

Two Syriac Disputations against the Jews attributed to Ephrem and John Chrysostom:  
Rediscovered sources of Dionysius bar Šalibi's *Treatise against the Jews*.

David G.K. Taylor  
University of Oxford

Although anti-Jewish polemic is systemic in Syriac theological texts there are relatively few surviving works which are dedicated to this dispute.<sup>1</sup> Notable exceptions are seven homilies against the Jews by Jacob of Serugh (d. 521);<sup>2</sup> a series of dialogue poems between disputants such as the Synagogue and the Church, or Sion and the Church from ca. 6<sup>th</sup> c.;<sup>3</sup> the *Disputation* of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew,<sup>4</sup> and an anti-Jewish florilegium,<sup>5</sup> both from the 8<sup>th</sup> c.; and the *Treatise against the Jews* of Dionysios bar Šalibi (d. 1171), which formed one part of his larger cycle of disputation texts.<sup>6</sup> But it is clear that other Syriac anti-Jewish disputation texts were in circulation in the medieval period. In his metrical *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writings* the Church of the East scholar 'Abdišo' bar Brika (d. 1318) mentions six treatises or disputation

---

<sup>1</sup> For an overview of Syriac anti-Jewish polemic, see Hayman, A. Peter, 'The Image of the Jew in the Syriac Anti-Jewish Polemical Literature', in Neusner, Jacob and Frerichs, Ernest S., (eds.), *To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews and 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 423-441; and Becker, Adam H., 'Syriac Anti-Judaism: Polemic and Internal Critique', in Aaron M. Butts & Simcha M. Gross, (eds.), *Jews and Syriac Christians: Intersections across the First Millennium* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 180; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), p. 47-66. For an excellent catalogue of all Syriac disputation texts see Debié, Muriel, 'Clavis de textes syriaques de controverse', in Ruani, Flavia, (ed.), *Les controverses religieuses en syriaque* (Études syriaques 13. Paris: Geuthner, 2016), p. 385-446. For a catalogue of the major Syriac and Christian Arabic anti-Jewish texts see Rosenkranz, Simone, *Die jüdisch-christliche Auseinandersetzung unter islamischer Herrschaft: 7.-10. Jahrhundert* (Judaica et Christiana 21; Bern: Peter Lang, 2004). Very useful for the wider tradition is Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)* (4th ed.; Europäische Hochschulschriften. XXIII.172; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999); *idem*, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (11.-13. Jh.): mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum 4. Laterankonzil* (2nd ed.; Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII.335; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991); *idem*, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (13.-20. Jh.)* (Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII.497; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994). Older, but still useful, is Williams, Lukyn, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935).

<sup>2</sup> Albert, Micheline, *Jacques de Saroug. Homélie contre les Juifs* (Patrologia Orientalis 38.1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976); see also Cosgrove, Isaac K., 'Three Homilies against the Jews by Jacob of Sarug, edited with introduction, translation and notes' (PhD dissertation, University of London, 1931).

<sup>3</sup> Brock, Sebastian P., *The People and the Peoples: Syriac Dialogue Poems from Late Antiquity* (Journal of Jewish Studies, Supplement Series 3. Oxford: Journal of Jewish Studies, 2019).

<sup>4</sup> Hayman, A. Peter, *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew* (CSCO 338-339. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1973).

<sup>5</sup> Minov, Sergey, 'An Unpublished Syriac Collection of the Old Testament Testimonia against the Jews from the Early Islamic Period', in Emiliano Fiori & Bishara Ebeid, (eds.), *Florilegia Syriaca: Mapping a Knowledge-Organizing Practice in the Syriac World* (Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 179; Leiden: Brill, 2023), p. 20-73.

<sup>6</sup> For the text and translation see Ebied, Rifaat Y., Malki, Malatius M., and Wickham, Lionel R., (eds.), *Bar Šalibī's Treatise Against the Jews: Edited and Translated with Notes and Commentary* (Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 15; Leiden: Brill, 2020). This replaces the earlier edition of Zwaan, Johannes de, (ed.), *The Treatise of Dionysius bar Šalibhi against the Jews. Part I. The Syriac Text, edited from a Mesopotamian ms. (Cod. Syr. Harris. 83)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1906). De Zwaan's unpublished English translation of this treatise is kept at the University of Birmingham. For other translations see: Petersen, Richard H., 'The Treatise of Dionysius bar Šalibhi 'Against the Jews', a Translation and Commentary' (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1964); Keryo, Behnam, Denys 'Traité Contra Judaeos de Dionysius bar Šalibi. Introduction, traduction et notes' (Ph.D. dissertation, Université Paris IV-Sorbonne, 1985) [not seen]; Kautt, James. L., (trans.), *Die Schrift Contra Judaeos des syrischen Kirchenschriftstellers Dionysius Bar Šalibi* (Tübinger Judaistische Studien 4; Lit Verlag: Berlin, 2021).

texts written against the Jews and known to him in Syriac:<sup>7</sup> those of Eusebius of Emesa (d. ca 360),<sup>8</sup> Ephrem of Nisibis (d. 373),<sup>9</sup> Diodore of Tarsus (d. ca 390),<sup>10</sup> John Chrysostom (d. 407),<sup>11</sup> Yoḥannan of Bet Rabban (6<sup>th</sup> c.),<sup>12</sup> and Abraham bar Dašandad (8<sup>th</sup> c.).<sup>13</sup> None of these was previously known to survive, but in this article the text and translation of two of them, those attributed to Ephrem and John Chrysostom, both preserved in Syrian Orthodox manuscripts, will be presented. It will also be shown that these disputation texts were two of the sources used by the Syrian Orthodox scholar Dionysios bar Šalibi in his *Treatise against the Jews*, and that comparison of the originals with Bar Šalibi's treatise provides important insights into his editorial methodology.

Both texts, plus some short associated materials, are found in Oxford, New College manuscript 331, which is a composite Syriac volume, probably of the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>14</sup> The first is called 'The disputation which was produced by Mar Ephrem the teacher against the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); and the second 'The disputation against the Jews which was produced by the holy Mar Iwannis, the bishop of Constantinople' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ [ܘܫܘܒܐ] ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ). The disputation attributed to Ephrem is also found in Charfet, Raḥmani manuscript 96, an 18<sup>th</sup>-century composite miscellany of Syriac and Garshuni texts on history and theology.<sup>15</sup>

In its present form New College ms. 331 mostly contains polemical texts. It starts with the History of the baptism of the emperor Constantine (fol. 3v-11v),<sup>16</sup> and a text in which he advises his mother Helena on how to dispute with the Jews (fol. 11v-22v).<sup>17</sup> It then has

<sup>7</sup> For the catalogue of 'Abdišo' see: Assemani, Joseph Simonius, *Bibliotheca orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, vol. 3.1 (Rome: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1725), p. 1-362; Habbi, Joseph, *Abdišo 'Šob († 1318), Catalogus Auctorum* (Baghdad: Publications of the Iraqi Academy, 1986); for an English translation, see Badger, George P., *The Nestorians and Their Rituals* (2 vols.; London: Joseph Masters, 1852), vol. 2, p. 361-379. A new annotated translation has been prepared by Seth M. Stadel, *The Catalogue of Books of 'Abdišo' bar Brikha: Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup> 'Writing against the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); see Assemani BO III.1, §36, p. 44; Habbi §36, p. 58. Jerome also ascribes a work to Eusebius entitled 'Against the Jews, Pagans, and Novatians'; see *De viris illustribus* 91, PL 23, 695. It no longer survives in any language.

<sup>9</sup> 'Disputation with the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); see Assemani BO III.1, §52, p. 63; Habbi §54, p. 64.

<sup>10</sup> '[Writing] against the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); see Assemani BO III.1, §18, p.29; Habbi §15, p. 44.

<sup>11</sup> 'Treatise against the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); see Assemani BO III.1, §16, p.26; Habbi §13, p. 42.

<sup>12</sup> 'Questions (ζητήματα) against the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); see Assemani BO III.1, §56, p.72; Habbi §58, p. 67.

<sup>13</sup> 'Disputation with the Jews' (ܘܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܪ ܘܫܘܒܐ); see Assemani BO III.1, §126, p.194; Habbi §133, p. 106.

<sup>14</sup> See Coxe, Henry O., *Catalogus codicum mss. qui in collegiis aulique Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur. Pars I* (Oxford: E typographeo academico, 1852), 'Catalogus codicum mss. collegii Novi', p.118-119, §5. A new catalogue of the Syriac manuscripts of New College is being prepared by the author. For a discussion of the date, see below.

<sup>15</sup> For a full and clear description that does not need to be repeated here, see André Binggeli, Françoise Briquel Chatonnet, Muriel Debié, Youssef Dergham, Alain Desreumaux, Jibrail Dib, *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et garshuni du patriarcat syriaque-catholique de Charfet (Liban) I. Fonds patriarcal (Raḥmani) 1-125* (Publications patriarcales de Charfet: Dar'un-Harissa, 2021), p. 383-386, §16, fol. 11v-14r; according to the cataloguers the section containing the disputation dates to the early 18<sup>th</sup> c., but later sections are dated to 1759, 1764, and 1770 CE. For an earlier catalogue see Sony, Behnam M.B., *Fihris al-makhṭūṭāt al-baṭriarkiyya fī Dayr al-Šarfe, Lubnān* (Beirut: Šarikat alṭab' wa-al-našr al-lubnānī, 1993), ms. 812, p. 215-217.

