܒܪ ܠܒܪܬ ܐܢܬܬܟ ܠܐ

Ph   ܡܢ x ܐܬܬܟ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܗܘ x ܠܡܕܒܪ ܠܒܪܬ ܐܢܬܬܟ ܠܐ

H   ܡܢ x ܐܬܬܟ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܗ ܐܢܬܬܟ ܓܝܪܐ ܠܒܪܬ ܐܢܬܬܟ ܠܐ

P   ܪܘܚܐ ܗܘ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ   x

Ph   ܪܘܚܐ ܗܘ ܕܩܕܝܫ   x

H   ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܕܝܫ x ܐܝܬܘܗܝ

G μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου.

In two citations[46] of this verse, the text of Ph renders the Greek word παραλαβεῖν as ܠܡܕܒܪ though a third citation[47] retains ܠܡܣܒ as found in the text of P. While ܢܣܒ ("to take, receive") is generally a better word-for-word translation than ܕܒܪ ("to lead, guide") for the Greek word παραλαβεῖν, the idiom ܕܒܪ ܐܢܬܬܐ means "to take a wife" or "to marry."[48] It is possible that the text of

---

[44] *CPJ* 42.20–21.

[45] None of the citations in *CPJ* contain ܗܘܐ here, but two of the citations of this verse from *Tractatus tres de Trinitate*, which are otherwise identical, include ܗܘܐ in addition to ܐܝܬܘܗܝ.

[46] *CPJ* 227.7–8; *CPJ* 41.15–16.

[47] *CPJ* 41.21–22.

[48] J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1999), 82; M. Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009), 271.

Ph included ܠܚܕܪܝ and Philoxenos simply reverted to the Peshitta reading ܠܚܘܡܪ 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 ܠܚܘܡܪ is an accident, it is reasonable to conclude that the text of Ph reads ܠܚܕܪܝ 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 ܒܗ in an attempt to match the word order of the Greek text by rendering τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν as ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܗ ܐܬܝܠܕ, 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: ܗܘ[ܝ] [ܓܝܪ] ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܗ.[50] Only one of the four citations includes ܓܝܪ, 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 -ܕ in this phrase. The three citations that match the Peshitta word order also include the -ܕ, 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 ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܗ ܐܬܝܠܕ 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 ܒܗ) and inconsistent citation habits with regard to particles/participles (inclusion of ܓܝܪ and -ܕ). 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 Alexandira'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

P	ܗܘܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ	x	ܕܘܠܗ	ܕܐܬܐ ܒܝܪ ܒܝܪܐ ܢܘܣܝܘܢ	x	ܫܡܥ	x	ܡܫܒܚܬܐ
Ph	ܗܘܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ	x	ܕܘܠܗ	ܕܐܬܐ ܒܝܪ ܒܝܪܐ ܢܘܣܝܘܢ	x	ܫܡܥ	x	ܡܫܒܚܬܐ
H	ܗܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܕܚܒܝܪ ܟܘܝܐ ܕܘܠܗ ܕܐܬܐ ܒܝܪ ܒܝܪܐ ܢܘܣܝܘܢ ܫܡܥ ܪܐܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܒܚܬܐ

P	x	x	x	x	ܬܬܩܪܐ̣ܝ ܒܓܪܡ ܥܡܗ	ܐܠܗܐ
Ph	ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ,	ܒܕ ܡܬܦܫܩ	x	ܥܡܢ	ܐܠܗܐ
H	ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ,	x	ܡܬܬܪܓܡ	x	ܥܡܢ	ܐܠܗܐ

G ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν,
καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὅ ἐστιν
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 ܓܝܪ. 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
ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον with the Syriac phrase ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܒܕ
ܡܬܦܫܩ. In addition to the change in word order, the text of Ph
also uses ܦܫܩ (Aph.—"to explain, translate") instead of ܬܪܓܡ ("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 (ܡܬܬܪܓܡ in
Scholia de Incaratione Verbi and ܡܬܦܫܩ 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 ܟܕ, 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

P	ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܝܫܘܥ	x	ܒܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܝܘܡܬܗ ܕܗܪܘܕܣ ܡܠܟܐ
Ph	ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܝܫܘܥ	x	ܒܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܝܘܡܬܗ ܕܗܪܘܕܣ ܡܠܟܐ
H	ܟܕ ܕܝܢ x ܝܫܘܥ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܝܘܡܬܗ ܕܗܪܘܕܣ ܡܠܟܐ

P	x	ܐܬܘ	ܡܓܘܫܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܢܚܐ	x	ܠܐܘܪܫܠܡ
Ph	ܗܐ	x	ܡܓܘܫܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܢܚܐ ܐܬܘ	ܠܐܘܪܫܠܡ
H	ܗܐ	x	ܡܓܘܫܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܢܚܐ ܐܬܘ	ܠܐܘܪܫܠܡ

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

Philoxenos cites this verse fully twice[54] and partially on two other occasions.[55] Two of the citations (one full length and one partial) contain the citation marker ܗܟܝܠ.[56] In the full length citation that contains the citation marker ܗܟܝܠ, it stands in the place of the post-positive particle ܕܝܢ. However, in the other full length citation, Philoxenos includes ܕܝܢ after ܟܕ. The Greek text includes δέ as the second word in the sentence, so it is likely that the text of Ph included ܕܝܢ, but that Philoxenos has simply replaced the particle with ܗܟܝܠ in one citation. It is interesting that the translator of Ph has not transposed the order of ܐܬܝܠܕ ܝܫܘܥ 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 ܗܐ and the placement of the verb ܐܬܘ. 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.

reading presented above. It is more likely that the text of Ph included the revised version found above for several reasons: 1) the revised citation includes the citation marker ܠܡ and the other one does not; 2) the addition of ܗܐ is an attempt to translate the Greek word ἰδού and the placement of ܐܬܘ in the revised text reflects the placement of παρεγένοντο in the Greek word order; 3) the text of H also includes both of these revisions; and 4) it is easier to explain the presence of a citation of P in Philoxenos' writings than it is to explain a variant reading that just so happens to display translation techniques characteristic of the translator of Ph. Philoxenos is not making an explicit point about the wording of this text, so we may assume that the citation that reflects the text of P is the result of Philoxenos quoting a more familiar wording.

2:2

P	x ܘܗܡܐ ܡܓܘܫܐ	x	x	x	ܠܟܠܗ ܕܡܬܩܪܝܢ ܐܬܪܘܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ ܠܗ	
Ph	ܗܐ ܡܓܘܫܐ ܐܬܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܬܪܘܬܐ ܠܟܠܗ	x	ܠܗ	
H	ܗܐ ܡܓܘܫܐ ܐܬܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܬܪܘܬܐ ܠܟܠܗ	x	ܠܗ	

P	ܠܗ ܠܡܣܓܕ ܘܐܬܝܢ x ܚܙܝܢܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܟܘܟܒܗ			
Ph	[ܓܝܪ] ܚܙܝܢܗܝ x ܚܙܝܢ ܘܐܬܝܢ ܠܡܣܓܕ ܠܗ			
H	ܠܗ ܠܡܣܓܕ ܘܐܬܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܙܝܢ ܓܝܪ			

G λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.

Philoxenos cites this verse twice,[59] but the two citations display different readings of the first half of the verse. One citation includes the first phrase as it is worded above (ܗܐ ܡܓܘܫܐ ܐܬܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܬܪܘܬܐ),[60] but this citation does not include the rest of the verse. The second citation contains the full verse, but it is identical to the wording of P.[61] It is concluded here that the text of the shorter citation represents the text of Ph for the first half of the verse because it agrees with the text of H and follows the kind of translation technique characteristic of the

---

[59] *CPJ* 43.14–15; 44.18–20.
[60] *CPJ* 43.14–15.
[61] *CPJ* 44.18–20.

translator of Ph. Moreover, it is safe to assume that the second half of the verse (beginning with ܣܒܡ) 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 ܐܢܬܘ to the phrase ܟܬܝܒ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘ and moves the verb ܐܬܝܠܕ to the position immediately following this phrase in order to provide a word-for-word translation of the Greek wording ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεῖς. The word ܓܝܪ 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 ܓܝܪ. In the text of *CPJ*, there is a ܠܡ where the ܓܝܪ would stand. It is strange that ܠܡ appears at this position in the sentence, as it usually appears near the beginning of a citation. However, the replacement of a conjunction with ܠܡ need not necessarily be considered a definitive omission. As seen in Matt 2:1, Philoxenos sometimes replaces post-positive conjunctions with the citation marker ܠܡ. This, in addition to the fact that the Greek text includes γὰρ here and both P and H contain ܓܝܪ, allows us to conclude reasonably that the text of Ph likely included ܓܝܪ.

2:6

P ܬܚܠܬܗ x ܒܝܗܘܕ ܠܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ x ܠܚܡ ܒܝܬ ܐܦ ܐܢܬܝ P
Ph ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܐܢܬܝ ܒܐܪܥܐ x ܠܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܠܚܡ ܒܝܬ ܐܦ x Ph
H ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܐܢܬܝ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ. ܠܚܡ ܒܝܬ ܐܦ ܘܐܢܬܝ x H

P ܕܐܝܣܪܝܠ x ܠܥܡܝ ܕܢܪܥܐ x ܗܘ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܢܦܘܩ ܓܝܪ ܡܢܟܝ. ܕܝܗܘܕܐ P
Ph ܕܐܝܣܪܝܠ x ܠܥܡܝ ܕܢܪܥܝܘܗܝ x ܗܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܢܦܘܩ ܓܝܪ ܡܢܟܝ. ܕܝܗܘܕܐ Ph
H ܠܐܝܣܪܝܠܝܐ ܠܥܡܐ ܕܢܪܥܝܘܗܝ ܐܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܢܦܘܩ ܓܝܪ ܡܢܟܝ. ܕܝܗܘܕܐ 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 ܕܠܗ 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 ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܒܐܡܪ ("a statement in the Gospel") and including the citation marker ܠܡ. The texts of Ph and H add the word ܐܪܥܐ, perhaps in an attempt to render more accurately the Greek phrase γῆ Ἰούδα. 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 Ἰούδα.[64] Thus, the most likely explanation for the presence of the word ܐܪܥܐ in Ph and H is that their *Vorlagen* included the word γῆ. The text of Ph also omits the verb ܙܥܘܪܬ and adds the enclitic second person pronoun ܐܢܬ following ܙܥܘܪܝܐ, 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 ἡγεμών with the Syriac word ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ('leader, ruler, governor') rather than ܡܠܟܐ ('king').

