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The 'Disputation of Sergius the Stylite' is a Christian anti-Jewish work, written sometime between 730-770 A.D., and ascribed to Sergius the Stylite, an otherwise unknown Syrian ascetic, who lived in Gousit, a town not far from Antioch in Syria. The work purports to report a dialogue between Sergius and an anonymous Jew. This dialogue has been incorporated into the framework of an anti-Jewish treatise possibly by Sergius himself. The work begins with a long series of biblical texts quoted in order to show that all the events of Jesus Christ's life were prophesied or prefigured in the Old Testament. The two participants in the dialogue then discuss such subjects as the Crucifixion and the Cross, the Incarnation, the Destruction of Jerusalem and the Dispersion of the Jews, Christian worship of the Cross and saints' relics, Christian consumption of swine's flesh, and finally, the problem of Christians who were attracted by Jewish forms of worship.

In the Introduction to this edition of the 'Disputation' a description of the manuscript is given. The date and authorship of the work are then considered, and its literary sources discussed. Some interesting biblical agrapha which are found in the 'Disputation' suggest that it stands in a stream of tradition going back to what is thought to be the earliest Christian literary activity, the composition of
'testimonies'. The work also contains some valuable quotations from an otherwise lost Syriac version of Flavius Josephus's 'War of the Jews'. The final chapter of the Introduction discusses the contents of the 'Disputation', the nature of the dialogue contained in it, the portrait which it gives of the Jewish participant, and the purpose for which the work was written.
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TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY folios 1-79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. (or B.Tal.)</td>
<td>The Babylonian Talmud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.C.S.</td>
<td>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob of Sarug</td>
<td>Jacob of Sarug's Homilies against the Jews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.L.</td>
<td><em>Journal of Biblical Literature</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.S.</td>
<td><em>Journal of Theological Studies</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin, Trypho</td>
<td>Justin Martyr, <em>The Dialogue with Trypho</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td><em>The Septuagint</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Manuscript, usually with reference to B.M. Add. 17, 199.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MT : The Massoretic Text
O.C. : Oriens Christianus.
OS : The Old Syriac Version(s) of the Gospels.
P : The Peshitta Version.
P.S. : Patrologia Syriaca.
S
S
s : The Sinaitic Syriac text of the Gospels.
T.U. : Texte und Untersuchungen.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LITERATURE CITED

Books mentioned in the list of abbreviations are not included in the following bibliography.

A. Sources Used.


The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila : ed. F. C. Conybeare, Anecdota Oxoniensia, 1898.


It is also edited in P.L.,lix, 157-180, Paris, 1862.


Jacob of Edessa: Jacobi Edesseni Hexaemeron, ed. A.Vaschalde, Louvain, 1953.

Of Jacob's seven homilies against the Jews Cosgrove has edited nos. one, three, and four, but numbered them I,II,III, respectively. Where Cosgrove's numbering departs from that normally accepted, the latter is placed in brackets after Cosgrove's number. For the other homilies against the Jews see the section on manuscripts below.

Jacob of Edessa : Jacobi Edesseni Hexaemeron, ed. A.Vaschalde, Louvain, 1953.


Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum, ed. H.Kottek, Berlin, 1886.


Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa

The Qurran Scrolls

Tertullian

The Bible

The Peshitta Old Testament

The Peshitta New Testament

The Old Syriac Gospels:

The Diatessaron

The Hebrew Bible


Pentateuchus Syriace, ed.


The Peshitta Psalter, ed.

W.E.Barnes, Cambridge, 1904.


Tetra Evangelium Sanctum, Simplex Syrorum Versio, ed.

G.H.Gwilliam, Oxford, 1901.

Evangelion Da -Mepharreshe, ed.

F.C.Burkitt, Cambridge, 1904.


The Septuagint: The Old Testament in Greek, ed. A.E. Brooke and N. McLean, Cambridge, 1906–.

Septuaginta, Göttingen Edition, 1931–.

The Targums: The Bible in Aramaic, ed. A. Sperber, Leiden, 1959–.


Syriac Manuscripts Used

London, The British Museum:
Add.12,174, folios 200v–205r, containing the Acts of Silvester.
Add.14,623, folio 19v.
Add.17,161, folios 31v–43v, containing Jacob of Sarug's Homilies 1–5 Against the Jews.
Add.17,199, containing the Disputation of Sergius the Stylite.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale:
Syriac Manuscript 196, folios 202v–205r, containing Jacob of Sarug's Homily 6 Against the Jews.

B. Other Literature Cited.

Bardy, G., Article 'Dialog', Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, pp. 928ff.
Baumstark, A., Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, Bonn, 1922.
Brockelmann, C., Lexicon Syriacum, Halle, 1928.
Duval, R., La littérature syriaque, Paris, 1907.
Herford, R.T., Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, London, 1903.


The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite is contained in BM Add.17,199, which is a vellum manuscript measuring about 8 by 5\(\frac{3}{4}\) inches and consisting of 79 folios. There are 9 quires each consisting of ten folios and marked at the foot of the first and last folios by Syriac letters. 8 folios are missing after the first folio, and 1 after folio 26. There is one column of writing which is marked out by two vertical lines ruled at its edges, and there are from 15 to 26 lines of writing on each page. Some of the folios have been damaged and occasionally the writing is so faint as to be virtually illegible; this is especially true of folios 62v,63v,71r, and 78r. There is a small hole in folio 18, which seems, however, to have been in the manuscript when originally utilised by the scribe.

According to William Wright 'this volume is written in a rather inelegant Estrangela, apparently of the eighth century.' The manuscript is undated but cannot possibly be earlier than the eighth century, since the work it contains must be dated on internal grounds c. A.D.730-770. In view of the fact that the manuscript itself contains numerous scribal errors, it is perhaps best to assume some transcriptional history behind it, and extend the possible range of its date into the ninth century. Although it would be unwise to attempt a more accurate dating, the manuscript is nevertheless unusually close in time to the original.

The title of the work on folio 1v is written in red ink, and so generally are the names of the participators in the dialogue, the names of biblical writers, and any other authors cited. Red ink is also used to emphasise

2.op.cit.
3.See the introduction, chapter II, passim.
such words as "the cross". This usage is not, however, completely consistent; for example, on folio 1v none of the names of the writers cited is written in red ink.

A noticeable phenomenon in the manuscript is the gradual decrease in the number of lines per page, and the gradual increase in the size of the writing. Folio 33 seems to represent a turning point: the first 33 folios have from 19 to 26 lines on each page and are written in small letters with, for example, the rounded Đàlath and Réš, the Serṭā Hē, and the closed rather than the open Mīm; folios 34 to 79, on the other hand, have usually from 15 to 21 lines per page and are written in a much bolder and larger hand, with the more angular and regular Estr-angelā letters. Either we have two scribes, or the one scribe mentioned in the colophon gradually realised that he had more vellum than he needed, and increased the size of his writing and decreased the number of lines per page in order to fill the available space. But the occurrence of Serṭā type letters is not exclusive to folios 1 to 33, nor the use of regular Estrangelā letters to folios 34 to 79; only the relative frequency of the forms varies. In view of this, and the fact that the colophon only mentions one scribe, the second possibility is to be preferred.

On folio 27v there is a rough, wavy, red line across the page, while on folios 41v and 50v there are more elaborately decorated lines. Since these lines coincide with real divisions in the argument, they clearly represent a scribal attempt to divide the work into chapters.1 On folio 10v, and from folio 59r to folio 75r, the manuscript

1. In the same way as he very often increases the size of his writing in order to fill the line, as, for example, on fol.8r.
2. Such a mixture, of forms which became characteristic of the Serṭā script and normative Estrangelā forms is, of course, by no means unusual; cf. W.H.P.Hatch, An Album of dated Syriac Manuscripts, plate LXVIII (dated 857 A.D.), p.119.
3. See n.iii to folio 27v.
is equipped with two sets of quotation marks in the right hand margin. One set in the form ‹ indicates biblical quotations, the other set in the form ‹ indicates extra-biblical quotations, in this case quotations from Josephus. The manuscript is also rather haphazardly supplied with a full system of diacritical points and accents. One marked feature of the orthography is the occasional writing of Yudh for 'Alaph; for example, כֶּדֶע for כַּדָע 'the righteous' (fol. 11r, l.7 and often), and מָבָא for מַבָא 'his coming' (fol. 15v, l.25).

On the recto of folio 1 there is a rather illegible note consisting of 8 or 9 lines of Serta writing followed by what looks like a signature. It appears to deal with the inheritance or ownership of the manuscript, the word כָּבָא 'inheritor, owner' being visible on line 2 and possibly also on line 3. Otherwise little else can be ascertained from this note.

The manuscript has two or three sets of scribal corrections. The first set seems to be the corrections of the original scribe, Romanus, who normally writes the correction over the relevant word. A second, more thorough, set of corrections is written in a fine Serta hand, and these corrections are written in the margin, frequently with a line inserted in the text to indicate where the correction should be read. These corrections, unlike the former set which is mostly concerned with spelling, supplement the text where something has dropped out. The author of this set of corrections is henceforth referred to as 'the Serta corrector.' There may be a third set of corrections

1. For this characteristic of Syriac manuscripts see Wright, op. cit., vol.III, p.xxviii.
2. For the probable phonological explanation of the orthography, cf. Nöldeke, A Compendious Syriac Grammar, para.4A.
3. Or line 1, since it is difficult to see whether there was a preceding line or not.
4. For this, see Wright, op. cit., vol.III, p.xxviii.
also in a Sertā hand, but if so, it is difficult to isolate which corrections are due to which corrector. The variation in the form of the writing may be due to no more than the amount of space available to the one corrector. The Sertā corrections are distinguished by the use of the form ḫ for Mim. The manuscript has also been carefully supplied with the sign ￦, by which corrector we cannot tell, to indicate where words should be transposed.

The colophon, unfortunately unfinished, is as follows:

'The disputation which was composed by Sergius the Sty- lite, who (lived) in Gousit, against a Jew who disputed with him, is finished. Let everyone who reads pray for the sinner, Romanus the abbot, who copied (it) out for....

It is difficult to ascertain how much of the colophon is missing. No writing appears to be visible on the verso of folio 79, but if there had been writing on it, it could easily have been rubbed off in the course of time. Unfortunately the missing part of the colophon probably contained the date of the manuscript.

1. The corrections to fol. 29v are the strongest evidence for the existence of two Sertā correctors; cf. n. iii to fol. 29v.
2. For this form see Wright, op. cit., vol. III, p. xxx.
3. Occasionally one of the scribes writes an isolated final Mim at the end of a line: folios 6r, 13; 10v, 8; 11v, 23; 17r, 16; 20v, 12; 28v, 2; 30v, 20; 31r, 13; 35r, 10; 38r, 11; 51r, 1; 67v, 9; 71r, 15; 77r, 8; 79r, 8; the purpose which it serves is not at all clear.
4. For this practice in Syriac manuscripts see Wright, op. cit., vol. III, p. xxvii f.
5. This is added by the Sertā corrector in the left hand margin of fol. 79r.
6. For conjectures as to the possible meanings of this unfinished word cf. n. 4 to fol. 79r.
CHAPTER II

THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF THE DISPUTATION

For information about the authorship and date of the Disputation of Sergius the Stylite we are entirely dependent upon the sole surviving manuscript of the work. The heading of the manuscript is as follows:

'The letter (or treatise) of the Blessed Sergius the Stylite of Gousit, which was composed by him against a Jew, who contended that God has no son, and (that) God has not begotten.'

The colophon, cited above in chapter I, is obviously dependent upon this heading.

References on folios 14v and 32r appear to date the work, as follows:

'Behold, your eyes are darkened today, seven hundred years without prophet, without king, without priest, without temple, without city, without altar, and without the putting on of the ephod, as Hosea prophesied.' (ch. viii.5).

'But now that you worship God, as you assert, and do not reverence idols, and observe circumcision and sabbath, why has this wrath been laid upon you for seven hundred
years, and (why) has he not sent to you even one conso-
molation, or prophet, or worthless dream?' (ch.viii.6).

'And you are not ashamed that, behold, for seven hund-
red years no man has been found among all your people
who prays and is heard, either for a dead or a sick man,' (ch.xiv.5).

Sergius the Stylite and his Disputation are briefly
mentioned by Baumstark. He regards Sergius as a writer
of the mid-sixth century, who came perhaps from the re-
gion of Emesa. Urbina gives the same information, most
probably in dependence upon Baumstark. S.Kazan in a re-
view of the Syriac anti-Jewish polemical literature also
mentions Sergius and his Disputation and gives the date
of his death as A.D.547. As their authority for these
statements, the latter two authors refer to Baumstark
and to the manuscript BM Add.17,199; Baumstark refers
only to the manuscript. We are driven, therefore, to con-
clude that none of these authors has actually read the
manuscript, and that they are all dependent upon Wright's
description of it. The grounds upon which Baumstark has
dated Sergius in the sixth century cannot be ascertained.

He places his note on Sergius in Part III of his work
entitled 'Die Literatur der monophysitischen Bewegung',
section A, 'Die Literatur der vorislamischen Zeit.'

2.Ortiz de Urbina,Patrologia Syriaca,p.103.


5.In reply to my enquiry,Dr.Kazan says in a private let-
ter, that he cannot remember where he came across this
date.

6.H.Delehaye, Les saints stylites,p.cxviiff, lists all
the known stylites; Sergius the Stylite of Gousit is not
mentioned.
For Sergius and his Disputation seem to be entirely ignored in the extant Syriac literature, though we must of course always bear in mind that a great deal of this literature has long since perished.

We are thus thrown back upon our manuscript, which must be investigated more closely for the information it supplies about the authorship of the Disputation. That Sergius was a stylite is confirmed by this speech which the Jew makes on folio 53r:

'But I, as one who loves the truth, have drawn near to you, although no one has compelled me, but (only) my (own) intentions, while I marvel at your ascetic way of life on this column, by which action you have devoted yourself to the restraint of an ascetic way of life like this'. (ch.xviii.9).

Whether Sergius was orthodox or monophysite is difficult to tell from the work itself; he was certainly not a Nestorian. His one brief excursus into Christology is capable of either an orthodox or a monophysite interpretation:

'But to the faithful and discerning it is known that the Godhead is three persons, one nature. And one of these three persons - that is to say, the Word - united (himself) to our nature by means of the God-bearing holy Mary, without confusion and without division'. (ch.ii.8).

Since Segius mentions only one (nature) - that of the humanity of Christ, and one (person) - that of the second person of the Trinity, and since his use of (nature) in the trinitarian form-
ula prevents it from being equated with person, his language could well be monophysite. On the other hand, it could be perfectly orthodox as the without confusion and without division implies. The doctrinal difference between the monophysite and orthodox Christians was in reality so small, that they can only be easily distinguished by their attitude to the Council of Chalcedon, Pope Leo's Tome, and to the representative theologians of each party, such as Flavian or Severus. Sergius does not make any reference to these in his Disputation.

The date as given in the Disputation needs examining more closely. A comparison with other Christian anti-Jewish works shows that their authors have a tendency to stress the length of the period during which Jerusalem has lain destroyed, and the Jews have been dispersed 'without prophet, or priest'. Of the Syriac writers Aphraates, Jacob of Sarug, and Dionysius bar Salibhi, date their works by this method. In non-Syriac anti-Jewish literature this practice is found in the 'Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo', the 'Dissertation against the Jews' attributed to Anastasius of Sinai, and the 'Letter of Rabbi Samuel'. The terminus a quo in Sergius's Disputation could be either the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 or the crucifixion of Christ. The former seems implicit in the text, but we must note that Dionysius bar Salibhi (op.cit., i.12) says that the Jews have been dispersed for 1140 years, or more significantly

1. For further observations and references with regard to Sergius's Trinitarian and Christological terminology, see notes 5f to folio 5v.
3. Homily 5 Against the Jews, BM Add.17,161, fol.43r-v.
4. ed.J. de Zwaan, Dionysius bar Salibhi Against the Jews, i.12, iii.21, iv.3.
6. op.cit., p.175.
7. op.cit., p.228, n.4.
in iv.3, that prophets and priests have ceased for 1142 years. If we calculate from the Fall of Jerusalem this gives as the date for Dionysius's work A.D.1210-1212. However, Dionysius died in 1171, and the elaborate calculations of ch.viii7 of his work show that he wrote in 1166 A.D., so that the figure 1140 (or 1142) must be calculated from approximately the time of Christ's crucifixion. In view of this, it is best to set the date of Sergius's Disputation within the wide limits 730-770 A.D.

We note, then, that the date implied in the Disputation is widely at variance with that suggested by Baumstark. It is, of course, possible that a scribe has altered $\text{κάθαρσις}$ (seven hundred) in the manuscript from $\text{καθάρσις}$ (five hundred), but if so, it is difficult to see why he did this. Besides, a date in the eighth century is confirmed by the fact that a large part of the work is taken up with discussion of images of the cross, and pictures and icons of the saints, subjects relevant to the eighth century when the iconoclastic controversy was raging, but less relevant to the sixth century. Moreover, the fact that Sergius makes use of a Syriac version of Eusebius's Chronicle, or Syriac chronographers who drew upon this version, argues against a date in the sixth century, since this version was probably made only at the beginning of the seventh century. We may, therefore, with reasonable confidence accept the date in the eighth century which the Disputation itself supplies.

The heading to the manuscript provides two pieces of information which could not have been derived from the work itself, thus increasing our confidence in its veracity. One, the description of the work as a letter ($\text{επιστολή}$), is dealt with in n.1 to folio iv. The other, that Sergius lived in, or came from, Gousit, must be examined here. W. Wright suggests that Gousit was near Homș (Emesa), a

1. See the Introduction, ch.3, section E.
suggestion which is confirmed by the 'Chronicon Anonymum ad 819 Pertinens' which mentions a town Be'eltan which was near Gousit, in the region of Emesa:—

Be'eltan, that town which is near Gousit in the region of Homș (Emesa).'

Michael the Syrian mentions Gousit in connection with a very interesting story. He tells us that in the year 635 A.D., the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius ordered Theodoricus, his brother, to assemble an army and march against the Arabs. The following incident is recounted as having occurred on the march:—

'They arrived at a town called Gousit, in the region of Antioch. And there was there a certain Chalcedonian, who was standing upon a column in the manner of a solitary. When Theodoricus had gone to him with some of his officers, and had conversed with him for some time, then the stylite began to say to Theodoricus, 'I know that the empire of the Romans will be delivered into your hands as (it was) into the hands of your brother. I believe that you will return victorious, if you will promise me that, when you return, you will wipe out the house of Severus.' When he heard these things, Theodoricus replied, 'I, even apart from your word, have resolved to persecute the partisans of Jacob.' But one of the soldiers with him, who was orthodox, when he heard what was said, was consumed with much zeal, but was unable to speak or to say (anything) for the moment, for fear of him who had authority. And when they advanced against the Arabs in the vain hope of pride, they pitched the whole of the camp in the neighbourhood of the Arabs. But when they had drawn up in line of battle against each other, the Arabs prevailed over the Romans,

2.Severus of Antioch, the leading monophysite theologian.
3.Jacob Baradaeus, the founder of the Jacobite Syrian church.
4.i.e. monophysite; Michael was the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch.
and the Romans began to flee; like rejected shoots they were cut down and trampled under foot by the Arabs. And when the Roman army began to be destroyed, that soldier drew near to Theodoricus and said to him, "Why then, O Theodoricus, where are the promises of the stylite (which he gave) to you, to whom you replied (so) haughtily?" Theodoricus, when he heard these things from that soldier, stood confused, and with a few men he scarcely made his escape. But on account of his shame, he hid himself that no one might see him."

This story is recounted, no doubt directly from Michael's work, by Bar Hebraeus, and the Chronicon ad Annum Christi 1234 Pertinens.

We must first note that Michael and Bar Hebraeus say that Gousit was in the region of Antioch. This does not conflict with the information contained in the Chronicon Anonymum ad 819 Pertinens and the Chronicon ad Annum Christi 1234 Pertinens, for the expression 'the region of Antioch' could well include that of Emesa. Gousit, then, was situated somewhere near Emesa, and this fact makes it more likely that Sergius was a monophysite Christian belonging to the Jacobite church. However, the most interesting aspect of this story is that it presents us with an anonymous stylite living in Gousit in A.D.635. Is the coincidence with the heading of our manuscript so strong that we must identify the two stylites?

We have seen above that there are strong arguments for rejecting the opinion that Sergius lived and wrote his Disputation in the sixth century. There are no arguments in favour of a date in the seventh century except the fact that we know that an anonymous stylite lived in Gousit in A.D.635. The statement that this stylite was a Chalcedonian is of no help, since we have seen that Serg-

3. ed.J.B.Chabot,p.242ff. This chronicle also places Gousit in the region of Emesa.
ius's language can be interpreted as either chalcedonian or monophysite. The stylite in Michael's story is an ardent supporter of chalcedonian orthodoxy, whereas in his Disputation Sergius shows no sign of being interested in christological controversy. But neither of these observations is of much value, since, on the one hand, Michael tells his story with a very pronounced anti-chalcedonian bias which should make us wary of accepting all the details of the story, while on the other hand, there is no reason why Sergius's Disputation, concerned as it is with anti-Jewish polemic, should mention the internal doctrinal quarrels of the Christian church. Supposing, however, that we make the identification of the two stylites, how are we to account for the presence in the text of \( \text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree} \) (seven hundred), twice on folio 14v and once on folio 32r? If it only occurred once, it would be possible to regard it as a scribal error, but its threefold occurrence rules out this possibility. If \( \text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree} \) (six hundred) was originally present in the text, it is extremely difficult to see why a scribe should deliberately alter it to \( \text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree}\text{\textdegree} \) (seven hundred). If we are dealing with an eighth century work falsely attributed to a seventh century author, the real author must be convicted of gross incompetence at providing a convincing pseudonym. In fact, any attempt at identifying these two stylites founders on the internal dating of the work in our manuscript. Besides, it is still relevant to recall that the Disputation seems more at home in the century of the iconoclastic controversy than in any earlier period. We must conclude, therefore, that Michael's story is of little value for our purpose. However, the existence of two stylites in Gousit, separated by more than a century, does suggest that a colony of stylites had established itself there. Probably several generations of stylites took over columns left vacant by the deaths of their previous occupants. It is,

of course, even possible that there was only one column in Gousit, and that we are presented with two successive occupants of the same column. Either way, Michael's story increases our confidence in the historicity of Ser- ius the Stylite.

We have, therefore, to be content with the meagre facts that the Disputation was written by an otherwise unknown stylite, named Sergius, who composed it either around 730 or 770 A.D. in a town called Gousit, situated somewhere near Emesa in Syria. Against a date for the work in the sixth or seventh century stands its own internal dating, the greater relevance of its contents to the eighth century, and in the case of the former date the use of a Sy- riac version of Eusebius's Chronicle or authors depending on such a version. The case for identifying Sergius with the anonymous stylite living in Gousit in 635 only comes into the realm of possibility if we conjecture, that, for some inexplicable reason, the date found in our manuscript is not original. Whether Sergius actually wrote the Dis- putation as it now stands, or whether his conversation with a Jew has been expanded into the present work by another hand, will be considered in a later chapter dealing with the literary structure of the Disputation.

1. See chapter IV, pp. 124ff.
CHAPTER III

THE LITERARY SOURCES OF THE DISPUTATION

A. THE BIBLE

Introduction

In any discussion between a Christian and a Jew the Bible was bound to play a principal part, for it was common ground to them both. In fact, most Christian-Jewish dialogues are little more than extended series of arguments about the proper interpretation of the Old Testament. Sergius's Disputation is no exception: almost the whole of the work is devoted to the discussion of the interpretation of a large number of Old Testament texts, something like 280 in all. The New Testament is used less frequently (except for the number of instances where it provides the text of Old Testament quotations), being quoted about 40 times. The situation with regard to the text of these biblical quotations is exceedingly complex. Sometimes the Peshitta version of both the Old and the New Testaments is quoted. Sometimes the disputants quote from memory. Frequently, where an Old Testament text is cited in the New Testament, it is reproduced in the Disputation in its New Testament form. Often the author reshapes Old Testament texts to make them conform more easily to the Christian interpretation which he wishes to give to them, or he even interpolates this interpretation into the quotation itself. On one or two occasions we can observe reminiscences of the Old Syriac versions of the New Testament, and even traces of the influence of Greek versions not attested elsewhere in the Syriac tradition. Most important of all, there is a clearly defined block of quotations, which have no basis in the biblical text as we know it but belong to the class of agrapha. The whole situation is, however, further complicated by the fact that, since we possess only one manuscript of Sergius's Disputation, we cannot tell to what extent the scribe of this manuscript has rendered the biblical quotations faithfully or has inserted the text with which he was most familiar. This proviso must be continually born in
We shall proceed by arranging the quotations into groups according to (1), whether they follow the text of the Peshitta; (2), whether they are Old Testament quotations influenced by, or exactly following, the text of them found in the New Testament; (3), whether they are quotations from memory; (4), whether they are New Testament quotations influenced by the Old Syriac versions; and, beginning a new section, (B), whether they are agrapha, or exhibit peculiar texts, having no basis in the extant ancient versions of the Bible. These latter will be referred to as testimony texts. This term is normally used to cover all those biblical texts commonly used by early Christian writers as evidence for the foreshadowing of Christ and the Church in the Old Testament, and for the rejection of the Jews as God's chosen people. This wide usage of the term covers many (if not most) of the quotations included in the former groups, and it will often be employed in this sense. But it will also be used in narrower sense to delineate agrapha and other peculiar texts which owe their origin to the exigencies of Christian anti-Jewish polemic.

In the following discussion the texts will be arranged in the order in which they occur in the Disputation, not according to the order of the biblical books. This is made necessary by the fact that, as we shall see, the relative order of the quotations is a vital clue to the literary sources of the Disputation. Discussion of the text of any one particular quotation can be found by referring to the index of biblical quotations, which indicates not only where the texts occur in the Disputation, but also where they are discussed in the Introduction. The Roman and arabic numerals following each quotation refer to the chapter and section of the Disputation in which they occur.
Quotations from the Peshitta Version of the Bible.

About 130 of the Disputation's biblical quotations exactly reproduce the Peshitta text, excluding for the moment those texts which belong to group (2). Many of them are testimony texts in the wider sense of the term.

Only a few of them merit any special comment here:

Ps.2.7, i.2; a testimony text. The introductory phrase ינושאר may come from Acts 13.33.

Is.7.14, i.3; a testimony text. It may be contrasted with the Peshitta text of Mt.1.23.

Ps.72.10f, i.6; a testimony text. The author (or the scribe) follows MS L of the Peshitta Psalter in reading נב after לֹא. Although this is a Nestorian manuscript, Barnes says that 'it is probable that at some period of its history L got into Jacobite hands.' In chapter ix.6 Ps 72.11 is quoted with נב after לֹא omitted by the original scribe. The Serta corrector has inserted it above the line.

Ps.146.7f, i.13:

'And (prophesying) that he would perform healings, David said: The Lord gives bread to the hungry; when he blessed the bread; the Lord releases the prisoners — those who are possessed; the Lord opens (the eyes of) the blind — the blind men; the Lord straightens the crooked — that

1. In the notes to the Translation, full references are given to the other Syriac (and sometimes non-Syriac) writers who use these texts in the same way as Sergius does.


3. i.e. Christ.

4. See n.iiito fol.3r.

5. Refering to Mk.6.41//s.

6. This probably refers to Mt.20.30ff.
woman whom the Adversary bowed down for eighteen years, and he (Jesus) laid his hand upon her, and she was made straight.'

This a good example of Sergius's practice of sometimes punctuating an Old Testament quotation with references to its New Testament fulfilment. The method of interpretation depends upon the very early and widespread Christian practice of identifying Christ, their Lord, with the 'Lord' of the Old Testament.

Ps.35.11, i.16; a testimony text. The latter half of the quotation may well be derived from Ps.27.12.

Am.8.9, i.19; a testimony text. It is wrongly ascribed to Zechariah.

Ps.51.11, ii.1. The text has דָּםַם, which is read by many manuscripts, instead of the more usual דָּםַם. Sergius presumably prefers the former, since he sees here a reference to the third Person of the Trinity.

Ps.68.18, iii.1; a testimony text. The Disputation follows the Jacobite reading דָּםַם, not the Nestorian reading דָּםַם.

Ps.69.9, xii.10; this could, however, just as easily be the Peshitta text of Rom.15.3.

Ps.1.1-3; xv.2; Ps.36.1-5, xv.5; Gen.9.1-4, xix.6; Is.57.3-8, xx.3; Is.65.2-4, xx.5; Is.65.5-7, xx.5; Is.66.16-22, xx.6; Is.62.10-12, xx.11; Is.65.9,11-15,17-18, xx.12; Num.27.15-20, xxii.8. All these lengthy quotations exactly follow the Peshitta text, and it is, therefore, unlikely though not impossible, that they are the result of quotation from memory.

Ps.82.2,4-5, xv.15:


2.See Barnes, op.cit.,p.xliif.
'Therefore he said to you through David: How long will you judge unjustly, and show partiality to the wicked? Rescue the poor and the needy from the hand of the wicked. For they, the wicked, in their wickedness, did not know nor did they understand that they were walking — that is to say, were judging — in darkness. And therefore, through the magnitude of their iniquity and evil, all the foundations of the earth were shaken — that is to say, all the inhabitants of the world were agitated.'

In this quotation Sergius does not alter the Peshitta text except in one small detail (ך for ל). But he interpolates into it explanatory, additions and omits other phrases, which serves the purpose of bringing out the interpretation he requires. He does the same with Ps.21.12 in chapter xxii. As we shall see, however, he is quite capable of substantially altering a biblical text to serve his purpose.

(2) Old Testament Quotations Following or Influenced by The Text of the New Testament.

This group of 14 quotations consists mainly of well known testimony texts some of them coming within the narrower definition of the term. It overlaps to some extent with group (3), the quotations from memory, so only those quotations which reproduce the Peshitta text are given here.

Jer.31.15, but following the text of Mt.2.18; i.7. 'Hos.11.1, but following the text of Mt.2.15; i.7. 'Is.11.1, but following the text of Mt.2.23; i.8. 'Is.61.1f, i.12. This is basically the Peshitta Old Testament text, but ḳרעה 'acceptable' comes from Lk.4.19. Dt.21.23, but following the text of Gal.3.13; v.1.

1. Rendel Harris, Testimonies, vol 11, p.59f, regards these three quotations as belonging to a very early collection of testimony texts underlying the New Testament itself.
Dt. 27.26, but following the text of Gal. 3.10; v. 1.
Is. 53.9, but mainly following the text of 1 Pet. 2.22; v. 14.
Is. 6.9ff., but following the text of Mk. 8.18; v. 16.
Ps. 35.19, 69.4, but following the text of Jn. 15.25; x. 3.
However, since this quotation is introduced only by רֹאשׁ 'as it is written', whereas Sergius normally introduces a quotation from a Psalm by 'David says', he may only intend to quote Jn. 15.25.
Is. 59.20, but following the text of Rom. 11.26; xi. 14.
Lev. 26.12, but following the text of 2 Cor. 6.16; xiii. 9, xiv. 12, xv. 3.
Ex. 9.16, but based mainly on Rom. 9.17; xvi. 10.
Dt. 18.19, but following the text of Acts 3.23; xvii. 7.
In chapter xxii. 18, Sergius mainly follows Acts 3.23, but introduces הבניא 'who speaks in my name' from the Peshitta text of the Old Testament.
Dt. 18.15, 18, but following the text of Acts 3.22; xxii. 7, xxii. 18.

(3) Quotations from Memory.

This group, consisting of approximately 75 quotations, gives us a better idea than any other of the way in which Sergius treats the Bible. Although many of his variations from the Peshitta may be no more than accidental (and some, of course, may be due to scribal error), some alterations are clearly deliberate. In Sergius's mind text and interpretation become fused together into an inseparable whole; his practice is not unlike that of the Jews and the Jewish Christians who regarded text and interpretation as equally authoritative. The following selection of quotations will demonstrate the wide diversity of Sergius's approach to the Bible:

Dt. 6.4f (Mk. 12.29f), i. 2, xx. 4.

(i) The text in the Disputation:

J. Daniélou, Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne, examines many other early Christian writings with parallel results to this examination of Sergius's treatment of the Biblical text; cf, for example, p. 53, 59f.
(ii) The Peshitta text of Mk.12.29f:-

(iii) The Peshitta text of Dt.6.4f:-

(iv) Mt.22.37, Lk.10.27 quote Dt.6.5, the Peshitta text in each case being identical with that of Mark, except for the reversal of the last two phrases.

We note first of all that Sergius's second quotation of the text exactly reproduces the Peshitta text of Dt.6.5, while his first quotation follows neither the Peshitta, MT, or LXX, of Deuteronomy, nor the Peshitta or the Greek of Mark. It is unique in reading ^cnvU and ^vtC, as well as in the arrangement of the clauses of the second half of the quotation. Apart from these (and ^vtC may well come from Mk.12.31), Sergius's quotation is clearly an amalgam of the Peshitta texts of Deuteronomy and Mark, quoted from memory.

The same kind of amalgam of Old Testament and New Testament texts, quoted from memory, can be seen in many other cases, for example, Ex.13.2,12f and Lk.2.23 in ch.i.5; Lev.12.6-8 and Lk.2.24 in ch.i.5 also; Is.40.3 and Mt.3.3 in ch.i.8; Dt.27.26 and Gal.3.10 in ch.xiii.14; and Is. 28.16 and Rom.9.33 in ch.xii.9.

Baruch 3.35ff, i.9. This exhibits many variations from all the versions, the most noteworthy being ^cnvU 'righteousness' for the Peshitta's ^cnvU 'wisdom'.

Dn.12.5f, i.10. The Disputation exactly reproduces 12.5

1.Cf. p.19 above, where it is noted that elsewhere Sergius follows Gal.3.10 exactly.
according to the Peshitta, but in v.6 it agrees with MT in reading 'and he said' (אָנוֹן) for the Peshitta's 'they said'. However, Sergius omits 'and' before 'he said' against both the Peshitta and MT, and this has the effect of reversing the speaker and the person spoken to. What exactly Sergius is trying to do is not at all clear, and since the quotation breaks off in the middle of a sentence, it is tempting to conclude that the manuscript is corrupt at this point.

Jer.31.31f, i.15. Sergius condenses the Old Testament text. Dn.9.24, i.15:

\[\text{And the angel said to Daniel: When Christ comes, vision and prophets will cease, and he will give a new covenant - and the holy of holies.}\]

The Peshitta text of Dn.9.24:

\[\text{'Seventy weeks are settled concerning your people and your holy city, to put an end to transgressions, and to abolish sins, for the forgiveness of iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to put an end to vision and prophets, and for the Messiah, the holy of holies.'}\]

We see here that Sergius is continuing a process begun in the Peshitta itself - the Christianisation of an Old Testament text. The Peshitta merely substitutes אֵלֶּהַ מְלָכָה for אֵלֶּה 'to anoint', thus reducing the latter half of the verse to nonsense. Sergius, however, completely rewrites the whole verse to get out of it a meaning wholly alien to the original text. In fact, if it were not for the fact that the phrase אֵלֶּהַ מְלָכָה 'and the holy of holies' has been left behind as an appendage, his quotation would show little trace of the origi-

1. The Greek versions and the Vulgate read 'and I said'.
Ps. 129.3, i.17. If the reading וַיִּקְרֵא 'and he prolonged' for the Peshitta's וַיְנָסֵל 'and they prolonged' is not just a scribal error, Sergius could be subtly altering the sense of the verse to say: the Jews caused Christ to be scourged, so God has prolonged his affliction of them.

Is. 48.16, ii.5. Sergius adds קֵלֶל 'and his Word' to the Peshitta text, in order to find a reference to the whole of the Trinity.

Gen. 49.8, xi.3. This is a good example of the adaptation of a text for polemical purposes - Sergius substitutes קְדָשׁ 'confessor' for the Peshitta's כַּפֵּרו 'Judah'.

Mt. 16.13-18, xi.10. This lengthy quotation has many variants from the Peshitta, the Old Syriac, and the Greek, which can only be explained as the result of quotation from memory.

Ps. 47.9, xi.15. Sergius has turned this quotation into a prophecy by reading יִּשְׁתַּל 'they shall turn' for the Peshitta's יִּנָּח 'they turned.' Ps. 81.15 is adapted for a similar purpose in ch. xv.11.

1 Cor. 11.24, 26, xii.13. Sergius is quoting from memory influenced by knowledge of the Syriac eucharistic liturgy.

Eccl. 12.7, xiii.4:-

'And Solomon (said): The Body returns to its dust, and the spirit to the Lord who gave it.'

The Peshitta text:-

'And the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to the Lord who gave it.' This adequately represents MT and LXX.

There is a slight measure of agreement between the Disputation and the Targum:-

1. They are pronounced similarly in Syriac.
2. See n.1. to fol. 26v.
'And your body (flesh), which was created from the dust, shall return to the earth as it was.'

Sergius agrees with the Targum in the insertion of a word 'body' as the subject of the sentence. The agreement is, however, so slight that it is probable that the variant is due to quotation from memory.

Ex. 20.3; 6.7; 3.6, xiii.7. This is an example of a composite Old Testament quotation. Other examples of this practice can be seen in chapters xvi.7, xvii.5, and xvii.10. Is. 65.17, xvii.4. The substitution of \( \text{they shall be forgotten} \) for the Peshitta's \( \text{they shall not be remembered} \) is just what one would expect in a quotation from memory.

1 Tim. 2.4, xviii.10. The text of the Disputation:

\[ \text{For I am the servant of him who wishes that all men should live and come to the knowledge of the truth.} \]

The Peshitta text:

\[ \text{He who wishes that all men should live and be turned to the knowledge of the truth.} \]

In both its variants from the Peshitta - the substitution of \( \text{s} \) for \( \text{h} \) and the inversion of the order of the last three words - the Disputation follows the Greek text: \( \text{kai eis epigneusen alhydratea eklebein.} \)

We can only assume that Sergius (or the scribe of the manuscript), living in an area heavily influenced by Greek-speaking Christianity, knew the familiar Greek rendering by hearsay, and it is reproduced here through quotation from memory. Since this is the only place where Sergius (or the scribe of the manuscript) shows know-
ledge of a reading from the Greek New Testament, being elsewhere wholly dependent on the Syriac versions, it would be unwise to conclude that he made use of the former. The variant may, of course, have existed in the Syriac tradition but with no witness to it surviving. Besides, it is worth noting that the text is not introduced as a quotation, but is blended into Sergius’s speech.

In chapter xxi.4 we have a series of composite New Testament quotations. The third quotation in the series well illustrates Sergius’s method; the first sentence exactly reproduces the Peshitta text of Mt.24.19, Mk.13.17; the second sentence is closest to the Peshitta text of Mk.13.19 but differs from it by omitting ܐܠܐ ܪܒܘܬܐ and by adding ܕܐ to ܐܠܐ; the third sentence is identical with the Peshitta text of Mk.13.20a, except for the insignificant variant ܡܐ for ܐܠܐ; and the last sentence follows the Peshitta text of Mt.24.22 except for the inversion of ܐܠܐ ܒܐ. The combination of these texts is not due to the influence of the Diatessaron¹.

(4) New Testament Quotations Influenced by the Old Syriac Versions

Four quotations or allusions seem to reflect knowledge of Old Syriac readings:-
An allusion to Jn.1.14, vii.2, reflects knowledge of the Old Syriac reading ܐܠܐ ܒܐ ܠܡܐ ܒܝܬܐ ‘and the Word became a body’, ܣ and Aphraates². It is, however, most unlikely that Sergius (or the scribe of the manuscript) used this version; that Christ ‘put on a body’ is a traditional phrase in Syrian Christianity, no doubt based on the Old Syriac reading, but continuing in use long after its ultimate source had been abandoned.
Jn.4.6, vii.4; in ch.vii.3 Sergius quotes Jn.4.6 according to the Peshitta text, but it is just possible that his use of the word ܠܡܐ in vii.4 comes from the Old Syriac

1. See A.S.Marmardji, Diatessaron de Tatien, pp.399-401.
Mt. 3.17, 17.5, ix.11. Basically Sergius's text is the Peshitta, but the reading אֶלֶף שֶׁאָבֹת 'and my Beloved' is a definite reminiscence of the Old Syriac. Its presence may be explained along the same lines as the allusion to Jn.1.14 in this version.

Lk. 23.48, xxI.1. The Jew's lamentation here seems to reflect that of the Jews who watched the crucifixion as recorded in the Old Syriac version. Sergius differs from Sc in reading יִנָּה for יִנָה.

Before we consider the last group of quotations - the testimony texts - it is necessary to recapitulate, and observe the flexibility of Sergius's approach to the biblical text. He feels by no means bound by the actual 'letter' of the text, but regards both 'letter' and 'spirit' as equally authoritative. This is made easier for him by his habitual practice of quoting from memory, for we may be certain that in many cases the quotations in the Disputation have been harmonised to the Peshitta; the notes to the Text reveal that the Serta corrector frequently corrects the manuscript along these lines, no doubt continuing an already existing process. Of course, there will also be many occasions where Sergius manages to quote the Peshitta accurately from memory. Nonetheless, the overriding impression we get from this work is that of a very firmly established tradition of exegesis, strong enough to invade and remould the text of the Bible.

1. Cf. T. W. Manson, 'The Argument from Prophecy', J.T.S. (1945), vol. 46, p. 136 - 'Accurate reproduction of the traditional wording of the Divine oracles took second place to publication of what was held to be their essential meaning and immediate application.'
B. THE TESTIMONY TEXTS

(1) The texts

i. Zech. 3.1f, 1.11. The text of the Peshitta:—

'And he showed me Joshua, the high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan was standing at his right hand to harm him. And the angel of the Lord said to Satan, "The Lord rebuke you! The Lord who has chosen Jerusalem rebuke you."

This differs from MT and LXX in two details: it reads 'angel of the Lord' (2°) for 'the Lord', and omits 'Satan' after 'the Lord rebuke you' (1°).

The text of the Disputation:—

'And (prophesying) that he would go forth and conquer Satan outside in the desert, his stronghold, Zechariah said: I saw Joshua, the high priest, standing, and Satan standing at his right hand and seeking to harm him. And he said to him, "Satan, Satan, the Lord rebuke you! The Lord, he who has chosen Jerusalem, rebuke you."

The text of the Syriac version of the Discussion of St. Silvester:—

1. The Serta corrector has added 'the angel' in the left hand margin of fol. 3r, conforming to the Peshitta text.
And (prophesying) that he would be tempted by the Adversary, who was overcome by him, Zechariah the prophet said: I saw Joshua, the high priest, standing, and Satan standing at his right hand to harm him. And he said to him, "The Lord, he who has chosen Jerusalem, rebuke you!"

The Greek and Latin versions of the Discussion also represent this text, except that they add 'O Devil' after 'the Lord rebuke you.'

(a) Sergius's Disputation and the Discussion of St. Silvester agree against the Peshitta, MT, and LXX, in reading 'I saw' for 'he showed me'.

(b) They agree against the Peshitta, MT, and LXX, in omitting 'before the angel of the Lord.'

(c) They agree in omitting the subject of v. 2; in the case of MT and LXX 'the Lord', and in the case of the Peshitta 'the angel of the Lord.'

In the rest of the quotation Sergius diverges from the Discussion of St. Silvester and follows the Peshitta more closely.

It is interesting to observe that Justin Martyr, in citing this text, agrees with Sergius's Disputation and the Discussion of St. Silvester in points (b) and (c), and he also agrees with the latter in reading 'the Lord rebuke you' only once. He does, however, cite the normal text.

1. The Discussion of St. Silvester is found in the apocryphal acts of Pope Silvester; the Syriac version can be found in E.W. Brooks, Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori Vulgo Adscripta, vol. 1, p. 69-93, this text on p. 74f; the Greek version is in Francis Combevis, Illustrium Martyrum Lecti Triumphi, pp. 290-336, with a shortened version in George Cedrenus, Compendium Historiarum, P. G., vol. cxxi, 521-540; the Latin version is found in B. Mombritius, Sanctuary seu Vitae Sanctorum, vol. ii, pp. 517-529.

2. Combevis, op. cit., p. 299.


5. He omits the beginning of the verse.
It can be easily seen that this particular text of Zech.3.1f is another example of the process we have observed above with regard to Sergius's use of the Bible. The Old Testament text is revised in the light of its supposed fulfilment - Mt.4.1-11, Lk.4.1-13. Variant (a) may be inserted to emphasize that Zech.3.1f is a prophecy, but it is difficult to be certain. Variant (b) removes the 'angel of the Lord' from the scene, and variant (c) allows us to read the text as though Christ, not the Lord or the angel of the Lord, rebukes Satan. It is also certain that Zech.3.1f was seen as a prophecy of the Temptation by early Christians through the link 'Jesus-Joshua'; in the Semitic languages and in Greek the names are identical.

ii.Is.26.19, i.14. Both Sergius and Aphraates insert יְהֹוָה 'O Lord' after יֶדֶנְךָ 'your dead'.

iii. An agraphon, based probably on Jer.4.3, i.16; the text of the Disputation:-

'And (prophesying) that he would be crowned with thorns, Jeremiah said: (With) the thorns of its transgressions this people surrounded me.'

This agraphon is also found in the Discussion of St. Silvester in the following form:—

1. op.cit.,115, P.G.,vi,741.
2. For the identification of Jesus with Joshua, the high priest, in the testimony tradition cf. Rendel Harris, Testimonies, vol.i, p.54ff.
3. op.cit., vol.I, col.382. He has the usual Peshitta text in I,996.
4. See on p. 65.
5. Syriac text, Brooks, op.cit., p.75.
'And that a crown of thorns was laid upon him, Jeremiah said: This people laid upon me the thorns of its sins.'

The Greek text of the Discussion of St. Silvester is as follows:—

οτι δε ἄκανθαις στεφανωθησεται, προ- ερημων Ιερεμίας, ἄκανθαις τῶν έαυτοῦ πτασμάτων ο λαὸς ούτως περιεστοίχισεν με.

The Latin text of the Discussion, and Isidore of Seville, have texts of this agraphon identical with this Greek text. Dionysius bar Salibhi also cites this agraphon as follows:—

'And Jeremiah said: This people (with) the thorns of its sins surrounded me.'

We may note, first of all, the striking fact that the text of the agraphon in Sergius's Disputation agrees entirely, both in its introduction and text, with the Greek and Latin versions of the Discussion. Dionysius follows Sergius on the whole, but agrees with the Syriac version of the Discussion in reading ἄκανθα (κάνθα) 'its sins.' The text of the latter is unique, though it could just possibly be a loose translation of the Greek.

Jer.4.3f is used as testimony text by many earlier Christian anti-Jewish polemicists, and once again we are presented with an Old Testament text 'developed and expanded in the Christian testimony tradition. P.Kahle regards this agraphon as reflecting a midrashic interpre-

5. Cf. The Epistle of Barnabas, ix.5; Justin, The Dialogue with Trypno, 28.2; Cyprian, Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews, i, 8; Tertullian, Adversus Judaeos, ch.iii. Cf. also R.Harris, op.cit., vol.1,p.36,79.
tation of the Hebrew text, quoting the Targum 'you shall not seek redemption whilst (you) are in sins.' He says that 'the source must have been a Greek translation of Jewish origin, differing entirely from the Christian 'Septuagint', the readings of which were still used by Christian authors in the seventh century and perhaps later.' It is, however, much more likely that the ultimate source of this agraphon is the Jewish Christian midrash on Jeremiah which Danielou posits as lying behind many Jewish Christian works. How it found its way into the Disputation of Sergius the Stylite will be discussed at a later stage.

iv. An Ezra agraphon, i.17; the text of the Disputation:-

\[
\text{And (prophesying) that he would be crucified, Ezra said: You (pl.) bound me not as the Father, who delivered you (pl.) from the land of Egypt. When (you) were crying before the seat of the judge, you (sing.) humiliated me; you (sing.) delivered me up(to be hung) upon the tree.}
\]

The same agraphon appears in the Discussion of St. Silvester; the Syriac text is as follows:-

\[
\text{And (prophesying) that he would be bound up and crucified upon the tree by the Jews, Ezra said: You (pl.) bound me not as your (pl.) Father who delivered you (pl.) from Egypt. When you (pl.) were crying before the seat of the judge you (sing.) delivered me up, and humiliated}
\]

2. The Theology of Jewish Christianity, p.102ff.
3. See n.i to fol.4r.
(sing.) me who was hung upon the tree.'

The text of the agraphon in the Greek version of the Discussion is as follows:

Ωτη δὲ, τοῖς δεσμοῖς αὐτῶν, δεσμησμα, καὶ σταυρωθησαν ἐπὶ δύλων παρὰ τῶν Ἰσωδαίων, λέγει δὲ ἦσθαν ἐσθιστε με, οὐκ ὡς πατέρα τοῦ ῥυσάμενον ὑμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. κράσοντες ἐπὶ τοῦ βημάτως τοῦ κρατοῦ, ἐπαιδεύσατέ με, κραμασθέντα ἐπὶ τοῦ δύλου παρεδώκατε με.

The Latin version of the Discussion as given by Mombritius is the equivalent of this Greek text, while M.R. James quotes a slightly different Latin text according to a twelfth century manuscript of the Acts of Silvester now in the library of Peterhouse, Cambridge. He also cites a variant of this agraphon found in an eleventh century manuscript of the Spanish recension of the Vulgate, where it is inserted after 4 Ezra 1.33.

Dionysius bar Salibhi also quotes this agraphon:

2. κραμασθέντα, according to George Cedrenus, P.G. cxxi, 525.
4. op.cit., p.xxviii.
5. op.cit., p.xxxix.
6. op.cit., vi.5.
'And he was bound upon the tree; Ezra said: You bound him up as the Father who delivered you from Egypt. In the crying before the judge you humbled him, and in the hanging upon the tree you delivered him up.'

Before discussing this agraphon it is necessary to make the proviso that it is unwise to draw any firm conclusions from the different forms of the text given above, principally because there is no critical version of the Acts of St. Silvester in existence, whilst for the texts of Sergius’s Disputation and bar Salibhi’s Against the Jews we are dependent in each case upon only one manuscript. The difficulty inherent in this state of affairs is illustrated by the problem of determining the exact text of the verbs in the agraphon. Most of the versions have the second person plural of the verb 'you bound, you bound up', except the Latin according to Mombrinius and the Vulgate manuscript M, which have the second person singular. The verb 'you humiliated, humbled' is second person singular in Sergius, the Syriac version of the Discussion of Silvester, and the Latin version of the latter according to Mombrinius, whilst it is second person plural in the Greek versions (Combebis and Cedrenus) of the Discussion and the Latin according to the manuscript in the library of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and in bar Salibhi. The verb 'you delivered up' is second person singular in Sergius, the Syriac of the Discussion, the Latin according to Mombrinius, and the Vulgate manuscript M; in the Greek version of the Discussion, in the Latin according to the Peterhouse manuscript, and in bar Salibhi it is second person plural. In the very early form found in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila all the verbs are in the third person plural. In the light of this mass of conflicting textual evidence, it is extremely difficult to ascertain the true text of the agraphon (if indeed there ever was one).

With regard to the inter-relation of these various texts we may once again observe the striking fact that both in text and word order Sergius’s Disputation invariably agrees with the Greek (and Latin) version of the
Discussion of Silvester against the Syriac version. Dionysius bar Salibhi has clearly tidied up an admittedly textually erratic agraphon, though we may suspect with good reason that a 'not' has dropped out before 'ο θεός των υμών' as the Father'; it is thus difficult to tell which version of the quotation he followed. We should also note that the version found in the Vulgate manuscript M differs widely from all the others so that James concludes that 'the passage in the Acts seems to be a shortened form of the text of M.' It is, however, just as possible that the version in M is an expansion of this text.

As with the previous Jeremiah agraphon, it is probable that this quotation has its ultimate source in a Jewish Christian midrash, this time on the Ezra literature. It is interesting to observe that Justin Martyr and Lactantius also use an Ezra agraphon as a testimony against the Jews:

Justin complains to Trypho that the Jews have removed this text 'from the expositions which Ezra gave of the law concerning the Passover.' It was thus clearly attached to Ezra 6,19ff, and has been developed out of such passages as 1 Cor.5.7, Phil.2.8 etc. Jean Daniélou is of the opin-

1. of Silvester.
2. op. cit., p.xxxix.
ion that it belonged to a Jewish Christian midrash on II Esdras, and quotes another agrâphon concerning the cross which he claims came from this midrash. Now although there are some points of contact between Justin's Ezra agrâphon and that found in Sergius's Disputation etc., particularly the 'humiliating upon the cross', it is clear that the one has not developed out of the other. This is made particularly clear to us by Dionysius bar Salibihi, who continues thus after citing the agrâphon:—

'And by the 'crying' he signifies that which they cried, "Crucify him, crucify him!" (Lk.23.21, Jn.19.6) and, "We have no king but Caesar" (Jn.19.15).

So our agrâphon is developed out of the Passion narrative, and the Λέξις is the Βύσια of Mt.27.19, Jn.19.13—the judgement seat of Pilate. The first sentence of the agrâphon is the link with 4 Ezra (the Ezra Apocalypse). For as is well known the early Christians identified Jesus with 'the Lord' of the Old Testament and would, for example, read 4 Ezra 1.7—'Was it not I who brought them out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage'—as the words of Jesus himself. We cannot be sure as to exactly what part of 4 Ezra 1 was developed by this midrash for the whole chapter is suitable for such development. The Vulgate manuscript inserts the agrâphon after 1.33, and this is certainly reasonable after 1.32: 'I sent to you my servants the prophets, but you have taken and slain them and torn their bodies in pieces. It would not be too difficult for a Jewish Christian to add a reference to the ultimate act of this kind perpetrated by the Jews. On the other hand, the dual form of the agrâphon in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila suggests that two agrapha, one formed out of 1.7, and the other out of 1.32ff, have been combined at a later stage to make our agrâphon. It is clear, however, that our agrâphon and that of Justin and Lactantius are not directly related to each other, but the

1. op.cit., p.101f. 2. op.cit., vi.6. 3. The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila, op.cit., also places the agrâphon in this context.
similarities, not only in text but also in the process by which they developed, make it at least possible that originally they belonged to the same work. In which case Daniélou's hypothesis needs to be revised, so that instead of there being a separate midrash to II Esdras, we must posit a single midrash covering all the Ezra literature, or better still, a collection of midrashim on selected passages. What happened subsequently to this collection of midrashim, and how the Ezra agraphon came to be present in Sergius's Disputation will be discussed at a later stage.

v.Lam.3.14, Jer.20.7, i.18: the text of the Disputation:—

'And (pronhesying) that he would be mocked, Jeremiah said: I have become a laughing stock to this people.

