

Sebastian Brock

Studies in Syriac Christianity

Also in the Variorum Collected Studies Series:

SEBASTIAN BROCK

Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity

HAN J.W. DRIJVERS

East of Antioch:

Studies in Early Syriac Christianity

W.H.C. FREND

Archaeology and History in the Study of Early Christianity

J.H.G.W. LIEBESCHUETZ

From Diocletian to the Arab Conquest:

Change in the Late Roman Empire

T.D. BARNES

Early Christianity and the Roman Empire

R.A. MARKUS

From Augustine to Gregory the Great:

History and Christianity in Late Antiquity

GERALD BONNER

God's Decree and Man's Destiny:

Studies on the Thought of Augustine of Hippo

HENRY CHADWICK

Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church

FRANÇOIS HALKIN

Martyrs Grecs, IIe-VIIIe siècles

IRFAN SHAHÎD

Byzantium and the Semitic Orient before the Rise of Islam

IHOR ŠEVČENKO

Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World

MICHEL AUBINEAU

Chryostome, Sévérien, Proclus, Hésychius et alii:

Patristique et hagiographie grecques

DAVID T. RUNIA

Exegesis and Philosophy:

Studies on Philo of Alexandria

JOHN DILLON

The Golden Chain:

Studies in the Development of Platonism and Christianity

Studies in Syriac Christianity

Sebastian Brock

Studies in Syriac Christianity

History, Literature and Theology



VARIORUM

This edition copyright © 1992 by Sebastian Brock.
All rights reserved.

Published by VARIORUM
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Gower House, Croft Road,
Hampshire GU11 3HR
Great Britain

Ashgate Publishing Company
Old Post Road
Brookfield, Vermont 05036
U S A

ISBN 0-86078-305-7

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library and the US Library of Congress.



A.C.N.-612/95

Printed by Galliard (Printers) Ltd
Great Yarmouth, Norfolk
Great Britain

COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES CS357

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Preface | ix-x |
| I Syriac historical writing: a survey of the main sources <i>Journal of the Iraqi Academy</i> (<i>Syriac Corporation</i>) V. <i>Baghdad, 1979/80</i> | 1-30 (297-326) |
| II North Mesopotamia in the late seventh century: Book XV of John Bar Penkāyē's <i>Riṣ Mellē</i> <i>Jerusalem Studies in Arabic</i> and <i>Islam IX. Jerusalem, 1987</i> | 51-75 |
| III Syriac inscriptions: a preliminary check list of European publications <i>Annali dell' Istituto Orientale di</i> <i>Napoli XXXVIII. Naples, 1978</i> | 255-271 |
| IV Jewish traditions in Syriac sources <i>Journal of Jewish Studies XXX.</i> <i>Oxford, 1979</i> | 212-232 |
| V A piece of Wisdom literature in Syriac <i>Journal of Semitic Studies XIII.</i> <i>Manchester, 1968</i> | 212-217 |
| VI Syriac and Greek hymnography: Problems of origin <i>Studia Patristica XVI, ed.</i> <i>E.A. Livingstone, Texte und</i> <i>Untersuchungen 129.</i> <i>Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985</i> | 77-81 |

| | | |
|------|--|---------|
| VII | A Syriac collection of Prophecies of the Pagan Philosophers <i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica XIV. Leuven, 1983</i> | 203–246 |
| VIII | The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander in Syriac <i>Journal of Semitic Studies XV. Manchester, 1970</i> | 205–218 |
| IX | Secundus the Silent Philosopher: Some notes on the Syriac tradition <i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie CXXI. Frankfurt am Main: J.D. Sauerländer's Verlag, 1978</i> | 94–100 |
| X | Towards a history of Syriac translation technique <i>Orientalia Christiana Analecta CCXXI. Rome, 1983</i> | 1–14 |
| XI | Clothing metaphors as a means of theological expression in Syriac tradition <i>Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter, ed. Margot Schmidt (Eichstätter Beiträge IV). Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1982</i> | 11–38 |
| XII | The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the fifth to early seventh centuries <i>Aksum-Thyateira: a Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios, ed. G. Dragas. London, 1985</i> | 125–142 |
| XIII | The conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532) <i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica XLVII. Rome, 1981</i> | 87–121 |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------|
| XIV | A Monothelete florilegium in Syriac <i>After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert Van Roey, ed. C. Laga, J.A. Munitiz and L. Van Rompay (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta XVIII). Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1985</i> | 35–45 |
| XV | Two sets of monothelete questions to the Maximianists <i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica XVII. Leuven, 1986</i> | 119–140 |
| | Addenda and Corrigenda | 1–3 |
| | Index | 1–6 |

| |
|------------------------------------|
| This volume contains x + 308 pages |
|------------------------------------|

PREFACE

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The articles in this volume, as in all others in the Collected Studies Series, have not been given a new, continuous pagination. In order to avoid confusion, and to facilitate their use where these same studies have been referred to elsewhere, the original pagination has been maintained wherever possible.

Each article has been given a Roman number in order of appearance, as listed in the Contents. This number is repeated on each page and quoted in the index entries.

This volume serves as a companion to my earlier collection, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (Collected Studies Series CS 199, 1984). Once again, many of the articles concern the interaction between Syriac and Greek culture in this period.

Several of the studies presented here constitute surveys of particular areas of Syriac literature: thus ch.I offers a summary guide to the main Syriac historical texts up to the 13th/14th century; ch.III collects the scattered bibliography on Syriac inscriptions; ch.IV seeks to identify the main areas within early Syriac literature where Jewish traditions are to be found; ch.VI examines the relationship between early Greek and Syriac hymnography; ch.X outlines the developments in attitudes to, and techniques adopted in, translations from Greek into Syriac up till the end of the 7th century. Two chapters are on specifically theological topics: ch.XI discusses the role of clothing imagery in early Syriac theological texts, while ch.XII provides a general introduction to the study of the christology of the Church of the East during the formative period (5th–7th centuries), together with translations of the relevant synodal texts.

Two further studies are focussed on particular texts: ch.II introduces and translates a local North Mesopotamian historical text from the late 7th century, and ch.IX studies the Syriac transmission of the Life of Secundus the Silent Philosopher, starting out from an identification of a quotation from this work in the writings of the East Syrian mystic, St. Isaac of Nineveh.

The remaining studies bring to light new and sometimes hitherto unknown texts. Thus ch.V concerns a short but intriguing Wisdom text related to the Ahiqar story; ch.VII publishes a collection of pagan prophecies which belongs to the tradition of the 'Tübingen Theosophy'; ch.VIII discusses some Laments on the death of Alexander the Great, otherwise only known from Latin and Arabic traditions; ch.XIII provides the Syrian Orthodox description of the theological conversations arranged by Justinian in 532, an event for which hitherto only a Chalcedonian report in Latin had been available: this theological encounter must be one of the few from Antiquity for whose proceedings we now have accounts from both sides. Finally, chs XIV and XV publish

some new texts of Monothelete provenance from the 7th century; the second of these is also of interest for the pre-history of Muslim *kalām* literature, and for the form taken by disputations in Late Antiquity.

For permission to reprint these articles* I am grateful to the Editors and Publishers of the *Journal of the Iraqi Academy, Syriac Corporation, Baghdad* (I); *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* (II); *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* (III); *Journal of Jewish Studies* (IV); *Journal of Semitic Studies* (V, VIII); *Studia Patristica/Texte und Untersuchungen* (VI); *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta/Periodica* (VII, XIV, XV); *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* (IX); *Orientalia Christiana Analecta/Periodica* (X, XIII); Verlag Friedrich Pustet and Frau Professor Dr. Margot Schmidt (XI); and to the Very Revd Dr. George Dragas (XII).

SEBASTIAN P. BROCK

The Oriental Institute, Oxford
June 1991

* The opportunity has been taken to correct misprints in the texts themselves. Other corrections, together with some additional notes, are to be found in the section of Addenda and Corrigenda; references to these are indicated by asterisks in the margin of the passages concerned. The following articles, to which reference is made in footnotes, are reprinted in my previous collection, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*:

- 'Early Syrian Asceticism' = ch.I;
- 'Aspects of translation technique in antiquity' = ch.III;
- 'Some aspects of Greek words in Syriac' = ch.IV;
- 'From antagonism to assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning' = ch.V;
- 'Syriac sources for seventh-century history' = ch.VII;
- 'Syriac views of emergent Islam' = ch.VIII;
- 'A letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem' = ch.X;
- 'The Orthodox-Oriental Orthodox Conversations of 532' = ch.XI;
- 'An early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor' = ch.XII;
- 'A Syriac fragment on the Sixth Council' = ch.XIII;
- 'John of Nhel: an episode in early seventh-century monastic history' = ch.XIV.

SYRIAC HISTORICAL WRITING : A SURVEY OF THE MAIN SOURCES

Although Syriac literature cannot boast any really outstanding historians, there do come down to us a number of pieces of historical writing in Syriac . mostly in the form of annalistic chronicles, which can provide valuable source material for the political , social and economic history of the Middle East ,in particular between the fourth and fourteenth centuries AD. Some of this material (such as the chronicles of Michael and Abu'l Faraj) is well known to modern historians, but much of it has not always received the attention it deserves, the texts having been published in many different , and sometimes out-of - the - way, places .

In the present survey my aim has simply been to bring together the main bibliographical information about these varied Syriac historical works in convenient form in the hope that this may prove a useful guide to the historian who is not necessarily well acquainted with Syriac studies as such . At the outset it should be stressed that no attempt is made to offer any new insights into this material or to analyse the sources afresh.

The definition of what constitutes historical writing is not always obvious , and I have included only chronicles , ecclesiastical. histories and

writings which can be described as essentially annalistic in character. Excluded are biographies, hagiography, monastic histories, historical notes in colophons and on fly-leaves (1) and works on chronology (such as that by Shem'on Shenqlāwāya); the same applies to independent translations of Greek historical works (such as those of Eusebius(2), Socrates and Theodoret) and to works translated from Syriac into Arabic no longer extant in their original language (notably the Chronicle of Seert(3)). Nor, finally, have I included lost (as opposed to fragmentary) works.

The items are divided up into West and East Syrian sources, the former category including Melkite and Maronite, as well as Syrian Orthodox, authors. Within each category the works are arranged in approximate chronological order. The bibliographical information(4) given for each

-
- 1 - This includes the fragmentary and perhaps contemporary account of the Arab invasion of Palestine on a fly-leaf of a sixth-century Gospel manuscript; for this text see Chronica Minora II (= CSCO 3/3, p. 74; Latin translation in CSCO 4/4, p. 60).
 - 2 - For the use of Eusebius Chronicon by the Syriac chronicles see P. Keseling, 'Die Chronik des Eusebius in der syrischen Ueberlieferung', OC III. 1 (1927), 23-48, 223-41; III. 2 (1927), 33-56.
 - 3 - PO 4, 5, 7, 13 (indices in PO 5 to part I, and in Mélanges de l'Université St Joseph 42 (1966) for part II, by J.M.Fiey). According to P. Nautin (Revue de l'histoire des religions 186 1974), (113-26) this work is to be identified as a translation of Isho'dnah's Ecclesiastical History, otherwise lost; Fiey however, prefers to leave the question open (see Parole de l'Orient 6/7 (1975/6), 447-59).
 - 4 - Abbreviations used are as follows: Barsaum = Ignatius Ephrem Barsaum, Kitāb al lū 'lū' al maṭūr fita'rīh alūlūm wal adāb as suriyāniya (2nd edition, Aleppo 1956; reprinted Baghdad 1976); Syriac translation by Philoxenus Yuhannon Dawlabani, Ktobo d-berulle bdire (Qamishli 1967); I give first the pagination of the 1976 reprint of the Arabic and then, after a stroke, that of the Syriac translation. CSCO = Corpus Scriptorum

source is confined to the more important items only; for further details reference should be made to the standard bibliographical aids(5) (for the earlier literature the section on Syriac sources in F. Haase's Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen (Leipzig 1925), pp. 6-24, will be found valuable).

WEST SYRIAN WRITERS

(1) Chronicle of Edessa

A Chalcedonian with 'Nestorian' leanings, writing in Edessa soon after 540,(6) composed a chronological list of events covering the years 132 BC to AD 540. The majority of entries are very short, but among the longer ones is §8, containing the famous account of a flood in Edessa in November 201, in which 'the nave of the Church of the Christians' was badly damaged. The fact that some of the author's material seems to have been derived from the local archives makes his short chronicle particularly valuable.

The text survives in Vat. syr. 163 of the seventh century. First edited by Assemani (Bibliotheca Orientalis I, 388-417), it has been reedited a number of times, notably by L. Hallier in Texte und Untersuchungen 9, 1

-
- Christianorum Orientalium (Louvain); the number in the complete series is given first, and then, after a stroke, that of the sub-series Scriptores Syri. OC = Oriens Christianus. OCP = Orientalia Christiana Periodica. PO = Patrologia Orientalis. ROC = Revue de l'Orient Chrétien. ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
- 5 - That is, C. Moss, Catalogue of Syriac Printed Books and Related Literature in the British Museum (London 1962); I. Ortiz de Urbina, Patrologia Syriaca (Rome 1965 (second edition)); S.P. Brock, 'Syriac Studies 1960-1970: a classified Bibliography', Parole de l'Orient 4 (1973), 393-456.
 - 6 - So F. Haase, 'Die Abfassungszeit der Edessenenischen Chronik', OC II. 7/8 (1918), 88-96, against Hallier who argued for a date after 570.

(1892 , with an important introduction, German translation and commentary), and by I. Guidi in Chronica Minora I (CSCO 1/1 , pp. 1-13 ; Latin translation in CSCO 2/2, pp. 1-11) . There is an English translation by B. H. Cowper in Journal of Sacred Literature 5 (1865), 28-45, and a Russian one by N.

* Figulevskaya in Palestinsky Sbornik 4 (67) (1959) , 79-96

(2) Pseudo - Zacharias Rhetor , Ecclesiastical History

The historical text which comes down to us in twelve books attributed to Zacharias of Mytilene is in fact a composite work of which only part represents a translation of the sixth-century writer Zacharias Rhetor; it consists of :

(a) Books I-II : miscellaneous short works of very varied provenance .These include , in Book I, Moshe of Inghilene's translation of the ' History of Joseph and Aseneth ' , the acts of St Silvester of Rome , the letter of the Priest Lucian concerning the finding of the relics of St Stephen, Gamaliel and Nicodemus, and , in Book II, a version of the legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus , documents on Eutyches and the second synod of Ephesus, and the letter of Proclus to the Armenians :

(b) Books III-VI: an abridged translation of a lost Greek historical work by Zacharias (explicitly named in III. 1 and elsewhere) . Dionysius bar Salibi, in quoting the work, speaks of the author as ' Zacharia the Rhetor, bishop of Melitene ' (read ' Mytilene ') ; this Zacharias Rhetor may be the same person as Zacharias Scholasticus (' lawyer ' or ' advocate ') , the author of one of the Lives of Severus (PO 2) who subsequently became bishop of Mytilene ; on the other hand it may be that Dionysius bar Salibi, by calling Zacharias Rhetor ' bishop of Mytilene ' was himself confusing two different people (so Kugener) .

Books III-VI are chiefly concerned with ecclesiastical matters , and cover the period 450—491 .

(c) Books VII-XII : these were composed by an anonymous author who was writing about 569 . This author , who on internal evidence appears to have been a monk living in north Mesopotamia (perhaps Amid), was

also responsible for putting together the work as a whole (thus including the translation and abridgement of Zacharias Rhetor's Greek history) . Book VII covers the reign of Anastasius, Book VIII that of Justin I, and IX-XII the reigns of Justinian and Justin II up to 569 . Of Books X and XII only fragments are preserved, while Book XI is entirely lost . In the course of these books the author translates several important Greek documents and letters whose originals are lost .

The entire work is preserved in London Add. 17202 copied about AD 600, only three decades or so after the anonymous compiler had completed his work. In the manuscript it is entitled ' History of events which occurred in the world ' , but it is interesting to note that the running title ' Ecclesiastical (History) of Zachariah ' is already applied to parts of the work not by Zacharias Rhetor . Excerpts of various parts are also to be found in some further manuscripts (London Add. 12154 (c. AD 800) , Vat. syr. 145 (9 th cent. ?) , London Add. 14620 (9th cent.) , and Add. 7190 (12th cent.)) .

The Syriac text has been edited in part or in whole by several different scholars, but of the two editions of the extant text in Add. 17202 that by E. W. Brooks in CSCO 83-4/38-9 (with Latin translation in CSCO 87-8/41-2) is much superior to that by J.P.N. Land in his Anecdota Syriaca III (1870) .

There is a German translation by K. Ahrens and P. Kruger (1899) and an English one by F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks (also 1899) ; neither is complete, books I-II being omitted. There is an important review of the two translations by M-A. Kugener in ROC 5 (1900) 201-14 , 461-80 .(8) .

(3) John of Ephesus , Ecclesiastical History

John of Amid, appointed bishop of Ephesus and Asia in 542, wrote towards

7 - Of the two translations the English is generally the more satisfactory ; both were of course made from Land's not always reliable edition .

8 - On Zacharias Rhetor see also E. Honigmann, ' Zacharias of Mytilene ' , in his Patristic Studies (Studia e Testi 173; 1952) , 194-204 , and K. Wegenast's article in Pauly - Wissowa, Realencyklopadie II. 9 (1967) , 2212—6.

the end of his life two works of the greatest importance for sixth - century history , the Lives of the Eastern Saints (written 566-8; published by Brooks with an English translation in PO 17-19) , and an Ecclesiastical History in three parts. As an independent work only Part III (written over the decade 575-585) survives, virtually complete. The original work consisted of :

Part I : this covered from the late first century BC to AD 449, although for the period from Caesar to Constantine it appears to have contained no more than just a catalogue of emperors.

Part II : this spanned the period 449 to 571. Some quite long extracts given in London Add. 14650 of AD 874/5: were printed by Land in Anecdota Syriaca II, 289-329; the variant readings of this manuscript are given by Chabot in his edition of the Zuqnin Chronicle (see §(11) , below) at the appropriate places⁹ (this chronicle, together with other later chronicles , made very extensive use of John's work) . Excerpts from various other manuscripts, deriving from this lost part, were published by Brooks in CSCO 104/53, pp. 402 - 17(10).

Part III : this final part , covering from 571 to at least 585, is preserved almost complete in a seventh - century manuscript , London Add. 14640 (some of the gaps in the manuscript can be filled in from excerpts from John's work in the later chronicles) . The Syriac text of this part was first edited by W. Cureton in 1853, and then reedited by Brooks in CSCO 105/54 (1935) . There exist English , German and Latin translations: the English by R. Payne Smith (1860), who reorders the sequence of the chapters; the German by J.M. Schönfelder (1862) , and the Latin by E. W. Brooks in CSCO 106/55 (1936) . Of these that by Brooks is the most reliable .

There are two old monographs in John's Ecclesiastical History , by J.P.N. Land (1856, in Dutch) , and by Diakonov (1908, in Russian)

9 - For translations, see under (11) below .

10- An excerpt on the building of Dara is it to be found appended to Gregory Abu'l Faraj's secular history in Oxford Hunt 52 : see E. A. W. Budge, The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj Oxford 1932), II, f. 189 (text) and pp. xxii-xxv (English translation) .

(4) Melkite Chronicle

A Chalcedonian chronicle, of Melkite origin, is preserved in Sinai syr. 10. ff. 42-53, of the eighth/ninth century . This covers, in very abbreviated form, from Adam to the emperor Heraclius and presumably the work was composed soon after Heraclius ' death (641) . Its chief interest lies in the sections on sixth - century ecclesiastical history and the fact that it shows an indirect relationship to the later Syrian Orthodox 846 Chronicle (no (14) below) .

The text was edited , with a French translation, introduction , notes and index , by A. de Halleux in Le Muséon 91 (1978) , 5-44. In previous articles de Halleux had discussed § 13 (on Philoxenus ; in Orientalia Lovanensia Periodica 6/7 (1975/6) , 253-66) , § 14 (on Severus ; in Parole de l' Orient 6/7 (1975/6) , 461 -77) , and §§ 17-23 (on three sixth - century synods ; in A Tribute to A. Vööbus (ed . R. H. Fischer ; Chicago 1977), 295-307) .

(5) Maronite Chronicle

One of the few early works in Syriac composed by a Maronite is a fragmentary chronicle covering the period from Alexander the Great to the time of composition, namely the mid 660s. The part covering the late fourth century to the late 650s. is entirely missing, but the final five pages deal with the war between 'Ali and Mu'awiah in some detail .

The chronicle survives in a single manuscript of the eighth / ninth century, now divided between Leningrad and London (Add. 17216, ff. 2-14) . The complete text was edited by Brooks in Chronica Minora II (= CSCO 3/3 . pp. 43-74 ; Latin translation (by Chabot) in CSCO 4/4, pp. 35- 57) . There was an earlier partial edition (of the final folios dealing with seventh - century history) by T. Nöldeke, with a German translation and commentary, in ZDMG 29 (1875), 82-98, and a partial French translation by F. Nau in ROC 4 (1899), 318-28 .

(6) Jacob of Edessa , Chronicle

The Chronicle of the outstanding Syrian Orthodox scholar **Jacob of Edessa** (died 708) is unfortunately lost apart from a fragment (perhaps of an abridgement) in London Add. 14685, ff. 1-23, of the tenth/eleventh century, and excerpts in later chronicles (notably **Elia of Nisibis**, **Michael** and **Abu'l Faraj**). The work was designed as a continuation of **Eusebius' Chronicon** , covering from the 20th year of **Constantine (326)** to (according to **Elia of Nisibis**) 692. What survives in Add.14685 is the introductory section where **Jacob** discusses **Eusebius' canon** and the error of three years it contains in its calculation. Then, for the pre-Constantinian period, **Jacob** added some information absent from **Eusebius** on certain foreign dynasties. This is followed by **Jacob's own ' canon '** in the form of a now damaged chronological table covering 326-630, the text breaking off with mention of **Heraclius**, **Ardashir III** and **Abu Bakr** .

The text in Add. 14685, together with the excerpts from **Jacob's Chronicle** made by **Elia of Nisibis** (no (26) below), were printed by **Brooks** in **Chronica Minora III** (=CSCO 5/5, pp. 261-330 ; Latin translation in CSCO 6/6, pp. 197-258). Previously he had edited the chronological canon with an English translation in ZDMG 53 (1899) 261-327, 550 (cp 54 (1900) , 100-102) .

(7) Historical notices for 712 - 716

Ten short but not uninteresting notices concerning events and natural phenomena during the years 712-716 are to be found in London Add. 17193 , ff. 75-76, of AD 874, following the account of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch **John I's** audience and discussion with an unnamed **Emir**. Both texts were edited together by **F Nau** (with a French translation) in **Journal Asiatique** XI, 5 (1915) ; the historical notices will be found on pp. 253-6, 264-7 .

(8) Chronicle to the year 724

A short world chronicle, covering from **Adam** to AD 724, is preserved in London Add. 14643, ff. 1-57, of the eighth century . The entries are mostly brief and in some disorder towards the end . The work concludes with a list of Arab ' **Kings** ', from **Muhammad** to **Yezid II**, giving the lengths of their reigns ; it was this list that led earlier European scholars to refer to the chronicle as the ' **Book of Caliphs** ' (**Liber Calipharum**) .

The chronicle was first edited by **Land** in his **Anecdota Syriaca I**, pp. 1-24 103-22 (1862) , but this has been superseded by **Brooks' edition** in **Chronica Minora II** (= CSCO 3/3 , pp. 77—156 ; Latin translation in CSCO 4/4 , pp. 61—119) .

(9) Excerpts concerning AD 501/2, 505/6 and 763/4

Berlin syr. 167 (**Sachau 315**), ff. 66-69 , of AD 1481 contains three historical excerpts concerning the above - mentioned years . The first is introduced as having been taken from ' a book of ecclesiastical (history) ' ; both it and the next entry concern **Amid** , while the third excerpt is on the misrule of **Musa b. Mus'ab** .

The text was edited by **Brooks** in **Chronica Minora III** (= CSCO 5/5 , pp. 331-6; Latin translation in CSCO 6/6, pp. 259-64) .

(10) Chronicle to the year 775

An extremely brief chronicle, covering from **Adam** to 775, is to be found in London Add. 14683, ff. 93-102 of the tenth century . Most of the space is devoted to the pre-Christian period , and only two folios are left for the first to eighth centuries AD : here little more than a list of emperors and caliphs is given, though there are a few short historical entries for the eighth century .

The work was edited by **Brooks** in **Chronica Minora III** (=CSCO 5/5, pp. 337-49; Latin translation in CSCO 6/6, pp. 265-75) .

(11) The Zuqnin Chronicle (' Pseudo - Dionysius ')

An anonymous writer , who was very probably a monk of the monastery of Zuqnin (near Amid) , compiled an important world chronicle which was completed in 775 . J. S. Assemani supposed that the author was none other than the patriarch Dionysius of Tellmahre , but both Nau and Nöldeke demonstrated that this could not be the case ; it is for this reason that the work is often referred to as the ' Pseudo - Dionysius Chronicle ' . Even though it cannot be the mostly lost chronicle of the patriarch Dionysius , it is nevertheless a document of great significance in that it incorporates valuable earlier sources .

The chronicle is preserved in a unique manuscript of the ninth century , now divided between two libraries , Vat .syr. 162 and London Add. 14665,ff.1-7. The manuscript lacks both the very beginning and the end of the work , and we are thus deprived of knowledge of the compiler's name . The only complete edition is that by J. B. Chabot in CSCO 91/43 and 104/53 (1927-33; for partial translations see below) .

The work consists of :

(a) A short and very damaged preface , written in AG 1087 (= AD 775/6' in the reign of Mahdi son of ' Abdallah, when Leon son of Constantinos ruled over the Greeks and Pepin over the Romans ' , it is addressed to Giwargis (George) chorepiscopus of Amid, the abbot Euthalius and various other members of the monastic community (of Zuqnin) . The text is printed in vol. II of Chabot's CSCO edition , pp. 418-20 .

(b) Creation to AD 313 (Chabot , vol. 1, pp. 2-159) . The colophon states that the material is derived from Eusebius and some other sources ; the latter will include the Cave of Treasures , an apocryphal text about Alexander ; (11)

* 11- On Alexander texts in Syriac see my note in Journal of Semitic Studies 15 (1970) , 215—8 .

another about the Magi (having connections with the Latin Opus Imperfectum in Matthaëum(12), and a version of the legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus (13) . This section had been previously published separately by Tullberg (1851) .

(c) AD 313—485 (Chabot , vol. 1, pp. 159—234) . The heading states that the source is Socrates ' Ecclesiastical History , but a number of further writings are used, such as another section on the Seven Sleepers and the Plerophoriae of John Rufus (published by F. Nau in P68) .

(d) AD 497-506/7 (Chabot , vol. 1, pp. 235-317) . This section represents an independent work addressed to an abbot Sergius ; on internal grounds it is likely that the author wrote in Edessa not long after 507 . Entitled ' A history of the times of affliction which occurred in Edessa, Amid and in the whole of Mesopotamia', it is a piece of local history of exceptional importance. Near the beginning of the work (f. 66 of the manuscript) a later scribe, Elisha of Zuqnin , has supplied the text of a lost folio and at the end he asks for God's mercy on ' the priest Mar Isho ' the stylite from the monastery of Zuqnin who wrote this book recording past evil times'. Assemani took this to mean that Isho ' (Joshua) the stylite was the author of this part of the chronicle , and in this many scholars have followed him; it is much more likely , however, that this Isho, was either the compiler of the work as a whole or (more probably) its original scribe.

Because of its historical importance this section has been separately edited a number of times, in 1876 by P. Martin (with French translation) , in 1882 by W. Wright (with English translation) , and in 1959 by the late Metropolitan Yuhannon Dawlabani (Mardin) . There is a Russian translation by N. V. Pigulevskaya in Mesopotamia na rubezhe V-VI vv. (Moscow / Leningrad 1940) , 130—70(14) .

12- See U. Monneret de Villard, Le Leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici (Studi e Testi 163; 1952) .

13- For the various Syriac texts on this subject see A. Allgeier in OC II. 4-8 (1915 —18) .

14- Among the secondary studies the following might be noted : H. Gelzer , * 'Josua Stylites und die damaligen kirchlichen Parteien des Ostens ' ,

(e) AD 489-578¹ (Chabot , vol. II, pp. 2-145). This section is very largely based on the otherwise lost Part II of John of Ephesus' Ecclesiastical History; it also includes Simeon of Beth Arsham's letter on the Himyarite martyrs .

(f) AD 587-775 (Chabot , vol II, pp. 145-399). At the beginning the author states that he is writing in AH 158 = AG 1086 (i.e. AD 775), and complains of lack of sources for this period . The entries for 587 to 713 are very brief , but for the rest of the eighth century, up to 775, the narrative becomes increasingly fuller, especially for the early Abbasid period. This section , which contains much important information about economic conditions of the time, was edited separately, with a French translation and index, by Chabot in 1895 under the (misleading) title Chronique de Denys de Tell-Mahre ; quatrième partie ; it should be noted that in this earlier edition Chabot did not yet know of Add. 14665 ff. 1-7, which continue on from the end of Vat. syr. 162 : these leaves accordingly are only to be found in the CSCO edition⁽¹⁵⁾.

Although it is the normal practice of the CSCO to provide translations , Chabot never lived to complete one for this Chronicle, and so only volume I of the Syriac text has an accompanying Latin translation (by Chabot, CSCO 121/66; 1949) ; this covers sections (b) to (d) above . Of the various partial translations mentioned earlier only Chabot's French one covers material in volume II of the Syriac text (our section (f) , but without the seven London folios at the end); thus the important section (e), covering the sixth century and deriving mostly from John of Ephesus, is not yet provided with any complete translation. There are , however, some quite extensive excerpts given with French translation by F. Nau in ROC 2 (1897), 41-68, and a German

Byzantinische Zeitschrift 1 (1892) , 34-49; E. Merten, 'De bello Persico ab Anastasio gesto, in Commentationes Philologicae Ienenses VII. 2.3 (1906) ; and F. Haase, 'Die Chronik des Josua Stylites', OC II.9 (1920) ; 62-73.

15- There is a discussion of the order of ff. 169-173 of Vat. syr. 162 and of the London folios in E. Tisserant, Codex Zuqninensis Rescriptus (Studi e Testi 23; 1911), pp. x-xv (the manuscript is a palimpsest., with texts from the Septuagint as underwriting) .

paraphrase of vol. II, pp. 54-69 , 111-2 is to be found in N. Pigulewskaja , Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien (Berlin 1969), pp. 325-351⁽¹⁶⁾.

(12) Chronicle to the year 813

Of some interest for the Abbasid period is a short anonymous chronicle preserved in London Add. 14642, ff.36-39, of the tenth/eleventh century. In its extant form this work covers AD 775 to 813; the manuscript, however, is badly damaged and has lost both beginning and end, with the consequence that the full extent of the chronicle and its approximate date of composition are both unknown, although the date of the manuscript itself provides a terminus ante quem for the latter .

The text was edited by Brooks in Chronica Minora III (= CSCO 5/5 , pp . 243-60; Latin translation in CSCO 6/6, pp. 183-96) . Earlier Brooks had published the text with an English translation in ZDMG 54 (1900), 195-230 .

(13) Chronicle to the year 819

A short chronicle, covering from Christ to AD 819, was discovered in 1911 by Ephrem Barsaum (later to become Syrian Orthodox patriarch) in a ninth century manuscript at Basabrina (Tur Abdin). According to a marginal note the work had been copied by a certain Severus for his uncle David, bishop of Harran (consecrated between 846 and 873) . About half the work is given over to the seventh and eighth centuries (a later hand has added an entry on a drought in 1094/5) .

The work was edited by Barsaum in CSCO 81/36, pp. 3-22, with a Latin translation in CSCO 109/56, pp. 1-16 (by Chabot) .

16- On this chronicle see also F. Haase, ' Untersuchungen zur Chronik des Pseudo-Dionysius', OC II.6 (1916) 65-90, 240-70; N. V. Pigulewskaja, 'Theophanes' Chronographia and the Syriac Chronicle ', Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft 16 (1967) , 50 - 60 (cp also her article (in Russian) in Palestinskij Sbornik 19 (82) (1969) , 118-26) *

(14) Chronicle to the year 846(17)

Another short chronicle, this time covering from creation to AD 846/7, is preserved in London Add. 14642, ff. 1-36, of the tenth century(18); the beginning of the work is lost and there are some lacunae elsewhere too. Prominent among its sources are an antecedent of the Melkite chronicle (no (4) above) and the Syrian Orthodox Chronicle to 819. In his edition in CSCO Brooks(19) concluded from the several mentions of the monastery of Qartmin (Tur Abdin) that the chronicle had been written there, but as Barsaüm later pointed out in his edition of the Chronicle to 819, such a provenance would be more suitable for the latter chronicle which served as a source for such entries to the 846 chronicle; even this, however, is far from certain.

The text was edited by Brooks in *Chronica Minora II* (=CSCO 3/3, pp. 157—238; Latin translation (by Chabot in CSCO 4/4, pp. 121—80). Brooks had previously edited the part covering AD 574-846, together with an English translation, in *ZDMG* 51 (1897), 569—88, and Nau had published the section (ff. 9-10) on St Peter and St Paul, with French translation, in *ROC* 1 (1899), 396 — 405.

(15) Dionysius of Tellmahre, Ecclesiastical History

The Syrian Orthodox patriarch Dionysius (818-45) wrote an Ecclesiastical History covering the years AD 582-842 at the request of John, bishop of Dara, but unfortunately the work as a whole does not survive, and only a few fragments come down to us. One short fragment, concerning 'the falling

17- Owing to the links between the 819 and 846 chronicles I take the 846 chronicle before Dionysius, who strictly should come first.

18- Although now bound up together with the 813 chronicle (no (12) above), originally these two chronicles come from two different manuscripts.

19- In *ZDMG* 51 (1897), p. 570, he had plausibly supposed that Harran was its place of composition.

away from the faith of Probus and abbot Iuhannon in the time of Peter, patriarch of Antioch' (581—91), is to be found in Vat. syr. 144, on the basis of which it was published by Brooks in the second volume of his edition of Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor (CSCO 84/39, pp. 219—24; Latin translation in CSCO 88/42, pp. 149—154). Much longer excerpts are incorporated into the later chronicles of Michael, the anonymous to 1234, and Gregory Abu'l Faraj; Michael includes both Dionysius' interesting prologue and his ending (Chron. X. 20 and XII. 21). A survey of materials from Dionysius in these three chronicles is given by R. Abramowski, *Dionysius von Tellmahre: Jakobitischer Patriarch von 818—845* Leipzig 1940, 14—29, 126—9 (on pp. 138—44 he also gives the text and German translation of the fragment in Vat. syr. 144). Abramowski's book as a whole gives a fine assessment of Dionysius' historical work and its importance.

(16) Michael, Chronicle

Undoubtedly the greatest of all Syriac chronicles is that of the Syrian Orthodox patriarch Michael (1166—99). Starting from creation this massive work in 21 books extends to 1194/5. Of the preface, listing his sources, we have only an Armenian summary, but much of the information it must have contained is incorporated into body of the chronicle. The following table, taken from Chabot's preface to his edition,(20) gives the main sources whom Michael claims to have used.

Michael also cites numerous shorter documents and letters, many of which are not preserved elsewhere.

The chronicle comes down to us in a single manuscript completed in 1598, preserved at Urfa (Edessa) at the end of the last century; from this two modern copies were made, one in 1887 for the future Syrian Catholic patriarch, Ignatius Ephrem Rahmani, the other in 1899 for J. B. Chabot. It is the text of the 1899 copy which was published photographically by Chabot

20- Chronique de Michel le Syrien, p. xxv.

| Books | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| I-VI | Creation to AD 323 |
| VII-VIII, 6 | AD 323-431 |
| VIII, 7-IX | AD 431-565 |
| X, 1-20 | AD 565-582 |
| X, 21-XI, 17 | AD 582-711 |
| XI, 18-XII | AD 711-842 |
| XIII-XV, 6 | AD 842-1081 |
| XV, 7-XVI | AD 1081-1143 |
| XVII-XXI | AD 1143-1195 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| Zunabius | Sorantes | Sabarius | Cyrus of | Dionysius of |
| | Theodoros | | | |
| Jacob of Khassan | John of Ephesus | | Cyrus of | Dionysius of |
| | John of Iliarka | | | |
| Ignatius of Malitene | Jacob of Khassan | | Cyrus of | Dionysius of |
| | John of Iliarka | | | |
| Michael | Dionysius bar | | Cyrus of | Dionysius of |
| | Sallibi | | | |

in his monumental edition, with French translation, notes and indices (1899-1924; reprinted 1963 in four volumes). The Urfa manuscript had a few lacunae, and so the work is not quite complete .

Two oriental translations are also available , one into Armenian, the other into Arabic . The Armenian version , made by the priest Ishok in 1248, is a work of abbreviation and far-reaching adaptation , rather than a direct translation (21) The 1871 Jerusalem edition of the Armenian text is superior to that of 1870 (also Jerusalem) which contains a yet further reworked text. There is a French translation by V. Langlois , Chronique de Michel le Grand , traduite pour la première fois sur la version arménienne du prêtre Ishok (Venice 1868) ; an earlier partial translation by E. Dulaurier , in Journal Asiatique IV , 12 (1848) , 281-334, and IV , 13 (1849) , 315-76 , covers the years 573 — 717 .

The Arabic translation, of which five manuscripts are known, is of limited use in that it was clearly made from the Urfa manuscript of 1598, and contains the same lacunae .

(17) Chronicle to the year 1234

An anonymous writer of the first half of the thirteenth century has left an important world chronicle divided up into two parts , separating secular from ecclesiastical history (a practice Gregory Abu'l Faraj was later to adopt) . According to Rahmani , who first edited part of the chronicle, the author came from Edessa, and this view is adopted by Barsaum who calls him the Edessene anonymous; (22) Chabot, however, maintained that he belonged

21- Cp F. Haase, 'Die armenische Rezension der syrischen Chronik Michaels des Grossen', OC II. 5 (1915)), 60—82 , 271—84. On Michael's chronicle in general see H. Gelzer, Das Geschichtswerk Mar Michael des Grossen , in his Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie (Leipzig 1898) II, 431—58, and R. A. Guseinov, in Palestiniskij Sbornik 5 (68) (1960) , 85—105 .

22- Barsaum, p. 131/78

to the patriarchal entourage and he went on to suggest that the work was composed at the famous monastery of Barsauma. The Edessene origin of the author is upheld by Fiey, who nevertheless does not rule out a subsequent connection with the monastery of Barsauma.

The secular history continues to at least 1234, while the ecclesiastical history (which, despite its position, second, in the manuscript, was evidently written first) stops at 1207: in both cases the endings have been lost. Since the author was in Jerusalem when it was taken by Salah ad Din in 1187, and had already written much of the work by 1204, it is unlikely that originally the chronicle continued many years beyond 1234.

The author makes ample use of his predecessors (some of whom he quotes by name), but the value of his work is enhanced by the fact that he is independent of Michael's Chronicle, and instead makes his own use of some of the same sources. One important lost source which he mentions by name is the History of Edessa by Basil bar Shumana (died 1171).

The unique manuscript of the fourteenth century, which was in private ownership in Istanbul at the beginning of the century, is not complete, and there are several large gaps, especially in the ecclesiastical history, which now opens with the sixth century.

The beginning of the text was published by Ignatius Ephrem Rahmani, Chronicon civile et ecclesiasticum anonymi auctoris (Charfet 1904), while the complete work was published by J. B. Chabot (with the help of Ephrem Barsaum, later Syrian Orthodox patriarch) in CSCO 81/36 and 82/37 (the profane history covers volume I and pp. 1-241 of volume II, the ecclesiastical history vol. II, pp. 242-350). Chabot provided a Latin translation for vol. I in CSCO 109/56 (1937), whereas vol. II was translated into French by A. Abouna, with an introduction, notes and indices by J. M. Fiey, in CSCO 354/154 (1974) (23).

23- Earlier partial translations are listed in Fiey's preface; cp also N. V. Pigulevkaya, Vizantiya i Iran na rubezhe VI i VII vekov (Leningrad/Moscow 1946) 252-89.

(18) Gregory Abu'l Faraj, Chronicle (secular and ecclesiastical)

Included in Gregory Abu'l Faraj's imposing literary output is a large historical work consisting of a secular chronography and an ecclesiastical history. Although largely dependent on Michael and other earlier chroniclers, Gregory's compilations are differently arranged and retain their own value, especially of course, for the period subsequent to that covered by Michael.

The secular chronography deals with pre-Christian and profane history up to and including his own life time. The work is divided into eleven sections entitled yubale or 'series', as follows: (1) Patriarchs, (2) Judges, (3) Kings of the Hebrews, (4) Kings of the Chaldeans, (5) Kings of the Medes (just Darius), (6) Kings of the Persians, (7) Kings of the Pagan Greeks, (8) Kings of the Romans (Augustus to Justin II), (9) Kings of the Christian Greeks (Tiberius to Heraclius), (10) Arab Kings (up to 1258), (11) Hun Kings (i. e. Mongols). The tenth section occupies some two thirds of the work as a whole. Gregory also provided an Arabic edition of this work, entitled 'Short History of Dynasties': for this he made use of Muslim sources as well.

The Syriac text is preserved in a number of manuscripts of which the oldest in Vat. syr. 166 (before 1356/7); several of these contain the ecclesiastical history as well. The text of the secular chronicle was first edited in 1789 by Bruns and Kirsch, but this has been replaced by the superior editions of P. Bedjan, Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Syriacum (Paris 1890), and E.A.W. Budge, The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj (2 volumes, London 1932); the latter is a photographic edition of Oxford, Hunt 52, and is accompanied by an English translation (24). The Arabic text was edited, with a Latin translation, by E. Pococke in 1663, and by A. Salhani in 1890 (Beirut, with an index) (25).

24- With index. There is a Turkish translation of Budge's English, Abu'l Farac Tarihi (Ankara 1945).

25- CP G. Graf, Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur (Studien Testi 133; 1947), II, pp. 274-5.

The second half of Gregory's historical work, dealing with ecclesiastical history, is itself divided into two parts. The first, which opens with a list of Old Testament high priests, is concerned with the patriarchs of Antioch, giving under each name an account of the chief ecclesiastical events of his patriarchate. The entries reach up to 1285, and about a quarter of the work is taken up with detailed accounts of events during the century previous to 1285. The second part is devoted to the catholicosate and maphrianate of the East. By continuing to list the line of catholici after the fifth-century schism Gregory has the distinction of being the only Syrian Orthodox church historian to have concerned himself with the affairs of the Church of the East as well.

The ecclesiastical history was finished in the year of his death (1286), the final entry being devoted to the time of his own tenure of the maphrianate (1264—1286). The work was continued by his brother Barsauma up to 1288.

The ecclesiastical history was sometimes transmitted with the secular chronicle, sometimes separately (26). It was edited by J. Abbeloos and T. J. Lamy, Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum (3 volumes (27), Lovain 1872—7), with a Latin translation; the text is based on London Add. 7198 of the sixteenth century, with some variants from two slightly earlier manuscripts Cambridge Dd. 3.8.1 and Oxford Hunt 1.

(19) Continuators of Gregory

Several anonymous works continuing on both parts of Gregory's chronicle survive:

(a) A continuation of the secular history, from 1289—1297, is incorporated into Bedjan's edition of Gregory's Chronicon (pp. 557-88). Bedjan conjectured

26- Note that Mingana syr. 585 is copied from the printed edition: see my 'Notes on some texts in the Mingana collection', Journal of Semitic Studies 14 (1969), 219—20.

27- Volumes 1 and 2 are paginated continuously.

that the author was Gregory's brother, Barsauma.

(b) There are continuations of the ecclesiastical history up to 1495 and to 1582. The former is included in Abbeloos and Lamy's edition of the Chronicon Ecclesiasticum (II, 781—846; III, 467—85), while the latter (in Florence, Med. Or. 118) is unpublished. Barsauma states (28) that he himself had compiled a continuation up to modern times.

(20) Anonymous historical texts of 14th / 15th century

Four anonymous works are appended to the text of Gregory Abu'l Faraj's Chronography in Oxford Hunt 52 and are reproduced in Budge's photographic edition (with an English translation in vol. II, pp. xxvi - liii)

(a) The murder of Nawruz.

(b) The expedition of the Huns, Persians and Mongols in the province in Diyarbekir, covering AD 1394—1402.

(c) The ravages of Timur Khan in Tur Abdin, 1395—1403.

(d) Part of a chronicle covering 1394—1493 (29).

According to Ephrem Barsauma (30) the compilers of these works were the priests Esha'ya and Addai of Basabrina.

EAST SYRIAN WRITERS

(21) Barhadbeshabba of Beth Arbaye, Ecclesiastical History

Although 'Ecclesiastical history' is the title given by the editor (following 'Abdisho'), the heading of the work itself describes the contents as a series of 'Histories of the holy fathers who were persecuted for the sake of the truth'.

28- Barsauma, p. 132/180.

29- The last three texts were edited earlier by Bruns in 1790; (d) is also to be found in Vat. syr. 167, with two other short, as yet unpublished, texts (on Hatem, king of Cilicia, 1296; and the sack of Amid, 1317).

30- Barsauma, p. 131/179.

The author, who must belong to the late sixth century, is called ' Mar Barhadbeshabba, priest and head badoqa of the holy school in Nisibis '. It is uncertain whether or not this Barhadbeshabba is to be distinguished from Barhadbeshabba bishop of Halwan, a thror of the ' Book of the foundations of the Schools' (ed . Scher , PO 4) .

The ecclesiastical history , consisting of 32 biographical entries covering the third to sixth centuries (ending with Narsai and Abraham), is preserved in a single manuscript, London Or. 6714, ff. 101 - 78 , of the ninth/tenth century . It was edited ,with a French translation, by F. Nau in PO 9, pp. 490— 630 (Introduction ; chapters 19—32) and PO 23 , pp. 177—343 (chapters 1 — 18, and Syriac index tn the whole work №31) .

(22) History of Karka d-Beth Slokh

Although this work is largely concerned with the local martyrs of this town (modern Kerkuk) , the fact that it is arranged chronologically allows its inclusion here . The history consists essentially of three elements :

- (a) the early history and its refounding by Seleucus;
- (b) the origins of Christianity there and the persecution of Shapur II;
- (c) the persecution of Yazdgard II in 445.

The last section is proportionally the longest and most detailed . Although P. Peeters had held the historical value of the work to be very low, more recently J. M. Fiey has suggested that a rehabilitation is in order (see Analecta Bollandiana 82 (1964) , 189-222) .

The works is preserved in a seventh /eighth century manuscript (Diyarbekir chald. 96) and two late nineteenth century copies . The text was first published by Moesinger in vol. 2 of his Monumenta Syriaca, and then again

31- On Barhadbeshabba, see A. Vööbus , History of the School of Nisibis (CSCO 266; 1965) , 280—2. For chapters 17 , 19—30, see L. Abramowski, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius (CSCO 242; 1963) , 33—103 .

by P. Bedjan in Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum 2 (1891) 507—35 , using the Diyarbekir manuscript . There is a German translation by G. Hoffmann in his Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer (Leipzig 1880) , 43—80, and a French summary by Fiey in Analecta Bollandiana 82 .

(23) Chronicle of Arbela

The anonymous work covering the history of Christianity in Adiabene from the beginnings to the mid sixth century , generally known as the Chronicle of Arbela (attributed by its editor to Meshihazkha, is a problematic text, of dubious credentials. Since the chronicle could potentially be important it will be necessary to examine the case in a little detail .

When the text was first published by A. Mingana (with French translation and index) his Sources Syriaques I (Leipzig 1907) , pp. 1-168 , it was widely greeted by eminent scholars such as Sachau as an important and basically reliable source for the otherwise obscure early history of Christianity in Adiabene. Subsequent study by P. Peeters(32) I. Ortiz de Urbina(33) and others, however, cast some doubts on its historical reliability , but more recently the good faith of its editor Mingana has also been called into question . Mingana had attributed the chronicle to the sixth-century writer Meshihazkha , whose work was otherwist lost , pointing to a marginal note giving his name . In 1941 , however, Vosté disclosed that the name Meshihazkha had actually been added to the manuscript by a local scribe at Mingana's own request(34) . Twenty five years later J. Assfalg examined the only known manuscript (Berlin , Ms. or . fol . 3126) and found that the hand, although

32- P. Peeters, 'Le Passionnaire d'Adiabène ', Analecta Bollandiana 43 (1925), 261— 304 .

33- I. Ortiz de Urbina, 'Intorno al valore storico della Cronaca di Arbela ' OCP 2 (1936) , 5—32 .

34- J. M. Voste, ' Alphonse Mingana', OCP 7 (1941) , 514—8 (sep. 517). Fiey later identified the scribe ; see note 36 .

estrangelo, was a modern one and not a tenth-century one as Mingana's introduction suggested⁽³⁵⁾, what is more, the printed text did not always correspond to the manuscript, and for one page there was no manuscript basis at all. The following year, in 1967, J. M. Fiey put forward the suggestion that the entire work was the product of Mingana himself,⁽³⁶⁾ although he was not able to bring forward conclusive evidence (such as the use of nineteenth-century European works of church history) that this must have been so; rather Fiey pointed to two other works edited by Mingana, whose authenticity had been questioned by other scholars during Mingana's own lifetime. Since, however, it turns out that these accusations were not justified⁽³⁷⁾, Fiey's case by insinuation is weakened, and the question must for the moment remain open.

Whatever the date of the chronicle's composition, it is now generally agreed that the very full account of the early Christian history of Arbela is totally unreliable, seeing that it finds no support from better sources of local history, such as the martyr acts. What is not certain, however, is whether this judgement applies to the rest of the work; here it is interesting to note that scholars whose primary interest is in Zoroastrianism and Sasanian history have usually held the work in higher repute⁽³⁸⁾: it is not so likely that a modern forger would have been able to produce seemingly reliable information on such subjects.

35- J. Assfalg, 'Zur Textüberlieferung der Chronik von Arbela', OC 50 (1966) 19—36. There is a photograph of the page with the added name of Meshihazkha in Assfalg's Syrische Handschriften (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland v; 1963), plate III.

36- J.M. Fiey, 'Auteur et date de la Chronique d'Arbèles', L'Orient Syrien 12 (1967), 285—302. Earlier (Analecta Bollandiana 82 (1964), 218) Fiey had spoken of 'l'auteur tardif (xvie siècle ?)',

37- See my 'Alphonse Mingana and the Letter of Philoxenus to Abu ' Afr ', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 50(1967), 199—206.

38- E. G. Messina, Orientalia 6 (1937), 234—44.

Clearly more critical work needs to be done on the chronicle itself before any parts of it can safely be used for historical purposes.

Besides Mingana's French translation in Sources Syriaques there is a German one by E. Sachau in the Abhandlungen der Königlich- Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. - hist. Klasse 1915, 6., and a Latin by F. Zorell in Orientalia Christiana 8 (1927), 144—204⁽³⁹⁾.

(24) Anonymous Chronicle

One of the most important East Syrian historical works is the Anonymous Chronicle, covering the last half century or so of Sasanid rule, known sometimes as ' Guidi's Chronicle ' (after its editor) or the ' Khuzistan Chronicle ' (after its probable place of origin). It was probably composed c. 670—680.

The work is preserved in Notre Dame de Semences (Alqosh) 169 (now in Baghdad), of the fourteenth century; from this manuscript a number of modern copies in European libraries were taken: Borg. syr. 82 (1891), Vat. syr. 599 (1871), Mingana syr. 47 (1907) and 586 (1932). Guidi's edition in Chronica Minora I (= CSCO 1/1, pp. 15—39; Latin translation in CSCO 2/2, pp. 13—32) was based on Borg. syr. 82. Some of the more important variants to be found in the two Mingana manuscripts are listed in my ' Notes on some texts in the Mingana Collection', Journal of Semitic Studies 14 (1969), p.221. A new edition of the text, making use of the Alqosh manuscript and edited by P. Haddad (with Arabic translation, notes and indices), has recently been published by the Syriac Academy (Baghdad 1976). There is a German translation, with an important historical commentary, by T. Nöldeke Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil. hist. Kl. 128, 9; 1893) and a Russian one, also with commentary, by N. Pigulevskaya in Zapiski Instituta Vostok. Akad. Nauk. 7 (1939), 55—78.

39- For further secondary literature on the Chronicle of Arbela, see Ortiz de Urbina, Patrologia Syriaca, 210—11.

(25) John of Phenek Resh Melle

John of Phenek, a monk from the monastery of Mar Yohannan of Kamul living at the end of the seventh century, was the author of a theologically orientated world history entitled Ktaba d-resh melle, in fifteen books. The work, addressed to a certain Sabrisho, covers the following topics: book I, Hexaemeron and history of the world up to the Flood; II, Flood to Exile; III, * Return from Exile to the Maccabean martyrs; IV - IX, theological and exegetical, rather than historical, in character; IX, on pagan religions; X-XI, life of Christ; XII, Ascension to destruction of the Temple (AD70); XIII, mission of the apostles; XIV; death of the apostles to the Arab invasions; XV, seventh century ..

T. Jansma (40) lists twelve late nineteenth or early twentieth century manuscripts of the work which he considers were probably all descended from a lost manuscript of 1262 written at Tabriz; there are two further incomplete manuscripts of uncertain derivation. So far only books X-XV, covering the first to the end of the seventh centuries AD, have printed, in Mingana's Sources Syriaques I, pp. 2*—171*, with a French translation of book XV only (pp. 172*—203*, with index). A German translation of extracts from the end of book XIV will be found in Abramowski's Dionysius von Tellmahre, pp. 5—8. Of the earlier books only an extract from book IX, on Zoroastrianism, has been published, with French translation, by J. de Mesnasse in Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 9 (1937/9), 587—601 (incorporated by R. Zaehner into his Zurvan (Oxford 1955), 419—29).

(26) Elia (Elijah) of Nisibis, Chronography

The only East Syrian chronological work conceived on a large scale to

40- T. Jansma, 'Projet d'édition du ktaba d-resh melle, de Jean bar Penkaye', L'Orient Syrien 8 (1963), 87—106, where references to earlier literature will be found. (It is unclear whether resh melle means 'summary' here, or whether it is a calque on Greek archaiologia).

have survived is the Chronography by Elia, metropolitan of Nisibis (1008-46). This bilingual (Syriac and Arabic) compilation is in two parts, the first consisting of various chronological tables followed by a list of notable events arranged by year (often listing the name of the source of information) and covering AD 25 - 1018 (the beginning is missing, and there are lacunae for the years 785—878 and 972—994). The second part is devoted to elaborate calendrical tables.

The work is preserved, not quite complete, in London Add. 7197, of AD 1018, parts of which are probably in the author's own hand. The complete Syriac text has been edited by Brooks and Chabot in CSCO 62/21—22 (with Latin translation in CSCO 63/23—4). There is a French translation by L. Delaporte, Chronographie de Mar Elie bar Shinaya, metropolite de Nisibe (Paris 1910), with an index of names. A German translation (together with Syriac and Arabic text) of the list of historical events for AD 622—1018 (corresponding to pp. 126—228 of Brooks' edition) is to be found in F. Baethgen, Fragmente syrischer und arabischer Historiker (Leipzig 1884); this too has an index of names (41).

(27) Fragment of ecclesiastical history

Vat. syr. 179, ff. 104—111, of 1703 contains an excerpt covering the ecclesiastical history of the fourth and early fifth century; the compiler, however, probably belonged to the eleventh century or later.

The text was first edited by E. Goeller in Oriens Christianus 1 (1901), 80—97, with a Latin translation; it was subsequently reedited by Chabot in Chronica Minora III (= CSCO 5/5, pp. 371—8; Latin translation in CSCO 6/6, pp. 297—304).

By way of conclusion it may be helpful to give a synoptic view of the periods covered by our various historical texts. In the table which follows

41- Cp D. Serruys, 'Les canons d'Eusèbe, d'Annanos et d'Andronicos d'après Elie de Nisibe', Byzantinische Zeitschrift 22 (1913), 1—36 An Arabic translation: J. Habbi, Syriac Academy, Baghdad, 1975.

the numbers refer to the different sources described above ; in recapitulation these are :

(West Syrian)

- 1 = Chronicle of Edessa
 - 2 = Ps. Zacharias Rhetor , Ecclesiastical History
 - 3 = John of Ephesus , Ecclesiastical History
 - 4 = Melkite Chronicle
 - 5 = Maronite Chronicle
 - 6 = Jacob of Edessa, Chronicle
 - 7 = Historical notices for 712—716
 - 8 = Chronicle to the year 724
 - 9 = Excerpts concerning the years 501—6, 763/4
 - 10 = Chronicle to the year 775
 - 11 = The Zuqnin Chronicle
 - 12 = Chronicle to the year 813
 - 13 = Chronicle to the year 819
 - 14 = Chronicle to the year 846
 - 15 = Dionysius of Tellmahre , Ecclesiastical History
 - 16 = Michael , Chronicle
 - 17 = Chronicle to the year 1234
 - 18 = Gregory Abu'l Faraj, Chronicle (secular and ecclesiastical)
 - 19 = Continuator of Gregory
 - 20 = Anonymous historical texts of the 14th/15th centuries
- (East Syrian)
- 21 = Barhadbeshabba , Ecclesiastical History
 - 22 = History of Karka d-Beth Slokh
 - 23 = Chronicle of Arbela
 - 24 = Anonymous Chronicle
 - 25 = John of Phenek, Resh Melle
 - 26 = Elia of Nisibis , Chronography
 - 27 = Fragment of ecclesiastical history .

An asterisk after a number in the following table indicates that the material in that source is either very brief or only partially preserved .

Creation - Alexander : 4* 8* 10 11 14 16 17 18 25 .
3rd - 1st century BC : 1 * 4 * 5 8* 10 11 14 16 17 18 25 .
1st — 3rd century AD : 1 4* 5 8* 10*11 13* 14 16 17 18 22 23 25 26.
4th - 5th century AD : 1 2 4* 5* 6*8* 10* 11 13* 14 16 17 18 21 22 23 25 26 27*.
6th century AD : 1 2 3 4 6 * 8* 9* 10* 11 13 14* 15* 16 17 18 21 23 24 25 26 .
7th - century AD 5 * 6 * 8 10.* 11 * 13 14 16 17 18 24 25 26.
8th - early 9th cent. AD : 7 8 9 * 10* 11 12 13 14* 15* 16 17 18 26.
mid 9th — 13th cent. AD : 16 17 18 26 (42).
14th - 15th century AD : 19 20 .

Finally I list, in chronological order , some secondary literature of a more general character which is concerned Syriac historical texts :

- A. Wirth, Aus orientalischen Chroniken (Frankfurt 1890) (43).
 E. W. Brooks , The sources of Theophanes and the Syriac chronicles ' Byzantinische Zeitschrift 15 (1906) , 578-87 . (Mainly on a source common to the 846 chronicle and the Greek chronicler Theophanes) .
 R. Duval , La littérature syriaque (3rd edition; Paris 1907) , 177 — 205 .
 F. Haase, Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen (Leipzig 1925) , 6-24 . (Survey of Syriac historical sources ; it should be noted that the references are not always accurate) .
 N. V. Pigulevskaya , Siriiskie istočniki po istorii narodov SSR (Moscow / Leningrad 1941) .
 — , Vizantiya i Iran na rubezhe VI i VII vekov (Moscow/ Leningrad 1946) , 30—49 . (Survey of Syriac sources) .
 I. E. Barsaum, Kitāb al lū' lū al manjūr ... , 126—37/173—89 .
 R. A. Guseinov, Siriiskie istočniki XII-XII vv. ob Azerbaidzhane (Baku 1960).

 42- To 1018 only .
 43- See Krumbacher's critical review in Byzantinische Zeitschrift 3 (1894) , 607—25 .

- *
 J. B. Segal, 'Syriac chronicles as source material for the history of Islamic peoples', in Historians of the Middle East (ed. B. Lewis and P.M. Holt; London 1962), 246—58.
 R.A. Guseinov, 'Les sources syriaques des XII et XIII siècles concernant l'Azerbaïdjan', Bedi Karthlisa (Paris) 15/6 (1963), 78—81.
 I. Ortiz de Urbina, Patrologia Syriaca (2nd edition; Rome 1965), 206-12, 220-23.
 E. Degen, 'Daniel bar Maryam. Ein nestorianische Kirchenhistoriker', OC 52 (1968), 45—80.
 J.M. Fiey, Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq (CSCO 310; 1970), 8-31. (Critical survey of sources).
 A. S. Proudfoot, 'The sources of Theophanes for the Heraclian dynasty', Byzantion 44 (1974), 367—439. (Includes some references to Syriac chronicles).
 S. P. Brock, 'Syriac sources for seventh-century history', Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 2 (1976), 17—36.

**NORTH MESOPOTAMIA
 IN THE LATE SEVENTH CENTURY**
 Book XV of John Bar Penkāyē's *Rīš Mellē*

To M.J. Kister

on the occasion of his seventieth birthday

In 1908¹ Alphonse Mingana published the first (and only) volume of his *Sources syriaques*, printed by the Dominican Press at Mosul, and now a rare volume. The *pièce de résistance* in this intriguing collection of texts was the now notorious Chronicle of Arbela, which Mingana wilfully accredited to the sixth-century writer Mšihāzkā, but which some today would lay at Mingana's own door.² More respectable are the other two texts which Mingana included in the volume, a verse history of the monastery of Sabrisho^c of Beth Qōqā (in Adiabene),³ and Books X-XV of John bar Penkāyē's *Rīš Mellē*, or summary of world history, addressed to a certain Sabrisho^c.⁴ Although John of Fenek's aim in this last work was, as Baumstark pointed out,⁵ 'weit mehr religiöse als historische Belehrung', the final book nevertheless retains a certain interest for the student of seventh-century history in that it offers its own individual theological interpretation of the events of this momentous period, and provides evidence for the currency of apocalyptic expectations in the late 680s in North

¹ No date is in fact given; the preface to the Chronicle of Arbela, however, is dated June 1907, and that to John bar Penkāyē's *Rīš Mellē* January 1908.

² J.M. Fiey, "Auteur et date de la Chronique d'Arbèles," *L'Orient Syrien* 12 (1967), pp. 265-302. The case is not proven, and perhaps it is preferable to see it as a medieval compilation; see my comments in *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968), p. 308.

³ On this see J.M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne*, Beirut 1965, I, pp. 130-57.

⁴ Text on pp. 1* - 171*; French translation (of Book XV only) on pp. 172*-197*. Throughout I cite by the page number of the Syriac text. The Sabrisho^c may well be Sabrisho^c, abbot of the monastery of John of Kamul where, according to his *vita*, John bar Penkāyē was a monk; for this monastery see J.M. Fiey, *Nisibe: métropole syriaque orientale* (CSCO 388, Subs. 54), Louvain 1977, pp. 199-200.

⁵ A. Baumstark, "Eine syrische Weltgeschichte des siebten Jahrhunderts," *Römische Quartalschrift* 15 (1901), p. 275. Baumstark's summary of the work is still useful.

Mesopotamia; at the same time John's narrative sheds some valuable contemporary side light on al-Mukhtār's rebellion⁶ – the only historical episode he treats in any detail.

The little that is known about John bar Penkāyē⁷ (later tradition confused him with John of Dalyāthā or John the Elder) and about the manuscripts containing his *Riṣ Mellē* was collected by T. Jansma⁸ and so need not be repeated here. On internal grounds John was clearly an eyewitness of troubles in the Nisibis region during the last decades of the seventh century, and at one point he specifically mentions AH 67 (686 CE) as marking the inception of all the misfortunes from which North Mesopotamia was 'today' suffering. 'Today' was clearly only a few years after AH 67. Since John does not yet know of the replacement of the Catholicos Ḥnānīshō^c by John of Dasen (AH 74/693 CE), but only of the latter's failure to oust Ḥnānīshō^c in 686, it is likely that the book was completed before 693/4. If the reference to the death of 'Zubayr' refers to Ibn al-Zubayr, rather than to his father (see note to p. 155*), then AH 73 will be the *terminus post quem*.⁹

John at one point¹⁰ states his purpose in writing the work: it was 'not to get entangled in lengthy narratives, and so lose the thread and forget our purpose... but to demonstrate what God has done for us in His grace, and what we in our wickedness have presumed to do in opposition to Him.' Reading his final two books, it soon becomes apparent that John's interpretation of history was entirely shaped by ecclesiastical considerations. The Arab conquests form part of the divine plan: they both destroyed the pride of the Sasanians and punished the Byzantines for their religious policies, attempting to impose theopaschite doctrines on the entire Christian world.¹¹ Indeed, Byzantine theological deviation was itself

⁶ Cp P. Crone, *Slaves on Horses. The Evolution of the Islamic Polity*, Cambridge 1980, pp. 16, 264 (note 647).

⁷ Fenek is on the Tigris, north of Gozarta (modern Cizre).

⁸ T. Jansma, "Projet d'édition du ktābā d'c rēš mellē de Jean bar Penkaye," *L'Orient Syrien* 8 (1962), pp. 87-106.

⁹ The mention of Spain and Kush on p. 142* probably signifies no more than the farthest west and south: it is most unlikely that John would have struck an apocalyptic note in connection with AH 67 if he had been writing after 711 CE.

¹⁰ P. 30*.

¹¹ On p. 147* John specifies the addition of the words "who was crucified for us" to the Trisagion; for the use of this formula in Syria at about this time see my "A Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor," *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 (1973), p. 323.

the outcome of laxity in the Roman Empire, following on the cessation of the persecutions and the conversion of Constantine; for the Church in the Persian Empire, on the other hand, persecution had continued right up to the end of Sasanian rule, and so this church had been spared the consequences of religious peace – namely the lapse into theological bickering.

The Arab invasions, then, were the tool of divine wrath; but the children of Hagar, too, required punishing once they had accomplished their task. This punishment took the form of the division of their 'kingdom' into two parts, Eastern and Western. Once Mu^cāwiya had gained control, however, conditions improved, and 'the peace throughout the world was such that we have never heard of or seen'. But peace inevitably brought with it laxity once again: the theopaschites took the opportunity to spread their doctrines, while in general moral corruption set in on an unparalleled scale.

With Yazīd's death, however, and the anti-caliphate of Ibn Zubayr, Arab rule began to totter. The ensuing events, including al-Mukhtār's revolt, are given in a certain detail, with special attention paid to what was happening in Nisibis, where, subsequent to the Battle of the River Khāzīr (AH 67), Ibn al-Ashtar's army of freed captives set up its own leader. These *šurte* (perhaps the *šurāt*)¹² John sees as about to be 'the cause of the destruction of the Ishmaelites' and in support of this he adduces a remarkable exegesis of Gen. 16:12. The concomitant plague, famine and earthquakes lead him (on the basis of Matt. 24:7) to interpret all these events as the birthpangs of the eschaton; the closing pages of his work accordingly take on apocalyptic dimensions.

John is not alone among Christian writers of the seventh century either in putting forward a sectarian theological explanation for the Arab invasions,¹³ or for his readiness to adopt an apocalyptic note. John's view that the Arab successes represented a punishment for Byzantine theopaschite religious policy reappears a little over a century later in the Catholicos Timothy I's Apology for Christianity.¹⁴ Nor were apocalyptic ideas exceptional,¹⁵ and in East Syrian circles hints of such speculation already

¹² See note to p. 157*.

¹³ For a survey see my "Syriac views of emergent Islam," in G.H.A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society*, Carbondale and Edwardsville 1982, pp. 9-21, 199-203.

¹⁴ Ed. A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies* 2, Cambridge 1928, pp. 59, 62.

¹⁵ This applies to all religions. An earlier messianic movement among Jews is recorded in the *Khuzistan Chronicle* (ed. Guidi, CSCO *Scriptores Syri* 1, p. 33) during the catholicosate of

occur in one of Ishoʿyahb III's letters;¹⁶ the most outspoken – and influential – text, however, was the apocalypse attributed to Methodius of Patara, dated by Alexander¹⁷ to between 644 and 678, but which I have elsewhere suggested belongs to the early 690s, just prior to ʿAbd al-Malik's cadastral survey and tax reform.¹⁸ If the slightly later date is correct, then Ps. Methodius will belong to very much the same time, as well as place (Sinjar), as does John of Fenek. The two works are, however, a long way apart in their outlook: John is content just to identify the birth pangs of the eschaton, and his key Biblical texts are Gen. 16:12 (interpreted as foretelling the end of the Ishmaelites),¹⁹ Matt. 24:7-8 (the signs of the eschaton), 2 Thess. 2:6-8 (the removal of *to katechoñ*, interpreted as the removal of God's providential care), and 2 John 1:7 (the 'Deceiver', who has still to appear on the scene). Ps. Methodius, on the other hand, boldly foresees the Byzantine recapture of Jerusalem, and his work centres round quite a different selection of Biblical texts, notably the apocalyptic 'weeks' of Daniel, Matt. 16:18, 2 Thess. 2 (interpreted differently), 1 Cor. 15:24 and Ps. 68:31.²⁰ The radical differences between these two apocalyptic

Maremmeh (c. 647-50): "At that time a certain Jew came forth from Beth Aramaye, from a village called Pallughta, where the Euphrates waters are divided up to irrigate the land, and he said that the Messiah had come. He collected together weavers, barbers and fullers, some 400 men in all, who set fire to three churches, and killed the local governor. Then an army from ʿAqula (i.e. Kufa) came against them and slew them and their wives and children. Their leader was crucified in his own village." Closer in time would be the case of Abū ʿĪsā of Isfahan, if Qirqisāni is correct in dating him to the time of ʿAbd al-Malik (Shahrastāni, the other main source, places him in the time of Marwan II); cp A.Z. Aeshcoly, *Ha-tenuʿot ha-meshihiyot be-Yisra'el*, Jerusalem 1956, I, pp. 100-2. In general, see A. Vasiliev, "Medieval ideas of the end of the world: East and West," *Byzantion* 16 (1942/3), esp. pp. 471-5.

¹⁶ *Liber Epistularum*, ed. R. Duval (CSCO Scriptorum Syri 11), p. 249.

* ¹⁷ P.J. Alexander, "Byzantium and the migration of literary works and motifs; the legend of the last emperor," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 2 (1971), p. 57 and note 29. It is hoped that Alexander's translation of the Syriac text of the Apocalypse of Ps. Methodius will appear shortly.

¹⁸ "Syriac Views," pp. 18-19.

¹⁹ The use of Gen. 16:12 is not uncommon in seventh-century texts, e.g. Sebeos, *Histoire de Héraclius* (trad. Macler), Paris 1904, ch. 30 (in connection with the Prophet), the Apocalypse of John the Less (ed. J.R. Harris, *The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*, Cambridge 1900, p. 18*), and Ps. Methodius (on which see G. Reinink, "Ismael, der Wildesel in der Wüste. Zur Typologie der Apokalypse der Ps. Methodios," in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 75 (1982) (I am most grateful to Dr. Reinink for letting me see the proofs of his article).

²⁰ For the use of Daniel, see G. Podskalsky, *Byzantinische Reicheschatologie*, München 1972, pp. 53-6; and for Ps. 68:31, see I. Shahid, in *Le Muséon* 89 (1976), pp. 174-6.

outlooks are readily to be explained by the fact that the two authors belonged to different ecclesiastical bodies.

Enough has been said by way of brief introduction in order to indicate something of John's main concerns in the final book of his *Riṣ Mellē*. Given the rarity of Mingana's edition of the text, it is hoped that the translation which follows will help rescue this intriguing document from undue neglect. It is a pleasure to offer it as a small tribute to Professor M.J. Kister on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

The translation below covers the end of Book XIV, insofar as that book deals with the Arab invasions,²¹ and most of Book XV: only two sections have been omitted for reasons of space, the first (pp. 148* — 154*) being a rather diffuse passage portraying the moral decadence that was consequent upon the peace brought about by Muʿāwiya's reign, and the second (pp. 168* — 171*) being the concluding paragraphs of the work and containing little of real interest. Annotation has been kept to a minimum, and illustration has largely been confined to Syriac sources,²² while on the Islamic side references have almost entirely been confined to entries in Caetani's *Chronographia Islamica*.²³ John's work is replete with Biblical quotations and allusions, and the absence of a concordance to the Syriac Bible makes it all the more likely that I have missed several of these. As one would expect, he quotes the Peshitta version (often rather different from the Hebrew and Greek).

In the translation below bracketed words have been supplied by myself for the sake of the sense. Names are given in their Syriac form in the translation, but (normally) in their Arabic form in the notes. In the annotation the following abbreviations are employed:

BH — Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris 1890; cited by page.

²¹ A German translation of the end of Book XIV and the beginning of Book XV was given by R. Abramowski, *Dionysius von Tellmahre* (Abh. KM XXV, 2), Leipzig 1940, pp. 5-8.

²² For a survey for this period, see my "Syriac Sources for Seventh-Century History," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976), pp. 17-36.

