Emmanuel Bar Shahhare's *Hexaemeron*:

An Edition and Translation of the Third *Mēmrā* with Commentary on the Fall of Angels

By
Erfan PapariDianat

Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in
Religion
May 9, 2025
Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

David A. Michelson, Ph.D.
Annalisa Azzoni, Ph.D.
Alison Salvesen, Ph.D.

"But as for thee, my beloved, let it not grieve thee that thy loneliness has been driven from place to place; because men are born for this end, to receive the accidents of the time. But thus reckon thou, that for wise men every place is equally the same; and for the virtuous, fathers and mothers abound in every city. Even indeed from thine own self take the trial. How many men, who know thee not, love thee as their own children, and a multitude of women receive thee like their own beloved ones."[1]

From Mara bar Serapion's letter to his son

[1] William Cureton, Spicilegium Syriacum Containing Remains of Bardesan, Meliton, Ambrose and Mara Bar Serapion (London: F. & J. Rivington, 1855), 72.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction....1

The Genre of Hexaemeron....2

The Early Stage of Syriac Literature....4

From the Fifth to the Seventh Century....7

The Islamic Era....9

Emmanuel bar Shahhare and his Hexaemeron....12

Chapter II: The Third Mēmrā: Themes and Content....18

Prologue: the Beginning of Creation....18

The Creation of Angels....19

The Number of Angels....20

The Creation of Light....25

Angels as Priests....25

The Hierarchy of Angels....26

The Fall of Angels....28

The Separation of Day and Night....32

Chapter III: Emmanuel's Sources: A Case Study....34

The Traditional Background of the Fall of Angels in Early Syriac Literature....35

The Hexaemeron and the Cave of Treasures....46

The Fall on the Fourth Day....53

Conclusion....58

Chapter IV: Manuscripts and Editorial Principles....61

Chapter V: Syriac Text....66

Chapter VI: English Translation....126

References....186

Chapter I

Introduction

The present thesis is an attempt toward introducing and studying a Syriac text known as the *Book of the Six Days*, or the *Hexaemeron*, written by the 10th-century East Syrian poet and exegete Emmanuel Bar Shahhare. Given the extensive length of the text, this study focuses on the third *mēmrā* (homily), which includes interpretation of the events of the first day of creation and therefore, is an opening to the author's larger exegesis of the creation week. Despite its popularity in the medieval period and its widespread readership among East Syriac Christians, the *Hexaemeron* has never been published and —except for an Arabic translation of the eleventh *mēmrā*— remained untranslated into modern languages. The second part of this thesis, therefore, consists of a critical edition of the Syriac text of the third *mēmrā* along with an English translation.

The first part, composed of three chapters, provides an introduction to the text and an analysis of its content. The first chapter, introduction, offers a general discussion of Emmanuel's place within the tradition of hexaemeral literature. The chapter begins with an overview of the genesis of *Hexaemeron* as a literary genre, its defining features, and its entry into Syriac literature. This is followed by a brief survey of Syriac exegetical writings on the biblical account of creation and the examples of Hexaemeron genre in Syriac literature. The chapter ends with an introduction to Emmanuel bar Shahhare's life and a general overview of his *Hexaemeron*.

The second chapter explores the main themes of the third *mēmrā*. These themes include the beginning of creation on the first day, the creation of angels and light, various aspects of

angelology such as the number, nature, and hierarchy of angels, as well as the story of the fall of angels and finally the separation of light from darkness and the beginning of the cycle of of day and night. This chapter does not intend to engage in a comparative study. However, in order to interpret Emmanuel's text, this chapter includes occasional references to other authors, particularly Pseudo-Dionysius. The third chapter, in contrast, offers a comparative study of one of the key themes of the *mēmrā*: the story of the fall of angels. This chapter primarily tries to identify the sources Emmanuel relied on to shape his interpretation of the story. By comparing Emmanuel's account of the fall of angels with the works of earlier Syriac authors, this chapter aims to explain how the *Hexaemeron* relates to the broader tradition of Syriac biblical interpretation.

The Genre of *Hexaemeron*

The word "Hexaemeron" is the Greek for "six days." It is also used in reference to a specific genre of biblical exegesis, which reflects upon the biblical account of the six days of creation described in the first two chapters of Genesis.[2] The oldest evidence of the use of the word *Hexaemeron* is attested in the writings of Philo of Alexandria, the Jewish Philosopher of the first century CE, who is also responsible for shaping the earliest outline of the hexaemeral genre in his *De Opificio Mundi*.[3] Following Philo, early Christian authors, such as Origen and

[2] Most hexaemeral works also include the Sabbatical rest on the seventh day and the account of the original sin and Adam and Eve's fall. For the traditional framework of the genre, see Erik ten Napel, "Some Remarks on the Hexaemeral Literature in Syriac," in *IV Symposium Syriacum, 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature (Groningen – Oosterhesselen 10-12 September)*, ed. Han J. W. Drijvers et al., Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987).
[3] Erik ten Napel, "Some Remarks on the Hexaemeral Literature in Syriac," 58.

Basil, adapted the outline and developed it into a form of Christian exegetical literature that remained popular throughout the history of Christianity.[4]

The most common scholarly opinion concerning the advent of the hexaemeral genre is that it was, above all, a response to the challenge of reconciling the biblical account with Greek philosophy and secular science that were extremely popular in the Hellenistic atmosphere of the early Christian era. The pioneer authors of this genre, like those mentioned above, were brought up in a Hellenistic milieu and received education in Greek philosophy and science.[5] Coming from such a background, they were intellectually concerned with harmonizing biblical cosmogony with the Greek knowledge of their time. In addition to this theological concern, Greek scientific materials found their way into Christian *Hexaemera* also through a second path. Since the biblical narrative is characterized by its concise and undetailed style, hexaemeral interpreters tended to fill the gaps, particularly in the account of the creation of the physical world, with details taken from Greek scientific sources. Thus, the genre of *Hexaemeron* took on an encyclopedic form, covering numerous fields of knowledge, such as geography, zoology, and phytology.

Despite the fact that the early *Hexaemera* were written in Greek, and the genre was deeply rooted in the intellectual concerns of Hellenistic society, it did not remain confined within the boundaries of Greek Christianity. Hexaemeral commentaries soon appeared also in other Christian languages, including Syriac. The present chapter aims to briefly review key sources for the study of Syriac hexaemeral literature. Although some West Syriac sources will be mentioned,

[4] A comprehensive study of the genre of *Hexaemeron*, and the history of its development in Western Christianity can be found in Frank Egleston Robbins, *The Hexaemeral Literature; a Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1912).
[5] For the educational background of Basil and Origen, see Adam Rasmussen, *Genesis and Cosmos: Basil and Origen on Genesis 1 and Cosmology*, The Bible in Ancient Christianity 14 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019), 13–41; Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea: A Guide to His Life and Doctrine*, Cascade Companions 16 (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012), 22–42.

the focus will be on those relevant to the development of the genre in East Syriac literature. It should be, however, noted that the history of hexaemeral literature inevitably overlaps with the broader history of exegetical literature in general. Therefore, apart from the *Hexaemera*, other exegetical sources that contribute to understanding East Syriac interpretations of the biblical account of creation will also be addressed.

The Early Stage of Syriac Literature

The Syriac literature before the fourth century, as Lucas van Rompay has noticed, is characterized by its religious diversity. Many works from this period were later labeled unorthodox, which might be one reason for the limited number of surviving texts from this era. Although no known Syriac commentary on Genesis or the Old Testament in general survives from this period, exegetical voices can still be identified within early Syriac sources. As Lucas van Rompay has argued, Bardaisan's discussion of man as the image of God and his interpretation of "sons of God" (Gen 6:2), along with the scattered reflections on paradise and humanity's pre-fall state in poetic works such as the *Odes of Solomon* and the *Hymn of the Pearl,* can be considered examples of early Syriac exegesis of the Book of Genesis.[6] To the sources mentioned by van Rompay, one could even add Mani's *Pragmateia*, which, based on fragments surviving in Middle Persian and quotations preserved in Theodore bar Koni's *Liber Scholiorum*, might be described as a sarcastic interpretation of *Genesis*.

The fourth century is characterized by the emergence of two of the most celebrated Syriac authors, Aphrahat and Ephrem. Although Aphrahat did not write a formal commentary on

[6] Lucas Van Rompay, "The Christian Syriac Tradition of Interpretation," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Interpretation. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Part 1: Antiquity*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 618–19.

Genesis, hexaemeral materials are scattered throughout his 23 *Demonstrations* (*taḥwiātā*).[7] Nevertheless, Ephrem should be credited with writing the first formal Syriac commentary of Genesis.[8] The initial part of the *Commentary on Genesis*, including Ephrem's interpretation of the account of creation, strongly reflects the author's polemical concerns. Ephrem, in fact, interprets the creation week specifically with the intention to challenge the teachings of Bardaisan, Marcion, and Mani.[9] Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis* has primarily been studied for its connections with Jewish and Greek patristic exegetical literature.[10] While earlier scholarship tended to view Ephrem as representative of a purely Syriac exegetical tradition, Ute Possekel has explored the presence of Greek philosophical concepts within in Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis*, resulting in a modification of Ephrem's portrayal as an exclusively Syriac thinker.[11] In addition to his *Commentary on Genesis*, Ephrem's poetic corpus, especially *On Faith* and *On Paradise*, includes exegetical thoughts on the story of creation and has been influential on later East Syriac hexaemeral writings.

---

[7] The Syriac text was published by Wright and Parisot in William Wright, *The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage, Edited from Syriac Manuscripts of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries in the British Museum, with an English Translation. Vol. 1: The Syriac Text* (London / Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1869); Jean Parisot, *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes*, Patrologia Syriaca 1.1 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1894); Adam Isaac Lehto, *The Demonstrations of Aphrahat, the Persian Sage*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 27 (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2010).

[8] The Syriac text, along with a Latin translation, has been published in Raymond Tonneau, *Sancti Ephraem Syri In Genesim Et In Exodum Commentarii*, vol. 1, 2 vols., Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 152 (Louvain: Durbecq, 1955); An English translation is available in Edward G. Mathews and Joseph P. Amar, *Selected Prose Works/St. Ephrem the Syrian*, ed. Kathleen E. McVey, The Fathers of the Church 91 (Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1994).

[9] See Mathews and Amar, St. Ephrem the Syrian. Selected Prose Works, 49–50.

[10] For a review of the scholarly trends in this area, see Jeffrey Wickes, "Ephrem's Interpretation of Genesis," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (2008): 45–48. For the relationship between Ephrem's commentary and Jewish exegeses see Sebastian P. Brock, "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30:2 (1979): 212–32; Tryggve Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis 1–11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian, with Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Traditions* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1978).

[11] Ute Possekel, *Evidence of Greek Philosophical Concepts in the Writings of Ephrem the Syrian*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 580 (Lovanii: Aedibus Peeters, 1999).

In addition to these native Syriac authors, another important aspect of Syriac literature from this era is the translation of Greek theological writings into Syriac. As it relates to the development of hexaemeral literature, two key figures should be addressed: Basil of Caesarea and Theodore of Mopsuestia. As mentioned before, Basil is responsible for composing the first extensive Christian *Hexaemeron*. Basil's nine homilies on the six days of creation were translated into Syriac in the fifth century, probably even earlier.[12] The exact influence of these homilies on later East Syriac commentaries on *Hexaemeron* needs further investigation.[13] However, a more significant figure for the development of exegetical traditions in the Church of the East is Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose theology shaped the foundation of East Syriac exegetical literature. Theodore of Mopsuestia composed a commentary on Genesis, which, like the majority of his writings, is not extant in original Greek.[14] The few surviving fragments of its Syriac version were published by Sachau.[15] In addition to Sachau's fragments, Raymond Tonneau and Taeke Jansma argued for Theodore of Mopsuestia's authorship of two other fragments containing commentaries on the initial chapters of Genesis, which were previously

[12] The Syriac version of Basil's *Hexaemeron* has been edited and translated into English by Thomson in Robert W. Thomson, *The Syriac Version of the Hexaemeron by Basil of Caesarea*, 2 vols., CSCO 550-551, Syr. 222-223 (Leuven: Peeters, 1995). For a discussion about the dating of the Syriac translations of Basil's work see David G. K. Taylor, *The Syriac Versions of the De Spiritu Sancto by Basil of Caesarea*, vol. 1, CSCO 576, Syr. 228 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 4–6.

[13] For the relationship between Basil's heritage and Syriac Christianity in general see David G. K. Taylor, "St. Basil the Great and the Syrian Christian Tradition," *The Harp* 4 (1991): 49–58.

[14] For an introduction to Theodore's writings, see Frederick G. McLeod, *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge, 2009), 71–74.

[15] Eduard Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni Fragmenta Syriaca: E Codicibus Musei Britannici Nitriacis* (Leipzig: G. Engelmann, 1869). A partial English translation of these fragments is found in Rambow, George F. "Theodore vs. the 'Arians' and the Parable of Humanity's Creation: A Syriac Fragment of Theodore of Mopsuestia's Commentary on Genesis 1.26." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 25:2 (2017): 231–54.

attributed to anonymous authors.[16] These additional fragments, too, might be considered part of Theodore of Mopsuestia's corpus in Syriac.

From the Fifth to the Seventh Century

The two Eastern and Western Syriac churches, which were divided by the Christological controversies of the fifth century, were represented by two pioneer poets of that era: Jacob of Serugh and Narsai. Both Narsai and Jacob of Serugh composed metrical commentaries on the Hexaemeron. Jacob of Serugh wrote a lengthy *mēmrā* titled *On the Construction of the Creatures*.[17] The *mēmrā* is divided into seven parts, each dealing with one of the days of the creation week. Jacob 's dyophysite antagonist, Narsai, also composed *mēmrē* on creation. Unlike Jacob 's work, however, Narsai's *mēmrē* on creation were not united together as a single work in manuscripts. Philippe Gignoux selected six of Narsai's surviving *mēmrē* that were thematically related to the biblical account of creation and published them together with a French translation.[18] However, Jansma revised Gignoux's selection by excluding two *mēmrē* and

[16] R. M Tonneau, "Théodore de Mopsueste. Interprétation (Du Livre) de La Genèse (Vat. Syr. 120, Ff. I–V)," *Le Muséon* 66 (1953): 45–63; Taeke Jansma, "Théodore de Mopsueste. Interprétation Du Livre de La Genèse. Fragments de La Version Syriaque (B. M. Add. 17,189, Fol. 17–21)," *Le Muséon* 75 (1962): 63–92.

[17] The Syriac text was first edited by Bedjan in Paulus Bedjan, *Homiliae Selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis*, vol. 3 (Paris / Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1907), 1–151; Based on Bedjan's edition, Mathews published the Syriac text with and English translation in seven separate volumes in Edward George Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The First Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2009); *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Second Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2016); *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Third Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2016); *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Fourth Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2018); *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Fifth Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2019); *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2020); *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Seventh Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2021). Another edition and translation has been published in Takamitsu Muraoka, Jacob of Serugh's Hexaemeron, Bilingual edition, Ancient Near Eastern Studies 52 (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2018).

[18] Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation* have been edited and translated into French in Philippe Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, Patrologia Orientalis 34.3-4 (Turnhout; Paris: Brepols, 1968). Of Gignoux's collection, mēmrē two and five are available in English translation in Robin Anne Darling, "Narsai of Nisibis. On the Expression, 'In the Beginning,' and Concerning the Existence of God," in

suggesting the inclusion of another two. Identifying an internal thematic structure and a common metrical pattern in these *mēmrē*, he argued that Narsai may have intended to compose a metrical commentary on Genesis.[19]

At this point, we should discuss the definition of *Hexaemeron* as a literary genre to determine whether Narsai's Jacob of Serugh's *mēmrē* on creation can technically be classified as *Hexaemera*. The genre of *Hexaemeron* can be defined in two ways. It can be defined as a literary form that was first started by Philo and developed by Basil. Thus, as established by its founders, the most iconic feature of this genre is the exploration of interactions between the biblical account of creation, Greek philosophy, and natural science. Adopting this definition, Erik ten Napel excluded the works of Narsai and Jacob of Serugh, arguing that their commentaries on creation incorporated less Greek philosophical and scientific material compared to later *Hexaemera*.[20] Nevertheless, another way to define *Hexaemeron*, focusing less on content and more on the general subject, is to consider it an independent exegetical work dedicated exclusively to the interpretation of six days of creation. By this definition, the metrical commentaries of Narsai and Jacob of Serugh can also be classified as *Hexaemera*, regardless of their lack of extensive philosophical and scientific materials.

Another work of this period that represents the official interpretative views on the Book of Genesis developed at the School of Nisibis is a treatise called *The Cause of the Foundation of the Schools*, composed by Barḥadbeshabba ʿArbaya in the late sixth or early seventh century.[21] In

---

Biblical Interpretation, ed. Joseph Wilson Trigg, Message of the Fathers of the Church 9 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988), 203–20; and Elisa Perotti, "Narsai's Mēmrā On the Creation of Angels: Translation and Analysis" (MA Thesis, Leiden, University of Leiden, 2018).

[19] Taeke Jansma, "Narsai's Homilies on Creation: Remarks on a Recent Edition," *Le Muséon* 83:1-2 (1970): 209–12.

[20] Erik ten Napel, "The Textual Tradition of Emmanuel Bar Shahhare's Hexaemeron in the Light of Monastic School Tradition," *Studia Patristica* 18:4 (1990): 289–91.

[21] The Syriac text, along with a French translation, was published by Scher in Addai Scher, "La Cause de La Fondation Des Écoles," in *Patrologia Orientalis*, vol. 4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), 317–404. An

this treatise, Barḥadbeshabba views the history of the world as the history of schools, which begins from the very first scene of the creation, described by him as a classroom for the angels, and ends with an account of the foundation of the School of Nisibis and its key figures such as Narsai, Abraham of Beth Rabban, and Ḥenana of Adiabene. What primarily connects this work to hexaemeral literature is its introduction and first chapter, which cover various hexaemeral themes, such as the creation of man and angelic activity during the days of creation.

The Islamic Era

From the end of the seventh century, when Arabs had already occupied most of the Syriac-speaking areas, there was a notable increase in the number of Syriac exegetical works. In the late seventh century, the East Syriac author, John bar Penkaye, composed his comprehensive history of the world, titled the *Book of the Main Events* (*Ktābā d-Reš Melle*). Although Bar Penkaye's composition is a historical work, it is more of a theological history rather than a typical chronology. The work is divided into fifteen prose *mēmrē*, the first of which is a commentary on the initial chapters of the book of Genesis, covering from the creation until the story of Enoch (Gen 5:24).[22]

It was at the beginning of the eighth century that the first originally-Syriac *Hexaemeron* was written by the West Syriac polymath, Jacob of Edessa. This extensive prose *Hexaemeron* was left unfinished due to the author's death that was then completed by George bishop of the Arabs.[23] The work was later used as a model by another West Syrian author, Moshe bar Kepha,

English translation is available in Adam H. Becker, "Barḥadbeshabbā, The Cause of the Foundation of the Schools," in *Sources for the Study of the School of Nisibis*, Translated Texts for Historians 50 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), 86–160.

[22] For an edition, English translation and study of the first *mēmrā* see Yulia Furman, "The Origins of the Temporal World: The First Mē'mrā of the Kṯāḇā d-Rēš Mellē of John Bar Penkāyē," *Scrinium* 10 (2014): 3–46.

[23] The Syriac text is found in Jean Baptiste Chabot, *Iacobi Edesseni Hexaemeron, Seu in Opus Creationis Libri Septem*, CSCO Syr. II.56 (Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1928); Julious Yeshu' Çiçek, *Hexaemeron: Commentary*

who composed another West Syriac *Hexaemeron* in the ninth century.[24] Returning to the Church of the East, fragments of a commentary on *Hexaemeron* have survived from Ishoʿbokht of Rev Ardashir, metropolitan of Fars, who was reportedly active in the late eighth century. Ishoʿbokht's commentary on *Hexaemeron* remains unpublished but is preserved in at least two manuscripts.[25] Although this unpublished text is sometimes referred to as a *Hexaemeron*, it is, in fact, a straightforward retelling of the book of Genesis with only limited exegetical content. Therefore, despite dealing with the six days of creation, these fragments do not fit the *Hexaemeron* genre.

One aspect of East Syriac literature in this era is the interest in compiling the literary and exegetical heritage of earlier generations. This interest could have been caused, above all, by the increasing spread of Islam during the early Abbasid era, which could have threatened the survival of Syriac culture.[26] Responding to this threat, Syriac authors of this period produced voluminous works with the primary goal of collecting their exegetical tradition. The works of the East Syrian exegetes of the eighth and ninth centuries, such as Theodore bar Koni,[27] Ishoʿ bar

on Creation by Jacob of Edessa, 2nd ed., Bar Ebroyo Kloster Publications 42 (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2010). The text has been partially translated into English in Marina Greatrex, "Memre One, Two and Four of the Hexaemeron of Jacob of Edessa: Introduction, Translation and Text" (ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2000). Jacob of Edessa's Hexaemeron is the most studied work of its kind in Syriac. Studies on this text include Jack Tannous, "By George! Jacob of Edessa's Hexaemeron and the Biblical Quotations of George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes," in *Mfaḥmono Kashiro: Perspectives on the Syriac Bible in Honor of Andreas Juckel*, ed. George A. Kiraz and Hannah Stork (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2024), 329–67; Alison Salvesen, "The *Hexaemeron* of Jacob of Edessa on Birds as Moral Examples," *The Harp* 35 (2019): 79–96; Alison Salvesen, "The Authorial Spirit? Biblical Citations in Jacob of Edessa's Hexaemeron," *Aramaic Studies* 6, no. 2 (2008): 207–25; Marina Wilks, "Jacob Of Edessa's Use Of Greek Philosophy In His Hexaemeron," in *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day*, ed. Bas ter Haar Romeny, Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 18 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 223–38; Marina Greatrex, "The Angelology in the *Hexaemeron* of Jacob of Edessa," *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 4 (2004): 33–46.

[24] The Syriac text with a German translation is found in Lorenz Schlimme, *Der Hexaemeronkommentar Des Moses Bar Kepha: Einleitung, Übersetzung Und Untersuchungen*, 2 vols., Göttinger Orientforschungen, I. Reihe: Syriaca 14 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977).

[25] Borg. Sir. 39, foll. 148v-149v and Alqosh (Notre-Dame des Semences) 45, foll. 291-294.

[26] For more on this historical background, see Sidney Harrison Griffith, "Chapter Ten of the *Scholion*: Theodore Bar Kônî's Apology for Christianity," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 47 (1981): 158–60.

[27] The exegetical materials related to the account of creation can be found in mēmrē 1 and 2 of Theodore bar Koni's Liber Scholiorum. The Syriac text was edited by Scher in Addai Scher, *Theodorus Bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, 2 vols., CSCO Syr. II.65-66 (Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1910). A French translation of the whole text was published in Robert Hespel and René Draguet, *Théodore Bar Koni. Livre Des Scolies (Recension de Séert)*, 2 vols., CSCO 431-432, Syr. 187-188 (Louvain: Peeters, 1981).

Nun,[28] and Ishoʿdad of Merv,[29] can be seen through this lens. All these authors provided detailed treatments of the creation account in their extensive commentaries.

It was around a century later, in the second half of the tenth century, that Emmanuel bar Shahhare composed his *Hexaemeron*. As mentioned above, the defining characteristic of the genre of *Hexaemeron* can be considered the attempt to harmonize biblical cosmology with Greek knowledge. With this regard, ten Napel argues that the exegetical works on the account of creation by early Syriac authors, such as Ephrem, Narsai, and Jacob of Serugh, do not properly align with *Hexaemeron* as a literary genre.[30] Applying this criterion, as mentioned above, the earliest example of Syriac a *Hexaemeron* that fits within the genre's framework is the one by Jacob of Edessa. Emmanuel was then the first East Syrian author to compose a *Hexaemeron* that meets the genre's defining criteria. Unlike the West Syrian exegetes, however, Emmanuel wrote his work in poetry, drawing extensively on earlier traditions of Syriac exegetical poetry and showing a strong influence from Narsai. At the same time, however, he also adhered to a core feature of the genre of *Hexaemeron* by employing Greek philosophy and secular science to interpret the biblical account of creation.[31]

---

[28] Ernest G. Clarke, *The Selected Questions of Ishō Bar Nūn on the Pentateuch: Edited and Translated from MS Cambridge Add. 2017, with a Study of the Relationship of Ishōʿdādh of Merv, Theodore Bar Kōnī and Ishō Bar Nūn on Genesis*, Studia Post-Biblica 5 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962).

[29] Ceslas van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išoʿ Dad de Merv Sur l'Ancien Testament, I: Genèse*, CSCO 156, Syr. 75 (Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1955).

[30] Erik ten Napel, "Some Remarks on the Hexaemeral Literature in Syriac," in *IV Symposium Syriacum, 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature (Groningen – Oosterhesselen 10-12 September)*, ed. Han J. W. Drijvers et al., Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987), 62–63.

[31] See Erik ten Napel, "Influence of Greek Philosophy and Science in Emmanuel Bar Shahhare's Hexaemeron," in *III Symposium Syriacum, 1980: Les Contacts Du Monde Syriaque Avec Les Autres Cultures (Goslar 7–11 Septembre 1980)*, ed. René Lavenant, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 221 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983), 109–18.

Emmanuel bar Shahhare and his *Hexaemeron*

Little is known about Emmanuel's life. Colophons informs us that he served as an exegete (*mpaššqānā*) at the school of the Upper Monastery (*Dayrā ʿEllāyta*), near Mosul.[32] The only biographical detail about Emmanuel comes from the 11th-century Arabic *Kitāb al-Majdal*,[33] where we read that Emmanuel, together with famous Ḥasan Bar Bahlul, endorsed ʿAbdishoʿ I for ascending to the patriarchate seat.[34] It can be inferred from this statement that Emmanuel was active and likely well-established in his career prior to ʿAbdishoʿ's election in 963 CE. The year 980 CE has been sometimes mentioned as Emmanuel's date of death. However, this date is merely based on an assertion by Gabriel Cardahi.[35] Following Assemani, Cardahi also refers to a certain ʿAbdishoʿ bar Shahhare as Emmanuel's brother.[36] The assumption of a familial relationship between Emmanuel and ʿAbdishoʿ, however, might be due to misinterpretation of the latter's name. Baumstark and Wright, while not completely disproving this hypothesis, notice that in Cod. Vat. 184, where an eulogy for the disciples of Mar Awgen is attributed to this ʿAbdishoʿ, his name appears as Bar Shaʿʿāra instead of Bar Shahhāre.[37]

Despite the shortage of information about Emmanuel's life, his writings have come down to us in length. Aside from a single *mēmrā* on baptism,[38] Emmanuel's major work is his

[32] Also known as the monastery of Mar Gabriel and Mar Abraham. For this site, see Thomas A. Carlson, "Mar Gabriel and Mar Abraham," in *Syriaca.Org: The Syriac Reference Portal*, ed. David A. Michelson, 2014, https://syriaca.org/place/661.

[33] While the text was traditionally believed to be a 12th-century composition, Holmberg has argued that it was written in the early 11th century. See Bo Holmberg, "A Reconsideration of the Kitāb Al-Magdal," *Parole de l'Orient* 18 (1993): 255–73. I am grateful to Dr. Thomas Carlson for drawing my attention to Holmberg's argument.

[34] Henricus Gismondi, *Maris Amri et Slibae de Patriarchis Nestorianorum Commentaria Ex Codicibus Vaticanis* (Roma: C. de Luigi, 1899), 101.

[35] Gabriel Cardahi, *Liber Thesauri de Arte Poetica Syrorum Nec Non de Eorum Poetarum Vitis et Carminibus* (Roma: Typographia Polyglotta, 1875), 71.

[36] See Josephus Simonus Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis Clementino-Vaticana: De scriptoribus Syris Nestorianis*, vol. 3.1 (Rome: Typis Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1725), 540; Cardahi, *Liber Thesauri*, 136–38.

[37] See, Anton Baumstark, *Geschichte Der Syrischen Literatur, Mit Ausschluss Der Christlich-Palästinensischen Texte* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1922), 238; William Wright, *A Short History of Syriac Literature* (London: A. and C. Black, 1894), 232.

[38] A facsimile of the Syriac text, based on Notre-Dame des Semences MS 33, with an Arabic translation, is found in J. Ishaq, "Rutbat al-ʿimād ʿind ʿImānūʾīl bar Shāhārī" [The Rank of Baptism according to Emmanuel bar Shahhare],

voluminous *Hexaemeron* (*Ktābā d-eštat yawmē*). The work is divided into 28 *mēmrē*, partially in heptasyllabic and partially in dodecasyllabic meter.[39] The first *mēmrā*, functioning as a prologue to the whole work, is an interpretation of John 1:14. In some manuscripts, this *mēmrā* is also attributed to Narsai.[40] The second *mēmrā* is reported as lost in all current manuscripts. The scribes' statement that the second *mēmrā* is missing, however, might have resulted from an error in older manuscripts. As Erik ten Napel has argued, the current structure of the text, even with the second *mēmrā* missing, fits neatly within the traditional framework of the genre of *Hexaemeron*, and therefore, it is possible that a second *mēmrā* did not exist in the first place.[41] From the third *mēmrā* to the fifteenth, Emmanuel deals with the main topic of the work, the interpretation of the events of the six days of creation, and also the rest on the seventh day. The sixteenth *mēmrā*, titled "On the Mysteries and Types that were showed forth during the seven days of creation, and on the Resurrection," links the first half of the work to the next twelve *mēmrē*, where Emmanuel discusses various themes related to Christian theology, such as the

Bayn al-Nahrayn 14, no. 2 (1983): 33–66; later, van Vossel published a French translation of the *mēmrā* with a commentary in Vincent van Vossel, "Quelques Remarques en Marge Du Memra Sur Le Baptême de Emmanuel Bar Shahhare," *Questions Liturgiques / Studies in Liturgy* 82:2 (2001): 128–47.

[39] At least in the first part of the composition, a certain metrical pattern might be observed. With only one exception —mēmrē 6 and 7 in heptasyllabic meter and *mēmrē* 8 and 9 in dodecasyllabic— Emmanuel alternates between a heptasyllabic and dodecasyllabic meter after each *mēmrā*. It is not clear whether or not this alternation was intentional. However, Jansama, after revising Gignoux's proposed order of Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation*, identified a similar metrical pattern in those *mēmrē*. Given that Emmanuel was deeply influenced by Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation*, he might have deliberately adopted this metrical structure. See Taeke Jansma, "Narsai's Homilies on Creation: Remarks on a Recent Edition," *Le Muséon* 83:1-2 (1970): 210–11.

[40] The *mēmrā* is available in English translation in Erin Galgay Walsh, "Narsai, Metrical Homily on 'The Word Became Flesh' (John 1:14)," in *The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings: Volume 4: Christ: Chalcedon and Beyond*, ed. Mark DelCogliano, vol. 4, The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 194–213. The text has been studied in Judith Frishman, "Narsai's Christology According to His Homily 'On the Word Became Flesh,'" *The Harp* 8–9 (1996 1995): 208–303. While the mēmrā shares stylistic similarities to Narsai's authentic works, its authorship requires further investigation, particularly with a focus on the text's lexical features. It should be noted that this *mēmrā* is preserved in all manuscripts of Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron*, including the earliest manuscript, Jer. Part. 34, dating 1288 CE/1600 AG, while it was transmitted under the name of Narsai only in manuscripts from the late 19th and early 20th century. See, Aaron Michael Butts, Kristian S. Heal, and Sebastian P. Brock, *Clavis to the Metrical Homilies of Narsai*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 690 (Lovanii: Aedibus Peeters, 2021), 76-77.

[41] The whole argument is found in Erik ten Napel, "Einige Bemerkungen Zu Den Mêmrê Des Emmnuel Bar Shahhare," in *XX. Deutscher Orientalistentag Vom 3. Bis 8. Oktober 1977 in Erlangen*, ed. Wolfgang Voigt, Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement 4 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980), 168–69.

human free will, the salvation by Christ, and Old Testament prophecies about the coming of Christ. The titles of the *mēmrē* slightly vary across different manuscripts. The following is William Wright's list of titles according to Cbr. Add. 1994:[42]

Mēmrā 1: On S. John's Gospel, ch i, 1 and 14.

Mēmrā 2: Wanting.

Mēmrā 3: On the creation of the Angels and of Light on the first day of the week.

Mēmrā 4: On the creation of the Firmament, which took place on the second day.

Mēmrā 5: On the third day and on the arrangement of the Seas.

Mēmrā 6: On the third day and on the growth of the seeds and trees.

Mēmrā 7: On the creation of Paradise on the third day.

Mēmrā 8: On the Luminaries and the fourth day.

Mēmrā 9: On the marine animals and all the water reptiles, and on the birds, and the fifth day.

Mēmrā 10: On the creation of the Animals and the sixth day.

Mēmrā 11: On the creation of Man and the sixth day.

Mēmrā 12: On Adam and the creation of Eve from him.

Mēmrā 13: On the Command given to Adam and his transgression thereof.

Mēmrā 14: On the Sentence of Adam and Eve and the Serpent.

Mēmrā 15: On the Saturday and on the Mysteries and Types which our Lord showed forth.

[42] William Wright and Stanley Arthur Cook, A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901), 391–404. For a list of titles according to BrM Or. 1300, see François Nau, "Note sur le manuscrit du British Museum Or. 1300 (Hexaméron d'Emmanuel Bar Schahharé)," Revue de l'Orient chrétien 19 (1914): 101–3.

Mēmrā 16: On the Mysteries and Types that were showed forth during the seven days of creation, and on the Resurrection.

Mēmrā 17: Showing how man's Freewill went astray until the Messiah was revealed.

Mēmrā 18: On the searching of the seers, and on the Coming of the Messiah for the consolation and expectation of all the nations.

Mēmrā 19: On the Vision that Moses saw on Mount Sinai, when the Lord said to Moses, No man can see Me and live.

Mēmrā 20: On the Revelation of the Messiah, and the Satisfaction for our sins, and our being freed from sin by His adorable Dispensation.

Mēmrā 21: On the Signs and Wonders and life-giving Words of our Lord and our God the Messiah, for the verification of the doctrine of the perfect life which by His Coming was given to the human race.

Mēmrā 22: Continuation of the same subject.

Mēmrā 23: Continuation.

Mēmrā 24: On the life-giving Words of our Lord, and that there is no Salvation save in Him.

Mēmrā 25: Showing that the Religion of Christ is true and adapted to the Church.

Mēmrā 26: On the Resurrection of the Body, from Nature and Scripture.

Mēmrā 27: On the Soul and its nature.

Mēmrā 28: On the Future Life and the Recompense.

Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* was transmitted in at least eighteen manuscripts, three of which are now reportedly lost.[43] These manuscripts represent three different recensions of the text, drastically varying from one another.[44] Although the *Hexaemeron* has never received a critical edition, fragments of the text were printed by Cardahi and Jacques Manna in their anthologies of Syriac poetry.[45] In addition, Andrawus Ṣana has published the Syriac text and an Arabic translation of the eleventh *mēmrā*, *On the Creation of Man and the Sixth Day*.[46] Secondary literature on Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* has been completely confined to the publications of Erik ten Napel. Despite the lack of scholarly attention, Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* is a significant source for studying Syriac exegetical tradition because it is the earliest and the most detailed example of its genre in East Syriac literature.

Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* achieved notable popularity among East Syriac Christians, as demonstrated by the large number of extant manuscripts. More recent manuscripts often include abundant explanatory glosses in the margins, which might indicate the text's continued use in scholastic circles.[47] Furthermore, Emmanuel's influence on later Syriac literature is evident in numerous quotations from the *Hexaemeron* incorporated into Ishaq Shbadnaya's *Commentary on*

[43] For a description of the manuscripts, see ten Napel, "Einige Bemerkungen Zu Den Mêmrê Des Emmnuel Bar Shahhare," 167–69. To the manuscripts listed by ten Napel, at least one more can be added: Qalb al-Aqdas Chaldean Church MS 105, dating 1885 CE. This manuscript was formerly known as Habbi 64, based on its numbering in Yūsuf Ḥabbī, *Fahāris Al-Makhṭūṭāt al-Suryānīyah Fī al-'Irāq*, vol. 1, 1977, 39. It has since been digitalized by the Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, under the shelfmark QACCT 00105, available online at https://w3id.org/vhmml/readingRoom/view/136569

[44] For an overview of the three recensions and the representative manuscripts of each recension, see Erik Ten Napel, "Some Remarks on the Quotations from Emmanuel Bar Shahhare's Hexaemeron in Ishaq Šbadnaya's Prose Commentary on the Divine Providence," *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989): 204.

[45] Cardahi, *Liber Thesauri de Arte Poetica Syrorum*, 68–71, includes the first section of the eighth *mēmrā*. Selected parts of *mēmrē* 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are found in Jacques Eugène Manna, *Morceaux Choisis de Littérature Araméenne,* vol. 2 (Mosul: Imprimerie des pères dominicains, 1901), ١٦–ܣܡܟ.

[46] Andrawus Ṣana, "Ḥilq al-Insān li-'Immanu'il Bar Šahāre" [On the Creation of Man, by Emmanuel bar Shahhare], *Journal of the Iraq Academy, Syriac Corporation* 11 (1987): 176–237.

[47] See Erik ten Napel, "The Textual Tradition of Emmanuel Bar Shahhare's Hexaemeron in the Light of Monastic School Tradition," Studia Patristica 18:4 (1990).

the Divine Economy, which, as ten Napel has argued, were likely borrowed from florilegia rather than the original text itself.[48]

With double attribution of the first *mēmrā* and the absence of the second, it is from the third *mēmrā* onward that Emmanuel's authorship becomes unquestioned. It is also from the third *mēmrā* that the main subject of the text, the interpretation of the six days of creation, begins. As an initial effort to explore Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron*, therefore, the present thesis deals with the third *mēmrā*. The following chapter offers a brief overview of the main themes and topics discussed throughout the *mēmrā*.

[48] Ten Napel, "Some Remarks on the Quotations from Emmanuel Bar Shahhare's Hexaemeron in Ishaq Šbadnaya's Prose Commentary on the Divine Providence," 209.

Chapter II

The Third *Mēmrā*: Themes and Content

Composed in dodecasyllabic meter, the third *mēmrā* consists of 850 lines (paired in 425 verses), though this count is not consistent across manuscripts.[49] The *mēmrā* is titled *On the Creation of the Angels and the Light of the First Day*. As this title suggests, the major portion of the *mēmrā* is dedicated to angelology, and the creation of light is discussed primarily in connection with angels. It is only in a brief section at the end of the *mēmrā* that Emmanuel specifically addresses the main theme of Gen 1:3–5, the separation of day and night.