The Peshitta text:—

Jer.20.7: ני"א יזבשא פ"גפב ר"ג יזבשא דרומ
'I have become a laughing stock all the day, and they all revile me.'

Lam.3.14: יזבשא יזבשא יזבשא דרומ
'I have become a laughing stock to all the nations.'

The identical addition יזבשא יזבשא 'to this people' is found in the Discussion of Silvester as follows:—

'And that they mocked him, Jeremiah said: I have become an object of revulsion and mockery to this people.'

The Greek version (which adequately represents the Latin) of the Discussion is as follows:—

3. Very much like the Qumran literature cited below on p.41,n.5.
2. Brooks, op.cit., p.75.
3. Άγγελος, according to Cedrenus, op.cit., col.525.
4. omitted by Cedrenus, op.cit.
Dionysius bar Salibhi uses Jer.20.7 as a testimony text, but the version he quotes is clearly a garbled rendering of the Peshitta.

Again, both in the introduction to, and the text of, this quotation Sergius's Disputation follows the Greek and Latin versions of the Discussion of Silvester against the Syriac version. The text of the latter seems to have been contaminated to some extent by the text of the Peshitta, and perhaps also of Ps.22.8 (P), but καμάν 'an object of revulsion' and καμάγ 'a laughing stock' could very well be alternative translations of the Greek ἐμπαιγμός. The modification of Jeremiah or Lamentations in this quotation must be compared with Sergius's method of treating scripture as it has been described above. What we probably have here is a text from Jeremiah or Lamentations being revised in the light of Mt.27.41//'s and Ps.22.6f. It is unlikely that it goes back to any of the midrashim on Jeremiah, since it is not quoted by anybody earlier than the Discussion of Silvester (early 6th century), nor are these texts used elsewhere for anti-Jewish polemical purposes.

vi. Another Jeremiah agraphon, 1.20; the text of the Disputation:

'And (prophesying) that he would be buried, Jeremiah said: And by his burial the dead shall live.'

Once again this agraphon is found in the Discussion of Silvester, the Syriac text being as follows:

'And (prophesying) that he would be buried, Jeremiah said: By his burial the dead shall live.'

As we have by now come to expect, the Greek text of this agraphon agrees exactly with that of Sergius even down to

1. op.cit.,vi.12.
2. Brooks, op.cit.,p.75.
The Latin text exactly follows the Greek. Dionysius bar Salibhi also quotes this agraphon with a text identical with that of Sergius.

A Jeremiah agraphon similar to, but more extensive than the one quoted by Sergius was well known in the early church. It is cited by Justin in the following form:

\[
\text{Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λογῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰερεμίου ὀμοίως ταῦτα περιέληκαν. Ἐμνήθη ὂς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χῶραν καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀναγεγέλισας ταῖς αὐτῶι τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ.}
\]

In his discussion on this agraphon Danielou assigns it to the Jewish Christian midrash on Jeremiah which we have mentioned above. Its Jewish Christian origin is apparent (especially in the phrase ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ τῶν νεκρῶν), for it deals with a problem felt acutely in this sector of the church. But as regards the relation of the two agrapha and the origin of the one cited by Sergius we are confronted with the same problem as we met earlier in connection with the relation of the two Ezra agrapha. Only this time the two quotations are more closely related. We may solve the problem in two ways: either we may adopt the solution suggested for the relation of the Ezra agrapha and say that they are two parallel passages from

3. op. cit., vii. 2.
5. op. cit., p. 102f, 233f. Other discussions of the two agrapha can be found in M. R. James, op. cit., p. xlif, A. L. Williams, op. cit., p. 342, and idem, Justin Martyr, the Dialogue with Trypho, p. 153, n. 1.
the same Jeremiah midrash, or we may suggest that the
text cited by Sergius is an abbreviated form of the ear­lier agraphon, so revised as to make it applicable to the
wider Gentile church by paring down its Jewish overtones.
On the whole, it is best to adopt the latter alternative,
and conclude that the shorter form of the agraphon has
evolved in the testimony tradition out of the longer
form. Once again discussion of how it eventually found
its way into Sergius's Disputation must be postponed.

vii. Is. 66.24, iii.4, xx.13. In the text of this quotation
the Disputation agrees with Aphraates¹ in reading יִתְנָה
יכַנְה 'you shall go forth and see' against the Peshi­
itta יִתְנָה יַכַנְה 'they shall go forth and see' –
which is also the reading of MT and LXX. The reversal of
the words יִתְנָה יַכַנְה יִתְנָה יכַנְה 'their worm shall not die'²
as against the Peshitta is made under the influence of
Mk.9.48. The agreement of Sergius and Aphraates will re­
quirc further investigation, particularly in view of the
fact that they both cite Is.66.16 immediately preceding
this quotation, and for the same purpose – as testimonies
for the Last Judgement.

(2) The Testimony Book Hypothesis.

In his two volume work, Testimonies, Rendel Harris
(assisted by Vacher Burch), building upon suggestions
made by earlier scholars, puts forward the comprehensive
hypothesis that the earliest Christian, written work
was a collection of Old Testament proof texts testify­ing to Jesus Christ, and to the supersession of the Jew­
ish people by the Christian church. He argues at great
length that this Book of Testimonies was used by nearly
all the New Testament authors, and has affected the text
of their writings in many places. He attempts to recon­

1. op. cit., I, 32.
2. Also found in Aphraates, op. cit., I, 1034, and Dionysius
   bar Salibhi, op. cit., viii.5.
struct parts of this Book from supposed extracts in many early Christian writings, and suggests that it is con-
tained, in whole or part, in the extant collections of
such testimonies made by Cyprian, Pseudo-Gregory of Ny-
ssa, and to a large extent Tertullian. He goes on to
identify this lost Book of Testimonies with the λόγια
which Papias says were compiled by the Apostle Matthew,
and even finds a direct descendant of this work in a 16th
century manuscript, written in Greek, from Mt.Athos, ascri-
bred to Matthew the monk, which is a collection of anti-
Jewish testimonies arranged in five books. The five books
of commentary on the Dominical Oracles (Λόγια Κυριακῶν)
which Eusebius attributes to Papias, are regarded by
Harris as a commentary on this Book of Testimonies.

The evidence for Harris's theory is cumulative and
lengthy and it is impossible to summarise it adequately
here. However, he arranges it under five heads as follows:
(a) Peculiar texts - the recurrence of readings, with the
arguments based upon them, unique to Christian anti-Jewish
writings.
(b) Recurrent sequences - recurrent sequences of testimony
texts in different anti-Jewish writers.
(c) Erroneous authorship - the recurrence in such works of
identical false ascriptions of authorship to Old Testament
texts.
(d) Editorials prefaces, comments, and questions - the recur-
rence of identical introductory and explanatory clauses
attached to particular testimonies.
(e) Matter for the use of the controversialist - material
which could be used in direct confrontations between

1. Three Books of Testimonies against the Jews ad Quirinum.
2. Selected Testimonies from the Old Testament against
the Jews.
3. Adversus Judaeos.
5. op.cit.
Christians and Jews, such as direct challenges and questions following the quotation of testimony texts.

Examples of all these phenomena are adduced, and Harris concludes that they cannot be due to the direct dependence of one author upon another, but by all the authors upon a common source - a Book of Testimonies. The rest of volume I of his work is devoted to the individual examination of various Christian anti-Jewish writers to demonstrate their dependence upon this work. Volume II of Testimonies is mainly devoted to the examination of each book of the New Testament in turn to demonstrate how they reflect the use of this Book of Testimonies.

Rendel Harris's thesis has had a mixed reception among scholars, particularly his claim that only one such collection of anti-Jewish testimonies existed. In particular, Jean Daniélou has demonstrated how many separate collections of testimonies existed in the early church, crystallizing around such words as λέγει, ἀπέλαυσε, and παρασκευάζεται. A.L. Williams rejects Harris's theory of only one Book of Testimonies, and suggests that, on the contrary, there were several, although he agrees that they may well have preceded the New Testament. R.A. Kraft, after a detailed study of the texts of the quotations from Isaiah in the Epistle of Barnabas, declares himself to be on the whole in agreement with Williams, concluding that the author of the Epistle used brief, testimony, note sheets. T.W. Manson suggests that 'we should think of the 'Testimony Book', not as something that was turned out in writ-

1. op.cit., I, pp. 9-20.
2. To be fair to Harris, he does qualify his thesis as follows: 'We have seen reason to believe that it (the Testimony Book) was to some extent fluid, and that it was accommodated at various points to the needs of the time,' op.cit., I, p. 100.
3. Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne.
en form in the earliest days of the Church, but rather as a collection of proof-texts assembled in the course of preaching, and forming part of the primitive kerygma. C.H.Dodd, however, in a study devoted solely to the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, completely rejects the hypothesis of a Testimony Book written earlier than any part of the New Testament, and suggests rather that 'there were some parts of scripture which were early recognized as appropriate sources from which testimonia might be drawn.' Likewise Barnabas Lindars, in a review of Daniélou's book, suggests that we should 'look for the links between Judaism and early Christianity, not in lists of selected quotations, but in a tradition of exegesis, in which authors borrow from one another, not slavishly, but creatively, handling the common material afresh as each one makes his contribution.'

This latter seems wholly inadequate as an explanation for the sort of phenomena adduced by Harris, and even more so in the light of the Qumran evidence, where we do in fact find a very similar use of proof texts from the Old Testament, in one or two cases in the form of a collection applied to the Teacher of Righteousness and the formation and experiences of the community. Some of the texts used by the community are the very ones which became the key texts of the Christian testimony tradition, for example, Dt.18.15 and Num.24.17. Daniélou repeatedly stresses the importance of the evidence from Qumran, and

2. According to the Scriptures, pp.28-60.
3. op.cit., p.59f.
6. op.cit., pp.9, 28, 166f.
also mentions the existence of such collections of proof texts elsewhere in pre-Christian Judaism. He thinks that the early Jewish Christians took over the testimony method from the Qumran community, and that it spread to the rest of the church, with collections of testimonies being utilised by the New Testament writers. He does, however, remark, 'Mais il ne parait pas qu'il y ait eu un livre des Testimonia, comme le supposait Rendel Harris.' It seems, therefore, that we must revise Harris's theory somewhat and conclude that there is a reasonable degree of certainty that collections of testimonies existed in the early church, but that only later with Meliton, Cyprian, and Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, do we meet compilations of these collections of testimonies into complete books. Harris's suggestion that a single written Testimony Book predated the New Testament must also be abandoned in the light of C.H. Dodd's work, though it does seem that the latter's hypothesis is inadequate as an explanation of the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers.

1. *op. cit.*, p. 86. Allegro in the former article cited above (*J.B.L.*, 75, p. 186, n. 107) says that 'it must now be regarded as more than a possibility that the first Christians were able to take over and use collections of Hebrew testimonia already current in a closely related religious community like this of Qumran.'


3. Although the work is no longer extant Meliton tells us, in a fragment preserved in Syriac, that he compiled such a book of testimonies, and even gives us an outline of the sort of subjects it covered:

'We have made collections from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ.' William Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, text p. 51, translation p. 53.
As to the other parts of Harris's thesis we may safely say that the identification of the original Book of Testimonies with the work ascribed to Matthew the monk in the Athos manuscript, and the identification of the writer with Matthew the Apostle, is very improbable. The identification with the λόγια which Papias says Matthew compiled, and of Papias's own five books on the Dominical Oracles with a commentary on this book, is interesting but hypothetical. It could be that the λόγια were collections of testimonies, but we cannot really decide, one way or the other. The discovery of the Gospel of Thomas does, in any case, reinforce the view that the λόγια were a collection of Dominical sayings.

The reason for this digression on the supposed Book of Testimonies is that Rendel Harris makes the interesting suggestion that his Book of Testimonies existed in Syriac, and was used in particular by Dionysius bar Salibhi. He suggests further that this Syriac Book of Testimonies was 'clearly known to the author of the Doctrine of Addai', and moreover, elsewhere he uses Ephraem and Aphraates as witnesses for the reconstruction of the Book. We must, therefore, proceed to investigate whether this hypothesis will help us to throw light on the problem of the origin of the testimony texts in Sergius's Disputation.

(3) The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite and the Discussion of St. Silvester.

The Discussion of St. Silvester, to which we had frequent—

1. Harris himself, in vol. II of his work, demotes this theory to an appendix, and concludes that 'on the whole ... it would be unwise to lay further stress on the Byzantine author whom we have been studying' - *op. cit.* II, p. 136.
3. *op. cit.*, I, p. 44.
ly to make reference in the section on the testimony texts, forms the second part of the apocryphal Acts of Pope Silvester. The exact origin and date of this work is, however, uncertain. It is studied by Jean Juster, who gives an extensive bibliography, A. L. Williams, who gives a good summary of the Discussion, and the Syriac versions of the Acts by A. Baumstark, Ortiz de Urbina, and R. Duval. It seems that the legend of Pope Silvester is of Oriental origin, quite probably from Syria, and that it was created at the end of the fourth century. The original legend concerned only the miraculous deeds of Silvester and his baptism of Constantine, for we possess a Syriac homily attributed to Jacob of Sarug which contains only this part of the legend, although the bishop who baptises Constantine is anonymous. Urbina and P. Peters (following W. Levison) regard this homily as spurious; Baumstark, on the other hand, thinks that it may be genuine. There is also a twelfth century Syriac manuscript which contains only this first part of the Acts of Silvester, this time with the bishop (Silvester) who baptises Constantine being named. That the two sections of the Acts were originally separate is confirmed by the fact that in the Greek and Latin editions they are printed separately.

1. For the texts and versions cf. p. 27, n. 1 of this chapter.
5. Patrologia Syriaca, pp. 98, 190.
6. La littérature syriague, p. 184 f.
7. See Baumstark and Urbina, opera cit.
8. op. cit., p. 98.
11. op. cit.
12. BM Add. 12, 174, fol. 200v-205r.
The fuller form of the Acts, with the Discussion added, first appears in Syria in the sixth century, for they are incorporated in the anonymous history compiled by a Syrian Jacobite, which is referred to, and edited by E.W. Brooks, as the 'Ecclesiastical History of Zacharias Rhetor'. The author of this work has included Zacharias's work, which covers the period 450-491 A.D., as books 3-6 of his 12 book work. The whole dates from 569 A.D., as the author tells us in Bk.I,1,3. The Acts of Silvester appear as Bk.I, ch.vii. Juster thinks that the legend came to the West, and received its final redaction probably in Rome, at the end of the fifth century. For the legend is first mentioned in the Pseudo-Gelasian decretal, and then the whole of the Acts are described by Gregory of Tours and later Western historians. We have then the definite fact that the fuller form of the Acts of Silvester, including the Discussion which interests us, emerged during the first half of the sixth century. In the light of this it seems that the homily attributed to Jacob of Sarug (who lived c.451-521 A.D.) could well be original. If we date Jacob's homily towards the end of the fifth century, we can summarise the probable growth of the legend of St. Silvester as follows: first, at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century an anonymous legend of the baptism of Constantine grew up in the Orient: towards the end of this century the name of Pope Silvester was added to it; and lastly, about the beginning of the sixth century the final redaction of the Acts took place when the Discussion of Pope Silvester with twelve Jews before Queen Helena and Constantine, was added to the legend.

Greek is clearly the original language in which these

1. See p.27, n.1.
2. De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris, 4.4.3, ed. E.v. Dohschütz, T.U., 38.4, and in P.L., 59, 173. It is to be dated c.500 A.D.
3. History of the Franks, 2.31, a work which was completed in 591 A.D. - cited by Juster, op. cit., p.67, n.2.
Acts were composed, for the author of the Latin version tells us explicitly that he translated his work from Greek\(^1\), and the Syriac version bears every sign of being a translation, with a very heavy incidence of rare Greek loan words. Against Juster, it is probable that the final redaction - the combination of the legend and the Discussion - took place in the Orient, probably Syria, although the Latin is the fullest form and did, therefore, receive additions when it eventually reached Rome. Juster\(^2\) says that it is difficult to decide whether the Syriac translation is earlier or later than the Latin; it is probable that they are approximately contemporaneous, although we cannot now tell whether the two parts of the Acts ever circulated separately in the West as they did in Syria.

This digression on the date and origin of the Acts of Silvester was necessary in order to clarify the relation of the work to Sergius's Disputation. We will proceed to investigate this relation by applying Harris's criteria\(^3\) for the detection of the use of his Book of Testimonies.

(a) Peculiar texts.

We have seen above\(^4\) that every agraphon which Sergius quotes is exactly paralleled by the Discussion of Silvester. It is to be particularly noted that (apart from Dionysius bar Salibhi and, in one case, the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila) these agrapha are confined to the two works, being found nowhere else in precisely the same form. We must, therefore, posit some literary relationship - either borrowing on the part of Sergius or mutual dependence upon some other work. The first alternative is virtually ruled out by the fact that the text of the quotations in Sergius's Disputation invariably agrees with the Greek and Latin versions of the Discussion against the Syriac. Since Sergius nowhere shows any knowledge of

2. *op. cit.*, p. 66f.
3. See above p. 39f.
Greek, and since the parallels with the Discussion are
cnfined to biblical texts, with no borrowing from the
substance of the work, we must opt for the latter alter­
native.

(b) Recurrent sequences.

It will have been noted in the discussion of the
testimony texts that they all occur on folio 4r (ch.i.16–
20) of Sergius's Disputation and on p.74f of the Syriac
text of the Discussion of Silvester. To illustrate this
facet of the relation between the two works, we will set
out in diagrammatic form the sequence of the biblical
quotations in the Discussion, with the parallel quotat­
ions from the Disputation alongside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Discussion of Silvester</th>
<th>The Disputation of Sergius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps.74.22</td>
<td>p.72,1.12²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt.32.39</td>
<td>p.72,1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.33.6</td>
<td>p.73,1.5,74,1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.2.7</td>
<td>p.73,1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.1.26</td>
<td>p.73,1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.51.11</td>
<td>p.73,1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.57.16</td>
<td>p.74,1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk.2.52</td>
<td>p.74,1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.7.14</td>
<td>p.74,1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar.3.35ff</td>
<td>p.74,1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.3.1f</td>
<td>p.74,1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis.2.12</td>
<td>p.75,1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.41.9</td>
<td>p.75,1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.22.18</td>
<td>p.75,1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.27.12</td>
<td>p.75,1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah agraphon (iii)³</td>
<td>p.75,1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.5r,1.11 (i.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.1r,1.12 (i.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.11r,1.14 (vi.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.4v,1.5 (ii.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.12v,1.19 (vii.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.1r,1.22 (i.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.2v,1.13 (i.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.3r,1.5 (i.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.3v,1.20 (i.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.4r,1.11, 18v,1.14 (i.18,x.5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fol.3v,1.22) (i.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol.4r,1.1 (i.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The equation of \( \text{καρδιος} \) and \( \text{καρδιωκ} \), and \( \text{καρδιωκ} \) and \( \text{καρδιωκ} \), which Sergius makes in iv.5 and xi.11 re­
respectively, requires only a knowledge of what is a loan word,
not a knowledge of Greek. Cf. Aphraates, op. cit., I,910, who
also equates the latter.
2. Of the Syriac version, op. cit.
3. See p.28 above.
The Discussion of Silvester | The Disputation of Sergius

Ps.69.21 | p.75,1.11

Lam.3.14, Jer.20.7 | p.75,1.13

The Ezra agraphon | p.75,1.15

Jeremiah agraphon (vi) | p.75,1.18

Col.2.9 | p.80,1.7

Jn.3.5 | p.80,1.10

Mt.4.10 | p.81,1.10

Gen.22.18 | p.82,1.12; 86,1.3

Ps.132.11 | p.82,1.12

Dt.18.15 | p.85,1.18

An allusion to Dn.9.25f | p.85,1.19

Dt.32.8f | p.86,1.4

Ex.3.15 | p.86,1.14

Dt.32.39 | p.90,1.25

Ps.69.21 | p.75,1.11

Lam.3.14, Jer.20.7 | p.75,1.13

The Ezra agraphon | p.75,1.15

Jeremiah agraphon (vi) | p.75,1.18

Col.2.9 | p.80,1.7

Jn.3.5 | p.80,1.10

Mt.4.10 | p.81,1.10

Gen.22.18 | p.82,1.12; 86,1.3

Ps.132.11 | p.82,1.12

Dt.18.15 | p.85,1.18

An allusion to Dn.9.25f | p.85,1.19

Dt.32.8f | p.86,1.4

Ex.3.15 | p.86,1.14

Dt.32.39 | p.90,1.25

What is immediately striking about this list is that the section from Is.7.14 - Jeremiah agraphon (vi) is almost exactly paralleled by Sergius's Disputation, and roughly in the same order, and certainly within the same small compass. Elsewhere the parallels are very scattered, and are in any case not very significant, except for the section on the Trinity on p.73. Now if we look at the subject matter in the parallel sections of the Disputation and the Discussion, we find that in each case we are presented with a biography of Jesus Christ in Old Testament quotations. On p.74 of the Discussion Godaliah, the third Jew to speak, asks for proof from the Old Testament regard-

1. See p.36 above.
2. Cf., p.21 above.
this list of testimony texts. In Sergius's Disputation the whole of the first six folios is devoted to just such a biography. Now Rendel Harris mentions with approval the view that 'a small collection of Old Testament extracts was gathered together in such a way as to be a biography of the Lord in prophecies.' Can we not detect here the common use of such a collection by the author of the Discussion of Silvester and Sergius the Stylite? There is also evidence to suggest that a collection of quotations on the Trinity and the Holy Spirit existed in the testimony tradition, and it seems possible that we can detect the use of such a collection on p. 73 of the Discussion and folios 4vff of Sergius's Disputation. It looks, therefore, as though the common source of the two works was a book of testimonies, containing one at least and perhaps two of the collections which we have isolated.

(c) Erroneous authorship.

There are no cases of erroneous ascriptions of authorship common to our two works, but we will note later on that Sergius has an error of this sort in common with Aphraates.

(d) Editor's prefaces, comments, and questions.

It will have been noted in our discussion of the testimony texts that there are striking agreements between the two works in the manner in which they introduce their testimony texts. We will again set these out side by side for the purpose of comparison.

The Discussion of Silvester  

The Disputation of Sergius

3.35ff. For other evidence of the existence of this collection cf. The Introduction, ch. iv, p. 107f.
The Discussion of Silvester

'And that he would live among men, hear again the prophet, who said.....'

The Greek text is even closer to the Disputation:

"οτί δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπους συναναστάφησεν, ἡκονετοῦ προφήτου Ἱερεμίου...."

Zech. 3:1ff. The introductions differ, and the only point of similarity may be that "he was overcome by him' and "he conquered Satan", may be alternative translations of the Greek νικήσας αὐτόν; it is interesting to observe that the Latin version reads 'vinceret diabolum', which is exactly Sergius's text, and may, therefore witness to a better underlying Greek text.

Ps. 41:9. καὶ οὐκ ἐξακολούθησαν... 'And again (prophesying) that his disciple would betray him the Psalm says.....'

Again the Greek text offers a better parallel to the Disputation:

"οτί δὲ καὶ παρὰ μαθητοῦ προδοθήσεται, λέγει ο Θεός....."

Ps. 22:18. καὶ οὐκ ἔσοδον στῆθέν με ἀπὸ τοῦ παθήσας..... '

'And (prophesying) that he would be stripped and his garments shared out, the prophet said.....'

1. Cedrenus, op. cit., col. 525A.
2. For the texts see p. 26 above.
4. Cedrenus, op. cit., col. 525B.

The Disputation of Sergius

'And (prophesying) that he would live among men, Jeremiah said.....'
Ps. 27.12 - "And (prophesying) that he would be accused by false witnesses, again the prophet said...."

'And concerning the false witnesses he writes....'

Jeremiah agraphon (iii)². The introduction to Sergius's quotation exactly reproduces that to the Greek text of the Discussion against the Syriac.

Ps. 69.21. - "And that he ate gall and drank vinegar, the prophet said...."

'And that they gave him vinegar and gall, David said....'

The Greek adds Δαυις ἐπὶ τὸ προφητής Δαυις λέγει....

Lam. 3.14, Jer. 20.7. ⁴ Sergius's introduction exactly follows that of the Greek text of the Discussion against the Syriac.

The Ezra agraphon⁵. Here Sergius seems to have only partly reproduced the heading to the quotation, the Syriac version of the Discussion having a fuller form, and the Greek text the fullest form.

Jeremiah agraphon (vi)⁶. All the texts agree exactly in the introduction to this quotation.

Here again we have a remarkable series of agreements between our two works, though it does look as though each author or translator occasionally rearranges his material. As with the texts of the agrapha, so with the introductions to them, we observe that Sergius's Disputation almost in-

1. Literally 'witnesses of falsehood'.
2. See p.28 above for the texts.
3. Cedrenus, op. cit., col. 525B.
4. See p.35 above for the texts.
5. See p.30 above for the texts.
6. See p.36 above for the texts.
variably follows the Greek text of the Discussion. The formula for introducing these texts should be noted: in Syriac it is usually  the subject of the quotation, the name of the Old Testament author, and  Occasionally it is varied, usually by substituting for  It is clearly a translation of the Greek  followed by a verb in the future tense. We may conclude, therefore, that the headings are drawn from the Book of Testimonies which we must posit lies behind our two works.

(e) Matter for the use of the controversialist.

Of course all these testimony texts are of use in anti-Jewish polemic, but we have no specific examples in common of the sort of direct challenges which Rendel Harris describes. However, we may note that the Discussion, though not Sergius's Disputation, contains the archetypal example of this genre - 'To whom did he say, "Let us make man ... "' (Gen. 1.26). Independent examples of this practice do occur in the Disputation.

Thus by applying Harris's five tests we are inevitably led to the conclusion that Sergius and the author of the Discussion of Silvester both used a Book of Testimonies which contained, possibly a section giving the Old Testament evidence for the Trinity, and, at the least, a biography of Jesus Christ in Old Testament prophecies. Since we have concluded that the Discussion of Silvester was added to the Acts around the beginning of the sixth century, this Book of Testimonies, in its Greek form, must have been in existence in the fifth century. Now we have

1. The same formula can be observed in Cyprian's Testimonies against the Jews, and Isidore's De Fide Catholica Contra Judaeos.
seen that it is most unlikely that Sergius borrowed his testimonies from the Syriac version of the Discussion (unless more than one Syriac version of the work was in existence), and that it is also unlikely that he drew upon the Greek text. This conclusion will be reinforced when we come to consider his use of the Syriac version of Josephus’s War of the Jews¹ and Eusebius’s Chronicle², for this establishes that it is his practice only to use sources which were available in Syriac. We must then surmise that this Testimony Book which we have isolated behind the Discussion of Silvester was, at some stage, translated into Syriac, and then used by Sergius, a conclusion which will perhaps account for the fact that although Sergius follows the Greek text of the Discussion more closely than the Syriac, he does not reproduce it exactly. The differences between the texts of the quotations in the Discussion and the Disputation, on the one hand, and in Dionysius’s treatise Against the Jews, on the other hand, may be explained by the fact that Dionysius drew upon this Syriac version of the Testimony Book, the text of which, we may conjecture, had in the course of several centuries been reshaped and simplified.

Before we attempt to trace the Testimony Book back any further in time, we must see if the relation between Dionysius’s work and Sergius’s Disputation can tell us any more about its contents.

(4) The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite and Dionysius bar Salibhi’s ‘Against the Jews’.³

It is almost impossible to summarize the relation

1. See the Introduction, this chapter, section C.
2. See the Introduction, this chapter, section E.
between these two works, for a very large part of Dionysius's treatise finds parallels, both in the texts quoted and in subject matter, with Sergius's Disputation. We have already mentioned that Rendel Harris makes extensive use of Dionysius's work in reconstructing his hypothetical Book of Testimonies. In discussing the work he says that it 'contains many relics of the earlier controversies, and probably whole sections, slightly disguised by their transference into Syriac, of the lost book that we are in quest of.' Quoting from a manuscript in his possession, he shows that Dionysius actually says that he is using testimonies. In the midst of a list of Old Testament quotations we find the following:

'All these testimonies refer to the three Persons, and to the descent and incarnation of God, the Word, one of the Persons, and his first coming and the signs which he performed, and his entry into Jerusalem and also to his suffering and his crucifixion, and to his disciple who betrayed him, from the prophets'.

Here bar Salibhi gives a very good summary of the first six folios of Sergius's Disputation, that is, a series of testimony texts on these subjects. The conclusion is unavoidable that he is summarizing the contents of a collection of testimonies which Sergius also used.

We must, however, go into some detail in order to delineate clearly the relationship between the two works, for we have to bear in mind that there are always two possibilities - direct borrowing or a common relationship to another source; and this other source could be either oral or written. We will attempt to show how the first

2. J. de Zwaan used this manuscript for his edition of Bar Salibhi's treatise.
Alternative is ruled out by the fact that however closely our two authors are related in the subject matter of their works, Dionysius never actually quotes Sergius' Disputation.

1. Dionysius begins his work with the etymology of the name 'Jew' which occurs in ch. xi.1 of the Disputation.  
2. The first chapter of Dionysius' work is mainly devoted to a discussion of the various sects of the Jews, and there are, therefore, few parallels with the Disputation. However, sections 12-13 of this chapter are entirely paralleled in the Disputation, folios 13vff.: 

a) Both authors taunt the Jews with the fact of the dispersion after the fall of Jerusalem, giving the precise interval from that event to their own time.  
b) Both mention the Jews' vain hope of a return. While Dionysius says, "You have not seen, even in your dream, one thing which indicates to you a return", Sergius says, "Why has he not sent to you even one consolation or prophet or worthless dream?"  
c) Both make the point that previously when the Jews apostatized, God did not deprive them of the prophets.  
d) Both assert that if the Jews had crucified 'a deceiver' (κακονόμος), then God would have blessed them.  
e) Both use the case of Phineas as an illustration.  

Elsewhere in Dionysius' treatise there are parallels to these folios in Sergius' Disputation:—

f) Both use Elijah as an example of God's blessing upon the killing of wrongdoers.  
g) They have a parallel argument on the cessation of prophecy, sacrifices, etc.  

At first sight it looks as though Dionysius is directly dependent upon Sergius, even though he never explicitly

1. See the texts cited in n.3 to fol. 19r.  
2. Dionysius, i. 12, Sergius, viii. 5f.  
3. Dionysius, i. 12, Sergius, viii. 6.  
4. Dionysius, i. 12, Sergius, viii. 6.  
5. Dionysius, i. 13, Sergius, viii. 7.  
6. Dionysius, i. 13, Sergius, viii. 7.  
7. Dionysius, iii. 23, Sergius, viii. 7f.  
quotes him. However, when we refer to the extant Books of Testimonies,\(^1\) we find that much of the material which Dionysius and Sergius have in common comes from the headings to the relevant collections of texts, and that they are both drawing upon a stock of arguments well known in the testimony tradition.\(^2\) Thus instead of direct borrowing they are both dependent either upon a Book of Testimonies or an oral (we might say, catechetical) tradition of anti-Jewish polemic.

iii. Chapter ii of Dionysius's treatise contains standard arguments on circumcision and the sabbath, which all occur, albeit in a summarized form, in ch.iv.1-3 of the Disputation. These same arguments recur throughout the Christian tradition of anti-Jewish polemic (some of them indeed going back to the New Testament), and there is no doubt that collections of testimonies on these subjects existed.\(^3\)

iv. The cessation of the Old Covenant and the introduction of the New is also discussed in this chapter of Dionysius's work, along with the attendant quotations. This also was the subject of a very early collection of testimonies,\(^4\) and Sergius briefly refers to the subject.\(^5\)

v. The use of Ps.72 by Dionysius in ch.iii.1,iv.9, is closely paralleled in the Disputation,i.6,ix.6-10. It is a very well known testimony text.\(^6\)

vi. In ch.iii.7,iv.8-12, Dionysius provides a whole series of testimony texts to meet Jewish objections to the Incarnation. Chapter vii.1-7 of the Disputation deals with exactly the same problem, often quoting exactly the same texts. For example, let us compare this collocation of

2. For other references see the notes to the Translation, folios 13vff.
5. Ch.i.15.
(Q.) 1 'How could your God say, "My soul is grieved unto death"?'

(A.) 'As he regretted when he made man, and he grieved in his heart.' 2

'If the Son grieved and was sorrowful at the time of his death, in the same way the Father regretted that he had made man, and he grieved in his heart.' 3

There is no verbal agreement between Sergius and Dionysius; what they have in common is the method of using Gen.6.6 to rebut Jewish objections. The use of texts like these clearly belongs to a later strata in the testimony tradition, since they do not appear in earlier writers. Nonetheless, it looks as though Sergius and Dionysius had a collection of such texts ready at hand.

In the rest of ch.iii of Dionysius's treatise there are many scattered parallels with the Disputation. Ch.iv. 17-19 also contains many testimony texts on Christ's two advents which Sergius uses.

vii. Chapters v.-vii.7 of Dionysius's treatise seem to be mainly drawn from the biography of Jesus Christ in prophecies which we have isolated above in the Discussion of Silvester p.74f, and in Sergius's Disputation, folios 1-6. Dionysius quotes all but one of the agrapha which are described in the section on testimony texts, 4 besides filling in the gap left in the list on p.47 where Sergius omits Wis.2.12. The following list gives Dionysius's para-

1. An imaginary Jewish opponent is speaking.
2. Dionysius, op.cit.,iii.7.
4. See above, pages,26-38.
In this list only two quotations in the two works have a different position in their order of occurrence—the Ezra agraphon and Ps.22.18; they are both also placed in a different position in Sergius’s Disputation. Dionysius places the Ezra agraphon in the context of Jesus’ trial, as we have noted above, and its position in the Disputation also really implies the same context. Like Dionysius, Sergius also places Ps.22.18 alongside Ps.69.21, but after, not before it, so we cannot be sure of its exact position in the original collection of testimonies. However, the otherwise striking agreement in the order of the quotations confirms our hypothesis that Dionysius is also a witness to the Book of Testimonies underlying Silvester’s Discussion and Sergius’s Disputation.

Dionysius, like Sergius, has a much fuller series of texts in this biography, and from the parallels between them we can add the following texts to the contents of our hypothetical Book of Testimonies: Ps.72.10f, Job.19.25, Is.40.3, Jer.16.16, Is.53.4, Zech.9.9, Jer.31.31f, Zech.12.10, Is.53.7, Dn.7.13f, Ps.110.1, Ps.50.3, Is.66.24, Ps.24.7. This

1. See p. 34.
2. The notes to the Translation indicate where these texts occur in Dionysius’s treatise.
does not mean, of course, that all these texts were necessarily part of the collection as it existed in the fifth century. It was the sort of work that easily lent itself to expansion; many of the quotations in Sergius's work are clearly of this nature. The lack of parallels to some of his quotations, besides their bizarre appearance, indicates that he has added them himself to the original collection which formed the basis of his first few folios. Nevertheless, since so many of the texts which we have listed here are used as testimony texts from the earliest times, we cannot rule out the possibility that the author of the Discussion has abstracted only a few quotations from the Book of Testimonies, and not quoted all those which he found in it. The fact that he does not complete the 'dispensation' of Christ with testimonies to the Resurrection, Ascension, Parousia, and the Last Judgement, indicates that this may have been his practice.

viii. In ch.viii.2-3 Dionysius deals with the subject of Christian worship of the cross and saints' bones, very much in the same terms as Sergius does in ch.x.2, xii.1-13, xiii.14-16, xiv.15-17. The possibility that there was a collection of testimony texts on this subject is discussed in the following chapter.

As regards the question of headings and introductions to quotations, there are few parallels worth noting between Dionysius and Sergius, largely because of the fact that the former tends to give a general heading to a section followed by a list of texts introduced only by the name of the Old Testament author. Nor do we find in Dionysius the introductory formula which we noted in Silvester and Sergius. The only parallel worthy of note is the following:

1. See Harris, op.cit., passim, and the notes to the Translation.
2. See the texts quoted in n.1 to fol.25r, n.2f to fol.35r.
3. See p.113f,116.
4. Harris, op.cit., I,p.57, gives the translation of a typical section.
'And concerning this (or because) - that he was pierced with a spear, Zechariah said...'

And (prophesying) that he would be pierced with a spear, Zechariah said......'

We find, then, that Dionysius bar Salibhi's treatise confirms our hypothesis of a Book of Testimonies, consisting of at least a biography of Jesus in prophecies, which existed in Syria from the fifth century onwards. The wide extent of the parallels between Sergius's work and that of Dionysius suggests also that this Book of Testimonies may also have included collections of texts dealing with such subjects as circumcision, the Sabbath, the Old and New Covenants, the Incarnation, and the worship of the cross and saints' bones. However, the evidence that these latter collections were written and not oral is a good deal less conclusive than that for the former. It is, for instance, not very difficult to see how the mention of the Sabbath would conjure up in the mind of the typical anti-Jewish polemicist the point made in Jn.7.22ff, the fact that the patriarchs did not keep the Sabbath, and the fact that God (and therefore, nature) does not stop work on the Sabbath. The same would hold for many of these collections.

But it is exceedingly difficult to see how it would account for the parallels between our three authors with regard to the biography in prophecies.

Before we sum up our study of the Book of Testimonies, we must consider the parallels between Sergius and Aphraates, and the other evidence in the Disputation, to see whether or not we can trace this Book back before the fifth century.

1. Dionysius, op. cit., vi.12.
2. Sergius, i.18.
As with Dionysius, so with Aphraates, there is a very wide area of overlapping material when we come to consider the parallels with Sergius's Disputation. Of course, much of this overlap can be explained by the fact that the primary concern of both works is the Christian as opposed to the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament. We have already stated that Rendel Harris regards Aphraates as a witness to his hypothetical Testimony Book, and indeed in many places the Demonstrations are little more than collected lists of texts on various subjects. For example, Demonstration 1.6 begins with the following words: "I come now to the first word which I said— that Christ is called a stone by the prophets." In the subsequent four sections Aphraates reproduces and comments upon one of the oldest collections of testimony texts (probably older than the New Testament, perhaps even going back to Jesus himself), that constructed around the word τὸ χίλιον. Another good example of this feature of Aphraates work is Dem. 16 and 19.3f., where we again find very ancient collections of testimony texts on the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of Israel. Elsewhere Demonstrations 11, 'Concerning Circumcision', 13, 'Concerning the Sabbath', 17, 'Concerning Christ the Son of God', etc., all contain

2. Parisot, op. cit., I, 16.
3. Aphraates is referring back to I, 8.
4. Cf. Harris, op. cit., I, p. 18ff and often, Danielou, Études, p. 8, 133, Théology, p. 83, 89, and Cyprian, op. cit., bk. I, 16ff, 'That Christ also is called a Stone', which latter includes most of the texts cited by Aphraates. Of this collection, Sergius cites only Is. 28. 16.
5. op. cit., I, 785ff.
6. op. cit., I, 852ff.
blocks of testimony texts which can be paralleled from anti-Jewish Christian works of all periods. Many of these Demonstrations contain much of the material found in the sections upon the relevant subjects in Sergius's Disputation and Dionysius's Against the Jews. We may safely conclude, therefore, that Aphraates used and reflects the earliest collections of testimony texts, though we cannot tell whether he had a complete Book of Testimonies combining all the various collections, as Harris argues, or whether he had only separate collections, or indeed, whether some of his material was only oral and not written. After studying the parallels between Aphraates and Jacob of Sarug's homilies against the Jews, I.K. Cosgrove confirms our conclusion by saying that 'it would seem that books containing biblical verses for use in disputes lay before both Aphraates and Jacob of Sarug.'

But does Aphraates show any knowledge of the 'Book of Testimonies' which we have suggested was used by the author of the Discussion of Silvester, Sergius, and Dionysius bar Salibhi? We may without hesitation answer this question in the negative, for there is no sign in the Demonstrations of the characteristic texts of this hypothetical work - the agrapha, Bar.3.35ff, Zech.3.1f, Wis.2.12, etc. There are scattered parallels to some of the texts listed on p. 58 as common to Sergius and Dionysius, but since these are common to the testimony tradition and Christian theology in general, we can prove nothing from them. Aphraates' nearest approach to this biography of Jesus is in Dem.17.9ff where Ps.2.7, Is.7.14, Dn.9.25ff, Ps.22.17-19, Is.53, Ps.16.10, Zech.14.7, and Ps.69.21 are quoted in reply to the Jewish statement that 'the Messiah has not yet come.' Both the motive for the citation of these texts, and the omission of those characteristic of our Testimony

1. The parallels between the three works are recorded in the notes to the Translation.
Book rule out the possibility that Aphraates is using it here.

Nevertheless, there are one or two interesting parallels between the Demonstrations and Sergius's Disputation, which are difficult to explain away by the hypothesis of oral tradition or common dependence upon the Syriac exegetical tradition:

1. Both Sergius and Aphraates wrongly ascribe Am.8.9 to Zechariah. We have here a case of 'erroneous authorship' corresponding to one of the criteria used by Harris for the detection of the use of his Book of Testimonies. He illustrates his criterion with an example from Irenaeus and Justin where they both attribute Num.24.17 to Isaiah. From the fact that Justin combines Num.24.17 here with Is.11.1 Harris explains the error as follows: 'From this passage we see how the error of placing the name of Isaiah on a prophecy of Balaam arose; for Justin shows us the passage of Isaiah following the one from Numbers, and the error lies in the covering of two passages with a single reference. It is clear, then, that Justin's mistake was made in a collection of Testimonies from the prophets, and that the same collection, or one that closely agreed with it, was in the hands of Irenaeus.' On p.21f Harris claims that the same explanation will account for the attribution of Mal.3.1 to Isaiah in Mk.1.2. It is very easy to prove that the same explanation will also account for the error made by Aphraates and Sergius. The clue is in the introduction to the quotation provided by the latter:

4. מְשָׁרָתָו מִלְתֵּיהֶם. מְשָׁרָתָו מִלְתֵּיהֶם. מְשָׁרָתָו מִלְתֵּיהֶם.

'And (prophesying) that the sun would be darkened, and in the time of the evening it would be light, Zechariah said.'

Now if we refer to Zech.14.7 we find at the end of the

1. Ch.1.19.
3. op.cit., I, p.10f.
4. מְשָׁרָתָו in the manuscript.
5. Followed by Am.8.9.
verse: \( \text{יְםָהּ יָמָהּ יָמָהּ יָמָהּ} \).

'And at the time of the evening it will be light.'

The combination of Am.8.9 and Zech.14.7 forms part of one of the oldest collections of testimony texts, witnessing to the darkness at the time of the crucifixion.\(^1\) Aphraates uses Zech.14.7 elsewhere for this purpose\(^2\), and so does Dionysius\(^3\). The heading to the quotation in Sergius's Disputation contains elements of both texts and was clearly meant to introduce both. Aphraates, on the other hand, clearly means to quote Am.8.9 but ascribes the text to Zechariah instead. It is difficult to resist the temptation to conclude that both authors had a written collection of testimonies in front of them in which both Am.8.9 and Zech.14.7 were part of a section dealing with the darkness at the time of the crucifixion, that the Zechariah quotation came first, and that their eyes slipped from the word Zechariah to the Amos quotation which they proceeded to give. On the other hand, we could draw the same conclusion as Harris and say that the error lay in the collection of testimonies before them. A third alternative is to suppose that they were both quoting from memory, and that never having been able to think of the one quotation apart from the other, they quite naturally confused them.

The first two alternatives are not really separable, the difference being that in the former we do not have to assume that Sergius and Aphraates were using the same written collection of testimonies. The decision between all three alternatives must necessarily be taken on the subjective ground of probability: how far can we stretch the factor of coincidence? We can be reasonably certain that on folio 4r Sergius is using a written collection of testimonies, and the introduction which he provides for Am.8.9 certainly looks as though it is literary with its

3. *op. cit.*, vi.10.
combination of elements from both quotations. Dionysius,
whom we suspect of using the same collection of testi-
monies, quotes Zech.14.7 right in the middle of the sect-
ton in his work where we have most reason to suspect the
presence of this collection. I think it probable that
Sergius had a written collection before him, that he re-
produces the introduction to this section and then quotes
only one of the two texts that it contained; Dionysius
omits this one and quotes the other. As regards the third
alternative, the decision as to whether Aphraates is de-
pendent or not on the same written source is finely bal-
anced. The scales are just tipped in the direction of
quotation from memory and its resultant confusion, by the
fact that nowhere else does he seem to be using the bio-
graphy of Jesus in prophecies which was, if not the whole
content, at least the base of Sergius's testimony book.
ii. The insertion of 'O Lord' into the text of
Is.26.19. This verse fluctuates in the ancient testi-
mony tradition between two groups - that connected with
Christ's raising of the dead, where it is usually combin-
ed with Is.53.4, and that connected with the resurrection
of the dead, where it is usually combined with the
sort of texts which Sergius cites on folio 6r - Ez.37 and
Dn.12.2f. Sergius places it in the first context, Aphr-
aates in the second. It is therefore unlikely that the var-
iant common to them both is due to their mutual depend-
dence on the same collection of testimonies. But it is,
nevertheless, difficult to see why they make the insert-
ion. Perhaps they wish to make it clear that it is to the
Lord's, that is, Christ's, dead that the text applies, and
not to Israel's dead as the context implies. The only oth-
er possibility is that Sergius is directly dependent upon
Aphraates, but the different way in which they use the
text argues against this.

1. Number (ii) in the list of testimony texts on p. 28.
2. See Rendel Harris, op.cit., I, p. 9f.
3. See Daniélou, Etudes, p. 117.
iii. The text of their quotations of Is.66.24. Sergius and Aphraates combine Is.66.16 and 24 as testimonies to the Last Judgement, while Dionysius quotes the latter only. It seems that the use of these texts is peculiar to these Syriac works. How are we to explain this unique reading? The clue to one possible explanation is given by Sergius's long quotation of Is.66.16-22, where these verses are applied to Christians. Perhaps then the text of Is.66.24 has been altered to make it quite clear that this particular verse applies to Jews not Christians - the 'you' is the Jewish opponent to whom the threat is applied, whereas the promises in the text are applied to Christians, following a very well known canon of Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. This may explain the origin of the reading, but if we are not to conclude either that Sergius is directly dependent upon Aphraates or that they are both dependent upon a Syriac testimony book, we must fall back upon the hypothesis of coincidence - they are both making the alteration independently, but for the same reason. However, if the reading belonged to a book of testimonies we would expect it to be more widely known, and specifically we would expect Dionysius to follow it; he does not. Unless, therefore, there is more evidence that Sergius is using Aphraates's Demonstrations or that Aphraates is dependent upon the Book of Testimonies used by Sergius we must be content, for the time being, with the hypothesis of coincidence.

There are many other parallels between our two authors, which will be found indicated in the notes to the Translation, but these are less specific and cover much exegetical material held in common with other Syriac writers. For example, the argument against the necessity for circumcision from the fact that the patriarchs from Adam to Abraham were not circumcised occurs in almost all Christ-

1. Number (vii) in the list of testimony texts on p. 38.
2. op.cit.,viii.5.
3. Ch.xx.6.
ian discussions of the subject. But Sergius (iv.1,6-10) not only follows Aphraates in reproducing this argument, but also like him uses Ezek.16, Dt.32.32, the argument that circumcision is of no use for evil doers, and quotes the examples of Jereboam and the other evil kings, all in the same context. Another example is Sergius's statement that Joseph's bones 'were buried in the inheritance of Joseph by Joshua, the son of Nun, the son of Ephraim, the son of Joseph.' The genealogy is an inference from Num. 13.8,16, but Sergius gives no explicit reason for introducing it here. Now if we refer to Aphraates we find the following: 'But why did Moses give the bones of Joseph to Joshua? - but because he was from the tribe of Ephraim, the son of Joseph.'

It is very difficult to decide whether material like this derives from direct borrowing from Aphraates or by a more indirect route through the Syriac tradition of biblical exegesis, of which Aphraates is one of the principal originators. The notes to the Translation will show how, now and then, Sergius is also using material which ultimately goes back to Ephraem, the other principal originator of this tradition. On the whole, it is more likely that Sergius has received this material from an indirect, rather than a direct, route. The same conclusion also applies to the testimony material which he has in common with Aphraates, for we can find no definite trace that the Testimony Book, which he uses, existed any earlier than the eighth century in the Syriac-speaking church, since Sergius himself is our first witness to it. This does not mean, of course, that Aphraates and the earlier Syriac writers did not make use of written collections of testimony texts either for catechetical or polemic purposes.

2. Ch.xiii.15.
4. See on, section P of this chapter.
They probably did, and Sergius and Dionysius reflect such collections in their discussions of subjects like the Sabbath, the Trinity, circumcision, and the rejection of the Jews. But these should be seen as part of a fluid testimony tradition, part written, part oral, which evolved and developed to meet changing circumstances. Much of this material is very primitive, going back in some cases to the earliest period of the church, and forming part of a tradition of anti-Jewish polemic common to all sections of the church. The biography of Jesus in prophecies, however, is specifically a written work, which appears at a definite time.


From what has been said above it is clear that we must look for the origins of this Book of Testimonies in the general stream of the testimony tradition to which the earliest anti-Jewish writers bear witness. We have already seen that Justin has the same peculiar text of Zech.3.1f which we find in Sergius's Disputation and the Discussion of Silvester; that Jer.4.3 is used as a testimony text by Justin, Cyprian, and Tertullian; that the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila has a shorter form of the Ezra agraphon found in our three witnesses to the Testimony Book, while Justin and Lactantius have a similar Ezra agraphon; that the Jeremiah agraphon on Christ's burial probably developed out of a similar one found in Justin and Irenaeus; and that besides, nearly all the texts which we have isolated as belonging to our Testimony Book were used by earlier anti-Jewish polemicists. We have also traced the agrapha to a very early Jewish Christian milieu. The Testimony Book is, then, either a very early compilation, or draws upon very early material. A comparison with the earliest extant Book of Testimonies compiled by Cyprian will show that the second alterna-

1. Note also the well known Ezra agraphon cited in the Epistle of Barnabas, xii.1, from 4 Ezra 5.5.
tive is more likely to be true.

Most early books of testimonies consist of two sections: 'those which are directed against the Ancient Religion, and those which are occupied with the work of the Founder of the New Religion, the Testimonies against the Jews and Testimonies concerning the Christ.' Bk.II of Cyprian's work falls into the latter category. Let us list the sections in this Book, followed by the quotations they contain, but only if these quotations occur in our hypothetical Book of Testimonies:

1. That Christ is the First-born, and that He is the Wisdom of God, by whom all things were made.

2. That Christ is the Wisdom of God; and concerning the sacrament of his incarnation and of his passion, and cup and altar, and of the apostles who were sent, and preached.

3. That the same Christ is the Word of God.

4. That Christ is the hand and arm of God.

5. That Christ is at once Angel and God.

6. That Christ is God; Is.40.3ff, Bar.3.35ff.

7. That Christ our God should come, the Enlightener and Saviour of the human race; Is.35.3ff.

8. That although from the beginning He had been the Son of God, yet He had to be begotten again according to the flesh; Ps.2.7.

9. That this should be the sign of His nativity, that He should be born of a virgin; Is.7.14.

10. That Christ is both man and God; Is.61.1f.

11. That Christ was to be born of the seed of David; Is.11.1f.

12. That Christ should be born in Bethlehem.

13. That Christ was to come in low estate in His first advent; Is.53.1-7, Zech.3.1ff.

14. That He is the righteous One whom the Jews should put

1.Harris, op.cit.,II,p.95.


3. See pages 47f and 58 for lists of texts which were probably part of it; one or two texts used by Sergius alone are included here as probable constituents of the Testimony Book.
to death; Wis.2.12.
15.That Christ is called a sheep and a lamb who was to be slain, and concerning the sacrament of the passion; Is.53.7.
16.That Christ also is called a stone.
17.That afterwards this stone should become a mountain.
18.That in the last times the same mountain should be manifested.
19.That Christ is the Bridegroom.
20.That the Jews would fasten Christ to the cross; Ps.22.18, Zech.12.10.
21.That in the passion and the sign of the cross is all virtue and power.
22.That in this sign of the cross is salvation for all people who are marked on their foreheads.
23.That at mid-day in His passion there should be darkness; Am.8.9.
24.That he was not to be overcome of death, nor should remain in hell; Ps.16.10.
25.That he should rise again from the dead on the third day.
26.That after he had risen again He should receive from His Father all power; Dn.7.13f, Ps.110.1f.
27.That it is impossible to attain to God the Father, except by His Son Jesus Christ.
28.That Jesus Christ shall come as a Judge; Ps.50.3.
29.That he will reign as a King for ever; Zech.9.9, Ps.24.7.
30.That He Himself is both Judge and King.

Here we find that many of the quotations which make up our Book of Testimonies are scattered at random throughout Cyprian's work, frequently being applied to different subjects. Cyprian does not construct or reflect a biography of Jesus but the materials for constructing one are present in his work. We find precisely the same state of affairs in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho; there is no complete biography in prophecies, but the materials for composing one are scattered throughout his work. Tertullian too does not construct an elaborate biography, but in chapters ix and x of his Adversus Judaeos, dealing res-
pectively with 'the prophecies of the birth and achievements of Christ' and 'the Old Testament predictions of the passion', the beginnings of one can be seen. In the light of this evidence must we not conclude that our biography belongs to a later stratum of the testimony tradition, but has been composed and constructed out of much earlier testimony material? Rendel Harris's observations on the development of the tradition fully support this conclusion, for he says that 'the four great facts of Christ, Birth, Life, Death, and Life again, are not treated in the primary Testimony Book as biographical factors but as explanatory factors......These matters also would, in the course of time, he divided into detail and labelled in harmony with the actual story of the Gospels. The process is seen going forward in the Cyprianic text, and complete in the Spanish text of Isidore's time.'

1 Without accepting Harris's theory of only one Testimony Book, it looks, nevertheless, as though our Testimony Book is part of the continuing process which he describes: it was built upon the basis of the earlier collections of testimony texts, given its definitive form in Greek sometime in the fifth century, subsequently translated into Syriac and Latin, and finally attained the complexity of the biography constructed on its basis by Sergius the Stylite in the eighth century. Whether or not this biography had by Sergius's time been amalgamated with other collections of testimony texts to

1. *op. cit.*, II, p.36. The 'Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila' also shows signs that the testimony material is in the process of being reshaped into a biography in prophecies: see *Conybeare, op. cit.*, pp.69ff.

