

**Syrians and the Others:
Cultures of the Christian Orient
in the Middle Ages**

SCRINIUM
Journal of Patrology, Critical Hagiography,
and Ecclesiastical History

X

Scrinium. Journal of Patrology, Critical Hagiography,
and Ecclesiastical History, established in 2005,
is an international multilingual scholarly series
devoted to patristics, critical hagiography,
and Church history. Each volume is dedicated to a theme
in early Church history, with a particular emphasis
on Eastern Christianity, while not excluding developments
in the Western Christianity.

**Syrians and the Others:
Cultures of the Christian Orient
in the Middle Ages**

Edited by

Basil Lourié

Nikolai N. Seleznyov

Gorgias Press LLC, 954 River Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2014 by Gorgias Press LLC

ISBN

ISSN 1817-7530

Saint Petersburg State University of Aerospace Instrumentation
Centre of Research and Education
in Philosophy, Religion, and Culture

SCRINIUM

Journal of Patrology, Critical Hagiography
and Ecclesiastical History

Volume 10

Syrians and the Others:
Cultures of the Christian Orient
in the Middle Ages



Edited by
Basil Lourié and Nikolai N. Seleznyov

Gorgias Press
2014

ISSN 1817-7530 (Print)
ISSN 1817-7565 (Online)

<http://scrinium.ru>

Scrinium. T. 10: Syrians and the Others: Cultures of the Christian Orient in the Middle Ages. Edited by Basil Lourié and Nikolai N. Seleznyov. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2014. x+534 p.

SCRINIUM

*Journal of Patrology, Critical Hagiography
and Ecclesiastical History*

Editor in Chief

Basil Lourié

Advisory Board

Sebastian Brock, Oxford (President);
Pauline Allen, Brisbane—Pretoria; Alessandro Bausi, Naples;
Gilbert Dagron, Paris; Kazuhiko Demura, Tokyo;
Gianfranco Fiaccadori, Mailand; Stephan Gerö, Tübingen;
Robert Godding, Bruxelles (Société des Bollandistes);
Alexander Golitzin, Milwaukee; Getatchew Haile, Avon;
Cornelia B. Horn, Berlin; Hubert Kaufhold, Munich (Oriens Christianus);
Robert Kraft, Philadelphia; Vladimir A. Livshits, St Petersburg;
Igor P. Medvedev, St Petersburg; Bernard Meunier,
Lyon (Institut des Sources Chrétiennes); Bernard Outtier, Paris;
Madeleine Petit, Paris; John C. Reeves, Charlotte;
Gerrit J. Reinink, Groningen; Antonio Rigo, Venice;
James Russel, Harvard; Samir Kh. Samir, Beirut;
Michael Stone, Jerusalem; Satoshi Toda, Sapporo;
James VanderKam, Notre Dame

Secretariat

Tatiana Senina, St. Petersburg;
Elena Bormotova, Montreal

© Authors, 2014

© B. Lourié and N. N. Seleznyov, 2014

© Gorgias Press, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	x
-----------------------------	---

Critical Editions

Yulia FURMAN

The Origins of the Temporal World: the First <i>mē`mrā</i> of the <i>Ktābā d-rēš mellē</i> of John Bar Penkāyē	3
---	---

Yulia FURMAN

Zeus, Artemis, Apollo: John bar Penkāyē on Ancient Myths and Cults	47
---	----

Nikolai N. SELEZNYOV

The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander the Great according to <i>The Blessed Compendium</i> of al-Makīn ibn al-' Amīd	97
--	----

Nikolai N. SELEZNYOV

“These stones shall be for a memorial”: A discussion of the abolition of circumcision in the <i>Kitāb al-Mağdal</i>	115
--	-----

Anton PRITULA

The <i>Wardā</i> Hymnological Collection and Šlēmōn of Aḥlāt (13 th century)	149
--	-----

Youhanna Nessim YOUSSEF

Litanies or Prayers for Travellers	208
--	-----

Hagiography

Andrey MOROZ

Folkloric Hagiography and the Popular Cult of Saints: Formation of Beliefs and Plots	219
---	-----

Alexander V. PIGIN

Hagiographic Writings in the Old Believer Controversies over ‘the Suicidal Death’ at the End of the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Centuries (Peter Prokop’ev’s Message to Daniil Vikulin)	230
---	-----

Tatiana A. SENINA (nun Kassia) Concerning the Dates of St. Makarios of Pelekete's Life and the Dating of his <i>Vita</i>	245
Tatiana A. SENINA (nun Kassia) Did St. John, the Abbot of the ton Katharon Monastery, Join the Iconoclasts under Leo V the Armenian?	251
Yulia M. SHEVARENKOVA Verbal Hagiography of Seraphim of Sarov	255

Patrology

Dmitry BIRIUKOV Hierarchies of Beings in the Patristic Thought: Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, and the Palamites	281
Irina KOLBUTOVA The Book of the Body of Christ: Jewish-Christian Mysticism of Letters and the Name of God as an Origin for the Christian Spiritual Exegesis	305
Dirk KRAUSMULLER A Chalcedonian Conundrum: the Singularity of the Hypostasis of Christ	361
Alexey OSTROVSKY and Maia RAPHAVA Notes on Georgian Translations of the Works of Nicetas Stethatos ..	383
Olena SYRISOVA L'anthropologie apocryphe et le traité <i>Περὶ Ἀρχῶν</i> d'Origène	402

Review Articles

Dmitry BIRIUKOV Providence and fate in the ancient philosophical tradition and in Greek patristics	415
Basil LOURIE Notes on Mar Pinhas: A "Nestorian" Foundation Legend; the Liturgy Implied; Polemics against Jewish Mysticism; an Early Christian Apology Used; Syrian Monasticism from Athens	422

Olga MITRENINA	
The Corpora of Old and Middle Russian Texts as an Advanced Tool for Exploring an Extinguished Language	455
Aleksandr V. PIGIN	
A new book on Old Russian demonology	462
Tatiana A. SENINA (moniale Kassia)	
Deux livres sur Cassia de Constantinople	468
Christos A. ZAFIROPOULOS	
Ahiqar, his <i>Tale</i> and the <i>Vita Aesopi</i>	479

Reviews

What Was the Question? The Inter-Byzantine Discussions about the <i>Filioque</i> , Nicephorus Blemmydes, and Gregory of Cyprus (B. LOURIE)	499
Прп. Максим Исповедник, <i>Богословско-полемические сочинения</i> (<i>Opuscula Theologica et Polemica</i>), пер. с древнегреч. Д. А. ЧЕРНОГЛАЗОВА и А. М. ШУФРИНА; научн. ред., предисл. и комм. Г. И. БЕНЕВИЧА [St Maximus the Confessor, <i>Opuscula</i> <i>Theologica et Polemica</i> , Russian tr. by D. A. CHERNOGLAZOV and A. M. CHOUFRINE; ed., intr. and comm. by G. I. BENEVICH] (G. B.) ...	507
Warren T. WOODFIN, <i>The Embodied Icon. Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium</i> (T. SÉNINA)	508
Two Books on Fr Antonii (Anthony) Bulatovich (1870–1919) and the <i>Imiaslavie</i> (Onomatodoxy, Name-Glorifying) (B. LOURIE) ..	510
The Monks and Their Reading (O. MITRENINA)	514
A Lonely Church as a Symbol of Faith and Power (B. LOURIE)	516
Syriaca et Varia Orientalia (B. LOURIE)	523
Das russisch-deutsche Seminar „Simon Lüdwigowitsch Frank: der deutsche Kontext der russischen Philosophie“ (A. MALINOV) ..	528

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ТОДРА	<i>Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы</i>
XB	<i>Христианский Восток</i>
AB	<i>Analecta bollandiana</i>
BMGS	<i>Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies</i>
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca
CE	<i>Coptic Encyclopaedia</i> , ed. by A. S. Atiya, 8 vols., New York, 1991
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
ER	<i>The Ecclesiastical Review</i>
HTR	<i>The Harvard Theological Review</i>
JCRT	<i>Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory</i>
J ECS	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
OC	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca</i> , acc. J. P. MIGNE, tt. 1–161, Parisiis, 1857–1866
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
SC	Sources chrétiennes
Scr	<i>Scrinium. Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique et d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>

Critical Editions

Yulia Furman

Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies
Russian State University for the Humanities
yufurman@gmail.com

**THE ORIGINS
OF THE TEMPORAL WORLD:
THE FIRST *MĒ* 'MRĀ
OF THE *KTĀBĀ D-RĒŠ MELLĒ*
OF JOHN BAR PENKĀYĒ***

At the end of the seventh century, the East-Syriac monk John (Yō-hannān) bar Penkāyē¹ wrote *The History of the Temporal World* (*taššūtā šal šālmā d-zabnā*), or as he entitled it *The Book of the Main Points* (*ktābā d-rēš mellē*).² The work covers the period from the beginning of the creation till 687 CE. It consists of fifteen chapters (*mē*'*mrē*) and is divided in two parts (the chapters 1–9 form the first part, and the chapters 10–15 form the second).³ John did not, however, intend to write a proper *history* as a chronicler. Rather, he was concerned with a relationship between God and the mankind and considered the origins of

(*) I am grateful to Dr. Sergey Minov (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem) and Vitaly Shevlak (UN) for reading an earlier draft of this publication and suggesting some improvements.

(1) For more detailed information about John bar Penkāyē and his writings see: A. BAUMSTARK, "Eine syrische Weltgeschichte des siebten Jahrh.s.," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Alterthumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* (1901), pp. 273–280; T. JANSMA, "Projet d'édition du *Ktābā D-rēš Mellē* de Jean Bar Penkaye," *Orient syrien*, 8 (1963), pp. 87–106; Ю. ФУРМАН, "Йоханнан бар Пенкайе и его «История»: курьезы интерпретации имени автора и названия произведения" [John bar Penkaye and his "History": misinterpretations of the author's name and the title of his main work], *Вестник РГГУ. Серия «Востоковедение, африканистика»*, № 20 (100) (2012), pp. 93–109.

(2) The extant manuscripts of the *History* are listed in: JANSMA, *Projet d'édition*, pp. 96–100.

(3) For a survey of the contents of this work, with summaries of its chapters, see: BAUMSTARK, *Eine syrische Weltgeschichte*, pp. 275–279.

this relationship, its development and dramatic completion, signs of which he recognized in tumultuous events of his time.⁴

The first chapter of *the History of the Temporal World* narrates the beginning of the world and human history and generally follows the book of Genesis. It describes in a more or less detailed way events of Gen 1–5:24, i. e. from the Creation till the story of Enoch. Though the narration is based on biblical material, the intention of Bar Penkāyē was to explain and interpret certain biblical events rather than to retell the book of Genesis. He relies on the text of the Scripture and expands it with his additions styled as a commentary. Mostly he devotes his attention to the creation, the Fall, the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise and the story of Cain.

This article discusses the first chapter of Bar Penkāyē's *History of the Temporal World* in connection with other East-Syriac works concerning the same subjects as well as the works that influenced East-Syriac authors. The genre of the first chapter is very close to the biblical exegesis, and, therefore, the extant exegetical works which were composed within the East-Syriac tradition or had some influence on it⁵ are used as a basis for our comparative research.⁶ These are Ephraem the Syrian's prosaic Commentary on the book of Genesis (d. 373),⁷ the Introduction to the book of Genesis and extant in Syriac language commentary on it of Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 350–428),⁸ homilies of Narsai (d. 502) on the Creation and the Fall of Adam and

(4) The intention of Bar Penkāyē and his motives for writing the *History* are discussed in: G. J. REININK, "Paideia: God's Design in World History according to the East Syrian Monk John bar Penkaye," in: *The Medieval Chronicle II: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht, 16–21 July 1999*, Amsterdam, New York, 2002, pp. 190–198.

(5) The main extant exegetical works in Syriac are listed in: S. BROCK, *The Bible In The Syriac Tradition*, 2nd rev. ed., Piscataway, 2006, pp. 73–77.

(6) The present article only deals with the works of this genre which extant in Syriac and belonged to or influenced the East-Syriac tradition. It mainly aims at demonstrating its continuity. More general treating the origins of various ideas and themes which occur in the first chapter of the *History* or in the probable sources of Bar Penkāyē are beyond the scope of the present research.