Prologue: the Beginning of Creation

The poet begins with a prologue, reflecting on God's main purpose in creating the world. The divine being, in his perfection, had no need of the created world. Thus the creation was motivated solely by love (*ḥūbā*).[50] It was out of love that God, who was entirely hidden, "revealed his hiddenness through his creatures,"[51] even though He paradoxically remained as hidden as He was before His self-revelation.[52] The created world, as Emmanuel describes it, is a mirror which signifies the divine existence.[53] Emmanuel goes on to say, "The whole aim He put in the construction of the world, was the deification of all the rational beings that his love had

[49] The two older manuscripts, Jer. Patr. 34 and Berlin 62, present a slightly shorter form of the text, especially toward the end of the *mēmrā*.
[50] For the occurrence of this theme in *mēmrē* of Narsai and Jacob of Serugh, see Philippe Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, Patrologia Orientalis 34.3-4 (Turnhout; Paris: Brepols, 1968), 566–67; Edward George Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The First Day* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2009), 18–19.
[51] Verse 2.
[52] For the background of this theme, see Sebastian P. Brock, "Ephrem on Reading Scripture," in *Treasure-House of Mysteries: Explorations of the Sacred Text through Poetry in the Syriac Tradition*, Popular Patristics 45 (Yonkers: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2012), 21–23.
[53] For more on the metaphorical use of the mirror in Syriac literature, see Sebastian P. Brock, "The Imagery of the Spiritual Mirror in Syriac Literature," *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 5 (2005): 3–17.

created."[54] The deification (*malhānūtā*) of the rational beings (*malālē*), a term encompassing both humans and angels, occurs in a learning process, during which God teaches the knowledge of his existence to those capable of learning it: "The entire world is in the rank of a teaching place (*bēt dūrāšā*), that His *remzā* wisely made for the rational beings."[55] This notion of divine *paideia*, which is a marked feature of East Syriac theology and rooted in the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, then becomes a flowing theme throughout the *mēmrā*.[56] Employing this pedagogical language, Emmanuel explains the events of the creation week in the context of God instructing the angels.

The Creation of Angels

Following the prologue, Emmanuel goes through his main topic, the creation of angels, which marks the end of the first stage of creation, that is the creation in silence: "After He created the paternal natures (*kiyānē abāhāyē*) in silence, He sealed it with the creation of spiritual beings."[57] The first stage of the creation includes all that was created before the creation of light, and the reason why Emmanuel calls it "creation of silence" (*brītā d-šetqā*) is that, unlike subsequent phases of creation, God did not proclaim the existence of these "paternal natures" through speech, mainly because the intended audience for God's spoken words, the rational

[54] Verse 5.
[55] Verse 6. This Syriac term *remzā* is commonly rendered as "signal," "gesture," or "hint." Given the wide range of theological connotations that this word carries, I preferred to retain it as an untranslated technical term. Further see, Khalil Alwan, "Le 'Remzō' Selon La Pensée de Jacques de Saroug," *Parole de l'Orient* 15 (1989 1988): 91–106.
[56] While acknowledging the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Adam Becker also suggests alternative sources for the development of pedagogical imagery in East Syriac exegetical literature. See Adam Howard Becker, "Bringing the Heavenly Academy Down to Earth: Approaches to the Imagery of Divine Pedagogy in the East Syrian Tradition," in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, ed. Raanan S. Boustan and Annette Yoshiko Reed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 174–91.
[57] Verse 30. By "paternal natures," Emmanuel most likely refers to the seven entities created on the first day, excluding the light, which was formed in a subsequent phase (see below). According to Emmanuel, this list includes heaven, earth, angels, air, fire, waters, and ether. Various East Syriac authors have presented this list slightly differently, substituting ether with darkness. See Yulia Furman, "The Origins of the Temporal World: The First Mē'mrā of the Kṯāḇā d-Rēš Mellē of John Bar Penkāyē," *Scrinium* 10 (2014): 6–8.

beings, had not yet been brought into existence.[58] The second stage of creation, which Emmanuel refers to as "creation of sound" (*brītā d-qālā*), thus began with the announcement "Let there be light" (Gen 1:3) and was fulfilled with the creation of Adam.

After mentioning the creation of angels, Emmanuel begins discussing their characteristics. He refers to angels as beings made of spiritual fire (*nūrā rūḥānāytā*): "The nature which resembles the fire burning in glory, as if they were formed and composed of the nature of flame; Substances of fire with great adornment, with their garments and cloaks being flame." Explaining that the fire, of which angels are made, is essentially intangible (*lā metragšānā*), Emmanuel further emphasizes the incorporeal qualities of angels, describing them as beings who are simple (*pšīṭā*) rather than composite (*mrakbā*), with the ability to perceive without bodily senses, needless of earthly nourishment, and eternally alive.

The Number of Angels

Pursuing the discussion about the attributes of angelic nature, Emmanuel writes, "The nature of spiritual beings is perfect and complete in [terms of] quantity."[59] Functioning as a connector, this line links the previous discussion about the angelic attributes to the next section of the *mēmrā*, where the poet engages in a relatively long discussion about the number of angels. Zooming in layer by layer, Emmanuel first divides the angels broadly into nine orders (*tegmē*). Alluding to Matt 26:53, he then notices that each order is subsequently divided into twelve legions (*legyonē*). In the next step, this time alluding to Dan 7:10, he writes, "In each legion, there are thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads, spiritual and intellectual powers"[60] by

[58] This is a well-known exegetical teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, as preserved in the surviving fragments of his commentary on Genesis. See Eduard Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni Fragmenta Syriaca e Codicibus Musei Britannici Nitriacis Edidit Atque in Latinum Sermonem Vertit* (Leipzig: W. Engelmann, 1869), ה.
[59] Verse 89.
[60] Verse 93.

which he means the number of individual angels in each of the legions. The rest of his discussion about the number of angelic beings, therefore, is an interpretation of the phrase "thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads" in Dan 7:10.

Emmanuel's main interpretation of the verse from Daniel is that the phrase "thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads" has to be understood figuratively. According to him, the phrase implicitly refers to the end of numbers rather than a specific number and thus denotes the innumerability of angels rather than limiting their number: "It was not that the prophet, by [mentioning] 'thousand of thousands,' here, limited the substances of all spiritual beings; There is no word limiting the number of the watchers, since there is only one who knows their end: the God of all."[61] To support this view, Emmanuel calls up another biblical verse, Deut 32:8, writing, "Listen to what the great prophet Moses said within his canticle according to the Hebrew Book; 'The Lord set the boundary of all nations that is the number of His angels,' Moses handed down."[62] Based on this, Emmanuel explains that the number of angels in each of the nine orders is equivalent to the number of all human generations who have ever lived on the earth. Just as the number of humans is beyond counting, so is the number of angels in each order, and even more if all the nine orders are considered together.

Concerning Emmanuel's interpretation of Deut 32:8, it should be noted that what he quotes from Deuteronomy does not accord with the Hebrew Bible or the Peshitta version. Closely following the Masoretic Text, Peshitta reads, "When the Most High divided out the nations, when he separated humankind, he established the boundaries of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel (*l-menyānā da-bnay ʾīsrāʾēl*)."[63] Emmanuel's reading of the

[61] Verses 97-98. Also See Pseudo-Dionysius, *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, 321A.
[62] Verses 100-101.
[63] Carmel McCarthy, George Anton Kiraz, and Joseph Bali, *Deuteronomy According to the Syriac Peshitta Version, with English Translation*, Surath Ktobh (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2013), 181.

verse, in fact, accords with the Septuagint, which has "according to the number of God's angels" (κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ) in response to the Masoretic Text's "according to the number of the children of Israel" (*le-mispar bnei yisraʾel*). Emmanuel's reading and interpretation of the verse, therefore, must have been taken from a Greek source. Although he does not directly mention his source, Emmanuel notes that his interpretation of the verse is a tradition coming from the *Theoforoi*, as he writes, "This way *Theoforoi*, the lords of mysteries, wisely interpreted the word of the prophecy."[64] It might be possible that by *Theoforoi*, Emmanuel refers to Pseudo-Dionysian corpus, since a reference to the same tradition is also attested in Pseudo-Dionysius' *On the Celestial Hierarchy* (260B): "So, then, it is the angels who take care of our own hierarchy, or so the Word of God tells us. Michael is called the ruler of the Jewish people, and other angels are described as rulers of other nations, for 'the Most High has established the boundaries of the nations by the number of his angels.'"[65] Since Emmanuel's previously mentioned explanation of the number of angels is very similar to the one in *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, his reading of Deut 32:8 may have also been influenced by Pseudo-Dionysius.

Building upon his interpretation of Deut 32:8, Emmanuel takes his discussion about the number of angels one step further. Based on his previous argument that the number of all human beings is the same as the number of angels in one order, Emmanuel concludes that all rational beings are divided into ten orders: nine orders of angels and one order of human beings. Thus he connects Deut 32:8 to the parable of the lost coin in Luke 15:8-10.[66] In this analogy, the ten coins are the ten orders of rational beings, and the lost coin is the human order that has been separated

[64] Verse 103. For the term *theoforoi* and its implications, see Johan D. Hofstra, "Some Remarkable Passages in Isho'Dad of Merw's Commentary of the Gospel of John," Parole de l'Orient 35 (2010): 5.
[65] Colm Luibhéid and Paul Rorem, trans., *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1987), 171.
[66] Verses 116-120.

from its divine source for a while. The nine angelic orders are the remaining nine coins and also the woman's friends and neighbors who rejoice with her after the lost coin is found, and finally, the woman herself represents God. It should be noted that instead of using the word "God" (*ʾalāha*), Emmanuel uses the word "Divinity" (*ʾalāhūtā*), which is a feminine noun in Syriac. The usage of this feminine noun allows the poet to apply an intentionally ambiguous language. The verbs he employs in verses 119 and 120 are feminine and refer to both the mistress of the house (*mārat baytā*) and the Divinity (*ʾalāhūtā*), as he writes: "And She lit the lamp, the radiance of life in the lamp of our body"[67] and, "And with that, She found the human nature and it turned back toward life, and She called Her neighbors, the *ecclesiae* of watchers to rejoice."[68]

The theme of angels' rejoicing at Adam's creation and their mourning after his fall is extant in Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation*.[69] Nevertheless, Emmanuel's particular interpretation of the parable of the lost coin might have been influenced by Pseudo-Dionysian writings. A reference to this interpretation, already rooted in Luke 15:7, is found in Pseudo-Dionysius' *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, where we read: "Finally, I must explain something about what scripture intends in the reference to the joy of the heavenly ranks. Now these ranks could never experience the pleasures we draw from the passions. The reference therefore is to the way they participate in the divine joy caused by the finding of the lost."[70]

Emmanuel's argument concerning the ten orders of rational beings also has parallels in the writings of other Syriac authors. Emmanuel's contemporary author, Eliya of Anbar, adds one final order, which he calls the order of "souls," to the nine angelic orders, and therefore, increases the total number of the rational orders to ten. It is also noteworthy that Eliya of Anbar's

[67] Verse 119
[68] Verse 120
[69] Narsa, *mēmrē On Creation*, 4:274-281.
[70] *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, 340A. Colm Luibhéid and Paul Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*, 190.

poetic work, the *Book of Exercise* (*Ktābā d-Durrāšā*), is symbolically divided into ten *mēmrē*, corresponding to the ten orders of rational beings.[71] Furthermore, in a Syriac *mēmrā* titled *On Adam and on the Good and the Evil*, attributed to Jacob of Serugh, we find an angelological interpretation of the parable of the lost sheep, mentioned in Luke 15:3-7 and Matt 18:12-14. Similar to the way Emmanuel interprets the parable of coins, the author of this *mēmrā* interprets the lost sheep as the human race and the remaining ninety nine sheeps as angels.[72] This interpretation of the parable of the lost sheep also might be an expansion of Pseudo-Dionysian materials.[73]

Emmanuel's discussion about the number of angels is then followed by another detailed argument about whether the angelic nature is single or multiple. After challenging the idea of the unity of the angelic nature, Emmanuel concludes, "They are spiritual natures separated in species."[74] His argument, in summary, is that all creatures can be broadly classified into two categories of corporeal and incorporeal. Just as corporeal beings are divided into various species based on their genera, incorporeal beings, too, must have different kinds and be of various natures, as the same rule is applicable to all creatures. Emmanuel, however, acknowledges that understanding the distinctions among spiritual species is beyond the capacity of the human mind. He tries to support this argument with scriptural reasoning by referring to Psalm 104:4, "He

---

[71] Andreas Karl Juckel, "Eine Ostsyrische Angelologie (Elījā von Anbār, Ktābā d-Durrāšā Mēmrā IX, 1-20)," in *Nubia et Oriens Christianus. Festschrift Für C. Detlef G. Müller Zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Piotr O. Scholz and Reinhard Stempel, Bibliotheca Nubica 1 (Köln: Jürgen Dinter, 1987), 119.

[72] Khalil Alwan, *Jacques de Saroug († 521). Sur Adam et Sur Le Bien et Le Mal: Homélie Métrique Inédite* (Jounieh, Liban: Apôtres, 2021), 68 (text) 117 (translation).

[73] Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Letters*, 1088A. For the influence of Pseudo-Dionysian corpus on this *mēmrā*, see Alwan, *Jacques de Saroug († 521). Sur Adam et Sur Le Bien et Le Mal*, 68.

[74] Verse 147. The idea of the unity of angelic nature, which Emmanuel here refutes, is attested, for instance, in *the Cause of the Foundation of the Schools* by Barḥadbshabba, who states "they (i.e. angels) are all one substance." See Adam H. Becker, "Barḥadbeshabbā, The Cause of the Foundation of the Schools," in *Sources for the Study of the School of Nisibis*, Translated Texts for Historians 50 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), 121. Emmanuel's opinion on this matter is closer to Eliya of Anbar, who indicates that there are three angelic substances (*ūsiyā*), and each substance is consequently divided into three types (*dmūtā*). See Juckel, "Eine Ostsyrische Angelologie," 126 & 141.

makes winds his messengers, flames of fire his servants." As Emmanuel interprets it, this verse provides biblical evidence for the theory that angels have at least two different natures: fire and wind.

The Creation of Light

Turning back to the creation scene, Emmanuel describes the first moments of angels after they were created. Since they were endowed with the power of discernment (*pārošūtā*), angels began questioning their existence. Astonished by the existence of themselves and the other creatures, they asked each other, "Who are we and where did we come from? We were not heretofore, and now we are! What is the reason and what is the cause for which we came?"[75] It was in response to the first query of the heavenly students that God taught His first lesson through announcing the creation of light: "Spiritual beings, while they were astonished in perplexity, heard an exalted voice, crying aloud and saying, 'let there be light.'"[76] Following a well-known interpretative tradition, Emmanuel states that by observing the creation of light from nothing (*mēn lā meddem*) and hearing the divine voice, the angels came to realize that they, too, must have been made by the same creator and in the same manner: "Thence they reckoned 'we did not exist, and the one who created the light brought us into being out of a sudden.'"[77]

Angels as Priests

Emmanuel connects this interpretation of Gen 1:3 to a discussion about angelic priesthood, a central theme in his angelology that also plays a role in his later account of the angelic fall. He describes the angels as heavenly priests who reside in their heavenly churches,

[75] Verses 156 & 158..
[76] Verse 164.
[77] Verse 182.

writing, "In front of the invisible altar which His *remzā* had prepared, the Spirit made them priests (*kahhen ʾennon*) rank after rank."[78] The first priestly work of angels begins right after the creation of light. Referring to the first-fruits tradition (*Bikkurim*), Emmanuel describes God's voice in Gen 1:3 as the first-born of voices (*bukrā d-qālē*), in response to which the angels praised God with the first-born of praises (*bukrā d-šūbḥē*), just as priests who offer the first fruits of the harvest.[79] The concept of the heavenly church is present in earlier Syriac literature.[80] The way Emmanuel develops the idea, however, is highly influenced by the Pseudo-Dionysian corpus.[81]

The Hierarchy of Angels

Emmanuel connects the theme of angelic priesthood to his discussion about angelic hierarchy. The poet divides angels into three triads, which he puts as three *ecclesiae* (*tlāt qlesiyās*), corresponding to the three levels, or as he phrases it, three talents (*tlāt kakrīn*) of priesthood, Perfection (*šūmlāyā*), Illumination (*nūhārā*), and Purification (*dūkāyā*), a categorization borrowed from Pseudo-Dionysius.[82] Each triad of angels is granted one of these three priestly talents. They are arranged in a hierarchical order, with the highest rank receiving the talent of Perfection, the middle rank that of Illumination, and the lowest that of Purification.

[78] Verse 211.
[79] Exod 23:19 and Deut 26:2.
[80] In Narsai's *mēmrā On the Sanctification of the Church*, for instance, we find a reference to the Church in heaven. However, Narsai does not explicitly refer to a heavenly church established on the first day of creation exclusively for angels, but he mentions the general idea of the heavenly church, which belongs to both angels and men. See Amir Harrak, *Mar Narsai: Homily 33 on the Sanctification of the Church*, Texts from Christian Late Antiquity 54 (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2018), 40–45; Furthermore, for the background of the concept of the heavenly temple in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Ruth M. M. Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian*, Studien Und Texte Zu Antike Und Christentum 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 116.
[81] Later in the *mēmrā*, Emmanuel directly refers to "the judge of the Areopagus" as the source of his angelology (Verse 382).
[82] These three words correspond to Pseudo-Dionysian terms τελείωσις, ἔλλαμπσις, and κάθαρσις, respectively. Cf. On *the Celestial Hierarchy*, 240D. For further on this categorization, see Ghislain Casas, "Ontology, Henadology, Angelology : The Neoplatonic Roots of Angelic Hierarchy," in *Neoplatonic Demons and Angels*, ed. Luc Brisson, Seamus Joseph O'Neill, and Andrei Timotin (Brill, 2018), 247–52.

According to this hierarchical structure, each rank possesses not only its own talent but also those of the ranks below it. The same, however, does not apply in reverse: each rank receives the higher talent from the rank above and, in turn, passes down its own talent to the rank below:

> "Yet there is a great perfection for the first order: the Thrones,
> Who make perfect and never receive perfection from another one.
> In the same way, they illuminate and do not receive illumination,
> They are also pure and do not receive purification from watchers like the others.
> Those above possess the power of endowments of those below,
> But those below do not possess what belongs to those above."[83]

Each of these three ranks is further divided into three subgroups that altogether make the nine orders (*tešʿā tegmē*) of angels, which are, from the highest level to the lowest: Thrones (*māwtbē*), Cherubim (*krobē*), Seraphim (*srāpē*), Dominions (*mārawātā*), Powers (*ḥaylē*), Authorities (*šūlṭānē*), Principalities (*ʾarkos/rēšānwātā*), Archangels (*rabbay ʿīrē*), and Angels (*malakē*). Emmanuel then goes through these orders and explains them each by each, mostly by focusing on lexical interpretation of their names. His arguments are based on the theory that there is a direct connection between the duties of each angelic order and the gifts they have received from God: "The name of their orders was not the names of their natures, but the names of the activities of their endowments."[84] Each angelic order, Emmanuel explains, is like an image that reflects a particular attribute of the divine being, often with a visible connection between the name of that angelic order and the divine attribute. He refers to this concept using the term *yūqnā*, meaning "likeness," "imprint," or "image," which he adopts from Pseudo-Dionysian angelology.[85] He also

[83] Verses 217-219. Cf. On *the Celestial Hierarchy*, 284C.
[84] Verse 225.
[85] See On *the Celestial Hierarchy*, 205B.

frequently uses the verbal form of this term, *yaqen*, meaning "to represent" or "to depict," stating that each angelic order depicts an epithet of the divine.

After giving a description of each order, Emmanuel starts an intermezzo about angelic virtues, which sets the stage for the next episode of the *mēmrā*, the fall of angels. Emmanuel once again highlights priestly characteristics of the angels, describing them as beings who constantly stand at the divine presence, praise him with "their endless spiritual hallelujahs,"[86] and "are constantly glad in observance of the laws."[87] Foreshadowing the story of the fall, Emmanuel also uses negating language to describe angelic virtues, stating, "They are not lazy (*lā ḥbenānīn*) to fulfill their priestly offices,"[88] and further noticing that envy (*ḥsāmā*) and fraud (*kāyomūtā*) were entirely taken away from the spiritual troops. The description of angelic virtues opens up a discussion on whether or not angels possess free will. Emmanuel demonstrates that angels have the privilege to choose and to reject. Thus they embody their virtues out of free will (*ḥerūt yātā*) and discernment (*pārošūtā*) and do not obey the divine commandment by force (*ba-qṭīrā*). It is in such a context that Emmanuel narrates the story of the fall of angels as a case that illustrates their capacity for free choice, as he writes, "Witness to the fact that they freely choose and reject, are those who fell from their orders through their own will."[89]

The Fall of Angels

The angelic fall, as Emmanuel places it, took place on the fourth day of creation, when, after the luminaries were created, God willed to examine the angels. On this day, according to

[86] Verse 270.
[87] Verse 277.
[88] Verse 277. This echoes a passage in the *Cause of the Foundation of the Schools*, where Barḥadbshabba contrasts lazy angels and diligent angels. See Becker, "Barḥadbeshabbā, The Cause of the Foundation of the Schools," 120–22. It must be, however, noted that "lazy angels" is Becker's interpretative title as Barḥadbshabba himself does not explicitly use a term such as *ḥbenānā* (lazy) in this passage.
[89] Verse 284..

Emmanuel, "He came to hand over their authorities (*šūlṭānayhon*) to them."[90] The authorities of the angels, as Emmanuel later explains, refer to their duty to govern the world. After God entrusted their services to them, "All of them made objections (*ʾeṯḥriyu*), and some of them failed because they did not obey."[91] The commandment for angels to govern the corporeal world led them to question the purpose behind its creation. Observing the tangible creatures of the first four days —such as the earth, the firmament, and the celestial bodies—the angels realized that both they and God were spiritual beings and thus had no need for material creation, an observation which led them to ask, "What are they all truly useful for?"[92] In response to this inquiry, God notified the angels in advance about the creation of Adam, answering to them, "For the earthly one (*l-ʿaprānāyā*) whom the *remzā* would create from dust (*men daḥīḥā*)."[93]

To explain the reason why this creature of dirt (*ʾademtā*) is "the chief and the ruler of the corporeal world,"[94] Emmanuel briefly sketches the principal themes of his anthropology, which he later develops in fuller detail in the eleventh *mēmrā*. Adam is the compound of a living and rational soul and a body. He thus has a dual kinship (*ʾḥyānūtā*), with his body making him similar to animals and his soul to spiritual beings. Based on this notion, Emmanuel refers to Adam as the bond of the world (*ʾasārā d-ʿālmā*), and further describes him as a microcosm (*ʿālmā zʿorā*), "in whom the likeness of God of all is manifested."[95] Revealing the creation of Adam beforehand, God entrusted various groups of angels with the duty of managing different parts of the natural world, such as the earth, the sphere, and the luminaries, all for the service of Adam: "The hidden *remzā* brought them into the furnace of trial (*l-kūr būḥrānā*), by

[90] Verse 288.
[91] Verse 288.
[92] Verse 297.
[93] Verse 301.
[94] Verse 303.
[95] Verse 302.

commanding [them] to govern the world and its benefits."[96] In response to this commandment, angels, who "for three days had remained with one accord,"[97] parted ways, as some of them refused to accept Adam's supremacy.

The reason behind the angels' transgression of the divine commandment, in Emmanuel's view, was their pride (*ḥtīrūtā*). According to him, the point of their pride was the excellence of nature that had been previously granted to them by God, as he writes, "They relied on the comeliness of their beauty (*payūtā d-yāyūthon*), and they cheapened and despised the Maker who had brought them into being."[98] Pride then awakened their envy (*ḥsāmā*) toward Adam. Being proud of their natures, some of the angels could not tolerate the greatness bestowed on Adam, whom they regarded as of a lower nature, and thus they refused to serve him, and consequently fell from their angelic status. Emmanuel describes the fall of the angels by presenting an etymological reinterpretation of the names of three groups of the fallen angels, Satans (*sāṭānē*), Demons (*daywē*), and Evil Spirits (*šēdē*): "Some of them, therefore, were shamelessly wretched (*ʾetdwiyu*) like the wretched ones (*dāwayyā*), and were named tyrant Demons (*daywē*) after their own deeds; Some of them went astray (*ʾasṭiyu*) from the divine commandment, and they, too, were named Satans (*sāṭānē*) based on the way they chose; All those who were wretched and turned aside, were cast out (*ʾeštdiyu*) and fell, and on this account they were called furious Evil Spirits (*šēdē*)."[99]

As these rebellious angels rejected their assigned service (*tešmeštā*), they lost their priestly offices and fell from their high status in heaven: "They became alienated from the assemblies and dwelling place of the watchers, the demons who had assailed and rebelled were

[96] Verse 312.
[97] Verse 289.
[98] Verse 318.
[99] Verses 314-316. I have distinguished between *šēdā* and *daywā* by rendering them into "Evil Spirit" and "Demon" respectively. However, the two terms share a similar connotation and are often used interchangeably. In New Testament Peshitta, both *šēdā* and *daywā* are used in response to Greek δαιμόνιον and, less frequently, πνεῦμα.

driven to exile; they were expelled and went out from their spiritual churches, and from the divine service of their priesthoods."[100] Emmanuel's depiction of the punishment of the fallen angels highly relies on clothing metaphors. The rebellious angels, who were first clothed in light (*ʿṭipay nūhra*), lost their beauty of appearance, which was the very point of their pride. Emmanuel conveys the core aspects of the punishment of the rebellious angels: their fall—both literally from heaven and figuratively from their priestly status—and their loss of divine brightness, by calling the biblical image, "I saw him, the deceitful one, Satan, who fell from heaven like lightning" (Luke 10:18), to which he interpretatively adds "and was extinguished."[101] Emmanuel then furthers this theme and provides a more detailed description, stating that the fallen angels "were stripped of their divine adornments."[102] Emmanuel describes them with words such as sterile (*mgazyā*), bare (*mšalḥā*), and profane (*šḥīmā*), as he writes, "Their desire made them hateful despondents, misshapen and naked spiritual beings!"[103]

A further question Emmanuel raises concerns the angelic orders to which the fallen angels originally belonged. He refers to Satan as the chief of the air (*rēšā d-āʿar*), indicating that "the chief of the air showed boldness first, and some from the other orders did the same afterward."[104] Emmanuel reports a previous opinion that from each of the nine orders, some angels fell. Although he does not refute this belief, he expresses a different view: "Paul said those who fell were from three orders, from the Principalities and the Authorities and the Chief of the Air."[105] The angels' transgression of the commandment and their consequential fall led

[100] Verses 349 & 347. Emmanuel usually employs the term *ʿīrē* (watchers) for angels as a whole, while reserving the term *malakē* (angels) specifically for the tenth angelic order. For the background of these two terms in Syriac, see Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy*, 154–55.
[101] Verse 366.
[102] Verse 345.
[103] Verse 351.
[104] Verse 330.
[105] Verse 331. Emmanuel does not quote any passage from the Pauline letters, but his reference is likely to Col 2:15 and Eph 6:12. The whole sentence, however, is somehow unclear since "the chief of the air" is an epithet for Satan rather than a specific angelic order. The same reference to Paul has been made by other East Syriac authors, though

them to the enmity of Adam, which was first intended against God himself: "They supposed that if they rebel and wrestle with the Maker, they will have the strength to fight."[106] Seeing their lack of power to overcome God, therefore, they shifted their animosity toward Adam, saying, "Perhaps we can fight His image."[107]

The first attempt of the hostile forces to defile the divine image was the deception of Adam and Eve through the serpent. Following the mainstream of Syriac Christian exegetical tradition, Emmanuel interprets Genesis 3:1-7 as Satan deceiving the first human couple by taking on the form of the serpent, which leads to the interpretation of Gen 3:14 as God's curse directed at Satan, not the serpent itself: "He cursed him, the chief of the liars, in the likeness of the serpent (*b-parṣop ḥewyā*)."[108] This marks the first moment of the long history of hostility between demons and the human race. After taking the story to this point, Emmanuel ends his account of demonology.

The Separation of Day and Night

The final section of the *mēmrā* is dedicated to the discussion about the separation of day and night. After ending his discussion about angels, Emmanuel goes through Gen 1:3-5. However, this section, consisting of 33 verses, is more of a poetic retelling of the biblical text, and includes less exegetical materials, compared to the previous sections. His exegetical effort in

with slightly different interpretations. According to Ishoʿdad of Merv, the fallen angels were from Archangels, Principalities, and Authorities. Eliya of Anbar, similar to Emmanuel, disagrees with the opinion that the fallen angels were from all the nine orders, and writes: "The tyrant Demons did not go astray and fall from all the orders, nor from all the churches, as the Fathers say." He also quotes Eph 6:12, but concluded that angels fell from two orders, Authorities and Principalities. See, Jacques Marie Vosté and Ceslas van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išoʿdad de Merv Sur l'Ancien Testament, I: Genèse*, CSCO 126, Syr. 67 (Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1950), 74; Andreas Karl Juckel, "Eine Ostsyrische Angelologie (Elījā von Anbār, Ktābā d-Durrāšā Mēmrā IX, 1-20)," in *Nubia et Oriens Christianus. Festschrift Für C. Detlef G. Müller Zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Piotr O. Scholz and Reinhard Stempel, Bibliotheca Nubica 1 (Köln: Jürgen Dinter, 1987), 144.

[106] Verse 356.

[107] Verse 362.

[108] Verse 374.

this section is primarily focused on explaining how light and darkness were separated before the fourth day of creation, when the luminaries came into existence and were set in motion, and the current system of day and night began working.

Emmanuel's main explanation is that during those three days, in the absence of the luminaries, the divine will lifted the light and gathered it above the clouds, as he writes, "The commandment which placed the light within the sphere, took it up here when twelve hours had been fulfilled; Before the fourth day, He did not took up this light which was mentioned, in the sphere, but elevated it above the clouds."[109] The problem, however, is that light is, by its nature, diffuse (ʾašīdā) and therefore, cannot be gathered in one place. To demonstrate that such an impossible phenomenon is made possible by divine will, Emmanuel calls up the events of Exodus 14, where God makes water, which is also naturally diffuse like light, stand in one place: "The commandment that held the waters as if in a wineskins, and made people pass, it itself held the light there; The waters are diffuse and so is the light, but their Maker gathered them when He wished."[110] After this brief section on the separation of light and darkness, Emmanuel adds a final prayer that summarizes the key themes of the text, this time in a more devotional language, and thus concludes the *mēmrā.*

[109] Verses 397-398. Cf. Ephrem, *Commentary on Genesis*, 5:2.
[110] Verses 400-401.

Chapter III

Emmanuel's Sources: A Case Study

As mentioned earlier in the introduction, when Islamization spread across the Middle East, East Syrian authors tried to preserve and compile the traditions of their earlier generations as much as possible. As a result, massive exegetical compositions appeared during this period by commentators such as Theodore bar Koni and Ishoʿdad of Merv. One could argue that East Syrian medieval exegetical writers were more of compilers rather than authentic authors. Therefore, as it is a common feature of Syriac exegetical compositions in the medieval period, Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron*, too, is highly compilatory in nature.[111] The text, therefore, is very diverse in terms of materials incorporated. Because of this key literary characteristic, a study of the poet's sources may become even more important, as it contributes to understanding the framework of his exegetical thought.

A comparison between Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* and earlier interpretations of Genesis in Syriac literature shows that the poet took his interpretative ideas from multiple sources, each pointing to a different exegetical tradition. Thus no single text had an excluding impact on Emmanuel's understanding of the book of Genesis. The close reading of the *Hexaemeron*, indeed, shows that the author was active in engaging with his sources. Often, Emmanuel borrows his themes from different exegetical backgrounds and blends them into a specific yet multilayered narrative through his exegetical creativity, which makes the *Hexaemeron* go beyond a mere compilation of earlier exegetical ideas. Sometimes, Emmanuel takes two different themes, originally belonging to distinct exegetical discourses, and by superimposing them, he

[111] See Lucas van Rompay, "Development of Biblical Interpretation in the Syrian Churches of the Middle Ages," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Part 2: The Middle Ages*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 559–60.

synthesizes a third approach to interpreting the scripture. In other cases, he reads his sources critically and engages in internal dialogue with earlier East Syriac commentators, though without explicitly refuting them.

To illustrate our poet's interpretative strategies, the present chapter examines the story of the fall of angels, included in the second half of the third *mēmrā*. The chapter will discuss each element of the story, as presented in the third *mēmrā*, in relation to earlier sources. The first section compares Emmanuel's account of the fall of angels with interpretations of the fall of Satan in the works of early Syriac poets, including Ephrem, Narsai, and Jacob of Serugh. The following section explores parallels between Emmanuel's text and a Syriac apocryphal work, called the *Cave of Treasures*, suggesting that the Cave of Treasures was likely a key source for the poet and served as an intermediary channel for the transmission of some earlier traditions to Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron*.

The final section aims to explain an element of the story that differs from all the sources discussed earlier, namely the fall of angels on the fourth day of creation. In order to interpret Emmanuel's view on the timing of angels' fall, a comparison will be made with passages from Ishoʿdad of Merv's commentary on Genesis, Kosmas Indicopleustes' *Christian Topography*, and an Ethiopian hexaemeral text called *Aksimaros*. Although the current state of scholarship on Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* does not yet allow to confidently comment on the author's sources, this chapter tries to identify various traditions that potentially shaped Emmanuel's exegetical thought and to see how he reworked those traditions into his ultimate interpretation of the story.

The Traditional Background of the Fall of Angels in Early Syriac Literature

Comparing Emmanuel's rendition of the fall of angels in his third *mēmrā* with the writings of early Syriac authors reveals several themes in common. Although Ephrem wrote little

about the fall of Satan, we find more detailed interpretations in the *mēmrē* of Narsai and Jacob of Serugh on creation. Despite the fact that these two poets represent two distinct confessional branches of Syriac Christianity, they share plenty of similar themes in their accounts of Satan's fall, which alludes to their common traditional and institutional background.[112] These common themes can be also attested in later Syriac compositions as well as the works of non-Syriac Christian authors who were influenced by Syriac traditions, such as Eznik of Kolb and Kosmas Indicopleustes. In spite of their fundamental differences, these sources altogether exhibit multiple interpretative ideas that must have been part of what Sergey Minov calls "the traditional Edessene exegetical repertoire."[113] To understand Emmanuel's position in the development of the story, every element shared by the *Hexaemeron* and these early sources should be viewed as Emmanuel's adherence to the common ground of Syriac exegetical tradition. Any deviation from or addition to this tradition by Emmanuel, therefore, is open to alternative explanations and may shed light on the author's own interpretive priorities.

The most basic similarity between the *Hexaemeron* and early Syriac sources is the fundamental notion of Satan's fall due to his jealousy of Adam. In his *Commentary on Genesis*, Ephrem places Satan's fall on the sixth day of creation, which automatically suggests a connection between Satan's transgression and the creation of Adam.[114] Although Ephrem's prose commentary has not much more about the fall of Satan, his poetic corpus includes several

[112] For an explanation of similarities between Narsai and Jacob of Serugh, see Lucas van Rompay, "Humanity's Sin in Paradise: Ephrem, Jacob of Sarug, and Narsai in Conversation," in *Jacob of Serugh and His Times: Studies in Sixth-Century Syriac Christianity*, ed. George Anton Kiraz, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 8 (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2010), 216–17; also see Erin Galgay Walsh, "From Sketches to Portraits: The Canaanite Woman within Late Antique Syriac Poetry," in *Syriac Christian Culture: Beginnings to Renaissance*, ed. Aaron Michael Butts and Robin Darling Young (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2020), 67.

[113] Sergey Minov, "Satan's Refusal to Worship Adam: A Jewish Motif and Its Reception in Syriac Christian Tradition," in *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity:*, ed. Menahem Kister et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 251.

[114] *Commentary on Genesis*, Ch. 32. For further discussion about the use of this theme in Ephrem's writings, see Gary A. Anderson, "The Fall of Satan in the Thought of St. Ephrem and John Milton," *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 3:1 (2000): 14–23.

references to Satan's jealousy of Adam. In *On Faith*, for instance, we read, "Lord, keep us away from the evil one, who is evil in vain; the one who envied Adam, the one who envied his offsprings."[115] In the same way, both Narsai and Jacob of Serugh mention Satan's pride and jealousy of Adam as the cause of his rebellion and fall. Both poets are unanimous in interpreting the motivation of Satan's jealousy. They indicate that Satan envied Adam because he was called the image of God and the ruler of the entire creation (Gen 1:26). Satan, who was already granted a high rank among the angels, did not accept to serve a bodily creature. In Narsai's fourth *mēmrā* on creation, we read, "Only one did not yoke himself to the dominion of Adam's love, and the unity [among the angels] did not please him, as he was struck by the arrow of envy; there was no reason for his envy and no place for his bitterness, other than the greatness of Adam whom he saw honored above all."[116] In the same way, Jacob of Serugh writes, "The reason that [Satan] had fallen I sought to make clear, [namely] that it is known to be that he was envious of the house of Adam, because Adam had become the image of divinity, and had become more exalted than the animals, even than all that had been fashioned."[117] This evidence clearly shows the background of Emmanuel's interpretation of the fall of angels, yet his emphasis on the excellence of angelic substance as the instigator of their pride does not have a parallel in these sources.

Another idea that is shared by most Syriac interpreters is the belief in angelic free will. The earliest evidence of this theme in Syriac literature appears in the *Book of the Laws of the Countries*. Bardaisan asserts that God made humans equal to the angels by granting them free will, though his interpretation of angelic sin—an inevitable consequence of free

[115] On Faith, 50.6. Edmund Beck, *Des Heiligen Ephraem Des Syrers Sermones de Fide*, CSCO 212-213, Syr. 88-89 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1961), 1:157. Translations of quotations from Syriac texts are all mine; otherwise, an existing English translation is cited as the source.
[116] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 4:101-102, 105-106. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 616.
[117] Jacob of Serugh, *mēmrā On the Six Days of Creation*, 6:2537-2540. Translation from Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*, 90.

will—completely differs from the Syriac tradition that followed.[118] In their retellings of the story of Satan's fall, Narsai and Jacob of Serugh both emphasize that he disobeyed God's commandment through his own free choice. Narsai refers to the free will of angels, though within the broader context of his angelology rather than specifically in the story of Satan's fall.[119] Jacob of Serugh, however, more specifically mentions the role of Satan's free will in his disobedience, writing, "And he willingly (*b-ṣebyāneh*) set himself to [instigate] rebellion, corruption, destruction and contention."[120] Although the idea of angelic free will has been a consistent part of Christian angelology, different exegetes applied it in various contexts to serve different exegetical purposes. A common approach was to explain Satan's rebellion through the lens of angelic free will, in order to address the problem of evil and avoid attributing it to God, the ultimate source of goodness. For instance, Eznik of Kolb, the Armenian theologian of the fifth century, who was influenced by Syriac traditions,[121] frequently alludes to this theme in his treatise *De Deo*, primarily within the context of his anti-dualistic polemics.[122] Furthermore, the motif of angelic free will is also attested in the *Cause of the Foundation of the Schools*, written by the 6th-century East Syriac scholastic Barḥadbshabba ʿArbaya. Just before addressing the fall of angels, he writes, "He gave them free will that they might complete everything according to

[118] For Bardaisan, the sin of angels is copulation with the daughters of men, an interpretation inspired by the Enochic tradition of identifying *Bene Elohim* in Gen 6:2 as a group of angels. See Han J. W. Drijvers, *The Book of the Laws of Countries: Dialogue on Fate of Bardaiṣan of Edessa*, 2nd ed. (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2006), 16; Further see Van Rompay, "The Christian Syriac Tradition of Interpretation," 618.
[119] For instance in *mēmrē On Creation*, 5:27-28, 185-186; 6:245-248.
[120] Jacob of Serugh, *mēmrā On the Six Days of Creation*, 6:2503-2504. The translation is taken from Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*, 86–87.
[121] For Eznik's reliance on Syriac traditions and a comparison between his interpretations of Genesis and Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation*, see Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 502–9.
[122] Monica J. Blanchard and Robin A. Darling Young, trans., *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Eznik of Kolb*, Eastern Christian Texts in Translation 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 60–61. The theme of Satan's free will also occurs in the *Cave of Treasures* 3:3, where we read that Satan transgressed the divine commandment "through his own will" (*b-ṣebyān napšēh*), which Toepel interprets as an example of the text's anti-Manichaean and anti-Zoroastrian agenda. See Alexander Toepel, *Die Adam -und Seth- Legenden im syrischen* Buch der Schatzhöhle. *Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung*, CSCO 618, Subs. 119 (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), 98.

their desire and that they might show their good will toward their master in their service to us."[123] To highlight Satan's agency in his disobedience, Barḥadbshabba employs the popular East Syriac pedagogical imagery, describing Satan as an angel who was negligent and failed to learn the lessons God had taught the angels, and "forgot the meaning hidden in this book and he thought great things about himself."[124] Emmanuel, too, emphasizes the freedom of angels but develops the theme in a slightly different way. Emmanuel does not address angelic free will as part of his discussion about the fall of angels, but the other way around. Tracking the topics in their vertical sequence in the *mēmrā* indicates that Emmanuel brings up the story of the fall of angels only after addressing angelic free will, which, in turn, is nested within a discussion of angels' virtues. Emmanuel's main exegetical aim, therefore, is to show that angels are not compelled to be virtuous, but as rational beings, choose to be obedient to God. It is in such a framework that Emmanuel introduces the story of the fall as an example to illustrate his point about angels' free choice. This thematic arrangement also explains the chronological inconsistency of the *mēmrā*, and clarifies why Emmanuel recounts the story of the fall of angels, an event he situates on the fourth day of creation, during the third *mēmrā* that covers the events of the first day.