<sup>16</sup> This Syriac version of the *Acts of Sylvester* is the same translation as that found in BL Add. 12174 (1197 CE), fol. 200v-205r (Wright, *Catalogue*, III, dcccclx, §32, p. 1128), which differs from that found in the *Ecclesiastical History of Pseudo-Zacharias*, I.7 (CSCO 83, p. 56-93 Syr.; CSCO 87, p. 39-65 trans). See Di Rienzo, Annunziata, 'Gli Actus Silvestri nella tradizione in lingua siriana: il testimone contenuto nella manoscritto BL Add. 12,174', *Adamantius* 22 (2016), 328–348.

<sup>17</sup> I will explore this text in a future article.

Dionysius bar Ṣalibi's *Treatise against the Muslims* (fol. 23r-65v),<sup>18</sup> and his *Treatise against the Jews* (fol. 66r-86v).<sup>19</sup> This is followed by the disputations against the Jews attributed to Ephrem (fol. 87r-89v), and John Chrysostom (fol. 90r-95r). There is then a series of short texts: a few paragraphs attributed to John Chrysostom on gentile prophets who are older than the prophets of the Jews (fol. 95r, 97r); biblical testimonies about Mary as the Mother of God (fol. 95r); a refutation of the Nestorians by Basil of Caesarea (sic! fol. 96r); sayings of the philosophers (fol. 97r-98r);<sup>20</sup> and another refutation of the Nestorians (fol. 98r-98v). Then comes Dionysius bar Ṣalibi's *Treatise against the Chalcedonians* (fol. 99r-144v).<sup>21</sup> Finally there are some sayings of the Fathers on Christology (fol. 144v-145v); a further collection of sayings of the Greek philosophers (fol. 145v-146r);<sup>22</sup> and some explanations of theological terms (fol. 146r).

The present manuscript is composite, and was created from at least four different types of unwatermarked middle eastern paper with laid lines only,<sup>23</sup> and has traces of 1 or 2 original series of quire marks, plus a later third series applied to the manuscript in its current form. Perhaps unsurprisingly the various treatises by Bar Ṣalibi (plus the sayings of the fathers and the second collection of sayings of the Greek philosophers) are written on the same paper and have matching original quire marks, and so presumably came from a single manuscript, whereas the first 22 folios and fol. 87-98 are on different papers, and have some unrelated quire marks, suggesting that they came from 1 or 2 additional manuscripts. So in this composite manuscript the texts on Helena and Constantine have been prefixed to a Bar Ṣalibi manuscript, and disputations attributed to Ephrem and John Chrysostom have been inserted after Bar Ṣalibi's *Treatise against the Jews*. This is confirmed by a marginal note which was added to the preceding fol. 86v at this time, which refers to the insertion of these texts on quires irregularly formed of 3 bifolia each (rather than the usual 5 bifolia) – 4 of which (not five as stated) can be identified by examination of the paper:

ܐܘܢܗܘܢ ܗܘܢܘ ܕܠܡܨܘܒܐ ܕܥܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ

‘Again, a disputation against the Jews, uttered by Mar Iwannis and Mar Aphrem. Behold, it is written on five quires with three bifolia (each). Read, our brother, and pray for the sinner who wrote.’

The manuscript has no colophon in any of its sections and so is formally undated. It was purchased in Diyarbakir in 1729 by a relation of Gloucester Ridley (1702-1774)<sup>24</sup> who donated

<sup>18</sup> See the edition and translation of Amar, Joseph P., *Dionysius bar Ṣalībī. A Response to the Arabs* (CSCO 614-615. Louvain: Peeters, 2005); for a detailed study, see Jacobs, Bert, ‘Syriac Testimonies against the Muslims: The Qur’ānic and extra-Qur’ānic Quotations in Dionysius bar Ṣalībī’s *Disputation against the Muslims*’ (PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2021).

<sup>19</sup> See the publication details given above.

<sup>20</sup> Edited and translated by Arzhanov, Yury N., *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers: A Study in Syriac Gnomologia with Edition and Translation* (CSCO 669; Leuven: Peeters, 2019).

<sup>21</sup> An edition is being prepared by Bogdan-Gabriel Drăghici; see also his ‘Competing Orthodoxies: Dionysius Bar Ṣalībī’s *Treatise Against the Chalcedonians*’ (DPhil dissertation, Oxford University, 2023).

<sup>22</sup> Also edited by Arzhanov, *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers*.

<sup>23</sup> Such paper was dominant in Hebrew manuscripts of Iraq from the 11<sup>th</sup> c. until 1250, but was still widely used in the 14<sup>th</sup> c.; see Malachi Beit Arié, ‘Quantitative Typology of Oriental Paper Patterns’, in Monique Zerdoun, (ed.), *Le papier au Moyen Âge: histoire et techniques*, (Bibliologia 19; Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), p. 41-53, especially p. 45.

<sup>24</sup> See Gloucester Ridley, *De Syriacarum novi foederis versionum indole atque usu dissertatio; Philoxenianam cum simpliciter e duobus pervetustis codd. mss. ab Amida transmissis conferente* (London: Clarke, Whiston, White & Dodsley, 1761), p. 3-8.

it to New College ca. 1764.<sup>25</sup> It is written throughout in cursive *ser̄to* script, which does not differ greatly from section to section, and is hard to date. Coxe dated the manuscript (perhaps simply due to the mention of Bar Ṣalibi) to the 12<sup>th</sup> c.,<sup>26</sup> but this seems too early, and Rabo instead suggests a date of the 13<sup>th</sup> -14<sup>th</sup> c., which is very plausible.<sup>27</sup> There are two later marginal comments by readers which are relevant and are in line with such a dating. At the end of the manuscript, fol. 146r, an unidentified birth is mentioned which is said to have occurred in AG 1651 (1340 CE). And on fol. 67v Bar Ṣalibi's remark in his *Treatise against the Jews*, I.12, that the Jews had been scattered for 1140 years at the time of his writing has attracted a marginal comment that they had now been scattered for 1416 years, indicating that 276 years had passed since Bar Ṣalibi himself wrote. The treatise seems to have been written between 1165 and 1168, and so the marginal note was presumably added at some point in the 1440s or slightly later.<sup>28</sup>

The historical Ephrem and John Chrysostom are renowned for their anti-Jewish sentiments and texts. In Ephrem's surviving works this material mostly consists of regular comments in his poetry and other writings.<sup>29</sup> But Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 523) also cites a specific anti-Jewish work by Ephrem titled 'Volume against the Jews and the sects' (ܘܠܘܡܢ ܕܘܚܪܝܢܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢܐ ܘܕܫܝܬܝܢܐ).<sup>30</sup> No surviving copy of this work has yet been identified, although Brock has tentatively suggested that an 8<sup>th</sup>- or 9<sup>th</sup>-century fragmentary anti-Jewish text in Deir al-Surian, Fragment 50, has a style reminiscent of Ephrem,<sup>31</sup> and an unpublished 6<sup>th</sup>- or 7<sup>th</sup>-century palimpsest text preserved in BL Add. 14512 includes an otherwise unknown discourse against the Jews (ܘܠܘܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܢܐ).<sup>32</sup> Neither the citation in Philoxenus, nor the fragment published by Brock, are related in any way to the disputation published here (whose style is in any case quite unlike that of genuine Ephrem). It also appears to be unrelated to a further dialogue attributed to Ephrem and his nephew and disciple Abraham concerning Jews and pagans that is preserved in Karshuni in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, syr. 203, which is a Maronite manuscript of 1470 CE.<sup>33</sup> As for John Chrysostom, in addition to his regular anti-

<sup>25</sup> See Poole, William, 'The Receipt of Manuscripts in New College Library 1624-1852', *New College Notes* 8.11 (2017), [p. 1-10], p. 8, 10.

<sup>26</sup> Coxe, *Catalogus codicum mss.*, p. 118.

<sup>27</sup> Rabo, Gabriel, *Dionysius Jakob Bar Ṣalibi. Syrischer Kommentar zum Römerbrief: Einleitung, Edition und Übersetzung mit einem Verzeichnis der syrischen Handschriften zu seinen sämtlichen Werken* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, I. Reihe: Syriaca 56. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2019), p. 414.

<sup>28</sup> For the date of Bar Ṣalibi's *Treatise against the Jews* see Petersen, 'The Treatise of Dionysius bar Ṣalibi 'Against the Jews', p. 260-268; summarised in Ebied, et al., *Bar Ṣalibi's Treatise Against the Jews*, p. 12. Bar Ṣalibi states, curiously, that the scattering of the Jews occurred two years after the crucifixion. It is unclear whether the writer of the marginal comment followed this, or calculated from the more usual date of 70 CE.

<sup>29</sup> See Shepardson, Christine C., *Anti-Judaism and Christian Orthodoxy: Ephrem's Hymns in Fourth-Century Syria* (Patristic Monograph Series 20. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008); Hayman, 'The Image of the Jew'.

<sup>30</sup> See Brière, Maurice, & Graffin, François, (eds), *Sancti Philoxeni Episcopi Mabbugensis Dissertationes decem de Uno e Sancta Trinitate incorporato et passo (Mēm̄rē contre Ḥabib)*. V. *Appendices I. Tractatus II. Refutatio III. Epistula dogmatica. IV. Florilegium* (PO 41.1; Turnhout: Brepols, 1982), Florilegium §33, p. 66.