(7) Sancti Ephraem Syri in *Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii*, ed. R. M. TONNEAU (CSCO, 152; SS, 71), Louvain, 1955.

(8) Theodori Mopsuesteni *fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. E. SACHAU, Lipsiae, 1869.

Eve.⁹ The later East-Syriac exegetical tradition is represented by the following interconnected works: the *Scholia* of Theodore bar Kōnī (the end of the 8th century),¹⁰ the commentaries of Ishō‘ bar Nūn (d. 828)¹¹ and of Ishō‘ dad of Merv (9th century),¹² and the anonymous commentaries adhering to this tradition.¹³ These works have some

(9) *Homélie de Narsai sur la création*, ed. Ph. GIGNOUX (PO, XXXIV, Fasc. 3 et 4 — № 161 et 162).

(10) The *Scholia* of Theodore bar Kōnī consist of eleven books. The first nine chapters are a commentary in a form of questions and answers on different passages of the New and the Old Testament. The first, the second and a part of the third book contain his commentary on Genesis. In 1910 and in 1912, the *Scholia* (the books 1–5 and 6–11 respectively) were edited by Addai Scher in the recension of Se‘ert: Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. A. SCHER (CSCO, 55; SS, 65), Parisiis, 1910; Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. A. SCHER (CSCO, 69; SS, 66), Parisiis, 1912. R. Hespel and R. Draguet in 1981–1982 translated them into French: Théodore bar Kōnī, *Livre des Scolies (recension de Séert) I. Mimrè I–V*, ed. R. HESPEL, R. DRAGUET (CSCO, 431; SS, 187), Lovanii, 1981; Théodore bar Kōnī, *Livre des Scolies (recension de Séert) II. Mimrè VI–XI*, ed. R. HESPEL, R. DRAGUET (CSCO, 432; SS, 188), Lovanii, 1982. For the recension of Urmiah see: Théodore bar Kōnī, *Livre des Scolies (recension d’Urmiah)*, ed. R. HESPEL (CSCO, 447; SS, 193), Lovanii, 1983. In the present article quotations from Theodore bar Kōnī’s *Scholia* are taken from the edition of Addai Scher.

(11) The work of Ishō‘ bar Nūn is a commentary on selected passages of the Pentateuch in a form of questions and answers. In 1962, it was edited by E. G. CLARKE, *The Selected Questions of Ishō Bar Nūn on the Pentateuch*, Leiden, 1962.

(12) Ishō‘ dad wrote a commentary on the Old and New Testaments. The part of this work that contains the commentary on Genesis was edited by J.-M. VOSTÉ and C. VAN DEN EYNDE: *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv sur l’Ancien Testament. I. Genèse* (CSCO, 126; SS, 67), Louvain, 1950.

(13) This is the East-Syriac Anonymous Commentary on the Pentateuch written in a form of elucidation of difficult passages and words. The part of this commentary that contains the exegesis of Gen 1–27 was edited by A. LEVENE: *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, London, 1951. It is preserved in several manuscripts. See: T. JANSMA, “Investigations into the Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis: An Approach to the Exegesis of the Nestorian Church and to the Comparison of Nestorian and Jewish Exegesis,” *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, 12 (1958), pp. 71–74.

Another exegetical treatise was found in one of the manuscripts of Anonymous Commentary (ms Diyarbekr 22) the first folios of which were replaced with the other commentary on Gen 1,1–Ex 9,32. It was probably written at the end of the eighth century: L. VAN ROMPAY, “A Hitherto Unknown

obvious textual similarities, and various scholars have discussed general interconnections that existed between all of them, on the one hand, and specific connections between some of them, on the other.¹⁴

A preliminary study shows that some exegetical treatises which were probably in circulation within the East-Syriac tradition and which John bar Penkāyē could use as his sources remain beyond our actual knowledge. However, some commonality in these works written before and after Bar Penkāyē may be noticed. The list of the common fragments discussed below is by no means complete, but it allows to trace some correspondence between these works.¹⁵

THE FIRST NATURES (KYĀNĒ RĒŠĀYĒ)

Bar Penkāyē begins his narrative of the Creation with naming of the natures which were created on the first day. According to him, they were eight: “The first natures which God had created, as He said by means of his servant Moses, are the heaven and the angels, the earth and the fire, the waters and the air, the darkness and the light” (*kyānē gēr rēšāyē da-brā ʔalāhā ʔaʔk da-mmallel b-ʔīdā d-mūšē šabdēh šmayyā w-mallaʔkē w-ʔaršā w-nūrā w-mayyā w-ʔāʔar w-ḥeššokā w-nuhrā*). The list of eight first natures is unique and is not found in extant works written before Bar Penkāyē.¹⁶ All the authors who mention the first created

Nestorian Commentary on Genesis and Exodus 1–9,32 in the Syriac Manuscript (olim) *Dijarbekr 22*,” *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, 5 (1974), pp. 78. It was edited with FT: *Le commentaire sur Genèse—Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Dijarbakir 22*, ed. L. VAN ROMPAY (CSCO, 483; SS, 205), Lovanii, 1986; *Le commentaire sur Genèse—Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Dijarbakir 22*, ed. L. VAN ROMPAY (CSCO, 484; SS, 206), Lovanii, 1986.

(14) For the discussion of the interconnection of all these commentaries see, for example: JANSMA, *Investigations*; VAN ROMPAY, *A Hitherto Unknown Nestorian Commentary*. Connection between Ishōʿ bar Nūn, Theodore bar Kōnī and Ishōʿ dad is discussed in CLARKE, *The Selected Questions*.

(15) Some of these common places were discussed by T. Jansma (JANSMA, *Investigations*, pp. 89–143).

(16) It is remarkable that John bar Zōʿbī, an East-Syriac author of the 12th–13th c., also writes about the first eight natures in his commentary on the liturgy *Puššāq ʔrāzē*. N. Seleznyov supposes that he was familiar with the *History of Bar Penkāyē* (Н. СЕЛЕЗНЕВ, “Востоочносирийский автор рубежа XII–XIII вв. — Йōханнāн Бар Зōʿбī — и его пролог к «Истолкованию таин»” [East-Syriac author of the 12th–13th c. — Yōhannān Bar Zōʿbī — and his Prologue to the “Explanation of the Divine Mysteries”], *Точку/Puncta*, 3–4 (2010), pp. 18–19).

natures list seven of them, but the composition of the lists differ from one author to another. In the *Commentary on Genesis*, Ephraem mentions the following seven natures created on the first day: the earth, the heaven, the waters, the air, the fire, the light, the darkness. When saying that the earth and the heaven were created of nothing, he emphasizes that the natures which appeared later on the same day had not been created in that moment: "Till that moment, the waters, the air and the fire were not created, the light and the darkness were not set."¹⁷ Narsai also talks about the first seven natures; in his *Homilies* they are mentioned three times. However, his lists do not agree with each other from place to place. In his homily "On the *brāšīt* and the divine substance", he gives the following list: "In the beginning of the day, He created the heaven and the angels, the earth, the waters, the darkness, the fire and the air" (*b-šurrāy yāw mā ʿḥad la-šmayyā wal-mallaḳkē w-la-ḡrsā w-mayyā wa-l-ḥeššokā w-nūrā w-ḡāḡar*).¹⁸ This list agrees with the one we find in the later tradition (see below). In yet another place, in his homily "On the formation of the created and the hypostases of the Trinity," Narsai gives the following list: "In the beginning, He created the heaven and the earth and the other five natures which He did not name. With this word [*brāšīt*], the fire, the waters, the darkness, the rational and silent angels (*mallaḳkē mlilē w-ḥaršē*) are enclosed within the formation that is in the beginning."¹⁹ It should be noted that Narsai connects the creation of the light with angels' ability to speak. Since the light was created after the above listed seven natures angels are described as "rational" and yet "silent." Finally, in his homily "On the formation of the created" 'the light' is listed, but 'the fire' is absent: "In the beginning, He formed the heaven and the earth, the waters and the air, the assembly of heaven and the light, the darkness spread over everything" (*brāšīt taqen šmayyā w-ḡarsā w-mayyā w-ḡāḡar w-kenšay rāw mā w-ḥeškā da-pṛīs ʿal kol*).²⁰ Later commentaries mention the first day creations too. Theodore bar Kōnī, in answering the question "How many first natures were created in silence?", names seven of them: the heaven, the earth, the fire, the waters, the air, the angels, the darkness.²¹

(17) Sancti Ephraem Syri in *Genesim*, ed. TONNEAU, pp. 8:28–9:6.

(18) GIGNOUX, *Homélie de Narsai*, pp. [158]:338–339.

(19) *Ibid.*, pp. [170]:101–105.

(20) *Ibid.*, pp. [109]:3–4.

(21) *Theodorus bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 23:10–13.

Ishō‘dad²² and the author of the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*²³ write the same. In the *Anonymous Commentary*, the five other natures are mentioned after the description of creation of the heaven and the earth.²⁴

THE FOUR ELEMENTS

After listing the first natures, there follows quite an obscure passage that seems to be a philosophical explanation of the process of creation: “Something appeared out of two. One was divided into something. One impels everything. By means of the four, everything was formed. One pointed something out. By means of the two, all the times and seasons of the little temporal world were defined.” As to the four by means of which everything was formed, it is likely that here John says about the four elements of which all the visible things were formed. Such an idea can be found in Theodore of Mopsuestia’s *Introduction to the Commentary on Genesis*: “By means of the air, the earth, the waters and the fire all this visible world was set” (*b-yad gēr ḡāḡar w-ḡarṣā w-mayyā w-nūrā metḡayyam ṣālmā hānnā d-metḡzē*).²⁵ The four things of this kind are mentioned in the later tradition too. Theodore bar Kōnī, in answering the question “What is the power of each of these elements and what are they in use for?”, writes: “Their use is fit for formation all the corporeal” (*hṣahthon dēn ṣāhnā l-quyyāmā d-kol ḡṣom*).²⁶ In the work of Ishō‘dad, thoughts like this are expressed as a commentary on Gen 2:1. Ishō‘dad writes: “This [saying] ‘all their hosts’ is to say that these appeared from them. For what was to be afterwards was formed of the four elements” (*hāy dēn d-kullēh ḡaylthon d-ne²mar hālēn da-hway menhon men ḡarbṣā gēr ḡeṣṡuksē ḡettaqqan^w hālēn d-men bāṡar ken*).²⁷ A similar passage can be found in the *Anonymous Commentary*²⁸ and in the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*.²⁹

(22) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 13:1–2.

(23) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 7:9–11.

(24) *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, p. 67:10–12.

(25) *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. SACHAU, p. 3:15–16.

(26) *Theodorus bar Kōnī, Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 24:15–21.

(27) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 49: 23–25.

(28) *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, p. 64:22–24.

(29) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 22:18–20.

CREATION OF THE LIGHT AND THE PRAISE OF ANGELS

Here is Bar Penkāyē's description of the creation of the light: "The angels had been waiting in silence for twelve hours until the light was created. Then they became excited. The summit of their excitement became recognition [of God] and praise to Him. For the appearance and the creation of the light strengthens the mind of the conscious and excites consciousness of the learned."³⁰

Similar attributes can be found in the narration of the creation of the light in other commentaries discussed here. Among them the idea that when the angels saw the beauty of the illuminated world, they praised the Creator. This episode is probably based on Job 38:7 being directly referred to by some authors.³¹

Theodore of Mopsuestia cites this verse from the book of Job in connection with another idea. While discussing that God needed the word to let "the rational and invisible natures" know about Himself in the process of creation, he cites Job as a proof that these natures praised to God after He had created the stars (i. e. after they had heard "Let there be light").³²

In the later tradition of the East-Syriac commentaries, this verse was being cited in connection with the creation of the light and the angels' praise.

Theodore bar Kōnī writes that the angels praised the Creator after He had created the light.³³ The same is written in the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr* 22: "Then He created the light. Because of its beauty all of them exclaimed and praised their Creator according to Job."³⁴ Narsai touches on the theme several times in his homilies.³⁵ Ishō'dad of Merv uses literally the same expressions in his commentary.³⁶

(30) One may suppose that such an important role of the light in the process of creation was the reason for including it in the list of "the first natures" by Bar Penkāyē.