3:15

P	ܗܟܢ ܗܘܐ ܓܝܪ ܝܐܐ	x	ܠܢ ܕܢܫܠܡ ܟܠܗ ܟܐܢܘܬܐ
Ph	ܗܟܢ ܗܘܐ [ܕܗܘܐ] ܓܝܪ ܐܪܐ	x	ܠܢ ܕܢܫܠܡ ܟܠܗ ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ
H	ܗܟܢ ܗܘܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܢ ܠܡܫܠܡ ܟܠܗ ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ

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 -ܕ to the word ܗܟܢ and omits the conjunction ܓܝܪ that immediately follows ܗܟܢ 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 ܗܟܢ ܓܝܪ but with ܕܗܟܢ. 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 ܓܝܪ. Philoxenos' citation of this verse also substitutes the word ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ for the word ܟܐܢܘܬܐ as a translation of δικαιοσύνη.[66] Because *CPJ* is generally more reliable than *CML* and because H also includes ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ, 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

P	ܢܓܕܘܢܟܘܢ	x	ܘܒܟܢܘܫܬܗܘܢ	ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܒܝܬ	ܓܝܪ	ܠܟܘܢ	ܢܫܠܡܘܢܟܘܢ	

P   ܢܫܠܡܘܢܟܘܢ ܠܟܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܒܝܬ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܒܟܢܘܫܬܗܘܢ x ܢܓܕܘܢܟܘܢ

Ph   ܢܫܠܡܘܢܟܘܢ x [ܓܝܪ][68] ܠܒܝܬ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܒܟܢܘܫܬܗܘܢ x ܢܓܕܘܢܟܘܢ

H   ܢܫܠܡܘܢܟܘܢ x ܓܝܪ ܠܒܝܬ ܕܝܢܐ ܘܒܟܢܘܫܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܢܓܕܘܢ ܠܟܘܢ

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 ܠܐ. 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 ܢܫܠܡܝܢ (plural participle) to ܢܫܠܡܘܢ (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 ܓܝܪ as a variant of the text of Ph because Philoxenos has placed the citation marker ܠܐ in the position of ܓܝܪ in the

---

[66] However, the partial citation of this verse in *CML* reads ܟܐܢܘܬܐ.

[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 ܟܐܢܘܬܐ; 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

P   ܢܫܠܡ ܕܝܢ ܐܚܐ ܠܐܚܘܗܝ, ܠܡܘܬܐ ܘܐܒܐ ܠܒܪܗ ܘܢܩܘܡܘܢ ܒܢܝܐ ܥܠ ܐܒܗܝܢ

Ph ܢܫܠܡ [ܕܝܢ] ܐܚܐ ܐܚܘܗܝ, ܠܡܘܬܐ ܘܐܒܐ ܠܒܪܗ ܘܢܩܘܡܘܢ ܒܢܝܐ ܥܠ ܐܒܗܝܢ

H   ܢܫܠܡ ܕܝܢ ܐܚܐ ܠܐܚܘܗܝ ܠܡܘܬܐ ܘܐܒܐ ܠܒܪܗ ܘܢܩܘܡܘܢ ܒܢܝܐ ܥܠ ܐܒܗܝܢ

P   ܐܒܗܝܗܘܢ ܘܢܡܝܬܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ

Ph ܐܒܗܐ ܘܢܡܝܬܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ

H   ܐܒܗܐ ܘܢܡܝܬܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ

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 Philoxenos[70] omits the conjunction ܕܝܢ, 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 ܐܒܗܝܗܘܢ, leaving the word ܐܒܗܐ. This is likely an attempt at word-for-word translation because there is no possessive pronoun here in the Greek text.

11:27

P   ܘܠܡܢ x ܕܨܒܐ ܒܪܐ ܕܢܓܠܐ

Ph ܘܠܡܢ x ܕܢܨܒܐ ܒܪܐ ܕܢܓܠܐ

H   ܘܠܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܨܒܐ ܒܪܐ ܠܡܓܠܐ

G καὶ ᾧ 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 ܨܒܐ ("to choose") from ܕܨܒܐ (perfect participle) to ܕܢܨܒܐ (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 ܠܝ, 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

P ܘܥܠ ܗܢܐ ܟܐܦܐ ܐܒܢܝܗ ܠܥܕܬܝ, x ܘܬܪܥܐ ܕܫܝܘܠ ܠܐ ܢܚܣܢܘܢܗ
Ph ܘܥܠ ܗܢܐ ܫܘܥܐ ܐܒܢܐ ܠܥܕܬܝ, x ܘܡܘܟܠܐ ܕܫܝܘܠ ܠܐ ܢܚܣܢܘܢܗ
H ܘܥܠ ܗܢܐ ܫܘܥܐ ܐܒܢܐ ܠܥܕܬܝ ܘܬܪ ܕܫܝܘܠ ܠܐ ܢܚܣܢܘܢܗ

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

In Philoxenos' citation of this verse[74] two out of three variations from the text of P agree with the text of H. The later translators have exchanged ܟܐܦܐ for ܫܘܥܐ and altered the demonstrative pronoun from the feminine ܗܕܐ to the masculine ܗܢܐ to match this change. This revision appears to be a revision aimed at a more "accurate" translation of πέτρᾳ. P. Hill asserts that ܫܘܥܐ "unambiguously means 'rock,' whereas ܟܐܦܐ 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 ܬܪܥܐ ("gates") to ܡܘܟܠܐ ("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. Brock[76] and Murray[77] argue that Tatian included the word ܡܘܟܠܐ based on an early Christian interpretation of Psalm 107:16 regarding the descent of Christ to hell after his death. In this interpretation, the ܡܘܟܠܐ are the bars of Sheol that Christ has

---

[72] See discussion of 3:12 above.

[73] *LMS* 70.3. This citation also adds ܗܘ 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 ܡܘܟ̈ܠܐ (Gr. μοχλοί) is not listed as a textual variant in the apparatus of NA[27] 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 ܡܘܟܠܐ 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 μοχλοί 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 ܡܘܟ̈ܠܐ 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 ܡܘܟܠܐ 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 ܠܬܪܥܐ ܕܫܝܘܠ as found in H as opposed to ܠܬܪܥܝܗ.

[80] Hill, "Matthew 16:18," 10.

19:28

P   x   x   x   ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܝܫܘܥ܂ ܐܡܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ x

Ph   x   x   x   ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ [ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ] ܝܫܘܥ܂ ܐܡܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ x

H   ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܥܢܐ ܗܘܐ x ܝܫܘܥ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܗܘܝܬܘܢ

P   ܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕ ܐܬܝܬܘܢ ܒܬܪܝ ܒܥܠܡܐ ܚܕܬܐ܂ ܡܐ ܕܝܬܒ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܗ ܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܥܠ ܟܘܪܣܝܗ

Ph   ܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕ ܐܬܝܬܘܢ ܒܬܪܝ ܒܗܝ ܕ ܡܢ ܕܪܝܫ ܗܘܝܐ܂ ܡܐ ܕܝܬܒ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܗ ܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܥܠ ܟܘܪܣܝܐ

H   ܕ ܢܩܦܬܘܢ ܠܝ x ܗܘܝܬܘܢ ܒܗܝ ܕܡܬܝܠܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܪܝܫ܂ ܡܐ ܕܝܬܒ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܗ ܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܥܠ ܟܘܪܣܝܐ

P   ܕ ܫܘܒܚܗ x ܬܬܒܘܢ ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܥܠ ܬܪܥܣܪ ܟܘܪܣܘܢ x ܘܬܕܘܢܘܢ x

Ph   ܕ ܫܘܒܚܗ x ܬܬܒܘܢ ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܥܠ ܬܪܥܣܪ ܟܘܪܣܘܬܐ x ܘܬܕܘܢܘܢ x

H   ܕ ܫܘܒܚܗ܂ܡܠܟܐ ܬܬܒܘܢ ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܥܠ ܬܪܥܣܪ ܟܘܪܣܘܬܐ ܕ ܢܒܠܡ ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ

P   ܠܬܪܥܣܪ ܫܒܛܐ ܕ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ

Ph   ܠܬܪܥܣܪ ܫܒܛܐ ܕ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ

H   ܠܬܪܥܣܪ ܫܒܛܘܗܝ ܕ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ

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 φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

Philoxenos introduces this citation[81] with the phrase ܟܬܒ- ("it is written [that]"). The brackets above indicate that this citation does not include the phrase ܣܥܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ, 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" (ܒܥܠܡܐ ܚܕܬܐ), while the translator of Ph renders the word "the rebirth" (ܡܠܕܐ ܗܝ ܕ ܡܢ ܕܪܝܫ). The translator of Ph exchanges ܚܕܬܐ for ܡܢ ܕܪܝܫ, 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 ܕܠܕ. The translator of H, on the other hand, retains the phrase ܡܢ ܕܝܢ but translates γενεσία with the Syriac word ܗܘܐ from ܗܘܐ ("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: ܬܪܘܢܘܣ, transliterated from the Greek θρόνος, and ܡܘܬܒܐ (sg: ܡܘܬܒܐ), which also means "throne." The texts of Ph and H, however, replace ܬܪܘܢܘܣ with ܡܘܬܒܐ so that the translation is consistent.