2. It is difficult to tell whether Isidore of Seville, whose *Bk.I.v-lxi (of Contra Judaeos)* consists of a biography of Jesus in prophecies, and who even quotes one of the Jeremiah agrapha (see above p.29), is dependent upon a Latin translation of our Book of Testimonies, or draws upon the Latin version of the Acts of Silvester, or even drew the quote from the general testimony tradition. Certainly the existence of a Latin version of the Testimony Book is much more hypothetical than that of a Syriac version.
form a comprehensive Book of Testimonies is difficult to ascertain. Many such works were composed in the early church. However, the differing structure of Sergius's Disputation and Dionysius's treatise suggests that they did not use the same comprehensive Book of Testimonies, though, of course, there would have been no necessity for them to model their works exactly according to their sources. All we can be reasonably certain of is that they used the same biography of Jesus in prophecies, whereas the evidence is insufficient for a firm decision on the wider question.
C. JOSEPHUS, THE WAR OF THE JEWS

Besides the use of collections of testimony texts, the other main literary source of Sergius's Disputation is Josephus's 'War of the Jews'. On folio 64v (ch.xxi.3) Sergius, perhaps following Eusebius's example, introduces Josephus as a witness to 'the destruction of Jerusalem after the crucifixion of the Son of Mary'. On the following folios he provides several extracts from what he calls the 'Chronicle of the wise Josephus (concerning) what happened in the reign of Caesars Vespasian and Titus'. These quotations are of some textual interest, since it is probable that they preserve some sections of a Syriac version of the 'War of the Jews', the greater part of which has long since perished.

(1) The Syriac Version of the 'War of the Jews'.

The most important and complete manuscript of the Peshitta version of the Bible, the Codex Ambrosianus B, contains at its end a Syriac version of the sixth book of Josephus's 'War of the Jews' under the title 'A Treatise on the Last Destruction of Jerusalem'. It comes after the fourth Book of the Maccabees, and the conclusion to the version indicates that it was regarded as the fifth Book of the Maccabees.

1. See on, p.98f.
2. See A List of Old Testament Peshitta Manuscripts, p.28f, edited by the Peshitta Institute of Leiden University.
3. There is a photolithographic edition of the manuscript: A.M. Ceriani, Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI Photolithographice Edita, (Milan, 1876).
5. For reasons why it was inserted into the canon of the Syrian church see H. Kottek, Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum, introduction, p.1f.
'The Book of Maccabees, in which there are five volumes, is finished.\(^1\) Whether it was included in the Maccabaean corpus, because Josephus was credited with the production of the whole of the corpus, or whether Josephus was credited with the production of the corpus because book six of his 'War of the Jews' was regarded as the fifth book of Maccabees, is uncertain, particularly in the light of the following extract from 'Abdisho' bar Berikha's catalogue of Syriac writings:–

\[\text{\ldots}\]

'Of the writer Josephus, the Fables\(^2\), and the story of the sons of Shamuni, and also the Book of Maccabees, and the story of King Herod, and the Book of the Last Destruction of Jerusalem at the hands of Titus.\(^3\)

Here Josephus is clearly credited with the production of the whole of the Maccabaean corpus, though it looks as though 'Abdisho' refers only to the sixth book of the 'War of the Jews' and not to a Syriac version of the whole of the work. However, 'the story of King Herod' is a reasonable summary of the earlier part of the 'War', and may indicate the existence of a complete Syriac version; it is not a good summary of 'The Antiquities', though this work does contain the 'story of King Herod'. Besides, that such a complete Syriac version existed must be presupposed in the light, not only of the quotations contained in Sergius's Disputation, but also of those contained in other Syriac works.\(^4\) Although most of these writers are indebted to Eusebius for their knowledge of Josephus, there are sufficient quotations which have no parallel in the 'Ecclesiastical History' to nec-

\(^1\) Geriani, op.cit., fol. 330r.
\(^2\) i.e. Aesop’s Fables; see Baumstark, op.cit., p. 26.
\(^3\) J.S. Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis, III\(^1\), p. 7.
\(^4\) See the Appendix to this chapter, pp. 96f.
essentialise the assumption that a complete version of the 'War of the Jews' existed in the Syriac-speaking church. The evidence of 'Abdisho's catalogue and of the Ambrosian manuscript suggests that this version circulated in two forms - a complete translation of the 'War', and a separate translation of the sixth book incorporated in the Maccabean corpus. It is difficult to tell whether the latter is abstracted from the former; some internal evidence is in favour of this. For example, at the beginning of the treatise the use of the word €² and the phrase €²£² 'as we have said' (referring to B.J. v.523) a few lines further on, indicate that something preceded, although an independent translator may have been inept enough to leave these indications in the text. We will, however, be in a better position to give an answer to this question when we have studied the two versions side by side, and seen whether their general characteristics are similar. R.Eisler states categorically that 'anterior to the sixth century is a Syriac translation, of which the sixth book of the 'War' was actually incorporated in the canons of the Syrian and Armenian churches', or that 'it is not at all improbable that all seven books of the 'War' once existed in a Syriac translation'.

The first editor of the extant Syriac version of the 'War', Heimann Kottek, claimed that it represents a Syriac revision of the original Aramaic edition which Josephus mentions in his preface to the work. He regards the Greek text as a modified rendering of the Syriac. Although he notes the many places where the Syriac seems to be dependent upon the Greek text, he thinks that the additions and the alterations found in the Syriac, which complicate, not simplify, the Greek, necessitate his conclusion. He thinks also that the deviations of the Greek from the Syriac heighten the glory of the Romans and criticize the rebels.

2. See on, p.76f, for the ineptness of the translator.
3. The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist, p.31.
4. op. cit., p.76.
5. op. cit. - see p.73, n.4.
6. I.3 in Niese's enumeration.
and therefore clearly represent a version adapted to suit a Roman audience.

Kottek's thesis has been unanimously rejected by later scholars - B. Niese, R. Eisler, H. St. J. Thackeray, and especially Th. Nöldeke. Nöldeke sets out his criticisms in a review of Kottek's book, and all other scholars simply refer to this review as having settled the question once and for all. Since the review is virtually inaccessible, and its importance is considerable, it will be worth recounting Nöldeke's views at some length. To begin with, he states categorically that the Syriac translation regularly follows the Greek wording, so that it cannot be derived from anything other than the Greek text: it translates in the style or pattern of the Greek, with the complex Greek sentence structure and Greek participial construction. We may add that the continual placing of the verb at the end of the sentence, in contrast to normal Syriac usage, also argues for a Greek original. Nöldeke posits that if a Palestinian original had been rewritten in Edessene Syriac, there would be a simpler sentence construction and many special Jewish expressions would show themselves. Moreover, he is able to demonstrate that words which Kottek regards as derived from Palestinian Aramaic are well attested as good Syriac. He also claims that the section in ch. x where the Syriac follows the Greek in explaining the name 'Melchizedec' as 'called in the native tongue, King of Righteousness', would hardly be necessary in Syriac. Nöldeke says that Kottek's error has arisen from his recognition that the Syriac text is far worse than the Greek, from which he has deduced that the Syriac represents the first rough edition, which the second, Greek edition has smoothed out. Thus, according to Nöldeke:

2. *op. cit.*, p. 75f.
5. vi. 438 according to Niese's enumeration.
Noldeke makes Josephus responsible for all sorts of errors which it is impossible for him to have made — for example, errors with regard to the Jewish Rite, which would easily be made by a later Christian translator. Nöldeke's explanation for the state of the Syriac text is that it is the work of a most incompetent translator: 'Der syrische Text ist eben die ganz flüchtige und fehlerhafte Arbeit eines Mannes, dessen griechische Kenntnisse auffallend mangelhaft waren und der sich mit Rathen half, wo diese versagten.'\(^1\) Examples of the translator's ignorance of many Greek words and expressions are given, and many omissions are explained by the translator's leaving out what he could not translate. So Nöldeke's general conclusion is that the Syriac text is derived from a Greek original, and must be used as a witness to that original with very great caution. He ends his review with a few scathing comments on the errors not only in Kottek's translation, but also in his transcription of the text of the manuscript.

Without doubt, Nöldeke's criticism, both of Kottek's thesis and his actual work, is justified.\(^2\) There can, indeed, be little doubt that the Syriac is derived from a Greek original, and that it is a very bad translation. Frequently it is almost incomprehensible as Syriac, and can only be explained by reference to the Greek text. Thus, if the excerpts in Sergius's Disputation can be shown to possess similar characteristics, we will have confirmation of the suggestion that there was one complete Syriac version of the 'War', for in his quotations from the sixth book Sergius is clearly drawing upon the Syriac version found in the Codex Ambrosianus.

The textual affinities of the Syriac version of Josephus's 'War of the Jews' have never been closely studied. Niese, in the introduction to his standard edition of

Josephus's works, makes a few comments on this subject, besides repeating Noldeke's opinion of the origin of the version. In general the Greek manuscripts of the 'War' fall into two main groups: the first group $P^2, A^3, (M^4, L^5)$, is the best text and is usually regarded as reflecting the later, more polished, editions: the second group $V^6, R^7, (C^8)$, is regarded by Niese as inferior, and reflects perhaps the earlier unrevised editions of the work. The manuscripts $M, L$, and $C$ oscillate between the two groups. A notable difference between the two groups is found in the heading which they give to the work, the first having Ἰουδαϊκὸς πολέμος πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, the second Περὶ Ἀλώσεως. The Syriac may reflect the latter in the heading to the sixth book, but this is more probably a specific heading to this book alone. After a short discussion of the Syriac translation Niese concludes: 'quo igitur usus est codice similior fuit Ambrosiano quam Parisino consensitque interdum et cum L et cum deterioribus. He does, however, admit that we would attain a greater degree of certainty if an accurate collation of the whole of the Syriac version were to be made. We might also add that a collation of the Syriac with the Slavonic version would throw additional light upon its textual affinities, if, as Eisler supposes, the latter is derived from a Greek manuscript representing the earliest edition of the work.

Before we embark upon a consideration of the text of the quotations from Josephus in Sergius's Disputation,

1. op. cit., p.xxif.
2. Codex Parisinus Graecus 1425, cent.x or xi.
3. Codex Ambrosianus D.50 superiore, cent.x or xi.
4. Codex Marcianus (Venetus) Gr.383, cent.xi or xii.
5. Codex Laurentianus, plut.lxix.19, cent.xi or xii.
6. Codex Vaticanus Gr.148, c. cent.xi.
7. Codex Palatinus (Vaticanus) Gr.284, cent.xi or xii.
8. Codex Urbinas (Vaticanus) Gr.84, cent.xi.
9. op. cit., p.lxxii.
it is necessary to add a word of warning. In the light of Sergius's treatment of the biblical text, as discussed above, we cannot doubt that he is quite capable of shaping his sources to suit his own purposes. We must, therefore, bear this possibility in mind, while also remembering that we have only one manuscript of his work, and also only one manuscript of the Syriac version of the sixth book of the 'War', so that we cannot be certain that we possess the true text, except, of course, when the two exactly coincide. One other factor which could complicate our investigation is the possibility of the mutual influence upon each other of the Syriac versions of Josephus and Eusebius, for the latter in the 'Ecclesiastical History' makes extensive use of the 'War of the Jews'. Two long quotations (from B.J.vi) in book 3 of Eusebius's work enable us to make a close comparison of the Syriac versions of these works. The result of such an investigation is that they appear to be quite independent of each other; only in one place do they agree together against their respective exemplars - in B.J.vi.298 (Eusebius 3.8) they read φῶς φῶς 'city' for the plural (φῶς φῶς) of the Greek texts. Since the difference between the singular and the plural of this word in a Syriac text is indicated only by a diacritical sign (the syre), this is insufficient evidence to reverse the overwhelming impression of their mutual independence. Nevertheless, we must bear in mind the possibility that Sergius may have been influenced by this Syriac version of 'The Ecclesiastical History', since there is evidence that he both knew and used the work, as well as being possibly acquainted with Eusebius's 'Chronicle'.


2.See on, section D of this chapter.

3.See on, section E of this chapter.
We will proceed in our investigation of the text of Sergius's quotations from Josephus by isolating them into two groups: first, quotations from book six of the 'War', for which, therefore, there is a parallel Syriac text; second, quotations from the other books of the 'War', for which no other parallel Syriac text is available.

(2) Quotations in the Disputation for which a Parallel Syriac Text is Available.

1. Fol. 67r, 1.6-13, (xxi.8), Josephus B.J. vi.217f. The text of the Disputation:-

'Let God blot out the men who eat their children; and let him not leave under the sun a city, in which mothers have eaten the fruit of their wombs. Yet (such food) befits fathers who after this bitter suffering of hunger (still) stand armed before the temple.'

Codex Ambrosianus, fol. 325r:

'And he would blot out the men who eat their children, and he would not leave under the sun a city, in which the mothers, the mothers, he eats the fruit of their wombs. Yet it is right for the fathers to stand armed before the mothers after such food and the bitter suffering of hunger.'

1. Or 'God will blot out... and he will not leave....'
2. The quotation is deliberately translated literally to emphasise the abysmal state of both the Syriac translation of the Greek and the text of the Codex.
The Greek text:  

καλύψεων μέντοι το ἡς τενναφαγίας μύσος αὐτῷ τῷ τῆς πατρίδος πτώματι καὶ οὐ καταλείψειν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκοσμένης ἡλίου καθοράν πόλιν, ἐν ἧς μήτερες οὕτως τρέφονται. προσήκειν μέντοι πρὸ μήτερων πατρίδοις τὴν τοπαύτην τροφήν, οὐ καὶ μετὰ τὴν καυτὰ πάθη μένουσιν ἐν τοῖς ὀπλαῖοι.

As a general observation, we may note first of all, that Sergius puts Titus's words into direct speech, while the Greek and the Syriac version give them in indirect speech. More specific observations are:

i) Sergius has introduced ἄνωθεν 'God' as the subject of the first sentence, so that, while in the Greek and Syriac Titus states his determination to efface the city, in Sergius's version he exhorts God to do so. The variant is dogmatic, for it emphasises that the Jews are under the wrath of God; we may safely attribute it to Sergius himself, who clearly treats Josephus in the same way that he treats the Bible.

ii) The two Syriac versions agree in shortening the first clause by rendering το τῆς τενναφαγίας μύσος by ἄνωθεν 'the men who eat their children' and by omitting altogether the phrase αὐτῷ τῷ τῆς πατρίδος πτώματι.

iii) The phrase ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκοσμένης ἡλίου καθοράν is simply rendered ἄνωθεν 'under the sun' by the Syriac versions.

iv) At the end of the first sentence the text of Codex Ambrosianus is clearly faulty and the Disputation provides a better reading. The second αὐτῷ must be omitted and the ἄνωθεν of Sergius's version must be read for the ἄνωθεν of the Codex.

v) The Syriac versions have expanded the ὀτρῶ of the

3. Or states, or prophesies, that God will do so.
4. See Bedjan, op. cit., p.804 and n.1.
Greek into κατά 'the fruit of their wombs', providing an object for the verb τρέφονται.\(^1\)

vi) In the last sentence the two Syriac versions diverge. The version in the Codex attempts a literal translation and produces nonsensical Syriac: κατά κατά which is clearly an attempt to render literally προςήκον μέντοι πρὸ μητέρων πατράς. The Greek πρὸ, here used in the sense of 'rather than', loses its correct meaning in the Syriac translation. The ζῆνα of the Codex is misplaced and should come before κατά κατά, where Sergius places it. His text is either derived from a version which represents an attempt to clear up the incomprehensible rendering of the Codex, or Sergius has done it himself by omitting the difficult κατά κατά, but retaining κατά and adding κατά after it. Even so we have to supply 'this food' to connect his version with the meaning of the Greek; it may be a scribal omission in the manuscript of the Disputation.

It is clear, first of all, that the Syriac version in the Codex Ambrosianus is derived directly from the Greek, of which it is a very literal translation. The agreements of the two Syriac texts against the Greek make it virtually certain that they belong to the same version, while their divergences are best explained as the result of attempts, either by scribes or Sergius himself, to improve and make sense of the very deficient text of the Codex, except where Sergius alters it for dogmatic reasons.

2. The quotation on fol.68r,1.11ff,(xxi.12), is drawn only indirectly from Jose-4hus via the medium of Eusebius's 'Chronicle', and will be considered separately at a later stage\(^2\).


2. See on, section E of this chapter.
3. Fol. 69r, 1.3-5, (xxi.14), Josephus B.J. vi. 250. The text of the Disputation:

'The judgement of God proclaimed long ago the burning of the temple.'

Codex Ambrosianus, fol. 325v:

'And concerning this also the judgement of God had proclaimed long ago the burning of the temple.'

The Greek text:

Sergius is clearly drawing here upon the version in the Codex, although he rearranges the word order; the omission of τοῦ is insignificant, for ἐγένετο could equally well be translated 'had proclaimed'. The changes are possibly due to quotation from memory, for we have observed that this is probably his normal way of quoting the Bible, and hence, we may surmise, of a work which did have a place in the canon. The phrase ἐγένετο in the Syriac versions is not a genuine variant for τοῦ but becomes necessary when κατέψησεν is translated somewhat loosely by [καταγέννησεν].

4. Fol. 69r, 1.5f, (xxi.14), Josephus B.J. vi. 266.

The text of Sergius's quotation exactly agrees with that of the Codex, which in turn renders the Greek more or less accurately.

5. Fol. 69r, 1.6-9, (xxi.14), Josephus B.J. vi. 285.

Here Sergius summarises rather than quotes, and no conclusion can be drawn from his text, except perhaps confirmation that he is relying upon his memory.

1. Niese, op. cit., p. 545, 1.19f.
2. op. cit., fol. 326r.
Here again Sergius briefly summarises the purport of the passage. The text of the Codex seems to be disturbed, apparently contradicting the Greek, though the general context supports the rendering implied by Sergius's summary.

The text of Sergius's quotation is identical with that of the Codex, except for one small detail - he reads  עַטָּר for the Codex's  בָּטָּר. This variant probably reflects the  אלָּא in the adverbial phrase of the Greek  כָּל אֲלָּא רָאָה, so that Sergius preserves here a better text of the Syriac version. The latter departs from the Greek at this point, considerably simplifying a complex Greek sentence, probably through inability to render it exactly.

'When Titus Caesar entered and saw the great buildings, he was amazed at their fortifications, and he said, "The power of God has fought, and it is God who has thrust down the Jews from these safe high places".'

'Codex Ambrosianus, fol.329r :-

'And Titus entered and saw all the walls of the city... He was amazed and astonished, and he said, "The power

1. op.cit., fol.325v.
2. See Bedjan, op.cit., p.808, n.2.
4. op.cit., fol.329r.'
of God has fought, and it is God who has thrust down the Jews from these safe high places.'

The Greek text:

(469) Παρελθὼν δὲ Τίτος εὐσεβῶς τα ἐκλαθη τῆς ὁμορρήτου τὴν πόλιν καὶ τῶν πόλεων ἀπεθανάτωσεν .... (411) ... σὺν θεῷ γε ἐπολέμησαμεν, ἔφη, καὶ θεὸς ὤν ὁ τῶν ἔρμοματων Ἰσραήλ ἐπεθελὼν ....

Here Sergiuis summarises the introduction to Titus's exclamation, because all that he is really interested in is the theological implications of this speech. His summary serves to emphasize the point that only God could have overthrown such strong fortifications. His text of Titus's speech exactly follows the version in the Codex, except for the insignificant addition of ὁμορρήτωσεν.

9. Fol. 69v, l. 11-17, (xxi. 15), Josephus B. J. vi. 442. The text of the Disputation:

'But neither her pre-eminence, nor her wealth, nor her fame in all the world, nor her glory and her worship, was able (to prevent) the destruction which came upon her. This is the end of the destruction of Jerusalem.'

Codex Ambrosianus, fol. 330r :

1. Niese, op. cit., p. 566, l. 7ff.
2. Or 'her great age, antiquity' following the Greek.
3. Lit. 'is able'.
4. The Syriac translates the Greek so literally that something like this needs to be added in order to make sense of it.
'But neither her pre-eminence, nor her very great wealth, nor her fame in all the world, nor her great glory, nor her worship, was able (to prevent) the destruction which came upon her. This is the end of the destruction of Jerusalem.'

The Greek text:-

1. Niese, op. cit., p. 570, l. 1ff.
2. We may perhaps surmise that ἐγκαταστάσεις has dropped out at a very early stage.
creates a presumption that for his text of the other books he will also be dependent upon a Syriac version rather than directly upon the Greek text. As far as the text of his quotations is concerned, although he does seem occasionally to provide a better text than the Codex, he must be used with great caution as a witness to the Syriac version, for we have observed once again his tendency to mould his sources to suit his own purposes. In these quotations there is no parallel text in Eusebius, so that Sergius’s variants cannot be explained as the result of influence from that quarter.

(3) Quotations in the Disputation for which no Parallel Syriac Text is Available.

1. Pol. 66r, 1.3-7, (xxi.6), Josephus, B. J. i. 12. The text of the Disputation:

'I think that all the tribulations and adversities of old are much less in comparison with those which have happened to the Jews' in Jerusalem.'

The Greek text:

The Syriac connects 'all' with ἀτυχήματα, while the Greek has it in a genitival relationship - 'the misfortunes of all'.

i) The Syriac renders ὅτι with ἀτυχήματα, with the two words ἔτσι and ὁτέρα.

ii) The Syriac adds ἁμαρτία, which is implicit in the Greek.

iii) The manuscript omits ὁτέρα, though it is added

1. The Sertā corrector adds ἁμαρτία, 'to the Jews', in the left hand margin.

2. Niese, op. cit., p. 5.1.16ff.
by the Serta corrector, and has \( \delta \alpha i o s \), a variant which has no basis in the Greek text.

v) The Syriac adds \( \lambda m \).

i) is the sort of error which we have come to expect from the translator responsible for the version of the 'War' found in Codex Ambrosianus. ii) is best explained by the Semitic partiality towards pairs of synonyms, a trait which can be observed in the Codex \(^{1}\). iii) adds nothing to the sense of the Greek. iv) is perhaps a genuine variant, though its absence in the Greek manuscript tradition suggests rather that it is a clarifying addition. v) strengthens the force of the comparison and is probably added by Sergius himself.

2. Pol. 66r, 1.7-9, (xxi.6), Josephus, B.J. iii.354. The text of the Disputation:-

'For because the Jews have sinned against their creator, (their) good fortune has transferred to the Romans.'

The Greek text:-

\[ \kappa \alpha \pi e \delta \eta \; t o \; \i o u d a i o w n , \; \varepsilon \varphi \iota \; \phi \upsilon \upsilon \varphi \; \o k l a s c e \; \theta o s \; \tau o w \; \k t i s a n t l , \; \mu e t \bar{e} \beta \eta \; \delta \varepsilon \; \pi r d s \; \r o m a i o v s \; \eta \; \tau \dot{u} \chi \eta \; \pi \acute{a} \sigma a \ldots \]

i) The Greek of the first clause is very difficult and has given rise to several variants in the manuscript tradition. The Syriac translator seems to have been unable to make any sense of it\(^{5}\). On the other hand, he could have read it as follows: 'since it seems to you, their creator, that the race of the Jews has slackened\(^{6}\) (their

1. See number 8 above, p. 84f, where the Codex renders \( \alpha p e b a i m a t e v \) with two Syriac words \( \i o m o t o \; o m o t \).
3. Josephus is praying to God.
4. This is Niese's reading; P, A, M, L read \( k o l a s c a i \); Thackeray, op. cit., vol. II, p. 676, reads \( k l a s a i \) following a Leyden manuscript, and renders \( k l a s a i \) by 'That it should sink into the dust', (n.1 to p.676).
5. The Slavonic translator also had difficulty with it—see Istrin, op. cit., vol. I, p. 233 and n.3.
6. Reading \( o k l a s c a i \).
zeal for God), their fortune etc.', hence the reading 'the Jews have sinned'. It seems more probable, however, that the Syriac translator avoided rendering the Greek exactly perhaps through inability to do so, a characteristic which we have observed in the version found in Codex Ambrosianus. Either way, it is difficult on Kottek's thesis to see how such a difficult Greek text arose out of such a simple Syriac text.

ii) The Syriac omits the πασα of the Greek for no apparent reason.

3. Fol. 66r, 1. 9-12, (xxi. 6).

The marks in the margin indicate that this is a quotation, but I have been unable to trace it in its present form.


The Syriac is a literal translation of the Greek, so literal, in fact, that as Syriac it reads very clumsily.

5. Fol. 66r, 1. 16-66v, 1. 2, (xxi. 7), Josephus, B.J.v.412f.

The text of the Disputation:—

'Now as it seems to me, even the Shechinah of God has departed from the sanctuary. And if a good man flees from an unclean house, and hates those who are within it, how much more shall God abandon an unclean people!'

The Greek text:—

1. See the Introduction, chapter I, p. 2f.
For the τὸ θεόν¹ of the Greek the Syriac has the Jewish expression "κανοὶ κανοὶ." This could be taken as favouring Kottek's hypothesis; it is, however, far more likely that either the Syriac translator or Sergius himself is influenced by Ezech. 10.18f.

ii) ἐκ τῶν ἀγίων is rendered by "κάνον"² which means much the same.

iii) The Syriac recasts the second sentence of the quotation, and particularly the last clause. Since the effect of the change is to heighten the rhetorical effect we shall not go far wrong in suspecting here the hand of Sergius himself.

6. Pol. 66v, 1. 3-6, (xxi. 7), Josephus, B.J. v. 442.³

With one or two minor variants the Syriac is a reasonable translation of the Greek.

7. Pol. 66v, 1. 6-9, (xxi. 7), Josephus, B.J. v. 559.⁴

Again with minor variants the Syriac is a literal translation of the Greek.

8. Pol. 66v, 1. 12-19, (xxi. 8), Josephus, B.J. v. 566. The text of the Disputation:-

"Now I think that if the Romans had delayed attacking the city, either it would have been swallowed up in the

1. One manuscript, L, reads τὸ θεόν.
3. Niese, op. cit., p. 495, 1. 8f.
4. op. cit., p. 510, 1. 17ff.
abyss\(^1\), or submersed in the waters\(^2\), or it would have received the affliction of Sodom\(^3\). God bore with a more godless generation than these.'

The text of the Syriac version of Eusebius's 'Ecclesiastical History', 3.6.19: 4

'Now I think that if the Romans had delayed attacking these rebels, this city would either have been swallowed up in the abyss\(^1\) or perished in a flood\(^2\), or the fire of Sodom would have been sent against it\(^3\). For God bore with this generation which is more godless than those who suffered in these (visitations).'

The Greek text of Josephus: 5

\(\text{σήμα κατακλυσμὸς \varepsilon που \ έλησθη\ η \ κατακλυσμωση \ αν \ υπο χάσματος η \ κατακλυσμωση \ την \ πόλιν \ η \ τους \ της \ Σοδώμης \ μεταλαβειν καρανον \ \pi\ol\upsilon \gamma\upsilon \tau\nu\nu \ \tau\upsilon\upsilon \ παθόντων \ η\upsilon\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon \ \gamma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\alpha\nu \ \alpha\beta\varepsilon\varepsilon\tau\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\tau\nu\varepsilon\nu\).'

1) In the first place Sergius's version simplifies the Greek by omitting τοις ἄλησθης and by making 'the city' the object of the verb 'delayed' and the subject of the following conditional clauses. This tendency towards simplification is characteristic of the version of Josephus found in Codex Ambrosianus, so that if we are confronted here with the same version, these variants do not represent genuine variants in the Greek text. The Syriac version of Eusebius follows the Greek more close-

1. A reference to the fate of Korah etc., Num. 16.32.
5. Niese, op. cit., pp. 511, 1. 17-20; the Greek of Eusebius is identical except for having \(\beta\rho\alpha\delta\nu\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\) for Josephus's \(\beta\rho\alpha\delta\nu\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\).
ii) Sergius's version gives only the very general Καταστροφὴ for the precise τῶν καταστροφῶν of the Greek; the Syriac Eusebius again translates more accurately, though not quite literally.

iii) Most important of all is the fact that both Syriac versions substantially alter the sense of the Greek in the last sentence of the quotation. Thackeray translates the Greek thus: 'For it produced a generation far more godless than the victims of those visitations'. The Syriac versions, however, have taken ἤνεχε in the sense 'endure, bear with, put up with', and then supplied the necessary subject of the verb - God. Firstly, this confirms that the Syriac version used by Sergius is secondary to the Greek, but, secondly, it does raise the question as to the influence of the Syriac version of Eusebius on either the Syriac version of Josephus or directly on Sergius himself. That the influence would be from the direction of the former version is made probable by the relative dates of the versions - the Syriac Eusebius dates from, at the latest, the beginning of the fifth century and may go back into the fourth century. The fact noted above that elsewhere the text of the Syriac version of the 'Ecclesiastical History' does not seem to have influenced the text of the Syriac version of the 'War', suggests that, if we are to accept the hypothesis of textual cross influence, it is more probable that Sergius is directly influenced by Eusebius. This, of course, involves making the by now not unreasonable assumption that Sergius is using a Syriac version of Josephus only part of which is represented in Codex Ambrosianus. However, it is not impossible that the trans-

3. See p. 79.
4. See on, section D of this chapter.
lators of the two versions, in complete independence of each other, took the Greek in the same way, for in the rest of the quotation they certainly represent independent translations, with the Syriac Eusebius decidedly the more accurate and literal.

9. Pol. 66v, 1.9-12, (xxi.7), Josephus, B.J. v. 567, 569

This is a paraphrase combining two separate texts. The numbers in the Syriac agree with those in the Greek, except that the latter gives the more precise total of 115,880 for the dead thrown out of the city gate.

10. Pol. 68f, 1.1-11, (xxi.12), Josephus, B.J. vii. 327f. The text of the Disputation:

'For Eleazar said: The people of the Jews, which from of old was the friend of God, has been committed to destruction. For if God had made peace with us or been only a little angry with us, he would not have averted his eyes from a destruction like this of all these men. For he has brought upon his holy city the fire of destruction from (her) enemies.'

The Greek text:

i) The Syriac substitutes ᵃ Copies for ᴅινο and adds ᴄο Copies as the subject of the second sentence. This is necessary in order to make clear to whom the δινο refers; it is, of course, perfectly clear from the context in the Greek.

ii) The Syriac confirms the reading of L.C, and the Latin version which add ᴄ.spatial before ᴄ.after, by having ᴄ.spatial

iii) The Syriac alters the structure of the latter part of the quotation. Instead of including the last sentence in the apodosis of the preceding sentence as does the Greek, it starts a completely new sentence which states the grounds on which the conditional sentence is based. The change has the effect of making God much more directly responsible for the destruction of Jerusalem, so once again we may suspect that Sergius's modifying hand has been at work.

11 Pol. 67r, l.1-4, (xxi.3), is a summarising allusion to B.J. vi.201-213, a very well known story, which is recounted by Eusebius.

We may draw the following conclusions from our study of the text of Josephus's 'War of the Jews' in relation to the quotations found in Sergius's Disputation:-

i) The version which Sergius is using seems to belong to that found in the Codex Ambrosianus. Their characteristics are identical: the same sort of errors and additions occur in both versions; we notice the same inability to render the Greek when it is difficult; and we notice in both versions the same tendency towards simplification. The fact that the quality of the Syriac in the text of Sergius's quotations is much lower than in the

1. The Slavonic does, however, contain the same additions; cf. Istrin, op.cit., vol. II, p.237.
2. The Slavonic has the addition, op.cit.
rest of the Disputation is added confirmation that he is using the translation represented in the Codex. Sergius's Disputation is, then, an important witness to the existence in the Syriac-speaking church of a single, complete, Syriac version of Josephus's 'War of the Jews'.

ii) Used with caution, the text of Sergius's quotations from book six of the 'War' is a valuable addition to the textual apparatus of the Syriac version.

iii) Sergius's quotations confirm that the Syriac version of the 'War' is translated from the Greek, and, therefore, they further invalidate H. Kottek's thesis.

iv) As a witness to the Greek text, the Syriac text of the 'War' must be used with great caution, despite the fact that Codex Ambrosianus is four centuries earlier than the oldest Greek manuscript. This is especially true of Sergius's quotations, for we have continually observed alterations made for dogmatic reasons. The principle on which he has selected his quotations - any text which ascribes to God direct responsibility for the destruction of Jerusalem and emphasises the Jews' estrangement from God - has affected the text of the quotations themselves. We should also be aware that the sixth book of the 'War' was incorporated into the canon of the Syriac-speaking church for the very same reasons for which Sergius uses Josephus in his Disputation, so that any variants in this version which emphasise these factors must be suspect. Nevertheless, in one place (B.J.vii.327) Sergius's quotation is a valuable witness for an important variant in the Greek manuscript tradition.

v) The text of B.J.v.566 in the Disputation may be evidence that the Syriac version of Eusebius's 'Ecclesiastical History' did influence the text of the Syriac version of the 'War of the Jews'. But alternative explanations are equally probable.

vi) Several interesting agreements between the text of Sergius's quotations and the Slavonic version of Josephus merit further study, and, in particular, a collation of the Slavonic with the whole of the Syriac version.
APPENDIX

Josephus's 'War of the Jews' in other Syriac Writings.

Josephus is widely quoted in the works of the Syriac chronographers:-

1) In the 'Chronicon Miscellaneum ad Annum Domini 724 Pertinens', B.J. vi. 299f, ii. 169f are quoted together, and vi. 420f further on. However, all these quotations are drawn directly from one of the Syriac versions of Eusebius's 'Chronicle'.

2) In the anonymous Chronicle attributed to Dionysius of Tellmahre we find the same two excerpts - B.J. vi. 299f and ii. 169f - combined together, along with several lengthy extracts from book vi, which have, however, been copied directly out of the Syriac version of Eusebius's 'Ecclesiastical History'. This chronicle also is wholly dependent upon Eusebius for its knowledge of Josephus.

3) According to J.B. Chabot the same situation applies with regard to the quotations from Josephus in the 'Chronicle of Michael the Syrian'. Once again we find the same combination of B.J. vi. 299f and ii. 169f, clearly drawn from Eusebius's 'Chronicle'. Bar Hebraeus, who in

2. op. cit., text p. 111, translation p. 98.
4. The 'Chronicle' is no longer extant in its Greek form, but see Jerome's translation, ed. R. Helm, Die Chronik des Hieronymus, GCS, Eusebius Werke, Band 7, p. 175. The Syriac versions also are no longer extant, but see on, p. 101ff.
his Chronicle relies heavily upon Michael, is also de-
pendent upon the same sources.

Thus the Syrian chronographers seem to have known
Josephus only through the medium of Eusebius's histor-
cal works. The situation is, however, somewhat differ-
ent when we examine the works of Isho'dad of Merv. He
refers frequently to both the 'Jewish Antiquities' and
the 'War of the Jews', although unfortunately he usually
refers to his sources without actually quoting them. In
his commentary on Genesis he refers to B.J.iv.456,476¹,
and in his commentary on Exodus–Deuteronomy to vi.423f²;
neither of these two texts are quoted by Eusebius. His
reference to Mary bath Eleazar eating her child³ could
be drawn from either Eusebius or Josephus. His reference
to Josephus's comments on the Jewish sects⁴ could be
drawn from either the Antiquities,13.9, or the War,2.8,
but not from Eusebius. In a series of quotations from
the 'War' in his commentary on the Gospels⁵, he seems to
combine elements from the Syriac version of the 'Eccle-
siastical History' with details drawn from some other
source. Finally in his 'Commentary on Acts' he refers to
B.J.ii.309ff,⁶ where again he cannot be dependent upon
Eusebius. Thus, unless we are to suppose that Isho'dad
drew directly on the Greek text of the 'War', we must
posit that he also, besides Sergius, drew on the Syriac
version of the work.

¹ ed. C. van den Eynde, Isho'dad de Merv, Commentaire sur
³ op. cit., p.85, translation p.115.
⁴ ed. M. D. Gibson, The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv.
⁵ M. D. Gibson, op. cit., Horae Semiticae, vi, p. 30, transla-
tion, vol. v, p.91.
⁶ M. D. Gibson, op. cit., Horae Semiticae, x, p. 33, translation,
p.33.
There are three main reasons for suspecting that, in the section from fol.64r to 69v (ch.xxi), Sergius is drawing upon Eusebius's 'Ecclesiastical History' in the Syriac version:—

i) The first has already been discussed — the text of Sergius's quotation of Josephus, B.J.v.566. We have seen that one possible explanation for his text is direct influence from the Syriac version of the 'Ecclesiastical History'. But we must remember that there are two other possibilities — that at an earlier stage this version has affected the text of the Syriac version of 'The War of the Jews', or that the two translators, in complete independence of each other, took the Greek text in the same way.

ii) The second reason is that the general structure of this section in the Disputation parallels that of the Ecclesiastical History, 3.5-8. The overriding theme in both works is the same — 'the judgement of God at last overtook them (the Jews) for their crimes against Christ and his apostles, completely blotting out that wicked generation from among men'. The theme is then illustrated by selected quotations from Josephus's 'War of the Jews' and from Christ's prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem. Like Sergius, Eusebius presents his quotations from Josephus as confirmation of the fulfilment of Christ's prophecies. However, Sergius presents a wider selection of quotations from Josephus, since he is concerned, not only to describe the horrors of the final siege, but also to illustrate God's estrangement from the Jews. Moreover, neither the quotations from Josephus nor from the prophecies of Christ found in the two works overlap to any great extent, so that the most we can say is that Sergius could be dependent on Euse-

1. See pp. 92f above.
2. Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, 3.5.3.
3. See the Ecclesiastical History, 3.7.6.
bius for the general idea of combining Josephus's 'War of the Jews' with Christ's prophecies to illustrate a theme which has very deep roots in the testimony tradition.¹

iii) On fol. 65v, (xxi. 5), Sergius may be more specifically dependent on Eusebius, especially in the following section:-

For God in his mercy gave you an opportunity for repentance for thirty-nine years;² but instead of repentance you shed much blood of the saints in these years. When again your presumption became apparent in your evil deeds, then vengeful justice was revealed upon you....' We may compare with this the Syriac version of Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, 3. 7. 8f.:⁴

'But it right to add these things, which are demonstrations of his mercy and the concern of his goodness—that for forty whole years after their presumption

1. See on, chapter IV, p. 121, n. 5.
2. The Serta corrector adds above the line 'after the crucifixion'.
3. The manuscript has 
4. Wright and McLean, op. cit., p. 130 f.
5. Manuscript A, the St. Petersburg Codex, and the Armenian version read 
which is clearly the correct reading.
against Christ he averted their destruction......The administration of God was hitherto patient with them, that perhaps at last they might repent and turn against the things which they had done, and have forgiveness and salvation.'

Sergius gives a succinct summary of what Eusebius says, and we may note that certain key words occur in both works - ἐνδοξάζετε 'his mercy', and ἁμαρτησία 'your (their) presumption'. The length of the interval differs, since in this case Sergius is either drawing directly upon Eusebius's 'Chronicle' or indirectly by means of some other Syriac chronicle. The statement made in the Disputation that the Jews occupied the period of grace by persecuting the saints is paralleled in the Ecclesiastical History, where Eusebius describes the Jews' deeds in detail.

There is, therefore, a prima facie case for suspecting the influence of the Syriac version of the 'Ecclesiastical History' upon Sergius. None of the points suggesting this are decisive in themselves, but taken together their force is sufficient to make such dependence a real possibility.

1. See on, section E of this chapter.
In two places Sergius draws either directly upon Eusebius's 'Chronicle' or on some work which is dependent upon it. The Syriac version of the 'Chronicle', like the original Greek, is no longer extant, but fragments have survived in some manuscripts, and P. Keseling in an extensive study has isolated evidence for the existence of two Syriac versions of the work dating from the seventh century.

i) On fol. 68r, (xxi.12), Sergius gives a list of the casualties resulting from the siege of Jerusalem:

'These are they who died in the famine - one million, one hundred thousand; and those who were killed and those who were sold - one hundred and sixty thousand.'

There are three traditions regarding this list of casualties. The first is that of the text of the 'War of the Jews' itself (vi.420), where Josephus gives 97,000 as the number of the prisoners taken, and 1,100,000 as the number of those who perished throughout the siege. The second tradition stems from Eusebius's 'Ecclesiastical History' which puts the numbers killed by famine and the sword at 1,100,000 and the number taken captive at 90,000. The anonymous chronicle attributed to Dionysius of Tellmehre, Isho'dad of Merv, and Dionysius bar Sal-

2. Read OL.
3. So the Codex Ambrosianus, op. cit., fol. 329r.
ibhi', follow this tradition. The third tradition is that of Eusebius's ' Chronicle', which in Jerome's Latin version, reads as follows:—

Titus Iudaeae capta et Hierosolymis subuersis sescenta milia virorum interfecit. Josephus vero scribit undecies centena milia fame et gladio perisse et alia centum milia captivorum publice uenundata.

The Syriac tradition of the text of the 'Chronicle' differs at this point by reading 60,000 for the number killed, not 600,000. It is followed by the 'Chronicon ad Annum Domini 846 Pertinens', 'The Chronicle of Bar Hebraeus', 'The Chronicle of Michael the Syrian', the 'Chronicon Miscellaneum ad Annum Domini 724 Pertinens', and the 'Chronicon Anonymum ad A.D. 1234 Pertinens'. Sergius is clearly dependent upon this third tradition in its Syriac form, so that he either knew a Syriac version of the 'Chronicle' or some other chronicle dependent upon it.

Concerning the quotation from fol. 65v (xxi.5) of the Disputation given above, we observed that the period mentioned is ultimately derived from Eusebius's 'Chronicle'. Jerome's Latin version gives the period from the beginning of Christ's ministry to the destruction of Jerusalem as 42 years:

Colligitur omne tempus in secundum annum Uespasiani et nouissimam euersionem Hierosolymarum a.XV. anno Imperii Tiberii Caesaris et ab exordio evangelicae praelectionis anni XLII.

Elsewhere in the 'Chronicle' Eusebius says that Christ preached for three years, leaving an interval of exactly 39 years from the crucifixion to the fall of Jerusalem. This information is repeated in the Syriac chronicles which were so heavily indebted to Eusebius, and we can be sure that once again Sergius is drawing either upon a Syriac version of the 'Chronicle' or upon one of these Syriac chronicles.

1. *op. cit.* , p. 175.
In his biography of the Lord in prophecies Sergius quotes Mt.2.23, which he attributes to Isaiah, and he appends the following explanation:

'And (prophesying) that he would live in Nazareth, Isaiah said: He shall be called a Nazarene. John the teacher explains and says that in the Hebrew language 'nurba' is called 'nasor'.

Although Sergius quotes a certain 'John the teacher' as his authority for this explanation, it goes back to Ephraem's 'Commentary on the Diatessaron', at least as far as the Syriac tradition is concerned. Unfortunately, for this part of Ephraem's commentary the Syriac text is no longer extant, so we have to rely upon the Armenian version of the work, which is, however, accurate in the places where it can be checked by the Syriac. L.Leloir's Latin translation from the Armenian is as follows:

Dicit etiam: Nazoroenus vocabitur, (qui nimirum) virga hebraice Nazor sonat, et propheta Nazor filium (eum) dicit quia et virga(e) filius est. Sed evangelista, propterea quod nutritus est (Dominus) in Nazareth, vidit insuper hoc (factum) simile esse illi (sc. verbis prophetiae), et illud huic; (itaque) dicit: Nazoroenus vocabitur.

1. ch. i. 8.
2. 'a shoot' translates the Hebrew in Is.11.1, a well known testimony text (for which cf. Aphr. I.150, Ephraem, Rome edition, III:213, and Danielou, Etudes, p.143.
4. Its ultimate origin is probably to be found in the earliest tradition of Jewish Christian exegesis.
The explanation is used by Isho'dad of Merv, no doubt borrowing from Ephraem, although he quotes also from a commentary by a certain Bar Sahriz who, he says, bases his interpretation on the same derivation from Is.11.1; by Dionysius bar Salibhi, and by Bar Hebraeus who, unlike the two previous expositors explicitly attributes the explanation to Ephraem. Rendel Harris (loc. cit.) refers to a marginal note in Cod.Vat.Syr.268 which also quotes Ephraem's explanation. Jacob of Sarug mentions the Nazarene (Christ) and then immediately afterwards refers to the 'shoot of Jesse', so he too probably knew Ephraem's explanation.

The unknown John the Teacher, whom Sergius quotes, was probably, therefore, dependent upon Ephraem for his explanation of Mt.2.23, though it does seem to have been current in the theological schools of the Syriac church from Ephraem to Bar Hebraeus. Other possible contacts between The Disputation and Ephraem's commentary are indicated in the notes to the Translation.

4. Homily I Against the Jews', lines 298ff, ed.I.K.Cosgrove, *op.cit.*.
CHAPTER IV

THE LITERARY GENRE AND CONTENTS OF THE DISPUTATION

Introduction.

As we have already seen, the introduction and the colophon to the manuscript claim that the work is a disputation written by Sergius the Stylite against a Jew who had argued with him. The manuscript itself, therefore, makes no claim actually to reproduce a verbatim report of the discussion which is purported to have taken place between Sergius and a real Jew. It suggests, rather, that the Disputation was written on the basis of the discussion. It is thus necessary to test these hints, contained in the introduction and the colophon, as to the literary nature of the work by a thorough examination of the text of the Disputation. In the course of this examination answers to the following questions will be sought. Is the Disputation a literary work or the record of an actual discussion? What portrait of the Jew does it reveal - a real historical person or a literary creation? Does the work show any first hand knowledge of Judaism and is there any historical foundation for its comments on the relations between Christians and Jews during the period in which it was written? And finally, what hints does the text give regarding the purpose for which the work was written?

(1) An Analysis of the Contents of the Disputation

The first folio of the Disputation (i.1-3) is a literary introduction of a type common in Christian anti-Jewish polemical literature. The quotation of Dt.6.4f contrasted with Ps.2.7 serves to state vividly the problem with which the Disputation has to deal - has God a Son or not? The 'Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila',

1 ed.F.C.Conybeare, op.cit., p.65ff. The first quotation in the 'Dialogue' is a free citation of Dt.6.4f.
'Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo', and Aphraates's Demonstration 17 'Concerning Christ the Son of God' all begin by posing the subject for discussion in terms of the question 'Has God a Son'. Besides Dt.6.4f and Ps.2.7, Is.7.14 is cited in the Disputation, ostensibly to prove that Ps.2.7 does not apply to David. Since, as has been already suggested, Sergius made use of testimonia material, it is probable that his choice of these three quotations, or at least the latter two, was influenced by the testimony tradition. Moreover, although we cannot say how Sergius might have developed the connection between Ps.2.7 and Is.7.14 because the following folios are missing, it is difficult to see how the latter proves that the former does not apply to David. It looks rather as though Sergius is moving on to the beginning of his Testimony Book and citing Is.7.14 in order to prove that the Old Testament prophesies the Virgin Birth. We conclude, then, that the first folio of Sergius's Disputation is a literary composition based rather on earlier models of dialogues against the Jews and on his Testimony Book than on a real discussion.

After the first folio 3 folios are missing, but on the basis of such collections of testimonies as that of Cyprian and that of Isidore of Seville, we may attempt to conjecture what these missing folios contained. Isidore's Bk.i, ch.10, has the heading 'Christ was born of a pure virgin' followed by the citation of Is.7.14, corresponding to Cyprian ii.9, and the Disputation i.3. His Bk.i.13 is entitled 'The Magi offered gifts', followed

1. See A.L. Williams, Adversus Judaeos, p.172.
2. Parisot, op. cit., I,785.
3. Cf., for example, Cyprian's 'Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews', ii.8f, cited above on p.69, where Ps.2.7 proving that Christ is the Son of God, is immediately followed by Is.7.14 testifying to the Virgin Birth.
by the quotation from Ps. 72 found in i.6 of Sergius's Disputation. In between these chapters Isidore has i.11 'Christ was born in Bethlehem', citing Mic. 5.2, and corresponding to Cyprian, ii.12, and i.12 'The Birth of Christ is shown by the sign of a star', citing Num. 24.17, and corresponding to Cyprian, ii.10. Apart from the rather remote possibility that Isidore drew upon the same Book of Testimonies as Sergius, it is a reasonable conjecture that such material as this was contained in the missing folios of the Disputation. It is also quite possible that the missing folios contained material akin to Isidore's Ek.i.8 'Christ sprang from the tribe of Judah', citing Gen. 49.10, a very well known testimony text which Sergius does not cite in the manuscript as we have it, and i.9 'That Christ was born of the seed of David', citing Ps. 132.11, 2 Sam. 7.12-16, Jer. 23.5f, and Is. 11.10, none of which is cited in the manuscript.

The manuscript resumes at fol. 2v in the middle of the series of testimony texts in the form of a biography of Jesus in Old Testament prophecies, which we have discussed in the previous chapter. As far as fol. 6v, the Disputation contains little more than a transcription of this collection of testimonies, though, of course, Sergius may have added to it now and then. In this list of testimonies the Jew plays no part whatsoever. The Jewish objection in i.3 that Ps. 2.7 refers to David is traditional and is found in almost all discussions of the text in anti-Jewish polemic. The Jew is not mentioned here, neither does the use of the second person singular 'you say' (fol. 1r, 1.20) necessitate the existence of a real opponent. Throughout the Disputation the whole Jewish race, past or present, is often addressed or subsumed under the second person singular.

2. Corresponding to Cyprian, Ek.ii.11.
4. The practice is traditional; cf., for example, the Ezra graffphon in i.17.
At the end of chapter i on fol.4v, the list of testimonies is interrupted after the citation of Mk.16.15, Mt.28.19, for Sergius clearly feels that the mention of the Holy Spirit needs the support of more testimonies. In line 3 of this folio, we find the bare words in red ink 'Concerning the Spirit', which looks like the heading of a testimony collection. In this section, which consists of a series of testimony texts for the existence of the Holy Spirit, the Jew again does not speak directly, but is treated as the representative Jew - 'any Jew'.

In ii.3 the representative Jew is again introduced: he opposes the doctrine of the Trinity, but this time his views are recounted in the form of a quotation: "Behold, three gods - the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit; how does the statement of Moses remain who said, 'God is One'?" Sergius (assuming him to be the speaker, for he has not yet been mentioned as a participant in the discussion) then addresses the Jew, "Do not accuse your prophets, O Jew, of acknowledging three gods", and follows with an explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity, citing two well known testimony texts, Ps.33.6 and Is.43.16 (the latter in a suitably adapted form). Again there is no need to postulate any more than literary convention in the direct address 'O Jew'. Such apostrophes occur in many works which are clearly not dialogues in form, but it is easy to see how they led most naturally to the development of the dialogue form of Christian anti-Jewish polemic.

At the end of the excursus on the Trinity and Christology (ch.ii), we find the author directly addressing

1.Cf.Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa,'Selected Testimonies Against the Jews', ch.xxii,Williams, op.cit., p.125; the chapter is entitled 'Concerning the Holy Spirit'. See also pp.48f,52 above, where the possibility that Sergius's Testimony Book contained a collection of testimonies on the Holy Spirit and the Trinity is discussed.
Christian readers. "But to the faithful and discerning it is known that the Godhead is three Persons .... But, nevertheless, you do not offer proper food to babes who need milk, for they cannot accept it, since it is harmful to them. For it is sufficient for you to say to the Jew, 'God is One with his Word and his Spirit; and yet, there is no other'" (ii.8). It is clear from this that the author is providing material for Christians to combat Jewish arguments. It would have no place in a real discussion with a Jew.

At the beginning of chapter iii, the author returns to the catalogue of proof texts with the words, 'Let us return to our previous subject.' He concludes the catalogue at the end of the chapter with the revealing words, 'But they (i.e. these testimonies) are sufficient for believers, and that simple men may not go astray after the error of the Jews' (iii.5). Clearly one of the author's principal reasons for composing his Disputation is the edification of Christians and, as we shall see, their preservation from apostasy to Judaism. The passage cited in note 1 to fol.6v, from the Discussion of St. Silvester, shows that this was a common, if not the preponderant, motive for the production of anti-Jewish polemical works by Christian writers.

In chapter iv.1-3 the author turns to the subjects of sabbath and circumcision. The representative Jew is again addressed directly - 'Because you say, O Jew, that without sabbath and circumcision man is not pleasing to God .... '(iv.1). There follows a series of arguments wholly composed of traditional material as to the notes to the Translation demonstrate.

Chapter iv.4 begins a new section rather abruptly with the words ἕλπις ἕλπίς 'Concerning children',

1. See on, pp.122ff, 135ff.
2. Cf. B. Blumenkranz, Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidental, p.75.
3. See also the discussion in the previous chapter, pp.56, 60.
again in red ink. It is probably another heading to a collection of testimony material. Again the arguments and examples used are composed from such wholly traditional material. The Jew, whether the particular Jew with whom Sergius is purported to have disputed or the representative Jew, is quoted as saying, 'Cursed be everyone who does not raise up seed in Israel'.

From chapter iv.6 to the end of the chapter, the author retails traditional Christian accusations against the Jews as murderers of the prophets who have always resisted God's will. The texts quoted are traditional testimony texts - Ezek.16, Is.1.4, Dt.32.32 - witnessing to the habitual perfidy of the Jews.

The beginning of chapter v marks a significant turning point in the literary structure of the work; the Disputation at last becomes a real dialogue:

The Jew said: It is written, 'Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree'.

The Blessed Sergius said: But also thus again it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who does not do all which is written in this law'.

It may be noted, however, that the text of Dt.21.23 cited by the Jew, is not the Massoretic text but the Peshitta text of Gal.3.13. The Disputation is not then a transcript of the actual discussion, although we must always make the proviso that the scribe of the manuscript may have inserted the text with which he was most familiar. The phrase יְנִי הנֵבִי 'the Blessed Sergius said' is unique in the work; normally we have only יְנִי הנֵבִי 'Sergius said'. The observation that in the manuscript the word בר כursed' is in red ink, while the rest of the phrase is not, prompts the sug-

1. Cf. Aphraates's Demonstation 18 entitled, 'Against the Jews on Virginity and Asceticism'.
2. Cf. the parallels with Aphraates noted above on p.67. and cf. also Cyprian,op. cit.,Bk.I.1-3.
estion that it is a scribal addition. If it is not, the phrase militates against the claim of the introduction and colophon to the manuscript that the work was written by Sergius the Stylite. It suggests rather that an anonymous author has employed the presumably well known figure of Sergius as an actor in his dialogue, and that subsequently the work itself was attributed to Sergius.