(31) Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ishō'dad of Merv, Theodore bar Kōnī, the *Commentary from ms Diyarbekr* 22 quote Job.

(32) *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. SACHAU, p. 4:13ff.

(33) *Theodorus bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 35:15–17.

(34) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 7:14–16.

(35) For example, *Homélies de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, pp. [109]:23–24; [110]:39–40.

(36) *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 16:5–11.

As for the light that according to Bar Penkāyē “strengthens the mind of the conscious and excites consciousness of the learned,” in the commentaries of the other authors there is no obvious emphasis on the connection between the light and knowledge. However, the idea that the light was created (or was created after the darkness) to let the angels know their Creator is found virtually everywhere. Narsai repeatedly mentions this in his homilies,³⁷ Theodore bar Kōnī as well as later Ishō‘dad (“for angels’ understanding, since it was necessary to let them know their Creator”),³⁸ the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr* 22 (“Since it was necessary to let the angels know about their existence and their Creator. [Therefore] first, He wrapped them neatly as if in swaddling clothes and tied them with a twelve hours’ term, then He created the light”)³⁹ evidently write about this too.

THE NATURES OF THE LIGHT AND THE DARKNESS

Bar Penkāyē’s account of the creation of the light is accompanied by his mentioning of that the darkness is also a nature. “It is said: ‘God separated the light from the darkness.’ He (i. e. Moses) does not mean division of the natures. For each of them got this [nature] together with its creation from the beginning.” In other words, separation of the light from the darkness is not a separation of the nature. It is rather two natures being set apart while each of them is independent in its existence from the other.

The discussion of the nature of the darkness is also found in the other commentaries and apparently can be traced back to Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁴⁰ In this case, Bar Penkāyē also follows this tradition.

Theodore bar Kōnī while listing the seven first creations among which there was the darkness, emphasizes that the latter belongs to the seven first natures according to “Blessed Interpreter” (i. e. Theodore of Mopsuestia) who contested other opinions. His opponents supposed that the darkness had appeared of the shadows produced by bodies.⁴¹ Ishō‘dad also writes about this: “It is known from the

(37) For example, *Homélies de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, pp. [109]:11–12; [110]:41–42; [152]:237–242.

(38) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 35:12–13; *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTE, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 15:25–27.

(39) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 7:11–14.

(40) JANSMA, *Investigations*, pp. 103–104.

(41) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 23:14–18.

blessed David that it (i. e. the darkness) is the nature as those seven first natures: ‘He created darkness, it became night’.⁴² In the *Anonymous Commentary*⁴³ and in the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*, this subject is discussed as well (*lāw gēr da-p̄raš nuhrā men ḥeššoḳā hānnāw dēn talqēh*).⁴⁴

CREATION AND FORMATION. HIERARCHICAL ORDER OF CREATION

While describing appearance of the world, Bar Penkāyē makes a differentiation between *creation* (*brīṭā*) and *formation* (*tuqqānā*) and gives a definition to both of them. *The creation*, — he says, — “is what did not exist and then came into existence.” *The formation* “gets something which was created and exists and needs formation.” He then adds: “the One who creates and the One who forms is the same. What was created and what gets the formation is the same too.” According to Bar Penkāyē, all the first natures got the formation: the earth, the firmament (the heaven) and the light, the air and the darkness, the fire, the waters and the angels. By “formation” Bar Penkāyē means structuring and decoration as is evident from the following explanation. Something that previously had remained in disorder got the structure. So, the darkness was bridled with a bridle of the light in order not to be scattered under all the heaven. The waters were divided and gathered in seas, rivers and springs. The air was squeezed into a wineskin not to be dispersed and to perish. These creations served as decorations for the earlier ones: the firmament — for the heaven, the lights — for the firmament etc.

Bar Penkāyē also describes the hierarchical order of creation: “those He had created earlier were useful for those He brought into existence later. That which is less important might appear before that which excels it [in importance] and needs it.”

There is no exact terminological opposition between the creation and the formation in the discussed commentaries. Though this general idea can undoubtedly be found there.⁴⁵ Thus, these writings mention some creatures being “decorated” by others.

(42) *Commentaire d’Išo’dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 14: 26–28.

(43) *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, p. 67:20–23.

(44) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 10:15–19.

(45) See the discussion in: JANSMA, *Investigations*, p. 134.

The opposition between the creation and formation was most obviously expressed by Theodore of Mopsuestia. In the *Introduction to the Genesis*, he states that God created all the creation without decoration and decorated it later: “Gradually, He first scattered the gloom of the darkness with the appearance of the light. Afterwards, He created the visible heaven by pouring plenty of the water on its back. Then, He gathered the waters and uncovered the earth. Afterwards, He created plants and seeds. After He had created animals, He created the human, the last of all.”⁴⁶

The commentary of Ishō‘dad and the *Anonymous Commentary* which literally agree with each other in their accounts of the decoration both say almost the same as Theodore of Mopsuestia said in his *Introduction* (“For those which had been created decorated each other...” etc.).⁴⁷

In other works, this subject is mentioned *en passant* and in the context of other themes. Ephraem the Syrian while discussing why it was not said (in the Scriptures) that “the firmament was good” after its creation, says that at that time the firmament got neither structure nor decorations i.e. the sun, the moon and the stars.⁴⁸ Ishō‘ bar Nūn gives a similar answer to the same question.⁴⁹ In the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*, the creations of the third day are named “the decoration of the earth” (*taṣbīṭāh d-ʔarṣā*).⁵⁰ T. Jansma observes that the idea of creation as decoration is the most favorite one of Narsai and gives numerous references.⁵¹

As to the idea of the hierarchical creation, it is expressed in these commentaries in a slightly different vein. Bar Penkāyē emphasizes that the previous creations are useful for the later ones. On the one hand, the summit of the creation was the human, for whose appearance the angels were waiting: “Therefore, they (the angels) were arranged and prepared, got up and waited for whom all this service would be in use.” On the other hand, the great divine plan is praised

(46) Theodori Mopsuesteni *fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. SACHAU, p. 3:24–4:3.

(47) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 49:14–17; *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, p. 64:19–22.

(48) Sancti Ephraem Syri *in Genesim*, ed. TONNEAU, p. 19:20–27.

(49) *The Selected Questions*, ed. CLARKE, pp. 4v:17–5r:2.

(50) *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, pp. 16:31–17:1.

(51) JANSMA, *Investigations*, p. 134.

with this particular order of the creation: "Those He had created earlier were useful for those He brought into existence later... for thus the great intelligence of the Creator is greatly praised."⁵²

In the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia and in the later Syriac commentaries, the hierarchical order of the creation is considered in a different way. The main idea of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the subject was that the order was necessary for instructing of the rational beings who by comparing themselves with the other (irrational beings) would see their advantages and would understand that God created them higher in rank than the others and made them more akin to Him (*b-pēhmā d-hālēn šal t̄ābāḥon yālṗīn ḥwāw d-da-²yḵ ṗaynā kyānā nsab^w men ṗalāhā w-lāw balḥod la-ḥwāyā ṗeṭā^w ṗāp̄ ba-kyānā d-da-²yḵ hānnā ḥwāw ṗaykānā da-b-saggiṗātā dmūtā qnēn ṗa^yḵ kmā d-meškḥā lwāt ṗalāhā*).⁵³ The relevant passages by Ishō'dad and the author of the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22* almost literally mirror each other.⁵⁴ The *Scholia* by Theodore bar Kōnī also contribute to the development of the theme.⁵⁵

THE FIRMAMENT

Bar Penkāye writes that on the second day of the creation the firmament was created of the waters. "A part of the waters gathered on its surface and [another] part remained on the earth." Then he explains why waters were needed to be located above and below the firmament. As to the waters which were above the firmament, he says that "from the waters, our friend, that are above the firmament, it is constantly getting magnitude and obesity in order not to become thinner and disappear during all this period because of flame and heat of the lights."

(52) Cf. also Theodore of Mopsuestia: "On this [day], He created also the human because He had considered it to be necessary that fourlegs animals would appear on the same day together with the human, for they were necessary for his use" (*Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. SACHAU, p. 27:12–14). See also: *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 20:12–16; *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTE, VAN DEN EYNDE, pp. 44: 28–45:2.

(53) *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. SACHAU, pp. 1:2–2:12.

(54) *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 49:6–14; *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, 64:11–19; *Le commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 2:29–3:8.

(55) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 30:17–26.

The idea that the firmament was created of the waters is evidenced almost in all the commentaries.⁵⁶ Ephraem mentions it in his *Commentary on Genesis*: “The firmament which is in the midst of the waters hardened of the waters” (*ḡarqīṣā dēn da-b-meṣṣat mayyā men mayyā ḡetrqaṣ h̄wā*).⁵⁷ Narsai writes about it many times in his homilies.⁵⁸ This is also a common place in the later East-Syriac tradition of the commentaries. Theodore bar Kōnī while answering the question “How did the firmament appear?”, reports among others the opinion of “Blessed Interpreter” who believed that the firmament “appeared of the waters” (*men mayyā h̄wā*).⁵⁹ Ishō‘dad does not refer to anyone but still writes the same,⁶⁰ and so do the *Anonymous Commentary*⁶¹ and the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22* as well.⁶² All these writings while stating that the firmament consists of the waters, connect this statement with the explanation of the name “firmament”: the word *ḡarqīṣā* “the firmament” there refers to the word *ḡetrqaṣ* “to become hard” (i. e. it hardened of “the soft waters”).

As to purpose of the waters which were above the firmament, the commentaries are not altogether clear about this. The *Anonymous Commentary*,⁶³ the Ishō‘dad’s *Commentary*⁶⁴ and the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*⁶⁵ explain that God put the nature of the waters below the firmament so that it vaporizes because of the lights, and He put it above the firmament being frozen and squeezed. Only Ishō‘dad explains the reason why the waters were placed above the firmament: “[they were placed there] in order that it (i.e. the firmament) may not be burned of their (i. e. the lights’) heat.”

Theodore bar Kōnī while answering the question “What is the reason of its (i. e. the firmament’s) formation”, says that “the waters

(56) This issue is discussed in JANSMA, *Investigations*, pp. 114–116.

(57) Sancti Ephraem Syri in *Genesim*, ed. TONNEAU, p. 17:27–28.

(58) References on these places can be found in the paper of JANSMA, see note 56.

(59) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 31:10–13.

(60) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 24:10–11.

(61) *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, p. 66:18–19.

(62) *Le commentaire sur Genèse—Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 13:3–4.

(63) *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis*, ed. LEVENE, p. 66:24–26.

(64) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 26:10–13.

(65) *Le commentaire sur Genèse—Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 14:3–5.

above it are [in use] for it may not be burned because of closeness of the lights which [are found] on its surface.”⁶⁶

There are numerous direct references to the subject in Narsai’s homilies: “He gathered the waters above it that it may not be burned because of the fire” (*ʔassen mayyā lʔel mennēh d-lā nestayyaʔ men nūrā*);⁶⁷ “let it hold the waters above its back not to be burned” (*w-neʔʕan mayyā lʔel men haʕʕēh d-lā nestayyaʔ*).⁶⁸

THE OCEAN

Touching upon the theme of water and seas, Bar Penkāyē writes thus about the Ocean: “The sea which is called Ocean surrounds all the earth. There is no earth outside it, but it (i. e. Ocean) is gathered and limited within the firmament.”

This concept can also be found in the cosmological treatise of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. This anti-astrological and anti-magical work was originally written in Syriac. It says that the Ocean is located beyond the Fiery River. The Ocean surrounds all the earth, fishes do not swim in its waters, and birds do not fly in the air above it. It surrounds the sea like the wall surrounds the city. Behind it, there is “the Paradise of gods” (*pardaysā d-ʔalāhē*).⁶⁹ The commentaries of Ishō‘dad⁷⁰ and Theodore bar Kōnī⁷¹ as well as the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 2272* also mention the Ocean surrounding all the creation (*ʔuqyānos da-ʔk qamrā ʕpīq l-kullāh brītā*). The commentaries, like the treatise of Pseudo-Dionysius, but unlike the account of Bar Penkāyē, state that there is the earth of Eden and Paradise (*ʔarʕā da-ʕden w-pārdaysā*) beyond the Ocean.