²³ For detailed accounts of al-Mukhtār's rebellion based on the Arabic sources, see J. Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam* (Abh. KGW Göttingen V, 5), 1901 (English translation: *The Religious Political Factions in Early Islam*, New York 1975), chapters 4-5 (based largely on Ṭabarī), and ʿA.A.ʿA. Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate 65-86/684-705*, London 1971, chapter 2 (based on Balādhurī); cp also W. Montgomery Watt, "Shiʿism under the Umayyads," *JRAS* 1960, pp. 158-72 (esp. 162-5).

Caetani — L. Caetani, *Chronographia Islamica*, Rome 1912; cited by entry number under the appropriate year.

Chron. 1234 — *Chronicon anonymum ad annum 1234*, ed. J.B. Chabot (CSCO Scr. Syri 36), vol. I; cited by page (of text volume). (Latin translation in Scr. Syri 56, with page numbers of text volume in the margin).

Elijah of Nisibis — *Opus chronologicum* (the relevant extracts are given in F. Baethgen, *Fragmente syrischer und arabischer Historiker* [Abh. KM VIII, 3], Leipzig 1884); cited by AH entry.

Khuzistan Chronicle — Anonymous Chronicle on the End of the Sasanids, ed. I. Guidi in *Chronica Minora I* (CSCO Scr. Syri 1); cited by page of text. (Latin translation in Scr. Syri 2).

MS — *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, ed. J.B. Chabot, Paris 1899–1924 (repr. 1963); cited by page of translation (vol. II) and of text (vol. IV).

In the notes dates are given in a simplified form, i.e. AH 64 — 683 CE (not 683/4); the following table gives the correspondences between the Hijra, Christian and Seleucid eras for the period:

| | |
|-------------|--|
| AH 64 began | 30 Aug. 683 CE — AG (Anno Graecorum) 994 ²⁴ |
| AH 65 began | 18 Aug. 684 CE — AG 995 |
| AH 66 began | 8 Aug. 685 CE — AG 996 |
| AH 67 began | 28 Jul. 686 CE — AG 997 |
| AH 68 began | 18 Jul. 687 CE — AG 998 |
| AH 69 began | 6 Jul. 688 CE — AG 999 |
| AH 70 began | 25 Jun. 689 CE — AG 1000 |
| AH 71 began | 15 Jun. 690 CE — AG 1001 |
| AH 72 began | 4 Jun. 691 CE — AG 1002 |
| AH 73 began | 23 May 692 CE — AG 1003 |
| AH 74 began | 13 May 693 CE — AG 1004 |
| AH 75 began | 2 May 694 CE — AG 1005 |

²⁴ The Seleucid year began on 1st October; thus AG 994 commenced 1st Oct. 682 = AH 63).

Translation

Book XIV

[141*] When the kingdom of the Persians came to an end, in the days of their king Khōsrō,^a the kingdom of the children of Hagar at once gained control over more or less the whole world, for they took the whole kingdom of the Persians, overthrowing all their warriors who prided themselves in the arts of war.

We should not think of the advent (of the children of Hagar) as something ordinary, but as due to divine working. Before calling them, (God) had prepared them beforehand to hold Christians in honour; thus they also had a special commandment^b from God concerning our monastic station, that they should hold it in honour. Now when these people came, at God's command, and took over as it were both kingdoms, not with any war or battle, but in a menial fashion, such as when a brand is rescued out of the fire;^c not using weapons of war or human [142*] means, God put victory into their hands in such a way that the words

[141*] ^a Khusrau II had in fact died in 628, prior to the collapse of the Sasanian empire.

* ^b Compare Chron. 1234, p. 240; Life of Gabriel of Qartmin (ed. P.Y. Dawlabani, *Maktabzabnē d-'umrā qaddīšā d-Qartmīn*, Mardin 1959, p. 97): 'Mar Gabriel preferred the advent of the Arabs to the oppression of the Byzantines, so he gave assistance and helped them. Subsequently he went to Gezira to their emir, who received him with great joy and honoured him greatly for his action on their behalf; he gave him a *prostagma* signed with his own hand with ordinances on all the points he had asked for: in it he granted all the *suryāyē* (i.e. Syrian Orthodox) freedom to use their church customs – the semantra, festival celebrations and funeral processions, and the building of churches and monasteries; he freed from tribute priests, deacons and monks, while he fixed the tribute for other people at four (currency unspecified). He also instructed the pagan Arabs to take great care to preserve the lives of the *suryāyē*.' (This passage is not included in F. Nau's selections from the Life of Gabriel in his "Notice historique sur le monastère de Qartamin," *Actes du XIVe Congrès international des orientalistes*, 1905, Paris 1907, II, pp. 19-31; a new edition of the Life of Gabriel, and of other abbots of Qartmin monastery, has been prepared by A.N. Palmer).

^c Amos 4:11; Zech. 3:2 (cp p. 165*).

written concerning them might be fulfilled, namely, 'One man chased a thousand and two men routed ten thousand'.^a How, otherwise, could naked men,^b riding without armour or shield, have been able to win, apart from divine aid, God having called them from the ends of the earth so as to destroy, by them, 'a sinful kingdom'^c and to bring low, through them, the proud spirit of the Persians.

Only a short period passed before the entire world was handed over to the Arabs; they subdued all the fortified cities, taking control from sea to sea,^d and from East to West – Aigyptos and the whole of Meṣrīn, and from Crete to Cappadocia, from Yāhēlmān^e to the gates of Ālān, Armenians, Syrians, Persians, Byzantines, Egyptians and all the intermediary regions: 'their hand was upon everyone',^f as the prophet says. Only half the Byzantine empire was left by them.

Who can relate the carnage they effected in Greek territory, in Kush, in Spain^g and in other distant regions, taking captive their sons and daughters and reducing them to slavery and servitude. Against those who had not ceased in times of peace and prosperity from fighting against their Creator, there was sent a barbarian people who had no pity on them.

Having reached thus far, however, [143*] in the narrative, let us end this book here, and give praise to Father, Son and Holy Spirit for ever, amen.

Book XV

While our affairs were thus prospering through divine care rather than from any human aid, we were seen to be resplendent, thanks to the power of our Victorious King,^a in the face of all the wars stirred up against us by tyrannical kings. All our affairs were conducted in orderly fashion as long as pagan kings were in control, seeing that the lax and lazy were not al-

[142*] ^a Deut. 32:30.

^b Compare the story in MS II, p. 422 = IV, p. 417.

^c Amos 9:8.

^d i.e. Mediterranean to Persian Gulf.

^e Identity uncertain, but it represents the furthest south, just as the 'Gates of Ālān' designate the furthest north.

^f Based on Gen. 16:12 (on Ishmael); cp p. 167*.

^g The terms are evidently used loosely to designate raids in the extreme west and south.

[143*] ^a A standard christological title in Syriac writers.

lowed to remain amongst us, owing to fear of (our) persecutors; for the moment someone dozed off, failing to keep vigilance for truth, the furnace of persecution would separate him (off from the church) without a synod having to go to the trouble. Sometimes, when the fierceness of persecution against us abated a little, then the (church) fathers would gather, according to custom, and would adjudicate on a few problems that had sprung up, and they would resolve any complications that had occurred, reaffirming the apostolic canons, as well as anything else appropriate that time and circumstances suggested to them that they should regulate and lay down.

[144*] Thus, as I have said, our faith prospered and our way of life flourished. Now there had been many gatherings (of bishops) prior to that at Nicaea,^a but they had not been ecumenical, and (their aim) was not to make a new creed, but their purpose was that which we have stated above. But once there was respite, and believing kings held sway over the Romans, it was then that corruption and intrigues entered the churches, and there were a great many creeds and assemblies (of bishops), seeing that each year they made a new creed. Peace and quiet thus brought considerable loss upon them, for lovers of fame did not fail to stir up trouble, furtively using gold to win the imperial ear, so that they could play about with the kings as if they were children.

Such, then, were the Romans.

Up to the time of the arrival of the children of Hagar the church in Persia had been under the rule of the Magians and so had nothing else to pit itself against. There were, however, some (internal) scandals which sprang up, but they were not allowed to come to anything, for our Lord held them back. This being the situation ever since the time of the Apostles up to the reign of this last Khōsrō, our Saviour – who foresees everything before it takes place – saw how much a state of ease proved detrimental to us, and (observed) the ills to which we had been exposed as a result of the interference of Christian kings who wanted us to ascribe suffering^b to that Nature which is above suffering – something that perhaps not even demons had ever [145*] dared to do.

[144*] ^a In 325 CE.

^b Ever since Justinian's proclamation of the so-called 'theopaschite formula' in 533, this issue had been the prize bone of contention between the Persian and Byzantine churches.

Even though God manifested many portents, we paid no attention at all; for ever since this iniquitous schism took place right up to this day, portents involving the sun – such as God manifested to the crucifiers at the time of the crucifixion – along with earthquakes, tremors and fearful signs in the sky, have appeared three times,^a indicating nothing else but the wickedness of heretics and (hinting) at what was to come upon the earth. And so, when God saw that no amendment took place, He summoned against us the Barbarian kingdom – a people that is not open to persuasion,^b which acknowledges no treaty or agreement, which accepts no flattery or blandishment, whose comfort lies in blood that is shed without reason, whose pleasure is to dominate everyone, whose wish it is to take captives and to deport. Hatred and wrath is their food; they take no comfort in what they are offered.

When they proved successful and had performed the will of Him who had summoned them, ruling and domineering over all the kingdoms of the earth, subjecting all peoples to harsh subjugation, taking their sons and daughters into slavery, taking vengeance on them for their abuse to God the Word,^c and for the blood of Christ's martyrs^d that had been shed in innocence, then was our Lord comforted and rested, and He was reconciled so as to act in mercy towards His people. And since it was right that the course of action taken by the children of Hagar should also be punished, it was for this reason that right at the beginning of their rule

[145*] ^a Solar eclipses are recorded in Syriac chronicles for AG 976 (Chron. 1234, p. 282); AG 983, Sun. 1st December (MS II, p. 456 = IV, p. 436); AG 1005, Sun. 5th October (MS II, p. 474 = IV, p. 446-7; Elijah of Nisibis *sub* AH 74). (The first two references will be to the eclipses of 25th Aug. 667 [i.e. read AG 978] and 7th [not 1st] Dec. 671 CE). Several further eclipses took place in this period, some of which would have been observable in the Middle East: see T. von Oppolzer, *Canon of Eclipses* (tr. O. Gingerich), New York 1962, pp. 180-3 and charts 90-91; and (for total eclipses only), J.F. Schroeter, *Spezieller Kanon der zentralen Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse welche innerhalb des Zeitraums von 600 bis 1800 n. Chr. in Europa sichtbar waren*, Kristiania 1923, p. 20.

^b Cp. Is. 65:2.

^c i.e. by imputing to him suffering.

^d Perhaps John has in mind the martyrdoms of men such as George/Mihramgushnasp, a convert from Zoroastrianism denounced as such by Khusrav II's court doctor, the monophysite Gabriel of Sinjar (Khuzistan chronicle, p. 23).

(God) made [146*] two heads, dividing the kingdom into two parts. This was in order that we might comprehend what had been said by our Saviour. For there had been concord until they had subdued the entire earth, but once they turned to themselves, and rested from war, then they quarrelled amongst themselves: those in the West were saying 'superiority is due to us, and the king should come from among us', whereas those in the East disputed this, (saying) that it was their due. As a result of this dispute they were provoked into war with one another.

Having let their dispute run its course, after much fighting had taken place between them, the Westerners, whom they call the sons of the 'Ammāyē, gained the victory,^a and one of their number, a man called M'awyā,^b became king controlling the two kingdoms, of the Persians and of the Byzantines. Justice flourished in his time, and there was great peace in the regions under his control; he allowed everyone to live as they wanted. For they held, as I have said above, an ordinance, stemming from the man who was their guide (*mhaddyānā*),^c concerning the people of the Christians and concerning the monastic station. Also as a result of this man's guidance (*mhaddyānūtā*) they held to the worship of the One God, in accordance with the customs of ancient law. At their beginnings they kept to the tradition (*mašlmānūtā*) of Muḥammad, who was their instructor (*tār'ā*), to such an extent that they inflicted the death penalty on anyone who was seen to act brazenly against [147*] his laws.

Their robber bands went annually to distant parts and to the islands, bringing back captives from all the peoples under the heavens. Of each person they required only tribute (*madattā*), allowing him to remain in whatever faith he wished. Among them were also Christians in no small numbers: some belonged to the heretics, while others to us.^a

Once M'awyā had come to the throne, the peace throughout the world was such that we have never heard, either from our fathers or from our grandparents, or seen that there had ever been any like it.^b It was as

[146*] ^a The battle of Šiffin, 657 CE.

^b i.e. Mu'āwiya, 661-680 CE.

^c The term *mhaddyānā* is also used of the Prophet in Chron. 1234, pp. 227⁷, 238²⁹.

[147*] ^a i.e. notably the Ghassanids and Lakhmids respectively.

^b Cp. Ps. Methodius, Vat. syr. 58, f.134a: 'Then there shall be peace on earth the like of which there has not been, for it is the final peace' (i.e. before the Gates of the North are opened).

though our Lord had written ‘I will test by this means, as it is written,^c “so that through grace and truth sin may be forgiven.”’

The accursed heretics, taking the situation then as beneficial to themselves, instead of converting and baptising the pagans, in accordance with ecclesiastical canons, started on a retrograde (kind of) conversion, turning almost all the churches of the Byzantines to their own wicked standpoint, reviving and re-establishing something that had been overthrown; (as a result) the majority of the Westerners were regularly using (the addition to the Trisagion of) the words “... immortal, who was crucified for us.”^d All the churches became like uncultivated land.

Just as we related above the praiseworthy actions of our valour at a time when we were worthy of this, so now we must disclose our laxity, without hiding anything, for “accursed is [148*] he who shall call good bad, and bad good”, as the Scripture says.^a For to such a state of laxity did that time of respite which had overtaken us bring us, that the same happened to us as had happened to Israel: “Israel has grown fat and recalcitrant, he has grown fat and strong, he has acquired wealth and has forgotten God who made him, reviling the Strong One who had redeemed him.”^b

The Westerners adopted their wickedness without a flinch, while we, who imagined that we held on to the true faith, were so far removed from the actions appropriate to Christians that, if one of the men of old were to be resurrected and were to see us, he would be seized by pangs of death, and he would say: “This is not the Christianity which I left behind at my death.” Accordingly I am obliged to disclose everything, in order that we may realize that everything that has befallen us has befallen us in (the course of) just judgment: we have been punished as we deserved, and in accordance with what we have done.

[John now goes on to enumerate in general terms the moral degradation and malpractices of bishops, clergy, rulers, judges and ordinary people during this time of peace, at a time when crops were bountiful and trade ‘doubled’ (pp. 148* - 54*)].

^c Prov. 16:6.

^d See note 11 to introduction.

[148*] ^a Is. 5:20.

^b Deut. 32:15.

[154*] While we were mixed up in all these evil and foul practices, which we have related above, God looked on in sorrow, and He began, in His accustomed compassion, to arouse our minds little by little to repentance: there were earthquakes in various cities,^a but our stubbornness looked on in silence: He manifested portents in the skies,^b but our wicked nature looked on and paid no attention; He brought on various kinds of locusts,^c which stripped the fields and vineyards, but there was no one among us who asked the question ‘why?’. The kingdom began to suffer disturbances, but our hearts were not in the slightest moved. He used up our strength (*or* wealth) in tribute, but we did not pay a thought; the kingdom over us was once again divided into two parts, each plundering the other, but this made no impression on our crassness of heart. (God) brought along raiders, He destroyed towns and laid waste the roads. During all this we (remained) in our wickedness, like a sheep in its flock; but then things began encroaching upon us little by little, with the intention that our hearts might possibly be aroused. (God) brought plague upon the oxen, so that we might come to our senses – but we imagined it might just be coincidence; reports reached us from all sides of captives being taken, and of plague – but we just said it was chance.

[155*] Accordingly, I too shall say with the prophet Isaiah, taking the role of our Lord, ‘Heaven and earth, rational beings and dumb animals, judge between Me and My people: what further is it appropriate to do to My people that I have not yet done? I waited for them to do good, but they did evil. Wait a little and see what I shall do to My people.’^a

When M^cawyā ended his days and departed from the world, Yazdīn^b his son ruled after him. He did not walk in his father’s ways,^c but instead was fond of childish games and empty delights. Men’s strength failed because of his empty-headed tyranny, and Satan wore down their progress by means of all sorts of tedious labours. God, however, speedily removed

[154*] ^a The Edessa region had suffered a devastating earthquake at Easter in 679 CE (MS II, p. 457 = IV, p. 436); Chron. 1234, p. 288 (date corrupt).

^b Cp. MS II, pp. 456, 470-1 = IV, pp. 436, 444-5; BH, p. 110, for such portents around this time.

^c Cp. BH, p. 110 (AG 990).

[155*] ^a Is. 5:3-4 (adapted).

^b i.e. Yazid I, April 680 - Nov. 683 CE.

^c Based on the phraseology of the Deuteronomist historian of Kings.

him and when he too departed from the world, one of the Arabs, by name Zubayr,^d made his voice heard from a distance. He made it known about himself that he had come out of zeal for the house of God, and he was full of threats against the Westerners, claiming that they were transgressors of the law. He came to a certain locality in the South where their sanctuary was, and lived there. Preparations for war were made against him and he was overpowered; in this way they even burnt their own sanctuary,^e as well as spilling much blood there. From that time on the kingdom of the Arabs was no longer firmly established. When Zubayr died^f they set up his son in the emirate (*'amirūtā*).

The Westerners had [156*] a general called 'Abd al-Rahmān bar Zāyāt,^a while the Easterners had one named Mukhtār.^b Now at that time the Westerners controlled Nisibis, and an emir called bar 'Uthmān^c was in control of it. Another emir from among the Easterners, whose name was bar Niṭrōn,^d advanced against him. The Westerners claimed that, because Nisibis had belonged to the Romans,^e it was right that they should have it, while the Easterners claimed that it had belonged to the Persians, and so was theirs. This was the reason for the great unrest in Mesopotamia.

^d i.e. 'Abdallāh ibn al-Zubayr, who proclaimed himself caliph in March 684: Caetani, AH 64, no. 27.

^e Evidently the episode of October 683 (Caetani, AH 64, no. 27) is meant, rather than al-Ḥajjāj's siege of Mecca in 692 (Caetani, AH 73, no. 14).

^f Ibn al-Zubayr was killed in 692; there is evidently some confusion over his son's succession (unless 'Zubayr' here [alone in this text] is al-Zubayr himself).

[156*] ^a Clearly an error, for 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ziyād was governor of Khorasan: his brother 'Ubaydallāh is meant.

^b The rebellion of al-Mukhtār features in MS II, p. 471 = IV, p. 444, and in almost identical wording in Chron. 1234, p. 290, as follows: '[In AG 995 Yazid died] and Mukhtār rebelled in 'Aqūlā [or Babylon]; he was a false deceiver who hypocritically said of himself that he was a prophet [and that he had visions].' (Passages in square brackets are omitted in Chron. 1234; cp. also BH, p. 110).

^c Not otherwise known; cp. M.G. Moroney, "Continuity and Change in the Administrative Geography of late Sasanian and early Islamic al-'Irāq," *Iran* 20 (1982), pp. 8-9.

^d Not otherwise known.

^e i.e. until 363 CE, and then again briefly during Heraclius' campaigns (627-8).

The Westerners won, and the Easterners were driven away. At the turn of the year bar Niṭrōn got together a large army, and horsemen, like sand in number, made ready with him. Goaded on by enormous pride he set his face to go down to fight the 'Aqūlāyē,^f taking with him John, who was metropolitan of Nisibis at that time.^g

Seeing that the Patriarch of the Church of Christ in the East, Mar Giwargīs,^h had already departed this life for a more blessed one, and Mar Ḥnānīshō^c the exegete had been appointed in his place, bar Zāyāt promised Johnⁱ 'if you will accompany me, I will depose him and establish you in the patriarchate in his place.' In this way he already [157*] considered that victory was his, seeing that he had many army commanders with him. Now Mukhtār, angry with the 'Aqūlāyē on the grounds that they were useless to him in war, had given orders that all their slaves should be liberated and go into battle in their masters' stead. When this order had been issued, several thousand of them, slaves of captive origin, collected around him, and he appointed them a commander whose name was Abraham.^a This man he sent against bar Zāyāt with 13,000 men, all footsoldiers, without arms or equipment, without horses or tents: all that they had in their hands was either a sword or a spear or a stick. They set off, and when the two armies met on the river named the Ḥāzar,^b there

^f 'Aqūlā = Kufa (so expressly stated in the Khuzistan Chronicle, p. 36).

^g On John of Dasen, or 'the Leper', see Fiey, *Nisibe* [see note 4], pp. 69-70.

^h 659-680/1 CE.

ⁱ 685/6-692/3 CE; the intervening (and very aged) John I is ignored.

^j Only later did John actually manage to occupy the patriarchal throne for 22 months (until his death in AH 76/695 CE). That John was in fact a rival candidate to Ḥnānīshō^c from the first is stated by Mari, *Liber Turrīs* (ed. Gismondī), p. 63 (text) = p. 56 (tr.).

[157*] ^a Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ashtar.

^b The defeat and death of 'Ubaydallāh ibn Ziyād on the banks of the river Khāzir took place, according to Islamic tradition, on 6 Aug. 686 CE (Caetani, AH 67, no. 2). MS II, p. 471 = IV, p. 445 gives the following account, with a different date: 'At the beginning of AG 996 (so editor, ms 995), on 22nd and 23rd Illul (September), the Arabs engaged in a fierce battle with each other, lasting several days. They mutually routed each other, and many tens of thousands of men fell on either side: it is said that the number of dead who were counted reached 400,000. This took place on the river Ḥāzir, in the region of Nineveh. They suffered huge

was a fierce battle in which all the warriors of the Westerners were slain. Thus was their pride turned to deep shame, seeing that they had been defeated, not by able-bodied men, but by weaklings. The man^c who was all prepared for the patriarchal throne only barely escaped with his cloak. The Westerners were utterly broken and their general was slain as well. As for all the stores they had collected, and their riches, belongings, arms and silver, all this their enemies inherited, while they retreated until they had crossed the Euphrates.

Those captives, who were nicknamed *šurtē*,^d [158*] signifying their zeal for righteousness, entered Nisibis^a and held it, thus gaining control over the whole of Mesopotamia. Wherever their enemies poked their noses out, the *šurtē* would win another victory.

When they had entered Nisibis, Abraham appointed his brother^b as commander over them, and he himself went down to °Aqūlā. Since, however, they preferred to have someone from their own ranks as commander – Abraham and his brother belonged to the Ṭayy – they rose up against him and slew him^c and all his associates. They then set up an emir from among themselves, whose name was Abuqarab.^d

The °Aqūlāyē repented of what they had done when they saw that their slaves had rebelled against them, and so they rose up against Mukhtār and made war on him. After defeating them several times, he was himself finally defeated, and they killed both him^c and a large army

losses; their might was brought low, and they were the cause of their own shame, for their pride and impiety had been very great.' (Compare BH, p. 110, where the date is given as 3rd Illul, AG 996).

^c i.e. John, metropolitan of Nisibis.

^d Probably the *šurāt*, who had 'sold' their life for the cause of God (Qur'ān IV.76), rather than the *šurṭa* (bodyguard); for the emphatic *ṭ*, compare *zyṭ* for Ziyād.

[158*] ^a Cp. Caetani AH 67, no. 2.

^b Ṭabari II, p. 716 names him as °Abd al-Rahmān.

^c i.e. Ibrāhīm's brother.

^d i.e. Abū Qārib, mentioned in Abū 'l-Faraj, *Kitāb al-Aghāni* (Bulāq edition), V, p. 155. MS II, p. 469 = IV, p. 445, Chron. 1234, p. 293 and BH, p. 111 all mention a certain Bwryd' (Bwryd, Chron. 1234) as holding Nisibis; according to Chron. 1234 he held it against °Abd al-Malik's brother Muḥammad, at a date subsequent to the battle on the Khāzir.

^e Mukhtār was killed in battle on 3rd April 687 (Caetani, AH 67, no. 4).

of the ex-captives that he had with him. Others of captive origin collected together and joined those who were in the city of Nisibis. Every day more would turn up, from every quarter, and join them. They captured a number of fortresses, and the fear of them fell on all the Arabs (Ṭayy). Wherever they went they were successful.

From then onwards God began to afflict the land: He stirred and arose like a warrior, He caused His sword to flash out, terrifying the earth; [159*] He revealed His arm, and the universe was terrified; He summoned destruction upon all His enemies, He began to take vengeance on those who hated Him,^a and (acted) in accordance with the one who said^b 'I have kept silence from eternity, shall I continue to be silent?', and again^c 'From now on I shall be raised up, says the Lord, henceforth I shall be raised up, henceforth I shall be exalted. You shall conceive thorns, and give birth to the bow in your spirits', etc.

For, seeing that we had remained in our wicked ways and had not turned at all to repentance during all this time, and 'the priests had not said "Where is the Lord their God", and the law-holders did not recognize Him and the shepherds had acted deceitfully with Him',^d while each of us had turned aside and we had said to the Lord 'Depart from here',^e then quite justly was (God) enraged against us: henceforth it was not through tyrannical kings who forced us to worship idols, or through Arians or even Eunomians (that He acted), but He began to wage war with us Himself, and as a result of His immense might 'peoples were stirred up and nations shook. He raised His voice and the earth shook,'^f for He set 'people against people, and kingdom against kingdom,'^g He brought on famines, earthquakes and plagues, as He had said.^h He handed over a sinful generation to bitter afflictions, the like of which had not been experienced before. What they sowed, they also reaped. He puffed at this

[159*] ^a John employs a mélange of Biblical phraseology here: cp. Ps. 78:65, 143:6; Ezek. 32:10; Is. 52:10; Deut. 32:41.

^b Is. 42:14.

^c Is. 33:10-11.

^d Jer. 2:8.

^e Cp. Is. 53:6, 65:5.

^f Ps. 46:7.

^g Matt. 24:7 (i.e. signs of the eschaton: cp. p. 165* below).

^h Matt. 24:7.

(generation) and it did not remain; He delivered us over into the hands of the raiders.

Who can henceforth enumerate the multiple woes that surround the world – in particular the unparalleled plague [160*] and famine? People were imprisoned (indoors) for fear of raiders, for they could not even move away to safety elsewhere.

In the year 67 of the rule of the Arabs,^a following on all these fearful signs which we have indicated above, and following those wars and battles by which (God) awoke us and summoned us to repentance – but we paid no attention; in this year 67 the accursed plague began:^b there had been nothing like it, and I hope that there will be nothing like it again.

Following the custom of the wickedness which is implanted in mankind, people did not even deem those who were harvested by death to be worthy of burial; instead, like the pagans,^c they left them and fled. From then on brothers and members of the family proved to be (like) dogs and wild animals to anyone who died: crows and vultures were their buriers. Human corpses were strewn in the roads and streets like ‘manure on the earth’^d with the result that springs and rivers became contaminated. The dogs began on many people while they were still alive: each saw his destruction with his own eyes. No brother had any pity on his brother, or father on his son; a mother’s compassion for her children was cut off: she would gaze on them as they were convulsed with the pangs of death, but she was not willing to approach and close [161*] their eyes.

Such was the fearful sight, such was the horrifying iniquity. Those who were still alive were scattered, like sheep without a shepherd, over the mountains: their aim was to escape the plague, but it, like a harvester, followed on their footsteps: dogs and wild animals would heap them up in sheaves. What was worst of all were the looters, from whom they could not escape, for they wandered about everywhere following them like

[160*] ^a AH 67 = 686/7 CE.

^b Cp. Caetani AG 67, no. 7 (and AH 69, no. 1); also already AH 65, no. 8.

^c The comparison will be with Zoroastrians; cp. M.G. Moroney, “The Effects of the Muslim Conquest on the Persian Population of Iraq,” *Iran* 14 (1976), p. 53.

^d So the variant reading in Mingana’s edition, = Jer. 16:4 (Mingana’s text has *tar‘a* ‘door’ for *ar‘ā* ‘ground’).

gleaners: they would haul them out of hidden places and strip them of their belongings, leaving them naked. They failed to consider or to think or say (to themselves) ‘no one can escape from God, except by means of repentance and conversion to Him.’ As for anyone who reminded them about this, they would angrily rebuke him, saying ‘Get out; we know very well that escape is much more profitable to us than supplication;’ and ‘We did repent, but it did not do us any good; we have not got the strength for this any longer.’ To such a state of despair have people come as a result of the multitude of their sins.

Afflictions such as these pressed upon them, but still they did not repent. ‘The bellows for their fire have failed, and so has the lead,’ as the prophet’s word says; ‘and the refiner refines in vain. Call them reject silver, for the Lord has rejected them.’^a Truly has He rejected [162*] them and His soul has abhorred them. He smote us, without any effect, as we did not accept the chastisement. He brought upon us locusts of various sorts, but we were not converted; He brought upon us raiders, but we did not repent; He held back the rain from us for three months prior to the harvest,^a but we were unmoved; plague herded us like sheep, but we only increased our wickedness; priests and upholders of the law expired, churches became ruined, and the holy vessels^b were profaned; villages were burned, towns laid waste, fear ruled over all the roadways.

This was just ‘the first generation’, that is to say, it was just the beginning of the pangs. God continued to chasten us seven times over^c for our sins. All the words of the prophets and all the curses of the law^d and the Apostles came to fulfilment concerning us. We were plundered and scattered over the whole earth; we were in anguish, resembling ‘a reed

[161*] ^a Jer. 6:29-30.

[162*] ^a For famine in Syria this year see Caetani AH 67, no. 15; see also MS II, p. 474 = IV, p. 447: ‘In that year (AG 1005 = 993/4 CE) there was a lack of rain everywhere, and grain became expensive, so that 3 modii of wheat were sold for a dinar, while seven years previously, when that great and dire famine occurred, a modius of grain had been sold in all the villages for 3 dinars, and people had eaten bread made out of lentils, varieties of chick-peas, and other kinds of pulse.’

^b Or ‘vestments’, for which one might compare Ps. Methodius. Vat. Syr. 58, f. 131a: ‘... they sleep in the sanctuary, and the holy vestments (*mānay quḏšā*) serve as their clothing.’

^c Gen. 4:15.

^d Cp. Dan. 9:11.

quivering before the winds,^e like Cain shaking and quivering on the earth.^f What further? Yet another blow, impossible to escape or run away from: famine and plague. When we escaped from plague, famine chased after us, and anything that we had left over was taken away from us by raiders.^g We are forced to use the words of Jeremiah: he lamented for a single people, that is, Jerusalem alone, but we (lament) for the entire world. Let us accordingly adduce from his lamentations, so that our suffering may be contained – but it will not be contained, for we are unworthy. (See) the notables of Sion ‘lying asleep at the head of every street, resembling flabby beetroot, having had their fill of the wrath [163*] of the anger of the Lord’.^a

Again, ‘the (very) hands of compassionate mothers have boiled up their children to serve as food – at the destruction of the daughter of my people.’^b Again, if I went out into the wilderness, there are those slain by the sword; or if I went into the inner rooms, there are those racked by hunger:^c ‘those killed by the sword were better off than those wracked by hunger, for these latter wasted away like people wounded’^d in war.

Our lax generation was imprisoned with all this chastisement. Owing to the strength of the famine, people’s faces turned (blue) like sapphire,^e or they turned black,^f like brands rescued from the fire.^g Many women rejected their children, and many of those who gave birth would convey them alive from their womb to the grave. There were no people left to bury, for everyone was exhausted and worn out from hunger. The storage pits which famine had emptied, were again filled by the famine with the corpses of human beings. Fortunate was the person who was overtaken by death swiftly, for suffering worthy of lamentation attached itself to him who daily underwent many deaths from hunger: how often, as he opened

^e 1 Kings 14:15.

^f Gen. 4:12.

^g Cp. Ezek. 6:12.

[163*] ^a Is. 51:20.

^b Lam. 4:10.

^c Cp. Jer. 14:18.

^d Lam. 4:9.

^e Cp. Lam. 4:7.

^f Cp. Lam. 4:8.

^g Amos 4:11, Zech. 3:2 (cp. p. 141*).

his mouth to ask for bread, did he faint with the very words. Many lay sprawled out in the streets, becoming silent the moment they fell. It was a sight truly worthy of grief. Young children in particular were a terrible spectacle: a father did not even recognize his children, so altered was the colour of their complexion: [164*] they fed off grass like young sheep, they hugged stones as they slept; in the morning they had become like dry sticks of wood.^a Many a mother made her children into food: sometimes in the evening she might be sleeping with her children, but in the morning their lives had been put to a silent end.

How many more woes do I have to relate – woes which came upon us as a result of our sins? Many fell down and died on the roadways, such was the grip of the famine. Corpses lay in the streets, with people treading on them as they passed along.

These, then, (are the circumstances) of the second trial, more specifically, the consequences of the mode of living we mentioned above. Is that enough so far? No, ‘you will be further smitten and chastised once again’.^b Because the poor have perished from hunger, and orphans and widows have faded away from lack of anyone to support them; monasteries and convents have become ruined as the monks and holy men were scattered, having left them to wander about all over the place; while wicked men have stopped up their feelings of compassion, and the rich have looked only for destruction – as the prophet said, ‘When will the month come to an end and the Sabbath pass, so that we can open up the store-chambers and give short measure’ etc.^c While expecting all these evils ‘you will be further smitten, and chastised once again’.^d The plague returned again to glean, following on them; it herded people, head by head. What the famine had left, the plague devoured, what [165*] the plague left over, the sword finished off.^a These torments were the retribution for our wickedness: because we had paid no attention to the fear of God in times when we were in straits; He neither had pity nor compassion – just as we had not had pity on the afflictions and tribulations of

[164*] ^a Cp. Lam. 4:8.

^b Is. 1:5.

^c Amos 8:5.

^d Is. 1:5.

[165*] ^a Cp. Joel 1:4.

our brothers. On the day of His wrath He did not keep in mind His holy name, but He delivered us over to our sins, averting His face from us; further, He became our adversary and fought against us, slaughtering without sparing, in the wrath of His anger.

These, then, are the causes of this chastisement that has come upon us, my beloved brother Sabrishō^c. This 'is our evil that has turned bitter and reached right into our heart'.^b Truly, I am aware that the end of the ages has arrived for us; I know this from the holy Scriptures, and in particular from our Lord's last words; for everything written has been fulfilled. Men have become deceitful and 'self-loving, traitors, brutish, haters of all that is good, enslaved to lusts, rather than to the love of God; they have the outward appearance of piety, but they are far removed from its true meaning'.^c The blessed Paul spoke these things with reference to our time, and here they are. Likewise, as our Lord said:^d 'One people is against another, one kingdom against another.' Here are famines, earthquakes and plagues; only one thing is missing for us – the advent of the Deceiver.^e I imagine that these are his birthpangs, as our Lord said: [166*] 'These are the beginnings of the birthpangs',^a and likewise the blessed Paul, 'If he who now holds (power) is removed from the midst, then the wicked one shall be revealed, whom our Lord will finish off with the breath of His mouth, bringing him to nought by means of the revelation of His advent'.^b What is 'he who holds (power)' if not the care of our Lord? See, He has removed it from mankind today, and there is no restoration at all; rather, the proper ordering of kings, priests and ordinary people has been brought into confusion; and the same applies to the seasons. Because wickedness has so much increased, love has also grown cold, as it was said:^c for whom can you see today who loves his brother

^b Jer. 4:18.

^c 2 Tim. 3:2-5 (abbreviated).

^d Matt. 24:7.

^e 2 John 1:7.

[166*] ^a Matt. 24:8.

^b 2 Thess. 2:7-8. The passage is also used by Ps. Methodius, but with a very different interpretation, where 'the restrainer' is the Byzantine empire, and 'until he is out of the way' is referred to the mystery of lawlessness: see P.J. Alexander in *Medievalia et Humanistica* 2 (1971), p. 54.

^c Matt. 24:12.

with a love appropriate to our Lord? Instead, all ranks of society are filled with envy, hate, accusations and complaint: people calumniate one another, and there is no one who offers support^d or comfort – or if you do find someone, he is only doing it in semblance, and not in truth.

Our Lord foresaw all this and said, 'The Son-of-Man shall come, and shall He find faith on earth?'^e For in whom can you see today (even) the semblance of the faithful? Look carefully, starting with those who are numbered among the first rank of the faithful, and continue until you reach me, who am at the last; begin with the priests, and finish with the ordinary people; look at the monks and consider those mingled (in society): can you find anyone who keeps to his (due) position? Can you see anyone who walks in his (proper) path? For we all walk completely in darkness. What other demonstration stronger than this do we need to indicate [167*] that the outcome of our Lord's words is at hand?

The arrival of these *šurtē*, and their victory, is from God; and I imagine that they will be the cause of the destruction of the Ishmaelites. And the prophecy of Moses is fulfilled, when he said 'His hand is upon all, and the hand of all is upon Him';^a for upon all peoples has the hand of the Arabs gained control, while these *šurtē* include among themselves all the peoples under heaven. Therefore, as it seems to me, their kingdom is going to receive its end in these people. That these people, too, will not last is clear: they will be mingled in with the other kingdoms from which they were taken captive; they will become their awakers, and it seems that those who survive the sword, famine and plague of today are being kept back for even more bitter afflictions than these. For a people from afar^b has been summoned against them, the one whose activities the prophets also indicated: for 'these will undo others';^c for they are striving to undo the Byzantine kingdom, and they are most eager to dominate everyone. It is a greedy people which is summoned to perform that which is not fitting and that which it does not realise.

^d Cp. Is. 63:5.

^e Luke 18:8.

[167*] ^a Gen. 16:12 (cp. above, p. 142*).

^b Cp. Deut. 28:49.

^c This looks like a quotation but I have failed to locate it.

When he is released from his tether, then do you arm yourself against the things within: the senses will be a manifest sign. When people have seen, they will understand. The land shall then be like wheat in a sieve; the earth will quake and the sky grow dark; the whole earth will be filled with the blood of mankind.^d For they are not striving against a kingdom, [168*] nor are they desirous of gold: they think nothing of possessions. For they are setting at rest the will of God. And after them is another calamity, an evil hidden in good, like poison in honey.^a Thus far is enough: here is the kingdom of the Lord. We began with Him, and we have committed (everything) into His hand; for everything (stems) from Him, everything is in Him, and everything (takes place) through Him – to whom be praise and blessing for eternal ages, amen.

[The final exordium (pp. 168* - 171*), addressed to Sabrishōc, adds nothing of substance].

^d Cp. Ezek. 9:9.

[168*] ^a No doubt a traditional image; it occurs in the letter of Babai (the Catholicos?) to Cyriacus, on the solitary life (§26 of my forthcoming edition): 'It is as if someone was given a honeycomb mixed with poison, and all unawares he ate it and ended up dead.'

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

(references are to the page number of Mingana's edition, given in the translation).

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| ‘Abd al-Rahmān bar Zāyāt (= ibn Ziyād) 156* | Khāzīr, river 157* |
| Abraham (see Ibrāhīm) | Khusrau (II) 141* 144* |
| Abū Qārib 158* | Kush 142* |
| Aigyptos 142* | |
| Ālān 142* | Mesopotamia 156* 158* |
| ‘Aqūlāyē 156* 157* 158* | Mešrīn (Egypt) 142* |
| Arabs (Ṭayy) 142* 155* 158* 160* 167* | Mu‘āwiya 146* 147* 155* |
| Arians 159* | Muḥammad 146* |
| Armenians 142* | Mukhtār 156* 157* 158* |
| | |
| Byzantines (Rhōmāyē) 142* 146* 147* 167* | Nicaea 144* |
| | Nisibis 156* 158* |
| | bar (ibn) Niṭrōn 156* |
| Cain 162* | |
| Cappadocia 142* | Paul 166* |
| Crete 142* | Persia 144* |
| | Persians 141* 142* |
| Egyptians 142* | |
| Eunomians 159* | Romans (Rhōmāyē) 144* |
| Euphrates 157* | |
| | |
| Giwargīs (patriarch) 156* | Sabrishōc 165* |
| | Sion 162* |
| Hagar (children of) 141* 144* 145* | Spain 142* |
| Hāzar (see Khazīr) | šurtē 157* 158* 167* |
| Hnānīshōc (patriarch) 156* | Syrians 142* |
| | |
| Ibrāhīm (ibn Āshtar) 157* 158* | Umayyads (Ammāyē) 146* |
| Isaiah 155* | bar (ibn) ‘Uthmān 156* |
| Ishmaelites 167* | |
| Israel 148* | Yāhēlmān 142* |
| | Yazīd 155* |
| | |
| Jeremiah 162* | (ibn) Zubayr 155* |
| Jerusalem 162* | bar Zāyāt (ibn Ziyād) 156* 157* |
| John (metropolitan of Nisibis) 156* | |

III

Syriac Inscriptions: A Preliminary Check List of European Publications *

The total number of recorded Syriac inscriptions is not particularly high, but details of them are scattered over a wide variety of different publications. Only for the pagan inscriptions of the 1st to 3rd centuries AD is there any systematic collection¹. The present checklist, covering European publications, has a twofold aim: to facilitate the work of scholars in the field, and at the same time to elicit from them supplementation to this preliminary list, since it is very probable that I have missed several items. There are of course many further Syriac inscriptions in existence, as yet unrecorded, or published in Arabic books and journals², but I have made no attempt to list the ones that happen to be known to me³.

The entries in the checklist are chronological, and within a particular year, alphabetical. Where helpful I have added a few comments, and given cross references to other publications or discussions of the same inscription.

On particular categories of inscriptions a few preliminary notes may be helpful.

1) The earliest Syriac inscriptions, of the 1st to 3rd centuries AD, have been particularly well studied in recent decades, by Segal, Jenni, Vattioni and Drijvers. A handy collection of these inscriptions, with glossary but without any translation, is available in Drijvers' *Old Syriac (Edesean) Inscriptions* (Leiden 1972); in this he also includes the famous Dura Europos parchment in Syriac (deed of sale of a slave girl from Edessa, dated AD 243), for which I give a select bibliography in Appendix I. There

¹ Drijvers 1972.

² See Gurguis 'Awwad, *A Catalogue of Articles on Syriac Subjects in the Arabic periodicals* (The Syriac Academy; Baghdad 1976), I. I make one exception (Abu Assaf 1972) because of the early date and importance of the inscriptions he publishes.

³ Here I would simply mention that the inscriptions of the monastery of Mar Behnam (near Mosul) will be found in Ephrem 'Abdāl's history of that monastery (Mosul 1951), and that many inscriptions from Tur 'Abdin are given in Ephrem Barsom's *Maktbonuto d-'al atro d-Tur 'Abdin* (Jounieh, 1964; ed. Faulos Behnam), pp. 134-13, and in Philoxenos Iuḥannan Dawlabani's *Habobo d-maḥṣāḥ 'al maktbonuto d-dayro d-Mor Ya'qub d-Ṣalah* (Atshane 1973), pp. 38-43.

also exist several papyrus fragments in Syriac from elsewhere, but these still await proper publication.

2) Although Christian Palestinian Aramaic is a western Aramaic Dialect, I include publications of the (rare) inscriptions in this dialect since the script used is estrangelo.

3) Some of the numerous Aramaic incantation bowls from southern Mesopotamia are in Syriac, and for convenience I have given the literature on these separately, in Appendix II.

4) Coin inscriptions are not included; for the main literature, see Drijvers 1972, pp. 58–9 and Vattioni 1971, pp. 440–1.

5) For Syriac inscriptions from central and eastern Asia only the standard or most accessible publications are given in Appendix III. Thus for the Hsi-an fu stele, whose Syriac inscription has been published many times, I list only a small selection.

Cross references are given by author and date, although for the following just the author is given:

Drijvers = H. J. W. Drijvers, *Old Syriac (Edessean) Inscriptions* (Leiden, 1972) 4.

Pognon = Pognon 1907.

1875

A. D. Mordtmann, *Neue Beiträge zur Kunde Palmyra's* (Sitzungsberichte der kön. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu München, 1875, 2).

– Includes three Syriac inscriptions on a sarcophagus from near Qiryaten; see Nöldeke 1878.

1878

T. Nöldeke, 'Christlich-palästinensische Inschriften', *ZDMG* 32 (1878) 199–200.

– On the inscriptions published by Mordtmann 1875; claimed as CPA, but see Sachau 1884.

1882

E. Sachau, 'Edessenische Inschriften', *ZDMG* 36 (1882) 142–67.

– Nos 2, 3, 5–8 = Drijvers 27–30, 36, 35 respectively; no 1 = Pognon 57–8, Pirenne 1963 (pp. 109–115). No 4 is a funerary inscription dated AG 805, Teshri 1 (AD 493, not 494 as Sachau states). Cp Nöldeke

⁴ Other abbreviations used are: AAAS = *Annales archéologiques arabes de Syrie*; AG = *Anno Graecorum* (i.e. Seleucid era); BSOAS = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*; CPA = Christian Palestinian Aramaic; IGLS = *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* (see under years 1929, 1939, 1955, 1959); MUSJ = *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph*; ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

1882.

T. Nöldeke, 'Bemerkungen zu den von Sachau herausgegebenen palmyrenischen und edessenischen Inschriften', *ZDMG* 36 (1882) 664–8.

1884

E. Renan, 'Deux monuments épigraphiques d'Edesse', *Journal Asiatique* 8, 1 (1884) 246–50.

– Drijvers 28, 44.

E. Sachau, 'Syrische Inschriften aus Karjeten', *ZDMG* 38 (1884) 543–5.
– Rereading of Mordtmann 1875, cp also Nöldeke 1878.

1885

R. Duval, 'Inscriptions syriaques de Salamas, en Perse', *Journal Asiatique* 8,5 (1885) 39–62.

– Eight inscriptions from Khosrova, Salamas etc; nos 1–4 are dated A.G. 1009, 1009, 1098, and 1672 respectively.

1896

I. Guidi, 'Di un'iscrizione sepolcrale siriana e della versione dei Carmi di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno fatta da Candidato di Amed', *Attes X^e congrès international des Orientalistes, III^e partie*, (Leiden 1896) 73–82 (and facsimile).

– Funerary inscription in Museo Borgiano, dated AD 759 from Amid; commemorates Maryam, a descendant of Candidatus of Dara who translated poems of Gregory in 655 (Vat. syr. 96).

E. Sachau, *Aramäische Inschriften* (Sitzungsberichte der Kön. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Phil.hist. Klasse 1896) (14 pages).

– Includes some inscriptions from Rabban Hormizd.

1898

B. Moritz, 'Syrische Inschriften aus Syrien und Mesopotamien', *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin; zweite Abteilung, Westasiatische Studien*, 1 (1898) 124–49.

– Nine inscriptions; no. 4 = Littmann 1904, Pognon 85; no. 5 = IGLS I, no. 58; no. 8 = Drijvers 27.

1899

R. A. S. Macalister, 'A Byzantine church at Umm er Rūs', *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* 1899, 200–4.

– p. 202 mentions mosaic with inscriptions in 'Syriac Hebrew and Greek' (in fact the Semitic inscriptions are all in CPA; a better drawing of the inscriptions will be found in *Revue Biblique* 8 (1899) 454).

1901

- J. Strzygowski, 'Der Schmuck der älteren el-Hadrakirche im syrischen Kloster der sketischen Wüste', *Oriens Christianus* 1 (1901) 356-72.
- Includes two inscriptions (pp. 365-7); cp Leroy 1974.

1902

- S. Ronzevalle, 'L'inscription syriaque de Krâd ad Dâsiniya, dans l'Emésène', *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 7 (1902) 386-409.
- Bilingual = IGLS V, no. 2143.

1904

- E. Littmann, *Semitic Inscriptions* (Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria 1899-1900; New York, 1904).
- Chapter 1 gives 24 Syriac inscriptions, mostly sixth century. No. 1 = Mouterde 1945, no. 14; no. 8 = Pognon 85; no. 21-24 = IGLS II, nos. 337, 314, 313, 312 respectively; no. 10 = IGLS II, no. 565.

1906

- F. C. Burkitt, 'The Throne of Nimrod', *Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology* 28 (1906) 149-55.
- Drijvers 27.
- J. B. Chabot, 'Mosaïque d'Edesse avec personnages et inscription syriaque', *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions* 1906, 122-3.
- Drijvers 45.
- J. B. Chabot, 'Note sur quelques monuments épigraphiques araméens, I', *Journal Asiatique* 10,7 (1906) 281-90.
- Drijvers 45.
- J. B. Chabot, 'Sur une inscription syriaque du Sinai', *Journal Asiatique* 10,7 (1906) 290-3.
- Left by pilgrims from Balad.

1907

- M. A. Kugener, 'Une inscription syriaque de Biredjik', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 1 (1907) 587-94.
- Drijvers 1.
- M. A. Kugener, 'Note sur l'inscription trilingue de Zebed', *Journal Asiatique* 10,9 (1907) 509-24.
- Cp Littmann 1911; = IGLS II, no. 310.
- F. Macler, 'L'inscription syriaque de Ste Anne à Jérusalem', in *Mosaïque Orientale* (Paris 1907).
- See review by S. Ronzevalle in *MUSJ* 3 (1908/9) 28*-31*, who shows that it is CPA.
- H. Pognon, *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mesopotamie et de la région de Mossoul* (Paris 1907).

- The majority are in Syriac. Nos. 2-12 = Drijvers 2-12; nos. 36-39 = Drijvers 31-34; nos. 44-50 = Drijvers 35-41; no. 118 = Drijvers 27. For nos. 16-18, see Littmann 1915. See also Nöldeke 1908.

1908

- T. Nöldeke, 'Syrische Inschriften', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 21 (1908) 151-61.
- On Pognon nos. 2-5, 36, 44, 46, 48; 40, 42, 26, 13, 19, 31, 35, 51, 53.

1909

- J. Euting, 'Notulae epigraphicae (mosaïque syrienne d'Ourfah)', *Florilegium ou Recueil de travaux d'érudition dédiés à M. le Marquis Melchior de Vogüé* (Paris 1909), 231-9.
- Drijvers 45-6.

1910

- N. Giron, 'Notes épigraphiques, 3. Bas-relief d'Orfa', *MUSJ* 5 1910/12) 77-8.
- Same inscription as Littmann 1912 = Drijvers 42.

1911

- E. Littmann, 'Osservazioni sulle iscrizioni di Ḥarran e di Zebed', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 4 (1911/12) 193-8.
- Cp Kugener 1907b = IGLS II, no. 310. (The Ḥarran inscription is Arabic/Greek).

1912

- E. Littmann, 'Eine altsyrische Inschrift', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 27 (1912) 379-82.
- Same inscription as Giron 1910 = Drijvers 42 (now Istanbul, Antiquities Museum, no. 2360).

1913

- B. Moritz, 'Syrische Inschriften', in *Inschriften aus Syrien Mesopotamien und Kleinasien gesammelt im Jahre 1899* (ed. Max Freiherr von Oppenheim) (Beiträge zur Assyriologie und Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft VII. 2, 1913) 157-74.
- The Syriac inscriptions include Drijvers 2, 31-4 and 45.

1915

- E. Littmann, 'Die syrischen Inschriften von Theleda', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 29 (1915) 301-10.
- Republishes Pognon 16-18.

1922

- N. Giron, 'Notes épigraphiques', *Journal Asiatique* 11,19 (1922), 88-92.

– Three Syriac inscriptions, of which the first = Drijvers 43 and the third = Mouterde 1945, no. 1.

1925

R. Savignac, 'Excursion en Transjordanie et au Kh. es-samrâ. B, Inscriptions syriaques (nos. 16–39)', *Revue Biblique* 34 (1925) 124–31.
– Found along with Greek inscriptions; possibly 5/6th century; script often similar to CPA.

1929

J. B. Chabot, 'Inscriptions syriaques de Bennaoui', *Syria* 10 (1929) 252–6.
– Two 6th century inscriptions, the first of which is now in the garden of the Damascus National Museum.

1929

L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, *IGLS I. Commagène et Cyrrestique* (nos. 1–256) (Paris 1929).
– no. 58 = Moritz 1898, pp. 131–2.

1930

J. M. Vosté, 'Les inscriptions de Rabban Hormizd et de Notre Dame des Semences, près d'Alqosh, Iraq', *Le Muséon* 43 (1930) 263–316.
– Cp Sachau 1896. For nos. 29–33 see also Mingana chr. arab. 72 (*Catalogue*, II, p. 155), and Leeds Syr. 9 (R. Ebied, in *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 197 (1974) 538–9).

1931

J. Jeremias, 'Das neugefundene Höhlen-Baptisterium bei Jerusalem', in *Festgabe V. Schultze* (Stettin 1931) 111–22.
– Cp also M. Marcoff and D. Chitty in *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* 1929, p. 169 and plates II–III.

1932

P. V. C. Baur, M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, *The Excavations at Dura Europos: Preliminary Report of a Third Season of* (New Haven 1932) 69–71.
– Syriac inscription = Drijvers 63.

P. Mouterde and R. Mouterde, 'Inscriptions grecques de Souweida et de 'Āhiré', *MUSJ* 16 (1932) 102–8.
– Includes Syriac inscription on lintel of church, dated AD 547/8.

1933

C. Torrey, *The Excavations at Dura Europos: Preliminary Report of a Fourth Season* (New Haven 1933), 178–81, 229–31.
– Drijvers 63.

1934

D. C. Baramki and St. H. Stephan, 'A Nestorian hermitage between Jericho and the Jordan', *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 4 (1934) 81–6 and plates LII–LIV.

– p. 83: 9th cent. mosaic inscription with names.

E. Littmann, *Semitic Inscriptions; Section B, Syriac Inscriptions* (Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1904–5 and 1909, Division 4; Leiden, 1934).

– 65 inscriptions; the appendix provides some improved readings for inscriptions published in Littmann 1904.

P. Mouterde, 'Un ermitage melkite en Emésène au VIII^e siècle', *MUSJ* 18 (1934) 101–6.

– Ten line building inscription mentioning Patriarch Theodoret and metropolitan Leon of Homs.

1935

W. F. Stinespring, 'Jerash in the spring of 1934', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 57 (1935) 9.

– Two potsherds with one word inscription in Syriac (probably CPA).

J. Lassus, *Inventaire archéologique de la région au nord-est de Hama* (Documents d'études orientales de l'Institut français de Damas, 1935).
– nos. 58 and 88 are Syriac; no. 58 = IGLS IV, no. 1786.

1939

L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, *IGLS II, Chalcidique et Antiochène* (nos. 257–698) (Paris 1939).

– no. 310 = Kugener 1907, Littmann 1911; nos. 312–314 = Littmann 1904, nos. 24, 23, 22; no. 317 = Mouterde 1945 no. 10; no. 337 = Littmann 1904, no. 21; nos. 373, 401, 535, 555 = Littmann 1934, nos. 53, 62, 7, 65 respectively; no. 565 = Littmann 1904, no. 10.

P. Mouterde, 'Deux inscriptions jacobites (Linteau de Chypre, XVI^e siècle; pierre d'autel du Musée de Beyrouth)', *MUSJ* 22 (1939) 49–56.

P. Mouterde, 'Inscriptions en syriaque dialectal à Kamed – Beqa', *MUSJ* 22 (1939) 71–106.

– 33 inscriptions including one in Greek (IGLS VI, 2988) and one in Pehlevi; no. 10 is dated AH 96 (AD 714/5). Cp also Mouterde 1968.

1940

B. Meissner, 'Eine griechisch-syrische Bilingue aus Qal'at Sim'an', *ZDMG* 94 (1940) 372–4.

– Originally published by Lietzmann in D. Krenker, *Die Wallfahrtskirche des Simeon Stylites in Qal'at Sim'an* (Abhandlungen der preuss. Akad. Wiss. 1938, no. 4). Cp Obermann 1946.

1941

- E. Littmann, 'Zu den Inschriften von Qal'at Sim'an', *ZDMG* 95 (1941) 311–16.
– Two further inscriptions.

1942

- P. Mouterde, 'Inscription syriaque du Gebel Bil'ās', *MUSJ* 25 (1942/3) 81–6.
– Building inscription of AD 574/5 with list of names.

1945

- P. Mouterde, 'Inscriptions syriaques de haute Syrie', in R. Mouterde, *Le Limes de Chalcis* (Paris 1945) 222–7, cp 140, 176.
– 15 short inscriptions; no. 1 = Giron 1922, no. 3; no. 6 is now in the garden of the National Museum, Damascus; no. 10 = IGLS II, 317; no. 14 = Littmann 1904, no. 1.

1946

- J. Obermann, 'A composite inscription from the church of St Simeon the Stylite', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 5 (1946) 73–82.
– On Meissner 1940.

1949

- R. B. Lemaire, in S. J. Saller and B. Bagatti, *The Town of Nebo* (Jerusalem 1949) 263–8 and plate 43,2.
– CPA inscription on mosaic at el-Quweisme; see also Milik 1960a.

1951

- P. Benoit and M. E. Boismard, 'Un ancien sanctuaire chrétien à Béthanie', *Revue Biblique* 58 (1951) 200–51.
– No. 70 (p. 241) is a barely legible graffito in estrangelo; the remaining inscriptions are in Greek.

1953

- J. T. Milik, 'Une inscription et une lettre en araméen christo-palestinien', *Revue Biblique* 60 (1953) 526–39.
J. B. Segal, 'Pagan Syriac monuments in the Vilayet of Urfa', *Anatolian Studies* 3 (1953) 116.
– Note 76 on p. 116 mentions two short inscriptions in caves.

1954

- J. B. Segal, 'Some Syriac inscriptions of the 2nd–3rd century AD', *BSOAS* 16 (1954) 13–36.
– Nos. 1–13 = Drijvers 13–25; no. 14 = Drijvers 47.

1955

- L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, C. Mondesart, *IGLS IV, Laodicée, Apamène* (nos. 1243–1997) (Paris 1955).
– No. 1786 = Lassus 1935, no. 58.

1957

- M. Kamil, 'Ein syrisches Ostrakon aus dem V Jahrh.', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 32 (1957) 411–3.
– Extract from a homily in 12-syllable verse.
J. Leroy, 'Mosaiques funéraires d'Edesse', *Syria* 34 (1957) 306–42.
– Drijvers 44–7.
A. Maricq, 'Les plus anciennes inscriptions syriaques', *Syria* 34 (1957) 303–5.
– Drijvers 1–2.
J. B. Segal, 'Two Syriac inscriptions from Harran', *BSOAS* 20 (1957) 513–22.
– No. 1 = Drijvers 26.

1958

- E. Littmann, 'Deux inscriptions syriaques', in G. Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord*, III (Paris 1958) 107–8.

1959

- L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, C. Mondesart, *IGLS V, Emésène* (nos 1998–2710) (Paris 1959).
– No. 2145 = Ronzevalle 1902.
J. B. Segal, 'New Syriac inscriptions from Edessa', *BSOAS* 22 (1959) 23–40.
– No. 1 = Drijvers 48; nos. 3–6 = Drijvers 52–55; nos. 7–9 = Drijvers 49–51; nos. 10–11 = Drijvers 56–7. (No. 2 is dated AD 1159).

1960

- J. T. Milik, 'Notes d'épigraphie et de topographie jordaniennes', *Studi Bibliici Franciscani Liber Annus* 10 (1960) 159–60, 177–80 and fig. 9.
– Rereadings of two inscriptions (CPA) in Lemaire 1949 (the former originally read as Arabic).
J. T. Milik, 'Inscription araméenne christo-palestinienne de 'Abud', *Studi Bibliici Franciscani Liber Annus* 10 (1960) 197–204 and figs. 8–9.
– Eleventh century CPA inscription mentioning patriarch Theodosius and archbishop Abraham.
P. Mouterde, 'Une inscription syriaque récemment trouvée en haute Djeziré', *AAAS* 10 (1960) 87–92.
– List of monks who anathematize Phantasiasts. Now in Aleppo Museum.

1961

- K. Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts*, (Berlin 1961) 65–6.
 – No. 18 is a trilingual inscription (Armenian–Arabic–Syriac), dated AD 1218.
- J. Leroy, 'Nouvelles découvertes archéologiques relatives à Edesse', *Syria* 38 (1961) 159–69.
 – On Drijvers 49–51.
- J. Teixidor, 'Épigraphes hiérosolymitaines en syriaque estranghelo', *Revue Biblique* 68 (1961) 541–4.
 – Two fragmentary inscriptions of 8/9th century, from Jerusalem.

1962

- A. Maricq, 'La plus ancienne inscription syriaque: celle de Birecik', *Syria* 39 (1962) 88–100.
 – Drijvers 1.
- A. Maricq, 'BDR D BHY dans l'inscription de Serrin', *Syria* 39 (1962) 100–3.
 – Drijvers 2.

1963

- P. Mouterde, 'Une curieuse page d'écriture syriaque', *MUSJ* 39 (1963) 211–6.
 – Inscription of unknown provenance in 11 fragments; perhaps part of a homily.
- J. Pirenne, 'Aux origines de la graphie syriaque', *Syria* 40 (1963) 101–37.

1964

- A. Grabar, 'Un reliquaire syrien au Musée d'Istanbul', *Cahiers Archéologiques* 14 (1964) 50–3.
 – See further, Leroy 1966.

1965

- E. Jenni, 'Die altsyrischen Inschriften, 1–3 Jahrhundert', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 21 (1965) 371–85.
 – List of inscriptions; remarks on orthography, grammar and vocabulary.

1966

- J. Jarry, 'Trouvailles épigraphiques à Saint Siméon', *Syria* 43 (1966) 105–15.
 – Several very fragmentary inscriptions, apart from two, dated AD 901/2 and 735/6. See also J. Teixidor in *Syria* 45 (1968) 383, and Nasrallah 1971.

- J. Leroy, 'A propos de l'inscription syriaque du reliquaire d'Istanbul', *Cahiers Archéologiques* 16 (1966) 17–22.
 – On Grabar 1964.
- F. Vattioni, 'A propos du nom propre syriaque Gusai', *Semitica* 16 (1966) 39–41.
 – In Drijvers 46.

1967

- J. B. Segal, 'Four Syriac inscriptions', *BSOAS* 30 (1967) 293–304.
 – Nos. 1–3 = Drijvers 48, 44, 62 respectively. No. 4 is a funerary inscription of AD 1118/9.
- J. B. Segal, 'A Syriac seal inscription', *Iraq* 29 (1967) 6–15.
- J. Teixidor, in B. Bagatti, *Gli Scavi di Nazaret*, I (Jerusalem 1967) 123–5.
 – Syriac graffiti from the sanctuary of the Annunciation.

1968

- P. Mouterde, 'Trente ans après: les inscriptions de Kamed (complément)', *MUSJ* 44 (1968) 21–9.
 – See Mouterde 1939.
- J. Jarry, 'Inscriptions arabes, syriaques et grecques du Massif du Belus en Syrie du Nord', *Annales Islamologiques* 7 (1968) 139–220.
 – See Teixidor in *Syria* 48 (1971) p. 460 on no. 32.

1969

- A. D. Bivar, *Catalogue of the Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum. Stamp Seals II: The Sassanian Dynasty* (London 1969).
 – Syriac inscriptions: pp. 16 (see also Teixidor, *Syria* 48 (1971) 466), 58 (= Segal 1967b), 113.
- H. J. W. Drijvers, 'Syrische Inscripties uit de eerste drie eeuwen AD', *Phoenix* 15 (1969) 197–205.
- C. K. Wilkinson, 'Christian Remains from Nishapur', in *Forschungen zur Kunst Asiens: In Memoriam K. Erdmann* (Istanbul 1969) 79–87.
 – p. 82 and fig. 4: bowl with Syriac inscription.

1970

- J. Jarry, 'Inscriptions arabes, syriaques et grecques du Massif du Belus en Syrie du Nord', *Annales Islamologiques* 9 (1970) 187–214 (suite).
- J. Jarry, 'Inscriptions de Syrie du Nord, relevées en 1969', *Annales Islamologiques* 9 (1970) 215–21.
- G. Maiberger, 'Die syrischen Inschriften von Kamid el-Loz und die Frage der Identität von Kamid el-Loz und Kumidi', in D. O. Edzard, *Schrift-dokumente aus Kamid el Loz* (Berlin 1970) 10–21.
 – Cp Mouterde 1939 and 1968.

- A. Schall, 'Zur syrischen Inschrift am Bronzetor der Basilica San Paulo fuori le Mura in Rom', *Römische Quartalschrift* 65 (1970) 232–7.
- J. K. Stark, 'Epigraphical gleanings', *Augustinianum* 10 (1970) 398–9.
– On name in Drijvers 27.
- 1971
- J. Nasrallah, 'A propos des trouvailles épigraphiques à Saint Siméon l'Alépin', *Syria* 48 (1971) 165–78.
– On Jarry 1966.
- F. Vattioni, 'Appunti sulle iscrizioni siriane antiche', *Augustinianum* 11 (1971) 433–46.
– List of inscriptions and notes on divinities.
- 1972
- A. Abu 'Assaf, (New Syriac inscriptions in the National Museum Damascus) (In Arabic) *AAAS* 22 (1972) 135–44.
– Four inscriptions (three on mosaics) of the 5th and 6th cent.
- H. J. W. Drijvers, *Old Syriac (Edesean) Inscriptions* (Leiden, 1972) (Semitic Study Series, new series no. III).
– Texts (no translation), glossary, index of names. Reviewed by R. Degen in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 31 (1974) 393–6, and by S. P. Brock in *BSOAS* 36 (1973) 133–4.
- J. Jarry, 'Inscriptions syriaques et arabes inédites du Ṭur 'Abdin', *Annales Islamologiques* 10 (1972) 207–50.
- J. Naveh, 'The North Mesopotamian Aramaic script in the late Parthian period', *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972) 293–304.
- J. B. Segal, 'The Church of St George at Urfa (Edessa)', *BSOAS* 35 (1972) 606–9 and 36 (1973) 109.
- E. Testa, *Cafarnao. IV, I graffiti della casa di S. Pietro* (Jerusalem 1972).
– Ch. 4: I graffiti dei pellegrini di lingua paleoestrangela (pp. 111–49).
- 1973
- H. J. W. Drijvers, 'Some new Syriac inscriptions and archaeological finds from Edessa and Sumatar Harabesi', *BSOAS* 36 (1973) 1–14.
– Six inscriptions, five of which are already included in Drijvers 1972 (nos. 65, 68, 66, 67, 64). See also Segal 1973 and Teixidor in *Syria* 50 (1973) 437.
- J. B. Segal, 'Observations on a recent article on Syriac inscriptions', *BSOAS* 36 (1973) 621–2.
– On Drijvers 1973.
- F. Vattioni, 'Appunti sulle iscrizioni siriane antiche', *Augustinianum* 13 (1973) 131–40.
– On certain divinities.

- F. Vattioni, 'Le iscrizioni siriane antiche', *Augustinianum* 13 (1973) 279–338.
– Transcription and translation of texts in Drijvers.
- 1974
- R. W. Hamilton, 'Thuribles: ancient or modern?', *Iraq* 36 (1974) 53–65.
– Dedication inscription on two thuribles in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
- J. Leroy, 'Le Décor de l'église du Couvent des Syriens au Ouady Natroun (Egypte)', *Cahiers Archéologiques* 23 (1974) 151–67.
– Gives text and translation of two inscriptions in church (cp Strzygowski 1901). There are Syriac inscriptions on several of the frescoes illustrated by Leroy; cp also plates LVII–LXII, LXIV, LXXII in H. G. Evelyn White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi 'n Natrûn. Part III, The Architecture and Archaeology* (New York 1933), with pp. 169–220.
- J. Naveh, 'Remarks on two east Aramaic inscriptions', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 216 (1974) 9–11.
– New interpretation of the end of Drijvers 48.
- 1975
- L. Haerinck, 'Quelques monuments funéraires de l'île de Kharg dans le golfe Persique', *Acta Iranica* 11 (1975) 163 and plate XXXVI(b).
– Syriac inscription above tombs no 63–4 (no reading attempted).
- J. Jarry, 'Un écrivain syriaque inconnu du Ṭur 'Abdin', *Syria* 52 (1975) 131–7.
– On Jarry 1972, no. 23.
- J. Leroy, 'Découvertes de peintures chrétiennes en Syrie', *AAAS* 25 (1975) 95–113.
– Titles of scenes given in Greek and (sometimes) Syriac.
- 1976
- J. Naveh, 'Syriac miscellanea', *Atiqot* 11 (1976) 102–4 and plate XXX.
– Lintel inscription from Deir Makr, with date (6th cent.); two Byzantine lamps from same mould with Syriac inscription (*mprws*).
- 1977
- M. Bar Asher, *Palestinian Syriac Studies* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem 1977), 117–24.
– List of CPA inscriptions.

APPENDIX I

Syriac Deed of Sale from Dura Europos: P. Dura 28
(Inv.D.Pg.20) of A.D. 243 = Drijvers P.

1933

- C. C. Torrey, 'A Syriac parchment from Edessa of the year 243 AD', *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 10 (1935) 33–45, 162.
– Cp also Brockelmann, *ibid.*, p. 163.

1935

- A. R. Bellinger, C. B. Welles, 'A third-century contract of sale from Edessa in Osroene', *Yale Classical Studies* 5 (1935) 95–154, plates I–II.

1959

- C. B. Welles, R. O. Fink, J. F. Gilliam, '*The excavations at Dura Europos: Final Report V, Part I, The Parchments and Papyri* (New Haven 1959), 142–9, plates LXIX, LXXI.
– For further bibliography, see pp. 145–6; reviewed by Goldstein in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 81 (1961) 429–32.

1964

- F. Altheim, R. Stiehl, *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*, I (Berlin 1964) 614–7.

1966

- J. A. Goldstein, 'The Syriac bill of sale from Dura–Europos', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25 (1966) 1–16.

1967

- J. B. Segal, 'Four Syriac inscriptions', *BSOAS* 30 (1967) 294–5.
– On interpretation of line 13.

APPENDIX II

Syriac incantation bowls

(For wider surveys of the subject of Aramaic incantation bowls in general, see F. Rosenthal, *Die Aramaistische Forschung* (Leiden 1939 = 1964), 218–23, and E. M. Yamauchi, 'Aramaic Magic Bowls', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85 (1965) 511–23 (513 on Syriac texts).

1853

- A. H. Layard, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (London 1853) 521–2.
– The bowl illustrated includes some estrangelo characters.

1912

- J. A. Montgomery, 'A magic bowl and the original script of the Manichaean', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 32 (1912) 438–9.

1913

- J. A. Montgomery, *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur* (Philadelphia 1913).
– Includes seven in Syriac.

1916

- M. Lidzbarski, 'Die Herkunft der manichäischen Schrift', *Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad.d.Wissenschaften* 1916, 1213–22.
– Publishes a text from the Berlin Museum (VA 3383) in Estrangelo script.

1946

- A. Dupont-Sommer, *La doctrine gnostique de la lettre 'waw' d'après une lamelle araméenne inédite* (Paris 1946).
– Estrangelo script. See Gordon 1949 for a different interpretation.

1949

- C. H. Gordon, 'An incantation in Estrangelo script', *Orientalia* 18 (1949) 336–41.
– On the text published by Dupont-Sommer.

1962

- J. Teixidor, 'The Syriac incantation bowls in the Iraq Museum', *Sumer* 18 (1962) 51–62.

1971

- V. P. Hamilton, *Syriac Incantation Bowls* (Dissertation, Brandeis, 1971).

1976

- M. J. Geller, 'Two incantation bowls inscribed in Syriac and Aramaic', *BSOAS* 39 (1976) 422–7.

APPENDIX III

Syriac inscriptions from central and eastern Asia
(selection)

1886

- D. A. Chwolson, *Syrische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie* (Academia Scientiarum Imperialis, Mémoires, ser. VII, tom. XXXIV, 4; St Petersburg 1886).

270

1890

D. A. Chwolson, *Syrisch-nesorianische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie* (Academia Scientiarum Imperialis, Mémoires, ser. VII, tom. XXXVII,3; St Petersburg 1890).

1897

D. A. Chwolson, *Syrisch-nesorianische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie*. Neue Folge. (St Petersburg 1897).

– On Chwolson 1886, 1890, 1897, see J. Dauvillier, ‘Les provinces chaldéennes de l’extérieur au moyen âge’, in *Mélanges au R. P. Ferdinand Cavallera* (Toulouse 1948), 291 note 131, and for Russian literature on the subject see Dzumagulov 1968. Tables of names in Chabot 1906.

1906

J. B. Chabot, ‘Contribution à l’onomastique syriaque’, *Journal Asiatique* 10,8 (1906) 286–93.

1913

F. Nau, ‘Les pierres tombales nestorianes du Musée Guimet’, *Revue de l’Orient Chrétien* 18 (1913) 1–35, 325–7.

1938

D. Martin, ‘Preliminary report on Nestorian remains north of Kuei-hua, Suiyüan’, *Monumenta Serica* 3 (1938) 232–49.

– Including some inscriptions in Syriac script, but shown by K. Groenbech (*Monumenta Serica* 4 (1939/40) 305–7) to be in Turkish.

1951

P. Y. Saeki, *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China* (Tokyo, 1951).

– For the Syriac text of the famous Hsi-an fu stele, see pp. 68–77; a select bibliography of earlier works is given on pp. 78–9.