3.2 Philoxenian Gospel of Luke

1:31

P	ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝ ܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܒܛܢܐ ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܘܬܩܪܝܢ ܫܡܗ x	ܝܫܘܥ
Ph	ܘܗܐ x ܬܬܒܛܢܝܢ ܒܟܪܣܐ ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܘܬܩܪܝܢ ܫܡܗ x	ܝܫܘܥ
H	ܘܗܐ x ܬܬܒܛܢܝܢ ܒܟܪܣܐ ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܘܬܩܪܝܢ ܫܡܗ ܕܝܠܗ	ܝܫܘܥ

G καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμψη ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξη 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 ܓܝܪ 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 συλλήμψη ἐν γαστρί (lit: "you will become pregnant in [the] belly") by changing the phrase ܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܒܛܢܐ (lit: "you will receive pregnancy") to ܬܬܒܛܢܝܢ ܒܟܪܣܐ (lit: "you will become pregnant in the belly"). One of the three citations[86] of this verse from

---

[84] *CPJ* 45.9–10; 45.11–12; 47.15–17.

[85] ܓܝܪ does appear in a citation of this verse in *LMS* (58.22), but it appears after, not before, ܬܐܠܕܝܢ.

[86] *CPJ* 47.15–17: ܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܒܛܢܐ. ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܠܣܠܡ ܕܚܠܟ. ܘܬܐܠܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ

Philoxenos' writings includes the wording of P (ܒܠܟ ܡܚܠܡ). 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 ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܘܩܐ ܐܡܪ ("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 ܬܚܒܨܟ ܠܒܠܟ 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

P	ܐܡܪ ܘܡܩܒܠܐ ܐܬܐܬܪܐ. x ܕܠܒܟ ܢܐܬܐ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܡܠܝܟ ܕܠܝܠ. ܗܘ ܡܢ ܗܘ x
Ph	ܐܡܪ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ. ܗܕܐ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܡܠܝܟ ܬܚܒܨܢܟ ܢܝܚ ܕܠܝܠ. ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ
H	ܐܡܪ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ. ܗܕܐ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܡܠܝܟ ܬܚܒܨܢܟ ܢܝܚ ܕܠܝܠ. ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ

P	ܕܡܬܝܠܕ ܕܝܢ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܘ x ܢܒܪܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܢܬܩܪܐ
Ph	ܕܡܬܝܠܕ [ܕܝܢ] ܡܪܝܐ x ܢܒܪܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ x
H	ܕܡܬܝܠܕ x ܡܪܝܐ x ܢܒܪܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ x

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 full[90] and three

---

[87] *LMS* 58.22.

[88] The Syriac translation of Cyril of Alexandria's *Epistle 39* also indicates the change in verb to ܬܚܒܢܝ, but it does not include either ܒܠܟ or ܬܚܒܨ; 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 ܕܠ.[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 ܐܬܐ ("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 ܥܠܝܟ ("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 ὑψίστος. In two citations[96] Philoxenos retains ܥܠܝ from P and in the other three he uses ܡܪܝܡܐ. However, one of the citations that uses ܥܠܝ 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 ܪܘܚܐ 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.

ܒܪܝܬܐ, and this is also found in the text of H. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that ܒܪܝܬܗ 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 ܐܦ 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 ܐܦ. Given the fact that Philoxenos includes ܐܦ 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 ܡܠܬܠ ܗܘܐ/ܗܝܐ is the original text of Ph. Two of the four full citations of this verse use ܗܘܐ and the other two use ܗܝܐ, and once again, both readings appear in *CPJ* and in *LMS*.[99] It is tempting to assert that the reading of Ph is ܗܝܐ because of its prevalence in other translations of the time[100] 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 ܗܘܐ 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 ܡܠܬܠ ܗܝܐ.

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 ܒܗ. Two of Philoxenos' citations of this verse (one from *CPJ* and one

---

[98] This citation in *LMS* (60.9–11) also includes a ܘ- attached to ܐܦ.

[99] Both citations of this verse in *Tractatus tres* use ܗܝܐ.

[100] King notes that ܗܝܐ 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] ܗܘܐ also appears in both citations of this verse in *Tract. tres*.

from *LMS*) omit ܚܡ,[102] but one retains it.[103] Moreover, to make the matter more complicated, Philoxenos' fourth full citation of this verse includes ܡܢܟܝ.[104] Of the two citations of this verse in *Tractatus tres*, one retains ܚܡ and one includes ܡܢܟܝ. 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 (ܡܢܟܝ).[105] Although the preposition -ܒ is not the common translation of ἐκ, this textual variant can explain the use of ܚܡ 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, ܡܢܟܝ is also a variant reading in the Peshitta tradition.[106] It could be argued that the ܡܢܟܝ reading is the text of Ph because it is a better translation of the Greek phrase, but this does not explain the use of ܚܡ 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 ܚܡ to ܡܢܟܝ;[107] the single occurrence of ܚܡ 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 υἱὸς

---

[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* Θ *f*[1] 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 ܡܢܟܝ.

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

ܡܒܪܟܬܐ ܐܢܬܝ ܒܢܫܐ ܘܡܒܪܟ ܗܘ ܦܐܪܐ ܕܟܪܣܟܝ	P
ܡܒܪܟܬܐ ܐܢܬܝ ܒܢܫܐ ܘܡܒܪܟ ܗܘ ܦܐܪܐ ܕܟܪܣܟܝ	Ph
ܡܒܪܟܬܐ ܐܢܬܝ ܒܢܫܐ ܘܡܒܪܟܐ ܗܘ ܦܐܪܐ ܕܟܪܣܟܝ	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 ܟܬܝܒ ܕܐܡܪܬ ("It is written that she [Elizabeth]
said...").[109] The variation in question is the omission of the
preposition -ܒ in the final word of the phrase (ܕܟܪܣܟܝ or ܕܒܟܪܣܟܝ).
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 -ܒ specifying the location of the fruit. However, there
is no preposition in the Greek text to represent -ܒ because it uses
the genitive phrase ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κολίας σου ("the fruit *of* your
womb"). By removing the preposition -ܒ, the text of Ph allows the
initial -ܕ   to function as a genitive and renders the Greek more
accurately as ܦܐܪܐ ܕܟܪܣܟܝ ('the fruit of your womb').

1:43

ܐܝܡܟܐ	ܠܝ ܗܕܐ	x	ܕܐܡܗ ܕܡܪܝ	x	ܬܐܬܐ ܠܘܬܝ		P
ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܠܝ ܗܕܐ	x	ܕܐܡܗ ܕܡܪܝ	x	ܬܐܬܐ ܠܘܬܝ			Ph
ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܠܝ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܬܬ ܐܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܠܘܬܝ	x						H

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

The citation of this verse[110] contains a revised translation of the
Greek word πόθεν and replaced ܐܝܡܟܐ ("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.

the virtually equivalent phrase ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ("whence?").[111] While πόθεν does mean "where?" or "whence?", it also carries the tertiary meaning "why?", and it is this meaning that is used in Luke 1:43. Thus, neither Ph nor P correctly interprets the nuance of the question.

2:6

P	ܘܗܘܐ	x	ܕܟܕ	x	ܡܢ ܐܝܢ	ܐܬܡܠܝ	ܝܘܡܬܗ	ܕܬܐܠܕ
Ph	ܗܘܐ	ܟܕ [ܕܝܢ]	ܕܗܘ	ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܢ x	ܐܬܡܠܝ	ܝܘܡܬܐ	ܕܬܐܠܕ
H	ܗܘܐ	ܕܝܢ ܟܕ	ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܢ x	ܐܬܡܠܝ	ܝܘܡܬܐ	ܕܬܐܠܕ

G ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν

In his citation of this verse,[112] Philoxenos provides intent to cite with the citation marker ܠܡ. The text of this verse in *CPJ* does not include the conjunction ܕܝܢ, but the citation marker stands in the text where this conjunction would stand, and we have already seen evidence that Philoxenos often replaces post-positive conjunctions with the citation marker. Thus, while it is not certain that the text of Ph originally included ܕܝܢ, it is likely that the translator of Ph, like the translator of H, added this conjunction to reflect the Greek δέ. The translator of Ph has also added the verbal phrase ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ as a translation of the Greek verb εἶναι αὐτούς in the phrase ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτούς. While the translation of P implies the same meaning as the Greek phrase, we see the translators of Ph and H attempting a "literal" translation of each Greek word.

2:7

P	ܘܝܠܕܬ	ܒܪܗ	x	x	ܒܘܟܪܐ.	ܘܟܪܟܬܗ	ܒܥܙܪܘܪܐ	ܘܐܪܡܝܬܗ	ܒܐܘܪܝܐ
Ph	ܘܝܠܕܬ	ܠܒܪܗ	x	x	ܒܘܟܪܐ	ܘܟܪܟܬܗ	ܒܥܙܪܘܪܐ	ܘܐܣܟܠܬܗ	ܒܐܘܪܝܐ
H	ܘܝܠܕܬ	ܠܒܪ ܐܝܠ	ܕܝܠܗ ܗܘ	ܒܘܟܪܐ.	x	ܘܪܝܬܗ	ܘܐܣܟܠܬܗ	ܒܐܘܪܝܐ

G καὶ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν φάτνῃ.

The citation of this verse[113] includes the addition of the third person direct object pronoun ܗ- to the end of the verb ܝܠܕܬ as well

---

[111] Smith, *CSD*, 13.

[112] *CPJ* 209.4–5.