From this point until fol. 15r (chapters v-viii) Sergius speaks. Chapters v-vi deal with the cross and the crucifixion, especially Old Testament types of the former; in chapter vii Sergius deals with Jewish objections to the incarnation, and then in chapter viii he describes the present plight of the Jews, blaming their situation on their murder of Christ. The Jew is addressed directly on several occasions, sometimes by rhetorical questions like 'Is the lamb which saved Isaac, which was lifted up on the wood, accounted accursed by you?' (v.4), and sometimes by the interjection '0 Jew' (vi.3), or '0 hard-hearted Jew' (vii.8). Once Sergius cites what the Jew is purported to be saying, namely, 'The cross has effected nothing' (vi.6). The substance of these chapters is once again drawn from traditional anti-Jewish polemical material. It is possible that a few of the types of the cross adduced by Sergius are original, and perhaps even the elaborate etymology of the word Κυριακος 'Passover' (v.13) is his own.

In chapter ix.1 the Jew speaks again, claiming that the Jews are the true sons of Abraham and of the prophets. No special knowledge of Judaism would be necessary for a Christian author to produce that statement! Sergius replies by saying that, since the Jews reject the prophecies of the prophets, they cannot be their sons. They have been put to shame by the Gentiles 'who have been taught by the prophets that which, in the name of the prophets you deny' (ix.2). The section which foll-

1. See the notes to the Translation and pp. 55ff, 59.
ows may be entitled 'The Gentiles have turned to Christ', and is certainly, along with its quotations from Ps.72, Gen.22.18, Jer.16.19, etc., based on testimony material.

Chapter x introduces, for the first time, a speech of reasonable length by the Jew. He agrees that the testimonies adduced by Sergius are compelling, and is particularly affected by the dispersion of the Jews. Nevertheless, he wants to know why Christians indulge in the worship of the cross, particularly by producing images of it, an activity which he regards as the equivalent of idolatry. At this point we appear to be confronted with material which has a real Sitz im Leben in the period in which this work was produced, for the subject is not dealt with in earlier anti-Jewish works. But in the 'Trophies of Damascus', written in A.D.681, the Christian participant in the dialogue defends the worship of the cross and images. Likewise Leontius, Bishop of Nicomedia, who lived A.D.590-668, in his five books against the Jews, seems to have argued, as Sergius does, that Christians do not really worship the wood of the cross. The 'Dialogue of Papiscus and Philo', composed in two stages A.D.600-1100, begins with an objection raised by the Jew to the use of images. Thus from the end of the seventh century A.D. onwards this subject became a standard issue for discussion between Christians and Jews. It is, then, a possibility that, in

1. Cf. Cyprian, op. cit., Bk. i. 21, 'That the Gentiles should rather believe in Christ', i. 22, 'That rather the Gentiles than the Jews should attain to the kingdom of heaven', and Isidore, op. cit., Bk. ii. 1, 2, 4, 7f, and also Aphraates, Dem. 16, 'Concerning the Nations who have replaced the Nation'.
2. A. L. Williams, op. cit., p. 162ff.
3. op. cit., p. 166. Williams thinks that the attribution to Leontius may be false, and that the material belongs to a later date.
4. See ch. xii. 6.
5. So also Stephen of Bostra, Williams, op. cit., p. 167.
the sections dealing with the Christian worship of images, Sergius's Disputation is based upon a real discussion with a Jew, and is not merely fabricated on the basis of collections of testimony material. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the testimony tradition, responding to new requirements, had already by the middle of the eighth century evolved a collection of testimonies to deal with these Jewish objections.

Chapter xi interrupts the discussion of the subject of images, while Sergius and the Jew turn aside to deal with the problem: which is the real Israel - the Church, or the Synagogue? This break in the argument suggests that Sergius may be guided by the course which his argument with the Jew actually took; such changes of subject are natural in real discussions. However, in this excursus the Jew seems to act as little more than a foil for Sergius's arguments, so that we must not be too hasty in assuming that we have a transcript from a real discussion. Certainly Sergius's argument, based on Gen. 22.13, is by no means original, nor is the fact that the Jew allows Sergius to call Mt.16.13ff. in evidence at all credible. Moreover, once again the material adduced by Sergius belongs to the testimony tradition. Finally, in ch.xi.17, the Jew is made to refer to I Samuel as 'the first book of kingdoms'. While such a usage is not too difficult in a Syriac work coming from the region of Antioch, and hence from an area heavily influenced by Greek-speaking Christianity, to find it on the lips of a Jew is, to say the least, problematic. We must, therefore, conclude that, while the break in the course of the discussion may reflect the circumstances of an actual disputation, the substance of this chapter is a literary creation.

At the beginning of chapter xii the Jew brings Sergius back to the subject of the worship of the cross, and accuses him of evading the question. Sergius tells the Jew to be patient and to listen in silence. While

1. Cf. n.5 to fol.23r.
such remarks may belong to the literary artifice of the
dialogue, it is not impossible that the Jew's persist-
ence reflects that of the real Jew with whom Sergius is
supposed to have disputed. At the least, it reflects
real experience of disputation with Jews. Again, through-
out this chapter, Sergius defends the Christian use of
images, building principally upon the analogy of the
worship of kings' images. The Jew is not convinced—an
important point.

A folio is missing after 26v, but hints in ch.xii.15
and xiii.12 suggest that it contained a 'fearful oath'
by the Jew 'not to deny the truth'. Sergius appears to
be trying to pin the Jew down, and get him to acknow-
ledge Jesus as the Messiah. The Jew says (xii.15) that
if the Messiah corresponds to the testimonies of the
prophets, he will not reject or conceal the fact. Ser-
gius takes this as a tacit acceptance of his position,
and says, "If you thus know, why do you not acknowledge
him". The Jew replies, "I do not acknowledge(him) for two
reasons: one, that my heart will not allow me to leave
the law of my fathers; and the other, that I fear my
people lest they stone me or burn me with fire". What
are we to make of this dialogue? Ostensibly it appears
to be a transcript from a real discussion. If, however,
we examine it more closely, the semblance of reality
begins to break down. Firstly, there is a hiatus between
the Jew's first speech and Sergius's reply. The Jew's
statement that he will accept Christ is hypothetical—
"Now if the Messiah is, as he is reported in the books
of the prophets, he whom you proclaim and no other, and
there is no other Messiah of God, and (if) the prophets,
and the events, and the set times, bear witness as you
have demonstrated above, then I will not reject or con-
ceal it on account of the oath which you made me swear.
If any other comes, he is false and a liar." The Jew
does not concede that the Messiah is the one whom Ser-
gius proclaims, yet Sergius proceeds as though the Jew
has conceded this, and the subsequent speech by the Jew
makes the same assumption. But the Jew's speech in xii.18
reverts to the hypothetical form - "Whether I acknowledge (him) or not, does not concern you". In the light of this, and the fact that at the end of the Disputation the Jew still does not accept Sergius's position, it seems that the Jew's speech, giving the reasons why he will not accept Jesus as the Messiah, is fabricated by Sergius to put the Jews in a bad light. For he is showing that, although they really know that Jesus is the Messiah, yet they refuse to acknowledge him on purely emotional grounds - clinging to the law of their fathers, and fear of reprisals from their co-religionists.

Chapter xiii marks the start of a large division in the argument, extending to the end of chapter xv, in which Sergius defends the use of martyrs' relics. The Jew's speech in xiii.1f reveals a good knowledge of Christian practice with regard to the adoration of saints' bones and the depiction of their exploits on the walls of churches. Once again the Disputation is touching on a subject, which is of specific relevance to the period in which it was composed, in contrast to much of the material hitherto dealt with. No section dealing with martyrs' relics is discernible in any of the earlier collections of testimonies. Dionysius bar Salibhi, however, in chapter viii.2-3 of his treatise 'Against the Jews', deals with the Jewish objections to Christian worship of the cross and saints' bones in very much the same terms as Sergius. Some of the details of Sergius's argument also find parallels in Aphraates's Demonstrations. It is inherently probable that as Christian practice with regard to images of the cross and saints' bones grew, teaching such as that found in Aphraates was developed and became the basis for a new collection in the testimony tradition. Some such collection seems to underlie both Sergius's Disputation and bar Salibhi's treatise. Nevertheless, we do get some impression from the discussion in this part of the Disputation that there is

1. See above p.59.
2. See the notes to the Translation for references.
a substratum of reality in the dialogue, despite the fact that the Jew still seems to act as the foil for Sergius's arguments and never attains the dimensions of a real personality, and despite the fact the Sergius never seems to show any real knowledge of Judaism. The main argument in favour of this substratum of reality is that, throughout, the Jew remains unconvinced by Sergius's arguments, whereas in other clearly fabricated anti-Jewish dialogues the Jew or group of Jews is invariably routed by the Christian, frequently by means of a miracle.

Two particular points in this section need to be mentioned. First, the Jew quotes frequently from the Peshitta text, even where it diverges from the Masoretic text, and raises no objection to Sergius's use of Wisdom 3.1.(xiii.9), nor to his statement that four times Moses averted God's wrath by appealing to the names of the righteous fathers, whereas the Pentateuch only reports one such occasion. Once again, observations about the biblical text purported to have been used by the Jew need to be qualified by the proviso that the scribe may have inserted the text with which he was most familiar. Second, in ch.xv.10, Sergius threatens the Jew, whom he regards as an enemy of God, with hell-fire. This may well be a reminiscence of a real discussion; Sergius, finding the Jew unconvinced by his arguments, in the manner of many since, resorts to threats about his opponent's eternal damnation. The Jew, unmoved, continues to question Sergius, this time about the use of pictures and icons in Christian churches. Sergius's reply occupies most of the next section of the Disputation which extends to the end of chapter xvii.

This section develops naturally out of the previous

1.Cf., for example, 'The Discussion of St. Silvester', where the issue is decided by Silvester raising a bull previously struck dead by a Jewish magician uttering the sacred name in its ear; Syriac version, Brooks, op.cit., pp.87ff.
discussion of the worship of the cross and saint's bones, and indeed, all three subjects are bound together by Sergius's recapitulation in xvii.13. Although the subject of this section could well have been raised and dealt with on the general lines depicted in the work, the actual text gives every appearance of being a literary production, with the Jew once again acting as Sergius's foil. It is particularly worth noting how the Jew in his long speech in ch.xvi.10-12 falls straight into a trap laid by Sergius. From the institution of the Passover in Ex.12f., and of the tassels on garments in Num.15.37-41, Sergius draws out the principle that the Old Testament sanctions the use of material objects to serve the purpose of teaching spiritual lessons. The Jew cannot, of course, disagree, and the way is then open for Sergius to apply this principle to the subject under discussion. "This making of pictures and icons, which are inscribed with pigments in the naves of our church(es), is confined to, and follows, the example of the scripture. And every narrative which the scripture regards worthy of a memorial, we depict the same in the church for the teaching and admonition of men, that whatever the scripture relates for the hearing of the ear, the eye might see in the form of a picture" (xvi.13). This argument which seems to be unparalleled in the other Syriac literature, may well be original. Before we move on to discuss the next section of the Disputation, we may note once again, that the Jew's citation of Ex.9.16 (xvi.10) is based mainly on the Peshitta text of Rom.9.17, though bearing in mind the usual proviso.

Chapter xviii marks the beginning of a clearly defined section in the structure of the Disputation, and for once the Jew speaks as one imagines a real Jew would. "I myself know that you have too many words, and everything which I ask you, you refute with idle talk. For the doctrine of the son of Mary is like this - a subtle contrivance of words" (xviii.1). He then proceeds to raise the problem of the dietary laws enjoined in the Old Testament, with particular regard to Christian con-
That such a problem would be raised in a discussion between a Christian and a Jew is inherently probable. It is, of course, treated in other Christian anti-Jewish works. Christian apologia on this subject, apart from that found in the New Testament itself, goes back as far as 'The Epistle of Barnabas', ch. x, and Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho', ch. xx. It merits a section in Isidore's 'Contra Judaeos' (Ep. ii. 18), entitled 'Concerning Foods', where the example of Elijah is adduced and the fact that God pronounced all things 'very good'. The fifteenth Demonstration of Aphraates is entitled 'Concerning the Distinction of Foods', and contains some material in common with Sergius's Disputation. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that Sergius is drawing here upon traditional testimony material, for the arguments retailed by all these writers, besides others such as Ephraem and Novatian, are identical, as are the texts which they cite. However, as far as can be ascertained, Sergius's argument that the Old Testament criteria for distinguishing clean and unclean foods are inconsistent, is original to the Disputation. Thus, although traditional anti-Jewish polemic serves as the basis for this part of the work, the author is adding original material of some importance.

In chapter xviii.9, The Jew makes an interesting speech in which he refers to Sergius's ascetic way of life upon his column. Probably we do have here reminiscences of a real discussion, and, if so, this is an important confirmation of the claims of the introduction and colophon of the manuscript regarding the literary structure and authorship of the Disputation. We must

2. P.G., vi, col. 517f.
6. See ch. xviii.2-8.
not, however, overlook the fact that this argument can be reversed: a scribe noting that the substance of the work is ascribed to a Christian called Sergius, and that this speech makes it clear that he was a stylite, could easily have made the step of attributing the Disputation to the otherwise unknown Sergius the Stylite. Nevertheless, another note of reality is struck by the Jew's persistence in pressing Sergius on the matter of the command to Noah to distinguish clean and unclean animals on entering the ark and on the matter of Moses's food laws\(^1\), and by Sergius's inability to extricate himself from the difficulty.

The discussion of the Jewish food laws comes gradually to an end in chapter xx, and an argument about the proper subject of the latter chapters of Isaiah develops out of the Jew's citation of Is.66.17. Sergius, using traditional Christian exegesis, separates out the promises contained in these chapters and refers them to Christians; the threats and curses he refers to the Jews\(^2\). The Jew, not unnaturally, protests.

The last major subject discussed in the Disputation is contained in chapter xxi, and it is, in many ways, the most interesting in the work, containing, as it does, a large number of extracts from Josephus's 'War of the Jews'.\(^3\) It can be broken up into three sections: (a) the Jew admits the miserable condition of his people (xxi.1-2); (b) Christ's prophecies concerning Jerusalem (xxi.3-4); (c) the witness of Josephus to the destruction of Jerusalem (xxi.5-15). For this general plan Sergius might be dependent upon Eusebius's 'Ecclesiastical History', where the same collocation of Christ's prophecies concerning Jerusalem with extracts from Josephus's 'War of the Jews' may be found\(^4\). However, as we have seen\(^5\),

1. See ch.xix.4,8.
2. See above, p.66.
3. See above, Chapter III, section C, passim.
4. See above, Chapter III, section D, p.98f.
5. See above, Chapter III, section C, pp.86f,92.
the author relies for his text of Josephus on the Syriac version, and not on Eusebius. The use of Josephus, though not particularly common, is found elsewhere in the Christian anti-Jewish polemical tradition. The Latin text of the Discussion of Silvester appeals to Josephus; Peter Damiani refers like Sergius to Josephus's total for the numbers killed in the siege of Jerusalem; and Anastasius of Sinai appeals to Josephus's testimony to Christ. It is more certain that Sergius is influenced here, as he is earlier in the Disputation, by those collections of testimony material which dealt with the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews. There are no more persistent themes than these in Christian works against the Jews. We must conclude, therefore, that the general structure of this section owes more to literary precedent than to reminiscence of an actual conversation.

On the other hand, if an actual discussion lies behind this Disputation, it is not impossible that the Christian participant would have called Josephus in evidence. The Jew's speech in ch.xxii.1 strikes a note of reality: 'I, then, when I approached you, approached in-

2. Williams, op.cit., p.373.
3. op.cit., p.178.
4. See ch.viii.
5. Cf. Cyprian, op.cit., 3k.i.6, entitled 'That the Jews should lose Jerusalem, and should leave the land which they had received', where Is. 1.7 and Mt. 23.37f are called in evidence; Sergius cites the former in ch.xx.8, the latter in xxi.13. Cf. also Isidore, op.cit., 3k.ii.10, entitled 'Concerning the desolation of Jerusalem', ii.11, entitled 'Concerning the spurning of the Jews and the rejection of the Synagogue', and ii.12, entitled 'Concerning the perpetual desolation of Jerusalem', both of the latter two chapters citing Is. 1.7.
advisedly, for I was unaware that you had all this know-
ledge'. The Jew is surprised by Sergius's knowledge of
Josephus, and so are we; such knowledge, and citation in-
dependent of Eusebius, is unique in the Syriac anti-
Jewish literature, and rare elsewhere. Perhaps therefore,
we should modify our conclusions with regard to this
section and say that, while it shows every sign of being
a literary construction, we cannot rule out the possibi-
ility that it also influenced by the course of an actual
discussion with a Jew, in which the author has either
participated or which he has observed.

The final section of the Disputation supports the
tentative conclusion reached above with regard to ch.xxi.
For this section, mainly devoted to the subject of Jud-
aizing Christians, shows every sign of being a trans-
cript of an actual conversation. The Jew continues, after
the sentence quoted in the previous paragraph, as follows:
"But now I am amazed how, knowing this¹, there are among
you some Christians who associate with us in the syna-
gogue, and bring offerings and alms and oil, and at the
time of the Passover send unleavened bread and, doubt-
less, other things also. They are not entirely Chris-
tians, and some of our men have said that, if they were
truly Christians, they would not associate with us in
our synagogue and in our law. And now, because of this,
we are all the more scandalized². Sergius's Disputa-
tion is another witness to the perennial problem of
Christian apostasy to Judaism, felt more acutely in the
Syrian church than almost anywhere else, as a series of
articles by S.Kazan demonstrates³. There can be little

1. i.e. the evidence from Josephus.
2. Ch.xxii.1. For parallel situations to that described
by the Jew, especially in the region of Antioch, see on,
pp.136ff.
3. 'Isaac of Antioch's Homily Against the Jews', Q.C.,
49(1965),pp.57-78.
doubt that Sergius's Disputation was written primarily to counteract the situation portrayed in this final section of the work.

There is, then, a reasonable degree of certainty that this section of the Disputation is based on an actual discussion of the subject of Judaizing Christians. Much of the dialogue in the section strikes a note of reality, especially when Sergius, being in an insecure position, descends rapidly, like many other controversialists, to vilification of his opponent instead of attempting to meet his objections. For example: "After all these miracles and wonders you, the sons of 'the sons of vipers', say now, "Christians scandalize us". This is the sort of statement one would expect to find in a real debate between Christians and Jews at this period. Not all the material in this concluding section can, however, be regarded as the verbatim report of an actual discussion. For the author weaves into it, and deals at some length with, the subject of 'Christ, the Prophet like Moses', a subject touched upon earlier in the Disputation. It is introduced in order to supply a fitting conclusion to the literary work: 'But because you boast in Moses, let us return to Moses, and as we began from him, so let us end with him. The Lord will raise up for you a prophet....' However, it is worth emphasizing that the Disputation ends not, as so often in other anti-Jewish dialogues, with the Jew giving way to the superior arguments of his Christian opponent, or being compelled to believe by means of a miracle, but with Sergius virtually declaring the Jew and his people irretrievably damned. We may feel reasonably confident that this conclusion is based upon actual experience of debate with Jews.

1.i.e. the miracles performed by Moses and Jesus.
2.Ch.xxii.16.
3.See ch.xxii.7.
4.Ch.xxii.18.
We are now in a position to attempt an answer to the questions raised at the beginning of this chapter. These were: Is the dialogue fictitious or real? What portrait does it give of the Jew, and does it show any first hand knowledge of Judaism? Has it a Sitz im Leben in the period in which it was written, and what was the purpose for which it was written?


Before we draw together the strands of our previous investigation, it may be of some use to refer to the conclusions which other scholars working in the field of Christian - Jewish polemic have reached as the nature of the abundant literature composed in the form of dialogues or disputations. G. Bardy, after a discussion of the Christian apologetic (mainly anti-Judaic) dialogues, comes to the conclusion that, while some are accounts of real disputations, most are literary productions. Of Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho', to which, as regards literary form, Sergius's Disputation most closely approximates, he says that, although it shows a pronounced literary character, it appears, nevertheless, to preserve the remembrance of a real discussion.

B. Blumenkranz, in a work devoted to the relations between Jews and Christians in the West in the period A.D.430-1096, discusses at some length the literary nature of the dialogues written during that period. Although as evidence for the nature of a Syriac work this is somewhat remote, the remarkable homogeneity of Christian anti-Jewish polemic makes his observations of some value. His general conclusion is that much real discussion lies behind the literary deposit, and he post-

1. Article 'Dialogue', in Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, p. 928ff.
2. Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidental.
ulates a principle for ascertaining the real or fictitious nature of these dialogues – the ratio of Old Testament to New Testament quotations in each particular work. He cites the example of the authentic discussion of Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster, with a Jew\(^1\), where the ratio is 163 Old Testament quotations to 63 New Testament quotations. In the forged continuation added later to the dialogue, the ratio is 41:30.

For what it is worth, let us apply this test to the Disputation of Sergius the Stylite. We find that the number of Old Testament quotations, excluding texts cited more than once, is approximately 280; the number of New Testament quotations, excluding those which provide the author's text of Old Testament quotations, is approximately 40. So the Disputation passes this test with flying colours. However, the test cannot be regarded as anything more than confirmatory evidence; it should not by itself be allowed to determine the reality or otherwise of a dialogue. Nevertheless, its basis is sound: in a real discussion between Christians and Jews the book which they both equally regarded as authoritative would be the final arbiter: Jews would refuse to allow the New Testament to be called as evidence.

J. Juster in Les Juifs dans l'empire romain provides a comprehensive, though brief, survey of the literary deposit of the 'polémique antijuive des Chrétiens\(^2\). He touches on the problem of the authenticity of the polemic dialogues and observes that, while they claim almost invariably to be the result of real discussions with Jews, there is a certain relationship between them all, and they are all cast in the same mould. However, he does qualify this observation in a footnote saying: 'On a vraiment exagéré en prétendant que les polémiques antijuives ne sont pas du tout sorties de discussions réelles entre Juifs et Chrétiens.'\(^3\) He then surveys the

3. op. cit., p.53,n.4.
the evidence which proves that Jews and Christians did frequently engage in debate. The conclusion from his survey would then seem to be that, while the written dialogues show signs of literary reworking, real contact between Jews and Christians underlies them.

In conclusion to this brief reference to the work of other scholars in this field, it may be of some value to quote A.L. Williams's opinion with regard to the origin of Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho': 'It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that, while making some one discussion with a Jew the basis of his book, he made additions, out of the experience that he had had of innumerable other discussions on the same subject. He may also have used old notes of his own lectures, or even of his homiletical discourses to Christian friends.' We may well come to the conclusion that it was in some such way as this that Sergius's Disputation was constructed, though it would be unwise to rely too heavily on the parallel with the 'Dialogue with Trypho', since other scholars would not all accept Williams's opinion on its composition.

There is one other objective test which may be applied in order to ascertain the authenticity or otherwise of a Christian anti-Jewish dialogue - whether, at the end of the disputation, the Jew is converted or not. As a matter of historical fact we know that this anti-Jewish polemic almost invariably failed to convert the Jews to Christianity, so that when a dialogue claims that the Jewish participant is convinced by the arguments of his Christian opponent, we may justifiably be suspicious. Moreover, the large number of dialogues in which the Jew (or Jews) is converted on the strength of the Christian participant working a miracle, may be sus-

pected of concealing either the Christian's inability to convert his opponent by the force of his argument, or of reflecting the unfortunate attempts made to convert Jews by force. In the Disputation of Sergius the Stylite the Jew is not converted, either by means of a miracle, or by the force of Sergius's arguments. Occasionally the Jew admits the strength of these arguments, but may we not, in the following example, detect a note of irony:—

'The Jew said: I do not have anything to say. On this account the times and the events yield to you in every respect, and the words of the prophets suit you, as you wish.'¹ The nearest the Jew comes to admitting that Sergius may be right is in the following speech:—

'The Jew said: I know that we have rebelled against the Lord our God from when our fathers sold Joseph, and in Egypt, and in the desert, and in the land of Canaan; as David said concerning us: we have sinned with our fathers, and we have gone astray and done evil². If again, as you say, the sin of the son of Mary was added to us, behold, a double evil! What has happened to us that, instead of being heirs and sons of Abraham, we are strangers and enemies.'³ But we may note that the Jew's admission is still hypothetical, and the fact that seems to grieve him more than anything else is not the force of Sergius's arguments, but the sad plight of his people⁴.

We must conclude, therefore, that not only does the Disputation pass Blumenkranz's test with comparative ease, but that, tested by the hypothesis suggested above, it gives every sign of reflecting a real situation.

Our discussion of the literary nature of the dialogue in the Disputation has, then, achieved the following result. The work, especially in its opening sections, is a literary construction, based on collections of testimony texts and traditional anti-Jewish polemic. The

1. Ch.x.1.
2. Ps.106.6.
3. Ch.xxi.1.
4. See the rest of ch.x.1.
first six folios (chapters i-iii) are nothing more than a transcript from a written book of testimonies and are constructed in the form of a treatise rather than a dialogue. No particular Jew is addressed or quoted in this section, only the representative Jew. It is thus interesting to observe that Rendel Harris says that 'we frequently find that a series of Testimonies is interpreted by a personal challenge to the Jew who is imagined to be listening to the demonstrations; and it was natural enough that this argumentum ad hominem should be varied by protestations on the part of the Jew against the conclusions that are being drawn. It was almost inevitable that when the testimony becomes a controversy, the collection of testimonies should become a dialogue; this will sometimes seem to turn Testimonia into a series of Questions and Answers.'\(^1\) Is not this precisely the process that we see at work in the construction of Sergius's Disputation?

From chapter v onwards the work assumes the form of a dialogue, which as it proceeds, grows gradually more and more realistic, until in the last section of the Disputation we seem to be confronted with extracts from a conversation which actually took place. We have noted, in the discussion of the contents of the text, the constant evidence for assuming that behind the literary framework there can be traced signs that the author is making use of a discussion (or discussions) which he had had with a Jew or which he had himself observed. Reminiscence of such discussions will account for the fact that Old Testament quotations preponderate over New Testament quotations, and that the Jew is not converted as the result of the dialogue. The extent to which the literary activity of the author has obscured his reminiscence of the real discussion (or discussions) is difficult to estimate, but we can see how, in different sections of the work, authentic dialogue lies closer to the surface than in others. The Disputation of Sergius

\(^1\)Testimonies, II, p.19; the italics are the author's.
the Stylite must therefore be regarded, not as the transcript of an actual discussion, but as a literary work, one of whose sources is an actual discussion (or discussions) with a Jew, which the author uses to varying degrees in the course of the work.

This conclusion does not conflict with the claims of the introduction and colophon to the manuscript that the work is a letter (or perhaps better, 'a treatise') written by Sergius the Stylite against a Jew with whom he had disputed. Sergius may have begun his treatise intending to set out all the evidence for the Christian position in the form of a collection of Old Testament testimonies and, as the work proceeded, it grew into a dialogue by the process outlined by Harris, a dialogue in which he made use of reminiscences of his discussion with a Jew (or more generally, discussions with Jews). However, it is a curious feature of this work that Sergius is always introduced in the third person - 'Sergius said', never in the first person - 'I said'. If we compare Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho', we find that Justin composes his work like a piece of autobiography. We could, therefore, suggest that the introduction and colophon are mistaken in attributing the work to Sergius, and that what we have is, say, a literary reworking by one of his disciples of a disputation which he attended between Sergius and a Jew. It may even be possible that the Disputation existed originally in an autobiographical form, and that a later scribe has converted it into a proper dialogue by introducing Sergius in the third person. If we choose to disregard the introduction and colophon entirely, the possibilities become limitless. For we could say that an anonymous author chose Sergius, as a well known figure, to act as a participant in the dialogue which he was writing, and that subsequently the work was ascribed to Sergius himself. Or the original author may have written the introduction himself, ascribing the work to Sergius in order to reach a wider public; the practice is by no means unknown in early Christian literature. But with such suggestions as these,
we are moving into the realm of pure conjecture: we have no information about Sergius the Stylite or his Disputation except this one manuscript. If he was a really well known figure, it is surprising that there is no mention of him elsewhere in Syriac literature, though it must be remembered that a large proportion of this literature has not survived.

Thus, if we disregard for lack of evidence those theories which ignore the introduction and colophon, only three hypotheses as to the origin and authorship of this work have anything to commend them:

(a) That Sergius the Stylite of Gousit wrote it, on the basis of a disputation which he had really had with a Jew.

(b) That it was written by a disciple (or other close connection) of Sergius on the basis of a disputation (or disputations) which he had attended between Sergius and a Jew.

(c) That it was written by Sergius in the form of an autobiography, which a scribe has subsequently altered into the form of a true dialogue.

Of these three hypotheses, the last has not much to commend it, and it is almost impossible to choose between the first two, for the only objective evidence we possess, with which to test them, is the introduction to the manuscript. And, as we have seen in a previous chapter, the only information this conveys, independently of the text of the manuscript, is the fact that Sergius the Stylite lived in Gousit. This small piece of evidence for the truth of the introduction does not, unfortunately, affect the issue either way. For if the work was written by one of Sergius's disciples, he could easily attribute it to him, since the bulk of the material probably derives from him anyway. It is best, therefore, however unsatisfactory it may be, to resist

1. The colophon is, of course, not independent of the introduction.
2. See above, pp. 59f.
the temptation to single out one of these two theories as the most probable.

(3) The Portrait of the Jew and the Author's Knowledge of Judaism.

Not much needs to be added to what has previously been said on these subjects. We have concluded that the Jew is a real figure, but that the literary form in which the Disputation is cast has prevented his emergence as a concrete personality. It is worthwhile noting, however, the manner in which Sergius refers to the Jew in the dialogue. Most frequently he refers to him as a 'wise man'; occasionally he refers to him as a 'teacher of the law'; and once he refers to him as a 'freeman'. By itself the title 'wise man' is not specific, but the title 'teacher of the law' would seem to claim that the Jew was a rabbi, though it is worth noting that the word used is not the technical term 'rabbi', but the more general term 'teacher'. Against this apparent claim by the Disputation, it must be noted that it is very frequently a part of the literary form of these anti-Jewish dialogues for the Jew (or Jews), who participates in the discussion, to be called a rabbi. Moreover, the passage quoted above from xxii.1 militates, if anything, against the suggestion that the Jew was a rabbi. The phrase 'some of our men have said' looks like that of an ordinary Jew referring to the opinion of the rabbis. Apart from this, there is little else in the work to help us to determine this question.

1. That Sergius is referred to throughout this thesis as the author of the Disputation is a mere convenience, and is not meant to indicate any choice between these two alternatives.
2. See ix.8, xii.3, xv.2, etc.
3. See xvi.3, xix.9.
4. See xix.9.
5. Cf., for example, the Discussion of Silvester, which is clearly fictitious.
one way or the other, except the general impression that although the Jew seems reasonably well informed, he displays little special knowledge of Judaism. But no conclusions can be drawn from the general impression that the Jew makes, for we cannot tell how much the portrait given of him owes to the literary artifice of the author. We have noted above that sometimes whole speeches made by the Jew are clearly fabricated by the author, and that in most other cases he acts merely as Sergius's foil, seeking information or asking leading questions. It is only in rare instances that the Jew attains the dimensions of a real personality, such a case being the two times when we are allowed to observe the Jew's deep grief over the plight of his people¹. On the whole, the portrait given of the Jew, despite the literary reworking, strikes one as fairly realistic. His persistent questioning and his refusal to accept Sergius's frequently contorted reasoning, contrasted with his occasional willingness to accept that Sergius has put forward a good argument, provides a picture of the Jews which contrasts strongly with the bitter and slanderous portrayal found in such works as the Discussion of Silvester.

A problem, closely related to that of the portrait of the Jew, is the knowledge of Judaism displayed in the Disputation. If the Jew, with whom Sergius disputed, was really a rabbi, we would expect his opinions to be reflected in the Talmud and Midrash. However, when we come to gather together and list the points made by the Jew in the Disputation, we find that there is remarkably little of any substance. As has been already observed, he serves mainly as Sergius's foil and, in most cases, his speeches are confined to asking questions. Elsewhere his opinions are directly drawn from some text of scripture with little element of interpretation.

The following examples merit closer attention:—

¹See x.1 and xxi.1.
(a) In i.3, Sergius quotes a Jewish interpretation (not explicitly that of the Jew in the Disputation) of Ps. 2 which applies it to David. As the reference above to the 'Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus' shows¹, this was probably a traditional opinion in the Christian anti-Jewish polemical tradition as to the way in which the Jews interpret the text. However, in the 'Midrash to the Psalms'², and in the Talmud³, the Psalm is taken to refer to the battle of Gog and Magog, and, therefore, v.7 is interpreted of the Messiah 'in the time to come'.

(b) The Jewish accusation (ii.3) that Christians worship three gods would be well known and shows no special knowledge. For vague allusions to this accusation in Jewish literature we may compare R.T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, pp.291-306.

(c) The quotation 'cursed be everyone who does not raise up seed in Israel' (iv.4) shows accurate knowledge of the attitude of rabbinic Judaism to asceticism⁴.

(d) The Jew quotes Dt. 21.23 according to the text of Gal. 3.13 (v.1), and it is probable that the author was dependent upon Paul for this section of the dialogue. However, there is no doubt that Jews did use this text against Christians⁵.

(e) In ix.8, the Jew maintains that Ps. 72 refers to Solomon, and the notes to fol.16v show that it is a traditional Christian opinion, going back as far as Justin, that the Jews interpreted it in this way. However, the 'Midrash to the Psalms' tends rather to apply the Psalm to 'king Messiah'⁶, despite the fact that the heading in the Masoretic text refers it to Solomon.

(f) In xii.2, the Jew seems to admit that the prophecies

1. See above p.108.
which Sergius has adduced do refer to the Messiah. This is probably an accurate reflection of Jewish opinion. Where they would differ from Christians is precisely stated by Sergius in xvii.12: 'Let us bring in one (subject) to the debate and to the discussion, and let us seek the truth that it may stand in the midst and settle the dispute between you and me - which is this, whether the Messiah has come or not.' It is interesting, however, to note that Herford, op.cit., finds no evidence in the Jewish literature of disputes between Christians and Jews on the question of the Messiah.

(g) We have already concluded that the Jew's speech1 giving the reasons why he refuses to believe is fabricated by the author2. Nevertheless, there is plenty of evidence for very strong Jewish hostility to converts to Christianity3.

(h) The Jew's statement that the dead are unclean (xiv.2), although based on the Old Testament, represents a very strong Jewish feeling4.

(i) The Jew's claim that the miracles of Jesus and the saints are phantasies5, should be compared with the Talmudic accusation that they were the result of magic.6

(j) The Jew's statement that the law restrains man's bestiality (xvi.12) is true to Jewish teaching that the Torah was ordained as an antidote to the evil Yetzer7, and that neglect of the law leads to social chaos8. Nevertheless, as we have explained above9, the actual

1. In xii.16.
2. See above, p.115f.
4. Cf., for example, B.Tal.Shabbath, 64a.
5. See xiv.8.
speech of the Jew falls neatly into a trap laid by Sergius, and we may therefore suspect that, although it is clearly based on knowledge of Jewish teaching, it is a literary construction.

(k) The Jew's application of Jer. 31.22 to a woman (xvii.5), certainly represents the rabbinic opinion in B. Tal. Yebamoth, 62b.

(l) The Jew's mode of referring to Jesus as 'the son of Mary' may reflect Jewish accusations that he was illegitimate.

(m) The Jew's statements regarding the uncleanness of the pig (xviii.3ff) represent Jewish sentiment on the matter fairly accurately.

This survey of the knowledge of Judaism reflected in the Disputation serves to reinforce the conclusions reached earlier as to the nature of the work. For in some places it represents Jewish teaching fairly accurately, while in others it tends to represent more what Christian tradition said Jews thought. There is not, however, enough evidence to decide one way or the other the problem of the Jew's status; the most that can be said is that there is nothing to disprove the apparent claim that he was a rabbi.

(4) The 'Sitz im Leben' of the Disputation and the Purpose for which it was written.

As we have seen above in the discussion of the contents, Sergius's Disputation makes perfectly clear in three places the purpose for which it was written. These are ii.8, iv.5, and most of the last section of the work, chapter xxii. The author's purpose is to strengthen Christians who are in danger of apostasizing to Judaism. The method chosen is the traditional one of demonstrating that the heir to the Old Testament is the church, not the Jews, whose rejection by God is emphasized by the destruction of Jerusalem and their consequent dispersion. We must, therefore, ask what other evidence

1. See n.3 to fol. 50v.
there is to prove that Christian apostasy to Judaism was a real danger at the time when this work was composed.

First, however, it is necessary to observe what the Disputation has to say about these Judaizing Christians. We have already quoted the Jew's speech (xxii.1)\(^1\), in which he states that some Christians at the time of the Passover bring offerings, alms, oil, and unleavened bread to the Jewish synagogues. Sergius admits that this happens and suggests that they are 'weak Christians who, doubtless, are the children of heathen and their mind has not yet been cleansed from the fear of the idols of their fathers. Or they are the children of Hebrews and the former custom is still strong in them' (xxii.5). In xxii.12, Sergius again mentions Christians who 'give oil or bring unleavened bread' to the synagogue, and in xxii.15, he quotes the rationale adopted by these Christians: 'If Christianity is good, behold, I am baptised as a Christian. But if Judaism is also useful, I will associate partly with Judaism that I might hold on to the sabbath.' Apart from a few other allusions which add nothing new, this is the total of what the Disputation has to say on the subject.

It is possible to cite evidence proving that the Disputation of Sergius the Stylite is witnessing here to a situation endemic in Syria from the first to the thirteenth century A.D. From the warnings of the 'Didascalia' in the third century to the canons of the Jacobite church in the thirteenth century the Christian authorities strove to counteract the perennial attraction of Jewish observances for Christians. If we accept the theory that Jewish Christians are at least included in the term 'Minim' by which the Talmud and Midrash refer to renegade Jews, then the frequent references found in this literature to the problem of their participation in the synagogue services\(^2\), are early evidence for

1. See above, p.122.
the kind of situation mirrored in Sergius's Disputation. Chapter xxvi of the 'Didascalia'¹ represents a Christian attempt to wean Jewish Christians in Syria from their attachment to Jewish observances. Very clear light is thrown upon the situation in Antioch at the end of the fourth century by John Chrysostom¹'s 'Eight Homilies against the Jews'². A detailed study of these homilies by Marcel Simon³ from the angle of the light which they throw on the Judaising movement concludes that the real problem underlying them is that of Christians participating in Jewish festivals, with some going as far as getting circumcised. This time, however, it is specifically Gentile Christians who are involved.

All the Syriac anti-Jewish literature has recently been studied by Stanley Kazan⁴ to see what light it throws on Christian - Jewish relations, and we need do no more than refer to his conclusions. These fully support the suggestion that the Disputation of Sergius the Stylicate was written to deal with a real and pressing problem. He summarises the evidence from Aphraates's 'Demonstrations' to prove that they were written to provide Christians with arguments with which to combat Jews, and to strengthen the faith of Christians who were weakening in the face of Jewish attacks.⁵ It is not difficult to prove that Ephraem's anti-Jewish statements 'seem to reflect a situation in which the Jews were proselytising among the members of the Syrian church in Nisibis'⁶. Of even greater interest is the fact that

4. 'Isaac of Antioch's Homily against the Jews', op. cit.
5. O.C., 46, p. 90f.
'the situation reflected in Ephraem's 'Hymns on Unleavened Bread' seems to be one in which Christians were celebrating the Jewish Passover by eating unleavened bread'.

Isaac of Antioch, whose 'Homily Two Against the Jews' is edited by Kazan in this series of articles, witnesses to the fact that the same state of affairs existed in his days as had existed in those of John Chrysostom; his homilies inveigh against Christians who practice circumcision and celebrate Jewish festivals. From the fifth to the thirteenth century there is a gap in the witness of the Syriac tradition of anti-Jewish polemic to the existence of Judaising Christians; Kazan concludes rightly that Jacob of Sarug in the sixth century was not faced with this problem, nor can we glean any evidence from Dionysius bar Salibhi's 'Against the Jews'. However, the existence of canons promulgated in the Jacobite church in the thirteenth century to deal with the problem we are considering, shows that the attraction of Jewish observances for Christians had not waned in the interval. These canons forbid the participation of bishops and other clerics in the Jewish Passover celebrations, enjoin the faithful to work on the sabbath and not observe it in the Jewish manner, and they forbid Christians to receive unleavened bread from the Jews.

The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite fills a gap in the witness of Syriac literature to the attraction of Jewish rites for Christians, for the Syriac chronographers appear to make no reference to this phenomenon in the eighth century. Although there does not seem to be direct evidence confirming the Disputation's statements, the existence of many parallel situations both before and after the date of its composition creates a presumption that its testimony is trustworthy. Particularly must we note the evidence that the problem was

1. op.cit., p.90.
2. The first half of the fifth century.
felt acutely in Antioch, since we have good reason to believe that the Disputation was written not far from that city. Here we may include as confirmatory evidence that the Disputation has a real Sitz im Leben in the period in which it was written, the fact that the main body of the work (chapters x-xvii) is occupied with subjects particularly relevant in the eighth century - the worship of the cross, of relics, and the use of pictures and icons. The first would be particularly relevant since we know that the Jews were joined by the Muslims, then in control of Syria, in their condemnation of Christian worship of images of the cross. We may therefore conclude, that the Disputation of Sergius the Sty-list reflects a real historical situation, both in the subjects chosen for discussion and in its allusions to Judaising Christians.

1. See above, p.10f.
2. The iconoclastic controversy spanned most of the eighth century, beginning in 725 A.D. when the campaign against images was inaugurated by the Byzantine emperor, Leo III. The controversy lasted until 842 A.D. Cf. C. Emerau, article 'Iconoclasme', Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique, vol. vii, col. 575-95.
3. See W. Hage, Die syrisch-jakobitische Kirche in früh-islamischer Zeit, pp. 70f, 86.
EPILOGUE

The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite is an important addition to the Syriac corpus of anti-Jewish polemical literature. Its literary form - a dialogue - is unique in this corpus, though it stands in a long tradition of earlier Greek and Latin dialogues. The Disputation fills a large gap in the continuity of the Syriac tradition, extending from the sixth to the twelfth century A.D. Anti-Jewish literature was written in Syriac during this period, but, except for Sergius's Disputation, it has all perished. Thus the work is of historical importance in that it witnesses to the fact that the earlier anti-Jewish polemic was by and large unsuccessful, not only in converting the Jews to Christianity, but also in preventing Christians from being attracted to many aspects of Judaism. The Jacobite canons in the thirteenth century show that the Syriac-speaking church never overcame this problem.

From the angle of the history of the tradition of anti-Jewish testimonies, the Disputation is extremely interesting, for it shows how firmly rooted this tradition was, so that even as late as the eighth century apocryphal quotations, which have never formed part of the manuscript tradition of the Bible, could be quoted and regarded as absolutely authoritative. Our investigation of Sergius's treatment of the biblical text, with its reliance on the 'spirit' rather than the 'letter', has shown how this use of apocryphal quotations was possible. For we can be sure that they were regarded as authoritative because they made explicit what, in the opinion of Christians, the prophets really meant to say. The Disputation also throws light on the way in which the vast mass of testimony material was continually reshaped and adapted throughout the centuries, and, in particular, it witnesses to the existence of a biography.

of Jesus in Old Testament prophecies which we can detect being used by other anti-Jewish polemicists also. We are thus able to see how, in the course of time, the testimony material was reshaped to align more closely with the Gospel tradition.

The Disputation is also a decisive witness to the existence in the Syriac-speaking church of a translation of the whole of Josephus's 'War of the Jews', for hitherto, only part of that translation - the sixth book - has been known. The text of Sergius's quotations confirms Th. Nöldeke's opinion that H. Kottek is completely mistaken in stating that the Greek text is a translation from the Syriac. But we have concluded that Sergius's quotations (and the Syriac version generally) needs to be handled with extreme care as a witness to the Greek text, for, apart from other considerations, we can discern here also, as in the biblical quotations, the same preoccupation with the 'spirit' of the text and the relative disregard of the 'letter'.

In the opinion of many scholars Christian anti-Jewish dialogues do not solely represent a literary activity, but also represent the literary deposit of real discussions between Christians and Jews. Sergius's Disputation is no exception. Although, as we have seen, it has been subjected to a considerable amount of literary editing, signs that it was based on real experience of discussion with a Jew (or Jews) can be detected. In the relative inability of both sides to comprehend the other's position, certainly in the stubborn reluctance of each participant to concede that the other has a point, and in the inconclusiveness of its result, the dialogue enables us to understand a little more of the relations between Judaism and Christianity at the time when the work was written.
1. My aim has been to produce as far as possible a diplomatic edition of the manuscript. So the diacritical points and the accents are written exactly as they are in the manuscript (so far as they are visible), except that a dot is added at the end of a speech if there is none in the manuscript; the scribe indicates the change of speakers by writing their names in red ink. Also, even though the Syriac is placed in a haphazard fashion in the manuscript, it has been faithfully reproduced, and emendation is only suggested where otherwise ambiguity would be present. Occasionally I have had to simplify the punctuation where the scribe has written several dots in a row, either at the end of a sentence, or to fill in a space at the end of a line. In one or two cases where the manuscript has got a strange or hybrid form, I have written what I consider to be the correct reading in the Text and described the reading of the manuscript in the notes. In the reproduction of folio 16v the last three lines have had to be rearranged for reasons of space; the lines of the manuscript are indicated by means of vertical strokes.

2. The chapter and section divisions have been made primarily to facilitate reference to the Disputation. As far as possible they coincide with sense divisions, but sometimes the division is arbitrary.

3. Square brackets in Text and Translation indicate conjectural restorations, though if part of a word is visible and the conjecture seems, therefore, to be reasonably certain, I have not introduced brackets into the Translation. Round brackets in the Translation indicate words which, though they have no basis in the text of the manuscript, are necessary to bring out the sense implied by the Syriac. The inexplicable $P^2$ is placed in half brackets when it occurs in order to indicate that it does not belong to the text of the Disputation.

1. Cf., for example, fol.22v,l.13, and n.iii.
2. See p.4,n.3, above.
4. When the notes to the Translation cannot be con­
tained on any one particular page, they are carried over
to the next page where they are enclosed between two
lines.
5. When a biblical text is cited more than once in the
Disputation, only on its first occurrence are the para­
allels in other Syriac works noted. In the notes to the
subsequent citations reference is usually made back to
the first occurrence. Otherwise the first occurrence of
a quotation can be found by means of the Index of Bibli­
cal quotations.
6. The Text = my transcription of the manuscript.
The Introduction = the introduction to the thesis.
The Translation = the translation of the Syriac
text in the thesis.

TRANSLITERATIONS

b; spirant b.
g; spirant g.
d; spirant d.
h
w
z
h
y
k; spirant k.
l
m
n
s
p; spirant p.
s
q
r
š
š
 There are no later occurrences of these letters.

Vowels

ā : ą
ā : a
ē : e
ī : i
ū : u

The vowelless letter at
the beginning of a word
(the shewa) is indicated
by a raised 'e'.

The names of the letters
of the Syriac alphabet
are as in the list in T.H.
Robinson, Syriac Grammar, 4th ed.,
p.4. Other technical terms
such as the names of the
verbal themes are also
written in the forms used
in this Grammar.
INDEX OF GREEK LOAN WORDS

In the following index the references are to the folios and lines of the Text. The particles κακόν, εἰς, ἐν, are omitted, as are Greek proper names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄρη (άρη)</td>
<td>11r,24;11v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγών (ἀγών)</td>
<td>34r,20;45r,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον (εὐαγγέλιον)</td>
<td>6v,2;10r,22;21v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐνοούχος (εὐνοούχος)</td>
<td>7r,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκδικέω (ἐκδικέω)</td>
<td>78r,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στῦλος (στῦλος)</td>
<td>53r,7 - 79r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σώ (σώ)</td>
<td>24v,5;45v,20;50v,13;58r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχη (ἀρχη)</td>
<td>34v,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γένος (γένος)</td>
<td>4r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαίμων (δαίμων)</td>
<td>17r,11;41r,11;57r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλαθής (ἐλαθής)</td>
<td>3v,11,13,18;8v,16;75r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱδίωτα (ἱδίωτα)</td>
<td>32v,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μή (μή)</td>
<td>17v,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποτήρι (ποτήρι)</td>
<td>2r,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίμημα (τίμημα)</td>
<td>40r,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τύπος (τύπος)</td>
<td>10r,4,18;11r,17;11v,3;17r,2; 19r,3,7;26v,3,7;45r,6,14;47v,7; 73r,6;75v,3,5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάξις (τάξις)</td>
<td>24r,19;24v,5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τύραννος (τύραννος)</td>
<td>26r,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰκών (εἰκών)</td>
<td>24v,12,19,22,23;28v,3;41v,10; 44v,12;46r,18;48v,18;49r,18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήρυξ (κήρυξ)</td>
<td>24v,16 - 2v,9;16r,22;17v,1; 36v,2;43v,12,16;48v,15,18;69r,5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
κυριώτατος (χριστιανός) : 6v,1;22r,4;60r,4;62v,1; 70r,5,10;72r,10;72v,14; 75v,15;77r,11,17;78r,11 - κυριώτατος - 77r,16.
κυρά(ληστής) : 40r,10.
δασιν(μοχλός) : 21v,18.
δάμα(μίλσων) : 70v,6.
δαμάς(μαρκούτης) : 58v,6.
κοσμο(νόμος) : 3v,14,16;7r,6;8r,18,20;15v,22; 16v,24;23r,5;27r,15;27v,11;28r,19; 30r,4,7;9,13;31v,17;34r,13;37r,6; 13;41v,12;44v,2,5;48r,15;50v,12; 51r,6,15;52r,4,5,19;52v,7,9,11; 14,16,17;53v,17;54r,16;54v,10; 58r,9;60r,15,66r,14;70r,14;75r,1,4.
καταγ(σεμίδασ) : 61r,9.
καταγορομέλεια(φιλοσοφία) : 24r,10.
κατά(πείσως,πείσας) : 19r,5;39v,1,6;77r,3 - μακ 
- 15v,5;18r,16;19r,17,19; 24r,15,18;25r,9;35r,19;35v, 15;36r,3;39r,17,19;49r,11,17; 60r,7;63v,8;78r,14;
κατ'α(πάντως) : 16v,18.
κατ'α(φαντασμά) : 33r,10.
καταγ(παράγεθε) : 31v,21.
κατοικοστή(παραστάς) : 10r,8;59v,1.
κατ'α(πρόσωπον) : 7v,23;18v,16;59v,4;76v,4; 77v,5.
κιόστος(κιβωτός) : 8v,11,16;9r,4;54v,5,11.
κατά(καλύτε) : 24r,17.
καταστή(ἀρραβών) : 68v,11.
The order, and chapter and verse divisions, of the English Bible have been followed. References are to the relevant folio and, in the case of the Syriac text, to the line. If a quotation is discussed in the Introduction, this is indicated by a page number in brackets.

### Genesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>45r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4v,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>11r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>53v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>9v,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13r,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4v,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19f</td>
<td>54v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2ff</td>
<td>54v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1-4</td>
<td>55r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>57r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>62r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20v,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1ff</td>
<td>57r,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>62r,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1ff</td>
<td>12v,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.9ff</td>
<td>8v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>16v,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20r,12; 22r,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.5ff</td>
<td>18r,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.1ff</td>
<td>18v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>13r,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>9v,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>20r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leviticus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>53v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>9v,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13r,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4v,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19f</td>
<td>54v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2ff</td>
<td>54v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1-4</td>
<td>55r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>57r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>62r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20v,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1ff</td>
<td>57r,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>62r,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1ff</td>
<td>12v,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.9ff</td>
<td>8v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>16v,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20r,12; 22r,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.5ff</td>
<td>18r,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.1ff</td>
<td>18v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>13r,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>9v,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>20r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9v,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>27v,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>4r,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7ff</td>
<td>14r,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>4v,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.32ff</td>
<td>43r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>28v,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.31ff</td>
<td>31r,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>31r,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.7f</td>
<td>9r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.11-22</td>
<td>27v,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>9r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>8v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.10ff</td>
<td>15r,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.12ff</td>
<td>73v,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.15-20</td>
<td>74r,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exodus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12v,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32v,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>77v,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>II Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 : 42r,1; 72v,2.</td>
<td>3.1 : 15r,13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 : 17v,16.</td>
<td>10.24 : 16v,8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8f : 41v,12.</td>
<td>11.4 : 16v,21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 : 35v,9.</td>
<td>13.11ff : 36r,14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4f : 1v,6; 59v,8</td>
<td>18.21 : 22r,7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.19f).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27 : 31r,17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3-20 : 51r,6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4 : 47r,14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.13-15, 17f : 74r,18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.15ff : 47v,13; 73r,7; 73v,2; 78r,13.</td>
<td>9.18 : 77v,17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.19 : 47v,15; 7sv,15.</td>
<td>1.7 : 13r,13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.25 : 2r,4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1-3 : 37r,10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 : 40r,5; 68v,18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.23 : 8r,15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.16f : 31v,22.</td>
<td>2.7 : 1v,12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.26 : 8r,17; 20v,3; 30r,12; 30v,4.</td>
<td>9.17 : 29r,14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.28 : 9v,9; 42v,5,17.</td>
<td>11.5 : 32r,2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.32 : 8r,6.</td>
<td>14.1 : 29r,12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.48 : 73v,9.</td>
<td>16.10 : 4r,23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.10 : 75r,8.</td>
<td>21.12 : 76v,2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>22.16 : 18v,13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7f : 75r,3.</td>
<td>22.18 : 4r,11; 18v,14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.23 : 13v,3.</td>
<td>24.7 : 6r,3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9 : 57v,4.</td>
<td>27.12 : 3v,22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.19 : 57v,6.</td>
<td>29.4 : 2v,24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Samuel</td>
<td>29.5 : 18v,23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 : 77v,7.</td>
<td>33.6 : 5r,12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.13 : 23v,1.</td>
<td>35.11 : 3v,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Psalms (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.51</td>
<td>25v,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>9v,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>12v,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>64r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.23</td>
<td>31r,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>76r,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.17ff</td>
<td>78r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>6r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.15</td>
<td>50r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.26</td>
<td>79r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.16</td>
<td>37r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.21</td>
<td>20r,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.57</td>
<td>37v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.89?</td>
<td>5v,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.93</td>
<td>37r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.137</td>
<td>67v,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.3</td>
<td>4r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.17</td>
<td>18v,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.15</td>
<td>17v,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.21</td>
<td>39v,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.4</td>
<td>39r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>43v,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.17</td>
<td>67v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.4</td>
<td>28v,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.7f</td>
<td>3r,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.16f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>28v,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.22f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Isaiah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>63v,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4f</td>
<td>33v,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>61v,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>76r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>39v,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27f</td>
<td>22v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18f</td>
<td>16r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>33r,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39v,10;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46v,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9ff</td>
<td>11r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9v,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1v,22;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12v,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>3v,15;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>19r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1?</td>
<td>2v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.104f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>45v,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2v,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>3v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.28,65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>25v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.21</td>
<td>70v,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.5f</td>
<td>33r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>35v,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>2v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.8?</td>
<td>5v,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.10f</td>
<td>45v,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>13r,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.16</td>
<td>5r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>45v,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>3v,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.5f</td>
<td>8v,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.6f</td>
<td>4r,19;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8v,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>10v,15;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20v,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.3-8</td>
<td>59r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>8r,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>22v,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.1f</td>
<td>3r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>62r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>21r,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.10-12</td>
<td>62v,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.10</td>
<td>4v,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.2-4</td>
<td>60r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>28r,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.5-7</td>
<td>60r,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.9-15</td>
<td>17f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>22r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.17</td>
<td>47r,1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>29r,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.16</td>
<td>6r,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.16-22</td>
<td>60v,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>28v,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50v,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58v,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>5v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6r,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39v,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63v,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.38,66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Jeremiah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jeremiah</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3?</td>
<td>4r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.28ff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4f</td>
<td>29v,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>12r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>3r,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>16v,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>59v,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.35f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>2r,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.31f</td>
<td>3v,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.32</td>
<td>47r,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>59v,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>9r,19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aegraphephon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aegraphephon</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4r,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p.36ff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Testament</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 : 4r,8</td>
<td>3.1f : 3r,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.35f)</td>
<td>(p.28ff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17-21 : 49r,4</td>
<td>2.17 : 13r,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2,12 : 68v,10</td>
<td>12.10 : 4r,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 : 46r,8</td>
<td>IV Ezra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 : 7v,22</td>
<td>Agraphon: 4r,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3,45 : 8r,1</td>
<td>(p.30ff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.8f : 49r,4</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.1ff : 26v,17</td>
<td>3.1 : 29r,20;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.10 : 6r,10</td>
<td>50r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.31ff : 18v,7</td>
<td>22.7 : 18r,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.27 : 33v,17</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10ff : 18v,7</td>
<td>3.35ff : 2v,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22 : 33v,17</td>
<td>(p.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3ff : 18v,8</td>
<td>Bel and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13 : 6r,8;</td>
<td>Dragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v,5;</td>
<td>36 : 4v,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v,9.</td>
<td>II Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.24-27 : 14r,11</td>
<td>6.8ff : 34r,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.24 : 3v,16</td>
<td>7 : 34r,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.21f).</td>
<td>NEW TESTAMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 : 6r,12</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5f : 2v,19</td>
<td>2.14 : 13r,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.20f).</td>
<td>2.15 : 2v,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>2.18 : 2r,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19f : 22v,15</td>
<td>2.23 : 2v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 : 14v,8;</td>
<td>(p.104f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61v,15.</td>
<td>3.3 : 2v,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 : 2v,5</td>
<td>3.7 : 78r,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>3.17 : 17r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 : 4r,15</td>
<td>(p.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.63ff).</td>
<td>10.40 : 50r,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>12.24 : 33r,13;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 : 58r,4.</td>
<td>78r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggai</td>
<td>15.11 : 56r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 : 4v,18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 16.13-18 : 21v,7| Mark         |
| 17.5 : 17r,16  | 7.15 : 55v,19|
| (p.22).        | 8.18 : 11r,8 |
| 22.29 : 29r,1  | 12.24 : 52r,8|
| 52r,8.         | 12.29f : 1v,6|
| (p.24).        | 13.17,19f : 65r,11|
| 23.38 : 68v,6  | (p.19f).     |
| 24.21f : 65r,11| 14.33f : 13v,4|
| (p.24).        | 16.15 : 4v,1 |
| 13.10-17 : 3v,1| Luke         |
| 13.35 : 68v,6  | 2.23f : 2r,7 |
| 19.41ff : 65r,3| 2.24 : 2r,8  |
| 21.23f : 65r,8 | 2.52 : 12v,19|
| (p.24).        | 4.19 : 3r,14 |
| 8.30 : 13r,12  | 11.15 : 35r,13|
| 13.35 : 68v,6  | 13.10-17 : 3v,1|
| 19.41ff : 65r,3| 13.35 : 68v,6|
| 21.23f : 65r,8 | (p.24).     |
| 22.43 : 13v,2  | 23.25 : 68v,2|
| 23.28,30 : 65v,3| 22.43 : 13v,2|
| John           | 1.14 : 12v,17|
| 1.29 : 4r,17;  | (p.24).     |
| 8v,2;          | 10v,14.     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John (contd.)</th>
<th>Galatians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.51 : 17r,17.</td>
<td>3.10 : 8r,17;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 : 13r,1,6</td>
<td>20v,3;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.24f).</td>
<td>30r,12;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.43 : 79r,1.</td>
<td>30v,4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.46 : 10r,22;</td>
<td>3.11 : 58r,4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73r,2.</td>
<td>3.13 : 8r,15,23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12 : 68v,1.</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9 : 33r,14.</td>
<td>2.10f : 11v,14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16 : 22r,22.</td>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.34 : 13r,14.</td>
<td>4.17 : 11v,4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10f : 33r,17.</td>
<td>I Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.25 : 18r,14.</td>
<td>2.4 : 53v,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.28ff : 14r,15.</td>
<td>(p.23f).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.29f : 14v,1.</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.36 : 4r,18.</td>
<td>8.8f : 3v,12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.25 : 17r,20.</td>
<td>I John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>3.8 : 46v,18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 : 40r,8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22 : 73r,7;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78v,13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23 : 47v,15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16 : 25v,5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.36 : 12v,4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17 : 43v,15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.33,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.11) :25v,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.26 : 22v,12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6 : 61v,10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3 : 25v,13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.24,26: 26v,4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.27 : 11v,6,13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.28 : 13r,17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14ff : 48r,16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.16 : 29v,4;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34r,6;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v,9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References are to the relevant folio and, in the case of the Syriac text, to the line. All these quotations are discussed in the Introduction, pp. 80-94, 101ff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Folio/Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.J.i.12</td>
<td>66r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.354</td>
<td>66r,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.401</td>
<td>66r,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.412f</td>
<td>66r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.442</td>
<td>66v,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.559</td>
<td>66v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.566</td>
<td>66v,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.567,569</td>
<td>66v,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.201-13</td>
<td>67r,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.217f</td>
<td>67r,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.J.vi.250</td>
<td>69r,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.251</td>
<td>69r,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.266</td>
<td>69r,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.285</td>
<td>69r,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.408</td>
<td>69r,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.409,411</td>
<td>69v,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.442</td>
<td>69v,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.327f</td>
<td>68r,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE DISPUTATION OF SERGIUS THE STYLITE:
TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY.
1.1. The letter of the Blessed Sergius the Stylite of Gousit, which was composed by him against a Jew who contended that God has no son, and (that) God has not begotten.

2. Moses said: Hear, O Israel: The Lord God is one Lord;\(^2\) and you shall love the Lord your God with all your strength, and with all your mind, and with all your soul.\(^3\) But he, this one God, said by the mouth of David the prophet in the second psalm: The Lord said to me,"You are my son, and today I have begotten you"\(^4\). Behold he, God, said that he has a son, and that he has begotten. Believe him, therefore, and do not withstand God and struggle with him. He said these things, not we! But because he has spoken, truly we did not believe man; we, therefore, have believed God in fear and trembling.

3. If you say (that) this was said concerning David\(^5\), behold Isaiah the prophet said: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son, and his name shall be called......\(^6\)

---

1. The title is in red ink in the manuscript.

1. Cf. the colophon (fol. 79r), where the work is called a 'disputation' (ךסנ). W. Cureton, Ancient Syriac Documents, p. 192, translates the plural כנפנ 'treatises', suggesting here the rendering 'treatise'. This would suit the work better, since it is certainly not in the form of a letter, but rather in the form of a dialogue cum treatise.

2. Or, The Lord God, The Lord is One.

3. Dt. 6.4f; cf. Mk. 12.29f, Mt. 22.37, Lk. 10.27, and D.b.S., iv. 23, v. 3. Aphraates, I, 48. For a discussion of the text of this quotation see the Introduction, p. 19f.

4. Ps. 2.7; cf. Acts 13.33, Heb. 1.5, and D.b.S., ii. 11, v. 8. Jacob of Sarug, II (3), 1. 305. Aphraates, I, 804, the Discussion of Silvester, p. 73. For the collocation of this and the previous text in the testimony tradition cf. the Introduction, p. 106f.

5. See the Introduction, pp. 107f, 133.

لا تنس أن تبكي في الرجاء، وطمع في العصوب، وجميل في الأذى.  
لا تزور في المداهنة، ولا تطمع في الأمانة، ولا تجاه في الابتهاج.
لا تكن في المادسة، ولا تكون في المدحة، ولا تكون في البكاء.
لا تهمش في المداهنة، ولا تメイン في المدامة، ولا تهمش في البكاء.
لا تكن في المداهنة، ولا تكون في المدامة، ولا تكون في البكاء.
4. ...Israel. And (concerning the fact) that for the sake of the salvation of men he came down from heaven, and put on a body, and was revealed upon earth, Job said: I know that my saviour lives, and at the last will be revealed upon earth. 5. And (prophesying) that he would be circumcised and presented in the temple, Moses said: Every first born (who) opens the womb shall be called holy to the Lord, and, They shall offer for him a pair of turtle-doves or young pigeons. This was fulfilled in our Lord alone: for sexual intercourse first opens the womb of every woman who gives birth, but our Lord opened the womb of his mother, yet did not break the tokens of virginity. 6. And (prophesying) that the Magi would offer presents to him, David (said): The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer presents to him. All kings shall worship him and all nations serve him. 7. And (prophesying) that Herod would kill the children, Jeremiah said: A voice was heard in Ramah, weeping and much lamentation. Rachel is weeping for her children and she refuses.

1. There are eight folios missing between folios 1v and 2r; cf. the Introduction, p. 1, and for conjectures as to the contents of the missing folios see p. 107f.
3. For the participle with modal force cf. Th. Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, para. 276. For a discussion of the formula used to introduce these testimony texts see the Introduction, p. 52.
4. Ex. 13. 2, 12f, but based mainly on Lk. 2. 23.
5. Lev. 12. 6-8, but based mainly on Lk. 2. 24; for Sergius's practice of amalgamating Old and New Testament texts see the Introduction, p. 20.
6. Ps. 72. 10f; cf. D. b. S., iii. 1. For the text of the quotation see the Introduction, p. 16.
to be comforted. And (prophesying) that he would enter Egypt, Isaiah said: Behold, the Lord rides upon swift clouds and enters Egypt; the swift clouds are the arm of the Virgin Mary. And (prophesying) that he would come out of Egypt, the prophet (said): Out of Egypt have I called my son. 8. And (prophesying) that he would live in Nazareth, Isaiah said: He shall be called a Nazarene. John the Teacher explains and says that in the Hebrew language 'nurba' is called 'nasor'. And (prophesying) that he would send John to preach before him, Isaiah said: A voice which cries in the desert, "Make level the way of the Lord, and make straight in the plain pathways' for our God. 9. And (prophesying) that he would live among men, Jeremiah said: This is our God, and we take account of no other beside him. He found all the way of righteousness; he gave it to Jacob, his servant, and to Israel, his beloved. After these things he appeared on earth, and lived among men. And (prophesying) that he would be baptised in the river by John, Daniel said: And I, Daniel saw, and behold, two others stood, one on this bank of the river and one on that. And the man clothed in magnificent raiment and (who) stood above the waters of the river said..... 8 10. And (prophesying) that the Father would call out above the Son over the Jordan, David said: The voice of the Lord is upon the waters; the glorious God thunders,
لد בתי ויתק求め. נ华盛.
וחות לשלמה. לה עטרה וлибоי.
יתק求め. נ华盛.
ולד בתי ויתק求め. נ华盛.
the Lord upon many waters. And (prophesying) that the Spirit would descend upon him, Isaiah said: And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest and abide upon him. And (prophesying) that he would go forth and conquer Satan outside in the desert, his stronghold, Zechariah said: I saw Joshua, the high priest, standing, and Satan standing at his right hand and seeking to harm him. And he said to him, "Satan, Satan, the Lord rebuke you! The Lord, he who has chosen Jerusalem, rebuke you!" And (prophesying) that he would choose for himself the twelve and the seventy disciples, behold Ezekiel said: Behold, I am sending many fishermen, and they shall catch them. And (prophesying) that he would teach them and during the first year no one would withstand him, Isaiah said: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me and sent me to bring good tidings to the humble, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and release to the prisoners, and to proclaim the acceptable year of (his) good will. And (prophesying) that he would perform healings, David said: The Lord gives bread to the hungry — when he blessed the bread; the Lord releases the prisoners — those who are possessed; the Lord opens (the eyes of) the blind — the blind men; the Lord straightens the crooked — that woman

1. In the left hand margin the Sēṭā scribe has added 'angel' correcting to the Peshitta text. 
2. Following the scribal sign (for which cf. the Introduction, p. 4) read לאתってしまった.
3. One of the correctors has written לאתってしまったabove the line.
4. A quire mark.

1. Ps. 29.4.
2. Is. 11.2; cf. Aphraates, I, 21.
3. In Syriac, as in Hebrew, the same word as 'Jesus'.
4. 'The angel' according to P; 'the Lord' according to MT and LXX. Cf. n. 1 above.
5. Zech 3.1f; for further references and a detailed discussion of this quotation cf. the Introduction, p. 26ff.
19. ר"ת [סיווה] שיש. חשמל עוזה
20. והנה רדסños מקבץ себе
שהזה 범 있는데 הנני
17. טובות מבניהם.
16. ונהיה עלипсалים.
15. רדסños מבניהם.
14. והנה רדסNos מיישב
13. על עבורי נִלְךַר
12. לעיני בני הנני.
11.클ל וגו. שלום
10. נדד מהם והנה
9. לẒריוф בתרות.
8. נִלְךַר בני הנני
7. והנה רדסNos
6. ובצאתם.
5. והנה רדסNos
4. והנה רדסNos
3. והנה רדסNos
2. והנה רדסNos
1. והנה רדסNos.
(whom) the Adversary bowed down for eighteen years, and he (Jesus) laid his hand upon her and she was made straight\(^1\).

And Isaiah said: Truly he has borne our sorrows, and endured our pains\(^2\). 14. And (prophesying) that he would raise the dead, Isaiah said: Your dead shall live, O Lord, and their bodies shall rise\(^3\). And (prophesying) that he would ride upon a colt, Zechariah said: Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, and shout aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem! For behold, your king comes to you, righteous, and a saviour, and humble, and riding upon an ass and upon a colt, the foal of an ass\(^4\). 15. And (prophesying) that he would give a new covenant, Jeremiah said: And I will give them a new covenant, not like that former one which I gave to their fathers\(^5\). And (prophesying) that he would seal the law\(^6\), Isaiah said: Bind up the testimony, and seal the law\(^7\). And the angel said to Daniel, "When Christ comes, vision and prophets will cease, and he will give a new covenant — and the holy of holies\(^8\).

16. And concerning (the fact) that he would be betrayed by his disciple, the psalm says: He who eats my bread, whom I trust, has greatly deceived me\(^9\). And concerning the false witnesses he writes: False witnesses rose up against me, and they asked me something which I did not know\(^10\). And (prophesying) that he would be crowned

\(^{i}\)Read αὐτῷ; the scribe probably wrote the singular first and then added ο as an afterthought, or it may be a correction to the Peshitta text.

1. Ps.146.7f; for further notes and a discussion of this quotation see the Introduction,p.16f.
6. i.e. terminate the dispensation of the law.
7. Is.8.16; Jacob of Sarug,I,288, interprets this differently.
8. Dn.9.24; see the Introduction,p.21f.
10. Ps.35.11; cf.Ps.27.12, D.b.S.,vi.8, Introduction,p.17,51.
with thorns, Jeremiah said: (With) the thorns of its transgressions this people surrounded me. 17. And (prophesying) that he would be scourged, David said: The scourgers scourged upon my back, and he prolonged their affliction. And (prophesying) that he would be crucified, Ezra said: You bound me not as the Father, who delivered you from the land of Egypt. When (you) were crying before the seat of the judge, you humiliated me; you delivered me up to be hung upon the tree. 18. And (prophesying) that he would be mocked, Jeremiah said: I have become a laughing-stock to this people. And that they gave him vinegar and gall, David said: They gave gall for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. And that they shared out his garments, David said: They shared out my garments among themselves, and for my clothing they cast the lot. And (prophesying) that he would be pierced with a spear, Zechariah said: They shall look on me whom they have pierced. 19. And (prophesying) that the sun would be darkened and in the time of the evening it would be light, Zechariah said: And I will darken the earth in broad daylight. And Moses said that on the fourteenth (day) of the month the Lamb of God would be slain - "he who takes away the sin of the world" - and (that) not a bone of him would be broken. And Isaiah bore witness: Like a lamb he was led to the slaughter, and, The Lord has laid on him the sins of us all. 20. And (prophesying) that he would be buried, Jeremiah said: And by his burial the dead shall live. And (prophesying) that he would rise from the dead, David (said): For you have not left my soul in Sheol, or allowed your holy one to see corruption. And (prophesying) that he would command his disciples:
Go and preach my gospel in all the world, and baptise them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit....

II.1. Concerning the Spirit. If, again, the Jew says that there is no Holy Spirit, behold David said: Take not your Holy Spirit from me. And Isaiah said: And they provoked and grieved his Holy Spirit, and the enemy overthrew them. 2. And Daniel wrote: And the angel laid his hand upon the head of Habakkuk, and lifted him by the hair of his head, and set him down in Babylon above the den, by the strength of the Holy Spirit. And Moses said: And the Spirit of the Lord was hovering over the face of the waters; and again: My Spirit shall not abide in man for ever, for he is flesh; and again: Do not be jealous, my son! Would that he had made For the Lord has bestowed upon them his Holy Spirit instead of the evil spirit which is consuming them. And Haggai said: My Spirit abides among you.

3. If the Jew says: 'Behold, three gods - the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit; how does the statement of Moses remain who said, "God is One"? Do not accuse your prophets, O Jew, of acknowledging three gods -

1. In red ink; cf. the Introduction, p. 109.
2. Add -ןך, following I.20, and faint traces of a scribal correction.
4. In red ink, indicating the beginning of Sergius's speech.

8. Error for Amos - 8.9; see the Introduction, pp. 63ff.
12. An agraphon; see the Introduction, pp. 36ff.

1. Mk. 16.15, Mt. 28.19; the expected Old Testament quotation (The notes are continued on the following page).
the Lord, and his Word, and his Spirit. They are one: one (in) three, and three (in) one. 4. For God without the Word and the Spirit is incomplete. But neither was he ever without his Word and his Spirit, nor can he be; nor can his Word and his Spirit separate from him. Do not blaspheme against your prophets, for we have learnt this from them. And if they are accounted true by you, accept them, and try to see that the prophets acknowledge one God in one indivisible Trinity. 5. Behold David, for he said: By the Word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all its hosts by the Spirit of his mouth. And Isaiah said: The Lord God sent me to you and his Word and his Spirit. God is one with his Word and his Spirit from everlasting to everlasting, and without beginning and without end.

6. Tell me, O Jew, this one God whom you acknowledge, has he a Word and a Spirit or not? If he has not, he is incomplete, and if he has, behold, it is as the prophets acknowledge — he was never without the Word and the Spirit, nor could he

1. Read אנה א; cf. lines 4f above.
2. A א is added above the line by the original scribe, so אנה should be read here.

is missing, because Sergius digresses to consider the Holy Spirit: the list of texts is resumed in ch.iii.1.

2. Ps.51.11; see the Introduction, p.17.
4. Bel and the Dragon 36.
5. Gen.1.2.
6. Gen.6.3.
7. Num.11.29; a very loose quotation. After לוכד תבש, seems to have dropped out. The final clause has no basis in Num.11.29, but cf.I Sam.16.14.
8. Hag.2.5.

1. Or 'breath'; Sergius makes use of the ambiguity.
2. Ps.33.6; cf. D.b.S.,v.5, Jacob of Sarug,I,91f, Silvester, p.73.
Fas. 5v

Fig. 5v

A

A

A

A

A

A
be without the Word and without the Spirit. 7. And if 'the
word abides for ever',1 as David said, and does not go from
him, and does not perish, and subsists and exists in a true
person,2 thus also the Spirit of God. I have acknowledged
and I do acknowledge one God with his Word and his Spirit.
And you also, you acknowledge and do not dispute3 how he ex-
ists with his Word and his Spirit, that you may not be con-
sumed by the 'fire which is not quenched'.4 But believe, as
he declared to you by the prophets, and be silent!
8. But to the faithful and discerning it is known that the
Godhead is three persons, one nature5. And one of these
three persons - that is to say, the Word - united (himself)
to our nature by means of the God-bearing holy Mary, with-
out confusion and without division. But, nevertheless, you
do not offer proper food to babes who need milk, for they
cannot accept it, since it is harmful to them. For it is
sufficient for you to say to the Jew, "God is One with his
Word and his Spirit; and yet, there is no other".
III.1. Let us return to our previous subject. And (prophes-
ying) that he would ascend to heaven, David said: You
ascended

1. Since שֵׁכָּב is a masculine noun, we would expect to
read סְדֹרַך here.

1. Ps.119.89? or a mistake for Is.40.8.
2. נְדוֹמָה is used in Syriac trinitarian theology as the nor-
mal equivalent of ὑπόστασις.
3. Or 'do not inquire too closely how.......
4. Is.66.24; cf.Mk.9.43,48 //'s.
5. מַי ; the normal Syriac word used to represent the Greek
όσια in the Trinitarian formula is מַי or מַדְפוּדָה-
cf., for example, Jacob of Sarug,III(4),39f, or the loan
is using מַי here as it is used in Bardaisan's 'Book of
the Laws of Countries',P.S.,II,559 (and often), - "that which
belongs in common to the members of any particular order of
beings",J.F.Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his Teaching, append-
ix on the Syriac Christological terminology,p.217. For an
approximately similar formula cf.E.A.Wallis Budge,The Discourses of Philoxenus, Syriac text,p.32.
6. The equivalent of θεοτόκος and Deipara.
لا يخبرون عصيم خصمه
لقد جاءك. أنتِ وَاللهُ صادقُ
أنتِ تعلم. لنعلم كيفية
ائقته تعني. كيف تعلم
ونسوا كلمة، كلها.
كانت تعرف. كانت تعلم. حسب
لا يعلم. لا تعلم. لا تعلم.
وسلب حرية. وتسلب حرية.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
الصبر. صبر. صبر. صبر.
to the height, and you led away captives, and you gave gifts to men. And that the gates of heaven were opened to those who are worthy, David said: Lift up your heads, 0 gates! and be lifted up, 0 everlasting gates! and the King of glory shall come in. And (prophesying) that he would sit at the right hand of the Father, David said: The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand." And (prophesying) that he would come upon the clouds of heaven, Daniel said: And I saw one like a son of man coming upon the clouds of heaven. And (prophesying) that all who lie in the dust would be raised, Ezekiel said: And they stood upon their feet, an exceedingly great host. Again Daniel said: And many of those who lie in the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to destruction and to the reproach of their fellows for ever. And (prophesying) that the Lord would judge by fire, David said: God will come, and he will not be silent; and fire will consume before him, and blaze greatly round about him. And Isaiah said: The Lord will judge by fire. And again (he said): And you shall go forth and see the dead bodies of the men who have rebelled against me, whose worm shall not die, and whose fire shall not be quenched; and they shall be a spectacle to all flesh.

i. We would expect to find the participle מַלְאָכָן. ii. The quotation does not fit its introduction very well: perhaps מַלְאָכָן 'to him who is worthy' would be a better reading, since the verse is usually applied to Christ in anti-Jewish polemic. The text of the MS is, however, good Pauline theology - cf. Col.3.1-3. iii. The original scribe has added יֶה יַֽעַר in the right hand margin: יֶה יַֽעַר should, therefore, be read. iv. See the Introduction, p.4, n.3. v. Following the sign מ, and the Peshitta, read מַשְׂכֵּלָה מַשְׂכֵּלָה.

فلس لم نعد نستمع. بل كتبنا:
لا تكن حياتك سهلة. مهما كانت مصايفك.
أعدك على جود لبسك. فلن كن لبسك.
لن نسمع له. بل كن لبسك.
لكن فدنت به ف دفنت به. كلنا.
لا تكن حياتك سهلة. بل كن لبسك.
لا تكن حياتك سهلة. بل كن لبسك.
لا تكن حياتك سهلة. بل كن لبسك.
5. These things Christians uphold; they are written in the Gospel. What is there here that the prophets did not say or teach? We were able to bring forward many testimonies to this fact. But him whom these things do not convince, ten thousand others would not either. But they are sufficient for believers, and that simple men may not go astray after the error of the Jews.

IV. 1. Because you say, O Jew, that without sabbath and without circumcision man is not pleasing to God and does not inherit the kingdom, behold Adam, Abel, Seth, Enosh, Kenan, Mahalalel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah, Shem, and Melchizedec: they did not circumcise, and they did not keep the sabbath. Yet they pleased God more than you who circumcise and keep the sabbath. And each of them has henceforward departed to life. 2. And behold Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and the twelve heads of the tribes; none of them kept the sabbath, yet they pleased God more than you, who keep the sabbath. 3. You circumcise a child on the sabbath; behold, you have broken the sabbath! And if you do not circumcise on the sabbath, you have made void that commandment about the eight days old child. Behold, see that they both break each other! When has the sun ceased from

---

1. The scribe originally wrote נְנַע, then either he or a later scribe has attempted to erase the first נ; read נע.


4. Dn. 12.2.

5. Ps. 50.3; cf. D.B.S., v.11,viii.5.

6. Is. 66.16; cf. Aphraates, I, 32.


---

1. See the Introduction, p.110, Silvester, p.85.

2. For the argument, which is as old as Justin (Trypho, xix, xxvii), cf. Aphraates, I, 476, 548f., 557ff, Isaac of Antioch, p.33f., P.B.S., ii.5, 12f., Jacob of Sarug, II (3), 184ff, 225ff, Homily 2, (The notes are continued on the following page).
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IV.3-6

its course on the sabbath, or the springs from flowing, or the trees from growing? Also God does not cease work on the sabbath. 1

4. Concerning children, and that which you say, "Cursed be everyone who does not raise up seed in Israel" 2: then according to what you say, the angels who do not raise up seed are accursed. 3 And children who die and do not raise up seed, are cursed by you. And Elijah, Elishah, and Jeremiah, and many other prophets and priests, who consecrated their flesh to God and did not take wives and beget children, are accounted accursed by you. 4 Daniel, Hananiah, Azariah, and Michael, who were eunuchs, that is to say אֲ זַרְיָּא שָׁ מָרְאֵ ל 5 who did not raise up seed, are they accounted accursed by you? Snakes and scorpions who beget young and raise up seed, are they indeed accounted blessed by you? 6. O foolish people, and without wisdom! a people whose whole mind is (fixed) on earthly things, and whatever is in heaven means nothing to them, as David said concerning you: He remembered

i. A section title in red ink; cf. 4v, 1.3, and n.i.

ii. Read קֵחוֹד; cf. 1.14 below.

iii. Error for קֵחוֹד.

iv. The more usual plural form is קֶחוֹדִים.

v. The accent is tâgsâ; cf. Segal, op. cit., p. 127.

vi. The accent is rahta; cf. Segal, op. cit., p. 71.

B.M. Add., 17, 161, fol. 31v.

3. קְצֵרִי must have this meaning, but the context requires a meaning like 'already'.


2. Cf. the Introduction, p. 133. That the Jews attacked the asceticism of the Syrian church can be plainly seen in Aphraates's Demonstration 18, Parisot, P. S., I, 817ff.

(The notes are continued on the next page).
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
that they were (made) of flesh, that wind which goes and does not return. It is indeed their carnal mind which does not return to righteousness and to spirituality, but seeks and thinks on everything which is of the flesh.

7. The prophets said that when the Messiah came, the law would be sealed and the testimony bound up. If you are a true Jew, accept your prophets, and do not reject anything from them. But if you reject them, you have shown yourself not to be a friend of the prophets but a hater and murderer of the prophets. And if, when they were alive you were their enemy and persecutor, now that they have died, will you accept their words? 8. But it is evident that as in their lifetime you killed and stoned them, so also today you oppose and dispute their prophecies. And although the prophecies of the prophets and the events of the times, and the chronology and the reckoning of the years and of the weeks are revealed, made known, and attested, you persist in perversity and you are not ashamed. You reverence neither God nor the events, but you stand in awe of men. 9. Therefore, rightly did Ezekiel and the prophets, his fellows, attack you in the person of a prostitute by way of a reproof.

5. ἡγεμόν can mean both 'faithful' and 'servant', hence 'eunuch'. Sergius, by giving the Greek loan word, points out the sense required. Cf. also the Introduction, p. 47, n. 1.

1. Ps. 78. 39.
2. This seems to be an inference from Is. 8. 16f; cf. ch. 1. 15.
3. The second person singular form of the verb shows how completely Sergius identifies the Jew with his forbears.
He calls your city the sister of Sodom, and your father an Amorite, and your mother a Hittite. Why do you glory in the name of Abraham, when you are the offspring of iniquity and a fornicating and false seed, as Isaiah testifies. Also Moses, in whom you boast, said thus concerning you: For their vine is from the vine of Sodom, and from the grove of Gomorrah. 10. What advantage is the circumcision of Abraham to you? How does it help you in these bitter reproaches? Jeroboam, Ahab, and the rest of the evil doers like them—these are your true fathers, who also were circumcised like you. Now if they inherit the kingdom of heaven by their circumcision, so also you (inherit) with them and like them.

V.1. The Jew said: It is written, 'Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree.'

The Blessed Sergius said: But also thus again it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who does not do all which is written in this law.' But no man has kept it, and none can keep it. 2. All the world was under the curse of the law and under the guilt which the sentence on Adam transmitted. But Christ came, and he became a curse for us, and he took the sin of the world.

1. Read בְּרָעָן; in the MS the Serto corrector has placed a over בְּרָעָן.

2. יְהֹּ֫שָׁע is written in the left hand margin by the Serto corrector, with a stroke after יְהֹ֫שָׁע to indicate where it should be read.

3. Read בִּנְיָיֶֽוּ; in the MS a is written underneath, between Ъ and Ъ, by a later hand.

4. In red ink.

5. The sign indicates that the word order should be changed to בִּנְיָיֶֽוּ בְּרָעָן; but follow the MS and cf. Gal.3.13 P.

2. Is.57.4.
4. For the parallels with Aphraates, cf. the Introduction, p.67.
5. Dt.21.23, but following the text of Gal.3.13.
7. Dt.27.26, but following the text of Gal.3.10.
الكلمات المكتوبة على الصفحة: 
لا يمكن قراءتها بشكل طبيعي.
and hung it upon the wood of his cross. For he is 'the Lamb of God (who)\(^1\) takes away the sin of the world\(^2\). 3. Isaiah testified, who said: He is killed for our sins, and, The Lord has laid on him the sins of us all\(^3\). And Moses, who lifted up the bronze serpent upon wood in the desert\(^4\), testifies that by his cross he would crucify sin. And by it, by that wood on which it was hung, God wished that they should have deliverance from the serpents. 4. Again, is the lamb which saved Isaac, which was lifted up on the wood\(^5\), accounted accursed by you? And the ark, which the priests carried with poles, is it accounted accursed by you? And (concerning) the cross, (about) which you say,"A carpenter made it, and if you wish, you can burn it with fire, and you can make (another) like it."\(^6\) – then the ark of the covenant of the Lord, which a carpenter made, he can go and burn it with fire, and he, the carpenter, can make (another) like it.\(^7\)

For before it all Israel worshipped the Lord. 5. The rod of Moses, by which he performed signs and miracles, he, Moses, a man, picked it from a tree.\(^8\) Why did he divide

---

1. Perhaps read \(\text{nix}\).
2. In red ink.

2. Jn. 1. 29.
6. Sergius is anticipating the Jew's objection that the cross is no special object containing any hidden power; it can be burnt and another made like it.
7. Sergius meets the objection by saying that this applies equally to the ark of the covenant, to which the Jews attached a special significance.
8. i.e. the fact that Moses's rod was picked from a tree does not invalidate the contention that it possessed a special hidden power.
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the sea with a rod? Tell me! Why did he break through the rock with it and the water flowed? Tell me! Why did he lay the rod before the Lord and (why) did it put forth buds and bear ripe almonds? Why did he put it in the ark of the Lord and command all Israel to sacrifice to the Lord before that (piece of) wood, and (why) did all Israel worship and sacrifice before it, both in the desert and in the promised land, unless the secret of the wood was that eternal life was in it? Why did you not burn it with fire? The prophets, righteous men, and apostles, whom you killed, did a carpenter make them? And if you destroyed these men, who are the creation and image of God, will you not surely burn the cross? You sacrificed your sons and daughters to demons, but this you do not do. You burnt the law in which is the name of God, so (witnesses) David; but the cross you do not burn. Behold you are like Nebuchadnezzar who burnt the temple of the Lord. Did not Zedekiah, the king of Judah, burn the book of Jeremiah?

7. None shall boast in pride; in pride, no one excels you. But, nevertheless, we know this that, if you dare, whether you or any other, to insult this

1. The original scribe has written שָׁלֵמָה at the bottom of the page, with a line after יִצְוֹא to indicate where it should be read.

2. Ex. 17.6f, Num. 20.11.
3. Num. 17.7f.
5. For the use of the second person singular cf. fol. 7v, n. 3.
6. A familiar accusation in anti-Jewish literature; cf. D. b. S., 1.12. It is probably based on Ezek. 20.26, Jer. 32.35, Jud. 11, etc.
7. i.e. burn the cross.
8. Cf. perhaps Ps. 74.7f: the reference seems to be displaced.
10. See notes 6–8 on the previous page. Sergius continues to meet the Jew’s objection that the cross is a mere piece of inert matter. He is saying that, although the Jews destroyed (The notes are continued on the following page).
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cross, which the prophets proclaimed and extolled, this world is given over to the insolent to fulfil their will. But we worship it and glory in it until he who was crucified upon it is revealed upon the clouds on heaven, as Daniel proclaimed. And 'he shall judge the world with righteousness', as David said, 'and the peoples with integrity'.

8. But because you are a people whose 'mind is reprobate', as Moses said concerning you, and 'there is no understanding in you', and (because) another prophet said that 'unless you believe, you shall not understand', hear the symbols of the cross. Moses, for forty years by night and day, set up a cross in the desert, when he made Israel encamp in four companies around the tabernacle. 9. God set up a cross in the midst of paradise - the source which divided into four heads. God set up the world like a cross - the East, and the West, and the North, and the South. God made a cross in heaven from the stars. Jacob made a cross with his hands when he crossed them.

1. In the MS there is a added by the original scribe below the line; so read .

ii. In red ink.

iii. Read . the is added below the line as in i. the prophets etc., that does not mean that they lacked supernatural power. Hence the rhetorical question, 'Did a carpenter make them?' i.e. 'are they no more than inert matter?' Three other examples of this principle are then adduced. David witnesses (?) that the Jews burnt the law, but this does not mean that it was not holy. Nebuchadnezzar burnt the temple, and likewise this does not mean that it was not holy. Lastly, the same principle applies to Jehoiakim's burning of the Book of Jeremiah. However, Sergius's argument is confused, for while he is trying to show that it does not matter whether the cross (i.e. Christian images of it) is burnt or not, nevertheless, he regards it as significant that the Jews do not actually burn it, no doubt, in his view, because of the supernatural power contained in it.

1. Dn.7.13; cf. ch.iii.2.

2. Ps.98.9.

(The notes are continued on the following page).
on the head of Ephraim and Manasseh, and by the cross he blessed them. 10. Moses again made a cross on the top of the mountain by stretching out his hands, and Aaron and Hur supported his arms in the shape of the cross beams, and by the symbol of the cross he conquered Amalek. Again Moses gave commandment to the children of Israel to make a cross of blood on the two doorposts and on the lintels of the doors, when the Angel destroyed the firstborn of Egypt. And by this symbol of the cross the firstborn of Israel were delivered from the sword of the Angel. 11. Although your heart is stopped up and you do not understand, understand even now that the blood of ten thousand lambs did not restrain the Angel from destroying the firstborn. If it had not been a symbol of the blood of Christ, he (the Angel) would not have seen (it) on the doors. 12. In this way the symbols, types, and the allegories, which are inscribed in the books of the prophets, declare (the things) concerning Christ, the Son of God. They were written concerning him, as he said in the Gospel: Moses wrote concerning me. And again he said: For if

---

i. Read Kin

ii. The diacritical point probably indicates the Pa'el.

iii. Read ḫw.".

iv. In the MS there is an inexplicable sign over wālān, wālān.

3. Dt. 32.28; cf. Aphraates, I, 852.
4. Is. 7.9.
5. Cf. Num. 2 passim.
6. Gen. 2.10.

---

2. Ex. 17.8ff; cf. Aphraates, I, 122, 960, Ephraem, The Hymns on Unleavened Bread, xx. 8–11, and Daniélou, Theology, p. 271f.
4. Jn. 5.46.
لم تعلم قوته كله. فما بالك أن تكون
كم من الرجال الذين وجدت.  
سأتركك جلست.  
أنا أعلم أنك تعلم أنك فشلت.
لم تعلم قوته كله. فما بالك أن تكون
كم من الرجال الذين وجدت.  
سأتركك جلست.  
أنا أعلم أنك تعلم أنك فشلت.
you believed Moses, you would also believe me.  

13. Observe also what the name of the Passover means: for it is, being interpreted, 'joy'. For the Lord said to Moses: I will see the blood, and I will pass over you. It is certain, therefore, that it means 'the joy of God': the symbol of the blood of his Son makes him rejoice. 14. Your deliverance from Egypt by means of the blood of a lamb proclaimed and symbolized the deliverance of all nations through the cross, from error as from Egypt, and from the subjection of Satan as from the power of Pharaoh. And the lamb which has no blemish in it is Christ, the Lamb of God, 'he who takes away the sin of the world', as John said. This - 'there is no blemish in him', (and) this - 'he did no iniquity, neither was deceit found in his mouth', is as Isaiah said concerning him. 15. If you will understand (it), the cross of blood upon the doors represented the stretching forth of his hands and of his arms upon the cross. And the doors are the mouths of believers who receive him by faith and with him seal their doors, that is, their mouths and their very selves.

i. See the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.

1. Jn. 5.46.
2. Psh vocalized peshâ. The same root, vocalized pesâhâ means 'joy'.
3. The verb psh means in the Aph'el 'to gladden' and 'to pass over, to keep the passover'. If, however, the Pe'al is read, it could mean 'I will rejoice'.
5. Pesihuṭâ.
7. Ex. 12.5. For the combination of Ex. 12.5 and Is. 53.9 cf. Aphraates, I, 516.
8. Jn. 1.29.
9. Is. 53.9; cf. I Peter 2.22, and Aphraates, I, 313.
11. Ibid. This exegesis well supports Danielou's connection between this testimony, cross typology, and liturgical symbolism.
He who destroyed the firstborn, who did not enter the house upon which the cross of the blood of the lamb was represented, signified Satan, who turns away from the person who is faithfully and truly fervent in the love of the cross. 16. But there is little time for us to collate each single (passage) [we know] by itself, which is set down and expounded by the prophets and the just concerning the cross of Christ, the Saviour of all. For 'you have eyes but you do not see', as the prophet said concerning you. You have outward eyes, not the understanding of the mind, or (rather), although you do understand, you fight against the truth.

VI.1. But let us speak a little more of those things which the scriptures and the just expound to us. God said: Let us make man in our image and according to our likeness. Though this sentence provides many meanings for us concerning Christ, nevertheless, (let us) follow one only (which) it proceeds to demonstrate. For man, when he was created, was created in the figure of a cross. 2. You, who have hated the cross, even if you pray and stretch forth your hands in prayer, you also, although you do not wish, show forth the cross. When you put on your coat, you show forth the cross: (likewise) in the window of your house, in the yoke and plough-share of your plough. Unless a bird stretches out its wings and its feet, it cannot fly on thin air.

1. There is a tear through the MS; perhaps read  .

2. Here and elsewhere for  cf. the Introduction, p. 3.

3. The corrector has added  in the right hand margin, and placed a stroke after  .

1. These verbs are really plural, but we cannot tell what their actual subject is because of the uncertainty of the reading in line 6.

2. Is. 6.9ff, but following the text of Mk.8.18 P.


5. Literally: but following one only.

3. O Jew, open your eyes and observe the bird, which by the power of the cross cleaves and passes through (the air). It provides a type that except by the power of the cross no man can fly on the clouds to meet our Lord in the air\(^1\), when he comes at the end and everything has been subjected to him, as is written concerning him\(^2\). 4. For he is that Son of man of whom Daniel said that he was brought near to the Ancient of Days, to whom he gave dominion that all the nations should serve him\(^3\). For he shall rule the kingdom which shall not be destroyed, as Daniel decreed. At that time, all his enemies shall be put under his feet\(^2\), and every knee shall bow, which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God, his Father\(^4\).

5. For there are many things which are written by the prophets and the just which show that by the power of the cross of Christ everything exists, and that there is no salvation and no resurrection, neither in this world nor in that which is to come, neither can the haters of the cross live or exist, except by the power of the cross.

\(i\). Elsewhere spelt לָכַשׁ: it is probably shortened by the scribe to fit the line better.
\(ii\). Read לָכַשׁ.
\(iii\). Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.
\(iv\). Read לָכַשׁ.

1. Cf. 1 Thess. 4:17.
2. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:27, but the ultimate reference is to Ps. 8:6, 110:1.
3. Cf. Dn. 7:13f, and see ch. iii. 2.
4. Phil. 2:10f.
6. ושם_di פְּרַע בְּזֹאת תִּשְׁעָה דָּעַת לָרַע.
7. וְלֹא נֶפֶשׁ לָגָם. הַיָּמִים תְּלַשׁ.
8. וְנָתַתָּנָה לָהֶם לְכָל מַעָּלָה.
9. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
10. נָתַתָּנָה לָךְ זוֹלַת זוֹלַת לְךָ.
11. גֵּלֵת: שָׁלוֹם לָךְ. לָךְ יָדוֹ לְךָ שָׁלוֹם.
12. בָּלָה הָאָמְרָה לְךָ. שָׁלֵא.
13. נָתַתָּנָה לְךָ זוֹלַת זוֹלַת לְךָ. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
14. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
15. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
16. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
17. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
18. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
19. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
20. שָׁלוֹם שֵׁם לָךְ. יָדָּךְ חֲגֻגוֹת.
6. Although these things are so and bear witness concerning themselves, are you saying to me, "The cross has effected nothing?" Behold we have learnt and demonstrated all these things from the writings of your prophets. And if before the coming of Christ the fathers and the prophets thus extolled the symbols of the cross, now that he has come and fulfilled the words and description\textsuperscript{1} of the prophets, and has suffered for us and been crucified, as the prophets proclaimed beforehand, and in him for those in whom he delights, all the world of men had life and salvation, do you urge upon me that the cross has effected nothing? 7. You do not know the power of the cross because your heart is blind to understanding, that is, by reason of your evil will, as the prophet said concerning you: They have gone after the evil will of their heart\textsuperscript{2}. But I will not listen to you, and I will not be contentious against God like you. But I will make the sign of the cross all the time, over everything which I approach [in the love] and in the faith.

1. Read ἀναφέρων.

1. i.e. the description they gave of Christ in their prophecies.

which is in Christ. 8. If for the sake of this cross you kill [me, then]¹ I shall be counted worthy for the holy inheritance of the prophets and apostles whom your fathers killed. As David says: For your sake we are killed all the day long, and we have been accounted as sheep for the slaughter¹, that whether we die or live, we may be counted worthy with them for the kingdom of heaven, through the prayers of all the saints for ever, Amen.

VII.1. If you are offended because the Son dwelt in the womb of a pure virgin and put on a body, though there is the testimony of the prophet Isaiah², (and) though he did not break the tokens of virginity, because the father dwelt in the thorns of a thorn bush and did not consume it³, what then do you say, and which is more excellent – a thorn bush full of thorns, or a pure, undefiled virgin, a daughter of Abraham and a daughter of David?⁴ 2. If it is written concerning the Son that he put on a body, it is written concerning the Father that 'he was covered with light as (with) a mantle.'⁵ And if it is written concerning the Son that he increased, it is written concerning the Father that 'the Lord God increased greatly.'⁶ And if it is written concerning the Son that he ate and drank, it is written also concerning the Father that he ate and drank with Abraham.⁷ 3. And if it is written concerning the Son that he slept, it is written concerning the Father: Awake, and do not sleep, O Lord!¹¹ and again: The Lord awoke as one who sleeps.¹²

i. There is room for about four letters; perhaps read כ[מל על או

ii. Read bankruptcy.

iii. In the MS this word is placed below the line under לאו מפה.

1. Ps. 44.22, but following the text of Rom. 8.36.
3. Cf. Ex. 3.2.
4. Sergius may well have drawn this parallel from Ephraem, ed. L. Leloir, Compendaire de l’évangile concordant, I. 25.
6. Ps. 104.2.
7. Lk. 2.52.

(The notes are continued on the following page).
13. פא. 13. מִי מָצָא בְּלָק: "לָהֶם נָסַעְתָּם לְהָלֹא.
ונִצְטָמְצֵה. צָאֵב נְבָא לְהוֹ: נָסַעְתָּם לְהָלֹא.
5.:[ו]א.ו.ק.ו. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה.
6. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה.
8. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה.
10. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה.
15. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה.
20. פא. 13. מִי מָצָא בְּלָק: "לָהֶם נָסַעְתָּם לְהָלֹא.
ונִצְטָמְצֵה. צָאֵב נְבָא לְהוֹ: נָסַעְתָּם לְהָלֹא.
25. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה. נָשָׁה נָשָׁה נָשָׁה.
And if it is written concerning the Son that he was weary from the strain of the way, it is written: You have wearied the Lord with your words. If it is written concerning the Son that he went down into Egypt, also concerning the Father it is written that he said to Jacob: I will go down with you, and I will bring you up. And if it is written concerning the Son that he rested, also concerning the Father it is written that he rested on the seventh day. If it is written concerning the Son that he used to go from place to place, also concerning the Father it is written that he used to journey from one resting place of the tabernacle to another. And if the Son asked Legion, "What is your name?" also the Father asked Satan, "Whence do you come?" And if the Son asked, "Where have you laid Lazarus?" also the Father asked, "Where are you, Adam?" and (he asked) Cain, "Where is Abel, your brother?" If it is said that the Son was subjected to the Father, it is said concerning the Father that he was subjected to Israel. For he said to them: You have subjected me with your sins, and you have wearied me with your iniquities. And if the Father was subjected to the creation and is without

i. Read אָדָם

ii. A quire mark.

8. Ps. 104.1.
10. e.g. Mk. 4.38.
11. Ps. 44.23.

1. Jn. 4.6.
4. Gen. 46.4.
5. Jn. 4.6; cf. the Introduction, p. 24f.
6. Gen. 2.2.
7. Lit. 'from tabernacle to tabernacle'; cf. 2 Sam. 7.6.
8. Lk. 8.30.
9. Job. 1.7. This could be read: Whence have you come; but (The notes are continued on the following page).
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אתם sollten נאלה לשתה. 5
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blame, how much more the Son to the Father! 7. If the Son sought help from an angel, in the same way the Father laid a curse upon Meroz because they did not come to the help of the Lord. And if the Son grieved and was sorrowful at the time of his death, in the same way the Father regretted that he had made man and he grieved in his heart. And if it is written concerning the Son that he descended and ascended, in the same way it is written concerning the Father that he descended to mount Sinai and ascended.

8. O hard-hearted Jew, God does not speak with us as he (really) is, for we would not be able to understand, but, as we are able, he has spoken with us. See what the people said to Moses, when they heard the mighty sound of the trumpet and (saw) the mountain which was blazing with fire: You speak with us, but let not God speak with us, lest we die. For God is superior to all minds, and to every thought, and to all human understanding; and he is inscrutable, incomprehensible, and infinite.

VIII.1. Behold, we have demonstrated all these things from your scriptures. If we have said anything which is outside your scriptures, you will not accept (it). But investigate and see that when you went down into Egypt, the prophets went down with you: Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, (and) Miriam. Two hundred years.

i. Read הָעָנָה, following Jud. 5. 23. P.
ii. The Serto corrector has written מַעָנָה above line 1, and has inserted a stroke after מ; it is a correction to Jud. 5. 23 P and should be read.
iii. The Serto corrector has added מַעָנָה in the left hand margin, which should be read.

since P reads פָּעִים כְּתוֹנָה, פָּעִים is probably the participle combined with the 2.m.s. pronoun; see Nöldke, op. cit., para. 64.
10. Jn. 11. 34.
11. Gen. 3. 9.
13. Cf. I Cor. 15. 28.
14. Lit. 'to it', i.e. to Israel.
(The notes for fol. 13v are on the next page).
The text on the page is not legible. It appears to be a handwritten note, but the content cannot be accurately transcribed.
passed, and see how many prophets (there were)! 2. There were prophets among you both in the desert, and also in the land of Canaan, and prophets never broke off from you. And when you went down to Babylon, Daniel, Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael, Ezekiel, Ezra, Mordecai, (and) Esther (were there). Seventy years passed, and see how many prophets (there were)! And when you went up from Babylon see again Ezra the scribe, Zerubbabel, Haggai, Zechariah, (and) Malachi. 3. But behold, after Christ came, according to the word of the angel which he spoke to Daniel, prophecy, priesthood, and kingdom ceased from you. And your back is bowed in subjection to all the nations all the time, as David said concerning you. 4. Because you gave gall to eat to him who gave you manna to eat, behold you are eating gall everywhere in subjection under tribute. And you are drinking the sour vinegar of reproach and shame in every place, so that even those men who are strangers to the faith of Christ are at enmity against you.

1. In the left hand margin of the MS there is an indistinct marginal note which seems to be נדכ, and there is a stroke after נדכ to indicate where it should be inserted.

(These are the notes to fol.13v)

1. Lk. 22.43.
2. Jud. 5.23.
6. Ex. 34.5.
7. Ex. 20.18f.

1. Dn. 9.24-27; cf. D. b. S., iii. 20, iv. 1-3, who parallels this argument (which goes back to Justin, Trypho, lii) with a similar list of Old Testament figures: likewise Jacob of Sarug, Homily 5, B.M. Add. 17, 161, fol. 43r. Cf. also Aphraates, I, 886.
2. Ps. 69.24.
3. Jn. 19.28ff; cf. Ps. 69.21, Mt. 27.34//’s.
4. Ex. 16.13ff, Num. 11.7ff.
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because you gave vinegar\(^1\) to him\(^2\) who gave you sweet\(^1\) water in the desolate, stoneless wilderness\(^3\) by means of the secret rod of the cross. \(5\). Behold, your eyes, are darkened today, seven hundred years\(^4\) without prophet, without king, without priest\(^5\), without temple, without city, without altar, and without the putting on of the ephod, as Hosea prophesied\(^6\). And you live in the vain hope that you will be gathered together. For the Lord has laid upon you a deceiving spirit, and he\(^6\) has darkened you. \(6\). For when you served idols God did not leave you without prophets, priests, and leaders. But now that you worship God, as you assert, and do not reverence idols, and observe circumcision and sabbath, why has this wrath been laid upon you for seven hundred years, and (why) has he not sent to you even one consolation, or prophet, or worthless dream?\(^7\) \(7\). If you were consumed with zeal for God and you crucified and killed the deceiver of your people, it would have been right.

1. A word play in the Syriac - ḫalā,'vinegar'; ḫalyā,'sweet'.
3. Cf. Ex. 15.25.
4. Cf. ch.viii.6,xiv.5. For the bearing of these passages on the date of the Disputation see the Introduction, p.8f.
فلد. 15

لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
for the justice of God to exalt you to honour and to make you famous among all the nations. For God has never treated unjustly the zeal of one who was zealous on his behalf, to which Phinehas and Elijah bear witness - one received the covenant of priesthood\(^1\), and Elijah ascended to heaven in a chariot of fire\(^2\). Thus also you: if God had been pleased with the deed which you did, heaven and earth would have taken arms against him who deceived you, but you he would have exalted above. But from the day that you crucified the Son of God you have gone down beneath\(^3\), but he, above, to the highest heaven. That which is written concerning David and Saul has been fulfilled: The house of David grows stronger and stronger, and the house of Saul grows weaker and weaker\(^4\). For if you were the sons of the prophets you would assent to and accept the writings of the prophets. But now, you have made known concerning yourselves that you are not the sons of the prophets.

IX.1. The Jew said: Now if you can, make the Father known to us apart from Abraham and the prophets. For we are truly the sons

1. Read לְבָנֵי הָעָם.

1. Num.25.10ff. Sergius is using Phinehas's killing of the Israelite who married a Midianite woman (Num.25.6-8) as an example of God blessing an act of murder. The same applies to Elijah's slaying of the false prophets of Baal (I Kings 18.40). For the parallels with D.b.S. cf. the Introduction, p.55.

2. II Kings 2.11.


4. II Sam.3.1.
פֶּה הֲגַזְמֵם. כָּלָהוּ סְגֵלָה. לַלֵּא. כְּפָה סְגוֹלָה. בָּ ebay. לַלֵּא.
נַגְּזֵם. כְּפָהוּ סְגְלָה. מָסרְפָה. לַלֵּא.
5 מָלְטִיבָה כְּפֶה לַסְגָלָה מְסָרְפָה. לַלֵּא. מָלְטִיבָה כְּפֶה. לַסְגָלָה. מָסָרְפָה. לַלֵּא.
בָּאְלְטִיבָה. כְּפֶה לַסְגָלָה. מָסָרְפָה. לַלֵּא. בָּאְלְטִיבָה. כְּפֶה. לַסְגָלָה. מָסָרְפָה. לַלֵּא.
10 לַטְבָ'יָה: הָסָרְפִּי. חֹסֵל: בּוּטָב. מַעֲשֶׂה. לַטְבָ'יָה: הָסָרְפִּי. חֹסֵל: בּוּטָב.
בּוּטָב לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב. מלֶקְנָה. לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב. לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב.
15 בּוּטָב לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב. לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב. מַעֲשֶׂה. לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב. מַעֲשֶׂה. לָכֵי: 30. בּוּטָב.
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of Abraham; and if sons of Abraham, we are the sons of the prophets. And this is known to everyone.  
2. Sergius (said): You boast in the name of Abraham, although you are far from the truth, and you do not obey the writings of the prophets. Therefore it has been made known that you are not the sons of the prophets, but the sons of the murderers of the prophets. Therefore you reject the prophets in that you do not accept their prophecies. And now you are put to shame by the nations, who have been taught by the prophets that which, in the name of the prophets, you deny. Therefore you lay claim to the prophets in name only. 3. Who indeed kills his enemy, and after his death loves him or receives his words? Your fathers, then, killed them — that is, the house of Ahab, Manasseh, and the rest who were like them. How can the son of Manasseh, who sawed Isaiah asunder, accept the prophecy of Isaiah concerning Christ, or of the prophets, his companions? 4. But because you have seen that the nations have hated the worship of idols and turned to Christ, you have turned to establish the law, which in its time you hated, even as you will always be perverse. Understand again also this, if you will, that with the coming of Christ

i. In the sense given in the translation the Aph'el is more usual; perhaps therefore we should read ἐσυσέλθησαν, or, if we accept the reading of the MS, translate 'you stand ashamed before the nations'.

ii. Read ἀφεθησάντες; cf. the Introduction, p. 3.