1954

J. Foster, ‘Crosses from the walls of Zaitun’, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1954, 1–25.

– 18 inscribed tombstones, one of which is in Syriac.

L. Hambis, ‘Notes sur quelques sceaux-amulettes nestoriens en bronze’, *Bulletin de l’école française de l’extrême orient* 44 (1954) 483–525.

1964

K. Enoki, ‘The Nestorian Christianity in China in medieval time according to recent historical and archaeological researches’, in *L’Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà* (Accademia dei Lincei, Rome 1964), 45–83.

Syriac Inscriptions

271

– Includes an appendix by S. Murayama, ‘Ueber die nestorianischen Grabinschriften in den innern Mongolei und in Südchina’, pp. 77–80.

1968

C. Dzumagulov, ‘Die syrisch-türkischen (nesorianischen) Denkmäler in Kirgisien’, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 14 (1968) 470–80.

1971

A. Bürke, ‘Das nestorianer-Denkmal von Si-an-fu. Versuch einer Neuübersetzung’, *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* Supplement 17 (1971) 125–41.

1972

J. Hamilton, ‘Le texte turc en caractères syriaques du grand sceau cruciforme de Mar Yahballaha III’, *Journal Asiatique* 260 (1972) 155–70.

1975

T. Jansma, ‘The establishment of the four quarters of the universe in the symbol of the cross. A trace of an Ephraemic conception in the Nestorian inscription of Hsi-an fu?’, *Studia Patristica* 13 = *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Berlin) 116 (1975) 204–9.

Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources

Syriac Christianity draws on three main cultural traditions, Jewish, Greek and ancient Mesopotamian. In the fourth century literature it is the first and third of these traditions that are most prominent, while from the fifth century onwards the prestige of Greek culture ensured that the influence of that tradition rapidly became the predominant one, at the expense of the other two. Nevertheless, as we shall see, Jewish tradition continued to exert an influence on Syriac literature well into the Islamic period. The presence of such traditions has often been noted, but no general survey of the phenomenon as a whole has, it appears, ever been offered. This paper represents a preliminary attempt to fill this gap, and our main aim here will be to isolate the most important areas in which such traditions are to be found, and at the same time to indicate some of the problems, chiefly of transmission and date, that surround the subject.

At the outset it will be convenient to provide a preliminary classification: Jewish traditions are to be found in the following four main areas of Syriac literature:¹

- (1) incorporated into the actual Syriac translations of Old Testament books, most obviously in the Pentateuch and Chronicles;
- (2) targumic traditions known to early Syriac writers but absent from the extant Peshitta text of the Bible;
- (3) apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of Jewish origin (which in some cases survive only in Syriac);
- (4) certain types of Syriac literature, notably of course commentaries, but also poetry, chronicles, and Old Testament 'hagiography' (I include here only traditions not mediated by 1-3).

We shall consider each of these in turn.

1. *The Syriac Bible*

In the course of the long drawn out controversy over the authorship, Jewish or Christian, of the Peshitta Old Testament many examples of the inclusion of specific Jewish traditions have been adduced.² To-day one can see that, in the case of the Pentateuch, the presence of such traditions will for the most part be

due to the background of the Peshitta Pentateuch in the Palestinian Targum tradition,³ even though the precise relationship of the Peshitta to the extant targumim, Babylonian (Onkelos) as well as Palestinian, is still a matter of uncertainty.⁴

The Peshitta Pentateuch is by no means the only section of the Syriac Bible where Jewish traditions are to be found, and notable examples can be adduced in particular from Peshitta Chronicles, and even in the Syriac New Testament there are elements which reflect a specifically Judaeo-Christian background.⁵ Our examination here, however, will be confined to the two most striking areas, the Peshitta Pentateuch and Chronicles, and Jewish traditions in these books can be divided into the following categories:

- (a) passages where the Peshitta simply follows the whole, or part, of the Targum tradition;
- (b) passages where the Peshitta exhibits targumic characteristics which happen to be absent from the extant targumim;
- (c) passages where the Peshitta attests a midrashic tradition, absent from the extant targumim but known from other Jewish sources;
- (d) passages where the Peshitta's interpretation has no direct parallel in Jewish sources, but which may nevertheless still be of Jewish origin.

These four categories can best be illustrated by means of specific examples.⁶

(a) *Peshitta follows Targum*

Agreement between Peshitta and Targum can take on a number of different forms; one of the more obvious ones consists in the 'updating' of certain toponyms, such as:

Gen.8:4, H Ararat, but P T Qardu.

³ For a good survey of the work by Baumstark, Peters, Vööbus and others in this field, see C.van Puyvelde in *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément VI* (1960), cols. 837-43.

⁴ That there are links with Onkelos as well as with the Palestinian Targum tradition was shown by P. Wernberg-Møller, *Studia Theologica* 15 (1961), pp. 128-80, and *Journal of Semitic Studies* 7 (1962), pp. 253-66. M.D. Koster, in his recent *The Peshitta of Exodus* (Assen, 1977), pp. 164-212, plays down the links between Peshitta and Targumim; see, however, my review in *JTS* ns 29 (1978), pp. 549-51. I have not yet been able to see Y. Maori, *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch in its Relation to the Sources of Jewish Exegesis* (Diss. Jerusalem, 1975).

⁵ Especially in the Old Syriac; some examples will be found in F.C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* (Cambridge, 1904) II, pp.80-4. The claims of Torrey and Black (see the latter's *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3rd edition (Oxford, 1967), pp. 281-6) that the Old Syriac includes western Aramaic elements going back to Palestinian oral tradition is implausible on linguistic grounds; cp K. Beyer, 'Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der ältesten syrischen Literatur', *ZDMG* 116 (1966), pp.242-54.

⁶ The following abbreviations are used: MT = Masoretic text; P = Peshitta; T = Targum (unless otherwise specified, for the Pentateuch T = Neofiti (N), Onkelos (O) and Pseudo-Jonathan (PsJ)).

¹ Compare R. Murray's helpful classification in his *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1975), p.280.

² Among older works J. Perles, *Meletemata Peschitoniana* (Bratislav, 1859) deserves special mention.

Several localisations of the site of the Ark's landing were current around the turn of the Christian era, and this particular one appears to have been widespread (cp Josephus, *Ant.* 1.93 (Berossus)). Awareness of this tradition is, incidentally still alive in the region around Mt Qardu (Judi Dagh) in north Iraq. The Peshitta concurs with Targum Jonathan in making the same identification of Ararat in Isaiah 37:38 (but not in the parallel 2 Kings 19:37).

Gen.14:7, H Hazazon-tamar, but P T En Geddi.

Deut. 1:46, H Qadesh, but P T Reqem.

1 Chr. 13:5 H Hamath, but P T Antioch.

Another important area of agreement between Peshitta and Targum lies in the matter of specifically 'targumic' phraseology⁷. This is present in the Peshitta Pentateuch and Chronicles both in places where it is also found in the extant targumim, and in passages where the extant targumim do not happen to attest the phraseology (this applies especially to Chronicles). The following are some examples of the former of these two categories (for the latter, see (b) below).

Where in Hebrew *eth* introduces God as the direct object, the Peshitta sometimes follows the Targum in employing the preposition *qedam*, 'before': e.g.

Ex. 3:12

MT *ta'avedun eth ha-'elohim*

P *teflehon qedam 'alaha* 'you shall serve before God'

T *tiflehun qedam ywy.*

The preposition *qedam* features in a number of other contexts as well, e.g.

2 Chr.14:10

MT *wayyiqra . . . 'el yhwh*

P *weṣalli . . . qedam marya* 'and he prayed before the Lord'

T *weṣalli . . . qedam yhwh.*

2 Chr. 15:1

MT *hayethah 'alaw ruah 'elohim*

P *sherath 'alaw ruha men qedam marya* 'there rested upon him the spirit from before the Lord'

T *sherath 'aloi ruh nevu'ah min qedam yhwh.*⁸

The Hebrew phrase 'and God appeared to . . .' is generally altered in the

⁷ Needless to say, agreements between P and T are by a long way outnumbered by places where P does not exhibit this characteristic phraseology.

⁸ According to J.P. Schäfer (*VT* 20 (1970), pp.304-14) 'spirit of prophecy' is characteristic of Onkelos over against 'holy spirit' of the Palestinian targumim (PsJ employs both); but *ruh nevu* is found in a recently published Genizah fragment (*Augustinianum* 9 (1969), pp. 122-3), as well as several times in N^mg (cp also A. Diez Macho in *Neophiti I: III, Levitico* (Barcelona, 1971), pp. 52*-55*). 'Spirit of prophecy' occurs occasionally in Syriac, e.g. Ephrem, *Comm. Diatessaron* XXI.6.

targumim to 'and God/ the Lord was revealed to/ over . . .'; several examples of this are to be found in the Peshitta Pentateuch and Chronicles,⁹ e.g.

Gen.18:1

MT *wayyera 'elaw yhwh*

P *we'ethgeli 'alaw marya* 'and the Lord was revealed over him'

T(PsJ) *we-'ethgeli 'alohi 'iqara de Y¹⁰*

T(O) *we'-ithgele leh ywy.*

2 Chr. 1:7

MT *nir'ah 'elohim lishelomoh*¹¹

P *'ethgeli marya 'al sheleymon* 'the Lord was revealed over Solomon'

T *'ithgele yhwh lishelomoh.*

The phraseology *'ethgeli 'al* is also occasionally found in quotations of the Pentateuch by early Syriac writers even in passages where it is absent from the Peshitta and Targum texts of the passages in question; for an example, see below, p.219.

Another targumic characteristic involves the use of the term *shekhina*, e.g.

2 Chr. 6:2

MY *makhon leshivtekha*

P *dukketha la-shekhintakh* 'a place for your shekhina'

T *'athar methaqqan l-veth shekhintakh.*

2 Chr.7:1

MT *kevod yhwh*

P *'iqara da-shekhinteh d-marya* 'the honour of the shekhina of the Lord'

T *'iqar shekhinteh d-yhwh.*

(b) *Peshitta has targumic characteristics where extant targum has none.*

There are a number of places, especially in Chronicles, where the Peshitta exhibits traits characteristic of the targumim even in passages from which these traits happen to be absent in the extant targumim. In view of the examples quoted in (a) above there can be little doubt that the Peshitta is representing genuine relics of a lost targum tradition.

Whereas the Peshitta Pentateuch is fairly restrained in its identifications

⁹ And elsewhere (e.g. I Kings 3:5, 9:2).

¹⁰ This example is actually uncharacteristic of the situation in the Pentateuch, since PsJ elsewhere always conforms with O's construction, using *l-*, whereas N (here different) normally employs *'al* (for which compare MT Zech. 9:14). In Gen. P usually agrees with N, whereas in Ex. P=N at Ex. 3:16, P=O at Ex.6:3, while elsewhere it employs the verb *'ethhezi* (in Gen., where God is subject, P has this only at 26:2).

¹¹ The same difference between P and T is also found in the parallel I Kings 3:5 (MT 'el).

and updating of place names, Peshitta Chronicles often goes considerably further than the extant (fairly late) targum, e.g.

- 1 *Chr.*18:5 MT T Soba, but P Nisibis.
 1 *Chr.*19:6 MT T Aram Maacah, but P Harran.
 2 *Chr.*35:20 MT T Carchemish, but P Mabbug.

As we shall see in (2) below, the early Syriac commentators, in particular Ephrem, go beyond the extant text of the Peshitta in their knowledge of some of the identifications made in the Pentateuch targumim.

In phraseology, too, the Peshitta sometimes exhibits typical targumic features which do not appear in the extant targum of the particular passage in question, e.g.

2 *Chr.*22:7

MY *meshaho yhwh*

P *de-'ethmeshah men qadam marya* 'who was anointed from before the Lord'

T *de-rabbeyeh . . .*

(c) *Peshitta represents a midrashic tradition absent from the extant targum.*

There are several instances of this phenomenon in Chronicles, and I quote but a single example:

2 *Chr.*33:7

MT *wayyaseh 'eth pesel hassemel*

P *wesameh le-šalma d-'arba' appin* 'and he placed the image of four faces'

T *we-'aqim yath pesel šurta . . .*

The Peshitta thus specifies the idol which Manasseh placed in the Temple as 'four-faced'. This tradition, absent from targum Chronicles, is known from *Deuteronomy Rabba* (on 3:5) and BT *Sanhedrin* 103b, while a variant one, where the idol has five faces, is to be found in *Apoc. Baruch* 64:3.¹²

(d) *Peshitta's interpretation is without direct parallel.*

With this category it is of course impossible to be certain whether the tradition represented is Jewish or not; in the case of the two examples given below this seems to me to be likely.

*Gen.*4:8a

MT —

P *peqa'ta* 'valley'

T *haqla/barra*

LXX *pedion.*

That the murder of Abel took place in a *valley* is of great importance in Syriac tradition and probably at a very early date this was tied up with the interpretation of the *bene 'elohim* of Gen. 6:2 as the Sethites (see below, (4)). The choice of the word 'valley' in fact implies a particular topographical tradition where Paradise is a mountain. In the Syriac understanding of this tradition Adam and Eve live on the foothills of the mountain after their expulsion from Paradise, while Cain's dastardly action takes place in the valley below. The concept of Paradise as a mountain¹³ is of course an old one (as well as being familiar from Dante); in early Jewish literature it is represented in Ezekiel and Enoch (but *not* Genesis), and it can be traced back to ancient Mesopotamia. The Peshitta is thus the sole version to introduce it implicitly into the Genesis text.

Ephrem interestingly enough deduces from the word 'valley' in the Peshitta here that Abel and Cain's sacrifice took place 'on a mountain';¹⁴ this actually conforms with Pseudo-Jonathan at Gen.8:20, which identifies the place of their sacrifice as Mt Moriah (Moriah — identified of course as the Temple mount — is also, according to Pseudo-Jonathan, the place where Adam and Eve dwell after their banishment from the Garden of Eden).¹⁵

2 *Chron.*31:18-19

The Peshitta has an intriguing gloss on the statement that Hezekiah's priests 'were faithful in keeping themselves holy': it adds the following words:

For the sons of Aaron the priest were holy (*qaddishin*);

their flesh was holy and they did not approach women.

In early Syriac literature the term *qaddisha*, besides meaning 'holy', can have the technical sense of 'continent', and it is used of married couples who abstain from sexual intercourse (whereas *bethule*, 'virgins', is reserved for celibates).¹⁶ The background of this specialized meaning of *qaddisha* is clearly Exod. 19, where, in verse 10, God tells Moses to 'sanctify the people', which is interpreted by Moses in verse 15 as 'do not go near a woman' (Targum Neofiti: 'Do not draw near for the use of the bed'). Although this ideal was clearly current

¹³ For Syriac, see especially N. Sed, 'Les hymnes sur le Paradis de saint Ephrem et les traditions juives', *Le Muséon* 81 (1968), pp. 455-501, and R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, pp. 306-10.

¹⁴ *Comm. Gen.* III.5 and *Sermones* (ed. Beck) IV, p.35 line 22.

¹⁵ PsJ Gen. 3:23.

¹⁶ It would appear that membership of the earliest Syriac-speaking Christian community (called the *qeyama*, 'covenant') was restricted to *bethule* and *qaddishin*; cp A. Vööbus, *Celibacy a requirement for admission to baptism in the early Syrian Church* (Stockholm, 1951).

¹² Cp P. Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse de Baruch* (Sources chrétiennes 144;1969), pp.304-9.

in some circles within Judaism,¹⁷ there appear to be no clear instances where *qaddisha* has this technical sense in Jewish texts. In this connection Guillaumont has made the attractive suggestion that the link made by Philo between the name Essene and the Greek *hosiotēs* may have specifically had in mind Essene celibacy.¹⁸ Since there are several elements in Peshitta Chronicles which point to a Jewish origin of the translation (quite apart from its targumic background),¹⁹ it is tempting to suppose that the technical sense of *qaddisha* in 2 Chron. 31 is a feature that is genuinely Jewish, as well.

2. Targumic traditions and phraseology known to early Syriac writers but absent from the Peshitta.

It is possible that in many of the cases which fall into this category the text of the Peshitta may once have contained the wording in question; indeed in a few cases the words are actually found as a variant in some Peshitta manuscripts. We may commence with such an instance.

*Gen. 49:10b*²⁰

MT 'ad ki yavo' shiloh

P 'adamma d-nethe man d-dileh (h)ji 'until there comes he to whom it belongs'.

Some dozen manuscripts (the earliest of which is the margin of a ninth-century lectionary) add *malkutha*, and this reading was already known to Aphrahat and Ephrem in the fourth century, even though it may not have reached them as part of their official Syriac biblical text (thus Jansma). *Malkutha* is well known in the targum tradition, featuring in both N and O (Ps J *malka meshiha*).

Awareness of certain targum traditions would appear to be quite common in Aphrahat and Ephrem (in particular in his *Genesis Commentary*). We saw in 1(a) that the Peshitta knows of some of the updatings of biblical toponyms to be found in the targum tradition; Ephrem clearly knew yet others in his

¹⁷ See for example PsJ at Num. 12:1-2, or *Gen. Rabba* 34,7 (Noah in the Ark). According to the *Anakephalosis* of Epiphanius' *Panarion*, the Pharisees preserved 'virginity and *engkrateia*', where the Syriac translation renders the second word by *qaddishuta* (see my 'Some Syriac accounts of the Jewish sects', in ed. R.H. Fischer, *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus* (Chicago, 1977), p.272).

¹⁸ A. Guillaumont, 'A propos du celibat des Esséniens', in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), pp. 395-404. Note also the use of the term *qaddisha* for angels, in connection with the statement of Mark 12:25 = Matt. 20:30 = Luke 20:35-6 about the anticipation of the marriageless life of angels on earth; cp also IQSa II.8 and IQHod III.19-23 (with Delcor's comments in *Les Hymnes de Qumran* (Paris, 1962), pp. 126-7).

¹⁹ Cp L. Haefeli, *Die Peschitta des Alten Testaments* (AT Abhandlungen XI.1; 1927), pp.28-30. Note also the rendering of P at 2 Chron.6:18: MT 'will God dwell with man?', but P 'the Lord has caused his Shekhina to rest with his people Israel'.

²⁰ This has been discussed in particular by A. Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs* (Stockholm, 1958), pp.25-7; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, pp.282-4; and T. Jansma in *Parole de l'Orient* 4 (1973), pp.247-56.

comments on Gen. 10:10-11, where he provides the following identifications:²¹

Arakh = Edessa

Achar = Nisibis

Kalya = Qtesiphon

Rahboth = Ḥadyab (Adiabene)

Kalah = Ḥatra

Rasan = Resh'aina

Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan have identical equations for the first four.

Early Syriac writers sometimes quote passages from the Pentateuch using phraseology characteristic of the targumim, but which nevertheless is absent from the Peshitta (and sometimes the extant targumim as well), e.g.

Gen. 4:9

MT = P = T 'And God said to Cain',

but both Ephrem *C.Gen.* III.6 and the Syriac *Life of Abel* §12²² (probably fifth century) have 'and God was revealed over him' (*w-ethgeli 'alaw 'alaha*). It is difficult to know how best to explain such a state of affairs.

In several places Ephrem's biblical text, as quoted in his *Commentary on Genesis*, conforms with the Targum tradition against the extant Peshitta manuscripts; the following are some instances where Ephrem's whole exegesis of a passage depends precisely on the Targum wording not to be found in the Peshitta:

Gen.9:22

Ham, on seeing Noah's nakedness (as a result of his drinking wine), tells his brothers *outside*. The Peshitta curiously has nothing corresponding to MT *mi-ḥuṣ*, but the biblical text quoted by Ephrem (*C.Gen.* VII.1-2) evidently had *b-shuqa*, 'in the street', and this is used as evidence in support of Ephrem's ingenious contention that the episode of Noah's drunkenness took place some time after the Flood had abated (if there was a street, there must have been a town, and towns are not built overnight) — a fact of some importance for Ephrem who claims that Noah's drunkenness was not due to over-indulgence or never having tasted wine before, but to his not having had any for at least six or seven years. Although there appear to be no extant Jewish parallels to this intriguing piece of exegesis, the wording *b-shuqa* does indeed feature in the targumim (N, O, PsJ).

Gen.22:13

The ram at the Aqedah is caught on a branch (*sawketha*) in the Peshitta, and no variant is recorded. Ephrem in his *Commentary* (XX.3), however,

²¹ I give the Peshitta forms of the names (Achar = MT Akkad).

²² Ed. Brock, *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), pp.467-92.

knows only the wording *b-'ilana*, 'in a tree', identical with the targumim (N, O, Ps.J). It says much for the conservatism of the later Syriac tradition of commentators that a ninth-century writer such as Isho'dad of Merv still quotes the passage with the wording *b-'ilana*, against the Peshitta text.²³

After quoting the passage Ephrem goes on to give a tradition that once again appears to have no parallel in extant Jewish sources: 'The mountain burst out with the tree, and the tree with the ram'.²⁴ This curious *haggadah* features in several later Syriac texts,²⁵ some of which go on to use it as a type for the virgin birth of Christ.²⁶

In the next two examples it is just Ephrem's comment which implies awareness of Jewish exegetical traditions.

Gen. 15:13

God tells Abraham 'your descendants will be sojourners in a land that is not theirs'. Ephrem comments as follows (*C.Gen. XII.2*): 'There are some who say that it was because of Abraham's doubt that this was said to him', and he goes on to refute this point of view. Pseudo-Jonathan has precisely this interpretation in *Gen.15:13*, *ḥelaf d-la hayment*, 'because you did not believe'.

Gen.17:17

On being told that he would have a child in his old age, Abraham 'fell on his face and laughed'. Ephrem glosses the Peshitta's 'laughed' with the words 'that is, was astounded' (*tehar leh*). This represents the Palestinian targum tradition, where Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan render 'laugh' of the Hebrew by *temah*, 'was amazed' (Onkelos provides a different exegetical tradition, 'rejoiced').

It would not be difficult to adduce further examples of this nature.²⁷

We may conclude this section with three phrases, 'second death', 'the evil *yeşer* or inclination', and 'garment of glory / light', to be found in Syriac literature (the last is very common), all of which certainly have their roots in targumic tradition.

'Second death'

The Edessene martyr Shemona (died c.306) tells the local governor conducting his case 'We (Shemona and Gurya) are dying for the name of Jesus

²³ Ed. J. Vosté and C. van den Eynde in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, scr.syri 67, p.175 line 4.

²⁴ Though it would seem to be related to the tradition that the ram was one of the ten things created at the beginning of creation.

²⁵ Ephrem (ed. Beck), *Sermo I de Genetrice Dei*, lines 417-8, and *Hymni de Maria* (ed. Lamy) IX.3; anonymous poem on the Aqedah (ed. Kirschner, *Oriens Christianus* 6 (1906), p.62 stanza 42; Jacob of Serugh (ed. Bedjan) II, p.150, and *apud* Bedjan, *Sahdona*, pp.750,796; Moshe b-Kepha, *Homily on the Nativity* (Harvard syr.41, t.32a).

²⁶ It is, however, unlikely that the 'event' created the 'type' in this case.

²⁷ E.g. most recently A. Guillaumont, 'Un Midrash d'Exode 4,24-26 chez Aphraate et Ephrem de Nisibe', in *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus*, pp.89-95.

our Saviour, so that we may be delivered from the *second death* which lasts for ever'. Although the phrase is rather rare, several Syriac writers, including both Aphrahat and Ephrem,²⁸ use it to denote condemnation to Gehenna at the final judgement, as opposed to the 'first death' (not that this phrase appears to be used) at physical death; as such it serves as a counterbalance to 'second birth', or baptism.

This phrase, 'second death', referring to the final 'death' of sinners, consisting in either their condemnation to Gehenna at the final resurrection, or their exclusion from that resurrection, occurs several times in the targumim²⁹ (but never, it seems, in the Peshitta). According to McNamara, it does not turn up elsewhere in Jewish literature until rather late (e.g. *Pirqe d-Rabbi Eliezer*).³⁰ In Christian literature it is indeed to be found in the Apocalypse (2:11 etc), but this cannot have been the mediary by which it reached Syriac writers of the fourth century, Aphrahat and Ephrem, since the Apocalypse was not known to the Syriac-speaking church until the fifth or sixth century.

'Evil Inclination'

Although the well-known rabbinic doctrine of the two inclinations does not, to my knowledge, turn up in Syriac literature, the term *yaşra bisha*, or just *yaşra*, with the same pejorative sense, does occur in several writers.³¹ The source is clearly the Peshitta text of Gen. 6:5 (cp. 8:21): 'and the entire inclination (*yaşra*) of the thought of man's heart became daily worse'.

'Robe of glory / light'

A very popular theme with early Syriac poets, Ephrem, Jacob of Serugh, Narsai and others, is the 'robe of glory' or the 'robe of light': this robe served as the original raiment of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden before the Fall; at the Fall they were stripped of this robe, but it is regarded as having been put on again by Christians at their baptism.³² The following are some typical passages:

²⁸ Aphrahat, *Dem.* VII.25 (*Patr.Syr.* I, col.356), VIII.19 (col. 396); Ephrem, *C.Nisibena* XLIII.15.6; LXXIII.8.4; H. *Abraham Qidunaya* XIII.17.1; 19.1 (Ephrem also speaks of 'hidden death' with the same sense); *Nachträge* (ed. Beck), p.39 line 42; Jacob of Serugh, *Letters* (ed. Ollender), p.100; Philoxenus, *Homilies* (ed. Budge), p.354 line 23; *Fenqitho* V, p.304a; Ps.Dionysius, *Chronicle* (ed. Chabot) II, p.86 line 12.

²⁹ E.g. Fragment Targum Deut. 33:6; Isaiah 65:6.

³⁰ *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Analecta Biblica 27; 1966), pp.117-25.

³¹ *Yaşra bisha: Acts of Thomas* (ed. Wright) p.240; Cyrus of Edessa (ed. Macomber) pp.84,181; Jacob of Serugh, (*apud* Bedjan, *Sahdona*) p.635; Barsauma of Nisibis (ed. Braun) p.91; Iohannan bar Penkaye (ed. Mingana) p.95*. *Yaşra* alone, (in a bad sense): Cyrus of Edessa, p.86; Shem'un d-Taybutheh (ed. Mingana) pp. 296,306-7.

³² For details, see my *The Holy Spirit in Syrian Baptismal Tradition* (Syrian Churches Series IX; 1979 (Kottayam, India)), pp.48-52.

With radiance (*ziwa*) and glory was Adam clothed at the beginning, before he sinned; the Evil one was envious, led Eve astray and had Adam ejected from Paradise: he was then covered by fig leaves in place of the glory with which he had been clothed³³. . . .
 . . . priest, pontiff and king did the Lord make Adam when he created him.³⁴

or,

Christ came to find Adam who had gone astray,
 to return him to Eden in the garment of light.³⁵

Or again, the baptized are told:

The robe of glory that was stolen away among the trees
 have you put on in the baptismal water.³⁶

Adam and Eve's loss of this garment is adumbrated in the work known as the *Apocalypse of Moses*³⁷, part of the once extensive literature on Adam and Eve that certainly had its roots in Judaism. Actually it is possible to pinpoint the exact place from which the tradition of the 'robe of glory/light' comes from:³⁸ it is Gen. 3:21, where the Hebrew has *kothnoth* 'or, 'garments of skin', and the passage is normally interpreted as referring to their clothing *after* the Fall. There are, however, traces of an early Jewish tradition according to which the verse was taken to refer to their clothing *before* the Fall, and that this clothing was of a supernatural character. One relic of this tradition is preserved in the rendering of the phrase in question by the targumim as *levushin d-'iqar*, while another is to be found in the statement that Rabbi Meir had a copy of the Torah with the reading *kothnoth* 'or, 'garments of light'.³⁹ Although the rendering of the targumim is normally interpreted in rabbinic traditions as referring to after the Fall, with the 'garments of glory/honour' identified as priestly garments (in due course transmitted to Seth), originally it can only have referred to his pre-Fall clothing, and will have corresponded to the Akkadian *šubat bašti*, 'robe of splendour', lost by Ishtar during her descent to the underworld at the seventh gate.⁴⁰

³³ Cp P Ps.8:6 (quoted below).

³⁴ Anonymous *sughitha* in the Maronite Breviary (1876 edition, p.403-4).

³⁵ Ephrem, *H. Virg.* XVI.9; see also his *Comm. Diat.* XVI.10.

³⁶ Jacob of Serugh (ed. Bedjan) I, p.209.

³⁷ §20 (Tischendorf, *Apoc. Apocryphae*, p.11).

³⁸ See J.Z. Smith, 'The Garments of Shame', *History of Religions* 5 (1965/6), pp.217-38, and my 'Some aspects of Greek words in Syriac', *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 96 (1975), pp. 98-104.

³⁹ *Genesis Rabba* 20.12.

⁴⁰ On the *šubat bašti* see D. Freedman, 'Šubūt bašti: a Robe of Splendor', *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 4 (1972), pp.91-5, and the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* s.v. *baštu*.

As far as Syriac writers are concerned, there is no evidence of any awareness that the phrases 'robe of glory' and 'robe of light' ever had anything to do with the exegesis of Gen. 3:21, and so the tradition of their being the pre-Fall garments must have passed from Judaism to Christianity in a context no longer directly connected with the biblical text of Genesis. As a matter of fact the idea would appear to be already embedded into other parts of the Syriac bible, for the Peshitta of Psalm 8:6 reads 'You created man a little less than the angels, in honour and glory did you *clothe* him' (MT, LXX, T 'crown'), and in the Peshitta text of Daniel the seer's angelic interlocutor also wears 'garments of glory' (Dan. 10:5, 12:7)⁴¹.

It was perhaps by way of early Syriac Christianity that the phrase 'robe of glory/light' passed to Manichaean and Mandaean literature, in both of which it enjoyed a great vogue.

3 Traditions available in Syriac translations of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.⁴²

In discussing this category it is of basic importance to know at what date particular works reached Syriac. It can be assumed that the standard Old Testament 'apocrypha' were translated into Syriac at an early date, and with the single exception of Ben Sira these were made from Greek.

Other early translations will include IV Esdras and the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, both preserved in a unique biblical manuscript of the sixth/seventh century (7al of the Leiden Peshitta). Both style of translation and possible allusions (at least to IV Esdras) in Ephrem point to an early date for the Syriac translation of these works.

In a few cases the names and/or dates of the translators are actually known. This applies, for example, to the Syriac translation of *Joseph and Aseneth*, incorporated into the *Ecclesiastical History* of Ps. Zacharias Rhetor (chapter 6 of Book I): as we learn from the prefatory correspondence, *Joseph and Aseneth* was translated in the early sixth century by Moses of Aggel from 'an old Greek manuscript' found by a correspondent of his at Aleppo. In the seventh century the famous polymath Jacob of Edessa included several pseudepigrapha (e.g. the *History of the Rechabites*) among his translations from Greek.

A comparatively late entry into Syriac is documented for the Five Apocryphal Psalms, three of which are now known in Hebrew from 11QP:

⁴¹ Likewise the righteous are clothed with glory in P Ps. 132:9, 16; cp Enoch 62:15-16; 108:12. In Ben Sira 50:11 the 'robe of glory' is the priestly robe of Aaron and Simon; the terminology will be derived from Adam's priesthood (familiar to both Jewish and Christian tradition).

⁴² For bibliographical details of the Syriac translations, see A.M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudepigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden, 1970) (second edition in preparation).

These were almost certainly translated in the late eighth century, the result of a discovery of 'more than two hundred psalms of David' near Jericho, described in a now famous letter by the East Syrian catholicos, Timothy I.⁴³

Much more problematic is the case of books like Enoch and Jubilees. Neither survives complete in Syriac. Enoch is quoted several times by the twelfth century chronicler Michael, but it seems likely that he knew the work only in extracts derived ultimately from early Byzantine world chronicles (not all his excerpts in fact turn out to be from I Enoch).⁴⁴ Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the Enoch literature was popular with the Manichaeans, one should leave open the possibility that the work might also have been known in Syriac as well at an early date, only to disappear subsequently from sight (this was the case, for example, with a New Testament pseudepigraph, III Corinthians).

Jubilees poses an even more complicated problem. Extant in Syriac we have a list of the patriarchs' wives 'according to the book called Jubilees among the Hebrews', an account parallel to Jubilees 11-12 quoted by Jacob of Edessa (died 708) in his letter 13, to John of Litarba, and extensive extracts incorporated into the anonymous chronicle *ad annum 1234*. The list of the patriarchs' wives may have reached Syriac indirectly, by way of Epiphanius; Jacob's letter includes a narrative corresponding to Jubilees 11 (on Abraham and the ravens), but using a different chronological schema which must in fact be earlier than that in Jubilees (Jacob says that the extract in question is to be found in 'Jewish histories').⁴⁵ The passages from Jubilees in the thirteenth-century chronicle were studied by Tisserant,⁴⁶ who came to the conclusion that the Syriac was probably translated from Hebrew rather than Greek; the grounds for this supposition, however, are very weak, and it would seem much more likely that these extracts reached the chronicler by way of a lost Greek chronicler.⁴⁷

Of completely unknown date are the Syriac translations of some other pseudepigrapha such as the *Psalms of Solomon*, excerpts from the *Testament of Adam* and the *Lives of the Prophets*. The same applies to a recently edited Daniel apocalypse which survives only in Syriac.⁴⁸

⁴³ Published by O. Braun in *Oriens Christianus* 1 (1901), pp. 300-19 (Letter 47).

⁴⁴ See *JTS* ns 19 (1968), pp.626-31.

⁴⁵ The letter was published by W. Wright in *Journal of Sacred Literature* ns 10 (1867), pp.4*-5*; French translation by F.Nau in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 10 (1905), pp.198-208. See my 'Abraham and the Ravens', *JSJ* 9 (1978), pp.135-52.

⁴⁶ *Revue Biblique* 30 (1921), pp.55-86, 206-32.

⁴⁷ Only some of the excerpts correspond to those transmitted in the extant Greek chronicle tradition.

⁴⁸ Ed. H.Schmoldt, *Die Schrift 'vom jungen Daniel' und 'Daniels letzte Vision'* (Diss. Hamburg, 1972).

The case of the *Prayer of Manasseh* is intriguing, for the Syriac translation of this work comes down in two different recensions, the earlier incorporated into the *Didascalia*, which according to some scholars, is a very early translation into Syriac;⁴⁹ the later, however, which consists of a revision of the first, was made when the Greek Horologion was translated into Syriac in the tenth century for the Melkite community of Syria/Palestine.

4. *Jewish Traditions in native Syriac literature.*

This area is in many ways the most intriguing, and for the most part there appear to be no clear means for judging just how these traditions were transmitted. It will be convenient to divide the material chronologically into three main periods:

- (a) fourth century literature (Aphrahat and Ephrem);
- (b) literature of the fifth to early seventh century;
- (c) literature of the Islamic period.

The break between (b) and (c) is probably of greater significance than that between (a) and (b).

(a) *Fourth century literature*

Jewish traditions are to be found in considerable number in the two great Syriac writers of the fourth century, Aphrahat and Ephrem,⁵⁰ and only a few characteristic examples can be quoted here.

In his fourth *Demonstration* on Prayer (IV.2) Aphrahat explains how Abel and Cain knew that the former's sacrifice had been accepted and the latter's rejected: fire had descended on Abel's and consumed it. This tradition, familiar to several Syriac writers (including Ephrem, *Comm.Gen.*III.3), is first attested in the Greek biblical translation of Theodotion, where at Gen.4:4 *wayyisha'* is rendered by *kai enepurisen*.⁵¹ If the Theodotion here is to be identified (as seems quite likely) with the author of the pre-Aquila hebraizing revision of the Septuagint isolated by Barthélemy, then we have an early Jewish witness to this particular tradition; this is a factor of some importance

⁴⁹ I.e. 4th century, on the grounds that the translation appears to have been known to Aphrahat; this, however, is not entirely certain, and the style of the translation would seem to me to rule out such an early date (in particular the appearance of Greek verbs in the aor. inf. constructed with 'bd (ed. de Lagarde, pp.17^a, 48¹⁹, 74², 102⁴) suggests a sixth century date; cp my 'Some aspects of Greek words in Syriac', *Abh.Ak.Wiss.Göttingen* 96 (1975), p.88).

⁵⁰ Cp.D. Gerson, 'Die Commentarien des Ephraem Syrus im Verhältnis zur jüdischen Exegese', *MGWJ* 17 (1868), pp. 15-33,64-72,98-109, 141-9; S. Funk, *Die haggadischen Elementen in den Homilien des Aphraates* (Vienna, 1891); S. Hidal, *Interpretatio Syriaca* (Lund, 1974) (esp.pp.131-8). See also now T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Gen. I-II in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian* (Coniect.Bibl. OT ser.II; 1978).

⁵¹ Syriac witnesses to this tradition include Narsai (ed. Mingana) II, p.388; Jacob of Serugh (ed. Bedjan) V, p.8; cp also *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), pp.486-7 (on p. 487 read 'Theodotion' for 'Symmachus').

seeing that all other Jewish sources attesting it are medieval in date.⁵²

In a later *Demonstration* (XVIII.4-5) Aphrahat defends the ideal of celibacy against Jewish attacks on the Christian downgrading of marriage by appealing to the tradition of Moses' *qaddishutha* (in the special sense of sexual abstinence; see above, 1(d), on 2 Chron.31:18-19). This tradition, like that of Noah's *qaddishutha* in the Ark, known to Ephrem, is well attested in rabbinic sources.⁵³

Ephrem elaborates, both in his *Commentary on Genesis* and in his poetry, on a tradition, found first among Christian writers in Julius Africanus (early third century), that the *bene 'elohim* of Gen.6:2 were, not angels (as earlier Jewish tradition had usually held)⁵⁴, but the sons of Seth, who descended from the lower slopes of paradise to the valley⁵⁵ where the daughters of Cain resided. This interpretation, which represents the dominant understanding of Gen. 6:2 in Syriac writers of all periods, would seem likely to be of Jewish origin, even though it is not found explicitly in extant Jewish sources until very much later: a clear hint that already by the later first century AD the Sethites had taken over the former role of the Watchers⁵⁶ or Angels in at least some Jewish circles is provided by Josephus *Antiquities* I.69-71 (on the Sethites and astronomy).

(b) *Fifth to seventh century literature*

The number of apparently Jewish traditions in the literature of the fifth to seventh century that cannot be traced to the Peshitta, the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, or to Aphrahat and Ephrem, is probably not very great. On the whole it seems more likely that these entered the Syriac ambience in the earlier period (but happen not to be directly attested then), rather than during this period when the gap between Syriac Christianity and its Jewish background widened. While in most cases there is no clear evidence either way, the following example may lend some support to this view.

In one of his homilies on Abel and Cain Jacob of Serugh (died 521) comments on Cain's reply to God's question to him concerning the whereabouts of Abel as follows:⁵⁷

Indeed truly he did not know where Abel was,
and all unawares the truth thundered forth from his lips;

⁵² Cp V. Aptowitz, *Kain und Abel in der Agada* (Vienna/Leipzig, 1922), pp.41-2.

⁵³ Moses: see Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, III, pp. 255-6 and VI, p.90; Noah: Ephrem, *C. Nisibena* 1.9; *Comm. Gen.* VI.12 etc; Ginzberg, I, p.166, V, p.188 (cp also Guillaumont (reference in note 18)).

⁵⁴ Cp P. Alexander, 'The Targumim and early exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Gen. 6', *JJS* 23 (1972), pp.60-71.

⁵⁵ See above 1(d) on Gen. 4:8.

⁵⁶ Contrast Jubilees 8:3, where astronomical teaching is attributed to the watchers.

⁵⁷ Ed. Bedjan V, p.20.

for he did not know that at his murder Abel had departed to the land of the watchers,
and that he had ascended and cried out in heaven before the divine Majesty;
no, he was not aware that Abel had been raised to the abode of the angels,
and had battered (*lit.* stoned) the dwelling place of the heavenly beings with his cries;
no, he did not realise that Abel had seen the face of the supernal King
and had effected a royal missive against the rebel, to exact justice;
he had no idea that the cry had gone up to heaven
to bring down the Lord to requite the injustice;
he did not know that Abel had stopped the Judge's chariot
and taken him along to bring the murderer to justice.

Although there is a certain ambivalence here between Abel himself and his cry reaching heaven, it seems likely that Jacob knew of a tradition that Abel had ascended to heaven, just as Enoch was to be taken up there later on. Ephrem evidently polemicizes against precisely this tradition when he writes (*C. Gen.* III.5):

'Once Cain had slain his brother, he then persuaded his parents that Abel had in fact entered Paradise because he had pleased God; proof of his entry there was his offering that had been accepted: 'for the keeping of the commandment effects entry into Paradise, just as your transgressing of it caused your departure from thence'. Cain imagined that he had deceived his parents, and that Abel had no avenger, but at that point God was revealed over him and said 'Where is Abel your brother?'

Possible hints of Abel's ascension are to be found in the *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:7-10, and it may be that the tradition is also reflected in Abel's role as judge in the *Testament of Abraham* 13.⁵⁸

The richest source for Jewish traditions, however, is the work known as the *Cave of Treasures*, a christianized re-telling of the biblical narrative, somewhat in the style of Jubilees. The work in its present form is probably a product of the sixth century, but according to Götze⁵⁹ the 'Urschatzhöhle' may go back to Jewish-Christian circles of the fourth century. Among the sources of this 'Urschatzhöhle' seem to be certain Sethite writings.

As a sample from the *Cave of Treasures* we may take another tradition connected with Cain and Abel. Already in Jubilees 4:1-11 mention is made of two sisters, Awen and Azura, of whom the former marries Cain, and the latter

⁵⁸ Cp also *Life of Abel* §11 (*Le Muséon* 87 (1974), p.478), and the Armenian *Teaching of St Gregory* §290.

⁵⁹ A. Götze, *Die Schatzhöhle: Überlieferung und Quellen* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist.Kl. 1922.4).

Seth. Later Jewish tradition knows a number of other names, and instead of the children all being born at intervals (as in Jubilees), Cain and Abel are provided with twin sisters, whose names according to the medieval *Midrash ha-Gadol*⁶⁰ are respectively *qnwntw* and *lwbd'w*. Similar names turn up in the *Cave of Treasures*,⁶¹ where, however, it is Lebeda who is Cain's twin sister and Qelimat Abel's. There can be no doubt that these names are related. The seventh century Syriac *Apocalypse of Methodius* (which is often closely based on the *Cave of Treasures*) reverses the order, making Qelima (*sic*) Cain's sister and Lebeda Abel's⁶² — corresponding to *Midrash ha-Gadol*.

This case is typical of many instances in the *Cave of Treasures*, where the only extant Jewish parallels are to be found in late sources. At present it seems impossible to define the nature of the relationship between the two⁶³ with any degree of certainty, although if these traditions belong to the 'Urschatzhöhle', then once again we are taken back to the fourth century or earlier for the actual point of contact.

Historically the *Cave of Treasures* is a work of some importance, for although it survives only in East Syrian manuscripts, it was much used in the West Syrian chronicle tradition, and was also translated into several Christian oriental languages, notably Arabic and Ethiopic; furthermore, by way of the *Apocalypse of Methodius*, several of the legends it incorporated reached western Europe when this work was translated into Latin (from an intermediary Greek version). In the west these legends came to enjoy enormous popularity.

(c) *Literature of the Islamic period*

Here we shall look at examples from three different types of literature, the East Syrian commentary tradition (especially fertile in the ninth century), the thirteenth century *Book of the Bee* by Solomon of Bosra (a narrative account of certain topics of biblical history), and the West Syrian chronicles. For the first two categories the Jewish parallels⁶⁴ are usually to be found in medieval

⁶⁰ Ed. Margulies, p.114.

⁶¹ Ed. Bezold, p.34 (tr. Budge, p.70).

⁶² Vat.syr.58, f.119a; this is also the order of Solomon of Bosra, *Book of the Bee* §18, and Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 1.1 (attributed to Methodius). The 'Prophecy of Adam', a christianized part of the *Testament of Adam*, speaks of Cain killing Abel for the sake of Lebeda (*Patr.Syr.* II, col.1343).

⁶³ Compare also the identification of Cain's weapon as a stone (*ibid*), just as in *Gen.R.* 24.8, *PsJ Gen.4:8* and *PRE* §21.

⁶⁴ Here I exclude from consideration the large number which are mediated by much earlier writers, both Syriac and Greek. Jansma, in his important methodological critique of A. Levene's *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, writes (*Oudtestamentische Studien* 12 (1958), p.181): 'A study of the influence of Jewish exegesis upon Nestorian exposition is to be a study of the influence of Jewish exegesis upon Greek exegesis and upon early Syriac expositors such as Ephrem'. In his classification of examples on pp.161-81 under E he lists agreements between Levene's commentary and Jewish sources where no earlier Greek or Syriac source can be identified; it is this category that we are concerned with here.

sources only, and for reasons elaborated below it may be suggested that they reached Syriac writers only in the early Islamic period; for the third category the Jewish traditions are often older, and were probably mediated by the Greek chronicle tradition going back in particular to the lost chronicles of Annianus and Panodorus (early fifth century).

From the East Syrian exegetical literature we may take two characteristic examples from discussions of the Aqedah narrative to be found in the ninth century *Commentary on Genesis* by Isho'dad of Merv.⁶⁵ With the exception of Jacob of Serugh⁶⁶, earlier Syriac writers did not ask how Abraham knew where the sacrifice was to take place; Isho'dad, in contrast, lists three different opinions: God told him in spirit (this corresponds to Jacob's explanation that it was revealed to him), or he saw a column of light, or he saw the cross as a column of light. Several Jewish commentators asked the same question, and in the *Sefer ha-Yashar* a very similar answer is given: he saw a column of fire.⁶⁷

Later on in his section on the Aqedah Isho'dad gives various views about the ram caught in the tree, and among these are two which have close Jewish parallels: it was 'a mountain animal', or it had been taken by the angel from Abraham's flocks. The first view is attributed to R. Eliezer in *Yalqut Gen. §101*, while the second (which Isho'dad attributes to 'the tradition of the Schools') is found in *Midrash ha-Gadol*.⁶⁸

As the title of his work implies, Solomon of Bosra offers his readers titbits culled from the choicest flowers that he could find. One of these titbits is a history of the staff of Moses, tracing its ancestry back to Paradise and the Tree of Good and Evil, through Midian, Pharez, Tamar, Judah, Isaac, Abraham, Shem, Noah, Seth to Adam who had cut off a branch from the Tree of Good and Evil (identified, as often, as a fig) to serve as a souvenir of his former home.⁶⁹

This is a familiar enough type of haggadah, where a sacred object or place is provided with a full documentation throughout sacred history. The origins of this sort of process can already been seen in the Bible, in particular in Chronicles, where the site of the Temple is implicitly identified as the site of the Aqedah — a theme that is developed to the full in the targumim, above all Ps.Jonathan. The interest in the prehistory of sacred objects, as opposed to places, does not seem to have quite such early origins. To take the case in question, Moses' staff: the beginnings of the process are to be found in *Pirqe*

⁶⁵ See note 23 for reference. The relationship between Isho'dad and the other East Syrian commentators is a complicated one, but the problem is not of direct concern here.

⁶⁶ Ed. Bedjan IV, pp.75,77.

⁶⁷ Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, I, p.278 V, p.250. In *Gen.R* and *PsJ* he sees the cloud of the Shekhina.

⁶⁸ Ed. Margulies, p.356 cp Ginzberg, V, p.252.

⁶⁹ *The Book of the Bee* (ed. Budge), §30.

Avot, where the staff is one of the ten objects created on 'the Eve of the Sabbath' (V.9). But the concatenation that we have in the *Book of the Bee* is not to be found until considerably later in Jewish sources: in this particular case a close parallel is to be found in *Pirqe d-Rabbi Eliezer*⁷⁰, usually assigned to the eighth or ninth century.

The late attestation of such traditions in both Syriac and Jewish literature in itself suggests that they travelled across the confessional boundary at a comparatively late date. There seem to be two possible ways in which this could have happened: first, by way of converts from Judaism to Christianity in the early centuries of Islam; and secondly, through discussion, on a friendly basis, between teachers and scholars of the two religions, perhaps especially in the ninth century, which appears to have been a period of remarkable openness among scholars of all three great religions. We have already seen how the East Syrian Patriarch Timothy learnt of the apocryphal psalms of David indirectly from 'trustworthy Jews then under instruction as catechumens in the Christian religion', and further evidence for such conversions under early Islamic rule can be found in the brief statement in the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian (XI.12) that 'at this time (second half of the seventh century) many Jews converted and became Christians'.⁷¹ The other path along which Jewish traditions might reach Syrian Christian circles may well have been through direct contact. The Karaite al-Qirqisani, for example, mentions how he used to engage in friendly theological discussions with 'Yashu' Sekha',⁷² who can be identified from the Syriac side as Isho'zekha, bishop of Ukbara in the late ninth century.⁷³ And elsewhere the same writer states that al-Muqammiš 'had intercourse with Christianity' as a student of 'Nana'⁷⁴ (i.e. Nonnus of Nisibis, the ninth century Syrian Orthodox writer, several of whose works survive).

We have already indicated in §3 how some medieval Syriac chronicles have preserved excerpts from Enoch and Jubilees. This rich storehouse of short fragments from Jewish writings of the Hellenistic and early Roman period still awaits proper exploitation; in many cases the material is also to be found in Byzantine chronicles, and so the interest of the Syriac sources is primarily textual, but occasionally these chronicles preserve material not known from the extant Greek chronicle tradition. This applies, for example, to some excerpts derived from Annianus, attributed to Enoch; none, in fact, belong to I Enoch, although they are clearly based on the Enochic tradition of the

⁷⁰ *PRE* §40.

⁷¹ One should probably rule out the earlier forced conversions under Heraclius.

⁷² *Kitab al-anwar wal-maraqib* (ed. Nemoy), II, p.220.

⁷³ Cp. J.M. Fiey, *Assyrie Chrétienne*, III (Beirut, 1968), p. 128.

⁷⁴ Ed. Nemoy, I, p.44

descent of the *bene Elohim* from Mount Hermon⁷⁵, but instead of being the Watchers, as in Enoch, the *bene Elohim* are 200 of the Sethites who had tried to recover the paradisiacal state by living a life of holiness on Mount Hermon; eventually disappointed at the lack of success of their venture they descend again, and elect Semiazos as their King. This material would seem to go back to Sethite literature, and it is related to, but not identical with, information to be found in the *Cave of Treasures*. According to the *Chronicle ad annum 1234*, before moving to Mount Hermon these Sethites had lived on the slopes of Paradise, 'the Mount of Victories', ministering at the 'cave of treasures' where Adam was buried. Mention of the 'Mount of Victories'⁷⁶ at once associates this text with certain legends surrounding the Magi preserved best in another Syriac *Chronicle*,⁷⁷ but also quoted in the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*⁷⁸ as deriving from the *liber apocryphus nomine Seth*. While we are obviously dealing with traditions that are Christianized in their present form, the speculation over the Sethites may well go back to Jewish developments of the Enochic literature (cp 4(a) above); this is a topic that certainly deserves further exploration.⁷⁹

We may summarize our survey as follows. The vast majority of the Jewish traditions attested in Syriac literature reached Syriac writers before the end of the fourth century; these travelled by three different paths: incorporated into the Peshitta, by way of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and independently of these two (whether orally or in written form is impossible to say; it is very possible that they travelled by both ways, and in the latter case the lost Adam literature is very likely to have been an important vehicle). The very fact that many haggadic traditions can be securely dated in their Syriac form to the fourth century or earlier is in itself important, seeing that Jewish witnesses to such traditions are often of very uncertain (or even late) date. In particular it might be mentioned here that these early Syriac sources (notably the Peshitta itself and Ephrem) could have a potentially significant role to play in the assessment of materials contained in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, and their relationship to earlier Palestinian Targum tradition.

From the fifth century onwards there would appear to be only a trickle of new material entering the Syriac sphere, and much of this comes in by way of

⁷⁵ English translation in *JTS* ns 19 (1968), p.627: cp also the Anonymous *Chronicle ad annum 1234* (ed. Chabot) I, pp.33 line 18 — 35 line 11.

⁷⁶ Only once, and in a different context, in the *Cave of Treasures* (transl. Budge, p.96).

⁷⁷ Ps. Dionysius, *Chronicle* (ed. Chabot) I, pp.57-70; cp U. Monneret de Villard, *Le Leggende Orientali sui Magi Evangelici* (Studi e Testi 163; 1952), pp.1-68.

⁷⁸ *Patrologia Graeca* 56, col.638.

⁷⁹ A.F.J. Klijn, however, in his *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 46; 1977), pp.60-77, sees these developments as purely Christian; cp also F. Dexinger, *Sturz der Göttersöhne oder Engel vor der Sintflut?* (Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 13; 1966), pp.97-116.

translations of Greek texts, either themselves of Jewish provenance, or incorporating Jewish exegetical traditions. Nevertheless, during the early centuries of Islamic rule there seems to be evidence of direct contact between Jews and Christians which resulted in the transfer of a limited amount of further material.

In this article only some bare outlines, indicating the main areas where haggadic traditions of Jewish origin, have been given: much spadework remains to be done before any definitive conclusions about the various channels of transmission can be reached, but if the present paper stimulates interest in this intriguing area it will have served its main purpose.

A PIECE OF WISDOM LITERATURE IN SYRIAC

The short text published here¹ is taken from Mingana syr. 71, f. 73^r, a manuscript written in two different West Syrian hands of about 1600, according to Mingana's *Catalogue*, where² it is given the title 'Questions addressed by the king of the Babylonians to the king of the Persians'. The same text is also to be found in Harvard (Houghton Library) MS. syr. 47 (Accession no. 3985), f. 5^r,³ a Jacobite manuscript written in July 1857 by the deacon Shem'on bar Abulhad in the monastery of Mar Abel and Mar Abraham, near Midyat [in Tur 'Abdin] (f. 238). The variants of the Harvard manuscript are denoted below by the symbol 'H'.

The text further occurs in two Garshuni manuscripts, B.M. Or. 7209, f. 213^{r-v}, and Neofiti 52, ff. 125^v-126^r. The former of these is a Jacobite manuscript completed on the 8th Nisan A.G. 1871 (= A.D. 1560), while the latter, Neofiti 52, is the only Nestorian manuscript known to me that contains this text; it was written by the deacon 'Abd al-Karim of Mosul, in 1676/7.

The Garshuni version, for which I rely on B.M. Or. 7209, exhibits a text slightly expanded in one or two places. Instances are denoted in the translation of Mingana syr. 71 below by the symbol 'G'.

TEXT

ܠܟܠܗ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ
ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢ

¹ I should like to thank Professor W. D. McHardy, Curator of the Mingana Collection (in the Selly Oak Colleges Library, Birmingham), for permission to publish this text.

² Vol. I, col. 183.

³ Described in Titterton's typescript catalogue as "six conundrums".

A PIECE OF WISDOM LITERATURE IN SYRIAC

ܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܝܟܠܐ ܟܘܢ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܝܟܠܐ ܟܘܢ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܝܟܠܐ ܟܘܢ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ
 ܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܝܟܠܐ ܟܘܢ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܪܫܝܐ

APPARATUS

a ܡܠܟܐ H. b ܡܠܟܐ H. c ܡܠܟܐ H (sic!). d ܡܠܟܐ H. e ܡܠܟܐ H
 f ܡܠܟܐ H. g ܡܠܟܐ H. h ܡܠܟܐ H. i ܡܠܟܐ H. j ܡܠܟܐ H.
 k ܡܠܟܐ H.

TRANSLATION

The king of the Babylonians wrote and sent to the king of the Persians, and said to him: "Explain to me six sayings (G+ 'those which I ask thee'), and take from me three years' tribute (G+ 'and if you do not answer them I will take from thee three years' tribute')."

Now the king wrote as follows: "What is heavier than a mountain, and what is hotter than fire; and what is sharper than a sword, and what is sweeter than honey, and what is fatter than a sheep's tail, and what is sure among created things?"

The answer of the king of the Persians which he returned to the king of the Babylonians (G H here have only: "the reply"): "That which is heavier than a mountain is deceit; that which is hotter than fire is the wrath of man; that which is sharper than a sword is the tongue of a wicked woman;¹ and that which is sweeter than honey² is milk in a child's mouth³ (G+ 'which it sucks from its mother'), and that which is fatter than a sheep's tail is the land and water that makes everything (G+ 'on them') fat; and that which is sure among created things is death" (G+ "that which is executed on every man (is) fate"). The end. And when he knew and explained them, he sent him three years' tribute, as he had settled).

COMMENT

In discussing the literary genre of this short piece one should separate the context (the letter) from the content (the riddles). In respect of the former, letters containing difficult demands or queries (not necessarily in the form of riddles) feature in a number of Oriental and Greek sources. Most famous among such letters

¹ Cf. Prov. v. 3-4; E. Littmann, *Morgenländische Spruchweisheit* (Leipzig, 1937), p. 62: "What is sharper than the sword?—The tongue."

² Cf. Judg. xiv. 18.

³ Cf. *Odes of Solomon* xl. 1.

A PIECE OF WISDOM LITERATURE IN SYRIAC

is that found in the Story of Aḥiqar: the king of Egypt sends to the king of Assyria demanding that he supply him with an architect to build a castle between heaven and earth; if the Assyrian king duly provides such a man, Pharaoh will send him the revenue of Egypt for three years, while failure to send someone means that the Assyrian king will forfeit the tribute of Assyria and Nineveh for three years.¹

It will be noticed at once that both in *Aḥiqar* and in the present text the transfer of tribute is to be for three years, but in *Aḥiqar* the Egyptian king never resorts to riddles, although various further demands are made by him once Aḥiqar has arrived at his court.

This episode in *Aḥiqar* is taken up in the Greek *Life of Aesop*, where the contest of wisdom is between Nectanebo, the Egyptian king, and Lykeros (Lykourgos), the king of Babylon, while Aḥiqar's part is played by Aesop himself.²

The whole literary genre of the epistolary contest appears to have its origin in Egypt, where it is represented by *The Quarrel between King Apōphis and Sekenenrē*, preserved in P. Sallier I.³ In this tale the Hyksos king Apōphis sends a message to his vassal Sekenenrē, in Thebes, complaining of the disturbance caused by hippopotami near Thebes, which prevented Apōphis—in Avaris, in the N.E. Nile Delta!—from sleeping. Sekenenrē and his wise men are at a loss to know how to deal with this problem, and at that point the story unfortunately breaks off.

This Egyptian tale was recognized by Maspero⁴ as belonging to the genre of problems or riddles posed by one king to another, such as one finds in *Aḥiqar*. Indeed the motif of the hippopotami causing Apōphis sleepless nights miles away in

¹ Cf. F. C. Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris, A. S. Lewis, *The Story of Aḥiqar* (2nd edn, 1913), pp. 114-15 (ET), p. 55 (Syriac text). This part of the story is not extant in the Elephantine Aramaic fragments. For the other Syriac recensions of *Aḥiqar*, see F. Nau, *Histoire et sagesse d'Aḥiqar l'Assyrien* (Paris, 1909); idem, "Documents relatifs à Aḥiqar", *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, XXI (1918/19), 148-60, 274-307, 356-400.

² *Vita Aesopi*, §§ 105-23. On the relationship between the *Life of Aesop* and *Aḥiqar*, see B. E. Perry, *Aesopica* 1 (Urbana, 1952), pp. 5-10. In the oldest recension of the *Life* (Perry's "Vita G") the tribute is for three years in § 123, as in *Aḥiqar*, but in § 105 (and in Perry's "Vita W(estermann)") in both places the figure has become ten years.

³ Translation in (e.g.) A. Erman, *The Literature of the Egyptians* (London, 1927), pp. 165-7; G. Lefebvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens de l'époque pharaonique* (Paris, 1949), pp. 131-6.

⁴ *Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne* (4th edn, Paris, n.d.), p. xxvi.

Avaris has a fairly close parallel in *Ahiqar*, where, however, the offending animals are horses.¹ There is, however, no mention (at least in what survives) of tribute in the Egyptian tale, and it is unfortunate that the whole context of the episode is not clear.

From Mesopotamia, on the other hand, there seem to be no examples of this particular type of literature, although several remains of "contest literature" survive both in Sumerian and Akkadian.²

In Classical Greek literature³ I know of nothing exactly similar. Contests of riddles are indeed extremely common, and constitute, among other things, a stock feature of symposia, but none of these contests take place by letter. For the Hellenistic period, however, the situation is rather different. The *Life of Aesop*, which probably belongs in its original form to the first century A.D., has already been mentioned. Another example is to be found in Plutarch's *Banquet of the Seven Sages* (151 b) where there is mention of a wisdom contest of a similar sort between Amasis, king of Egypt, and the king of the Ethiopians, and it is interesting that this choice of participants again points to an Egyptian origin for the genre.

Contests, specifically of riddles, and between royalty, are said by Josephus, who quotes the otherwise unknown Dios, to have taken place between Solomon and Hiram:⁴

They say that Solomon, the ruler of Jerusalem, sent riddles (αἰνίγματα) to Hiram, at the same time requesting him for others. He who was unable to solve them was to pay a fine to the one who did. Then, with the help of a certain Abdemon of Tyre, Hiram solved the riddles that had been set, and proposed others which Solomon was unable to solve, and so had to pay him back a large quantity of money.

This is no doubt a Hellenistic embellishment on the Old Testament narrative. In the Old Testament itself the ability to answer

¹ *The Story of Ahiqar*, p. 120 (ET), p. 63 (Syriac text): "The horse of thy [Ahiqar's] lord neighs in Assyria, and our mares hear his voice here [in Egypt] and their foals miscarry."

² Cf. J. J. A. van Dijk, *La sagesse suméro-accadienne* (Leiden, 1953), pp. 31 ff.; W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 150 ff. This contest literature is usually interwoven with another genre, the fable. It is worth noting that within this fable contest literature the riddle in the form "what is more X than Y?" never occurs.

³ In general compare K. Ohlert, *Rätsel und Rätselspiele der alten Griechen*² (Berlin, 1912); also W. Schultz, *Rätsel aus dem hellenischen Kulturkreis* (Mytholog. Bibliothek, III, 1; Leipzig, 1909).

⁴ *Antiq.* VIII. 148 = *C. Apion.* I. 114.

נִידָה "riddles, hard questions", is the mark of a wise king such as Solomon himself,¹ or the "king of bold countenance",² who is described as מֶלֶךְ חָכָם (ὁ διανοούμενος αἰνίγματα, ὁ συιῶν προβλήματα). Indeed in I Kings v. 14 (EVV iv. 34, LXX iv. 30) an old stratum of the Septuagint (similarly Peshitta) states that Solomon's wisdom (presumably in the sphere of answering the riddles of other kings) was the reason for *tribute* paid by them to him:

καὶ παρεγίνοντο πάντες οἱ λαοὶ ἀκοῦσαι τῆς σοφίας Σαλωμων, καὶ ἐλάμβανεν δῶρα (=ἡμνα*) παρὰ πάντων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς ὅσοι ἤκουον τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ.

From a very much later period, the Persian author Nizámí-e-'Arúdí, in his *Four Discourses* (*Chahár Maqála*),³ said that it was the custom for the kings of the ancient dynasties of Persia—as, later, the Caliphs—to dispatch their ambassadors armed with "wise sayings, riddles and enigmatical questions".

In none of the instances of royal "wisdom contests" do we find the riddle or problem expressed in the same manner as in the present text, "What is more X than Y?"⁴ This, of course, is precisely how the Philistines phrased their answer, itself in the form of a riddle, to Samson's riddle in Judges xiv. 18: "What is sweeter than honey, what is stronger than a lion?" The form is surprisingly rare, although a related type, "What is most X?" is commonly found, especially in Greek literature.⁵ Possibly the form with the comparative is a popular rather than a literary one.⁶ Examples, with moralizing answers, are, however, especially to be found in medieval times, both in Greek and Latin. As

* ¹ I Kings x. 1; cf. v. 10 ff. (MT; EVV iv. 29 ff.). The actual questions posed by the Queen of Sheba were, not surprisingly, eventually provided in a late Syriac pseudepigraph (unpublished; I hope to edit this). Cf. also L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, IV, pp. 145 ff.

² Dan. viii. 23.

³ Revised ET by E. G. Browne (*Gibb Memorial Series* XI, 2; Cambridge, 1921), pp. 25-6.

⁴ The nearest is in Plutarch, *Banquet* . . . , 153 a: τὶ πρεσβύτατον; χρόνος.

⁵ Cf. preceding note; other examples can be found in Ohlert, *op. cit.* pp. 107 ff.

⁶ Compare the modern examples in Archer Taylor, *English Riddles from Oral Tradition* (University of California, 1951), pp. 533-70; and, for Arabic, Littmann, *op. cit.* pp. 47 ff. The majority of these, however, consist of two or more comparatives, paradoxically contrasting. J. Huizinga, *Homo Ludens* (ET, London, 1949), pp. 105 ff., stresses the ritual connotations of the riddle.

A PIECE OF WISDOM LITERATURE IN SYRIAC

an illustration of the former, I give two taken from Heinrici's collection of Byzantine Ἑρωταποκρίσεις:¹

no. 117 Τί ὑψηλότερον παρὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; Ἡ ἀγάπη.

In the second example the catechetical intention is made quite specific:

no. 44 ποία ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν βαρυτέρα πάντων; Ἡ μισαδελφία.

On the Latin side I quote a single example out of several cited by Suchier:²

Quid dulcius melle? Divina precepta.

These medieval "Questions and Answers"³ (which have their counterpart in the frequently recurring Syriac ܩܘܣܬܐܘܢܐ, "questions"), however, tend to have a consistently moral or didactic aim, whereas in the Syriac riddles under consideration this hardly applies to the answers to the fourth and fifth queries. Nor, in the Greek and Latin texts, are the questions phrased consistently in the same form.

This, inevitably rather superficial, survey has shown that the short Syriac text here published is, in form, without any exact parallel, although ultimately it was certainly inspired by *Aḥiqar*.⁴ It would be extremely hazardous to attempt to date the text, and I deliberately refrain from offering any guess. But, of whatever date, this short piece is nevertheless of some interest, demonstrating as it does the continued use of the old genre of royal wisdom contests carried out by means of letter.

¹ In *Abh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss.* xxviii (1911), 8⁵, pp. 43 ff.

² Cf. L. W. Daly, W. Suchier, *Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti Philosophi* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, xxiv, nos. 1-2, 1939), pp. 121, 124, 127.

³ On these see especially G. Bardy, "La littérature patristique des 'Quaestiones et responsiones' sur l'Écriture", in *Revue biblique*, xli (1932) and xlii (1933).

⁴ It is remarkable that Syriac *Aḥiqar* manuscripts are all Nestorian, while the present text has a predominantly Jacobite tradition.

Syriac and Greek Hymnography: Problems of Origin

Early Syriac poetry has for a long time played an important role in discussions of the origins of Greek hymnography, seeing that the earliest collections of Christian hymns are in Syriac, and belong to the fourth century—considerably earlier than anything in Greek of comparable extent. In the present paper my aim is a very modest one, to clear away certain misconceptions that are widespread in connection with the Syriac side. The consequences, however, are not without interest for a correct appraisal of the Greek evidence.

The claims of the famous Germanist, Wilhelm Meyer, concerning Syriac poetry and its influence on the development of accentual verse in Europe will be well-known to all.¹ Although Meyer's theories have fallen out of favour now, the influence of Ephrem on Byzantine hymnography, and in particular on the greatest of all Byzantine poets, Romanos, is still widely admitted, both as far as form (in particular isosyllabism) and content are concerned. One authoritative voice, however, has spoken out against any real influence of Syriac poetry on the origins and development of Greek hymnography. Professor A. Dihle, in the course of an important article entitled "Die Anfänge der griechischen akzentuierenden Verskunst"², claims that, far from being a Syriac contribution to Greek hymnography, isosyllabism was in fact something alien to Syriac poetry and a comparatively recent introduction into it in Ephrem's time. This, it will readily be seen, is the complete reverse of Wilhelm Meyer's hypothesis, and a return to the view propagated by Sozomen, who stated (*Hist. Eccl.* III. 16):

It is related that Bardaisan's son Harmonios was deeply versed in Greek learning, and was the first to subdue his native tongue to metres and musical laws. These verses he had sung by choirs, and even now the Syrians frequently sing, not the precise poems of Harmonios, but the same melodies.

We shall come back later to consider the value of Sozomen's statement, but first it will be best to state what is definitely known about the nature and origin of early Syriac poetry.

¹ W. Meyer, 'Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung', in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellatein. Rhythmik*, Berlin 1905, II, pp. 1-201 (esp. 103 ff.).

² *Hermes* 82 (1954), pp. 182-99, especially 191 ff.

The first sizeable collection of Syriac poetry that we possess consists of the works of St Ephrem, the main features of whose poetic corpus are as follows: most obviously there are two quite distinct categories of poem, stanzaic and non-stanzaic. The former is by far the most important, and comprises a dozen odd hymn cycles, where each cycle contains anything from four to 87 hymns, or *madrashē*, to use the Syriac term. These *madrashē* were certainly sung, and the titles of the melodies are preserved, but alas not the original music. The stanzas were probably sung by soloists, while a fixed response was provided by a choir after each stanza. The stanzas are constructed on isosyllabic principles, and the isosyllabic pattern can range from the very simple (e.g. five short lines of four syllables each to a stanza) to the highly complex and diffuse patterns of the longer stanza models. Ephrem uses well over fifty different stanza patterns, each with its own *qolo*, or melody, to which it was sung.

The non-stanzaic poetry, or *memra*, is much less extensive (at least as far as the genuine Ephrem is concerned). In Ephrem the *memra*, or verse homily, always consists of couplets of 7 + 7 syllables.

That Syriac verse is based on isosyllabic principles there is absolutely no doubt. Certain scholars, however, in particular Hölscher³, have tried to argue that there is some further accentual principle as well (thus providing a close parallel to the homotony of certain types of Byzantine hymnography). Since, however, we know very little – if anything – for certain about the nature of the accent in classical Syriac⁴, any theory on this basis must inevitably remain highly speculative and uncertain, and Hölscher's whole thesis was severely criticised by Bergsträsser in a review of his book *Syrische Verskunst*.⁵

Two other features characteristic of early Syriac poetry should be mentioned: the acrostic, either alphabetic, or spelling out the author's name, is employed on various occasions by Ephrem; rhyme, on the other hand, is *not* a regular feature, and Ephrem uses it only very sparingly; we shall shortly see, however, that rhyme *may* have played a more important part in the very earliest Syriac poetry, of which only snatches survive. This is a surprising state of affairs, since rhyme re-appears again in the Islamic period, under the influence of Arabic poetry.

It so happens that Ephrem is the earliest Syriac poet whose works survive in any quantity, but the great variety of poetic forms that he employs with

³ G. Hölscher, *Syrische Verskunst*, Leipzig 1932; an earlier writer who argued along the same lines was H. Grimme, *Der Strophenbau in den Gedichten Ephraems des Syrers*, Freiburg 1893, and in *ZDMG* 47 (1893), pp. 276–307; 53 (1899), pp. 102–12; cp also his 'W. Meyer und die syrische Metrik', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 16 (1902), pp. 273–95.

⁴ Grimme and Hölscher based their theories on modern west Syrian pronunciation. This assumes that (a) there was no change in the nature and placing of the word accent over 1500 years, and (b) that the musical accent was identical with that of the spoken language. Both these are unlikely assumptions.

⁵ In: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 36 (1933), cols. 748–54.

such facility suggests that behind him lies a long tradition of Syriac poetry. In fact Ephrem himself here and there preserves odd quotations of earlier poets—the heretics, such as Bardaisan, whom he is combatting. He specifically states, too, that Mani himself wrote *madrashē*.⁶ Furthermore two early isosyllabic poems actually survive, incorporated into the third-century *Acts of Thomas*, one of them being the famous *Hymn of the Soul*. These two poems are both in six syllable couplets, without rhyme. We also have snatches of even earlier poetry: Baumstark identified⁷ a quotation from a pagan poet in a *memra* of Isaac of Antioch: this is in rhyming seven syllable couplets, but unfortunately we have no means of dating the piece. Definitely earlier is another quotation identified by Baumstark, this time incorporated into the *Letter of Mara to Serapion*, one of the very earliest pieces of Syriac literature, which Baumstark proposed dating to soon after AD 70 (others have preferred slightly later dates).⁸ This fragment is again in rhymed seven syllable couplets. There is also a short pagan funerary inscription of the third century AD which may possibly be in verse⁹: if so, isosyllabism seems to be absent, but rhyme present.

Both rhyme and isosyllabism also turn up in another favourite literary genre of early Syriac writers, namely artistic prose (*Kunstprosa*), employed for example by Afrahat, Ephrem and the authors of some of the early Persian martyr acts. This has much in common with the corresponding Greek prose style that flourished in the period of the Second Sophistic – another area where we have the problem of exact relationships!