<sup>31</sup> Brock, Sebastian P., & Van Rompay, Lucas, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts and Fragments in the Library of Deir al-Surian, Wadi al-Natrun (Egypt)* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 227. Leuven: Peeters, 2014), p. 404.

<sup>32</sup> Wright, William, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired since the Year 1838* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1870), vol. I, ms. cccxii, p. 251. I owe this reference to Grigory Kessel who is working on the surviving witnesses to Ephrem's anti-Jewish texts.

<sup>33</sup> See Zotenberg, Hermann, *Catalogues des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaites) de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1874), §6 (fol.125), p. 154. Another text that might be mentioned is a dialogue poem titled 'The Synagogue and Our Lord', which is attributed (incorrectly) in a late manuscript to Ephrem; see Brock, *The People and the Peoples*, p. 75-97.

Jewish comments in his writings, he also wrote eight homilies against the Jews (CPG 4327).<sup>34</sup> Extracts from these homilies are preserved in Syriac in BL Add. 14623 of 823 CE, and part of another, *Against the Jews and the Pagans that Christ is God* (CPG 4326), is found in Syriac in BL Add. 14604 of the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>35</sup> There are no obvious links between any of these genuine Chrysostomic works and the disputation text published here.

The description given by ‘Abdišo’ bar Brika to the work attributed to Ephrem, ‘disputation’ (*drāšā*, ܕܪܳܫܳܐ), closely matches the title of Ephrem’s work as edited below, and does not correspond to the title of any of his genuine writings. The title of the anti-Jewish work assigned to Chrysostom by ‘Abdišo’ has the less specific label ‘treatise’ (*mēmra*, ܡܳܝܳܡܳܪܳܐ), although the text edited here describes itself as a ‘disputation’. ‘Abdišo’ does, however, refer to a single treatise, rather than to the multiple Chrysostomic treatises known in Syriac epitome. Knowledge of the Ephrem disputation text might also imply knowledge of the Chrysostom disputation text, if they were often copied together as in New College ms. 331 (a combination also implied by the pattern of their citation by Bar Ṣalibi). On balance, I think one can reasonably presume that the Ephremic text referred to by ‘Abdišo’ is the text published here, and it seems likely, but unprovable, that the Chrysostomic text he knew is also that published here. If this is right, it is evidence that by the 13<sup>th</sup> century both disputations were known to both Syrian Orthodox and Church of the East scholars (and the examination below of Bar Ṣalibi’s use of the disputations will push Syrian Orthodox knowledge of the texts back to the 12<sup>th</sup> c.). There is as yet no further external evidence to date the composition of the disputations, and so further precision will depend on an analysis of their contents.

### *Pseudo-Ephrem, Disputation against the Jews*

As already noted, this text is found in both New College ms. 331 and Rahmani ms. 96. In both manuscripts the Ephremic text has been compiled from three originally independent units. First, there is an initial dialogue (§§1-38) in which an unnamed Jew (ܡܳܝܳܡܳܪܳܐ) proposes 13 anti-Christian propositions or questions,<sup>36</sup> mostly focussing on Christian claims about Christ, and often citing the New Testament.<sup>37</sup> To each of these the Teacher (ܡܳܠܳܡܳܐ) – also anonymous, except in the title and subscription – responds with biblical citations taken from the Old Testament.<sup>38</sup> There is no conclusion to the disputation, no declaration by the Jew that he will continue to adhere to his own religion, or that he has been persuaded by the Teacher’s citations that the Christian interpretation is valid. The disputation simply stops after a flurry of citations. This is followed by a second unit (§39), entitled ‘A question against the Jews, from the (Book of) Great Wisdom’ (ܩܳܘܳܣܳܬܳܐ ܕܳܝܳܗܳܘܳܐ ܕܳܡܳܠܳܟܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܕܳܡܳܘܳܠܳܘܳܬܳܐ). This consists of the Peshitta text of Wisdom 2.12-20, a passage in which the speakers question and challenge God, here understood as the Son of God. In this polemical context this text is clearly considered to be a

<sup>34</sup> See Wilken, Robert L., *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Mayer, Wendy, ‘Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews’, in Chris L. de Wet & Wendy Mayer, (eds), *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives* (Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill), p. 58–136; Harkins, Paul W., *St. John Chrysostom: Discourses against Judaizing Christians* (The Fathers of the Church 68. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1979).

<sup>35</sup> For these texts see Minov, Sergey, ‘The Syriac Reception of John Chrysostom’s *Homilies against the Jews: First Soundings*’, in *Vigiliae Christianae* (forthcoming); Hayman, ‘The Image of the Jew’, p. 434.

<sup>36</sup> See §§ 1, 3, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31.

<sup>37</sup> The Jew also cites Daniel in §27, and possibly Isaiah in §31.

<sup>38</sup> This disputational methodology – the Christian citing scriptures accepted by the Jewish opponent, and the Jew citing the New Testament – is that proposed at the start of the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*, but not actually implemented; see Morlet, Sébastien, *Dialogue de Timothée et Aquila. Dispute entre un juif et un chrétien* (Bibliothèque de l’Orient chrétien 3. Paris: Les belles lettres, 2017), 3.21, p. 8, and see also p. xxxvi-xxxvii.

piece of Jewish self-incrimination. At the end of this passage, there is the subscription ‘The end (of the disputation) of Mar Ephrem’ (ܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܪ ܝܫܘܥ). This is followed in both manuscripts, however, by a third section (§§40-51) entitled ‘A question against the Jews’ (ܫܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐܝܢ), which addresses a Jew who is never allowed to speak, and which begins by calling in turn upon the sun, sky, earth, temple, and angels to bear witness to the divinity of Christ, before moving on to more formal Christological sections (§46-51) relating to the various births of the Son of God. These latter sections appear to have relatively limited relevance for Jewish-Christian polemic. At the end of this textual unit, markedly different in tone from the first section, there is the subscription ‘End of these questions of Mar Ephrem’ (ܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܪ ܝܫܘܥ ܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐܝܢ). So the disputation attributed to Ephrem appears to have grown by accumulating other anonymous anti-Jewish texts. In Rahmani ms. 96 the process continues, for a blank space at the end of the third Ephremic unit has been filled with a further short anti-Jewish text (§52) written at right angles to the main text. It contains citations from a later recension (12<sup>th</sup> c.?) of the Harklean New Testament intended to demonstrate that Christ did indeed call himself God.

The first section of the Pseudo-Ephremic text, in which the Jew and the Teacher debate, is perhaps the most interesting, not least because the Jew is allowed to get in some good shots on his Christian opponent, which is not typical of this polemical literature. After an initial assertion that the Jews are the true children of Abraham, he says (§3): ‘From his own words I will show that this Jesus of yours is a human being’. This clearly echoes Wisdom 2.20 that is cited later, ‘Let the questioning be according to his words’. He continues: ‘For it is written about him that “he was hungry” and “he ate”’.<sup>39</sup> And these words may be employed with reference to people, but not to God’. He then says (§7): ‘It is written, “(Jesus) was weary from the toil of the road”. Is there a god who is weary?’. And shortly after (§10) he asks: ‘It is written concerning Jesus: “He slept upon a cushion at the back of the boat”. Is there a god who sleeps?’. He turns the screw further, by touching on sensitive topics of Christology and Theology, by stating (§15): ‘Again, it is written: “I and my Father, we are one”. So then, when he went up on the cross, was God with him?’. This is a question that gets to the heart of impassioned Christian discussions about Theopaschism.<sup>40</sup> And equally challenging, he asks (§17): ‘Was it impossible that God should bring you close to him without the blood of this son of Jesse?’. Further questions relate to Christian claims that Jesus was both incarnate God and Messiah. So he says (§19): ‘Is there a god who is born of a woman?’. There is a discussion (§§27-28) about whether the Messiah will come once (so the Jew) or twice (so the Teacher), followed by the stark statement (§29): ‘Behold, your Messiah was conceived from the seed of a man, and his father is Joseph’. The Jew also questions how the eucharistic bread could become the body of God (§25). Needless to say, the Teacher is always shown to have good answers to these questions, and yet it is the Christian teachings that are subject to criticism here and require defence, not Jewish beliefs and practices, as in so many polemical texts. Curiously, there is very little rhetorical or exegetical overlap with other surviving Syriac (or Greek) anti-Jewish polemical texts, even though, inevitably, some of the same biblical testimonies are cited.

There is no good reason to think that this text was composed by Ephrem, and yet it has a few features which might suggest Syriac origin and an early date. The Old Testament passages are cited throughout from the Peshitta, and its wording is essential for the arguments proposed. The few Gospel citations also seem to be close to the Peshitta text, although in two cases – Mt 14.36 (§12), and Mt 1.23 (§20) – they have Old Syriac readings, which might

<sup>39</sup> For these biblical references, and those which follow, see the notes to the relevant sections of the edition.