In the *Hexaemeron*, the story of the fall of angels begins with a description of their inquiry about the use of the corporeal world. In Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation*, too, we find angels inquiring about Adam, but from a completely different perspective. On the sixth day of creation, God announced the formation of Adam by declaring, "Let us make man in our image" (Gen 1:26). Narsai interprets the use of the first person plural language as a reference to divine counsel (*melkā*) as if God was calling the other Persons who were with Him (*qnūmē d-ʿamēh*). By altering His creation formula, Narsai explains, God intended to reveal the mystery of the

[123] Becker, "Barḥadbeshabbā, The Cause of the Foundation of the Schools," 120.
[124] Becker, 120. The theme of the book that God teaches to the angels also appears in Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 2:249-252.

indication of the Persons (*rāzā d-būdāq qnūmē*), that is, the Trinity. Amazed at this revelation, angels ask, "O Creator, who is he for whom you alter [your manner]? A new counsel and deliberation in the dust of Adam!"[125] Narsai also uses this motif to explain the motivation of Satan's jealousy by making Satan utter, "For me, a spiritual being, who has authority over the legions of my fellows, He did not wish to indicate our formation even with a single word; but this worthless soil of earth, this son of dust, He adorned and formed him with a great counsel and deliberation."[126] Although Emmanuel does not mention it in the third *mēmrā*, he was certainly familiar with this interpretation, as in the eleventh *mēmrā*, he writes, "When the watchers were in wonder, and so was the world, He proclaimed 'let us make man;' [Angels said] 'we, spiritual natures, were created in silence, and the rest of creatures were created with a simple word; But this one with a voice of invitation and preparation, and thus [became] the image of the God of all, what a great marvel!'"[127] Nevertheless, what Emmanuel presents in the third *mēmrā*, namely the inquiry of angels about God's purpose for the creation of the material world, has a parallel in Jacob of Serugh's *mēmrā* on the sixth day. Jacob recounts that after the creation of the material world was completed on the sixth day, "The hosts of heaven stood in wonderment, at what had been fashioned for they did not know who it was for; a bridal chamber had been made up but no one knew who the bride was, a house had been fashioned but no one could make out who would dwell in it."[128] This tradition was also well-known among East Syriac interpreters besides Emmanuel, as it appears in the seventh-century *Book of the Main Events (Ktābā d-rēš melle)* by John bar Penkaye.[129]

---

[125] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:127-128. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 534.
[126] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:235-238. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 540.
[127] Ṣana, "Ḥilq al-Insān li-'Immanu'il Bar Šahāre," 4.
[128] Jacob of Serugh, *mēmrā On the Six Days of Creation*, 6:2063-2066. The translation is taken from Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*, 34–36. The imagery of the bridal chamber is also used by Emmanuel in the eleventh *mēmrā*. See Ṣana, "Ḥilq al-Insān l-'Immanu'il Bar Šahāre," 3.
[129] Furman, "The Origins of the Temporal World," 27 (Text), 39 (Translation).

As noted above, one reason Emmanuel gives to explain why Adam is meant to rule over the entire world and why all creatures, including the angels, should serve him is that the human being is the bond of the whole world: "The one animated in the body whom the *remzā* created, shall become the chief and the ruler of the corporeal world; he shall also become the bond of the whole world (*ʾasārā d-ʿālmā kuleh*), of the spiritual beings together with corporeal beings in one accord."[130] The dual kingship of Adam, as the bond of creation, is a recurring motif in Narsai's *mēmrē*. Using the verb *ʿsr* (to bind), which shares the same root with Emmanuel's *ʾasārā* (bond), Narsai frequently indicates that God united the entire creation in the formation of Adam. In his first *mēmrā*, for instance, Narsai writes, "Come let us make a rational man according to our image, and let us bind everything (*nēsor kulā*) by the affinity (*ʾḥyānūtā*) of his soul and body; he shall be akin (*ʾḥyānā*) to the heavenly beings through his living soul, and through the constitution of his body he shall be close to corporeal beings."[131] Furthermore, we find several references to this theme in *Christian Topography*, written by Kosmas Indicopleustes, the culturally Greek but confessionally East Syrian author of the sixth century. Describing the scene where angels mourn after Adam and Eve's fall, Kosmas writes, "Since man was the bond uniting the whole creation, as well as the image of God, they abandoned after his sentence all hope both of themselves and of the universe."[132] The same motif also appears in the compositions of later East Syriac commentators such as Theodore bar Koni.[133] The popularity of this theme in East Syriac literature stems from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. For Theodore, referring to Adam as the bond of creation was part of the broader context of his understanding of Adam-Christ

[130] Verse 303-304.
[131] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:149-152. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 534. The theme occurs in several places throughout Narsai's *mēmrē On Creation*, including 3:344-5; 4:7-8, 93-4; 5:187-8; 6:251-6, 303-4.
[132] John W. McCrindle, trans., *The Christian Topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian Monk, Translated from the Greek, and Edited with Notes and Introduction* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 77. Furthermore, for the theme of angels' lamentation after the fall of Adam and Eve, see Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 4:274-284.
[133] Addai Scher, *Theodorus Bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, CSCO Syr. II.65-66 (Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1910), 1:30, 52.

typology. As Frederick McLeod explains, Theodore develops this idea based on his interpretation of Col 1:7, "In Him (Christ) all things are held together." Given the archetypal relationship between Adam and Christ, Theodore believed, the same is applicable to Adam. In his commentary on Genesis, Theodore further argues that God gathered the whole creation in one bond, Adam, who reflects both tangible and intangible nature through his soul and body.[134] This motif, originating in the teachings of the Interpreter, most likely found its way into Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* through the intermediary of Narsai. Therefore, it is not surprising that this theme has no parallel in the works of Jacob of Serugh and Ephrem.

In the *Hexaemeron*, the fall of angels is depicted through an etymological explanation of the names of different tribes of demons. Besides the passage quoted above, Emmanuel makes etymological word plays with these terms elsewhere in the *mēmrā*: "Evil Spirits (*šēdē*) and Demons (*daywē*) who had acted against their Lord were cast away (*ʾeštdiyu*), and Satans (*sāṭānē*), too, who went astray (*ʾasṭiyu*) and fell from their magnificence."[135] The tradition of interpreting the term Satan (*sāṭānā*) as derived from the root *sṭā* (to go astray) has a long history in Syriac exegetical literature. Allusions to this tradition are found in the *mēmrē* of both Narsai and Jacob of Serugh. In his sixth *mēmrā*, for instance, Narsai writes, "He was sanctified, unlike Satan (*sāṭānā*) who went astray (*sṭā*) and fell."[136] Similarly, Jacob of Serugh indicates, "And he went astray (*ʾasṭī*) to corrupt [Adam], for this reason he is called Satan (*sāṭānā*)."[137] The same interpretation appears in Eznik of Kolb's *De Deo*, likely reflecting the author's familiarity with Syriac tradition: "We know that Satan has not come into being from God. But the name 'Satan'

[134] Frederick G. McLeod, *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge, 2009), 26–29. It should also be noted that the term *ʾasārā* (bond), which Emmanuel also uses, is employed in reference to Adam in the Syriac translation of Theodore's Commentary on Genesis. See Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca*, ١.
[135] Verse 357.
[136] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 6:223. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 684.
[137] Jacob of Serugh, *mēmrā On the Six Days of Creation*, 6:2532. The translation is taken from Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*, 90.

is on account of his going astray, because 'Satan' is translated from the Hebrew and Syriac languages as 'misled.'"[138] It can be inferred from this evidence that the term Satan was traditionally understood as a general title, which can explain Emmanuel's use of the term in plural form, as he collectively refers to one group of the fallen angels as Satans (*sāṭānē*).[139] It is in this context that Ephrem, in his *Commentary on Genesis*, writes, "Satan secretly became Satan on that sixth day."[140] Although Ephrem does not elaborate on the etymological background of this statement in his *Commentary*, he does so in *Against Heresies*: "And how Satan (*sāṭānā*) could be a kinsman of night? This one went astray (*sṭā*) and also led [others] astray (*ʾasṭī*), and even his very name testifies his apostasy (*masṭyānūtēh*)."[141] This passage from *Against Heresies,* in fact, can be considered the earliest evidence of this interpretation of Satan's name in Syriac literature, yet the tradition itself certainly predates Ephrem. The earliest evidence of this tradition in Christian literature comes from the second-century *Dialogue with Trypho* attributed to Justin Martyr.[142] Ephrem thus refers to a well-established idea that had already been developed before

---

[138] Blanchard and Young, *A Treatise on God*, 62.

[139] This idea naturally raises the question of whether the term "Satan" can apply to beings other than Satan himself. East Syrian commentators such as Theodore bar Koni and Ishoʿdad of Merv answer the question by pointing to two biblical examples: Peter, whom Christ called Satan (Matt 16:23), and the angel who confronted Balaam (Num 22:22–34). See Scher, *Theodorus Bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, 78; Vosté and van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išoʿdad de Merv Sur l'Ancien Testament, I: Genèse*, 74. The reason they refer to the angel in Balaam's story as an example of the general usage of the term "Satan" likely derives from the Peshitta's rendering of Numbers 22:32, where the Syriac text reads, "I have come out to become a Satan for you (*d-ʾehwe lāk sāṭānā*)." While modern translations of this verse interpret the Hebrew *l-śāṭān* as an infinitive meaning "to oppose," it is easy to imagine that for an ancient interpreter, the lexical similarity between the Hebrew term and the name of the biblical adversary might have been sufficient to suggest a connection between this angel and Satan, even though in Balaam's story, the angel is portrayed as a righteous figure. It should also be noted that Ephrem, too, in *On Paradise* 15:13-16, refers to the Story of Balaam in Num 22 to make a similar point. Unlike Theodore bar Koni and Ishoʿdad, however, Ephrem sees Balaam's donkey, and not the angel, as an example of a Satan. Ephrem further introduces Balaam's donkey as an example of a "good" Satan, in contrast to the serpent in Genesis 3 who was an "evil" Satan. See Sebastian P. Brock, *Saint Ephrem. Hymns on Paradise* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990), 186–88.

[140] Ephrem, *Commentary on Genesis*, Ch 32. Mathews and Amar, "Commentary on Genesis," 121.

[141] *Against Heresies,* 17:10. Edmund Beck, *Des Heiligen Ephraem Des Syrers Hymnen Contra Haereses*, CSCO 169-170, Syr. 76-77 (Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957), 1:63.

[142] In *Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. 103, we read that the word "Satanas" consists of two parts. The first part, "*Sata*" in "the Jewish and Syrian tongue" means apostate and the second part "*nas*" means serpent. See Michael Slusser, ed., *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, trans. Thomas B. Falls, Selections from the Fathers of the Church ; Volume 3 (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 156. The rendition of "nas" as "serpent" might be a reinterpretation of the Greek form influenced by the Hebrew *nāḥāš* (serpent).

his time, and later became part of the formal interpretation of Satan in numerous Syriac exegetical sources, including Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron*.

As mentioned previously, Emmanuel notes that Satan deceived Adam and Eve in the form of the serpent. Thus he adheres to a long-standing Syriac interpretive tradition that identified the serpent in Genesis 3 with Satan. Multiple times in his *Commentary on Genesis*, Ephrem refers to Satan as "that one who was in the serpent."[143] This tradition is also attested in Narsai's first *mēmrā* on creation. In fact, Narsai mentions Satan's envy only after he addresses the divine commandment in Gen 2:16-17. Satan's envy then drove him to hostility against Adam. Similar to Emmanuel, Narsai indicates that Satan initially intended to harm God, but, finding himself unable to do so, decided to defile God's image instead: "Because of his dominion, pride seized the rebellious one, and in the haughtiness of his heart he wished to exalt himself over the Creator; but since the evil one could not do evil to the power of the Essence, instead of the Creator he wished to revile the Creator's image."[144] Determined to fight against humanity, therefore, Satan planned to deceive Adam and Eve. To justify why Satan used the serpent's body as his cover to approach Adam and Eve, Narsai explains that if Satan had come to them in his spiritual and non-compound form, they would not have been able to see him. Narsai furthers that, "At the beginning of time the envious one was unable, to change himself (*nšaḥlep yātēh*) and to deceive the man through multiple appearances,"[145] and therefore, he put on the serpent and "like a lyre, the spurious one sang on carnal strings."[146] Given that in this scene Satan and the serpent are completely intertwined together, Narsai mixes the account of Satan's fall with his interpretation of God's curse of serpent in Gen 3:14-15. Calling the tradition of Satan's rule over

[143] Ephrem, *Commentary on Genesis*, Chs 18-19. Mathews and Amar, "Commentary on Genesis," 110–11.
[144] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:445-448. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 552.
[145] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:243-244. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 540.
[146] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:246. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 540.

the air (Eph 2:2) and instilling it into the biblical account of the serpent's punishment, Narsai creates an ironic image: the one who once ruled over the aerial realm will now crawl on the ground and eat dust, which also alludes to the dusty nature of Adam that was the source of Satan's envy in the first place. Narsai writes, "He had the authority of ruling the air and used to put it in motion, and because he envied Adam he fell from his rank like a lightning; and He cursed him by 'you shall walk on your belly upon the earth,' so that he would not ascend again to the height through his swiftness."[147] As the quoted passage infers, Narsai intentionally employs a double-edged language and does not distinguish between the fall of Satan and the punishment of the serpent. For Narsai, therefore, these two stories are, in fact, one; Satan did not fall after he envied Adam, but only after he deceived Adam and Eve. Although Emmanuel accepts the identification of the serpent with Satan, his interpretation of Satan's fall subtly differs from Narsai, and to some extent, gets closer to Jacob of Serugh who wrote that Satan "immediately" (*meḥdā*) fell after he envied Adam.[148] According to Emmanuel, the angels fell on the fourth day of creation right after they refused to obey God's command, which means that when Satan deceived Adam and Eve in the form of the serpent, he had already fallen. In other words, for Emmanuel, the deception in Gen 3 was a consequence of Satan's fall, not its cause.

The comparison between the story of the fall of angels in the *Hexaemeron* and the works of early Syriac poets, Ephrem, Narsai, and Jacob of Serugh, affirms that Emmanuel inherited many of his themes from the tradition of Syriac exegetical poetry before him. Nevertheless, in spite of all the similarities mentioned above, these sources cannot exclusively explain Emmanuel's exegetical thought. There are notable structural differences between Emmanuel's version of the story and those found in these early sources. Emmanuel addresses the fall of the

[147] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:333-336. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 546.
[148] Jacob of Serugh, *mēmrā on the Six Days of Creation*, 6:2531. Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*, 91.

angels as a group while highlighting Satan specifically as the head of the rebellion in heaven. Although occasional references to the group of demons, as Satan's assistants, are found in the works of early Syriac poets, they primarily focus on the fall of Satan, not the collective fall of angels and their degeneration into demons.[149] Furthermore, certain themes developed in the *Hexaemeron* find no counterparts in these sources and can bear further explanation. Here and there throughout the third and eleventh *mēmrē*, Emmanuel either deviates from or expands upon this early interpretative tradition. Therefore, while he undoubtedly drew on the exegetical and literary heritage of early Syriac poets, particularly Narsai, as suggested by the close similarities in their wordings, he must have also relied on other sources for composing his *mēmrā*.

The *Hexaemeron* and the *Cave of Treasures*

Among the Syriac sources dealing with the fall of angels, Emmanuel's version of the story shares the most similarities with the *Cave of Treasures* (hereafter CT), a Syriac world history, or as it is sometimes described, a "rewritten bible," composed in the late sixth or early seventh century by an anonymous author.[150] The third chapter of CT includes an account of the fall of angels. The story in CT, as Minov has shown, is largely based on earlier Syriac traditions.[151] Many elements of CT's story, therefore, are identical to those described above.

[149] Narsai refers to demons as Satan's companions on multiple occasions, for instance, in *mēmrē On Creation*, 6:224. Additionally, in 5:466, Narsai asserts that "the ranks of demons were divided from the angels by Him, and he made them be well separated from their fellows." Perotti, "Narsai's Mēmrā On the Creation of Angels: Translation and Analysis," 71. Narsai, however, makes this remark in the context of a discussion about God's foreknowledge, indicating that God already knew the future events of the world, including the destiny of the fallen angels. In spite of this statement, which describes a pre-creation moment, Narsai's account of the actual fall on the sixth day mainly focuses on Satan.

[150] The compilation date of CT has long been a matter of scholarly dispute. The most widely accepted theory, however, places its composition between the mid-sixth and early seventh centuries. For discussions on the dating of CT, see Sergey Minov, "Date and Provenance of the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*: A Reappraisal," *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 20:1 (2017): 131–49; Alexander Toepel, "The *Cave of Treasures*: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures. Volume 1*, ed. Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2013), 535–36.

[151] Minov, "Satan's Refusal to Worship Adam," 249–52.

Building on the interpretational framework previously set by earlier Syriac writers, CT's anonymous author presents the entire story in an integrated form, gathering all its traditional features in one place, while also adding elements that are not paralleled by earlier sources. In CT, we read that a group of angels, headed by Satan, after the creation of man and before the seduction in Eden, envied Adam and refused to serve him, and as a result, they fell from heaven and turned into demons. The overall outline of the story in CT, therefore, closely matches that of our text. Furthermore, beyond this general similarity, the *Hexaemeron* and CT also share specific details that suggest CT as a potential source for Emmanuel.

One of the distinguishing features of CT is its explanation of the cause of Satan's jealousy. According to CT, Satan's refusal to submit to Adam was mainly due to his belief in the superiority of his own angelic nature: "When the rebellious order, that is one the spiritual orders, saw what greatness had been bestowed to Adam, it envied him from that very day. And they said to one another 'We do not want this since we are from fire, and we cannot worship the being of dust, who has been fashioned from soil.'"[152] The passage reflects Psalm 104:4, based on which, most Syriac interpreters believed that angels were made of fire and spirit. While this view was widely accepted by earlier Syriac authors, it is for the first time in CT that angelic nature is explicitly linked to their fall and presented as the primary cause of Satan's disobedience.[153] Earlier Syriac authors, such as Narsai and Jacob of Serugh, interpret Satan's pride by referring to

[152] CT, 3:1-2. Su-Min Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors: Les Deux Recensions Syriaques*, CSCO 486-487, Syr. 207-208 (Louvain: Peeters, 1987), 20. As will be discussed below, Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* shows more affinity to the Eastern recension of CT. The two available English translations by Budge and Toepel are both based on British Museum Add. 25875 and do not reflect the entire textual tradition of CT. Therefore, for the sake of this discussion, the translation of the quoted passages from CT are mine, based on Ri's edition of the Eastern recension.

[153] The theme also appears in the *Qur'an*, in verses such as 7:12, 38:76, and 15:27-33. For the relationship between CT and the *Qur'an*, see Holger M. Zellentin, "Trialogical Anthropology: The Qur'ān on Adam and Iblīs in View of Rabbinic and Christian Discourse," in *New Approaches to Human Dignity in the Context of the Qur'ānic Anthropology: The Quest for Humanity*, ed. Rüdiger Braun and Hüseyin I. Çiçek (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 61–131; Gabriel Said Reynolds, "Redeeming the Adam of the Qur'ān," in *Arabische Christen – Christen in Arabien*, ed. Detlev Kreikenbom, Franz-Christoph Muth, and Jörn Thielmann, Nordostafrikanisch/Westasiatische Studien 6 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007), 71–83.

his leadership over other angels. Although they do not emphasize Satan's superior nature as his motivation, their *mēmrē* include occasional references to Satan viewing Adam as an inferior being, made of dust. This theme, of which an example was mentioned above, might have been the source of inspiration for CT's author: Satan humiliated Adam for being made of dust, and therefore, he must have been proud of his own angelic substance. Similar to CT, the concept of angelic nature is central to Emmanuel's interpretation of their pride, as he writes, "The comeliness of the splendor of their natures (*payūt hedrā da-kiyānayhon*)[154] made them arrogant, and the snare of anger drew them toward haughtiness; they lifted up a heel against the Maker with an evil inclination, and with reliance on the self (*yātā*), that is to say, their substances (*qnomayhon*)."[155] Emmanuel's emphasis on angelic nature in this context can therefore be understood in light of the parallel in CT, where this theme was first developed.

According to CT, an immediate consequence of the fall of angels was their nakedness and loss of beauty: "And they were stripped (*ʾetʿarṭalu*) of their glory (*men tešboḥthon*) … and thenceforth they are bare (*šlīḥē*), agitated (*tazīzē*), naked (*ʿarṭelāyē*), and ugly looking (*mšakray ḥzātā*)."[156] While the description of the nakedness and deformity of the fallen angels can be considered as CT's exegetical innovation, references to angels' elegant clothing before their fall have a longer history in Syriac literature. Narsai, for instance, calls the angels "clothed in light" (*ʿṭipay nūhra*).[157] Additionally, the image of the angelic "garment of glory" was popular in Syriac literature, likely through the Peshitta version of Dan 10:5 and 12:6, where the Hebrew "clothed in linen" (ləḇūš habbaddîm) was translated into "clothed in garments of glory" (*lbīš lbūšīn*

[154] A similar phrase, "splendor and glory of their substances" (*hedrā w-šūbḥā da-qnomayhon*) is used by Narsai in 5:284. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 654.
[155] Verse 317 & 319.
[156] CT, 3:5,7. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 22.
[157] Narsai, *mēmrē On Creation*, 1:331. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*, 546.

d-ʾīqār).[158] The author of CT, therefore, adopts familiar imagery of the angels' pre-fall appearance and, by applying it to the narrative of their fall, crafts the image of angelic nakedness, which also mirrors the depiction of Adam and Eve's nudity after their transgression.[159] Although the mainstream reading of Gen 3 is that Adam and Eve covered themselves after the transgression, there has been an alternative tradition that understood the scene in the opposite way, indicating that Adam and Eve, who were formerly dressed in garments of light and glory, became naked after they disobeyed the divine commandment.[160] The author of CT thus extends the image of nakedness from the story of the fall of Adam and Eve to the fall of angels. Emmanuel, therefore, grasps both aspects of CT's description, namely nakedness and ugliness, when he calls the fallen angels, "misshapen (*škīrē b-ḥezwā*) and naked (*ʿarṭelāyē*) spiritual beings."[161] Evoking another image from Dan 10:5, Emmanuel advances the theme of angels' loss of clothing, as he writes, "The belts of adornment (*zūnās d-hedrā*) that were worn by the spirituals, like the belt of the attendants of the king, were undone."[162] Furthermore, Emmanuel borrows the theme from CT but connects it to his concept of angelic priesthood. By linking these two originally unrelated motifs, Emmanuel adds a further exegetical layer to the story: "They were expelled and went out from their spiritual churches (*ʿedāthon rūḥānyātā*) and from the divine service of their priesthoods; He stripped them of their spiritual ephods (*ʾapūdayhon rūhḥnāyē*), and their crowns were trodden and abolished by the just judgment."[163] As the quoted passage illustrates, instead of using a neuter word such as *lbūšā*

[158] Sebastian P. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," in *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie Bei Den Östlichen Vätern Und Ihren Parallelen Im Mittelalter: Internationales Kolloquium, Eichstätt 1981*, ed. Margot Schmidt and Carl Friedrich Geyer, Eichstätter Beiträge 4 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982), 15; Sebastian P. Brock, "The Robe of Glory: A Biblical Image in the Syriac Tradition," *The Way* 39:3 (1999): 248.
[159] Zellentin, "Trialogical Anthropology," 84–85.
[160] *Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," 14.*
[161] Verse 351.
[162] Verse 342.
[163] Verses 347-348.

(garment), Emmanuel employs the term ephod that carries a strong priestly connotation. Thus according to Emmanuel, the fallen angels were cast out not only from heaven but also from their heavenly churches, and lost not only their clothes but also their ephods, and were deprived not only of their angelic status, but also of their priesthood.

As mentioned earlier, there was a well-established exegetical tradition that interpreted the name of Satan as coming from the Syriac root *sṭā* (to go astray), a tradition that is also reflected in the *Hexaemeron*. Emmanuel's explanation of the names of the fallen angels, however, also includes etymologies of two additional terms, Evil Spirit (*šēdā*) and Demon (*daywā*), which he connects to the roots *šdā* (to cast out) and *dwā* (to be wretched), respectively.[164] This etymological explanation, as formulated in the *Hexaemeron*, might have been borrowed from CT, where it first appears in its triple form. Following the pattern that can also be attested in previously mentioned examples, the author of CT expands on the earlier interpretation of the name of Satan and applies the method to explain the two other terms.[165] The passage in CT that includes the etymologies, however, slightly differs in the two recensions of the text. Both recensions are unanimous in connecting *sāṭānā* to the root *sṭā*: "And his name became Satan (*sāṭānā*) in that he went astray (*sṭā*)."[166] Both recensions link the term *šēdā* to the root *šdā* (to cast out). The Western recension continues, "and Evil Spirit (*šēdā*) in that he was cast out (*ʾeštdi*)."[167] Although this phrase is absent from Ri's edition of the Eastern recension, his apparatus notes its presence in several Eastern manuscripts of CT, suggesting that it was part of

[164] These etymologies, of course, are not linguistically accurate. For the Akkadian origin of the word *šēdā*, see Andreas Su-Min Ri, *Commentaire de La Caverne Des Trésors. Étude Sur l'histoire Du Texte et de Ses Sources*, CSCO 581, Subs. 103 (Louvain: Peeters, 2000), 155. Ri notes that the term *daywā* comes from an Indian origin. This Syriac word, however, is undoubtedly a loan from Iranian languages, and corresponds to Middle Persian *dēw*, Old Persian *daiva*, and Avestan *daēuua*. See Claudia Angela Ciancaglini, *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*, Beiträge Zu Iranistik 28 (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 2008), 151.

[165] Ri even suggests the entire story might have originally been intended as an additional explanation of Satan's name. Ri, *Commentaire de La Caverne Des Trésors. Étude Sur l'histoire Du Texte et de Ses Sources*, 155.

[166] CT, 3:6. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 22.

[167] CT, 3:6. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 23.

the textual tradition of the Eastern recension as well. The main difference appears in the case of *daywā*. Interpreting the term in the context of angels' loss of clothing, the Western recension reads, "and Demon (*daywā*), in that he destroyed (*ʾawbed*) the garment of his glory."[168] The Eastern recension, while preserving this interpretation, adds one more verb that connects the term *daywā* to the root *dwā* (to be wretched), as it reads, "And Demons (*daywē*), in that they were wretched (*dawwiyu*) and destroyed (*ʾāwbedu*) the garment of their glory."[169] Therefore, Emmanuel's etymological interpretation of the names of the three groups of fallen angels expectedly corresponds to CT's Eastern recension.[170] It must also be noted that other East Syriac sources that preserve this tradition present it in alignment with the Eastern recension of CT, interpreting the term *daywā* as derived from the root *dwā*.[171] Furthermore, Emmanuel's interpretation of these three terms, which he likely borrows from CT, mirrors another theme that he develops earlier in the *mēmrā*. While discussing the nine angelic orders, Emmanuel mentions that each order is named after its specific function, an idea that he takes from Pseudo-Dionysius.[172] Emmanuel writes, "The name of their orders was not the names of their natures, but the names of the activities of their endowments (*šmāhē d-maʿbdānwātā d-šūkānayhon*)."[173] These two interpretations, the naming of angels and demons, though originating from two different traditions, might be viewed as completing each other within the thematic structure of Emmanuel's *mēmrā*, as together, they form a more comprehensive exegetical notion: demonic tribes are named after their own wicked deeds, just as angelic orders

[168] CT, 3:6. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 23.
[169] CT, 3:6. *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 22.
[170] The quoted sentence is based on Ri's edition. However, as indicated in Ri's apparatus, other manuscripts of the Eastern recension conjugate the verb in Etpʿel, and instead of *dawwiyu*, read *ʾetdwiyu*, which is the same verb found in Emmanuel's *mēmrā*.
[171] See Vosté and van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išo'Dad de Merv Sur l'Ancien Testament, I: Genèse*, 73; Scher, *Theodorus Bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, 78.
[172] Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, 205B-C. A brief reference to this theme is also attested in Narsai's *mēmrē* on creation, 6:281-2.
[173] Verse 225.

are named after their virtuous acts. Emmanuel's interpretations of the names of both angels and demons can also be understood in light of his emphasis on the free will of spiritual beings, as according to him, even their names signify what they have performed by choice.

Another marked feature of CT's narrative is its statement that all creatures, including the angels, were commanded to worship (*sgd*) Adam rather than serve (*šmš*) him.[174] In the second chapter of CT, we read, "And God gave him (Adam) dominion over all creatures: beasts, and cattle, and birds. They all passed before Adam and he named them, while they bowed their heads, and worshiped him (*sāgdīn lēh*)."[175] Thus in the third chapter, we find the rebellious angels saying to each other, "We cannot worship (*nesgod*) the being of dust, who has been fashioned from soil."[176] This word choice inevitably leads to a theological consequence and must be understood in the context of CT's extensive use of Adam-Christ typology. Written in Northern Mesopotamia within the Sasanian territory, CT was long thought to have an East Syrian origin. Minov's further studies, however, have shown that CT was first written by a West Syrian author, even though the text underwent modifications in the Eastern manuscripts to align with East Syrian theology.[177] Building on Minov's theory, it can be argued that the tradition of Adam's worship by the angels in CT is in line with miaphysite hermeneutics of Adam-Christ typology. We read in CT that "In everything Christ resembled Adam,"[178] which justifies why creatures were commanded to worship Adam. In other words, to worship Adam, whom the West Syrian

[174] An earlier instance of this tradition is found in the apocryphal Questions of Bartholomew, written in the second or third century. See Minov, "Satan's Refusal to Worship Adam," 248. The theme likely reached the Qur'an through CT, and is attested in Qur'anic verses such as 2:34, 17:61, 20:116, 18:50, 7:11, 15:30, and 38:73. For an argument on the Qur'an's "corrective" adoption of the tradition of angelic worship of Adam, and its relationship with CT and rabbinic sources like Bereshit Rabbah, see Zellentin, "Trialogical Anthropology," 97–131.
[175] CT, 2:19-20. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 18.
[176] CT, 3:2. Ri, 20.
[177] For the West Syrian origin of CT and especially the text's miaphysite approach to Adam-Christ typology, see Minov, "Date and Provenance of the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*: A Reappraisal," 150–200.
[178] CT, 49:1. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 406.

poet, Jacob of Serugh calls "a god of flesh" (*ʾlāh besrā*), is to worship Christ.[179] The hypothesis that the tradition of worshiping Adam comes from a miaphysite nature can be strengthened by further evidence from Jacob of Serugh's writings, as the same tradition is attested in Jacob's *mēmrā On the Sixth Day*: "This newly anointed (*mšīḥā ḥadtā*) Adam, who was the image of the Son, now stood in the world and the entire world knelt (*brak*) and worshiped (*wa-sged*) him."[180] The tradition of worshiping Adam, therefore, might be seen as a feature of miaphysite anthropology. As one might expect, references to this tradition are absent from the works of Narsai or other East Syrian commentators. Following the mainstream of East Syrian interpreters, Emmanuel, too, does not mention the worship of Adam by angels in the third *mēmrā*, but rather, he indicates that the angels were assigned to the service (*tešmeštā*) of Adam. However, Emmanuel was certainly familiar with this tradition as he refers to it in the eleventh *mēmrā*, writing, "Behold, you have clearly seen Adam, the image of God, whom the assemblies on high (*kenšay rāwmā*) worship (*sāgdīn*) in their legions."[181] The occurrence of this theme in the *Hexaemeron* can, therefore, be regarded as an instance of Emmanuel's departure from East Syriac exegetical norms, and thus might be explained as a theologically unrefined literary borrowing from CT. This evidence, along with those mentioned above, further illustrates our poet's dependence on CT.

The Fall on the Fourth Day

One aspect of Emmanuel's interpretation that has yet to be explained is his belief that the angels fell on the fourth day of creation. The sources addressed in the previous sections, all of which tie the fall of the angels to the creation of Adam, naturally place it on the sixth day, when

[179] Jacob of Serugh, *mēmrā On the Six Days of Creation*, 6:2154. For further evidence of the usage of this theme by other Syriac authors, see Mathews, *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*, 46.
[180] The translation, with slight modifications, is taken from Mathews, 66.
[181] Ṣana, "Ḥilq Al-Insān Li-'Immanu'Il Bar Šahāre," 14.

Adam was created. Ephrem, Narsai, and Jacob of Serugh, all note that Satan fell on the sixth day of creation. Similarly, in CT, we read: "He, together with his entire order, fell on Friday, at the second hour."[182] Emmanuel himself was certainly aware of this tradition, as he remarks, "There are some who said that they fell in the morning of the sixth day, and there are also some [who said it was] before this time, and there is no blame [in believing so]."[183] In spite of this acknowledgment, however, Emmanuel situates the fall on the fourth day, after the creation of the luminaries. Further, on multiple occasions, he emphasizes that the fallen angels envied Adam and refused to serve him even before he was created: "The enmity against the divine image, shattered them and cast them away [even] before he came into being."[184] Although the fall on the sixth day was the dominant interpretation in East Syriac exegetical literature, some sources mention the fall on the fourth day, but merely as a marginal tradition. In the first *mēmrā* of his *Book of the Main Events*, John bar Penkaye, without explicitly referring to the fall on the fourth day, notes, "The lights were created on the fourth day as we said. As someone says, on the same [day], angels' duties were divided."[185] Similar to Emmanuel, Bar Penkaye goes on to address the angels' inquiry about the use of the corporeal world. Although Bar Penkaye does not directly mention the fall of the angels on the fourth day, his testimony suggests that this belief was thematically linked to the idea of the division of angelic authorities on the same day. A more direct reference to the fourth-day tradition is found in Ishoʿdad of Merv's Commentary on Genesis. Ishoʿdad, like Emmanuel, lists various opinions on the timing of the angels' fall. However, unlike Emmanuel, he argues in favor of the idea that the fall occurred on the sixth day:

[182] CT, 3:4. Ri, *La Caverne Des Trésors*, 22.
[183] Verse 333 The phrase "before this time" (*qdām zabnā hānā*) could be ambiguous, as it may refer to a time both before the sixth and before the fourth day. However, a time before the sixth day also includes the fourth day, which corresponds to Emmanuel's own choice. Therefore, since he is reporting an opinion other than his own, "before this time" can be best understood as a reference to the fall before the fourth day. For evidence of the tradition of the fall of angels on the first day of creation, see below.
[184] Verse 360.
[185] Furman, "The Origins of the Temporal World," 27 (Text), 39 (Translation).

"Some said that Satan fell on the first day since he did not praise the Maker with his companions in the [moment of] the creation of light. Others say on Wednesday since on that day the luminaries were divided and their ranks were separated and he (Satan) was appointed [to rule] over the air as the blessed apostle said (Eph 2:2). Others said he fell on Wednesday morning. Others said that He was patient with him —like our Lord with Judas— until the creation of man so that he himself would cause his own scandal. Others said it was Friday when he envied the man because he alone was called the image. In fact, it seems that he fell on Friday because it was not fitting [for God] to punish them before examining their will."[186] This statement, nearly identical in wording, is likewise attested in Theodore bar Koni's *Liber Scholiorum*.[187]

Besides these occasional references by late East Syriac commentators, we find a detailed account of the fall of angels on the fourth day in Kosmas Indicopleustes' *Christian Topography*. Unlike the authors mentioned above, Kosmas refers to the fourth-day tradition as his main exegetical choice. Representing the tradition of fall on Wednesday that Ishoʿdad reports, Kosmas, like Emmanuel, places the fall of angels on the fourth day after the angels were assigned to govern the world, as he writes, "This work (government of the world) they were commanded to do on the fourth day when God adorned the heaven with its stars. The work of the adverse demons, as rebels against God, is to do what will mar his image, for on the fourth day they transgressed the command and were cast out of heaven."[188] In the *Christian Topography,* too, we read that angels rebelled against God because of their pride and jealousy. However, a key distinction sets Kosmas apart from other interpreters, as for him, the jealousy that caused the fall of angels was directed primarily toward God himself, rather than Adam. In the following passage, which is an interpretation of 1 Tim 3:6, Kosmas notes that the main reason for Satan's

[186] Vosté and van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išo'Dad de Merv Sur l'Ancien Testament, I: Genèse*, 73.
[187] Scher, *Theodorus Bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*, 79.
[188] McCrindle, *The Christian Topography of Cosmas*, 77.

fall was his desire to seize God's authority: "The devil suffered through being puffed up, and has hereby clearly shown why he was hurled down, namely, by his being puffed up, deeming himself to be God, whence also he had the wish to communicate his own disease to man, saying: Ye shall be as Gods."[189] Kosmas also mentions Satan's jealousy of Adam as the image of God, but only after his fall and, as one would expect, after Adam's creation on the sixth day.[190] In addition to Kosmas' *Christian Topography*, additional evidence of the fourth-day tradition is found in a text known as the *Hexaemeron* of Pseudo-Epiphanius, which is extant in an Arabic version, as well as an Ethiopian translation, titled *Aksimaros*.[191] In an account of the fall of angels included in this text, Satan, referred to as "the beautiful angel," rebels against God on the fourth day of creation in an attempt to seize God's sovereignty, resulting in his fall along with his companion angels. Like the *Christian Topography*, the *Aksimaros* account of the angels' fall makes no mention of Satan's jealousy of Adam as the cause of his fall.[192] The tradition of the fall on the fourth day also appears in another Ethiopian hexaemeral text, titled *Ṭəntä Haymanot* (*Beginning of Faith*), again with no connection to the creation of Adam.[193]

---

[189] McCrindle, 102.

[190] See McCrindle, 78.

[191] It is unclear whether the Arabic text is an original composition or a translation. A Coptic origin and a Syriac origin, based on surviving Garshuni manuscripts, have both been suggested. For a discussion of the origin of the Arabic text and its possible compilation date as well as the relationship between the Arabic and Ethiopian version, see Sophia Dege-Müller, "Ms. Cerulli 165 in the Light of the Aksimaros' Manuscript Tradition," in *Aethiopia Fortitudo Ejus. Studi in Onore Di Monsignor Osvaldo Raineri in Occasione Del Suo 80° Compleanno*, ed. Rafał Zarzeczny, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 280 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2015), 163–80.