How does this picture—based on the actual surviving material—fit in with Sozomen's description of the origins of Syriac poetry? If Baumstark's dating of the *Letter of Mara to Serapion* is correct, the bottom would be knocked out of Sozomen's claim, for we would then have an example of Syriac isosyllabic poetry written well before the time of Harmonius (early third century). Unfortunately, as we have seen, the dating of the letter is not certain. There is, however, another feature of Sozomen's statement that arouses suspicions, namely the very person of Harmonius. On quite other grounds Drijvers has shown¹⁰, in his book on Bardaisan, that Harmonius is in fact the invention of Sozomen, and has no basis in history. What we have

⁶ *H. contra Haereses* (ed. E. Beck), I. 16. 3.

⁷ A. Baumstark, 'Altsyrische Profandichtung in gereimten Siebensilbern', *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 36 (1933), cols. 345–8.

⁸ F. Altheim, *Weltgeschichte Asiens*, II, Halle 1948, p. 146, 163, prefers a third century date, c. 260. In support of a first century date, see F. Millar, *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971), p. 4.

⁹ So J. B. Segal, who published it in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30 (1967), pp. 293–7. (The inscription is no 48 in H. J. W. Drijvers' collection, *Old Syriac (Edessean) Inscriptions*, Leiden 1972). The omission of the Odes of Solomon from the above discussion is deliberate, since I believe them to be a translation from Greek.

¹⁰ H. J. W. Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa*, Assen 1966, pp. 180–3; before him also M. Sprengling, in *AJSL* 32 (1915/16), p. 199f.

here turns out to be a case of Greek chauvinism: Sozomen could hardly deny the fame of Syriac poets such as Ephrem, but this was worrying to a loyal Greek speaker, to whom music and metre were the preserves of hellenic culture. Accordingly, the famous Bardaisan is accredited with this son Harmonius (the Greek name at once arouses suspicion: Bardaisan's genuine sons had Semitic names), and in this way Sozomen neatly makes poetry in barbaric Syriac—and thus indirectly the poetry of the prestigious Ephrem himself—the tributary of Greek culture.

I should not spend so much time on Sozomen's view except for the fact that it appears to have been very influential. It was taken over by Theodoret, and has not been without its influence on modern scholarship. The early nineteenth-century German scholar, August Hahn, the author of an influential book entitled *Bardasenes Gnosticus Syrorum Primus Hymnologus*¹¹, was probably misled by Sozomen's tendentious picture when he interpreted a well-known passage in one of Ephrem's *Hymns against Heresies*¹² as evidence that Bardaisan himself introduced *madrashé* and metrical form into Syriac, a view not without its adherents in more recent scholarly literature as well. In reality all that Ephrem is saying in this particular hymn—as Sprengling pointed out long ago¹³—is that Bardaisan put over his pernicious doctrines in poetic form—a well-known technique in early Christianity. The stanza in question reads as follows:

He (Bardaisan) wrote *madrashé* and provided them with tunes;
he composed psalms and put them into metrical form;
by means of measures and balances he distributed the words.
He offered to the guileless bitter things in sweet guise,
in order that, though feeble, they might not choose wholesome food.¹⁴

There is, in fact, absolutely no reason to suppose that isosyllabic poetry was something new in Bardaisan's day, let alone an import from some other culture. Indeed isosyllabism as a principle of Semitic poetry may well be something extremely ancient: it may be a feature of the funerary inscription known as the Carpentras stele¹⁵, and recently it has been claimed that syllable count plays an important part in early Hebrew poetry.¹⁶

If the case for Greek influence on early Syriac poetry, first put forward by Sozomen, quite definitely lacks any sound basis and can be dismissed

¹¹ Leipzig, 1819, p. 28ff.

¹² *H. contra Haereses* LIII. 5.

¹³ M. Sprengling, 'Antonius Rhetor on versification', *AJSL* 32 (1915/16), p. 202. (Sprengling's long article [pp. 145–216] gives an excellent summary of earlier studies on the subject of Syriac versification).

¹⁴ I use Sprengling's translation, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

¹⁵ No 269 in H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*, Wiesbaden 1962/4.

¹⁶ E. g. D. N. Freedman, 'Acrostics and metrics in Hebrew Poetry', *HTR* 65 (1972), pp. 367–92; for Ugaritic, see F. M. Cross, 'Prose and Poetry in the mythic and epic texts from Ugarit', *HTR* 67 (1974), pp. 1–15.

without further ado, the reverse proposition is much more problematic, and here I can only make a few observations:

(1) Meyer's extreme thesis, that Greek and Latin accentual verse are to be traced back to the influence of isosyllabic translations of Ephrem's poetry, is no longer tenable. Dihle, for one, has shown that the rhythmic principle of late Greek accentual verse is an inner Greek development, unconnected with the influence of isosyllabic translations of Syriac verse.¹⁷ On the other hand it needs stressing that Syriac poetry was sung, and this means that less weight needs to be put on the nature or position of the (spoken) word accent in Syriac than some writers on the subject have done. Consequently isosyllabism will indeed be the most important element in any theory of Syriac influence on Greek hymnography.¹⁸

(2) The one clear case of the influence of Syriac isosyllabism is to be found in the Ephrem Graecus corpus. According to Dihle¹⁹, these texts stand quite apart in Greek hymnography, but from the Syriac side too they raise a problem: in hardly any case does a Syriac original survive, and it is not always certain that they really are translations. In any case, even if they are, the content has been handled quite freely, since the biblical allusions are sometimes to be traced specifically to the LXX, and not the Peshitta.²⁰

(3) The *kontakion* is a problem that needs to be considered by itself. Most of the elements of the *kontakion*, apart from homotony, are present in, and characteristic of earlier Syriac poetry, in particular the *madrasha*, which in Ephrem's hands often matches up excellently to Paul Maas' description of the *kontakion* as a 'lyrische Predigt'.²¹ Indeed, all that Maas had to say in an article of 1910 on the subject of the origins of the *kontakion* still stands to-day. While the *kontakion* cannot be called a straight borrowing from Syriac poetry, I think there can be little doubt that the creation of this completely new poetic form in Greek owes not a little in inspiration to Syriac religious poetry.

(4) The question of thematic influences is quite a separate one. Here it should be remembered that a large number of educated people in Syria in the fourth to sixth centuries were bilingual, and so borrowing—either way—need not be confined to written texts and translations: the liturgical poetry of Ephrem and his successors would have been familiar from its regular use in church. This, in particular, I would say, is an area where much profitable work remains still to be done.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.* (see note 2)

¹⁸ In this connection it would be worth investigating how many isosyllabic stanza patterns are common to both Syriac and Greek; note, for example, that the syllabic pattern of no 14 in C. A. Trypanis, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica*, Vienna 1968, corresponds exactly to that of Ephrem, *H. Nat.* 1 and *H. Epiph.* 3 (7+7+7+7, refrain of 7+7).

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

²⁰ E. g. the poem on the sacrifice of Isaac (ed. S. I. Mercati), stanza 104 (=Gen, 22, 13), on which see my 'Sarah and the Aqedah', *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), p. 69, note 16.

²¹ P. Maas, 'Das Kontakion', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19 (1910), p. 289.

VII

A SYRIAC COLLECTION OF PROPHECIES
OF THE PAGAN PHILOSOPHERS

For Peter Megaw

When the Georgian poet Rustaveli visited Jerusalem in 1192 he recorded seeing on the frescoes of the Monastery of the Holy Cross, alongside Christian saints, portraits of the Greek sages "such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cheilon, Solon, Thucydides and Plutarch, just as they are to be found in our monastery on Athos"¹. Although these particular wall paintings in Jerusalem were destroyed in the middle of the nineteenth century, those at the Monastery of the Georgians (Monē Ibērōn) on Athos can still be seen by the modern visitor. Indeed, so regular a feature of ecclesiastical iconography were these pagan sages considered that instructions for their portrayal are even included in the famous early eighteenth-century manual by Dionysios of Fourna². The popularity of these figures from the ancient pagan world in Byzantine and meta-Byzantine ecclesiastical art³ might at first sight seem surprising, being a feature which one might rather associate with the art of the western European Renaissance, yet, as von Premerstein pointed out in a magisterial article⁴, the theme of these wall paintings finds its origin in a particular genre of early Christian literature, collections of sayings thought to be prophetic of certain aspects of Christian teaching, culled from the works of

Greek pagan philosophers by highly educated converts to Christianity who wished to justify, perhaps to themselves as much as to their friends who still remained pagan, their own action, abandoning the ancestral religion for a *superstitio barbarica*.

An early start was evidently made at assembling suitable sayings of the wise men of classical antiquity, as can be seen from Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis*; by the fourth century loose collections must have been available for wide circulation, since related groups of sayings turn up in such works as Ps. Justin's *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, Lactantius' *Divinae Institutiones*, Didymus' *de Trinitate*, Theodoret's *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, and Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Julianum*⁵. But it was in the last decade of the fifth century, and perhaps at Alexandria, that an influential work (though now almost entirely lost in its original form) was produced, entitled *Theosophia*, of which books VII-XI contained a collection of pagan oracles and 'prophecies' which pointed to particular Christian doctrines. Of the original *Theosophia* only a fragment and an abstract survive, the latter generally known as the "Tübingen Theosophy"; this evidently represents a drastic abridgement. Other related small collections of sayings of pagan Greek writers are also preserved, under such titles as *Symphōnia*, *Chrēsmoi*, and *Prophēteiai*⁶. The popularity and wide diffusion of such works is shown, not only by the large Greek manuscript tradition and their use in sermons⁷ and art, but also by the fact that related sayings are to be found in Syriac, Armenian, Coptic⁸, Arabic and Ethiopic. It is with an intriguing new Syriac witness to this genre that the present article is concerned⁹.

Syriac preserves a number of small collections of sayings of Greek philosophers, though the majority of those hitherto published do not

¹ K. SPETSIERIS, *Eikones hellēnōn philosophōn eis ekklesiās*, in *Epistēmōnikē epetērīs tēs philosophikēs scholēs tou panepistēmiou Athēnōn* II.14 (1963/4), p. 426.

² The relevant sections are given in German translation by N. A. BEES, *Darstellungen altheidnischer Denker und Autoren in der Kirchenmalerei der Griechen*, in *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 4 (1923), p. 117-9.

³ Examples are to be found in several monasteries on mount Athos, as well as elsewhere in Greece, Bulgaria, and Romania; these are listed by SPETSIERIS, p. 386-458. For Bulgaria, see especially I. DUJČEV, *Heidnische Philosophen und Schriftsteller in der alten bulgarischen Wandmalerei*, in *Rheinisch-westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge* G 214, 1976.

⁴ A. VON PREMIERSTEIN, *Griechisch-heidnische Weise als Verkünder christlicher Lehre in Handschriften und Kirchenmalereien*, in *Festschrift der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, Vienna, 1926, p. 647-66, and further in *Neues zu den apokryphen Heilspropheten heidnischer Philosophen in Literatur und Kirchenkunst*, in *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 9 (1932), p. 338-74. A summary of the first article (hard to procure) can be found by H. GREGOIRE in *Byzantion* 2 (1926), p. 544-50.

⁵ Cp R. M. GRANT, *Greek literature in the treatise de Trinitate and Cyril contra Julianum*, in *JTS* ns 15, 1964, p. 265-79, and W. J. MALLEY, *Hellenism and Christianity* (Analecta Gregoriana 110, 1978), p. 258-61.

⁶ The texts were collected by H. ERBSE, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, Hamburg, 1941.

⁷ A. DELATTE, *Anecdota Atheniensia* I (Bibl. Fac. Philos. et Lettres, Liège, 36, 1927), p. 324-8.

⁸ For these see R. VAN BROEK, *Four Coptic fragments of a Greek theosophy*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 32, 1978, p. 118-42. (An extensive bibliography can be found on p. 118, note 1).

⁹ To be precise, not entirely new: see below for RAHMANI's edition of the opening and final sections (on Baba the prophet of Harran).

describe themselves as collections of prophecies¹⁰, in contrast to the work presented here, which carries the explicit title “Prophecies of the pagan philosophers in abbreviated form”. This short work, which is addressed to the pagans of Harran and specifically invites them to convert to Christianity, consists of an introduction (1), short sayings of Greek philosophers and oracles alluding to the Trinity, Incarnation etc., (2-21), slightly more extensive quotations from “the Sibyl who interpreted the dreams of the hundred judges in Rome” (22) and the ‘Sagai’ (23). Then the Harranians are directly addressed and rebuked for their obstinacy in refusing to convert (24-5), whereupon the compiler now plays his master card: even if they refuse to believe the prophecies of the Greek philosophers, they should at least pay heed to their own prophet, Baba (26). There follow a series of sayings attributed to Baba and taken from his book entitled the ‘Revelation’ (27-32, 34). In the final section (35-7) the author again addresses the pagans of Harran and urges them either to accept Christ whose incarnation had been prophesied, thanks to divine Providence, by their own prophet, or anathematize Baba for having been a deceiver. (These sections on Baba have already been published, as long ago as 1904, by Rahmani: see below).

As will be seen from the table on p. 208, most of the sayings of Greek philosophers and oracles in our Syriac text can be identified with sayings in extant Greek sources, but it is clear that the Syriac compiler has drawn on more than one Greek collection seeing that, in four cases, he has actually reproduced the same text in two slightly different forms (Thules, 2 and 16; Hermes, 4 and 14; Cyzicus oracle, 7 and 18; Plato, 8 and 17). His choice of texts runs from oracles (reply to Thules, 2, 16; Orpheus, 3, 11; reply to Petissonios, 6; oracle at Cyzicus, 7, 18; Apollo, 12, 18), to figures of classical Greece (Sophocles, 5; Plato, 8, 9, 17; Pythagoras, 10), to the Hermetic and Sibylline literature (4, 14, 19, 21-3), and to some Neoplatonists (Porphyry, 13; Amelios (corrupted to MYLYTWS), 15; and Plotinus (corrupted to PWLYTYNWS), 20).

Comparison with the extant Greek collections at once shows that

¹⁰ For Syriac collections of sayings of Greek writers see N. ZEEGERS-VAN DER VORST, *Une gnomologie d'auteurs grecs en traduction syriaque*, in *OCA* 205, 1978, p. 163-77, and my *From antagonism to assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning in East of Byzantium* (ed. N. GARSOIAN et al.), Washington 1982, p. 33-34, notes 114-117. The only two (small) collections which are adduced as ‘prophecies’ are preserved in Dionysios bar Šalibi’s *Against the Muslims* and Barhebraeus’ *Candelabra* III and IV: these are translated and discussed in my *Some Syriac excerpts from Greek collections of pagan prophecies*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* (forthcoming).

none of these can have served as the compiler’s source, but an important clue to the more immediate provenance of at least some of his quotations is provided above all by the historical introduction to 7, the oracle at Cyzicus, which agrees with the wording to be found in the Chronicle of John Malalas (against that of the Tübingen theosophy and related texts); indeed the entire run of sections 2-8 all find a counterpart, very close textually, to sayings incorporated into Malalas’ Chronicle. Since the disagreement in sequence (see table) makes it unlikely that the Syriac compiler has excerpted the sayings from the Chronicle, it is reasonable to suppose that for these sections both Malalas and the Syriac author drew on an identical common source¹¹, itself probably a derivative of the *Theosophia*.

For 9-11, 14-15 and 17 it is sayings in Cyril’s *Contra Julianum* that provide the nearest parallel; several of them are not to be found in the extant descendents of the *Theosophia* tradition, although it is very possible that the original *Theosophia* may have included these as well. This may also apply to the four texts that remain unidentified, attributed to Porphyry (13), Hermes (19), Plotinus (20) and the Sagai (23b). 21 (Poimandres) is of interest in that it is taken from the *Corpus Hermeticum* XIII, which is not represented in the texts assembled by Erbse.

12 (attributed to Apollo!), 22 and 23 all derive from the Sibylline literature, and both 22 and 23 contain passages not known from the extant Greek Sibylline texts. Of particular significance is 22 which, beside containing an apostrophe to Mary derived from *Or.Sib.* III, 785-8, has two passages describing what is to occur in the fourth and fifth generations. The title to the section, referring to the Sibyl who interpreted the dream of the hundred judges in Rome, immediately suggests a connection with the Tiburtine Sibyl, known from reworkings in Latin, Greek, Arabic, Armenian and Ethiopic¹². In particular,

¹¹ It is worth noting that Malalas mentions (ed. DINDORF, p. 76) that he quotes a saying of Orpheus from the chronographer Timotheos; for other texts reference is sometimes made to their use by Cyril of Alexandria.

¹² Latin, ed. E. SACKUR, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen*, Halle, 1898, p. 177-87 (reproduced in A. KURFESS, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen*, Berlin, 1951, p. 262-79; Greek, ed. P.J. ALEXANDER, *The Oracle of Baalbek*, Washington DC, 1967 (note the stemma suggested on p. 66). For the oriental versions see J. SCHLEIFER, *Die Erzählung der Sibylle: ein Apokryph*, in *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.hist.Kl. Bd 33.1, Vienna, 1908, who edits the Arabic and Ethiopic; a further Arabic version is given by R. EBIED and M.J.L. YOUNG, *An unrecorded Arabic version of a Sibylline prophecy*, in *OCF* 43, 1977, p. 279-307 (cp also *OC* 60, 1976, p. 83-94).

the description of the hundred as 'judges' links our Syriac excerpt with the Greek version (*virī* in Latin, 'wise men' in the other oriental versions), and there are some verbal links with the Greek text, although it is quite clear that the Syriac must be quoting a different — and probably earlier — form of the oracle, since it contains elements not found in the extant Greek reworking.

The Syriac compiler¹³, then, has drawn on texts which have some sort of relationship with both the *Theosophia* and the Baalbek Oracle: was he the first to combine materials from these two sources, or did he find these elements already joined together in his Greek source(s)? These are questions which for the moment must remain unanswered, and this is not the place to pursue the complex subject of the early transmission of the *Theosophia* and the Baalbek Oracle; enough, however, has been said to indicate the potential interest of this Syriac collection of prophecies for such a study, seeing that it has drawn on Greek sources considerably different from those that have come down to us. It is evident, too, that our collection will also have to be taken into account in future discussions of the original form and the sources of the Chronicle by John Malalas.

Date and Composition

When Rahmani edited¹⁵ the final paragraphs of our document, concerning Baba, he did not offer any comment about the date of the work. Subsequently H. Pognon suggested in passing that it probably belonged to the early Arab period¹⁶; a date subsequently (and it seems independently) put forward by F. Rosenthal, who gave an English translation of Rahmani's text¹⁷.

As will be seen below, an eighth-century *terminus ante quem* is provided both by the possible date of the Vorlage of our three extant

All these oriental texts represent much later reworkings and they have no special links with our Syriac excerpts. M. GASTER drew attention to some parallels between the Tiburtine Sybil and the Samaritan book known as the *Asatir*: see his *The Asatir: The Samaritan Book of the 'Secrets of Moses'*, London, 1927, p. 42-61 (his views need to be regarded with caution).

¹³ Who may have been working about AD 600: for the date, see below.

¹⁵ *Studia Syriaca* I, Charfet, 1904, p. 48*-50* (text), 47-50 (translation).

¹⁶ *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie...*, Paris, 1907, p. 13 note 1. POGNON thought that 31 contained a reference to Muhammad.

¹⁷ *The Prophecies of Baba the Harranian*, in *A Locust's Leg. Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh*, London, 1962, p. 220-32. Rosenthal also made use of Mingana syr. 4.

TABLE¹⁴

| | <i>Syriac</i> | <i>Erbse</i> | <i>Cyril</i> (PG 76) | <i>Malalas</i> (Dindorf) | <i>Other</i> |
|----|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 2 | Thules (cp 16) | ω. 16 | | 25 ⁶⁻⁸ | |
| 3 | Orpheus | | | 73 ⁵⁻⁹ , 74 ⁶⁻¹⁰ 74 ¹²⁻⁷⁵ 26 ¹¹⁻²⁰ | |
| 4 | Hermes (a) | ω. 1 | | 27 ⁵⁻⁶ | |
| | (b) (cp 14) | ω. 1 | (556A) | 27 ⁷⁻¹¹ | |
| | (c) | ω. 1 | (552C) | 40 ¹⁷⁻¹⁸ | |
| 5 | Sophocles | ω. 17 | 549D | 65 ¹³⁻⁶⁶ 3-7 | |
| 6 | Petissonios | | | 77 ¹⁴⁻⁷⁸ 2 | |
| 7 | Oracle at Cyzicus (cp 18) | θ. 53-4 | | | |
| 8 | Plato (cp 17) | (ω. 3) | | 188 ⁷⁻¹² | |
| 9 | Plato | | 548D | | |
| 10 | Pythagoras | | 548D | | |
| 11 | Orpheus | | 541B | | = Kern 245 ⁷⁻⁸ Or. Sib. I, 324-5 |
| 12 | Apollo | | | | |
| 13 | Porphyry | | | | |
| 14 | Hermes (cp 4(b)) | ω. 1 | 552CD | | |
| 15 | Amelios | | 936A | | |
| 16 | Thules (cp 2) | ω. 16 | | | |
| 17 | Plato (cp 8) | ω. 3 | 916B, 553B | 188 ⁷⁻¹² | |
| 18 | Apollo (cp 7) | θ. 54 | | | |
| 19 | Hermes | | | | |
| 20 | Plotinos | | | | |
| 21 | Poimandres | | | | Corp. Herm. XIII,1-2,4 |
| 22 | Sibyl (a) | | | | cp Baalbek Oracle |
| | (b) | | | | Or. Sib. III, 785-8 |
| | (c) | | | | cp Baalbek Oracle |
| 23 | Sagae (a) | (p. 196) | | | Or. Sib. VI,26; VIII,312 |
| | (b) | | | | |
| | (c) | (p. 195) | | | Or. Sib. VIII, 287-90, 292-6 |
| | | | | | 27-32, 34 Baba of Harran |

manuscripts and by the fact that the work was quoted in the eighth-century Commentary on the Gospels attributed to Lazarus of Beth Qandasa. It is, however, possible, on purely internal grounds to suggest a slightly earlier date: 25 speaks of "all nations, peoples and tongues"

¹⁴ ERBSE = H. ERBSE, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien* (see n. 6). Cyril = Cyril of Alexandria, *contra Julianum*, in PG 76. Malalas = Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. DINDORF, Bonn, 1831. Many of the sayings are to be found in other sources as well: for these see ERBSE and the commentary below; θ and ω are Erbse's symbols for individual collections of prophecies.

as having accepted the Gospel, and it hardly seems likely that a Syriac writer would use such terms after the rise of Islam. A slightly earlier date, late sixth or early seventh century would accordingly seem preferable. Now in both the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian and in the anonymous chronicle *ad annum* 1234 we learn of an attempt, during the reign of Maurice (582-602) to convert the pagans of Harran; the passage in Michael reads as follows¹⁸:

At that time the emperor Maurice ordered Stephanos, bishop of Harran, to institute a persecution against the pagans of Harran. Some he managed to convert to Christianity, while many who resisted he carved up, suspending their limbs in the main street of the town. Then the governor (*hēgemōn*) in authority over the town was discovered to be making sacrifices in secret, hiding under the cloak of Christianity. He was denounced before the bishop by his secretary, who uncovered and revealed the matter. When this had been confirmed he was crucified, and in his position of authority the secretary, who had uncovered the affair, was appointed. This man's name was Iyarios, from whom the House of Iyar are descended; he was an orphan whom his parents had abandoned in a *colonia* of Armenia Prima, in one of the villages of Nikopolis; there, having learnt to read and write, he became a secretary. On coming to Harran he attached himself to Akindynos who was in authority over Harran. When Akindynos was exposed, as we have just said, and was found to be a pagan and sacrificing, he was for that reason put to death and Iyarios took his place.

In the slightly shorter account in the anonymous chronicle¹⁹ the secretary's name is 'N'RYWS (Honorios?); the only additional information it gives is that Akindynos was crucified on the Tell in Harran.

Although bishop Stephanos' methods, as portrayed here, relied more on force²⁰ than on persuasion, it is attractive to suppose that others at about that time preferred to win over the pagan population by reasoned argument, and that our document represents the gentler sort of weapon that they employed²¹.

¹⁸ Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* (ed. CHABOT) II, p. 375-6 (translation) = IV, p. 388 (text).

¹⁹ *Chronicon anonymum ad annum 1234* (ed. CHABOT, CSCO 81, 109) I, p. 214-5 (text) = p. 168-9 (translation).

²⁰ Memory of the persecution survived into the Arab period: al Nadim, *Fihrist* IX.1 (transl. B. DODGE, II, p. 763 = D. CHWOLSON, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, St Petersburg, 1856, II, p. 34) records that on 13th Kanun I the Sabian priests prayed "for the revival of the religion of 'Uzūz which used to be in the place of those things we have described" (i.e. the mosque, Melkite church and market). This refers to the time before "it had been uprooted by the Byzantine kings when they conquered Harran". Cp note 89.

²¹ Alternatively, as A.N. Palmer suggests to me, the work was composed *post eventum* in order to justify the use of force (persuasion supposedly having failed).

That the entire work was composed in Syriac seems probable, for the sections where the compiler himself speaks show no signs of having been translated from Greek, and Syriac, rather than Greek, would clearly be a more effective tool for Christian propaganda in Harran, where, according to Mas'udi²², the gate of the temple of the Sabians had inscribed in Syriac the following saying of Plato: "Whoever recognizès his essence, is divine".

Did the compiler draw on an earlier Syriac translation of some derivative form(s) of the *Theosophia*, or did he make the selection and translation himself? On the evidence available no clear cut answer can be provided to this question, but the extremely inadequate nature of the Syriac translation of those passages which are in archaic language suggests that we are dealing, not with the work of a professional translator, but with an *ad hoc* effort, perhaps put together in a hurry²³ in order to meet a practical need, by someone whose knowledge of Greek was not very profound. This rather suggests that the translations were the compiler's own work, and that he was not making use of an already existing Syriac translation of what might have been a rather longer collection of prophecies.

Manuscript tradition

The learned Syrian Catholic patriarch, I.E. Rahmani, published the sections concerning Baba (1, 26-37 of our present edition) in his *Studia Syriaca* I, Charfet, 1904, p. 48*-50* (text), 47-50 (Latin translation). According to his introduction (p. 53) the text was derived "ex quodam sat vetusto codice qui asservatur in ecclesia oppidi Modiad in monte Turabdinensi, et ex quo fuit anno 1901 transcriptum exemplum nostrae bibliothecae". It is just possible this is the same manuscript as that mentioned by him in *Studia Syriaca* II, Charfet, 1908, p. 1, as being "in ecclesia sanctae Samonae in oppido Mediad in monte Masio prope Mardin; est membranaceus litteris estrangelis exaratus, uti videtur, saeculo VIII"²⁴. Whether this estrangelo manuscript is

²² Maçoudi, *Les prairies d'or* (ed. and tr. C. BARBIER DE MAYNARD), IV, p. 64-5 = CHWOLSON, *op. cit.* II, p. 372-3. For the use of Syriac by pagans at Harran see also J.B. SEGAL, *Edessa and Harran* (Inaugural lecture), London, 1963, p. 21.

²³ Another indication of haste is provided by the fact that the compiler momentarily forgets in 35 that he is addressing the Harranians.

²⁴ See my discussion of this point in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 14, 1969, p. 211-5, where it emerges that on the whole it is unlikely that the two manuscripts are identical.

still in Midyat (Ṭur ʿAbdin), or has been removed to Mardin, or was destroyed in “the year of the sword” (1915) during the massacres in that area, is not known to me²⁵. Fortunately, however, three modern apographs of the manuscript survive in western libraries²⁶. Mingana syr. 4 of 1895 (M), Harvard syr. 99 of 1899 (H), and Vat. syr. 596 of 1917 (V)²⁷, and between these three manuscripts serious variation is minimal so that in most cases it is possible to reconstruct their Vorlage with considerable certainty.

Even though there is some doubt over the identification of the Vorlage with the eighth-century manuscript in the church of Mart Shamouni, a similar *terminus ante quem* for the work is provided by some quite extensive quotations from 19, 22-3 in an eighth-century commentary on the Gospels attributed to Lazarus of Beth Qandasa (British Library Add. 14682, of the tenth century)²⁸.

Subsequently our work was quoted by Dionysios bar Ṣalibi, in his *Treatise against the Muslims* (chapter 19)²⁹, where he cites from 22, 23 and 30. Dionysios also quotes from the Oracle at Cyzicus (corresponding to 7, but in a different translation) and adds two further texts: these three sayings represent an independent Syriac collection which is also attested in Base IV of Barhebraeus’ great theological compendium, *The Candelabra of the Sanctuary*. Yet a third collection (of eight sayings), also with some overlap with our present compilation but again based on a different translation from Greek, is to be found in Base III of Barhebraeus’ work³⁰.

²⁵ As will be seen below there is probably some indirect evidence for its survival in Ṭur ʿAbdin.

²⁶ RAHMANI’S own printed text was derived from another modern copy of the Midyat manuscript; this is presumably still in the library of the Syrian Catholic Patriarchate at Charfet. Montserrat ms or. 31 (of 1915) also contains the text: see J.C.J. SANDERS in *A Tribute to A. Vööbus*, Chicago 1977, p. 51.

²⁷ If this manuscript (written in Mosul) was taken direct from the Midyat manuscript, then of course the latter will have survived the destruction of 1915.

²⁸ Unpublished; the extracts are printed in WRIGHT’S *Catalogue...*, II, p. 609.

²⁹ This was already noted by RAHMANI, p. 70. The work remains unpublished; I have used Mingana syr. 89 f. 67a-b and 215f. 83a-84a. After giving the quotations Dionysios triumphantly asks his imaginary Muslim readers “What have you got to say, o sons of Hagar, in response to these clear testimonies to Christ and his incarnation and passion, all prophesied by pagans? Which of them ever prophesied concerning your Muhammad?”.

³⁰ The texts are published in *PO* 27, p. 582-4 (Base III) and 31, p. 18-20. For the two small collections of prophecies (independent of our present collection) which are attested by Dionysios and Barhebraeus, see my *Some Syriac excerpts from Greek collections of pagan prophecies*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* (forthcoming).

The quotations in both Lazarus and in Dionysios contain a few readings which are clearly superior to those of the manuscripts HMV.

Mention should also be made of the citation of 27-30 (the prophecies of Baba) in a modern work written in classical Syriac, *Ktobo d-marduto d-suryoye* (“Book of the culture of the Syrians”) by Abrohom Gabriel Zsaumo (*sic*)³¹, published at the “Casa Editorial Asiria”, Banfield, Buenos Aires, in 1967 and reprinted photographically by Çiçek (now Metropolitan Yulios) at Würzburg in 1975. Most of the book is devoted to the pre-Christian culture of Mesopotamia, but in chapter 7, on the Syriac language, three examples of pagan writers using Syriac are given: Aḥiqar, Baba of Harran and Mara bar Serapion.

Zsaumo states (p. 159) that Baba (whom he consistently calls Babay) wrote in the last centuries before Christ, that “a certain Addai wrote concerning him”, and that he is called “a philosopher” (rather than a prophet) by Dionysios bar Ṣalibi³². Then follow (p. 160-1) quotations of 27-30 of our text in vocalized form. Zsaumo cannot be using Rahmani’s edition since he has the correct text (along with the Harvard manuscript) in two places where Rahmani’s text has lost some words; nor has he derived the quotations from Dionysios, since that author only quotes 30. One must conclude that his knowledge of the work is based on a manuscript still in Ṭur ʿAbdin and perhaps in Midyat, from which town Zsaumo says in his preface that he originates; this manuscript could then very well have been the Vorlage from which our extant manuscripts HMV are copied. Comparison of his quotation with the text of our other witnesses suggests that he has at times rephrased the original (above all in 30), and accordingly variants attested only by him are not included in the apparatus.

Although Zsaumo does not directly say so, his wording leads the reader to infer that the Addai who wrote about Baba was in fact the author of the work in which he found the prophecies, in other words, of our present collection. Unfortunately no hint is given of the source for this intriguing piece of information.

³¹ Not mentioned in R. MACUCH, *Geschichte der spät- und neusyrischen Literatur*, Berlin, 1976. According to A. NOURO, *My Tour in the Parishes of the Syrian Church in Syria and Lebanon*, Beirut, 1967, p. 239, ZSAUMO (Sawma) also wrote some plays, including one on Abgar the Black.

³² This is quite correct: Dionysios introduces the quotation of 30 with the words “Of Baba the Harranian philosopher, from his book”.

I adjure you, first voice of the father, which spoke when he made firm the entire universe by (his) will, the first voice of the father which he spoke to⁴⁰ the only-begotten, his word.

5. *Sophocles said concerning the Father*: One is the God who fixed the heaven, made firm the earth, spread out the water, and poured out the air and blasts of wind.

6. *Petissonios Pharaoh, king of Egypt* went out to the renowned oracle at Memphis, and having made a sacrifice he enquired of the Pythia, saying: "Reveal and explain to me who is prior to Kewan?". An oracle was granted him: "He who rides on the heaven, who is clothed in flame, is first of all, (who is) light that never dies, immortal light, at which everything trembles — heaven, earth and the seas; the demons in the lowest depths shook, trembled and quaked before him. He is God, father of his own accord, having no father (himself), father, Lord of himself, thrice rich".

When Pharaoh the king heard (this) from the oracle he gave orders that the words⁴¹ he was given be carved on tablets of stone. These things stand inscribed and carved on tablets of stone to this day at the spot where the Nile issues forth.

7. In the town of Cyzicus a temple was built, and when the Argonauts came to the oracle, the place called Pythia Therma, they too offered up sacrifices and enquired, saying as follows: "Prophecy to us, o prophet Titan Phoebus Apollo, whose shall this house be, or what will it become?" There issued an oracle for them as follows: "I am made for those who are prepared for virtuous actions and (for) a created adornment⁴². I understand three (things): one single supernal god; that a young girl will conceive his ineffable word; and that he shall run like a bow clothed in fire within her. He who shall confine the entire world will also offer it up to his father an offering. Hers shall this house be, and Maria is her name".

8. *Plato said concerning the Trinity*: concerning how God is known by three names, one power, and godhead, he said; and the first cause is the good which has compassion on every thing; the second cause⁴³ is the mind⁴⁴, he who created everything; the third cause is the life-giving soul, which gave life to all that lives. The three powers, then, he acknowledged to be a single godhead.

9. *The same, on the Father*: Since the making of everything belongs to the father and creator, we can say that he turns out to be powerful in everything.

10. *Pythagoras, on the Father*: He is one, the whole of him who visits the whole orb; in heaven, being the beginning, and light, and father of all, mind and principle of souls and of movement of all. He is a single god who is master

⁴⁰ Or 'namely'.

⁴¹ So by a small correction (cf Greek; Syriac mss *mlk* 'counsels' for *ml* 'words', with consequent partial grammatical incongruence).

⁴² So by a small correction (cf Greek; *nsbt* 'planting' in the Syriac mss is a corruption of *sbt* 'adornment').

⁴³ So by a slight correction (cf Greek; Syriac mss *mlt* 'word' for 'It' 'cause').

⁴⁴ So by a slight correction (cf Greek; Syriac mss *hkn* 'thus' for *hwn* 'mind').

to both angels and men, without human body with respect to limbs, or thought or mind; who puts all things into motion and causes them to shake, being great and mighty; who is far removed from likeness, who is beyond everything. How can any word praise you? For you are the word, for you are beyond explanation, and hidden; and all created things, when they shall speak of you, are endowed with speech so as to praise you.

11. *Orpheus, on the Father*: For you alone, o king, does the world live, and for you, o being self-originate; begetter of one, whom all fear.

12. *Apollo, on the Father and the Son*: The son of god, great and exalted, shall come, clothed in flesh, resembling mortals.

13. *Porphyry, on the Son*: The radiance, the second mind, who issued forth and descended for this reason, returned and was raised up. He is light, then, even when he descends, for he illuminates the world by his ineffable descent.

14. *Hermes, on the Son*: The word of the same was born, being perfect in everything, born and creator, having descended into a mother who gave (him) birth, and dwelt in nature; and he caused the waters to conceive.

15. *Amelios⁴⁵ on the Son*: The word was with god and was god, and through him everything came into being. Having descended from heaven and been clothed in a body, he appeared (as) a man, and he manifested the greatness of nature.

And again, that he is god as he was before he came down.

16. *Thules, on the Trinity*: On returning from war in Africa he went in and sacrificed, making an enquiry which was answered by the oracle as follows: "First⁴⁶ god, then the word, and the spirit with them. All of them equally as one, whose might lasts for ever".

17. *Plato, on the Trinity*: The principle of the states⁴⁷ of all things we define as being the *ousia* of the godhead. The highest god is the good; after him (comes) duality and trinity.

18. *Apollo, on the Trinity*: We see this with regard to virtue and adornment, I mean, three (is) one alone, the most high god.

19. *Hermes, on the Father and on the Son*: Therefore he resembles the power of the father who is with him. The son is therefore in the father and the father⁴⁸ in the son, for he is the cause for everything to come into being; child of the father, who is light of light, who is from fire and with fire; so too the mind which is with the father is also the word in light.

20. *Plotinus⁴⁹, on the Trinity and the inhomination*: Of him from whom is the root of all things that exist, of him whose word and name is holy, also the

⁴⁵ In the Syriac mss the name has been corrupted to *mylytws*, an easy process in Estrangelo script.

⁴⁶ So by a slight correction (cf Greek; Syriac mss *lw mdm* 'not anything' for *lwqdm* 'first').

⁴⁷ Perhaps *qwym* 'states' is a corruption of *qnmw* 'persons', which would be a more usual translation of ὑπόστασις.

⁴⁸ So the quotation in Lazarus; the Syriac mss omit.

⁴⁹ Mss *pwlytyrws*.

power and the wisdom⁵⁰ of activity. He appears as eternal word with respect to indication and knowledge of those who are to come to know god; for he is the child of god, (coming) from the supreme godhead of that chief god, his father self-originate. Now the word of this (god) is god; he is creator of all things that exist, and maker and craftsman of all that shall be.

21. *Poimandres, on Christ*: "From what womb, then, o Trismegistos, or of what seed?" Hermes says: "Intellectual wisdom, my son, and what is above the true good". Questioner: "Who is the sower, father, for I am totally at a loss?" Answer: "The will of god, my son, with respect to the godhead". Questioner: "Of what sort, o father, is he who is born?" Answer: "God, the son of god, who is all and in all and is omnipotent and the establisher of all". Questioner: "Tell me, o father, who is the creator of rebirth?" Answer: "God, the son of god, who became man by the will of god".

22. *Next, the Sibyl who interpreted the dreams of the hundred judges in Rome.*

(a) In the fourth generation God shall appear in the south; no man shall have known his mother (in intercourse), and there shall rise up against him a king who is unable to save himself, and he will slay children because of him who has been revealed in the land of Judah. He shall not benefit himself in anything⁵¹.

(b) Rejoice, o maid, and exult; for to you has he given joy for ever: he is God who created both heaven and earth; yet he shall dwell in you and he shall be to you endless light.

*The same, on the cross*⁵².

(c) In the fifth generation there shall rise up a mighty king and a portent shall be manifested for/by him in heaven, a sign upon which God is about to be hung, (namely) on the cross.

23. *The Sagae, on the cross.*

(a) "O cross thrice blessed, upon which God was stretched out", and "the dead one who finished off death when he slept for three days".

(b) Him who is exalted above all did they dare to torture and to hurt, and they held back (*sic!*) their hands against him lawlessly — against the one whose nature is not to suffer and not to toil, who did not consider this to be buffeting. Two others did they crucify on either side in mockery together and preparing to destroy him; and they said to one another: if he is God or the son of God, if he has the ability at all, let him bring himself down from the cross and fly to his father.

(c) Finally he shall come into the hands of those who are lawless and do not believe, and they shall strike the cheeks of God with human hands, and with unclean mouths will they spit at his face. He shall give his back to scourges then, and as he is buffeted he will keep silent so that none will recognize who he is,

⁵⁰ Cf. I Cor 1:24.

⁵¹ So Dionysios bar Šalibi; in the Syriac mss *nwt* 'benefit' has been corrupted to *nktr* 'remain'.

⁵² Dionysios bar Šalibi prefaces his quotation of this with the words "The Sibyl also prophesies concerning king Constantine".

or whose he is, or whence he has come; so that, being crowned by thorns, he will open his mouth and speak. His side did they pierce with the sword because of their law.

24. It is a matter of great wonder, therefore, o unbaptized men of Harran, how those of the philosophers, wise ancients and leaders of pagan religion who have now been adduced, spoke openly and in an unveiled manner about the Trinity and unity of the Godhead who is worshipped and glorified by the Christians; how this Godhead is the one true God who is known in three persons, of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This is something which not even the true prophets opened up and illuminated in their revelations of the Christian faith to any greater extent than did the pagan philosophers who made clear pronouncements about how God is one, creator of all that is visible and invisible; and that he has a Son eternally born from him, and beyond time, just as a ray is born from the sun; who is his Word, through whom and in whom he created the worlds; how he also has a Spirit who continually proceeds from him, and how the Godhead is single, and there is no other God except one.

They also prophesied that the Son and Word of God would come down upon earth and be embodied from a virgin, and become a man, clothed in humanity; and how he was about to suffer, be crucified, be buried, rise on the third day, and be raised up to his Father and Sender.

They did not neglect even to utter the name of the virgin, as if in prophecy, and (the name) of the temple which was built in their time at Cyzicus which to-day belongs to her, just as they foretold, openly laying bare her name, saying "Maria is her name".

How then, after testimonies such as these, can you be so brazen as to stand in dispute, not just with his own prophets, but also with those who were leaders of the religion to which you belong?

25. You should realize, then, that it was not vainly that God effected this with the pagan philosophers, but it was because his holy Gospel was going to be preached among all the nations under the sky, in order that the pagan nations, on hearing the name of "Son of God" and again of his birth from a virgin and his passion, death and resurrection, should not feel disgust and run away as though from something strange and unacceptable. It was for this reason he educated their hearing with utterances such as these which were committed to writing by their oracles. For the divine power compelled their demons, to whom they were sacrificing, to testify to God and to his Son and his Holy Spirit, and concerning the entire economy of Christ God, one of the holy Trinity, so that when the mystery was revealed in its own time, it might be believed by all the nations on the grounds that the testimonies of their own wise men and philosophers agreed with those of the prophets and apostles sent by God for the salvation of mankind. This has taken place in this way, and now all nations, peoples and tongues⁵³ have accepted the Gospels and believed in Christ and in his Father and his Holy Spirit — with the exception of yourselves who have made yourselves of your own choice and freewill the

⁵³ Dan 3:4 etc.

refuse of mankind. How great, then, is your sin against God, seeing that the world moves in the great light of the Gospel of Christ as in daylight, while you alone of the Christian polity are unwilling to leave the darkness of the hateful night of the idolatry by which formerly the entire world went astray through ignorance. For in Abraham's time, when the darkness of the error of paganism was spread over the whole world, and Abraham alone knew God and believed in him, your ancestors did not consent at all to walk in the light of Abraham's lamp and so escape and be saved from the darkness of error which gripped all the nations.

But now that the mighty light of the Sun of Righteousness, of the Gospel of Christ God, has shone out, and all the gloom of paganism has been rolled away and destroyed from the entire polity, you nevertheless remain in disobedience, not willing to walk in the light of day, but instead you carry a lamp full of dirt and gloom, in whose glimmer you walk at midday, with the result that you and your ancestors as well are shown to be opposing God in everything.

26. *Prophecy of Baba, the god of Harran.*

But listen to what Baba, who actually lived in Harran, said, whose books the pagans continuously read, who is renowned as a prophet amongst them, and whom they hold as superior to all the philosophers, taking refuge in him. (Listen) to how openly he spoke and indicated concerning Christ the Son of God, his prophecy being proved correct by the divine power in the same way as Balaam the diviner's⁵⁴. He said in his first book, which they name 'Revelation', in (his) very words as follows:

27. I did not want to say these things, but I am constrained against my will to write concerning things that are about to take place — and there will be lamentation and weeping when they occur, when the Fire, which was prior to the world, is come to the earth and has appeared in a body (belonging to) the earth, but men will not recognize (it), and it will return again and ascend to its exalted region, to the glory which is hidden from all. And when it is in its own place there shall come people resembling me and take vengeance on the men of Harran, and the men of the city of Sin will say «The madness of Baba is wisdom from the heavenly beings»; and as they assail 'Azzuz who distils everything in him, his inhabitants will leave him, and they (*fem.*) shall become a martyron⁵⁵, and the remainder a latrine.

⁵⁴ Num 22-24.

⁵⁵ The sense of this sentence is as obscure to me as it was to RAHMANI and ROSENTHAL. RAHMANI rendered it "impellent dein Azzuz educentque ex eo ipsius incolae, eritque in locum testium...", and ROSENTHAL "shaking 'Azzuz in which all exaltation (reading *rm* for *rs*) they will expel those who dwell in it and it will become a house of martyrs...". If *rs*' is not a corruption (ZSAUMO has *rwq*', see below), it must derive from *rss* 'sprinkle'. The phrase "his inhabitants will leave him" could just as well be translated "they will drive out from him his inhabitants" (the pronominal suffixes "in him", "from him" could easily be corruptions of "in it", "from it" (feminine, referring to 'Azzuz, which the form *rs*' indicates to be feminine), and under the influence of this one might suppose that *mwrwhy* "his inhabitants" hides an original *mwrwh* "its inhabitants). ZSAUMO's text reads "assailing 'swr (glossed as Asshur) in which all kinds of ignominies

28. *From the same book*

For the immortal mind of fire, sacrifices⁵⁶ that never pass away, and incorruptible light will appear on earth, while (still) dwelling in heaven, having sway over both heaven and earth. In it is life (*or* salvation) for everyone who takes refuge in it. But the men of Harran proved deceitful. (It is) all that was and comes into being, and it is before everything; in it does wisdom reside and dwell, and outside the light nothing exists. O land, land, do not drink error⁵⁷; rather, recognize the fire that has appeared; it exists and does not pass away. When it shall leave⁵⁸ the height and shall spend some years, (only) a short and brief (time), on earth, evil shall come upon their wickedness, and their foot shall not stand (still) until they see the fire that has appeared and (until) they worship it in the right fashion.

29. *From the same book*

And they shall utter a pleasant word, "Come, let us fall down upon the earth and worship God, its Maker". And there shall be (*or* And let there be) on earth a great and holy temple, and the entire people shall offer up to God an offering in perfect love.

30. *From the second book*

They shall gaze upon the radiance which will spring forth from where they are not expecting it; and it shall be seen from their place, and, along with all who are worthy of it, it shall be seen with great (and) unattainable light. All the inhabitants of the world shall perceive the gloriousness of the ray which was hidden and then was revealed.

And I saw in the spirit according to what had been spoken to me: that a child of light and of fire has been born from earth, for both advantage and for loss, for a rising up and a falling down.

Alas, alas, for afterwards the house of the gods in you (i.e. Harran), which is glorious and as tall as the Capitol of Rome, shall not have a stone left standing on another.

Do not quake, O Harran, do not quake, for if you recognize the light of the radiance, many great things shall be brought to nought.

The radiance of the Lord shall openly come down upon earth and they shall be without signs until the ascent of Lampōn. And Persians shall come offering gifts to the radiance. Glorious is the conduct of the godhead, and wondrous is the wonder which shall appear on earth; it is exalted above word(s), and it is beyond mind; it is utterly unattainable and impossible to number.

(*lit*: spittle; *rwq*', for *rs*' for our manuscripts) and it shall become a martyron' (he omits the words "and his inhabitants will leave him"). *rs*' could well be a corruption of *rwq*' (in which case the masculine suffixes could refer to 'Azzuz); *swr*, on the other hand, looks like a guess.

⁵⁶ V has "which is in life" (probably a corruption).

⁵⁷ So RAHMANI and ROSENTHAL; ZSAUMO, however, vocalizes the text to read "let not error be at peace".

⁵⁸ Translation uncertain: *tps* (vocalized *tap(p)es* by ZSAUMO) could be from either *nps* or (the more usual) *pss*, but none of the normal senses are suitable in the context. RAHMANI translated "dum ille se erga celsum expandit(?)", while ROSENTHAL conjectured *tsq* 'ascend' (although the opposite seems to be required by the context).

Furthermore, the earth shall dwell in peace for a little, and an oriental kingdom shall be aroused. It will go up and destroy the city of Judaea. 'BWR shall go down in captivity, and Babylon will serve in slavery because it spoke of a child of wonder in his manner⁵⁹.

Again, kings of the west shall be aroused and they will come as far as our region; they will sacrifice in 'Azzuz, and in its midst they will offer offerings, and they will seek to bring religion to an end, though they shall not be able to speak⁶⁰ thus, because of others who will reign after them, believing.

31. Again Baba says

After a considerable time a great name shall come from the south and will recline in the midst of 'Azzuz; he will honour its initiates, and over everyone who does not consent to his words shall the sword reign.

32. Again Baba says concerning the apostles

Contemptible are his apostles, or his runners.

33. He has indicated clearly concerning the apostles of Christ, for they were contemptible and simple people, whom he sent out and they ran over the whole world; and through the divine power of Christ which accompanied them they were able to catch all mankind for life (or salvation), performing wonders and glorious miracles.

34. Again, the augur went on to speak about the child of the light on earth as follows: ' >⁶¹ above all and hidden in all. It was a wonder which was performed".

35. All these testimonies, then, testified concerning Christ, (coming) from him whom they hold to be a prophet. How is it that they are not ashamed, seeing that they are unwilling to believe Christ, the Son of God, and to abandon the pagan error which they hold on to? For they should, if they hold him as a prophet, accept the prophecy of their own prophet and believe in Christ the Son of God, just as Baba himself prophesied concerning him.

36. If you do not accept Christ, about whom your own prophet Baba prophesied and wrote, you should not then accept Baba, your prophet, himself, on the grounds that he has prophesied falsehood to you; instead, you should reject him and anathematize him as being false and a deceiver. For he did not say anything about Christ which did not actually take place and was fulfilled, and was described in the Gospel.

37. This (happened), as I said before, because God knew that the pagan nations would not accept the books of the prophets in the same way as the books of their own wise men and oracles; he therefore caused their oracles to speak against their will concerning Christ and his birth before (all) worlds from God the Father, and about his second nativity from a virgin at the end of times, so that even if the nations would (only) believe their own native prophets,

⁵⁹ For "it spoke", "I spoke" is also possible. RAHMANI translated *šrbh* "in sua generatione", but for this one would expect *šrbth*.

⁶⁰ ROSENTHAL suspects that the text is corrupt and suggested correcting *dnmlwn* to *dnšklwn* or *dnšmlwn* "bring to completion".

⁶¹ Although there is no break in the manuscripts, there must be a lacuna here, as RAHMANI saw.

they would still be persuaded. Just as Baba himself, your own diviner, said: "I did not want to say these things, but I am actually constrained to write down, against my will, the things that are going to happen in the world". So too did Balaam, the diviner from Aram Nahrain, prophesy unwillingly concerning Christ, being under pressure from the divine command.

COMMENTARY

1 The abrupt opening suggests that we do not have the complete work (this is also intimated by the title).

2. To be found in both the Tübingen Theosophy (ERBSE, p. 207: ω. 16) and Malalas (for other witnesses see ERBSE, p. 111)⁶². Malalas reads (p. 25⁶⁻⁸):

Πρώτα θεός, μετέπειτα λόγος^a και πνεῦμα σὺν αὐτοῖς· σύμφυτα δὲ πάντα και εἰς ἓν ἰόντα, οὐ κράτος αἰώνιον.

a. Syr. + "from him".

3. This only occurs in Malalas and the dependent Kedrenos (p. 101); Malalas reads (p. 73⁵⁻⁹, 74⁵⁻⁷⁵):

Ὡ ἀναξ, Λητοῦς υἱέ, ἑκατηβόλε, Φοῖβε κραταίε,
ὦ δέσποτα, ἡμέρας υἱέ, ὁ τὰ πάντα πόρρωθεν ταῖς ἀκτίσι σου τοξεύων,
ἀμίαντε και δύνατε,

πανδερκές, θνητοῖσι και ἀθανάτοισι ἀνάσσων,
ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐπιβλέπων, θνητῶν και ἀθανάτων βασιλεύων ... (εἰρηκῶς ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐκθέσει) ἀκατάληπτόν τινα (και πάντων ὑπέρτατον εἶναι) και προγονέστερον δὲ και δημιουργόν ἀπάντων και τοῦ αἰθέρος^a αὐτοῦ και τῆς νυκτός και πάσης τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν αἰθέρα οὔσης^b και καλυπτομένης κτίσεως· τὴν δὲ γῆν εἶπεν ὑπὸ τοῦ σκότους ἀόρατον οὔσαν· ἔφρασε δὲ ὅτι τὸ φῶς^c ῥῆξαν τὸν αἰθέρα ἐφώτισε τὴν γῆν και πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν, εἰπὼν ἐκεῖνο εἶναι τὸ φῶς τὸ ῥῆξαν τὸν αἰθέρα τὸ προειρημένον, τὸ ὑπέρτατον πάντων^d, οὐ τὸ ὄνομα ὁ αὐτός Ὁρφεὺς ἀκούσας ἐκ τῆς μαντείας ἔξειπε, Μῆτιν, Φάνητα, Ἐρικεπαῖον· ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται τῇ κοινῇ γλῶσση βουλή, φῶς, ζωοδοτήρ· εἰπὼν ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐκθέσει τὰς αὐτὰς τρεῖς θείας τῶν ὀνομάτων δυνάμεις μίαν εἶναι δύναμιν και κράτος τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ, ὃν οὐδεὶς ὄρᾳ, ἥστινος δυνάμεως οὐδεὶς δύναται γνῶναι ἰδέαν ἢ φύσιν· ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς δυνάμεως τὰ πάντα γεγενῆσθαι, και ἀρχὰς ἀσωμάτων και ἥλιον και σελήνην, ἐξουσίας και ἄστρα πάντα

⁶² The same saying reappears in **16**, in a slightly different translation, and prefaced by a short historical introduction (see commentary to **16**). The differences between the two translations can be seen from the following:

πρώτα] + μεν **16**
 λογος] + from him **2**
 σύμφυτα] *nšibe akhda* **2**; *šawya`it* **16**
 ἰοντα] *om* **16**
 οὐ] ὦν **16**.

Yet a third translation of the oracle is to be found in Barhebraeus' *Candelabra* (see my *Some Syriac excerpts...*); there the name has been corrupted to *hlys*.

καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν, τὰ ὀρώμενα ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα. τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος εἶπεν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ πλασθέντα ἐκ γῆς καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντα λογικὴν, καθὼς Μωσῆς ὁ πάνσοφος ἐξέθετο ταῦτα^ε. ὁ δὲ Ὀρφεὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ βίβλῳ συνένταξεν ὅτι διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν τριῶν ὀνομάτων, μίας δὲ θεότητος, τὰ πάντα ἐγενετο, καὶ αὐτός ἐστι τὰ πάντα^φ.

a. Syr. *pr* 'fiery'. — b. Syr. corrupt, but with 'air' rather than 'aither'. — c. Syr. 'the first light'. — d. Syr. *om*. — e. Syr. *om*. — f. Syr. 'the cause of everything'.

The Syriac translator has completely misunderstood the verse passages and he evidently did not have quite the same rendering "into the common tongue" as that provided by Malalas.

4. The introductory section and the sequence of the three sayings links the Syriac with Malalas' version of these widely known utterances (for other witnesses see ERBSE, p. 104-5)⁶³. Malalas reads (p. 26¹¹⁻²⁰, 27⁵⁻¹¹):

(a) Ἑρμῆς ὁ τρισμέγιστος ὁ Αἰγύπτιος, ἀνὴρ φοβερός ἐν σοφίᾳ. ὃς ἔφρασε τρεῖς μέγιστας ὑποστάσεις^α εἶναι τοῦ ἀρρήτου καὶ δημιουργοῦ ὄνομα, μίαν δὲ θεότητα εἶπε: διὸ καὶ ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Τρισμέγιστος Ἑρμῆς. ἐμφέρεται γὰρ ἐν διαφόροις αὐτοῦ λόγοις πρὸς Ἀσκληπίον εἰρηκῶς περὶ θεοῦ φύσεως ταῦτα. Εἰ μὴ πρόνοιά τις ἦν τοῦ πάντων κυρίου ὥστε μοι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἀποκαλύψαι, οὐδὲ ὑμᾶς τοιοῦτος ἔρωσ κατεῖχεν, ἵνα περὶ τούτου ζητήσαιτε: οὐ γὰρ ἐφικτόν ἐστιν εἰς ἀμνήτους τοιαῦτα μυστήρια παρέχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τῷ νοί ἀκούσατε. ἐν μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ φῶς νοερόν πρὸ φωτός νοεροῦ^β καὶ ἦν αἰεὶ νοῦς νοῦς φωτεινός...

(b) ... Ὁ γὰρ λόγος αὐτοῦ προελθὼν παντέλειος ὢν καὶ γόνιμος^ε καὶ δημιουργός, ἔν γονίμῳ φύσει πεσών, ἐν γονίμῳ ὕδατι, ἐγκυον τὸ ὕδωρ ἐποίησε^δ.

(c) καὶ ταῦτα εἰρηκῶς ἠϋξάτο λέγων, Ὀρκίζω σε, οὐρανέ, θεοῦ μεγάλου σοφὸν ἔργον, ἴλαος ἔσο· ὀρκίζω σε, φωνὴ πατρός, ἦν ἐφθέγγατο πρώτην^ε, ἠνίκα κόσμον ἅπαντα ἐστηρίζατο βουλῇ. φωνὴν πατρός, ἦν ἐφθέγγατο πρώτην, τὸν μονογενῆ λόγον αὐτοῦ.

a. Syr. 'threefold powers of majesty'. — b. Syr. 'sensible'. — c. Syr. *om*. — d. Syr. *om*. — e. Syr. evidently read as a nominative.

5. The text of this widely attested saying⁶⁴ occurs in Malalas as follows (p. 40¹⁷⁻¹⁸):

⁶³ Attributions other than to Hermes are to be found in several of the witnesses. 4(b) is repeated in 14, which gives a fuller translation of the Greek text, and a partly overlapping excerpt, in a different translation, occurs in Barhebraeus' *Candelabra* (see my *Some Syriac excerpts...*).

⁶⁴ For witnesses see ERBSE, p. 140-1. Barhebraeus in his *Candelabra* also has a saying attributed to Sophocles, but only the opening words correspond to the present

Εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ὃς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔτευξε καὶ γαῖαν μακρὰν πόντου τε χαροποῦ οἶδμα καὶ ἀνέμων βίας.

As usual when faced with verse the Syriac translator resorts to guesswork.

6. The piece occurs only in Malalas and Kedrenos (p. 84)⁶⁵; Malalas reads (p. 65¹³⁻⁶⁶):

Ὁ δὲ Πετισσώνιος Φαραῶ βασιλεὺς ἐνθέως^α ἀπῆλθεν ἐν τῇ Μέμφῃ εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον τὸ περιβόητον καὶ ποιήσας θυσίαν ἐπερώτα τὴν Πυθίαν λέγων, Σαφήνισόν μοι τίς ἐστὶν πρῶτος ὑμῶν^β καὶ μέγας θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,^ε καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ χρησμὸς οὗτος. Ἔστι κατ' οὐρανοῖο μεγάλιο βεβηκὸς φλογὸς ὑπερβάλλον αἶθριον, ἀέναον, ἀθάνατον πῦρ^δ, ὃ τρέμει πᾶν, οὐρανός, γαῖα τε καὶ θάλασσα, ταρτάριοι τε βύθιοι δαίμονες ἐρρίγησαν^ε. οὗτος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοπάτωρ, ἀπάτωρ, πατὴρ υἱός^ε αὐτός ἑαυτοῦ, τρισόλβιος· εἰς μικρὸν δὲ μέρος ἀγγέλων ἡμεῖς· μαθὼν ἄπιθι σιγῶν^ε. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Φαραῶ ἀκούσας ταῦτα παρὰ τῆς μαντείας, ἐκέλευσε πλάκα λιθίνην γλυφῆναι τὰ παρὰ τοῦ χρησμοῦ δοθέντα αὐτῷ ῥήματα. ἄτινα ἕως τῆς νῦν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τῇ πλακί γλυφέντα ἄνω ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ Μέμφης^β, ὅθεν ὁ Νεῖλος ποταμὸς πορεύεται.

a. Syr. 'of Egypt'. — b. Syr. 'prior to Kewan' (i.e. Kronos)⁶⁶. — c. Syr. *om*. — d. Syr. 'light'⁶⁷. — e. Syr. + 'trembled and quaked'. — f. Syr. 'and lord'⁶⁸. — g. Syr. *om*⁶⁹. — h. Syr. *om*.

7. The introductory words again link this extract with Malalas, who reads (p. 77¹⁴⁻⁷⁸)⁷⁰:

... ἔκτισεν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Κυζίκῳ πόλει μετὰ τὴν νίκην ἱερόν. καὶ

text (the rest belongs to the oracle to Petissonios); see my *Some Syriac excerpts*. For the Sophocles saying in the third Passion of St Catherine, see J. BIDEZ, in *Byz.Z.* 11 (1902), p. 390-1.

⁶⁵ For a possible reflection of another episode connected with Petissonios in Malalas (the miracle contest between Moses and Jannes and Jambres), see my *Some Syriac legends concerning Moses*, in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33, 1982, p. 245.

⁶⁶ *lk'wn* could of course be a corruption of *lkwn* 'to you' (= Greek), but then it is extremely unlikely that a Syriac scribe would substitute *lk'wn* for *lkwn*.

⁶⁷ This could be a corruption of *nwr* (fem.) 'fire' to *nwhr* (masc.) 'light', but if so it has involved a large-scale alteration of genders in the vicinity as well.

⁶⁸ But *wmr* could be a corruption of *wbr* 'and son'.

⁶⁹ The previous phrases are included by Barhebraeus in a saying attributed to Sophocles (see note 64); the words εἰς μικρὸν δὲ μέρος ἀγγέλων ἡμεῖς are of particular interest since, not only do they occur in a different context in the Tübingen Theosophy (ERBSE, p. 169 line 31), but they also turn up in a genuine oracle inscribed on stone at Oinoanda, on the borders between Lycia and Phrygia (see L. ROBERT, *Un oracle gravé a Oinoanda*, in *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1971, p. 597-619 (esp. 605).

* ⁷⁰ For other witnesses see ERBSE, p. 117-21. A different Syriac translation, employing another form of Greek text, is to be found in the small collection of three prophecies quoted by Dionysios bar Šalibi and Barhebraeus (*Candelabra*, Base IV): for these, see my *Some Syriac excerpts...*

ἀπελθόντες οἱ Ἄργοναῦται εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον, ἔνθα λέγεται τὰ Πύθια θερμά, καὶ ποιήσαντες θυσίαν ἐπερώτησαν λέγοντες ταῦτα. Προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, προφήτα, Τιτάν, Φοῖβε Ἄπολλον, τίνας ἔσται δόμος οὗτος, εἰ τί δὲ ἔσται, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς χρησμός παρά τῆς Πυθίας οὗτος. Ὅσα μὲν πρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ κόσμον ὄρωρε ποιεῖτε. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφετιμῶ τρεῖν ἓνα μόνον ὑψιμέδοντα θεόν, οὗ λόγος ἀφθιτος ἐν ἀδαεὶ κόρη ἐγκυος ἔσται. οὗτος ὡσπερ τόξον πυριφόρον μέσον διαδραμῶν ἅπαντα κόσμον, ζωγρεύσας πατρὶ προσάξει δῶρον. αὐτῆς ἔσται δόμος, Μαρία δὲ τοῦνομα αὐτῆς.

The Syriac translation is rather free in places, due no doubt to the translator's unfamiliarity with archaic vocabulary; no variants appear to be involved.

8. Malalas' version of the saying⁷¹ reads (p. 188⁷⁻¹²):

... περὶ θεοῦ εἶπεν ὅτι τὸ θεῖον ἐν τρισὶν ὀνόμασι, μία δὲ δύναμις καὶ θεότης, εἰπὼν εἶναι πρῶτον αἴτιον τὸ ἀγαθὸν τὸ οἰκτεῖρον τὰ πάντα, δεῦτερον αἴτιον νοῦς ὁ δημιουργήσας τὰ πάντα, τρίτον αἴτιον ἡ ζωοποιὸς ψυχῆ, ἥτις ἐξωγόνησε τὰ πάντα. τὰς οὖν τρεῖς δυνάμεις μίαν ὑπάρχειν θεότητα ὠμολόγησε.

9. The nearest parallel appears to be Cyril, *Contra Julianum* I (PG 76, col. 548D), which reads:

... τὸν γὰρ πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντός, εὐρεῖν τε ἔργον, καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἐξείπειν ἀδύνατον.

The translator has badly misunderstood the Greek.

10. The closest text in Greek would again appear to be Cyril, *Contra Julianum* I, in a passage immediately preceding the extract which features as Syr. 9. The Syriac text, however, not only omits the two passages bracketed in Cyril's text given below, but at the end it adds two further sentences which find no correspondence in the Greek⁷². Cyril reads (PG 76, col. 548D):

Ὁ μὲν θεὸς εἷς, (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐχ ὡς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τῆς διακοσμῆσιος, ἀλλ') ἐν αὐτῷ ὄλος ἐν ὄλω τῷ κύκλῳ ἐπισκοπῶν (πάσας γενεάς, ἐπὶ κρῆσιν ὧν τῶν ὄλων αἰώνων, καὶ φῶς τῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμεων καὶ ἔργων),

⁷¹ For a related text, see ERBSE, p. 139-4 and 204 (ω. 3), who does not mention Malalas. A different version of the saying, closer to ω. 3, will be found in 17.

⁷² A related Syriac text, much closer to Cyril's, is surprisingly to be found in Theodore bar Koni's account of Pythagorean teaching, immediately preceding an extract from Porphyry's *Vita Pythagorae* 42; the relevant passage in Theodore reads (*Liber Scholiorum* II, ed. A. SCHER, CSCO 69, p. 291¹¹⁻¹⁸): "On the subject of God he said, 'God is one, and he is not, as some have supposed, outside his creation, but he is entirely within it, the whole of him being in the entire orb, as he looks upon all generations. And', he says, involving him in mixture, 'he is a mixture of all ages, and maker ('bwd', conceivably a corruption of *nwhr*' = Cyril's φῶς) of his powers, the principle of all light in heaven, father of all, mind and soul of all, activator of all orbs'".

ἀρχὰ πάντων, ἐν οὐρανῷ^a φωστήρ, καὶ πάντων πατήρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῶν ὄλων κύκλων, πάντων κίνασις...^b.

a. Syr. *om.* — b. For the additional sentences in Syr. see the full translation above

11. This appears to be intended as a translation of the following two lines in a sixteen-line quotation from Orpheus given by Cyril in *Contra Julianum* I (PG 76, col. 541B):

Ἄτραπιτοῦ, μόνον δ' ἐσόρα κόσμοιο Ἄνακτα,
εἰς δ' ἔστ' αὐτογενής· ἐνὸς ἔκγονα πάντα τέτυκται.

12. The attribution to Apollo is incorrect, for the text is taken from the Sibylline Oracles, I, 324-5⁷³:

Δὴ τότε τοῦ μεγάλιο θεοῦ παῖς ἀνθρώποισιν
ἦξει σαρκοφόρος θνητοῖς ὁμοιούμενος ἐν γῆ.

13. Unidentified. For ὁ δεύτερος νοῦς compare Chaldean Oracles (ed. DES PLACES), fragment 7, with the comments of W. THEILER, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios*, reprinted in his *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus*, Berlin, 1966, p. 258-9.

14. This is a rather fuller translation of the text already represented in 4(b)⁷⁴; Cyril's version, which differs from that of Malalas in two minor details, reads (PG 76, col. 552D):

Ὁ γὰρ λόγος αὐτοῦ προελθὼν, παντέλειος ὢν, καὶ γόνιμος καὶ δημιουργός,
ἐν γονίμῃ φύσει πεσὼν ἐπὶ γονίμῳ ὕδατι^a ἐγκυόν τε^b ὕδωρ ἐποίησε.

a. Syr. "having descended into a mother who gave (him) birth, and dwelt in nature". — b. Syr. seems to support Cyril's τε, against Malalas' το.

15. The name has been badly corrupted, for MYLYTWS hides Amelios, a Neoplatonist cited by Eusebius, *Dem. Ev.* XI.19.1 (and thence by Cyril, *contra Julianum* VIII, PG 76, col. 936A)⁷⁵. The passage in Eusebius⁷⁶ reads:

(... καὶ οὗτος ἄρα ἦν) ὁ λόγος (καθ' ὃν αἰεὶ ὄντα τὰ γινόμενα ἐγίνετο...) πρὸς θεὸν εἶναι καὶ θεὸν εἶναι, δι' οὗ πάνθ' ἀπλῶς γεγενῆσθαι (ἐν φ' τὸ

⁷³ Compare also *Or.Sib.* XII.32-3. The passage was quoted in the *Theosophia* (ERBSE, p. 192).

⁷⁴ For a different translation in Barhebraeus' *Candelabra* see my *Some Syriac excerpts* ...

⁷⁵ On this excerpt see H. DÖRRIE, *Une exégèse néoplatonicienne du prologue de l'évangile de St Jean*, in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris, 1972, p. 75-87.

⁷⁶ There are some minor variants in Cyril. The text also occurs in Theodoret's *Graecarum affectionum curatio* II, 88.

γενόμενον ζῶν καὶ ζωῆν, καὶ ὄν πεφυκέναι.) καὶ εἰς τὰ σώματα πίπτειν καὶ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον⁷⁷ φαντάζεσθαι ἄνθρωπον, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τηνικαῦτα δεικνύειν τῆς φύσεως τὸ μεγαλεῖον. (ἀμέλει καὶ ἀναλυθέντα πάλιν ἀποθεοῦσθαι,) καὶ θεὸν εἶναι, οἷος ἦν πρὸ τοῦ εἰς τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον καταχθῆναι.

The Syriac translator has omitted some phrases (bracketed in the text above) and has abbreviated the last sentence.

16. This is a duplicate to **2**, but this time provided with a historical introduction, which is an abbreviation of the Greek text common to Malalas (p. 251⁶) and the Paschal Chronicle (I, p. 83²⁰-84²):

καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀφρικὴν χώραν εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον ἐν ὑπερηφανία καὶ θυσιάσας ἐπυθάνετο λέγων, Φράσον μοι... καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ χρησιμὸς οὗτος· Πρῶτα θεὸς κτλ.

For differences in the translation of that part of the text shared by **2** and **16**, see commentary to **2**.

17. This is a rather garbled version of ERBSE's ω. 3, where *αχρη* has evidently been misread as *ακρον*. The end has been shortened. ω. 3 reads as follows (ERBSE, p. 204)⁷⁸:

ἄχρη γὰρ τριῶν ὑποστάσεων, ἔφη Πλάτων, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ προελθεῖν οὐσίαν. εἶναι δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀνωτάτω θεὸν ἀγαθόν, μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ δεύτερον τὸν δημιουργόν, τρίτον δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ψυχήν.

18. This is a duplicate of the opening words of Apollo's oracular reply, already found in **7**; no doubt the compiler derived it from another source⁷⁹. Once again the Syriac translator has misunderstood the Greek.

19. Unidentified, and evidently not from the extant Corpus Hermeticum. A few phrases (only) are in common with the citation of Hermes in Cyril, *contra Julianum* I (PG 76, col. 556A)⁸⁰. The passage is quoted (from our text) in the Gospel Commentary attributed to Lazarus of Beth Qandasa.

20. Unidentified.

21. This is a somewhat abbreviated translation of *Corpus Hermeticum* XIII.1-2, 4:

⁷⁷ J. M. RIST (*St John and Amelius*, in *JTS* ns 20, 1969, p. 230-1) regards this phraseology as docetic: in fact the metaphor is used by second-century writers with specifically anti-docetic intent; see, for example, R. CANTALAMESSA, *La cristologia di Tertulliano* (Paradosis 18; 1962), p. 75-8.

⁷⁸ For witnesses, see ERBSE, p. 139-40. The saying bears an obvious relationship to **8**.

⁷⁹ Unfortunately there are no significant Greek variants in the short extract involved.

⁸⁰ = NOCK-FESTUGIÈRE, *Corpus Hermeticum* IV, p. 126 = ERBSE, p. 202 (ω. 1).

1 ... (ἀγνωῶ,) ὁ Τρισμέγιστε, ἐξ οἷας μήτρας ἄνθρωπος^a ἐγεννήθη, σποράς δὲ ποίας.

2 Ὡ Τέκνον, σοφία νοερά ἐν σιγῇ^b καὶ ἡ σπορά^c τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἀγαθόν. — Τίνος σπείραντος, ὦ πάτερ; τὸ γὰρ σύνολον ἀπορώ. — Τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ θεοῦ^d, ὦ τέκνον. — Καὶ ποταπὸς ὁ γεννώμενος, ὦ πάτερ; (ἄμοιρος γὰρ τῆς ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐσίας καὶ τῆς νοητῆς. — Ἄλλος ἔσται ὁ γεννώμενος) θεοῦ θεὸς παῖς, τὸ πᾶν ἐν παντί, ἐκ πασῶν δυνάμεων συνεστῶς...