[113] *CPJ* 209.5–6.

as the direct object marker -ܠ to the word ܒܪܐ. It is possible, though not certain, that Philoxenos' text of the Peshitta retained this reading because the OS manuscript S also read ܘܠܕܬܗ, 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 ܐܣܡܟܘܗ, an Aphel form of ܣܡܟ ("to make recline, to seat"), as the translation for the Greek word ἀνέκλινεν rather than ܐܪܡܝܬܗ, from ܪܡܐ ("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

P	ܘܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܫܠܡܐ	x	x	ܫܠܡܐ ܘܛܒܐ ܠܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ				
Ph	ܘܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܫܠܡܐ	ܘܒܒܢܝܢܫܐ	x	ܨܒܝܢܐ	x	x	x	
H	ܘܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܫܝܢܐ	ܘܒܒܢܝܢܫܐ	ܨܒܝܢܐ ܫܦܝܪܐ	ܨܒܝܢܐ	x	x	x	

G   καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας

The revision found in this citation[115] 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 ܘܒܒܢܝܢܫܐ ܨܒܝܢܐ ("and among people [good] will") while the text of P reads ܘܫܠܡܐ ܛܒܐ ܠܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ("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 ܨܒܝܢܐ ("will, desire, delight") as an equivalent for the Greek εὐδοκία, replacing the translation of P ܫܠܡܐ ܛܒܐ ("good will"). The translator of H also uses the word ܨܒܝܢܐ but adds the modifier ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ (from ܫܦܝܪ "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, Bas ter 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

P	ܘܒܪܟ ܐܢܘܢ ܫܡܥܘܢ ܘܐܡܪ x ܠܡܪܝܡ ܐܡܗ ܗܐ ܗܢܐ ܣܝܡ
Ph	ܘܒܪܟ ܐܢܘܢ ܫܡܥܘܢ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܡܪܝܡ ܐܡܗ ܗܐ ܗܢܐ ܣܝܡ
H	ܘܒܪܟ ܐܢܘܢ ܫܡܥܘܢ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܡܪܝܡ ܐܡܗ ܗܐ ܗܢܐ ܣܝܡ

P	ܠܡܦܘܠܬܐ ܘܠܩܝܡܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܒܐܝܣܪܝܠ ܘܠܐܬܐ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ
Ph	ܠܡܦܘܠܬܐ ܘܠܩܝܡܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܒܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ ܘܠܐܬܐ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ
H	ܠܡܦܘܠܬܐ ܘܠܡܩܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܒܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ ܘܠܐܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ

G   καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεὼν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Μαριὰμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, Ἰδοὺ οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν 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 ܠܝ, 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 ܠܡܪܝܡ ("to Mary") to the longer, but equivalent in meaning, phrase ܠܘܬ ܡܪܝܡ. This alteration

---

[116] Romeny, "A Philoxenian-Harclean Tradition?," 67.

[117] *CPJ* 209.12–13.

[118] *CPJ* 220.6–7: ܗܐ ܗܢܐ ܗܘ ܣܝܡ ܠܡܦܘܠܬܐ ܘܠܩܝܡܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܠܐܬܐ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ ܘܠܐܬܐ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ

CML 44.5–6: ܗܐ ܗܢܐ ܠܝ ܣܝܡ ܗܘ ܠܡܦܘܠܬܐ ܘܠܩܝܡܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܘܠܐܬܐ ܥܠ ܣܒܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ

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 ܠܐ in the place of ܘܡܢ. However, we should not conclude that the text of Ph omits ܘܡܢ 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 ܩܝܡܐܘ (with P) or ܠܩܝܡܬܐ (with H). In one citation, the text of this verse reads ܩܝܡܐܘ, 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 -ܘ, so it seems clear that it was included in the text of Ph. Thus, we may conclude that the text of Ph read ܠܩܝܡܬܐܘ.

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 ܠܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ ("to/for Israel") rather than ܒܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ ("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 -ܠ back to a -ܒ. 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 ܠܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ. It is also possible that the scribe responsible for the MS of *CPJ* accidentally included -ܠ because the two previous nouns (ܠܢܘܦܠܬܐ and ܠܩܝܡܬܐܘ) included the prefix -ܠ. Thus, we conclude that the text of Ph originally read ܒܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ.

---

[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.

2:35

P	x ܚܠܦܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܟܝ ܒܢܦܫܟܝ ܬܥܒܪ ܪܘܡܚܐ x ܕܢܬܓܠܝܢ		
Ph	ܚܠܦܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܟܝ ܒܢܦܫܟܝ ܬܥܒܪ ܪܘܡܚܐ x ܕܢܬܓܠܝܢ ܡܢ		
H	ܘܚܠܦܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܟܝ ܢܚܙܐ ܣܝܦܐ ܕܢܬܓܠܝܢ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܡܢ		

P	ܕܠܒܘܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܪ̈ܥܝܢܐ
Ph	ܠܒܘܬܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܪ̈ܥܝܢܐ
H	ܠܒܘܬܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܪ̈ܥܝܢܐ

G καὶ σοῦ [δὲ] αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία, ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί.

The citation presented above is part of a longer quotation encompassing most of 2:34 and all of 2:35.[122] The text of Ph is nearly identical to the text of P, except for two minor revisions that are also included in the text of H. The text of Ph includes the contraction ܐܝܟܢܐ instead of the shorter ܐܝܟ. There is no apparent reason for this change because there is no change in the meaning, and there is no apparent Greek word which the translator of Ph is attempting to replicate. The other revision from the text of P in this verse is the addition of the preposition ܡܢ. The text of the OS S contains this word, but the text of P does not. However, this could also be the result of a textual variant in the *Vorlage* of the text of P. Several manuscripts omit the preposition ἐκ,[123] so it is possible that the Greek text behind the text of P also omitted it and, likewise, that the Greek texts behind the translations of Ph and H included it. However, it is also possible that the Greek text behind the translation of P did include ἐκ and that the translator(s) of P utilized the genitive action of the prefix -ܕ to convey the same meaning. Considering the fact that both Ph and H omit this prefix, this is the most likely explanation. Thus, syᵖ should be removed from the critical apparatus of NA27 as a witness to the absence of ἐκ.

---

[122] *CPJ* 220.6–9. See discussion of 2:34 above.

[123] The witnesses that omit ἐκ (other than P) are: D sa bomss.

2:43

P	x	x	ܝܫܘܥ	x	ܟܕ	ܐܠܠ	ܒܐܘ ܠ ܗ	ܒܐܘܪܫܠܡ	ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥܘ	ܐܠ	ܝܕܥ ܥ	

The Syriac lines read (right to left):

P: x x ܝܫܘܥ x ܟܕ ܐܠܠ ܗ ܠ ܗܘ ܒܐܘܪܫܠܡ ܘܣܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܗ ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥܘ

Ph: x x x ܣܒܘ x x ܐܠܠ ܗ ܠ ܗܘ ܒܐܘܪܫܠܡ x x ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥ

H: ܗܠ ܠ ܗܘ ܥ ܥ x ܗܘ ܐܠܠ x x ܒܐܘܪܫܠܡ x x ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥܘ

P: x   x   x

Ph: ܝܘܣܦ   ܘܐܡܗ

H: ܝܘܣܦ   ܘܐܡܗ ܕܝܠܗ

G ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ
ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ

The citation of this verse from Ph[124] and the text of H both omit
the conjunction ܕ, 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 ܝܘܣܦ ܘܐܡܗ ("And Joseph and
his mother") with the verbal phrase ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥ ("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 NA[27] reads οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ
γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ("His parents did not know"),[125] but a well attested
variant reads οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰωσὴφ 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
ܝܕܥ rather than the third person plural ܝܕܥܘ. 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] *CPJ* 209.13–14

[125] The witnesses that attest to this reading are: ℵ B D L W θ f¹ 33.
579. lat sa

[126] The witnesses that attest to this reading are: A C Ψ 0130 *f*¹³ it bo^pt.

2:48

ܘܐܡܪܬ݂ ܠܗ ܐܡܗ ܗܘ. ܒܪܝ. ܡܢܐ ܥܒܕܬ ܠܢ ܗܟܢܐ   P

[ܘܐܡܪܬ݂] ܠܘܬܗ ܐܡܗ. ܒܪܝ. ܡܢܐ ܥܒܕܬ ܠܢ ܗܟܢܐ   Ph

ܘܐܡܪܬ݂ ܠܘܬܗ ܐܡܗ. ܒܪܝ. ܡܢܐ ܥܒܕܬ ܠܢ ܗܟܢܐ   H

G   καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ· τέκνον, τί
ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως;

In this citation,[127] the translator of Ph replaces the preposition -ܠ
with the independent preposition ܠܘܬ as the translation of the
Greek preposition πρός. The texts of Ph and H consistently
demonstrate this same revision in other verses, so it is reasonable
to conclude that this minor revision is in fact part of the text of Ph.
The citation shown above omits the initial -ܘ, but we need not
conclude that the text of Ph omitted it because it is likely that
Philoxenos simply omitted it based on the context in which he
quoted the verse. The citation also adds a -ܕ to the beginning of the
word ܘܐܡܪܬ in order to introduce direct discourse. It is possible
that this addition is part of the text of Ph, but the translator of H
does not include this revision, so we have no external evidence to
support this conclusion.