SATAN IS THE HEAD OF THE AIR

In his account of the Fall of Adam, Bar Penkāyē says that the Devil was filled with envy towards Adam and decided to devise a plot

(66) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 31:23–24.

(67) *Homélie de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [174]:152.

(68) *Ibid.*, p. [109]:50.

(69) G. FURLANI, “A Cosmological Tract by Pseudo-Dionysius in the Syriac Language,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1917), p. 251:14–18.

(70) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 30: 8–11.

(71) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, pp. 36:22–37:2.

(72) *Le commentaire sur Genèse—Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 15:6–10.

against him. He states that “the Devil, the rebellious, to whom leadership in the air, together with all its ranks, was given” (*ḡākel qarṣā gēr mārodā d-ḡeṡyahbaṡ lēh rēšānūtā d-ḡāḡar ṡam kullāh ṡaksīyās dīlēh*).

Here, we certainly have to quote Paul (Eph 2:2) who mentions “the ruler of the kingdom of the air,” but the reference seems to be insufficient. It is difficult to pinpoint any other source of the legend told by Bar Penkāyē. It is probable that Eph 2:2 was further developed within the Syriac literary tradition. In any event, some Syriac authors while describing the Devil’s leadership in the air do quote this verse. According to Bar Penkāyē, God made Satan the head of the air before his fall. This motif is also evident in other above-mentioned Syriac works.

Narsai in his homily “On the formation of the created” writes the following: “He made the Devil the head of air movements (*rēšā damzīṡ l-ḡāḡar*) and entrusted him as a chief (*rab ḡaylā*) with his fellows. Pride seized this rebellious with the help of his power and he wished to raise above the Creator in arrogance of his heart.”⁷³

Theodore bar Kōnī does not say directly that the Devil was appointed the head of the air, but this motif can be traced in several places in his *Scholia*. As an answer to the question “Why does God show mercy to people when they sin and not to devils?” he writes *inter alia*: “For the Devil ruled over the air (*ṡal ḡāḡar gēr mašlam ḡwā ḡākelqarṣā*). Or, according to Paul ‘by the will of the head of the air of spiritual [beings]’.”⁷⁴ In this fragment Theodore bar Kōnī quotes Paul as a source of the tradition that the Devil is the governor of the air. In another line, he thus formulates his question: “What is the reason that God made Satan the head of the air (*rēšā d-ḡāḡar*) while knowing about his evilness?”⁷⁵ Though he does not recount the story about how Satan was made the head of the air and then was deprived of his rank, it may be supposed that he also knew this tradition.

In his commentary on Gen 3:1, Ishō’dad cites opinions of different authors on what day Satan fell from the heaven, and he writes the following: “Others [say] that on Wednesday, because then the lights were divided and their ranks were distributed according to the order.

(73) *Homélie de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [134]:443–446.

(74) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, p. 79:2–3.

(75) *Ibid.*, p. 80:19–21.

And he (i.e. the Devil) was appointed over the air (*ʔetpaqqad ʕal ʔāʔar*) as said the blessed Apostle."⁷⁶

“HE WILL RULE OVER YOU”

After Adam and Eve had violated the commandment of God by eating of the forbidden tree, He sentenced both of them. As an explanation of why Eve ought to obey her husband, Bar Penkāyē writes as follows: “[That is] because when she heard that vain promise: ‘You will be like God, knowing good and evil’, she tried to surpass [Adam] and first ate of this tree to become the head and raise above Adam.”

Similar explanations of Eve’s offence which wanted to get priority over Adam is found in the other writings. Ephraem the Syrian in the *Commentary on Genesis*, while explaining the biblical phrase “He will rule over you”, writes “[That is] because you thought that by eating of the fruit you would then rule over him.”⁷⁷ Narsai also says about this in his homily “On the formation of the created” the following: “By eating of the fruit she wanted to seize for herself a name of god (*šem ʔalāhā*), to raise in rank above her husband (*dargā lʕel men baʕlāh*) and become the head.”⁷⁸ A similar passage on the subject is found in both Ishō’dad⁷⁹ and the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*:⁸⁰ “Since you first violated the commandment to seize for yourself a priority over the man (*rēšānūtā d-ʕal gabrā*) and the divine rank (*dargā d-ʔalāhūtā*), you will be on the second place like a maid waiting for the help from your husband.”⁸¹

ADAM’S MORTALITY

Having commented Adam’s punishment, Bar Penkāyē raises the question whether Adam and the human beings in general were mortal from the very beginning or became mortal because of the Fall. Bar Penkāyē answers unambiguously: “I suppose that no one doubts that

(76) *Commentaire d’Išo’dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 73: 18–21.

(77) *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim*, ed. TONNEAU, p. 43:24–27.

(78) *Homélie de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [124]:277–278.

(79) *Commentaire d’Išo’dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTÉ, VAN DEN EYNDE, p. 88: 20–23.

(80) *Le commentaire sur Genèse – Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 43:14–17.

(81) The translation from the Syriac is based on the commentary of Ishō’dad.

Adam was created mortal by nature.” As an argument against those who suppose that God made Adam mortal because of his violation of the commandment, he says that then God would have equally punished both the righteous and the evil ones. However, even innocent Abel died “before that one who had sinned” (i. e. Adam). Therefore, humans always were mortal. The death only actually entered them because of the original offence.

This theme, naturally, did not escape the attention of other authors.

Ephraem writes that God created Adam neither mortal, nor immortal. Adam could choose for himself a way of keeping the commandment or that of violating it.⁸²

The further East-Syriac tradition here was based on the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia about human mortality. According to him, man was created mortal from the beginning, he did not get mortality as a punishment for his offence. Thus, Theodore of Mopsuestia believed that God could not become angry because of the offence of one human and inflict His punishment on all innocent people.⁸³

Narsai thoroughly treats the question of Adam’s original state in his homily “On the formation of the created” where he writes the following: “He created Adam of the dust and named him His likeness, He made his dust the mortal dust, from the very beginning He put it (i.e. mortality) in the structure of his body in order that he may follow mortal way asking for the life. He set curses and labour pains not because of rage, He brought the death on mortals not because of regret. Natural qualities which He put in the mortal nature He put them as a punishment for people’s help. He knew even when Adam’s dust did not exist that the death would destroy it and annihilate the

(82) Sancti Ephraem Syri in *Genesim*, ed. TONNEAU, p. 34:28–31.

(83) See Synesii Episcopi Cyrenes *opera quae exstant omnia, accedunt Theodori Mopsuesteni Episcopi, S. Arseni Eremitae scripta vel scriptorum fragmenta quae supersunt*, ed. D. PETAVIUS, in *PG*, 66, Paris, 1859, col. 1005–1012. For the ET of the fragment see: F. G. MCLEOD, *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, London, 2009, pp. 86–91. For a survey of the various mentions of the human mortality in works translated into Syriac see: *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in Evangelium Iohannis apostoli*, ed. J.-M. VOSTÉ (CSCO, 115; SS, 62), Parisiis, 1940, p. 78:21–22. *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord’s Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, ed. A. MINGANA (Woodbrooke Studies, 4), Cambridge, 1933, p. 136:17–19. See also MCLEOD, *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, pp. 24–26.

structure of his body. It was clear to Him that he would sin by desiring the fruit; He knew evil nature of his discernment."⁸⁴

The commentary of Ishō‘dad⁸⁵ and the *Commentary of MS Diyarbekr 22*⁸⁶ which again literally mirror each other on the subject say that the man was created mortal by nature (*da-kyānā?it māyoṭā ?eṭbrī*). God made the sin the immediate cause of the death (*ṣelṭā dēn d-māwtā sām la-ḥṭṭā*) so that it may become hated in the eyes of all people. When we sin and become restricted with limits of the death, we should blame not God, but the sin which became for us the cause of the death. Theodore bar Kōnī also expresses this opinion almost literally.⁸⁷

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the first *mē?mrā* of his *History of the Temporal World*, while treating the biblical traditions, John Bar Penkāyē often expresses opinions that mostly go back to Theodore of Mopsuestia. For now it is difficult to conclude for certain whether Bar Penkāyē followed the established tradition of the East-Syriac exegesis on which the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia had a great influence, or read Theodore’s works directly (or did both). Besides the *Commentary of Ephraem the Syrian* (which apparently influenced first chapter of Bar Penkāyē’s *History* to a less degree than the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia), systematic commentaries on Genesis composed within the original Syriac-Mesopotamian school and relevant for the subsequent East-Syriac tradition do not seem to be extant (if scattered exegetical passages of Aphraat are not taken into consideration). It resulted in a large gap between the early East-Syriac school of exegesis and the time when the majority of the extant exegetical works which deal with the book of Genesis appeared in this tradition. On the one hand, this preliminary research does not let us conclusively identify authors and writings which Bar Penkāyē could use while composing the introduction to his *History*. Unlike the later commentaries such as the *Scholia* of Theodore bar Kōnī, the commentaries of Ishō‘dad of Merv and Ishō‘ bar Nūn, and the anonymous commentaries, for which the borrowing

(84) *Homélie de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [130]:355–366.

(85) *Commentaire d’Išo‘dad de Merv*, ed. VOSTE, VAN DEN EYNDE, pp. 64:24–65:8.

(86) *Le commentaire sur Genèse — Exode 9,32*, ed. VAN ROMPAY, p. 30:7–18.

(87) Theodorus bar Kōnī, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. SCHER, pp. 67:12–68:6.

of numerous quotations with almost no revision is typical, the *mē?mrā* of Bar Penkāyē mostly remains a mystery as to its possible sources. Same could be said about the motifs and the elements of composition of the *mē?mrā*: it remains uncertain what patterns Bar Penkāyē followed. On the other hand, the comparative analysis of the similarities given above lets us conclude that Bar Penkāyē was unquestionably an author of the tradition of East-Syriac exegesis which found its expression in Narsai's works and the later commentaries. Undoubtedly, the famous Syriac oral tradition, which unites different authors into one "school" played an important role as well.⁸⁸ The further research of the other chapters of Bar Penkāyē's *History* will certainly contribute to the defining both the originality and the sources of this most interesting author of the East-Syriac tradition.

(88) Mar Barḥadbšabba 'Arbaya, évêque de Ḥalwan (VIe siècle), *Cause de la fondation des Écoles*, ed. A. SCHER (PO, IV, fasc. 4, No 18), Paris, 1908, p. [68]/382.

John bar Penkāyē

THE BOOK OF THE MAIN POINTS. THE FIRST CHAPTER

The present edition of the first chapter is based on six manuscripts: **L** — MS London, The British Library, BL.Or.9385 (19th century),⁸⁹ fol. 3v–10r/^{syr}p.13; **M** — MS Mingana, Library of the Selly Oak Colleges, Mingana 179 (20th century)⁹⁰, fol. ^{syr}1r–^{syr}7v; **P** — MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Syr.405 (20th century),⁹¹ fol. ^{syr}3r–^{syr}20r; **S** — MS Strasbourg, Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, MS. 4133 (19th century),⁹² fol. ^{syr}1r/1v–^{syr}10r/10v; **V** — MS Vatican 497, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.Syr.497 (20th century)⁹³, fol. ^{syr}1r–^{syr}13v; **Ũ** — MS Vatican 592, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat.Syr.592 (20th century),⁹⁴ fol. 153r/p.^{ar}305–158r/p.^{ar}319. While setting the type, I indicated the ends of lines in **L**. Since the signs for *rbāṣā karyā* and *rbāṣā ʔarrikā* are used inconsistently in these manuscripts they are normalized in the following edition.

(89) See description of the MS in unpublished handwritten catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since 1899.

(90) A. MINGANA, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham* (3 vols. (Woodbrooke Catalogues, 1–3), Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933, 1936, 1939, Vol. 1 (1933), pp. 395–396.

(91) F. BRIQUEL-CHATONNET, *Manuscrits syriaques de la Bibliothèque nationale de France (nos 356–435, entrés depuis 1911), de la bibliothèque Méjanes d’Aix-en-Provence, de la bibliothèque municipale de Lyon et de la Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg. Catalogue*, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1997, pp. 139–141.