1. Plural 'you', so Sergius is referring to all Jews.
3. Sergius reverts to the second person singular.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
behold, the worship of idols ceased from the Nation and from the nations, that they should not again sacrifice their sons and daughters to demons, as they used to do formerly. It was all the more right that you should be amazed and wonder at this, and that you should not doubt that Christ is the Son of God. Because in him was fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah who said: The idols shall utterly pass away, and they shall enter into the caves of rock and into the holes of the earth, from before the terror of the Lord, and from before the glory of his power, when he rises to subdue the earth. Tell me now, what prophet or priest or any of the fathers was able to cause the idols to pass away from the earth, except he who is the mighty Lord? For he said that from before the terror of the Lord they would pass away, when he rises to subdue the earth.

6. The Jew said: What does it mean - 'When he rises to subdue'?

Sergius (said): 'When he rises to subdue' means this - that he rose from the dead, when he had conquered death. He rose and subdued the earth by his disciples, and brought the nations and tongues into subjection, that they might worship his cross, as David proclaimed beforehand: All the nations shall be blessed in him, and they shall all praise him. Again (he said): All kings shall worship him, and all nations serve him.

1. The Sertap corrector has written [א] in the left hand margin with a line after עבב.
2. The Sertap corrector has written וא above the line after נבנ, completing the quotation on the basis of P.
3. Read המלך; the נ is written underneath in the hand of the original scribe.

1. The Nation = the Jews, the nations = the Gentiles.
2. Cf. ch.v.6 (fol.9r,n.6).
3. Or 'worship, fear'; Sergius makes use of the ambiguity.
4. Is.2.18f. Sergius understands עניון ס_dependencies 'the terror (worship) of the Lord' as the worship of Christ, the Lord.
5. Ps.72.17.
6. Ibid.v.11; cf. ch.1.6 (fol.2r,n.6).
لأجل اليوم: هناك بعض التغييرات التدريجية في الأدب العربي.

1. وضعت كتابة جديدة في المقدمة.

2. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الأول.

3. تناولنا بعض المضاعفات في القسم الثاني.

4. تم إجراء بعض التغييرات في القسم الثالث.

5. تبادلنا بعض الآراء الجديدة في القسم الرابع.

6. تم تحديث بعض الأفكار في القسم الخامس.

7. تم إضافة بعض المعلومات الجديدة في القسم السادس.

8. تناولنا بعض التحليلات الجديدة في القسم السابع.

9. تم تحديث بعض الأفكار في القسم الثامن.

10. تم استخدام بعض الأدوات الجديدة في القسم التاسع.

11. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم العاشر.

12. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الحادي عشر.

13. تناولنا بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الثاني عشر.

14. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم الثالث عشر.

15. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الرابع عشر.

16. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم الخامس عشر.

17. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم السادس عشر.

18. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم السابع عشر.

19. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الثامن عشر.

20. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم التاسع عشر.

21. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم العاشر عشر.

22. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم الحادي عشر عشر.

23. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الثاني عشر عشر.

24. تم تحديث بعض المعلومات في القسم الثالث عشر عشر.

25. تم إضافة بعض الأفكار الجديدة في القسم الرابع عشر عشر.
7. Behold then, David witnesses that in Christ all the nations have been blessed. And also that which God said to Abraham has been fulfilled in him: In your seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. Again another prophet said: The nations shall say, "Surely the idols which our fathers left us as an inheritance are nothing."  

8. The Jew said: That (passage), "All kings shall worship him," was said concerning Solomon. For the scripture says that all the kings of the earth sought to see his face and to hear his wisdom. And the queen of Sheba came from the ends of the earth to greet him with presents and gifts; and all kings came like her. 

Sergius said: Tell me, 0 wise man, does the scripture testify that Solomon, to whom the kings came, turned them from the fear of idols to the worship of the one God? Or can you give proof of this? 

The Jew (said): Scripture does not say that he turned them from the fear of idols, but by all means he made the one God known to them. 

9. Sergius (said): Know, 0 wise man, that Solomon reigned for only forty years, though he did not serve the Lord all these years. For it is written: In the time of the old age of Solomon his wives turned away his heart and he served their gods. If then the son of David turned aside from the law of his father and went after strange gods, how could the heathen and the sons of the heathen continue in his teaching?

i. Read אבקנו. 

ii. The Serta corrector has added אבק in the right hand margin opposite 1.15, to be read after אבק. 

iii. The Serta corrector has added אבק in the left hand margin opposite 1.24, to be read after בק. 

iv. For lack of space the last three lines of the MS have been rearranged: the strokes indicate the lines in the MS.

כית ב' מהו ידיעה על תקלה בyard. 6
למשל 1\(\text{m}^2\) מספנ accomסות 3\(\text{cm}^2\)
כקומ. 1\(\text{m}^2\) מספנ accomסות 3\(\text{cm}^2\).
למשל 1\(\text{m}^2\) מספנ accomסות 3\(\text{cm}^2\).
למשל 1\(\text{m}^2\) מספנ accomסות 3\(\text{cm}^2\).
10. Therefore it is certain that it was not fulfilled in Solomon, but a pattern like a kind of type was effected in it. For Solomon is not 'from before the sun'; and he did not 'descend like rain upon the mown grass'; and he did not 'deliver the children of the poor'; and 'right' did not 'flourish in his days'; and the other things which are said in the prophecy. How could right flourish in the days of him who multiplied his sacrifices upon all the mountains to all the gods of the nations?

11. But open your eyes and see that all these have been exactly fulfilled in Christ, the Son of God. Behold, the weeks of which Daniel spoke bear witness. Behold the years of the kings which agree one after the other. Behold the chronologies and the events with signs and miracles of every kind - God who thundered with a voice from heaven, "This is my Son and my Beloved, in whom I am well pleased"; angels descending and ascending to him; demons who obey his command; the dead who rise at his voice; and the rest of the other marvellous things, which, if every one of them had been written down, the whole world would not have been sufficient for the books which would have been written, as John, his disciple said.

1. Delete as unnecessary.
2. Read οὐκέτα.
3. In the MS the original scribe has added Λ above the line; it should be read.
4. Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.

1. μὴ 'in it' probably refers to Ps. 72, which is regarded as containing typological references to Christ.
3. ibid v. 6; Ephraem, Rome Ed., III. 214 identifies the 'mown grass' with the Virgin Mary; cf. also D. b. S., iii. 11, v. 9, and the Introduction, p. 56.
4. ibid v. 12f.
5. ibid v. 7.
6. Or 'his high places'.
7. Mt. 3. 17, 17. 5 OS; cf. the introduction, p. 25.
9. Cf. Mk. 1. 25f, 5. 8ff etc.

(The notes are continued on the following page).
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1. If you find it difficult to understand the text, consider:
   - Looking at similar texts
   - Asking for help from a teacher or tutor

2. Do not focus on the handwriting difficulties, as long as you can read the text.

3. Please ensure that the text is clear and easy to read.

4. If you continue to have difficulty, reach out to a professional for assistance.

5. Consider using a text-to-speech tool to help with reading.

6. Ensure that you are using the correct materials and resources.

7. Remember that practice makes perfect.

8. If you are still having trouble, please consult with your instructor or a specialized tutor.

9. Practice regularly to improve your reading skills.

10. Consider using a dictionary or glossary to help understand new vocabulary.

11. Take breaks to avoid burnout.

12. If you still struggle, consider seeking additional support or accommodations.

13. Remember that everyone learns differently.

14. If you are still having difficulty, please consult with your instructor or a specialized tutor.

15. Practice regularly to improve your reading skills.

16. If you are still struggling, consider seeking additional support or accommodations.

17. Remember that everyone learns differently.

18. If you are still having difficulty, please consult with your instructor or a specialized tutor.

19. Practice regularly to improve your reading skills.

20. If you are still struggling, consider seeking additional support or accommodations.

21. Remember that everyone learns differently.
But after the prophets who preached about him, and after the set time of the weeks which have been fulfilled, and after the accuracy of the events which stand (as confirmation)\(^1\), what answer have you now to return?

X.1. The Jew (said): I do not have anything to say. On this account the times and the events yield to you in every respect, and the words of the prophets suit you, as you wish. This especially rebukes me to silence - that we have been humiliated more than all the nations upon the face of the earth, and we have been dispersed in all the uttermost parts (under) heaven. And we do not have any resting-place\(^2\), and we are not in one place. 2. But, nevertheless, I have this to say: whether the Messiah has come or not, why do you worship the cross? For it is written: You shall not make for yourself any image or any \(^1\) likeness (of anything) which is in heaven above or which is in the earth beneath\(^3\). But you, behold, you have filled the earth with material crosses (made) of everything found by you - of wood and of stone, of bronze and of iron, and the rest. And with regard to this, in what way are they less than idols\(^4\)? It is written: The idols of the nations

---

1. The original scribe has added \(\sqcap\) above the line.

2. Read \(\sqcap\).

3. Perhaps emend to \(\sqcap\); cf. n. 4 below.

4. Cf. Mk. 5.41ff//s, Lk. 7.14f, Jn. 11.43f.


1. i.e. 'after the Messianic prophecies have been so accurately fulfilled in the events of Christ's life.'

2. Lit. 'we do not have a support for the head'.

3. Ex. 20.4, Dt. 5.8.

4. Lit. 'in what way are you less than idols', which does not make very good sense. The emendation suggested above (n.iii) gives a tolerable sense, which fits the context. For it is clear that the Jew cites Ps. 135.15 in order to prove that the Christian images of the cross are idols.
שידת הכותב

סם: הנוסח המודרני:

לעתה לא שכנו כאן.

לאחר מכן ידוע עִם.

הנה, אני מ랜ד"ה

לחלוצנו, עלינו.

מפני זאת, נצפת

נשカテゴיה, ביטוי

לצרכנו, נגזר.

ל_titlesב, כו. ק"צ

ליצירתם.

בגיאתך, בירושלמי.
are silver and gold, and the rest. Now if you love Christ and believe in him, worship Christ, and it is sufficient for you. The cross is then, for you, superfluous. For this image which is visible in the world is useless.

3. Sergius (said): Now you have compelled me to speak the word of the wise Bar Sira: The man who teaches a fool is like one who glues potsherds together. But a man's enemy scarcely loves him, though sometimes he does not harm him. Let Christ be an example to us, whom, although he did not harm you in any way, behold, you hate without a cause. As it is written: They hated me without a cause. 4. The examples then, which we have cited from the prophets, have not, as it seems, taught you anything. Tell me then, why he changed the figures of the sons of Jacob into sheaves of the field? God spoke figuratively in the dreams.

1. Read either or omit the following: is the Aphi. ptc. pl. plus.
2. Read (cf. 33r.1.5); in the MS it looks as though the has been run into the .
3. There is a hole in the MS at this point but nothing seems to have dropped out; perhaps it was there originally.

1. Ps.135-15; cf. D-b.2. viii.2, who also begins his section on Jewish accusations of Christian worship of the cross and saints' bones by quoting Ex.20.4 and Ps.135-15.
2. *i.e.* unnecessary.
3. Ecclesiasticus 22.7; Sergius inverts the order of the clauses.
4. Apart from the problem of the correct reading, this sentence is difficult to understand. It can be taken in one of two ways: first, Sergius seems to be saying that the Jew being Christ's enemy can hardly be expected to love him, although he (Christ) has done him (the Jew) no harm; second, a man has great difficulty in loving his enemy though at times he manages to avoid actually harming him. Christ, by inference, not only manages to avoid harming the Jew who is his enemy, but actually loves him.
5. Ps.35.19,69.4, but following the text of Jn.15.25.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة.
of Joseph. Again (he compared) Rachel and Jacob to the sun and the moon, and again, his brethren to eleven stars. And where is it that Rachel came to worship him, as Jacob interprets, since she died before (that) time? And why did he show Pharaoh the years of plenty and of famine in cows and ears of grain? Also he compared Nebuchadnezzar to a tree and the world to an image, and he showed Daniel beasts coming up from the sea. Many similar things were spoken by the prophets in allegories and parables. 'Behold, I will open my mouth in parables', said David. Show me where David went down into a deep pit; or where dogs surrounded him, as he says; or that they pierced his hands and his feet; or that they shared out his garments; or that he ate gall and drank vinegar. There are many things which he spoke about his own person, and not one of them happened to him, if things are as reported. Show that David had a horn! Or what righteous man has a horn upon his head like a he-goat, as he said: The horns of the righteous shall be exalted? Or where did the Lord break the cedars of Lebanon? At this point we have the other side of the hole in the MS (see n.iii to 18r); again nothing seems to be missing.

1. Gen.37.10.
2. She died before Joseph's dream; see Gen.35.18f.
3. Gen.41.1ff.
4. Dn.4.10ff.
5. Dn.2.31ff.
6. Dn.7.3ff.
7. Ps.78.2.
8. Ps.40.2, 88.6.
9. Ps.22.16.
10. ibid. v.18.
11. Ps.69.21.
12. e.g. Ps.132.17.
13. Ps.75.10.
14. Ps.29.5.
내가 جميع العلم تعتبر نافياً.

لا يوجد معنى لدولة تشكل العالم.

كما أن كل ما نرى في العالم هو مجرد ظاهرة.

لقد أدركنا أن العلم لا يملك شيئًا.

العلم هو مجرد تجربة. ونحن نتعلم من التجارب.

ولكن ما هو العلم؟ هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعرف أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد نعلم أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.

لقد ندرك أن العلم هو مجرد تجربة.
Isaiah said: Lebanon shall fall in its glory. However, we cannot discuss each one severally which was spoken by the prophets typologically. But if you are a worshipper of God these should be sufficient to convince you. And know also concerning Christ that all his dispensation was spoken of in symbols and types - his annunciation, his conception, his birth, his upbringing, his miracles, his crucifixion, his death, his descent into the grave, his resurrection from the dead, his ascension to heaven, and his session at the right hand; and that he is to come on the clouds of heaven in the glory of his angels; and that he will judge the world with righteousness; and that he will reward everyone according to his deeds like a just judge.

XI.1. But if you are a disciple of the prophets, accept and obey the prophets. For it is certain that if you do not obey the prophets you cannot call yourself a Jew. For the name 'Judaism' is to be interpreted 'confession'. And if you strive against the prophets you have become

1. The original scribe seems to have written \( \Delta \kappa \) above the line.

1. Is. 10. 34.

2. Sergius slips into the testimony style here.

3. This etymology, deriving both words from the root \( \kappa\nu\nu\cdot \), Aph'el 'to confess, acknowledge', can be traced back as far as the third century Didascalia Apostolorum, ch. xiii, Syriac text, ed. P de Lagarde, p. 59, English translation by R. H. Connolly, p. 126. Cf. also D. b. S., heading, ed. de Zwaan, n. 1., and i. 3.
וד. 19 וְכִּבְּרָהָּ הָּלָּא יָדָהָּ לְשָׂאֲלוּתֶיהָ לְפָרָּעָה. וְכִּבְּרָהָּ הָּלָּא יָדָהָּ לְשָׂאֲלוּתֶיהָ לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ לְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.

לִבְּרָהָּ لְפָרָּעָה. לְפָרָּעָה לְפָרָּעָה.
a denier and not a Jew. For until Christ you were correctly called Jews and Israel, but since Christ and henceforward the name of Jews and of Israel is, for you, superfluous, and it is not right that you should be called either Jews or Israel.

2. The Jew (said): And what is our name then?

Sergius (said): This is your correct name - deniers, crucifiers, and rejectors: deniers, because you denied that Christ is the Son of God; and crucifiers, because you crucified him without a criminal charge; again rejectors, because, behold, you reject those things which are written by the prophets, and are apparent in the events. You are like a blind man who has never seen the light and (who) contradicts those who can see saying that the sun has not risen, although it is no longer dark. And though the sun burns his body with its heat, he denies that there is either sun or light.

3. The Jew (said): And what is a real Jew and Israel?

Sergius (said): The true confessor: he is the real Jew.

1. Read ܡܕܢܚܐ.

2. i.e. a confessor.

3. i.e. without being able to convict him of any real offence.

For parallels to this discussion of the question, 'Who is the real Israel?', which extends to the end of this chapter, cf. Jacob of Sarug's 6th Homily Against the Jews, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Syriac MS 196, folios 203-205, entitled ܐܘܠܒܐ ܕܒܝܬܐ ܕܒܝܬܐ, 'On the Synagogue and the Church'.
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as it is written that Jacob said in his blessings: O confessor, your brethren shall praise you. Because Christ was thus to arise from Judah, Jacob made beforehand a confession by the name 'Judah'. Henceforth, not everyone who is born from Judah is a Jew, but everyone in whom is born the true confession of Christ, even if he is from an alien people. 4. For God said to Abraham: In your seed all the nations shall be blessed. Do you think then, that in Ishmael and in the sons of Keturah, or in the wicked sons of Jacob, the heathen nations are truly blessed? Do not err! The heathen cannot be blessed by wicked men, but by Christ, the Blessed and the Righteous One: in him the accursed nations have been blessed. 5. For it is written: You have rebuked the nations and cursed are those who wander from your commandments. So then

1. At the bottom of the folio the Serta corrector has added following the Peshitta, and placed a line after to indicate where it should be inserted.

1. Gen.49.8; Sergius has substituted ḫnūm 'confessor' for the 𐤫𐤍𐤃𐤃𐤂𐤁𐤀 'Judah' of the Peshitta.
2. Gen.22.18; cf. ch.ix.7.
3. Ps.119.21.
قد يلقي نظرة على الفقرة الأخيرة من المقالة، حيث يتحدث عن مسألة التي تتعلق بالعلاقة بين الجنس والصحة العامة. يشير المؤلف إلى أن هناك علاقة مزدوجة بين الجنس والصحة، حيث أن الجنس يمكن أن يكون عاملًا في تطور某些健康问题، ولكن أيضًا يمكن أن يكون جزءًا من التراكب النفسي والاجتماعي. يشدد المؤلف على أن التفكير في الجنس كعنصر عالي المستوى من الصحة العامة يتطلب تحليلًا جامعًا للأوجه المختلفة للعلاقة بين الجنس والصحة العامة.
according to the word of David everyone who wanders from the commandments is bound under a curse, in accordance with that which (is written): Cursed is everyone who does not do all which is written in this book. Now present to me one of all the seed of Abraham who has not wandered from the commandments except Christ, concerning whom the prophet Isaiah witnessed and said: He did no iniquity, neither was deceit found in his mouth. Therefore it is certain that it has been fulfilled in Jesus Christ, that is — 'in your seed all the nations shall be blessed'. And this is through the Christian faith. Everyone who is outside the Christian faith, whether from the Nation or from the nations, is subject to the curse, and is not near to the blessing of the faithful Abraham: Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness. Similarly to Abraham, to everyone who believes in Christ it is also reckoned for righteousness. Therefore it has been made known and it has been confirmed that those who believe in Christ are the sons of Abraham and the Israel of God.

7. The Jew(said): Then if it is as you say, why are you not called Jews and Israel?

1. Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.
2. Dt. 27.26; cf. Gal. 3.10 and ch. v. 1.
3. Is. 53.9; cf. ch. v. 14.
5. Gen. 15.6; cf. Rom. 4.3, Gal. 3.6, Apoc. I, 34 and frequently, D. b. S., ii. 5, and for further references Harris, Testimonies, II, p. 33.
If you are the true Jews and Israel, it is right that you should be called Jews and we by a name that suits us. But why then do you shrink from the name of 'Jews'?

S. Sergius (said): If both we and you were thus called by the same name, (one) people would not be distinguished from another or (one) person from another, and there would be great confusion in the world. It would not be right for corn and straw to be mixed up together under the one name. Therefore it pleased God that the ancient name should remain upon you as a reproach, but we have been called Christians — (that is) confessors.

This name makes a distinction between confessors and deniers, that the real Jews might be named Christians, and instead of the 'Synagogue' it might assume the name 'Church'. For Isaiah said to the Synagogue: And you shall be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord will give. Rightly then

1. In the left hand margin next to יָאָה the Serṭā corrector has added יָאָה. If this is read the translation must be altered to: 'It was right that you should have been called Jews', or 'It would have been right....'.

2. The Serṭā corrector has crossed out the first יָאָה and written יָאָה above it; read יָאָה with the corrector.

1. Lit. 'people would not be distinguished from people or person from person'.

2. i.e. the body of confessors.
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the synagogue of confessors has been named the Church, which was decreed by the mouth of the Lord. For the truth required (it) thus.

10. The Jew (said): Show me how and where it was decreed.

Sergius (said): If you will believe the Gospel, thus it is written, that when Jesus had multiplied the bread and five thousand men besides women and children had been satisfied by five loaves, he asked his disciples,"Who do the crowds say concerning me that I am?" The disciples answered, "Some say that you are Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets". And he said to them,"But who do you say that I am?" Simon, who was called Cephas, answered and said,"You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God". Jesus answered and said to him,"Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona! For flesh and blood has not revealed (this) to you, but my Father who is in heaven. Therefore I tell you that you shall be called Cephas, and on this rock I will build my church, and the bars of Sheol shall not prevail against it". 11. Behold, as Isaiah said, the synagogue of God was called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord gave. And he made a distinction between the synagogue of the sinners and of the righteous.

1. Read ܐܡܐ ; cf. the Peshitta of Mt.16.16.
2. For the accent cf. Segal, op.cit., p.71.
3. The Serta corrector has added ܐܡܐ in the left hand margin with an insertion line after ܠܐܐ.
4. Read ܠܐܐ ; cf. line 2 above and 21r,1.21.
5. An Aph'el form of ܡܡ seems to be mentioned only in the lexicon of George Karmsedinoyo, and there as an equivalent to the Pa'el ܡܡ in the meaning 'to point' a book (cf.Payne Smith, Thesaurus, col.2561). Perhaps we should read ܡܡ.

2. Mt.16.13ff; cf. the Introduction,p.22.
3. As we have noticed above Sergius, like many other early Christian writers equates Jesus, the Lord of the New Testament, with 'the Lord' of the Old Testament. Thus he can regard the events recorded in Mt.16.13ff as the fulfilment of Is.62.2.
10. The president had signed the official document.

15. Consequently, he had sent it to the head office and it has been confirmed.
Again, he called his servants by another [name], as he said through Isaiah: And the Lord will kill you, but his servants he will call by another name. And this is Christians which is interpreted 'the Messiah's men'.

12. Understand then, like a wise man, that even in the time of Elijah the people was divided into two factions. For he said to them, "How long will you divide into two factions? If the Lord is God, follow him; but if Baal, follow him." In the same way Jehu also showed (this) when he deceived the wicked worshippers of Baal and said, "Search and see if there is any of the servants of the Lord among you in all the house of Baal." And they said, "There is none". Then his sword prevailed over them. Then this holy portion of the Lord was called by a new name, 'the church' and 'Christians'. And the Gentiles have adhered to it and they have been grafted in through the Christian faith, and they have been blessed. That which God said to Abraham stands firm and has come to pass: In your seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. They have become all one flock.

1. Perhaps should be restored here; cf. 1.3.
2. The original scribe has added in the left hand margin; so should be read. Cf. 1.8 below.

1. Is. 65.15: cf. ch. xx. 12, Aphraates, I, 909.
2. Sergius gives first the Greek loan word (κρυπταντα), and then the native Syriac equivalent ; cf. the Introduction, p. 47, n. 1.
4. II Kings 10.23.
5. The same verb is used in the Peshitta text of Rom. 11.17. Probably Sergius is dependent upon Rom. 11 for his argument that the faithful portion in Israel together with the Gentiles has become the church; cf. Aphraates, I, 784.
and (there is) one shepherd, Christ. 14. For all the prophets meditated on this portion of the Lord. For things to come make clear a prophecy, and as it draws near, it is proved by later events. Therefore David said: In the portion of the Lord I meditated, that I might keep your commandments. And the excellent promises and good pledges, which are written in the prophets, were spoken concerning this holy portion. (For example): Zion shall be redeemed by judgement, and her captivity by righteousness. But the wicked and the sinners will be crushed together. And again: The deliverer will come from Zion, and he will turn away iniquity from Jacob. And Hosea said: I will betroth you to me in righteousness, and I will betroth you to me in faithfulness. 15. There are many things like these concerning the nations who are grafted into this holy portion through the Christian faith. When David saw the multitude of crowds and tongues, who, with all kinds of musical notes and

1. Perhaps read <\u05dc\u05d4\u05d2> ? See n.4. below.

ii. The sign over these two words indicates that the corrector thought that they should be reversed. An attributive adjective normally follows the noun in Syriac but the two can be reversed for emphasis (Nöldeke, para. 211); but cf. 1.18 below.

iii. The MS is corrupt, reading something which looks like

iv. A quire mark.


2. i.e. the event prophesied.

3. i.e. the prophecy or the event prophesied.

4. Lit. 'far off things'. As the MS stands this must mean that either the prophecy is proved by the occurrence of the event prophesied at a much later date, or the event (or better, the significance of the event) is proved by reference to prophecy uttered at a far earlier date. On the other hand, if we read <\u05dc\u05d4\u05d2> we could translate 'For prophecies of things to come reveal it (the portion of the Lord)....i.e. the existence and nature of the portion of the Lord is confirmed by prophecies made in the distant past.

(The notes are continued on the following page).
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pleasant melodies, sing praises with his psalms, he said in the joy of his heart: I will give thanks to you in the great church, and among many nations I will praise you. And again (he said): All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to the Lord, and all the families of the nations shall worship before him. For the kingdom is the Lord's, and he rules over the nations. Again (he said): The rulers of the nations shall turn to the God of Abraham. 16. Say then, O deceiver, who errs wilfully and through ignorance, when, and where, and at what time, did David give thanks to God in the great church, and sing praises among many nations, if it was not in the church of Christ, as I have said? 17. The Jew said: Among the Philistines, and among the Moabites and the Ammonites, as the first book of Kingdoms shows. 18. Sergius (said): The book of Kingdoms shows that he fled and hid himself and begged bread like a poor man, and was afraid lest any man should know that he was David. And the book says

1.A quire mark.

5. Ps. 119.57.
6. Is. 1.27f.
7. Is. 59.20, but following the text of Rom. 11.26.
8. Hos. 2.19f.

1. Or 'congregation', but 'church' is what Sergius saw in the text.
2. Ps. 35.18f.
4. Ps. 47.9; cf. the Introduction, p. 22.
5. This is the Septuagint title for I Samuel, but it was used in Syriac-speaking areas heavily influenced by Greek-speaking Christianity; cf. Jacobi, *Edesseni Hexaemeron*, ed. A. Vasilchale, p. 21, and the Introduction, p. 114.
that he made his spittle run down on his beard near Achish, king of Gath, from fear lest he should die, while it was an important matter in his eyes whether he could save himself from death. But the book does not say that he turned a (single) man to the knowledge of the law. Neither did any of the nations sing praises with his hymns in his time. But now, through the Christian faith, behold, all nations meditate on his hymns, and sing praises with his psalms. His prophecy, which I quoted, has been fulfilled: I will give thanks to you in the great church, and among many nations I will praise you. And now answer me, whether you will accept the prophecy of the prophets or fight against God who is in the prophets.

XII.1. The Jew said: O obstructive man! I have asked you why you worship the cross, and you have eluded me in many ways. And I have pursued after you to bring you back to the question, but still you go round me in circles on the way. Do not elude the question! You realised that I alarm you with this question. 2. Tell me

1. The MS reads לָֽאָ֥זֶר < בַּֽעֲדוּ : the < must be omitted as a scribal error.

1. Cf. I Sam. 21,13f.
2. Ps. 35,18f.
لا يمكنني قراءة النصوص العربية في الصورة المقدمة.
then, why do you worship the cross? Tell me exactly, and explain your worship to me, but do not tell me again the story of Christ. For I know these things which are in the prophets, who spoke about him. This I demand of necessity that you explain to me why you worship the cross, so (much so) that you fill the earth with crosses in every place.

3. Sergius (said): Be patient with your question like a wise man, and listen calmly to our discourse. For this is philosophy - patience. For it is not right that the word of faith should come into existence in a tumult, but in sobriety and self-control. Listen then! Has not the rod of Moses persuaded you that by the secret of the cross which is in it he performed all the miracles both in Egypt and in the desert? And the rest of the examples from the prophets which we have brought forward and which we have omitted, do they not persuade you? 4. Let us tell you one example from the world, namely, the rank of kingship, which is as follows. As even you know, when a king has begun to reign and sat upon

i. The original scribe has inserted a Yudh above the word, so read לְאָנָא.
ii. Following the scribal sign ל should be read before כְּבֹרֶנֶה.
iii. Read מָלַיָּה; cf. 18r.1.15.
iv. Read מְלָיוּךְ.

2. Cf. ch.v.5.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
his royal throne, the hosts of his servants draw near to worship him, while not needing anyone to give a description of him — what the king is like, or of his ornaments, or his royal attire — because they see him face to face and worship him with awe. 5. But (for) those who are afar off and (for) the cities of his realm, because they cannot assemble and come to one meeting-place and render the worship which is due to their lord, he is carefully depicted with choice pigments on images and pictures. Great care is taken, as far as possible, to make (them) exactly like the shape of (his) person, crown, and throne. And they are given to the cities and regions under his rule, and the heralds and the authorities exhort the crowds to accept the image of the king with the praises and honours which befit kingship. 6. These crowds, as it were, really see the person and figure of the king, offering worship with love to the image of their lord. Likewise the king also himself accepts that those who honour and worship his image, worship and honour his real self.

1. Read χαίρειν; cf. line 15.

1. Lit. 'how the king is'.
2. i.e. the reality represented by the image.
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likewise again, also the king's enemies and adversaries, 
even if they cannot harm the king in person, if the king's 
image falls into their hands, they vent their hatred upon 
it, and assuage their wrath by destroying it. 7. Behold, I 
have given you a clear example, if you wish to be instruct-
ed. Understand by means of this simile why we worship the 
cross. The cross is the image of Christ, and in its form 
the sign of the crucifixion is shown to us. And, as it were, 
we see Christ crucified (and) we worship the likeness with 
love. S. Therefore in our love for him, we depict him in 

every place remembering his victory over death and the de-

1. i.e. what it represents. This rationale of the worship of 
the cross is also found in Ecclus., viii.2 -

'Ve do not worship the wood, but we worship him who was 
crucified upon it'.

And an even closer parallel -

'Whenever we see the cross it as though we see Christ cru-
cified upon it.'

2. i.e. the cross; or 'which came to pass in him (Christ)'.

1. i.e. the cross; or 'which came to pass in him (Christ)'.

/
في هذه المعلومة، تتضمن المستحلبات التالية:

- رسالة إلى الطلاب المستقبليين
- رسالة من المعلمين للطلاب
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And because we know that it is a terror to the demons and the rebellious powers, we sign ourselves with it both at our going in and at our coming out, at our eating and at our drinking, and at our waking and at our sleeping. 9. For we know that it is the power of God unto the salvation of all who believe. As it is written: Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone of stumbling and a stone of offence, and he who believes in it shall not be afraid. We believe and we boast in his crucifixion, the prophets being with us and strengthening us that we may not become weak. 10. Even if we suffer reproach for his sake we do not mind but we rejoice because it is written: The reproach of those who reproached you fell upon me; again (it is written): Your enemies have reproached me, O Lord, and they have reproached the footsteps of your Messiah. What have you to say against these things, you who reject the truth? 11. The Jew (said): This cannot be - that both the worship of Christ and the cross is the same thing. If you worship Christ, the worship of the cross is, for you, superfluous. And if you worship the cross, what

1. Read אֶלְכָּאֹדוֹנָה.
2. Read מָטַרְנָה.
3. Read פְּלַסְקָו: one of the two correctors has written a Beth above the line.

2. Is. 28.16, but influenced by the text of Rom. 9.33, 10.11: cf. also I Peter 2.6, and the Introduction, p. 20. Ephraem, Rome Edition, III.219D, has a different mixture of this text and Rom. 9.33, 10.11. The marginal note to D.ē.ς., v. 7, cited by de Zwaan, op. cit., p. iv wholly follows the text of Romans. Cf. also Jacob of Sarug, Homily 6, Bibl. Nat., Syr. MS 196, fol. 204 r. For its use as a testimony text see Harris, Testimonies, I, p. 26ff, II, pp. 137, 139.
3. Or 'its' i.e. the cross's sake.
4. Ps. 69.9: cf. Rom. 15.3.
5. Ps. 89.51.
good is Christ to you?

12. Sergius (said): Fear God, 0 man, and judge what is right and do not reject the truth, but remember the example which I put forward to you of the king and his image. Who is there, who is in subjection to the king, who can despise or insult the king's image without passing a sentence of death upon himself. It is certain that after the insult he shall either be burnt or cut in pieces. And those who are near to the king, worship the king, but for those who are distant the king's image is necessary, that by worshipping the image they may show that they are the king's servants and subjects. If there is anyone who despises and insults the king's image, he is rebellious and insolent. And when, on one occasion, the king comes to one of the cities under his rule, its inhabitants do not any more need to worship his image as long as the king is present in person.

i. Read ɾuʃ.

ii. Read either ɾɔʃdʊn or ɾɔʃdʊ. 

iii. There is a hole in the MS at this point, though as with folio 18 nothing seems to be missing.

iv. ɾɔɾ is beyond the margin and may have been added later by the original scribe.

v. Read ɾɔɾkəɾ. 
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13. Thus also we, until Christ comes, we worship his cross, which is the symbol of his crucifixion. For he said to us:
   Do thus in remembrance of me until I come. But when he has
   come we shall not need to worship the symbol, for we shall
   be with him, and we shall rejoice in his kingdom and enjoy
   ourselves at his table. 14. In that day his friends shall
   rejoice but his enemies shall lament for themselves, when
   they have seen the sign of his cross between earth and hea-
   ven upholding and being upheld from one end to the other, and (heard)
   the sound of the trumpet blowing, which is
   more powerful than that of Mount Sinai. And then, with one
   gesture of command, the dried bones of the departed shall
   be gathered together, as Ezekiel prophesied beforehand. For
   the dead shall be raised and the living shall draw near
   and be present together at the one meeting-place of the
   just judge, who will reward everyone according to his deeds.
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15. I can flee from it. I speak the truth as I know (it) and do not conceal (it). Now if the Messiah is, as he is reported in the books of the prophets, he whom you proclaim and no other, and there is no other Messiah of God, and (if) the prophets, the events, and the set times, bear witness as you have demonstrated above, then I will not reject or conceal (it) on account of the oath which you made me swear. If any other comes he is false and a liar.

16. Sergius (said): If you thus know, why do you not acknowledge (him)?

The Jew (said): I do not acknowledge (him) for two reasons: one, that my heart will not allow me to leave the law of my fathers; and the other, that I fear my people lest they stone me or burn me with fire.

17. Sergius (said): This is a marvel - that the judgement of man is more important to you than the judgement of God. Now I advise you not to fear the judgement of man

1. The Jew is speaking now.
3. For a discussion of this passage see the Introduction, pp.115f,134.
樓علم היום. לәה גען וס ברעוו.

אִילְקָה לָוֶנה לֶא יִכְלֵל לָּו. זֶה גֶּה

בַּשְּׁם. יָפֶה לֶא פְּרַעְפַּעְפַּע: לֶא גָּלֶם

גֶּה שֵׁם לָו. לַעֲכֹרְכָּה חֲלִים

נָשַׁלְתַּהוּ. לַעֲכֹרְכָּה חֲלִים

יִנְּהָגַת שֵׁם. שֵׁם יִנְּהָגַת שֵׁם. שֵׁם יִנְּהָגַת שֵׁם. שֵׁם יִנְּהָגַת שֵׁם.
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who comes to an end and passes away, but fear the judgement of God who has no end and is eternal.

18. The Jew (said): Concerning this — whether I acknowledge (him) or not, does not concern you. But prepare yourself and answer about the things which I am going to ask, lest you render void your faith and fall under censure on account of the things which you hold.

Sergius (said): But the truth which I hold stands firm on its own, for the truth cannot be overcome.

XIII.1. The Jew (said): It is written in the law: You shall not touch the bone of a dead man, especially those who are priests. But you, behold you carry the bones of the dead in your pockets, and you defile yourselves with dead bodies, and you are unashamed. And not only this, but also you pray to and worship dry and withered bones. You rub the dust

1. In the right hand margin the Sertã corrector has added אדנא, which should be read.

ii. Read יָאָדְנָה.

iii. There is a wavy line across the page at this point with what appears to be יָאָדְנָה written upside down in the right hand margin opposite it. There is another indistinct word above the latter. This may indicate that at this point another scribe has taken over, but since the script before and after the line is identical this seems unlikely. Since the line coincides with a real division in the argument it is more probably the attempt of a later scribe to indicate the divisions in the argument. We might compare 3M Add.14, 623, fol. 19v, where in the right hand margin יָאָדְנָה marks the end of one set of extracts from the writings of John Chrysostom and the beginning of another.


2. Cf. Lev. 21.11, Num. 6.6.
סָּנָהוּ רַגְלֵיהֶםּ מֵעָפָה בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה.

כִּי זָרַע אֲשֶׁר מָצָא, נָשִּׁיאֳה וַאֲשֶׁר בָּאָה לְאַרְגָּם

בְּדֹּחֲלַת פְּנֵיהֶם לֵבֶן מִצְרָיִם.

וְשָׁתָה מֵתָה אֶת שָׁתָה בְּאֶשֶׁר קָוָה.

וַיַּחֲצָה בְּאֶשֶׁת צִדְקָוָה אֶת מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיהָ.

וְהִעֲשִׂיתָ לָהּ אֶת חָדָשׁ תִּקָּרֵאת נַעַר עַל-

הָאָדָם הַבָּשָׁם. וַיַּחְסִּידָה לָהֶם צָנָאת נַעַר.
from them on your bodies, and you regard (this practice) as something important. But even if one touches a bone with the tip of a finger, one is unclean until the evening. He who touches dead, putrefying, matter with it, how much more shall he be unclean! But you build churches for them, and you paint pictures for them with pigments. And you dedicate them to martyrs and call them a house of prayer.

Though you have testimonies concerning Christ from the books of the prophets, there is nothing at all about these things. For Moses gave commandment concerning the bone of a dead man, and Isaiah said: They defile their vessels with dead bodies, and they eat flesh, and vermin, and mice; they shall be consumed together says the Lord. Behold then, you defile yourselves with dead bodies and bones, and you eat the pig and the rest of the things which God through the law has forbidden. In all these things you are condemned and, as it seems to me, you do not have even one excuse. But now, give an answer.

1. A scribe has written א at the top of the page; it should be read after פִּי in line 2.
2. Perhaps add כָּלָה; cf. Is. 66.17 P, 1.18 below, andfolios 50v, l.17f, 58v, l.1-3.
3. Read לֹאָה.
4. There are two words in the left hand margin from the Sertä scribe: the first is קַדְרָה, and there is a stroke after כָּלָה to indicate where it should be read.
5. The second word from the Sertä scribe is partly illegible and looks like קַדְרָה; we may conjecture קַדְרָה 'which he has forbidden'. There is an insertion stroke after קַדְרָה.
6. Read לֹאָה.

1. i.e. for the churches.
2. Is. 65.4.
3. Is. 66.17.
3. Sergius (said): These are your questions - the bone of a dead man, and images which are icons, and swine's flesh. With which do you wish to begin?

The Jew (said): Concerning the bone of a dead man first.

Sergius (said): Whom do you call dead? Tell me!

4. The Jew (said): I call dead everyone from whom his spirit has departed. For David said: His spirit departs and he returns to his earth, and on that day all his thoughts perish. And Solomon (said): The body returns to its dust, and the spirit to the Lord who gave it. Therefore all flesh in which there is no spirit is dead.

5. Sergius (said): Are both the righteous and the sinners included without distinction under this name 'death'?

The Jew (said): The scripture makes no distinction. For it says: His spirit departs and he returns to his earth. This is sufficient evidence.

6. Sergius (said): Then why did God say: I am the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob? If they are dead and are like all the sinners and the heathen, then he ought not to single out a man's name, but (say), "I am the God of all the dead". as Moses said:0 God, the God of the spirits of all flesh. For the living

---

1. Once again Sergius gives the Syriac word and then the equivalent Greek loan word; cf. iv.5,xi.11, and the Introduction,p.47,n.1.
2. Ps.146.4.
3. Eccl.12.7. For a discussion of the text of this quotation see the Introduction,p.22f.
4. In the following argument Sergius is clearly dependent on Mt.22.23-33: cf. also Aphraates, I,993.
5. Ex.3.6; for the use of this quotation as a testimony text cf.Harris, Testimonies, II,pp.59,61,66.
מלשננו, לַאֲשֹׁר יְהוָה֙ הוא לָנוּ בַּיִּמּוֹתּוֹ, כִּי־וֹזִיקֵנוּוּ עַל אֶרֶץ מֵאֶחָד לֵאֶחָד. מְזֹרֵעֵנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ הַגּוֹיִם, גְרוֹעֵנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מְנַעֲלֵה, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ חַמָּה. נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ עָבְרָי, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מֵאֶרֶץ, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ שִׁבְכַּה. נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ יְבוּשָׁה, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מַטְשָׁף. נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ אַרְעַי, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ חֳדָשָׁה.

 //- בְּאֶרֶץ מֵאֶרֶץ, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ שִׁבְכַּה. נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ יְבוּשָׁה, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מַטְשָׁף. נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ אַרְעַי, נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ חֳדָשָׁה. נָשַׁדֵּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מֵאֶרֶץ.
and true God is the God of the living not of the dead. 7. For he set himself apart and made known that he is not the God of the erring or of the heathen. Therefore he commands and says: You shall not go after the gods of the nations, for I am the Lord your God, the God of Abraham, and of the rest. You tell me now how he can be both the God of Abraham and of the wicked and impious. Be straight with me and speak the truth.

8. The Jew (said): I cannot say that the God of Abraham is the God of the wicked and impious, because it is written: The wicked says in his heart, "There is no God." And again (it is written): The impious shall turn to Sheol, and all the nations who forget God.

9. Sergius (said): Behold then, acknowledge that the sinners and the impious, even though they are alive in the body, are dead to God. Thus also the righteous, although they are dead in the body, are alive to God. For it is written: The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God. Again it is written: On whom shall I look and in whom shall I dwell, but in the meek and the contrite in spirit, who trembles at my word.

1. Read אַֽדְּמוֹ. 
2. Read אַֽדְּמוֹ: cf. Ps. 9.18 P. 
3. סֵיָּמֶ should be added.

1. Cf. Mt. 22.32 //'s. 
2. Cf. Ex. 20.3, for the first clause, Ex. 3.6, 6.7, for the second. 
3. Lit. 'Direct your word straight to me'. 
5. Ps. 9.17. 
6. Wis. 3.1. 
7. As the argument develops it becomes clear that Sergius is using these texts to prove that God dwells 'in' the righteous. So 'in' rather than 'with' is the best translation here. 
8. Is. 66.2; cf. *Aphraates*, I, 829.
לוס. 29 ו. הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 30 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 31 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 32 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 33 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 34 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 35 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 36 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶчֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 37 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 38 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 39 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב. 40 הָאָבָב הָאָבָב פָּנָיו נֶחֶמֶת רְשָׁע הָאָבָב.
Again it is written: You are the temple of God, if you amend your ways and your deeds before him. And again he said: I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people. What is God — life or death?

10. The Jew (said): He is life. For he is the life of everything which is alive, and apart from him there is no life, but utter death and everlasting destruction.

11. Sergius (said): Then where do the living dwell? Death has no authority (over them), in the same way as darkness cannot enter a house to which the sun gives light. For he said: I will dwell in them and walk in them. If God is life and he dwells in the righteous, behold we do not honour the bones of a dead man but the life and power of God which dwells in them. Moses laid down the commandment: You shall not touch the bone of a dead man. From it what you say to me derived strength, namely, that we worship the bones of dead men. Tell me now, are you under a fearful oath to God?

i. Read ψολπ.

ii. In the right hand margin the Serta corrector has added , which should be read here.

iii. Between ψολπ and ψολπ, above the line and also in the left hand margin, the Serta corrector has added ψολπ. In the right hand margin a much later corrector (?) has added the same in a very fine Serta hand. It should be read.

iv. In the right hand margin the Serta corrector has added ψολπ, which should be read.

v. Read ψολπ.

1. Jer. 7.4f P. Aphraates (I, 10, 793) also cites this and the following text together.
2. Lev. 26.12, but following the text of II Cor. 6.16.
3. Or: Then where does the life dwell? Death has no authority (over it)....
4. D.R.S., viii.2, also gives this as the rationale for the worship of saints' bones.
5. i.e. this law.
ע$

פֶּלֶג 30, 4

הֵם רָאִין הַיָּדָה מִדְּרָשָׁהּ. וְהֵם לֹא מְעַמְּלִין לָהֶם. הֵם בְּאָדָם שֶׁעָמַר לוֹ הָאָדָם. לֹא לְחָזֵקְךָ לָהֶם. לֹא לְחָזֵקְךָ לָהֶם. לֹא לְחָזֵקְךָ לָהֶם.
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כִּלְכֶם וַתְּהַלְמִיד לָהֶם לַחֲמָם שֵׁל בְּנֵיה. וַתְּהַלְמִיד לָהֶם L
not to deny the truth? But judge truly the question which I am going to ask you: is it right and just that he who lays down the law should abide by the law, or he who did not lay it down?

13. The Jew (said): Truly it is right for him who lays down the law to abide by the law which he has laid down that he may not be a hypocrite. If he does not, he cannot blame anyone else who breaks his law.

14. Sergius (said): Moses laid down the commandment: You shall not touch the bone of a dead man, and he who touches (it) shall be unclean until the evening. And again he said: Cursed is everyone who does not keep all which is written in this law. Tell me, were the bones of Joseph those of a dead or a living man?

The Jew (said): As we Hebrews maintain, those of a dead man.

15. Sergius (said): Then show me where he who laid down the commandment cast the bones of the righteous Joseph?

The Jew (said): I cannot show (anything) except that he carried the body around on all the journeys of the children of Israel for forty years, until they entered the promised land. And they were buried in the inheritance of Joseph by

1. Following the scribal sign these two words should be reversed.

2. Lit. 'the word'.
4. Dt.27.26, but influenced by Gal.3.10: cf. ch.v.1.
עַד אֶלְכֵּלָה יַעֲמֹר וְנִשְׁמָה לַאֵל הַגֹּדוּל
לֹא יְזַכֵּר עָנָי לְאֶלֶּה.
בַּשְׁלֹשָּׁהָ יָמִים יַעֲמֹר וְנִשְׁמָה לַאֵל הַגֹּדוּל
לֹא יְזַכֵּר עָנָי לְאֶלֶּה.
וְיָשְׁר לִמְדַבֵּר בְּאֶלֶּה.
לָנוּ הָאָדָם בְּתוֹכָהוּ.
לָנוּ הָאָדָם בְּתוֹכָהוּ.
לָנוּ הָאָדָם בְּתוֹכָהוּ.
לָנוּ הָאָדָם בְּתוֹכָהוּ.
Joshua the son of Nun, the son of Ephraim, the son of Joseph.

16. Sergius (said): Tell me, is Moses under the curse which he pronounced - "Cursed is everyone who does not do all which is written in this book"? He laid down the precept concerning the bone, but he carried the bones. And he cursed him who transgresses anything which he commands. Come, condemn Moses! Come! Your boast is in Moses, your master and teacher. If Moses is condemned, so am I. And if Moses is innocent, so am I, like him. Come, answer me: Why are you silent?

17. The Jew (said): Although Moses did indeed carry the bones, he did not worship (them) as you have done. And you cannot show that he did worship (them).

Sergius (said): Neither can you show that he did not worship (them). But as he carried, so also he worshipped and honoured (them), although he did not worship (them) as God, but as a righteous man whose intercesssion God accepts.

i. The Sētā corrector has added _above the line, which should be read.

ii. Read .

iii. There are traces here of the letter , for which see the Introduction, p.4, n.3.

1. For a parallel with Aphraates see the Introduction, p.67.

2. D.b.S. (viii.2) also uses the example of Joseph's bones in this context.
قاتلاً للملك... مع اتباعه من أملاك، وفقاً لقراراته. للملوك، والحكام، والحكاية،...
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10

5

0

قد يبدأ الملك بالسماح...

بناءً على النص، نحن،...

باستخدام بعض النصوص...

لا يمكنني...
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And as he presented the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in his prayer, so he also mentioned the bones of Joseph before God. If there had been another just man between Abraham and himself, he would also have made mention of him before God, that with him they might repair the breaches of your sins. 18. For David said: If Moses, his chosen, had not stood in the breach before him and averted his wrath that he might not destroy them, it is certain that they would have been destroyed, as the sons of Aaron were destroyed, and as the two hundred and fifty priests whom the fire which went out from before the Lord burnt up, and as the company of Korah and Dathan perished, and as the rest of the wicked men whom the fire round about the camp consumed. See that four times God threatened to destroy them, and Moses took up like presents and offerings the names of the righteous fathers and presented (them) to God. Then his wrath was assuaged. Are these things (so) or not? 19. The Jew (said): They are, and I cannot deny (it), for they have their own attestation.

1. See the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.

2. This is an inference made by Sergius, for it is nowhere stated in the Pentateuch.
3. i.e. either Abraham or the other 'just man'.
4. i.e. the righteous fathers.
5. Ps. 106.23. Sergius supplies an apodosis after the quotation.
6. Cf. Lev. 10.2.
7. Cf. Num. 16.35.
10. Cf. Ex. 32.13 f, Dt. 9.27. The Pentateuch only reports one occasion when Moses did this, although there were others when God threatened to destroy the people and Moses interceded for them without specifically mentioning the names of the fathers - Num. 11.2, 14.12 ff, 16.22 ff.
 CDNס נים לחם בים. לחה.

כלה לא ביה קש שול.

לעה. לא נינה קשים. נל

כלה. נל 2 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 3 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 4 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 5 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 6 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 7 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 8 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 9 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 10 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 11 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 12 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 13 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 14 קשים. נל.

כלה. נל 15 קשים. נל.
XIV.1. Sergius (said): Come then, let us search for the truth. For these men are alive for ever—(this is) the orthodox faith. For I said to you, "Whom do you call dead?" And you said to me, "Everyone from whom his spirit has departed". Then according to your definition, everyone who is dead to this life is unclean, and everyone who is alive in this physical life is clean.

2. The Jew (said): The scripture said: He who touches the bone of a dead man shall wash his body with water and be unclean until the evening. And in this it does not distinguish between the righteous and the sinner. Therefore I say that everyone who is dead is unclean.

3. Sergius (said): Are the heathen, the Magi, the enchanters, the idolaters, the adulterers, the thieves, the murderers, and the transgressors of God's law and commandments, holy until they die?

The Jew (said): I do not say that they are holy, but (I say it) because the scripture has instructed.

4. Sergius (said): But behold, the scripture says: Kings (who) do iniquity are unclean.

1. In the right hand margin opposite 1.20 the Sertã corrector has added לָמוֹת 'the dead', no doubt with the intention of providing a subject for אֲמֹתָם, and therefore necessitating the translation '..... the dead are holy...' Since this is the opposite of the required sense, the correction should not be read.

2. A quire mark.

1. Lit. 'word'.
2. Lit. 'out of'.
4. Untraceable; perhaps it is based on Dt. 17.14-20, 25.16.
ফাতেম মেহর হামিদ আব্দুর রহিম ফেডারেশন লিমিটেডের সদস্য হওয়ার উদ্যোগের জন্য তিনি সহকারী প্রামাণ্যতা পেয়েছেন।

ফাতেম মেহর হামিদ আব্দুর রহিম ফেডারেশন লিমিটেড এর সদস্য হওয়ার জন্য তিনি সহকারী প্রামাণ্যতা পেয়েছেন।

ফাতেম মেহর হামিদ আব্দুর রহিম ফেডারেশন লিমিটেড এর সদস্য হওয়ার জন্য তিনি সহকারী প্রামাণ্যতা পেয়েছেন।

ফাতেম মেহর হামিদ আব্দুর রহিম ফেডারেশন লিমিটেড এর সদস্য হওয়ার জন্য তিনি সহকারী প্রামাণ্যতা পেয়েছেন।
And David said concerning the Lord: His soul hates the wicked and the lovers of iniquity. Therefore it is clear that the wicked is unclean and defiled both in his life and in his death, and this is truly death: he who cleaves to him defiles himself. But the righteous and he who loves God is clean and holy both in his life and in his death: the divine power dwells in his bones. And the bones of Elisha bear witness - which gave life to the dead man who touched them and who returned with those who were digging his grave. 5. Behold, let your whole people be gathered, you who live and speak, and pray over one dead body, and call on God to whom you pray, and mention Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, your fathers, and let the power of your prayer be seen in the coming to life of the dead body. If then, you cannot do this, although you cannot, why do you deny the truth and find fault with our glorious faith? And (why) are you not ashamed that, behold, for seven hundred years no man has been found among all your people who prays and is heard, either for a dead

1. Read אדונֵי.
2. A quire mark.
3. Ps.11.5.
5. Cf. ch.viii.5f, and the Introduction, p.8f.
لا أستطيع قراءة النصوص العربية أو الفارسية بشكل طبيعي. إذا كنت بحاجة إلى ترجمة أو مساعدة في شيء آخر، فسأكون سعيدًا بالمساعدة. يرجى الإشارة إلى النصوص المطلوبة أو سؤالك بشكل واضح.
or a sick man. But by this it is clear to the unlearned that you are exasperating, and also (that) God is exasperated by you. But you do not understand and still you harden your hearts to his exasperation.

ó. The Jew (said): But where are the signs that are performed among your people?