<sup>40</sup> See O’Keefe, John J., ‘Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology’, *Theological Studies* 58 (1997), p. 39-60; Viezure, Dana I., *Verbum Crucis, Virtus Dei: A Study of Theopaschism from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to the Age of Justinian* (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 2009).

suggest a 5<sup>th</sup> c. date. More noteworthy is that in one passage (§30) the divine Logos, the Word of God, is treated as feminine: ‘and she the Word dwelt within the womb of a virgin’ (ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܐ). While *meltā* (ܩܘܡܐ), ‘word’, is feminine when used of ordinary utterances, from the late 4<sup>th</sup> century on it was treated as masculine when used of the divine Logos.<sup>41</sup> The use of the feminine here could be a simple error, but it is more plausibly evidence for an early date for this passage. Again, in §21 the famous Messianic text of Gen 49.10 is cited (‘the staff shall not depart from Judah, nor the commander from between his feet’), but instead of the Peshitta ending ‘until he shall come to whom it belongs, and the peoples shall await him’, the passage here reads ‘until he shall come to whom the kingdom belongs, and the peoples shall proclaim him’. The only other author who cites the passage in this form is Aphrahat (fl. 337-345), in two separate demonstrations,<sup>42</sup> although a similar form is also found in Ephrem’s *Commentary on Genesis*.<sup>43</sup> The next verse, Gen 49.11, ‘He will wash his garment in wine, and his robe in the blood of grapes’, is used (§30) as a proof of the Virgin birth, as also in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho* (ca. 160 CE), §54 (and §63), but rarely elsewhere – perhaps because it claims that Christ’s blood was not human, but of the Holy Spirit. So dating of the first section of the Pseudo-Ephrem *Disputation* in its present form is difficult, because of the need to distinguish the final work from its constituent sources. It appears to be using an early collection of anti-Jewish biblical proof texts and arguments, some of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. and some earlier, but its Gospel citations mostly agree with the Peshitta, and preserve only occasional Old Syriac readings, which could suggest a 5<sup>th</sup> c. to early 6<sup>th</sup> c. date.

By contrast, the third of the units attributed to Ephrem cites (§45) Ps 24.10 from the Syro-hexaplaric version, suggesting a date after the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and it also refers (§43) to the prophet Isaiah being sawn asunder by Manasseh, which presumably postdates the 6<sup>th</sup>-century Syriac recension of the Pseudo-Epiphanius text, *The Lives of the Prophets*.<sup>44</sup> Its use of one lexical item is also in line with this dating.<sup>45</sup> The adjective *māranāyā* (ܩܘܡܐܐܝܐ), ‘of the Lord’, in §42 is a form that does not appear in non-translated Syriac texts until the early 6<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>46</sup>

### *Pseudo-Chrysostom, Disputation against the Jews*

The Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputation* is so far only known to survive in New College ms. 331, although (as shall be seen) it was clearly also known to Bar Ṣalibi. In this *Disputation* the debate is between ‘the Jew’ (ܩܘܡܐ) and ‘the Christian’ (ܩܘܡܐܝܐ), and the Jew begins it by baldly stating (§1): ‘The Messiah has not come’. The argument develops around proofs and counter-proofs that Christ was a false Messiah and a deceiver because the Jews are still in captivity, and he taught three gods. From §34 on the discussion turns to the question of observance of the Law. The Jew asks: ‘If it is true that the Messiah taught according to the will of the Law, why do you, then, not keep the Law?’, and he is particularly interested (§36) in why Christians do not offer sacrifices, circumcise, and keep the sabbath. The first two issues are addressed by the Christian, who then, to the Jew’s considerable surprise, accuses Jews of failing to observe the sabbath. Once again, there is no clear logical conclusion to the

<sup>41</sup> The Logos is masculine not only in Peshitta Jn 1.1 but also in Old Syriac Curetonian Jn 1.1, and in the citations of this verse in Aphrahat (*Dem.* I.10) and Ephrem (*Commentary on the Gospel* I.3, 4, 5). In Curetonian Jn 1.14, however, *meltā* remains feminine, and so also in Aphrahat (*Dem.* VI.10, VIII.15), Ephrem (*Commentary on the Gospel* I.8), and in the Syriac translation of Titus of Bostra (4.145) preserved in a manuscript of 411 CE.

<sup>42</sup> Aphrahat XVI.1, 760.11, XIX.11, 885.9. For a full discussion see the relevant section of the edition.

<sup>43</sup> Ephrem’s *Commentary on Genesis*, see Tonneau (CSCO 152) §42.5, 113.15-114.3.

<sup>44</sup> The account of Isaiah’s death by being sawn in two at the command of king Manasseh is not found in the Bible, but it is a Jewish tradition that early entered Christian exegesis. See the discussion in the edition.

<sup>45</sup> This was kindly drawn to my attention by Sebastian Brock.

<sup>46</sup> See Sokoloff, Michael, *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum*, (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, 2009), p. 836.

disputation, nor any final response by the Jew. In this text the Jew is allowed to argue fluently, but without the cutting edge of his equivalent in the *Disputation* attributed to Ephrem. Biblical proof texts (from the Peshitta) are again used, but they form a smaller proportion of the arguments deployed.

This text is almost certainly later than that attributed to Ephrem. In §18 the Christian asks: ‘Who is it who destroyed Jerusalem, and drove out from it those Jews who crucified him, and gave it to the Christian Romans (for) five hundred and fifty years and more?’ Presumably the author has in mind the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE, and so that suggests the text was written after 620 CE. Jerusalem fell to the Sasanians in 614 CE, was recaptured in 629/630 CE, and was lost to the Muslim armies in 637 CE, that is 567 years after 70 CE, or after approximately 550 years of Christian rule. How long after the 620s/630s the text was written is hard to judge. In §30, the Trinity is compared to a tree, with the Father as root, the Son as fruit, and the Spirit as branches. The idea that the Father is a tree and the Son a fruit is already found in Ephrem (d. 373) and Isaac of Antioch (mid 5<sup>th</sup> c.), but I only know of this precise trinitarian development from an anonymous late 8<sup>th</sup>-century Arabic treatise, ‘On the triune nature of God’.<sup>47</sup>

### *The Pseudo-Ephrem and Pseudo-Chrysostom Disputations as sources of Bar Ṣalibi*

It has long been recognised that Bar Ṣalibi’s *Treatise against the Jews* (ca. 1165-1168 CE) shares polemical themes and interpretations of key biblical passages with earlier anti-Jewish polemical sources, although very few of these parallels have been identified.<sup>48</sup> There seems to be resistance, however, to the idea that in his polemical treatises Bar Ṣalibi acted as the compiler and editor of existing texts, rather than as an independent author. In part this is because he never names any of his polemical sources, and in part because the few other surviving Syriac polemical texts written against the Jews did not appear to have been known to him, or to have been systematically used by him. (And very few of the surviving Christian Arabic polemical texts have yet been edited or studied.)<sup>49</sup> By contrast, Bert Jacobs’s recent work on Bar Ṣalibi’s *Treatise against the Arabs* has demonstrated his reliance there on the *Dialogue of Patriarch John and the Emir*, the *Disputation of Timothy I with the Caliph al-Mahdī*, and the first and second letters of Abū Rā’īṭa al-Takrītī, as well as a presumed reliance on other lost Syriac and Arabic texts.<sup>50</sup> This work of editing and compilation is typical of the scholarship of Bar Ṣalibi’s age, and its importance and creativity should not be minimised.

Happily, comparison of the Pseudo-Ephrem and Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputations* with Bar Ṣalibi’s *Treatise against the Jews* demonstrates beyond any doubt that they were two of his direct sources, as can be seen from the following tables.

<sup>47</sup> Gibson, Margaret D., (ed.), *An Arabic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Seven Catholic Epistles ... with a Treatise, On the Triune Nature of God* (Studia Sinaitica 7; London: C.J. Clay & Sons, 1899), p. 4 and ٧١. Two possible precedents from the Greek writings of John of Damascus (d. ca 749) and Hieronymus of Jerusalem (8<sup>th</sup> c. ?) are discussed in Sadowski, Michał, *The Trinitarian Analogies in the Christian Arab Apologetic Texts (750-1050)* (Syro-Arabica 7; Cordoba: CNERU / Beyrouth: CEDRAC, 2019), p. 156-157 (with thanks to Bert Jacobs for this reference).

<sup>48</sup> A notable exception is James Kautt, who provides a table of thematic parallels with other Syriac anti-Jewish texts; see Kautt, *Die Schrift Contra Judaeos*, p. 109-113.

<sup>49</sup> See Rosenkranz, *Die jüdisch-christliche Auseinandersetzung*; Barbara Roggema, ‘Polemics between Religious Minorities: Christian *Adversus Judaeos* from the Early Abbasid Period’, in Clara Almagro Vidal, Jessica Tearney-Price, & Luke Yarbrough, (eds), *Minorities in Contact in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 33. Turnhout: Brepols, 2020), p. 119–133.

<sup>50</sup> See Jacobs, ‘Syriac Testimonies against the Muslims’, p. 69-97.

Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, as a source for Bar Ṣalibi, *Treatise against the Jews*

PsE	DbṢ	PsE	DbṢ	PsE	DbṢ	PsE	DbṢ	PsE	DbṢ
§1	4.4	§12	4.5.4	§23	4.9	§34	4.13	§45	-
§2	4.4	§13	4.5.4	§24	4.9	§35	4.13	§46	-
§3	4.5.1	§14	-	§25	4.10	§36	4.13	§47	-
§4	4.5.1	§15	4.6	§26	4.10	§37	4.13	§48	-
§5	4.5.1	§16	4.6	§27	4.11	§38	4.13	§49	-
§6	4.5.1	§17	4.7	§28	4.11	§39	7.11	§50	-
§7	4.5.2	§18	4.7	§29	-	§40	-	§51	-
§8	4.5.2	§19	4.8	§30	-	§41	-	§52	-
§9	4.5.2	§20	4.8	§31	4.12-13	§42	-		
§10	4.5.3	§21	4.8	§32	-	§43	-		
§11	4.5.3	§22	-	§33	4.13	§44	-		

Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Disputation*, as a source for Bar Ṣalibi, *Treatise against the Jews*

PsC	DbṢ	PsC	DbṢ	PsC	DbṢ	PsC	DbṢ	PsC	DbṢ
§1	4.14.1	§11	4.14.3	§21	-	§31	-	§41	-
§2	4.14.1	§12	4.14.3	§22	-	§32	-	§42	-
§3	4.14.2	§13	-	§23	-	§33	-	§43	-
§4	4.14.2	§14	-	§24	-	§34	-	§44	-
§5	4.14.2	§15	-	§25	4.15	§35	-	§45	-
§6	4.14.2	§16	-	§26	4.15	§36	4.2	§46	-
§7	4.14.3	§17	-	§27	-	§37	4.2		
§8	4.14.3	§18	-	§28	5.1	§38	-		
§9	4.14.3	§19	-	§29	-	§39	-		
§10	4.14.3	§20	-	§30	-	§40	-		

From this comparison a number of interesting features are apparent. Almost all of the passages dependent on the two *Disputations* are found in Bar Ṣalibi's chapter 4, and the very start of chapter 5. Bar Ṣalibi draws on the Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputation* immediately after the Pseudo-Ephrem *Disputation* with no break or interruption (from 4.13 to 4.14), which clearly suggests that in his source manuscript they followed one another as in New College ms. 331.

Of the Pseudo-Ephremic materials published here Bar Ṣalibi incorporates the great majority of the text contained in §§1-38, the main dispute between the Teacher and the Jew, although all references to these figures are suppressed. His own citation of Wisdom 2.16-20 (shorter than that found in Pseudo-Ephrem §39) is located in his chapter 7, and fills the gaps found here. He did not use any of the material in §§40-52, the *Question against the Jews*. It is at least possible that the text of the Pseudo-Ephrem *Disputation* to which he had access only ran from §§1-38, which is presumably its earliest form. But it is also possible that the later sections were present but did not interest him. The material taken from Pseudo-Ephrem always follows its exact order in that text. Bar Ṣalibi regularly abbreviates the material he takes over, and in a few instances he omits an entire section. In some cases this appears to be because the issue was too sensitive, such as the Jew's statement (§29) that 'your Messiah was conceived from the seed of a man, and his father is Joseph'. §30 was also omitted, perhaps because of the theologically problematic statement that 'the blood of the Messiah was from the Holy Spirit'.

But §14 may have been dropped because it was not clear what relevance the citation of Ps 22.19, ‘They cast lots over my clothing’, had as a refutation of the statement that God does not wear clothes. The text of Pseudo-Ephrem §§1-38 runs to 791 words,<sup>51</sup> and the corresponding passages in Bar Ṣalibi, after abbreviation, amount to 541 words, which represents approximately 6% of his entire *Treatise*, which contains about 9,000 words.

The Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputation* is used more sparingly by Bar Ṣalibi. He draws from §§1-12 in order, but then omits §§13-24 which discuss the issue of whether or not the Messiah has come and the significance of Gen 49.10-11 (‘The sceptre shall not depart from Judah ...’). Possibly this was because he had already addressed this in 4.1. He then jumps to the Trinitarian discussion in §§25-26, and §28 (with which he begins 5.1). The remaining arguments in Pseudo-Chrysostom §§29-46, concerning circumcision, sacrifices, and sabbath observance, are mostly passed over, possibly because some of their key arguments had already been used in passages taken from other texts. The text of Pseudo-Chrysostom runs to some 2,000 words, and the corresponding passages in Bar Ṣalibi amount to 251 words, which represents approximately 3% of his entire *Treatise*. In total, therefore, the two *Disputations* were the sources for 9% of Bar Ṣalibi’s *Treatise*.

It seems likely that much of the rest of his *Treatise* was compiled in similar fashion, by systematically working through Syriac and Arabic anti-Jewish polemical texts to which he had access, and then selecting and revising their materials according to his own interests and theological sensitivities, and avoiding undue repetition. It is to be hoped that future publications of anti-Jewish polemical texts will reveal more of Bar Ṣalibi’s sources, but in the meanwhile the Syriac Pseudo-Ephrem and Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputations*, which are of great interest in their own right, also provide valuable information about his editorial techniques.

#### NOTES TO THE EDITION

The following edition is based on Oxford, New College ms. 331 (13<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> c.), fol. 87r – 95r, (= **N**), with variant readings for the Pseudo-Ephrem *Disputation* only from Charfet, Rahmani ms. 96 (18<sup>th</sup> c.), fol. 11v – 14r, (= **R**). The original orthography has not been altered or standardised, and variant orthographic forms are not usually recorded. In the Syriac text round brackets ( ) enclose expansions of standard abbreviations and added punctuation. Square brackets [ ] enclose lost or damaged text. Angled brackets < > enclose an editorial correction to the text.

I have subdivided the Syriac text into numbered paragraphs, on the basis of changes of speaker or of content.

The title of the *Disputations* and the indications of speaker (‘the Jew’, ‘the Teacher’, ‘the Christian’) were written in red ink in the manuscript. This has not been reproduced here, and so the loss of rubrics indicating the speakers requires a minimal addition of punctuation.

Folio breaks and their numeration are included in the Syriac text, and in the facing English translation. Column breaks (where a folio is divided into two columns) are indicated in the Syriac text by \*.

Words that I have supplied in the translation to aid the reader are placed within round brackets ( ).

---

<sup>51</sup> The whole of the Pseudo-Ephrem materials run to some 1600 words.

N87r R11v|

הוהב הוהב  
הוהב  
לחז, רחזר חלפז  
הלמטל מוהב: 52

|N87r R11v

AGAIN, THE DISPUTATION  
WHICH WAS PRODUCED BY  
MAR EPHREM THE TEACHER  
AGAINST THE JEWS.

[1] הוהב רחזר. סמ חוהב,  
הרזרזר רחזר.

[1] The Jew says: We are the children of Abraham.<sup>53</sup>

[2] חלפז רחזר 54 (.). חו. חזרזרזר,  
הרזרזר 55 חזרזר חוהב חוהב,  
הרזרזר חוהב חוהב.  
רזרזר חוהב חוהב 56.  
חזרזר חוהב חוהב חוהב חוהב:

[2] The Teacher says: When you were doing the works of Abraham you were called the children of Abraham. But when you acted wickedly, Isaiah called you ‘rulers of Sodom’ and ‘people of Gomorrah’.<sup>57</sup>

[3] הוהב (.). סמ חזרזרזר (חוהב),  
חוהב רחזר חזרזר חוהב  
חזרזר. חזרזר חוהב חוהב.  
חוהב חזרזר חוהב חוהב.  
חוהב חזרזר חוהב חוהב חוהב:

[3] The Jew: From his (own) words I will show that this Jesus of yours is a human being. For it is written about him that ‘he was hungry’<sup>58</sup> and ‘he ate’.<sup>59</sup> And these (words) may be employed with reference to people, but not to God.<sup>60</sup>

[4] חלפז (.). רחזר חזרזר חזרזר  
חוהב חוהב חוהב חוהב חוהב

[4] The Teacher: Thus said Isaiah about his Father: ‘You (O Israel) have not brought me the lambs of your burnt offerings, and with

<sup>52</sup> Compare the title given in ‘Abdišo’, *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writings*, Assemani BO III.1, §52, p. 63; Habbi §54, p. 64: ‘Disputation with the Jews’ (רזרזר חזרזר חוהב).

<sup>53</sup> The promises made to the descendants of Abraham were well known to all readers of the scriptures: see for example Gen 13.16, 17.7-8, 22.17; and for ‘seed/offspring of Abraham’ as an epithet see Ps 105.6. The right of Jews to refer to themselves as ‘children (or offspring) of Abraham’ is already contested in the New Testament: see Mt 3.9 (|| Lk 3.8), cf. Jn 8.37; and Gal 3.7, cf. Rom 9.7. Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§1-2 is the source of Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.4.

<sup>54</sup> חזרזר N] om R.

<sup>55</sup> חזרזרזר N° R] רחזרזר err N\*.

<sup>56</sup> חזרזר N] רחזרזר err R.

<sup>57</sup> Isa 1.10. This pair of insults, extracted from the verse, was frequently used by Aphrahat in this form, e.g. IV.18 (177.20-21), XI.1 (468.12-13), (469.21-23), (472.10-11), XII.11 (533.14-15), XVI.3 (765.15-16), XXI.3 (937.20-21).

<sup>58</sup> See Mt 4.2 (|| Lk 4.2), Mt 21.18 (|| Mk 11.12).

<sup>59</sup> See Mt 9.11 (|| Mk 2.16), Mt 26.17, Lk 7.36, 22.8.

<sup>60</sup> Or ‘a god’ (see below). Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§3-6 is the source of Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.5.1.