(92) BRIQUEL-CHATONNET, *Manuscrits syriaques*, pp. 219–220.

(93) A. VAN LANTSCHOOT, *Inventaire des Manuscrits Syriaques des Fonds Vatican (490–631), Barberini oriental et Neofiti*, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1965, pp. 28–29; see also: J.-M. VOSTE, “Manuscrits Syro-Chaldéens récemment acquis par la Bibliothèque Vaticane,” *Angelicum*, 6 (1929), pp. 39–40.

(94) VAN LANTSCHOOT, *Inventaire des Manuscrits Syriaques*, pp. 119–121.

TEXT

[f.3v] ܩܕ ܕܩܕܘܨܘܠܘܨܘܢܐ ܐܬܐ ⁹⁵ܡܛܘܚܝܢ | ܠܚܝܗܘܬܐ ܫܩܘܬܐ ܕܩܕ
 ܩܩܝܠ ܟܘܨܚܐ ܩܕ | ܠܟܘܠ ܕܩܕܢܐ: ܕܠܚܝܗܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܢܐ | ܕܐ ܩܦܦܘܬܐ
 ܩܠܘܨܐ ܫܩܘܬܐ ܐܨܝܩܐ ⁹⁶ܐܬܐ ⁹⁷ܕ ⁹⁸ܡܛܘܚܝܢ | [5] ⁹⁹ܡܛܘܚܝܢ

¹⁰⁰ܩܕ | ܥܘܘܘܘܕ ܩܦܘܬܐ ܕܩܕ ܕ ⁹⁹ܩܕ ܐܬܐ ¹⁰⁰ܩܕ | ܕܩܠܘܨܘܠܘܨܘܢܐ ⁹⁹ܩܕ
 ܕܚܘܩܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܢܐ ܐܬܐ ܩܕ ܕܩܕܘܨܘܠܘܨܘܢܐ | ܩܕ. ܐܘ ܩܘܨܘܠܘܨܘܢܐ: ܕܐ ܩܠܘܨܘܠܘܨܘܢܐ:
 ܩܩܝܠ | ܩܕܩܘܨܘܠܘܨܘܢܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ: ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ: [10] ܠܥܘܩܝܩܐ ܫܩܘܬܐ ¹⁰¹
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ. ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ. ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ. ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ: ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ: ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ [P.1/f.4r] ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ. ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ: ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ | ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ¹⁰³ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ. ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ. [5]
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ

(95) Add. V, M, V̄, S.
 (96) Abs. V.
 (97) Abs. V̄; P ܩܠܘܨܐ ܩܩܝܠܐ
 (98) Add. P.
 (99) Abs. L.
 (100) L ܩܩܝܠܐ
 (101) L ܩܩܝܠܐ
 (102) Abs. L, V̄, V.
 (103) In V̄, V, M, S, P interchanged.

וְכֵן מִיָּדֵי מֶלֶךְ. אֵל לִי חַיֵּי חַיֵּי ¹⁰⁴. | דַּחְתָּ דְבִיעַ מַלְכִּי דְבַעֲתָּהּ קַלְמִי
 בְּמִשְׁרָא, דְּמַלְכִּי מְלִיכָא מְלִיכָא : מְלִיכָא | מִיְּכָל כֵּן חֲזַתְנָא תַּיִן : לֵב דְּבִיבֵי
 וְחֲזַתְנָא מְלָכִי דְבַלַּת. וְצִפּ לֵב [10] דְּבִיבֵי לִי מַלְכִּי חֲמַתְנָא כְּמִתְנָא דְבִיבֵי
 לְצַפּ יִשְׁרָאֵל. מִזְּמַנָּה כֵּן חַל ¹⁰⁵ | דְּבַעֲתָהּ לְמַלְכִּי, חֲזַתְנָא מְלִיכָא מְלִיכָא ¹⁰⁶ אֵל
 חַל דְּמַלְכִּי מְלִיכָא מְלִיכָא | פְּרַיְזָה מְלִיכָא. דְּבִיבֵי יִשְׁרָאֵל חֲמַתְנָא דְבַלַּת דְּבַלַּת
 מִיָּדֵי מְלָכִי | יִשְׁרָאֵל דְּבַלַּת מְלָכִי. יִשְׁרָאֵל דְּבִיבֵי. אֵל מְלִיכָא מְלִיכָא. מְלָכִי |
 חֲזַתְנָא מְלָכִי מְלָכִי יִשְׁרָאֵל חֲמַתְנָא חֲמַתְנָא חֲמַתְנָא מְלָכִי מְלָכִי דְבַלַּת [15] חֲמַתְנָא.
 דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי חֲמַתְנָא מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי וְצִפּ לֵב דְּבִיבֵי. | כֵּן חֲמַתְנָא
 חֲמַתְנָא מְלָכִי : דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי | דְּבִיבֵי חֲמַתְנָא חֲמַתְנָא
 מְלָכִי חֲמַתְנָא מְלָכִי ¹⁰⁷ דְּבַלַּת מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי דְּבִיבֵי. | לְמִי דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי. [20] מְלָכִי חֲמַתְנָא. אֵל כֵּן חֲמַתְנָא
 מְלָכִי דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי. דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי : מְלָכִי מְלָכִי | מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי חֲמַתְנָא
 דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי : מְלָכִי מְלָכִי | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. יָכָן מְלָכִי מְלָכִי.
 חֲמַתְנָא מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי חֲמַתְנָא
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי | מְלָכִי דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי ¹⁰⁸ דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי
 חֲמַתְנָא [P.f.4v] מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי |
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי :
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. דְּבִיבֵי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי [5] מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי ¹⁰⁹ מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. | מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי
 מְלָכִי [10] מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. מְלָכִי מְלָכִי. |

(104) L מְלָכִי
 (105) Abs. Ṽ.
 (106) Ṽ מְלָכִי מְלָכִי M, S
 (107) Ṽ מְלָכִי M, V, S
 (108) Add. P מְלָכִי
 (109) Ṽ מְלָכִי M, S

ميسعجيه ميسعذيه. مع هذيه تيهه ميذيه. هجذ لحيذيه زي فكلج. هجذ | فكلجيه جكل.
 هجذيه ذذذيه ميحبيح حك. ¹¹⁰ [هجذ ذيهو] جك ميذيه. هجذيه | هذيه ميحبيح وبيته
 ميسعكليه حلهه : ذذذذيه وهذذيه هذيه. | ذذذذيه جيهه بيذذذيه. ذذذ ذذذيه
 عذذيه مذذذيه مكلجيه. مكلته [15] ميسذيه. مذذذيه ميسعجيه ميسعذيه. هذذذيه
 هذذذيه ذذذذيه | مكلجيه بيذذذيه. ذذذذيه جيهه ميسعذيه. هذذذيه زي هذذذيه ¹¹¹
 ذذذيه هذذذيه | ذذذذيه ميسعذيه : ذذذذيه تيهه هذذذيه : ذذذذيه. هذذذيه ¹¹²
 جيهه | هذذذيه ميسعذيه. ميسكذيه لحيذذيه ميسكذيه. هذذذيه ذذذيه | هذذذيه
 ذذذذيه. هذذذيه ذذذيه ميسعذيه ذذذيه ذذذيه ميسعذيه ذذذذيه [20] ذذذيه. هذذذيه
 ذذذيه ذذذيه. ميسكذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. | هذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 ذذذذيه ميسعذيه لحيذذيه : كم هذذذذيه | ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. هذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه :
 حك هذذذيه ميسعذيه | ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ¹
 هذذذيه ¹¹³ | ميسعذيه هذذذيه ¹¹⁴ [ميسعذيه] ذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ¹¹⁵
 ذذذيه. [P. 4/f.5r] ذذذيه ميسعذيه ¹¹⁶ ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 : هذذذيه | ميسعذيه ذذذذيه. هذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ¹¹⁷ ذذذذيه ذذذذيه : هذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه | مع
 ذذذذيه. هذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ¹¹⁸ ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. هذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذذيه. | ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 ذذذذيه. هذذذذيه ذذذذذيه ذذذذذيه. ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه [5] ذذذذيه ذذذذذيه ذذذذيه.
 هذذذيه ذذذذذيه. ذذذذيه ذذذذيه. هذذذذيه ذذذذيه. | هذذذذيه ¹¹⁹ هذذذذيه. ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 ذذذذذذيه. ذذذذذذيه هذذذذيه ¹²⁰ هذذذذيه ذذذذذيه | ذذذذيه. هذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 هذذذذيه. هذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذذيه | ذذذذذيه. هذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 ذذذذيه. هذذذذيه ذذذذيه ذذذذيه | ذذذذذيه ذذذذذيه : هذذذذيه ذذذذذيه. ذذذذيه

(110) ذذذذيه L
 (111) ذذذذيه L
 (112) ذذذذيه V ذذذذيه
 (113) ذذذذيه S
 (114) Add. L.
 (115) ذذذذيه P ذذذذيه ذذذذيه
 (116) Abs. L.
 (117) ذذذذيه V (this strange reading might appear under the influence of V where *taw* is similar to *nin* in this place).
 (118) ذذذذيه V ذذذذيه
 (119) Abs. M.
 (120) ذذذذيه M, V, S ذذذذيه

בַּד אֶת אֶת ¹²¹ [10] דִּתְּנֵהוּ אֶתְּךָ דְּבַחֲבֵי: מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶת דְּבַחֲבֵי אֶתְּךָ |
 דְּבַחֲבֵי. לְךָ אֶתְּךָ לְךָ אֶת דְּבַחֲבֵי דְּבַחֲבֵי מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. | תְּחַמְּדֵהוּ:
 אֶתְּךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ. מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ. | אֶתְּךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ. מִיָּד חָדַשׁ
 דְּבַחֲבֵי מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. | בְּחֻמְךָ דְּבַחֲבֵי אֶתְּךָ ¹²² חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ
 חָדַשׁ: לְךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ [15] דְּבַחֲבֵי מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. לְךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ
 לְבַחֲבֵי: לְךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ | לְבַחֲבֵי אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ ¹²³ מִיָּד חָדַשׁ
 לְבַחֲבֵי. | לְךָ לְבַחֲבֵי | דְּבַחֲבֵי מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. |
 אֶתְּךָ דְּבַחֲבֵי ¹²⁴ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ |
 אֶתְּךָ דְּבַחֲבֵי ¹²⁵. מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. [20]
 מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. | מִיָּד חָדַשׁ
 חָדַשׁ: מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. | יוֹדֵיב מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ
 דְּבַחֲבֵי לְךָ יוֹדֵיב אֶתְּךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. אֶתְּךָ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ
 חָדַשׁ. מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ | לְבַחֲבֵי אֶתְּךָ. תְּחַמְּדֵהוּ לְבַחֲבֵי
 חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ [P. d/f.5v] חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ ¹²⁶ דְּבַחֲבֵי חָדַשׁ
 לְבַחֲבֵי | יוֹדֵיב. חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ יוֹדֵיב מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ ¹²⁷ חָדַשׁ |
 דְּבַחֲבֵי לְבַחֲבֵי. לְךָ לְבַחֲבֵי מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ: | דְּבַחֲבֵי חָדַשׁ
 חָדַשׁ: מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. [5] חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ
 יוֹדֵיב לְבַחֲבֵי מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ: חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ חָדַשׁ
 לְבַחֲבֵי חָדַשׁ. ¹²⁸ לְךָ לְבַחֲבֵי | מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ לְבַחֲבֵי
 חָדַשׁ. | מִיָּד חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ. חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ
 לְבַחֲבֵי [10] חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ: חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ חָדַשׁ |

(121) Abs. S.
 (122) Abs. L.
 (123) L אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ The scribe of the MS marked that the words were inter-
 changed by putting the letter *bēt* under the first word and the letter *ʔālap*
 under the second.
 (124) Abs. V̄, V.
 (125) V̄ אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ וּמְבַחֲבֵי אֶתְּךָ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ
 (126) L חָדַשׁ
 (127) V̄ חָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ וּחָדַשׁ לְבָרְכָהוּ
 (128) Add. S חָדַשׁ