4 ... τίς ἐστι γενεσιουργὸς τῆς παλεγγενεσίας; — Ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς, ἄνθρωπος εἷς, θελήματι θεοῦ.

a. Syr. *om.* — b. Syr. *om.* — c. Syr. appears to have read as ἡ παρά. — d. Syr. + "with respect to the godhead".

Besides having abbreviated the original, the translator has, in the course of a somewhat free rendering, given a more Christian flavour to certain phrases.

22. As was pointed out in the introduction, the title, mentioning the 'hundred judges', indicates some connection with the Greek reworking of the Tiburtine Sibyl, known as the Oracle of Baalbek, and **22(a)** and **(c)** do indeed seem to bear verbal similarities with parts of the Greek, though at the same time it is obvious that the Syriac translator must have been using a rather different recension from that which survives⁸¹. Furthermore, **22(c)**, an allusion to the apparition of the cross to Constantine⁸², is allocated to the sixth, and not the fifth⁸³, generation in the Oracle of Baalbek.

For **22(a)** the comparable text in the Baalbek Oracle reads (ed. ALEXANDER, lines 38-9, 61-4):

ὁ τέταρτος ἡλιος τετάρτη γενεά ἐστιν· θεότητος γονὴ φανήσεται ἐν μεσημβρία..... καὶ ἀναστήσονται κατ' αὐτοῦ βασιλεῖς, Ἀλέξανδρος, Σέλευκος καὶ Ἡρώδης, οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι σῶσαι ἑαυτούς. ποιήσουσι διωγμοὺς πολλοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν χώραν καὶ φονεύσουσι νήπια μετὰ τῶν γονέων αὐτῶν...

For **22(c)** compare (ed. ALEXANDER, lines 85, 88-9):

... καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστήσεται βασιλεὺς ὀνόματι Κωνσταντίνος, ... καὶ φανήσεται αὐτῷ σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπιζητήσει ἡ μητὴρ αὐτοῦ Ἐλένη τὸ ξύλον τοῦ σταυροῦ ὅπου ὁ Χριστὸς μέλλει σταυρωθῆναι ...

Note in particular the preservation of the prophetic future tense in the Syriac.

⁸¹ There are no links with the Arabic texts in SCHLEIFER (see note 12 above).

⁸² So specifically Dionysios bar Šalibi, who quotes this section. There is probably some confusion with the famous apparition of the cross seen in the sky above Jerusalem in the time of Constantius and described by Cyril of Jerusalem.

⁸³ It is very unlikely that the Syriac text is corrupt (both Lazarus and Dionysios support 'fifth'). As Dr Michael Whitby observed to me, the Syriac may represent a Greek text which has deliberately compressed the earlier generations in order to fit in additional material towards the end of the oracle, in the process of updating it.

22(b) has quite a different origin, being taken from Or. Sib. III, 785-8 (not among the Sibylline texts in the extant fragments of the *Theosophia*); this reads:

Εὐφράνθητι, κόρη, καὶ ἀγάλλεο· σοὶ γὰρ ἔδωκεν
εὐφροσύνην αἰῶνος, ὅς οὐρανὸν ἔκτισε καὶ γῆν.
ἐν σοὶ δ' οἰκῆσει· σοὶ δ' ἔσσεται ἀθάνατον φῶς.

22(c) is quoted in the Gospel Commentary attributed to Lazarus; the whole of **22** features in Dionysios bar Ṣalibi.

23. The use of the Latin *sagae*, 'soothsayers', is surprising: it does not seem to be recorded as a loan word in Greek, and its application to the Sibyls appears to be unparalleled.

23(a) combines Or. Sib. VI.26 with VIII.312 (in the *Theosophia* they are quoted adjacently: ERBSE, p. 196):

ὦ ξύλον ὦ μακαριστόν^a, ἐφ' οὗ θεὸς ἐξετανύσθη...
καὶ θανάτου μοῖραν τελέσει^b τρίτον ἡμῶν ὑπνώσας.

a. Syr. 'thrice blessed' — b. Syr. 'and the dead one who finished off death'.

23(b) remains unidentified: it does not come from any of the preserved Sibylline oracles.

23(c) is taken from Or. Sib. VIII, 287-90, 292-6, a slightly longer extract than that to be found in the *Theosophia* (ERBSE, p. 195); Geffken's text reads:

εἰς ἀνόμων χεῖρας καὶ ἀπίστων ὕστερον ἦξει,
δώσουσιν δὲ θεῶν ῥάπισματα χερσὶν ἀνάγκοις^a
καὶ στόμασιν μιαιοῖς ἐμπτύσματα φαρμακόντα·
δώσει δ' ἐς μάστιγας ἀναπλώσας^b τότε νῶτον
(line 291 is an interpolation, bracketed by modern editors)
καὶ κολαφιζόμενος σιγήσει, μὴ τις ἐπιγνῶ,
τίς τίνος ὦν^c πόθεν ἦλθεν, ἵνα φθιμένοισι λαλήσει.
καὶ στέφανον φορέσει τὸν ἀκάνθινον· ἐκ γὰρ ἀκανθῶν
τὸ στέφος ἐκλεκτῶν αἰώνιον ἐστὶν ἄγαλμα.
πλευρὰς νύξουσιν καλάμῳ διὰ τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν.

a. Syr. 'human'. — b. Syr. does not help with the textual variation here. 291 is absent from Lactantius and the *Theosophia* as well as from Syr. — c. Syr. represents τὶς τίνος η.

23(c) is quoted by Lazarus, **23(a)-(c)** by Dionysios bar Ṣalibi.

24. *just as a ray is born from the sun*: a standard analogy in early Christian writers; among Syriac authors note especially Ephrem, *Hymni de Fide* 40 and 73, and the fragment published by Rahmani in *Studia Syriaca* 1, p. 8 (text) = p. 7 (translation).

clothed in humanity: the compiler reflects traditional Syriac phraseology: see my *Clothing metaphors as a means of theological expression in Syriac tradition*, in M. SCHMIDT (ed.), *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren*

Parallelen im Mittelalter (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4, 1982), p. 11-40 (for the present phrase, p. 24).

25. *educated their hearing*: for the general idea, compare Jacob of Serugh (ed. BEDJAN), I, p. 89 ff (on Magi).

Christ God, one of the Trinity: perhaps a reminiscence of the famous troparion *Monogenes*, attributed to Justinian in the Byzantine, and to Severus in the Syrian Orthodox, tradition.

lamp full of dirt and gloom: compare the imagery (applied to Jews) in Jacob of Serugh's Homily on the veil of Moses (ed. BEDJAN) III, p. 303-4⁸⁴.

26. (*The prophecy of Baba*), *the god of Harran*: this will be an editorial addition: elsewhere the text implies that Baba was a prophet, not a deity⁸⁵. Baba of Harran is mentioned elsewhere only in Arabic sources⁸⁶, al-Bīrūnī and Ibn al-'Adīm; the latter writer reports that Baba was said to have lived 367 years before the Hijrah, and that the "Book of Baba the Sabian from Harran" was in seven chapters. Ibn al-'Adīm then goes on to quote two apocalyptic excerpts from chapters 4 (on the coming of the Abysinnians)⁸⁷ and 6 (on the end of the kingdom of al-Ahwāz).

27. My translation differs from Rosenthal's in a number of details; the comments offered here merely supplement Rosenthal's.

I am constrained: compare the Chaldean Oracles (ed. DES PLACES), Fragment 220: κλυθὶ μευ οὐκ ἐθέλοντος ἐπεὶ μ' ἐπέδησας ἀνάγκη.

the Fire: compare the role of fire in the Chaldean Oracles (ed. DES PLACES, Index s.v. πῦρ); W. KROLL, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, Breslau, 1894, p. 13-5 etc.

Sin: Zsaumo glosses 'the moon'. This moon goddess is included by Jacob of Serugh among the idols of Harran in his famous homily "on the fall of the idols"⁸⁸ (ed. BEDJAN) III, p. 797.

'Azzuz: evidently the name of the sacred temenos in Harran⁸⁹.

29. *Come let us fall down...*: Ps 95:6!

⁸⁴ English translation in *Sobronost/Eastern Churches Review* 3, 1981, p. 70-85.

⁸⁵ A demon called Babai is mentioned in the Syriac life of John of Dailam (Harvard syr. 38f. 183b; edition forthcoming in *Parole de l'Orient* 10).

⁸⁶ For details, see ROSENTHAL, *The prophecies...* (see n. 17), p. 220-2.

⁸⁷ This would probably repay study in the context of the Abyssinians in the Apocalypse of Ps. Methodius (linked with Ps. 68:32) and the Kebra Nagast; cp also I. SHAHID, *The Kebra Nagast in the light of recent research*, appendix II, in *Le Muséon* 89, 1976, p. 174-6.

⁸⁸ On this poem see now W. CRAMER, *Irrtum und Lüge. Zum Urteil des Jakob von Sarug über Reste paganer Religion und Kultur*, in *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 23, 1980, p. 96-107.

⁸⁹ So ROSENTHAL, *The prophecies...*, p. 228 note 4. Perhaps "the religion of 'Uzūz" in al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* (quoted in note 20) refers to this temenos too; DODGE, however, in a note to his translation takes it as a local name for, or a corruption of, 'Uzza (Venus), whose twin star was 'Azizos. For the problem of gender, see note 55.

30. Dionysios bar Salibi quotes two extracts from this section, "And I saw ... falling down", and "The radiance of the Lord ... gifts to the Radiance".

a rising up and falling down: Lk 2:34 (under the influence of which Zsaumo has added "of many").

a stone left standing ...: cp Mt 24:2 and parallels⁹⁰.

Lampon: Rahmani suggested reading *lmpwn* for *lmpwn* (i.e. *lampron*), but the text is correct and *Lampon* is to be identified with the planet Kronos which, as recorded by Malalas (ed. DINDORF), p. 25, was called τὸν λάμποντα by the Egyptians according to Manetho.

'BWR': unknown; Rahmani translated 'Heber', and Zsaumo glossed it as 'Hebrews', but the name evidently represents a town since the verb is feminine.

35. *they hold*: the writer forgets that he is addressing the Harranians (this could give some support to the suggestion mentioned in note 21)⁹¹.

Index of Greek words (references are to sections)

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ἄηρ 3 5 | νόμος 23 |
| Αἰγύπτιος 4 | ξένος 25 |
| αιθήρ 3 | οὐσία 17 |
| ἄρα 24 25 | πεῖσαι 25 37 |
| ἄρχαι 3 | mettpisanuta 25 |
| γάρ I 4 9 10 13 14 20 22 25 28 35 36 | πολιτεία 25 |
| γένος 3 | σωλήν 25 |
| εὐαγγέλιον 25 36 | τάξις takkes 25 |
| θεολογία I | τρισμέγιστος 4 21 |
| ιδιώτης 33 | φιλόσοφος I 2 24 25 26 |
| λάμπων 30 | χριστιανός 24 25. |
| μέν 3 7 8 16 17 18 24 | |

Index of names

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Abraham 25 | Baba 26 27 32 35-7 |
| Africa 16 | Babylon 30 |
| Amelios (ms <i>mylytwys</i>) 15 | Balaam 26 37 |
| Apollo 7 12 18 | Cyzicus 7 24 |
| Aram Nahrain 37 | Egypt 4 |
| Argonauts 7 | Harran 24 26 28 30 |
| Asclepius 4 | Hermes 14 19 21 |
| 'Azzuz 27 30 31 | Judaea 30 |

⁹⁰ ZSAUMO's slightly different wording is influenced by the New Testament passages.

⁹¹ I have had the benefit of discussion on various aspects of this collection of prophecies with a number of friends and colleagues, in particular Garth Fowden, Robin Lane Fox, Oliver Nicholson, Andrew Palmer and Michael Whitby.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Kewan 6 | Porphyry 13 |
| Lampon 30 | Pythagoras 10 |
| Maria 7 24 | Pythia 6 |
| Memphis 6 | Pythia therma 7 |
| Nile 6 | Rome 30 |
| Orpheus 3 11 | Sagae 23 |
| Persians 30 | Sheol 1 |
| Peter 1 | Sibyl 22 |
| Petissonios 6 | Sophocles 5 |
| Phoebus 7 | Thules 2 16 |
| Plato 8 17 | Titan 7 |
| Plotinus (ms <i>pwlytytwys</i>) 20 | Trismegistos 4 21 |
| Poimandres 21 | 'BWR' 30. |

VIII

THE LAMENTS
OF THE PHILOSOPHERS OVER
ALEXANDER IN SYRIAC¹

In an earlier article² I drew attention to the existence in Syriac of the Laments, or Sayings, of the Philosophers at the tomb of Alexander, a piece of Alexander literature hitherto not known from Syriac, but familiar from other Oriental sources as well as from Western European versions.

In the early Middle Ages collections of sayings of various "wise men" came to be attached³ to the story of Alexander's death, and in the course of time these gained enormous popularity both in the East, where they originated, and in the West, translated from Arabic.⁴ What may be the oldest collection of sayings at Alexander's tomb was perhaps already to be found in the third part of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq's⁵ *Kitāb ādāb al-falāsifa*,⁶ also known under the title *Nawādir al-falāsifa*. Unfortunately this work does not survive in its original form, but only in a later

¹ I take the opportunity to thank the Reverend Professor W. D. McHardy, Curator of the Mingana Collection, for permission to publish this text.

² "Notes on some texts in the Mingana Collection", *J.S.S.* xiv (1969), 216.

³ Perhaps suggested by Pseudo-Callisthenes δ (Syriac, ed. E. A. W. Budge, *The History of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1889), p. 142).

⁴ See especially W. Hertz, "Aristoteles beim Tode Alexanders", in his *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart/Berlin, 1905), pp. 130-53.

⁵ A.D. 808-73.

⁶ The work has not yet been published. On it see K. Merkle, *Die Sittensprüche der Philosophen. Kitāb ādāb al-falāsifa von Honein ibn Ishāq in der Überlieferung des Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Anṣārī* (Leipzig, 1921); also M. Plessner, "Liḡqūṭim le-sefer 'Musere ha-Philosofim' me'et Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq ule-targumo ha-'Ivri", *Tarbiḡ* xxiv (1954-5), 60-75; and J. Kraemer, "Arabische Homerverse", *Z.D.M.G.* n.F. xxxi (1956), 293 ff.

Ḥunayn probably made extensive use of Byzantine *florilegia* for this work (cf. G. Strohmaier, *Hermes* xcv (1967), 254), and the introduction to the Spanish translation [see below, note 3, p. 206] actually states that the work had been translated from Greek; cf. also Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 143 n. 1. Nothing, however, corresponding to the sayings at the tomb is to be found in Greek (for late Greek Alexander texts see H. J. Gleixner, *Das Alexanderbild der Byzantiner* (Munich, 1960), and G. Veloudis, *Das neugriechische Alexander* (Munich, 1968)).

PHILOSOPHERS' LAMENTS OVER ALEXANDER IN SYRIAC

reworking by Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Anṣārī,¹ and in Hebrew² and Spanish translations.³ All these contain the sayings, but the fact that the Alexander section, with the sayings at the tomb, is placed at the end of the work in the Hebrew, rather than in the middle, as in the Arabic and Spanish, led Merkle to suggest that the whole section was an interpolation, and that it did not constitute part of Ḥunayn's original work.⁴

At any rate the sayings at the tomb enjoyed great popularity in the West,⁵ finding their way into Petrus Alphonsus' *Disciplina Clericalis* (early twelfth century),⁶ whence they were interpolated into one of the main medieval Alexander texts of the West, the *Historia de preliis*,⁷ in the recension known as I³.

¹ Uncertain date, but before 1198. See Merkle, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

² Ed. A. Loewenthal, *Sefer Musere ha-Philosofim* (Frankfurt a.M., 1896); translation: *idem*, *Honein ibn Ishāq, Sinnsprüche der Philosophen* (Berlin, 1896); a less satisfactory translation of the Alexander section in M. E. Stern, *Zur Alexander-Sage* (Vienna, 1861).

The version was made by Jehudah al-Ḥarīzī (1170-1235). Material from this work, including some of the sayings, constitutes Part II of the Hebrew Alexander text (in Paris Heb. 750) published by I. J. Kazis, *The Gestis of Alexander of Macedon* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

³ *El Libro de los Buenos Proverbios*, published by H. Knust, *Mitteilungen aus dem Escorial* (= *Bibliothek des litt. Vereins in Stuttgart*, Bd. 141; Tübingen, 1879). The sayings at the tomb will be found on pp. 46 ff.

According to Loewenthal the Spanish was translated from Hebrew; Merkle, however, showed that it was taken direct from Arabic, *op. cit.* pp. 12-14.

⁴ Merkle, *op. cit.* p. 9, cf. 60-1 (tables). Plessner (*art. cit.* pp. 71-2) offers a more elaborate theory about the origin of the different parts of the Alexander section.

⁵ Sayings at the tomb also reached the West via al-Mubashshir's *mukhtār al-hikam*, translated into Spanish under the title *Los Bocados de Oro* (ed. H. Knust, *op. cit.* pp. 66-394; sayings: pp. 302 f.). On al-Mubashshir see especially F. Rosenthal, "Al-Mubashshir ibn Fātik. Prolegomena to an abortive edition", *Oriens* xiii-xiv (1961), 132-58. The Arabic text (with German translation) of the Alexander section can be conveniently found in B. Meissner, "Mubaššir's Aḥbār el-Iskender", *Z.D.M.G.* xlix (1895), 583-627 (sayings: pp. 601 f. (Arabic), p. 618 f. (German)).

⁶ Ed. A. Hilka, W. Söderhjelm, *Die Disciplina Clericalis des Petrus Alfonsi* (= *Sammlung mittellateinische Texte*, 1; Heidelberg, 1911), pp. 48-9 (Exemplum xxxiii); cf. V. Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes...*, ix (Liège-Leipzig, 1905), 38; Hertz, *op. cit.* pp. 145 ff.

⁷ *Historia de preliis* is the name given to Archpriest Leo's Latin translation (tenth century) of Pseudo-Callisthenes δ. Good general orientations can be found in F. P. Magoun, *The Gestis of King Alexander of Macedon* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), pp. 50 f.; G. Cary, *The Medieval Alexander* (Cambridge, 1956 [repr. 1967]), p. 52; D. J. A. Ross, *Alexander Historiatus* (London, 1963), p. 61. In particular on this recension, see F. Pfister, *Münchener Museum für Philologie des Mitt. und Renaissance*, 1 (1912), 249-303, esp. pp. 271 ff., 278 ff.

PHILOSOPHERS' LAMENTS OVER ALEXANDER IN SYRIAC

In the East¹ similar sayings are found in both Arabic and Persian,² Muslim and Christian writers, although in a number of different forms. A detailed study of the relationship of all the occurrences of the sayings at the tomb would be both interesting and instructive, but such a study lies outside the scope of the present article, and indeed is beyond my competence. Here it must suffice to note that, while the Muslim versions—Ya'qūbī (†897),³ Mas'ūdī (†956),⁴ Tha'ālibī (961–1038),⁵ Mubashshir (eleventh century),⁶ Shahrastānī (1076–1153),⁷ etc.—do not have much in common with the Syriac sayings, the Christian ones, found in Eutychius,⁸ al-Makīn, Abū Shākir, etc.,⁹ are much more closely related to them. In the case of Eutychius (876–939),¹⁰ indeed, the relationship is so close that it is clear that either the Syriac is actually derived from Eutychius,¹¹ or both derive from

¹ For a general orientation, cf. F. Spiegel, *Die Alexandersage bei den Orientalen* (Leipzig, 1851 [repr. 1970]); I. Friedländer, *Die Chadirlegende und der Alexanderroman* (Leipzig, 1913); E. G. Gómez, *Un Texto Árabe Occidental de la Leyenda de Alejandro* (Madrid, 1929), ch. 1; E. E. Bertels, *Roman ob Aleksandre i ego glavnii versii na vostoke* (Moscow–Leningrad, 1948); A. Abel, *Le Roman d'Alexandre* (Brussels, 1955); F. Pfister, *Alexander der Große in den Offenbarungen der Griechen, Juden, Mohammedaner und Christen* (Berlin, 1956).

² Notably by Firdawsī (940/1–1020), ed. J. Mohl, *Firdousi, Le Livre des Rois* (1886), v, 257–61; also in Turkish, published by A. Zajaczkowski, "Treny filozofów na śmierć Iskendera", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* xxxviii/2 (1965), 13–57.

³ Ed. M. T. Houtsma, *Ibn Wadhih qui dicitur Al-Ja'qubi historiae* (Leiden, 1883), I, 162–3 (all the sayings are anonymous).

⁴ Ed./tr. C. Barbier de Meynard and Pavel de Courteille, *Maqoudi: Les Prairies d'or* (Paris, 1863), II, 252–7 (the sayings are anonymous).

⁵ Ed./tr. H. Zotenberg, *Histoire des rois des Perses* (Paris, 1900), pp. 450–4 (the first ten philosophers are named, the rest being anonymous).

⁶ See note 5, p. 206.

⁷ Ed. W. Cureton, *Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects by Muhammad al-Shahrastani*, Part I (London, 1846 [repr. 1923]), pp. 331–2. German translation in T. Haarbrücker, *Abu'l Fath' Muhammad asch-Schahrastani's Religionsparteien und Philosophenschulen* (Halle, 1851), II, 188–9.

⁸ Ed./tr. E. Pococke, *Contextio Gemmarum sive Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini Annales* (Oxford, 1656), pp. 292–5; L. Cheikho, *Eutychii Patriarchae Annales* (= *C.S.C.O.*, I/Ar., VI, 1906), I, 83–4.

⁹ English translation of the relevant sections in E. A. W. Budge, *The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1896), pp. 377 ff. (al-Makīn), 398 ff. (Abu-Shākir). The two are almost identical.

¹⁰ If the Alexander section in the *Nawādir al-falāsifa* is an interpolation, then, apart from Ya'qūbī, Eutychius provides the earliest occurrence of the sayings.

¹¹ If this is so, the Arabic text underlying the Syriac must have differed in some details from the printed texts.

PHILOSOPHERS' LAMENTS OVER ALEXANDER IN SYRIAC

a common source. What the source of Eutychius (and the Syriac) was is impossible to say, although it does not seem to have been the (interpolated?) Alexander section of Hunayn's *Nawādir al-falāsifa*, at least to judge from the Spanish and Hebrew versions of this work, for, while there are a number of scattered sayings in common, there are many striking differences.¹ Until the relationship of the various Arabic collections of sayings at the tomb has been properly studied it will no doubt be best to leave open the question of sources for Eutychius and the Syriac.² Accordingly, in the edition and translation of the Syriac text below I have confined attention exclusively to the parallel sayings in Eutychius. In order to illustrate fully the close relationship between the Syriac and Eutychius, the Syriac text has been divided up into sections, and after each section the Arabic text of the corresponding text in Eutychius is given. Likewise the English translation of the Syriac is set out in parallel with Pococke's Latin translation of the relevant sections in Eutychius.

The Syriac text is self-confessedly only a selection, and Eutychius in fact provides thirty sayings. It will be seen from the table below that the Syriac selection follows the order of Eutychius' sayings (the attribution of the sayings is also given):

| | Syriac | Eutychius |
|----|-------------|----------------|
| 1 | Aristotle | 3 Aristotle |
| 2 | Theon | 4 Nāren |
| 3 | Another | 6 Another |
| 4 | Another | 7 Another |
| 5 | Another | 8 Another |
| 6 | Loṭas | 9 Loṭas |
| 7 | Another | 10 Meṭron |
| 8 | Sisynnios | 11 Sisynn(ios) |
| 9 | Another | 12 Another |
| 10 | Demetr(ios) | 13 Demetr(ios) |
| 11 | Plyqṭn | 17 Filoqaṭōn |
| 12 | Another | 20 Another |
| 13 | Another | 26 Another |
| 14 | Another | 28 Another |

¹ E.g. the sayings of the *Musere* and *Buenos Proverbios* are all anonymous, and occur on two different occasions.

² Likewise the question of the original language. Unfortunately there are no clear indications in the Syriac to point to the language from which it ultimately derived. For a possibility that Eutychius derives from a Syriac source, see below, p. 215.

PHILOSOPHERS' LAMENTS OVER ALEXANDER IN SYRIAC

"This throne which belongs to me is being kept until Christ comes and sits upon it. And it was a throne of gold."

Compare Budge, *op. cit.* pp. 146 (translation), 258 (text); Pseudo-Dionysios, *Chronicon*, I, 41, lines 19 f. (text); 33, lines 25 f. (translation).

(d) A verse history of Alexander and Gog and Magog is attributed¹ to Jacob of Serugh, and has been edited several times:

G. Knös, *Chrestomathia Syriaca* (Göttingen, 1807), pp. 66–107. [An unsatisfactory edition, taken from Paris Syr. 13 (West Syrian, late(?)).]

E. A. W. Budge, "The Homily on Alexander the Great attributed to James, Bishop of Baṭnān", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* VI (1891), 357–404. [Based on BM Add. 14624 (ninth century), with variants of Paris Syr. 13].]

H. Gismondi, *Linguae Syriacae Gramm. et Chrestomathia* (2nd edn. Beirut, 1900), pp. 80–93 [based on Knös and Budge].

C. Hunnius, "Das syrische Alexanderlied", *Z.D.M.G.* LX (1906), 169–209, 558–89, 802–21. [Eclectic text, using BM Add. 14624, Paris Syr. 13 and 243 (Maronite, A.D. 1611).]²

The most satisfactory translations³ are by Budge, *The History of Alexander the Great*, pp. 164–200, and by Hunnius, *art. cit.* On this text see especially C. Hunnius, *Das syrische Alexanderlied* (Göttingen, 1904); E. Nestle, "Zum syrischen Alexanderlied in Heft I", *Z.D.M.G.* I (1906), 401–2; Czeglédý, *art. cit.* [p. 215] and "Monographs on Syriac and Muhammadan sources in the literary remains of M. Kmosko", *Acta Orientalia* (Budapest) IV (1955), 19–90, esp. 31 ff.; also A. R. Anderson, *Alexander's Gate. Gog and Magog and the Enclosed Nations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

(e) Alexander's Gate is also mentioned in Pseudo-Ephrem, *De fine extremo* (T. Lamy, *S. Ephraemi hymni et sermones*, III, 195–6). On this see Anderson, *op. cit.* pp. 16–19; Czeglédý, *Acta Or.* IV (1955), 34 f.

5. *Alexander and the bones of Jeremiah*

This episode⁴ is to be found in the life of Jeremiah in Pseudo-Epiphanius' *Lives of the Prophets*. Of the several extant recensions⁵ of the Syriac translation of this work the oldest has been published by E. Nestle,

¹ According to Hunnius, *Das syrische Alexanderlied* (Göttingen, 1904) it dates from A.D. 628/37.

² The homily is also to be found in Mingana Syr. 88 (West Syrian, fifteenth century), ff. 16^a–24^b.

³ There are older translations: G. Knös, *Carmen syriacum de Alexandro Magno* (Uppsala, 1826); A. Weber, *Des Mar Yaḡūb Gedicht über den gläubigen König Alexandrius* (Berlin, 1852); P. Zingerle, *Ein altes syrisches Alexanderlied* (Brünn, 1882).

⁴ On this see F. Pfister, "Eine jüdische Gründungsgeschichte Alexandrias", *Sb. Heid. Akad. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.* V (1914), Abh. 11.

⁵ See T. Schermann, *Propheten und Apostellegenden* (= *Texte und Untersuchungen* III. 1. 3; 1907), pp. 24–39.

PHILOSOPHERS' LAMENTS OVER ALEXANDER IN SYRIAC

Syriac Grammar (2nd ed. Berlin, 1889), ٥٢–١٣.¹ Extracts from this work can also be found in most of the Syriac world chronicles.

6. *Notices in Chronicles*

The following may be singled out: *Chronicon maroniticum*, in *Chronica Minora*, C.S.C.O., III/Syr., III (Louvain, 1904), 43 (text) = C.S.C.O., IV/Syr., IV, 37 (translation); J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (Paris, 1899 [repr. 1963]), I, 113 (translation), IV, 71–2 (text); *Chronicon ad annum 1234*, C.S.C.O., LXXXI/Syr., XXXVI (Louvain, 1920), 104 (text) = C.S.C.O., CIX/Syr., LVI (1937), 82 (translation). Cf. also C. Kayser, *Das Buch von der Erkenntnis der Wahrheit* (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 133–4 (Brahmans), 264 (Gog and Magog).

7. *Astronomical "Book of Alexander"*

A work of this title, containing astronomical tables, is to be found in Vat. Syr. 555 (West Syrian, A.D. 1501), ff. 20^b–25^b. Whether the Alexander is Alexander the Great is not clear from the catalogue.

¹ An apparatus is provided in Nestle's *Marginalien und Materialien* (Tübingen, 1893), pp. 36 ff.

SECUNDUS THE SILENT PHILOSOPHER:
SOME NOTES ON THE SYRIAC
TRADITION

In a short discourse on patience by Isaac of Nineveh the example is given of a philosopher who had so mastered his will in the matter of a vow to keep silence that, even when threatened with death if he did not speak, he steadfastly refused to utter a word¹).

Although no names are given, it is not difficult to recognize in this passage a reference to the Life of Secundus the Silent Philosopher, a text which has hitherto been known in Syriac only from a fragmentary ninth-century manuscript published by E. Sachau²), and reprinted by B. E. Perry in his monograph on Secundus, where he supplied it with an English translation³).

Isaac introduces the allusion to the Life of Secundus by telling his readers that, if they are unwilling to listen to what the church has to teach on the subject of patience, they should turn to the philosophers; then follows the outline of the story of Secundus⁴):

“One of them had mastered the will of the body to such an extent that, in order not to give up and deviate from the choice he had made, he did not even allow his mind to be disturbed when the sword was drawn; so fear of death could not break through the barrier he had made for himself. When he had kept silence for many years, the king of the Greeks⁵), wondering at

his fame and desiring to put him to the test⁶), ordered him to appear before him. As the philosopher remained silent whenever the king spoke and questioned him, giving no answer, the king became incensed⁷) and ordered him to be put to death, because he was not even impressed by the splendour of his throne and crown⁸). The philosopher was not moved by this, but kept his rule quietly. Then the king ordered the executioners⁹) to slay him if he should break his rule¹⁰) out of fear of the sword; but to bring him back alive if he should be firm of will¹¹). When the moment had come and the executioner commanded him to bend his will or die, he deliberated thus¹²): it is better once to suffer death, while keeping the rule of my will which I have borne all this time, than to give way out of fear of death, putting to shame my wisdom, and to be a coward because of that which I shall have to meet in any case, whenever it may be. – By this firmness of will and this heroic mind he was delivered even from death, being found just and true to his rule. Do you see what power will possesses? This sage stretched out his neck¹³) before the sword without breaking his own rule”.

As mentioned above, the one surviving manuscript of the Syriac version of the Life is incomplete: not only is the beginning lost, but there are also three lacunae in the course of the text itself. Since Sachau's edition does not make clear the extent of the portions lost, the following observations, based on an examination of the manuscript in question, may be helpful. The Syriac text of the Life is to be found on ff. 1r.2 – 2r.1 of BM Add. 14620. The top of f. 1 has been cut off, with the result that about seven or eight lines have been lost at the top of each column. Since the previous work ends at the bottom of column

6) Cp Greek (Perry, p. 79 line 19) δοκιμάσαι θέλων; this section is lost in Syr.

7) *etgawzal*; Syr *hemta rabbta etmli*, “was filled with great wrath”.

8) Isaac reads this into the story.

9) *qaṭole*; Syr (as Greek) uses the Latin term *speculator* here (already found in the Old Syriac Gospels, see *Le Muséon* 80 (1967), 416).

10) Lacuna in Syr. The Greek (and evidently once the Syriac, to judge by the one word left) has *ἐὰν μὲν ἀποκριθῆναι αὐτὸν πείσης*.

11) Greek “if he does not answer”; Syr has “remains”, followed by a lacuna, which Sachau fills in by “in his silence”. In the light of Isaac, however, we should rather supply *b-ṣebyaneh*, “in his resolve”.

12) A moralising addition evidently provided by Issac.

13) So Greek (Perry, p. 74 line 6) and other versions, but not in Syr (which is otherwise fuller than the Greek here!). Evidently Isaac knew a form of text slightly different from the one that survives.

1) Syriac text in P. Bedjan, *Mar Isaacus Ninivita, de perfectione religiosa* (Paris, 1909), 403–4; English translation in A. J. Wensinck, *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh* (Amsterdam, 1923), 271.

2) E. Sachau, *Inedita Syriaca* (Halle, 1870), 84–8 (BM Add. 14620; Wright, *Catalogue...*, no. DCCC). In three places Sachau misrepresents the manuscript: p. 84 line 10, read *mškēh*, for his *mškēh'*; p. 85 line 16, the column comes to an end after *tsb*, and Sachau's ensuing *hywby* is not in the manuscript, and so should be in square brackets; p. 85 line 18, delete note 4: the manuscript indeed reads *'ytyby*.

3) B. E. Perry, *Secundus the Silent Philosopher* (Cornell, 1964).

4) I use Wensinck's translation, slightly adapted.

5) Syr (= Syriac, ed. Sachau) has “Caesar” throughout.

1 of f. 1^r, this means that only the title and a few lines of text can have been lost at the beginning of the Life, and that the lacunas between f. 1^{r.2} and 1^{v.1}, and between f. 1^{v.1} and 1^{v.2}, will also cover only seven or eight lines each. Between ff. 1 and 2, however, the lacuna is much larger, and the structure of the codex indicates that two folios must be missing here¹⁴).

Isaac's summary of the narrative implies a knowledge both of the beginning of the story, lost in BM Add. 14620, and of the portion missing in the lacuna between the recto and verso of f. 1. In one place he seems to have slightly adapted the story to his own purposes, for Secundus' deliberation in the face of the threat of death ("It is better once to suffer death...") has no parallel in any of the surviving forms of the story (it is of course conceivable that he knew a version already expanded in this way). Throughout Isaac retells the story in his own words, and thus, since there are almost no verbal quotations, the main interest of the passage will lie in the indication it gives that the Syriac Life of Secundus was known in Nestorian monastic circles in the second half of the seventh century.

Unfortunately little or nothing is known of Isaac's personality and education, and we have only the barest of details available about his career: he was born in Beth Qatraye (Qatar), and was ordained bishop of Nineveh (Mosul) in the famous monastery of Beth Abe (N. Iraq)¹⁵ by the Catholicos George (659-81)¹⁶, but soon retired to a solitary life in the mountains of Beth Huzaye (Khuzistan), where he lived to a great age¹⁷. Isaac's works on the spiritual life were very widely read, and in the ninth century they were translated into Greek at the monastery of St Saba in Palestine¹⁸. Their subsequent influence on Greek and Russian monastic spirituality has been considerable¹⁹,

14) Folio 1^v is marked as the end of quire 10, and f. 9^v as the end of quire 11. In the surviving parts of the codex the quires consist of 10 folios.

15) See J. M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* (Beirut, 1965), 236-48.

16) This synchronism provides the only evidence available for Isaac's date.

17) On Isaac see E. Khalifé-Hachem, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 7.ii (1971), 2041-54.

* 18) The discovery of some ninth-century fragments of Isaac in Greek was announced at the Seventh International Patristic Conference (Oxford, September 1975) in a paper by K. Treu (forthcoming in *Studia Patristica*).

* 19) Especially through extracts in the Philocalia. The full Greek text of Isaac was first printed in 1770 (there are several recent reprints). The passage on Secundus appears as chapter 25 in the Greek edition (correspond-

and even to-day among the Athonite monks Isaac the Syrian is still widely read and regarded as one of the most profound of all writers on the spiritual life. By this roundabout way Secundus is thus assured of continued, albeit anonymous, fame in at least one unexpected corner of the modern world.

*

Since Perry's translation of the Syriac fragment of the Life of Secundus is in places misleading or incorrect, I offer, by way of appendix, a revised English translation:

".. | on my right hand and on my left. And you do not wish to make known your wisdom, but instead stand in silence. You are like an insolent man who wants to withhold what has been entrusted to his keeping²⁰), and you are depriving many people of an advantage, whereby you yourself will suffer no loss. You are (simply) withholding the wisdom given to you, like a wicked and insolent man."

When the Caesar had spoken thus, the philosopher was (still) unwilling to speak with him.

Now Secundus was silent and said nothing at all. Marvelling at him, the Caesar again said to him:

"O Secundus, before you came²¹) here you were silent because you had available no one like me to listen to you or who could comprehend the (meaning of) your words, but now that I (or you) have come, give me an answer to all that I shall ask, lest I give orders that your life be taken with the sword."

On hearing these things the philosopher was unafraid of him and was unabashed, not answering him a word, but instead he stood in complete silence before him.

ing to chapter 57 of the Syriac; see the tables in K. Deppe, "Die *Λόγοι ἀσηπτικοὶ* des Isaak von Niniveh", in *Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen, 1968), 35-57).

20) There is nothing exactly corresponding in any of the other of the Life. Seeing that so little of the opening has been lost in the manuscript (see above), it would appear that Syr began the story in quite a different way from the Greek.

21) So explicitly the Arabic (Perry, p. 127: "you came to us"), but the Greek has *πρὶν με ἔλθεῖν*. Later in the sentence Syr is ambiguous (either "I", or "you have come" is possible): the point in the manuscript should suggest that "I" is intended (but note *hwyt* in line 10, pointed in the same way, but it must be taken as 2nd sing.), in which case we should perhaps read here 'dl' 'l', "until I came" (1st sing. ipf.), in place of 'dl' 'l', "until you came" (Greek *πάρειμι*, Arabic omits).

The king was seized with great amazement and looked towards his tribune²²), saying to him: "Sir, do you persuade this man to give me an answer." Now they say of that man (*sc.* the tribune) that he was very patient and wise, and was the instructor of all stubborn men, to such an extent that he could even persuade²³) lions to speak like human beings. Accordingly he approached the philosopher and spoke to him many words of wisdom, partly persuasive, and partly threatening; and he strongly urged him to comply, and give an answer to the Caesar, thus avoiding death.

Although he spoke a great deal with him, he was unable to alter his resolve; instead (Secundus) stood silent in mien. Thereupon the Caesar was filled with great wrath²⁴), and gave orders that he should die. He²⁵) sent and called for an executioner (*speculator*)²⁶), and said to him: "In the case of a man who is unwilling to give Caesar an answer, I am unwilling that he should live; rather, I have given orders that you take his life by the sword. | ...

[lacuna of seven or eight lines]

.. | if he utters a word, remove his head; but if he remains [in silence]²⁷) and goes along with you, do not kill him, but bring him (back) to me alive."

As the executioner went off with him, he spoke many words to him, but (Secundus) was not prevailed upon (to depart) from his self-imposed law, but instead preserved the silence that he loved from the first day up to death.²⁸)

The executioner looked at him in amazement and said: "Even if you have remained silent up to the present, and have

22) On the basis of this Perry restores *τριβούνην τιμήν* in the Greek text for *τροπώντη* of the manuscript (*tyrponti* in the Latin of Willelmus medicus). Attention, however, might be drawn here to a remarkable rendering that appears in the Syriac translation of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV, 2, 3, where *Μάρκιον τριβούνην* becomes *Μαργγὺς τρυβῆν* "Marcius the tribune". This Marcus Turbo may be the person referred to in the Life of Secundus; cp Perry, p. 28, note 40; also E. Frézouls, in *Syria* 30 (1953), 247-78.

23) Syr supports *ἐπειθεν* of R, which Perry emended to *ἔστι πείθειν*.

24) See note 7.

25) I.e. Caesar; in the Greek presumably the tribune is meant; cp Perry, p. 105 note. Isaac supports Syr over this.

26) See note 9.

27) So Sachau's restoration, but see note 11.

28) This paragraph, and the beginning and end of the next, are fuller than the corresponding section in the Greek.

been unwilling to save yourself by means of a word, nevertheless open your mouth (now) and speak to me, and you shall live. Grant yourself life by means of a word, for you are wise and are called a philosopher, and I think that it does not escape you that when the swan is on the point of death it not only speaks, but actually sings. You, then, have been consigned to death on account of silence; you are not willing to speak and live, but rather you are going to die because of a word which you refuse to utter. I advise you to repent of this resolve of yours, give an answer and save yourself. The time that you have been silent is quite sufficient, when you were a free man without any fear. Now, however, the sharp sword stands over you, and no one can save you, apart from your own will."

He spoke other words, too, to him, but was unable to alter his resolve, because (Secundus) despised death²⁹) and was intending to receive it in silence.

He went off with him silent, and they reached the place where criminals were put to death. The executioner drew his sword and showed it to him | ..

[lacuna of seven or eight lines]

... [but when he refused] | to speak (the executioner) was greatly amazed at his perseverance. He put his sword back into its sheath and, following the Caesar's orders, did not kill him, for his instructions were as follows: if he gives you any answer and speaks to you, kill him, but if he remains as he is in silence, bring him back to me alive³⁰). So he led him off and came to Caesar, did obeisance to him and said: "My lord Caesar, live for ever! The man you committed to me I have brought back to you just as he was: just as he left your presence, so has he remained right up to the point of death. He has kept his law of silence, and has not answered me a single word. Here he is, standing before you."³⁰)

When (the Caesar) heard this he was greatly amazed at the man's perseverance. Much astounded at him, he said: "O philosopher, if you, who have imposed this law of silence on yourself, have kept it right to the point of death, then I, who am king, with the power to kill and keep alive, to lay down law and to abrogate it, shall not achieve my will. Nevertheless I shall

29) Greek "life".

30) Fuller than the Greek.

break³¹) this law of yours, for even if you are not willing to speak to me with your mouth, I shall make you speak to me with your hands. You may keep the law that is pleasing to your will to keep, (but) take this writing tablet, and write down on it what you like; speak to me with your hands rather than with your voice, and make me a defence concerning all that I shall ask you”.

Then Secundus took the writing tablet from the Caesar, and wrote as follows: “O Hadrian, over my life and my death, in very truth, you have power, for these things belong to the sphere of your will, whether I should live or die | ..

[lacuna of 2 folios]

.. | Death is this: sleep for eternity, what dissolves the body, terror of the sick, the object prayed for by the aged, the hope of the unfortunate, the separating off of the soul, the enemy of youth, the limit of old age, the end of life, the destroyer of wise things, what is willed by the poor, the resting of limbs, what brings the world to an end, the fulfiller of fate, what completes (all) measures, the hinderer of life, what terrifies men, the fountain-source of tears, the king of those who are no more, the grief of many, rest for a few, the terrifier of souls, the departure of what is light, what sends away to darkness, what scatters bones, what dissolves thoughts, what nullifies cunning, the friend of silence, the enemy of pleasure, the object of hate for the rich in that it accepts no bribes, the corrupter of every corpse, dissolution for everything.

“Secundus the silent philosopher” is ended”.

³¹) I take *'šrywby* as imperfect, rather than (aphel) imperative, as Perry does. The Greek has nothing corresponding, but compare the Arabic (though the sense is different).

TOWARDS A HISTORY OF SYRIAC TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

I

Goethe, in his *Noten und Abhandlungen zum vestöstlichen Divan*, has a famous passage where he offers a threefold classification of translations, the ‘schlichtprosaische’, or straightforward literal prose translation, the ‘parodistische’, which sought to emulate, rather than translate, the original, and thirdly ‘Einer Übersetzung, die sich mit dem Original zu identifizieren strebt, nähert sich zuletzt der Interlinear-Version und erleichtert höchlich das Verständnis des Originals’. Goethe saw these as a historical sequence, the first represented by Luther’s Bible, the second by 17th and 18th century translations, whereas the third is his own ideal.

It so happens that the history of Syriac translation technique up to the early eighth century likewise falls into three periods, each with its own rather different ideal of translation. To some extent, as we shall see, the three types of translation technique which emerge even bear a certain resemblance to Goethe’s three categories, although they follow a different sequence.

The aim of the present paper is to offer some general considerations of a preliminary nature on the diachronic study of Syriac translation technique. Since the ultimate purpose of such an enquiry is to establish criteria by which undated translations can be approximately dated, we shall be looking at Syriac translations from Greek from a rather limited angle only. We shall not, for example, here be concerned either with the text-critical value of Syriac translations (though our findings of course have an important bearing on this) or with an analysis per se of the process of translation from Greek into Syriac. Our concern is, rather, to try to isolate those particular features of translation technique which can serve to distinguish diachronically one type of translation from another. The significance of such an enquiry for the history of Syriac culture as a whole

is obvious, given the massive influence that certain types of Greek literature were to exercise, over the course of time, on Syriac writers.

In attempting to draw up some sort of classification of translations on a diachronic basis it is of course essential that we should have some fixed points upon which a framework can be constructed.¹ Fortunately there survive a reasonable number of translations which are either attributed to known and datable persons, or which are preserved in manuscripts that are sufficiently early to provide a useful *terminus ante quem*. Particularly illuminating are those works for which we have a datable revision of some earlier translation that was no longer considered adequate, for in such cases we are offered numerous insights into the interests and techniques of the translator-revisers.

Translations with specific attributions

It would seem that, for the fifth century, the only translation with a definite attribution attached is that of Cyril of Alexandria's *de recta fide*, put into Syriac by Rabbula, bishop of Edessa († 435). For the sixth century we are better off, with Polycarp's revision of the New Testament (the Philoxenian), completed in 507/8; translations of *Joseph and Aseneth* and Cyril of Alexandria's *Glaphyra* by Moses of Inghilene; of various works of Severus by Paul of Kallinikos; and the *Corpus Dionysianum*, Ps. Aristotle's *de mundo* and other texts by Sergios of Resh'aina. It so happens that all these belong to the first half of the sixth century, whereas for the second half there are no specific attributions of translations available.

It is the seventh century which is best documented for us: active in the second and third decades are the famous pair of biblical translators, Thomas of Harkel and Paul of Tella, as well as another Paul, of Edessa, who revised an earlier translation of Gregory Nazianzen's homilies in Cyprus (623/4).

From the middle of the century we have Athanasios of Balad, reviser of an earlier translation of Porphyry's *Eisagoge* (645) and Kandidatos of Amid, whose translation of Gregory's *Iamboi* was finished in 665; at much the same time another Athanasios, of Nisibis, translated various works of Severus (one is dated 668/9), while to the latter part of the century belong

¹ The present article is limited to the period 4th-7th century.

Phokas (whose revised translation of the *Corpus Dionysianum* may belong to c. 684-6),² Jacob of Edessa and George bishop of the Arabs. Jacob's translation activities covered many different spheres, biblical, patristic and secular, while the only extant translation by George is of the first three books of Aristotle's *Organon* — in fact another revision rather than a new translation.

The eighth century seems to have been a period of temporary decline in Syriac scholarship, prior to the flurry of translation activity which characterizes the following century. The only translation of this century with a specific attribution would appear to be of Sophronios' *Letter to Arkadios*, the work of the Melkite Constantine of Edessa, and dated 720/1.

For a number of different reasons the present survey deliberately stops short of the ninth century, and consequently excluded are both the ninth-century translations of Greek secular works made at the Abbasid capital, and the tenth/eleventh-century Melkite translations of liturgical texts made in the Antioch region.

In that we have only one work with a specific attribution to the fifth century, early manuscripts containing translated works take on a particular significance: here I would single out for mention Titus of Bostra's *Adversus Manichaeos* as well as various works of Eusebius and Basil, all preserved in fifth-century manuscripts. Also important is a dated, but anonymous, translation of synodical canons, to be found in B.L. Add. 14528: according to the colophon these were translated 'exactly and clearly' in Mabbug in 500/1. As de Halleux has shown,³ it is likely that the sponsor was none other than Philoxenus of Mabbug.

Less important, since they cannot be attached to specific extant works, are the names of translators given in secondary sources such as 'Abdisho's *Catalogue* or Ibn an Nadim's *Fihrist*. The former, for example, mentions Ibas (along with the undated Qumi and Probus) in connection with translations of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but none of the extant texts of Theodore bear this attribution (although some do indeed contain features characteristic of early translations).⁴

² See OC 63 (1979) 21.

³ A. DE HALLEUX, La philoxénienne du symbole, OCA 205 (1978) 295-315.

⁴ In passing it should be noted that many translations were specifically commissioned (e.g. those mentioned in n. 15). In one case we are told that the translation involved two people: the translator proper gave an oral translation which was taken down in writing by a second per-

Criteria

If our aim is to develop some sort of typology of translations, then it is important to isolate satisfactory criteria by which such a typology can be established. Two sets of criteria in particular would appear to be especially helpful for our purpose: criteria having to do with the aim of the translator, and those concerning his actual practice.

a) Aim

The character of a translation will always depend very much on the attitude of the translator (and his readers) to the source text, and this in turn will depend, in a general way, on the respective prestige of the two languages involved, and, in particular, on the nature and authority of the text in question. In the period with which we are dealing, the prestige of Greek is continually on the increase, and so there is an accompanying shift in translation practice: earlier translations can essentially be seen as bringing the source text to the Syriac reader, whereas with later ones the movement is the reverse, drawing the reader towards the original.

Much too will depend on the role in which the translator sees himself: is he self-effacing before the authority of the original, or does he regard himself as playing the role of expositor as well? If the latter, does his exposition take the form of an attempt to penetrate into the essence of the meaning of the original (thus producing Goethe's ideal of the Interlinear-Version), or does he rather seek to impose his own views, or those of a group, upon the text he is translating, with the result that the translation becomes, in a certain sense, a work of propaganda? (That translations were an ideal way of accrediting respectable and authoritative writers with heretical views was widely recognized in late antiquity).

Depending then on the attitude that the translator takes to his own role as translator and to the text he is translating, his basic aim in making the translation will differ. If he adopts a self-effacing, referential attitude towards his source text, then he will probably seek to produce a mirror translation, where every detail of the original is, as far as possible, reproduced in the translation: the focus of attention will be directed en-

son: see E. W. BROOKS, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus*, London 1902, I, p. 521.

tirely to the original, rather than on the reader. If, on the other hand, the translator sees his own role as an important one in the transference of information from one language to another, then he will aim at a more expositional type of translation, essentially reader-oriented, where he will try to involve the reader emotionally by employing appropriate cultural equivalents. Should the translator, however, go a step further, and seek to interpose his own views on to the text in what may at times be a partisan way (as for example happened to some extent with all biblical translation in the Reformation period), then he will produce a tendential rendering.⁵

In the history of Syriac translation from Greek there is a marked swing away from the expositional to the mirror type of translation: the pivotal point appears to have been around the year 500, although naturally the shift is a gradual one. But we also have examples of tendential translations, most noticeably perhaps in connection with the Evagrius corpus, although instances are to be found in quite a number of other, fifth-century, translations, especially those of a homiletic nature.

b) Practice

Although popular theorizing about translation technique in antiquity, such as we find above all in Cicero and Jerome, sought to provide a sharp division between 'literal' and 'free' translation (Cicero's antithesis of *interpretis* and *oratoris*, Jerome's contrast between *verbum e verbo* and *sensus de sensu*),⁶ reality has never been so straightforward, seeing that a continuum exists between the two poles; accordingly the terms 'free' and 'literal' are not particularly helpful for establishing a typology of translation styles,⁷ and we must therefore look elsewhere.

Three main criteria would seem illuminating from the specific point of view of our requirements. The first concerns the choice, by the translator, of a particular unit of text from

⁵ Mirror translation may of course also be tendential; in view of the fact that *pašseq* means both 'translate' and 'give an exposition of', it is significant that virtually all early translations are expositional in character. For these different types of translation compare L. G. KELLY, *The True Interpreter*, Oxford 1979, ch. 3 (Kelly's use of K. Bühler's terms, 'symbol', 'symptom' and 'signal', for them is, however, most inappropriate).

⁶ See in general my *Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity, Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979) 69-87.

⁷ See the pertinent discussion in J. BARR, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, NAWG Phil.-hist. Kl. 1979, Nr 11.

which his translation takes its starting point: in other words, how does he segment the Greek original? The choice is quite wide, and except when in difficulties, the competent translator will not normally shift from one sized unit to another. The unit may be as large as a paragraph (this is characteristic of many fifth-century translations of homiletic literature), or can be as small as the bound morpheme, i.e. the constituent elements in Greek compound nouns and verbs. Over the course of time one can observe a continuous reduction in size of the unit of translation: thus in very general terms one can say that most sixth-century translators adopt the sentence or phrase as the unit, while seventh-century ones reduced this to the word (and often segment even below word level).

The second criterion concerns the tension between *signifiant* and *signifié*, the word employed and the meaning it conveys. What respective importance does a translator attach to each of these? Again, in very general terms one can say that earlier translators see the *signifié* as far more important than the *signifiant*, whereas from the sixth century onwards — and above all in the seventh — much greater attention is paid to the *signifiant*, often at the expense (we would say) of the *signifié*, but we should remember that the translators themselves no doubt regarded the *signifiant* as constituting an essential element of the *signifié*.

A translator who sees the *signifié* as the most important factor will seek for dynamic, rather than formal, equivalents: thus, for example, the translator of Eusebius' *Hist. Eccl.* represents Greek Zeus by Baal Shamin, the cultural equivalent (whereas the sixth and seventh-century translator and reviser of Gregory Nazianzen's *Homilies* invariably gives the Greek name). Likewise Rabbula (whose translation of Cyril's *de recta fide* verges on the tendential at times) translates *enanthrōpōē* by *lbeš pagrā*,⁸ a phrase which Philoxenus was later to condemn as inexact since it 'inclined to the position of Nestorius'.⁹ The use of a particular cultural equivalent can of course often tell us something about the cultural attitudes of the translator and his readers.

We should also note that dynamic equivalence can involve both content and form: an example of the former would be

⁸ Following the practice of the earliest translation of the Symbol (see A. DE HALLEUX in *GOF Syriaca* 17 (1978) 161-90). The phrase is common in early Syriac writers.

⁹ CSCO 380, 53-4.

Rabbula's rendering of *ho makarios Paulos* by *ardēklā ḥakkīmā Paula*, replacing a stock Greek epithet by a stock Syriac one. This type of dynamic equivalence is generally termed 'modulation', in contrast to 'transposition', which involves only a change in the grammatical category involved;¹⁰ a very common form of transposition in all early translations is the use of *dalath* + substantive in order to represent Greek adjectival forms.

The general shift in preferences which is exhibited by translators over the course of time is well illustrated by the respective treatment of *kata anthrōpon* (I Cor. 3:3) in the Peshitta, Philoxenian and Harklean:

Peshitta: *ba-bsar*
 Philoxenian:¹¹ (?)*nāšāʾit*
 Harklean: *ʾa(y)k barnāšā*

Here the movement is, first of all, away from one type of dynamic equivalent (modulation) in the Peshitta to another (transposition) in the Philoxenian; subsequently in the Harklean a formal equivalent replaces any kind of dynamic one.

Where great weight is put on formal equivalence (a feature above all of the seventh century) we will meet all sorts of lexical and syntactic calques, as well as neologisms and borrowings of technical terms. Semantic calques are likewise common; these will often arise from the practice of stereotyping, whereby a particular Greek word is given a regular Syriac equivalent, regardless of the fact that the Syriac and Greek words may have very different semantic ranges (e.g. *šubḥā* 'glory', used to represent *doxa* in the sense of 'opinion').

A third criterion concerns the general flow of the sentence, the *demarche*: the translator's attitude towards word order, connecting particles, Greek hypotaxis etc. Even in the seventh century word order would seem to be the least important of these, except in biblical translation. The changing attitude to particles is particularly instructive, and a clear pattern of development can be seen: although Syriac has formal equivalents to Greek *de*, *gar*, *oun* (i.e. *dēn*, *gēr*, *hākīl*), prior to the sixth century there is only very partial correspondence in usage between the Greek originals and the Syriac translations over these

¹⁰ Cp W. KOLLER, *Grundprobleme der Übersetzungstheorie*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Stockholmer germanistische Forschungen 9 (1972) 119-20.

¹¹ CSCO 380, 157, 181.

particles, whereas from the late sixth century onwards formal equivalence becomes the norm. Several borrowings in this area, too, can be traced diachronically: thus *men* and the hybrid *badgoun* only become common in the course of the fifth century, while *eita*, and *kit* to represent Greek *te*, *ge*, and *dē*, seem to be seventh-century innovations.

In all this there are of course many variables, and it is these that will serve as a useful basis for distinguishing between different styles of translation, and in particular between different kinds of literal translation.

Such, then, are some of the main criteria which should in due course prove helpful in establishing a satisfactory typology of translation styles.

II

In the second part of this paper we shall look at Syriac translations of the fourth to seventh centuries diachronically, dividing the time span into three periods, 4/5th centuries, 6th century, and 7th century. Ideally the shifts in translation technique which are to be observed over these three periods would be best illustrated by a series of extended annotated examples of datable translation and revisions,¹² but since, for reasons of space, only a few very brief illustrations can be given, for the most part my remarks on shifting patterns of translation usage are abstracted from a detailed study of a selection of representative texts.

First of all, however, it will be helpful to glance at a few examples of Syriac writers' own perceptions of the problems and aims of translation.

It is not surprising to find that the need for *akribeia* in theological matters, engendered by the christological controversies of the fifth century, was one of the main reasons why Philoxenus commissioned a revision of the Peshitta New Testament. As he explains in his *Commentary on the Prologue of John*, Philoxenus found himself obliged to undertake this because the original translators "had made mistakes in many things, whether intentionally or through ignorance".¹³ Else-

¹² I hope to produce such an 'album' in conjunction with Mr. J.G. Blum, to whom I am indebted for helpful discussion on the topic of the present paper.

¹³ CSCO 380, 53.

where, commenting on the neologisms *etbassar w-etbarnaš* he had introduced into the Creed (to replace *etgaššam wa-hwā besrā*), he writes:¹⁴ "those who have translated books from Greek into Syriac, by not bothering to preserve the exactitude of the words employed by the Greeks, or the precision of the sense, have gone astray and put what took their fancy, or some word they considered to be in current use in Syriac. They did not realize that, had they translated using these neologisms (i.e. *etbassar w-etbarnaš*), they would soon have become just as familiar as the older terms".

How the ideal of a more precise type of biblical and theological translation began to affect other translation as well can be seen from three prefaces¹⁵ by translators who point out to their readers that the biblical quotations in their translations may sound unfamiliar, since their practice (evidently novel) has been to translate the Greek form of the citations, rather than to follow the older practice of adapting them to the Peshitta. One of these prefaces is by Moses of Inghilene, and so belongs to the early sixth century; the similarity of the other two makes it highly probable that they too belong to the same period, which was clearly one of growing awareness of the need for greater exactitude in translation practice.

Whereas the interests behind Philoxenus' revisions were primarily theological, those of the seventh-century biblical revisers, Paul and Thomas, were much more philological.¹⁶ Their striving for formal equivalence — a striving which characterizes all seventh-century translations and revisions, whether biblical or non-biblical — is already given expression in an appended note to a translation (late sixth century?) of a letter by Theodosius of Alexandria:¹⁷ "This *memrā* was translated and interpreted from Greek into Syriac word for word without alteration in so far as possible, so as to indicate, not just the sense, but,

¹⁴ CSCO 231, 54-5. The introduction of these terms (c. 500) serves as a valuable means of dating many anonymous translations of theological works: see DE HALLEUX [note 3] and compare J. GRIBOMONT, PdO 6/7 (1975) 125-58.

¹⁵ See I. GUIDI, *Mose di Aghel e Simeone Abbate*, RRAL 283 (1886) 404, 551; C. VAN DEN EYNDE, *La version syriaque du commentaire de Grégoire de Nysse sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, Louvain 1939, 72. Compare Paul of Kallinikos' preface to his translation of Severus' anti-Julianist works, CSCO 244, 1-2.

¹⁶ See my *The resolution of the Philoxenian/Harklean problem*, in *Essays in honour of B.M. Metzger*, Oxford 1981, pp. 325-43.

¹⁷ CSCO 17, p. 40.

by its very words, the words in the Greek; and for the most part not one letter has been added or subtracted, provided the requirements of the language have not hindered this".

From the late seventh century Phokas¹⁸ pays tribute to the many scholars "who have been skilled in the craft of translation from the Greek language", singling out for special mention Athanasios of Balad and Jacob of Edessa, whose knowledge of the two languages had enabled them to "acquire, by their diligence, many neologisms hitherto unfamiliar to the Syrians, expressions based on the precision of the Greek".

Although Phokas does not castigate Sergios by name (as later writers were to do), the very fact that he found it necessary to revise that scholar's translation of the *Corpus Dionysianum* (introducing many of the neologisms he admires) clearly indicates the basic change in attitude to translation that had taken place over the course of some 150 years: Sergios was among the last expositor-translators, for whom the *signifié* was of prime importance: to the seventh-century translator, on the other hand, the *signifiant* was equally important, being regarded as an essential part of the *signifié*. On such a view, a mirror version of the original is the only acceptable form of translation, although to what extremes this ideal is taken will vary considerably from one translator to another.

1. Fourth/Fifth century

The earliest Syriac translations from Greek are free to a surprising degree. They are essentially reader-oriented, and can all be classed as either expositional or tendential in character. The unit of translation can be as large as the paragraph, though in the case of biblical translation it is normally the sentence or phrase. Dynamic equivalence is the norm, with extensive use of modulation as well as of transposition. There is consequently little or no use of calques, either on the lexical or on the syntactic level; adjectival forms are rather rare. Greek sentences are regularly restructured, often in a radical way, and there is no attempt to provide any formal equivalence over the use of particles.¹⁹ Archaic features, such as *rūḥā d-qūdšā* treated grammatically as a feminine, are quite common.

¹⁸ G. WIESSNER, *Zur Handschriftenüberlieferung der syrischen Fassung des Corpus Dionysianum*, NAWG Phil.-hist. Kl. 1972, Nr. 3, 199.

¹⁹ See H. GRESSMANN, *Studien zu Eusebs Theophanie*, TU NF VIII.3,

Among examples of restrained expositional translations come those of works by Titus of Bostra and Eusebius. In Rabbula's translation of Cyril's *de recta fide*, on the other hand, one has the impression that it is often Rabbula preaching through Cyril. A more extreme tendential translation is provided by the fifth-century version of Basil's homilies, where the translator has expanded the material by up to 50%.

Biblical translations are just as much reader-oriented as patristic ones; thus, for example, in the Old Syriac Gospels (a rather uneven translation in character) the Old Testament quotations are frequently given in the wording of the Peshitta Old Testament, even when this conflicts openly with the Greek.

Even in this early period we can see the beginnings of the process of revising earlier translations which had come to be considered as too free in their rendering, but at present this activity is confined to biblical texts; the interests and techniques of these early correctors can be directly studied in the Peshitta Gospels.

2. Sixth century

This century represents a period of transition between earlier practice and the strict literalism of the seventh century. This can be well illustrated by a comparison of the Peshitta, Philoxenian and Harklean texts of Hebr. 1:1,

Pesh. *b-kul mnawwān wab-kul demwān mallel allāhā ʿam abbāhayn ba-nbīʿē men qdīm.*

Phil.²⁰ *b-saggī mnawwātā wab-saggī znayyā mallel allāhā men qdīm l-abbāhātā ba-nbīʿē.*

Hkl. *kad b-saggīʿūt mnawwātā wab-saggīʿūt znayyā men qdīm mallel allāhā l-abbāhātā ba-nbīʿē.*

Philoxenus (Polycarp) corrects the Peshitta in six particulars: (1) *poly-* is more closely represented by *saggī*, and (2) *-trop-* by *znayyā*; (3) *men qdīm* is placed earlier; (4) *mallel ʿam* is altered to *mallel l-*, to correspond better to the Greek dative; (5) the suffix is removed from *abbāhayn*, and (6) the form is altered from *abbāhē* (ancestors) to *abbāhātā* (spiritual fathers).²¹

1903, 44, and my remarks in B.M. METZGER, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford 1977, 93-4.

²⁰ CSCO 380, p. 7.

²¹ Thomas carries the process further in three significant ways: (1) he has a more exact representation of *poly-*, using the construct state

The general shift away from the reader-oriented to the source-oriented type of translation is readily discernable in the altered attitude to biblical quotations, mentioned earlier, yet the very fact that a Moses of Inghilene feels the need to apologize to his readers on this point indicates his continued concern for their requirements, and in other respects Moses, like Sergios, evidently saw the role of the translator as still very much that of the expositor. Nevertheless the new practice, of Moses and others, with biblical citations pointed the way towards the more literal style of translation that was subsequently to become the norm. Closer in line with later trends is the work of Paul of Kallinikos, in that he adopts a more referential attitude to the text he is translating.

In general, translation of this period will tend to take the sentence or phrase as the unit of translation (with a definite shift towards the latter as time goes on). The use of dynamic equivalents remains common, though transposition is often preferred to modulation. Increasing attention is paid to the *signifiant*, and this results in a growing number of calques, both lexical and syntactic, as the desire for formal equivalence becomes more strongly felt; there is consequently a marked increase in the number of Syriac adjectival forms employed.²²

3. Seventh century

The seventh century witnesses the victory of the mirror type as the norm for all translations, whatever the subject matter, whether it be biblical, liturgical, patristic or Aristotelian logic. This shift from the expositional to the mirror version as the accepted ideal meant that much seventh-century translation work in fact took the form of revisions of sixth-century (or earlier) translations which no longer matched up to the new standards.

of an abstract (a practice widely followed in all 7th-century translations); (2) he reproduces Greek hypotaxis by means of *kad*; (3) he has a closer equivalence in word order.

²² A feature not otherwise found before the 6th century is the use of the Greek aor. inf. (active or passive) + *'bad*: the presence of this in Probus' commentaries on the *Organon* fits with the 6th-century dating for this work which is demanded on internal grounds (see F. ZIMMERMANN, *Al-Farabi's Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle's de Interpretatione*, London/Oxford 1981, p. xci n. 2, and, for the background, my *From antagonism to assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning in N. GARSOIAN, T. MATHEWS, R. THOMSON (edd.), East of Byzantium*, Washington D.C. 1982, 1-15.

Translation now seeks to take the reader to the original by offering him a rendering which reflects as many details of the Greek source text as possible. The translator no longer presumes to take on any more of the role of expositor than is absolutely necessary as he adopts a totally self-effacing attitude towards the authority of the original. Great importance is attached to formal equivalence, and consequently the unit of translation is reduced to the word, while very frequently segmentation takes place below word level; characteristic of seventh-century practice are forms such as *šappīrūt dehl̄tā* for *eusebeia* (replacing the earlier dynamic equivalent, *dehl̄lat allāhā*), or *pa'yūt* (°) *nāšā'it* to render *anthrōpoprepōs* (thus Phokas, replacing Sergios' *d-pā'ē* (h) *wā l-(°)nāšūteh*). Stereotyping becomes very common, and results in such curiosities as *l-meḥdā* to translate the salutation *chairein*.

The ideal of formal equivalence is extended to syntax as well, and highly sophisticated techniques are evolved in order to give an exact representation of Greek sentence structure (even though the results in some cases go totally against the spirit of the Syriac language). Particular attention is paid to Greek particles, and very often to word order as well (this applies especially to biblical translation).²³

This exceedingly literal method of translation, the underlying presupposition of which is that there is no distinction between the *signifiant* and the *signifié*, is reminiscent of Aquila's famous Greek translation of the Old Testament; more significantly, it is also found in some contemporary Latin and Armenian translations from Greek:²⁴ clearly such a widespread attitude

²³ Studies of individual 7th-century translations (sometimes including comparisons with earlier versions) will be found in S. RØRDAM, *Libri Iudicum et Ruth secundum versionem Syriaco-Hexaplarum*, Copenhagen 1859-61; J. G. E. HOFFMANN, *De hermeneuticis apud syros aristoteleis*, Leipzig 1869; A. MERX, *Historia artis grammaticae apud syros*, Leipzig 1889; J. GWYNN, *The Apocalypse of St John in a Syriac Version Hitherto Unknown*, Dublin 1897, and *Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible*, London 1909; K. GEORR, *Les Catégories d'Aristote dans leur versions syro-arabes*, Beirut 1948; W. BAARS, *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts*, Leiden 1968; J. M. SAUGET, *Une homélie de Proclus*, Mus 82 (1969) 9-13; S. P. BROCK, *The Syriac Version of the Ps. Nonnos Mythological Scholia*, Cambridge 1971, and *The Syriac Euthalian material and the Philoxenian Version of the NT*, ZNW 70 (1979) 120-30; F. GRAFFIN, Jacques d'Édesse réviseur des homélie de Sévère, OCA 205 (1978) 243-55; C. J. A. LASH, *Techniques of a translator [Jacob of Edessa]*, TU 125 (1981) 365-83.

²⁴ For Latin: R. RIEDINGER, *Lateinische Übersetzungen griechischer Häretikertexte des siebenten Jahrhunderts*, SBÖAW 352 (1979); for Ar-

to translation from Greek can tell us something important of the intellectual spirit of the age.

*

In a letter to Thomas Carlyle of 20th July 1820 Goethe wrote: "Denn, was man auch von der Unzulänglichkeit des Übersetzens sagen mag, so ist und bleibt es doch eine der wichtigsten und würdigsten Geschäfte in dem allgemeinen Weltwesen". Where could this be more applicable than in the history of Syriac culture?

menian: H. MANANDIAN, *The Hellenizing School and its Development*, [in Armenian] Vienna 1928, and C. MERCIER, *L'école hellénistique dans la littérature arménienne*, REArm 13 (1978/9) 59-75. The date of this Armenian hellenizing school is, however, disputed).

CLOTHING METAPHORS AS A MEANS OF THEOLOGICAL EXPRESSION IN SYRIAC TRADITION

When one reads Syriac writers of the golden age of Syriac literature (4th - 7th centuries), and in particular the poets of this period, one cannot fail to notice that two sets of imagery are especially beloved among these authors, firstly letter imagery (fittingly, in view of the earlier role of Aramaic as the chancery language of the Achaemenid empire), and secondly the imagery of clothing. It is this second area of metaphorical language that will be considered here, with attention focussed on certain central themes which are specifically of theological interest. Indeed one can even speak, with E. PETERSON¹, of a "theology of clothing", seeing that the entire span of salvation history can be expressed in terms of clothing imagery. The roots of this imagery are of course already to be found in the Bible² - and above all, as we shall see, in the Syriac Bible - but these biblical roots are developed in a highly imaginative and individual way in the Syriac tradition so as to build up a complete and consistent picture where the individual elements are all neatly and logically interrelated, giving the imagery a dynamic character which might otherwise have been lacking. While individual elements of this imagery are indeed quite often to be found in Greek and Latin writers³, it would appear that it is in the Syriac tradition that the imagery is the most consistently and fully developed.

I. The Setting

It will be helpful if at the very outset an outline is given of the conceptual framework within which salvation history is viewed by these Syriac writers. The course of salvation history can be described as a dramatic sequence consisting of four main scenes. Although, owing to the allusive nature of the majority of texts employing this imagery it is only rarely that we are presented with all four scenes together, there is no doubt that the entire scenario was familiar to all Syriac writers of the period⁴.

Scene 1

Before the Fall Adam and Eve are in Paradise (viewed as a mountain)⁵ clothed in "robes of glory"⁶ or "of light". As we shall see in due course, this concept derives from Jewish speculation concerning the "garments of skin" in Gen 3,21

Scene 2

At the Fall, Adam and Eve are stripped of their "robes of glory/light". It may be noted at once that, in contrast to Greek tradition which loved to speculate on the nature of the garments with which God now clothes them⁷, Syriac tradition shows little interest in this aspect, and is primarily concerned with what they took off at this point.

Scene 3

In order to remedy the naked state of Adam/mankind which had been brought about by the Fall, the Divinity himself "puts on Adam" when he "put on a body", and the whole aim of the Incarnation is to "re clothe mankind in the robe of glory". The three central "staging posts" of the Incarnation are the Nativity, the Baptism, and the Descent/Resurrection, events separate in profane time, but intimately linked in sacred time, all three being seen as descents of the Divinity into successive wombs, the womb of Mary, the womb of the Jordan, and the womb of Sheol⁸. Of central importance for our purpose is the descent into the Jordan, for it is then that Christ deposits the "robe of glory/light" in the water, thus making it available once again for mankind to put on in baptism.

Scene 4

The baptism of Christ is the fountainhead and source of Christian baptism⁹: at his descent into the Jordan Christ sanctified in sacred time all baptismal water; at Christian baptism it is the invocation to the Holy Spirit in the prayer of consecration of the water which effectually makes the water of the individual font identical in sacred time and space with the Jordan waters. Thus, when he or she is baptized, the Christian is himself going down into the Jordan waters and from them he picks up and puts on the "robe of glory" which Christ left there.

The "robe of glory" which Adam and Eve lost in Paradise at the Fall is thus recovered by the Christian at Baptism in the font. Baptism is indeed a reentry into Paradise, but this is not just the Paradise of the beginning of time, but also an eschatological Paradise. There is a certain tension here, for at baptism the robe of glory is regained in potential, but not yet fully in reality, for this will only happen at the end of time, at the general resurrection¹⁰. This final reality can, however, to some extent be anticipated in this life by the saints, who preserve their baptismal robe "unspotted".