2:52

ܘܝܫܘܥ ܗܘ ܪܒܐ ܒܩܘܡܬܗ ܘܒܚܟܡܬܗ ܘܒܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܒܢܝܢܫܐ   P

[ܘܝܫܘܥ] x ܪܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ ܘܒܩܘܡܬܐ ܘܒܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܒܢܝܢܫܐ   Ph

ܘܝܫܘܥ x ܡܬܪܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ ܘܒܩܘܡܬܐ ܘܒܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܒܢܝܢܫܐ   H

G   καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν [ἐν τῇ] σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ
χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις

Philoxenos quotes this verse eight times, and although only two of
these quotations are found in *CPJ*, five of the remaining six are

---

[127] *CPJ* 209.15–16. There is a citation from *CML* that incorporates
the latter portion of this verse, but it is omitted from this section for three
reasons: 1) the portion discussed above is not included in the citation
from *CML*; 2) the citation from *CML* is found only in later (13th century)
mss, and is thus not as reliable as *CPJ*; and 3) the text of the citation from
CML accurately represents the text of P, so there is no need to include it
here.

found in MS A, the earliest witness for *CML*.[128] Philoxenos displays an intent to cite with the citation marker ܠܡ in three of the citations[129] and introduces the text of the citation found above with the phrase ܗ̇. ܕܐܡܪ ܟܠܗ ܐܘܢ. The text of Ph omits the conjunction ܕܝܢ, as does the text of H. This is likely an intentional omission by the translators because there is no post-positive conjunction in the Greek text. The verse in Greek does begin with καί, and the translator of H has added -ܘ to the first word to account for this. The -ܘ does not appear in any of the citations of Ph, but it is not necessary to conclude that the text of Ph omits this conjunction because the citations begin here and the -ܘ is not necessary. The only other alteration of the text of P found in Ph is the omission of the possessive pronoun ܗ- from the words ܩܘܡܬܗ and ܚܟܡܬܗ ("stature" and "wisdom"). It is not clear why these pronouns were used originally, as they are unnecessary; and this is likely the reason for their omission in the text of Ph and H.[130] One citation of this verse does display the transposed word order of H for these two words,[131] but six citations contain the word order found above. Thus, it seems most likely that the text of Ph retained the word order of P and that Philoxenos accidentally transposed the words in one citation.

3:23

P	x	x	x	ܗ̣ܘ ܕܝܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܫܢܝܢ ܬܠܬܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ.
Ph	ܐܝܟ	- -	ܝܫܘܥ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܫܢܝܢ ܬܠܬܝܢ ܟܕ ܡܣܬܒܪ ܕܝܘܣܦ.
H	ܐܡܐ x	ܐܝܟ	ܝܫܘܥ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܫܢܝܢ ܬܠܬܝܢ ܟܕ ܡܣܬܒܪ ܕܝܘܣܦ.

P	ܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܝܘܣܦ
Ph	ܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܡܣܬܒܪܕ ܝܘܣܦ
H	ܒܪ ܕܝܘܣܦ ܗܘܐ ܡܣܬܒܪܕ

G   καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὢν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ

D   ἦν δὲ Ἰησοῦς ὡς ἐτῶν [τριάκοντα] ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἐνομίζετο εἶναι υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ

---

[128] *CPJ* 71.25–26; 184.29–185.2; *CML* 44.22; 53.2–4; 53.5; 54.8–9.

[129] *CPJ* 71.25–26; *CML* 54.8–9; 65.13–14.

[130] Philoxenos does retain this possessive on ܩܘܡܬܗ in one brief allusion to this verse: *CML* 44.22.

[131] *CML* 53.5: ܚܟܡܬܐ ܘܩܘܡܬܗ

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 ܝܫܘܥ, so we cannot conclude whether or not the text of Ph omitted ܗܘ and included -ܘ at the beginning of the verse as the text of H. The texts of Ph and H have added the phrase ܕܫܿܪܐ ('beginning'-a participle of ܫܪܐ) after ܩܢܝ ܬܠܬܝܢ, 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 NA[27]. 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 NA[27] critical text.

　　With the exceptions of placing the verbal phrase ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ (the translation of ἦν) *after* the subject (Jesus) rather than before it, and, similarly, placing the verb ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, (the translation of εἶναι) *before* the clause ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܬܒܪ ܗܘܐ (the translation of ὡς ἐνομίζετο), 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 ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, in the text. One of the five shorter citations[133] renders the final phrase ܡܣܬܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܒܪ ܝܘܣܦ. 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 ܠܗ. 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 NA[27]. 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

ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ	P
ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ	Ph
ܟܠ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ̣ܐ,	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 ܡܕܡ rather than ܠܐ.[136] Moreover, ܡܕܡ 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

ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܣܗܕ	x	ܐܠܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ	x	ܗܘܐ	x	ܗܘ ܠܐ	P
ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܣܗܕ	x	ܐܠܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ	x	ܗܘܐ, ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܠܐ			Ph
ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܕܢܣܗܕ ܐܝܟ ܐܠܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܗܘ ܗܘܐ, ܐܝܬܘܗܝ x ܠܐ							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 ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, to ܗܘܐ, 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 ܠܐ ܡܕܡ. The OS C also contains ܡܕܡ, 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 ܠܐ at the beginning of the
sentence to the Philoxenian version. Pusey and Gwilliam do not list
ܠܐ 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 ܠܐ; 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 ܠܐ is
found in the text of Ph.

1:10

P   ܥܠܡܐ   x   ܘܥܠܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܝܕܗ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܗܘܐ   x   ܐܠ ܝܕܥܗ

Ph   ܥܠܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܝܕܗ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܠܗ ܐܠ ܝܕܥ

H   ܥܠܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܝܕܗ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܠܗ ܐܠ ܝܕܥ

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 ܕܝܢ (after ܥܠܡܐ) and introduces the citation with
the phrase "the evangelist wrote and said thus concerning him"
(...ܕܗܟܢ ܟܬܒ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܗܠܝܢ, ܐܘܢܓܠܝܣܛܐ ܗܘ ܕ). As with Jn 1:8
above, the text of Ph adds the verb ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, to ܗܘܐ 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
ܗ- with the independent direct object ܠܗ 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

P	x	ܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ	x	ܘܕܝܠܗ ܠܐ ܩܒܠܘܗܝ	x,	
Ph	x	ܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ	ܘܕܝܠܗ ܠܐ ܩܒܠܘܗܝ	x,	
H	ܠܥܠܡ ܕܝܠܗ	ܐܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ	ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܐ	x	ܩܒܠܘܗܝ,	

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 ܠܬ 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 ܗܠܝܢ. 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 ܕܝܠܗ does not reflect the plural antecedent. Although the text of H displays the pronoun ܗܢܘܢ rather than ܗܠܝܢ in order to distinguish the gender, these translations are virtually equivalent, and it appears that the translators had similar intentions.[142]

1:14

P	x ܘܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܓܢ ܒܢ ܗܘ ܘܚܙܝܢ. x ܫܘܒܚܗ ܐܝܟ				
Ph	ܘܗܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܓܢ ܒܢ ܗܘ ܘܚܙܝܢ. x ܫܘܒܚܗ ܐܝܟ				
H	ܘܗܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܓܢ ܒܢ ܗܘ ܠܚܕܒܣܪܐ ܕܝܠܗ.ܫܘܒܚܗ ܐܝܟ				

P	ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܕܡܠܐ x ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܘܩܘܫܬܐ			
Ph	ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܕܡܠܐ x ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܘܩܘܫܬܐ			
H	ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܘܩܘܫܬܐ			

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 ܗܠܝܢ 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 ܘܗ 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 ܠܡ in citations with and without ܘܗ. The particle ܘܗ 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 ܘܗ.[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 ܘܗ 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 ܘܗ here as a translation of the Greek article.[146]

There is some question about the word order of ܒܣܪܐ ܗܠܬܐ ܘܗܐ 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 ܘܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܣܪܐ. 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 ܘܗ, 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 ‑ܘ each time he cites the portion of the text that includes ܫܘܒ, 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 ܫܘܒ. 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 ‑ܘ unnecessary.[147]

The text ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܗ as opposed to ܫܘܒܚܗ 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 ܠܐ with the former wording, and this citation is longer than the citations that read ܫܘܒܚܗ, providing some evidence that the longer rendering is actually in the text of Ph. The translation ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܗ 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 ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܗ 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 ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܗ 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 ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܗ rather than ܫܘܒܚܗ.

---

[147] Moreover, P. J. Williams asserts that the presence or absence of ‑ܘ 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 ܫܪܪܐ rather than ܩܘܫܬܐ 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 ܫܪܪܐ as a variant, though it is possible that the Peshitta text with which Philoxenos was familiar retained ܫܪܪܐ from the text of the OS, though this must remain uncertain. However, it is not necessary to conclude that Philoxenos' text of P included ܫܪܪܐ, as it is likely a lexical revision by the translator of Ph to offer a more accurate translation. The text of H also includes ܫܪܪܐ rather than ܩܘܫܬܐ, adding further support to the case that the text of Ph read ܫܪܪܐ as well.

1:15

P	ܝܘܚܢܢ ܡܣܗܕ ܥܠܘܗܝ, ܘܩܥܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܗܘ x ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ x ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܕ x ܒܬܪܝ,
Ph	ܝܘܚܢܢ ܡܣܗܕ ܥܠܘܗܝ, ܘܩܥܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܕ ܒܬܪܝ,
H	ܝܘܚܢܢ ܡܣܗܕ ܥܠܘܗܝ, ܘܩܥܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܕ ܒܬܪܝ,
P	ܐܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ x ܩܕܡܝ x ܗܘܐ ܕܩܕܝܡ ܡܢܝ x ܗܘ x x
Ph	ܐܬܐ x x ܡܢ ܒܬܪܝ x ܗܘܐ ܩܕܡ ܡܢܝ ܗܘܐ x x ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ
H	ܐܬܐ x x ܡܢ ܒܬܪܝ ܗܘܐ ܩܕܝܡ ܡܢܝ x ܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ

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 twice[150] and cites phrases of the verse twice as well.[151] In one of the two full citations, Philoxenos provides the citation marker ܠܡ.[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 ܟܕ to the participle ܐܡܪ, the addition of the verbal phrase ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, as a translation of ἦν, and the addition of the pronoun ܗܘ as a literal translation of the Greek definite article ὁ so that the Greek text ὁ ὀπίσω μου is rendered

---

[150] *CPJ* 231.13–15; 242.16–17.

[151] *CPJ* 242.2; 242.22–23.

[152] *CPJ* 241.13–15.