כִּי לֹא הִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לְעֹלֹתֶיךָ.<sup>61</sup> וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לִּי.<sup>62</sup>

your sacrifices you have not honoured me'.<sup>63</sup>

[5] וְעַתָּה לָמָּה לֹא בִּישַׁתְּתָה לִּי חֵמֶת וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ.<sup>64</sup>

[5] And again: 'You have not bought me sweet cane with money, and with the fat of your sacrifices you have not intoxicated me'.<sup>65</sup>

[6] וְעַתָּה לָמָּה לֹא בִּישַׁתְּתָה לִּי חֵמֶת וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ.<sup>64</sup>

[6] And again: When Noah went out of the ark he offered up sacrifices to the Lord from the clean (animals and birds),<sup>66</sup> 'and the Lord smelled the odour',<sup>67</sup> and the Lord said 'I will not again do as I have done'.<sup>68</sup> It was no great matter then, this (statement) that 'he ate', like that (mention) that 'he did indeed smell'.

[7] וְעַתָּה לָמָּה לֹא בִּישַׁתְּתָה לִּי חֵמֶת וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ.<sup>64</sup>

[7] The Jew: It is written, '(Jesus) was weary from the toil of the road'.<sup>69</sup> Is there a god who is weary?<sup>70</sup>

[8] וְעַתָּה לָמָּה לֹא בִּישַׁתְּתָה לִּי חֵמֶת וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ.<sup>64</sup>

[8] The Teacher: Thus said Isaiah concerning (God) his Father: 'You (O Israel) have subdued me with your sins, and with your iniquity you have wearied me'.<sup>71</sup>

[9] וְעַתָּה לָמָּה לֹא בִּישַׁתְּתָה לִּי חֵמֶת וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ וְשֵׁן מִשְׁחֵתֶיךָ.<sup>64</sup>

[9] And again: Through the prophet Malachi he said: 'You have wearied the Lord with your words'.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>61</sup> R. [N] וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לִּי.

<sup>62</sup> R. [N] וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לִּי.

<sup>63</sup> Isa 43.23.

<sup>64</sup> . וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לִּי [err N R<sup>vid</sup>] leg וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לִּי.

<sup>65</sup> Isa 43.24.

<sup>66</sup> See Gen 8.20.

<sup>67</sup> Gen 8.21.

<sup>68</sup> See Gen 8.21.

<sup>69</sup> Jn 4.6.

<sup>70</sup> Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§7-9 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.5.2.

<sup>71</sup> Isa 43.24.

<sup>72</sup> Mal 2.17.

[10] .אעב חב חב (.)אגא [10]  
אגא אגא 74 אגא 73  
אגא 75 אגא .אגא אגא  
:אגא

[10] The Jew: It is written concerning Jesus:  
'He slept upon a cushion at the back of the  
boat'.<sup>76</sup> And is there a god who sleeps?<sup>77</sup>

אגא 78 אגא (.)אגא [11]  
אגא אגא (,)אגא אגא  
אגא אגא :אגא אגא  
אגא אגא אגא .אגא אגא  
אגא אגא אגא אגא :אגא  
:אגא אגא אגא

[11] The Teacher: Thus said David about his  
Father: 'The Lord awoke like a sleeper, and  
like a man who has sobered from his wine'.<sup>79</sup>  
And is he not, therefore, like a sleeper, or like  
a man that has sobered from his wine, but like  
a drunkard?

אגא אגא (.)אגא [12]  
אגא אגא אגא אגא  
אגא אגא אגא אגא  
אגא אגא אגא אגא .אגא אגא  
אגא אגא אגא אגא .אגא אגא

[12] The Jew: It is written that many sick  
people were touching the fringe of his  
garments and were living (being saved).<sup>80</sup> Is  
there a god who wears the clothing of  
humans?<sup>81</sup>

אגא N87v | אגא (.)אגא [13]  
אגא אגא אגא אגא  
אגא אגא אגא אגא  
:אגא אגא

[13] The Teacher: Thus <sup>N87v</sup> it is written in  
Daniel (of the Ancient of Days): 'His clothing  
is white like snow, and the hair of his head is  
pure as wool'.<sup>82</sup>

אגא אגא (.)אגא [14]  
אגא אגא אגא אגא

[14] And again: David said: 'They cast lots  
over my clothing'.<sup>83</sup>

אגא אגא אגא אגא [15]

[15] The Jew: Again, it is written: 'I and my

<sup>73</sup> אגא N] om R.

<sup>74</sup> אגא N] אגא (orth) R.

<sup>75</sup> אגא N] אגא R.

<sup>76</sup> Mk 4.38.

<sup>77</sup> Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§10-11 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.5.3.

<sup>78</sup> אגא N] om R.

<sup>79</sup> Ps 78.65.

<sup>80</sup> See Mt 14.36 ('fringe': אגא S P; אגא C; || Mk 6.56, אגא S P); Mt 9.20 (אגא S; אגא P; || Lk 8.44, אגא S C P).

<sup>81</sup> Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§12-13 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.5.4.

<sup>82</sup> Dan 7.9.

<sup>83</sup> Ps 22.19, cited Jn 19.24. Psalm 22 was widely read by Christians as a prophecy of Christ, whose words were fulfilled in the events surrounding Christ's crucifixion (see already Mt 27.35, Mk 15.24, Lk 23.34). While there is a thematic link to clothing citations, it is not obvious what relevance this passage has here as a proof text that God can be described by Scripture as wearing clothes. Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §14 is omitted by Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.5.4.

אָבִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>84</sup> חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

Father, we are one'.<sup>85</sup> So then, when he went up on the cross, was God with him?<sup>86</sup>

[16] חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (.) חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>87</sup>

[16] The Teacher: So then, since his Father said to Jeremiah, 'I am with you, and I will not fail you, and I will not leave you',<sup>89</sup> so then, when you threw Jeremiah into the pit of mud,<sup>90</sup> God was with him. Confess to me, then, that he was with him! And then, are you authorised to accuse me?

[17] חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (.) חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>88</sup>

[17] The Jew: Was it impossible (that God) should bring you (Christians) close to him without the blood of this son of Jesse?<sup>91</sup>

[18] חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (.) חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>92</sup>

[18] The Teacher: Was God unable to bring out the children of Jacob from Egypt without the killing of a lamb?<sup>93</sup>

[19] חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (.) חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. חַוְּתָהּ אִתָּךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ.<sup>94</sup>

[19] The Jew: Is there a god who is born of a woman?<sup>95</sup>

<sup>84</sup> R<sup>txt</sup> לְיִשְׂרָאֵל N R<sup>mg</sup> לְיִשְׂרָאֵל.

<sup>85</sup> Jn 10.30.

<sup>86</sup> Many Christian theologians denied that God or the Godhead or the Logos suffered on the cross with Christ, God incarnate. See O'Keefe, John J., 'Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology', *Theological Studies* 58 (1997), p. 39-60; Viezure, Dana I., 'Verbum Crucis, Virtus Dei: A Study of Theopaschism from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to the Age of Justinian' (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 2009). The Jewish disputant is therefore probing this sensitive issue. Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§15-16 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.6.

<sup>87</sup> R. (orth) N] אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה.

<sup>88</sup> R. (orth) N] אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה.

<sup>89</sup> Joshua 1.5 (אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ). The proof text from Joshua has at some point been transferred to Jeremiah by error.

<sup>90</sup> See Jer 38.6.

<sup>91</sup> Jesse was the father of king David (1 Sam 16.12-13), and thus was considered by the Christians as an ancestor of Jesus (Mt 1.6, Lk 3.31-32). The prophecy of Isaiah concerning an individual known as the 'root of Jesse' (Isa 11.1, 10) was considered to be a Messianic prophecy by both Jews and Christians (see Rom 15.12). It thus seems unlikely that a genuine Jewish critic of Christianity would refer to Jesus as 'son of Jesse'. Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§17-18 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.7, where Jesus is referred to as 'the son of David'.

<sup>92</sup> R. N] om R.

<sup>93</sup> See Exod 12.1-13, describing the command to the Israelites in Egypt to take the blood of the first Passover lamb, and to put it on the doorframes of their houses.

<sup>94</sup> R<sup>txt</sup> אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה N R<sup>mg</sup> אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְהוָה.

<sup>95</sup> Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§19-21 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.8.



הממדין ויהיה חר המלך  
למלך המלך. הנה המלך.  
הנה המלך (הנה) המלך.  
הנה המלך המלך המלך.  
הנה המלך המלך המלך.

city of the (holy of) holies you shall destroy  
the people of the king who shall come'.<sup>98</sup>  
Behold, is it not evident that he came, that one  
about whom Israel said: 'Behold, in Jerusalem  
there is neither king nor prophet, nor priest,  
nor altar'.<sup>99</sup>

[23] הממדין ויהיה חר המלך  
למלך המלך. הנה המלך.  
הנה המלך (הנה) המלך.

[23] The Jew: How do you (Christians) call  
him God? And (how) was his great divinity  
capable of dwelling in a small body?<sup>100</sup>

[24] הממדין ויהיה חר המלך  
למלך המלך. הנה המלך.  
הנה המלך (הנה) המלך.  
הנה המלך המלך המלך.  
הנה המלך המלך המלך.  
הנה המלך המלך המלך.

[24] The Teacher: Do you not know that it is  
written about his Father: 'Heaven and earth by  
him are filled'.<sup>102</sup> How was his greatness  
capable of standing upon Mount Sinai,<sup>103</sup> and  
(how was he able) to speak from within a bush  
that is contemptible and smaller than every  
tree,<sup>104</sup> or to stand upon a brick (of  
sapphire)?<sup>105</sup>

[25] הממדין ויהיה חר המלך  
למלך המלך. הנה המלך.  
הנה המלך (הנה) המלך.