The whole process of being stripped of the robe of glory at the Fall and of recovering it and putting it on at baptism is thus not just a cyclical movement; rather, it has a linear quality, for (as we shall see) the final stage of mankind is seen as far more glorious than that in the primordial Paradise, for God will finally grant to mankind the divinity which Adam and Eve had previously tried to snatch, in disobedience to the divine command not to eat of the Tree of Life.

We should also note at this point that the robe of glory has a number of different aspects: not only is it Adam and Eve's original clothing in Paradise which is put on again by the Christian at baptism, it is also the clothing of angels and of the just; it is furthermore a royal and priestly robe, and at the same time the "wedding garment" for the eschatological banquet (Mt 22,12).

These various episodes in the drama of salvation are summed up within the compass of a single stanza by Ephrem¹¹:

"All these changes did the Merciful One make, stripping off (glory) and putting on (a body); for He had devised a way to re clothe Adam in that glory which Adam had stripped off. He was wrapped with swaddling clothes, corresponding to Adam's leaves, He put on clothes instead of Adam's skins; He was baptized for Adam's sin, he was embalmed for Adam's death, he rose and raised up Adam in his glory. Blessed is He who descended, put Adam on and ascended."

II. Biblical Sources

We turn now to a brief examination of the biblical sources for this clothing imagery, and of the way in which the Syriac tradition has developed these.

1. The "robe of glory/light"

Without any doubt the starting point for this terminology lies in Gen 3,21 "and the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin (*kotnōt* ^C*ōr*) and he clothed them". Although the Septuagint and Peshitta have literal translations here, the Targum tradition (both Babylonian and Palestinian) provides *lbbšīn d-īqār* - "garments of glory", while Midrash Genesis Rabba 20,12 tells how Rabbi Meir was reputed to have had a manuscript in which, instead of ^C*wr* - "skin", there stood the reading ^{wr} - "light"¹².

Now, as generally understood in both Jewish and early Christian exegetical tradition, the verse Gen 3,21 refers to the action of God clothing Adam and Eve's nakedness *after* the Fall. There is, however, sufficient evidence to indicate that there was also another way of understanding the time reference of Gen 3,21, where the verbs are to be taken as pluperfects, referring to the status of Adam and Eve at their creation, *before* the Fall. It seems likely that this second interpretation was popularized in the now largely lost apocryphal Adam literature; to this cycle belongs the so-called Apocalypse of Moses¹³, where Eve says to the serpent, "why have you done this to me, in that I have been deprived of the *glory* with which I was *clothed*?" Subsequently in both Christian and Jewish tradition we find writers combining both interpretations of Gen 3,21. Thus in a Maronite liturgical text of uncertain date we have¹⁴:

"With radiance and glory was Adam clothed at the beginning, before he sinned; the Evil one was envious, led Eve astray, and had Adam ejected from Paradise: he was then covered by fig leaves in place of the glory with which he had been clothed. This day (sc. Friday) did the Lord fashion Adam, today too did he drive him from Paradise; Priest, pontiff and king did the Lord make Adam when he created him."

Curiously similar is the statement in the Zohar (I. 36b): "*Before* the Fall they were dressed in garments of light, but after their trespass in garments of skin."

It is possible that we have in this concept of Adam and Eve's loss of an original "garment of glory" an interaction between Jewish and ancient Mesopotamian ideas, for it was precisely a "robe of splendour"- *ṣubāt baṣṭi* that the goddess Ishtar lost at the seventh gate during her descent to the underworld¹⁵. The phrase "garment of light", on the other hand, has parallels in Iranian texts; it was subsequently to become very popular with both Mandaean and Manichaean writers¹⁶.

2. "Glory" as clothing elsewhere in the Peshitta Old Testament

The Hebrew Bible is already very rich in clothing imagery, but from our point of view it is important to observe that in the Syriac translation, the Peshitta, this imagery becomes even more prominent. A significant example of this has already been seen in Ps 8,6 (note 13 above). Clearly we are dealing with a factor which goes back to the very roots of Syriac tradition. Two passages employing the term "robe of glory" are of importance to us here, Ben Sira 50,11 (where it refers to the high priest's robe), and Dan 10,5 (also 12,7), where it is worn by the angel who speaks with Daniel. That Adam's "robe of glory" (to use the Targum's rendering) was a priestly robe, to be handed down over the generations, was a familiar idea in Jewish tradition, and the term has preserved this priestly aspect in Syriac tradition as well.

In Ps 132,16 the Peshitta (against the Hebrew and the Septuagint) speaks of "glory" as the clothing of the just, and this eschatological dimension was clearly something already familiar to Judaism of the early post-biblical period, seeing that Enoch 62,15, for example, reads "The righteous and the elect will have arisen from the earth... and will be clothed with garments of glory". This eschatological aspect of the "robe of glory" remains an important one in Syriac texts too.

3. The Incarnation as "putting on a body"

The New Testament - or rather, the Greek New Testament - does not employ such phraseology, but an obvious starting point is to be found in two wellknown passages in Paul, Röm 13,14 and Gal 3,27, where the converse is found: the Christian "puts on Christ" at baptism. It would seem likely that Phil 2,7-8 is also of importance in this context¹⁷.

Although the phrase "put on the body", with the Logos as subject, is not found in the Greek New Testament, similar terminology does occur in the Peshitta translation at Hebr 5,7 and 10,5. At the former Christ is spoken of as "being clothed in flesh"¹⁸ (Greek: "in the days of his flesh"), while at the latter the quotation from Ps 40, taken as a Christological prophecy, is rendered "you clothed me in a body"¹⁹ (Greek: "you prepared a body for me"). It was the phrase "put on the body", rather than "put on flesh", which was to become a standard term for the process of the Incarnation in early Syriac Christianity: not only is it found with great frequency in almost all early Syriac writers (Acts of Thomas, Acts of John, Aphrahat, Ephrem, Doctrina

Addai etc.), but it was also given official status that it was employed to translate *sarkōthenta* in the earliest Syriac translation the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, as adopted by the Persian Church at the Council of Seleucia in 410²⁰.

It should not, however, be supposed that early Syriac Christianity was alone in speaking of the Incarnation as "putting on the body", for the metaphor of "putting on" occurs in several anti-docetic Greek and Latin writers of the second and third century, such as Melito of Sardis, Ps. Hippolytus (*Peri Pascha*), and above all Tertullian, for whom *induere carnem* is his preferred metaphor for the Incarnation²¹.

III. Adam typology

Before examining the various Syriac developments of the clothing metaphor in connection with the Incarnation it is important to stress the close connections that this way of looking at salvation history, in terms of "putting on" and "putting off" garments, has with Adam typology: the first Adam loses the robe of glory at the Fall; the second Adam puts on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the robe of glory to mankind in baptism; the Christian puts on "the new man" (Eph 4,24) or "Christ" (Röm 13,14 Gal 3,27) at baptism, at the same time putting on "the robe of glory". In these three closely linked stages of salvation history there is a certain merging of identity between the first and the second Adam: the Fall brought a loss of the first Adam's true identity; God then puts on Adam/Man in order that Adam/Man may put on God, in other words, may attain, not just his pre-Fall status, but the status of divinity which was the intention of his creation²². This merging of the first and second Adam is found above all in the famous Hymn of the Soul in the Acts of Thomas, to which we shall return below.

The sources of this *mythologoumenon* are to be sought in the fusion of three originally separate elements: Paul's first and second Adam typology, his use of the phrase "put on Christ" at baptism, and, thirdly, Jewish speculation about the nature of Adam and Eve's clothing, both before and after the Fall.

IV. The extension of the clothing metaphor for the Incarnation

It has already been pointed out that the phrase "put on the body" (*lbeš pagrā*) is a standard one in early Syriac Christianity. Numerous extensions of this initial phrase are found in fourth-century writers:²³ "put on our body", "put on us", "put on humanity", or "our humanity"; or the Adam typology may be introduced: "put on the body of Adam", "put on the first Adam"²⁴, etc. In all

this it is very significant that what is put on is generic: never, it seems, do we find in these early writers "put on man" (which in Syriac is capable of being understood as "put on a man"); this is terminology first found in Syriac in the Syriac version of Theodore of Mopsuestia's Catechetical Homilies (III.5): "for our salvation he put on (a) man and dwelt in him". Subsequently this wording turns up only (as one might suspect) in East Syrian (Nestorian) writers.

It was this sort of innovation by writers belonging to the Antiochene tradition of christology that led some theologians of the Alexandrine theological tradition, not just to object to this particular phraseology, but to become suspicious of any use of the clothing metaphor in connection with the Incarnation. We can observe this reaction very well in Philoxenus of Mabbugh's Commentary on the prologue of John²⁵, written about AD 505; commenting on the Peshitta translation of Hebrews 5,7, "when he was clothed in the flesh", Philoxenus complains that, instead of translating Paul's words, they had inclined to the position of Nestorius who cast a body on to the Word as one does a garment on to an ordinary body, or as purple is put on emperors". What Philoxenus will particularly have in mind here is the extension of clothing imagery by Nestorian writers; thus his older contemporary Narsai speaks of "the robe of the body" and Cyrus of Edessa (first half of the sixth century) of "the robe of (the) humanity", phraseology which is consistently avoided by Syrian Orthodox writers and which is indeed very rare in early Syriac writers²⁶. The starting point for this development would seem to lie in the exegesis of Gen 49,11, "he washes his garment in wine, and his vesture in the blood of grapes", on which Cyrus of Edessa²⁷, for example, comments: "scripture calls 'robe' the form of a servant that the divine nature assumed".

It is tempting to suggest that a further factor underlying this equation of Christ's body with a garment might have been the well-known interpretation, alleged to be Origen's, of the garments of skin (Gen 3,21) as "bodies". Although it is conceivable that some Greek writers made this connection, it is out of the question that Syriac writers in the Antiochene exegetical tradition were influenced by such exegesis here: the standard East Syrian understanding of Gen 3,21 adopts Theodore of Mopsuestia's literalist interpretation of the "skins" as "tree bark", and among Greek writers in the same exegetical tradition Theodoret explicitly rejects the "allegorists" interpretation of the skin garments as the mortal body²⁸. One should accordingly look rather to popular conceptions widespread in late antiquity (and ultimately of Orphic and Pythagorean origin) that the soul is "clothed

in" the body²⁹ and wears it as a garment".

We can see very clearly how the concept of Christ's body as a garment is an objectionable one to someone brought up in the Alexandrine christological tradition from another work by Philoxenus, where he has his Nestorian opponent say³⁰:

"Just as a king puts on purple clothes which remain in their own *hypostasis*, outside the *hypostasis* of the king, so did God put on the different *hypostasis* of a man who served him as his purple robes".

The comparison of Christ's body to royal purple was indeed a popular one in some circles, and in Syriac it is found, for example, in the Doctrine Addai, as well as in more openly Nestorian writings³¹.

In view of Philoxenus' polemic against the use of phraseology involving *lbeš*/*lbūšā*, "put on/clothing", it is ironic that it was the East Syrians, and not the Syrian Orthodox, who substituted *etgāssam*, "was embodied", for *lbeš* *pagrā*, "put on a body", as a translation of *sarkōthenta* in the Creed incorporated in the Acts of the Synod of Seleucia (410)³².

V. The character of the robe recovered

The fourth and final act of the drama of salvation history sees the recovery by mankind of Adam's lost "robe of glory": deposited by Christ at his baptism in the Jordan waters, it is henceforth available to mankind to put on again in Christian baptism. Here we are in fact brought back to the Pauline imagery of "putting on Christ" at baptism, for Aphrahat says³³ that this "clothing and garment of glory with which the righteous are clothed" is nothing else but Christ himself. By applying the imagery of the "robe of glory" to baptism Syriac tradition has very effectively succeeded in placing Christian baptism into its context within the whole course of salvation history, with the "robe" as the continuum running from primordial man through Christ to the individual Christian; furthermore it draws attention to the neat symmetry in the pattern of salvation. Ephrem puts the matter succinctly in a hymn where he addresses Christ³⁴: "Our body became your garment, your Spirit became our robe", while an Epiphany hymn in the Syrian Orthodox *Fengito* (Breviary) describes the entire process even more tersely³⁵: "He put us on and we put him on" (*labšan wa-lbešnāy(hy)*). Thus at baptism the Christian can variously be said to "put on Christ", "put on the Spirit", "put on the robe of the Spirit", as well as "put on the robe of glory/light". Where the phrase "put on the robe of glory/light"

is employed it denotes entry into a new mode of being, and at the same time it draws attention to a number of different aspects of what baptism confers:

1. Return to Paradise

The recovery of the "robe of glory" that Adam and Eve had lost is often seen explicitly as a re-entry to Paradise: as the Maronite baptismal rite says³⁶, the baptized are brought "into glorious Paradise, that is, the believing Church". Already in the Odes of Solomon the reversal of Gen 3,21 is brought out³⁷: "I was covered with the covering of your Spirit, and I cast off from me the raiment of skin". In this Commentary on the Diatessaron Ephrem³⁸ has an extended passage contrasting the "garment of glory" this time with the "fig leaves" (Gen 3,7), where he also introduces the Gospel episode of the cursing of the fig tree (Mt 21,19-21). In the same vein we find, in one of the Epiphany hymns attributed to Ephrem³⁹, "Instead of the leaves from the trees, he clothed them with glory from the water".

2. The garment of the righteous at the resurrection

When Christians put on this "robe of glory" at baptism they are also potentially anticipating the resurrection, when the righteous will be clothed with the same "robe of glory/light". Thus for example Ephrem, in an extended meditation on the Last Judgement where he gazes into "the mirror of the Gospel", describes⁴⁰ how

"I saw there beautiful people, and I was desirous of their beauty; and I saw the place of the good where they were standing, and I was eager for their position. I saw their bridal chamber opposite, which no one who has not a lamp may enter; I saw their joy, and I myself sat down in mourning, not possessing works worthy of that bridal chamber. I saw them clothed with the "robe of light", and I was grieved that I had prepared no virtuous raiment".

3. The wedding garment of Mt 22,12

The "robe of glory" thus belongs to Urzeit and Endzeit; the Christian puts it on at baptism in sacred time, even though he or she is still living in historical time. The life of the baptized Christian should accordingly be that of a realized eschatology, and to describe the tension between the

two times, sacred and historical, Syriac tradition introduces into the nexus of clothing imagery the "wedding garment" of the parable in Mt 22. Baptism is seen as the wedding feast of Christ the Bridegroom and the Church his bride; the guests are those about to be baptized: as they arrive at the wedding/baptism they are given a wedding garment, which turns out to be none other than the "robe of glory". Once clothed in the robe, they must keep it unsoiled by sin, otherwise they will be cast out of the kingdom, like the man in the parable. The provision of the wedding garment is here understood as taking place in historical time, at baptism; its appearance, soiled or clean, at the wedding itself, is regarded as belonging to sacred time, to the *eschaton* or last judgement. Ephrem gives an interesting twist to this set of images in one of the CNIS, laying particular stress on the value of the body, so often denigrated in patristic writers⁴¹:

"The Firstborn wrapped himself in a body, as a veil (to hide) his glory; the immortal bride shines out in that robe. Let the guests in their robes resemble him in his. Let your bodies, which are your clothing, shine out; for they bound in fetters that man whose body was stained. Do you whiten my stains at your banquet with your radiance!"

4. The robe of glory is a royal and priestly robe

1 Petr 2,9 reads in the Peshitta "a choice race, one which serves as priests for the kingdom". Baptism is seen as entry into the royal priesthood of Christ; Adam too had been priest and king, and in this connection one must recall that in Jewish tradition the "clothing of honour", which, according to the Targumim, Adam received after the Fall, was understood as referring to the priestly robes which were handed down by way of Seth to future generations. Syriac writers are still aware of this priestly and royal aspect of the "robe of glory" received at baptism⁴².

We have already seen that the eschatological aspects of the "robe of glory" obviate any idea of a purely cyclical process, in that the Endzeit is by no means a straight reflection of the Urzeit: the last state of Adam/mankind is to be far more glorious than his former state in the primordial Paradise, for, as Ephrem puts it⁴³, "The exalted One knew that Adam had desired to become a God, so he sent his Son who put Adam on, to give him his desire". The Syriac Fathers, no less than the Greek, see the *theōsis* or divinization of man as the end purpose of the inhumanization of God.

Although this mystery is expressed in rather different terms in the two

languages, the underlying conception is very much the same, and it is already very clearly present in the writings of Ephrem (c. 306-373).

It has been mentioned earlier in passing that quite often there is to be observed a certain merging of identity between the first and the second Adam: Christ, the second Adam, "puts on" the first Adam (Mankind) so that the first Adam may put on Christ the second Adam. Nowhere is this fusing together of the two roles, of Saved and Saviour, more obvious than in the famous Hymn of the Pearl in the Acts of Thomas⁴⁴: when the prince leaves the Iranian highlands for Egypt - the fallen world - his glittering robe is taken off by his parents who tell him, "If you go down to Egypt and bring the pearl guarded by the serpent you shall put on your robe again". In Egypt the prince puts on local dress, but then as a result forgets the aim of his mission; only when awoken by a letter from his parents does he carry out his purpose and seize the pearl. At this point he strips off the "filthy dress" of the Egyptians and his parents send his own robe - his double - to meet him. The mysterious poem ends with the realization that the robe and the prince were "two in distinction but one in likeness". The subsequent use of the robe imagery in Syriac literature could in fact be said to provide a remarkably illuminating commentary on the Hymn of the Pearl⁴⁵, the main difference lying in the much less negative evaluation of the world that is to be found in orthodox Syriac writers of later times.

Conclusion

We have thus a remarkably consistent use of the clothing metaphor, and its application to the entire span of salvation history gives it a dynamic quality that would seem to be lacking in the Greek and Latin traditions. It is quite clear that this "theology of clothing" is something deeply ingrained in the Syriac tradition, for, although the roots of such imagery are to be found in Judaism, there are already significant developments to be observed in the Syriac translations of the Bible, both of the Old and of the New Testament. In the two earliest writers for whom a reasonably extensive corpus of works survives, namely Aphrahat and Ephrem in the fourth century, the imagery appears in its fully-fledged form, applied to all the various stages of salvation history. We have here, indeed, an excellent example of the Syriac genius for expressing profound theological truths in purely symbolic terms⁴⁶. Although this symbolic approach to theology suffered a set-back with the christological controversies of the fifth and following centuries (when men like Philoxenus, feeling the need for the precision of Greek philo-

sophical terminology, openly criticised the imprecision of Ephrem's theological language)⁴⁷, it nevertheless continued to be favoured by the liturgical poets (above all by Jacob of Serugh), and thus it lives on to the present day, preserved in the liturgical books of the Church of the East, the Maronite, and the Syrian Orthodox Churches. The long life of this religious symbolism of putting on and off points to its potency, which indeed lies in its ability to convey simultaneously, by means of the resonances it evokes, a whole range of different but interrelated theological meanings⁴⁸. The Syriac "theology of clothing", which I have tried to outline in this paper, would appear to be something that is essentially Semitic, and here I would point to a general contrast with the native Greek tradition: whereas Semitic tradition is far more concerned with what garments are *put on*, culminating in the paradisiacal "garments of glory", Greek tradition lays much more emphasis on what is *taken off*; it would seem that the ideal of *gymnotēs*⁴⁹, which caused such a stumbling block when Hellenism and Judaism met head on in Palestine in the first half of the second century BC⁵⁰, was fundamentally as much religious as an aesthetic one to the Greek way of thinking. It is this basic difference in ideals which will explain both the popularity of the imagery of the "robe of glory" in Syriac Christianity, and at the same time the comparative lack of interest, in the same literature, in the imagery of stripping⁵¹ to describe the purification of the soul, imagery which is recurrent in Greek and Latin writers of late antiquity⁵².

From the Syriacist's point of view it would be interesting to learn the answers to two questions in particular in connection with the theological use of clothing imagery in the medieval west. Firstly, is there ever to be found such consistent employment of the metaphor, whereby the term "robe of glory" runs through all the various stages of salvation history, neatly linking together the first Adam⁵³, the second Adam, the individual Christian and the eschatological kingdom? The second question is not unrelated, and concerns the contrast between the Semitic abhorrence for, and the Greek religious ideal of, nakedness: clearly at times when, and in writers in whom, the neoplatonic tradition is uppermost, it will be the Greek ideal of the soul's nakedness that will be the most prominent, but it would be intriguing to discover how these two conflicting ideals, the medieval west's double inheritance from antiquity, interacted with each other in the course of time and place.

Clothing imagery, then, is capable of touching on profound issues concerning human existence; E. PETERSON excellently sums up the matter⁵⁴:

"Die Frage nach dem Verhältnis des Menschen zum Kleide ist nun aber primär gar kein moralisches Problem - insofern bewegt sich die moralische und die moralisch-indifferente Beurteilung dieser Frage auf derselben Ebene -, sondern ein Problem der Metaphysik und der Theologie."

APPENDIX: ILLUSTRATIVE TEXTS

(From the most part examples are taken from early writers. All quotations from EPHREM are taken from E. BECK'S editions in CSCO unless otherwise stated; those of APHRAHAT are from PSyr 1-2)

I. The original robe of glory and its loss at the Fall

EPHREM, *Comm Gen* (ed. R.M. TONNEAU), II.14 (end): "Because of that glory with which they were wrapped they felt no shame; but when this was taken away from them after the transgression of the commandment, they felt shame because they had been stripped."

EPHREM, *HdF LXXXIII.2*: "You (sc. the Pearl) are like Eve, who though naked was still clothed (sc. in glory). Cursed is he who deceived and left her stripped. The serpent cannot strip off your glory; in Eden shall women be clothed in light, resembling you."

SOLOMON OF BOSRA (13th cent.), *Book of the Bee* (ed. E.A.W. BUDGE) 16: "Adam and Eve were stripped of the fair glory and the glorious light of purity with which they had been clothed."

II. The Incarnation: The Word "puts on..."

a) generic uses (the following lists do not aim at being complete)

1. "puts on a body" - *lbeš pagrā*: very common in all Syriac writers⁵⁵, e.g.
 - Acts of Thomas (ed. W. WRIGHT) 217: "You are the Son and you put on a body.."
 - APHRAHAT, *Demonstration XXI.20*: "Jesus, because he put on a body and humbled himself, delivered the Church and her children from death".
 - EPHREM, *HdVIRG XXIX.1.1-2*: "The Word of the Most High came down and put on a weak body.."
 - DOCTRINA ADDAI (ed. G. PHILLIPS) 27: "Even though he put on this body, he was still God with his Father".

2. "our body" (*paḡran*): EPHREM, HdNATIV XXII.39 "you put on our visible body".
3. "humanity" (*nāšūtā*): EPHREM, HdJEJU III.6.3.
4. "our humanity" (*nāšūtān*) Acts of Thomas (ed. W. WRIGHT) 250, 280-1; APHRAHAT, Demonstration III.16; liturgy of Addai and Marī (Urmiah edition) 15 =Maronite Sharrar (Anaphorae Syriacae III.1) 298.
5. "our likeness" (*āmūtān*)⁵⁶ cp Phil 2,7: EPHREM, HdF XXXI.3.
6. "our image" (*ṣalman*): EPHREM, HdNATIV XXIII.4.5.
7. "our form" (*eskīman*) (cp Phil 2,7): EPHREM, HdF XXXI.2.5.
8. "our nature" (*kyānan*): JOHN OF APAMEA, Letters (ed. L.G. RIGNELL) 28; NARSAI⁵⁷ (ed. A. MINGANA) I, p.28; idem (PO 40) 128 (line 660).
9. "us" (*labšān*)⁵⁸: JOHN OF APAMEA (ed. W. STROTHMANN) X. 199.

b) introducing Adam typology

1. "Adam"⁵⁹: EPHREM, HdJEJUN II.4.7.
2. "the first man" (*barnāšā qaḏmāyā*): Acts of Thomas (ed. W. WRIGHT), 179.
3. "the body of Adam": EPHREM, CNIS XXXV.8.5.
4. "the body of mortal Adam": EPHREM, SdDN IX.
5. "a body from the seed of Adam": APHRAHAT, Demonstration XXII.3.
6. "a son of Adam": NARSAI (POr 40) 128 (line 628).

c) associated with Mary

- Acts of John (ed. W. WRIGHT) 37: "he came and entered by the ear⁶⁰ of the Virgin Mary, resided in her womb nine months, and put on a body from her".
- APHRAHAT, Demonstration XXIII.20: "from Mary he put on a body".
- EPHREM, HdNATIV XVI.11.5: "his mother, whose body he had put on, put on his glory".

d) with references forward

- JACOB OF SERUGH (ed. P. BEDJAN) III. 288: "Christ put on the Church in the Virgin's womb, and she put on him in the waters of baptism".

e) of qualities

1. "smallness" (*z'ūrūtā*)⁶¹: EPHREM, HdF XXXII.12.1; JOHN of APAMEA (ed. W. STROTHMANN) IX.466, X.89, XI.357.
2. "visibleness" (*ḡalyūtā*): EPHREM, SdDN XLVIII.
3. "humility" (*makkiḡūtā, mukkaḡā*): JACOB of SERUGH (ed. P. BEDJAN) III. 339 "(Christ) the Mighty One descended and put on total humility".
4. "our weakness" (*mḡīlūtān*): EPHREM, HdF LIV.8.2.
5. "our sickness" (*krīhūtān*) (based of Hebr 4,15, cp 5,2): PHILOXENUS.

Discourses (ed. E.A.W. BUDGE) 204

6. "suffering" (*haššā*): EPHREM, HdECL LI.4.8.

f) the shift to Nestorian phraseology

Occasionally there are to be found in purely orthodox writers certain phrases which are ambiguous, in that the terms employed are capable of being understood either in a generic or in a particular sense; no doubt when Melito spoke of the Lord as having put on "*ton anthrōpon*" (Homily on Passion, line 100) he intended "man" to be understood generically, but is significant that no early Syriac writer ever employs the Syriac equivalent, "*Ibeš barnāšā*", since this could be understood (rather more easily than in Greek) as "a particular man". It is thus no surprise to discover this terminology first in the Syriac translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia⁶², and subsequently in several East Syrian writers.

Examples of ambiguous terminology in early writers are:

- EPHREM, HdNATIV. XXII.35.3: "he put on a/the servant in the womb (cp Phil 2,7)
- JOHN of APAMEA, Letters (ed. L.G. RIGNELL) 97: "...a human person ("prosōpon") Specifically East Syrian (Nestorian) developments are:
- ANDREW of SAMOSATA (ed. J.J. OVERBECK) 224: "He is God who put on (a) man for our sake".
- NARSAI (ed. A. MINGANA) I, 66 (God speaks to Abraham): "I am going to put on your seed like a garment".
- BABAI (ed. A. VASCHALDE) 302: "...in a man he had put on with all his limbs".

g) Christ's body as a garment

It would seem that a difference was felt between the dynamic concept of "putting on the body" etc., and the static one of Christ's body as a garment. The latter terminology is very occasionally found in orthodox writers (based on Gen 49,11); in only becomes common (as one might expect) in the later East Syrian tradition. Examples from orthodox writers include⁶³:

- EPHREM, Hom. in prol. Johannis (ed. J. LAMY) II, col.511: "the Word in his love bent down and put on the body of humanity so that he might give life to humanity..with the nails of the cross did they marr his outer garment (i.e.body) The following will illustrate some of the subsequent developments in the East Syrian tradition:
- Martvrdom of the CATHOLICOS SYMEON (PS II) 950: "You (Christ) turned us back from error by means of the rational robe (*estīā mallīlītā*) which you

put on from our humanity".

- NARSAI (PO 40) 130: "He made it (sc. our nature) a garment for his hiddenness".
- NARSAI (ed. A. MINGANA) II, 161 (with reference to Gen 49,11) "with his holy blood did he cleanse the robe of his corporality (*est:lā d-pagrānūteh*).
- CYRUS of EDESSA (ed. W.F. MACOMBER) 25: "...the divinity which was hidden in the robe of our Lord's humanity".
- MAR ABHA, Credal statement (Synodicon Orientale, ed. J.-B. CHABOT) 542: "...for Christ is not ordinary man, nor is he (just) God who is naked of the garment of humanity in which he was revealed".
- SYNOD OF EZEKIEL, AD 576 (Synod.Or.) 113: "one Son in whom the oldness of our nature was renewed, and by the robe of his humanity the debt of our race was repaid".
- SYNOD OF GEORGE I, AD 680 (Synod.Or.) 241: "... the Son of God, because of the human robe in which he was wrapped so as to hide thereby the radiance of his eternal divinity".
- ISHODAD OF MERV (9th cent.) Commentary on Genesis (ed. C. VAN DEN EYNDE) 173: (the purpose of the Aqedah, Gen 22, was to indicate) "that the garment of the Word was going to be sacrificed on the cross".

III. Christ places the robe of glory in the Jordan waters at his baptism

- JACOB of SERUGH (ed. P. BEDJAN) I, 168: (Christ) "placed in the womb of baptism the robe of glory".
- JACOB of SERUGH (ed P. BEDJAN) III,593: "Christ came to baptism, he went down and placed in the baptismal water the robe of glory, to be there for Adam, who had lost it".
- JACOB of SERUGH (ed. P. BEDJAN) V, 681: "Christ wove garments of life for Adam in the baptismal water".
- FENQITHO III, 254a: "Blessed is He who put on Adam from the waters of baptism"⁶⁴.

IV. The recovery of the robe of glory at Christian baptism

a) general

- EPHREM(?), HdEPIPH V.1: "Go down, my brothers and put on the Holy Spirit from baptism".
- JACOB of SERUGH (ed. P. BEDJAN) I, 211: "The Father prepared the robe, the Son wove it, the Spirit cut it (off the loom), and you went down and put it on in divine fashion"; IDEM, I, 196: "Baptism weaves a garment of living

fire for everyone who comes to it".

- Syrian Orthodox baptismal service (Homs edition) 42: "You are anointed a spiritual lamb so that you may put on the robe of glory from the water".
- East Syrian baptismal service (Urmiah edition) 74: "...that they may preserve in purity the robe of glory with which You clothed them in Your mercy".

b) recovery of Adam's lost robe of glory

- EPHREM, HdVIRG XVI.9: "who came to find Adam who had got lost, and to return him in the garment of light to Eden".
- JACOB of SERUGH (ed.P. BEDJAN) I, 197: "Baptism gives back to Adam the robe of glory which the serpent had stolen from him among the trees".

c) contrasted with the fig leaves (Gen 3,7)

- EPHREM, HdNATIV I,43: "He is able to clothe them (sc. Adam and Eve) with the glory they had stripped off, to replace the fig leaves".
- EPHREM, Comm. Diat. (ed.L. LELOIR) XVI.10: "When Adam sinned and was stripped of the glory with which he had been clothed, he covered his nakedness with fig leaves. Our Saviour came and underwent suffering in order to heal Adam's wounds and to provide a garment of glory for his nakedness. He dried up the fig tree (Mt 21,20-21) to show that there would no longer be any need of fig leaves to serve as Adam's garment, since Adam had returned to his former glory, and so no longer had any need for leaves or "garments of skin".

V. Eschatological aspects

- EPHREM, HdPAR VI.9: "Among the saints none is naked, for they have put on glory, nor is there any clad in fig leaves, or standing in shame, for they have found, through our Lord, the robe that belongs to Adam and Eve".
- JACOB of SERUGH (ed.P. BEDJAN) V, 669: (Jesus speaks to the repentent thief) "I will clothe you with a robe of light in the marriage chamber on high".
- PHILOXENUS, Commentary on Mattew (ed.J.W.WATT) 31: (At the resurrection) "the just will put on that glory and light which we said had belonged to Adam before the transgression: Moses had been covered with it (sc. on Sinai), and Moses and Elijah had appeared in it when they came with Jesus (sc. at the Transfiguration).
- ISAAC of ANTIOCH (6th cent.) (ed.P. BEDJAN) I, 275: "Do you, who made garments of skin for Adam and Eve, give garments of light to the departed in your paradise. You allowed Adam to remove his hands from their task of

covering his nakedness; thanks to those skins with which you clothed them, Lord, you freed their hands by your mercy. Give clothing of glory to the departed, and a robe of light to those buried".

Notes

¹E. PETERSON, *Theologie des Kleides*, *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* 16 (1934) 347-356.

For letter imagery see S.P. BROCK, *Some aspects of Greek words in Syriac*, *AGG* 96 (1975) 80-108, bes. 104-106.

²E. HAULOTTE, *Symbolique du vêtement selon la Bible*, *Théologie* 65 (1966).

³A. KEHL, *Gewand (der Seele)*, *RAC* 10 (1978) 945-1045.

⁴A selection of illustrative texts will be found in the appendix.

⁵On this point see R. MURRAY, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, Cambridge 1975, 306-310, and S.P. BROCK, *Jewish tradition in Syriac sources*, *JJS* 30 (1979) 212-232, 216f.

⁶Sharply to be distinguished from the nearly synonymous "*ho tēs doxēs chitōn*", which according to a statement attributed to Plato (apud ATHENAEUS, *Deipnosophistae* XI, 507 D), is taken off at death: in the passage *doxa* means "fame" or better "false opinion", and it is in this sense that the phrase is used by Philo who states that when the High Priest enters the Holy of Holies on the day of Atonement "he lays aside the garment of opinions ("*ton tēs doxēs... chitōna*") and impressions of the soul..." (De Leg. Alleg. II.56). On this usage see especially P. WENDLAND, *Das Gewand der Eitelkeit*, *Hermes* 51 (1916) 481-485; lying behind it is the idea, widespread in the late antiquity, that in its ascent the soul strips off the garments of the spheres (vgl. F. CUMONT, *Die orientalischen Religionen im römischen Heidentum*, Leipzig/Berlin³1931, 290f., Anm. 69); compare also the passages cited below in note 52.

⁷J. DANIELOU, *Les tuniques de peau chez Grégoire de Nysse*, in: *Glaube, Geist, Geschichte: Festschrift für E. Benz* (hrsg. von G. MÜLLER), Leiden 1967, 355-367 and: DERS., *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, Lyon 1944, 55-60 (*Les tuniques de peau*); cp. also M. HARL, *La prise de conscience de la 'nudité' d'Adam: une interprétation de Gen 3,7 chez les Pères grecs*. *Studia Patristica*

⁷(TU 92, 1966) 486-495.

⁸For the "staging post" and "wombs" see S.P. BROCK, *Baptismal themes in the writings of Jacob of Serugh*, *OrChrA* 205 (1978)326.

⁹For Syriac tradition on this point see in particular G. WINKLER, *Zur frühchristlichen Tauftradition in Syrien und Armenien unter Einbezug der Taufe Jesu*, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 27 (1978) 281-306; also S.P. BROCK, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition* (*Syrian Churches Series* 9) 1975, esp. 75-79.

¹⁰For the anticipation of the angelic life on the earth (an idea already present in the Qumran community) see S.P. BROCK, *Early Syrian Asceticism*, *Numen* 20 (1973) 6 and 10.

¹¹HdNAT XXIII. 13.

¹²For details see J.Z. SMITH, *The garments of shame*, *History of Religions* 5 (1965/66) 217-238 and S.P. BROCK, *Some Aspects of Greek words in Syriac*, o.c., 98-104, and DERS., *Jewish tradition in Syriac sources*, o.c., 221-223. The "garment of light" has a parallel in Zoroastrianism (cp G. WIDENGREN, *The Great Vohu Mana and the Apostle of the God*, Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift 1945, 5, 51; and in K. RUDOLPH, Hrg., *Gnosis und Gnostizismus*, Darmstadt 1975, 422-423). In the Christian writers the term is notably to be found in the Macarian Homilies (see H. DÜRRIES, *Die Theologie des Makarios/ Symeon*, *AGG*, phil.hist. Kl. III.103 (1978) - Index: "Lichtkleid der Seele"). The concept of the "fiery garment" put on by the intellect (*nous*) after separation from the body (e.g. CORPUS HERMETICUM X.18) is almost certainly quite independent.

¹³Apocalypse of Moses (ed. C. TISCHENDORFF) 20. Although the Peshitta translates Gen 3,21 literally as "garments of skin", there is a reminiscence of this other interpretation to be found in the Syriac version of Ps 8,6: "You created man a little less than the angels; in honour and glory did you clothe him" (against Hebrew, Septuagint and Targum, which all have "crown him").

¹⁴MARONITE SHEHIMTO (i.e. weekday prayers), Beirut 1876, 403f.

¹⁵See D. FREEDMAN, *Ṣubāt ba'ṣti: a Robe of Splendour*, *Journal of the Ancient*

Near Eastern Society of Colombia University 4 (1972) 91-95; the sense which FREEDMAN gives to *baṣṭi* is, however, not at all certain (I am grateful to Dr. S. DALLEY for advice on this point).

¹⁶See esp. K. RUDOLPH, *Die Mandäer, II: Der Kult*; Göttingen 1961, 181-188.

¹⁷This applies to Greek and Latin writers (see R. BRAUN, *Deus Christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullian*, Paris ²1977, 310-317, 311, and R. CANTALAMESSA, *La Christologia di Tertulliano*, *Paradosis* 18 (1962) 76 as well as to Syriac (see the examples from Ephrem cited in the Appendix, IIa and IIb).

¹⁸*Kad besrā lbīṣ (h)wā*. Compare 13,3 (of men), where the Greek has *ontes en sōmati*, while the Syriac renders *ā-besrā lbīṣīn*. The phrase *lbēṣ besrā*, put on flesh, is actually very rare in early Syriac literature, and normally in this period Greek *sarx* is represented by Syriac *pagrā* "body" and not *besrā* "flesh".

¹⁹*pagrā dēn albeṣtan(y)*; the Peshitta Psalms and the Hebrew are very different: "you pierced my ears".

²⁰The original text is preserved in the West Syrian (Syrian Orthodox) recension; See A. HALLEUX, *La symbole des évêques perses au synode de Séleucie-Ctésiphon* 410, *Erkenntnisse und Meinungen* (ed. G. WIESSNER), *Göttinger Orientforschungen* I.17, II, (1978) 161-190, esp. 163, 179-182.

²¹See R. BRAUN, o.c., R. CANTALAMESSA, o.c. and S. OTTO, *Natura und Dispositio: Untersuchung zum Naturbegriff und zur Denkform Tertullians*, München 1960, 153-157: "Das Bild des Kleides".

²²On this point see below.

²³I am only concerned here with Syriac texts; for some Greek parallels, see A. KEHL, o.c., 979-983. Note that in the new life of Mani, whose Greek text is probably translated from Syriac, Mani speaks of "putting on this instrument" (p.22⁹⁻¹⁰, cp. pp. 15⁴⁻⁵, 87⁶), phraseology very similar to that used by HIPPOLYTUS of Christ (PG 10) 701A.

²⁴For examples and references see Appendix.

²⁵Ed. A. DE HALLEUX (CSCO 165f) 53 (text), 53 (translation). See S.P. BROCK, *The resolution of the Philoxenian/Harclean problem*, *New Testament Textual Criticism: Essays in Honour of B.M. Metzger*, Oxford 1981, 325-343. esp. 328-329 for details.

²⁶See Appendix for examples.

²⁷Ed. W.F. MACOMBER (CSCO 155f.) 96 (text), 83 (translation). The interpretation is already in Ephrem's commentary on Genesis (ed. R.M. TONNEAU (CSCO ScSyr 71f.) 1955 XLII.6: "... in the blood of grapes his garment": because with his own blood did he wash his body (*guṣmēh*) which is the raiment (*taksītah*, lit. "covering") of his divinity'. Some of the main passages in Greek are quoted in G.W.H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1968, s.v. *chitōn*.

²⁸Q. Gen 39. Some passages in Greek are quoted in G.W.H. LAMPE, o.c., s.v. *chitōn*.

²⁹A good collection of references from Greek and Latin writers can be found in HUSNER and BOUFFARTIGUE-PATILLON. This particular imagery does not appear to have had a similar appeal for Syriac writers. For Syrian Orthodox authors, who regularly compare the nature of the union of godhead and humanity in Christ to that of the soul and the body, there are obvious theological objections to the imagery (sensed, as we have seen, by Philoxenus), seeing that, if the body is the "garment of the soul", there are then problems about describing the body and soul as "one" (well expressed by NEMESIUS, *de Natura Hominis* (PG 40) 595B, who asks "How then can the soul be one with its 'clothing', seeing that a garment and its wearer are not one?"). On the passage see H. DÜRRIE, *Porphyrios' Symmikta Zētēmata*, *Zetemata* 20 (1959) 51-53.

³⁰*Dissertationes Decem de Uno e Sancta Trinitate Incorporato et Passo* I.55, (PO 15) 464.

³¹*Doctrina ADDAI* (ed. G. PHILLIPS, London 1876) 20; *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts* (ed. L. ABRAMOWSKI and A.E. GOODMAN, Cambridge 1972) 183 (text), 189 (translation).

³²See note 20.

³³*Demonstration XIV. 39* (*Patrologia Syriaca* I) col. 681, in a list of

Christological titles.

³⁴HdNATIV XXII.39.3.

³⁵Fenqito (Mosul 1889) III, 274a; cp. II, 38a, 44a (the Church speaks)
"He put me on and I put him on".

³⁶J.A. ASSEMANI, *Codex Liturgicus* II, Rome 1749, 331.

³⁷Odes of Solomon XXV.8. This particular contrast is rather rare in Syriac writers.

³⁸Comm. Diat. (ed. L. LELDIR, Dublin 1963) XVI.10 (quoted in the Appendix).

³⁹HdEPIPH XII.4.

⁴⁰Letter to Publius § 12, ed. S.P. BROCK, *Le Muséon* 89 (1976), Ephrem here touches on the moral aspects of the robe, a topic which we cannot deal with here (cp. P. OPPENHEIM, *Symbolik und religiöse Wertung des Mönchskleides im christlichen Altertum*, Münster 1932).

⁴¹CNIS XLIII.21.

⁴²Cp. G. WINKLER, The original meaning of the prebaptismal anointing and its implications, *Worship* 52 (1978) 24-45, and S.P. BROCK, The transition to a post-baptismal anointing in the Antiochene rite, *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies in honour of A.H. COURATIN, Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia* 19 (1981) 215-225. In this context the robe is associated with the pre-baptismal anointing.

⁴³CNIS LXIX.12. Cp. EPHREM, *Comm. Gen.* II.17 and 23, where he states that Adam and Eve would have been given immortality/divinity but for the Fall. The idea of their having been created in an intermediary state, with the potential of divinization if they kept the commandment, is also found in THEOPHILUS, *Ad Autolyicum* II.23 and 27. Cp. also the passages from EPHREM quoted in S.P. BROCK, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition, Syrian Churches Series* 9 (1979)64.

⁴⁴Acts of Thomas §§ 108-113; for some secondary literature see the commentary in A.F.J. KLIJN, *The Acts of Thomas*, Leiden 1962.

⁴⁵An adaption, on more orthodox lines, is to be found in a prayer put into the mouth of the martyr CYRIACUS (whose Acts survive only in Syriac): see H. GRESSMANN, *Das Gebet des Kyriakos*, *ZNTW* 20 (1921) 23-35.

⁴⁶See esp. R. MURRAY, *The theory of symbolism in St. Ephrem's Theology*, *Parole de l'Orient* 6/7 (1975/76) 1-20; DERS., *Der Dichter als Exeget: der hl. Ephräm und die heutige Exegese*, *ZKTh* 100 (1978)484-94; also S.P. BROCK, *The poet as theologian*, *Sobornost* VII.4 (1978) 243-50.

⁴⁷Letter to the monks of Senoun, ed. A. DE HALLEUX (*CSCO Scri. Syri* 98) 51. On this phenomenon see S.P. BROCK, *From antagonism to assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning*, forthcoming in a *Dumbarton Oaks Symposium* volume (ed. R. THOMSON et alii).

⁴⁸See M. ELIADE, *Methodological remarks on the study of religious symbolism, The History of Religions: Essays in Methodology*, ed. M. ELIADE and J.M. KITAGAWA, Chicago 1959, 99.

⁴⁹See for example the illustrative texts cited by A.J. FESTUGIÈRE *Révélation de'Hermès Trismégiste*, III, *Doctrines de l'Âme*, Paris 1953, 131.

⁵⁰This issue underlies several episodes mentioned in 2 Macc. 4.

⁵¹The one place where stripping and nakedness are important in the Christian context is in the catechetical literature concerning baptism (see esp. J. QUASTEN, *The Garment of Immortality, Miscellanea Liturgica in onore di sua Eminenza il cardinale GIACOMO LERCARO*, Rome 1966, I, 391-401), but it is only the later Syriac writers, who are under strong Greek influence, who pay much attention to this.

⁵²See esp. J. PEPIN, *Saint Augustin et le symbolisme néoplatonicien de la vêtue, Augustinus Magister: Congrès international augustinien*, Paris 1954, I, 293-306. Four characteristic passages may be cited: (1) *Corpus Hermeticum* I.26 (After the dissolution of the body and after passing through the seven spheres) "a man is then stripped naked of what the spheres had effected on him (sc. in the descent of soul) and enters the eighth nature, possessing his own power, and there he hymns the Father with the other beings"; (2) PLOTINUS, *Enn.* I.6.7. (tr. MACKENNA): "To attain it (sc. the Good) is for those that will take the upward path, who will set all their

forces towards it, who will divest themselves of all that we have put on in our descent: so, to those that approach the Holy Celebrations of the Mysteries, there are appointed purifications and the laying aside of the garments worn before, and the entry in nakedness - until, passing, on the upward way, all that is other than the God, each in the solitude of himself shall behold the solitary dwelling Existence..."; (3) PORPHYRY, De Abstinencia I.31.3: "We have to strip off our many garments, both this visible one made of flesh, and the inner ones we have put on, which resemble 'those of skin'. Let us ascend to the stadium naked and without a garment to contest the soul's Olympic Games"; (4) PROCLUS, Elements of Theology (tr. E.R. DODDS) 209: "The vehicle of every particular soul descends by the addition of vestures increasingly material; and ascends in company with the soul through divestment of all that is material and recovery of its proper form, after the analogy of the soul which makes use of it: for the soul descends by the acquisition of irrational principles of life; and ascends by putting off all those faculties tending to temporal process with which it was invested in its descent, and becoming clean and bare of all such faculties as serve the uses of the process".

⁵³For western traditions of Adam and Eve's original clothing much interesting material is collected by B. MURDOCH, The garments of Paradise. A note on the WIENER GENESIS and the ANEGENGE, in: Euphorion 61 (1967) 375-382 (I owe this reference to Professor R. WISBEY, London).

⁵⁴E. PETERSON, o.c., 347.

⁵⁵Note that *lbeʿ* with *besrā* ("flesh") and *gušmā* ("body") are both rare, see also note 18.

⁵⁶Cp. IV Esdras 8,6: "He who put on the likeness of man".

⁵⁷Perhaps borrowed by NARSAI from THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA, Cat.Hom. VII.1, "He took our nature, put it on and dwelt in it".

⁵⁸Cp. APHRAHAT, Demonstration XXIII.50, "the head of our resurrection is the body which he put on from us".

⁵⁹This is certainly not meant literally, as some heretics, according to EPIPHANIUS, see A. KEHL in: RAC 10 (1978) 983, claimed.

⁶⁰This concept which arose through contrastive Eve typology, is very common in early Syriac writers.

⁶¹Early Syriac writers often speak of the Incarnation in terms of "the Great One who became small"; some references are given in OrChr 64 (1980) 62.

⁶²Cat.Hom. III.5, quoted above 17.

⁶³In Greek compare GREGORY OF NYSSA (PG 46) 693B-C, "Having put on the filthy garment (*tēn rupaṛān stolēn*) of our life".

⁶⁴This phrase, which sounds suspiciously adoptionist, may in fact simply be an archaism, reflecting the time when the Nativity and Baptism of Christ were both celebrated on the same day (6th January - as they still are in the Armenian Church).

LITERATUR

ARNOLD-DOEBEN, V. Die Bildersprache des Manichäismus (Arbeitsmaterialien zur Religionsgeschichte 3, Köln 1978).

BOUFFARTIGUE J. and PATILLON M. Porphyre: de l'abstinence I, Paris 1977, 37-41 'Les tuniques de l'âme'.

BRAUN H. Deus Christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabuaire doctrinal de Tertullien, 2nd éd. Paris 1977, 310-17 'Les periphrases: Induere carnem hominem'.

BROCK, S.P. "Some aspects of Greek words in Syriac", in: ed A. DIETRICH, Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet, AGG 96 (1975) 80-108, esp. 98-104.

DERS. "Jewish traditions in Syriac sources", JJS 30 (1979) 212-32, esp. 221-3.

- DERS. The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition (Syrian Churches Series 9) 1979, esp. 48-52.
- CANTALAMESSA, R. La cristologia die Tertulliano, *Paradosis* 18 (1962) 75-8 '...sed indutus carnem'.
- DERS. L'omeilia "in S. Pascha" dello Ps. Ippolito di Roma, Milan 1967, 206-7 'Il verbo *enduo* e l'incarnazione'.
- DANIÉLOU, J. Platonisme et théologie mystique, Lyon 1944, 55-60 'Les tuniques de peau'.
- DERS. "Catéchèse pascale et retour au paradis", *La Maison Dieu* 45 (1956) 99-119, esp. 114-8.
- DERS. "Les tuniques de peau chez Grégoire de Nysse, in: (Glaube, Geist, Geschichte: Festschrift für E. BENZ) hrg. von G. MÖLLER, Leiden 1967, 355-67.
- DERS. The Bible and the Liturgy, *Notre Dame* (1966) 37-40, 49-53.
- DÖRRIE, H. Porphyrios' *Symmikta Zētēmata*, *Zetemata* 20 (1959) 51-3, 199-203.
- EISLER, R. *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt*, 2Bde., München 1910.
- FREEDAMN, D. "Subāt baṣṭi: a Robe of Splendour", *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*, 4 (1972) 91-5.
- GOODENOUGH, E.R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period IX*, New York 1964, 124-74: 'Symbolism of dress'.
- GOTHEIN, M. "Der Gottheit lebendiges Kleid", *ARW* 9 (1906) 337-64.
- HARL, M. La prise de conscience de la 'nudité' d'Adam: une interprétation de Gen 3,7 chez les Pères grecs", *Studia Patristica* 7 (TU 92, 1966) 486-95.

- HAULOTTE, E. *Symbolique du vêtement selon la Bible*, *Théologie* 65; (1966).
- HUSNER, F. Leib und Seele in der Sprache Senecas, *Philologus Suppl.* XVII.3 (1924) 84-91 'Der Leib - ein Kleid der Seele'.
- KEHL, A. "Gewand (der Seele)", *RAC* 10 (1978) 945-1045.
- KLEIN, F.N. Die Lichtterminologie bei Philon von Alexandrien und in den hermetischen Schriften, Leiden 1962, 61-66, 'Das Lichtkleid als Symbol des Besitzes göttlichen Lichtes'.
- OPPENHEIM, P. *Das Mönchskleid im christlichen Altertum*, RQ, Supplementheft 28 (1931).
- DERS. *Symbolik und religiöse Wertung des Mönchskleid im christlichen Altertum*, Münster 1932.
- OTTO, S. 'Natura' und 'Dispositio': Untersuchung zum Naturbegriff und zur Denkform Tertullians, München 1960, 153-7 'Das Bild des Kleides'.
- PASCHER, J. *Hē Basilikē Hodos: Der Königsweg zur Wiedergeburt und Vergottung bei Philon von Alexandrien*, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums VII.* 3-4 (1931) 51-60 'Kleidungsallegorese und die Gewand-symbolik der Mysterienreligionen'.
- PEPIN, J. "Saint Augustin et le symbolisme néoplatonicien de la vêtue", in: *Augustinus Magister: Congrès international augustiniens I* (Paris 1954) 293-306.
- PETERSON, E. "Theologie des Kleides", *Benediktinische Monatsschrift* 16 (1934) 347-56. (for French translations see Pépin, 306.)
- PÖSCHL, V. et alii, *Bibliographie zur antiken Bildersprache* Heidelberg 1964, Index: Kleid, Lichtgewand etc.

QUASTEN, J. "The Garment of Immortality", *Miscellanea Liturgica in onore di sua Eminenza il cardinale GIACOMO LERCARO*, Rome 1966, I, 391-401.

RIESENFELD, H. *Jesus transfiguré* (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 16, 1947) 115-29 'La robe sacrée'.

SCHMIDT-KOHL, V. *Die neuplatonische Seelenlehre in der Consolatio Philosophiae des Boethius*, *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 16 (1965) 25-6 'Kleidertausch'.

SMITH, J.Z. "The garments of shame", *History of Religions* 5 (1965/6) 217-38; reprinted in J.Z. SMITH, *Map is not territory: Studies in the history of Religions, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity* 23 (1978) 1-23.

WENDLAND, P. "Das Gewand der Eitelkeit", *Hermes* 51 (1916) 481-5.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE CHURCH OF THE EAST IN THE SYNODS OF THE FIFTH TO EARLY SEVENTH CENTURIES: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS AND MATERIALS

Among Archbishop Methodios' many publications his *The Person of Jesus Christ in the Decisions of the Ecumenical Councils* (1976) provides a valuable collection of the main documents on the Christological controversies of the fifth century, together with information on modern initiatives leading to theological dialogues between the Oriental Orthodox Churches and both the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches. Similar theological discussions involving the Church of the East have not so far been held in modern times, and this is of course a Church with a very different tradition of Christology from that of the Oriental Orthodox Churches. The present article, which is offered as a modest tribute to Archbishop Methodios' concern for ecumenical matters, attempts to provide some preliminary considerations and documentation in the hopes that these might prove of use when such discussions with the Church of the East do eventually take place. My concern here is solely with the period that proved formative for the Christological position of the Church of the East, namely, the fifth to the early seventh centuries; and at the outset it should be stressed that my aim is merely to put forward some suggestions for ways towards a constructive understanding of the Christology of the Church of the East, and not to offer any judgement on that position.

The presentation follows the following pattern:

I Sources

- (a) Synods
- (b) Individual writers

II Preliminary considerations

- (a) Geographical
- (b) Political
- (c) Linguistic
- (d) Variety of positions within the Christological spectrum.

III Translations of the main Christological statements in the Synodicon of the Church of the East.

- (a) Synod of 410
- (b) Synod of 486.
- (c) Synod of 544.
- (d) Synod of 554.
- (e) Synod of 576.
- (f) Synod of 585.
- (g) Synod of 598.
- (h) Synod of 605.
- (i) Assembly of bishops in 612.

Sources

(a) Synods

Our most important source of knowledge of the official Christology of the Church of the East during the formative period of the fifth to seventh centuries¹ is provided by a collection of synodical texts usually known as the *Synodicon Orientale*, following the title employed by its editor, J.B. Chabot²; in the course of these are to be found a number of credal statements, and it is these that are translated below in III. The texts published by Chabot in fact constitute just a part of a vast synodical collection (of eighty items) which is transmitted in a number of nineteenth and twentieth-century manuscripts copied from a manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth century (Alqosh

1. For the background J. Labourt's *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide* (Paris 1904) is still fundamental; his work is brought up to date in certain respects by J.M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 310, 1970). In English the best works are W.A. Wigram, *An Introduction to the History of the Assyrian Church* (London 1910) and W.G. Young, *Patriarch Shah and Caliph* (Rawalpindi 1974).

2. J.B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* (Paris 1902).

ms 169, perhaps of AD 1298/9); the collection was put together in its present form in the eleventh century.³ The following synods contain texts of relevance for our present purposes:

(1) *Synod at Seleucia-Ktesiphon held under the Catholicos Isaac in 410.*

It was at this synod, summoned on the initiative of Marutha bishop of Martyropolis, that the Council of Nicaea was officially recognized by the Church of the East. Prefaced to the canons of the synod is a credal profession whose Syriac text comes down in two different recensions, of which the one is transmitted in Syrian Orthodox sources⁴, while the other is to be found in the manuscripts of the East Syrian Synodicon; the latter gives the Nicene Creed in its 'pure' form.

There has been a long controversy over the relationship between these two texts. Some have held that the Acts of the Synod of 410 were originally prefaced by both creeds, while others have claimed that the West Syrian recension represents a late interpolation (largely on the grounds of the occurrence of phraseology that seemed reminiscent of the *filioque* clause). Very recently, however, A. de Halleux⁵ has demonstrated that it must in fact be the West Syrian text, and not the form in the Synodicon Orientale, that is the original; this is shown (a) by the presence of archaic phraseology in the West Syrian recension, and (b) by the appearance in the East Syrian text of certain neologisms which otherwise first occur in texts from c.A.D. 500 onwards.

The West Syrian recension concludes with the statement that "we are in agreement with the faith of the 318 bishops in the city of Nicaea; this is our confession and our faith, which we have received

3. The contents of this collection are well described by W. Selb, *Orientalisches Kirchenrecht, I. Die Geschichte des Kirchenrechts der Nestorianer* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Sb. I, 1981).

4. In Syrian Orthodox eyes the Church of the East in Persia was orthodox until the end of the fifth century, when it was 'nestorianized' as a result of the nefarious influence of Barsauma, metropolitan of Nisibis. As is pointed out below, the language of the synod of 486 is Theodoran, not Nestorian, but since Theodore was seen by the Syrian Orthodox as implying Nestorius, the epithet 'Nestorian' was misleadingly applied. (This synod was further held in abhorrence by the Syrian Orthodox since it allowed the clergy (including bishops) to marry—a canon which was invoked in recent times by Mar Shem'on XXIII, with tragic results).

5. „Le symbole des évêques perses au synode de Séleucie-Ctésiphon (410)”, in ed. G. Wiessner, *Erkenntnisse und Meinungen II* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, I. Reihe: Syriaca, Band 17; 1978), pp. 161–90. The West Syrian recension has recently been re-edited by A. Vööbus, 'New sources for the Symbol in early Syriac Christianity', *Vigiliae Christianae* 26 (1972), pp. 291–6; the two oldest manuscripts belong to the eighth century. See also J. Gribomont, 'Le symbole de foi de Séleucie Ctésiphon (410)', *A Tribute to A. Vööbus* (ed. R. H. Fisher), (Chicago, 1977), pp. 283–94.

from our holy fathers". De Halleux very plausibly suggests that this profession of faith made at the Synod of 410 represents an adaptation of a local Persian creed made by the council fathers in the light of the Nicene Symbol.

(2) *Synod at Seleucia-Ktesiphon held under the Catholicos Akakios in 486.*

Although synods had met in 420 and 424 no credal statements were issued. Two further synods were convened in 484 and 485, during the course of a feud between the Catholicos and Barsauma, metropolitan of Nisibis.⁶ The Synod of Beth Lapat in 484 evidently included a Christological statement expressed in Antiochene terms, by way of reaction against Zeno's religious policies across the border, in the Roman Empire; the canons of this synod,⁷ however, along with those of a further synod in 485, were not preserved, although in all probability the tenor of their theological position is reflected in the important credal statement issued at the synod of Seleucia-Ktesiphon in 486, translated in III(b). The importance of this text lies in the fact that it is the first such statement that we possess from the Church of the East from the period subsequent to the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon; its language markedly belongs to the Antiochene tradition of Christology, but it can in no way be described as openly 'Nestorian'.⁸ The accompanying anathemas are anti-'Theopaschite' in character.

(3) *The synod held under the Catholicos Aba in 544.*

The learned Catholicos and confessor Aba had travelled widely in the Roman Empire prior to his elevation, and it was while he was in Alexandria that he met Kosmas, author of *Khristianike topographia*. Kosmas clearly held Aba (to whom he refers as Patrikios) in high esteem.⁹ It was Aba who brought back to Persia various works by Nestorius and had

6. For the background see S. Gero, *Barsauma of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the Fifth Century* (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 426; 1981).

7. The synod of Gregory I (605) states that at the synod of 484 Barsauma upheld the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia against the accusations of 'heretics' (perhaps he had Philoxenus in mind: see his letter to the monks of Beth Gogal, recently published by A. de Halleux in *Le Muséon* 96 (1983), pp. 5–79).

8. As, for example, W. de Vries in *Das Konzil von Chalcedon* (Würzburg 1951), I, p. 683. In this connection it might be noted that W. Macomber's study of this synod's Christological position ("The Christology of the Synod of Seleucia-Ctésiphon AD 486", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 24 (1958), pp. 142–54) gives an unnecessarily hostile interpretation of the text; his approach serves as a good modern example of how a theological statement can be understood wherever possible in *malam partem* (Macomber's later writings show more sympathy).

9. Cp. M. Wolska, *La topographie chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustes* (Paris 1962), pp. 63–73 etc.

them translated into Syriac (the extant Book of Heraclides was translated in 539/40¹⁰).

The Acts of the Synod of 544 themselves contain no Christological statement, but the Synodicon Orientale preserves a letter on 'orthodoxy of faith' by Aba, addressed to the clergy of Susa. The theological language is surprisingly traditional for the man who brought Nestorius' writings to Persia, and the profession of faith perhaps deliberately avoids any of the contentious technical terms.

(4) *Synod held under the Catholicos Joseph in 554.*

The profession of faith from this synod (held the year after the Fifth Council) is very close in tenor to the Chalcedonian definition. While the terms 'natures' and 'properties' feature in it, no mention is made either of *qnoma* (i.e. hypostasis) or *prosopon*. Those who speak of 'two Christs' or 'two Sons' are specifically anathematized.

(5) *Synod held under the Catholicos Ezekiel in 576.*

Although the synod issued no formal profession of faith, the preamble to the canons includes some passages of Christological relevance. Once again the absence of the terms *qnoma* and *prosopon* may be noted; on the other hand, at one point the phraseology „Christ who is in the flesh, who is known and confessed in two natures, God and Man, a single Son...” seems to echo directly the wording of the Chalcedonian definition.

(6) *Synoder held und the Catholicos Isho'yahb I in 585.*

Two professions of faith are preserved, one belonging to the synod itself, the other to be found in an accompanying document which evidently belongs to the occasion of Isho'yahb's diplomatic mission to the emperor Maurice. According to the medieval chronicle known as the Liber Turris Isho'yahb's profession of faith was accepted as orthodox by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch. As will be seen, the language is indeed far more Chalcedonian than Theodoran in spirit.

(7) *Synod held under the Catholicos Sabrisho in 598.*

Although no formal profession of faith is preserved the preamble contains some relevant passages.

10. The English translation by G.R. Driver and L. Hodgson (*The Bazaar of Heraclides*, Oxford 1925) needs to be used with caution; see R.H. Connolly in *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1926), pp. 191–200.

(8) *Synod held under the Catholicos Gregory I in 605.*

It was at this synod that it was laid down that "each of us should receive and accept all the commentaries and writings of the blessed Theodore the Interpreter". The credal statement, however, is not distinctly Theodoran; it speaks of the "single union of one prosopon"; no mention is made of the term *qnoma*.

(9) *Assembly of bishops held during the interregnum in 612*

After the death of the Catholicos Gregory I in 608 the Persian Shah Khosroes II refused to let the bishops of the Church of the East to elect a successor, and during the period while the patriarchate remained vacant (till the Shah's death in 628) the affairs of the Church of the East were run by Babai the Great (see II.b.4) and Aba, Archdeacon of Seleucia. In 612, instigated by his influential Christian doctor, Gabriel of Sinjar (who was a Syrian Orthodox), Khosroes ordered that a disputation take place between representatives of the Church of the East and the Syrian Orthodox; from this occasion the Synodicon Orientale preserves a profession of faith presented by the bishops of the Church of the East to the Shah. As might be expected in the context of such a confrontation the position adopted is a hard-line one, expressed in fairly uncompromising Antiochene phraseology.

In the Synodicon Orientale there follows a series of objections against the tenets of the "Severan Theopaschites",¹¹ as follows:

- against those who confess a single nature and a single *qnoma* in Christ;
- against those who say that God suffered in the flesh and died in the flesh;
- against those who ask whether the holy Virgin gave birth to the God or gave birth to the Man;
- against those who falsely accuse us of confessing a quaternity in God, instead of a Trinity;
- against those who accuse us of (confessing) a duality of Sons".

These in turn are followed by a reply to two questions (clearly posed by their opponents): "Is it the Nestorians or the monks¹² who have turned aside from the foundations of the faith transmitted by the teachers of old", and „Previous to Nestorius, is there anyone who says that Christ is two natures and two *qnoma*, or not?" The reply to these questions takes the form of a florilegium, and in the preamble to this there occurs an important passage which shows that the Church of the East understands the term *qnoma* in a Christological context in a markedly

11. Chabot (*Synodicon Orientale*, p. 586) already noted that many of the arguments also occur in St. John of Damascus, *Contra Jacobitas*.

12. i.e. the Syrian Orthodox.

different sense from that of *hypostasis* in the Chalcedonian definition.¹³

(b) *Individual writers*

Besides the Synodicon Orientale there also survives a number of other texts which deal directly or indirectly with Christology; the most important of these, for the period late fourth to early seventh century, are:

(1) *Narsai*

Narsai, the famous East Syrian poet, taught at the 'Persian School' in Edessa until c. 471, when local hostility from his theological opponents led him to make a hasty move, across the Roman border, to Nisibis, where he was welcomed by the metropolitan, Barsauma, and where he eventually became head of the renowned theological School of Nisibis. He died at a great age soon after the turn of the sixth century (the exact date is not known). The following of his verse homilies, or *memre*, are of particular relevance:

—Verse homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, edited with English translation by F.G. McLeod in *Patrologia Orientalis* 40, fasc. 1 (1979)¹⁴.

—Verse homily on the Three Doctors (Diodore, Theodore, Nestorius), edited with a French translation by F. Martin in *Journal Asiatique* IX. 14–15 (1899–1900)¹⁵.

(2) *Cyrus of Edessa*

Cyrus, who belongs to the mid sixth century, wrote six 'Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts' which have been edited with an English translation by W. Macomber in the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 355–6 = *Scriptores Syri* 155–6 (1974). Although these are not directly concerned with Christology, the background which they provide is helpful for gaining an understanding of the general theological approach of writers in this tradition; a useful outline of this will be found in W. Macomber's article "The theological synthesis of Cyrus of Edessa", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 30 (1964), pp. 5–38, 363–84.

13. Translated below, III.1.2.

14. McLeod gives a short introduction; more detailed studies are provided by his dissertation, *The Soteriology of Narsai* (Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome 1968) and in that by I. Ibrahim, *La doctrine christologique de Narsai* (Angelicum, Rome 1974/5).

15. Cp. G. Sfair, 'L'ortodossia di Narsai rilevata dalla sua omelia sui Dottori greci', *Bessarione* 33 (1917), pp. 313–27; I. Abramowski, 'Das Konzil von Chalkedon in der Homilie des Narsai über die drei nestorianischen Lehrer', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 66 (1954/5), pp. 140–43; K. McVey, 'The memra of Narsai on the three Nestorian Doctors as an example of forensic rhetoric', *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221 (1983), pp. 87–96.

(3) *Discussions between Paul, Metropolitan of Nisibis and the Chalcedonians*

The text of an official theological discussion arranged by Justinian which took place soon after 561 between the Chalcedonians and Paul, the representative of the Church of the East, is preserved in a Syriac manuscript of Monothelite provenance.¹⁶ It has been published with a French translation by A. Guillaumont, "Justinien et l'église de Perse", in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/4 (1969/70), pp. 39–66.

(4) *Babai the Great*

Babai (died 628) was a prolific author who exercised a profound influence on the Church of the East, and his treatise „On the Union” (sc. of the two natures in Christ) is the one major statement on Christology that we have from the Church of the East in this period. This work was edited, with a Latin translation, by A. Vaschalde in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 79–80 = *Scriptores Syri* 34–5 (1915), together with a short treatise „Against those who say that, just as the soul and the body are one *qnoma*, so too God the Word and the Man are one *qnoma*". A useful, and sympathetic,¹⁷ English presentation of Babai's Christology is given by G. Chediath, *The Christology of Mar Babai the Great* (Kottayam, 1982).

Whereas for most East Syrian writers it is Theodore of Mopsuestia who is the prime formative influence, Babai's Christology is clearly also influenced by the Syriac translation of Nestorius, Book of Herakleides.¹⁸

(5) *Martyrius/Sahdona* (early seventh century)

Martyrius, the author of a fine work on monastic spirituality, The Book of Perfection, is to be identified with the bishop Sahdona ('little martyr'), whose expulsion from the Church of the East for 'heresy' is related by Thomas of Marga and others.

Martyrius' Christological position is outlined in chapter 1 of Part II of his Book of Perfection (edited with French translation by A. de Halleux in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 214–5 = *Scriptores Syri* 90–91 (1961)). It was his formulation of a single *qnoma* in Christ (consonant with the wording

16. For this aspect see my 'A Monothelite florilegium in Syriac', in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* (forthcoming).

17. The author is a Syro-Malankara priest (and so belongs to a Church with an Alexandrian Christological tradition).

18. For this aspect see L. Scipioni, 'Il Libro di Eraclide di Nestorio e il Liber de Unione di Babai il Grande', in his *Ricerche sulla cristologia del 'Libro di Eraclide' di Nestorio* (Fribourg 1956), pp. 110–58. Other important studies of Babai's Christology are by L. Abramowski, 'Die Christologie Babais des Grossen', *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 197 (1974), pp. 219–45, and 'Babai der Grosse: Christologische Probleme und ihre Lösungen', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 41 (1975), pp. 290–343; V. Grumel, 'Un théologien nestorien, Babai le grand', *Echos d'Orient* 22 (1923), pp. 153–81, 257–80; 23 (1924), pp. 9–33, 162–77, 257–74, 395–99.

of the Chalcedonian definition, but going against the traditional usage of the Church of the East) that led to his condemnation by the authorities of that Church; in all other respects his Christological language remains characteristically Antiochene, as is shown by A. de Halleux in an article, "La christologie de Martyrios/Sahdona dans l'évolution du nestorianisme", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 23 (1957), pp. 5–32.

(6) *Isho'yahb II*

Isho'yahb II was Catholicos from 628–646, years which witnessed the change from Persian to Arab rule. His interesting letter on "How we should confess the single propopon of Christ", addressed to a certain Rabban Abraham, has recently been published, with a French translation and good introduction, by L.R.M. Sako, *Lettre christologique du Patriarche syro-oriental Isho'yahb II de Gdala* (Rome, 1983).¹⁹

(7) *Miscellaneous Christological texts*

An important collection of East Syrian Christological texts, perhaps put together about the 9th century, includes a number of pieces belonging to the late sixth and the seventh centuries; these have been published with an English translation, by L. Abramowski and A.E. Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1972)²⁰.

(8) *Liturgical texts*

Since liturgical texts often contain important doctrinal testimony, these should not be overlooked; in particular attention should be drawn to the prayers introducing the Institution Narratives in the Anaphoras attributed to Theodore and to Nestorius, both translated into Syriac in the sixth century. A recent English translation can be found in K.A. Paul and G. Mookan, *The Liturgy of the Holy Apostles Adai and Mari together with the Liturgies of Mar Theodoros and Mar Nestorius* (Trichur, 1967), pp. 76–7, 94–6.

II

Preliminary Considerations

When studying the Christology of the Church of the East, and especially when comparing it with western positions and developments (whether Greek

or Latin), a number of important considerations need to be held in mind.

(a) *Geographical*

Since the Church of the East functioned within the Sasanian Empire, and thus outside the bounds of the Roman Empire, it was not directly involved in any of the general Councils convened by imperial command. The canons and the symbol of the Council of Nicaea are indeed recognized by the Church of the East, but this was only achieved 85 years later, at the Synod of Seleucia-Ktesiphon in 410, thanks to the initiative of Marutha, bishop of Martyropolis. The Council of Ephesus (431) is specifically rejected,²¹ but a more ambivalent attitude, *post eventum*, is taken to the Council of Chalcedon; thus Isho'yahb II (628–46) comments:²²

Although those who gathered at the Synod of Chalcedon were clothed with the intention of restoring the faith, yet they too slid away from the true faith: owing to their feeble phraseology, wrapped in an obscure meaning, they provided a stumbling block to many. Although, in accordance with the opinion of their own minds, they preserved the true faith with the confession of the two natures, yet by their formula of one *qnoma* (hypostasis), it seems, they tempted weak minds. As an outcome of the affair a contradiction occurred, for with the formula 'one *qnoma*' they corrupted the confession of 'two natures', while with the 'two natures', they rebuked and refuted the 'one *qnoma*'. So they found themselves standing at a cross roads, and they wavered²³ and turned aside from the blessed ranks of the orthodox, yet they did not join the assemblies of the heretics; they both pulled down and built up, while lacking a foundation for their feet. On what side we should number them I do not know, for their terminology cannot stand up, as Nature and Scripture testify: for in them many *qnoma* can be found in a single 'nature', but that there should be various 'natures' in a single *qnoma* has never been the case and has not been heard of.