[192] The account of the fall of angels in the Ethiopian version is found in Ernst Trumpp, *Das Hexaëmeron Des Pseudo-Epiphanius. Aethiopischer Text Verglichen Mit Dem Arabischen Originaltext Und Deutscher Ubersetzung* (Munich: Verlag der k. Akademie, 1882), 72–80. The Arabic text has never been published, but a survey of its content has been provided by Marlène Kanaan. For the reference to the fall on the fourth day in the Arabic version, see Marlène Kanaan, "Création et Êtres Angéliques d'après Un Manuscrit Arabe Inédit: L'Hexaéméron Du Pseudo-Épiphane de Salamine," in *The Intermediate Worlds of Angels: Islamic Representations of Celestial Beings in Transcultural Contexts*, ed. Sara Kuehn, Stefan Leder, and Hans-Peter Pökel (Beirut: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2019), 224.

[193] Further information about this tradition is found in Sophia Dege-Müller, "Die Angelologie der Aksimaros-Literatur. Aufnahme und Anwendung eines literarischen Motivs" (PhD Dissertation, Universität Hamburg, 2022). I would like to thank Dr. Sophia Dege-Müller for drawing my attention to the evidence in *Ṭəntä Haymanot* and for generously sharing parts of her work with me.

The evidence outlined above makes it clear that we are dealing with two originally distinct traditions: one attributing the fall of angels to their jealousy of God and rebellion against him on the fourth day of creation, and the other linking it to their jealousy of Adam on the sixth day. Emmanuel's approach to the story of angels' fall in the third *mēmrā* of *Hexaemeron* is, in fact, an amalgamation of both traditions. Adopting elements from both traditions, Emmanuel describes the fall of angels as occurring on the fourth day due to jealousy of Adam. This exegetical choice, as expected, poses a major structural issue: Adam had not yet been created on the fourth day. In order to resolve this challenge, therefore, Emmanuel introduces another element to the story, indicating that the divine "revelation" announced the creation of Adam beforehand on the fourth day: "When they inquired about the tangible constructions, they perceived through revelation (*gelyānā*) for whom they are useful; the power of revelation made them understand for what it is useful, for the corporeal being whose genesis would be from dirt."[194] Emmanuel then employs this theme to justify the punishment of the rebellious angels for refusing to serve Adam. Even though Adam had not yet been brought into being, Emmanuel argues that the punishment of angels on the fourth day was an act of justice because they were already fully aware of the supremacy God intended to grant Adam. It can even be imagined that Emmanuel intentionally disputes with Ishoʿdad or the kind of argument Ishoʿdad represents in the passage quoted above, when he writes, "If then the power of commandment was not revealed to them, as well as the judgment and punishment, they would not be blameworthy; It is, therefore, clear that before spiritual beings turned aside, through the revelation, they had already accepted the manner of the punishment that would come in the future."[195] In addition to this, Emmanuel tries to back his interpretation with scriptural reasoning. He cites John 8:44, "He was

[194] Verses 290 & 300.
[195] Verses 320 & 324.

a manslayer from the beginning," and interprets "from the beginning" as evidence of Satan's fall and his enmity toward mankind prior to the creation of Adam: "Concerning this thought, concerning Satan, the Lord of all said 'he was a manslayer from the beginning'; he was prepared even before the human race came into being, and from the beginning, behold, he had plotted and crafted his stratagem."[196] In summary, Emmanuel's account of the fall of angels is a fusion of two separate exegetical traditions, which he attempts to reconcile through reworking the structure of the story.

Conclusion

Concerning the dynamics of the East Syriac exegetical tradition in the medieval period, Lucas Van Rompay observes that later Easy Syriac commentators, while consistently adhering to the legacy of Theodore of Mopsuestia as the doctrinal bond of their tradition, tended to adopt a broader viewpoint in interpreting scripture.[197] The study of the third *mēmrā* of Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* shows his alignment with the exegetical trend of his time. The keystone of Emmanuel's approach to the six days of creation, that is interpreting the events of the creation week as God's lessons for angels, is a marked feature of Theodore of Mopsuestia's thought, which Emmanuel presumably received through Narsai's poetry. However, he develops his main angelology based on Pseudo-Dionysian literature. To his angelology, Emmanuel attaches an account of the angel's fall. According to Emmanuel, the fall of angels took place on the fourth day of creation, after God assigned them the task of governing the world. In response to angels' inquiry about the ultimate purpose of their service, God announced the creation of Adam and commanded them to submit to Adam's supremacy and serve him. Being proud of the excellence

[196] Verse 367.
[197] Van Rompay, "Development of Biblical Interpretation in the Syrian Churches of the Middle Ages," 570.

of their natures, however, some angels envied Adam and refused to serve him. As a result, they were stripped of their adorned garments, disfigured, deprived of the priestly offices previously granted to them, exiled to earth, and transformed into hostile forces, categorized into three groups: Satans, Demons, and Evil Spirits.

A comparison between Emmanuel's account of the fall of angels and interpretations of Satan's fall found in the works of early Syriac poets such as Ephrem, Narsai, and Jacob of Serugh reveals that Emmanuel's version is, to a considerable extent, in line with the traditional Syriac Christian understanding of the story. The differences between Emmanuel's *mēmrā* and these sources, however, can be explained mostly in light of Emmanuel's influence from the CT, as the account of the angels' fall in the third chapter of CT shares the closest parallels with the story in Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron*, both in structure and detail. The story of the fall of angels in CT, which is itself a reworking of earlier Syriac traditions, made its way to the Qur'an and thereby found a canonical status in Islam. As Minov has argued, the canonization of the story in the Qur'an influenced its development in later Syriac literature. In response to the popularity of the story among Muslims, Minov indicates that some post-Islamic Syriac Christian authors from various branches of Syriac Christianity, including Timothy I, Theodore Abū Qurrah, and Dionysios bar Ṣalibi tended to either reject the story or treat it as an external and originally Muslim legend.[198] In this context, the study of Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* points to another tendency among later Syriac exegetes to preserve CT's account as a plausible part of earlier Syriac exegetical tradition. While Emmanuel shares numerous themes with earlier Syriac poets on one hand and with the CT on the other, his *mēmrā* ultimately represents the reworked synthesis of his sources rather than a straightforward reproduction of any particular one. As an

[198] Minov, "Satan's Refusal to Worship Adam," 256–67. For further evidence of the rejection of the story by post-Islamic Christian authors, see Anderson, "The Fall of Satan in the Thought of St. Ephrem and John Milton," 9.

interpreter, Emmanuel has the method of bringing together different motifs from distinct exegetical discourses and harmonizing them into a third, unique interpretative approach. The two examples of linking the notion of angels' priesthood to their fall, and connecting the tradition of angels' fall on the fourth day to their jealousy of Adam, illustrate this aspect of Emmanuel's interpretative strategy. As scholarship on Emmanuel's *Hexaemeron* progresses and editions and translations of his other *mēmrē* become available, it will be possible to examine more comprehensively the poet's sources and exegetical methodology, as well as his place in the development of East Syriac biblical interpretation during the medieval period.

Chapter IV

Manuscripts and Editorial Principles

The most significant contribution to the study of the textual tradition of Emmanuel's Hexaemeron has been made by Erik ten Napel. In addition to taking the first steps in evaluating the genealogical relationships between the existing manuscripts, he provided a list of sixteen known manuscripts.[199] To his list, at least two more can be added: Mosul 73 and Qalb al-Aqdas Chaldean Church 105.[200] Of these eighteen manuscripts, at least three are considered lost. Since not all the manuscripts have been accessible, the Syriac text of the third *mēmrā* has been prepared based on the following six manuscripts:

Jer = the Library of Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem MS 34[201]

This manuscript is preserved in the library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem. It has been published online by the Library of Congress.[202] The catalog does not specify the script, but it appears to be Melkite, with occasional Eastern diacritical marks. The verses are arranged horizontally and separated by verse-marker dots, though there are several instances of misplacement. The colophon on fol. 187a is somewhat damaged. However, Chabot has deciphered the date as 1600 AG (1289 CE), which makes Jer. Patr. 34 the oldest among the surviving manuscripts.

---

[199] Erik ten Napel, "Einige Bemerkungen Zu Den Mêmrê Des Emmnuel Bar Shahhare," in *XX. Deutscher Orientalistentag Vom 3. Bis 8. Oktober 1977 in Erlangen*, ed. Wolfgang Voigt, Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement 4 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980), 167–69.
[200] Addai Scher, "Notice Sur Les Manuscrits Syriaques Conservés Dans La Bibliothèque Du Patriarcat Chaldéen de Mossoul," *Revue Des Bibliothèques* 17 (1907): 245. For Qalb al-Aqdas Chaldean Church 105, see below.
[201] Jean Baptiste Chabot, "Notice Sur Les Manuscrits Syriaques Conservés Dans La Bibliothèque Du Patriarcat Grec Orthodoxe de Jérusalem," *Journal Asiatique* IX, 3 (1894): 123–24.
[202] Available at https://www.loc.gov/item/00271072144-jo

Ber = Berlin 62 (Sachau 310/309)[203]

This manuscript consists of two parts, listed as manuscripts 310 and 309 in Sachau's catalog. Sachau 310 contains the first eighteen *mēmrē*, while Sachau 309 has the remainder. The final folios, which may have contained the colophon, are missing. The exact compilation date of the manuscript, therefore, is unknown. However, according to Sachau's estimation, it was written in the 17th or 18th century. The first few folios of both volumes were seriously damaged and were reconstructed at a later time. Sachau notices that the vocalization was influenced by the scribe's vernacular. As it is reflected in the apparatus below, this manuscript has a tendency toward using *ā* instead of *a*. The verses are arranged horizontally and separated by verse-marker dots.

Min = Mingana 197[204]

This manuscript, numbered 197 in Mingana's collection, is now preserved in the library of the University of Birmingham. As the Arabic colophon on fol. 173b informs, the manuscript was produced for Alphonse Mingana in 1928, based on an older manuscript which was, in turn, compiled in 2000 AG (1689 CE). The colophon of the original manuscript, which is extant in the current version, states that it was written by a scribe named George, son of Israel, in Alqosh. Mingana notes that the original manuscript once belonged to the East Syrian Patriarchate at Mosul. The current manuscript is written in Serto script, with occasional Eastern diacritics. In

[203] Eduard Sachau, *Verzeichniss Der Syrischen Handschriften Der Königlichen Bibliothek Zu Berlin*, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse Der Königlichen Bibliothek Zu Berlin 23 (Berlin: A. Asher & Co, 1899), 217. Available online at https://www.qalamos.net/receive/DE1Book_manuscript_00010347

[204] Alphonse Mingana, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, Woodbrooke Catalogues 1-3 (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933), 428–29.

addition to the 28 *mēmrē* of the Hexaeemron, it also includes Emmanuel's *mēmrā* On the Mysteries of Baptism.

Vat = Vatican.Sir 182[205]

This manuscript was written in 2018 AG (1706 CE), as indicated by the colophon on fol. 273b. It was copied by the deacon Yoḥannan, son of Elias, from Mosul. The text is written in a neat *Maḏnḥāyā* and is almost fully vocalized. This manuscript contains 28 *mēmrē* of the Hexaemeron, as well as the *mēmrā On the Mysteries of Baptism.*

Ber2 = Berlin 61 (Sachau 170/169)[206]

This manuscript consists of two parts, manuscripts number 170 and 169 in Sachau's list. Sachau 170 contains the first thirteen, while Sachau 169 has the remainder. The scribe's note at the end of the third *mēmrā* states that the *mēmrā* was completed in 1880 CE. The writing took around two years, since another note at the end of the manuscript informs us that the whole work was finished in 1882 CE. The text is written in a very neat *Madnḥāyā* and fully vocalized. Sachau notices that the vocalization is influenced by the scribe's vernacular, particularly when it comes to *a* and *ā*. Sachau also remarks that the text of Berlin 61 shows plenty of similarities with that of Berlin 62, suggesting that they both may have been copied from the same source. However, this statement is not entirely accurate, as the text presented by this manuscript is much more similar to manuscripts such as Vatican 182, Mingana 197, and Qalb al-Aqdas 105 than to Berlin 62.

[205] Available online at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.sir.182
[206] Sachau, *Verzeichniss Der Syrischen Handschriften Der Königlichen Bibliothek Zu Berlin*, 211–16. Available online at https://www.qalamos.net/receive/DE1Book_manuscript_00010213

QA = Qalb al-Aqdas Chaldean Church 105

This manuscript, now digitalized by the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, belongs to the collection of manuscripts preserved in the Qalb al-Aqdas Chaldean Church.[207] The text was copied by the deacon Francis, son of Gewargis, son of Francis, son of Yusof, in 1885 CE. This manuscript is written in a very neat *Madnḥāyā* and fully vocalized, and contains the full text of the Hexaemeron, as well as other texts such as Gewargis Warda's *mēmrā On Man as a Microcosm*. Based on its numbering in the previous catalogs, this manuscript is also known as Habbi 64.[208]

These manuscripts vary from one another to the extent that ten Napel recognized three different recensions of the text. The final edition of the text, therefore, cannot exclusively rely on one manuscript and a critical edition is inevitable. While a thorough genealogy of manuscripts, based on all extant copies, remains a desiderium, a few observations can be made. All the six manuscripts mentioned above go back to a common ancestor, as indicated by shared errors. For example, the second *mēmrā* is missing from all manuscripts, and some lines have been omitted across all of them, as a result of homoeoteleuton errors in their common ancestor.[209]

The two oldest manuscripts, Jer and Ber, should be grouped together as representatives of what ten Napel calls the first recension of the text. Although Ber dates centuries later than Jer, the text it represents is much more similar to Jer than to other chronologically closer manuscripts like Vat and Min's base manuscript. In addition, Jer and Ber share certain scribal errors, alluding to their common ancestor. In spite of their shared features, however, these two manuscripts also

[207] Available at https://www.vhmml.org/readingRoom/view/136569
[208] Yūsuf Ḥabbī, *Fahāris Al-Makhṭūṭāt al-Suryānīyah Fī al-'Irāq*, vol. 1, 1977, 39.
[209] For instance verse 80 & 174.

have significant differences, indicating that they developed independently, although from a common ancestor. The other four manuscripts, Min, Vat, Ber2, and QA, belong to a different family and represent a text which ten Napel has referred to as the third recension. As several instances of simplified readings suggest, these manuscripts overall present a more modified version of the text. Additionally, at least in the case of the third *mēmrā*, they contain a slightly longer text. Some of the extra verses may have been later scribal additions. However, it can be argued based on textual evidence that some of these verses were likely part of the original text, as their absence in the first recension can be attributed to scribal errors.[210]

The following Syriac text is primarily based on the Jer. Whenever there was a difference between Jer's readings and those of other manuscripts, including Ber, Jer has been preferred. However, in cases where the variations could have been ascribed to recognizable scribal errors, the text has been corrected using other manuscripts. As noted above, the additional verses found in Min, Vat, Ber2, and QA should not be entirely ignored. However, lines that are missing from both Jer and Ber and appear exclusively in the third recension manuscripts have been placed in braces. The Syriac text that follows is an early attempt at preparing a critical edition of the text and therefore, should not be regarded as the final version. Consulting other manuscripts, particularly those representing the second recension, will lead to a more comprehensive and reliable edition and may resolve some of the text's difficulties.

[210] For example verses 324-329.

Chapter V

Syriac Text

ܟܬܒܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ .ܩܛܝܪܐ ܐܚܪܬ ܠܟܠ .ܩܛܝ ܒܐܓܪܬ ܠܟ ܡܠܦܢ ܩܝܡܟ ܕܘܝ

1

ܡܠܦܢ ܕܐܒܝܟ ܒܫܡܝ ܩܕܫ ܟܐ ܕܐܬܐ
ܟܠܟ ܩܝܡ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܒܫܡܝ ܐܦ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ

2

ܒܟܝܡܐ ܡܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܡܝܬ ܕܝܢ
ܡܝܬ ܠܐ ܡܝܬ ܐܦ ܡܝܬ ܫܬܐ ܟ ܠܚ

3

ܘܡܕܒܪܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܡܝܬ ,ܩܐ ܟܒܫܐ ܐܦ
ܡܝܬܡܫܐ ܡܝܬܒܪܟܐ ܡܝܬܒܪܟ ܫܘ

4

ܟܐܬܫܒܚܐ ܟܐܬܫܡ ܥܠ ܩܝܬ
ܒܟܬܘܒ ܥܡܟܒܝܐ ܟܬܒܐ ܥܡ

5

ܟܠܟ ܦܘܩ ܠ ܐܡ ܟܝܐ ܥܠ ܒܬ
ܡܝܬ ܩܝܡ ܟܬܒ ܐܠ ܐܡ ܟܐܬܫܟ

6

ܟܬܝܐ ܒܐ ,ܘܩܨܒ ܥܡܐ ܟܠܟ
ܒܟܝܡܐ ܟܬܒܐ ܥܡ ܡܝܐ ܡܒܐ

7

ܟ ܟ ,ܐܒ ܟܬ ܒܐܒܐ ܐܠ ܟ
ܐܝܟ ܡܝܬ ܟܐܬ ܟܠ ܐܡ ܐܠ ܟ

8

ܟ ܐܬ ܟܒܠ ܟܒܐ ܒ ܟ
ܟܬܒ ܥܡ ܥܒܝܐ ܟ ܟܬ ܐ

6: ܡܒܐ Ber.

7: ܟܬܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

9

ܡܬܝܡ ܒܥܒܕ ܕܟܝܢ ܒܝ ܐܠܗ ܐܡܪ ܐܝܟ
ܐܒܝܟ ܒܢܝ ܐܒܕ ܒܢܝ ܐܬܡܐ ܐܠܐ

10

ܡܒܪܟܐ ܠܟ ܐܠܝܢ ܐܦܣܩ ܐܝܬ ܐܢ
ܡܒܪܟܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܫ ܐܒܪܟ ܒܝ ܕܐ

11

ܥܠܝ ܒܫܡ ܬܒܪ ܐܠܐ ܒܝ ܐܡܪ ܫܒܚ
ܐܢܝ ܒܪܟ ܐܠ ܐܒܪܟ ܠܟ ܒܝ ܐܒܪܟ

12

ܐܒܕ ܒܢܝ ܒܪܟ ܐܦܒܪܟ ܒܪܟ ܒܐ ܠܐ
ܐܡܪ ܒܪܟ ܐܒܪܟ ܐܝܟ ܒܪ ܐܡ ܒܟ

13

ܐܒܪܟ ܐܫܒ ܐܝܟ ܐܒܪ ܐܡ ܒܪܟ
ܒܪܟ ܒܪܟ ܐܡ ܐܒܪ ܐܠ ܐܒܪ ܠܟ

14

ܥܠܝ ܒܪܟ ܐܦܣܩ ܒܪܟ ܐܒ ܒܟ ܒܪ
ܥܡܢ ܐ ܐܒ ܐܒ ܒܪ ܐܠ ܐܦ ܐ

15

ܐܒܪ ܥܡܢ ܐܒ ܒܢ ܐܒ ܒܪ ܐܒ
ܥܡ ܐ ܐܒ ܐ ܐܒ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ

16

ܒ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ
ܥ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ ܐ

9: ܐ ܐ ܐ Ber, Vat, Ber2 Min, QA.
11: ܥ ܐ ܐ Ber, Vat, Ber2 Min, QA.
12: ܐ Ber.
15: ܐ ܐ Ber.

17

ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲓⲃ ⲛⲁⲗⲏⲑⲏⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉ
ⲏⲉ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲙⲁ ⲉⲙⲁ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲙⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲁ

18

ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲟⲩⲟ
ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙ ⲛⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲁ ⲛⲉⲓⲥⲣⲁⲏⲗ

19

ⲙⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲓⲁⲙⲁ ⲧⲉⲙⲟ ⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲥⲁⲣⲁ
ⲙⲁⲓⲁ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲉⲓⲙⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲡⲟⲗ

20

ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙⲏ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲛⲉ ⲙ
ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲙⲁ ⲉⲙⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟ ⲛⲁⲓⲁ ⲉⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ

21

ⲛⲉⲙⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲓⲁ ⲙⲓⲉⲓⲁ ⲟⲙ ⲛⲥⲱ ⲓⲉⲗ ⲟⲙ
ⲛⲓⲉⲗ ⲁⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙ ⲙ ⲧⲉⲙ ⲟⲟⲟⲙ

22

ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲥⲓ ⲛⲁⲙ ⲓⲉⲁ
ⲛⲁⲙⲡⲁ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙⲁⲓ ⲁⲙⲁ ⲛⲥⲙⲁⲉⲓⲟ

23

ⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲧⲉⲙ ⲧⲉⲙⲟ ⲧⲉⲓⲁ
ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲛⲉ ⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲙⲏ ⲛⲁⲣⲁⲣⲁⲙ

17: ⲥⲁⲣⲁⲙ Ber | ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲛⲉ ⲡⲉ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ⲙⲁⲙⲁ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
18:ⲛⲓⲙ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ⲛⲁⲙⲁⲛ ⲛⲉⲓ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
19: ⲛⲉⲓⲁ Jer | ⲛⲉⲙⲁ Ber.
23: ⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲁ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ⲙⲁⲛⲁⲙⲏ Ber.

24

ܟܬܒܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܫܠܡ ܐܢ ܟܕ ܐܬܝ ܠܘܬ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܬ
ܒܐܝܡ ܐܢ ܒܝ ܐܦ ܒܐ ܕܐܬ ܒܐܝܡ ܐܢ ܐܬ ܐܢ

25

ܐܢ ܐܬ ܕܐ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

26

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

27

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

28

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

29

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

30

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

31

ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ

25: ܐܢ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܐܢ ܐܢ ܐܢ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
26: ܐܢ Ber | ܐܢ Ber2, QA, Min.
29: ܐܢ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
30: ܐܢ Ber.
31: ܐܢ Ber.

32

ܟܒܪ ܕܡ ܟܫܡܐ ܡܢ ܟܒܝܫ ܟܠ ܕܐ ܐܚ
ܟܬܠܚ ܫܚܡ ܒܫܪ ܟܠܐ ܟܒܝܫ ܒܢܝܐܠ

33

ܟܝܒ ,ܕܡܫ ܟܡܥܝ ܟܒܝܫ ܒܥܝܫ ܟܫܒܟ
ܟܝܪܐ ܟܠܐ ܟܒܝܫ ܐܚܡ ܫܚܡ ܟܩܒܠ

34

ܟܬܟ ܠ ܟܫ ܟܝܬܟ ܠܟܐ ܕܫܘܒ ܟܫ
ܟܒܝܫ ܠܟ ܟܫܡܝܘ ܟܝܒܠ ܥܡܝ ܥܡܘ

35

ܡܥܫܝ ܒܟ ܡܟ ܟܬܟ ܥܡܟܠܐ
ܥܡܝ ,ܒܝܒ ܟܡܩܐ ܠܟ ܘܟܒܥܝ ܫܘ

36

ܒܫܐ ܥܡ ܗܡ ܘܡ ܒܚܒ ܫܘ ܥܡܝ ܟܫ ܟ
ܒܚܒܘ ܥܡܝ ܟܡܩܐ ܒܚܟ ܒܟ ܫܘ ܟܝ

37

ܟܦܟ ܟܫ ܟ ܠܫܡ ܥܡܘ ܟܝܬܟ ,ܒܫ
ܒܫܟ ܟܠ ܕܩܒ ,ܟܦܝ ܒܝܥ ,ܟܡ ܒܟ

38

ܚܟܒܟܫ ܫܝܘ ܚܟܩ ,ܟܝܬܟ ܘܕܡ ,ܐ ܫܘ
ܟܫ ,ܟܬܟ ܟܫ ܟܡ ,ܟܠ ܕܩܒ

34: ܥܡܝ ܥܡܘ Ber | ܥܡܝ ܝܡܘ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟܡܡ ܟܠ Jer, Ber.
36: ܟܩܘܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܘܡܬ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
38: ܫܝ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

39

ܘܐܫܬܘܠܘ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܐܦ
ܠܐ ܐܫܟܚ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܕܥܒܕ ܘܐܡܪܝܢ

40

ܡܢܘܗܝ ܡܝܬ ܒܪ ܠܐ ܐܫܟܚ
ܡܫܘܥܐ ܕܠ ܫܠܝܛ ܐܦܝܣ ܟܝ ܩܠܝ

41

ܡܢܚܢܝܐ ܩܠܝ ܢܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܝ ܗܘ
ܡܫܡܫ ܐܒܝ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܫܡܝ

42

ܡܢܥܝܐ ܡܢܚܢܝܐ ܩܠܝ ܐܢ ܡܢ
ܡܥܝܐ ܡܚܝܢ ܗܘ

43

ܡܢܥܝܕ ܡܢܚܢܝܐ ܩܠܝ ܣܟ
ܐܢ ܐܒܝ ܐܢ ܩܠܝ ܢܝܢ ܕܗܐ ܠܐ ܗܘ

44

ܫܟܚ ܐܡܪ ܡܫܐ ܐܒܝ ܦܩܕ ܡܟܚ
ܒܐܒܝ ܩܒܪ ܫܟ ܒ ܠܝ ܐܒܪ ܡܟܐ

45

ܡܫܘܐ ܫܟܚ ܡܝܒ ܐ ܦܡ
ܘܐܬܒܘ ܘܩܒܠܘ ܩܒܝ ܩܒܝ

39: ܡܠܟܘܬܐ missing in Jer.

42: ܡܢܥܝܐ ܡܢܚܢܝܐ Vat (both lines).

43: ܡܝ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ܕܗܐ) | ܡܥܝܐ Min.

46

ܟܫܘܬܐ ܕܒܝ ܡܪܥܝܬܐ ܒܗ ܟܠܐ ܟܠܝܡ ܒܗ ܟܝ
ܩܕܝ ,ܩܡܗ ܒܝܬ ܟܝ ܒܗ ܡܒܝ ܟܝ

47

ܒܥܟܒܝܢ ܐܩܡܘ ܒܒܝ ܟܝܝ ܡܫܒ
ܩܫܢܒܝ ܟܠܡܗ ܒܘ ,ܠܐ ܒܗ ܐܝܬܐ

48

ܟܝܝ ܟܐ ܠܒ ܟܫܠܗ ܟܫ ܒܥܒ
ܟܝܝ ܟܐ ܐܡ ܟܒܫܗ ܒܘ ܟܝܝ ܟܒܫܐ

49

ܟܝܝ ܟܐ ܐܡ ܩܚܝ ܟܒ ܟܝ ܒܝ ܟ
ܟܝܝ ܟܒܒ ܟܒܘܡ ܩܗ ܟܒ ܒܒ ܩܡ

50

ܟܒܘܒܒ ܟܝ ܟܩܡܐ ܟܡܠܐ ܟܦܗ
ܩܬܒ ܐܝ ܡܫܡܠܘ ܡܝ ܡܩܘܐ

51

ܐܡ ܣܥܒ ܟܠ ,ܩܡ ܠܒ ܟܒܠ
ܟܒܘܒܘ ܟܒܫܒ ܟܐ ܟܝ ܒܝ ܒ

46: ,ܒܝ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟܩܐ Vat | ܟܩܐ Min.
47: ܠܒ Jer.
48: ܩܡ ܒܒ Min | ܟܠ Vat, Min.
49: ܟܒ Jer, Min.
50: ܟܩܐ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܣܒܘܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܡܩܘܐ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

52

ܟܬܒܬ ܟܬܒ ܠܥ ܒܝ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܫܡܥܝ ܒܒ
ܟܢ ܚܦܝܒ ܟܝܫܘܬ ܟܬܒܐ ܟܠܦ

53

ܫܡܥܝ ܒܒ ܫܡܥܐ ܕܐܠ ܐܡܝ ܝܟ ܐܠ
ܩܫܛܒܐܨܒ ܟܠܒܢ ܟܬܒ ܠܥ ܒܝ ܐܒܪܗ

54

ܒܐܟܠܒ ܟܢܥ ܒܝ ܐܦܐ ܟܬܐ ܟܬܚ
ܟܐܠܒܢܗ ܟܐܫܘܬ ܡܒܩܐ ܒܒܗ

55

ܟܢ ܚܦܝܒ ܐܡܐ ܟܠܐܒ ܟܐܠ ܟܬܐ
ܟܝܒܒܒܐ ܟܫܘ ܟܬܒ ܟܝܢ

56

ܟܬܐ ܟܠܝ ܟܐܢܡ ܡܒܩܐ ܒܒܗ
ܒܒܚܐ ܟܠ ܟܫܩܐ ܟܫܘܐ ܒܒ

57

ܢܒܒ ܒܒܗ ܟܐܒܒ ܫܐ ܐܟܢܡ
ܐܐ ܟܒ ܟܐܐ ܟܢܝ ܟܩ ܟܩܐ

58

ܟܠܚ ܐܐ ܟܢ ܟܠ ܐܩܐ ܟܠ
ܟܢܐ ܒܒ ܟܝܚܐ ܟܠ ܟܒ ܟܩ

59

ܟܐܫܒ ܟܢ ܟܐ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܒ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

52: ܝܒ Jer.
57: ܟ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of).
58: ܟ Ber.

60

ܡܠܐ ܕܐܢܫ ܒܝܕ ܒܥܝܬ ܫܒܥ ܚܢܐ
ܟܬܒܐ ܕܐ ܡܫܘܚ ܠܥܡ ܟܐܦ

61

ܟܝ ܟܐܡܬ ܥܝܢ ܠܥܡ ܟܬܒ
ܡܒܥܠܐ ܕܡܒܩܫ ܕܡܬܚܠ

62

ܕܡܥ ܒܗ ܒܠ ܥܝܢ ܟܬܝ ܟܩ
ܒܥܟܒܒ ܟܐ ܒܒܒ ܡܠܐ ܒ

63

ܕܡܥ ܒܗ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܚ ܟܐ ܢܫ
ܡܫܦܪܦ ܡܟܡ ܟܐ ܩܕܐ ܟܬܐ

64

ܒܥܫܘ ܒܟܓ ܟܗܐ ܟܠܬܐ ܩܕ
ܣܐܐ ܣܐ ܣܥܒ ܒܥ ܡܒܒ ܟܠܐ

65

ܐܠܐ ܫܐ ܒܢܒ ܒ ܐ ܕܡܐ ܟܐ
ܟܒܐ ܒ ܓܒܒ ܫܐ ܟܐ ܐܦܟ

66

ܟܨܒ ܐ ܫ ܟܟܐ ܟܒ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܐ ܟ ܐ

61: ܕܡܥ ܒܗ ܒܠ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA (instead of ܟܬܝ ܟܐܡܬ)
ܒܥܟܒܒ ܟܐ ܒܒܒ ܡܠܐ ܒ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA (second line).
62: ܡܫܦܪܦ ܡܟܡ ܟܐ ܩܕܐ ܟܬܐ Jer (second line).
63: The first line is missing in Jer | ܕܡܥ ܒܗ ܒܠ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.
65: ܟܐ Vat, Min.
66: ܟܒ Ber | ܟ ܐ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA | ܟ ܐ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.

67

ܒܚܒܫ ܒܠܥ ܟܒܝܢܬ ܟܬܒܬ ܟܠܐ
ܠܐܘܥ ܟܐ ܕܘ ܟܒܝܢܬ ܟܐ ܐܚܫ ܟܐ

68

ܟܐ ܥܠ ܟܬܒ ܒܐ ܒܒܚܒ ܐܝܟ ܟ
ܟܬܥܒܕ ܫܒ ܟܬ ܕܒܥܐ ܟܬܟܐ ܒܘܒ ܟܠ

69

ܒܚܟ ܟܠܐ ܒܥܟ ܟܠܐ ܒܨܨ ܒܘܒ ܟܠ
ܟܢܨ ܟܬܐ ܟܬ ܐܟܬ ܚܠ ܒܚܒ ܟܐ

70

ܟܬܥ ܟܐ ܥܢ ܟܬܚ ܟܬ ܟܢ ܟܠ
ܟܬܥ ܫܒ ܟܒܝܢ ܒܚ ܟܬܒ ܟܠ

71

ܡܢܩ ܒ ܥܢ ܟܬܚ ܐܚܫ ܟܠܐ
ܒܟܟܒܡ ܥܩ ܒ ܟܒ ܟܒ ܫܒ

72

ܟܢܨ ܒ ܡܥ ܐ ܒ ܐܚܫ ܟܠܐ
ܟܢܩ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܟ ܥ ܟ ܟܠ

73

ܟܒܥ ܟ ܟ ܐ ܒ ܐ ܟ ܒܘܒ ܟܠ
ܟ ܒ ܐ ܒ ܐ ܟ ܐ ܒ ܐ ܟ ܐ

67: ܒܚܒܫ ܒܠܥ Ber, Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.
69: ܒܥܟ ܟܠܐ ܒܚܟ ܟܠܐ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.
71: ܒܟܟܒܡ Vat.
73: ܟܠܐ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA (instead of) | ܟ ܠ ܟܠܐ ܐ ܒ ܐ ܒܘܒ ܟܠ QA | ܒ ܟ ܒ ܐ ܒ ܐ Vat (marginal note).

74

ⵍⵍⵉ ⵢⵉⵍⵍⴰⵏ ⵏⵉⵜⵜⴰⵏ ⴷⵉ ⵙⵙⵓ ⵎⵎⵉⵙⵙⵏ ⵜⵜⵓⵜⵜ ⵏⵉⵍⴰ
ⵜⵜⵓⵏⵏⵉⵎⵉⵏ ⵙⵎⵓⵙⵓⵜⵜⵓ ⵜⴰⵏⵏⴰⵏ ⴷⵉ ⵏⵉⵍⴰ

75

ⵎⵎⵉⵍⵍⵉⵏ ⵓⵔ ⵢⵉⵏⴰ ⵏⵍⵍⵓⵔ ⵢⵉⵜⵜ ⵏⵍⵍⵓⵔ
ⵢⵙⵙⵓ ⵏⵉⵜⵜⵓⵙ ⵏⵜⵜⵓⵜⵜ ⵜⵜⵓⵏ ⵜⵉⵎⵎⵉⵙ ⵏⵍⵍⵓⵔ

76

ⵏⵜⵜⵜⵓⵙⵙⵉⵍ ⵓⵔ ⵏⵜⵜⵔ ⵏⵉⵜⵜⵉ ⵔⵓⵎ ⵜⵜⵓⵔ ⵜⵉⵏ ⵏⵏ
ⵏⵜⵜⵙⵏⵉⵔⵉⵏ ⵏⵜⵜⵓⵔⵓⵜⵜⵓⵏ ⵏⵜⵜⵓⵜⵜ ⵏⵉⵍⴰ

77

ⵏⵜⵜⵙⵏⵉⵔ ⵏⵜⵜⵓⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⴷⵉ ⵎⵎⵉⵙⵙⵏ ⵜⵜⵓⵜⵜ ⵏⵉⵍⴰ
ⵏⵜⵜⵙⵙⵉⵍ ⵏⵜⵜⵉⵢ ⵔⵓⵎⵍ ⵎⵎⵉⵔⵔ ⵏⵜⵜⵓⵎⵓⵜⵜⵓ ⵏⵜⵜⵉⵎⵎⵉ

78

ⵏⵏⵉⵎⵓ ⵜⵜⵓⵍ ⵙⵙⵉⵙ ⵏⵏⵍⵍⵓⵍ ⵏⵉⵜⵜⵓⵍ ⵏⵉⵏⵏⵉ
ⵏⵏⵉⵎⵓ ⵜⵜⵓⵍ ⵎⵉⵉⵎ ⵉⵔⵔ ⵍⵔⵔ ⵎⵔ ⵏⵎⵎⵉⵔ ⵏⵉ ⵉⵔⵔ

76: ⵏⵍⵍⵓ Ber, Vat, Ber2, and QA (instead of ⵓⵔ).

77: ⵎⵎⵉⵔⵔⵍ Ber, Var, Ber2, Min, QA.

79

ⵔⵉⵔ ⵔⵜⵜⵓⵃ ⵙⵙ ⵔⵏⵊ ⵢⵀⵓⵛ ⵀⵢ ⵔⵏⴰ
ⵔⵅⵅⵙ ⵔⵏⴰ ⵔⵉⵊⵢ ⵙⵍ ⵜⵢ ⵔⵙⵜⵜⵛ ⵔⵛⴰ

80

ⵔⵅⵓⵛ ⵢⵍⵃⵢ ⵢⵉⵅⵜⵛ ⵅⵊ ⵊⵛ ⵢⵃⵃⵓⵛ ⵔⵏⵢⵔ
{.....}

81

ⵔⵜⵃⵊ ⵔⵜⵙ ⵍⵢⵛ ⵔⵜⵢⵏ ⵅⵊⵜⵃⵜⵛⵔ
ⵔⵛⵓⵙ ⵔⵅⴰⵏ ⵔⵍⵖ ⵀⵢ ⵍⵜ ⵔⵅⴰⵏ ⵢⵃⵔⵄⴰ

82

ⵔⵜⵢⵔ ⵙⵃⵔ ⵔⵜⵙ ⵢⵖⵍ ⵔⵢⵊⵅⵢⵊ
ⵛⵙⵙ ⵔⵅⴰⵏ ⵍⵍⵢ ⵀⵢ ⵍⵜ ⵔⵅⵍⵃⵍ ⵔⵜⵢⵔⴰ

83

ⵔⵢⵙⵡⵊⵊ ⵔⵅⵍⵃⵍ ⵔⵜⵢⵔ ⵛⵃⵢⵔ ⵔⵅⵙⵔ
ⵛⵅⴰⵏ ⵍⵍⵢ ⵀⵢ ⵔⵏⴰ ⵛⵙⵙ ⵔⵅⴰⵏ ⵢⵃⵔⵄⴰ

84

ⵅⵍⵍⵃⵃⵅⵢ ⵍⵜ ⵔⵢⵙⵡⵊⵊ ⵔⵜⵙ ⵃⵢⵊⵛ
ⵔⵅⵅⵃⵃⵔⵔⵛ ⵃⵃⵔⵔⵃⵃⵍⵍⵏ ⵙⵙ ⵔⵍⵔ

85

ⵙⵢⵍⵅⵅⵢⵊ ⵔⵏⴰ ⵢⵉⵅⵜⵛ ⵀⵢ ⵍⵜ ⵏⵢⵛ ⵔⵢⵊⵊⵛ
ⵔⵢⵊⵅⵢ ⵀⵔⵔ ⵔⵏⵓⵃ ⵊⵍ ⵅⵅⵙⵙ ⵊⵃⵃⵔ ⵔⵏⴰ

79: ⵔⵓⴰ Ber2, Min and QA (instead of ⵔⵓⵊ).
80: ⵢⵃⵃⵓⵛ Ber.