Sergius (said): Who can number the signs and miracles and mighty works which have been performed among our people in all nations, in all places, in the name of Christ, through his disciples and the saints after them, even until this day? In all generations you see with your eyes but you do not wish to believe, because you are the children of those who saw his wonderful deeds but (who) afterwards said to Aaron, "Make us gods that they may go before us". 7. If you were not their children you would have seen the dead who were raised, the lepers who were cleansed, the blind (whose eyes) were opened, the lame who leapt like

i. Read אַדָּוַעַד .
ii. Read אַדָּוַעַד ; the scribe has shortened the word in order to fit the space available.
iii. Read אַדָּוַעַד : the original scribe has written a under the line.
iv. There is an illegible marginal note in the right hand margin opposite line 16.

1. Or 'to the common people'.
2. Ex. 32.1; cf. ch.xxii.16.
harts, as Isaiah prophesied beforehand, and the evil spirits who were driven out, and others without number. For on account of them the nations turned to the God of Abraham. What place or city, or even just a village, is there, in which God has not placed the treasure of one of his saints, from whose bones flow cures and healing like Elisha's. There are thousands and ten thousands living and speaking among you, while you are deprived of (even) one simple sign.

8. The Jew(said): They are phantasies, and not true.

Sergius (said): You are like your fathers, who when they saw the evil spirits coming out said, "This man casts out demons by Beelzebub". And about the blind man (whose eyes) were opened they said, "It is not he, but he is certainly like him." And (because) they did not know what to say about Lazarus who rose from the dead, they wished to kill him that he might not say that it was Jesus who had raised him up.

9. But what can you say without burying yourself in falsehood? Then let the word of the prophet Isaiah tell you; he who foresaw your slander said: Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, and put light for darkness and darkness

1. Read יִפְרַגְוּ .

2. Read יְהוּדָה; the original scribe has written the ה underneath the line.

1. Cf. Is. 35.5f, and see also Mt. 11.5, Lk. 7.22, and cf. D. b. S., v. 10.
2. Mt. 12.24, Lk. 11.15.
لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

أنا أرى أنني لم أكن هناك. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

لم أكن أستطيع أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي. 

هل يمكنني أن أتذكر ذلك في المنشأة. لقد غاب عن رؤيتي.
for light, and put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. And again he said: Woe to the sinful people, a people weighed down with iniquity. Behold, see now the magnitude of your iniquity that pure and holy men are regarded by you as evildoers and impious. Pure and holy men in whom the Spirit of the Lord dwells are regarded by you as unclean and defiled, and 'he who touches them defiled'. For Moses, who carried the bones of the holy man, proves to you that the bones of the saints are not unclean, but those of wicked men, who are unclean both in their lives and in their deaths. The holy bones of Elisha, from which life sprang up for the dead man, put you to shame. Even your own are regarded by you as unclean and 'he who touches (them) defiled'. The companions of Hananiah and of Daniel, to whom beasts and flame(s) showed honour and did not harm their bodies — holy bodies, in which holiness dwelt, why did they become unclean after their death, as you say, and 'he who touches them defiled'?

11. The Jew (said): But can you show that you have the bones?

1. Is. 5:20.
2. Is. 1:4f.
of the companions of Hananiah and of Daniel?

12. Sergius (said): Although I do not have the bones of the companions of Hananiah, I do have like them victory over the beasts and fire. Now they held out against and endured all tortures that God might not depart from them, he who said: I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God. And in antiquity Daniel, and Hananiah and his companions, and the Maccabees, and the old man Eleazar, and Shamuni and her seven sons, and many others, gave themselves up to death in their integrity for the sake of the law of their God, that they might not change (their) worship of him. Sometimes God showed his power in the miracles which he did, but sometimes he disregarded and left his servants to die. 13. Recently in like manner sometimes miracles occurred and many were converted, (while) there are some

i. Read אָבָבִי אָבָבִי לָאָבָבִי

ii. Read אָבָבִי אָבָבִי

1. Lev.26.12, II Cor.6.16; cf. ch.xiii.9,11.
2. Cf. II Macc.6.18ff.
who ended their lives in the contest. We regard both the former and the latter\(^1\) as servants of God, and we honour them as the servants of God.

14. The Jew (said): Honour and worship are two different things\(^2\), and I observe that you worship and honour (them) as gods.

15. Sergius (said): Tell me, if you enter before a king and worship before him, do you worship a judge and all the ranks of authority or all the order of rulers, with the same (position of the) head with which you have worshipped the king?\(^3\) You change the (positions of the) head according to the authority of each one of them.

16. The Jew (said): It is impossible for me to change the (positions of the) head according to each one of them severally as they are lifted up and brought low.\(^4\) So with the same (position of the) head I worship the king and the lower ranks of the kingdom. But the mind distinguishes

1. מָפָע normally refers to an order of angels - 'the principalities, archons', so we should perhaps read מָפָע or מָמָע.

1.i.e. those who worked miracles to escape martyrdom, and those who were martyred.

2.Lit. 'something other is honour, and something other is worship'.

3. The same word is used in Syriac for worshipping God and doing obeisance to secular authorities. To the oriental mind worship is essentially a physical activity - bowing oneself, whereas to the western mind worship is a mental activity. Hence Sergius can use this simile in a manner which is perfectly valid in his cultural environment. D.b.S. makes this point in ch.viii.3, demonstrating the ambiguity of the word מָפָע by adducing the examples of Abraham worshipping before the sons of Hamor (Gen.23.7) and Jacob worshipping before Esau and Joseph (Gen.33.3,47.31). Cf. also Aphraates, I,800f, who uses this analogy to defend the worship of Christ.

4. Probably this is an ironic comment on the frequency with which officials were promoted and demoted.
the honour of each one of them according to the measure of his rank.

17. Sergius (said): If you cannot change (the position of) your head, so that with the one with which you have worshipped the king, with the same you worship the judge, the military commanders, the rulers, and every man who has the honour of authority, why do you then complain of me that with the bending of one (position of the) head I honour the King and his servants? I also have a mind which distinguishes the rank of each one of them. When I offer to God as the Lord of all the worship which is due to him as the King of all the worlds, (I do so) also to the martyrs as the servants and great friends of the King, who have demonstrated their love for him by enduring ... ... iii tortures. Although I do not forget that the King is the King, I need both the servants, the stewards, and the attendants of the King, that they might intercede with the King, my Lord, against whom I have sinned, and because I know that he does

i. A shortened form of אֲדֹנָי
dii. Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.
iii. Even the three possible letters are uncertain.

1. i.e. God and his saints.

2. Cf. D.b.S., viii. 3 - לָכֹּ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֔ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣בּוֹ יְהוָ֗ה גֵּ֣דֹּ֖וּ וְאֶ֣חֶ֑י יְהוָ֖ה לָכֹ֣b

We offer worship to the martyrs as the servants of God.'

3. D.b.S., viii. 3, again closely parallels Sergius's argument - 'As we worship before kings and no blame attaches to us, so when we worship the martyrs in order that we may be helped by their prayers, we are not blameworthy.'
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the will of those who fear him.

18. The Jew (said): Give me a sure example and a trustworthy testimony for these things which you have related.

19. Sergius (said): You ought not to have forgotten what I said, that for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the holy bones of Joseph, the people was delivered many times from wrath in the desert. For God said to Moses: I act kindly towards thousands of generations on account of those who love me and keep my commandments. 20. When Sennacherib came up against Jerusalem and the city and its inhabitants were in distress, Hezekiah, the king, sent his servants and the oldest priest to Isaiah asking him to pray for them that the remnant which had been left might not perish. When the prophet had prayed and made supplication, a word came forth to him from before the Lord and he said: I will protect this city and save it for my sake, and for the sake of David, my servant.

1. Another shortened form of ἀμώμι, made here to fit the line.

2. Read ἀμώμι.

3. Perhaps read Αμώμι and translate 'and the senior priests' following II Kings 19.2 P, Is.37.2 P. Reading the plural here would, however, entail emending ἀμώμι in the following line to ἀμώμι.

4. Cf. ch.xiii.17f.

2. This, although not the sense of the original text of Exodus, fits Sergius's argument better, otherwise why should he introduce the quotation in this context? Sphraem, In Genesis et in Exodum Commentarii, ed.R.M.Tonneau, p.149, takes this text in this way and interprets the Ἰ as Ἰ ἰ 'on account of'.

3. Ex.20.6, Dt.5.10.

פל Salisbury...
לכן הפל הלילה
שלא יראו
הleşה...
והנה...
21. What more clear and certain example is then required by you? But if you wish to be convinced by the truth, then do not dispute, but accept and believe the things which are written, namely, that the bodies of the just give help to the places in which they are buried, and to the men who in faith honour them. For as the friends of a king, while they are persuading him procure from him a gift for the man who perhaps is unworthy, so the bones of the saints give help to the districts in which they are buried. 22. Let the bones of the prophet convince you, who came from Judah to Bethel when Jeroboam and the people were offering up sacrifices on the altar to the golden calves which he had made and set up in Bethel. How did the bones of the aged prophet who dwelt in the city escape?

1. Read הַנָּפְשׁ.

because he buried his dead body in the grave of the prophet of God, who proclaimed against the altar of Bethel the judgment of the sin of the priests and the people, (namely), the burning of the bones of the wicked by Josiah, the righteous king. It is written that when Josiah saw the sign which was over the grave of the prophet he asked, "What is the sign which I see?" And they said to him, "The grave of the prophet who prophesied this deed [which] you have done." Thus the righteous are a protection to the places and districts where they are present both in their lives and in their deaths. Along with these which we have set forth, Sodom, in which there were thousands and ten thousands of men, bears witness. If only ten righteous men had been interspersed among them, it would not have been overthrown.

XV.1. The Jew (said): The things which you have said are compelling. But nevertheless, I wish to inquire again

4. Lit. 'possess force'.
into this: You shall not touch the bone of a dead man.  

2. Sergius (said): Know, like a wise man, that all the thought of the righteous man and of him who fears God is in God, as David said: On the portion of the Lord I directed my thoughts, that I might keep your commandments; and in your law I meditated that I might not forget your words; I will never forget your commandments, for in them is my life. And he called him blessed who is like this, and he said: Blessed is the man who has not walked in the way of the wicked, nor stood in the counsel of sinners, nor sat on the seat of scoffers; but his delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law he meditates day and night. And therefore he who is like this shall be like a tree planted by a stream of water, which yields its fruits in its season, and whose leaves do not drop off.

1. Either emend to or just add it ; the Sertā corrector has written under the line after , and above the line before it, correcting to the Peshitta text.
2. Read .
3. Add with the Peshitta and the original scribe, who has written it above the line.

2. Ps. 119.57.
3. Ps. 119.16.
4. Ps. 119.93.
5. Ps. 1.1-3.
לא ניתן לקרוא את התוכן המוצג ב.imagín. מה ניתן לעשות? ניתן לקרוא את התוכן המוצג ב.imagín.
heat, and is not diminished by thirst, so is the man of God. God is to him like the spring of water to the tree. He is planted by his side, and he draws from him everlasting life; and the impulse of his thoughts originates in him; and the Spirit of God dwells in him as in a holy temple, as he said: I will dwell in them and walk in them.  

4. But why do you think concerning the man who is like this that, because his temporal life has ended, his holiness and the power of his God concealed in him as in Elisha has also died with him? You will say that his bones are unclean. But as he is holy during his life, so also after his death. But the wicked and impious, the heathen and the sorcerer, and all the lying workers of iniquity, are unclean and defiled both in their lives and in their deaths. For as the servants of God

1. The MS seems originally to have read Δανη, but the Χ has been subsequently rubbed out.  
2. Read Αποκοροα with the original scribe who has written the Α over the line.  
3. Read Βαβον.  

1. Lev. 26.12, II Cor. 6.16.
meditate on him and he dwells in them, also in like manner Satan (dwells) in his disciples. 5. The wicked devises impiety in his heart because there is no fear of God before his eyes: for it is hateful in his eyes that he should abandon his sins and hate them. The word of his mouth is trouble and deceit, and he does not wish to do good. But he devises trouble upon his bed, and he walks in a way that is not right that he may do evil. This man is defiled and unclean both in his life and in his death. Demons dwell on the bones of this man, and Satan also dances inside his grave and on his corpse. For in him and those like him the word which the prophet David spoke is fulfilled: The rebellious shall dwell in the tombs. Flee from the graves of such men! For the bones of such men are the abode of demons, and the meeting-place of fierce devils. For Moses said: You shall not keep a sorcerer alive.

1. In the left hand margin the Sertã corrector has written עון; however, Ps. 36.2 P reads קדוש and there is no need to emend the text.
2. See the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.
3. Following the scribal sign these words should be reversed; read ...דוע מזגא א"ת בכרה.בכרה אלהי יבשע.

1. Ps. 36.1-5.
2. Ps. 68.6.
3. Or. 'accursed devils'.
4. Ex. 22.18.
And he shall have no burial, but after his death his bones shall be burnt with fire, in order that his grave and his bones may not be an abode for devils.

Are things as I have said, and has the truth become apparent, or will you still go on disputing?

6. The Jew (said): They are as you have said, and the truth bears witness concerning them. But we Jews thus hold that which is written: He who touches the bone of a dead man shall wash his flesh in water and be unclean until the evening. And in this we make no distinction whether he is righteous or a sinner, but (we hold) only that one should never touch the bone of a dead man. For the scripture makes no distinction.

7. Sergius (said): But because of this - because you do not make distinctions in your reading, error has taken possession of you. Distinguish then the question which I am going to ask you. Which is preferable to you: to cleave to the bone of the righteous who has died, or to associate with a wicked man who lives in this life?

8. The Jew (said): As before God, it is indeed much better for me to approach a righteous man rather than

---

1. In the right hand margin the Sertă corrector has written קָאָו, indicating by means of a line that it should be read before כָּוְאָו.
2. In the right hand margin the Sertă corrector has written קָאָו and placed an insertion line after כָּוְאָו.
3. Read אָדָוְוְדָו.

---

1. This looks like a midrashic expansion of Ex.22.18 by Sergius.
3. Or 'has ruled over you'.
4. Lit. 'word'.

to associate with a wicked man. For I do not forget that
David said: With impious men I shall not have fellowship\(^{1}\);
and he who cleaves to the wicked learns from his ways\(^{2}\).

9. Sergius (said): Then wherefore your accusation against
us that we honour the bones of the righteous and the saints?
For we trust and also we know by experience that the power
of God dwells in their bones. And cures and healing flow
from them to those who touch them in faith, as life flowed
from the bones of Elisha to the dead man who touched him.
This testimony of Elisha is sufficient for us in place of
ten thousand arguments. And it is certain that many (argu-
ments) will not convince the man who is not convinced by
this. But he persists in his presumption until he comes to

1.Read \(\kappa \iota \iota\), the whole point of the argument being that
although the righteous are dead, the power of God continues
to dwell in their bones.

1.Lit. 'eat salt'. The quotation is Ps.141.4.
2.In its present form this is untraceable; cf. perhaps
Prov.22.24f.
that teacher who will give him instruction.

10. The Jew (said): And what is this?

Sergius (said): Everlasting fire, the worm which does not die, (and) barren darkness. When the flame of retribution roars before him, then he will accept instruction. And that which the Lord said will be fulfilled: Ah, I will take vengeance on my enemies, and I will avenge myself on my foes. And again (he said): Woe to those who call evil good and good evil.

11. The Jew (said): But can you show me that we are the Lord’s enemies?

Sergius (said): The prophet of God, David, has testified, saying: The enemies of the Lord have denied him, and therefore their ruin shall be eternal. And you will not suppose that the prophet of God lies! What the prophet says, God says. Again he said: I have hated your enemies, O Lord, and raged against those who rise up against you.

1. Read אָלָלָל.

2. Is. 1.24.
3. Is. 5.20.
4. The point of using this quotation lies in the identification of Christ with 'the Lord'.
5. Ps. 81.15.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.

يرجى تقديم النص الذي يجب قراءته بشكل طبيعي.
And I have hated them with a perfect hatred.

12. The Jew (said): But how have we risen up against the Lord?

Sergius (said): As it is said in the second psalm: They took counsel together against the Lord and against his Messiah. For you took counsel and you agreed among yourselves to resist the will of the Lord and to reject his Messiah, and you chose that a murderer and a robber should be given to you instead of the Lord's Messiah. And the evil and sin which you committed is not enough for you, but still you pervert the straight ways of the Lord, in which Christians walk, while you, the wicked, stumble in them.

13. The Jew (said): How do we stumble in them? Explain to me!

Sergius (said): We journey in the way of righteousness and of faith, and God is our guide through the writings of his prophets. But you brand with blame and disgrace the faultless Way,

i. Read אֶת נַפְסָה ; the original scribe has written the above the line.

ii. Read אֵלֵךְ . Sergius does oscillate between the second person singular and plural when he is referring to the Jews as a whole or to the Jew in the dialogue as the representative of his people, but the following אֵלֵךְ demands the plural form here.

iii. Read סָד ; the original scribe has written the ס under the line.

1. Ps. 139.21.

2. Ps. 2.2. Note how Sergius omits the subject of the quotation, 'the kings of the earth', in order to make it serve his purpose better. Cf. Acts 4.25f, ch. xxi. 13, and Harris, Testimonies, II, p. 80ff.

and you speak evil against us, the upright. Your hands are entangled in evil, and you do not wish to know the truth, or although you know (it), you deny and you suppress (it).

14. The Jew (said): Say how!

Sergius (said): You have forgotten what I told you that you cleave to unclean and defiled sorcerers, and you are accomplices in their polluted deeds with adulterers, fornicators, murderers, and all evil doers. Doubtless it does not enter your mind that even you have ordinary sin or a little defect! But although, with them and among them, you are filled with every sin and provocation, you find fault with us on account of the bones of the saints and the righteous, concerning whom God has witnessed that they are pure and holy through the signs and miracles which he has done and is doing by their bones.

1. This must be contained in one of the missing sections of the manuscript: see the Introduction, p.1,107f,115.
15. But you resist God in your evil will, and where God pronounces (something) holy, you say, "It is unclean"; and where you pronounce (something) unclean, it is clean. Therefore he said to you through David: How long will you judge unjustly, and show partiality to the wicked? Rescue the poor and the needy from the hand of the wicked. For they, the wicked, in their wickedness, did not know nor did they understand that they were walking - that is to say, were judging - in darkness. And therefore, through the magnitude of their iniquity and evil, all the foundations of the world were shaken - that is to say, all the inhabitants of the world were agitated.

XVI.1. The Jew (said): Enough! For you have wearied me with your words. Let us approach another question. Let us see what you (can) say to us.

i. Read מַעַבְדָּהוּ; cf. fol. 69v, 1.3.

1. Ps. 82.1-5; for a discussion of Sergius's midrashic expansions to the text see the Introduction, p. 17f.
Sergius (said): You question me and I will answer you according to the facts\(^1\). But nevertheless, I have told you that it is impossible for the truth to be overcome\(^2\).

2. The Jew (said): Behold, you have instructed me about the Messiah, and you have instructed me about the bones of the dead, those whom you call martyrs. Instruct me now about pictures and images, which are the icons with which you have filled your churches—pictures and likenesses of every kind. For it is written in the law: You shall not make for yourself any image or any likeness (of anything) which is in heaven above, or which is in the earth beneath, or which is in the water under the earth. You shall not worship them,

\(^{1}\)At this point there is a decorated wavy line across the page of the manuscript to indicate the change of subject; cf. fol. 27v,n.iii.

\(^{2}\)Read ָספִ.י

\(^{3}\)A quire mark;

1. Lit. 'as it (reality) is'.

2. Cf. ch.xii.18.
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and you shall not serve them. I am the Lord your God who brought you up from the land of Egypt.

3. Sergius (said): Now as a wise man and teacher of the law, tell me the reason for this commandment; whence was it? For every commandment had (a reason).

The Jew (said): The reason for it was paganism, the multitude of gods, and the various religions of all kinds to which all the regions of the earth inhabited by men adhered.

4. Sergius (said): And the children of your people, what were they in that time? Were they pagans or not?

The Jew (said): I cannot say that they were not pagans. For Moses said to God, when he was commanded by him to go down into Egypt: Behold, when I say to them, "The God of your fathers has sent me to you", and they say to me, "What is his name?" what shall I say to them? This shows then that the name of the Lord had been forgotten from their mouths as well as from their minds. But perhaps there was someone who was aware of the God of our fathers. For it was impossible that absolutely everyone should have forgotten.

1. In the left hand margin one of the correctors (probably but not certainly the Serta corrector) has written א"ת, and inserted a line after א to indicate where it should be read.

ii. A quire mark.

1. Ex.20.4f, Dt.5.8f.
2. Ex.20.2, Dt.5.6.
3. This seems to indicate that the Jew was a rabbi, either in reality or, for the purposes of the dialogue, as a literary device; cf. the Introduction, p.131f.
4. Lit. 'to which all the inhabited earth of men adhered'.
5. Ex.3.13.
 כאשר התיינע יתט השם אִישׁ. וְלֹא מִצָּא לָֽהוּ הָאָדָם אִישׁ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה.

וַיֹּאמֶר ה' לְאִישׁ אֶל֖וּ קָרֹֽא אֶל֖וּ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה וְקָרֹֽא אֶל֖וּ נִשָּׁה אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַمָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה. וַיִּקְרָא אִישׁ שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה שֵׁם אַמָּתְךָ אֲלֵיהּ נִשָּׁה.
But for the most part paganism abounded amongst them. For he said: You shall have no other gods besides me\textsuperscript{1}; and afterwards he said: You shall not make for yourself any image or any likeness\textsuperscript{2}. This was the reason for this commandment.

5. Sergius (said): Indeed I also know that this was the reason, and because of this I have questioned you — that you might witness concerning the reason. Now tell me in the fear of God, in what way is this which we do near\textsuperscript{3} to the situation of that time?

6. The Jew (said): If it is not near\textsuperscript{3}, you tell me what difference there is between that (situation) and this. For I hold thus — that in comparison, they are the same. He said: You shall not make....\textsuperscript{2} But if you know something else, speak! For to this we have been called — that we should seek the truth.

7. Sergius (said): Do you know that when God commanded

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ex. 20.3, Dt. 5.7.
\item Ex. 20.4, Dt. 5.8.
\item i.e. similar.
\end{enumerate}
لا تسمح بهم فصول جداً. يأخذي نقلً
فأنني يحل ما أنا عليه. لي: ينام فضلاً.
三项 أتماً. لا. لا كأنك قدك.
نأتيك هنا دفع فعَّالٌ ما.
قلت: بل هوا تائهلاك.
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لا تسمح بهم فصول جداً. يأخذي نقلً

15

لا تسمح بهم فصول جداً. يأخذي نقلً

20
لا تسمح بهم فصول جداً. يأخذي نقلً
Moses about the Passover, he said: When, in time to come, your son will ask and say to you, "What does this service mean?" say to him, "With a mighty hand and an uplifted arm the Lord brought us out of Egypt, when he killed all the first-born of the Egyptians."  

The Jew (said): Yes, it is true.

3. Sergius (said): Again, when he who gathered wood on the sabbath day forgot, and the commandment came upon him and he was stoned, God commanded that they should make fringes on their cloaks - a reminder lest they should forget the commandments of the Lord and die.

The Jew (said): And this also is true.

9. Sergius (said): If they are true, as they are true, come, let us lay them down as solid stones beneath a building, and upon them let us build the argument which concerns us. Now I will put their reminder in your mind, and do not forget (it), for doubtless I shall have to establish on them at length the foundations of suitable historical accounts. For

1. A composite quotation based mainly on Ex. 13.14f; cf. Ex. 6.6, 12.26, Dt. 4.34.

2. Num. 15.32-41; cf. Jacob of Sarug, Homily II(3), 121ff, and also Cosgrove's comment, op. cit., Introduction, chapter 6, p. 8, on the rabbinic collocation of Num. 15.32-36 and 37-41.

3. I.e. Israel's fringes, Num. 15.37ff.
जिन्हें नवीन स्वास्थ्य से शुरू किया गया था,
लेकिन उन्हें समय में नहीं दिया गया था।

मैंने उन्हें अप्रतिमता दी गई थी।

लेकिन उन्हें समय में नहीं दिया गया था।
it is impossible for a building to be constructed with one
foundation. But tell me, which matters does the scripture
relate - those which are regarded worthy as a reminder, or
those which are not regarded worthy?

The Jew (said): Those which are regarded worthy are re-
called.

10. Sergius (said): Why did he do this, and why was it
necessary for them to be written down?

The Jew (said): It was indeed exceedingly necessary.
For they were written down that they might not be forgotten
from the mind of men and from the hearing of the ear, and
that they might not perish through stupid forgetfulness.
For if, now that they have been written down and proclaimed,
forgetfulness still takes hold of the world, if they had
not been written down, what would the world have come to?

For he said to Pharaoh in the scripture: For this purpose I
have raised you up - that I might show forth my power in
you, and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.
For as it was necessary for the battle of the Lord with
Pharaoh to be written down, so it was necessary that all
these matters which have been written down should be written
down.

11. David (said): One generation shall relate your
deeds to another. And again

i. Read אפעא

ii. Read אפועא

iii. Read אפעא

1. i.e. provide the memorials of the dedication of the first-
born and the fringes.
2. Cf. ch.xvi.12.
3. Ex.9.16, but based mainly on Rom.9.17.
4. Ps.145.4.
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(he said): The things which we have heard we have known, the things which also our fathers told us, so as not to hide (them) from their children but to tell (them) to the next generation. He commands our fathers to inform their children in order that the next generation might know, and the children who are being born and raised up might tell their children that their hope should be in God, and that they should not forget the works of God, and that they should keep his commandments. For the children who are being born today or in every generation, whence do they know except from the teaching and from the instruction of the scriptures and the fathers? If this were not so men would be like beasts, and their fierceness would surpass every mad beast.

1. Ps. 78.3f.
2. Lit. 'as he commands'; it is better to separate the two halves of a very involved Syriac sentence.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
Even though the scriptures, the laws, and the severe punishments of judges, now exist, wilful men still dare to trample under foot the precept of justice. And if the scriptures, as we have said, and the laws had not terrified them, it is certain that the world would have already come to an end and would not exist.

13. Sergius (said): I confess to God that behold, I have heard the truth from your mouth. Now therefore that you have opened for me a convenient door, listen to me in the fear of God. This making of pictures and icons, which are inscribed with pigments in our churches, is confined to, and follows, the example of the scripture. And every account which the scripture regarded worthy as a reminder, the same we depict in the church for the teaching and admonition of men, that whatever the scripture relates for the hearing of the ear, the eye might see in the form of a picture.

i. Perhaps read the plural - ὄρασις.
ii. Read ἀφήμι.

1. Or, 'in the naves of our churches'.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
14. For Moses wrote: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth\(^1\). And where we depict 'in the beginning',\(^2\) thus we draw the likeness of the various things which were created in the six days. As the mind of man is able to provide a likeness and a representation, so also (we make one) of Abel, so also of Noah, so also of Abraham, so also of Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and of the rest, one after another until Christ; and of Christ and all his dispensation, and after Christ (of) every saint who set foot in the struggle of the contest against sin. And the sentences of his judgement\(^3\) have been written down like those of Daniel and the companions of Hananiah\(^4\). 15. When men enter to worship, and see these accounts inscribed on the walls of the church in front of their eyes, will they not ask the learned,"What does this mean?" And the learned will teach and inform them in every way

\(^1\)Read \textit{א princípio}. cf. Nöldeke, \textit{op. cit.}, para. 320, n. 1.

\(^2\)Gen. 1.1.

\(^3\)i.e. the creation story.

\(^4\)i.e. the saint's martyrlogy in an abbreviated form or as a legend accompanying the picture.

\(^4\)i.e. in the book of Daniel.
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in accordance with it\(^1\). Then the ignorant will learn, and by teaching knowledge will enter, and from knowledge will be born the fear of God. For it is written: The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters which cover the sea\(^2\). 16. Behold then, the earth has been filled with the knowledge of the Lord through Christ, as it is written: My salvation shall be to the ends of the earth\(^3\). Behold, the mountains, the hills, and the valleys, are full of the knowledge of the Lord. Tell me, when and where was the prophecy of Isaiah fulfilled which says: Sing to the Lord a new song, his song from the ends of the earth, (you) who go down to the sea with its fulness, and the islands and (you) who dwell in them. The desert and its towns shall rejoice, and the meadows Kedar inhabits. Those who dwell in the crags shall sing to him; and they shall shout from the tops of the mountains. And they shall give

i. In the right hand margin the Serṭā corrector has added קים which should be read.

ii. In the left hand margin a scribe, possibly later than the Serṭā corrector, has added כְּשָׁם in a very fine Serṭā script, correcting to Is.42.11 P.

1. i.e. the picture and its accompanying legend.

2. Is.11.9; cf. Hab.2.14.
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praise to the Lord, and declare his praise in the islands.  

XVII.1. How long will you refuse to understand that these things have been fulfilled and have come to pass in Christ? For we do not have pictures for the purpose which you think we do, and we do not err with regard to them as you erred in every way, as the prophet Ezekiel rebuked you. For through every door which the Lord caused him to enter he saw the variety of your abominations - of the sun, of the moon, of Babylonian pictures, of the women weeping for Tam-muz, and of many others with a variety of all sorts of paganism.  

2. But behold, God transformed these heathen pictures into holy ones, and instead of the name of gods and goddesses which was remembered through the images of idols, behold through the icons the name of holy men and women is remembered, who fought valiantly and bravely, and who trod under foot all the torments.

1. Read αὔων; one of the correctors has inserted a over the word.


2. Lit. 'as you think about us'.

3. Ezek. 8 passim.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
of the times of distress, and laid hold on the crown of victory through the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. 3. But you, in your folly and your enmity towards Christ, call this observance by which God is honoured by his servants images and idols, so as to be always perverse and provocative. And you make the prophets liars and you pervert their words according to your evil will. Where their prophecies concerning Christ are clear and evident, you make yourselves like a dumb, senseless stone. 4. For I have told you that all the evil and hateful things which Satan brought into the world, Christ has transformed into good and honourable things. Entirely to this end Christ came — that he might destroy the works of Satan. But behold, the good things appear to you as evil! Woe to those who call evil good,

1. Following the scribal sign these two words should be reversed.

1. For Sergius's use of ἡ ἀλήθεια here, which is not recorded in the dictionaries, cf. Ephraem, *Sermones de Fide*, ed. E. Beck, III.251.
2. I Jn. 3.8.
and good evil. Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and again: For the former things shall be forgotten and shall not come into mind. Behold, I create a new thing upon the earth: the female shall embrace the male. Tell me, what does this mean?

5. The Jew (said): This is certainly said concerning a woman.

Sergius (said): If it is said concerning a woman, it is not a new thing and he who says that he creates a new thing is a liar. For women are always embracing men; and where is this — behold, I create a new thing? And again (he said): Cast out the old before the new; and leavened bread shall not be seen in any dwelling-place of yours; and every person who eats leavened bread, that person shall be cut off from his people, for he has broken my covenant.

6. The Jew (said): About the unleavened bread at the feast...

There is a faint marginal note opposite lines 10-13 in the left hand margin, which looks like 'a comparison, similitude'.

1. Is. 5.20.
2. Is. 65.17; cf. the Introduction, p. 23.
3. Jer. 31.22. Sergius is not concerned with the exact meaning of this or the preceding texts in their context, but wishes only to collect prophecies which speak of a new act by God.
4. Cf. the Introduction, p. 135, for evidence that this represents the rabbinic exegesis of Jer. 31.22.
5. Lit. 'that', but 'this' is required in English to describe what follows.
7. Ex. 13.7, Dt. 16.4.
8. Ex. 12.15, 19; cf. Gen. 17.14, Lev. 23.29 f. 'Leaven' is here identified with the 'old' which the Jew must now reject; see ch. xvii. 7. Cf. the use of 'leaven' in Mt. 16.6, 11 f., I Cor. 5.7 f., and Ephraem, In Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii, ed. R. M. Tonneau, p. 141, ed. E. Beck, Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Paschahymnen, p. 31, (Hymns on Unleavened Bread, XVII.5).
of the Passover — he commanded that they should be made in order that they might remember the Exodus from Egypt, and that they might not forget the deliverance which he wrought for them from subjection to Pharaoh's oppression.

7. Sergius (said): Remember what I said that as the dream of Pharaoh was a symbol for the famine which was about to come, and (as) he expressed the years figuratively in cows and ears of grain\(^2\), so through unleavened bread he indicated to you that you should reject the ancient customs as leavened bread before the new and pure unleavened bread of the new gospel of the new prophet Christ, whom the Lord raised up for you from your brethren\(^3\), according to the word of Moses who said: Every person who does not give heed to that prophet, that person shall be cut off from his people\(^4\). See now how much the person who eats leavened bread and the person who does not give heed to the prophet are equal to each other\(^5\)!

---

1. Read \(\text{ךבש} \). An \(\text{ך} \) has been written above the word by one of the scribes.

2. Originally the scribe seems to have written \(\text{ךבש} \), and then superimposed a \(\text{ך} \) on the first \(\text{ך} \).

1.i.e. unleavened loaves.

2.Cf. ch.x.5.

3.Cf.Dt.18.15ff, and fol.73r,n.2.


5.See ch.xvii.5. Sergius is using a rabbinical exegetical principle: he deduces that the offences are identical from the fact that the punishment prescribed for them both is the same: cf.S.Rosenblatt, The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishnah, p.26.
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نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
كونه يعرضه على سلالة
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
كونه يعرضه على سلالة
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
15
سأ欢喜冰淇淋 담끼 먹는
كونه يعرضه على سلالة
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
كونه يعرضه على سلالة
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
كونه يعرضه على سلالة
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
كونه يعرضه على سلالة
نوعًا من التفاح، نحن تغطية
20
(See) that the meaning hidden in them is the same, and the sentence of judgement passed on them is the same — that is to say, everlasting destruction! 8. If, then, you fear the decreed destruction, reject the old which is hidden in you, and do not let leavened bread be seen anywhere in the dwelling-place of your soul. Receive (and) refresh yourself with the sweet and wholesome wine which has come from the cluster which sprang up and rose from the thirsty earth, a virgin vine as Isaiah said, which is pressed by a spear in the wine-press of the cross. Then your eyes which are darkened by error will be opened, and your soul which is sick in the infirmity of the law will be revived. And when the veil which covers your face has been lifted and you have seen the light of the splendour of Christ, then you will say, "The Lord Christ is my strength and my glory,

i. Read עָסַּ֔כֶּנֶו; clearly the סְיָמֶה was originally present in the manuscript but one dot has faded out.

1. Sergius seems to be alluding to such texts as Gen.49.11f, Num.13.23,Is.5.1-7,7.14,65.8,IV Ezra 5.5(Epistle of Barnabas xii.1),Jn.15,19,34. For the imagery, which appears to have a Jewish Christian background, cf.Daniélou,Theology, p.104f,Études,pp.100-7, and Aphraates,II,40, where the cluster = the people of Israel, and the blessing hidden in the cluster is the King Messiah — Christ. Here in the Disputation the cluster seems to have the narrower meaning, Christ, though the overtones of the wider meaning are present with the reference to Isaiah.

2. Cf. II Cor.3.14ff.
ن. 480

لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المحملة.
and he has become my helper; and I will give thanks to him and say, 'I give thanks to you that you have answered me and become my Saviour. For you have rescued my soul from the death which is ignorance, and my feet from the slippery ways of sin.' "9. Know that as the bitter waters of Marah were changed into sweetness by the tree which Moses cast into them, so the world has been changed through the tree of the cross from the bitterness of ignorance to the sweetness of true knowledge. Everything which was worn out has been changed and become something (new). Thus instead of the heathen pictures of the pagan gods, behold the pious and dignified pictures of the servants of the most high Godhead. And instead of the images of idolatry which proclaimed the vile and abominable deeds of shame which their gods did in their lifetimes, behold the icons of these proclaim the victory and the bloody martyrdoms which they showed forth in their lives within the pagan communities. Yet the fulness of sin did not prevail over them.

i. Read ܐܢܓܐ; a scribe has attempted to rub out the final ܐ.
ii. Read ܐܬܐܢܐ.
iii. This word looks as though it has been altered, but it is impossible to tell what the scribe originally wrote.
iv. Read ܐܪܐܢ; the MS has a singular suffix but the scribe has been misled by what looks at first sight to be the suffix to a plural noun. Cf. Nöldeke, op. cit., p. 11, n.1 - 'The sign * is even set improperly over words, which are singular, but look like a plural'.

2. Cf. Payne Smith, Thesaurus, col. 2342f, where the meanings 'Hunters, slaughters, hunts' are given for ܐܪܐܢ: C. Brockelmann, Lexicon Syriacum, adds the meaning 'wild animals'. So Sergius is probably referring to the martyrdoms in the arena where the saints were hunted and slain like wild animals.
لك فضلك، نعم هذا نموذج للذكاء الصناعي الذي يمكنه الإجابة على الأسئلة والملاحظة عن النصوص العربية.
10. If you are willing, accept (it); but if not, behold, you have free will. And I am innocent of your blood as it is written in Ezekiel: If you warn the sinner and he does not repent, you shall save yourself. But if you have not warned him, the sinner shall die in his sins, and his blood will I require at your hands.

11. If you could have profited from a multitude of words, there would have been many things to say to you. But if on account of these you do not repent even a little and you are not persuaded, it is certain that these among the many are not, then, sufficient. First you asked me about the Messiah, and I invoked the prophets and they came and bore witness, but you did not accept (it). And you asked me about the bones of the righteous, and Moses, Elisha, and others, bore witness, but you were not persuaded. And again, I startled you with regard to the pictures and icons of the saints, but because your foot has slipped from the way of Christ's truth

1. Lit. 'your will rules over you in your freedom'.
2. Ezek. 3:17-21, 33:8f.
3. i.e. 'these which I have said'.
4. i.e. 'the many which I could have said'.

i. Read ןֵוֹןָו

ii. There is an illegible marginal note in the left hand margin opposite lines 12f.
אני מתנצל, אני לא יכול прочитать את הווילהullah שכתבת כאן. אני יכול לעזור אחרים אם יש לך שאלה אחר. אם לא, אני מודה לך על הווילהullah שכתבת כאן.
behold, you cling to and lay hold on arguments in which you think you may stand firm. But you do not know that even they will utterly overthrow you so that you will not stand firm. But nevertheless, let us leave the many alone and let us bring in one (subject) to the debate and to the discussion, and let us seek the truth that it may stand in the midst and settle the dispute between you and me - which is this, whether the Messiah has come or not. If he has come, behold, all that Christians hold is the truth, and you are clothed in error as (with) a cloak. Now it is certain that he came to his native land. And if you do not believe the things which have been said until now by the prophets, perhaps you have other prophets who teach you otherwise. Go, search in them, and sit, wait for him until he comes, like a madman who has gone mad and gone out of his mind, who though many speak reason to him persists in his madness. But concerning this about which we were talking

1. Read

ii. Read

1. Lit. 'you cling to that you may lay hold on'.
2. i.e. the many which Sergius could have said.
3. Cf. perhaps Jn.1.11. There is perhaps a word play in the Syriac between māṭā 'native land' and ʾēṭā 'he came'. 
נַמֵּשׁ חַרְמִישׁ מֵלָסָם, כֹּלַחַל מִגֵּשׁ. 50.

קֹנְנוּ הָאָרֶץ. הֶנְךָ לְאַרְגְּשָם,

וֹדְעָה תְּעוּשְׁנָה. לְצָלַמְאָם.

וִיהֶה מִתְּנָשְׁנָה, מִתְאָסְפָּה. לְזָהָה.

זָהָה. יִתְסַמְּכִּים וּלְצַמְּנָה. לְעַלְמָם.

לְצָלַמָם, לְעַלְמָם לְצָלַמָם.

סֶם. סְלֶם, צָלַמָם, צָלַמָם.

ךָסִלְמָם, כָּסִילְמָם. סֶם.

בֵּם הָאָרֶץ. יִתְשַׁמְּכִּים, אוּתָפָם.

בֵּן חַמְּנִי לָא, חֵם תִּמְלַל לָא,

לְכָלָם. מְלַל, בְּכָלָם לְכָלָם.

רִלְלָם, רִלְלָם, בְּכָלָם. בְּכָלָם.

זָעַר, זָעַר, גֶּפֶּר מֶפֶר.

זָעַר, זָעַר, גֶּפֶּר מֶפֶר.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.

לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם, לְכָלָם.
I will add one saying, the conclusion of all these words. David said: Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of the righteous. If their death is precious in his sight, it is certain that also the bones of the righteous are precious in his sight. Then he agrees with Christians who honour him whom God honours. And Solomon said: The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God; and so also are their bones. And Christ, our Lord, said to us: He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me. Then we Christians, whenever we kiss the pictures of the righteous, it is as though we are embracing their bones. And when we honour their bones, we praise and honour their Lord in them.

1. In the left hand margin the Serṭā corrector has added מִשְׁמַע, correcting to the Peshitta text.

1. Ps. 116.15.
2. Wis. 3.1.
4. Cf. ch. xiii.11.
to whom be praise, and honour, and dominion, and worship, with his Father and his life-giving\(^1\) holy Spirit, for ever and ever, Amen.

XVIII.1. \(^2\) The Jew (said): I myself know that you have too many words, and everything which I ask you, you refute with idle talk. For the doctrine of the son of Mary\(^3\) is like this — a subtle contrivance of words. But nevertheless, I want you to tell me why you eat the swine, like which there is none as defiled and unclean among the animals, which also the law declares more unclean and defiled than all animals. And also its appearance is abominable to look upon. For its food is every unclean thing on the face of the earth, and the scripture treats it as equal to the insects, vermin, and mice. For it said: And the eaters of swine's flesh, vermin, and mice.

i. At this point there is another wavy, decorated line across the MS indicating the change of subject, as on folios 27v, 41v.

ii. Perhaps add \(\ldots\).

iii. Read \(\text{\‘living’}\); cf. line 18.

1. Or 'living'; cf. ch. xxii.18. Aphraates, II, 128, Liber Graduum, ed. M. Kmosko, Patrologia Syriaca, III, 204, have a more primitive form with the adjectives 'holy' and 'life-giving' in the feminine form.

2. For a similar discussion to that which follows on the Jewish food laws cf. Aphraates, Demonstration xv, 'Concerning the Distinguishing of Foods', ed. Parisot, I, 728ff.

3. It is possible that behind the use of this title 'the son of Mary' lie Jewish allegations that Jesus was illegitimate; cf. The Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. VII, p. 170, and the references cited there. But contrast Jacob of Sarug, Homily III(4), 307, where the Christian author uses the title with no apparent overtones.
নাম: নায়েফের হাফশিম

মোৎসমতি নামের জন্য ও নামের ভাষা আমি এখানে নিয়ে নিচের সম্পর্কিত বিষয়গুলি লিখছি।

1. নামের বুদ্ধিমত্তা
2. নামের ইতিহাস
3. নামের সাংস্কৃতিক ধর্ম

নামের বুদ্ধিমত্তা

নামের বুদ্ধিমত্তা মানুষের মনের অর্থ সারবদ্ধ করে। নামের নামের বুদ্ধিমত্তা সংশ্লেষণ ভাষা ও সংস্কৃতির সাথে সংশ্লিষ্ট হয়।

নামের ইতিহাস

নামের ইতিহাস মানুষের অন্যতম প্রাচীনতম ইতিহাস। নামের ইতিহাসে মানুষের ইতিহাসের যে কোন অংশ বা অংশের সাথে সংশ্লিষ্ট হয়।

নামের সাংস্কৃতিক ধর্ম

নামের সাংস্কৃতিক ধর্ম ভাষার প্রথম অংশের সাথে সংশ্লিষ্ট। নামের সাংস্কৃতিক ধর্মের মাধ্যমে মানুষের ইতিহাসের অন্যান্য অংশের সাথে সংশ্লিষ্ট হয়।
shall come to an end together, says the Lord. And now, say whatever you wish, and I shall be pleased to listen.

2. Sergius (said): Explain to me in what way the swine is more unclean than the rest of the animals and the birds which the law declares unclean. For it says: The animal which is cloven-footed and chews the cud is clean to you; eat it. But the swine which is cloven-footed but does not chew the cud is unclean to you. And the camel again, which chews the cud and is not cloven-footed, is unclean to you. Tell me now, in what way does the uncleanness of the swine exceed that of the camel and the ass of which you make use, and (that of) the horse and the mule which are utterly unclean according to the law. For they are not cloven-footed and they do not chew the cud, but you make use of them and think nothing of it; only the swine is abominable to you. Tell me why you do this.

3. The Jew (said): I have told you that it is made a grave for every unclean thing of the earth,

i. Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.

ii. Neither Payne Smith, Thesaurus, col. 768, nor Brockelmann, op. cit., p. 129, quote any examples of the use of a Pa‘el or Aph‘el form of the denominative verb from אֵרְבָּה.  

1. Is. 66.17.

for there is no limit and no measure to its uncleanness.
For it is made a grave, as I have said, for all the filth of the earth.

4. Sergius (said): I also have said that if (it is unclean) because it eats defiled filth, behold the mule, the wild ass, the horse, and the camel: they are clean and pure and they do not eat any filth, for their food is hay and grass. Then eat these and grow fat like them, but do not eat of a bird — the cock — whose brother is the swine. If its food is pronounced unclean — for it eats everything it can and swallows up both reptile and vermin — do not eat it. Behold the peacock which is beautiful and does not eat any filth: eat

1. Normally spelt κρία.
2. Another example proving the inadequacy of the Jew's criterion for uncleanness. The cock, although its food is filth, is not pronounced unclean by the law.
the peacock and the pelican, and the rest - any (animal) whose food is clean, whether it be cattle, or a (wild) animal, or a bird, or an insect of the earth. But you have broken the law of Moses, and made for yourself a new law.

5. The Jew (said): Now I know that you have completely mocked me.

Sergius (said): Truly I have completely mocked you, because you do not know the scripture nor the power of God, as Christ, whom you call the son of Mary, said to your fathers, the Sadducees.

6. The Jew (said): But how?

Sergius (said): As I have told you, if because of its food the swine is unclean, (so) also are the cock and the fish unclean like it, and the horse also, (all of) which you have regarded as clean and pure. And the argument has led to the conclusion that they are unclean. But in vain the law has said concerning them that they are unclean.

7. The Jew (said): We cannot say

---

1. Yet another example invalidating the Jew's criterion for uncleanness. The law declares the peacock and the pelican unclean (cf. Lev. 11.18f P) although their food is clean.

2. MS - 'They have broken the law of Moses, and I will make for yourself a new law', which makes no sense. The meaning according to the emended text is that by setting up a new criterion of uncleanness, whereby an animal is unclean according to the food which it eats, the Jew must logically declare clean animals whom the law declares unclean.

3. Sergius seems to be using the Aph'el of קַלְקֵל in the sense usual to the Ethpa'al + ה, to mock, delude etc. (The notes are continued on the following page).
قد. 32، 4، 8، 12، 16، 20، 24، 28، 32، 36، 40، 44، 48، 52، 56

لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي في الصورة المقدمة. من فضلك قم بإعادة تحميل الصورة بصيغة أخرى يمكنني قراءتها.
that they are clean, although their food is not unclean.

Sergius (said): So then, you cannot say concerning the swine that it is unclean because of its food, or that all who eat unclean things like it are unclean in the same way as it is, or that those who do not eat filth are clean, while the law declares them unclean.

The Jew (said): I cannot pronounce unclean the cock and the fish who swallow filth, whom the law pronounces clean. And I cannot pronounce clean the horse and the mule because their food is clean, as long as the law declares them unclean.

8. Sergius (said): Behold then, you fight against God who created them, and against the law which declares them unclean, and against yourself because you do not know the meaning which the law decrees.

The Jew (said): How do I not know the meaning which the law decrees?

Sergius (said): Because you do not distinguish its intention. For if you had distinguished its intention, you would have understood what it teaches.

9. The Jew (said): Show me its intention and explain to me what it teaches. For entirely to this end 2 we have come to this (discussion) that we might arrive at

1.Reverse these two words following the scribal sign.

5.i.e. the cock and the fish.
6.Lit. 'the argument produces uncleanness'.
7.i.e. the horse and the mule, etc.

3. The text of this paragraph is probably disarranged. The words ἄλλοι καὶ τὸ κολοκύθων 'and the horse also' seem out of place, for it is the cock and the fish, not the horse, which the Jew (through the law) has regarded as clean and pure. The Jew's new criterion leads to the conclusion that they are unclean, whereas, judged by the food it eats, the horse must be clean. It is the last sentence of the paragraph which refers to the horse, mule, etc., for by applying the Jew's new criterion the Law's decree that they are unclean is reversed.

1.Lit. 'uncleanness'.
2. For the expression cf.46v, 1.17, and note 1 to that folio.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
لا يزيد. فتاني وضحى، فتاني، فتاني، فتاني.
the truth, and that it might be clearly known with whom the truth lies. For you take offence at us and we at you. But I, as one who loves the truth, have drawn near to you, although no one has compelled me, but (only) my (own) intentions, while I marvel at your ascetic way of life on this column, by which action you have devoted yourself to the restraint of an ascetic way of life like this. Therefore, let us diligently seek the truth without anyone concealing the truth from his fellow. Tell me then, how do I not understand the will of the Lord from the reading of the law? 10. Sergius (said): Know then even you, like a wise man, that I have not devoted myself to this restraint rashly or needlessly, and not for the sake of anything uncertain, but for the sake of the clear and certain truth.

1. Following the scribal sign these two words should be reversed.

1. Lit. 'with whom the truth is'.
2. There is perhaps a play on words in the Syriac: ḫūṣāḥay, 'my (own) intentions'; ḫūṣyāḵ, 'your ascetic way of life'.
3. For the bearing of this passage on the claims of the colophon to the manuscript cf. the Introduction, p. 7, 119f.
ס"ד ו' unten

א. ק"ת 12 ל"ג
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XVIII.10-XIX.1

For it is hateful for a labourer not to know his reward, or for a hired servant not to recognize his master. Therefore I know the reward of my labour, and I recognize my master. And therefore I do not keep silent concerning the truth, for I am the servant of him who wishes that all men should live and come to the knowledge of the truth.

11. The Jew (said): I also pursue the knowledge of the truth, and I wish that if you know anything else besides things of which you have spoken, you will explain (them) clearly.

XIX.1. Sergius (said): Do you acknowledge that the creator of all is one?

The Jew (said): I acknowledge that the creator of all is one and not two or many.

Sergius (said): And did he create clean and unclean all the things which the law distinguishes?

The Jew (said): Yes, and no other.

Sergius (said): And is what Moses wrote true? - God saw all that he had made, and behold, it was excellent.

1. One of the correctors has written Κίλεον above the line after Κατοικία in line 8, and below the line after Κατοικία in line 9, where in both cases it should be read.

ii. The scribe has left out the final η of Κατοικία, because there is no room for it at the end of the line: we may compare his practice elsewhere of shortening the names Κατοικία and Κατοικία when the space available is limited.

1. Cf. I Tim. 2.4; cf. the Introduction, p. 23f, for a discussion of the text of this quotation.


Fol. 54v.

The face of a page with text written in Hebrew script, but the content is not legible due to the handwriting style and faded ink.
The Jew (said): Yes, it is true.

2. Sergius (said): But how then does that which you hold agree with this which you have testified is true? If the creator is one and all that he has made is very good, there is then nothing which is unclean in his creation. If it is good, then it is not unclean; and if it is unclean, it is not good. For it is impossible for anything to be both unclean and good at the same time. For uncleanness is not good.

3. The Jew (said): But why then did he declare unclean and make distinctions?

Sergius (said): It is not for you to say to me, "Why did he declare unclean and make distinctions?" but it is for me to require at your hand why indeed he witnessed concerning everything that it is good, and afterwards said, "Declare unclean and make distinctions." You then, like a teacher of the law, and like a Hebrew who boasts in the law, tell me how God saw all that he had made was very good, and after many generations.

1. Following the scribal sign these two words should be reversed.

1. Gen. 1.31. Perhaps the א before הought to be omitted following the Peshitta, since Sergius assumes this reading in lines 4 and 19. The translation would then read: '...behold, it was very good'.

2. Cf. Aphraates, I.732, who starts his discussion of the Jewish food laws at this point.

3. Or 'afterwards said that it is unclean, and made distinctions'.

4. Cf. ch. xvi. 3 and note 3 to folio 42r.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
commanded you and said, "You shall not eat such and such: it is unclean to you".

4. The Jew (said): From the beginning the clean and the unclean were distinguished, as God said to Noah: Bring with you into the ark two pairs from all the cattle, (wild) animals, and birds, and seven pairs from those which are clean. Behold the clean were distinguished from the unclean, and not recently did the law make known the clean and the unclean.

5. Sergius (said): In the entering into the ark he called the clean by name — that is, the harmless — who are exploited for food both by men and by those who are unclean, which are the wild, rapacious, and bold, beasts, who even until today are inferior in fertility — the lions, the leopards, and the rest. And again behold, we see that these who are food are fertile; even this swine.

1. (Jf. Gen. 6.19ff, 7.2ff.

2. Sergius seems to be attempting to prove (not very successfully) that the distinction between clean and unclean animals in the story of Noah's ark refers to the difference between domesticated, fertile animals used for food, and infertile, wild animals which are of no use to man.
whose name is detestable in your sight, is not placed on the side of the unclean by Noah's action. For it is not reckoned with the wild beast but with the driven and those who are eaten. And because it is exploited more than all animals, so God has increased its offspring and fertility. By (doing) this the creator has testified concerning it that it is not unclean for men's food for those whose conscience accepts it. But that you may confirm (the truth of) the argument for yourself let us bring for a witness to it the passage which Moses related concerning Noah: And God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. The fear of you and the dread of you

i. The Serta corrector has written a א above the כ to read תמר which is better Syriac.

ii. Read עבשנונך.

1. i.e. the domestic animal.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
shall be [upon] every animal of the earth, and upon every bird of heaven, and upon every creeping thing which the earth breeds, and (upon) all the fish of the sea; into your hands they shall be delivered. Every creeping thing that lives shall be food for you. Like the green plant I have given you everything. Only you shall not eat flesh with its life, (that is) its blood. And he said the same things to those of the house of Adam, and he regarded them as a green plant. 7. Where then is the uncleanness either of the swine or of anything (else)? However, in the beginning and the middle and the end of the times he forbids only blood. God said: Like the green plant I have given you everything. But will you pronounce unclean after God, the creator, has pronounced clean, and will you declare defiled that (concerning) which he said then, in the beginning: Like the green plant I have given you everything. He said at the end of the times: There is nothing

1. Add following the Peshitta.

ii. In the right hand margin the Serta corrector has added בדנה with an insertion line before בדנה. This may be read, although it is not absolutely necessary.