Likewise the eighth-century writer Shahdost²⁴

21. For a recent statement see Mar Aprem, *The Council of Ephesus of 431* (Trichur 1978).

22. Ed. Sako, sections 42–49.

23. The French translation (p. 147) misrepresents the sense here.

24. In Abramowski-Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection*, II, p. 20. The 'falsification' of the Chalcedonian definition in the text of the East Syrian Synodicon will evidently be a subsequent development; for this 'revised' text, see A. de Halleux, 'La falsification du symbole de Chalcedoine dans le Synodicon nestorien', *Mélanges offerts à Jean Dauvillier* (Toulouse 1979), pp. 377–84 (the alterations include a change to 'two *qnoma*'). Cp. also W. de Vries, 'Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalkedon', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, I, pp. 603–35.

says that "although they (sc. the Catholicos Akakios and the Metropolitan Barsauma of Nisibis) did not accept the Synod of Chalcedon... nevertheless they did not entirely reject it".

Justinian's ecclesiastical policy, culminating in the 'Three Chapters' and the Fifth Council, not surprisingly comes under sharp attack, above all from Babai.

In all this it should always be kept in mind that, from the point of view of the Church of the East, these Councils were far from being truly ecumenical, seeing that they were only of direct concern to those living within the Roman *oikoumene*.

(b) Political

It was only after Christianity had been adopted as the official religion in the Roman Empire that persecution of Christians took on serious dimensions in the Sasanian Empire. It was certainly the case that, in the fourth and fifth century, persecution was a likely concomitant of any outbreak of hostilities between the two empires; indeed Persian Christians were sometimes suspected of being secret sympathisers of the enemy.²⁵ It is, then, possible that one of the reasons why the Church of the East chose to adopt a markedly Antiochene position on Christology at the Synod of Seleucia-Ktesiphon in 486 was the conscious desire to disassociate Persian Christianity from the official Christological position in the Roman Empire at the time.

The combination of geographical and political separation of the Church of the East from Christianity in the Roman Empire had a further important consequence from the point of view of Christology: since the Church of the East was not directly involved in the fierce Christological controversies taking place in the Roman Empire from the 430s onwards, its theological language and its understanding of certain technical terms remained comparatively 'old fashioned'. Any awareness of developments within the Greek-speaking world would come primarily by way of the Persian School of Edessa (closed in 489) and its successor, the School of Nisibis, and the flavour of this theological language was thus going to be essentially Antiochene, and specifically Theodoran. An Antiochene slant to Christology having been initially accepted, it is not surprising that subsequent influences from across the border should have been from theologians writing in that tradition, one of whom, of course, was Nestorius.

It is a fact that Nestorius was held in high regard

25. Occasionally this was justified, cp my 'Christians in the Sasanian Empire: a case of divided loyalties', *Studies in Church History* 18 (1982), pp. 7-9, reprinted in *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London, 1984), ch. VI.

26. And perhaps earlier, at the Synod of Beth Lapat in 484; this was certainly how later Syriac Orthodox writers explained the matter (e.g. Barhebraeus, *Chron. Eccl.* III, col. 65).

by Narsai,²⁷ and that Nestorius' Book of Herakleides (not translated into Syriac until half a century after the Synod of 486) exerted a strong influence on the Christology of Babai,²⁸ but at the same time it needs to be remembered that Nestorius never came to hold anything like the position of authority that was accorded to Theodore of Mopsuestia, the 'Exegete' *par excellence*. Accordingly, it is misleading in the extreme to speak (as is often done) of a 'nestorianization' of the Persian Church over the course of the century and a half that followed the synods of the 480s; to do so is to be beguiled by the rhetorical hyperbole of the theological opponents of the Church of the East, who regularly labelled anything to do with Theodore as, by implication, Nestorian.

(c) Linguistic

It is well known that one of the complicating factors in the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries lay in the varying understandings that different parties had of the central technical terms οὐσία, φύσις, ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον. This situation became all the more complex when the controversy was being conducted in Syriac rather than Greek, for two different reasons: (i) The standard equivalent terms in Syriac had a rather different semantic range from that of their Greek counterparts;²⁹ thus, for example, the connotations of Syriac *kyana* and *gnoma* are by no means precisely the same as those of φύσις and ὑπόστασις which they regularly represent (see further below); (ii) Over the course of the late fifth to the seventh century Syriac translation technique underwent many refinements, above all in West Syrian circles.³⁰ Theologians of the Church of the East, however, living outside the Roman Empire, were not always aware of these developments which took place in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, and chiefly in Syrian Orthodox circles.

In the Chalcedonian definition the words μία ὑπόστασις proved a stumbling block just as much to the Church of the East as they did to the Syrian Orthodox, for both groups shared the view that φύσις implied ὑπόστασις (and vice versa). Thus, to the Syrian Orthodox, ἐν δύο φύσεσι was the illogical element, since for them μία ὑπόστασις implied their own starting point μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμέ-

27. His homily on the Three Doctors, however, suggests that he had little or no direct knowledge of Nestorius' works; probably Narsai (and others in the Church of the East) simply saw him as a martyr for the cause of Antiochene Christology.

28. See note 18.

29. This was an old problem that had already been highlighted by the Greek translators of the Hebrew Bible (e.g. when they rendered Torah by Nomos).

30. Cp. my 'Towards a history of Syriac translation technique', *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221 (1983), pp. 1-14.

νη;³¹ to the Church of the East, on the other hand, it was the μία ὑπόστασις that was illogical,³² since their starting point was the two natures, which for them implied two *gnome* (*gnoma* being the regular translation of ὑπόστασις).

In East Syrian understanding *kyana* ('nature', φύσις) is generic, while *gnoma* is an individual manifestation of a *kyana*;³³ thus the two *kyane* in Christ are often specifically described as being 'the divinity and the humanity', and correspondingly the *gnoma* of the divinity is God the Word, perfect God, and the *gnoma* of the humanity is the Man Jesus, perfect Man; and here it needs emphasizing that 'the Man'³⁴ is definitely never thought of as having any separate pre-existence, prior to the Union.³⁵ Furthermore, for all the traditional dislike of theopaschite language in writers of the East Syrian tradition, there is never any doubt that God the Word, in his humanity, suffered and died: there is no question of two subjects, as will be clear from the texts translated below in III.

Underlying the varying opposing formulations are several different understandings of the connotations of the term 'nature': to the Church of the East *kyana* 'nature' is associated much more closely with *ituta* ('essence', οὐσία)³⁶ than with *prosopon*, while in Syrian Orthodox tradition οὐσία and φύσις are sharply distinguished, and φύσις is associated rather with πρόσωπον.³⁷ This difference of usage is reflected very clearly in sixth-century translation practice in connection with the term ὁμοούσιος:

(1) East Syrian writers normally preserve the older, fifth-century, usage whereby ὁμοούσιος is translated by *bar kyana*, 'of the same nature' (lit. 'son of nature'), or by *bar ituta*, 'of the same essence' (lit. 'son of essence').

31. E.g. Severus, *ad Nephaliim* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 119), p. 16: 'It is obvious to all who have just a modicum of training in the teachings of true religion that it is contradictory to speak of two natures with reference to the one Christ, he being one hypostasis; for whenever one speaks of one hypostasis, one must necessarily also speak of one nature'.

32. E.g. Isho'yahb II, quoted above in II.a.

33. Thus we often encounter the phrase 'the two *kyane* and their *gnome*'.

34. In East Syrian terminology 'the Man' means 'an individual human being' (in the abstract), and definitely *not* a specific person: see, for example, Babai, *Liber de Unione* (ed. Vaschalde), p. 160. Thus the phrase 'He put on the Man' in sixth-century East Syrian writers corresponds to 'He put on Adam/our humanity/(our) body', characteristic of early Syriac authors. Cp also note 60.

35. So Babai repeatedly, e.g. *Liber de Unione* (ed. Vaschalde), pp. 59, 91ff, 100, 111, 116, 244 etc.

36. Thus, from the East Syrian point of view, Cyril's μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη was barely different from saying μία οὐσία—a formulation that Cyril's expositor *par excellence*, Severus, of course firmly rejected.

37. Here it should be noted that normally East Syrian writers speak of three *gnome* in the Trinity (rather than three *prosope*).

(2) West Syrian writers refine the translation usage and provide the more precise equivalents *shawe b-ituta* or *shawe b-ousia*, 'equal in essence'. Thus, in sixth-century Syrian Orthodox usage *kyana* 'nature' is kept firmly separate from *ituta* 'essence'.

On occasion some awareness is shown of the existence of an understanding of key technical terms that differs from that which the writer himself employs: thus Babai at one point³⁸ explains why 'the former fathers' used the formula 'one *gnoma* from two natures' (i.e. the Syrian Orthodox position); this he explains, was because they were countering Arius, Eunomius and Apollinarius who denied that Christ was either complete God or complete Man. Babai goes on to say that these fathers sometimes used *gnoma* and *prosope* interchangeably 'just as happens now, so they say, in Roman territory'; such usage, however, is to be avoided, according to Babai, in order to counter theopaschite teaching.

In the translations in III below I regularly employ the following formal translation equivalents:

| | |
|---------|-------------------|
| itya | (divine) Being |
| ituta | (divine) essence |
| kyana | nature |
| gnoma | (transliterated) |
| prosope | person, prosopon. |

I have preferred to leave *gnoma* untranslated in order to draw attention to the difference in sense that it has in sixth-century East Syrian texts from ὑπόστασις in contemporary Greek writers (even though it is the standard translation equivalent). It should be noted that modern translators have sometimes rendered *gnoma* in a Christological context as 'person': this is to be deplored, since it can lead to obvious misunderstandings (in none of these East Syrian texts do we ever encounter the 'Nestorian' formula of 'two prosope')³⁹

(d) Variety of positions within the Christological spectrum

In seeking to understand the ecclesiological dimensions of the controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries it is essential to avoid the simplistic three-fold model of 'Nestorian-Chalcedonian-Monophysite'. Matters are far more complex. For present purposes one might propose the following spectrum,

38. Ed. Vaschalde, pp. 305-6.

39. For studies on the East Syrian understanding of the various technical terms reference may be made to Anon., 'On the history of the Syriac terms *itutha*, *kyana*, *prosope* and *gnoma*', in J.F. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching* (Cambridge 1908), pp. 212-32, and W.A. Wigram, *An Introduction to the History of the Assyrian Church* (London 1910), pp. 279-85, besides the monographs on individual writers mentioned in I.b. Cp also J. Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom* (600-1700) (Chicago/London 1974), pp. 39-49.

moving from extreme Antiochene to an extreme Alexandrian Christological position:

- (1) True 'Nestorians' (two prosopa).
- (2) Strict Dyophysites outside Roman Empire: Church of the East.
- (3) Strict Dyophysites within Roman Empire: e.g. Theodoret, Akometai, Roman Church.
- (4) Silence over Chalcedon: e.g. Henotikon, Dionysios the Areopagite.
- (5) Neo-Chalcedonians.
- (6) Henophysites:⁴⁰ Timothy Ailouros, Philoxenos, Severos.
- (7) Eutychians (true Monophysites).

It should of course be kept in mind that even this seven-fold model is an oversimplification in that it glosses over the various shades of opinion within each group: thus, for example, it is clear that within the Church of the East itself there were several stances, with Babai representing the strictest dyophysite position, openly rejecting the Chalcedonian position (and so presumably even those of group 3), while others⁴¹ were evidently very close to the position of those in group 3, within the Chalcedonian camp.

Within this sevenfold model the various positions can be seen as dividing up in different ways, depending on the criterion by which they are being judged; thus, for example:

| | |
|--|------------|
| -acceptance of Chalcedonian definition: | groups 3-5 |
| -Antiochene Christological tradition: | 1-3 |
| -Alexandrian Christological tradition: | 4-7 |
| -anti-Theopaschite: | 1-3 |
| -single subject in Christ: | 2-7 |
| -Christ is ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν as well as ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ | 1-6 |

Writers belonging to the Neo-Chalcedonian position had already conceded that the Chalcedonian definition was not an exclusive criterion of orthodoxy: ἐκ δύο φύσεων was, in their eyes, also acceptable, provided that ἐν δύο φύσεσι was not itself rejected.⁴² This last point was a stumbling block for the Henophysites in the sixth century, and it remains a problem in at least some Oriental Orthodox circles today as well⁴³ (owing to their rather different understanding of the terminology).

With the Church of the East there is a similar problem of verbally conflicting formulae (two *gnome*

against μία ὑπόστασις). Clearly if progress in dialogue is to be made, several things need to happen:

(1) The clue offered by the Neo-Chalcedonians, that orthodoxy in Christology does not necessarily have to be confined to adherence to the Chalcedonian definition, needs to be followed up and developed.⁴⁴ In other words, a criterion of orthodoxy other than that of Chalcedon needs to be applied to the sevenfold model suggested above; as a beginning one might propose the last two of the various criteria mentioned above (a single subject in Christ, and Christ as ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν as well as ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ.

(2) A serious attempt must be made to penetrate behind the wording of the various formulae in order to discover how they were arrived at and (above all) the way in which they were understood by those who put them forward. And here two basic points need to be kept constantly in mind: firstly, that the central technical terms were understood in markedly different ways by the different parties;⁴⁵ and secondly, that each position was developed by way of reaction against a particular trend that was (rightly) seen as dangerously heretical: the existence of different bêtes noires led to the emergence of different emphases. With the benefit of hindsight we are able to see that, at the roots of the tragedy of these fifth and sixth-century schisms, lay the failure on all sides to make the necessary effort of imagination: each party saw its opponent's position only in the light of its own understanding of the technical terminology and only in the light of its own fears and preoccupations. A clear example of such misunderstanding is provided by the two sides of the so-called Theopaschite controversy.

(3) The concentration of attention on a restricted area of Christological terminology needs to be avoided. Thus, in the case of the Church of the East, it would be unfair to find fault with its favoured imagery of 'the temple' or 'the clothing', taken in isolation; it so happened that, for various reasons, this imagery (which had perfectly respectable Biblical origins) came to be dropped in the sixth century by virtually everyone living within the Roman Empire, and was thus preserved and developed only by the Church of the East, beyond the borders. Furthermore we should remember, not only that this imagery is archaic, but also that its advocates themselves insist that no one image should be taken in isolation: each image needs to be used in conjunction with a variety of others as well, seeing that no single image can provide an adequate analogy to the nature of the union of the two natures in Christ.⁴⁶

40. It is very important to avoid the term 'Monophysites' for this group.

41. These will have included Henana and Martyrius.

42. This was also Justinian's position at the conversations with the Syrian Orthodox in 532: see the text translated in my 'The conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 47 (1981), pp. 113-17.

43. E.g. Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios, 'The Christological consensus reached in Vienna', *Wort und Wahrheit*, Suppl. 3 (1976), pp. 21-2. Compare also note 45.

44. See, for example, A. Grillmeier in *Wort und Wahrheit*, Suppl. 2 (1974), pp. 28-40.

45. Thus on Severos' understanding of what φύσις meant, the Chalcedonian definition would have seemed objectionable to Chalcedonians themselves.

46. Babai draws attention to this in his *Libet de Unione* (ed. Vaschalde), pp. 233, 249-50. At the other end of the theolo-

Any atomistic approach, then, which concentrates on individual formulae, images or analogies, will inevitably lead to a static and unsatisfactory perception of a particular Christological tradition, such as that of the Church of the East. What is needed, rather, is an approach which seeks to understand that tradition against the backdrop of its theology and anthropology as a whole (especially its understanding of the nature of the Fall), for only then will the full dynamic of the tradition become apparent.

Translations.⁴⁷

(a) Synod of 410.

(It was pointed out above (I.a.1) that we have two texts claiming to be the declaration of faith made at this synod, of which the West Syrian recension has recently been shown to be the original, while the text preserved in the East Syrian Synodicon must date at the earliest from the sixth century. Both forms of text are translated here; in the West Syrian recension verbal agreements with the East Syrian (which represents the 'pure' Nicene symbol) are italicized).

(1) West Syrian recension.⁴⁸

We believe in one God, Father, who in his Son, made heaven and earth; and in him were established the worlds above and below; and in him he effected the resurrection and renovation for all creation.

And in his Son, the Only-Begotten who was born from him, that is, from the essence (ituta) of his Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God; he was born and was not made; who is of the same nature (bar kyaneh)⁴⁹ as his Father; who, for the sake of us human beings who were created through him, and for the sake of our salvation, descended and put on a body and became man, and suffered and rose on the third day, and ascended to heaven and took his seat at the right hand of his Father; and he is coming in order to judge the dead and the living.

And we confess the living and holy Spirit,⁵⁰ the li-

gical spectrum Philoxenos makes the same point in *Tractatus Tres de Trinitate et Incarnatione* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 9, pp. 152-5).

47. The translations are deliberately on the literal side; brackets denote words added by myself for the sake of the sense, or occasionally, where it has been thought helpful, the corresponding Syriac term. Annotation is kept to a minimum and only direct biblical quotations are noted; each of the passages deserves a full commentary, but that would be out of place here. Much shorter extracts from these synods can also be found translated in W.A. Wigram, *An Introduction to the History of the Assyrian Church*, chapter 13.

48. Translated from Vööbus' edition (see note 5); the text is reproduced by de Halleux (title in note 5), with a few modifications (notably the addition of 'Almighty' in the first clause, on the basis of Paris syr. 62).

49. The standard early translation of ὁμοούσιος: see above II.c.

50. Syriac ruha...gaddisha; the East Syrian recension here retains the older terminology, ruha d-quisha.

ving Paraclete who (is) from the Father and the Son;⁵¹ And in one Trinity and in one Essence (*ituta*) and in one will (*sebyana*).

(2) East Syrian recension.⁵²

We believe in one God, Father Almighty, maker of heaven and of earth, and of all that is seen and that is not seen.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, who was born from the Father, the Only-Begotten, that is, from the Essence (ituta) of the Father; God from God and Light from Light, true God from true God, who was born and was not made, of the same essence (bar ituta) as the Father, through whom everything came into being that is in heaven and on earth; who for the sake of us human beings and for the sake of our salvation came down from heaven and was embodied and inhuman (etgasham w-etbarnash); and he suffered and rose after three days, and ascended to heaven; and he is coming to judge the living and the dead.

And in the Holy Spirit.

Those who say that there is (a time) when he was not, and that before he was born he was not, or that he came into being from nothing; or who say that he is from (another) gnoma or from another essence; or who consider that the Son of God is subject to change and alteration (meshtahlpana w-meshtagnyana): such people the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.

(b) Synod of 486⁵³

Let the faith of us all be in the single confession of the one divine nature which exists in the three complete *gnome* of the single true and eternal Trinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, (a confession) by which paganism is vanquished and Judaism judged.

(p. 55) Further, let our faith in the dispensation of Christ be in the confession of the two natures, of the divinity and of the humanity, while none of us shall dare to introduce mixture, mingling or confusion (*muzzaga aw hultana aw bulbala*) into the differences (*shuhlape*) of these two natures; rather, while the divinity remains preserved in what belongs to it, and the humanity in what belongs to it, it is to a single Lordship and to a single (object of) worship that we gather together (*mkannshinan*) the exemplars (*parshagne*)⁵⁴ of these two natures, because of the

51. Note the absence of 'proceeds', which gives a different nuance; de Halleux (title in note 5) offers some pertinent observations on the wording here, pp. 172-3.

52. Translated from Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* (henceforth *SO*), pp. 22_a-23_a.

53. Translated from *SO*, pp. 54_b-55_b.

54. This is not a term used elsewhere in a Christological context it seems; in translations from Greek the word usually renders ἀντίτυπον.

perfect and inseparable conjunction (*nqiputa*)⁵⁵ that has occurred for the divinity with respect to the humanity.

And if someone considers, or teaches others, that suffering and change (*hashsha w-shuhlapa*)⁵⁶ have attached (*nqep*) to the divinity of our Lord, and (if) he does not preserve, with respect to the union (*hdayuta*) of the *prosopon* of our Saviour, a confession of perfect God and perfect Man, let such a person be anathema.

(c) *Synod of 544* (Letter of Mar Aba)⁵⁷

We believe in one eternal God who has no beginning or end; and there was never a time when he was not, but (rather) he was continually and is always. Neither has death or change in any way ever had authority over him, nor will it; nor has he been, nor will he be, (involved) in it; and he alone is not made and not created: the maker and creator of all existing things and all natures. He alone has never been in need of anything, nor will (ever) be in need: he who fills all our needs. And he it is who, by his indication (*remzeh*), controls everything and guides everything, the provisioner of all. And he is the giver of the two testaments, of the Old and of the New. And there is no other God apart from him; he is the first and he is the last. He is omniscient and the giver of wisdom. And it was he who was preached to the ancients through the prophets in singleness of nature (*ba-hdanayut kyana*) 'in all sorts of ways and in all sorts of forms, and in the latter days he spoke with us in his Son whom he appointed as heir of everything' (Hebr 1: 1-2) who is Christ our Lord, he who was born in the flesh from the holy Virgin Mary without intercourse with a man, by the power of the Holy Spirit, as was told her by the angel Gabriel: 'The Holy Spirit will come and the Power of the Most High will overshadow you' (Luke 1:35).⁵⁸ And this Son, Christ, was in the world for thirty years, in that he was making repayment on behalf of the debts of nature and of Adam, the head of our race, and of the law of Moses, as Scripture said: 'He was under the law', and 'he bought us (back) from the curse of the law by his perfect righteousness' (Gal. 4:4 and 3:13). At the age of thirty he approached and was baptized by the blessed John, and he sanctified our baptism by his baptism. And after he had been baptized and had contended with Satan and overcome him in the

55. Corresponds to *συνάψια*, another once respectable term which most Greek writers dropped after the 430s.

56. Note the combination; among East Syrian writers 'suffering' has something of the Stoic connotations of *πάθος*, hence their abhorrence of Theopaschite language.

57. Translated from *SO*, pp. 541_r-543_r.

58. Here, as is the norm in East Syrian exegetical tradition, the 'Power of the Most High' is associated with the Holy Spirit; this contrasts with West Syrian exegetical tradition which identifies the 'Power' as the Logos.

fast of forty days in the wilderness, he chose the holy apostles and performed signs and wonders.

And when he had fulfilled on earth the work of him who had sent him, that is, his teaching, which he confirmed by various mighty deeds that he performed, and (after) he had handed over the mystery of his Body and his Blood to his disciples, then he sealed his dispensation by his passion and his death on the Cross. And on the third day he overpowered Death by the might of his divinity, and he rose after three days as he had told the reprobate Jews: 'Undo⁵⁹ this temple, and after three days I will raise it up', speaking of the temple of his body, as the Evangelist explained (John 2:19, 21). This (temple) which the Jews had undone, he rebuilt with immortal and immutable life.

And after he had arisen from the dead he appeared to his disciples and confirmed them concerning his resurrection, saying 'Touch me and recognize that a spirit does not have flesh (p. 542) and bones, such as you observe that I have (Luke 24: 39). And after forty days he ascended to heaven while there were looking on (both) his disciples and those to whom it had been said by the angels 'This Jesus whom you have seen ascend to heaven' (Acts 1:11), (as if) to say that, as he ascended in his true body, that is, in his perfect humanity, 'thus is he going to come' at the end of the world in the glory of his angels in order to raise the dead and to judge the whole creation, as it is written 'God is going to judge all the earth in righteousness at the hands of a man whom he has separated out; and he has caused everyone to turn to faith in him, in that he has raised him from the dead' (Acts 17: 31).

And at the end of the days of Pentecost he sent upon his disciples the Holy Spirit from heaven in the likeness of tongues of fire, just as he had told them: 'Do not leave Jerusalem until you have put on might from on high' (Luke 24:49). And when the grace of the Holy Spirit had rested upon the holy apostles, it taught them all truth, as our Lord had told them: 'When the Spirit, the Paraclete, comes upon you, he will teach you all truth' (John 16:13). And what truth did the Holy Spirit teach his disciples, and if not concerning the holy Trinity, which was hidden from all created things, and had been spoken of in veiled terms (*remzana'tt*) in the Old Testament, but at the baptism of our Lord was revealed as though in image in the Son who was recognised in him who was being baptized, and (in) the Father who was testifying concerning him, and in the Holy Spirit who rested upon him like a dove: this is the mystery of the Trinity to which he referred when speaking to the apostles

59. The word used here and elsewhere in these texts (*shraw*) is not that of the Peshitta or Old Syriac Gospels, but is evidently derived from the Syriac versions of Theodore's writings where *shraw* occurs (e.g. *Commentary on the Creed*, ed. Mingana in Woodbrooke Studies V, p. 200).

after his resurrection: 'Go, instruct and baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit' (Matt. 28:19). These things came to be known with exactitude by the gift of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples; for they learnt from the Holy Spirit that Christ is not an ordinary man, nor is he God naked of the garment of humanity⁶⁰ in which he had been revealed, but (that) he is Christ God and Man, that is, the humanity which has been anointed with the divinity which anointed it, as it is said: 'For this reason God your God has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your companions' (Ps. 44 (45):8). This indicates concerning his humanity.⁶¹ And again: 'In the beginning was the Word' (John 1:1). This indicates his divinity, which exists eternally for ever, which created all that is visible and all that is invisible.

And (the divinity) exists in three *qnomin*, without beginning, without change, without suffering and without division, (the *qnome*) being the Father Son and Spirit, as our Lord said; for in him was the eternal Trinity made known, as he indicated concerning himself: 'Undo this temple' (John 2:19), that is, the humanity which he had put on; and again 'My Father who dwells in me performs these works' (John 14:10); and again, concerning the Holy Spirit who (was) in him, saying 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for this reason he has anointed me' (Luke 14:18).

Thus from the name of Christ we have learnt concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit: and from this same (name) we have understood concerning his humanity. In it is (p. 543) the seal of the entire confession of Christianity.

(There follow various anathemas, including one aimed at the Theopaschites).

(d) *Synod of 554*⁶²

Before everything else we preserve the upright confession of two natures in Christ, that is, his divinity and his humanity. And we preserve (p. 98) the characteristics (*dilayata*) of the natures, by which (sc. the characteristics) we get rid of confusion and disturbance (*bulbala w-duwwada*), alteration and change (*w-shugnaya w-shuhlapa*).

We also preserve the number of the *qnome* of the Trinity as threefold, and we confess the single

60. This is again archaic imagery (e.g. Ephrem *Hymns on Faith* 19:2) which Greek writers later tended to drop; it derives from a Christological interpretation of Genesis 49:11. (The phrase 'He put on the body' is the standard metaphor for the Incarnation in early Syriac tradition: see my 'Clothing metaphors as a means of theological expression in Syriac tradition', in ed. M. Schmidt, *Typus, Symbol Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*, Regensburg 1982), pp. 11-40).

61. In East Syrian tradition the 'anointing' of the humanity of Christ is understood as having taken place already at his very conception: for a specific statement to this effect see Babai, *Liber de Unione* (ed. Vaschalde), pp. 278-9.

62. Translated from *SO*, pp. 97_{st}-98_r.

true and ineffable union (*hdayuta*) in the single true Son of the one God, the Father of truth.

In the case of anyone who considers or speaks of two Christs, or two Sons, or who for one reason or another, and by some device or other, arouses (thought of) a quaternity, such a person have we anathematized and we do anathematize him, considering him to be a limb rejected by the entire body of Christianity.

(e) *Synod of 576*⁶³

We have offered the worship of acknowledgement and thanksgiving to God, Lord of all dominions, whose nature is high and exalted, and glorified above all words of praise, the eternal Being (*itya*) who alone truly exists eternally, ineffably, hidden, unattainable, uncontained, without beginning and without end, having authority over all, maker of all created things, removed from all changes and alteration, distanced from all sufferings and stirrings (*hashsin w-zaw'in*), in whom all exists while he exists outside everything and inside everything in the glory of his majesty; and with the indication (*remza*) of his authority and with the might of his power he controls and governs, provides for and performs everything; the giver of the Old and the fulfiller of the New (Testament); through his holy prophets he taught former (generations) concerning the singleness of his nature (*hdanayut kyaneh*), and by various indications he manifests concerning the glorious *qnome* of his threefold being (*tlitayuteh*, Trinity).

While in latter days, according to the word of the universal apostle Paul (Hebr. 1:2) the elect, he was revealed to us and spoke with us in his Son Christ our Lord; in him the glorious *qnome* of his Father and of himself and of the Holy Spirit became known in a new way, when he taught and commanded his holy apostles, his true preachers, 'God, instruct all peoples, and baptize them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. (Matt. 28:19); and when they have been reborn from baptism, give them sustenance appropriate to their requirement—the teaching and commandments and admonitions that I gave you, that they should keep them and meditate on them, for from them they are able to enter and enjoy the kingdom of heaven; and behold I am with you all the days until the end of the world (Matt. 28:20), amen'.

It is he who lowered himself of his own will for the salvation of our nature that had grown old and worn out through acts of sin; and he took for himself a perfect temple for the dwelling of his divinity, in an inseparable way, from Mary the holy virgin; and he was conceived and born from her by the power of the Most High: Christ who is in the flesh, who is recogni-

63. Translated from *SO*, pp. 113-114_r. There are a number of reminiscences of Mar Aba's letter (IIIc).

zed and confessed (as being) in two natures, God and Man, one Son. In him the oldness of our nature was renewed, and in the robe of his humanity the debt of our race was repaid, in his drawing close (*metqar-rbanuteh*) to suffering and the death of the cross. And by the power of his divinity he rose from the dead after three days, as he had told the Jews: 'Undo this temple and after three days I will raise it' (John 2:19), which (p. 114) the evangelist interpreted, saying 'Now he spoke of the temple of his body' (John 2:21). And in his resurrection he shattered the bars of death and broke down the walls of Sheol; he rendered ineffective the strength of sin and brought low the pride of Satan who had been roaring fiercely for the destruction of our nature. And he gave hope and a pledge of resurrection from the dead to all the world through his own resurrection and his going around with his disciples up to the time of his ascension...

(f) *Synod of 585.*

(1) *Profession of faith at the synod:*⁶⁴

'We believe in one God, Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and in one Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father'. Even though the serial reading of the words places the names of the Holy Trinity at a distance (from each other), owing to the attachment (in each case) of those terms which particularly and properly attach to them, yet the sense and the meaning of this composition of the Fathers requires such an attachment in order to indicate that the Trinity is above number, so that it might be realized that the words 'one...one...one' point to the single nature of the (divine) essence; as it is said 'The Lord your God is one' (Deut. 6:4). The words 'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit' indicate the difference of the *qnome* of the essence, following the tradition of the Gospel of Christ our Saviour: 'Go forth, convert all peoples and baptize them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit' (Matt. 28: 19).

By adding 'God' and 'Lord' and 'Spirit' they also attached common terms to the individual names, 'Father', 'Son,' 'Holy Spirit'. The fathers clearly showed that these were common terms, each one of which, that is, (all) three, extend to the three *qnome*, for it is clear and without dispute that the Father is God and Lord and Spirit, and the Son is Lord and God and Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is Spirit and Lord and God.

Our Fathers did well to utter the confession of the Trinity briefly; by it they taught wisely and fully the equality of nature and the equality of essence and the difference of the *qnome* and the singleness (*hdanayut*) of the Godhead. They proclaimed equality of essence

and equality of nature, then, as though to stop the crazy mouth of Arius who wickedly devised to split up the equality of essence of the Trinity. And our Fathers proclaimed the difference of the *qnome* of the Trinity to nullify the supposition of the obstinate Jews who suppose that God is one *qnome*. As for the terms which are extended and are (held) in common, while being attached to the individual names that are not extended, our Fathers proclaimed 'one Godhead', 'one Lordship', 'one spiritual Being' as though to nullify and refute the doctrine of the pagans (p.134) who insanelly acknowledge various godheads and lordships.

Having thus overthrown the wickedness of Arius by the proclamation of the equality of essence, and silenced the childishness of the Jews with the difference of the *qnome*, and muzzled the error of paganism too by the singleness of Lordship, then they went on to things which follow on from their confession, attaching 'Almighty' to the words 'one God', and saying 'maker of all that is visible and that is invisible', in that he is the maker and establisher and arranger of all in all.

Likewise they attached to the words 'one Lord' the (further) words 'Jesus Christ', and they showed that the word 'one' is common to the *qnome* of the Trinity, as hinted at above.

The fact that they did not add 'and in one Lord the Son', corresponding to the words 'one God the Father', but instead altered the order of their words and said 'in one Lord, Jesus Christ', will not escape the notice of right believers, for this abundantly points to the humanity of God the Word and it wisely proclaims the single union (*hdayuta*) of the divinity and the humanity of Christ, even though the Euty-chians speak insanelly, defrauding the humanity of the Son of God: for the name 'Christ' is an indicator of his Godhead from the Father and of his humanity from (his) mother indisputably, even though Eutyches and those in error with him may prattle away, defrauding and denying the taking of our humanity, or speaking of the suppression of the humanity of Christ. For the Fathers add, following on (this), 'the Only-Begotten and the First-Born of all created things', that is, Only-Begotten without brothers, with regard to the divinity, and Firstborn of many brothers, that is, Firstborn of all created things, as it is written (Col. 1:15).

And then they add 'Through whom the worlds were established and everything was created', showing that he is cause and maker of all, together with his Father. And again they show, concerning his (divine) essence, that 'he was born from his Father before all worlds, and he was not made: Light from Light, true God from true God', Jesus Christ in his divinity. Again they add, in refutation of Arius, putting 'the Word who is homoousios', that is, of the same nature and of the same essence (*bar kyaneh*

w-bar ituteh) 'as the Father, through whom everything came into being', Jesus Christ in his divinity.

Thus, contesting with the invincible armour of true doctrine that they wore against the fantasies and imaginings of the false teachings of the Simonians and the Manichaeans, they say 'He who for the sake of us human beings and for the sake of our salvation came down from heaven, and was embodied (*etgas-hsham*) of the Holy Spirit and of Mary the Virgin and became man' - Jesus Christ in the unification of his natures (*ba-mhayyudut kyanaw*) and in his manifestation in the flesh and in his embodiment. The unification of the natures, of the divinity and of the humanity, is an indication that he came down and was embodied and became man: (p. 135) it informs, without dispute, concerning the taking of our humanity, thus removing from all sides the empty fancies of the Simonians and Mani who deny the fleshly state (*besranuteh*) and the embodiment and manifestation of God the Word who took our humanity and resided ('*mar*') in it, as (John) said: 'The word became⁶⁵ flesh and dwelt among us' (John 1:14) - in order that the magnitude of the grace of him who descended and resided in us might be all the more manifested. For the wicked Arius, by applying both the exalted and the lowly things to the nature of the Word's divinity, not knowing how to allocate them singly and individually as truth demands,⁶⁶ stumbled and fell on this point, going astray himself and leading (others) astray, (as a result of which) he was anathematized and driven out.

The Fathers add further and complete the wording about the dispensation: after the teaching on the divine nature of the Only-Begotten, and after the teaching on the unification of the natures of Christ - that is, of his unchanged and undying divinity and of his humanity that is not abused or absorbed - they attach teaching concerning his humanity. And, just as they showed clearly above concerning his divinity, (so) they will show openly concerning his humanity which was taken for our sakes and for our salvation, and for the renovation⁶⁷ of all created things, saying 'And he was crucified for us in the days of Pontius Pilate, and he suffered and died and was buried and rose after three days as the holy Scriptures say'. Jesus Christ in his humanity, or, to utter the truth, in his fleshly state (*besranuteh*) accepted the death of the cross for our sakes.

It is obvious to all who are orthodox in their confession that just as he did not suffer or die according

65. The Syriac can just as well mean 'was'.

66. It is worth noting that part of the Church of the East's abhorrence of Theopaschite language stems from this anti-Arian stance.

67. This interestingly reflects the wording of the West Syrian recension of the profession of faith of 410, confirming de Halleux's view that this recension preserves the original text; cp also Isho'yahb I's profession of faith, III.f.2 below.

to the nature of his divinity, neither did his soul receive the sentence (*apophasis*) of death, in that the nature of the soul is not constituted so that it is subject to the limit of death, (as) our Lord himself testifies: 'Do not fear those who kill the body; they are unable to kill the soul' (Matt. 10:28). Also testifying to this is the fact that after our Lord had been crucified and his holy body had died and been buried, in his soul he went to Paradise.

The blessed Fathers then go on: 'And he ascended to heaven and sat at the right hand of his Father' - Jesus Christ in his humanity: for it was in his humanity that he received exaltation and the seat at the right hand, and not in his divinity, for he had been eternally and without beginning with his Father.

'And he will come in glory to judge the living and the dead; whose kingdom has no end' - Jesus Christ in his divinity and in his humanity.

After they had spoken against the ejected bands of the Anomoeans, they turned themselves to the wickedness of Maccdonians who had blasphemed against the Holy Spirit, and they said 'And in one Holy Spirit, Lord, life-giving, who proceeds from the Father and is worshipped with the Father and the Son; who spoke in the prophets and apostles'. Thus by their divine teaching the Fathers preached magnificently concerning (p.136) the *qnome* of the Holy Spirit, showing him to be of the same essence and of the same nature as the Father and the Son. As it is said, 'He searches out everything, even the depths of God' (I Cor. 2:10).

This is the faith without corruption; this is its sense, put briefly, following the sequence of its phrases. By it the person (*prosopon*) of Christ and the natures of his divinity and his humanity are fully proclaimed, in opposition to those who confess his divinity but deny his humanity, and in opposition to those who confess his humanity but deny his divinity, and in opposition to those who deny his divinity and confess that he is an ordinary man, or who liken him to one of the just.

Because our blessed Fathers cause the baptized to inherit the wealth of their faith, they further add: 'And in one holy, catholic and apostolic Church, and in one baptism for the forgiveness of sins; and in the resurrection of the dead and in the new life, and in the world to come'.

After having thus richly and fully proclaimed the truth they turned from this to the anathema on Arius and those who had gone astray with him - on those who say 'There is a time when he was not' and 'Before he was begotten he was not', or 'He came into being out of nothing', or who say that he is from (another) *qnome* or another essence, or who consider the Son of God to be subject to change and alteration: (all) these the catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes - heretics who in their stubbornness have dared to attribute to the nature and *qnome* of the

64. Translated from *SO*, pp. 133-136. The text is in the form of a running commentary on the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed; there seem to be some reminiscences of Theodore's commentary (ed. Mingana in Woodbrooke Studies 5), and the last paragraph reflects the last paragraph of III.a.2 above.

divinity and (divine) essence of the Word the characteristics (*dilayata*) and sufferings of the nature of Christ's humanity, things which sometimes, because of the perfect union that took place for the humanity of Christ with his divinity, are allocated to God by economy, but not by nature.

(2) Confession of faith composed by Isho'yahb I⁶⁸

We believe in one eternal God, uncontained, without beginning and without end;⁶⁹ a living spirit, hidden, unattainable, whose nature power and authority have no limit or boundary; who knows all prior to all, giver of wisdom, who alone is wise, maker and lord of all created things, visible and invisible, by the indication (*remza*) of whose will the worlds above and below were established and set up; the beneficent governor and upright judge, the wise provisioner of this world and the world to come, giver of all graces, who never wearies or proves lacking, who is not changed or subject to blame, the Being (*itya*) without cause, the cause of all, from whom is everything, because of whom is everything, belonging to whom is everything, (directed) towards whom is everything; the one timeless Godhead, three *qnome* without any beginning which are perfect in everything and do not lack in anything; the one God who is known, confessed and worshipped in the three *qnome*, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who are distinct and united in an ineffable wonder, equal, not confused, conjoined (*nqipin*), not intermingled, alike but different: alike in their equality of nature, but distinct in the distinction of *qnome*; one Father, beside whom there is no other Father, who begat eternally without himself being born, cause that has no cause, (p. 194) maker of everything, from whom everything was established; one Son, beside whom there is no other Son, who was born eternally, but did not beget, the causer (*'elltana*) from the Cause (*'ellta*), the cause of everything with the Father, without whom there was not even a single thing that came into being; one Holy Spirit, beside whom there is no other Spirit, who proceeds, who did not beget and was not born, proceeding from the Father eternally, the causer (*'elltana*) from the Cause, the cause of everything along with the Father and the Son, who 'searches out everything, even the depths of God' (1 Cor. 2:10).

One nature which is not reduplicated, three *qnome* who do not become four; (whose) fullness (*shumlaya*) is one-fold (*hdama'it*) and indication (*shudda'a*) is threefold (*tlita'it*); one nature eternally, in which and with which are also the *qnome* eternally; and with it the Son is born eternally, and with it the Spirit proceeds eternally; at once nature, at once *qnome*,

at once Father, at once Son, at once Holy Spirit, one God and not three Gods—let the crazy Marcion wail; three *qnome* and not one *qnome*—let the errant Sabellian wail, and along with him Paul of Samosata who denied the Essence (*ituta*) of the Word before the ages...

This is the Christianity that the Holy Spirit taught through the apostles and through the prophets concerning the revelation of God the Word and concerning his dispensation in the body, and concerning his embodiment for our sakes and for the sake of our salvation, and for the renovation and restoration of all created things.

Out of his great love with which he loved us he departed from the bosom of his Father voluntarily and without being changed, and he came to the world, while being in the world, as it is written (John 1:10); the hidden one who was revealed in the flesh: 'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us' (John 1:10). He became, but was not changed—he who is 'the form of God emptied himself and took the form of a servant' (Phil. 2.7);⁷⁰ 'he took', but did not add (to himself), for both in his 'becoming' and in his 'taking' his Essence remained without change or addition. Jesus Christ, Son of God, God the Word, Light from Light. He came down and was embodied and became man, by dispensation, above alteration and change, our Lord God, Jesus Christ. He who was born from the Father before all worlds in his divinity was born in the flesh from Mary the ever-Virgin in latter times, one and the same (Person), but not in the same (way) (p. 195). 'The Word became flesh'—in an indivisible union (*hdayuta*)—and dwelt among us'. O profundity of the riches of faith! 'He became', but was not changed: let the Eutychians and Apollinarians wail; 'he took', but did not add (anything): let the Photinians and Paulinians wail.

Again I say, let the abusers and schismatics listen, and let them be united to the Church; let them not be like old rags cut off from the harmony of concord; let them not rend the perfect garment of faith and baptism, woven with divine craftsmanship by the operation of the Spirit, the Lord. The soldiers who crucified him did not dare, and were not able, to rend the garment of Christ (John 19:23-47); so you (singular) should not tear the perfect garment of the harmony of the apostolic Church; rather, listen to the truth of the faith and remain inside the ecclesiastical sheepfolds, together with all the Church redeemed by the blood of the great Shepherd of the flock, Jesus Christ the Son of God, God over all, born in his divinity from the Father, without a mother, eternally;

70. Isho'yahb in fact uses two different Syriac words corresponding to the repeated $\mu\omega\phi\eta\tau\iota$ in Greek (in this he follows the Peshitta New Testament).

71. For the history of this exegesis of the passage see M. Aubineau, 'Dossier patristique sur Jean 19:23-47', *La Bible et les Pères* (Strasbourg 1971) pp. 9-50.

one and the same, but not in the same (way), he was born in his humanity from (his) mother, without a father, in latter times; and he suffered in the flesh and was crucified and died and was buried, in the days of Pontius Pilate; and he arose from the dead after three days.

He suffered in the flesh, Christ the Son of God, one and the same; but in the nature of his divinity Christ the Son of God is above sufferings: impassible and passible, Jesus Christ, creator of the worlds and recipient of sufferings, who for our sakes became poor, while being rich (2 Cor. 8:9). God the Word receives the abuse of sufferings in the temple of his body according to the dispensation in the supreme inseparable union, while in the nature of his divinity he does not suffer, as our Saviour himself said: 'Undo this temple and after three days I will raise it' (John 2:19). And because the Jews in their stubbornness imagined that he was speaking about the temple (made) of stones, the evangelist interprets the Saviour's utterance, saying 'He spoke concerning the temple of his body' (John 2:21). Our Lord himself indicates the sublimity⁷² of the prosopic union (*hdayuta parsopayta*) unitedly and unconfusedly, when he says: 'No one has gone up to heaven except he who came down from heaven' (John 3:13): the Son of Man is he who came down from heaven, the Son of Man is the one who is in heaven. Christ, who came down without any change in his divinity from heaven, being unembodied and in the limitlessness of his divinity in heaven, in his humanity is raised up to heaven, while not destroying his visible nature, following the angelic indication: 'This Jesus who has gone up from you to heaven, shall come in like fashion as you have seen him ascend to heaven' (Acts 1:11). Christ is Only-Begotten (*ihidaya*) and united (*mhayyda*): Only-Begotten with respect to the Father, and united and unseparated (in the union), for his divinity does not die or get destroyed or changed, while his humanity is not stolen away or hidden or absorbed...

(g) *Synod of 596*⁷³

(We profess the Nicene faith) which accurately and luminously teaches us the confession of the glorious nature of the holy Trinity, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; which reveals and manifests to us the glorious mysteries of the dispensation of God the Word which he perfected and fulfilled at the end of times in the nature of our humanity.

By this faith paganism, which confesses a plurality of gods, is vanquished, and Judaism, which does not confess the Trinity of *qnome*, is judged, and all (kinds) of heresy, which deny the divinity or humanity of our saviour Jesus Christ, are rebuked and

condemned. We accept it in the precise sense of our holy Fathers, expounded by the glorious among the orthodox, the blessed Theodore of Antioch, bishop of the town of Mopsuestia, the Exegete of the divine Scriptures.⁷⁴ With it all the orthodox everywhere have agreed and do agree, and it has also been held by all our holy Fathers who governed this apostolic and patriarchal see of our government.

We anathematize and alienate from our company anyone who denies the nature of the divinity or the nature of the humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ; or anyone who (p. 198) introduces into the union of the Son of God any mixture, mingling, or composition or confusion; or anyone who (introduces) suffering or any of the base things of humanity in any way into the glorious nature of his divinity; or anyone who considers the dominical temple of God the Word to be ordinary man—(that temple) which, in an inexplicable mystery and in a union that cannot be understood, he united to himself from the womb of the holy virgin in a union which is for ever, indissoluble and inseparable.

We also abhor anyone who introduces a quaternity into the holy Trinity; or anyone who calls the one Christ Son of God two Sons or two Christs; or anyone who does not say that it was God the Word himself who perfected the passion for (*lit.* of) our salvation in the body of his humanity, being in it and with it and by it in the womb and on the cross and in the passion, and for ever, inseparably, while the glorious nature of his divinity did not share in any of the sufferings.

But we believe firmly, in accordance with the words and sense of the Scriptures and the traditions of our holy Fathers, in one Lord Jesus Christ, Only-Begotten Son of God, who was born before the foundations of the world in his divinity spiritually without a mother, and at the end of times was born of the holy virgin in the flesh (*besrana'it*) without intercourse of a man, by the power of the Holy Spirit. In his divinity that is from everlasting and in his humanity that is from Mary he is the one true Son of God, who, in the nature of his humanity, received for our sakes suffering and death. And by the power of his divinity he raised up his body without corruption after three days, and he promised resurrection from the dead and ascension to heaven, and a new world, indissoluble and lasting for ever.

With this true and apostolic faith do we agree, and both we and the flocks entrusted to us preserve it. And if anyone dares to tear up, or does not accept, this deposition of the true faith, we will make him an alien to the entire company of Christians, ejected and driven out, until he accepts correction and agrees to this true faith of the Church.

68. Translated from *SO*, pp. 193₁₀-194₂₀, 194₂₁-195₂₄. There are some reminiscences of Mar Aba's letter (III.c) as well as of the profession of faith of 585 (III.f.1).

69. I omit here a phrase which is badly corrupted.

72. Reading *m'lywt'* for *m'lnwt'*, entry'.

73. Translated from *SO*, pp. 197₁₅-198₂₄. There are some reminiscences of III. b. and f.l. above.

74. The reference will be to the text published by Mingana (see note 64).

(h) *Synod of 605*.⁷⁵

One and the same (sc. with the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople) is our opinion and faith in the holy Trinity and the mysteries of the dispensation of our Lord in the body. (It is the faith) which our Fathers have taught us and shown to us; it consists for us in the confession of the one divine nature, the eternal Being, Creator of all created things, cause of all, having no beginning and possessing no end, who exists continually without ending, who is above the limit and boundary of suffering, change and alteration of any sort. Never has anything had, nor will it ever have, authority over him: he controls all and governs all; for he is the first and the last, who indicated concerning our renovation through the prophets in the Old (Testament), and revealed it through the apostles in the New, by means of his beloved Son, whom he had made heir of everything and in whom he had made known concerning the Trinity of his *qnome*, which are without beginning and without change, a single Godhead, unattainable, a single eternal nature who is known in three *qnome*, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Who, through the Firstfruits from us (1 Cor. 15:23), effected the liberation and renovation of our race, for 'the form of God took the form of a servant', according to the apostolic utterance (Phil. 2:7), and in him he perfected and completed his exalted dispensation for the sake of our salvation: the form of God in the form (p. 201) of a servant, the single Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom everything came into being, perfect God and perfect Man: perfect God in the nature of his divinity, and perfect Man in the nature of his humanity, two natures, of divinity and of humanity, the divinity being preserved in what belongs to it, and the humanity in what belongs to it; and they are united in a true union (*hdayuta*) of the one person (*prosopon*) of the Son, Christ. And the divinity perfected the humanity in the suffering, as it is written, while suffering change and alteration of any sort did not enter into the divinity.

This faith we have agreed to and have held. All the holy fathers have agreed to it, and we too hold it in the pure concurrence of our mind, concurring with it and anathematizing all who slip away from it in any way.

(i) *Assembly of bishops in 612*.⁷⁶

(1) We believe in one divine nature which exists eternally, without beginning, living and life-giving, mighty, creating all powers, wise, providing all wisdom, simple spirit, unlimited, incomprehensible,

75. Translated from *SO* pp. 209^g-210^g. There are reminiscences of III.b and perhaps of III.c and f.2.

76. Translated from *SO*, pp. 564^u-567^g. There are reminiscences of III.c.e and f. 1-2.

uncomposed and without parts, unembodied, invisible, unchangeable, impassible, immortal; neither in itself (*b-yateh*), nor in another, nor with another, is it possible that any suffering or change should enter into it; rather, it is perfect in its essence (*ituteh*) and in all that belongs to it; and it cannot receive addition or subtraction, for it alone is Being (*itya*) and God over all, who is known and confessed in three holy *qnome*, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, a nature with three *qnome* essentially (*tlitay qnome itya'it*), *qnome* with a single eternal nature (*hdanay kyana mtomaya*), between whom there is no distinction apart from the distinct characteristics (*dilayata*) of their *qnome*, (namely) Fatherhood and Sonhood and Procession.

For the rest, everything that is confessed of the (divine) nature in common is likewise confessed of, and is the case with, each of the *qnome* individually, without subtraction. And in that the Father is not passible and unchangeable, (so) too the Son and the Spirit are confessed as being without suffering and without change, along with him and like him. And just as the Father is believed (to be) unlimited and without parts, so too the Son and the Spirit are confessed (as being) without limit and without composition.

Three *qnome*, perfect in everything, in a single Godhead, in a single Power that is not weakened ever, a single knowledge which is not surpassed, a single will which is not deflected, a single authority which is not dissolved: for he creates the world in his grace and guides it with the indication (*remza*) of his will.

Having at the beginning instructed the human race with knowledge of his divinity in a small way, with respect to the measure of the greatness of knowledge of him, and having during the intermediary time (p. 565) been revealed in different visions and various forms to the saints, and having educated and given wisdom to human beings for the increase of their knowledge, by means of various laws; and then, at the end of times, it having pleased his unattainable wisdom that he reveal and make known to rational beings the wonderful mysteries of his glorious Trinity in order to magnify our nature and sow in it the true seed of resurrection from the dead and the new and incorruptible life that receives no alteration unto eternity, in accordance with his foreknowledge and will that is from eternity; therefore, for the sake of us human beings and for the sake of our salvation, the Son of God, the Word, without having departed from his Begetter, 'came to the world and was in the world, and the world came into being through him' (John 1:10).

And because created natures were unable to see the glorious nature of his divinity, he fashioned for himself in exalted manner, from the nature of the house of Adam, a holy temple from the blessed Virgin Mary, a complete man, who was completed without the intercourse with a man that follows the natural course (of events). And he put him on and united him to himself, and in him he was revealed to

the world, in accordance with the utterance of the angel to the mother of our Saviour: 'The Holy Spirit shall come and the power of the Most High shall overshadow you; for this reason he who is going to be born from you is holy and shall be called the Son of God' (Luke 1:35).

Concerning the wonderful conjunction (*neqpa*) and inseparable union (*hdayuta dla purshana*) that took place from the very beginning of its fashioning⁷⁷ for the human nature that was taken by God the Word, the 'taker', he taught us that from that point we should recognize as one person (prosopon) our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was born from before the worlds, without beginning, from the Father in the nature of his divinity, and who was born latterly of the holy virgin, the daughter of David, in the nature of his humanity; just as God had previously promised to the blessed David: 'From the fruits of your womb shall I cause to sit upon your throne' (Ps. 131(132): 11). And after the outcome of the events the blessed Paul expounded the promise, saying to the Jews concerning David: 'From the seed of this man God has raised up, just as he promised, Jesus the Saviour' (Acts 13:23). And again, he wrote to the Philippians as follows: 'Ponder this in yourselves, that even Jesus Christ, although he is the form of God, took the form of a servant' (Phil. 2:6-7). For who was the one whom he calls 'form of God' if not Christ in the nature of his divinity; and whom again does he name 'form of a servant', if not Christ in his humanity? With respect of the former he says 'he took,' and to the latter 'was taken'; (Thus) it is not possible to confuse the characteristics (*dilayathon*) of the natures; for it is impossible that 'he who took' should become 'who was taken', and that 'he who was taken' should become 'the taker'. (But) it is possible for God the Word to be revealed in the human being whom he put on, and for his human nature to become visible to creation in the mode (*teksa*) of his humanity and in the inseparable union (as) the single Son of God, just as we have learnt and hold. (p. 566) That the divinity should be changed into humanity, or that the humanity should be altered to the nature of the divinity, is impossible; for it is not the case that Being (*itya*) can fall under the compulsion of change or of suffering, for if the divinity is changed, it is no longer a revelation, but a destruction, of the divinity. And if, again, the humanity should depart from its nature, salvation no longer obtains, but a wiping out of the humanity.

For this reason we believe with our hearts and we confess with our lips a single Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, whose divinity is not hidden, and whose humanity was not stolen away, but who is perfect God and perfect Man. When we speak of Christ as

77. Here, as perhaps elsewhere in this document, we can identify the influence of Babai who issues this phrase on many occasions (e.g. *Liber de Unione*, pp. 133, 278-9).

perfect God, we are not referring to the Trinity, but to one of the *qnome* of the Trinity, God the Word. And when again we call Christ perfect Man, we are not referring to all mankind, but to that single *qnome* who was specifically taken, for our salvation, into union with the Word.

For this reason our Lord Jesus Christ, who was born in his divinity from his Father eternally, in latter times for our sakes was born the holy Virgin in his humanity. While he remained, in his divinity, without need and without suffering and without change, in his humanity after his nativity he was also circumcised and grew up, according to the testimony of Luke the evangelist: 'Jesus was growing in stature and in wisdom and in grace before God and mankind' (Luke 2:52); and he kept the law and was baptized in the Jordan by John; and then he began to preach the new covenant, performing wonders by the power of his divinity- the cleansing of lepers, the opening of the eyes of the blind, the chasing out of demons, the resurrection of dead people; while in the nature of his humanity he thirsted, he hungered, and he ate and drank, grew tired and slept; and last of all, for our sakes he gave himself up and was crucified, and he suffered and died- without his divinity having departed from him or having suffered; and his body was wrapped in a shroud and was laid in a place of burial; then after three days he rose, by the power of his divinity, just as he had told the Jews beforehand: 'Undo this temple, and after three days I will raise it up' (John 2:19), which the evangelist interprets, saying, 'He was speaking of the temple of his body, (John 2:21).

And after he arose, he went about on earth with his disciples for forty days, showing them his hands and his feet, saying: 'Feel me and know that a spirit does not have flesh and bones such as you see that I have' (Luke 24:39) - so that both by word and by actions he might assure them of his resurrection, and so that, from the assurance of his resurrection, he might assure in us a hope of our resurrection.

And after forty days he ascended to heaven in the sight of his disciples as they looked on, and a cloud received him, and he was concealed from their eyes, according to the testimony of Scripture (Acts 1:9).

And we confess that he is going to come from heaven in the power and glory of his angels, and he will effect a resurrection for all the race of humanity, and a judgement and examining (p. 567) for all rational beings, just as the angels told the apostles themselves at the time of his ascension: 'This Jesus, who has been taken up from you to heaven, will in like wise come just as you saw him go up to heaven' (Acts 1:11). And by this they openly taught us this too: 'He was taken up to heaven'-and the *qnome* of his humanity was not dissolved and was not changed, but is preserved in the inseparable union with his divinity in the exalted glory in which he is going to behold, at his final revelation from heaven, the shame of those who cruci-

ified him and the glory and pride of those who believe in him.

To him, and to his Father and to the Holy Spirit, be praise and honour, for ever.

(2) From the reply to questions posed by theological opponents:⁷⁸

It is clearly apparent that Christ is perfect God and perfect Man. Now he is said to be God, being perfect in the nature and *qnoma* of divinity, and he

is then said to be perfect Man, being perfect in the nature and *qnoma* of humanity. And just as it is made known, from the opposition (expressed in) the words just used, that Christ is two natures and two *qnoma*, so too, from the fact that they refer to the one Christ, Son of God, it is made known that Christ is one — not in a oneness (*hdanayut*) of nature and of *qnoma*, but in an the single *prosopon* of Sonship and the single (source of) authority and single governance and single power and single lordship.

The conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)

Probably in the spring of 532 ⁽¹⁾ — only a few months after the Nika riots ⁽²⁾ — there took place in Constantinople, under Justinian's auspices, a three day conference between five Chalcedonian bishops and five or more ⁽³⁾ Syrian Orthodox ('Severan') bishops, the aim being 'the reunion of the churches' after the disruptions caused by the Chalcedonian definition ⁽⁴⁾. We are

⁽¹⁾ The date is not quite certain: see STEIN title in note 4, pp. 378-9.

⁽²⁾ These, however, were unconnected with religious issues; see A. CAMERON, *Circus Factions* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 129-30, 278-80.

⁽³⁾ See below, pp. 117-118.

⁽⁴⁾ The more important secondary literature is as follows: E. K. CHRYSOS, *Ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ πολιτικὴ τοῦ Ἰουστινιανῶν* (Saloniki, 1969), p. 101; R. DEVREESSE, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi 141; 1948), pp. 194-5; F. DIEKAMP, *Analecta Patristica* (OCA 117; 1938), pp. 109-15; L. DUCHESNE, *L'Église au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925), pp. 81-7; W. H. C. FREND, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 263-8; R. HAACKE, in ed. A. GRILLMEIER and H. BACHT, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (Würzburg, 1953) II, pp. 156-8; J. HEFFLE-H. LÉCLERCQ, *Histoire des Conciles* (Paris, 1908), II.2, pp. 1120-5; S. HELMER, *Der Neuchalkedonismus* (diss. Bonn, 1962), pp. 132-3; E. HONIGMANN, *Évêques et Évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle* (CSCO 127, Subsidia 2; 1951), pp. 150-1; J. LEBON, *Le monophysisme sévérien* (Louvain, 1909), pp. 73-4; M. RICHARD, « Le néo-Chalcédonisme », *MSR* 3 (1946), pp. 158-9; E. SCHWARTZ, *Kyriillos von Skythopolis* (Texte und Untersuchungen 49.2; 1939), pp. 389-92; E. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1949) II, pp. 378-9; A. van ROEY, in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, II, pp. 351-2. Henceforth these works are cited by name of author alone.

fortunate enough to know something of the proceedings from the two summarized accounts emanating from either side (something of a rarity for antiquity): from the Chalcedonian side there is the Letter of Innocentius⁽⁵⁾, bishop of Maronia (one of the participants), addressed to the priest Thomas, of Thessaloniki, while from the Syrian Orthodox there exists a short anonymous summary of the proceedings which was published in 1919 by F. NAU in *Patrologia Orientalis* 13⁽⁶⁾, from an eighth century manuscript, British Library Add. 12155. There also survives the *plerophoria* or doctrinal statement put out by the Syrian Orthodox bishops for the consideration of the emperor and his bishops⁽⁷⁾. To these sources can now be added an important new one, the full account (albeit preserved only fragmentarily) of the proceedings from the Syrian Orthodox point of view. Although this text is now acephalous, it is likely that it is the work of Severus' biographer, the abbot John bar Aphthonia, who accompanied the bishops and wrote an account of the proceedings⁽⁸⁾; it is also evident that it served as the source for the summary published by Nau.

The new Syriac text is to be found in Harvard syr. 22, of the eighth or ninth century; this manuscript has unfortunately suffered considerably from the ravages of time, for many folios have been lost and those that do survive are in complete disorder

⁽⁵⁾ ACO IV.2, pp. 169-84.

⁽⁶⁾ Pp. 192-6. It is astonishing that this has been almost entirely neglected in the secondary literature: only Honigmann gives (just) the reference in a footnote (p. 150 note 6; cp also p. 75). The *Collatio* is also mentioned in passing by Elias, in his *Life of John of Tella* (ed. BROOKS), pp. 59-60. (The summary is also quoted in a florilegium in Add. 14533, f. 168a).

⁽⁷⁾ Preserved in Ps. Zechariah Rhetor, *Eccl. Hist.* IX.15 and in Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.22; an English translation is given by FRIEND, pp. 362-6. *Plerophoria* is the name given to it in our new document; Innocentius refers to it as a *chartula satisfactionis*, Ps. Zechariah as a *deësis* (p. 89) or *pyasa* (p. 115), while Michael calls it a *diathesis dapyasa*.

⁽⁸⁾ So Ps. Zechariah, *Eccl. Hist.* IX.15 (ed. Brooks, p. 122²²⁻³). Since John's other works (*Life of Severus*, *Commentary on Song of Songs*, and some Hymns) were originally written in Greek, this work too may be a translation, although there are no obvious internal indications that this is so apart from the possible misunderstanding mentioned in note 53.

and are often much damaged⁽⁹⁾. Although most of the manuscript is devoted to letters from (or occasionally to) Severus, there are several other items belonging to the sixth century which have no direct connection with the patriarch; among these are ff. 67, 78 and 79, constituting a continuous text of which both the beginning and end are missing⁽¹⁰⁾. The contents of these folios quickly indicate that we have here the central portion of a day by day account of the conversations.

The extant portion of the text⁽¹¹⁾ opens (§1) with the ending of the second audience which the Syrian Orthodox bishops evidently had with the emperor prior to the arrival of the Chalcedonian bishops; during this they handed over to him the statement of their doctrinal position. It was only after 'a certain number of days' that the Chalcedonian bishops arrived in Constantinople and were given the statement to consider (§2). §3 gives the setting of the conference and mentions the officials present (already known from Innocentius). The first day's proceedings (§§4-10) are devoted mainly to Dioscorus' reception of Eutyches at Ephesus II (449), a point of embarrassment to the Syrian Orthodox, requiring a rather careful explanation. The question of ordinations stemming from Chalcedon is also said to have arisen, but little information is given on this point.

§§11-33 cover the second day, during which the *plerophoria* and Syrian Orthodox objections to Chalcedon were discussed; the latter centre on the council's acceptance of Theodoret and the Letter of Ibas. Ibas' letter causes the Chalcedonian delegation some embarrassment and they try to assert that a particular *praxis* had not taken place at all at Chalcedon. Discussion then turns to Cyril's letter to Eulogius, and the authority of doctrinal statements of the fathers which did not happen to be 'confirmed' by Chalcedon.

On the third day (§§34-47) the bishops met in the presence of the emperor who asks the Syrian Orthodox what they have

⁽⁹⁾ See my preliminary list of contents in "Some new letters of the Patriarch Severus", *Studia Patristica* 12 (1975), pp. 17-24.

⁽¹⁰⁾ As will be seen, the summary published by Nau gives the substance of what must have been lost at the end

⁽¹¹⁾ See below, pp. 118-120, for a comparison of the contents with those of Innocentius' account.

achieved. The reply is that they have dispelled suspicions some had had that they were heretical (i.e. Eutychians). Justinian accepts this, but he wants practical results, in other words the ending of the Syrian Orthodox withdrawal from communion with the Chalcedonians. He tries to get them to go to discuss the doctrinal problems with the other patriarchs, but they offer various excuses, whereupon Justinian presses them to suggest some means of reunion themselves, and asks them if they are in communion with the Patriarch of Alexandria, evidently a point of some delicacy, but whose exact significance is obscure: since the bishops' guarded reply was couched in manifestly anti-Julianist language, it would seem that Timothy had at that point been won over by the Julianist faction in Alexandria. After this the text breaks off, but we have the summary of the Syrian Orthodox bishops' own proposals (and some indications of the concessions the emperor was willing to make himself) in the last paragraphs of the summary published by Nau.

The new text also gives some interesting information on certain procedural points. The Syrian Orthodox bishops repeatedly try to have the discussions taken down officially in writing, but this was turned down by the Chalcedonian bishops and, more importantly, by Strategius, the *locum tenens* for the Magister (§11). Their intention in asking for this becomes clear in §33, when, at the end of the second day, they ask that the emperor should learn of the day's proceedings with both parties present, and not just the Chalcedonian (as had happened on the first day). Although this is promised, matters turn out otherwise the next day (§34), and the Chalcedonian delegation saw the emperor before the other side, and when the latter asked the emperor for permission to give him their own account of what went on, they were refused (§37).

With these preliminaries it is time to turn to the text itself. A fuller discussion of certain aspects of the contents of our new document will be reserved until after the text and translation have been given.

Text⁽¹²⁾ and translation

The orthography (often inconsistent for recurrent Greek words) of Harvard syr. 22 (= **H**) is preserved throughout. In the small number of places where I have found it necessary to correct the text I give the reading of the manuscript in each case in the apparatus.

In the translation, words in brackets are supplied for the sake of the sense. In the notes I give cross references to Innocentius' account (= **I**) and to the Syrian Orthodox summary published by NAU (= **S**)⁽¹³⁾. Since the latter text has been unduly neglected I also give a translation of this document, following the translation of Harvard syr. 22.

⁽¹²⁾ The text is published by kind permission of the Harvard College Library, and I should like here to thank the Librarian and the staff of the Houghton Library, Harvard University, for their help and kindness on my various visits to the library.

⁽¹³⁾ **H**, **I** and **S** are quoted by section number.

8 The opposing bishops say: 'What was said (only) hesitatingly is not a clear confession. For this reason it was all the more necessary for Dioscorus to make exact enquiry of Eutyches concerning the term 'of the same nature' (i.e. *homouosios*). And then they enlarged on the matter, saying: 'Dioscorus' neglect over exactitude is a betrayal of the faith, and he who neglects even one small item from matters that are obligatory is subject to censures and serious punishments'.

9 The orthodox bishops said: 'Reserve those words and the discussion of them for the proper time; but now tell us, do you hold the blessed Dioscorus to be a heretic?'.

The opposing bishops say: 'We do not hold him to be a heretic, for his opinions were orthodox, but he was neglectful in matters of urgent importance'. After this they added other lines of argument, saying that the synod at Chalcedon had met very usefully on the matter of Eutyches (27).

10 With this the first day's session was dissolved. Other things were discussed there (too), about ordinations (*cheirotoniai*) (28): on these, the orthodox bishops said that the ordinations which were transmitted from the synod of Chalcedon were confirmed by true faith and by communion with the orthodox.

11 The next day (29) they gathered again, and first of all the orthodox bishops asked that what was said might be taken down in writing, just as they had asked the previous day, without success. The opposing bishops did not accept this, not did the *locum tenens* for the Magistros, saying: 'I did not receive any such authorization from the serene emperor' (30).

12 The orthodox bishops asked for the statement they had given to the emperor to be read (31). They straightway provided a copy and it was read out, after which they asked the opponents saying: 'Say if you have anything you find fault with in this statement'.

(27) Cp I 18.
(28) There is nothing on this in Innocentius. Cp *Synodicon* (ed. VÖÖBUS) §§ 20, 23.
(29) For Innocentius' account of the second day, see I 19-78.
(30) There is no mention of this in Innocentius.
(31) According to Innocentius (I 9) the Syrian Orthodox bishops opened the session on the *first* day by saying that they had handed over *satisfactionis chartulam de fide nostra* to the emperor; Hypatius, the

8 8
9
10
11
12
II 67 b. 2

Chalcedonian spokesman, replied that they had indeed seen it. On the second day it would seem that I 21-27 refer in fact to a discussion of the *plerophoria*.

of the world would be filled with the harm brought about by Nestorius' wickedness. For this reason the blessed Cyril, like a wise doctor in an emergency, accepted all the bishops of the diocese of the Orient — even if it was without going into details (*lit.* exactly) — once they had acknowledged that Nestorius had been deposed (*lit.* ejected) by them from the priesthood, and they themselves had given an orthodox profession of faith: he did not consider Theodoret as a case (where the malady) was mingled in with and joined to the entire body. So afterwards, when he learnt that he had remained in his teachings that were hateful to [5 lines lost] Theodoret... and he reminded John⁽³⁹⁾ that 'Theodoret needs reprimands (*lit.* blows) from you'. Then, after a certain time, the synod at Chalcedon took place, and when the orthodox faith had been established through the grace of God, and while all peoples everywhere were rejecting the wicked heresy of Nestorius with the result that Theodoret, too, of evil name, was ejected from the priesthood⁽⁴⁰⁾ because of his failure to repent of his wickedness, (it was at that point that) the synod at Chalcedon received him without trial, (thus) putting itself under just condemnation. How are those who received him not guilty of his wickedness, since, when he had anathematized Nestorius alone, they did not (go on) to require him to anathematize his wicked writings which he wrote against the holy Cyril and against the true faith?

18 The opposing bishops were put to shame by these (words) and kept silence, whereupon the orthodox bishops reverted to the discussion of the wicked Ibas, and they read from the Acta of the synod of Chalcedon the declaration (*dialalia*) of Pascasinus, Lucensius and Bonifatius⁽⁴¹⁾, the representatives of Leo who was bishop of the church of Rome. In this declaration they said in brief that on the basis of the letter that had been read out Ibas was orthodox.

19 The orthodox bishops then asked the Magistros to allow the Letter to be read. He did so⁽⁴²⁾, and the Letter of the wicked Ibas addressed to Mari the Persian was read out. [3½ lines lost]

(39) Patriarch of Antioch; see ACO I.4, p. 231.

(40) At Ephesus II, 449.

(41) ACO II.1, p. 398 (161); also cited by Severus in a letter to Sergius the physician and sophist (*Collected Letters*, 31, in PO 12).

78 a. 2
 78 b. 1

78 a. 2
 78 b. 1

(42) Cp I 75. ('Magistros' will be a slip for 'locum tenens of the Magistros'; see H 3).

written by Athanasius, the great fighter in support of religious doctrine, despite the fact that these (works) had not been confirmed by the synod.

29 Since the father and teacher Cyril had likewise aided the truth, his Letter to Eulogius was read (55). Once its contents had been seen, the orthodox bishops said: 'We are of a like opinion, and we acknowledge the single nature of God the Word incarnate (56), and we do not divide up the single Christ after the union into a duality of natures, even though we recognize their difference'.

30 The orthodox bishops also wanted the Letter to Acacius of Melitene to be read out (57), but the auditor checked them: 'Much of the day has already passed, and', he said, 'it is altogether equivalent in its sense to that addressed to Eulogius'.

31 The opposing bishops said: 'We too (will) introduce the holy fathers and show that they spoke of two natures with reference to Christ' (58).

32 The orthodox bishops pressed them, saying: 'Show us the God-clothed fathers who (used) these words and said that it is right to call Christ two united and inseparate natures after the union; just as we have (ourselves) shown that they taught that after the union [it is right to speak of only a single nature of God the Word incarnate]' (59). The opposing bishops promised: 'We will show this tomorrow'.

33 The orthodox bishops asked that the emperor should not learn of the conversations from one of the sides (only), as had happened the previous day, but that this should take place with both sides present. They promised (that this should be so). Thereupon the session was dissolved (60).

(55) Cp I 44. H mentions nothing of the long discussion of this letter which ensues in I 45-9.

(56) Cp S 2.

(57) According to I 50-7 this was also discussed (he calls it the second letter to Succensus, for reasons explained above, note 51). In Innocentius' account discussion of Theodoret and Ibas takes place after that of Cyril's letters (see note 33).

(58) See next note.

(59) The whole of this statement is quoted almost verbatim in S 2. I 58-61 gives 'two nature' testimonia adduced by the Chalcedonians already on the second day. No doubt the Syrian Orthodox bishops

קִיּוּם לְחַלְּלֵם כְּמִלְכָּם הַחֲבֵרָתָם לְרַבְשֵׁיכֵם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה
לְחַלְּלֵם הַחֲבֵרָתָם כְּמִלְכָּם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם
כְּמִלְכָּם . . .

29 וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם כְּמִלְכָּם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם
כְּמִלְכָּם . . .

30 וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם כְּמִלְכָּם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם
כְּמִלְכָּם . . .

31 וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם כְּמִלְכָּם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם
כְּמִלְכָּם . . .

32 וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם כְּמִלְכָּם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם
כְּמִלְכָּם . . .

33 וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם כְּמִלְכָּם וְכִי כִּי הָיָה הַחֲבֵרָתָם
כְּמִלְכָּם . . .