מִתְּחִלָּה דַּעַן זֶה מְנַח יִכְיֶה. יִכְיֶה מִן הַיָּמִים | דִּבְרֵיךְ מִן הַיָּמִים מְהֵרָה מְנַח.
 תִּתֵּן יָדְךָ אֵלַי דִּבְרֵיךְ | תִּתֵּן. לְאֵלַי דִּבְרֵיךְ זֶה לְכֹהֵן. זֶה דִּבְרֵיךְ
 בְּדִבְרֵיךְ אִתְּךָ | בְּדִבְרֵיךְ מִן הַיָּמִים מְהֵרָה. לְכֹהֵן מִן הַיָּמִים מְהֵרָה מְנַח
 [20] אִתְּךָ אֵלַי דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה : דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה דִּבְרֵיךְ. זֶה זֶה | דִּבְרֵיךְ
 דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. מִן הַיָּמִים | מְהֵרָה דִּבְרֵיךְ דִּבְרֵיךְ
 מְהֵרָה. תִּתֵּן זֶה דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה. | מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה.
 מְהֵרָה. דִּבְרֵיךְ מִן הַיָּמִים : | זֶה זֶה לְכֹהֵן אֵלַי אִתְּךָ מְהֵרָה
 דִּבְרֵיךְ. יִכְיֶה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה [P.o/f.6v] זֶה זֶה. בְּדִבְרֵיךְ אִתְּךָ זֶה זֶה
 לְכֹהֵן מְהֵרָה. אִתְּךָ מִן | מְהֵרָה דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה : דִּבְרֵיךְ מִן הַיָּמִים
 בְּדִבְרֵיךְ אִתְּךָ. לְכֹהֵן | דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. יִכְיֶה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה
 דִּבְרֵיךְ אִתְּךָ | לְכֹהֵן. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה : מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה
 מְהֵרָה [5] מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. יִכְיֶה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. זֶה זֶה
 דִּבְרֵיךְ [137] מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה | מְהֵרָה
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה | אִתְּךָ מְהֵרָה
 מְהֵרָה [138] מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. | מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה.
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה [10] מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה.
 מְהֵרָה | מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה
 מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה | מְהֵרָה :
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה [139] מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. יִכְיֶה מְהֵרָה [141]
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. [15] זֶה זֶה
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. | מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. | מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה.
 מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה : דִּבְרֵיךְ מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. | מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה
 מְהֵרָה | מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה. מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה [20]

(135) מְהֵרָה M מְהֵרָה V, S מְהֵרָה V
 (136) מְהֵרָה L
 (137) מְהֵרָה L
 (138) Add. L מְהֵרָה
 (139) M זֶה
 (140) Add. V : מְהֵרָה מְהֵרָה
 (141) מְהֵרָה P מְהֵרָה V, S מְהֵרָה M מְהֵרָה V

נִיחַ | וְחַכְּדוֹם לְיַהֲרִיקוֹם מִכִּשְׁתֵּי דָלַק לְדַעֲבָב יַעֲמֵר. וְעַמֹּר פָּסָר חַד בַּעֲמֵל תִּלְיָה |
 מִיַּעֲתָה בְדַעֲבָב. דַּעֲבָבִים לְחַפְּזֵיהֶם חָלְדוֹתָתָן. מִיַּחַל דָּלַק לְיָבִישׁ. [P. w/f.7v] פֶּעַם
 בְּעַמֹּר חַבְתָּ דִּבְלָקִין. וְדַעֲבָבִים לֹא יִשְׁמָרוּ. כְּתוּבָה תִּתֵּן אֵת אֶתְךָ | מִיַּישׁ. שָׂדֵן מִיַּחַל
 עֲלִיבְמָשָׁר חַנְדָּה. מְדַעֲבָבִים בָּלַד דְּחַוְתָּה הִיא. | תִּדְבְּרֵם אֵת מַלְכָּתָּ : חַד בַּת טוֹתָן
 יִיחַתְּתֵךְ מִסַּבְלָה. נִיחַ אֵת דָּלַק תְּיָד | לְחַזֵּק יַעֲמֵר : חַבְתָּ תִּינָן מִן טוֹסְטָן. נִיחַ נִשְׁאֵר
 דְּעַמֹּר מִן אֵשׁ לְחַזֵּק נַעֲ ¹⁵⁰ [5] יִשְׁרָה. יִשְׁרָה פָּסָר מִיַּחַל וְלִקְרֹמָתָם תִּשְׁלָמְהוּ אֵת
 יִשְׁמָר ¹⁵¹ : מְדַעֲבָבִים | מְדַעֲבָבִים בְּיָד דָּלַק מִיַּשְׁמָר אֵתְךָ. יַעֲבָד לְחַפְּזֵךְ יִלְכָה
 מִכַּבְּרָה. דִּבְלָק | לְבַד יַעֲמִיר. מְשָׁרֵה דִבְתִּיכִיךָ לָתֵת מִיָּהֱבָה. לָתֵת לְבַתְּךָ : מִמִּכְתָּן
 | נִיחַ תִּחַ דָּלַק מִן לְבַד מִפְּקַדְתָּ לָתֵת הִיא. לֵמַ לְבַתְּךָ דָּלַק לְבִלְבָב | מְדַעֲבָבִים
 חֲלַפָה וְדַעֲבָבִים. מַלְכָּתָּהּ יִלְכָה דַעֲבָבִים לָתֵת דְּחַמְטָה [10] יַעֲמֵר לְבַד. יִלְכָה וְמַלְכָּתָּ
 וְמַלְכָּתָּהּ מַלְכָּתָּהּ מִפְּקַדְתָּ לְבַתְּךָ : נִיחַ דָּלַק | יַתֵּן מִמִּשְׁפַּחָה תִּחַ. מִיַּחַל תִּתֵּן תַּוֹרָה לָתֵת
 דְּחַמְטָה לְבַד. יִלְכָה | מִבַּלַּד דַּעֲבָבִים לָתֵת מִיַּשְׁמָר מִיָּתֵן דִּעֲבָבִים דָּלַק חוֹתְמָה. וְיִתֵּן אֵתְךָ
 לְךָ | דְּחַמְטָה מִיַּשְׁמָר. כְּתוּבָה תִּלְכָה דְּעַמֹּר מִלְּחַמְטָתָּ : מְדַעֲבָבִים דְּחַמְטָה | מִן
 דְּבִלְכָתָּ : דְּחַמְטָה מִפְּקַדְתָּ דָּלַק מְחַפְּזָתָּ [15] נִיחַ תִּחַ
 דְּחַמְטָה לְבַד. וְלַחֲזֵק מִיַּחַל דְּחַיִּי אֵתְךָ. לֹא אֵת חֲלַפָה | דְּבִלְכָתָּ דְּבַחְדָּתָּ :
 דְּעִלְיָהֶם עֲלִיבְמָשָׁר לְחַפְּזֵם מְדַעֲבָבִים אֵתְךָ. | מְדַעֲבָבִים לֹא מִכַּבְּרָה לְךָ.
 כְּתוּבָה אֵת יִלְכָה דְּחַמְטָתָּהֶם : לְחַפְּזֵיךָ | מְדַעֲבָבִים מִן אֵתְךָ. כְּתוּבָה אֵתְךָ מִשְׁמָר אֵתְךָ
 עֲלֵיךָ יִתֵּן דְּחַמְטָה : נִיחַ | מִן חַדְוֹת דְּחַמְטָה מִכַּבְּרָה. מִתָּה לֹא מְדַעֲבָבִים מִכַּבְּרָה אֵתְךָ
 לְךָ : נִיחַ [20] דְּחַמְטָה לְחַמְטָה ¹⁵² מִיָּתֵן לָתֵת אֵתְךָ. יִלְכָה וְמַלְכָּתָּהּ ¹⁵³ מְדַעֲבָבִים
 דָּלַק חַתְּתָּה | יִלְכָה לְחַמְטָה. מִיָּתֵן יִלְכָה ¹⁵⁴ לְחַמְטָתָּה דְּחַיִּי אֵתְךָ. אֵתְךָ פָּסָר חֲלַפָה
 יִיחַתְּתֵךְ : | סָבִיב ¹⁵⁵ כְּתוּבָה דְּחַמְטָה מְרֻחֵת דְּבִלְכָתָּ לָתֵת. דְּחַמְטָה מִן דְּבִלְכָתָּהּ דְּעִלְיָהֶם |
 מִיָּתֵן לְךָ דָּלַק מְחַפְּזָתָּהּ יִלְכָה. יִשְׁרָה פָּסָר חַד בַּת דְּחַמְטָה דְּחַמְטָתָּהּ | יִלְכָה
 תְּפַחְתָּהּ דְּחַיִּי מִיָּתֵן מִיָּתֵן לְךָ מִכַּבְּרָה : חַבְתָּ תִּילָל בַּל טוֹתָן. [P. w/f.8r] מְחַמְטָה
 תִּשְׁלָמְהוּ אֵתְךָ דָּלַק הִיא מִיָּתֵן בָּלַד דְּעִבְתָּהּ | לְחַמְטָתָּהּ דְּעִבְתָּהּ לְךָ
 מְחַמְטָתָּהּ דְּחַיִּי אֵתְךָ. תִּדְבְּרֵם לֹא אֵת מִיַּחַל | דְּחַמְטָה וְחַיִּי לָתֵת מִן יִשְׁרָה לְחַמְטָה

(150) Add. V וְ חֶלֶץ V לֵתֵת
 (151) M, V, S, P מְדַעֲבָבִים
 (152) L אֵתְךָ
 (153) M מִיָּתֵן
 (154) P עֲלֵיךָ M, V מִיָּתֵן S עֲלֵיךָ M, V מִיָּתֵן
 (155) V סָבִיב

יתלכר: גזבר דכר | לחרבך כסמך דכר מר דכר דכר דכר דכר דכר
 חקכר: [5] לחרבך מר דכר: דכר דכר דכר דכר דכר דכר דכר
 חקכר: | דכר דכר דכר דכר: מר דכר דכר דכר דכר: |
 דכר דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר דכר: דכר | דכר דכר
 מר דכר: דכר דכר דכר דכר: מר דכר | דכר דכר דכר דכר
 דכר: מר דכר ¹⁵⁷ דכר דכר [10] דכר דכר דכר דכר: דכר
 דכר דכר: מר דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר דכר: דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר
 דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: דכר דכר דכר: | דכר דכר

(156) Abs. M.
 (157) מר דכר V, S דכר M
 (158) M, P דכר
 (159) L דכר
 (160) L דכר
 (161) Abs. L.
 (162) Abs. L.

וּבְיָמָיו ׀ חֲמִשָּׁה פְּסָלִים ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּלָמָּה שֶׁבִיבָה׃
 אָמֵן בְּ יְמֵי חַדְשׁוֹ בְּיָמָיו ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּלָמָּה שֶׁבִיבָה׃
 וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ [10] בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ אֲחֵרָתוֹ עַד יְבִיבוֹ מְהִיבָה׃
 מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ
 בְּ יְבִיבוֹ בְּיָמָיו ׀ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃
 כִּלְכִלֵּם אֵלֶיךָ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ אֲחֵרָתוֹ עַד יְבִיבוֹ
 מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ [15] וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 יְבִיבוֹ בְּ יְמֵי חַדְשׁוֹ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ 186 לָמָּה תִּיבֵן בְּיָמָיו׃
 מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ חֲמִשָּׁה פְּסָלִים ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ 187
 אֲחֵרָתוֹ עַד יְבִיבוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ [20] מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 עַד יְבִיבוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ 188 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 ׀ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ לְכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ [P. d/f.10r]
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃
 [10] בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃ ׀ וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ מְהִיבָה׃ בְּכָל חַיֵּי חַיָּתוֹ׃

(185) Add. L.
 (186) L דַּבְּרֵי
 (187) L חֲמִשָּׁה
 (188) V דַּבְּרֵי S דַּבְּרֵי V דַּבְּרֵי M וְכָל תְּשׁוּבָתוֹ ׀
 (189) Add. V, V.
 (190) M דַּבְּרֵי L דַּבְּרֵי
 (191) L ׀

دٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ | ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲ
 ٲٲٲٲٲ : ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ¹⁹² | ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ | ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ
 ٲٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲٲ | ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲ
 ٲٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . [15] ٲٲٲٲ : ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ
 ٲٲٲٲ¹⁹³ . ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ | ٲٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲ ٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ :
 ٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ | ٲٲٲٲ : ٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲ
 | ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ . | ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲ
 * ٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲٲ ٲٲٲٲٲ *

TRANSLATION

[f.3v] With the help of our Lord Jesus Christ we begin to write the Book of the Main Points, History of the Temporal World, composed by saint Mār Yōḥannān bar Penkāyē, let his prayer help us, amen.