ܪܝܕܒܐ ܗܘ (though ܗܘ is functioning grammatically as a pronoun). The text of Ph also places the verb ܗܘܐ after the preposition ܩܕܡܝ to match the Greek order ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν. And as we have seen elsewhere, the text of Ph adds the full verbal phrase ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ at the end of this sentence to reflect the Greek verb ἦν.[153]

1:16

P	ܘܡܢ ܡܠܝܘܬܗ x ܢܣܒ ܟܠ ܘܚܢܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܚܠܦ ܣܘܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ		
Ph	ܡܛ ܡܠܝܘܗ x ܐܢܚܢ ܟܠ ܢܣܒܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܚܠܦ ܣܘܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ		
H	ܘܡܢ ܡܠܝܐܗ ܕܝܠܗ ܣܢ ܟܠ ܢܣܒܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܚܠܦ ܣܘܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ		

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

Philoxenos' commentaries contain one full[154] and two partial[155] citations of this verse. The revisions are slight: the text of Ph replaces ܡܠܝܘܬܐ with the virtually identical ܡܠܝܐ, both derivatives of the verb ܡܠܐ. It is also interesting to note that while H also uses ܡܠܝܐ, Ph retains the possessive suffix -ܗ found in P order to reflect the use of the Greek αὐτοῦ whereas the text of H uses the extended ܕܝܠܗ. The text of Ph also provides the extended form of the first person plural pronoun ܐܢܚܢ. Philoxenos quotes this precise wording on two different occasions, and one of the citations includes ܟܠ, so it is reasonable to conclude that this is the wording of Ph.[156]

1:17

P	ܡܛܠ ܕܢܡܘܣܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܛܝܒܘܬܐ x x ܒܝܕ		
Ph	ܡܛܠܘ ܕܢܡܘܣܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ x x ܐܬܝܗܒ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܟܐܝܫܐ ܒܝܕ		
H	ܡܛܠ ܕܢܡܘܣܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ x x ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܫܪܪܐ[157] ܒܝܕ		

---

[153] Jn 1:8,10.

[154] *CPJ* 245.5.

[155] *CPJ* 245.20–21; 245.27

[156] This word is marked with an asterisk and obelus in the Harclean 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.

P   ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ ܗܘܐ

Ph   ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ ܗܘܐ

H   ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ ܗܘܐ

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 ܫܪܪܐ and ܛܝܒܘܬܐ, and moves the particle ܕܝܢ.

1:33

P   ܘܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܗܘܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ x ܕܫܕܪܢܝ ܕܐܥܡܕ ܒܡܝܐ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ x x ܕܐܝܢܐ x x ܕܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܪܘܚܐ x ܕܢܚܬܐ ܘܡܩܘܝܐ x x ܥܠܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܥܡܕ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ

Ph   ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܗܘܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ x ܕܫܕܪܢܝ ܕܐܥܡܕ ܒܡܝܐ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ x x ܕܥܠܘܗܝ x ܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ x ܠܪܘܚܐ ܢܚܬܬ ܘܡܩܘܝܐ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܥܡܕ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.

H   ܘܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܗܘܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܠܐ ܗܘ x ܕܫܕܪܢܝ ܠܡܥܡܕܘ ܒܡܝܐ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ x ܕܠܟܠ ܗܘ ܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ x ܠܪܘܚܐ ܢܚܬܬ ܘܡܩܘܝܐ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܥܡܕ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ

G κἀγὼ 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 ܕܐܝܢܐ and replaces it with ܕܥܠܘܗܝ. 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᾽ ὅν. It appears also that

---

[157] *CPJ* 245.6–7; 246.27–28.

[158] *CPJ* 216.8–11.

the text of H attempts to render this phrase even more literally with the phrase ܗ̇ܘ ܕ݂ܗ. Thus, the translation of this phrase is an 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 ܪܘܚܐ ܕ݂ܢܚܬܐ to read ܕ݂ܢܚܬܐ ܪܘܚܐ, which more accurately represents that of the Greek τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον. The translator of Ph also adds the verbal phrase ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, as a translation of ἐστίν.

1:34

P   ܘܐܢܐ ܚܙ݂ܝܬ ܘܐܣܗܕ݂ܬ݂ܐ ܕ݂ܗܢܐ ܒܪ݂ܗ x   x   ܕ݂ܐܠܗܐ

Ph   ܘܐܢܐ ܚ݂ܙܝܬ ܘܐܣܗܕ݂ܬ݂ܐ ܕ݂ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, x   ܒ݂ܪܗ ܕ݂ܐܠܗܐ

H   ܘܐܢܐ ܚ݂ܙܝܬ ܘܐܣܗܕ݂ܬ݂ܐ ܕ݂ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗ̇ܘ ܒ݂ܪܗ ܕ݂ܐܠܗܐ

G κἀγὼ 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 ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, 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

P   ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܚ݂ܒ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕ݂ܠܒ݂ܪܗ x   x   ܝܚܝܕ݂ܝܐ ܢܬ݂ܠ

Ph   ܗܟܢܐ [ܓܝܪ] ܐܚ݂ܒ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕ݂ܠܒ݂ܪܗ x   x   ܝܚܝܕ݂ܐ ܝܗ݂ܒ

H   ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܚ݂ܒ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕ݂ܠܒ݂ܪܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܝܚܝܕ݂ܐ ܝܗ݂ܒ

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 ܐܝܟܢܐ, though it is not necessary to assume that it is missing from the text of Ph because one of the citations includes ܕ݂ܠ in the place of ܐܝܟܢܐ,[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 ܢܬ݂ܠ to ܝܗ݂ܒ. Despite the

---

[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 ܕ݂ܠ where ܐܝܟܢܐ would stand.

fact that the spelling of these words differs significantly, ܠܕܬ is a
defective form of ܝܗܒ. Thus, it appears that this revision is an
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
ܡܛܠܘܗܝ ("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 ܡܛܠܘܗܝ is likely an attempt to
"resolve" the verse and make it coherent as a self-contained
thought.

<div align="right">

3:28

</div>

P   ܕܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܝܬ   x   x   x   ܡܫܝܚܐ.   ܐܠܐ ܫܠܝܚܐ   x   ܐܢܐ   x   ܕܩܕܡܘܗܝ,

Ph   x   ܕܠܐ   x   ܐܝܬܝ, ܐܢܐ   x   ܡܫܝܚܐ.   ܐܠܐ   x   ܕܡܫܠܚ   ܐܢܐ   x   ܩܕܡ ܗܘ

H   x   ܕܠܐ   x   ܐܝܬܝ, ܐܢܐ   ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܫܝܚܐ.   ܐܠܐ   x   ܕܡܫܠܚ   x   ܐܝܬ, ܩܕܡ ܗܘ

G   οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός, ἀλλʼ 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 ܗܘܝܬ with the
verbal phrase ܐܝܬܝ, ܐܢܐ. The text of H also includes this reading,
though it adds the pronoun ܗܘ to reflect the presence of the Greek
definite article. The text of Ph also replaces ܫܠܝܚܐ with the verbal
phrase ܕܡܫܠܚ, 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 ܐܢܐ with the verb ܐܝܬ, in the final
phrase.

---

[162] Though it is also worth noting that ܠܕܬ 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

P   ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܬܐ x   ܐܠܟ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܗܘ x

Ph   ܗܘ x ܕܡܢ [x ܫܡܝܐ] ܐܬܐ x ܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܟܠ x ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,

H   ܗܘ x ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ x ܐܬܐ ܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܟܠ x ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,

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 ܘܗܘ, likely because there is no conjunction in the Greek text. In the final phrase, the text of Ph replaces the verbal enclitic ܗܘ with the verb ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, 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 ܫܡܝܐ ("heaven") rather than ܠܥܠ ("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 ܫܡܝܐ. And while it is possible that that Philoxenos (or the translator of Ph) thought that ܫܡܝܐ was a better translation in this context than ܠܥܠ, this does not seem likely as ܠܥܠ 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

P   ܚܬܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܫܪܝܪ x   ܗܘ x

Ph   ܚܬܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܫܪܝܪ x   ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,

H   ܚܬܡ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܫܪܝܪ x   ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,

G   ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν

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 ܗܘ with ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, as a translation of the Greek word ἐστιν 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

P   ܐܝܟ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ x   ܢܣܒ ܐܢܐ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ

Ph   ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘܐ ܠܐ x ܡܢ ܒܪܢܫܐ x   ܢܣܒ ܐܢܐ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܐ x

H   ܐܝܟ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ x ܡܢ ܒܪܢܫܐ x   ܢܣܒ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܢܐ x   ܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ

P   ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ x   x   ܕܐܢܬܘܢ   ܬܚܘܢ

Ph   ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ x   ܕܐܢܬܘܢ   ܬܬܦܪܩܘܢ

H   ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ x   ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ   ܕܐܢܬܘܢ   ܬܬܦܪܩܘܢ

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

The text of 5:34 in Philoxenos' citation[167] 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 ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ 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 ܗܠܝܢ 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 ܬܚܘܢ to ܬܬܦܪܩܘܢ (from ܦܪܩ, 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.

7:39

P ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܥܕܡܐܝܬ x ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܪܘܚܐ x x ܚܝܠܐ x ܕܠܐ

Ph ܠܐ [ܓܝܪ] x x ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ x ܚܝܠܐ x ܕܠܐ

H ܠܐ x ܓܝܪ ܥܕܡܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ¹⁶⁸ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܬܝܗܒ ܠܐ

P ܥܠܡܪܐ ܐܬܫܒܚ ܗܘܐ ܥܕܟܝܠ

Ph ܥܠܡܪܐ ܐܬܫܒܚ ܗܘܐ ܥܕܟܝܠ

H ܥܠܡܪܐ ܐܬܫܒܚ ܗܘܐ x

G οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη

Philoxenos quotes this verse only once,[169] but he includes the citation marker ܠܡ. As he often does, Philoxenos places ܠܡ in the position of the post-positive conjunction, so although the citation does not include ܓܝܪ, we should not necessarily conclude that it was omitted from the text of Ph. It is possible that the omission of ܥܕܡܐܝܬ in the text of Ph was intentional because the Greek word οὔπω carries the meaning of the Syriac phrase ܠܐ ܥܕܡܐܝܬ. Thus, it is possible that the text of Ph represents an attempt at a word-for-word correspondence and omitted ܥܕܡܐܝܬ. 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 ܝܗܒ ("to give"). This appears to be a result of a textual variant, as several witnesses include the phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον δεδόμενον.[170] Thus, the text of Ph (ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ, '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 ܐܝܬܘܗܝ from feminine to masculine in order to represent the Holy Spirit as male, not female.[171]

---

[168] This word is marked with an asterisk and obelus in the Harclean tradition to denote Thomas's insertion of a word not found in his Greek *Vorlagen*. See n. 156 above.