86

ﻣﻴﺘﺠﻔﻮ ﻣﻠﺤﻮﻈﻪ ﺑﻦ ﻣﺠﻔﻮﻭ ﺑﻦ
ﻧﻮﻣﺲ ﻣﻴﻮﻩ ﺳﻮﻉ ﻣﻴﻮﻩ ﻧﺘﺮ ﻫﻲ ﺑﺞ

87

ﻣﺘﻘﻮﻣ ﻭﻣﻠﺤ ﻭﻣﻠﻮ ﻣﻨﻦ ﻭﻡ ﻣﻨﻮﻣ ﺳﻮﻉ
ﻣﺠﻔﻮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﻣﻌﻮﻣ ﻗﻮﻣﻮ ﻭﻨﻮﻣﻮ ﻣﻌﻮﻣ

88

ﻧﻮﻣﺲ ﻟﻲﻮ ﻣﺠﻔﻮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﻧﻴﺮ ﻣﻴﻢ
ﻣﺘﻮﻣ ﺳﻮﻉ ﻣﻮﻨﻮﻣﺒﺞ ﻭﺲ ﻣﻲﺳﻮ ﻧﻮﻗﻠﻮ

89

ﻣﻮﻨﻮﻠﺠﺞ ﻨﻠﻨﻘﻮﻩ ﺑﻠﻮﻝ ﻣﻴﻮﻗ ﻧﻲ
ﺑﻴﻘﻮ ﺑﻦ ﻣﻮﻩ ﻧﻴﻜﻲ ﻟﻮﻫ ﻣﻮﻩ ﻭﻨﻌﻲ ﺑﻮﻫ ﻣﻮﻩ

90

ﻣﻮﻨﻮﻠﺠﺞ ﻣﻮﻩ ﻣﻴﻨﻲ ﻫﻮﻫ ﻣﻌﻨﻮﻠﻮ ﻧﻨﻠﻪ
ﻣﻲ ﻓﻨﻘﻲ ﻣﻮﻨﻮﻠﻮﻫ ﻣﻮﻩ ﻣﻮﻨﻠﻢ ﻣﻮﻩ

91

ﻣﻨﻴﻲ ﺑﻦ ﻣﻮﻨﻮﻠﺠﺞ ﻣﻴﻮﻨﻮﻨﻌ ﻣﻮﻩ
ﻭﻴﻠﺠﻨﻮﻭ ﻣﻨﻴﻲ ﻭﻨ ﻟﻴﻲ ﺑﻠﻠﺞ

92

ﻣﻨﻴﻲ ﺑﻦ ﻧﻠﻔﻨﻲ ﺑﺞ ﻣﻲﻠﻮ ﻣﻨﻌﻲ
ﻣﻴﻠﻲ ﻫﻨﻪ ﻣﻴﻠﻨﻮﻨﻮ ﻣﻲﻠﻮ ﺑﻪ ﻟﺞ

93

ﻭﻨﻲ ﻨﻴﻲﻩ ﻓﻘﻠﻨ ﻭﻨﻨ ﻣﻴﻠﻲ ﻟﺞ
ﻣﻨﻨﻠﻨﻲﻩ ﻣﻴﻮﻗ ﻣﻨﻮﻠﻪ

94

ꡔꡁꡊꡀ ꡊꡂꡀ ꡏꡂꡔꡊꡊꡀ ꡀꡔꡁꡀ ꡔꡁꡀꡂ ꡔꡂꡀ ꡔꡁ
ꡀꡔꡔꡁ ꡊꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡊ ꡔꡀ ꡊꡁꡁꡊ ꡊꡁꡔꡀ ꡁꡔꡂꡀ

95

ꡊꡀ ꡊꡁꡔꡁꡀ ꡀꡔꡔꡁ ꡊꡁꡊ ꡊꡀ ꡁꡀꡀ ꡔꡂꡀ ꡀ
ꡊꡁꡔꡀ ꡁꡔꡂꡀ ꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡊꡂꡀꡀ ꡀꡔꡔꡁ ꡊꡁꡊ ꡁꡀ

96

ꡀꡊꡁꡔꡂ ꡁꡊꡀ ꡀꡔꡂꡁ ꡁꡔꡁꡊ ꡀꡔꡂ ꡊꡁꡁ
ꡔꡁꡀꡂ ꡀꡔꡁ ꡀꡔꡔꡁ ꡔꡂꡁ ꡁꡀꡀ ꡀꡔꡁꡀ

97

ꡔꡁꡊꡀ ꡊꡂꡀ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡀ ꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡀꡔꡊ ꡀ
ꡊꡂꡁ ꡔꡁꡀꡂ ꡀꡔꡔꡁꡁ ꡊꡁꡔꡁꡊ ꡁꡔꡁꡀ

98

ꡀꡔꡁ ꡔꡀꡔꡁ ꡀꡔꡂꡁ ꡁꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡀꡊꡁꡁꡊ ꡁꡀꡀ ꡀ
ꡀꡔꡁ ꡁꡔꡂ ꡊꡁꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡔꡂꡁ ꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡁꡀ ꡁꡔꡁ

99

ꡁꡔꡁꡀꡂ ꡊꡂꡀ ꡊꡁꡔꡁꡀꡀꡔꡁ ꡁꡔꡁꡀꡀ ꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡊ
ꡀꡔꡁ ꡔꡀꡁ ꡀꡔꡔꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡊ ꡁꡀ ꡀꡊꡁ ꡁꡀꡊ ꡀꡂ

100

ꡁꡔꡂ ꡀꡔꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡂ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡀ ꡔꡁꡁꡊ
ꡁꡔꡔꡁꡁꡁꡊ ꡀꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡔꡁ ꡁꡀ ꡀꡔꡁꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡀꡊꡂ

94: ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡊ Jer | ꡀꡔꡁꡁ Ber, Ber2.
96: ꡁꡔꡁꡂ ꡀꡔꡁ Vat, Ming, QA, Ber 2.
97: ꡀꡔꡁꡁꡊ ꡁꡔꡁꡊ Vat, Ming, QA, Ber 2.
98: ꡁꡔꡁꡂ Vat, QA.
99: ꡀꡁꡔꡁꡀꡂ Jer | ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡁ ꡀꡀ ꡀꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡂ Ber | ꡀꡔꡁꡊ ꡁꡔꡁꡔꡁ ꡁꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡂ
ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ ꡀꡔꡁꡁ Vat, Ber 2, Min, QA.
100: ꡀꡔꡁꡔ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA | ꡔꡁꡁ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.

101

ܟܬܒܝ ܪܫܠܝ ܠܡܐ ܟܬܘܫ ܒܝܕ ܫܡܥ
ܫܠܝܚ ܟܝܐ ܠܐ ,ܫܐܒܟܝ ܒܫܐ ܕܡ

102

ܒܝܕ ܟܐ ܒܐ ܟܐܝܠ ܕܡ ܟܬܒ ܠܐ ܒܐ
ܦܩܘ ܕܩ ,ܟܬܒ ܪܫܠ ܒܫܐ ܫܝܥ

103

ܐܝܟ ,ܒܟ ܕܒܕܩܕܝ ܐܦܦ ܟܐ
ܡܟܒܒ ܟܠ ܒܒ ܒܟ ܠܐ ܒܒܟܒ

104

ܟܬܒ ܒܐ ܫܐ ܟܝܟ ܒܫ ܫܒ ܠܐ ܒܟ
ܟܫܟ ܟ ܟ ܟܒܝ ܟܒ ܟ ,ܫܠ

105

ܟܫܟ ܡ ܕܩ ܟܒ ܫ ܟ ܟ ,ܐ
ܡܒܒ ܒܐ ܟ ܟ ܫ ,ܐ

106

ܟ ܫ ,ܐ ܟ ܟ ܫ ,ܐ ܟ ,ܐ
ܒ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ

107

ܟ ,ܫ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ
ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ

103: ܟ ,ܫ Vat (marginal note)

104: ,ܟ Jer.

105: ,ܟ Vat, Ber2, Min | ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ QA.

106: ,ܟ QA | ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ ,ܟ Ber, Ber 2, Vat, QA, Min.

107: ,ܟ Ber.

108

ܟܠ ܡܢ ܟܝܦ ܟܬܒ ܟܫ ܒܫ
ܒܟܒܫܐ ܟܥܝ ܟܬܒܝ ܟܬܒܐ ܟܬ

109

ܟܬܒܝ ܟܬ ܒܒ ܐܡܪ ܡܢܐ ܟܬܒܐ
ܟܒܪ ܟܢܫ ܡܐ ܟܬܒ ܟܬܒܝ

110

ܟܝ ܟܠ ܡ ܒܟܫܐ ܒܒ ܒ
ܟܪ ܫܐ ܟܬܒܝ ܒ ܡܐ ܟܢܫ

111

ܒܒ ܒܫ ܟܢܫ ܡܐ ܟ ܐ ܟ
ܟ ,ܡܟ ܡ ܡ ܟ

112

ܟܒ ܡ ܡ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ
ܟ ܒ ܐ ܡܐ ܟ

113

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܟ
ܒ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܒ

114

ܟ ܒ ܒ ܡ ܟ ܒ ܟ
ܟ ,ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

109: ܟ ܟ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min.
111: ܟ ܡ ܟ ܟ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min.
112: ,ܡ ܟ ܡ ܟ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min.

115

ܒܚܨܚܐ ܟܚܝܫܐ ܩܕܝ ܗܕܝܐ ܦܛܠܟ ܟܠܟܐ
ܟܬܚܟ ܒܘܗ ܠܚܝܫ ܟܝܫܐ ܟܩܠܟ ܟ ܗܘ

116

ܟܬܝܠܐ ܟܚܝܫ ܟܫܝ ܠܟ ܚܚܐܟ ܒܘܗ
ܟܫܠܟ ܚܒ ܟܐܒܫܚ ܟܠܐ ܒܚܟ ܟ

117

ܟܟ ܠܐܟܟ ܟܘܫ ܒܚܟ ܟܐܘܫܠܟ
ܟܬܚܟ ܒܟ ܚܒܝ ܟܙܐ ܟܚܝ ܟ ܫܒ

118

ܐܚܒ ܟܬܚܠ ܟܬܝܠܐ ܟܚܝ ܫܙܐ ܟܚܝ
ܟܬܚܟ ܒܟ ܟܫܫܝ ܟ ܫ ܚܒܝ ܫܒ

119

ܟܚܝܒ ܠܚܒ ܟܙܐ ܟܫܝ ܟܚܚ ܐܚܫܟ
ܟܝ ܫܐܠܟ ܫܟ ܐܚܫܒܚ ܟܐܒܟܫܟ

120

ܟܙܐ ܟܒܒ ܟܬܟ ܒܟ ܐܫܟ ܗ ܫܝ
ܫ ܟܫ ܐܚ ܟܝܟ ܫܟܠ ܫܐܒܟܟ

115: ܟ Ber.
117: ܫܙܐ Ber, Ber 2, Var, QA, Min.
118: ܟܚܚ Ber, Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.
119: ܠܚܒ QA.
120: ܫܠܟ Ber | ܪ Jer (instead of ܐܫܟ).

121

ܟܬܒ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܡܫܡܫ̈ܢܐ ܠܓܘ ,ܡ ܟܐܘ
ܡܒܟ ܪܡܙܐ ܟܠ ܡܐ ܕܝ ܕܒ̈ܪ ܗܘ

122

ܡܫܘܐ ܠܒ ܟܒ̈ܥܐ ܕܟ ܟܬ̈ܒ ܟܐ ܒܐܐ
ܟܠ̈ܐ ܗܘ ܒܝ̈ܫ̈ܐ ܟܡܐ ,ܒ̈ܪܬ

123

ܟ̈ܫ̈ܐ ,ܪܡܙ ܐܡ ܗܘ ܐܒ̈ܟ ܐܡ ܒܝ̈ܟ
ܪܡ̈ܙ ܒܐ ܪܡ̈ܙ̈ܠ ܟ̈ܗ ܐܒ̈ܟ ܟ̈ܬ

124

ܠ̈ܐ ܫܒ̈ܚ ܟ̈ܫ ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ܒ ܟ̈ܦ̈ܠ
ܟ̈ܒ̈ܫ ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ ܫ̈ ܒ̈ ܟ̈ܫ ܦ̈ܒ

125

ܟ̈ܒ̈ ܟ̈ܦ̈ ܟ̈ ,ܫ ܟ̈ܗ ܟ̈ ,ܒ
ܫ ܒ̈ ܟ̈ ܦ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ,ܒ̈ ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ ,ܒ

126

ܪ̈ ,ܫ ,ܒ̈ ,ܫ ,ܒ̈ ,ܒ̈ ,ܒ̈ ,ܒ̈ ,ܒ̈
ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ ,ܒ̈ ,ܒ̈ ,ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈ ,ܟ̈

121: ܗ ܟ Ber (instead of ܡ).
122: ܟ ܒ̈ Ber.
123: ܐ ܒ ܟ Ber, Vat, Ber 2, QA | ܐ ܗ ܒ Vat, Ber 2.
125: ܦ ܟ ܒ ܐ Ber (instead of ܦ ܟ).

127

ܟܘܒܥܐ ܕܘܝ ܟܟܝܪ ܒܒܥ ܠܠ ܟܬܝܢ ܟܐܠܐ
ܒܒܠܐ ܟ ܕ ܟ ܟܬܥܒܝ ܠܠ ܘܐ ܒܨܒ

128

ܟܬܥܝ ܥܡܠܠ ܟܬܝܒ ܗܐ ܟܐܒܒܐ ܒܒ
ܟܒܨܝ ܕܘܝ ܟܐܠ ; ܒܒ ܟ ܟܡܐ ܟܒ

129

ܒܒ ܠ ܝܒܐ ܥܒܒ ܠ ܟܬܝ ܒ ܟ ܒ
ܐ ܒܒ ܟ ܝ ܟܝ ܟܟ ܟܥ ܒ ܒ ܟ

130

ܐ ܒܒ ܠ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܒ
ܟ ܒ ܟ ܐ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܒ

131

ܒ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ; ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ

132

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

133

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

127: ܠܥܒ Ber | ܘܡ Ber (instead of ܘܘܡ).
128: ܒܘܝ ; ܒ ܟܐܠ Ber | ܟܬܥܒܝ ܠܠ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min.
131: ܟܒܠ Jer, QA.

134

ܕܫܡܫܐ ܒܪܝܬ ܟܠ ܒܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܬ
ܕܡܚܒܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܪܝܬ ܕܡ

135

ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܢܫܝ ܕܒܝܬ ܟܠ ܒܪ
ܕܡܫܠܡܢܢ ܒܗ ܒܫܚ ܐܢܫ ܒܪܚܡ

136

ܟܝܠܒܠܚ ܟܘܡ ܫܡ ܐܢܫ ,ܡ ܟܝܟ
ܕܫܟܚ ܕܡܡ ܟܬܒܚܐ ܟܚܐ ܫܡܐ

137

ܟܬܝܡ ܟܫܝܠ ܡܢ ܐܒܚܐ ܟܬܒܚܐ ܟܫܒܡ
ܒܪܝܫ ܕܡܡܘ ܒܪܚ ܥܒܕ ܟܐ ܒܪܚܡ

138

ܢܝܡ ܟܬܘ ܟܚܐ ܕܡ ܟܘܡ ܢ
ܟܟܐ ܟܬܝ ܥܡ ܢܚ ܕܡ ܟܬܒܚܐ ܐܓ

139

ܟܢܡ ܕܡ ܡܝ ܟܫܘ ܐܟ ܫܘ ܕܡ ܒܪܚܡ
ܒܪܝܢ ܟܚܢܐ ܟܢܒܚ ܟ

140

ܟܦܫܐ ܢܘ ܢܝ ܒܡܒܚ ܕܫܒܚ ܢܚ
ܕܫܒܚ ܫܡ ܡܢܩ ܟ ܒܪܚ ܕ

137: ܐܓ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min (instead of ܒܪܚܡ).

138: ܫܟ Jer | ܒܪܚܡ QA (instead of ܥܡ).

141

ܩܫܬܐ ܕܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܡܢ ܟܒܘܫ ܒܝܬ ܕܝ
ܩܡܐܒܕܬ ܐܦܠ ܡܐܬ ܒܗ ܒܢ ܡܒܝܕ

142

ܒܝܫܐ ;ܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܫܡ
ܟܝܫܐ ܒܢ ,ܡܐܒܐ ܒܗ ܠܐ ܡܠܝܐ

143

ܒܝܕܐܒܠ ܒܝܫܐ ܐܘܐ ,ܫܡܐܟܠ ܒܒ
ܝܟ ܟܬܒ ܡܢ ܒܨܐ ܒܝܐ ,ܡܢܢܒܩ

144

ܫܦܐ ܒܝ ܟܝܫܐ ܟܬܒ ܟܠ
ܒܪܐ ܟܐܐ ܒܝܐ ܐܟ ܐܒܐ ܟܩܫ

145

ܐܒܦܐ ܟܐܐ ܒܝܐ ܠܒ ܒܬ
ܟܬܐ ܒܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܐ ܒܝ ܐܦ

146

ܒܩ ܐ ܐܠ ܠ ܫ ܟ ܒ ܫ ܒ ܟ
ܟܬܒ ܐܒ ܟܝܫܐ ܟܬ ܟܒܐ

147

ܟܠܗܐ ܐܦ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܐ ܟ
ܟܬ ܟ ܟ ܟܝܫܐ ܩ ܟ

148

ܟ ܟ ܠ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܟ

141: ܟܒܘܫ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min.
142: ܟܐ Jer (instead of ܡܢ ܐ).
144: ܟܐܐ ܒܪܐ ܟܝܐ Vat, Ber 2, QA, Min.
146: ܟ ܒ Ber | ܐ Vat | ܫ Ber2, Min, QA | ܟ ܒ Jer (instead of ܟ).
147: The whole verse is missing from Jer.
148: ܟ Jer.

149

ܟܝܐܡ ܐܒܐ ܟܢܫ ܚܦܝܫ ܠܚܡ ܠܥܝܫ
ܒܝܒܚ ܒܒ ܟܠܚܘܡܒ ܟܐܡܫ ܟܠܝܠܡ

150

ܐܡܪ ܡܡ ܡܝܪ ܟܒܘܥܘܦ ܟܒܚ ܫܠ
ܫܒ ܟܒܠ ܟܢܒܐ ܡܪ ܟܒܘܝܟ ܚܪ

151

ܒܡܒܒ ܪܒ ܟܫܘܐ ܟܐܫܬ ܐܫ
ܐܘܝ ܡ ܡܐ ܐܘܝ ܡܒܟ ܒܪ ܪ ܪܒ

152

ܟܬܝ ܒܒܟ ܟܝܪ ܐܒܪܒܒ ܒܟܪ ܚܟܐ
ܟܘܪܬ ܫܠ ܐܘܝ ܐܡܪ ܡܒܐ ܡܒ

153

ܐܘܝ ܠܡܐ ܡܒܐ ܡ ܐܘܝ ܐܡܪ
ܐܫܒܚܠܘ ܟܫܘܐ ܟܒܒܐܒܟ

154

ܐܟܒܚܟܡܒܐ ܐܫܢܒܪ ܟܫܘܐ ܐܒܫ
ܐܟܡ ܢܫܐ ܐܘܝ ܒܟܟ ܟܝܫ ܢܫ

155

ܟܢܪ ܐܒ ܟܐ ܒܐ ܟܒ ܐ ܒܒ
ܟܫ ܐ ܟܬ ܟܪ ܟ ܐ ܟ ܐ ܟ

149: ܠܝ ܡ Ber.

152: ܒ ܡ Jer | ܒ ܡ Ber | ܟܪ ܒܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

156

ڕەمژەنجڵەوە ڕەمبۆڵبڵەحبۆ ملێبە ێر ملڵ
ڕبۆبۆبێ تبۆه ڕحێتبێ حبه ڕۆبۆ هتبۆ

157

ۆبۆڵبۆه لڵبۆ ڕۆەحبۆحه ڕۆەۆ ڕئ هتۆ
ڕئ بۆبۆڕه بۆبۆڕه ڕبۆه ڕتێڵێ ڵێۆه

158

ڕۆبۆ ڕۆۆه ۆەۆبحەێ بۆۆم حۆ بێ ڕک
بۆۆبێ ڵێ ڕتبۆۆ هتۆه ڵۆڵڵ ,ه ڕبۆبۆ

159

بۆێ ڕۆهۆبۆ ڵ ۆبۆ ڕۆڵڵبۆ هبۆ ێر ملڵ
ڵۆڵڵ ,ه ڕئ بۆێ بۆبۆبۆ ڕک ڕۆۆه بۆحۆبۆ

160

بۆهۆبۆ ۆێ بۆت ۆۆۆم ڕئ ێک ڕئۆبۆڕک ڵەسۆ
ۆبۆحۆبۆ ەۆم ۆۆبۆ ڕۆبۆۆبۆه ۆێم ڕۆۆبۆەۆبۆۆه

161

ڵەسۆۆۆۆتۆحسۆ ڕێۆۆ ەۆۆه ڕۆۆۆۆەه ۆۆۆ
ۆۆۆۆه ەۆۆۆ ,ه ڕبۆبۆ ڕۆڵڵ ۆبۆبۆ ڕک بۆ

156: ۆبۆبۆۆۆبۆ Ber | ۆبۆبۆۆۆبۆ تبۆه ڕتبۆ ۆبۆه Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

157: ۆبۆڵبۆ ڕۆۆبۆحه لڵبۆ ڕۆۆبۆ ڕئ‌ۆۆۆتۆحسۆ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ڕئ بۆبۆڕه بۆبۆڕه Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

158: ۆبۆبۆ ڕلۆڕه ڕتۆه ۆەۆبۆ بۆ ۆبەه بۆبۆ ڕک Jer | ڕۆڵڵ Jer | ۆبۆێ Vat | ۆبۆێ Ber2.

160: ەۆۆبۆ Ber | ۆبۆۆۆ Vat, QA, Min (instead of ۆبۆحۆ).

162

ولم يلحظوه ولم يسمعوه ولكن لو
ولم يخلق لي لحية لصار هو كإخوته

163

كأني بتيه وأنظر في بحسابه نجد
وأسمع وصية نجيء ملء عيني لم يجد

164

كأنهما هيئ بحسابه نج كوني يجد
وأسمع وصية نجيء كيف كأن ملء

165

كيوتا يجد ملء ملء مي لي
وأسمع وصية لصلة كحية وكخصم هجل

166

كتحوج لي ملء يجد كحوج لي
لصحة وكيهم مهجمج لي كيلة نج

167

كسهج لي لم نج لصلة كيوح سهد
كحد شهد لصحة لم نجم لم نجهد

168

لحسفهم نج لصلح لهد كيتح كتحوج
بسوا لحم ليه كحد كهوهج لم

169

نجد ملء كيوا يجد وأسمع وصية
وأنظر لم وتشج شد ومجهم وشهم

165: كيوتا ملء يجد ملء مي لي Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
167: لم Min.
168: كيج Ber | كيتح Min (Instead of كيتح)

170

ركِبَ عَلَى ظَهْرِ دَابَّةٍ وَسَارَ فِي الطَّرِيقِ
وَهُوَ يَتَأَمَّلُ فِي الْأَشْجَارِ وَالْأَزْهَارِ حَوْلَهُ،

171

فَلَمَّا وَصَلَ إِلَى الْمَدِينَةِ اسْتَقْبَلَهُ أَهْلُهَا
وَهُمْ يَهْتِفُونَ بِاسْمِهِ وَيَرْفَعُونَ الرَّايَاتِ

172

وَكَانَ فِي الْمَدِينَةِ رَجُلٌ اسْمُهُ عَلِيٌّ
وَهُوَ مِنْ أَكْثَرِ النَّاسِ حُبًّا لِلْعِلْمِ وَأَهْلِهِ،

173

فَلَمَّا سَمِعَ بِقُدُومِ الْعَالِمِ خَرَجَ لِلِقَائِهِ
وَهُوَ يَقُولُ فِي نَفْسِهِ: مَا أَسْعَدَنِي بِهَذَا الْيَوْمِ!

174

وَلَمَّا رَآهُ عَلِيٌّ نَزَلَ عَنْ دَابَّتِهِ
{.....}

175

وَسَارَ إِلَى جَانِبِهِ، وَهُوَ يَسْأَلُهُ عَنْ أَحْوَالِ الطَّرِيقِ
وَعَنْ أَخْبَارِ الْبَلَدِ الَّتِي قَدِمَ مِنْهَا

176

فَأَخَذَ الْعَالِمُ يُحَدِّثُهُ عَنْ أَهْلِ تِلْكَ الْبِلَادِ
وَعَنْ عَادَاتِهِمْ وَأَخْلَاقِهِمْ وَمَا يَعْرِفُونَ

174: Missing from Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.

177

ܟܵܡܵܐ ܟܠܡܵܐ ܟܬܵܒ ܟܵܫ ܟܠܵܐ ܟ ܫܒܥ
ܟܢܵܫ ܟܠ ܟܫܝܵܐ ܐܒܵܐ ܟܠ ܒܵܒ ܟ

178

ܟܫܘܵܬ ܟܫܒܵܐ ܟܒܵܐ ܟܠ
ܟܬܒ ܟܬܝ ܟܝܵܐ ܟܒܵܐ ܐܒܐ

179

ܟܒܵܐ ܟܵܫ ܟܒܵܡ ܟܠ ܟܫܘܵ ܐܒ
ܟܵܒ ܒܵܐ ܟܫܒܒ ܠܵܐ ܟܠ ܒܵܒ ܟ

180

ܟܵܐ ܠܒ ܟܵܫ ܟܒܵܡ ܟܠ ܟܒܵܡ
ܐܵܫ ܟܡ ܟܒܵܐ ܟ ܟܵܒ ܒܵܟ

181

ܒܟܟܒ ܟܫܘܵ ܐܵܡ ܐܠܒ
ܟܵܐ ܟܒ ܡ ܟܒܵܐ ܟܵܐ ܒܒ ܟܡ

182

ܐܵܡ ܒܵܟ ܟ ܠ ܫ ܐܵܡ ܐ
ܟܒܵܐ ܟܒ ܟ ܐ ܡ ܫ ܟ ܐ

183

ܐ ܒ ܫ ܠ ܡ ܟ ܟ ܐ
ܡ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ

182: ܒܵܟ Ber | ܫ ܠ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.
183: ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܐ ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

184

ܟܺܝ ܟܠܳܗ ܟܳܡ ܟܳܡ ܟܳܡ ܒܳܟ ܟ̈ ܟܠ̈ ܟ̈
ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈

185

ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈
ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈

186

ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈
ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈

187

ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈
ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈

188

ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈
ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈

189

ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈
ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈ ܟ̈

184: ܟ̈ ܟ̈ Jer.

186: ܟ̈ Ber | ܟ̈ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

187: ܟ̈ ܟ̈ Vat, Ber2.

188: ܟ̈ Ber | ܟ̈ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of) | Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of).

190

ܟܝܡܐ ܒܡܨܢ ܡܝܬ ܫܒܥ ܟܬܒܐܝ ܟܝܚܐ
ܕܡܫܠܚܬ ܟܠܒܐ ܟܫܒܐܝ ܟܝܟ ܐܝܒܝܟ

191

ܟܠܒܟ ܪܚܡܝܐ ܟܚܘܒܟ ܫܒܥ ܟܘܪܟ ܢܒܠ
ܪܝܫ ܟܝ ܒܝ ܟܝܡܐ ܟܚܝ ܟܫܠܚ ,ܐܠܐ

192

ܟܝܡܐ ܟܥܣ ܟܚܝ ܐܐܡܐ ܟܘܪܟ ܫܒܥ
ܠܐ ܒܝ ܢܒܘ ܣܝܠܟ ܐܟ ܒܝ ܣܝܦܟ ܫܚܝ

193

ܟܝܡܐ ܟܚܝ ܟܫܚ ܢܒܐ ܢܒܘ ܢܒܘ
ܪܝܫ ܟܝ ܒܝ ܟܝܡܐ ܟܚܝ ܠ ܠܚܚ ܡܝܐ

194

ܡܝܐ ܡܒܚܐ ܣܝܦܟ ܫܚܝ ܡܥܒܘ ,ܐܐܡ
ܕܡܥܒܐ ܐܟ ܦܡܟܐ ܟܚܝ ܟܒܟ ܟܚܘ

195

ܕܐܟ ܟܝܚ ܕܩܫܢܚ ܟܟܚܐ ܐܚܐ
ܟܡܐ ,ܦܬܚ ܟܝܡܐ ,ܩܡ ܐܘܝܘ ܐܒܫ

190: ܟܡܐ ܟܚܐ Jer | ܟܡܐ ܟܚܐ Ber.
192: ܟܘܪܟ Vat, Ber2, Min.
193: ܪܝܫ ܟܝ ܒܝ ܚܚ ܐܐܡܐ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
194: ܚܚ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

196

אבאשמה קמטה פאם אבו אחד
קמטמאחב אשבאה ההבה אקאחב אבאפה

197

אלחם אבאפ קחד הבזה בהאב אאר
בחאפם א בהאב אאכ קחבאאב זבה

198

אשזה הבה אאשמזה אאחבת טר
באאשאב אבחזאב קמזחבם

199

אבחבה אטלח אאשמזה בחמהה טר
אחלט פאפאה אבו אזאא אטחה בחאב

200

אאשמזה אזחאשבה באאבזחבה
קמזטאבחם אאהה אחלט אאהה אשבאה

201

אאם בחפ זב קמטפ בלא שאה אאם בחה
אזאמה בחטנ אאבהאאר אב אאזאאהה אשבאה

202

אחמר ,בזב אשבה אזאמה אשקאאחאר זב
אשהאה אאל קמאר בזפ אזאר אשאם

203

אחמר ,בזל קמאר אאם אזבהאה אשאר
קמטאבל זב קמאר אזבר שאה אאמה

196: אחד Vat & Min.
197: קאבאב QA | בחאאם Ber.
202: אשהזאה Vat.

204

ܒܗܝ ܟܝ ܟܟ ܐܟ ܟܬܒܬ ܒܟܒܟ ܟܢܟܐ ܡܠܟܬܟ
ܡܠܟܣܠ ܟܟܟܠ ܟܡܟ ܡܥܐ ܟܒܟ

205

ܟܥܐܠ ܟܐ ܟܟ ܡܟ ܟܥܐ ܟܒܐ ܒܟ ܟܗ
ܟܥܐܟ ܡܒ ܒܟܒܟ ܟܐܠܐ ܟܠ ܟܠ

206

ܟܢܝ ܒܠ ܟܢ ܐ ܒܠ ܐ ܠܟ ܐ ܒ
ܟܒܐ ܟܥܐ ܟܐ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

207

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

208

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

209

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

210

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

204: ܡܠܟܣܠ ܟܟܟܠ Vat, QA, Ber2, Min.

206: ܟܢܟ ܒܠ ܟ ܒ Vat, Ber2, QA | ܟܢܟ ܒܠ ܟ ܐ ܠܟ ܐ ܒ Ber & Min.

209: ܟ ܟ ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (marginal note) | ܟ ܟ ܟ Jer & Ber.

211

ܡܢܝ ܐܠܝܗ ܟܢܘܢܝܐ ܫܒܚܘ ܒܝ ܩܕ
ܒܝܬܗ ܒܝܬܗ ܪܒܐ ܫܘܝ ܠܥܡ ܥܡܝ

212

ܟܬܒ ܟܬܒ ܠܥܡ ܚܟܡ ܡܦܩܝܢ ܒܠܒ
ܟܝܫܘܬ ܠܡܫܝܚ ܩܕ ܠܥܡ ܫܒܥ

213

ܫܡ ܫܘܝ ܠܥܡ ܥܡ ܒܚܩ ܒܠܒ
ܟܢܘܢܝܐ ܟܝܣܘ ܒܘܒ ܟܠܚܐ ܗܘ

214

ܟܐ ܟܬܝܒ ܟܠܚܐ ,ܡܐ ܟܒ ܟܝܬ
ܟܬܝܒ ܒܡ ܟܝܣܘ ;ܡ ܠܡܝܕ ܒܐ

215

ܫܠܚ ܒܡ ܟܢܘ ;ܡ ܟܬܒ ܒܘܒ
ܠܡܒܘܡ ܚܒ ܠܡܠ ܒܢܟܘ

216

ܫ ܒܢ ܟܒ ܢܒ ܚܒ ܠܡܘ ܠܡܒ
ܒܝܘ ܒܝܡ ܝܒ ܟܠܚܐ ܟܒ ܟܩܒ

212: ܟܬܒ ܒܠ ,ܡ Vat, QA, and Min (marginal note) | ܟܬܒ Ber2 (marginal note).

213: ܟܘܢܢ ܟܝܡ ܚ ܘܢ ܟܠܚ ܚ Jer, Ber.

214: ܟܐ ܟܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟܘ ܘܡ ܟܝ ,ܡ ܠܡܝ Jer.

215: ܟܬ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

216: ܠܡܒ Var, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of) | ܒܝ Var, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of) | ܒܝ Var, Ber2, QA, Min.

217

ܟܝܫܐ ܟܬܒ ܟܚܠܐ ܟܕ ܟܠܡܥ ܒܪ
ܝܫܟ ܒ ܡܥܒܡ ܠܐܡܥܬ ܟܐ ܥܡ ܠܐܡܬ

218

ܥܡ ܠܒ ܒܥܒ ܒܪ ܒܫܡܒ ܟܐ ܒܫܡ ܒܥܒ
ܟܬܒ ܟܚܒ ܟܬ ܒ ܒ ܠܒ ܠܒܥܒ ܟܐ

219

ܟܥܫܠ ܒܡ ܟܒܥ ܫ ܟܐ ܣ
ܟܐܠ ܟܥܫ ܣ ܡܟ ܒ ܟ

220

ܥܡ ܠܒܡ ܡܟ ܒܫܡ ܠܐ ܣ
ܫ ܟ ܟܐ ܥܫ ܟܐ ܠܥ ܟ

221

ܠܐ ܒܥ ܒܪ ܒܫܡ ܠܒ ܟܐ ܥ
ܟܒ ܫ ܒ ܫ ܟ ܒ ܫ ܟ ܥ

222

ܟ ܒ ܟ ܥ ܟܝܫ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ

223

ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ
ܟ ܫ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ

217: ܥܡ ܠܒ Ber.
220: ܒ Vat.

224

ܟܒܟ ܟܒܟ ܟܬܝܐ ܡܠܚܡ ܟܝܗܩܐ ܠܥܡ
ܠܟܘܒܒܥ ܒܒܘ ܟܫܟ ܟܚܠܠ ܟܐ

225

ܠܥܫܢܘ ܟܬܚܥ ܟܐܡ ܟ ܠܥܫܒܟܠ ܥܥ
ܠܥܫܢܐܥ ܟܠܟܘܒܘ ܟܫܡܥ ܟ

226

ܟܫܡ ܟܟ ܠܥܐ ܡܟܠ ܣܫ ܟܥܘ
ܠܥܐ ܥܒܘ ܠܥܐ ܠܡ ܣܫ ܢܒܘ

227

ܘܐܘܘܟܐ ܠܥܐ ܥܥܒ ܟܬܢܡ ܟܝܗܩ
ܠܥܫܒܢ ܟܡ ܟܥܘ ܠܥܡ ܘܡ ܡܟܒ

228

ܟܬܝܐ ܡܡܡ ܟܠܟܘܟ ܡ ܡܟ ܡܒܢ
ܡܟ ܡܡܡ ܟܫܟ ܘܟ ܠܥܡ ܘܟܒܫ

229

ܡ ܡ ܫܡܒ ܟܒܟ ܘܫ ܣ ܡܥܢ
ܘܟܟܘܟ ܟܒܟ ܘܟ ,ܫܘܘ ܣ

230

ܟܬܢܡ ܟܝܗܩ ܟܘܫܣܟ ܢ ܡܥܢ ܒܘܘ
ܟܫܟ ܘܫ ܡܒܘܘ ܟ ܡܘܘܡ ܟ

225: ܘܟܡ Var, Ber2, QA, Min.
227: ܘܟܡ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܡܟܠ Jer.
228: ܡܢܥ Ber.
229: ܡܥܢ Ber.
230: ܡܥܢ Ber.

231

לא כי אחסה אלוהיך ישועתי כי
אלוהי אלוהים יהוה כי לעולם אקוה

232

אלוהינו עוד ישוב לחמנו וכוסו
אלוהים את אלילים ונבזה נפשך אקוה

233

,שמוש קרו פה אלה מלכי משיח וכוסו
ועתה אלוהים מלה אלוהי ישי עם נפש

234

ישע יכי אלוהים לבו יוכיח ותפש
יחבל עזה מאחב כי יוכי שם אלו

235

אלש אחזו, ם ונוסף אבן אלוהים לעולמי
מאלוהים מלה אלוהי מי יחלו פה

236

מסגרתיה בפה ישוה לחמנו וקוסו
אלוה אחזו אלהו ויהי עם מסחרו

237

ויכו ,מואויב אלוהיך עם} לחמנו ויהי
{שמש קפנה ותבל שמחו ותלל יחמנו

231: אלוהאלהים Ber.
232: עוד Jer.
233: ישע Var, Ber2, QA, Min.
236: אנשי Vat, Ber2 | אנשי QA | אנשי Min | אלוה Vat, Ber2, Min.
233: Second line is missing from Jer and Ber | אלוה עם אור אשיהו לחמו ויהוה Jer | אלוה עם אור אשיהו לחמו ויהו Ber.

238

ⵔⵓⵙⵏⴼⵓⵎ ⵔⵉⵀⵓ ⵔⵄⵓⵎ ⵔⵍ ⵜⵊⵎⵙ ⵔⵉⵀⵓ}

{ⵜⵍ ⵎ ⵀⵅⵅⵉ ⵔⵓⵙⵙⵓⵖ ⵔⵉⵀⵓ ⵔⵍⵔ

239

{ⵔⵓⵙⵜⵊ ⵣ ⵔⵓⵖⵊⵔ ⵔⵓⵏⵀ ⵔⵇⵇⵊⵏ ⵍⵉⵙ}

ⵔⵙⵀⵙ ⵀⵅⵅⵊⵔ ⵔⵇⵉⵓⵎ ⵔⵄⵓⵄⵙⵉ ⵜⵊⵎⵙ ⵔⵓⵃⵃⵊⵔ

240

ⵔⵓⵅⵙⵉⵏⵀ ⵔⵓⵖⵊ ⵔⵜ ⵔⵓⵇⵇⵃⵙ

ⵔⵓⵇⵇⵃⵙⵉ ⵔⵓⵇⵓⵃⵙ ⵣⵓⵉ ⵍⵓⵔ ⵔⵜⵄⵓ

241

ⵔⵏⵉⵓⵊ ⵔⵍⵉ ⵔⵓⵇⵓⵃⵙ ⵜⵍ ⵜⵊⵎⵙ ⵣⵜⵉ

ⵣⵙⵅⵓⵅⵊⵉ ⵔⵓⵇⵇⵃⵙⵏ ⵔⵓⵇⵓⵃⵙ ⵛⵎⵅⵄ

242

ⵔⵏⵣⵓⵔ ⵔⵍⵣ ⵖⵊⵇⵅⵓ ⵔⵜⵜⵖ ⵙⵔ ⵛⵄⵀ

ⵍⵄⵎⵛⵉ ⵔⵃⵍⵛⵄ ⵔⵏⵉⵔⵄ ⵔⵏⵊⵓⵊ ⵒⵊⵛⵊⵓ ⵒⵎⵛⵉ

243

ⵔⵉⵀⵓⵊ ⵔⵍⵉ ⵣⵍ ⵀⵅⵔ ⵔⵍⵅⵄ ⵔⵄⵀⵅⵔ ⵄⵎ ⵔⵍⵣ

ⵍⵓ ⵣⵄ ⵖⵍⵅ ⵄⵎ ⵒⵄⵄⵒ ⵅⵅⵊⵔⵃⵏⵉⵛⵉ ⵔⵍⵖ ⵄⵎ ⵒⵄⵄⵒ

244

ⵀⵅⵔⵓⵄⵎⵄ ⵙⵛⵊⵓ ⵔⵏⵉⵓⵊ ⵔⵍⵉ ⵔⵍⵣ ⵔⵍⵔ

ⵔⵣⵙⵓⵉ ⵔⵜⵜⵖ ⵍⵖⵅⵄ ⵄⵎ ⵔⵍⵓ ⵒⵙⵔⵄ

240: ⵔⵜⵅⵊⵓ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ⵍⵓⵔ) | ⵔⵍⵓ ⵀⵅⵓⵓ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ⵔⵓⵇⵇⵃⵙⵉ).