The first chapter

[of the first part]¹⁹⁴ is about the beginning of creation. Moreover, I will write you a helpful history about well-known deeds. Oh faithful friend! When Got strongly desires and gives power to our word, in accordance with His glory and will¹⁹⁵ we can demonstrate it (i. e. history).

Indeed, it is impossible to say or to hear something useful without His help. So, let the answered prayers of His saints and of all the assembly of His angels be our advocate before Him in order that what we want to say may be obvious and clear. So, hence we begin with the help of our Lord. In [this book] we will demonstrate, mainly in brief, history of the deeds past and present in this temporal world in accordance with what we have learned from the holy Scriptures and [in accordance with] what our poor mind could understand. In short, [we will demonstrate it] as much as the grace of our Lord will help

(192) Abs. V̇, V.
 (193) L ٲٲٲٲ
 (194) Abs. L.
 (195) L “mercy.”

our feebleness. We pray Christ, Jesus, our Lord, the merciful King that He may place on us power in accordance with the promise given to us. [We pray] that the achievement of this work may follow, [p. 1^{SYR}/f. 4r] that it may neither reel nor stop, that it may not be a laughingstock for evil demons and impious people. We are convinced that the work we have begun is very great and its goodness is boundless. But despite this, [success of this work is entirely depends] on the confidence in His mercy. We will demonstrate what He did for us by His grace and what did our ingratitude towards Him. [We will demonstrate] what the marvelous providential deeds He has been constantly doing¹⁹⁶ for us at all times in order that we might turn to Him. [We will demonstrate] how many evil inventions our shamelessness invented for itself in to hide itself within them in the distance from Him and in the disobedience. Indeed, according to the saying of the blessed Paul: “the fulfillment of the ages has come”¹⁹⁷ and “the Judge is standing at the door.”¹⁹⁸ I am the smallest and the last of all humans, and, therefore, as the tongue [represents] the whole body, so I ought to become a sinner of all mankind and to acknowledge all that God did for us by His grace and to arrange all that our ingratitude did towards Him. When this is acknowledged on the lips and in the hearts of all the people, then glory of good deeds’ doer will multiply and our ingratitude will be put to shame. And with the help of shame [belonging] to our free will it (i.e. ingratitude) will grant to itself pity and mercy with which it will be generous strewn in order to prepare a just judgment.

So, at first, I ought to tell about created natures, which were created together with us for our pleasure. [I ought to tell] about formation order of this world and about abundance of wisdom hidden in it. For this is a part of the history about God’s good deeds toward us. Because all that was created was created to [provide] help for us. And nothing of what was created by the Creator [was to cause any] harm to us. So, there are no these that were designed as causing harm to our body, be them wild beasts, snakes, scorpions or the others similar to these. You think that they cause harm to us, but [they] are full of use. All of these are an instructive rod mercifully aimed at disobedient sons. According to the Book of Proverbs, “he who loves his son is

(196) Lit. “was renewing.”

(197) 1 Cor 10:11.

(198) Jas 5:9.

careful to discipline him.”¹⁹⁹ The one [p. 2^{SYR}/f. 4v] who did not exist and came into existence, what grace can he demonstrate except that which was given to him? And the one to whom all he has was granted out of charity, how can he equally repay? I suppose there is no way [he could do it]. Therefore, we should know that all of us are God’s debtors. And there is no way we can fully repay it. Because He created us when we did not exist. When we did not possess anything, He made us rulers of all his creatures and [rulers] of ourselves too. And this first good is invaluable. And each who came into existence equally submits to this. There is [only] a partial difference.

From now on, we demonstrate what was promised. The appearance of the created natures. The first natures which God had created as He said by means of his servant Moses are the heaven and the angels, the earth and the fire, the waters and the air, the darkness and the light. Something appeared out of two.²⁰⁰ One was divided into something. One impels everything. By means of the four, everything was formed. One pointed something out. By means of the two, all the times and seasons of the small temporal world were defined.²⁰¹

So, on the first day, God created the heaven, the earth, the angels, the waters and the fire, the air, the darkness and the light. Thus, the angels had been waiting in silence for twelve hours until the light was created. Then they became excited. The summit of their excitement became acknowledgement [of God] and praise to Him. For the appearance and the creation of the light strengthens the mind of the conscious and excites consciousness of the learned. The light assumed power on twelve hours as the darkness did too. Then it (i. e. the darkness) replaced it. And it (i. e. the light) was gathered in storages prepared for it. For it is said: “God separated the light from the darkness.”²⁰² He (i. e. Moses) does not mean division of the natures.

(199) Prov 13:24.

(200) Probably, Bar Penkāyē means by “two” the heaven and the earth. In the Theodore of Mopsuestia’s introduction to the Commentary on Genesis, we read: “He began to tell about creation of these which were from the heaven and from the earth. Nothing was created before those (i. e. the heaven and the earth). He remembered these because they are created and all the creation they enclose within themselves” (Theodori Mopsuesteni *fragmenta Syriaca*, ed. SACHAU, pp. 6:24–7:2).

(201) I. e. by means of the darkness and the light.

(202) Gen 1:4.

For each of them got from the beginning²⁰³ this [nature] together with its creation. But he wants to say that God divided [them] and gave each of them an appointed²⁰⁴ time in order that they might show their activity as much as it is allowed to them.²⁰⁵ [p. 3^{SYR}/f. 5r] They might not overreach each other without any order. But when this is approaching that should move away. And when that has come and approached this should completely vanish before it. These are [deeds] of the first day, i. e. Sunday.

[The deed] of the second day is the firmament, and that of the third [day] – the formation of the earth. The earth was unseen and unformed, as it is written. It was necessary for the earth to get mountains and heights, valleys and feet with the rest of other things. Finally, it got them during the process of formation. We described this in another book.²⁰⁶ There is no need to repeat all the same.

We learn that the creation is one thing, the formation is another. However, the One who creates and the One who forms is the same. What was created and what gets the formation is the same too, but the process of creation of something and that of formation of something was not the same. The creation is what did not exist and then came into existence. The formation accepts something that was created and exists and needs formation. Just as materials for a house or a ship are gathered together but till now they have not received either structure or decoration. And if somebody wants to investigate [it] in truth, so not only the earth after the creation got the formation and other decoration, but also the firmament, the light, the air and the darkness, the fire, the waters and even the angels. This is the heaven. Something was spread [on the heaven's surface] as its (i. e. the heaven's) decoration like on the surface of the earth. This is the firmament. And after its appearance the firmament was nicely decorated with lights. And the light was divided and arranged among many and different lights. And the fire was shed into the lights and was gathered into all things. And the darkness was squeezed and bridled with a bridle of the light in order not to be scattered under all the heaven

(203) Lit. "naturally."

(204) Add. L.

(205) Lit. "as much as He allows to them."

(206) In the first chapter of the *History*, Bar Penkāyē says about another book he wrote *Against Heresies* in which he demonstrated benefit of the lights. It is probable that he means this book here too. See note 211.

as before. The waters earlier covered all the earth. Then they were divided and gathered in seas, rivers [p. 4^{SYR}/f. 5v] and springs. Power of natural flowing was added to them for the common use. Similarly to this, the air was squeezed and gathered between the firmament and the earth into a wineskin not to be dispersed and perish. All the natures got these decorations and formations. They got them after their (i. e. natures') appearance so that rational beings might learn that the One who decorated the natures and finally formed them is the Same who brought them into existence when they did not exist at all. Likewise, the incorporeal natures earlier, when they were created, remained in ignorance, and step by step they came closer to knowledge.

On the second day, the firmament was created of the waters. A part of the waters gathered on its surface and [another] part remained on the earth. If somebody asks: "What is the need the waters above the firmament are for?", or "What use is in multitude, abundance and greatness of the seas?", we have prepared an answer for him. From the waters, our friend, that are above the firmament, it (i. e. the firmament) is constantly getting magnitude and fatness not to become thinner and disappear during all this length of time because of flame and heat of the lights. Also, abundance and greatness of the sea softens heat of the sun and lessens thickness of the air when it surges and storms. For severe winds are constantly blowing at the sea, ruffling its waves and raising them high into the air for a long way. If the divine command did not arrange it, nothing restrictive would exist, and all the earth would be covered with its waves. During the flood, when it (i. e. the sea) was allowed [to do it], it easily did this. And when it was commanded, it returned again to its place, it was limited and closed in order not to exceed its bounds²⁰⁷ anymore as it is written "You set a boundary they cannot cross; never again will they cover the earth."²⁰⁸ If someone doubts that little currents which flow from the seas are not able to soften heat of the sun, [p. 5^{SYR}/f. 6r] he should know that as the sun can naturally heat so the waters can naturally cool. [He] should also know that the sun cannot be equal in greatness²⁰⁹ with any of the seas. It is [not] as big as any of the great seas. What can compare with greatness of unmeasured

(207) Lit. "its place."

(208) Ps 104:9.

(209) L "in his greatness."

abysses, which cover all the earth as it remains in the middle like an island? The sea which is called Ocean surrounds all the earth. There is no earth outside it, but it (i. e. Ocean) is gathered and limited within the firmament. Beside this one, there are other seas which separate out from it within the inhabited world and send waters of rivers and do a great deal of good for the people.

After the waters had been gathered and enclosed in the abysses according to the divine command — and He did this so that the earth may become passable — He gave shape to it which it had not got during the creation. So in due time, He commanded it to bring forth grass, seeds and trees of many various species without number. He decorated it and formed. He had made it a table full of different delicacies before those who needed it came into existence. [He did so] to make it clear that thoughts as to do one way or another have not just come to Him, but He always had knowledge about it before anyone's appearance. Those He had created earlier were useful for those He brought into existence later. That which is less important might appear before that which excels it [in importance] and needs it. For thus the great intelligence of the Creator is greatly praised.²¹⁰ [Just] like the firmament He formed earlier in order that it might be of use for the forthcoming world.

After He had ended to form these [creations] of the third day, He created the lights, put in order their movements, paths and times on the fourth day. Though their benefit is evident for understanding people, we demonstrated fully for what they are in use [p. 6^{SYR}/f. 6v] in that book which we had written before — “Against heresies.”²¹¹ Now, since we have another subject before us to elucidate in this book we do not have to use many words.²¹² But we will demonstrate only what corresponds to this subject. And we let know what God did for the human race and what they were doing during all the generations. So, the lights were created on the fourth day as we said. As

(210) Cf. *Homélies de Narsai*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [112]:89–90.

(211) There are works ascribed to Bar Penkāyē in the *Catalogue of 'Ab-dīšō'* of Nisibis (J. S. ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, Romae, 1719–1728, Vol. III:1 (1725), p. 190) and in the ‘*Liber thesauri de arte poëtica Syrorum*’ of Gabriel Cardahi (G. CARDAHI, *Liber thesauri de arte poëtica Syrorum nec non de eorum poetarum vitis et carminibus*, Roma, 1875, p. 35) which bear similar titles: *luqbal dehlāw* ‘Against heresies’ and *ar-radd šalā al-mubtadašīn* ‘Refutation of heresies’.