[169] *CML* 52.17–18. This citation comes from MS A.

[170] The witnesses that include this variant are B *pc* e q sy^h

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

12:26

P   ܟܐ ܠܝ ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܡܫܡܫ x ܠܝ ܒܝ x ܐܠܗ ܘܐܝܟܐ x ܘܐܝܢܐ ܕܐܢܬܝ ܐܢܐ ܬܡܢ ܗܘܐ

Ph   ܟܐ ܠܝ ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܡܫܡܫ x x ܒܝ ܘܐܝܟܐ ܐܠܗ ܘܐܢܐ ܕܐܢܬܝ ܐܝܟ ܬܡܢ ܒܗ ܗܘܐ

H   ܟܐ ܠܝ [ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܡܫܡܫ ܠܝ] ܢܒܣ x x   ܘܐܝܢܐ ܕܐܢܬܝ ܐܝܟ ܒܗ ܗܘܐ

P   ܐܦ ܡܫܡܫܢܝ ܕܝ ܕܠܝ x   x   x   x   x   ܡܫܡܫ ܢܡܝܩܪܗܝ, ܐܒܐ

Ph   ܐܦ ܡܫܡܫܢܝ x ܕܝܠܝ x ܘܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܢܐ ܠܝ ܡܫܡܫ ܢܡܝܩܪܗܝ, ܐܒܐ

H   ܐܦ ܡܫܡܫܢܝ x ܕܝܠܝ [ܗܘܐܢ] ܘܐܢ x ܐܢܐ ܠܝ ܡܫܡܫ [ܢܡܝܩܪܗܝ, ܐܒܐ][172]

G ἐὰν ἐμοί τις διακονῇ, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθείτω, καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ καὶ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται· ἐάν 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 ܐܠܗ ܒܝ in P. While this is essentially an inconsequential revision, the text of Ph matches the Greek ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθείτω. Moreover, the text of Ph inverts the order of the phrase ܐܢܐ ܐܢܬܝ in order to reflect more accurately the Greek text. The text of H also displays this revision. The phrase ܘܐܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܢܐ ܠܝ 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 ܗܘ). Thus, the text of Ph appears to be an attempt at a more word-for-word translation of the Greek text.

14:2

P   ܕܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܐܛܝܒ ܠܟܘܢ ܐܬܪܐ

Ph   ܕܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܐܛܝܒ ܠܟܘܢ ܡܩܘܕܐ

H   ܕܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܛܝܒ ܠܟܘܢ ܡܩܘܕܐ

G ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι 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 inelligible 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.

The only revision in this citation[174] is the replacement of ܐܬܪܐ with the virtually equivalent ܕܘܟܬܐ. The text of H and a citation in the Syriac translation of Cyril[175] also display this reading, providing support for its existence in the text of Ph.

14:3

P   ܐܬܐ ܬܘܒ ܘܐܕܒܪܟܘܢ ܠܘܬܝ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ, x ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܬܗܘܘܢ

Ph   ܕܬܘܒ ܐܬܐ ܘܐܕܒܪܟܘܢ ܠܘܬܝ ܕܐܝܟܐ x ܕܐܝܬܝ, ܐܢܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܬܗܘܘܢ

H   ܬܘܒ ܐܬܐ ܘܐܕܒܪܟܘܢ ܠܘܬܝ ܕܐܝܟܐ x ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ, ܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܬܗܘܘܢ

P   x
Ph   x
H   ܐܝܬܝܢ

G πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε

In this citation,[176] the text of Ph reflects the inverted word order of the phrase ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ in order to conform it to the Greek εἰμὶ ἐγώ. This reading is also found in the text of H.

16:12

P   ܬܘܒ x ܣܓܝ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܡܛܥܢ

Ph   - x ܕܣܓܝܐܬܐ x ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ x

H   ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܡܛܥܢ

P   ܗܫܐ   x
Ph   ܗܫܐ ܠܡܛܥܢ
H   ܗܫܐ   x

G ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι

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 ܕܐܡܪ rather than the infinitive

---

174 *CPJ* 210.12.
175 King, *Syriac Versions*, 456.
176 *CPJ* 210.13–14.
177 *CML* 9.12–13; *CPJ* 159.1–3; 178.9–11.

ܠܟܘܬܪ found in P and H. All three quotations also include ܡܢܚܒܣ rather than ܡܢܝܡ 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 (ܠܟܘܬܚ ܣܗܪ),[178] and one of the quotations agrees with the word choice of H but reverses the order (ܣܗܪ ܠܟܠܚ).[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 ܠܟܠܚ, 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 ܠܟܠܚ 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.

16:13

P ܐ̈ܝܢܐ ܕ ܟ ܡ ܕ ܟ ܟ ܘܐܝܢ ܕܩܘܫܬ ܗܘ ܩܗܝܕܣ x ܐܝܢ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ x ܡܠܠ x

Ph ܟ ܡ x ܐ̈ܝܕ ܡ x x ܘܐܝܢ ܕܩܘܫܬ ܗܘ ܩܗܝܕܣ ܘܠܐ ܟܠܗ ܠܐܝܢ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ

H ܐ̈ܝܕ، ܡ x ܗܘ ܪܗܡ ܐܝܢ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ x x ܩܘܡܫܗ x ܟܠܗ ܠܐܝܢ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ

G ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,
ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ·

Philoxenos quotes this verse four times with two full[181] and two
partial citations.[182] The text of Ph, along with the text of H, places
ܡ before the verb ܐܬܐ, 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 ܡ with ܠܝܕ.[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 ܠܟܠ ܕܬܐ in
place of the shorter phrase ܒܟܠܗ. 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 ܒܟܠܗ 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 NA[27] reads ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ,
but several MSS replace ἐν with εἰς.[187] The slight difference of

---

[181] *CPJ* 159.3–4; *CML* 9.12–13.

[182] *CPJ* 178.11–12; *CML* 3.20–21.

[183] *CPJ* 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 ܡ.

[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 NA[25] 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 -ܒ with ܠܘܬ, 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

P	ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܢܦܩܬ ܘܬܘܒ ܐܬܝܬܗ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܐܬܝܬ ܘܬܘܒ. ܫܒܩܢܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ
Ph	ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܢܦܩܬ x ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܘܐܬܝܬ ܠܥܠܡܐ. ܬܘܒ ܫܒܩ ܐܢܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܘܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ
H	ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܢܦܩܬ x ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܘܐܬܝܬ ܠܥܠܡܐ. ܬܘܒ ܫܒܩ ܐܢܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܘܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ

P	ܐܒܐ ܠܘܬ ܠ
Ph	ܐܒܐ ܠܘܬ x
H	ܐܒܐ ܠܘܬ x

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

Philoxenos displays his intent to cite this verse with the citation marker ܕܐܝܟ.[188] The texts of both Ph and H omit the preposition ܠܘܬ in the first phrase of this verse. It is possible that this revision is the result of textual variation in the Greek *Vorlagen*. The NA[27] critical text words the opening phrase ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, but several witnesses replace παρά with the preposition ἐκ.[189] It is possible, then, that ܠܘܬ is a translation of παρά from the Greek *Vorlage* of the text of P,[190] and, likewise, that the Greek *Vorlagen* of Ph and H read ἐκ rather than παρά. This explains the absence of ܠܘܬ 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 ܠܘܬ and allowed ܡܢ to represent παρά. In the final phrase of this verse, both Ph and H omit ܠ. 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 NA[25] as noted by the symbol † in the textual apparatus.

[190] Cf. John 1:1 for an example of ܠܘܬ translated from παρά.

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 ܠ. The translators of Ph and H omitted this phrase for the sake of literal translation of the Greek word order.

17:11

P	ܐܠܐ ܐܡܪܗ ܒ̇ ܐܘܢ ܝܫܡܥ x ܗܘ ܕܡܝܘܬ ܠܗ. x
Ph	ܐܡܪ ܡܢܬܗ ܠܒܐ ܐܘܢ ܝܫܡܥ x ܗܘ ܕܡܝܘܬ ܠܗ. x
H	ܐܡܪ ܡܢܬܗ ܒ̇ ܐܘܢ ܝܫܡܥ ܢܠܡ ܗܘ ܕܡܝܘܬ ܠܐܪܐ.

P	ܕܢܗܘܘ̣ x ܒܪ̈ ܕܐܠܟܐ x ܢܠܡ x x
Ph	ܕܢܗܘܘ̣ x ܒܪ̈ ܕܐܠܟܐ ܢܐܕ ܠܡ x x
H	ܕܢܗܘܘ̣ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܪ̈ ܕܐܠܟܐ ܢܐܕ ܠܡ ܒܪ ܐܘܬܡ

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

In Philoxenos' only citation of this verse,[191] the text of Ph uses ܐܒ rather than ܐܒܐ. It was common in early Syriac to add the first person (sg. or pl.) possessive ending to titles, such as ܡܪܝ ("lord") and ܐܒܐ ("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 ܐܒܐ 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 ܐܒܐ to ܐܒ 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 ܐܦ 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 καί in the phrase ἓν 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 P[107], codices B, Θ, and several other later mss and versions.

seems reasonable to conclude that the *Vorlage* of the text of P did not include καὶ and the *Vorlagen* of Ph and H did.