241: ⵣⵙⵅⵓⵅⵊⵉ Ber2.

242: ⵔⵇⵇⵓ Jer | ⵔⵜⵍⵔ ⵔⵜⵙ Ber | ⵄⵎ ⵛⵓⵉ Ber.

243: ⵄⵒⵀⵅⵓ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

244: ⵄⵎ is missing from Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

245

ܟܫܡ ܟܠܗ ܠܝܫ ܒܩܥ ܟܠܐܬ ܕܟ
ܥܡܒ ܟܡܠܐ ܟܟܝܟ ܟܒܥ ܡܠܗ ܕܡ

246

ܒܣܠ ܐܕܐ ܟܠܒܬ ܒܟ ܟܒܬ
ܟܬܟ ܟܝ ܒܒܟ ܗܒܥܒ ܡܠܗ

247

ܫܠܗ ܟܫܫ ܟܫܝ ܡ ܕܝ ܠܝܫ ܐܒܝ
ܟܗܥ ܠܝܟ ܫܥ ܕܟ ܒܟ ܟܐܒ

248

ܟܫܥ ܟܗܥ ܠܝܫ ܒܟ ܡ
ܗܠܗ ܟܫܝ ܟܫ ܐܒ ܟܐ ܐܒ

249

ܐܒ ܟܗ ܡ ܟܥ ܗ ܗܠ ܟܗܥ
ܫܠܗ ܠܠ ܗ ܥ ܟ ܟ ܡ

250

ܥܟ ܗ ܟ ܒ ܠ ܐ ܒ ܟ
ܟ ܗ ܫ ܗ ܟ ܡ

245: ܟ ܠ Ber, Ber2.
247: ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟ Ber.
248: ܟ ܟ Ber.
249: ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟ Ber | ܟ Ber | ܥ Ber.
250: ܒܩ Var, Ber2, QA, Min.

251

ܟܠ ܒܝ ܕܝ ܟܬܒ ܒܗܕܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܒܠ
ܒܥܝܢܐ ܟܚܟܒܐ ܟ ܡܒܗܕ ,ܫ٥

252

ܫܥܬܐ ܠܐ ܒܝ ܠܟܬܐ ܒܝ ܒܥܡܠܟ
ܟܒܘܬܐ ܟܠܗ ܟܦܐ ܟܠܗ ܟܒܗܕ ;ܡܐ

253

ܫܠܝ ܒܗܕܐ ܟܬܒ ܒܝ ܠܐ ܒܝ
ܟܚܟܠܗ ܟܢܐ ٥ܫ ܟܟܠܒ ܫܟܒ

254

ܟܒܫܒ ܟܠ ܟܒܗܕ ;ܡ ܒܝ ܟܬܐ
ܒܥܟܢܐ ܫ ܡܗܒܐ ܟܬܫܒ ܟܬ

255

ܠܠܐ ܒܡ ܟܫ ܟܟܠ ܟܚܟܠ ܕܟ
ܠ ܒ ܒܐ ܟܒܐ ;ܡ ܒܝ ܟܐ

256

ܒܣܘ ܒ ܡܐ ܒ ܟܢ
ܟܫ ܟܒ ܟܒ ܟ

257

ܟܠ ܟ ܟ ܒ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ٥ ܟ ܟ

253: ܟܠ ܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
254: ܟ Ber | ܟܒܫܒ ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܡܗܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
256: ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ܟ)

258

ⲙⲡⲉ ϩⲟⲟⲩ· ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲥⲧⲁⲍⲉ ⲫⲓⲥⲙⲁⲓ ⲥⲁⲙ
ⲛⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣ ⲛⲁⲙⲓϣ ⲗⲁ· ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲓϫⲓⲛⲁ

259

ⲡⲓⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲱⲗ ⲙⲁⲁⲃⲁ ⲁⲣ ⲗⲓϣⲱ ⲥⲁⲙⲓϣ
ⲙⲓⲉ· ⲛⲁⲫⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲓⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲏⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ

260

ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲙⲁⲗ ⲡⲓⲏⲁⲙⲓⲉ ⲁⲣⲉ· ⲥⲁⲓ ⲥⲁⲙ
ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ ⲛⲟⲃ ⲛⲓⲙⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲙⲟⲩⲁ

261

ⲙⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲁϫ· ⲛⲱⲙ ⲛⲉⲓⲁ· ⲥⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓⲁ
ⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲩ ⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲃⲓⲗⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲁⲩⲉ ⲟⲙ ⲁⲣⲉ·

262

ϫⲓⲁϫ ⲥⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲉ· ⲗⲁⲓ ϩⲓ ⲥⲛⲁⲃⲁⲓ
ⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲃⲓϩⲁⲩ· ⲛⲓⲃⲓⲗⲓ ⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲗⲁ ⲃⲓⲉ ⲟⲙ

263

ⲛⲁⲓⲉ· ⲃⲱⲕ ⲥⲁⲓ ⲙⲓⲁⲁ ⲥⲁⲓ ⲥⲓⲁ
ⲣⲁⲁⲗ ⲛⲁ· ⲛⲓⲉ ⲏⲱⲩⲁ ⲛⲁⲉⲁ ⲛⲓⲓⲁⲁ

264

ⲛⲓⲃⲁ ⲛⲓⲙⲉ ⲥⲱⲁ ⲥⲓⲃⲁⲓⲁ ⲛⲥⲟⲩ· ⲥⲓⲁ
ⲥⲉⲁ ⲏⲁⲓⲁ ⲡⲓⲗⲁⲉ ⲉⲓⲉ ⲛⲓⲗⲓⲗⲁ ⲛⲓⲉ

258: ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲥⲧⲁⲍⲉ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
259: ⲙⲓⲙⲓⲛ Ber.
261: ⲛⲓⲃⲓⲗⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲩ ⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲩⲉ ⲟⲙ ⲁⲣⲉ· Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
262: ϫⲓⲁϫ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ϫⲓⲁ) | ⲟⲩⲛ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ⲁⲣⲉ).
264: ⲥⲓⲃⲁⲓⲁ Jer | ⲥⲓⲃⲁⲓⲁ Ber | ⲥⲓⲃⲁⲓⲁ Vat, Ber2, QA.

265

ܐܦܡ ܐܡܫܚܐ ܡܫܘܫܠ ܡܒܐ ܨܥܨ
ܡܫܘܫܠ ܡܫܒܡܟ ܐܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܒܦܐ ܫܒܐ

266

ܡܟܢܒܫܐ ܠܚܫ ܡܒܗܡ ܡܦܥܐ ܫܒ
ܡܫܢܘܐ ܡܫܦܟܬܐ ܥܒܝ ܒܚܝ

267

ܡܣܐ ܒܫܡ ܡܒܡܦ ܥܒܝ ܟܠܐ ܡܝܗܒ ܫܒ
ܡܚܟܐ ܡܚܟܐ ܥܒܝ ܢܥܒ ܥܡܢܝܐ

268

ܥܒܝ ܒܫܐ ܥܒܝ ܫܚܟ ܀ ܀ ܀
ܡܝܒܐ ܡܚܐ ܠܐ ܡܟܢܒܫܐ ܡܫܒܫ ,ܫܫ

269

ܡܫܒܫܠ ܥܡܫܦܟܬ ܡܒܐ ܥܡܥܫ
ܡܫܥܐ ܡܟܐ ܡܡܒ ܡܒܐ ܥܡܝܒܐ

270

ܥܡܝܐ ܡܫܒܐ ܠܥ ܐܦܡ ܐܫܐ ܡܫܫ
ܡܢܢܐ ܡܫܐ ܡܟܐ ܥܡܠܐ

271

ܡܝܠܫ ܥܡܢܐ ܥܡܢ
ܡܒܒ ܣܐ ܡܒܡ ܫܫܫ ܥܡܢܫ

265: ܐܡܫܚܐ Ber | ܡܝܗܒ Vat | ܡܦܥܐ ,ס Vat (marginal note).
259: ܡܫܚ Ber.
269: ܥܡܫܦܟܬ Ber | ܡܫܥܐ ܡܟ Jer.
270: ܡܫܡ ܡܟܐ Ber.
271: ܥܢܢܐ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܥܡܐ Jer.

272

ܟܟܘܣܐ ܡܙܕܪܟ ܕܫܒܚܬܐ
ܒܫ ܕܡܐ ܟܬܝܠ ܐܠ ܟܬ ܟܥܒܕ

273

ܒܚܒ ܗܘ ܟܐ ܕܫܬܬܚܒ ܥܠܝ ܝܠ ܟ
ܒܚܒ ܝܒܒ ܕܫܙܗܒ ܒܚܒܐ ,ܒܙܥܕ

274

ܣܙܒܠ ܟܚܐ ܒܙܥ ܟܫ ܟܫ ܦܝ
ܣܥܝܠܐ ܟܐ ܒܙܗܒ ܐܠ ܟܙܗܒ ܒܙ ܕܫ

275

ܒܟܥܒ ܟܫܐ ܟܚܠ ܒܡ ܡܠ
ܟܙܗܩ ܐ ܒܐܒܚ ܐ ܒ ܒܟܚܙ

276

ܣ ܒܙܒܐ ܟܠܐܒ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܒܐ
ܟܫܐ ܟܠܫ ܒ ܒܟܚ ܟ

277

ܟܙܙܩ ܟܙ ܐܒ ܥܠ ܦ
ܕܫܫܒ ܒܐܚ ܟ

278

ܕܫܐ ܟܙ ܒ ܒ ܦ ܟ
ܟܙܫ ܟ ,ܒ ܟ

272: ܕܫܒܚܬܐ Ber | ܕܫܐ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
273: ܦܝ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ܥܠܝ) | ܟܚܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ,ܒܙܥ) | ,ܒܚܐ Ber.
274: ܒܚ Ber | ܟ ܐ Ber.
275: ܐ ܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
276: ܟܫܐ ܟܙ Vat, Ber2, Min | ܟܫܐ ܟܙ QA.
277: ܐ ܠ Vat, Ber2.
278: ܕܫ ܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

279

אבראלם ישמה ראשי ראלהים
ראית את כל אשר אתה אבראבעה

280

ישתחוה ראשי ראשה ראבים ראלה
ראשי אי ראפשי יצי ראפה ראשי ראשה

281

ראשה יי אתה אלים ראשמע לי
ראלהיהפלה אבראשי בשם אין

282

ישלח את אבר אלי אהיראי בשם ראבצ
חיי ראיש אשתי חיי ושתה חיי ושתי

283

ראלי בי איר אשית היראי ראיר
בשני עין ראלהיהלי שלפי ראיש

284

אשתי חיי ראהיראית ראשי ראשם
ישראי יבי ישתחוי בי אלפי ישם

285

ראחרית אמר ישי ישם שמי ראשה אלי
אתה בי יבי שני ראשתו אמם אין ראי

279: ראשי Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | אחיתם יי ,ם Vat (marginal note).
280: ישתחוה Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
281: ראלהיהפ Jer, Ber | אבראפהפלה Min.

286

ڪنھن ڪاٽي ويو جڏھن لڳي ڀُک
ويماڻ ٻوڙائي ويو ٿلھيءَ ويو ڇڪ

287

لڳي ڪمائڻ ٿي ڪاڄ ڀڳي ڀک
ٻاٻڙھي ويمڻي ٻڌندي ٻيو ڪندي ڪنھن

288

ويسٿلاءِ ويل ٻانڊيل ڪاڻ ڀڃ ڀڃ
ڏڪاري ڪا ڏِ ٻاٻڙھي ويمڻي ويل ٻڌاڻ

289

ٻوءِ ڪڇ ويل ڏاڻي ٻھڪ ڪاڻا
ڪنڪ ڪڇڻ ڏڪڻ ڪٻڙ ڪيڪل

290

ڪيڪٽاري ڪنڊا ڏ ڏجي ڀڃ ڀڃ
ٻسڻ ٻل ڏ ٿس ڏڏاري ڪنڙ ڀن

291

ٿاڻيوسي ڀ ٿ ڏ ٻڻڏاڻي ڪڀ ٿاڪ
ڀڪڙ ڀڪڙ ٿس ڏڏاري ٿلي ڪٿ

292

ٻڀڏ ڀاڻ سڏل ڏڀ ڪڻ ڏ
ٻڀل ڀاڻ ڪاڻ ٿڻ ڪل ڀ

288: ڏڀڏاڻ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

293

ܟܠܠ ܝܚܝܥ ܫܒܬ ܒܝܟܬ ܟܐܡܬܠ ,ܡܬܐܟ ܫ
ܟܐܫܠܟ ܟܐܒܠܒܚܒ ܟܡܒܟ ܕܐ

294

ܩܦܩܟ ܩܒܥܟܟ ܟܒܗܬܩܚܒ ܟܟܝܟܠ ܡܬܐܟ ܫ
ܟܬܠܒܟܒܝ ܪܡܒܒܟܩ ܒܝ ܟܬܒܟ ܠܚ

295

ܝܚܒ ܟܐܟ ܟܬܒ ܪܠܚ ܒ ܟܦܬܐ ܐ ܫ
ܟܝܒܗܥ ܠܚܠ ܟܐܩܟܝ ܬ ܟܡܒ ܒܩ ܕ

296

ܐܒܟܒ ܗ ܬܒ ܫ ܐ ܐ ܐ

301

ⵔⵉⵎⵉ ⵜⵉⵙⵉ ⵔⵙⵉⵜ ⵅⵉ ⵔⵏⵜⵜⵅⵏ
ⵔⵜⵅⵜⵅ ⵔⵀⵍⵍⵅ ⵔⵀⵙⵙ ⵔⵜⵜⵔⵔ ⵔⵜⵀⵔⵏ ⵔⵎⵍⵎ

302

ⵔⵅⵍⵅⵅ ⵔⵜⵔ ⵜⵅⵅⵜ ⵔⵔⵔ ⵅⵉ ⵔⵏⵜⵏⵜⵀⵜⵜ
ⵔⵍⵎ ⵎⵀⵜⵏ ⵔⵀⵜⵔⵍⵎⵅⵅ ⵔⵏⵔⵔⵀⵜⵜ ⵎⵏⵏ

303

ⵔⵉⵎⵉ ⵔⵏⵜⵜ ⵜⵅⵅⵜ ⵔⵔⵜⵜⵏ ⵔⵏⵔ ⵜⵍⵅⵔⵎ
ⵒⵔⵔⵅⵜ ⵔⵎⵍⵎⵏ ⵔⵏⵜⵏⵜⵀⵜⵜ ⵔⵜⵅⵜ ⵔⵔⵔⵔ

304

ⵎⵍⵏ ⵔⵎⵍⵎⵏ ⵔⵜⵔⵜⵜ ⵜⵔⵔⵔ ⵔⵔⵔⵔ ⵏⵜⵜⵀ ⵔⵎ
ⵜⵜⵔⵔⵜ ⵔⵜⵎⵏ ⵔⵍⵜⵅⵅⵔⵔⵜ ⵔⵔⵔⵔⵜⵜⵏ

305

ⵔⵜⵜⵔⵔⵜ ⵔⵏⵏⵔ ⵎⵅⵜⵔⵔⵅⵅⵜⵜ ⵎⵅⵅⵅⵅ
ⵔⵎⵔⵔⵏⵜⵎⵜⵜ,ⵎⵔⵔⵜⵜⵅⵅⵅ ⵔⵅⵅⵎⵅ ⵔⵅⵅⵜⵔⵜ

306

ⵔⵎⵔⵔⵜⵜⵜⵜ ⵔⵅⵅⵜ ⵚⵜⵏⵏⵜⵅⵅ ⵎⵅⵜⵔⵔⵅⵅ ⵏⵏⵏ,
ⵔⵅⵜⵜⵜⵜⵜ ⵔⵏⵏⵜⵜⵔ ⵔⵅⵅⵅ ⵔⵅⵅⵏⵜⵜ ⵔⵎⵔⵔⵜ

307

ⵔⵔⵔⵔⵜ ⵔⵏⵅⵅ ⵔⵅⵜⵏⵜⵔⵔ ⵏⵔⵔⵜ ⵔⵏⵜⵜ
ⵔⵅⵅⵔⵔⵜⵅⵅ ,ⵜⵜ ⵏⵏⵔ ⵜⵅ ⵔⵏⵏⵜ ⵔⵜⵜⵔⵔ ⵔⵅⵅⵅ

301: ⵒⵜⵜⵔ Vat, Min | ⵒⵜⵜⵔ QA.
302: ⵔⵅⵍⵅⵅ Ber | ⵔⵅⵍⵅⵅ Ber2 | ⵔⵅⵍⵅⵅ Vat, QA | Min: ⵔⵅⵍⵅⵅ | ⵏⵔⵔ Ber | ⵔⵏⵜⵏⵜ Min.
303: ⵔⵜⵔ Ber.
304: ⵔⵔⵔ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
306: ,ⵜⵔⵔⵅⵜⵜⵜⵜⵜ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
307: ⵔⵏⵜⵜ Ber2, QA, Min.

308

ܒܒܟ ܟܝܫ ܟܬܪܬܥܝ ܒܘܠ ܟܫܒܟ ܟܢܟ
ܟܥܝ ܠܚܟ ܫܥܫ ܐܡ ܡܠ ܟܦܩܒܘ

309

ܟܬܪܬܥܝ ܠܟ ܡܚܡ ܟܒܠ ܟܢܩܐ ܟ
ܣܒܟܐ ܒܒܟ ܟܠܝ ܫܒ ܟܠܟ ܡܟܘܐ

310

ܟܒ ܐܟܒ ܟܒܒܩ ܠܟܟ ܠܡ
ܟ ܐܟ ܠܡ ܟܐ ܠܡ ܟܟ ܠܡ

311

ܟܢܘܟܒ ܟܒܣ ܠܟ ܟܚ ܠܡ
ܡܠ ܟܠܟ ܟܒܘܐ ܟܟ ܠܡ

312

ܟܚ ܟܐ ܐܡ ܠܟ ܟܫ ܒܘ
ܡܒܫܒ ܟܠܟ ܟ ܟܒܒ ܟܒܒܐ

313

ܟܩ ܒܘ ܒܫܒ ܡܡ ܐܒܟܒ ܡ
ܟ ܒܟ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ

314

ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ
ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ

315

ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ
ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ ܒ ܟ

308: ܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟ Ber | ܡ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
309: ܟ Jer, Ber.
310: ܟ Jer, Ber (instead of) | ܟ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

316

ולפֿוּ וּיִהְיוּ אֶלְפֵי רִמְלָה וּמִרְיָתָיִם רִמְלָה
רִקְּחוּ רִיחֵי וּמִבְחָיו כֵּן רִהְמַלְּטוּ

317

לְעֵי תְּיָשִׁיו רִמְשְׁנִיחַ רִיחֵם תְּעוּרִם
רִיְלְוּיו רִשְׁ לְעֵי תְּיָחֵל רִאְּחְמִיּוֹ

318

לְמִתְעוּרִיו רִאְּעוּרִם לְ לְחֵם וּלְחִתְּיִי
לְעֵי ,וְמִיָּו רִיּוֹבֵל לְ וּפְּבִיּ וּלְּבִיּוּ

319

רִיֵּי תְּעִבְּבִי רִיּוֹבֵל לְ רִכְּמֵי וּמְיִיר
לְקִבְּעוּוּ תְּבִי רִאֵּי לְכֵי רִאְּעוּבְּתְּבִיּוּ

320

רִיּוּוּפִי שֵׁי לְמוּ וּיִכְּתְּיִי לְחֵם רִי רִי
וּפִּם נְעִיר רִי רִיּוּיִפִי קִי רִיִּי יִיְלְיִ

321

לְחֵל רִיְּיִתְּ רִכְּפִּם שְׁיִי רִיְּלִי רִלֵי
רִיּוּיִפִי קִי רִיִּי תְּיִיּ לְמִחְי שֵׁי

322

רִיְּלֵי תְּכֵל תְּכֵל וּמִחְי רִלֵּיִי ,נְתְּיִ יִּכְלֵי
לְמִיּוּוּ קִי לְ לְיִּיְּתְּלֵי יִי וּמִלְּוּפִ יִּמְּם

317: רִיּוּמְחְוּוּ רִיּוּתְּם כִּי Vat (marginal note).
318: לְמִתְעוּרִיו Jer | לְמִתְעוּרִיו Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
319: רִיֵּי Ber.
320: יִיְלְיִ Ber2.
321: רִיְּיִתְּ רִכְּפִּם Vat, QA, Min | לְחֵל Vat, QA, Min | קִי רִיִּי יִיְלְיִ רִיּוּיִפִי שֵׁי רִיּוּיִפִי Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (second line).
322: יִיְּמְּם Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | רִפְּלֵי קִי יִיְּיִתְּלֵי Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | לְמִחְכֵּי Ber.

323

ܟܝܡ ܚܒܪ ܠܐ ܟܠܝܬ ,ܫܘܝ ܒܗ ܟܕ ܟܝܪ
ܟܢ ܝܕܥ ܠܐ ܟܬܒ ܒܫ ܡܐܡܪ ܟܕ

324

ܟܫܘܬ ܐܠܗ ܩܕܫ {ܟܠܝܬ
{ܢܒܝܐ ܟܢ ܠܢ ܐܠܝܩ ܟܠܝ ܚܒ

325

{ܟܡܐܡܪ ܬܒ ܢܝ ܩܝܠ ܒ ܩܕܫ ܒܪܟ}
{ܟܐ ܒ ܡ ܒ ܡ ܒ ܡ

331

ھەلەف ملعبۃ بخبے کچیلاھ بے کاُبلاھ کھ
بےکےۃ، کےیۃ ھیلھبعۃ ہُ ھەحەبےک کھ

332

ملاھھےۃ وفھ ملفہ کھیلاھ لحہ کھ، وبخبے تتبکہ
ہلیھ کلسفعحہ کاُفتشفہ کےیُحہ ہُنۃ

333

وفھ ملفہ ہیلفیحہ کاُبہ ہھحۃ، وبخبےۃ، حوھ ہُنکہ
کنُبے ہُنۃ کاُھ کنحہ، ہھُحۃ، حوھ ہُنکہ

334

تتبکہ ھسُہ، کتحہ، کلسفعحہ کنُبے ہُنۃ
ےھھاللفحفہ لحہ کاُلفہ ھلھ وھ ہُنکہ کنُبخ

335

لفہ، ۃھھھکہ کنلہ کفُبحہ کھُلکہ بح
کفُبخ ہُفحہبح کےُفلحلےکہ کتُبخ حےہ

336

کنُلھضا ھا کاُبحبُ ہُم ھا ہُنۃھ کاُیہ
ھا ھلُبُبُاُےۃ کھەۃُ کھ لفہ کفُبخ ہُفحہبخ،

337

کفُبخ ہُفحہبخ بےہ کۃھ بھنُۃ سبحبۃ کۃھ کاُکۃ
کاُھلاُہ کاُبھفۃفۃ لحہ بخبےۃ ہُبخ ہُبخ

338

کاُھلاُہ کۃُا کۃھ ھفلح کسُحۃفہ کۃھ حبحل
کتتفحبۃ کاُلُبحبۃ کتەسلح ہُاُہ

331: ملعبۃ ھەلەف بخبے Var, Ber2, QA, Min | کاُبلاھ کھ Var, Ber2, QA, Min | کحہ Ber.
334: کاُتُبلفہ Ber2.
335: کحبح حےہ Ber | کےُفلح لحےہ Ber2.
336: ےُبخبُاُےۃ Vat, QA.
338: کاُلتلتفحہ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of کاُلُبحبۃ).

339

{בחיר ראיתיו עשׂית ראשׁם עמּוֹ בּרית

{שׁוֹבְרֵי עמּוֹ וּבְלִיַּעַל יֵצְאוּ בְּקִרְבֶּךָ

340

עשׂוּ רבואה וּבזוּם עמּוֹ ערכוּהָ

לְהַשְׁחִית וּמִבְחָר וּמְלֵא הָאָרֶץ

341

וּבְזוּ לֹא רָצוּי בְּחַיֵּיהֶם עמּוֹ וּיְעַשְׂתִּיהָ נִבְזֶה

אֲשֶׁר לֹא עמּוֹ לִי עמּוֹ שׁלְחוּ

342

{עמּוֹ וּמִסְפַּחְתִּיהָ רָחֵב שִׁלַּח וְזֹאת אֲחַרְתִּי

{וְשִׂיחוֹת עמּוֹ בְּנֵי וּבְזוּם וְזֹאת

343

{מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם לִי רָעָתָה בְּיַד מִי לְקָחְתִּיהָ

{חֵמָה וַיְהִי וְרִיבוּ לְבַד וְעמּוֹ לְמַלְכָּה

344

וְהַפְּלִשְׁתִּי יִהְיֶה שִׁמְךָ לְעֵינֵי וְרָעָה אֲנִי

לְמַה וְשִׂחֲקוּ בִּי אֲשֶׁר וְיָדָהּ וְשָׂמָה

345

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַעֲלֵיכֶם לִי לְמַ לְקָחְתִּיהָ

וְעמּוֹ שׁלְחוּ לְמַעֲשֵׂיהֶם וְיִקְרָא לִבּוֹ

339: ראשׁם ,ם Vat (marginal note).

341: וְיִשְׂחֲקוּ לֹא וְחֵמָה יְעַשְׂתִּיהָ יהוה Jer, Ber | לְמַעֲלֵיכֶם Jer, Ber (instead of וְשִׂחֲקוּ עמּוֹ).

344: לְמַה וְשִׂחֲקוּ בִּי מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם Jer | מִ מַעֲשֵׂה Ber | מִי מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם וְיָדָהּ וְשָׂמָה לְמַה וְשִׂחֲקוּ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

345: וְיִשְׂרָאֵל Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of וְיִקְרָא).

346

ⵔⵓⵙⵙⵓⵖ ⵔⴰⵀⵓⵎⵜ ⵅ ⵓⵖⵎ ⵀⵀⵉⵀⵓⵅⵀⵔ
ⵍⵓⵔ ⵛⵙⵜⵔ ⵔⴰⵀⵓⵔⵛⵉⵊ ⵡⵀⵡⵉⵀⵓⵅⵀ

347

ⵔⴰⵀⵙⵓⵖ ⵍⵙⵡⵀⵊⵜ ⵅ ⵀⵅⵓⵅⵓ ⵓⵉⵊⵀⵔ
ⵍⵙⵡⵙⵓⵀⵓⵛⵊ ⵔⵓⵙⵎⵍⵔ ⵔⵓⵜⵛⵜⵔⵀ ⵅⵓⵎ

348

ⵔⵛⵙⵓⵖ ⵍⵙⵡⵊⵓⵅⵓⵔ ⵍⵓⵔ ⵙⵍⵜⵔ
ⵔⵏⵔⵛ ⵔⵏⵊⵓⵎ ⵀⵍⵍⵅⵓ ⵀⵜⵊⵓⵔⵔ ⵍⵙⵏⵏⵙⵅⵓ

349

ⵍⵙⵎⵏⵓⵏⵓ ⵔⵛⵊⵓⵊ ⵔⵛⵜⵛⵍ ⵓⵖⵎ ⵓⵊⵊⵓⵅⵀ
ⵓⵊⵊⵎⵓ ⵓⵅⵀⵓ ⵔⵛⵜⵔ ⵓⵊⵀⵜⵔ ⵔⵏⵊⵓⵀⵀⵔⵛⵏⵓ

350

ⵀⵓⵔⵍⵍⵜⵊ ⵔⵏⵛⵅⵓ ⵔⵛⵜⵜⵛ ⵓⵅⵓ
ⵍⵓⵔ ⵛⵊⵅⵛⵜⵎ ⵍⵙⵀⵓⵊⵓⵀⵙⵓ ⵔⵀⵓⵓⵓⵊ

351

{ⵍⵙⵀⵓⵓⵊⵉ ⵍⵓⵔ ⵛⵊⵅⵛⵜ ⵔⵜⵓⵀⵀ ⵔⵛⵜⵅⵛⵎ}
{ⵔⵍⵍⵜⵊⵓⵏ ⵔⵓⵙⵜ ⵔⵛⵊⵅⵛ ⵔⵙⵏⵓⵖ}

352

{ⵍⵅⵓⵓ ⵓⵊⵀⵔⵜⵏ ⵔⵊⵔⵓⵊ ⵜⵅ ⵔⵀⵀⵔⵜⵛ ⵓⵖⵎ ⵓⵜⵛⵅ}
{ⵔⵊⵉⵏⵛ ⵔⵛⵙⵍⵛ ⵍⵙⵀⵓⵓⵊⵅⵓⵅⵏ ⵍⵙⵀⵓⵓⵊⵏⵀⵙ ,ⵎⵏ}

346: ⵓⵅⵊⵙⵓⵀⵔ ,ⵎ Vat (marginal note) | ⵓⵀⵊⵀⵓⵀⵔ Ber.
349: ⵔⵀⵓⵓⵊⵅ ,ⵎ Vat (marginal note).
352: ⵓⵜⵛⵍ ,ⵎ Vat (marginal note).

353

ﻛﺎﻫﺤﺨ ﺠﻦ ﺨﺤﻠﻟ ﻛﻳﺎﺘﻠﻫ ﻭﻫﻡ ﻫﺠﻱ ﻛﺎﻫﻠﻫ}

{ﻟﻤﻛﺎﺤﺨ ﺠﻦ ﻛﻬﻨﻬﺤﺨﺎ ﻣﻬﻤﻠﻤﻳ ﻫﻦ

354

{ﻫﻤﻬﻤﻬﻳ ﻛﻱ ﻟﻤﻡ ﻗﻳﻛﺎ ﺗﻛﻨﻏ ﻭﺨﺤﻫ

{ﻛﻠﻬﻭ ﻛﻬﺠﻫﻫ ﻟﻤﻛﻬﻛﺎ ﻫﻨﻫ ﻣﻫﻑ ﻛﻨﻳ

355

{ﻛﻨﻠﻴﺤﺎ ﻣﻬﻤﻓﻓﻛﻟ ﻭﻫﻡ ﻭﺨﻏﻫ ﻛﻱ

{ﻣﻠﻫ ﻳﻨﻫﻫﻳ ﻟﻤﻛﺨ ﺤﻨﻤﻫ ﻳﺨﻠﻱ ﻛﻱ ﻟﻛﺎ

356

{ﻛﺎﺤﺎ ﻳﻠﻛﻫ ﻳﺎﺨﺨ ﻳﺎ ﺨﺤﺎ ﻭﺨﻨﻤﻫ ﻛﻨﻳ

{ﻫﻫﻬﺨﻬﻳﻟ ﻛﻠﻫ ﻳﻴﻤﻫ ﻛﻨﻫﺠﻫ ﻣﺤ

357

{ﻟﻤﻛﺨ ﺠﻨﻤﻫ ﻭﺨﺤﻠﻛﺎ ﻛﻳﻨﻫﻭ ﻛﻨﻛﻫ ﻫﻨﻫﻫﻫﻳ

{ﻟﻤﻛﻬﻨﺎ ﻣﺤ ﻫﻨﻨﻫ ﻫﻠﻤﺎ ﻛﻳﻴﻤ ﻫﻬ

358

{ﻛﻠﻫﺎ ﻛﻬﻨﻳﻬﻛﻟ ﻭﻫﻡ ﻫﻨﺠﻬﻬﻳ

{ﻛﻴﺒﻫ ﻛﻴﻴﻨﻫ ﻛﻨﺎﻫﻤﻤﻛﻳ ﻛﻨﺎﻛ ﻫﻨﻨﻫ

359

{ﻫﻴﻠﻫ ﻛﻴﻴﻫ ﻣﺤ ﻛﻨﻨﻱ ﻫﻫﻑ

{ﻛﻴﻨﻫ ﻛﻳﻛﻨﻫ ﻟﻤﻠﻨﻨﻫ ﻛﻬﻨﻬﻫ ﻣﻫﻭ

360

ﻛﻠﻫ ﻛﻴﻠﻱ ﻫﻨﻨﻫ ﻛﻬﻨﺠﻨﻴﻤ

ﻟﻨﻳ ﻫﻨﻫﻭ ﻫﻨﻤﻫ ﻫﻴﻫ ,ﻣﻭﻬﻬ ﻣﻱ ﻫﺠﻫ

353: ﻛﻫﻭﻨﻴﻫ ,ﻣ Vat (marginal note) | ﻫﺠﻫﻴﻟ Min | ﻛﻬﻨﻭﻬﻨﻫ Vat.

255: ﻛﻴﻨﻫ ﻫﻨﻫﻴ ,ﻣ Vat (marginal note).

361

ܟܬܒܘܗܝ ܠܟ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܫܠܝܟ ܟܡܠܟ ܗܘ
ܢܒܝܐ ܟܠܠ ܥܡܐ ܒܝܬ ܝܗܘܕܐ ܘܡܢ ܐܝܬܐ

362

ܠ ܫܟܚ ܟܡ ܡܫܚ ܟܒܪ ܢܒܝ ܟ ܥܝ
ܒܝܪܘܫܠܡ ܡܫܠܚ ܒܟ ܫܠ ܚܙܐ ܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗ

363

ܟܠܝ ܟܝܟܚ ܥܡܬܐ ܟܐܒܘܗܝ ܟܝܐܟ ܗܒ
ܡܝܘܗ ܠܟ ܟܠܠ ܦܐܟ ܩܡ ܟ ܠܟ

364

ܡܥܡ ܟܠܚ ܟܐܟ ܐܟ ܒܝܬ ܫܠ ܟܝ ,
ܫܐܘܡ ܡܘܐܟ ܟܒܐ ܟܝ ܟܠܘ

365

ܥܐܫܒܘ ܟܝ ܟܠܟ ܟܐܘܗܒ ܗܒܟ
ܥܐ ܚܝ ܡܗܐܘܒ ܟܝ ܫܟ

366

ܟܠ ܟ ܒܟ ܟ ܟ ,
ܟ ܟ ܠܐ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܠܐ ܟ

367

ܟ ܒܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ}
{ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܒ ܟ

368

ܟ ܟ ܟ ,
{ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

362: ܡܒ Jer.

363: ܟ Jer.

365: ܡ Ber.

366: ܟ Jer (instead of ܟ) | ܟ ܟ ܠ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ Vat, Ber2, Min, QA.

368: ,ܟ Vat (marginal note).

369

{אמר כי אעמוד לי וכאיה שלי לבוש אלי}
{איאיב בב אינו איבר פפעה ליש בב ליה}

370

{אמלך ,יהוה כמך אינך איום ,אמב}
איום אאבוך אשר אוחבבל אוזם אינוך אנו

371

אוחבב בב איעבאו אאכיאם ואזם ליוהבם
לעיך איעבאר אישוחוי ואזם ליי בכ

372

אמלך ,יהוה כמה אכהב איזמל מפפוטו
אלילוהי אאוחבי אשמו אינאר אוי אכהב

373

אוים יכיבב פוינאכ אטהב נאיר בכ בארו
בינאר אוים אטהבו אינך אליהו אכי כי

374

פוינאכ נאיר אטהבל אוכם אזם לאי בכו
אתיבב דיב שי אזם לאי אוים בזיכיבב

375

אחילבי בב פוסעל אכהב פיב יכי אכ
ועוחבוה בב לי פיבבו אאוכיל אאוחבאכ

376

אלב שלוי עעיך אטבבו אאוחבאכ ,שי
אאוכבחבוי אוזם אאוחבי יכשו אכהבי

370: אוי אלו Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
371: שוחוחו Jer.
372: אטאר אוי Jer | אלילוי Ber.
374: דוי Ber.

377

ܟܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܠܟܠ ܕܡܐܒܝܢ ܒܗ ܠܟ
ܒܐܪܥܐ ܗܘܝ ܟܬܝܒ ܟܬܒܐ ܐܪܟܐ

378

ܡܐܢܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܫܘܝ ,ܫܘܝܪܟ ܟܬܒ
ܐܒܐ ܟܬ ܒܘܫܟ ܟܝܦ ܟܫܘ ܟܬܘܢ ܟܝܐ

379

ܟܒܘܫ ܘܘܡ ܝܟ ܐܝܟ ܟܫܘܟ ܒܘܒܘ
ܫܐܠ ,ܝܟܐ ܒܝܢ ܟܫܠ ܝܟܘ ܟܝܫܘܬ

380

ܟܝܟܠ ܠܟ ܟܬܒ ܟܝ ܠܟܝ ܒܘܟ
ܟܬܐ ܕܡܠܟ ܡܒܘܟܒ ܠܟ ܟܢܘ ܠܟ

381

ܟܬܐ ܕܡܠܟ ܕܫܒܟܒ ܒܘܒ ܟܢܒܘ ܠܟ
ܟܒ ܫ ܟ ܟܒܡܒ ܫ ܟܐܒܒ

382

ܕܫܒܟܒ ܠܟ ܒܒ ܘܘܠ ܠܟ ܒ ܒ
ܘܟ ܘܒ ܟ ܘ ܡܒܠ ܟ

383

ܟܫܘ ܠܟ ܠܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܘ ܘ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

384

ܟ ,ܒ ܟ ,ܘ ܟ ܟ
ܕ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

381: ܟܐܢܬܐ Ber, Vat, Ber2, QA.
384: ܟܐ Jer & Ber | ܟܝ Vat & QA.

385

ܟܝܡܐ ܒܫܡܐ ܠܥܠܡ ܥܠܡܝܢ ܟܝܢ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܠܟ ܐܠܗܝ
ܨܗܝܘܢ ܘܟܠ ܟܠܒܐ ܫܠܝܐ ܟܠܒܐ ܫܠܝܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܚܝܠ

386

ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܪܟ ܟܝܡܐ ܠܡܫܠ ܟܫܠ ܐܝܟ
ܟܠܒܐ ܕܟ ܠܐ ܢܫܒܩ ܠܥܠܡ ܘܥܕ ;ܐ

387

ܟܝܡܐ ܡܝܬ ܟܝܒ ܟܝܡܐ ܒܪܟ ܟܝ ܢ
ܟܝܡܐ ܒܪܟ ܡܐ ܕܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܐ ܗܘ ܟܠ

388

ܟܬܝ ܟܠܐ ܟܢܒ ܟܝܡܐ ܟܫܠ ܟܝ ܒ
ܟܐ ܟܝܒ ܐ ܕܐ ܒ ܡܒܪܟ ܟܝ ܒ ܚ

389

ܫ ܟܬ ܟܝ ܟܝܡܐ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܐ ܟ ܐ ܟ
ܠ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

390

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ;ܐ

391

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ,ܐ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

392

ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ
ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ ܟ

385: ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܟܠܒܐ QA (omitting ܐ).
386: ܟܠܒܗܠܚ Jer.
387: second line is missing from Jer.
389: ܟܬܝ ܒܝ ܒܐ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
390: ܒܪܟܐ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟܘܐ Jer.
292: ܕܡܒܗ Ber, QA.