(212) Lit. “to go out for long words.”

someone says, on the same [day], angels' duties were divided. Since these [things] were being created here and there they were in need of guidance which was realized by the angels according to²¹³ the divine will.²¹⁴ Therefore, they were arranged and prepared, got up and waited for who all this service would be in use. For, on the fifth day, He commanded the waters to bring forth reptiles of all kinds and birds of many species without number, and they did. When the angels saw this they thought if not because of them all this was created. But no one of them knew about those that had been before him and he did not deserve [all of this]. [And the angels thought] that they were in use for someone else too. Likewise, they thought [the same] again when on the sixth day He commanded the earth to have on it wild beasts and domestic animals. They understood that no one of those that had appeared hitherto fits and deserves this entire honor. When they heard the frightening voice: "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness,"²¹⁵ then they understood that the heir had come. Some of them rejoiced at his coming, others were full of fire of envy against him. Oh Adam! How much you were honored, when the high, the deep and all in them served you. Even God, your Creator, was serving you during six days of the work. He prepared for you a spacious house full of various goods.²¹⁶ And you could not keep His word even a day! Woe to rebellious servants! Those for whom was not sufficient²¹⁷ that great honor which they got from their Creator [p. 7^{SYR}/f. 7r] who was great and excelled them in rank, but they also wished to occupy His place. For the Devil, the rebellious, to whom primacy over the air, together with all its ranks, was given, he was seized with deep jealousy against Adam, when he saw him and he said to himself: "If this is the heir to whom I also should serve I will kill him and disinherit him". What was next? He began to devise an evil plot against the innocent. And came [to him] a desire with vain promises [to taste] the fruit and seized Adam. He forgot the honor [which had been given to him] and the One Who had given honor to him. Adam, should you repay the One Who gave you the honor in such a way? In what were you lesser than He, except the nature?

(213) L "in order to become the divine will."

(214) Cf. *Homélies de Narsäi*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [134]:437–438.

(215) Gen 1:26.

(216) Cf. *Homélies de Narsäi*, ed. GIGNOUX, p. [114]:103–104.

(217) L "was not sufficient."

[In]²¹⁸ other respects He is not a master in His house, but He made you a possessor of all His property. What was next? Here is a good Master. Go look at the paternal love and the unmeasured kindness. He saw that His order had been violated and His rebellious servants mocked at Him. He did not become angry and He was not furious, but He became very sad and ordered His servants to mourn heavily over departure of His friend. He mercifully ascended to comfort those who erred and, with a warning word, to make them return. Go look now at the judgment full of mercy with which He judged the bad ones. Earlier, He made the decision on him (i. e. Adam): “In the day, when you eat of the tree, you will surely die.”²¹⁹ But when He saw weakness of one to whom He gave the command, He rejected [His own] sentence and did not come out against him immediately. But as if from afar He lets him hear the sound of treads as it is written: “He heard the sound of the LORD God as he was walking in the garden in the cool of the day.”²²⁰ He lets them²²¹ hear the voice from afar in order not to disturb them with His unexpected appearance. He appeared to them in peaceful way as usual in order not to trouble them. When they heard the voice and recognized [it] they ran to hide themselves in refuge. Because they could not [p. 8^{SYR}/f. 7v] hide amongst the trees so that they would become invisible. Firstly, they were ashamed of Him because of their palm branches, so to say, and secondly, because they had deceived Him. When The Gracious had seen this weak mind, He began to call [him] from afar as if He was crying and did not know where they were: “Where are you, Adam?”²²² Since Adam could not acknowledge his foolishness and knew that he could not be hiding anymore, he devised to say an explanation: “I heard your voice and I saw that I was naked; so I hid.”²²³ “Oh, human! What do you have which I did not see and would not know very well? All your members were created and put together by My hands, were not they? Why are you ashamed to show them to me? It is likely that something else, something different happened to you. Something I did not put into you. And because of it you are ashamed

(218) Add. L.

(219) Cf. Gen 2:17.

(220) Cf. Gen 3:8.

(221) Bar Penkâyē obviously means Adam and Eve.

(222) Gen 3:9.

(223) Cf. Gen 3:10.

to show them²²⁴ to Me. But if you are ashamed of me now at the wrong time you would be ashamed of Me at the very moment when you violated My commandment and dared to taste the tree that I had warned you about and command you not to eat of it. What excuse can you give Me for yourself? May be because you were hungry? No, all the paradise trees that I had set to you for food were before you, but you still have not tasted them. What was the reason for your haste to steal and eat of that [tree]? Why was the fruit of the fig tree for you more desirable than [fruits] of the other trees? And now you have not even tasted those²²⁵ to despise them and to rush for this. It is likely that some desire not [belonging to your] nature brought [you] there and led to fallacious behavior like this. All that mind is seized with something that showed you that you are naked. And now you have eaten of the tree that I told you about and commanded you not to eat of it." When Adam saw that the first reason he had held was disproved and he was obviously exposed he began to put blame on Eve [p. 9^{SYR}/f. 8r] and to explain as if he accused Him too for giving him the woman who had committed this offence with him. Since she learned from Adam first to give excuses then she also began to accuse the serpent that had tempted her with vain promises to eat of the tree. But it is obvious that guile like this could not belong to the serpent. For from all the created corporeal natures only Adam was rational. As then blessed Moses witnesses and says: "God created all the species and brought them to Adam to see what he would name them."²²⁶ And he adds: "But for Adam no suitable helper was found."²²⁷ He is a likeness. It is known that he (i. e. Moses) says not about likeness of structure. Here all of them got all the same members put together and differing in a form. But Adam differs from animals not only in this. There are also many species that differ from each [other] in a form. It is clear from this what he said about inheritance of intelligence and power of speech. There was no equal to Adam among these visible natures because only him God had given a rational soul similar to that of spiritual [beings]. And only because of this He named him His likeness. What do I want to report? [I want to report] that this guile did not belong to the serpent, but to the Devil

(224) Lit. "it."

(225) L "them."

(226) Cf. Gen 2:19.

(227) Gen 2:20.

hiding in it. For he stirred it up against the woman and put in her ears all this great evil. Therefore, God did not deign him an examination but from the very beginning He sentenced him. This is clear. For he inclined towards evil before that. Then He [sentenced] Eve. And finally [He sentenced] Adam. As He began an examination from Adam because He had commanded him not to eat of the tree so He began his judgment from this (i. e. from the Devil). Because [p. 10^{SYR}/f. 8v] at the beginning he drew [the evil?] with the yoke of the sin, settled it and fixed it on every side. [This is] a sentence corresponding to his offence. He who perhaps brighter than a lightning had flashed in the light on the heaven and had been a chief of all the air but because of his evil he was thrown down upon the earth was destined to crawl as the serpent in dust. For the serpent had crawled on its belly before Adam ate of the tree. As [it crawls] now, it was created [in such a way] by nature. He made that (i.e. the Devil) similar in this [respect] to the serpent, as if he wanted to be a friend to that which was against Adam. Instead [to have] spiritual knowledge and divine appearances which are food for the angels, [his fellows],²²⁸ he rolls in the darkness without knowledge in the midst of the earth as the serpent in dirt of evil and own disgrace. The Devil was made a hated enemy for the human race from this moment till the end. Sign of his hostility is engraved on the serpent, a tool of his service. When we see every day a serpent we recall the hidden enemy who happened upon us. We beware of him and fear him as the serpent. This is the reason why the serpent and Satan were cursed.

And the woman He condemned to sorrows of conceptions and labour pains. When she suffers from these sorrows of conceptions and labour pains she should remember her first offence. She should understand from it how evil and bitter are different deeds which have origin in [this] sin. He tied her up with weakness and subjection to her husband. Because when she heard that vain promise: "You will be like God, knowing good and evil"²²⁹ she tried to surpass [Adam] and first ate of this tree in order to become the head and to rise above Adam.

Then He sentences Adam, placing [p. 11^{SYR}/f. 9r] on him as usual a great deal of mercy. What [is it], Adam? Because you have committed this, the earth is cursed because of you. Praise to the unspeakable

(228) Add. L.

(229) Gen 3:5.

mercy! He raised a rod [to drop it]²³⁰ on the sinner but He returned His love, withdrew it (i.e. rod) and pointed it aside. What was next? "I pity you and do not want to put a curse on you. But because of you I curse the earth. As for you, I condemn you to arduous toil and torments on it, so that you gather food to sustain your perishable life in sorrow and troubles, when you toil and suffer from constant labour on it every day; so that you may understand how bad it is to violate commandments; that you may not incline your ears to evil advices of the woman. All this you accept as a trial from this moment on and till when you will return to the earth, from where you were taken. Because I created you of dust, and I will turn you into dust." Then He said: "I will take him away of Eden," explaining this as if He was afraid that "He would reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever."²³¹ In truth, He thus points out the flame of desire that dragged him [to this]. And together with it, He teaches people to come that there is another reason why people will become immortal. When He took the race of Adam out of the Garden He as a loving father began to take care of them and made tunics of leaves of one of the trees for them and clothed them.

I suppose that no one doubts that Adam was created mortal by nature. As some suppose that God in a rage put death on him because he had despised His commandment. It is clear that this is a heresy. For the One who is above and below showed to him love of fathers to sons and did not curse His love in order to destroy that who had despised all. Rage was not put on all of this [p. 12^{SYR}/f. 9v] in order to punish equally and without differences all people, righteous and evil, because of the offence of one human. Here, before that one who had sinned died, earlier the innocent Abel had died in whom there were neither sin nor offence. It is clear from this example that God wished to create people mortal from the very beginning of their existence. He created death in order that it might enter them because of the offence, [as I said].²³² [He created death] in order that it might [indeed]²³³ strengthen in them awe of His laws and hate towards the sin. He also shows with it that as the sin and the death entered all the [human] nature because of the offence of one human who had listened to Sa-

(230) Add. L.

(231) Gen 3:22.

(232) Add. L.

(233) Add. L.

tan so righteousness and life will rule over the human nature because of obedience of one human. Here, the death and the sin entered us because of Adam. And everyone understands that because of Christ they left our nature and they will entirely die out it.²³⁴ No one till this moment wanted to confess that this is a demonstration of the divine mercy and a sign of our depravity.

What was next? The sin began to demonstrate its power. It passed from Adam to Cain, his son, as a bad inheritance. He began to gather [them] in handfuls²³⁵ and send to death's mouth. The brave [man] killed [his] brother with a sword of envy. But even then God did not despise [him] but made Abel's blood desirable in order that it may moan and its voice heard up in heaven. And also He fairly punished the murderer with roaming and wandering that He sent upon him so that he may be an example and a fearful sign for all following generations, that they might not follow the same ways. The shout and call of Abel's blood were sufficient to give hope and comfort for the incorporeal natures. But division of [the race] of Adam made all of them sad. [p. 13^{SYR}/f. 10r] Only for few hours Seth made them glad. Then God began to divide between offspring of Cain and offspring of Seth. He named children of Seth 'Sons of God' (*bnay ʔalohim*) and children of Cain [he named] 'people'. He set them a law that these shall not mingle with those, that is they shall not take wives from them and give [wives] to them. In order that righteous offspring might not mingle with sinners. The earth bore fruits with difficulty because of the curse [put] upon it, especial for offspring of Cain. The source of food for them as is shown by the Blessed Interpreter²³⁶ was a skimpy meal from the other fruit trees. For there were no crafts hitherto. Finally, God gave [these] to Cain's race through Jabal, Jubal, Tubalcain and Naamah, sons of Cain. God gave [crafts] to them before because of construction of the Ark. As it is written, Cain begot Enoch, Enoch begot Irad, Irad begot Mehujael, Mehujael begot Methusael, Methusael begot Lamech from whom were born Jabal, Jubal and Tubalcain, the first craftsmen.

God as usual did not despise people mercifully in that moment, He pitied them and comforted with departure of righteous Enoch of

(234) Cf. Theodori Mopsuesteni *commentarius in Evangelium Iohannis apostoli*, ed. VOSTÉ, p. 78:21–24.

(235) L "handful."

(236) Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Seth's race. He moved him to paradise and made angels and people find hope and comfort in him. He made it in such a way that he may live a life of joy there. [p. 14^{SYR}/f. 10v] The end of the first chapter.

SUMMARY

The present article deals with the work *The History of the Temporal World* of an East-Syriac monk John (Yōḥannān) bar Penkāyē (end of 7th century). The first chapter of *the History* narrates the beginning of the world and human history, generally following the book of Genesis, and describes events of Gen 1–5:24. This chapter of Bar Penkāyē's work is discussed in connection with other East-Syriac works concerning the exegesis of the book of Genesis as well as the works that influenced East-Syriac authors. The edition of the hitherto unedited chapter is based on six manuscripts and includes its English translation.