

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU

School of Theology and Seminary Faculty
Publications

School of Theology and Seminary

1-2015

"Review of *La Vetus Syra del vangelo diLuca: Trasmissione e recezione del testo*"

Michael Patella OSB

College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University, mpatella@csbsju.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_pubs



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patella, Michael. Review of *La Vetus Syra del vangelo diLuca: Trasmissione e recezione del testo*, by Luca Carrega Gian. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, vol. 77 issue 1, (2015): 169-170.

Originally published in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, <https://catholicbiblical.org/publications/cbq>.

that this is one of several roles played by the literary unit of vv. 1-38 (see vv. 1-2)? Generally, too much is made of vv. 31-32 as a new stage in the Gospel's literary structure, but not a word is given to the exit of Judas in v. 31a that motivates Jesus' triumphant cry in vv. 31b-32. John 13 is enclosed by references to Judas (vv. 2, 10c-11, 18, and v. 31a), Peter (vv. 6-11 and 36-38), and the parallel between the example of v. 15 and the new commandment of vv. 34-35. In addition, 13:1-38 is "narrative," 14:1-16:33 is "discourse," and 17:1-26 is "prayer." This does not take away from the quality of this study. I was pleased to see the interpretation of 20:23 as the disciples' continuation of Jesus' critical presence as the revelation of the truth. A link with the Paraclete passage of 16:8-11 would strengthen this position.

I wondered, as I came to the end of the book, what the original Johannine Christians were to make of the Jesus-story that addressed them, assuring them that their belief in Jesus Christ, Son of God, rendered them children of the Father. By what authority could this impressive claim be made? Was this account seen by its Johannine author(s) as just another early Christian exhortation? Was it perhaps the *graphē* "not yet known" by the Beloved Disciple and Peter (20:9), chosen from the many unwritten (v. 30: *ouk estin gegrammena*) signs Jesus had done in the presence of the original disciples, and *written* (v. 31: *gegraptai*) so that those who do not see would believe in his name (vv. 29, 31)?

Francis J. Moloney, S.D.B., Australian Catholic University, Fitzroy, Victoria 3065, Australia

GIAN LUCA CARREGA, *La Vetus Syra del vangelo di Luca: Trasmissione e ricezione del testo* (AnBib 201; Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2013). Pp. 536. Paper €43.

Gian Luca Carrega's doctoral dissertation, written under Craig E. Morrison for the Pontifical Biblical Institute (2010), studies the Old Syriac (VS) version of the Gospel of Luke. C. argues that the VS is not simply a translated variant of the Greek Lucan text but rather it is a fine theological and literary work in its own right.

In chap. 1, C. outlines the history and problems of the VS and proposed solutions. The foundational issue C. tackles, as well as the thesis of the book, is that Syriac scribes of the NT manuscripts are interpreters of the text; they are not mechanically rendering the Greek text into their native tongue. Consequently, research into the ancient translations of the Gospels should not be limited to the study of the textual variants in the critical apparatus but must also take into consideration how the scribe-translators have interpreted the text in front of them.

Carrega outlines his method. He carefully delineates for the researcher how to read the Curetonianus (C) and the Sinaitic Palimpsest (S) vis-à-vis the Greek. When S and C show a variant in respect to the standard text that is shared by some other Greek manuscripts, there is always the possibility that the translator found the variant in the Greek manuscript itself. The scribe's involvement in that particular reading, therefore, is minimal. C. admits that it is not always easy to hold to this criterion, however, for when a reading in the VS is found only in some minuscule in which there is infrequent contact with other characteristic readings, it becomes difficult to hypothesize a dependence on the Greek. Thus, C. deems it

appropriate not to fix a rigid rule in excluding some cases as a *legacy from Greek manuscripts*. While people like Bruce Metzger generally consider the VS to be a type of Western witness, namely, part of the family belonging to Codex Bezae (D), the *Vetus Latina*, and uncial mss 0171 and 0177, C.'s insight maintains that it is more likely that S, C, and D share a common ancestor in their *Vorlage*, but that S, C, and D each evolved differently.

Carrega then carefully disentangles the questions associated with the connection the VS may have with the *Diatessaron*. Because there is no complete copy of the *Diatessaron*, the manuscripts of the VS often are considered witnesses to it, and scholars are too quick to catalogue S and C as oriental texts of the *Diatessaron*. Similarly, the principal problem in using the VS and the Peshitta (P) against the *Diatessaron* is that the *Diatessaron* text is mixed with non-*Diatessaron* material and it is very difficult or nearly impossible to distinguish between the *Diatessaron*, on one hand, and the VS and P, on the other.

In chap. 2, C. amply demonstrates that the VS is not a faithful rendering of the Greek. He addresses in chap. 3 the peculiarities connected to particular Syriac forms and how to translate them and in chap. 4 furnishes notes on the syntax of the VS. In chap. 5, C. discusses interpretations of the Greek according to theological, historical, and semantic influences. He displays in chap. 6 the errors found in the Greek and Syriac texts and offers brief explanations of their probable cause. In chap. 7, he demonstrates the influence that biblical and extracanonical literature have had on the VS, and chap. 8 continues with a discussion on the transmission and recension of the VS text. A conclusion completes the study.

The structure of the research is a great strength of the book. C. organizes the references to the Lucan passages according to the topics of the book's eight chapters. Each selection from the Gospel is assigned a number running sequentially through the work, thereby making the pertinent passages easy to find. The index of Lucan verses, on the other hand, follows the Gospel narrative with the assigned number in brackets. At a glance, therefore, the reader can see the totality of the VS and where to find its analysis. This setup is especially helpful in determining how a reader can apply the research. Those who seek a synchronic commentary on the Third Gospel have one at their disposal, while those who prefer a diachronic reference work have an excellent resource. Every passage contains the original Greek or Syriac followed by its respective Italian translation.

This book evidences arduous, competent, and creative scholarship, the excursions and tangents common to dissertations notwithstanding. C.'s hermeneutic, as explicated in chap. 1, finds worthy support in Francis Watson's recent *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013 [reviewed in this issue of *CBQ*]). Readers using both works in tandem will have an excellent example of how textual criticism and literary criticism are always connected. Not only does C.'s research shed a whole new light on the compilation of the NT; it also underscores the important role that Syriac texts have played in the development of Christian theology.

The work is recommended for Lucan critics, NT scholars, and patristic researchers, especially those dealing with the *Diatessaron*, Ephrem the Syrian, and other major Syriac texts.

Michael Patella, O.S.B., Saint John's University, Collegeville, MN 56321



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.