393

ܟܬܒܝ ܠܒܣܡ ܟܝܡܣ ܟܩܡ ܟܚܙ ܕܡ ܒܝ
ܟܢܢܟ ܟܝܡܣܐ ܟܠܠ ܟܬܒܝ ܟܢܚܐ ܒܥ

394

ܦܣܩܘ ܦܥܐ ܟܝܟ ܟܬܪ ܪܝ ܦܥܐ
ܟܝܙܚ ܟܐ ܥܒܝ ܥܒܡ ܥܫܢܚ

395

ܝܟܒܚܒ ܟ ܒܚܣܡ ܟܢܢܟ ܟܝܚܐ ܟܠܠ
ܥܒܝܟܝ ܒܐ ܕܥܐ ܒܢܢܟ ܠܐ ܟܢܚ ܒܝ

396

ܟܢܢܟ ܕܥ ܟܠܠ ,ܡܐܒܟ ܣܠܐܚ ܒܥ
ܥܡܒܚܫܝ ܟܒܚܢܚ ܠܟܒ ܝܟ ܟܐ

397

ܟܝܦܣܝ ܐܟ ܟܝܡܚ ܣܒܣ ܟܝܚܣ ܕܡ
ܚܣܝܒ ܟܬ ܟܚ ܒܚܒ ܒ ܣܒܡ ܒܐ ܐܡ

398

ܝܡܝ ܟܡ ܟܝܡܚ ܣܒܡ ܟܝܦܣܝ ܐ
ܟܬܒ ܒ ܒܒ ܣܒܟ ܟܒ ܟܢܝܟ ܡܣ ܒܝ

399

ܝܟܟ ܣܒܣ ,ܩܡ ܒܠܒܝ ܟܢܚ ܟܬܒ
ܚܣܝܒ ܟܬ ,ܩܡ ܡܣ ܟܝܡܚ ܟܚܣܬ ܒܝܐ

394: ܥܫܢܚ Ber.

395: ܒܚܣܡ Jer.

396: ܟܝܡܚ Jer & Ber (instead of ܟܠܠ).

298: ܝܟܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ܟܬܒ).

299: ܒܠܒܝ Jer | ܣܒܣ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.

400

ⵎⵍⵍⵉⵜ ⵔⵜⵜ ⵅⵎⵎⵉⵅ ⵔⵙⵙⵉ ⵔⵖⵎ ⵜⵜⵎⵎⵜ ⵅⵉⵏ

ⵔⵉⵎⵏ ⵙⵓⵏ ⵔⵜⵜⵉ ⵛⵜⵛⵜ ⵔⵉⵖⵢ ⵃⵜⵉ ⵣⵎ

401

ⵔⵇⵉⵛⵜ ⵙⵏ ⵔⵜⵜ ⵜⵛⵙⵜ ⵔⵏⵓⵎⵖⵖ ⵃⵎ

ⵔⵜⵉⵎ ⵔⵉⵎⵏⵍ ⵎⵜⵛⵜ ⵃⵜⵉ ⵄⵎ ⵔⵎⵛⵜ ⵅⵜⵛⵔⵄ

402

ⵔⵅⵜⵔ ⵜⵔ ⵃⵖⵛⵎ ⵔⵉⵎⵏⵄ ⵔⵜⵅⵜⵔ ⵔⵜⵛ

ⵍⵄⵉⵔ ⵔⵖⵎ ⵎⵖⵎ ⵔⵛⵢⵜ ,ⵃⵛⵉⵔ ⵍⵎⵔⵅⵛⵜ ⵄⵎⵄ

403

ⵍⵎⵔⵅⵛⵜ ⵄⵎ ⵔⵖⵎ ⵔⵛⵢⵜ ⵔⵎⵛ ⵔⵜⵛ ⵄⵖⵎ ⵄⵅⵎ

ⵔⵅⵜⵔ ⵃⵎ ⵔⵉⵎⵏ ⵃⵖⵛⵎ ⵔⵜⵍⵜ ⵔⵎⵜⵎⵎ

404

ⵔⵉⵎⵎⵔⵉ ⵄⵍ ⵙⵏ ⵍⵛⵄ ⵔⵉⵎⵏ ⵎⵅⵍⵃⵏⵉⵜ ⵔⵎⵛⵔ

ⵔⵜⵜⵏ ⵢⵏ ⵄⵍ ⵔⵏⵜ ⵔⵃⵣⵄ ⵙⵏ ⵍⵛⵄ ⵎⵅⵍⵃⵏⵉ

405

ⵔⵢⵉⵥ ⵍⵜⵎⵎⵎ ⵔⵉⵎⵎⵔⵉ ⵙⵏ ⵍⵜⵛⵎ ⵜⵔⵔ

ⵍⵛⵓⵃⵜⵎ ⵔⵍⵄ ⵔⵅⵄⵖⵜⵖⵎⵄ ⵔⵅⵖⵎⵎⵅⵓⵄ

406

ⵃⵜⵔ ⵙⵎⵜ ⵔⵉⵎⵏⵄ ⵔⵜⵜⵉ ⵍⵜⵎⵎ ⵃⵖⵛⵎ

ⵅⵓⵅⵔ ⵍⵣ ⵔⵏⵎⵛ ⵔⵍⵎⵉ ⵎⵖⵉⵄ ⵍⵜⵔ

400: ⵎⵍⵍⵉ ⵔⵜⵜ ⵄⵎⵎⵉⵅ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ⵄⵎⵎⵉⵅ ⵔⵜⵜ ⵎⵍⵍⵉⵜ Ber.

401: ⵎⵜⵛⵛ Ber.

402: ⵔⵅⵓⵅⵔ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ,ⵃⵅⵔ).

403: ⵔⵉⵎⵏⵄ ⵃⵖⵛⵎ Ber | ⵔⵉⵎⵏⵄ ⵃⵖⵛⵎⵄ Vat, Ber2, Min | ⵔⵉⵎⵏ ⵃⵖⵛⵎⵄ QA.

406: ⵣⵎ ⵎⵜ Ber.

407

ܡܫܟܚ ܠܐ ܟܝܦ ܟܩܡܐ ܟܬܒ ܟܩܡ
ܟܡܐ ܠܒܘܠ ܟܡܫܟܚ ܒܝܥ ܟܠܠ ܒܝܥ

408

ܬܡܗܐ ܚܝܩ ܟܠܘܒܐ ܫܟ ܠܒܫ ܟܬܒ
ܐܡ ܒܟ ܒܘܩ ܐܡ ܚܫܘܒ ܩܪ ܚܨܠܚ ܥܠܡ

409

ܟܡܘܬ ܩܪ ܟܓ ܐܩܡ ܟܠܠ ܟܬܒ
ܫ ܟܬܒܚ ܫܝܒ ܐܩܡ ܟܡܫܟ ܩܪ

410

ܟܢܒܚ ܟܓ ܟܡܫܟ ܟܝܦ ܒܘܟ
ܫ ܠܡܒܚ ܟܡܐ ܫܝܒ ܒܘܩ ܟܠܠ

411

ܒܒܟ ܟܢ ܟܡܠ ܫܒܩ ܟܒܪ ܟܡܐ
ܟܡܪ ܐܡ ܟܒܘܩ ܠܡ ܒܒ ܫܩ ܟܢ

412

ܫܚ ܒܐ ܚ ,ܫܐܚܟ ܫ ܚ ܟܡܐ ܒܟ ܩܪ
,ܫܟܒܪ ܒܟ ܟ ܐܡ ܫ ܩܝܪ ܟܒܪ ܟܚܐ

413

ܫܠ ܩ ܟܢ ܟܒܫ ܟܡܐ ,ܫܟܒܪ ܒܟ ܟ
ܒܒܟ ܟܡ ܐܡ ܟܒܪ ܠ ,ܫܟܒܪ ܒܟ ܡܐ

414

ܟܒܪ ܟܡܐ ܟܡܪ ܟܒܘ ܒܟ ܐܟ
ܟܐܪ ܒ ܟܒܫ ܟܡܐ ,ܫܟܒܪ ܟܚ ܟܟ

409: ܟܬ Ber.
410: ܟܬ Ber | ܫ ܟܬܒ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
411: ܒܒܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min | ܟܢܒܚ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
412: ܒ ܚ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min (instead of ܚ ܐܡ) | ܫ ܒܟ Vat, Ber2, QA, Min.
413: ܒܒ ܟܡ Jer.
414: ܟܡ ܟܡ ܒ ܟ ܟ ܐ Ber.

415

ﻗﺠﺘﻞ ﻛﻠﺘﺤ ﺩﻫﺩﻛﺩ ﺳﺒﻔﺩ ﺩﺒﺠﻫﺩ ﺳﻗﻘﻬﻴﻛ
ﺗﻬﻴﺦ ﻣﻴﺤﻫ ﻗﺠﺤﻤﻘﺤﻠﻔ ﻛﻗﻘﻬﻫ ﻟﺦ

416

ﻛﺃﺴﻞ ﻛﻫﻴﻛﺩ ﻣﺠﻴﻌﻔ ﻫﻤﻘﻔﺩ ﻣﻞ ﺩﺩﻫﺠﻤﻔ ﻫﺒﻫﺦ
ﻣﺴﺒﻫﻌ ﻫﻔﺤﺒﻔ ﻛﺸﻫ ﻟﺦ ﻛﺠﻞ،ﻣﻩﻤﻘﻘﻬﺒﻔ

417

ﻛﺃﻣﻩﺩ ﺒﻘﻴﻥ ﻗﺠﻠﺤ ﺳﺒﻔﻌ ﻛﺒﻛﻠﻔ ﻣﻔ
ﻛﻫﻔﻬﻘﻌﺴﻔ ﻛﻫﻴﺦ ﻛﻴﺤﺩ ،ﻣﻩﻤﻔﻔﻫﻔ ﺩﻴﻞﺩ

418

ﻗﺠﺘﻞ ﻛﻠﻤﻴ ﻛﻌﺒﺦ ﻫﻠﻫ ﻛﺠﺩ ﻟﺒﻘﻫ ﺩﻴﻣﺒﻴﻛ
ﻛﻴﺩﻫﻣﺤﻴﻛ ﻣﻴﻔ ﻟﻩﻫﻌﻔ ﻛﻫﻔﻩﻩﺒﻔﻫ

419

ﻛﺠﺩ ﻛﻴﺤﻞ ﻛﻫﻌﻫﻩ ﻫﻔﻩﻫﻔﺦ ﻣﻞ ﺩﻩﺒﺤﻫﻌﻛ
ﻛﻫﻔﻬﻌﺴﻔ ،ﻣﻩﻴﻔﻫﻔ ﻔﺦ ﻣﻴﻔ ﻫﻠﻘﻫ

420

ﻣﻫﻔﻫﻴﻘﻔﻞ ﻗﺠﻠﻔﺩ ﻛﺒﻴ ﻣﻞ ﻟﻌﻫﻔﻫ ﻛﺠﻩ
ﻣﻫﻴﻤﻴﻞ ﻫﻫ ﻗﺠﻠﻴﻔ ﻛﺠﻩ ﻗﺤﻠﺤ ﻛﻘﻛﻴﻩ

421

،ﻣﻩﻴﻔﻫﻘﻔ ﺩﻴﻞ ﻛﻫﻔﻬﻘﻔﻫ ﻛﻘﻬﺴ ﻛﻴﻛ
ﻗﺤﻠﺤ ﻛﻘﻤﻴﻩ ﻛﻤﻴ ﻛﻠﻬﻔﺩ ﻣﻞ ﻫﻘﻘﻔﻫﻴﻩ

422

ﻛﻘﻘﻴ ﻫﻔ ﻣﻠﻔ ﻛﻤﻠﻴﻥ ﻟﺤ ﺗﻬﻛ ﻴﻞ
ﻫﻘﻴﻫﻌ ﻫﻴﻘﻔﺩﻩ ﻫﻘﻘﻴﻔ ﻫﻴﻘﻔﻩ ﻫﻫﻔﻘ ﻴﻞﻔﻩ

417: ﺩﻴﻞﻩ QA.
418: ﺩﻴﻣﻔﺩﻴﻛ Ber | ﺩﻴﻫﻔﺩﻴﻛ Vat, Ber2.
419: ﻫﻤﻞﻔ Ber | ﻫﻠﻔ Ber2, QA, Min.
422: ﻫﻫﻘﻴﻠ Vat.

423

ڕەنج هەڵگرن بۆ ئەوەی ئاسۆ هەبێ
ئەگەر بەرگەی بێهیوایی ڕابگرێ

424

ئێمە لە هێڵەکانی ژیانماندا
بەدوای ئاسۆدا دەگەڕێین

425

ئاسۆیەک هەیە تێیدا هەموو
ڕەنگەکان یەک دەگرنەوە

Chapter VI

English Translation

Now, the third *mēmrā* of the *Hexaemeron* and on the creation of the angels and the light of the first day

1 The hidden will was perfect in essence and in goodness

His love made [it] gush forth like a deluge and created the world.

2 He wisely revealed his hiddenness through his creatures

Even though he did not alter his state from his hiddenness.

3 His creation became like a mirror and signified that He existed

And [also signified] the power of His Being and His might and His wisdom

4 He made the rational beings partaker of the essence and the existence

So that they would prudently become divine

5 The whole aim He put in the construction of the world

Was the deification of all the rational beings that his love had created

6 The world is entirely in the rank of a teaching place

That his *remzā* wisely made for the rational beings

7 He was not willing to bestow the perfection of the essence at the very beginning of the time

Instead, He waited for the new form that His love would prepare

8 From the beginning, He nourished the infants with the milk of mysteries

[Since] He desired that all the rational beings grow up during a course of progress

9 He did not want the goodness of his love to be blasphemed

And the good cause to turn into the bad cause

10 But [He wanted rational beings] to attain persuasion about His Being

and also [about] the truth of the great power of His divinity

11 He was able to grant them wisdom without instruction

But He kept watch to the end and brought the world to perfection

12 If the good cause were blasphemed at the beginning,

On that account, the inclination of the reason would grow wild

13 The lofty inclination of the reason lifted up a heel

Against the Maker, and did not yield to be subjected

14 And although they were subject to variation,

They did not desist from their will to go on the wayward path

15 They acted boldly and fell from [the rank of] the spiritual ones and from the assemblies,

And they never yielded to their Lord's yoke

16 But in case you would say that He was yet able

To make them not fail at all and bring them to perfection

17 Your objection withdraws nature from its essence[211]

And [means that] the rational beings are led by force like irrational ones

18 This is the beauty of the fair likeness of reason

That it should examine and choose according to its will without force

19 And again, it is its beauty that brings its own abilities

to the good end, which He piled up[212] and placed in its nature

20 Freedom is the fruit of reason,

Of the essence, which the hidden *remzā* granted to rational beings

21 The power that examines and chooses and rejects

Is reason, the lord of treasures

22 The fair beauty of reason might have perished

And the divine likeness might have been tarnished

23 So, through freedom, the Lord of Goodness entrusted

The keys of goodness to the discernment of reason

[211] Vat, Ber2, QA, and Min read ܡܢ ܚܪܝܬܘܬܗ, "from its freedom." This reading, however, may represent a simplified interpretation of ܡܢ ܟܝܢܘܬܗ "from its essence," as attested in Jer and Ber. The explanation for the latter reading could be: rational beings are essentially free and cannot be led by force. Thus, this statement (verse 16) negates the essential characteristic of their nature, i.e., freedom.

[212] Jer's reading, ܐܬܩܢ, stands out from the other manuscripts that read ܒܢܐ and ܐܬܒܢܐ. Although Jer's ܐܬܩܢ (He constituted, created) sounds to be the more difficult reading and would make sense in the context of the verse, it should be ignored because the same phrase, ܒܢܐ ܫܡܪ, later in verse 150, where all manuscripts, including Jer, read the same.

24 He would not at all imprison freedom by force

Because its imprisonment would destroy[213] its essence

25 If there is someone who now says "I am tongue-tied,"

This is the word in his mouth that he is confessing!

26 Likewise, when the freedom of reason

Is compelled, it is not indeed "freedom" any more

27 So then, beautiful and fair and becoming and just and praiseworthy

Is the whole arrangement of the creation of the God of all

28 [Now] let the word come to to the fair arrangement of the creation

And glorify and give thanks and extol the Being, the Lord of creation!

29 Come, see, and say "Behold, He is also [the Lord] of spiritual beings!"

And extol the power who wisely created them

30 After He created the paternal natures[214] in silence

He sealed it with the creation of spiritual beings

31 The seal of the silence is the creation of spiritual beings

[At the same time] the creation of heavenly beings is also a beginning

[213] In this context, the verb ܫܪܐ means "to destroy, to annul." However, as the verb also means "to untie bonds, to set free," a word play must have been intended in its occurrence beside ܫܪܝܪܐ and ܫܒܝܩܐ.

[214] By "paternal natures" (ܟܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܐ) the poet refers to the seven entities that were created on the first day, before the creation of light. See verses 44-45.

32 The beginning of sound was the creation of the diffuse light

And the fulfillment of the creation of sound [was] Adam, the sum of the world![215]

33 Just as He sealed the creation of silence, that is genesis of the watchers,

In the same way, the ranks then sealed the creation of the fair sounds (?)

34 And He wished to make known that He had created the world because of rational beings

And they were signs and seals of all creatures

35 The whole world, together with its benefits [was created] because of them

And when all the works were fully fulfilled, He brought them (i.e. rational beings) [into being]

36 He did not create them while they were in want of something

But indeed [he created them only] when the works that they needed were complete

37 So, He did not create with sound before rational beings were brought into existence

For there was no one at all to heed or hear the voice

38 And then after rational beings, who are able to hear and comprehend, came into existence

The hidden *remzā* spoke audibly in whatever He created

[215] The phrase "the sum of the world" (ܟܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܣܟܘܡ) here likely expresses the same notion as the phrase "the bond of the world" (ܟܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܩܛܝܪ). See pp. 41-42.

39 Whatever He created [was] because of rational beings and for their benefits

And because of them, He spoke audibly so that he would make them understand

40 He made them understand that there was a creator and fashioner

And whatever He wishes is easy for His instantaneous power

41 And when He finished the foundation of the incorporeal world

He provided the spiritual beings with the creation of the light

42 He created both the incorporeal and the corporeal world

And he laid the foundations of incorporeal and corporeal beings

43 And He arranged the incorporeal world in the corporeal one

And placed them in the edifice of the world one after another

44 First of all the heaven, and ether, and fire, and air and water

And the solid earth above the waters as it is written

45 And then he began to create the spiritual natures

Order by order, in their legions and their lines

46 He did not make spiritual beings from matter and material

But He indeed brought them into existence from nothing

47 As soon as He wished, He spoke, and suddenly they came into existence

And swiftly they came to perfection of their natures

48 Whatever the divine power wishes is easy

And as soon as He wishes, there is no delay for what He wishes

49 For what He wishes, He does not seek a convenient time

He even made the time convenient as He wishes

50 He seeks neither material nor matter for manufacture

And all matters and their materials are made by Him

51 So, the key to the existence of all is His will

For when He wishes, behold the existence and the constitution!

52 His will blew and suddenly brought forth the glorious natures

The phalanxes and the lines of spiritual beings in the blink of an eye

53 His *remzā* flew, His commandment moved, His will blew

And all of a sudden, rational natures sprouted by themselves

54 Nine orders swiftly came into being all at once

Nine spiritual and rational essences

55 Three triad ranks appeared in the blink of an eye

Standing in ranks in their spiritual and invisible posts

56 Nine splendid essences with magnificent splendors

Through transformations, intangible substances

57 Nine settlements, in circumference like a camp

The Lord brought into existence the joyous persons with splendors and brightnesses

58 Circles sprouted by the hidden power, and the world was enriched

Rational and intelligible substances, clothed in light

59 A nature resembling the fire burning in glory

As if they were formed and composed of the nature of flame

60 A nature shining luminously like blaze

With a spiritual fire which cannot be perceived

61 They are substances of fire in great adornment

And their garments and cloaks are flame

62 For each one of them [there are] wings of fiery feathers

[Made] of flame, cleverly distinct in form

63 Each one of them has an essence of spiritual fire

And feathers and flying wings, [made] of astonishing fire

64 Wings with wheels and axles that revolve spiritually

And the end of each one attains its nature, all of it with all of it (?)[216]

65 Their fire is not similar to the one we are familiar with

And cannot even be perceived by those belonging to the earth

66 It is not even a fire which requires material for nourishment

And it neither ceases nor is seen by bodily eyes

[216] Ez 10:9-10

67 [They are] not rational beings who gain wisdom through learning in parts

[They gain wisdom] but not part by part and stage by stage

68 Indeed, they are not in need of eyes to see

Nor ears to hear voices, like corporeal beings

69 They neither smell nor touch nor taste

But rather they perceive without senses through hidden motions

70 And they are not composite natures, but simple

And unlike corporeal beings, they are not divided into parts

71 They are not even composed of substances

Like the man who is by nature from flesh and soul

72 So, they do not grow and sprout through nourishment

Nor do they rest and are thus restored out of necessity

73 And they do not labor and then rest in slumber and sleep

Neither do they get cold and then get hot through change

74 They do not need at all the earth to carry them

And [they do not need] the air to breathe it like an ensouled being[217]

75 They do not increase, decrease, or change

Nor do they multiply through intercourse and procreation

76 There are indeed no males or females among them

And no intercourse and bodily partnership

77 They do not need earthly clothing

As all of them put on honor and glory, a beautiful adornment!

78 [They have] natures perfect in whatever is needed for sustenance

As they do not take anything from the outside for sustenance

[217] The word ܒܥܕܟܝ was not found in Syriac dictionaries, and might be a hapax. The word is derived from ܥܕܐ, meaning "breath." The translation above is based on the assumption that ܒܥܕܟܝ is an adverbial form, based on ܥܕܟܝ, which could mean "the one who breathes, ensouled being."

79 They never die in that they are not indeed alive in [the animal] soul

Whatever is prone to change will be left with a lifeless body (?)

80 They are not composite beings that suffer death when they are dissolved

{……..}

81 For the life of watchers is constant of motion

And the one whose motion is constant, the motion of his life never ceases

82 The life of corporeal beings ceases with the departure of the [animal] soul

But the motion of the life of the rational soul never comes to an end

83 The rational soul is akin to spiritual beings

The motion of its life is constant and its motion never comes to an end

84 Likewise, the life of spiritual being does not come to an end

But rather, they live eternally and constantly

85 This is why they are never dissolved and do not change

And they do not need procreation as corporeal beings do

86 Bodily beings are generated through intercourse

In that they indeed depart and they sprout and they die

87 The nature of all animate beings is like a tree

That sprouts leaves and lets them fall, even if it produces growth by means of intercourse

88 They sprout through marriage and grow and die

And thus, in the like manner, the rest of them are just like trees

89 The nature of spiritual beings is perfect and complete in quantity

It never brings forth, nor does it die, nor does it grow old

90 The one whose nature is without diminishment is guarded by might

And youth and old age do not cleave to it

91 And there is no excess in quantity through number

Since the number of their substances is also perfect

92 There are nine orders that when divided by number

In each order there are twelve legions[218]

93 In each legion, there of thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads[219]

Spiritual and intellectual powers

[218] Matt 26:53
[219] Dan 7:10

94 When the prophet in his book mentioned “thousand of thousands

And myriad of myriads,” he arrived at the end of all numbers

95 There is no number at all which is higher

Than this “thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads”

96 Those whom he had seen in that moment in front of the Majesty

The prophet limited [them] by the number which was mentioned

97 It was not that the prophet, by [mentioning] “thousand of thousands,” here

limited the substances of all spiritual beings

98 There is no word limiting the number of the watchers

Since there is only one who knows their end: the God of all

99 Come with me and hear [about] the camps of those I mentioned

That there is no limit that counts the number of the watchers

100 Listen to what the great prophet Moses said

within his canticle[220] according to the Hebrew Book

[220] Syr. ܫܒܚܬܐ, meaning “canticle” or “song.” The title “Song of Moses” has been traditionally ascribed to Deut 32:1-43.

101 "The Lord set the boundary of all nations

That is the number of His angels," Moses handed down[221]

102 One order of the angels, one from nine,

[Is] like the number of all the nations that were and are

103 This way *Theoforoi*,[222] the lords of mysteries,

wisely interpreted the word of the prophecy

104 When the number of people is reduced to a single order

The course of the human offspring inside the world is finished

105 With your mind, see how many people were in the world

And how many will come thence, and marvel and praise

106 See how many people are in your own generation

And estimate the people of the generations that have gone and also those who will come

107 This word[223] concerning the number of watchers is quite confusing:

One from the [nine] orders is like all human beings who were and are [in the world]!

[221] Deut 32:8
[222] See p. 22.
[223] "This word" (Syr. ܟܬܺܝ ܟܠܳܐ) may refer to either the quotation from Deut 32:8 or the entire ongoing argument.

108 Now interpret the beautiful purpose of the God of all

Who wisely created rational beings [in] nine orders

109 Rational beings, who belong in spirit and those who are of body, are altogether in ten orders

The orders of the angels and one [order] of the Adamic nature

110 It also beautifully corresponds to this word

And the number of men is like the number of one of the orders

111 It was not proper that one number was lacking

But the substances of each substance are in the same number

112 In the same number are the substances of each order,

Of those who are incorporeal and those who are corporeal, without diminishment

113 Among all numbers, there is no number above ten

As every number surrounds ten and is contained in it

114 Thousand, therefore, is ten times hundred and likewise, also hundred

Is ten times ten that make one chain

115 And thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads are encompassed by ten

The latter is from thousands and so is the former, so they are again bonds!

116 Now make sure about the number of the ten orders

From the life-giving saying of the son of God

117 Our Lord likened the Deity to a mistress of a house

And [likened] human nature to the one missing from the ten coins[224]

118 Her ten coins [are] the ten rational orders that [the divinity] created

And the one missing from their sum [is] the human nature

119 And She[225] lit the lamp, the radiance of life in the lamp of our body

The communion that was united with the word of Father (?)

120 And with that, She found the human nature and it returned to life

And She called Her neighbors, the *ecclesiae* of watchers to rejoice in it

[224] Luk 15:8-9
[225] See pp. 22-23.

121 Thus is the *katastasis* of the number of the watchers

That the only one who knows it is the God of all through whom is their sum

122 Now let us solve the doubt about the substances

Of the assemblies on high, in a clear and thoughtful manner

123 Some say that the nature of spiritual beings is one

Others say that their natures are also like their orders[226]

124 The sorts of words that are not examined are obscure and murky

But those that go through examination are clear and openly evident

125 When you separate that exalted substance, the genus of genera,

Indeed, you divide it into the corporeal and incorporeal

126 In one [genus] is mind, and in the other [genus] is body

For all corporeal beings in each order there are three dimensions

[226] That is to say, multiple.

127 Three dimensions for each: direction, length and breadth,

They cleave to all corporeal beings because they are indivisible

128 There is no division at all in dimensions among all corporeal beings

Until you arrive at the word [that denotes the] genus

129 When you categorize the genera of all their species

You will see one [genus] of corporeal beings in many natures

130 According to essential differences, you divide

One body into multiple substances

131 And when you compare them according to the highest branch[227] between corporeal and incorporeal

[You will see that] they are united in corporality

132 Likewise is the rule concerning spiritual beings

For they are united in spirituality, in comparison with the corporeal

133 And if you see them in orders and legions

You recognize nine substances in their differences

[227] The word ܓܘܦܐ originally means "shin-bone" or "fore-arm," and by extension, "branch, lineage, division." Here ܓܘܦܐ ܕܦܠܓܐ likely refers to the highest line of division that divide all beings into two general categories of corporeal and incorporeal. Considering the literal sense of the word, a word play between ܓܘܦܐ and ܐܝܕܐ might have been intended.

134 Even if we do not know their differences

Their [differences] are known spiritually to them through their wisdom

135 They are not known to us but only through inference

Thus they are kept hidden from us in their differences

136 Therefore, according to the rule of reason, it is right

That their divisions are like the divisions of the corporeal

137 As the corporeal is divided into genera and species

In a spiritual sense, likewise are the incorporeal according to their own rule

138 There is one rule that holds the three dimensions

For all corporeal beings, even though the natures are multiple

139 In the same way, also all spirituals possess this:

In general, [there is] no difference in parts

140 And when their orders are defined through variations

They are also separated into substances according to their orders

141 Behold, also the Scripture make manifest to you their natures

That they are distinguished, to put it in one word, according to their obedience[228]

142 Adapt the insightful word that was mentioned

And [see that] the nature of spiritual beings is not altogether one

143 "He made his angels wind" said the citharist

"And his ministers a burning fire," behold, [here are multiple] natures indeed![229]

144 He wished to describe the variation of the natures of spiritual beings

Through variations between fire and air and wind

145 Fire and wind are essentially separated

Thus learn [about] the nature of watchers

146 So, for the one who is omnipotent, it is proper and there is no defect[230]

In creating spiritual beings like corporeal beings

147 Do not dispute then with the reasoning

They are spiritual natures separated in species

148 The Creator created the glorious natures in a quantity

That is not revealed to us but only to the divine *remzā*

---

[228] Syr. ܫܡܥܬܐ. The term, which literally means "hearing," is difficult to understand in this context. As the word also conveys the sense of "obedience" by extension, it might be a reference to Ps 104:4, which is quoted in verse 143.

[229] Ps 104:4

[230] Manuscripts vary in vocalization of ܚܡ. Jer and Ber have ܚܰ, Ber2, Min, and QA have ܚܶ, while Vat strangely writes ܚܺ. The reason why later manuscripts have ܚܶ might be misunderstanding of the pronouns reference. The vocalization ܚܶ interprets ܐ as a masculine pronoun in order to match ܟܠ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ: "the omnipotents that there is no defect (or lessening) in Him." However, if this were the case, it would be more natural to connect the two phrase by using ܕ instead of ܕ. The conjugation particle ܕ suggests that ܠܝܬ ܚܝ̈ܢ ܚܡ stands as its own and it not an explanation for ܟܠ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ. If we accept the vocalization of Jer and Ber, the feminine pronoun can be explained as a general reference to an omitted word. In Syriac, feminine gender sometimes has an impersonal usage, the verse can be explained in this way: "It is proper for the one who is omnipotent to create spiritual beings like corporeal beings, and there is no defect in this [statement]."

149 Suddenly, in the blink of an eye, thus they came into existence

Intelligent rational beings who are very rich in intellect

150 He piled up and put in them the intellectual power of discernment

As well as freedom, together with its offspring: will

151 Being astonished, spiritual beings gazed at each other

Not knowing how and from whom they were

152 In the middle of the air, in the land of darkness, the watchers were created

And afterwards, the power of the Creator made them priests

153 Afterwards, He made them priests and exalted them

To the spiritual lands and their churches

154 Spiritual beings marveled at their natures and their arrangement

Who was the one who had just brought them into being, and what was their story

155 They fixed their sight toward the height and saw the heaven

And toward the earth, and they saw the darkness, the waters, and the void[231]

[231] Gen 1:2

156 Then, with their reason, they may have asked their fellows

“Who are we and where did we come from?

157 What is this height above and the depth below,

And these open spaces of fire, ether, and air?

158 We were not heretofore and now we are!

What is our reason and the cause for which we came?”

159 They may have answered that “we have a cause which is hidden from us

And perhaps we do not currently understand what our cause is.”

160 It would not have been possible [for them] by any means to look at the Being

But they possessed the discernment and the knowledge through which they are set to work

161 In perplexity, the spiritual beings stood in thought,

Not knowing for what reason they existed

162 They knew that did not exist permanently

And thus they did not doubt that there was a beginning for them

163 And when the assemblies on high were astonished with wonder,

They suddenly heard a voice that said, “let there be light.”[232]

164 Spiritual beings, while they were astonished in perplexity, heard

An exalted voice, crying aloud and saying, “let there be light.”

165 The one who does not have voice, made spiritual beings hear the voice

Of “let there be light,” according to to their understanding and hearing

166 The incorporeal one made the incorporeal ones hear a voice

Although His incorporality was much more exalted than them

167 Just the way their sublimity is [more exalted] than us [to the extent] that it is not visible to us

The God of all, therefore, is much more exalted than them

168 They are all solid bodies when they are compared

With the Being, however spiritual they may be

169 Spiritual beings heard a voice, saying, “let there be light”

And they wondered and marveled and looked at one another with astonishment

[232] Gen 1:3

170 Spiritual beings heard a chant, sweeter and more glorious than everything

A new voice, before which no voice had ever been heard

171 The first born of divine voices thundered in the world

And in a great marvel, it produced fruit: beautiful light

172 It befits the divine voice, this fruit of light

Glorious and awe-inspiring for both watchers and men

173 They did hear the voice but they barely saw [anything][233]

And they began to seek the source of the voice they heard

174 Marvel grew over the initial astonishment

{……..}

175 They heard "let there be light," when there was none

And suddenly, the light shone forth in the entire air

176 Like a whirlwind, the light came all of a sudden and shone forth

And the assemblies on high were dazzled and astonished at the new sight

[233] It implies that angels heard God's voice before they saw the light.

177 A great sight, full of marvel, suddenly shone

From the utterance that they had heard unexpectedly

178 The rays entered into the eyes of spiritual beings

And the assemblies of watchers flapped their fiery wings

179 Spiritual beings clamored, with a voice full of astonishment and with eyes full of wonder

And with that word, their minds ran toward the Creator

180 The amazing voice and the amazing sight made them understand

That there was a creator both for them and for the light they saw

181 Spiritual beings wisely understood

That they had been created by the one who spoke and the light came into existence

182 Thence they reckoned "we did not exist

And the one who created the light brought us into being out of a sudden

183 He is our Creator and so, we do not exist by ourselves

The one who spoke and the light came into being with the strength of His power[234]

[234] Syr. ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܦܩܢܐ occurs in the *Peshitta* version of Eph 1:19 and 6:10.

184 There was no light, and with this voice, it came into being

In the same way, we, too, came into being by this power”

185 In the genesis of light, they also witnessed another great marvel

That the darkness suddenly fled away from its rays as soon is it shone

186 They sought the darkness and behold, with the genesis of light, it was not there anymore!

They marveled more about where it was and what happened to the darkness

187 Being astonished and marvelling, spiritual beings understood

That there was a creator and suddenly, all of them joyously shouted praises

188 Suddenly, they fluttered, while flying and unanimously crying out

And saying with marvel, “Glory to the hidden one who created the light”

189 Spiritual beings shouted praises to the Bestower of Light

A new praise before which no praise had ever been uttered

190 Watchers praised the Bestower of Light with the first-born of praises

And they proclaimed the first-fruits of praise to their Fashioner[235]

191 "Venerated be the Creator, praised be the Maker, exalted be the Being

Thanks to the hidden one who created the light out of nothing

192 Praised be our Creator, the one who just created the light

Blessed be His honor within His place that is holier than all[236]

193 Holy holy holy is the hidden one who created the light[237]

And through it He made us understand that it was He who created the light from nothing

194 Confessed be the holiness, blessed be the honor, and laudable be the *remzā*

Of the good Lord who created and fashioned us" their lines cried aloud

195 They learned that their natures were created

The assemblies on high rejoiced and exulted in the genesis of light

[235] Exod 23:19 and Deut 26:2.
[236] Ez 3:12
[237] Isa 6:3

196 Their voices spiritually became a great thunder[238]

Of virgin mouths that brought first fruits of praise to their Fashioner

197 Thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads articulate mouths

That are are not limited to a thousand of thousands, if they are multiplied

198 Spiritual beings sang spiritual chants

Divinely with their invisible harps

199 The sound of spiritual music,[239] with glorious utterances

Watchers celebrated at the great feast of the making of the world

200 The spiritual choirs praised in festive mode

a new praise, in the new world, with their *citharae*

201 Their voices became so sweet, when they shouted

Praise and confession to the Bestower of Light

202 When the light shone forth and watchers on high praised

The *remzā* suddenly brought them near priesthood

203 Watchers on high were made priests by the Holy Spirit[240]

The one who created them when they did not exist

---

[238] Cf. Ps 104:7

[239] The difficulty with this verse is that ܩܠ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܫܒܚ cannot be semantically considered the direct object of ܫܒܚ in the second line. In addition, the word ܩܕܫ either cannot be the direct object since it is attached to the preposition ܒ. Therefore, ܫܒܚ must be interpreted as an intransitive verb, meaning "they celebrated." As this interpretation leaves ܩܠ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܫܒܚ with no verb to connect with, one possibility is to understand it as a direct object of ܐܬܒ in the previous verse.

[240] These two consecutive verses, 202 & 203, show that the poet uses *remzā* and the Holy Spirit interchangeably.

204 “By the word of the Lord the heavens were made” sang the son of Jesse

“And by his spirit all orders, His powers”[241]

205 Even though it is said that the Spirit created spiritual beings,

They were created by the Son and the Father as well as the Spirit

206 One is the power and one is the nature and one is the will

And one is the creation of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit

207 So, the enquiry of the prophecy recognized for the Spirit

The creation of watchers as well as the endowments[242] of all their orders

208 The Living Spirit separated the lines of spiritual beings

And arranged them degree by degree and made them priests

209 The Spirit ordained the watchers

And made them enter the spiritual lands

210 He made spiritual beings priests and made them enter their shelters

And their lodging places and their churches

[241] Ps 33:6

[242] By the using the term ܥܬܝܕ̈ܐ (gift, endowment), the authors likely refers to the priestly offices and the holy duties that God endowed to the angels.

211 In front of the invisible altar which His *remzā* had prepared

The Spirit made them priests line by line

212 Degree by degree, He arranged them in three *ecclesiae*

And named spiritual beings after the name of their ranks

213 The Living Spirit ordained them priests in three talents

One, that of Perfection, and then, of Illumination, and of Purification

214 [He gave] the great talent of Perfection to the high orders

And after them, He gave to those in middle that of Illumination

215 Then, to the others, His excellency gave that of Purification

But they all have their identity in common

216 From them and among them, for each there is an order (?)

For the three ranks: that of Perfection and the other two

217 Yet there is a great perfection for the first order: the Thrones

Who make perfect and never receive perfection from another one

218 In the same way, they illuminate and do not receive illumination, also they are pure

And do not receive purification from watchers like the others

219 Those above possess the power of endowments of those below

But those below do not possess what belongs to those above

220 Thus, they would make perfect and illuminate and purify [everyone]

Except for those above them and not the whole

221 And those above purify and and illuminate and also make perfect

Those below, without ever giving up the endowments

222 The first order are the Thrones who are at the gate of *Shekhinah*

And from the Being, they receive theophanies

223 The Thrones do not receive the power of endowments

From creatures or through creatures, but from the Divinity

224 And the Thrones transmit the splendors hand by hand

To the last order that is close to our vicinity

225 The name of their orders was not the names of their natures

But the names of the activities of their endowments

226 The hidden *remzā* appointed them images[243] of His power

And through His power, made them priests and sanctified them

227 *Theoforoi*[244] interpreted them [as] honorable Thrones

By whom the good images of their honorer are brought (?)

228 They are honorable ones who receive splendors from the Being

And thus they confer them to the others as well

229 And they depict Him, the Glory who is is more glorious than all

The one to him alone the glory essentially belongs

230 The honorable Thrones also depict the Divinity

In that they never move toward those below

[243] Syr. ܡܨܝܬܐ. For this term, see pp. 27-28. In the following verses, this term has been translated into "image," and its verbal form, ܨܒ, has been translated into "depict."
[244] See p. 22.