[25] The Jew: Concerning this which you say,  
'This bread, it is the body of my God that I  
receive', persuade me how it is (so).<sup>106</sup>

<sup>98</sup> See Dan 9.26. This is another complex verse. The Peshitta reads, 'the Messiah shall be killed, and does not exist for her, and the holy city shall be destroyed with the king who shall come' ( הממדין ויהיה חר המלך המלך המלך); compare the Hebrew, 'an anointed one shall be cut off, and has nothing, and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary' ( קְרַת מְשִׁיחַ וְיָצִין לוֹ הַקְּדוֹשׁ וְיִשְׁחָתוּתוּ ); and the LXX: ἀποσταθήσεται χρισμα και ουκ εστι, και βασιλεια εθνων φθερει την πολιν και το αγιον μετα του χριστου, 'the anointed one shall be destroyed, and shall not be, and a kingdom of (the) peoples shall destroy the city and the sanctuary along with the anointed one'. The modified text found in the *Disputation* differs significantly from all of these, and has not yet been identified elsewhere. In Aphrahat XIX.9 (877.22), XIX.10 (881.4), the text is as the Peshitta, and so also in the Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputation*, §18.

<sup>99</sup> Possibly this is an allusion to Hos 3.4: 'Because many days will the children of Israel sit without king and without prince, and without sacrifice and without altar' ( חַלְלֵה נְשִׂאֵהוּ וְלֹא יִהְיֶה עֹלָה וְלֹא יִהְיֶה זֶבֶח וְלֹא יִהְיֶה כֹּהֵן וְלֹא יִהְיֶה נָבִיא ). This is paraphrased in the Pseudo-Chrysostom *Disputation*, §21, as: 'the children of Israel will sit without king and without prince, and without priest and prophet' ( חַלְלֵה נְשִׂאֵהוּ וְלֹא יִהְיֶה עֹלָה וְלֹא יִהְיֶה זֶבֶח וְלֹא יִהְיֶה כֹּהֵן וְלֹא יִהְיֶה נָבִיא ). Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §22 is omitted by Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.8.

<sup>100</sup> Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§23-24 is the source of Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.9.

<sup>101</sup> N\* R. חַלְלֵה נְשִׂאֵהוּ וְלֹא יִהְיֶה עֹלָה וְלֹא יִהְיֶה זֶבֶח וְלֹא יִהְיֶה כֹּהֵן וְלֹא יִהְיֶה נָבִיא.

<sup>102</sup> See Jer 23.24.

<sup>103</sup> See Exod 34.5, and Exod 24.10 cited below.

<sup>104</sup> See Exod 3.4.

<sup>105</sup> See Exod 24.10.

<sup>106</sup> Pseudo-Ephrem, *Disputation*, §§25-26 is the source of Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.10.









ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܪܝܢܐ 134 ܩܘܪܝܢܐ [34]  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ

[34] And again, (Isaiah) said: ‘He was led to slaughter like a lamb,<sup>135</sup> and like a ewe before the shearer he was silent, and he did not open his mouth.<sup>136</sup> After<sup>137</sup> imprisonment and after judgement he was led away, and who shall tell of his generation?’<sup>138</sup>

ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ [35]  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ

[35] David said: ‘They gave (me) bitterness in my food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink’.<sup>139</sup>

ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ [36]  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ

[36] And again, Isaiah said: ‘He shall be killed for our sins, and he shall be humiliated for our iniquity. The punishment that made us whole (was) upon him, and we are healed through his wounds’.<sup>140</sup>

ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ [37]  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ  
ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ

[37] And the prophet Jeremiah said: ‘I am like an innocent lamb that is led to slaughter, and against me they have devised a scheme and said, “Come, let us destroy (him) on the wood with his bread, and let us remove him from the earth. And his name shall no more be remembered among us”’.<sup>142</sup>

<sup>134</sup> ܩܘܪܝܢܐ R (leg) ܩܘܪܝܢܐ N.

<sup>135</sup> Christ is identified as ‘the lamb of God’ in Jn 1.29, 36, and as ‘a lamb without blemish or spot’ in 1 Pt 1.19. In Acts 8.32-33 this passage from Isa 53.7-8 is read by the Ethiopian eunuch, and Philip uses the passage to tell him about Jesus. The identification of Christ with the Lamb is a major theme in the Revelation of John (for example Rev 5.12, 17.14, 19.7, 21.14), but this book was not part of the Syriac New Testament canon, and exercises little influence on Syriac writers.

<sup>136</sup> For Christ’s silence when on trial see Mt 26.63, 27.14, Mk 14.61.

<sup>137</sup> Or ‘by imprisonment and by judgement’.

<sup>138</sup> Isa 53.7-8. The citation here follows the Old Testament Peshitta text, rather than that of its citation in the Peshitta of Acts 8.32-33.

<sup>139</sup> Ps 69.22. For Christ being given vinegar to drink, see Mt 27.48, Mk 15.36, Jn 19.30. In Jn 19.28 it is stated that this act was to fulfil scripture, but Ps 69.22 is not actually cited in any Gospel.

<sup>140</sup> Isa 53.5. This verse clearly underpins 1 Pt 2.24, but it is not cited there.

<sup>141</sup> ܩܘܪܝܢܐ N<sup>c</sup> R] ܩܘܪܝܢܐ N\*.

<sup>142</sup> Jer 11.19. The Hebrew text contains the curious phrase *וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל*, which is usually rendered ‘let us destroy the tree with its fruit’, (literally ‘with its bread’), and this is followed by the Peshitta (ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ). (The LXX, followed by the Vulgate, paraphrases as: *ἐμβάλωμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ*, ‘let us throw wood into his bread’.) Here the phrase has been modified by the addition of a single letter, the preposition *ܐ*, to provide a reference to the cross: ‘let us destroy (him) on the wood’. In Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.13 (Ebied *et al.*, p. 78.2-3), it has the form ‘let us destroy his bread on the wood’ (ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ). The verse is not cited in the New Testament.

[38] וְדָוִד אָמַר \* הַבְּרִיחַ אֶתְּיָדַי  
וְאֶתְּפִי וְכָל־עֲצָמוֹתַי שָׁעָרוּ  
וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי אֶת־לִבְּעוֹתַי אֶת־כָּל־  
הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה 143

[38] And David said: ‘They pierced my hands  
and my feet, all my bones wailed’.<sup>144</sup> Behold,  
see the mystery of his crucifixion! And just as  
you have heard (from the Scriptures), so the  
Messiah did.

וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי אֶת־לִבְּעוֹתַי  
וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי אֶת־כָּל־

A QUESTION AGAINST THE JEWS, FROM THE  
(BOOK OF) GREAT WISDOM  
(Wisd. 2.12-20).<sup>145</sup>

[39] 2<sup>12</sup> נַחֲמֵנוּ 146 לְדַעַתְנוּ חַלְלָה דְּלֵךְ  
כַּסְפָּא לֵךְ כַּסְפָּא. פְּרַק לֵךְ לִמְסַלְּתָא  
חֲבָרָה. 147 רְחִימֵנוּ לֵךְ חֲבָרָה, וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־לִבְּעוֹתַי. 13 וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי אֶת־כָּל־  
הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. 14 וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. 15 וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. 16 וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. 17 וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה. 18 וְכִי־זָכַרְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂוִים מִיָּדַי חֲבָרָה.

[39] 2<sup>12</sup> Let us obstruct the righteous one,  
because we have no pleasure in him. For he  
stands against our deeds; <sup>R13r</sup> and he shames  
us through his lawful deeds; and he recalls  
against us the offences of our impudence.  
<sup>13</sup> And he proclaims that he has the knowledge  
of God within him, and he says about himself  
that ‘I am the Son of God’.<sup>149</sup> <sup>14</sup> [...] <sup>150</sup> He is  
a burden to us, even that we should see him,  
<sup>15</sup> because his manner of life does not  
resemble that of others [...].<sup>151</sup> <sup>16</sup> We are  
reckoned as unclean in his eyes [...],<sup>152</sup> and he  
blesses the ways and the end of the righteous  
ones, and he boasts that God is his father.  
<sup>17</sup> Let us see if his words are true, let us test  
him through his departure (from the world).

<sup>143</sup> N. חבבה [R (leg) חבב].

<sup>144</sup> Ps 22.17-18. These verses are not cited in the New Testament, but this Psalm was inextricably linked to the crucifixion in Christian thought since Christ spoke its opening words on the cross (Mt 27.46, Mk 15.34), and Ps 22.19 is cited in Jn 19.24.

<sup>145</sup> The whole of Wisd 2.12-20 is cited from the Peshitta, with minimal omissions (identified below), as a prophecy by Solomon of the negative Jewish reaction to Jesus. It was not thought necessary by the compiler of these texts to add any commentary. Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 7.11, cites Wisd 2.16-20; he also cites Wisd 2.12 in 6.2. But the gaps found in these verses here (§39) are filled in by Bar Šalibi.

<sup>146</sup> R. נחמה [N] נחמה.

<sup>147</sup> R. err נחמה [N] נחמה.

<sup>149</sup> LXX ‘and he calls himself a child of the Lord’, και παῖδα κυρίου ἐαυτὸν ὀνομάζει.