17:22

P	ܐܠܗܐ ܗܝ x ܥܒܕܬ ܐܢܐ x ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܠܝ ܝܗܒܬ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܝܗܒܬܗ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܘ
Ph	ܐܠܗܐ ܗܝ x ܥܒܕܬ ܗܘ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܠܝ ܢܬܠ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܝܗܒܬܗ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܘ
H	ܐܠܗܐ ܗܝ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܝܗܒܬ ܥܒܕܬ ܗܘ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܠܝ ܢܬܠ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܝܗܒܬܗ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܘ

P	x ܚܕ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܢܗܘܘܢ
Ph	ܐܟܘܬܢ x ܚܕ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܢܗܘܘܢ
H	ܐܟܘܬܢ x ܚܕ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܢܗܘܘܢ

G　κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν

In his commentary, Philoxenos introduces this citation not with a citation marker, but with a hermeneutical paraphrase of the verse: ܢܗܘܘܢ ܚܕ ܒܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܦ ܘ ("And also they shall be one in us").[195] Philoxenos then quotes the verse to which he is alluding and provides the text above. The text of Ph includes the pronoun ܗܘ as a translation of the Greek relative pronoun ἥν, and the translator of the text of H also includes this translation. It is likely that the translator of P thought that the relative pronoun -ܕ prefixed to the next word was sufficient to carry the intended meaning, but the "word-for-word" translations of Ph and H include the additional pronoun to reflect the Greek text. In the final phrase of this verse, both Ph and H replace the first person plural pronoun ܚܢܢ with the first person plural verb ܐܝܬܝܢ. The previous verse discussed[196] ends with a phrase that is quite similar to the final phrase of this verse. The text of H includes the verb ܐܝܬܝܢ in both cases while the text of Ph includes it here only. This could be a case of inconsistent translation on the part of the translator of Ph, but it is more likely that this revision is a result of a textual variant in the Greek texts. Several Greek witnesses[197] include ἐσμέν at the end of the sentence, precisely where the texts of Ph and H read the equivalent

---

[195] *CPJ* 210.19–20. There is also an adapted allusion to this verse in *CPJ* 213.13–14.

[196] Cf. Jn. 17:11.

[197] This variant is attested by corrections in ℵ and C, and in the original text of A, Θ, and Ψ.

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

17:24

P	ܐܒܐ ܗܿܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܝܗܒܬ ܠܝ܆ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܬ	x	ܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ
Ph	ܐܒܐ ܗܿܘ ܕܝܗܒܬ ܠܝ܆ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܦ	
H	ܐܒܐ ܗܿܘ ܗܕܡ ܕܝܗܒܬ ܠܝ܆ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܐܦ	

P	ܗܘܘ ܢܗܘܘܢ	x	ܥܡܝ	x	ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܚܙܝܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܗܿܘ
Ph	ܗܘܘ ܢܗܘܘܢ	x	ܥܡܝ	x	ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܚܙܝܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܐܝܢܐ
H	ܗܘܘ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܝܟܘܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܚܙܝܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܿܘ

P	ܕܝܗܒܬ ܠܝ	x	ܕܐܚܒܬܢܝ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܬܘܪܡܝܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ
Ph	ܕܝܗܒܬ ܠܝ	x	ܕܐܚܒܬܢܝ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܬܘܪܡܝܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ
H	ܕܝܗܒܬ ܠܝ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܚܒܬܢܝ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܬܘܪܡܝܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ

G πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι ὅτι ἠγάπησάς 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 ܐܒܐ 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 ܗܢܘܢ and adds the virtually equivalent phrase ܐܝܠܝܢ-. 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 εἰμὶ ἐγώ ("where I am") with the phrase ܐܬܪ ܕܐܢܐ ("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 ܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܐܢܐ ("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 ܗܿܘ with the phrase ܐܝܢܐ -ܕ in order to more accurately translate the Greek relative pronoun ἥν.

---

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

18:8

P ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܗܘ ܐܢܐ x ܠܝ ܒܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܫܒܘܩܘ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܙܠܝܢ

Ph ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ ܗܘ x ܠܝ ܒܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܫܒܘܩܘ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܙܠܝܢ

H ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ ܗܘ ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܝ ܒܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܫܒܘܩܘ ܠܗܢܘܢ ܐܙܠܝܢ

G ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἄφετε τούτους
ὑπάγειν

This citation[199] also includes an example of a revision toward a more word-for-word translation with respect to the word order of the Greek phrase ἐγώ εἰμί by replacing the enclitic pronoun ܐܢܐ with the verbal phrase ܐܝܬܝ. The translator of H also includes this reading.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The primary focus of the present study has been to simply present the data for the text of the Philoxenian version for various Gospel passages as those texts can be reconstructed from the citations of Philoxenos. While this study has focused only on citations from the Gospels and presented data for only fifty-two verses, it is possible to make some tentative conclusions[200] about the nature of the Philoxenian version and its place within the shifting Syriac translation technique of the sixth-century. First, we summarize briefly the types of revisions that are evident within the Philoxenian version, and then we will offer a few brief suggestions about the implications of these conclusions for the future of study with regard to the Philoxenian version.

4.1 Revisions Characteristic of the Philoxenian Version

Based on the revisions found in the Scripture passages presented above, it is possible to discuss a few trends of translation technique evident within the Philoxenian version. These trends include: lexical changes for more "accurate" translation, attempts at more accurate and consistent translation of verb tense, lexical omissions

---

[199] *CPJ* 166.11.

[200] These conclusions must remain tentative until the completion of a similar project for Philoxenos' citations outside the Gospels and a more thorough comparison with other sixth-century translation projects.

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 ܝܠܕ in Matt 1:1 and 1:18.[201] In both of these passages, Philoxenos replaces a word built from ܝܠܕ with the word ܗܘܐ ("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" (ܗܘܐ) 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 ܝܠܕ with regard to Jesus' birth. Philoxenos cites Matt 1:20 four times, and three of the citations include the word ܐܬܝܠܕ as a translation of the Greek γεννηθέν. The fourth citation replaces ܐܬܝܠܕ with ܐܬܒܪܝ, 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 ܐܬܝܠܕ in reference to Jesus.

[203] However, the case of Matt 1:1 is particularly intriguing because although the word ܬܘܠܕܬܗ is built from the root ܝܠܕ, 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 πύλαι as ܣܘܟ̈ܐ ("bars [of iron]") rather than ܬܪܥܐ ("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 ܠ- ("to, for") with the independent preposition ܠܘܬ ("to, toward") as the translation of the Greek preposition πρός.[206] This translation revision could be explained in one of three ways: 1) the translator has decided that ܠܘܬ is simply a better translation than ܠ- based on the context; 2) the translator of Ph is attempting to render the Greek word order more faithfully, and the addition of ܠܘܬ represents πρός 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 πρός as ܠܘܬ, the translator of Ph retains ܠܘܬ, but every time the text of P translates πρός as ܠ-, the translator of Ph revises the text to read ܠܘܬ, and, moreover, when the text of P includes ܠܘܬ and there is no πρός in the text, the translator of Ph omits ܠܘܬ.[207]

In Matt 2:6, the translator of Ph replaces two occurrences of the word ܡܠܟܐ ("king") in the text of P with ܗܓܡܘܢܐ ("leader, ruler, governor") as a translation of the Greek word ἡγεμών. 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 ܠܘܬ, see Jn 16:28; and adding ܠܘܬ, see Lk 2:34 and 2:48.

ܚܕܪܘܗܝ 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, ܬܪܘܢܘܣ ("throne"-transliterated from Greek) and
ܟܘܪܣܝܐ (also "throne"). In an attempt to make the translation
consistent, the translator of Ph replaced ܬܪܘܢܘܣ with ܟܘܪܣܝܐ so
that both instances of θρόνος were translated with ܟܘܪܣܝܐ. 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 ܣܒܪܐ
(which can mean "hope, trust; thought, opinion") with ܨܒܝܢܐ
("will, desire"). This example is intriguing because the Greek word
in question is εὐδοκίας ("good will"), and while it seems that
ܨܒܝܢܐ is a better translation than ܣܒܪܐ, the translator of Ph does
not add an adjective to ܨܒܝܢܐ to translate the εὐ- prefix. The texts
of P (ܛܒܐ) and H (ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ) 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 ܡܘܠܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܪܝܫ (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 ܒ 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 ܒ to Syriac participles[210] 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 + ܒ

Another trend in the translation technique of Ph with regard to verbs is the consistent use of the verbal phrase ܐܝܬ- + 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 ܐܝܬ- 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]   ܐܝܬܝ,

ἐστίν   [213]   ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,

εἶναι   ܐܝܬ (+ context sensitive pronoun)[214]

ἐσμέν   [215]   ܐܝܬܝܢ

ἦν   ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, (usually + ܗܘܐ)[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 -ܐܝܬ when the text of P translates the text in idiomatic Syriac with either the use of an absolute state noun in the predicate position[217] or the enclitic use of ܗܘܐ.[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 ܕܝܢ,[219] prepositional phrases,[220] and the 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 ܗܘܐ 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 (ܕܝܢ[223] and ܓܝܪ[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 ܐܝܬܘ- 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 Mabbugensis: Tractatus Tres de Trinitate et Incarnatione.* CSCO 9, 10. Louvain: Secretariat du CorpusSCO, 1907.

Watt, J. W. *Philoxenos of Mabbug: 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. Afinogenov and A. Muraviev. Moscow: Izdatelstvo, 1996. Repr. in 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." Pages149–160 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 Kulturgebeit.* 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 Cruetonian 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 Harclean 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 Bekkum, 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.

Vööbus, 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.