2. i.e. all animals.
3. Cf. Gen.1.30. Sergius is saying that as God gave all the green plants to men for food, so he has also given them all animals without exception.
from outside which by entering a man can defile him; but that which comes out from his heart, that defiles the man. 8. The Jew (said): But if, as you say, he regarded them in the beginning like the green plant and in the end said that they do not defile a man, why through Moses did he increase (the number of) unclean things and distinguish the clean? For he said to them: Every animal which is not cloven-footed and does not chew the cud is unclean to you. He explained again his word concerning that which is cloven-footed but does not chew the cud, and he said: The camel, which chews the cud but is not cloven-footed, is unclean to you. And the swine, which is cloven-footed but does not chew the cud, is unclean to you. If they are regarded as the green plant and there is no uncleanness, why then

1. The normal form is בּוּנָי; cf. lines 12 and 16, and folio 51r passim.

1. Mk. 7.15; cf. Mt. 15.11, and Anhœates, I, 728. Note also once again the identification of Christ with the God of the Old Testament.

2. Or ..... 'which is not cloven-footed but chews the cud.' The quotation seems to be a negative version of Lev. 11.3.

3. Lev. 11.4, 7. Both Sergius's quotations from Lev. 11 and those of the Jew show a certain amount of confusion. Both ignore the item 'parts the hoof', both never quote the text exactly, and in some cases they quote only their inferences from it.
רעיוןון ש רשאיו ש伸びיהו. לא י הני
עודא הילך גלגלית.

בשֶם הַיָּמִים. 30 ז"ח יב, י"ג. 32
בָּשָׁם הַיָּמִים. 30 ז"ח יב, י"ג.

לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.

5 לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.

7 לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.

10 לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.

12 לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.

15 לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
לֹא יִתְמַגֵּן הַכֶּלֶל הַשָּׁעָה בּוֹשָׁה.
did he increase the prohibition and the commandment concerning them? For the law and the commandment were not instituted in vain.

9. Sergius (said): O free man, understand like a wise man, that there are no unclean things, but they are the cause of the mental bonds of the soul of men in relation to God. But because God knew that the will of men inclined to falling into the sin of paganism, he set round about the fence of commandments on various occasions, that freedom in relation to him might continue, and that you might not wander in the pathless desert of error away from the knowledge of his worship. Like a skilful physician who anticipates the illness with herbs and mixtures, incisions and cauterizations, that it may not spread

1. i.e. distinctions between clean and unclean things.
2. Cf. the Mishnah, Aboth, I.1, III.14.
3. Or 'that you might continue (in) freedom (or free-will) in relation to him'.
4. i.e. the worship of him.
in the body and result in destruction, so also God, wise in everything, was anxious that the race of men should not be destroyed by him. 10. He gave the commandment to every generation like that herb which is useful for its sickness: to Adam, that he should not eat from the tree of knowledge; to Noah, that they should not eat blood and (the covenant of) the rainbow; to Abraham, the covenant of circumcision; and to Moses, because the ulcers and sores in the body of the world had increased, so God increased the commandments and the precepts as remedies for the healing of that generation, because it was full of a multitude of evils and of paganism. 11. But know also this, that for the just whose knowledge

1. Read 

1. Or ..... 'should not be lost to him'.
2. Cf. Gen.3.3.
6. Behind this section there lies in all probability the traditional Syrian conception of the five covenants, each one granted to meet changing circumstances; cf. S. Kazan, O.C., 49(1965), p. 73, Aphraates, I, 473f, 497f, Jacob of Sarug, Homily III(4), 1.109ff.
יתן נסהศך כלאון. ונבג
והמה 30 והלאה 30. אַל
יתן נסהศך כלאון.
נשא 20 ונטה 20. אַל
יתן נסהศך כלאון.
יתן נסהศך כלאון.
is steadfast in the love of God, nothing is defiled or un­
clean. Tell me, was Samson who ate honey from the skeleton of a lion^ defiled? Or was he who drank water from an ass's jaw-bone2 unclean? Or (was) Elijah who ate bread and meat from the mouth of unclean3 ravens4 (unclean)? Were they condemned, or what accusation followed them? For he who split the jaw of the ass and caused water to come out for the Nazirite's thirst, and sent the ravens to serve the prophet, he proclaims all foods clean, whether the swine or any other, through the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ by the mouth of those who believe in him. 12. Nothing can de­file the heart in which God dwells and which is inflamed with love for him.

1. Following the scribal sign these two words should be re­versed and the second שֵׁפֶת eliminated, or just the first שֵׁפֶת should be eliminated following faint traces of a corrector's attempt to do so.

3. Cf. Lev. 11.15.
לא ניתן לקרוא את התוכן המוצג בתמונה.
as nothing which enters a fire can defile it, but it changes to its form everything which falls into it. For it is written: The righteous shall live by faith. And as again, nothing can defile him who fears God, so nothing is clean to the wicked and him who provokes God (to anger), but all the things which are clean in the law become polluted in the mouth of the wicked, as everything which falls into a trough of slime becomes unclean. Are these things true, or do they not seem to you to be true?

XX.1. The Jew (said): They are true and I cannot say that they are not true. For the truth which is in them compels me to say that they are true. But what shall we do

1. There is a + sign in the left hand margin opposite 1.4 and between קָנָי and קָדָוָי. We might compare the use of such marks in 1QIs. to indicate testimony quotations; cf. G.R.Driver, The Judaean Scrolls, pp. 527-532.

1. Hab. 2.4, Gal. 3.11; cf. Rom. 1.17, Harris, Testimonies, II, n. 14.

We could translate: He who through faith is righteous shall live. If the translation in the text is correct, then the quotation is being used to prove that 'the righteous shall live by faith', not according to the Jewish food laws. If the alternative translation is correct, the meaning is that one is justified not by keeping the food laws but on the ground of faith.
about this which is written: The eaters of swine's flesh, vermin, and mice, shall come to an end together, said the Lord.

2. Sergius (said): I compare you very much to a foolish child, lacking in knowledge, who when someone shows him pure gold and precious pearls continues in his childish state, and does not desire any of them but nuts and things to which his childish state is accustomed. For you use the passage like an infant and not like a discreet man who discerns the meaning of scripture. Now it is necessary for us to bring the passage forward that it may stand on its own, (and) that it may not through ignorance be wrongly treated. 3. It is right that you should know that the prophet Isaiah completely exposes your sins — those which were done in secret and in the darkness, and openly

1.Is.66.17; cf. ch.xviii.1.
2.i.e. Is.66.17.
and before the eye. You seemed to be like keepers of the
law, and you boasted before strangers as those who are the
sons of Abraham. Then the Lord saw that your deeds and your
words do not agree with each other, and he rebuked you
through the prophet and said: But you, draw near hither,
sons of the afflicted woman\(^1\), seed of the adulterer and the
fornicator\(^2\). Of whom have you made sport, and against whom
have you opened your mouth and stuck out your tongue? Be­
hold, you are the offspring of iniquity and a deceitful
seed, who are comforted\(^3\) by idols under every tree of the
forest. And you have slain children in the valleys under
the clefts of rock. Your portion and inheritance is with
the portion\(^4\) of the valleys, and also upon them you have
poured out drink-offerings and offered up oblations. Upon
the high and lofty mountains you have made your bed, and
also thither you went up to offer sacrifices.

1. The MS omits the לְֽתוֹכְנָה לְֽתוֹכַּנָּה of the Peshitta by a
scribal error.

2. On this folio the scribe begins to use regularly the
quotation marks discussed in the Introduction, p. 2f.

3. There is an illegible marginal note in the left hand
margin opposite lines 9-11.

1. נְעַרְנָה, i.e. f. pass. ptc. of נָעַר. MT has נְעַרְנָה
'sorceress'. The Peshitta has treated it as though it is
from the root נָעַר 'to be afflicted'. LXX, unable to
translate the Hebrew, paraphrases τοῦ ἡμῶν, although
Symmachus and miniscule 86 correctly translate καταγραφώντας.

2. Sergius follows the Peshitta in not reading נ before כָּרָא
and כָּרָא; slavish imitation of the Hebrew has led to the
breakdown of the Syriac syntax.

3. The Peshitta has read the MT בְּעַתְּנָה as Niph. ptc. of
מִנָּה not of מֵית. So also LXX which reads παρα-
καλοῦντες.

4. The Peshitta has misunderstood the word play in MT between
מִנָּה 'portion' and קָרָא 'smooth (stone)'; hence the in-
comprehensibility of its translation. LXX does likewise.
וכך היה ב印 משם שזיתו
 LARGE 3. מעל ידך
MARK
וזה זה יד נפש למאקדמה

 large 5.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ. וַיְסָפְרֵי

 large 10.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה. וַיְסָפְרֵי

 large 15.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 20.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 25.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 30.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 35.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 40.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 45.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 50.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 55.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 60.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 65.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 70.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 75.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 80.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 85.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 90.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 95.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה

 large 100.
 מָיִם יְשָׁרֵהוּ לְמִשְׁבַּחּ שָׁמָּה
And behind the doors upon the door-posts you have inscribed your memorial. 4. (With) many things like these he reproaches your synagogue in the person of a harlot who, when she has hated her husband and loved others, devises all sorts of evil things against him. So also you, inasmuch as you have turned away from that commandment—love the Lord your God with all your heart—have not only eaten swine's flesh but also have not kept one of the commandments. And it is clear from that (passage) that you have sacrificed children to demons, (concerning) which he said to you through Jeremiah: It never entered my mind. In the same way that you utterly provoked God to jealousy, you have eaten swine and slain

1.Is.57.3-8.
2.Lit. 'all evils'.
3.Dt.6.5.
4.It is just possible that this sentence reflects a metaphorical interpretation of the food laws—equating 'eating swine' with breaking the ethical commandments. Such an interpretation was very widespread in the early church; cf., for example, Novatian, 'On the Jewish Meats', Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vol. XIII, p. 389: 'Or when it (the law) forbids the swine to be taken for food (what does it mean?) it assuredly reproves a life filthy and dirty, and delighting in the garbage of vice, placing its supreme good not in generosity of mind, but in the flesh alone.' See also the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. X, for the same moralistic interpretation, which goes back as far as the Epistle of Aristeas. However, the fact that elsewhere Sergius shows no sign of using this interpretation but is content merely to contrast, without attempting to reconcile, the opposing sections of the Old Testament, makes it probable that he is not making such a sophisticated re-interpretation here.
5.Or more literally 'you have slain children for demons'; cf. ch.v.6 and note 6 to folio 9r.
6.Jer.19.5,32.35.
لقد 30 سنة بجانب بعض
الله . 30 سنة جدما بجانب بعض
اتخذنا نحن جميعًا المبادرات للاقتراب
من بعضنا البعض. 5. لقد
صلنا سنيننا هذه سنًا لسنًا
نتطلع إلى أن نكون معًا
كلما حدث شيء أو شيء
نستطيع أن نفعل فيه
نلون به بأسف. 10
نتمنى لك كاستفادة تامة
نكتن فيها مطلع حكمة.
نندم أننا نعود
ن غالبًا على بعضنا البعض.
تمنى لك بقوله وله
لمسا لعذابه . ولل totalPrice
للمـ: : 5 ملـ: 
للمـ: . 
للمـ: .
children. And if there was anything else more evil than these, you did (it). This (about) which you asked was said concerning you, not concerning us Christians. 5. Hear these things which Isaiah repeated concerning you when he said: I have spread out my hands all the day to a disobedient people, who walk after their own opinions in a way which is not good; a people who continually provoke me to anger, sacrificing in gardens, and burning incense upon bricks, and sitting in graves, and spending the night in caves, and eating swine's flesh, and polluting their vessels with dead bodies - to break the law and to defile the holy covenant that they might provoke the Lord to anger. And they say, "Go far away, do not come near me.

1. The Serto corrector has inserted here above the line following Is.65.5 P.

1. Is. 65.2-4; cf. Rom.10.21,2.P.vii.11.
2. This addition is not in P, MT, or LXX. It may be an explanatory addition by Sergius, or an agograph since the marks in the margin indicate a quotation. However, A. Resch, Agrapha, (Texte und Untersuchungen N.F. 15,3/4,1906), does not mention it.
for I am set apart". These were smoke in my wrath\(^1\) and a fire that burns all day. Behold it is written before me: I will not keep silent until I repay them twofold into their bosom their sins and the sins of their fathers\(^2\). 6. Again when he threatened punishment of your sins he said: And those slain by the Lord shall be many. Those who sanctify and purify themselves one after another in the midst, and eat swine's flesh, vermin, and mice, shall come to an end together, says the Lord. And I shall know your deeds and thoughts when I have come to gather all nations and tongues. And they shall come and see my glory, and I will set a sign among them. And from them I will send survivors to the nations, to Tarshish, and to Pul, and to Lud\(^i\), and to Tubal, 1. There is a faint marginal note under the last line - perhaps און 'a bow', referring to what has been missed out of Is.66.18 i.e. און זמ 'who draw the bow' after פל 'and to Lud'. 1. MT 'נה', which can mean either 'my nostril' or 'my wrath'. The Peshitta takes it in the latter sense as does the Septuagint. 2. Is.65.5-7.
לחצו על חלקי תשמישת. להזדה יוכד על את השם
ופسلوك משות. חרסה, מסרי
לכלים, ת tjejer ודלוש
ensagem מועבה לנה, רכיעה
להתאמה謝שנה, ממשל脈
להתאמה谢שנה, ציבוץ, להנה
לצאת לשובי ציד ונת.
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and to Javan, and to the distant islands, that have not heard my name or seen my glory. And they shall declare my glory among the nations, and they shall bring all your brethren from all the nations (as) an offering to the Lord, upon horses, and in carriages, and in chariots, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, says the Lord, as the Israelites bring the meal offering in clean vessels to the house of the Lord. Also some of them I will take for priests and Levites, says the Lord. As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make, they will remain before me, says the Lord. 7. Behold these things! You have compelled me to speak again about your ignorance, that I might show you that for us Christians everything is clean through the love of our Lord Jesus

1. The Peshitta reads אַלּם in the MS no is visible, but it could have been there as there is a break in the line from א to כ.

1. Lit. 'the mountain of my holiness', which is a literal imitation of the Hebrew idiom.

2. Is. 66.16-22. The last sentence reads literally: 'As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make which shall remain before me, says the Lord.....' Taken literally there is no apodosis, and Sergius has cut off the quotation in the middle of a verse. Perhaps he thought it wise to end the quotation here because Is. 66.22 continues, 'so shall your descendants and your name remain', which is inconvenient for his argument. The translation given above depends upon the allusion on the next page (61v,5-7) which shows how Sergius interpreted the quotation. 'They' stands for the 'priests and Levites' who are interpreted as 'Christians', or more narrowly, 'Clergy and ascetics'.

1. Lit. 'the mountain of my holiness', which is a literal imitation of the Hebrew idiom.

2. Is. 66.16-22. The last sentence reads literally: 'As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make which shall remain before me, says the Lord.....' Taken literally there is no apodosis, and Sergius has cut off the quotation in the middle of a verse. Perhaps he thought it wise to end the quotation here because Is. 66.22 continues, 'so shall your descendants and your name remain', which is inconvenient for his argument. The translation given above depends upon the allusion on the next page (61v,5-7) which shows how Sergius interpreted the quotation. 'They' stands for the 'priests and Levites' who are interpreted as 'Christians', or more narrowly, 'Clergy and ascetics'.
ف.ر. 317

لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
Christ. We have nothing which is defiled, just as you have nothing which is clean. For by the 'survivors' whom he sent to us — that is, the holy apostles — he cleansed everything for us, and he chose us for himself to be priests and Levites, as he said. And behold, we serve him in purity and holiness, in celibacy and abstinence, and in poverty. And he who eats, eats in purity and gives thanks to God who has cleansed all. 8. Behold, the perfect priesthood is ours and you 'have been left like a booth in a vineyard', which is plucked and remains without fruit. You are deprived of priesthood, prophecy, and kingdom. And you make the house of the nations a reproach and a mockery, and you are enemies even in the sight of

1. Perhaps read לֶחֶם.
2. Read נַחֲלָה.
3. From its form this must be plural, so read נַחֲלָות.
4. The quire mark seems to be כ, which is an error; it should be כ.

1. These are the ideals and catchwords of the stylite movement (as well as of Syrian asceticism in general); cf. H. Delehaye, Les Saints Stylites, pp. cxxiv-clxxvi.
2. Lit. 'That which is eaten (he) eats'. Cf. Rom. 14.6.
3. Is. 1.8.
4. Cf. Hos. 3.4, and ch. viii. 5. Ephraem, Home Edition, III. 211 f, 217, elaborates the theme of Israel as the ravished vineyard replaced by the new vine from the Gentiles — the Church; cf. also Aphraates, II, 65.
5. i.e. the Church.
 conseils ونصائح لمساعدتك. اسم تي
مساعد سم 36. حتى أن تأتي
ل嗨 كنزنا ولم تعسر. بل إنها
تشمل. لمساء: نستند إلى نهج
حذرت عن نفسه سنة. 9. نسبياً. 
لله تفسير ثلاثة صفح.
لم نرى نجاح جزئي.
سنioms النهاية لم نحن
وتشبينه في غبط. لستاً صال
عمل الذي للملت منته. سنتها
إليها. 10. هنضت. صرحاً غلبه
وكانوا في ثلاثين
إعتقاساً حتى. له لا غلبه
لمساً. تحس سه طاقة
نمسكت نص تسمي اسم
هم تعاون. بل يمكنك لـ
دعاً طاساً همما
تعتقد له
those who are strangers to Christ. But we are honoured even in the sight of all nations, as Isaiah said concerning us: All who see you shall acknowledge that you are the seed which the Lord has blessed.

9. The Jew (said): He did not speak at all concerning you, but concerning us—concerning the seed of Abraham, as he said to him: I will bless you, and I will multiply you exceedingly. Why then do you take what is ours and make it your own?

10. Sergius (said): How is it fulfilled in your case that 'all who see you acknowledge you'? For it is not fulfilled regarding you that all who see you by the sight of the eye shall know you. But everyone who sees us Christians by the sight of the eye acknowledges us

1. A quire mark.

1. Cf. ch.viii.4.
2. Is.61.9.
3. Gen.12.2; cf. the words of the 'Synagogue' in Jacob of Sarug, Homily 6, Bibliothèque Nationale Syriac MS 196, fol. 204r-v.
5. Lit. 'with you'.
6. The native Syriac word meaning 'the Messiah's men'.

to be Christians - that is, 'the seed which the Lord has blessed'. 11. Let the prophecy of Isaiah come (forward): Lift up an ensign to the nations. The Lord has proclaimed to the ends of the earth: Say to the daughter of Zion, "Behold, your deliverer comes: behold, his reward is with him, and his wealth before him". And they shall be called the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord. 12. Again (he said): And I will bring forth a seed from Jacob, and from Judah an inheritor of my mountain; and my chosen shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there. But you who have forsaken the Lord, and forgotten his holy mountain, and filled tables for Fortune, and mixed for them bowls of wine, I will smite you with the sword, and all of you shall bow down to the slaughter; because I called you, and you did not answer, and I spoke, but you did not listen, but you did what is evil before me, and you chose that which I do not desire. Therefore

i. A later scribe has written over the words in this line in black ink, probably because they were faint in his day, just as the whole page is faint today. He has made a Sētā Mīm in the first word - כ for ק, so the scribe was probably the Sētā corrector.

ii. Read מִי־נָה

iii. The Peshitta has מִי־נָה, 'I will number you', following MT. Although the MS is very faint at this point, the reading given seems reasonably certain and also makes good sense.

1. The Greek loan word Χριστιανός.
2. Is. 62.10-12.
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thus said the Lord: Behold, my servants shall eat, but you shall be hungry; behold, my servants shall drink, but you shall be thirsty; behold, my servants shall rejoice, but you shall weep; behold, my servants shall sing praises from the gladness of their heart, but you shall cry from the pain of your heart and from the crushing of your spirit. You shall leave your name to my chosen for curses, and the Lord God will kill you; but he will call his servants by another name. For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But they shall rejoice for ever in that which I create. And there are many things like these without my reciting all the scripture.

1. Lit. 'from the good things of their heart'. The following contrast - 'pain of heart' and 'crushing of spirit' - makes 'gladness of heart' the probable meaning of the expression.
2. i.e. you will exchange your name for curses.
3. Cf. ch.xi.11.
4. Is.65.9,11-15,17f.
क्रिया निर्देशित प्रयत्न से पूर्व तिथि 13

क्षिप्रता परिवर्तन के कारण अवशेष का मानवता का संकेत मानवता निर्देश नहीं है। जल्दी ही अपने से दूर रखिए तब ही उनका संकेत रखिए।

लक्ष्य का संकेत आप के संबंध में नयी बात के लिए संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें।

लक्ष्य का संकेत आप के संबंध में नयी बात के लिए संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें।

लक्ष्य का संकेत आप के संबंध में नयी बात के लिए संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें। नया संकेत दें।
13. You have persuaded me that we should come to the house of Isaiah, and I have acquired much profit. I have seen many things by faith, things which I cannot bring(forward now). Because you asked one question as it were hostile to me, this one also has turned out hostile to you. But nevertheless, I have two things to say to you. One at the beginning of his prophecy and one at its end, that you may be convinced by them if you wish, although I am omitting many things in between. At the beginning he says: [Hear], O heavens, and give ear, 0 earth: sons have I reared and brought up, but they have rebelled against me. And again at the end he says: And you shall go forth and see the dead bodies of the men who have rebelled against me, whose worm shall not die.

1. In the right hand margin opposite line 13 there is an illegible marginal note; possibly it is adding ανκ from Is.1.2 P.

1. Or 'to the school of Isaiah'.

2. If the reading is correct (the last three letters are certain and the first two probable) we could also translate: '...and by faith I have acquired much profit', taking απατή with the previous sentence, and 'I have seen many things, things which I cannot bear (or tolerate)'. Sergius would then be saying that while he has found much of profit in Isaiah, he has also found some things with which he disagrees, e.g. Is.66.17. Perhaps the following sentence indicates this, since it is possibly a tacit admission that not everything in scripture supports his position. On the other hand it seems unlikely that Sergius (or any other Syrian theologian) would admit that any part of the Old Testament could not be reconciled with the Christian position. Moreover the translation given in the text does link up with the clause in line 9f 'although I am omitting many things in between'.

3. i.e. concerning the quotation from Is.66.17; cf. ch.xviii.1, xx.1.

4. i.e. the quotation from Is.65.9ff.

5. Is.1.2; cf. D.B.S.,iii.5,ix.4, Aphraates,I.774,789.
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and whose fire shall not be quenched. And they shall be a spectacle to all flesh 1.

XXI.1. The Jew (said): I know that we have rebelled against the Lord our God from when our fathers sold Joseph, and in Egypt, and in the desert, and in the land of Canaan; as David said concerning us: We have sinned with our fathers, and we have gone astray and done evil 2. If again, as you say, the sin of the son of Mary 3 was added to us, behold, a double evil! Then woe to us! What has happened to us that, instead of being heirs and sons of Abraham, we are strangers and enemies?

1. There is an illegible marginal note in the left hand margin opposite line 10.

2. Ps.106.6.

3. i.e. the sin of killing Jesus.

4. Cf. n.3 to folio 50v.

5. This is possibly an echo of the Old Syriac rendering of Lk.23.48.
�ל. ס" י ה' תב"כ: ל"ז. נב"י ח"ה
ש"כ: ח"כ הח"כ ח"כ ח"כ
כנר: ח"כ כ"כ ח"כ ח"כ
ךלד"כ: ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ

5. ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ

6. ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ

10. ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ

15. ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ ח"כ
2. Sergius (said): Tell me, what good have you experienced after the crucifixion of the son of Mary? Have you been aware that God has helped you to your advantage or to your disadvantage?

The Jew (said): If I say that we have profited, reality refutes me. And if I say that we have suffered loss, again our dispersion and wandering in all regions testifies concerning our humiliation and adversities.

3. Sergius (said): Come then, let us investigate diligently the real state of affairs until the truth manifests itself to us also in this as in all things. Hear what Josephus wrote, the wise man of the Jews, who related the destruction of Jerusalem after the crucifixion of the son of Mary.

1. Lit. 'seen'.
2. Cf. ch.viii.8 and note 3 to folio 15r.
3. Cf. D.b.S.,iii.23:-

'But you, if you crucified 'the deceiver', as you say, show what advantage you gained from your zeal.'
Cf. also Jacob of Sarug, Homily 5, B.M. Add.17,161, fol. 41r-v.

4. Or 'the real state of affairs'; cf. 1.12.
5. Or more literally 'in all them', perhaps referring to all that has previously been discussed.
لا يمكن القراءة بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
4. And Christ prophesied these things concerning it when he entered it on Palm Sunday. It is written: He wept over it, and said to it, "Behold, the days are coming when your enemies will surround you, and hem you in on every side; and they will overthrow you and your children within you, because you did not know the time of your visitation. There will be wrath upon this people, and they will be delivered to the edge of the sword, and be led away captive to every place." And again (he said): But woe to those who are pregnant and to those who give suck in those days! For there shall be tribulation the like of which there has not been from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never shall be. And if the Lord had not shortened these days, no human being would be saved. But for the sake of the elect those days will be shortened.

1. Read ἀνελθὼν following Mk.13.19 P.
2. For a parallel use of the following texts and a parallel argument cf. Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, 3.7. For the possibility that Sergius is dependent on Eusebius cf. the Introduction, p.98ff.
3. Lk.19.41,43f.
פֶּל. 65 וְזָרַעְתָּ עַל אָדָם נַפָּה לֶכְכָּמָה, וְזָרַעְתָּ הָעַרְבָּתָה בְּהַשָּׁמֶשׁ.

לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה חַסְדֵּךְ וְלֹא יַעֲשֶׂה שֶׁפֶחְטָך. לֹא יִכְפֶּרֶץ. כֶּנָּה וָּלְכֹלָה.

פֶּל. 5 לֹא תֹּאכֵל בְּרֹסְתֵּךְ אֶחָד. לֹא תִּהְיֶה נְדָרִיָּה לְכָל בְּרֹסְתֵּךְ. לֹא תִּלְמֵה. לֹא תִּנְטֵשׁ. לֹא תִּטְמֵא. לֹא תִּנְטְפִּשׁ.

לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכְלָבָהּ. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל עָנָיָה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל נְשָׁה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל מְרֹדֶשׁ. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל לֶבֶנָּה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל עָנָיו. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל נְשָׁה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל מְרֹדֶשׁ. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל לֶבֶנָּה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל עָנָיו. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל נְשָׁה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל מְרֹדֶשׁ. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל לֶבֶנָּה. לֹא תִּטְעַמֵּל בְּכָל עָנָיו.
And when he was going out to be crucified he said to the women who were mourning for him and to the crowds: Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but for your husbands and your children. For behold, the days are coming in which they will say to the mountains, "Fall upon us"; and to the hills, "Cover us".¹

5. Come, hear now the chronicle of the wise Josephus, (concerning) what happened in the reign of the Caesars Vespasian and Titus. For God in his mercy gave you an opportunity for repentance for thirty-nine years¹, but instead of repentance you shed much blood of the saints in these years². When again your presumption became apparent in your evil deeds, then vengeful justice was revealed upon you.

¹. The Sētā corrector has inserted קִזֶּה קָדוֹFormerly 'after the crucifixion' above the line. It clarifies the sense but need not necessarily be read.

². Read קִזֶּה.

1. Lk. 23.28,30.
2. For discussions of this passage see the Introduction, pp. 99f.,102f.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
in severe wrath, because of the rebellion which you declared against the Romans. 6. For thus Josephus said: I think that all the tribulations and adversities of old are much less in comparison with those which have happened to the Jews in Jerusalem. For because the Jews have sinned against their creator, (their) good fortune has transferred to the Romans. And this is the evil thing - that God darkened the mind of the Jews because of their wickedness. 3. And he said to the Jews, "But you, what of the things blessed by the law-giver have you done, or what that he has cursed have you left undone?" 7. Now as it seems to me, even the Shechinah of God has departed from the sanctuary. And if a good man flees from an unclean house.

i. In the left hand margin the Serta corrector has added with a stroke after αύγα to indicate where it should be read.

ii. Read αυγα.

iii. Perhaps read καύσανι since the form καύσανι is unknown to the dictionaries.

1. 3.J.1.12; see the Introduction, p.87f, for a discussion of this quotation.
2. 2.J.iii.354; see the Introduction, p.88f.
3. Untraceable in its present form; see the Introduction, p.89.
4. i.e. Josephus.
5. i.e. Moses.
6. Lit. 'what have you omitted of his curses'. The quotation is 3.J.v.401; see the Introduction, p.89.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
and hates those who are within it, how much more shall God abandon an unclean people!' No other city has endured such things as these, neither has any other generation from of old brought forth evil things like these. It is God who has condemned the people of the Jews, and turned their every way of escape to destruction. And from one gate of the city the dead went out - one hundred and fifteen thousand; and six hundred thousand in number were cast out from the city wall. Now I think that if the Romans had delayed attacking the city, either it would have been swallowed up in the abyss, or submerged in the waters, or it would have received the affliction of Sodom. God bore with a more godless generation than these.

1. Read כמעז.

1. B.J.v.412f; see the Introduction,p.89f.
2. B.J.v.442; see the Introduction,n.90.
3. B.J.v.559; see the Introduction,n.90.
4. B.J.v.567,569; see the Introduction,p.93.
5. A reference to the fate of Korah etc.,Num.16.32.
8. B.J.v.566; see the Introduction,p.90ff.
לֹא (ף 61) כְּיָמֵה יָכוֹשָׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּכְיָמֵה יָכוֹשָׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּכְיָמֵה יָכוֹשָׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל।

כַּלְדוֹתֵיהֶם יְכֹרְעָה לִשְׂאָל הַלֵּא רֵעֵה לִשְׂאָל הַלֵּא רֵעֵה לִשְׂאָל הַלֵּא רֵעֵה

לֹא טָסֵי שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם.

לֹא נָשָׂא שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם.

לֹא נָשָׂא טָסֵי שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם.

לֹא נָשָׂא טָסֵי שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם.

לֹא נָשָׂא טָסֵי שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם שָׂלֵם.
For in this siege out of immeasurable distress even women descended\(^1\) to inhuman cruelty in that they ate their children\(^2\). When it\(^3\) had been subjected to\(^4\) Titus Caesar, he said, "Let God blot out\(^5\) the men who eat their children: and let him not leave\(^5\) under the sun a city, in which mothers have eaten the fruit of their wombs. Yet (such food) befits fathers who after this bitter suffering of hunger (still) stand armed before the temple".\(^6\) 9. Consider now that it has not been heard concerning any other people under heaven except you that it ate its children. But you do not eat swine, yet you reproach us on account of swine.

1. The \(\Delta\) here seems to have no function. Perhaps we should emend to \(\text{κράνος}\) and attach it to the following sentence (67v, 1.1f), which though clearly a question lacks an interrogatory particle.

ii. There are no quotation marks in the margin opposite lines 1-5, indicating that the text does not contain a direct quotation from Josephus.

1. Lit. 'came to'.
2. Cf. B.J. vi. 201-213; see the Introduction, p. 94.
3. i.e. the city.
4. Lit. 'came into subjection to'.
5. Or 'God will blot out ....... and he will not leave .......'
Can you say that God did these things to you unjustly?

10. The Jew (said): God forbid that I should say that God did wrong, for it is written: You are righteous, O Lord, and your judgements are exceedingly upright. And again (it is written): The Lord is righteous in all his ways.

11. Sergius (said): If the Lord is righteous in all his ways and you, as you say, do not go astray, why has your people, your city, and your temple which was unique in the world, received wrath like this?

12. Hear then the things which Eleazar the Jew said, who also was one of those who endured the tribulation.

i. Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.

ii. Perhaps read לְהַגַּהְתָּה.

1. Ps. 119.137.

2. Ps. 145.17.

3. Or '.....why has your people, your city, and your temple, received wrath like this, of which there has never been (anything) like it in the world'.

4. Lit. 'is'.
לפי קליפה זו, לא ניתן_DIRECTLY_ לקרוא את התוכן המוצג בתמונה."
XXI. 12-13

For Eleazar said: The people of the Jews, which from of old was the friend of God, has been committed to destruction. For if God had made peace with us or been only a little angry with us, he would not have averted his eyes from a destruction like this of all these men. For he has brought upon his holy city the fire of destruction from (her) enemies.¹

These are they who died in the famine — one million, one hundred thousand; and those who were killed and those who were sold — one hundred and sixty thousand².

13. These things Josephus, your wise man, related concerning the recompense which the God of your fathers gave to you because you crucified 'the deceiver of your people',


1. Eleazar of Machaerus, Josephus, E.J. vii. 327f.; see the Introduction, p. 93f.

2. See the Introduction, p. 101f., for references to the sources of these figures and a discussion of the literary problems raised.
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as you said: He deceives our people, when he began from Galilee even to here\(^1\). But this is your recompense – the destruction of your city, (and) the burning of your temple, as he who does not lie spoke to you the truth: Behold, your house is left to you desolate\(^2\). And again, he added to you hunger, pestilence, persecution, dispersion, captivity, and the sword which lays waste after you, as Ezekiel said\(^3\). These things you have received in this world as a foretaste until he who is to come comes, that by him justice might be avenged upon you, as your crimes deserve. For not even yet have you been satisfied with error, and with the evil will which you have acquired towards God and towards his Messiah. 'They took counsel together against

\(^1\) Lk.23.2,5; cf.Jn.7.12, and the possible reference to Jesus in b.Sanh.43s. : 'He has practised magic and deceived and led Israel astray'.

\(^2\) Mt.23.38, Lk.13.35.

\(^3\) Cf. Ezek.5.2,12.
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the Lord and against his Messiah\(^1\).  
14. But let us continue with Josenhus, and let us see the rest of these things. The judgement of God proclaimed long ago the burning of the temple\(^2\). And it was not burnt by the will of Caesar\(^3\). One false prophet deceived the people saying,"The Lord says that all the people should assemble at the temple"\(^4\). See how you incline after error and after lying spirits of falsehood who like dogs and vultures smell the scent of an unclean thing: Thus also you are enticed after vanity. 15. Again let us follow the rest of these things. The Jews more than the Romans set the city on fire\(^5\). All these evil things which she endured in this siege are more than the good things

1. Read אַחֵרַכְלָה.

1. Ps.2.2; cf. ch.xv.12, and note 2 to folio 40r.
2. B.J.vi.250; see the Introduction,p.83.
3. B.J.vi.266; see the Introduction,p.83.
4. B.J.vi.285; see the Introduction,p.83.
5. B.J.vi.251; see the Introduction,p.84.
which were in her from the day that her foundations were laid. And doubtless no other deserved a retribution like this except this generation which she also bore\(^1\). And when Titus Caesar entered and saw the great buildings, he was amazed at their fortifications. And he said, "The power of God has fought, and it is God who has thrust down the Jews from these safe high places\(^2\). But neither her pre-eminence,\(^3\) nor her wealth, nor her fame in all the world, nor her glory and her worship, was able\(^4\) (to prevent)\(^5\) the destruction which came upon her. This is the end of the destruction of Jerusalem\(^6\).

XXII.1. The Jew said: I, then, when I approached you, approached inadvisedly,

i. Read ἀνεποιηθεν; cf. folio 45r,13, and note i to that folio.

ii. Read ἀναγινωσκαν.

iii. Perhaps add ἅπαν.

1. P.L. vi.408; see the Introduction, p.84.
2. P.L. vi.409,411: see the Introduction, p.84f.
3. Or 'her great age, antiquity', following the Greek.
4. Lit. 'is able': see n.iii above.
5. The Syriac translates the Greek so literally that something like this needs to be added in the English translation to bring out the implied meaning.
6. P.L. vi.442; see the Introduction, p.85f.
for I was unaware that you had all this knowledge. But now I am amazed how, knowing this, there are among you some Christians, who associate with us in the synagogue, and bring offerings and alms and oil, and at the time of the Passover send unleavened bread (and), doubtless, other things also. They are not entirely Christians, and some of our men have said that, if they were truly Christians, they would not associate with us in our synagogue and in our law. And now, because of this, we are all the more scandalized.

2. Sergius (said): Understand now, like a wise man, that in every religion which exists, there are found in it the weak

1. Read ידוע ; cf. folio 75v.1.16.
2. Perhaps read ידוע to agree with the plural verb and ידוע.

1. In the MS the word for 'you' is a plural form. It could be an error for the singular, but it is not impossible as it stands, for the Jew could mean 'you Christians.....'

2. Lit. 'after this knowledge' i.e. the evidence from Josephus.

3. For the bearing of this passage on our knowledge of the state of the relations between Christians and Jews in Syria in the eighth century A.D., and for parallel statements in other Syriac literature, see the Introduction, pp.122f, 135-139.

4. i.e. because of this apparent acquiescence of Christians in the practices of Judaism, the Jews are confirmed in their own religion and in their opposition to Christianity.
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and the feeble, and therefore a wise man ought not to be scandalized. However, the learned man is not scandalized, and the discerning does not stray, because milestones are placed on the king's highway, and it is plain and clear to those who see. If anyone goes astray and departs from it, he makes it clear about himself that he has strayed of his own accord or that he has gone out of his mind. So, let the way of Christ be laid for you as the highway of the great king: and like true guides the prophets stand upon it, and declare to everyone that the king has come. As it is written in Isaiah: And you shall hear a word from behind
you saying, "This is the way, walk in it". For as long as
a man walks in the straight way there is no need for an­
other to call out to him from behind him and turn him back.
But Isaiah, as one who sees hidden things, predicted your
error to you, (namely) that after Christ you would go
astray; and behold, you do go astray. Isaiah and the pro­
phets, behold, they cry to you always: This is the way,
walk in it. But you do not cleave either to the prophets
or to reality. And they appear before your eyes. 4. For
it would have been right for you,

i. An Ettaph'al form is unattested, so perhaps we should
read לָעַל. ii. A fairly definite reading; we could, of course, read the
plural and translate 'or to the facts'. iii. Cf. the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.
iv. Less definite readings. v. The sense requires this; it fits the available space, and
it can perhaps be very faintly seen.

1. Is. 30. 21. 2. There is a play here and on the previous page on the
double meaning of the roots לָעַל and לָעַל, 'to wander'
and 'to err'. 3. Presumably the testimonies of the prophets, though if we
read the plural לָעַל (see n. ii above), it could refer to 'the facts'.
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as sons of Abraham and sons of the prophets, to be guides for the nations towards Christ, as are the prophecies of the prophets. But because your foundation is moving away from the faith which is in God and his Messiah, it is a trifling thing for you to seek to fall like a tottering wall and an abandoned fence. That is what David foretold concerning you, that you would concur treacherously about Christ. And also you plotted to thrust him out from his honour, if it was within your power. For you are no different.

1. Read ἐπαλ. Perhaps we should also add ἀναν and translate 'because your foundation moved'. Or leaving the text as it stands we could paraphrase ἑα and translate 'because your foundation is unstable (lacking) the faith...'.

There is a confusing alternation in this section between past and present tenses designed, no doubt, to emphasize the solidarity between past and present Jews in apostasy from God.

ii. The gender of these two words presents a problem. It is best to read ἐπαλ ἀν since there is no way of construing the sentence without connecting these words to ἑα; cf. fol.73r,1.16f.

iii. A quire mark.

1. Perhaps an allusion to Ezek.13.9-16.
2. A reference to Ps.2.2, quoted in ch.xxi.13.
3. Lit. 'If it came into your hands'.


لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
XXII.5-6

to your fathers, who saw the miracles of Moses, but while he remained with God for the forty days, a calf was estab-
lished in their heart instead of him. So also you, wicked sons of impious fathers, have failed to wonder and be amazed at the signs of Jesus, and you have seized on a pretext in weak Christians who, doubtless, are the children of heathen and their mind has not yet been cleansed from the fear of the idols of their fathers. Or they are the children of Hebre-
w and the former custom still prevails over them. 6. For a thousand thousands and ten thousand ten thousands of times God has called out to you with

i. Read

ii. The in this word looks like a later insertion. So the original reading could have been دک, giving a translation 'For also thousands and ten thousand ten thousands......' However, the parallelism with دک دک 'ten thousand ten thousands' suggests that دک is the correct reading.

iii. A quire mark.

1. Lit. 'You are not strangers to your fathers'.

2. This meaning of دک is recorded only in the lexica of Bar-Ali and Bar-Bahlul (see Payne Smith, Thesaurus, col. 2441); normally it means 'hiss, rage'. So the usage of the word here in the Disputation confirms the meaning recorded in the lexica.

3. That this was a real problem with converts from Judaism is shown by the Didascalia Apostolorum, ch.xxvi, ed. P de Lagarde, p.107, trans. R.H. Connolly, p.216: 'But you who have been converted from the People (i.e. the Jews) to believe in God, our saviour Jesus Christ, do not henceforth continue in your former way of life, brethren, keeping vain restrictions, purifications, sprinklings, and washings.'
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
terrifying miracles which he performed before your eyes: I am the Lord your God who brought you up from the land of Egypt. But in the twinkling of an eye you returned to the paganism which you loved. So also now, in the same way, you have left out (of consideration) the prophecies of the prophets concerning Christ, and the time of the weeks of years which they fixed for his coming, and the miracles and mighty works which he performed among your people and among you, and the trials and evil things which came upon you after you crucified him; and you have seized on a pretext in some Christians who, in some respects, honour your synagogue. 7. But perhaps you have lied about them, and you do these things because you love apostasy from

1. The original scribe has written a > above the line; so read אֲדֹנָה.

ii. In the right hand margin opposite lines 11-13 there is an illegible marginal note.

1. Ex. 20.2, Dt. 5.6.

2. For the rendering of אָרָך by 'leave out (of consideration)' cf. the extract from Ephraem translated by P. C. Burkitt in his Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe, vol. II, p. 139.
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the true God. For he, Christ, said to you: If you believed Moses, you would also believe me; Moses wrote about me. For besides the symbols and types with which Moses depicted him, he wrote on that (subject): A prophet like me the Lord will raise up for you from your brethren. Here clearly he shows him forth. But you in your stubborn unbelief interpret it (as) concerning Joshua, the son of Nun. For if it had been written before Joshua, the son of Nun, arose and before Moses ordained him, there would have been perhaps a place for your argument. But if it is apparent that after he showed him to all the people, and ordained him, and filled him

1. Read ἀντέλθη; cf. line 9.

1. Jn. 5.46.
2. Dt. 18.15, 18, but following the text of Acts 3.22; cf. ch. xvii. 7, xxi. 9, 18, P.h.S., vi. 20, Jacob of Saruq, Homily I, 1.177, Discussion of Silvester, p. 85.
3. Dionysius, vi. 21, also says that the Jews interpret Dt. 18.15 of Joshua or one of the prophets.
قالت مسلمة: أتمنى أن تزوجني?
قالت: أتمنى أن تزوجني?
فقال: لا، تزوجت بنت مالك.
قالت: أتمنى أن تزوجني?
فقال: لا، تزوجت بنت مالك.
قالت: أتمنى أن تزوجني?
فقال: لا، تزوجت بنت مالك.
قالت: أتمنى أن تزوجني.
فقال: لا، تزوجت بنت مالك.
with spirit and power, as God commanded, and afterwards said, "The Lord will raise up for you a prophet like me", it has been made clear that he did not speak about Joshua, the son of Nun, but about Jesus Christ, the son of God. But let the book of Moses come and let it testify concerning the truth. And the Lord spoke with Moses and said to him, "[Go up] to this mountain of Abarim, and see the land of Canaan which I have given to [the children of] Israel. And see it, and also be gathered to [your] people [as] Aaron your brother was gathered, because you made bitter the word of my mouth in the wilderness of Zin in the strife of the congregation, and you did not sanctify me at the waters before their eyes."

1. There was definitely a word here originally, but all that can be seen is perhaps a at the end of it; there is room for about four letters.

1. The Peshitta has mistaken the Hebrew יְרֵע as coming from the root רע, to be rebellious; instead of from the root בָּר, to be rebellious; hence the obscurity of its rendering.

2. Dt.32.48ff conflated with Num.27.12ff.
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And Moses spoke before the Lord and said, "Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, appoint a man over the congregation, who shall go out before them and come in (before them), and who shall lead them out and bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord may not be as sheep which have no shepherd". And the Lord said to Moses, "Take to yourself Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay your hand upon him, and make him stand before Eleazar the priest and before all the congregation. And commission him before their eyes, and bestow upon him some of your honour, and all the congregation of the children of Israel shall obey him".

These things are written in the book of Numbers which is the fourth. [But] in the fifth book which is called 'The Second Law', it is written thus: Be perfect before the Lord your God.

1. The of this word is perhaps just faintly visible.
2. There may be another word before הָאָרָךְ, but nothing definite can be seen, and the Peshitta has nothing between הָאָרָךְ and הָאָרָךְ.
3. Num. 27.15-20.

1. Or: 'that he may go out.....'
2. Cf. the Peshitta which has another here.
3. Num. 27.15-20.
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XXII. 9-10

For these nations, which you are about to dispossess, give heed to diviners and soothsayers: but the Lord your God has not allowed you (to do) so. The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you from your brethren: give heed to him. And the Lord said to me, "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren: and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them everything which I command him. And the man who does not give heed to my words which he speaks in my name, I myself will require it of him." 2.

10. What then do you want that is clearer than these? How do these things fit the servant of Moses? For God and Moses said that the prophet who was to arise would be like Moses. And in what respect did the disciple, Hoshea the son of Nun, resemble and (in what respect) was he like his master?

1. The Serta corrector has inserted a "cn." above the line: so read "inherit".

2. Dt. 18.13-15,17f.: cf. note 2 to folio 73r.

3. Sergius uses this form of Joshua's name here to emphasize the contrast between him and Jesus Christ. 'Joshua' and 'Jesus' are, of course, identical names in Syriac. 

1. Lit. 'inherit'.
2. Cf. note 2 to folio 73r.
3. Sergius uses this form of Joshua's name here to emphasize the contrast between him and Jesus Christ. 'Joshua' and 'Jesus' are, of course, identical names in Syriac.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
Moses? What laws did he lay down? Or did he make and deliver a covenant to the world? But he taught him not to turn aside from the law of his master, neither to the right nor to the left, and that he should meditate on it night and day. Again the scripture testifies and says: And there has never again arisen in Israel a prophet like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face. But Jesus Christ is not only like Moses, but his glory is many times greater than that of Moses. For Moses was only called the son of a virgin when he was not

1. Read κορυφή; cf. Nöldeke, op. cit., paragraph 300.
2. It looks as though the scribe may have originally written ἀδραμέντος here, and altered it later to ἄδραμεν.

1. Cf. D. b. S., vi. 21
'How did Joshua lay down a law?'
2. I. e. God.
3. Cf. Josh. 1. 7f.
4. Dt. 34. 10.
5. Referring to the adoption of Moses by pharaoh's daughter - cf. Ex. 2. 10. Cf. Jacob of Sarug, Homily I, lines 181-5:
'Moses took for himself a borrowed mother and made her his mother, as Christ took for himself a mother, a daughter of the poor. When Moses had been born and his birth was finished (Lit. he was perfected in his birth), he acquired for himself a mother, and he depicted (thereby) Mary, the mother of the Son.'
ד"ב י"ז ו"ט, כתבו לבר aliられます. כתובות קדומות קשמיט
יתא ד"ח, כתובות קדומות קשמית.
והי פ"ק ד"ע, כתובות קדומות קשמית.
the son of a virgin: but Christ was truly the son of a virgin. For the reality is greater than the type, and the substance than the shadow. Moses is the type and Christ is the anti-type and the truth. For as the child of a virgin is greater than the name 'the son of a virgin', so when they are each compared, that of Moses and that of Christ, the dispensation of Christ and his signs are more glorious than that of Moses. 12. But you have left out (of consideration) the miracles, the mighty deeds, and the wonders, and behold, you are scandalized by some Christians who give oil or bring unleavened bread to your synagogue which provokes (God) to anger. For it is not a house of prayer

1. Or 'original, prototype'.
2. Cf. Aphraates I.524,957ff, for a development of the comparison and contrast between Moses and Christ.
3. i.e. the whole period from Christ's conception to his ascension: cf. D.b.S., vii.16:-

'All the dispensation from the Conception to the Ascension'.
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as you in your error think, but your synagogue is a house of wrath and anger, as it is written concerning you: Their prayer shall be sin. And in Isaiah it is written: When you spread forth your hands, I will avert my eyes from you; and even though you multiply prayer, I will not listen, for your hands are full of blood. Now then, you think that the blood of which Isaiah says your hands are full, is the blood of bulls and sheep. The prophet contended with your fathers whose hands were full of the blood of the prophets and the righteous, but he intended the prophecy for you, the children of sinners.

1. Ps. 109.7. In the context of the psalm this is better translated: 'Let their prayer be considered as sin'; but Sergius clearly read it as a prophecy.
2. Is. 1.15; cf. Aphraates, I, 182, who gives the same interpretation of this text.
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on whose hands the blood of Christ is spotted. As it is written: You shall place a spot upon them, and you shall set your preparation—that is, your wrath—against their faces. For whenever your fingers are stretched forth in prayer, not only is your prayer not heard, but also the wrath of God is aroused against you. For as your wrath is the more aroused against a man if he kills your son, and (with) his body and his hands sprinkled with his blood in his madness thinks that he can appease you with gifts: and when he draws near to you, you see the blood of your beloved on his fingers, so also you by your prayer and your sacrifices arouse the wrath of God against you and against him who associates

i. In the MS it looks as though יאכז was written first, and the original scribe has written in the י later.

ii. Originally the scribe seems to have written יבלאנ, and then written י over the first י.

iii. Read ידראז.

1. Ps. 21.12, according to the Peshitta text.

2. Or: 'defiled'.
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XXII.13-15

with you. 14. And as again, if a man comes with the murderer of your son to make supplication to you wishing to please the murderer; and you, because you see the blood on the murderer's hands, treat with contempt the gifts which they offer to you, and look upon them both with one threatening glance full of wrath and indignation; so every Christian who offers anything in your synagogue is regarded before God. 15. This man in his madness is undecided with regard to them both, and in his folly he thinks thus: "If Christianity is good, behold, I am baptised as a Christian. But if Judaism

i. See the Introduction, p. 4, n. 3.

ii. Read ἀγαλματιζόμενοι.

iii. Read αὐθανάστης.
..
is also useful, behold, I will associate partly with Judaism that I might hold on to the sabbath'. These things he has reasoned in his thoughts. Or perhaps he does these things because he stands in awe of men. In his madness he has forgotten that which is written: The Lord is (a God)\(^1\) of knowledge, and crafty devices do not stand firm before him\(^2\). And (he forgets) this: God will scatter the bones of those who please men\(^3\).

16. For your fathers were not disheartened by all the signs which God performed through Moses in Egypt, and in the sea, and in the desert, and until he went up Mount Sinai. Yet they would set them\(^4\) aside (by) following the calf which they had forged, and they would say: "This is your God, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt"\(^5\). And you, just like your fathers, when you saw

i. Read אֶלֶךֶנָה.

ii. Between כַּע and בֶּן there is an inexplicable form which looks like a Qoph plus an inverted Gimmel plus a Yudh; a preposition is really needed, e.g. בִּ.

iii. In the right hand margin opposite line 4 there is an illegible marginal note with a line inserted after וַיֵּלֶד to indicate where it was supposed to be read. At a guess it is some form from the root שֵׁאָה, perhaps שֵׁאַה 'detestably', i.e. 'he has reasoned detestably...'

1. The Peshitta has omitted the רַי of MT; hence the hiatus in the sense.
2. I Sam. 2.3.
3. Ps. 53.5.
4. i.e. the signs performed by Moses.
ב. 760
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לזה נשתמך

לחי
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the signs of Jesus - the sick who were healed, the lepers who were cleansed, the lame who walked, the withered who were restored, the blind whose eyes were opened, the paralysed who were made straight, the demons who were driven away, the elements which were changed, (and) the dead who rose - you dared to say: "This man does not cast out demons except by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils"\(^1\). After all these miracles and wonders you, the sons of 'the sons of vipers'\(^2\). say now, "Christians scandalize us". 17. Therefore he will name you sons of darkness and the very sons of those who are disobedient to God. You loved curses and you did not delight in blessings\(^3\), and it is a trifling thing for you to seek to depart from God. And you were clothed with curses like armour\(^4\), as David said

i. Instead of the participles in lines 1-5 one would expect perfects, i.e. כְּשָׁמַע, etc.: cf. ch. xiv. 7. They must be translated as if they were perfects to agree with לְכָּזַע, 77v, 20, and לְכָּזַע לְכָּזַע on this page, line 6; cf. Höldeke, on cit., paragraph 275.

ii. Read כְּשָׁמַע.

iii. For the linguistic problem of agreement cf. Folio 71v, note ii.

2. Cf. Mt. 3. 7.
3. Ps. 109. 17.
4. Ps. 109. 18.
concerning you. And behold, we see that like water and oil that curse has entered into your bones. And it is to you like a cloak for the body, and like a girdle all the time. He explained and said: This is the work of those who malign the Lord. For you are they who maligned the Lord Christ.

But because you boast in Moses, let us return to Moses, and as we began from him, so let us end with him. The Lord will raise up for you a prophet like me from your brethren. And I will put my words in his mouth, and every person who does not give heed to that prophet who speaks in my name, that person shall perish. And also Christ said to you:

2. i.e. David.
3. Ps. 109.20.
4. ἐκτὸς normally means 'where'. But here the context and the following ἐν requires the meaning 'as'; perhaps it is an error for ἐκτὸς.
5. Referring to the opening words of the Disputation, ch. i. 2, the quotation from Dt. 6.4f.
6. Dt. 18.15, but following the text of Acts 3.22; cf. folio 73r.n.2.
I have come in the name of my Father, and you do not receive me; if another should come in his own name, you would receive him. Here he indicated the false and deceiving Messiah whom you in your error are expecting. David said: Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, to whom be glory, and honour, and dominion, with his Father and his life-giving holy Spirit, for ever and ever, Amen.

19. The Disputation which was composed by Sergius the Sty- lite, who (lived) in Gousit, against a Jew who disputed with him, is finished. Let everyone who reads pray for the sinner, Romanus the abbot, who copied (it) out for

---

1. See the Introduction, p.4, n.3.
3. Cf. folio 50v, n.1.
4. In the absence of the whole of the colophon we can only guess at the meaning of ..., especially since there is no point visible to distinguish from . We could read and translate: 'who wrote (this) treatise'. Or we could conjecture any of the numerous compounds of , e.g. , , 'for the abbot', or , 'for the bishop'. could be translated 'the chief part' or 'the beginning'. We could even by reading conjecture a reading like 'for a present'. None of these readings can be any more than mere suggestions.