231 The Divinity, who is more honorable than all, does not move

And in the same way, they, too, do not move in their stability[245]

232 Cherubim then are images of the vision

With four faces and many eyes[246] and also with the burden[247]

233 Cherubim convey God of all, the one whose seven eyes

See the entire world and everything inside it[248]

234 He investigates and sees the four corners of every place

And nothing ever surpasses His knowledge

235 Their burden is the *Shekhinah,* the chief image of the majesty of the power

The one who bears the whole world with His providence

236 Seraphim then are interpreted as fiery ones

And they depict of the great fire of the majesty of the world

237 {"The Lord is a consuming} fire,"[249] {who, in the blink of an eye,

Illuminates the righteous ones and burns the evil ones}

[245] Ez 10:11
[246] Ez 10:12-14.
[247] Ez 9:3 and 10:19.
[248] Rev 5:6
[249] Heb 12:29

238 {So, the fire was not the material fire

But the spiritual fire, higher than all}

239 {These are the three ranks of the exalted Church}

The neighbor of the Holy of holies, *Shekhinah* of the hidden one

240 The Dominions are chiefs of the second Church

They are images of that Dominion of dominions

241 To Him belongs the eternal power of dominion

And He gave the domination to the Dominions to depict Him

242 Then, also the Powers are images of the divine power

By which the heaven and the earth and everything inside them were made

243 The Being is the Power and to Him belongs the eternal power

Not the power that will come into effect [in the future]

244 But a power that is essentially present without a beginning

And is omnipotent and has shaped[250] the spiritual Powers

[250] Syr. ܢܨܒ. In the context of this verse, however, the verb cannot mean "to depict" or "to represent" as the verses above. Since here God is the subject and angels are the object, the verb likely means "to form" or "to shape."

245 Also the Authorities depict the hidden Authority

The one whose authority is [over] the heaven and the earth and everything inside them

246 He alone is the authority of authorities

And to His authority are altogether subjected both angels and men

247 The Archontes are the head of the last church below

The Archon, thence in other words, the Principality

248 In the third Church, thus the spiritual Archontes

Depict the Principality of principalities

249 The Archontes depict the Principality that does not have a principle[251]

The one that holds every principality above and below

250 And then the Archangels depict

The Greatness whose greatness is without beginning

[251] Syr. ܕܠܐ ܫܪܝܫܐ ܠܗ, meaning "that does not have a beginning."

251 There is no beginning for the hidden Greatness which is greater than all

And His greatness will not be physically degraded

252 He is divinely higher and more exalted than every measure

With a greatness that is endless and measureless

253 Through the greatness of His power, He formed the Archangels

in the entire order that is the second after that of the Angels (?)

254 They are the resemblances of that unlimited greatness

The limited watchers who signify it symbolically

255 Then the Angels are the last rank for those above

They are images of the Goodness which is higher than all

256 Through their names, they are interpreted as the messengers

The glorious images, [those] of the earthly vicinity

257 They are the rhetors for the human being and the transmitters

Of all endowments and priestly consecrations and all helps

258 To them was given the diaconate of guidance of the living ones

And the ambassadorship of all heavenly good things

259 To each of us, therefore, some of them joined

As guardians against the hidden injuries of the lower things (?)

260 They are those who are also sent to the holy ones

And through revelations, they bestow theophanies

261 They are images of the Living Son who redeemed the living ones

Who also came from the presence of His Father like an angel

262 For He, too, was named because He came to us in flesh

He is the word, that is to say, an angel of His Father's mind

263 He made them priests and arranged them into three Churches

The nine spiritual orders, the incorporeal natures

264 The height blossomed and also the heaven flourished

With thousand of thousands and myriad of myriads living rational watchers

265 With the divine hand-stretching, they were made priests

And put on the divine splendor like ephods

266 Like a priestly robe, He adorned them

With invisible ornament and with spiritual mantles

267 He made them shine with the beauty of holiness as if with oraria

And order by order, made them stand in their degrees

268 He arranged the assemblies of angels and set them in order,

Circle by circle around the invisible altar

269 Their clothing is fire and their mantles are flame

And their oraria are the delightful and invisible light

270 Their *citharae* and their endless spiritual hallelujahs[252]

Sang the glorification and the voice of thanksgiving

271 Their refrains are their divine hallowings

And their sermons on the greatness of the marvel of the Creator's power

[252] Rev 19:1-6

272 Their delicacies are *theoriai* of the Divinity

And [their] great drink is the power of revelations that shine upon them

273 At their feasts, they are never silent or satisfied

And when their hallowings grow intense, they require even more

274 In that holy house, they cry aloud to one another

—each order to its fellow— the power of the insight in its revelation

275 They are eagerly inclined to the divine obedience

And very desirous to accept all commandments

276 Then they rejoice in the power of authority by which they are yoked

And they do not cease from godly labor

277 They are constantly glad in observance of the laws

And they are not lazy to accomplish their priesthoods

278 Envy was taken away from the legions of their phalanxes

And there is no treachery among the spiritual troops

279 Fraud was entirely effaced from them

And they abundantly ponder all the time with all [eyes] open

280 The way they live is full of quiet peace and silent stillness

And perfect love, from end to end[253] without harm

281 Spiritual beings do not possess all these [qualities] by force

But willingly and through discernment

282 They all have the gift of free will

By which they choose and reject whatever they wish

283 When was it that freedom was taken away from those endowed with speech?

[For] whatever rebellion they ever make He has [already] reckoned

284 Witness to the fact that they freely choose and reject

Are those who fell from their orders through their own will

285 If the force had subdued them to service

It would not have been possible by any means to turn aside from it

[253] Syr. ܟܦܘ ܟܦܘ. The word ܟܦܐ literally means "lip." Since here it is used together with nouns like "peace" and "stillness," and adjectives like "quite" and "silent," a word play might have been intended.

286 After the hidden *remzā* separated them

He made them priests and delivered their free will to them

287 After the whole decoration of the height above was finished

On the fourth day,[254] they were examined and some of them failed

288 And when He came to hand over their authorities to them

All of them made objection[255] but some of them failed because they did not obey

289 For three days, all of them remained with one accord

With perfect blessings and brightness and divine glory

290 When they inquired about tangible works

They perceived through revelation whom they are useful for

291 They saw the earth was restored from its thirst

And the waters upon it were brought into order in every place

292 They saw the firmament that He had separated its rank into two abodes

Into two halves, one above and one below

[254] Gen 1:14-19

[255] The reading "made objections" (ܥܒܕܘ), is based on Jer and Ber. Other manuscripts, instead, read "were tested" (ܐܬܒܚܝ). Both verbs make sense in the context of the *mēmrā*. The latter regards God's plan for testing the angels, and the former alludes to the inquiry of the angels (verses 297-298). However, ܥܒܕܘ should be preferred as *lectio difficilior*, which is also supported by the two oldest manuscripts.

293 They saw the light that sets, rises, and the night passes away

So does the day, [all this] by the divine providence

294 They saw the earth which, by the commandment, had fostered and brought forth

All trees together with their edible fruits

295 They saw the construction of the abode of life: the Garden of Eden

That Paradise, full of delights, with all benefits

296 They saw the luminaries that were appointed and put in circulation

In order to separate the time and seasons of day and night

297 Watchers inquired: "what are they all truly useful for?

And why is another creation formed?

298 This creation is profitable neither for us nor for the Being

Since our dwelling place, behold, was already perfect"

299 Spiritual beings were uncertain about the genesis of the world

As they did not know for whom the tangible [world] was useful

300 The power of revelation made them understand what it was useful for:

For the corporeal being whose genesis would be from dirt[256]

[256] The Syriac term is ܐܲܪ̈ܥܵܐ, which reflects the biblical etymology in Gen 2:7.

301 For the earthly one whom the *remzā* would form from dust

A microcosm with a living and rational soul in body

302 One individual, compound of soul and body

In whom the likeness of God of all is manifested

303 The one animated in the body whom the *remzā* created

Shall become the chief and the ruler of the corporeal world

304 He shall also become the bond of the whole world,

Of the spiritual beings together with corporeal beings in one accord

305 The heaven and the earth are because of him and to serve him

And you shall become his guardians and his servants

306 You are tested through his service and [the service] of his works

And through him, you receive crowns of glory and victory

307 Thus whoever that gladly serves this one

His service will entwine for him a crown of honor

308 And whoever that opposes the service of the one who is coming

And the works that benefit him, will fail and be cast away

309 The commandment beckoned to watchers keep the service

Of the arrangement of the world that benefits the image of the greatness of His glory

310 To some He entrusted the authority to govern the sea

To some the earth, to some the air, to some the globe

311 To some the course of the luminaries that are in the orbit

To some the other supervisions of the entire world

312 The hidden *remzā* brought them into the furnace of trial

By commanding [them] to govern the world and its benefits

313 Some obeyed and some resisted against the commandment

The free will which all of them possessed brought fruits

314 Some of them, therefore, dared to be wretched like the wretched ones

And they were named tyrant Demons after their own deeds

315 Some of them turned aside from the divine commandment

And they, too, were named Satans based on the way they chose

316 All those who were wretched and those who turned aside were expelled and fell

And on this account, they were called furious Evil Spirits

317 The comeliness of the splendor of their natures made them arrogant

And the snare of anger drew them toward haughtiness

318 They they relied on the charm of their beauty

And they disparaged and despised the Maker who had brought them into being

319 They lifted up a heel against the Maker with evil inclination

And with reliance on the self, that is to say, their substances

320 If then the power of commandment had not been revealed to them

As well as the judgment and punishment, they would not have been blameworthy

321 But according to right thought it is necessary

To bring a lawsuit against them and he inherits judgment (?) with punishment

322 Without contract and without the law there is no blame

Paul testifies as he goes through their ranks (?)

323 When was it that there was no contract which was declared but He did not put it into action?

And without law, there is no blame and lawsuit

324 It is, therefore, clear {that before spiritual beings turned aside,

Through the revelation, they had already accepted the sort of punishment that would come in the future}

325 {And in the same way Adam received the law afterward

And when he did not keep it, with that he was condemned by justice}

326 {The divine *remzā* called them beforehand to witness

the service and the punishment and the judgment}

327 {He envied the glory of the image of the hidden one before he would come into being

As if the spiritual tribes should serve the dust}

328 {He yoked us, watchers, for the earthly one who will come

Since the magnificence of our essence is equal to his} (?)

329 {How Great is [the magnificence] of the one whom} we serve

and are subjugated to the earthly image that He will create (?)

330 "The Chief of the air"[257] showed boldness first

And after that, some from other orders did the same

[257] Eph 2:2

331 And Paul said those who fell were from three orders

From the Archontes, the Authorities, and the Chief of the air[258]

332 Some said that from each order there were some who fell and failed

And there is no fault in faith with these differences

333 There are also some who said that they fell in the morning of the sixth day

And there also some [who said it was] before this time and there is no blame [in believing so]

334 There is no blame in various times that people inclined toward

Since there is no hesitation at all concerning their fall

335 In a clear voice, the Son of God testified that

"The chief of Liars," "the Slanderer," fell like lightning

336 "I saw him, the deceitful one, Satan,

Who fell from the height like lightning"[259] and was extinguished

337 He was beautiful and glorious and luminous like lightning

Before he transgressed against the divine commandment

338 He used to put on glory and wear divine brightness

Like legions and armies of celestials

[258] Eph 6:12
[259] Luk 10:18

339 {He was yoked by the divine chain and the rope of watchers

And with them, he used to ruminate on *theoriai*}

340 He used to boast of the adornment of divine holinesses

And of glorifications and their glorious cries of "Holy!"

341 But when they became proud and lifted up a heel against the Creator

They were openly stripped of that glory

342 {The belts of adornment that were worn by the spirituals

Like the belts of the attendants of the king, were undone} [260]

343 {The chief of the rebellious was stripped of his glory

As well as all those who fell upon the earth and had rebelled with him}

344 Like lightning that shines and radiates through its rays

And then fades away and is extinguished, thus their glory was extinguished

345 They were stripped of their divine adornments

And they were despoiled of the honor of their principality

[260] Dan 10:5

346 They were deposed of the spiritual priesthood

By the deposition that justly stripped them

347 They were expelled and driven away from their spiritual churches

And from the divine service of their priesthoods

348 He stripped them of their spiritual ephods

And their crowns were trodden and abolished by the just judgment

349 They became alienated from the assemblies and dwelling place of watchers

And the demons who had assailed and rebelled were driven to exile

350 The angels of darkness and the sterile ones halted naked

Since the drunkenness of their arrogance destroyed them

351 {Their desire made them hateful despondents

Misshapen and naked spiritual beings!}

352 {They wore shame together with disgrace, and they were cast away and fell

And their arrogance and their audacity were like the lustful youth} (?)

353 {Those furious ones wished to band up against the Maker

Also [to make] a tumultuous riot against their Creator}

354 {Those insane ones supposed that even if they were not strong

They would remain [safe] as if they were in glory and power}

355 {They did not believe the verdict that was in the revelation

That if they do not observe the commandment of their Lord, they will be deposed and fall}

356 {But they supposed that if they rebel and wrestle

With the Maker, they will manage to resist}

357 {Evil Spirits and Demons who had acted against their Lord were cast away

And Satans, too, who strayed and fell from their magnificence}

358 {They became alienated from spiritual lands

Those naked and profane ones fell upon the earth and [went to] exile}

359 {Those barren ones moved away from divine conversations

And those disfigured and sick ones [moved away] from the agreement with their fellows}

360 The enmity against the divine image [in humanity]

Shattered them and cast them away [even] before he came into being

361 They hated God in His image and transgressed against the commandment

And they began to spy out to see when the image would come

362 "If we do not wage war against him who subdued us

And drove us away and cast us away, perhaps we can fight His image"

363 [With] malice in their hearts, the ambushes of deceit, they remained wrathful

Against the one for whom the world was fashioned and against His dwelling place

364 Their entire gaze was [fixed] on [the time] when the image would come and they would see him

And [to see] to whom he would resemble and how his essence would be

365 They abandoned lamenting and the great mourning for themselves

And [they put] all concerns on the hypostasis that cast them away

366 Regarding this concern, [and] regarding Satan,

The Lord of all said that "from the beginning he was a manslayer"[261]

367 {He was prepared even before the human race came into being

And from the beginning, behold, he had plotted and crafted his stratagem}

368 {This is the story of the deed of Satan

And the account of how and why he fell from his glory}

[261] John 8:44

369 {But maybe you would tell me that Moses did not write down here

Either about the making of the watchers or the demons}

370 {The *remzā* kept it secret there in the beginning of the world}

Since such knowledge would not help the human race

371 Regarding the Maker, they would think of several beings

Because they would think that spiritual beings were [also] Beings

372 The scripture kept it silent back at the beginning of the world

Until the time that it would be a useful matter to be revealed to another generation

373 Also, when the evil one deceived Adam in the serpent's body

The *remzā* did not want to reveal that it was the evil one who waged war in the serpent

374 And when the Lord cursed the evil one who had deceived Adam

He cursed him, "the Chief of the Liars," in the likeness of the serpent[262]

375 For the first time, the Scripture remarked about the angels

Through the banished handmaid, in order to inform us about their servitude[263]

376 Through the handmaid, He showed that they are servants of the God of all

As Hagar was a handmaid and servant of Sarah

[262] Gen 3:14-15
[263] Gen 16:7

377 Indeed, many of the divine books clearly wrote

About the creation and the servitude of spiritual beings

378 "The Lord made his angels a spirit and his ministers

A burning fire" the Spirit cried aloud through the mouth of the son of Jesse[264]

379 And again that "By the Lord's breath were created the hosts

Of spiritual beings"[265] and they overcome and keep his words

380 In Job and also in Prophets, about the angels

And in all of the books, about Satan and his fall

381 And again, in all of the books, about the difference of their orders

In the Old Testament as well as the New

382 More than anyone, Paul wrote about their orders

Also his pupil, the judge of the Areopagus[266]

383 Until this point, the word was about spiritual beings

And from now on, we shall turn toward the making of the world

384 We brought near the account of the genesis of watchers at the beginning of the world

And of those who remained in and those who were rejected from their ranks

[264] Ps 104:4
[265] Ps 33:6
[266] Cf. Acts 17:34

385 The word stopped at the joyous shout of of the angels who praised

The Bestower of Light, and then the word about their orders came in

386 “God saw that the light was beautiful” in its essence

Which we still see everyday

387 Becoming and beautiful is the light which the Lord of Light created

All the more so that its Creator testifies that “the light is beautiful”

388 “God called the light daytime and the darkness night”

Two opponents, coupled by the yoke of day

389 The light and the darkness together fulfill three days

Day and night are brothers, separated in color and power

390 Both of them are servants and fluid in their corporeality

Since the air comfortably receives both of them

391 The light came and from its rays the darkness ran away

And then the light gives way and the darkness comes in and fulfills its night

392 The hidden *remzā* named the ruler of darkness night

And called the ruler of light daytime: the two of them one day

393 From that moment when the light was in front of the darkness

The name of “night” was attached to darkness and “daytime” to light

394 And even if the hours are reduced or increased

Their names are unchangingly the same

395 A short night or a daytime that is likewise will not fail

From the name of “day and night” and also when they get long

396 “Night” and also “daytime” are the names of their authority

And not, therefore, [names] of the quantity that they possess

397 The commandment which placed the light within the sphere

Took it up here when twelve hours had been fulfilled

398 Before the fourth day, He did not took up this light which was mentioned

in the sphere, but elevated it above the clouds

399 In the evening, the clouds would go up to the end of the air

And between the darkness and the light, there were twelve hours

400 And when the darkness was serving the twelve hours during its night

At the daybreak, the clouds set and the light shines

401 The commandment that held the waters as if in a wineskins

And made people pass through,[267] it itself held the light there

402 The waters are diffuse and so is the light

But their Maker gathered them when He wished

403 For as long as their Maker wished the waters stood

Brief and at ease, and so was the diffuse light

404 Just as the light was obeyed and entered the sphere

[In the same way,] it obeyed and entered the clouds for three nights

405 Just like the sphere, the air, therefore, receives colors

And heat and cold, but it is not ruined

406 Likewise is the darkness and the light spends the night within it

The hidden *remzā* brought in and led out day and night

[267] Ex. 14

407 “And there was evening and there was morning”; [that] is the night and morning

The beginning of night and the beginning of daytime for the completion of a Day

408 Morning, therefore, is like a ladder for two groups

The same for those who ascend as well as those who descend

409 For the night, evening is a beginning and also an end

And also for the day, it is the one that drives it away and transfers it

410 And in the same way, morning is a beginning and a start for the day

And for the night, it is the one that drives it away and expels it and brings it to an end

411 He named this aforementioned day “the first day”

It was not that He said “one” because it is the first-born of days

412 Every day is “one” with with respect to itself

And the first day, although it was one [day], there was no [day] before it

413 There was not another day before it at all

And if there was [a day] before it, then it was not “the first” but “the second”

414 This was the first-born of the days: “the first day”

Before which no day was [ever made] by the Creator

415 O rational beings, rejoice and praise and confess your Lord

For the works that His *remzā* prepared for your delight

416 Bless and worship Him and applaud the name of the concealed Being

Who revealed the power of the greatness of His glory through His works

417 You all praise the Bestower of Light together with angels

And diligently observe the commandment of the Lord of the creation

418 Be careful that your heart does not go astray like the evil one

And you are not wretchedly driven into exile because of him

419 Submit to the Lord of all by confessing the truth

And gladly carry His yoke through His commandments

420 Do not harden the inclination of your heart to wrath

It will swear against you and will never put you into rest

421 Instead, observe His commandments with love and purity

And pray that He may multiply compassion and mercy upon you

422 O the Omnipotent! Keep the entire world away from deceits

And keep your Church safe and bless her sons and exalt her walls

423 And on the day of your manifestation, make us all worthy of an open countenance[268]

And provide the banquet of your *remzā* for those who love your love

424 And upon the sinner who made made this interpretation, O Merciful one, show mercy

And with your hyssop, purify all his sins and made him worthy of your blessings[269]

425 By all mouths and all tongues, we shall clamor your glory

O Father and Son and the Holy Spirit, the concealed nature

[268] 1 John 2:28 and 4:17
[269] Num. 19:18

References

Alwan, Khalil. "Le 'Remzō' Selon La Pensée de Jacques de Saroug." *Parole de l'Orient* 15 (1989 1988): 91–106.

———. *Jacques de Saroug († 521). Sur Adam et Sur Le Bien et Le Mal: Homélie Métrique Inédite*. Jounieh, Liban: Apôtres, 2021.

Anderson, Gary A. "The Fall of Satan in the Thought of St. Ephrem and John Milton." *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 3:1 (2000): 3–27.

Assemani, Josephus Simonus. *Bibliotheca orientalis Clementino-Vaticana: De scriptoribus Syris Nestorianis*. Vol. 3.1. 3 in 4 parts vols. Rome: Typis Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1725.

Baumstark, Anton. *Geschichte Der Syrischen Literatur, Mit Ausschluss Der Christlich-Palästinensischen Texte*. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1922.

Beck, Edmund. *Des Heiligen Ephraem Des Syrers Hymnen Contra Haereses*. 2 vols. CSCO 169-170, Syr. 76-77. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957.

———. *Des Heiligen Ephraem Des Syrers Sermones de Fide*. 2 vols. CSCO 212-213, Syr. 88-89. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1961.

Becker, Adam H. "Barḥadbeshabbā, The Cause of the Foundation of the Schools." In *Sources for the Study of the School of Nisibis*, 86–160. Translated Texts for Historians 50. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008.

Becker, Adam Howard. "Bringing the Heavenly Academy Down to Earth: Approaches to the Imagery of Divine Pedagogy in the East Syrian Tradition." In *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, edited by Raanan S. Boustan and Annette Yoshiko Reed, 174–91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Bedjan, Paulus. *Homiliae Selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis*. Vol. 3. 5 vols. Paris / Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1907.

Blanchard, Monica J., and Robin A. Darling Young, trans. *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Eznik of Kolb*. Eastern Christian Texts in Translation 2. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Brock, Sebastian P. "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition." In *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie Bei Den Östlichen Vätern Und Ihren Parallelen Im Mittelalter: Internationales Kolloquium, Eichstätt 1981*, edited by Margot Schmidt and Carl Friedrich Geyer, 11–38. Eichstätter Beiträge 4. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982.

———. "Ephrem on Reading Scripture." In *Treasure-House of Mysteries: Explorations of the Sacred Text through Poetry in the Syriac Tradition*, 21–30. Popular Patristics 45. Yonkers: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2012.

———. *Saint Ephrem. Hymns on Paradise*. Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990.

———. "The Imagery of the Spiritual Mirror in Syriac Literature." *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 5 (2005): 3–17.

———. "The Robe of Glory: A Biblical Image in the Syriac Tradition." *The Way* 39:3 (1999): 247–59.

———. "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30:2 (1979): 212–32.

Butts, Aaron Michael, Kristian S. Heal, and Sebastian P. Brock. *Clavis to the Metrical Homilies of Narsai*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 690. Lovanii: Aedibus Peeters, 2021.

Cardahi, Gabriel. *Liber Thesauri de Arte Poetica Syrorum Nec Non de Eorum Poetarum Vitis et Carminibus*. Roma: Typographia Polyglotta, 1875.

Carlson, Thomas A. "Mar Gabriel and Mar Abraham." In *Syriaca.Org: The Syriac Reference Portal*, edited by David A. Michelson, 2014. https://syriaca.org/place/661.

Casas, Ghislain. "Ontology, Henadology, Angelology : The Neoplatonic Roots of Angelic Hierarchy." In *Neoplatonic Demons and Angels*, edited by Luc Brisson, Seamus Joseph O'Neill, and Andrei Timotin. Brill, 2018.

Chabot, Jean Baptiste. "Notice Sur Les Manuscrits Syriaques Conservés Dans La Bibliothèque Du Patriarcat Grec Orthodoxe de Jérusalem." *Journal Asiatique* IX, 3 (1894): 92–134.

———. *Iacobi Edesseni Hexaemeron, Seu in Opus Creationis Libri Septem*. CSCO Syr. II.56. Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1928.

Ciancaglini, Claudia Angela. *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. Beiträge Zu Iranistik 28. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 2008.

Çiçek, Julious Yeshu'. *Hexaemeron: Commentary on Creation by Jacob of Edessa*. 2nd ed. Bar Ebroyo Kloster Publications 42. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2010.

Clarke, Ernest G. *The Selected Questions of Ishō Bar Nūn on the Pentateuch: Edited and Translated from MS Cambridge Add. 2017, with a Study of the Relationship of Ishō'dādh of Merv, Theodore Bar Kōnī and Ishō Bar Nūn on Genesis*. Studia Post-Biblica 5. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962.

Cureton, William. *Spicilegium Syriacum Containing Remains of Bardesan, Meliton, Ambrose and Mara Bar Serapion*. London: F. & J. Rivington, 1855.

Darling, Robin Anne. "Narsai of Nisibis. On the Expression, 'In the Beginning,' and Concerning the Existence of God." In *Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Joseph Wilson Trigg, 203–20.

Message of the Fathers of the Church 9. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988.

Dege-Müller, Sophia. “Die Angelologie der Aksimaros-Literatur. Aufnahme und Anwendung eines literarischen Motivs.” PhD Dissertation, Universität Hamburg, 2022.

———. “Ms. Cerulli 165 in the Light of the Aksimaros’ Manuscript Tradition.” In *Aethiopia Fortitudo Ejus. Studi in Onore Di Monsignor Osvaldo Raineri in Occasione Del Suo 80° Compleanno*, edited by Rafał Zarzeczny, 163–80. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 280. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2015.

Drijvers, Han J. W. *The Book of the Laws of Countries: Dialogue on Fate of Bardaiṣan of Edessa*. 2nd ed. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2006.

Frishman, Judith. “Narsai’s Christology According to His Homily ‘On the Word Became Flesh.’” *The Harp* 8–9 (1996 1995): 208–303.

Furman, Yulia. “The Origins of the Temporal World: The First Mē’mrā of the Kṯāḇā d-Rēš Mellē of John Bar Penkāyē.” *Scrinium* 10 (2014): 3–46.

Gignoux, Philippe. *Homélies de Narsaï Sur La Création*. Patrologia Orientalis 34.3-4. Turnhout; Paris: Brepols, 1968.

Gismondi, Henricus. *Maris Amri et Slibae de Patriarchis Nestorianorum Commentaria Ex Codicibus Vaticanis*. Roma: C. de Luigi, 1899.

Greatrex, Marina. “Memre One, Two and Four of the Hexaemeron of Jacob of Edessa: Introduction, Translation and Text.” ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2000.

———. “The Angelology in the *Hexaemeron* of Jacob of Edessa.” *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 4 (2004): 33–46.

Griffith, Sidney Harrison. “Chapter Ten of the *Scholion*: Theodore Bar Kônî’s Apology for Christianity.” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 47 (1981): 158–88.

Ḥabbī, Yūsuf. *Fahāris Al-Makhṭūṭāt al-Suryānīyah Fī al-ʻIrāq*. Vol. 1, 1977.

Harrak, Amir. *Mar Narsai: Homily 33 on the Sanctification of the Church*. Texts from Christian Late Antiquity 54. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2018.

Hespel, Robert, and René Draguet. *Théodore Bar Koni. Livre Des Scolies (Recension de Séert)*. 2 vols. CSCO 431-432, Syr. 187-188. Louvain: Peeters, 1981.

Hofstra, Johan D. "Some Remarkable Passages in Isho'Dad of Merw's Commentary of the Gospel of John." *Parole de l'Orient* 35 (2010): 303–35.

Holmberg, Bo. "A Reconsideration of the Kitāb Al-Magdal." *Parole de l'Orient* 18 (1993): 255–73.

Ishaq, J. "Rutbat al-ʿimād ʿind ʿImānūʾīl bar Shāhārī." *Bayn al-Nahrayn* 14, no. 2 (1983): 33–66.

Jansma, Taeke. "Narsai's Homilies on Creation: Remarks on a Recent Edition." *Le Muséon* 83:1-2 (1970): 209–35.

———. "Théodore de Mopsueste. Interprétation Du Livre de La Genèse. Fragments de La Version Syriaque (B. M. Add. 17,189, Fol. 17–21)." *Le Muséon* 75 (1962): 63–92.

Juckel, Andreas Karl. "Eine Ostsyrische Angelologie (Elījā von Anbār, Ktābā d-Durrāšā Mēmrā IX, 1-20)." In *Nubia et Oriens Christianus. Festschrift Für C. Detlef G. Müller Zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Piotr O. Scholz and Reinhard Stempel, 115–59. Bibliotheca Nubica 1. Köln: Jürgen Dinter, 1987.

Kanaan, Marlène. "Création et Êtres Angéliques d'après Un Manuscrit Arabe Inédit: L'Hexaémeron Du Pseudo-Épiphane de Salamine." In *The Intermediate Worlds of Angels: Islamic Representations of Celestial Beings in Transcultural Contexts*, edited by Sara Kuehn, Stefan Leder, and Hans-Peter Pökel, 219–28. Beirut: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2019.

Kronholm, Tryggve. *Motifs from Genesis 1–11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian, with Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Traditions*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1978.

Lehto, Adam Isaac. *The Demonstrations of Aphrahat, the Persian Sage*. Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 27. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2010.

Luibhéid, Colm, and Paul Rorem, trans. *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1987.

Manna, Jacques Eugène. *Morceaux Choisis de Littérature Araméenne*. 2 vols. Mosul: Imprimerie des pères dominicains, 1901.

Mathews, Edward George. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Fifth Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2019.

———. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The First Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2009.

———. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Fourth Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2018.

———. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Second Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2016.

———. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Seventh Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2021.

———. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Sixth Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2020.

———. *Jacob of Sarug's Homilies on the Six Days of Creation: The Third Day*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2016.

Mathews, Edward George, and Joseph Phillip Amar. “Commentary on Genesis.” In *St. Ephrem the Syrian. Selected Prose Works: Commentary on Genesis, Commentary on Exodus, Homily on Our Lord, Letter to Publius*. The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 91. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994.

McCrindle, John W., trans. *The Christian Topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian Monk, Translated from the Greek, and Edited with Notes and Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

McLeod, Frederick G. *Theodore of Mopsuestia*. The Early Church Fathers. London: Routledge, 2009.

Mingana, Alphonse. *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*. 3 vols. Woodbrooke Catalogues 1-3. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933.

Minov, Sergey. “Date and Provenance of the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*: A Reappraisal.” *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 20:1 (2017): 129–229.

———. “Satan’s Refusal to Worship Adam: A Jewish Motif and Its Reception in Syriac Christian Tradition.” In *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity:*, edited by Menahem Kister, Hillel Newman, Michael Segal, and Ruth Anne Clements, 230–71. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. *Jacob of Serugh’s Hexaemeron*. Bilingual edition. Ancient Near Eastern Studies 52. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2018.

Nau, François. “Note sur le manuscrit du British Museum Or. 1300 (Hexaméron d’Emmanuel Bar Schahharé).” *Revue de l’Orient chrétien* 19 (1914): 101–3.

Parisot, Jean. *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes*. Patrologia Syriaca 1.1. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1894.

Perotti, Elisa. "Narsai's Mēmrā On the Creation of Angels: Translation and Analysis." MA Thesis, University of Leiden, 2018.

Possekel, Ute. *Evidence of Greek Philosophical Concepts in the Writings of Ephrem the Syrian*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 580. Lovanii: Aedibus Peeters, 1999.

Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew. *Basil of Caesarea: A Guide to His Life and Doctrine*. Cascade Companions 16. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012.

Rasmussen, Adam. *Genesis and Cosmos: Basil and Origen on Genesis 1 and Cosmology*. The Bible in Ancient Christianity 14. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019.

Reynolds, Gabriel Said. "Redeeming the Adam of the Qur'ān." In *Arabische Christen – Christen in Arabien*, edited by Detlev Kreikenbom, Franz-Christoph Muth, and Jörn Thielmann, 71–83. Nordostafrikanisch/Westasiatische Studien 6. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007.

Ri, Andreas Su-Min. *Commentaire de La Caverne Des Trésors. Étude Sur l'histoire Du Texte et de Ses Sources*. CSCO 581, Subs. 103. Louvain: Peeters, 2000.

Ri, Su-Min. *La Caverne Des Trésors: Les Deux Recensions Syriaques*. 2 vols. CSCO 486-487, Syr. 207-208. Louvain: Peeters, 1987.

Robbins, Frank Egleston. *The Hexaemeral Literature; a Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1912.

Sachau, Eduard. *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca e codicibus Musei Britannici Nitriacis edidit atque in latinum sermonem vertit*. Leipzig: W. Engelmann, 1869.

———. *Verzeichniss Der Syrischen Handschriften Der Königlichen Bibliothek Zu Berlin*. 2 vols.

Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse Der Königlichen Bibliothek Zu Berlin 23. Berlin: A. Asher & Co, 1899.

Salvesen, Alison. “The Authorial Spirit? Biblical Citations in Jacob of Edessa’s Hexaemeron.” *Aramaic Studies* 6, no. 2 (2008): 207–25.

———. “The *Hexaemeron* of Jacob of Edessa on Birds as Moral Examples.” *The Harp* 35 (2019): 79–96.

Ṣana, Andrawus. “Ḥilq Al-Insān Li-‘Immanu’Il Bar Šahāre.” *Journal of the Iraq Academy, Syriac Corporation* 11 (1987): 176–237.

Scher, Addai. “La Cause de La Fondation Des Écoles.” In *Patrologia Orientalis*, 4:317–404. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907.

———. “Notice Sur Les Manuscrits Syriaques Conservés Dans La Bibliothèque Du Patriarcat Chaldéen de Mossoul.” *Revue Des Bibliothèques* 17 (1907): 227–60.

———. *Theodorus Bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum*. 2 vols. CSCO Syr. II.65-66. Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1910.

Schlimme, Lorenz. *Der Hexaemeronkommentar Des Moses Bar Kepha: Einleitung, Übersetzung Und Untersuchungen*. 2 vols. Göttinger Orientforschungen, I. Reihe: Syriaca 14. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.

Slusser, Michael, ed. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Translated by Thomas B. Falls. Selections from the Fathers of the Church ; Volume 3. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Tannous, Jack. “By George! Jacob of Edessa’s Hexaemeron and the Biblical Quotations of George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes.” In *Mfaḥmono Kashiro: Perspectives on the Syriac Bible in Honor of Andreas Juckel*, edited by George A. Kiraz and Hannah Stork, 329–67.

Piscaway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2024.

Taylor, David G. K. “St. Basil the Great and the Syrian Christian Tradition.” *The Harp* 4 (1991): 49–58.

———. *The Syriac Versions of the De Spiritu Sancto by Basil of Caesarea*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. CSCO 576, Syr. 228. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

Ten Napel, Erik. “Einige Bemerkungen Zu Den Mêmrê Des Emmnuel Bar Shahhare.” In *XX. Deutscher Orientalistentag Vom 3. Bis 8. Oktober 1977 in Erlangen*, edited by Wolfgang Voigt, 167–69. Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement 4. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980.

———. “Influence of Greek Philosophy and Science in Emmanuel Bar Shahhare’s Hexaemeron.” In *III Symposium Syriacum, 1980: Les Contacts Du Monde Syriaque Avec Les Autres Cultures (Goslar 7–11 Septembre 1980)*, edited by René Lavenant, 109–18. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 221. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983.

———. “Some Remarks on the Hexaemeral Literature in Syriac.” In *IV Symposium Syriacum, 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature (Groningen – Oosterhesselen 10-12 September)*, edited by Han J. W. Drijvers, René Lavenant, Corrie Molenberg, and Gerrit J. Reinink, 57–69. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987.

———. “Some Remarks on the Quotations from Emmanuel Bar Shahhare’s Hexaemeron in Ishaq Šbadnaya’s Prose Commentary on the Divine Providence.” *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989): 203–10.

———. “The Textual Tradition of Emmanuel Bar Shahhare’s Hexaemeron in the Light of

Monastic School Tradition." *Studia Patristica* 18:4 (1990): 289–95.

Thomson, Robert W. *The Syriac Version of the Hexaemeron by Basil of Caesarea*. 2 vols. CSCO 550-551, Syr. 222-223. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.

Toepel, Alexander. *Die Adam -und Seth- Legenden im syrischen* Buch der Schatzhöhle. *Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung*. CSCO 618, Subs. 119. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.

———. "The *Cave of Treasures*: A New Translation and Introduction." In *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures. Volume 1*, edited by Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov, 531–84. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2013.

Tonneau, Raymond Marie. "Théodore de Mopsueste. Interprétation (Du Livre) de La Genèse (Vat. Syr. 120, Ff. I–V)." *Le Muséon* 66 (1953): 45–63.

———. *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii*. 2 vols. CSCO 152-153, Syr. 71-72. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1955.

Trumpp, Ernst. *Das Hexaëmeron Des Pseudo-Epiphanius. Aethiopischer Text Verglichen Mit Dem Arabischen Originaltext Und Deutscher Ubersetzung*. Munich: Verlag der k. Akademie, 1882.

Tuschling, Ruth M. M. *Angels and Orthodoxy: A Study in Their Development in Syria and Palestine from the Qumran Texts to Ephrem the Syrian*. Studien Und Texte Zu Antike Und Christentum 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Van Rompay, Lucas. "The Christian Syriac Tradition of Interpretation." In *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Interpretation. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Part 1: Antiquity*, edited by Magne Sæbø, 612–41. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

———. “Development of Biblical Interpretation in the Syrian Churches of the Middle Ages.” In *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Part 2: The Middle Ages*, edited by Magne Sæbø, 559–77. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

———. “Humanity’s Sin in Paradise: Ephrem, Jacob of Sarug, and Narsai in Conversation.” In *Jacob of Serugh and His Times: Studies in Sixth-Century Syriac Christianity*, edited by George Anton Kiraz, 199–217. Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 8. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2010.

Vossel, Vincent van. “Quelques Remarques En Marge Du Memra Sur Le Baptême de Emmanuel Bar Shahhare.” *Questions Liturgiques / Studies in Liturgy* 82:2 (2001): 128–47.

Vosté, Jacques Marie, and Ceslas van den Eynde. *Commentaire d’Išo‘Dad de Merv Sur l’Ancien Testament, I: Genèse*. CSCO 126, Syr. 67. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1950.

Walsh, Erin Galgay. “From Sketches to Portraits: The Canaanite Woman within Late Antique Syriac Poetry.” In *Syriac Christian Culture: Beginnings to Renaissance*, edited by Aaron Michael Butts and Robin Darling Young, 66–82. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2020.

———. “Narsai, Metrical Homily on ‘The Word Became Flesh’ (John 1:14).” In *The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings: Volume 4: Christ: Chalcedon and Beyond*, edited by Mark DelCogliano, 4:194–213. The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Wickes, Jeffrey. “Ephrem’s Interpretation of Genesis.” *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (2008): 45–65.

Wilks, Marina. “Jacob Of Edessa’s Use Of Greek Philosophy In His Hexaemeron.” In *Jacob of*

Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day, edited by Bas ter Haar Romeny, 223–38. Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 18. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.

Wright, William. *The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage, Edited from Syriac Manuscripts of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries in the British Museum, with an English Translation. Vol. 1: The Syriac Text*. London / Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1869.

———. *A Short History of Syriac Literature*. London: A. and C. Black, 1894.

———. *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901.

Zellentin, Holger M. "Trialogical Anthropology: The Qur'ān on Adam and Iblīs in View of Rabbinic and Christian Discourse." In *New Approaches to Human Dignity in the Context of the Qur'ānic Anthropology: The Quest for Humanity*, edited by Rüdiger Braun and Hüseyin I. Çiçek, 61–131. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.