79 a 2

(e) Ms p. J.

(f) Ms אֲנִיכְרִיכְרִי

pointed out that no reference was made in any of the passages adduced to 'after the union', for in I 79 Innocentius says that when the second session broke up the Chalcedonian bishops 'prepared numerous testimonia concerning the two natures'.

(60) Cp I 79.

on the church, and this was the cause of our departure; for *libelli* were given to us all to put our signature to, (*libelli*) in which we were required to anathematize ourselves and those who were our fathers — and indeed more or less the entire world. For to anathematize Peter, archbishop of Antioch and all who remain in communion with him, and Acacius of Constantinople and Peter of Alexandria ⁽⁷⁶⁾, as well as those who persevere ⁽⁷⁷⁾ in communion with them, (this) is nothing other than to anathematize ourselves, and, as it were, everything under the sky’.

2. When they had openly ⁽⁷⁸⁾ shown forth their true (faith) in the presence of the bishops whom the emperor had brought to discuss with them, and in the presence of the (state) officials who were listening, and stated that ‘the fathers taught us to confess a single nature of the incarnate Word after the union’ ⁽⁷⁹⁾, then they said to the opposing party: ‘Show (us) the God-clothed fathers who used the words ‘after the union we should call the one Christ two natures, united or inseparable’, in the same way that we have shown that they taught that it is right to acknowledge one nature of God the Word incarnate after the union’ ⁽⁸⁰⁾.

The opposing party said they would show (this), but they failed to do so ⁽⁸¹⁾.

3. Then the emperor tells the orthodox that, because they had not agreed to what the diphysites said, they should go again (*or* now) to the patriarch of Rome and of Antioch and of Jerusalem ⁽⁸²⁾, and offer them arguments, or provide some means for the peace of the churches ⁽⁸³⁾.

desert’ by the dux Theodotus (not otherwise known: cp P.-W. *sub nomine* (no 39)); cp Ps. Zechariah, *Eccl. Hist.* IX.15 (ed. BROOKS, p. 116¹⁸).

⁽⁷⁶⁾ I.e. Peter the Fuller (†488), Acacius (†489) and Peter Mongus (†490). S 1 evidently refers to the two audiences which the Syrian Orthodox bishops had with Justinian prior to the arrival of the Chalcedonian bishops.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ NAU misses the sense here.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ NAU mistakenly prints (and translates) ‘*ly’yt* for *gly’yt*’.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Cp H 29.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ A direct quotation of H 32.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Cp H 34.

⁽⁸²⁾ Cp H 38.

⁽⁸³⁾ Cp H 40.

The orthodox bishops say: ‘The canon does not allow five insignificant bishops, bishops moreover of small towns, to provide any common (statement) on the faith by themselves’ ⁽⁸⁴⁾.

4. ⁽⁸⁵⁾ When they asked (the emperor) if they might be dismissed to their homes (*lit.* places), the emperor said: ‘Put down in writing that you will not make any ordinations, and that you will not baptize or give the sacrament to anyone apart from those who are with you’ ⁽⁸⁶⁾.

They refused to put this in writing, saying: ‘It would be an insult to the emperor if we were to agree with him in writing to the situation that he has ordered (i.e. the *status quo*)’.

The emperor then said: ‘In that case, let each of you say that he will not do any of these things; then you can go. Otherwise you will be dismissed to Zeugma’ ⁽⁸⁷⁾.

They replied: ‘The divine laws do not allow priests to use oaths, nor can any man transgress an imperial order without danger’.

The emperor said: ‘Either bring Severus to suggest some means for the peace of the churches, or suggest one yourselves’.

They said: ‘We do not know where the holy Severus is’ ⁽⁸⁸⁾.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Cp H 41.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ S 4-7 constitute our only source for the lost ending of H.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Cp Elias, *Life of John of Tella* (ed. BROOKS, p. 59): ‘The emperor ordered them with threats not to exercise any priestly function for the benefit of those who agreed with him (*sc.* Justinian; i.e. for Chalcedonians)’. So ms A, but B has ‘for those who do not agree with you (*sc.* the Syrian Orthodox bishops)’. Brooks’ text and translation wrongly conflate the two readings (*... ergo eos qui ei non consentirent...*), giving the wrong sense: the text of both A and B agree with the Summary here in having Justinian seek to limit the bishops’ sacerdotal functions to their own party: they were not to try to win over Chalcedonians to their point of view (presumably Justinian had cases like those of Z’ura/Zooras or Mare in mind).

⁽⁸⁷⁾ HONIGMANN (p. 75) conjectures that this was because Zeugma (= Belkis) was a Chalcedonian stronghold at the time; in view of its military importance this seems likely: Procopius (*Aedif.* II.9.18-20) informs us that its walls were renewed under Justinian; cp also J. WAGNER, *Seleukeia am Euphrat/Zeugma* (Wiesbaden, 1976), p. 96.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ From Severus’ reply to the emperor, preserved in Ps. Zechariah *Eccl. Hist.* IX.16, we know that Justinian wrote to him at about this time, asking him to come to the capital; (it is possible that this letter

5. They then pressed them to suggest some means themselves by which it might be both fitting and possible to achieve the peace of the holy churches. Under this pressure the orthodox bishops said: 'We do not think that those who ⁽⁸⁹⁾ have specifically withdrawn themselves from communion with the opposite party, will be united, unless they ⁽⁹⁰⁾ anathematize those who speak of two natures after the inexplicable union, as well as the Tome of Leo, and what took place at Chalcedon in opposition to the orthodox faith'. They were silent, however, for the moment about any anathema of particular names out of consideration for the accomplishment of universal union.

6. The bishops also said this: 'First of all the *libelli* of the *Romaioi* must come to an end, to which all the bishops to-day holding sees have put their signature'.

Such was the advice of the orthodox bishops if ways were to be found of achieving the peace of the churches.

7. The emperor objected to this, (and said): 'Would (the following conditions), perhaps ⁽⁹¹⁾, be acceptable to them: they might anathematize Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, Ibas, Nestorius and Eutyches, and accept the Twelve Chapters of the holy Cyril, while anathematizing what had been written against them; they might confess one nature of God the Word incarnate, but they should refrain from anathematizing those who speak of two natures after the inexpressible union, (anathematizing) instead those who hold Nestorian views and divide up Christ into two natures, while confessing, as a crafty device which they had discovered long ago, together with the other side 'the two united and inseparable natures' ⁽⁹²⁾; they should accept the synod at Chalcedon as far as the expulsion of Eutyches was concerned, but they need not accept the definition of the faith made there;

may have been sent at the *same* time as the summons issued to the oriental bishops through Theodotus). It was only in 535 that Severus eventually agreed to come to Constantinople.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ I.e. opponents of Chalcedon.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ I.e. supporters of Chalcedon.

⁽⁹¹⁾ NAU misses the sense here. The extent of Justinian's concessions is of great interest.

⁽⁹²⁾ I.e. the Syrian Orthodox should distinguish between the ordinary upholders of Chalcedon and those who did so as a convenient front to hide their genuinely Nestorian position.

they should cease their anathema of the Tome of Leo; and the *libelli* of the *Romaioi* should not be suspended'.

These things failed to persuade the orthodox ⁽⁹³⁾.

8. The bishops whom the emperor had brought to speak with the orthodox bishops are as follows: Hypatius of Ephesus, Stephan of Isaurian Seleucia, Innocentius of Amorium, John of Byzie ⁽⁹⁴⁾ — the towns of these (two) are in Thrace — and Anthimus of Trebizond. These men found fault with Dioscorus because he was not (sufficiently) attentive to details in (the matter of) the reception of Eutyches, (failing) to examine him on the matter of (his) faith carefully on every point, as is right that everyone should be attentive to all the tricks of the heretics; but they had no complaint against him (Dioscorus) in matters of faith ⁽⁹⁵⁾.

The Participants

Our sources are somewhat at variance over the names of the participants:

(1) Innocentius specifically says *nos quidem eramus quinque et illi vero sex*. On the Chalcedonian side he gives (I 3) Hypatius of Ephesus, John of Vezina, Stephan of Seleucia, Anthimus of Trebizond, as well as himself. With this **H** and **S** are in agreement. Innocentius also mentions that Demetrius of Philippi was amongst those summoned by the emperor, but owing to illness he was unable to attend; the silence of **H** and **S** is thus not surprising.

On the Syrian Orthodox side Innocentius lists (I 6): Sergius of Cyrrhus, Thomas of Germanicia, Philoxenus of Dulichium, Peter of Theodosiopolis (= Resh'aina), Iohannes of Constantia (= Tella) and Nonnus of Ceresina. Neither Philoxenus ⁽⁹⁶⁾ nor

⁽⁹³⁾ It is a pity that the summary does not specify whether all or only some (as would seem likely) of these conditions were unacceptable; the matter of the *libelli* would have been an obvious stumbling block.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Corrupted to Beroea in the manuscript; cp **H** 2 for the list. In both **H** and **S** Maronia has been corrupted.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Cp **H** 4-9; evidently the most important outcome of the conversations from the Syrian Orthodox point of view, which is not surprising in view of Justinian's legislation against heretics.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ HONIGMANN, pp. 72-3.

Nonnus⁽⁹⁷⁾ figure in the Syriac list (for which we have only **S**); in the case of Philoxenus this is not unexpected in view of his subsequent defection.

(2) The Syriac summary agrees with Innocentius over the Chalcedonian bishops, but for the orientals it gives: Sergius of Cyrrhus, Peter of Resh'aina, Thomas of Germanicia, Thomas of Dara and John of Tella. Philoxenus is omitted and Thomas of Dara replaces Nonnus of Circessium; the order, too, is slightly different.

(3) Elijah in his *Life of John of Tella* (ed. Brooks, p. 59) specifically states that there were eight bishops on the Syrian Orthodox side, of whom John of Tella was one.

Even supposing that both Nonnus and Thomas of Dara were present, this would still only make the number up to seven. One possible solution is to suppose that the number eight included the abbot John bar Aphtonias, who is known to have accompanied the bishops (see note 8), and who may be the author of **H**.

Innocentius' letter compared with H and S.

It is instructive to compare the accounts of the proceedings as reported by either side, and it is hardly surprising to find that each gives a rather slanted picture, passing over in silence developments in the discussions that proved embarrassing; likewise each gives proportionately more space to the speeches of their own side. Here I list the main topics as given by the various accounts in order to facilitate comparison between the documents.

| <i>Innocentius</i> | <i>Syrian Orthodox (H and S)</i> |
|--|--|
| — | Preliminary audiences of Syrian Orthodox with Justinian(H 1, S 1) |
| Preliminary audience of Chalcedonians with Justinian (4-5) | — |
| Day 1 (I 6-18; H 4-10) | — |
| Strategius' address (7-8) | — |

⁽⁹⁷⁾ HONIGMANN, pp. 53-4.

| | |
|---|--|
| chartula of Syrian Orthodox (9) | cp H 2 |
| Reception of Eutyches by Dioscorus (10-18) | H 4-9 ⁽⁹⁸⁾ |
| — | Ordinations stemming from Chalcedon (H 10) |
| — | Day 2 (I 19-78; H 11-33) |
| — | Procedural request (H 11) |
| Recapitulation of Day 1 (19-20) | — |
| cp 22-8 | Plerophoria read (H 12) |
| Syrian Orthodox objections to Chalcedon | H 13-14 |
| Their 'one nature' testimonia, allegations of forgery (22-8) | cp H 12 |
| Discussion of technical terms <i>subsistentia</i> and <i>natura</i> (29-32) | — |
| Flavian's rescript to Theodosius (33) | — |
| Cyril's testimonia (36-63) | H 24-30 ⁽⁹⁹⁾ |
| Purpose of Councils (64-7) | — |
| Theodoret (68-73) | H 14-17 |
| Ibas (74-8) ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ | H 18-23 |
| — | Procedural request |

Day 3

For Day 3 we have from Innocentius only a very general statement, praising the emperor's speech (**I** 79-81), in contrast to the much more detailed accounts in **H** 34-47 and **S** 3-8.

The remainder of Innocentius' letter (**I** 82-90) is concerned with subsequent events not covered by **H** or **S**: the oriental bish-

⁽⁹⁸⁾ **H** has no mention of Flavian and Eusebius, who both feature in Innocentius.

⁽⁹⁹⁾ **H** omits all reference to the discussion of the Letter to Eulogius, retailed in some detail by Innocentius.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Innocentius is silent on the episode of the *dialalia* of the Roman delegates concerning Ibas' Letter to Mari.

ops, he claims, have it insinuated to the emperor that the Chalcedonian bishops did not believe *deum passum carne*, but this is disclaimed by Hypatius (I 82-6) ⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

The final paragraphs (I 87-90) speak of another audience the Chalcedonian bishops had with Justinian, during which he told them how, before receiving the bishops on Day 3, he had gone to the oratory of the archangel Michael and prayed to God as follows:

si in veritate uniri habent nobis, magis autem sanctae ecclesiae tuae, compunge eos velociter consentire nobis; sin autem nolunt, praepedi eos, ut ex ipsis magis culpa nascatur et non ex nobis (I 88).

Innocentius goes on to report that of the oriental bishops only Philoxenus was won over, although subsequently some clergy and monks accepted communion with the Chalcedonians (I 89); from some of these he learnt (by way of an interpreter, since they only spoke Syriac) that the Syrian Orthodox bishops had told their flock that the Holy Spirit had left the Chalcedonian churches and their baptism (I 90) ⁽¹⁰²⁾.

Conclusion

Our document is not without contemporary interest, in view of the renewed theological discussions between the Syrian Orthodox and both Catholics ⁽¹⁰³⁾ and Orthodox ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. Reading the accounts of the discussions of 532 as reported by the two sides one can readily enough see that each party has given a biased account of what must have taken place, dwelling on points where

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Justinian's so-called 'Theopaschite formula' was issued on 15 March 533; this provides the *terminus ante quem* for the discussions.

⁽¹⁰²⁾ For similar claims (this time by East Syrian bishops), see *Chronicle of Seert* §94 (PO 13, p. 572).

⁽¹⁰³⁾ High-lighted by the visit of His Holiness Mar Ignatius Jacoub III to the Vatican in October 1971; for an English translation of the common declaration of Pope Paul and Mar Ignatius Jacoub, see M. FOUYAS, *The Person of Jesus Christ in the Decisions of the Ecumenical Councils* (Addis Ababa, 1976), p. 237.

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Cp FOUYAS, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-32, and the various articles in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10 (1964/5).

they felt they had scored, and passing over in silence awkward moments; nor is it difficult, with our hindsight, to discern certain shortcomings in the attitudes of both sides, and to detect the reasons why the conversations failed to achieve the goal which Justinian had in mind. One may conclude with the hope that the modern successors of these good bishops will learn from the mistakes of their predecessors and achieve success where these had failed ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ For a preliminary presentation of the text published here see my "The Orthodox - Oriental Orthodox Conversations of 532", *Apostolos Varnavas* [Nicosia] 41 (1980), pp. 219-27. Justinian's conversations with Paul, the East Syrian bishop of Nisibis, probably belong to much later in his reign (562-3: see A. Guillaumont, "Justinien et l'église de Perse", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/4 (1969/70), pp. 39-66).

A MONOTHELETE FLORILEGIUM IN SYRIAC

Among his many contributions to the study of theological developments during the centuries immediately following the Council of Chalcedon Professor Albert van Roey has published a group of short Chalcedonian texts in Syriac — something of a rarity in this language¹; accordingly it will not be inappropriate to honour his 70th birthday by drawing attention to some sixth and seventh-century Chalcedonian excerpts to be found in a Syriac florilegium preserved incomplete in British Library Add. 14535.

Add. 14535 is written in a neat *serfo* dated by WRIGHT to the ninth century and contains a very miscellaneous assortment of texts². The acephalous florilegium with which we are here concerned is to be found on ff. 1a-20a, and this is the only item in the manuscript which takes up a specific christological position. According to WRIGHT it is 'a treatise against the Nestorians compiled by a Monophysite'. Likewise GUILLAUMONT, who published the interesting dialogue held before Justinian between a 'Nestorian' and an 'Orthodox' (ff. 16b-20a), also speaks of the text as 'd'origine monophysite'³. An examination, however, of the post-Chalcedonian writers cited in the course of the florilegium will quickly indicate that the author was a Chalcedonian, for we find cited a number of staunchly Chalcedonian writers: Pope Vigilius, the Patriarch Menas⁴, Justinian, St Symeon the Stylite of the Wonderful Mountain, Anastasios I, patriarch of Antioch, Heraklios and a certain George the monk who wrote against Severus and Julian.

Further scrutiny of the florilegium in fact provides an even closer definition of the compiler's theological stance, for, while the extant section headings are straightforwardly anti-Nestorian in character⁵,

¹ *Trois auteurs chalcédoniens syriens: Georges de Martyropolis, Constantin et Léon de Harran*, in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 3, 1972, p. 125-53; his opening remarks are very relevant. "L'apport des Melkites et des Maronites à la littérature syriaque a été minime si on le compare à celui des Jacobites et des Nestoriens. Ce qui nous en reste est d'autant plus précieux et mérite d'être recueilli soigneusement".

² W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue...*, no. DCCXCVIII (p. 796-9).

³ A. GUILLAUMONT, *Justinien et l'église de Perse*, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24, 1969-70, p. 41-66 (esp. 52).

⁴ Nicknamed "vessel (*mānā*) of wrath" by Michael the Syrian, *Chron.* IX, xxix.

⁵ Printed by WRIGHT, p. 796 (ch. 6: "A chapter showing, by means of testimonies of the holy fathers, that the holy Virgin Mary gave birth to God"; ch. 7: "a chapter showing ... that God was crucified for our sakes in the flesh").

the acephalous earlier part of the collection is clearly aimed against the doctrine of the two wills (ff. 1a-7b) and the two operations or energies (ff. 8a-12b) in Christ; in other words, we are dealing with a specifically monothelete florilegium. A note by the compiler on f. 12b makes the matter perfectly plain: "following this patristic opinion we understand one operation for Christ. That we should call 'two operations' the properties of the (two) natures and the things performed in them (*sc* the natures), as has pleased some — we have not found that the holy fathers employed such a usage, and likewise it does not seem to us to be correct and appropriate to the truth"⁶.

In the present article I publish those excerpts which are drawn from sixth-century writers, and leave aside for another time the quotation from Heraklios' *Ektthesis* and the fairly extensive extracts from George the monk.

First of all we may take a group of three which belong to around the time of the Fifth Council.

1. Pope Vigilius

On f. 9b we have the following excerpt:

ܕܗܠܝ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ

Of the holy Vigilius, patriarch of Rome, from the *libellon* to the emperor Justinian.

Whoever does not confess that God the Word was incarnate, that is to say Christ, that he is a single hypostasis (*qnōmā*) and a single person (*prosōpon*) and a single operation, him we anathematize.

This text can be identified as coming from Vigilius' letter to Justinian preserved in the Latin Acts of the Fifth Council; the corresponding Latin (*ACO* IV.1, p. 187³¹⁻³²)⁷ reads:

qui non confitetur incarnatum deum verbum, id est Christum, esse unam subsistentiam et unam personam et unam operationem, anathematizamus.

⁶ See also the compiler's note following the quotation from Symeon the Stylite (printed below).

⁷ Compare the passage (according to SCHWARTZ a later forgery) attributed to Vigilius in Liberatus, *Breviarium* 22 (= *ACO* II.5, p. 138⁸⁻¹¹).

questions (employing the logical dilemma known as 'Morton's fork') is of interest for the background of the argumentation employed in early *kalām* literature: see M. COOK, 'The origins of *kalām*', *Bulletin, School of Oriental and African Studies* 43, 1980, p. 32-43. These questions (which I hope to publish shortly) definitely belong to the period after 680/681 since they refer to 'your empty council'²⁴.

- (3) A hostile life of Maximos the Confessor, published in *Analecta Bollandiana* 91, 1973, p. 299-346. In contrast to the Greek life, the Syriac states that Maximos originated from Palestine; in the light of his subsequent career this is perfectly plausible²⁵.

In my editions of (1) and (3) I tried to indicate something of the importance of these texts for our understanding of the course of religious developments among the Chalcedonian communities in Syria/Palestine in the seventh and eighth centuries, and the light the two texts throw on the emergence of the Maronites as a separate Chalcedonian community²⁶. In the case of the present florilegium and the as yet unpublished questions we can perhaps gain a modicum of insight into some of the actual thinking behind the 'monothelete' position. And as with any theological dispute between two parties, resolution can only come through a balanced understanding of each side's true position (as opposed to the caricature projected by its opponents), combined with a sensitive awareness of what each side was primarily afraid of when it came to formulate its position.

²⁴ F. 67b; COOK publishes nos 2, 3 and 13 of the first set.

²⁵ For an appraisal of the new life, see I.H. DALMAIS, *La vie de S. Maxime le confesseur reconsiderée?*, in *Studia Patristica* 17,1, Oxford, 1982, p. 26-30.

²⁶ See also the survey by J. GRIBOMONT, *Documents sur les origines de l'Église Maronite*, in *Parole de l'Orient* 5, 1974, p. 95-132.

TWO SETS OF MONOTHELETE QUESTIONS TO THE MAXIMIANISTS

British Library Add. 7192, from which the texts published below are taken, combines two separate Syriac manuscripts, of very different origins:

- A. ff. 1-50 contain part of the theological polemic against Damian by Peter, the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch (†591). The hand is dated by WRIGHT to the seventh century; Berlin Sachau 201B was originally part of the same manuscript¹.
- B. ff. 51-78 contain a variety of texts, several of which are of specifically monothelete provenance:
- (1) ff. 51^a-57^b: fragment of the Julian 'Romance', published by HOFFMANN in *Julianos der Abtrünnige*, p. 242-59; cp NÖLDEKE in *ZDMG* 28 (1874), p. 660-74.
 - (2) ff. 57^b-65^b: astronomical and meteorological works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, published by KUGENER in *Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Paris, 1907, p. 137-98 (text: p. 146-64); the text on ff. 57^b-63^a was independently published by FURLANI in *JRAS* 1917, p. 245-72.
 - (3) f. 66^{ab}: a acephalous text explaining why 'we' reject the VIth Council (of 680/1), published by myself in *OC* 57 (1973), p. 65-71 = *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, London, 1984, ch. XIII.
 - (4) ff. 66^b-71¹: twenty six questions to be posed to the Maximianists on their belief in the two wills (in Christ), published below as text I.
 - (5) ff. 71^a-72^b: eleven questions to be posed to the Maximianoï on their belief in the two operations (in Christ), published below as text II.
 - (6) ff. 72^b-78^b: a (hostile) life of Maximus the Confessor, published by myself in *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 (1973), p. 299-346 = *Syriac Perspectives*, ch. XIII².

¹ See R. Y. EBIED, A. VAN ROEY and L. R. WICKHAM, *Peter of Callinicum: Anti-Tritheist Dossier* (OLA 10, 1981), p. 12-13.

² For some reactions to this text, which sheds new light on many episodes in Maximus'

This second part of the manuscript is dated by WRIGHT to the seventh or eighth century³; on internal evidence it must have been written after the Sixth Council of 680/1. Texts (3) - (6) are all manifestly written by adherents of the Council of Chalcedon who rejected the dyothelete teaching of the Sixth Council, which they associate above all with the name of Maximus (the Confessor); in other words these texts are of monothelite provenance.

Material from (6) is also to be found in two later Syrian Orthodox chronicles⁴, that of Michael the Syrian and that of the anonymous chronicler *ad annum* 1234; both these writers say that they drew their material on Maximus from a refutation of Maximus' 'heresy' by Shem'un, a priest of the (Syrian Orthodox) monastery of Qenneshre. The anonymous chronicler further adds that Shem'un had made use of 'Maronite books against the Maximians'. On this evidence we are justified in calling the Life of Maximus a Maronite work, and it is accordingly highly probable that the other texts in Add. 7192B are also of Maronite provenance. In my editions of (3) and (6) I tried to draw out something of the significance of this for the obscure period of the emergence of the Maronite Church as a separate Chalcedonian community⁵.

The two series of 'Questions', (4) and (5), which are published below, date from a time subsequent to the Sixth Council, to which the first set specifically refers (I.4 'that vain assembly of yours'; I.5 'the wicked decree of your concil'). Since, on palaeographical grounds, the manuscript can hardly date from more than about fifty or so years after the Council, and since the presence of certain scribal errors makes it very

life, as well as on his country of origin, see I. H. DALMAIS, *La vie de S. Maxime le confesseur reconsidérée?* in *Studia Patristica* 17, Oxford, 1982, p. 26-30, and J.-M. SANSTERRE in *Byzantion* 51 (1981), p. 653-7.

³ *Catalogue* ..., p. 126, correcting ROSEN-FORSHALL, *Catalogue*..., p. 83, where the separate origin of the two parts receives no mention. Failure to take note of WRIGHT's corrections has led several scholars (including A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn, 1922, p. 247) to assert that the texts in the second half are also of 'Jacobite' provenance.

⁴ See *An Early Syriac Life*..., p. 337-40, and A. GUILLAUMONT, *Les 'Kephalai Gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'Origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, Paris, 1962, p. 175-82.

⁵ This has been further developed by J. GRIBOMONT, *Documents sur les origines de l'Église Maronite*, in *Parole de l'Orient* 5 (1974), p. 95-132. For the monothelite florilegium in B.L. Add. 14535 see my *A monothelite florilegium in Syriac*, in *OLA* 18, Leuven 1985, p. 35-45.

unlikely that the manuscript is the compiler's autograph, it would seem quite probable that the questions were devised in the immediate aftermath of the Council (the same probably applies to (3), on the Council).

The questions are in the form of a series of logical dilemmas, whereby the questioner forces his opponent (who usually has to answer 'yes' or 'no') into a position where his own doctrinal formulation proves to be self-contradictory, and so untenable. The procedure normally takes the following pattern. First, the opponent is posed a question to which he has to answer 'yes' or 'no'. One of these answers (e.g. 'no') is usually manifestly untenable, in which case the interrogator is instructed 'If he says "yes", let him be further questioned'; whereupon another such question, requiring the answer 'yes' or 'no' is posed. Again, one of the answers will land the victim in a position of absurdity or blasphemy, while the other (which he will be forced to choose) will show — on his own admission — that his own theological position is logically untenable, whereas that of his opponent alone follows the dictates of this form of dialectic.

This dialectic technique seems to have gained a considerable popularity in certain circles during the sixth and seventh centuries, and it was of course especially suited for public confrontations⁶. Thus, in the first half of the sixth century Simeon of Beth Arsham, or Simeon 'the debater' (*dārōshā*) as he was popularly known, caused endless consternation to the local clergy of the Church of the East by turning up unexpectedly all over the place and demanding theological disputations — whose outcome was always a foregone conclusion, given Simeon's great dialectic skill⁷. As the Zoroastrian umpire at one such debate commented to the poor victim of Simeon's onslaught of theological dialectics (no less a person than the Catholicos Babai, John of Ephesus tells us)⁸,

⁶ Compare C. MOELLER, 'La scholastique de l'époque se manifeste de deux manières: l'utilisation des Catégories d'Aristote, dans la version de Porphyre [i.e. the *Eisagoge*], aux fins d'interpréter les formules dogmatiques litigieuses, et l'emploi du genre didactique "Questions et réponses", pour exposer les problèmes et les résoudre' (*Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en orient de 451 à la fin du VI^e siècle*, in A. GRILLMEIER and H. BACHT, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon I*, Würzburg, 1951, p. 639). The technique of *reductio ad absurdum* is called *mawblānūtā da-lwāt škirātā* by Nonnus of Nisibis (9th century; *WRIGHT, Catalogue*, p. 619).

⁷ John of Ephesus, *Lives of Eastern Saints* X (PO 17, p. 144-52).

⁸ PO 17, p. 151. My colleague Dr F. W. Zimmermann draws my attention to a pagan antecedent in Eunapius, *Lives of the Sophists* V.3.4 (an episode involving Iamblichus and ὁ διαλεκτικώτατος Ἀλύπιος).

By the words you have spoken you have refuted and condemned yourself; and men who are fewer than you hold the true and sound logical position, and the thing is as they say by your own testimony.

Several sets of these theological questions, demanding the answer 'yes' or 'no', survive in Syriac. Thus, for example, B.L.Add. 12155, a 'volume of demonstrations from the holy fathers against various heresies'⁹, contains questions of this sort posed by Syrian Orthodox both to Chalcedonians (ff. 128^a, 188^b) and to Julianists (ff. 180^b-82^b); since many of the texts in this eighth-century manuscript belong to the second half of the sixth century, this may well apply to the questions as well. From the Chalcedonian side one might adduce some of the texts in Sinai syr. 10, recently edited by BETTILOLO¹⁰ (texts I, II, IV, VII, VIII, XI-XIII, XXI-XXII), while a dated example from the Church of the East is provided by the documents accompanying the assembly of bishops in 612 (CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale*, p. 569 = 587, 573 = 590).

Although this form of argumentation cannot be considered a very satisfactory (let alone attractive) mode of conducting theological debates in our own age, rather more open to ecumenical encounter, it nevertheless turns out to have considerable historical interest, in that it was evidently a dialectic technique which was taken over in the early Muslim *kalām* literature; indeed, in a recent article COOK has pointed explicitly to these two sets of questions in Add. 7192 as prime examples of the genre¹¹.

One curious feature of the questions in Add. 7192 should be noted: although the compiler usually commences each section as if he were providing a set of instructions directed towards the interrogator, telling him how to proceed, he then frequently goes on to address the opponents, who are being questioned, directly in the 2nd person plural.

Is the Syriac text a translation from Greek? As is often the case with seventh-century Syriac literature, it is not possible to give a firm answer to this question. There are, however, two small indications which suggest that the work was probably compiled in Syriac (even though the

⁹ On these see R. DRAGUET, *Julien d'Halicarnasse*, Louvain, 1924, p. 86-7. M. COOK (title in note 11) already adduced Add. 12155 in this context, along with several other texts. Cp also PO 14, p. 754-8 (anti-tritheist texts).

¹⁰ CSCO 403-4 = *Scr. Syri* 177-8, 1979. See also the Chalcedonian texts ed. by A. VAN ROEY, in OLP 3 (1972), p. 137, 142.

¹¹ *The origins of kalām*, in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980), 32-43. COOK publishes I.2,3 and 13.

framework of reference for the topic manifestly has its roots in a Greek-speaking milieu):

- (1) The biblical quotations (not always very accurate) seem to reflect the wording of the Peshitta (see notes 37, 39, 40, 42, 50).
- (2) The use of the infinitive for purposes of emphasis (the so-called 'tautological infinitive'¹², corresponding in function to the Classical Hebrew infinitive absolute) occurs in I.12, and this is not a feature which one would expect in seventh-century translation style, where mirror versions are the norm¹³.

Text and translation

The text contains a few manifest errors which have been corrected in the edition below: in every case the manuscript's reading has been given in the apparatus. In I.8, II.1 and II.6 a word has been written twice, over a line break; the first occurrence in each case was then subsequently crossed out. In I.21 and 22 a negative has evidently intruded, while in I.18 a negative must have fallen out. Twice (II.10 and 11) **d'yn* has been corrupted to *dyn*. The rubrication for II.8 has been provided in the wrong place. For the spelling of 'yn 'yes', the edition follows the usage of the scribe (normally 'n)¹⁴.

The translation has deliberately been kept rather literal, and the following equivalents have regularly been employed¹⁵:

will, to will ܟܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܟܘܢܘܢܐ (θέλημα, θέλειν)
gnomic will ܟܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܟܘܢܘܢܐ (θέλημα γνομικόν)
volition ܟܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܟܘܢܘܢܐ (probably βούλησις rather than εὐδοκία which *mestabyānūtā* translates in the Harklean)

equality of volition ܟܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܟܘܢܘܢܐ

(Maximus uses the terms συμβουλή (see *Quaestiones et Dubia*, ed. J.H. DECLERCK, index) and ταυτοβουλία (e.g. PG 91, 192C), rather than συνευδοκία, so it is perhaps best to see συμβουλή as the model for this calque where *šawwūt* probably represents συν- rather than ὁμο-)

¹² Cp G. GOLDENBERG, *Tautological infinitive*, in *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971), esp. p. 47-59.

¹³ See my *Towards a history of Syriac translation technique*, in OCA 221 (1983), p. 1-14.

¹⁴ The same variation 'yn/'n also occurs in Sinai Syr. 10 (of 8th or 9th century): BETTILOLO in CSCO 403 = *Scr. Syri* 177, p. 7* note 7.

¹⁵ In brackets I give the corresponding Greek term.

the Father was (willing it), then he is positing for the will of the flesh an opposition to the will of the Father and our salvation. And what is more disgraceful²⁷ and wrong than this?

2. Did Satan will the Son of God to die and our nature to be saved by his death? Yes or no?

And if they say 'He willed it', then Satan has the same will as the Father — which is most shocking. But if they say 'He did not will it', then let them be further asked: 'Did the human will of the Son will to die and save us? Yes or no?' And if it did will this, why did he pray that the cup of death might pass from him²⁸? For it is shocking that someone should be praying (for something) contrary to his own will and be striving against his own self, especially in prayer.

But if they say 'It did not will this', then here too is something very shocking, for it turns out not to be willing our salvation, and it is, in this, in opposition to the will of the Father who did not spare his Son²⁹, but rather delivered him up on behalf of us all. There is also found, according to your word(s) something very shocking and fearful to utter — that this will separated and drove itself back from equality of volition with Satan³⁰.

3. This human will that you confess, is it good or bad?

And if good, why did he say 'Let it not be...'³¹ For according to your opinion, Christ was not willing what was good when he was seeking to render ineffective his good will and said 'Let it not be...'

But if they say that it is bad, it is obviously shocking and cannot be covered up.

<4.> Did the human will that you confess have a mind (*tar'itā*) or thoughts? Yes or no?

And if they say 'Yes', then you are splitting up the Son of God, and you are confessing two minds and are confessing a gnostic will, and not a natural one, and you are found to be in opposition to your teachers and to the leader of your schism, I mean Maximus your master, and (in opposition) to that vain assembly of yours which defined and spoke of natural wills, and not gnostic ones, in Christ³².

And since you say that there is a human mind and thoughts in Christ, let the holy Athanasius rebuke you, who said³⁷ '(Quite) separate from the will of the

²⁷ Or 'absurd' (and passim).

²⁸ Luke 22:42.

²⁹ Romans 8:32.

³⁰ COOK (see note 11) translates '... and removed itself [from the Messiah] through its agreement with Satan'.

³¹ Luke 22:42.

³² Compare §3 of the Maronite critique of the Sixth Council (text (3) in Add. 7192B). The Sixth Council indeed speaks of two 'natural wills' in Christ and appears not to use the term 'gnostic will' at all. Maximus held that the θέλημα φυσικόν belonged to the level of φύσις or λόγος, and that consequently Christ had two 'natural wills', but that the θέλημα γνωμικόν belonged only to the level of τρόπος, and so did not apply to Christ.

³³ Ps. Athanasius, c. *Apollinarium* II.10 (PG 26, 1148C): (ἐν ἐπιδείξει σαρκός) δίχα σαρκικῶν θελημάτων καὶ λογισμῶν ἀνθρώπων. The passage is also quoted by Maximus, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 320B.

flesh and human thoughts' was the establishment of our nature in the hypostasis (*qnōmeh*) of God the Word.

And if they say that that human will which they confess does not have a mind and thought, then it is something beastlike, and they confess him to be animal-like, and turn out to be of the same mind as Apollinarius.

5. The name of Jesus Christ, to what does it refer, to the hypostasis (*qnōmā*) or to the nature?

And if they say 'To the nature', either they are confessing three natures in the Trinity, like Arius, or they are saying the entire Trinity was embodied, like Sabellius.

But if they say 'It indicates the hypostasis (*qnōmā*)', then it is the hypostasis (*qnōmā*) which wills and operates, and not the nature; and that council of yours is false in that it said³⁴ 'Each one of the natures wills and operates what belongs to it(self)', and you are found to be confessing, like the wicked decree of your council, three who will and operate.

6. Did the nature will (it) and become embodied, or the hypostasis (*qnōmā*)?

And if you say 'The hypostasis (*qnōmā*)', while speaking of the will as natural³⁵, you are found to be confessing three wills.

But if it was not the hypostasis (*qnōmā*) which willed (it) and became embodied, but rather the nature, then either you are embodying the whole Trinity, like Sabellius, or you are confessing three natures, like Arius.

7. This human will that you confess in Christ, which you describe as having desire and not having authority over itself — tell us, what is its desire? Towards what does it have a yearning? But perhaps you will say, as is your wont, that it desires the life here, and (refer to) its unwillingness to die; and so, because of this, you say that it was afraid and begging off death, while desiring the life here. Then tell us, out of love for the truth, does he (Christ) have this desirous will today, and does he (now) desire and yearn with a yearning for life? Yes or no?

And if they say 'Yes', then they are confessing him to be still lacking (something), and placed under fear and dread; and he turns out to be for them in the rank(s) of the sinners and the wicked who, after the resurrection, are under fear and dread of Gehenna.

8. Are the Father and Son equal in divine will, and are they one in divine will? Yes or no?

And if they say 'Yes', let them be further questioned: 'This human will which you confess that Christ assumed, did he assume it so that it might be equal with him and with the Father in volition, or in order that it might be opposed in volition? And if it was so that it might be equal in volition, why at the time of the Passion, when the divine will was willing and in readiness, was the human will running away and begging off?'

Again, if it was that it might be equal with him in volition, then, according to your word(s), since you confess it to be a natural (will), you are confessing him to be one nature, and so you prove to be Jacobites.

³⁴ MANSI XI, 639A (dogmatic decree in session 18): ... ἐκατέραν φύσιν θέλαιν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἴδια.

³⁵ I.e. as belonging to the nature.

But if he assumed it so that it might be opposing him in volition, then you are confessing an enmity and opposition in the Christ who is our peace³⁶!

9. Because you are continually saying this, that you are not talking of two autonomous wills — lest, as a result of this, you divide up the Son of God and confess numerically two authorities; but, rather, you confess them to be natural wills that are desirous and yearn, (this being so), recognize well that a nature naturally yearns for and desires that which it is capable of receiving, while it runs away from and begs off that which harms it. Now tell us, who are questioning you, when you speak of two natural wills, having yearning and desire, the one yearning for and desiring death, and the other begging off and running away (from it), which do you say received death — the one which was longing for it, or the one begging off it? And if you say the one that was begging off it, then death was in opposition to them both, and the will of one of them was not fulfilled.

10. That nature which was longing for death, was it desirous and longing for death as one about to receive death, or as one going to impose it upon another?

And if as (one) going to receive it, then you turn out to be Theopaschites. But if as one who was not himself going to receive death, but who was going to impose it upon another, then you place Emmanuel among the rank(s) of the Scribes and Pharisees who tie up heavy burdens and place them on the shoulders of others, while they themselves do not even touch them with their finger³⁷.

11. Again we ask: That nature which was begging off death, did it know if it was possible that the cup of death might pass from it³⁸, or did it not know?

And if it did know, why was it praying, knowing that it was not possible?

But if it did not know, how is it not inferior to the prophets, who indicated concerning his Passion and his death, pointing out the Emmanuel?

12. That nature which was begging off death, when it received death, did it completely change and receive death willingly? Or did it remain in its state of begging off, without change, even though it suffered?

And if it completely changed, then they are confessing a changeable will.

13. Do you say that there is one mind (*tar'itā*) in Christ, or two?

And if one, let them be asked: 'Are these two wills set in motion from this one mind?' And if they say 'Yes', how is it possible for two wills to be set in motion from a single mind?

But if they say 'Two', that is shocking.

14. Are the two wills equal in volition, or opposed in volition?

And if equal in volition, then, just as those equal in nature are a single nature, so those equal in volition are a single will.

But if they are opposed in volition, that is most shocking.

15. It is written 'I came down from heaven, not to do my will...' ³⁹.

This will, since he did not come down to perform it, what did he will? Good or bad?

And if good, then he did not come down to do good. And if bad, then you are confessing a bad will in Christ.

16. This human will which you speak of in Christ, did he operate it, or did he not operate it?

And if he operated it, how did he say that he had not come to do it?

And if he did not operate it, why? Because it was wanting something bad or something good? And if good, then, according to your word(s), full of blasphemy, he was not willing something good. And if bad, then you are confessing a bad will in Christ.

17. These two wills which you confess in Christ: are they both operative, or does the one operate, while the other does not?

Now if they say that the two of them operate, how did he say 'I came down from heaven, not to do my will...?'³⁹ But if one operates and the other does not, then one is authoritative and master and operative, while the other is bound, not authoritative, and subordinate. But tell us, subordinate of his (own) will, or by compulsion?

18. This human will which was not willing to die, did it change and suffer willingly, or did it remain in the same (disposition of) will and suffer out of compulsion, while not willing it?

And if it did <not> change, then it suffered under compulsion, and without willing it. And what blasphemy surpasses this?

19. This human will, was it willing those things which God the Word willed, or not?

And if it was willing (them), did it will them of its own will, or not of its own will?

And if of its own will, then it was authoritative; but if not of its own will, then (it is) from compulsion, and one is the subordinator and the other the subordinated; one is the servant, and the other the master; one directs through compulsion, the other is directed by compulsion. And all this is sufficient to you (to show up) your shame.

20. It is written in the Gospel 'He who does the will of my Father is my brother and my sister and my mother'⁴⁰. This human will, was it doing the will of the Father or not?

If it was doing (it), why did it pray that the cup might pass from it?⁴¹ — And (thus) the Father was willing it, but it was begging off and running away (from it).

But if it was not willing (it), (then) it is not his neighbour, nor associate, in any way at all.

21. It is written in the Gospel 'It is right that the Son of Man should be crucified'⁴². This human will, was it willing to be crucified, or not?

³⁶ Eph. 2:14.

³⁷ Matt. 23:4 (Peshitta, with wording slightly adapted).

³⁸ Luke 22:42.

³⁹ John 6:38 (Peshitta).

⁴⁰ Matt. 12:50 and Mark 3:35 (the compiler fuses the Peshitta wording of the two parallel passages).

⁴¹ Luke 22:42.

⁴² Not an exact quotation: compare Mark 8:3, Luke 9:22 and 17:25 (all with the verb

And if not, then it was willing things which were not right.

But if it was willing (it), why did he pray that the cup might pass away from him⁴³?

22. The man who wills in accord with the will of God, (does he do so) well or badly?

If well, then the person who does not will in accord with the will of God, wills badly. Then the will of Christ⁴⁴ was also acting badly, in that it was not willing in accord with the will of God — according to your word(s) filled with blasphemy.

23. It is written that we should pray that his will come to pass⁴⁵.

Which of these two wills are you praying to come to pass, the divine one or the human? And if the human, how is it that he (himself) did not perform it, while you are praying that it should come to pass.

But if the divine, then the other was despised and rejected.

24. The holy Mar John Chrysostomos said⁴⁶ 'The cross (is) the will of the Father, the glory of the Son, and the splendour of the Holy Spirit'.

Did this human will show willing on the cross, or not? And if it did, why did he pray that (the cup) should pass by?

But if he did not will (it), then it was not willing in accord with the will of the Father, nor (did it will) the glory of the Son, nor the splendour of the Holy Spirit, and it turns out to be in opposition to the Holy Trinity.

25. Does the human will belong to the nature or to the hypostasis (*qnōmāyā*)?

And if to the nature, how so, seeing that we and you are a single nature, but we are not (of) a single will?

26. The holy John Chrysostomos said as follows, as though from the mouth of our Lord to Peter, in the Commentary on Matthew, in Book 54⁴⁷: 'Do you imagine that it is a shameful thing for me to suffer? I am telling you that my not suffering is the will of the devil'.

This human will, was it willing that he should die, or not? And if it was willing, then its will and the Father's are one.

But if it was not willing, according to the word of the teacher (i.e. John Chrysostom) it willed in accord with the devil.

'suffer'). In all these passages the Peshitta renders *dei* by *'attid d-*; contrast, however, Luke 24:46 where *zādeq* is used (as here), but there 'Christ' (not 'the Son of Man') is subject, and the verb is again 'suffer'.

⁴³ Luke 22:42. The manuscript erroneously has a negative, 'that the cup might *not* pass away'.

⁴⁴ Ms *šbynh 'l d-mšyh*: I can make no sense of 'l' in this position and assume that it is an error (the scribe is changing to a new column at this point).

⁴⁵ Matt. 6:19, Luke 11:2 (the compiler seems to forget that this is addressed to the Father!)

⁴⁶ John Chrysostom, *Sermo de Coemeterio et de Cruce*, PG 49, 396 (end): σταυρος τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς θέλημα, ἢ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς δόξα, τὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀγαλλίαμα.

⁴⁷ PG 58, 537 (top): σὺ μὲν γὰρ νομίζεις, ὅτι ἀνάξιον μοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ παθεῖν · ἐγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω, ὅτι τὸ μὴ παθεῖν με τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου γνώμης ἐστίν.

II Again, questions concerning the two operations, against the erring Maximians.

1. To what is the operation attached? To the nature or to the hypostasis (*qnōmā*)?

And if to the nature, then let them say: in the case of all humanity, are they either wicked or just in that they are all of one nature?

And again, if to the hypostasis, then you are saying there are two hypostaseis just as there are two operations.

2. To what is the operation attached? To the nature or to the hypostasis?

And if they say 'To the nature', then let them be asked 'Are these two natures preserved in Christ to-day, or not?' And if they are preserved, let them be (further) questioned 'Does he operate two operations to-day, or one?' And if two, let them show that they are.

And if they say '(The operation) belongs to the hypostasis', then just as the hypostasis is one, so the operation is also one.

3. What is this human operation which you confess in Christ?

And if they say 'The one referring to "He wept"⁴⁸, and the one referring to "He wearied and was fatigued"⁴⁹, then let them be asked 'Are these in him to-day, or are they not?' And if they are, then he is still subject to suffering and he has not been raised above sufferings, according to your word(s).

4. Does the operation exist naturally, and does he who operates it operate it naturally? Yes or no?

And if he says 'Naturally', then someone is operating naturally when he performs a good deed and when he performs a bad one, according to your word(s), O Manichean!

And if it is the hypostasis which operates, then there are two operative hypostaseis, corresponding to your confession of two operations.

5. Is there an operation that has no power which sets it in motion so that it acts?

And if they say that a power sets in motion every operation so that it acts, how is it you do not speak of two powers, corresponding to the two operations? And if they say that (this) is so, let them declare (it).

6. Is it believed by you, and firm for you, and do you confess with the holy Fathers, that the divinity of our Lord is united to his humanity (even) more than the soul is united to the body? Yes or no?

And if they say 'Yes', let them be asked 'Does this human being, who even though united will be dissolved and separated, operate a single operation, or two?'

And if two, then Christ was operating three.

And if one, how did he who was united inseparably not operate a single operation?

7. The name 'Jesus' and 'Christ', what do they indicate? Nature or hypostasis?

And if the nature, how is it you do not confess a single nature, like the Jacobites?

⁴⁸ Luke 19:41; cp John 11:35.

⁴⁹ Cp John 4:6.

And if the hypostasis, then it, and not the nature, wills and operates.

8. Our Lord said 'I cannot do anything of my own accord, except what the Father does'⁵⁰.

Does the Father (then) operate the human operation, or not? And if he does not operate (it), then neither does the Son.

But if the Son operates it, then so does the Father — unless you make them liars.

9. Does the body of Christ operate the human operation, or was it raised to the divine operation?

And if the body operates its own operation, then this (eucharistic) Body which we receive operates the operation of ordinary bread. Why then do you name it 'life-effecting'?

But if it operates the divine operation, (then) there is a single divine operation.

10. Can there be an operation outside whatever operates it, or not?

And if 'Yes', let them demonstrate (it).

But if it is not possible, then there are two operators, and you are confessing two Christs and two Sons.

11. Is it assured with you that the divinity is united to the humanity even more than fire is united with iron? Yes or no?

And if: 'Yes', let them be asked 'Does iron operate the operation of fire when it is united to the latter, or not?' And if 'Yes', how much more does the body of our Lord operate divinely, having been united to God the word.

The questions are ended.

Apollinarius **I.4**

Arius **I.5-6**

Athanasius **I.4**

Council (Vith) **I.4-5**

Jacobites **I.8, II.7**

John Chrysostom **I.24,26**

Maximianists, Maximians **I** title, **II** title

Maximus **I.4**

Pharisees **I.10**

Sabellius **I.5-6**

Scribes **I.10**

Theopaschites **I.10.**

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

(see end of Preface for cross references)

Study I: Syriac Historical Writing

p.4, line 5: For the Chronicle of Edessa see now W. Witakowski, 'Chronicles of Edessa', *Orientalia Suecana* 33/35 (1984/6), pp.487-98.

p.6: For the *Lives* see now S.A. Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis. John of Ephesus and the Lives of the Eastern Saints* (Berkeley, 1990), and for the *Ecclesiastical History*, E. Honigmann, 'L'histoire ecclésiastique de Jean d'Ephèse', *Byzantion* 14 (1939), pp.615-25.

p.7 (5): For an annotated translation of this and other Syriac historical texts for the seventh century see A.N. Palmer, *In the Shadow of the Moon: the Seventh Century in Syriac Chronicles and Apocalypses* (Liverpool, forthcoming).

p.10, note 11: = Ch. VIII below.

p.11, note 13: This Syriac material needs to be used in the light of P. Peeters' critique, *Analecta Bollandiana* 41 (1923), pp.369-85.

p.11, note 14: See also A.N. Palmer, 'Who wrote the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite?', in R. Schulz and M. Görg (eds), *Lingua Restituta Orientalis: Festgabe für Julius Assfalg* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 20; Wiesbaden, 1990), pp.272-84.

p.13, note 16: See now W. Witakowski, *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 9, 1987).

p.21, note 28: see now P.Y. Dolabani, *Die Patriarchen der syrisch-orthodoxen Kirche von Antiochien* [in Syriac] (Glane, 1990).

p.25, line 6: There is now a photographic edition, with German translation, by P. Kawerau in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 467-8, Scr. Syri 199-200 (1985).

p.25 (24): A new edition of the Anonymous Chronicle, with translation and commentary, by L.A. Conrad, M. Whitby and S.P. Brock is in preparation.

⁵⁰ John 5:19 and 30 (the Peshitta wording of the two verses has been run together).

p.26, line 6: An English translation of Bk XV is now available, see Ch.II below.

p.30: A recent survey is provided by P. Nagel, 'Grundzüge syrischer Geschichtsschreibung', in F. Winkelmann and W. Brandes, *Quellen zur Geschichte des frühen Byzanz (4.-9. Jahrhundert)* (Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten 55 (1990), pp.245-59.

Study II: North Mesopotamia

p.54, note 17: P.J. Alexander's translation is now published in his *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley, 1985).

p.57, note b: For the Life of Gabriel, see now A.N. Palmer, *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier: The Early History of Tur 'Abdin* (Cambridge, 1990).

Study III: Syriac Inscriptions

Some additions are provided by A.J.P. Desreumaux in *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 40 (1980), pp.704-8. Subsequent bibliography can be found in my 'Syriac studies 1981-1985, a classified bibliography', *Parole de l'Orient* 14 (1987), pp.321-2; cf also A.N. Palmer, 'A corpus of inscriptions from Tur 'Abdin and environs', *Oriens Christianus* 71 (1987), pp.53-139.

Study V: A Piece of Wisdom Literature

p.212: Harvard Syr. 47 (Accn 3985) now has a new shelf-mark, Harvard Syr. 59.

p.216, note 1: The Queen of Sheba's Questions are now published in *Le Muséon* 92 (1979), pp.331-45.

Study VI: Syriac and Greek Hymnography

p.81 (4): For this aspect see now W.L. Petersen, *The Diatessaron and Ephrem Syrus as Sources of Romanos the Melodist* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 475, Subsidia 74, 1985), and my 'From Ephrem to Romanos', *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989), pp.139-51.

Study VII: A Syriac Collection

p.211, note 30: Now published, *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984), pp.77-90.

p.238, note 70: For the presence of the same passage in Codex Laudianus (Bodl.Laud.gr.35) see C. Mango, 'La culture grecque et l'occident au VIIIe siècle', reprinted in his *Byzantium and its Image* (Variorum Reprints, 1984), ch.VI.

Study VIII: The Laments

p.217 (d): There is now a new edition by G. Reinink in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 454-5, Scr.Syri 195-6 (1983).

Study IX: Secundus the Silent Philosopher

p.96, note 18: Now published, *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985), pp.114-20.

p.96, note 19: Isaac is included only in the Russian edition of the Philocalia. Tables showing the correspondence between the Syriac and Greek chapters can now also be found in [D. Miller], *The Ascetical Homilies of St Isaac the Syrian translated by the Holy Transfiguration Monastery* (Boston, 1984), pp.CXIII-CXV.

INDEX

- Aaron: IV 217
 Aba, archdeacon: XII 127
 'Abd al-Malik: II 54, 66
 'Abd al-Rahman ibn Ziyad: II 64, 65
 Abdemon: V 215
 'Abdisho': I 21; X 3
 Abel: IV 217, 225-7
 Abha, patr.: XI 26; XII 126-7, 134-5, 138
 Abraham: IV 220, 229; VII 233
 Abraham of Nisibis: I 22
 Abraham, Rabban: XII 129
 Abraham, bp of Resafa: XIV 44
 Abu Bakr: I 8
 Abu Qarib: II 66
 Abu'lfaraj: *see* Barhebraeus
 Abyssinians: VII 244
 Acacius: XIII 104, 106
 Acacius, catholicus: XII 130
 Acacius, patr. Cp: XIII 114
 Adam: IV 217, 221-3; XI 12-16, 18-22;
 XII 134, 140
 Addai: VII 212
 Addai of Basebrina: I 21
 Addai, Doctrine of: XI 15, 18, 23
 Adiabene: IV 219
 Aesop: V 214-5
 Africa: VII 230
 Ahiqar: V 214-5, 217; VII 212
 Akindynos: VII 209
 Alan, gates of: II 58
 Alexander the Great: I 7, 10; VIII *passim*
 Alexandria: VIII 214; XII 126; XIII 108,
 110, 112
 Amasis: V 215
 Amelios: VII 205, 208, 230, 240
 Amid: I 4-5, 10-11, 21
 Ammianus: I 27; IV 229-30
 Anastasius: I 5
 Anastasius I, patr.: XIV 35, 40-42, 44
 Andrew of Samosata: XI 25
 Annianus: I 27; IV 229-30
 Anomoeans: XII 137
 Anthimus of Trebizond: XIII 92, 117
 Antioch: I 20; IV 214; XII 127; XIII 108,
 114
 Aphrahat: IV 218, 221, 225-6; VI 79;
 XI 15, 18, 21, 23-4
 Apollinarius: XII 131, 138; XV 135
 Apollo: VII 205-6, 208, 229-30, 240
 Apophis: V 214
 Aquila: IV 225
 'Aqla: II 66
 'Aqulaye: II 65, 66
 Ararat: IV 213-4
 Arbela: I 22-3
 Ardashir III: I 8
 Argonauts: VII 229
 Arians: II 67
 Aristotle: VII 203; VIII 208, 211; X 3, 12;
 XV 121
 Aristotle, Ps.: X 2
 Arius: XII 136-7; XV 135
 Armenia Prima: VII 209
 Asclepius: VII 228
 Assyria: V 214
 Athanasius: XIII 106; XIV 39; XV 134
 Athanasius of Balad: X 10
 Athos: VII 203
 Avaris: V 214-5
 'Azzuz: VII 233, 235

 Baalbek Oracle: VII 207, 242
 Baba: VII 205, 208, 210, 212, 233, 235-6,
 244
 Babai the Great: XI 25; XII 127-8, 130-1,
 135, 141
 Babai, catholicus: XV 121
 Babylon: VII 235; VIII 214
 Bardaisan: VI 77, 79-80
 Barhaddeshabba: I 21-2, 28
 Barhebraeus: I 1, 8, 15, 17, 19-21, 28;
 VII 205, 211; VIII 214, 216
 Barlaam: VII 233, 236
 Barlaha stratelates: XIV 42
 Baršauma, brother of Barhebraeus: I 21
 Baršauma, bp of Nisibis: XII 126, 128, 130
 Baršauma, monastery: I 18
 Basebrina: I 13
 Basil of Caesarea: X 3, 11
 Basil bar Shumana: I 18
 Beth Lapat: XII 126, 130
 Bonifatius: XIII 100

- Cain: IV 217, 219, 225–7
 Callisthenes, Ps.: VIII 205–6, 214–6
 Cappadocia: II 58
 Cave of Treasures: IV 227–8
 Chalcedon, Council of: XII 126, 129–30, 132; XIII 89, 96, 98, 100, 102, 116, 119
 Cheilon: VII 203
 Chosroes II: II 57, 59; XII 127
 Chronicle, Anonymous (Khuzistan, ed. Guidi): I 25, 28; II 53, 56
 Chronicle of Arbela: I 23–5, 28; II 51
 Chronicle, Ps. Dionysius: *see* Chronicle of Zuqnin
 Chronicle of Edessa: I 3–4, 28
 Chronicle, Maronite: I 7, 28; VIII 218
 Chronicle, Melkite: I 7, 28
 Chronicle of Seert: I 2
 Chronicle, Ps. Zacharias: I 4–5, 15–6, 28; IV 223
 Chronicle of Zuqnin: I 6, 10–13, 28; VIII 216
 Chronicle to year 724: I 9, 28
 Chronicle to year 813: I 13, 28
 Chronicle to year 819: I 13, 28
 Chronicle to year 846: I 14, 28
 Chronicle to year 1234: I 17–8, 28; II 56, 61, 63; IV 224; VIII 218; XV 120
 Cicero: X 5
 Clement of Alexandria: VII 204
 Constantine: I 6, 8; VII 242
 Constantine of Edessa: X 3
 Constantinople: XII 127, 140; XIII 87, 89, 94; XIV 38
 Cosmas Indicopleustes: XII 126
 Crete: II 58
 Ctesiphon: *see* Seleucia
 Cyprus: X 2
 Cyril of Alexandria: VII 204, 206, 239–41; X 2, 6; XII 131; XIII 89, 98, 100, 103–4, 106, 116, 119
 Cyrus, bp: XIV 38
 Cyrus of Batna: I 16
 Cyrus of Edessa: XI 17, 26; XII 128
 Cyzicus: VII 205, 208, 229, 232
 Damian: XV 119
 Dante: IV 217
 Dara: I 6
 Darius: VIII 213, 216
 David: XII 141
 David, bp: I 13
 Demetrius: VIII 208, 212
 Demetrius, bp of Philippi: XIII 117
 Didymus: VII 204
 Diodore: XII 128; XIII 116
 Diogenes: VIII 214
 Dionysius bar Šalibi: I 4, 16; VII 205, 211–3, 243, 245
 Dionysius, Ps.: *see* Chronicle of Zuqnin
 Dionysius, Ps. the Areopagite: X 2; XII 132; XIII 95; XV 119
 Dionysius of Telmahre: I 10, 14–6, 28
 Dios: V 215
 Dioscorus, patr.: XIII 94, 96, 117, 119
 Edessa: I 3, 11, 15, 17–8; IV 219; XII 128, 130
 Egypt: II 58; V 214; XI 21
 Elias of Nisibis: I 8, 26–8, II 56
 Elisha of Zuqnin: I 11
 En Geddi: IV 214
 Enoch: IV 217, 224, 230–1
 Ephesus, I Council of: XII 126, 129; XIII 93, 98–9, 104, 106
 Ephesus, II Council of: XIII 89
 Ephesus, Seven Sleepers of: I 4, 11
 Ephrem: IV 218–21, 223, 225–7, 231; VI 77–81; VII 243; XI 13, 15, 19–27, 31–2; XII 135
 Ephrem, Ps.: VIII 217
 Epiphanius, Ps.: VIII 217
 Epiphanius, patr. of Cp: XIII 93
 Esha'ya: I 21
 Eulogius (1): XIII 104
 Eulogius (2): XIV 39
 Eunapius: XV 121
 Eunomius, Eunomians: II 67; XII 131
 Eunomius of Nicomedia: XIII 102
 Euphrates: II 66
 Eusebius: I 1, 8, 10, 16, 27; VII 240; X 3, 6, 11
 Euthalius: I 10
 Eutyches, Eutychians: I 4; XII 136, 138; XIII 89, 94, 96, 116–7, 119
 Eutychius: VIII 207–8, 211, 214–5
 Evagrius: X 5
 Eve: IV 217, 221–2; XI 12–3, 19
 Ezekiel: IV 217
 Ezekiel, catholicus: XI 26
 Flavian: XIII 119
 Gabriel, archangel: XII 134
 Gabriel of Qartmin: II 57
 Gabriel of Sinjar: XII 127
 Gamaliel: I 4
 George, chorepiscopus: I 10
 George, patr.: II 65; IX 96

- George, bp of the Arabs: X 3
 George the monk: XIV 35–6, 44
 Gregory I, patr.: XII 127
 Gregory of Nazianzus: X 2, 6; XIII 104; XIV 39
 Hadrian, emperor: IX 100
 Hagar: II 53, 57, 59–60
 Harmonius: VI 77, 79–80
 Harran: I 13–4; IV 216; VII 205, 208–10, 232–4, 244
 Hatem, king of Cilicia: I 21
 Hatra: IV 219
 Henana: XII 132
 Henanisho', patr.: II 52
 Heraclianus: XIII 92
 Heraclius: I 7–8, 19; XII 129; XIV 35–6
 Hermes Trismegistos: VII 205–6, 208, 228, 230–1
 Hezekiah: IV 217
 Hippolytus, Ps.: XI 16
 Hiram: V 215
 Honorios: VII 209
 Honorios, pope: XIV 38
 Hormisdas, House of: XIII 92
 Hunayn ibn Ishaq: VIII 205–6, 208
 Hypatius, bp of Ephesus: XIII 92, 94, 96, 98, 104, 117, 120
 Ibas: XIII 89, 98, 100, 102–3, 104, 106, 116, 119
 Ibrahim: II 66
 Ignatius of Melitene: I 16
 Innocentius of Maronia: XIII 88–9, 92–3, 96, 98, 106–8, 117–20
 Isaac of Antioch: XI 27
 Isaac of Nineveh: IX *passim*
 Isha': *see* Joshua
 Isha'dad of Merv: IV 220, 229; XI 26
 Isha'yahb I: XII 127, 137–8
 Isha'yahb II: XII 129
 Isha'yahb III: II 54
 Isha'zkha, bp: IV 230
 Ishtar: IV 222; XI 14
 Iwannis of Kaisum: I 16
 Iyaros: VII 209
 Jacob of Edessa: I 8, 16, 28; IV 223–4; X 3, 10
 Jacob of Serugh: IV 221, 226, 229; VII 244; VIII 217; XI 22, 24, 26–7
 Jacobites: XV 135, 139
 Jeremiah: II 70; VIII 217
 Jericho: IV 224
 Jerome: X 5
 Jerusalem: I 18; II 54, 70; VII 203; XIII 108, 114
 John, Acts of: XI 15, 24
 John, catholicus: II 65
 John, patr. of Antioch: XIII 100
 John I, patr. of Antioch: I 8
 John of Apameia: XI 24–5
 John bar Aphthonia: XIII 88, 118
 John the Baptist: XII 134
 John Chrysostom: XV 138
 John of Dara: I 14
 John of Dasen: II 52, 65
 John the Elder (of Dayatha): II 52
 John of Ephesus: I 5–6, 12, 16, 28; XV 121
 John of Litarba: I 16; IV 224
 John Malalas: VII 206, 236–41, 245
 John of Nikiu: XIV 38
 John of Phenek: I 26, 28; II *passim*
 John Rufus: I 11
 John of Tella: XIII 88, 113, 117–8
 John of Vezinia (Bizue): XIII 92, 117
 Jordan: XI 12, 18
 Joseph and Aseneth: I 4; IV 223; X 2
 Josephus: IV 214, 226; V 215
 Joshua the Stylite: I 11
 Jubilees, Book of: IV 224, 227, 230
 Judaea: VII 235
 Judah: VII 231
 Julian, emperor: XV 119
 Julius Africanus: IV 226
 Julian of Halicarnassus: XIV 35
 Justin II: I 5, 19
 Justin, Ps.: VII 204
 Justinian: I 5; II 59; VII 244; XII 128, 130, 132; XIII 87, 90, 113, 115, 117–8, 120; XIV 35, 38–9
 Karka d-Beth Slokh: I 22
 Kedrenos: VII 236, 238
 Kewan: *see* Kronos
 Khazir, river: II 53, 65
 Kosmas Indicopleustes: XII 126
 Kronos: VII 229, 245
 Kush: II 58
 Lampon: VII 234, 245
 Laurentius: XIII 92
 Lazarus of B. Qandasa: VII 208, 211–3, 241, 243
 Leo, emp.: I 10
 Leo, pope: XIII 116
 Lotas: VIII 208, 212
 Lucensius: VIII 100

- Lucian, pr.: I 4
Lykourgos: V 214
- Mabbug: IV 216; X 3
Macedonians: XII 137
Mahdi: I 10
Makarios, patr.: XIV 44
Makin: VIII 207
Malalas: *see* John Malalas
Manassch: IV 216, 225
Manetho: VII 245
Mani, Manichaeans: V 79; XI 30; XII 137; XV 139
Mara bar Serapion: VI 79; VII 212
Marcion: XII 138
Marcus Turbo: IX 98
Maremeh: II 54
Mari the Persian: XIII 98, 100
Marinos, pr.: XIV 40–1
Martyrius: XII 128, 132
Marutha of Martyropolis: XII 126, 129
Mary: VII 206, 229, 232; XI 12; XII 134–5, 137–40
Mas'udi: VIII 207
Maurice, emp.: VII 209; XII 127
Maximus the Confessor: XIV 45; XV 119–20, 123, 134
Meir, Rabbi: IV 222; XI 14
Melito: XI 16
Menas, patr.: XIV 35, 37–8, 43
Meshihazkha: I 23; II 51; *see also* Chronicle of Arbela
Mesopotamia: II 66
Methodius, Ps. Apocalypse: II 54, 61, 69, 72; IV 228; VII 244
Metron: VIII 208
Michael, archangel: XIII 120
Michael the Syrian: I 1, 8, 15–7, 19, 28; II 56; IV 224, 230; VII 209; VIII 218; XIII 88; XV 120
Moriah: IV 217
Moses: II 73; IV 217, 226, 229; VII 238; XII 134
Moses of Inghilene: I 4; IV 223; X 2, 9, 12
Muhammad: I 9; II 61
Muhammad ibn 'Ali al-Ansari: VIII 206
Mukhtar: II 52–3, 64–6
Musa b. Mus'ab: I 9
Mu'awiyah: I 7; II 53, 55, 61
- Narsai: I 22; IV 221; XI 24–6; XII 128
Nawruz: I 21
Nectanebo: V 214
Nemesius: XI 31
- Nestorius: X 6; XII 126–30; XIII 98, 100, 102, 105, 116
Nicaea, Council of: II 59; XII 126, 129, 133, 140; XIII 93–4
Nicodemus: I 4
Nikopolis: VII 209
Nile: VII 229
Nineveh: II 65; V 214; IX 96
Nisibis I 22; II 52–3, 64–7; IV 216, 219; XII 128, 130
Nitron, bar: II 64–5
Noah: IV 219, 226, 229
Nonnus of Ceresina: XIII 117–8
Nonnus of Nisibis: IV 230; XV 121
- Origen: XI 17
Orpheus: VII 205, 208, 228, 230, 240
- Panodorus: IV 229
Pascasinus: XIII 100
Paul, apostle: II 72; X 7; XI 16–7; XII 135
Paul of Edessa: X 2
Paul of Kallinikos: X 2, 12
Paul, bp of Nisibis: XII 128
Paul of Samosata: XII 138
Paul of Tella: X 2, 9
Persians: II 57; VII 234
Peter, patr.: I 15
Peter, patr. Alexandria: XIII 114
Peter, patr. Antioch: XIII 114; XV 119
Peter the Fuller: XIII 114
Peter Mongus: XIII 114
Peter, bp of Reshaina: XIII 113, 117–8
Petissonios: VII 205, 208, 229
Petrus Alphonsus: VIII 206
Philo: IV 218; XI 28
Philoxenus: I 7; X 2–3, 6, 8–9, 11; XI 17–8, 21, 24, 27; XII 132
Philoxenus, bp of Dulichium: XIII 117–8
Phokas: X 3, 10, 13
Photinians: XII 138
Photius: XIV 39–40
Plato: VII 203, 205, 208, 210, 229–30; XI 28
Plotinus: VII 205–6, 208, 230
Plutarch: V 215; VII 203
Plyqtn: VIII 208, 213
Poimandres: VII 206, 208, 231
Polycarp: X 2, 11
Porphyry: VII 205–6, 208, 230; XI 34, XV 121
Probus (1): X 3, 12
Probus (2): I 15
Proclus, bp: I 4

Proclus, philosopher: XI 34
Procopius: XIII 92, 115
Pythagoras: VII 205, 208, 229
Pythia: VII 229

Qardu (Judi Dagh): IV 213–4
Qartmin: I 14
al-Qirqisani: IV 230
Qumi: X 3

Rabbula: X 2, 6, 11
Reqem: IV 214
Resh'aina: IV 219
Romanos: VI 77
Rome: I 4; VII 231, 234; XIII 100, 108, 110, 114
Rushank (Roxana): VIII 213

Sabellius: XV 135
Sabians: VII 210
Sabrsho' II, patr.: II 51, 72, 74
Sabrsho', mon.: II 51
Sagai: VII 205, 208, 231
Sahdona: *see* Martyrius
Sampson: V 216
Secundus: IX *passim*
Sekenenre: V 214
Seleucia: IV 219; XI 16, 18; XII 126, 129–30
Seleucus: I 22
Semiazos: IV 231
Sergius: I 11
Sergius, patr.: XIV 38
Sergius, bp of Cyrrhus: XIII 113, 117–8
Sergius of Resh'aina: X 2, 10, 13; XIII 95
Seth: IV 217, 226, 229, 231; XI 20
Severus: I 13
Severus, patr.: I 4; VII 244; X 2; XII 131–2; XIII 88–9, 94, 100, 111, 115; XIV 35
Shahdost: XII 129
Shapur II: I 22
Sheba, Queen of: V 216
Shem'on of Qenneshre: XV 120
Shem'on Shenqlaway: I 2
Shmona: IV 220
Sibyl: VII 205–6, 208, 231, 242–3
Simeon bar Sabba'e: XI 25
Simeon of Beth Arsham: I 12; XV 121
Simonians: XII 137
Sion: II 70
Sisynnios: VIII 208, 212
Socrates: VII 203
Socrates, historian: I 2, 11, 16

Solomon: V 215–6
Solomon, Odes of: VI 79; XI 19
Solomon of Bosra: IV 228; XI 23
Solon: VII 203
Sophocles: VII 205, 208, 229
Sophronius, patr.: X 3
Sozomen: VI 77, 79–80
Stephanos, bp: VII 209
Stephanos, bp of Seleucia: XIII 92, 117
Strategius: XIII 90, 92
Susa: XII 127
Sylvester, St: I 4
Symeon: *see also* Simeon
Symeon the Stylite (the Younger): XIV 35, 42–3

Targum: IV *passim*; XI 14–5, 29
Tertullian: XI 16
Tha'alabi: VIII 207
Thebes: V 214
Themistius of Alexandria: XIV 39–40
Theodore bar Koni: VII 239
Theodore of Mopsuestia: X 3; XI 17; XII 126–30, 134, 136, 139; XIII 116
Theodoret: I 2, 16; VII 204; XI 17; XIII 89, 98, 100, 106, 116, 119
Theodoros: XIV 40
Theodosius, patr. of Alexandria: X 9
Theodosius, emp.: XIII 119
Theodotion: IV 225
Theodotus: XIII 116
Theon: VIII 208, 211
Theopaschites: II 59; XII 135; XV 136
Theosophia: VII 204
Thomas, Acts of: V 79; XI 15–6, 21, 23–4
Thomas, bp of Dara: XIII 113, 118
Thomas, bp of Germaniceia: XIII 113, 117–8
Thomas of Harkel: X 2, 9
Thomas of Marga: XII 128
Thrace: XIII 92
Thucydides: VII 203
Thules: VII 205, 208, 228, 230
Tiberius, emp.: I 19
Timothy I: II 53; IV 224, 230
Timothy Aelurus: XII 132
Timothy, patr. of Alexandria: XIII 90
Timur: I 21
Titus of Bostra: X 3, 11
Trisagion: II 62
Trismegistos: VII 228; *see also* Hermes Tyre: V 215

'Ubaydallah: II 64–5

Umayyads: II 61
bar 'Uthman: II 64

Valentinus: XIII 94
Vigilius, pope: XIV 35–8, 43

Yahelma: II 58
Ya'qubi: VIII 207
Yazdgard II: I 22

Yazid I: II 53, 63
Yazid II: I 9

Zacharias Rhetor, Ps.: *see* Chronicle of Ps.

Zacharias
Zeno: XII 126
Zeugma: XIII 115
al-Zubayr, ibn: II 52, 64