<sup>150</sup> Omits the words: ‘he has become for us a critic of our thoughts’ (חבבה לֵךְ חבבה).

<sup>151</sup> Omits the words: ‘and his paths are different’ (חבבה).

<sup>152</sup> Omits the words: ‘and he keeps distant from our ways as from uncleanness’ (חבבה חבבה). Included in Bar Šalibi, *Against the Jews*, 7.11.











ܩܠܗܘܢ ܟܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ  
 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ  
 ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ

a human, and his nature was not added to, and  
 neither was it changed.

[50] ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ  
 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ  
 ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ  
 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ

[50] And John bears witness, who said that  
 those who believed in the Word God who was  
 made flesh, ‘he gave to them authority that  
 they should become children of God’.<sup>179</sup> You  
 know that (means) that we become children of  
 God from baptism.

[51] ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ  
 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ  
 ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ  
 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ  
 ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ

[51] Again, another proof. Just as the Holy  
 Spirit descends upon the bread and the wine,  
 and it becomes the body and blood of God,  
 although their nature does not change, and  
 neither is the divine power which dwells  
 within them changed by the blood and bread,  
 so let us believe (with regard to) the Word that  
 was made flesh and his divine body.

<sup>180</sup> ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ

END OF THESE QUESTIONS OF MAR EPHREM.

*Additional text in R:* <sup>181</sup>

[52] ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ  
 ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ  
 ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ

[52] The Jews say that Christ did not say ‘I  
 am God’. But behold, in Matthew, Satan said  
 when he drew near,<sup>183</sup> ‘If you are the Son of  
 God, cast yourself down from here’.<sup>184</sup> (And)

<sup>179</sup> Jn 1.12.

<sup>180</sup> [N] om R.

<sup>181</sup> This paragraph is only found in R, where it follows the text attributed to Ephrem, but is written at right angles, filling the blank space at the bottom of fol. 14r.

<sup>183</sup> When Christ was in the wilderness, see Mt 4.3.

<sup>184</sup> Mt 4.6. The citation is that of the Harklean version, rather than the Peshitta, and it is closer to the later (12<sup>th</sup> c.?) recension of the Harklean, as printed in Joseph White, *Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana* (Oxford, 1778), than to the earliest text of the Harklean (7<sup>th</sup> c.), as printed in G. Kiraz and A. Juckel, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions* (NTTS 21.1; Leiden, 1996). (Peshitta: ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ; Harklean CESG: ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ; Harklean White: ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ; Harklean White: ܘܠܗܘܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܨܘܢ).

182 ✦
   
 තැනැත්තා. ආදාමයාගේ පුත්රයාගේ
   
 නමින් තමාට පූජා කළොත්.
   
 ආදාමයාගේ පුත්රයාගේ නමින්
   
 පූජා කළොත්. ආදාමයාගේ
   
 පුත්රයාගේ නමින් පූජා කළොත්.
   
 ආදාමයාගේ පුත්රයාගේ නමින්
   
 පූජා කළොත්. ආදාමයාගේ
   
 පුත්රයාගේ නමින් පූජා කළොත්.
   
 ආදාමයාගේ පුත්රයාගේ නමින්
   
 පූජා කළොත්. ආදාමයාගේ
   
 පුත්රයාගේ නමින් පූජා කළොත්.
   
 ආදාමයාගේ පුත්රයාගේ නමින්
   
 පූජා කළොත්.

Jesus said to him, ‘You shall not test the Lord  
 your God’.<sup>185</sup> And again Satan said to Christ,  
 ‘I will give you the kingdoms and all of these  
 (countries) if you will fall down (and) worship  
 me’.<sup>186</sup> ‘Then Christ said to him, “Get behind  
 me, Satan! It is written that you shall worship  
 the Lord your God, and him alone shall you  
 serve”. Then Satan left him, and behold angels  
 drew near and were serving him’.<sup>187</sup> And  
 again: He said to his disciples, ‘Go to the  
 village, and bring the colt, that I may ride and  
 enter Jerusalem. And if anyone should say  
 anything to you, say “The Lord has need of  
 him”’.<sup>188</sup> And ‘the Lord’, this is God. And  
 again: When he had entered the temple, Jesus  
 said ‘My house is a house of prayer. But you  
 have made it a den of robbers’.<sup>189</sup>

<sup>182</sup> End of text from R.

<sup>185</sup> Mt 4.7 Harklean.

<sup>186</sup> Mt 4.(8)-9 Harklean.

<sup>187</sup> Mt 4.10-11 Harklean.

<sup>188</sup> Lk 19.30-31 Harklean, paraphrase, with elements from Mt 21.2-3, Mk 11.2-3.

<sup>189</sup> Mt 21.13 Harklean.

ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ<sup>N90r</sup>

[N90r] AGAIN, A DISPUTATION AGAINST THE JEWS

ܕܚܒܝܢܐ  
ܠܡܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
(ܕܡܫܝܚܐ)  
<sup>190</sup>: ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ

WHICH WAS PRODUCED BY  
THE HOLY MAR IWANNIS,<sup>191</sup>  
THE BISHOP OF  
CONSTANTINOPLE.

[1] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ (.) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
(.) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ

[1] The Jew says: The Messiah has not come.<sup>192</sup>

[2] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ (.) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
(.) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ

[2] The Christian says: And who is it who turned the peoples away from the worship ('fear') of idols to the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob?<sup>193</sup>

[3] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ (.) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ

[3] The Jew says: That Messiah is false.<sup>194</sup>

[4] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ (.)  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ (ܕܡܫܝܚܐ) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ

[4] The Christian replies: And if the Messiah is false, how was he teaching the peoples that they should know the true God, who made heaven and earth and all that is in them? For one who is false is unable to speak the truth.

[5] ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ (.) ܕܡܫܝܚܐ  
ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ

[5] The Jew: By means of deception<sup>195</sup> he taught them to follow him.

<sup>190</sup> Compare this title with 'Abdišo', *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writings*; see Assemani BO III.1, §16, p. 26; Habbi §13, p. 42: 'Treatise against the Jews' (ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܘܨܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ). 'Constantinople' is written with non-standard orthography for ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ, or the more common ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ, ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. At the start of the next text in N (fol. 95r), a treatise attributed to John Chrysostom on the prophets of the peoples who are more ancient than the prophets of the People, the following orthography is found: ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ.

<sup>191</sup> That is, Ἰωάννης, John. In this case John Chrysostom.

<sup>192</sup> Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Disputation*, §§1-2 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.14.1.

<sup>193</sup> See, e.g., Mt 22.31-32.

<sup>194</sup> Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Disputation*, §§3-6 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.14.2.

<sup>195</sup> The Syriac term *tā'yutā*, 'error, deception, going astray', is used in combinations such as *tā'yutā da-ptakrē* (ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ), 'error of the idols', to indicate 'idolatry', and it is then used alone with the same sense. So is the statement of the Jewish disputant here a reiteration of his earlier point that Jesus was a false Messiah, or a new point that in teaching people to follow (and worship) himself, Jesus was propagating idolatry?



superstitions (‘fears’).  
[9] The Jew: Because of this we did not accept Jesus, because he was not teaching the truth. We will accept him who comes and teaches the truth.<sup>199</sup>

superstitions (‘fears’).

[9] The Jew: Because of this we did not accept Jesus, because he was not teaching the truth. We will accept him who comes and teaches the truth.<sup>199</sup>

[9] The Jew: Because of this we did not accept Jesus, because he was not teaching the truth. We will accept him who comes and teaches the truth.<sup>199</sup>

[10] The Christian: And if you hated the Messiah since, as you say, he was not teaching the truth, why have you not loved the God of your fathers?

[10] The Christian: And if you hated the Messiah since, as you say, he was not teaching the truth, why have you not loved the God of your fathers?

[11] The Jew: And how have we hated our God?<sup>200</sup>

[11] The Jew: And how have we hated our God?<sup>200</sup>

[12] The Christian: In the wilderness you made for yourselves a golden bull<sup>203</sup> and you worshipped it, and you offered sacrifices, and you said that ‘This is your God, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt’.<sup>204</sup> And again, in the land of Canaan, ‘you served Baal and the Astartes’, and all the hosts of heaven, as the text of the Book of Judges said about you.<sup>205</sup> ‘And you sacrificed your sons and your daughters to the demons and to the idols, and you shed innocent blood’, as he said [about you the prophet David.<sup>206</sup> And as he said] concerning you Isaiah the prophet, ‘You

[12] The Christian: In the wilderness you made for yourselves a golden bull<sup>203</sup> and you worshipped it, and you offered sacrifices, and you said that ‘This is your God, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt’.<sup>204</sup> And again, in the land of Canaan, ‘you served Baal and the Astartes’, and all the hosts of heaven, as the text of the Book of Judges said about you.<sup>205</sup> ‘And you sacrificed your sons and your daughters to the demons and to the idols, and you shed innocent blood’, as he said [about you the prophet David.<sup>206</sup> And as he said] concerning you Isaiah the prophet, ‘You

<sup>199</sup> Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Disputation*, §§9-10 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.14.3.

<sup>200</sup> Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Disputation*, §§11-12 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 4.14.3.

<sup>203</sup> The main biblical account of this episode, (Exod 32.4, 8, 19, 20, 24, 35)—in Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac—describes the making and worship of a calf (ܥܘܠܐ, *‘eglā*), and so too the later references to it (Deut 9.16, 21, Neh 9.18, Ps 106.19), and parallel episodes (1 Kgs 12.28, 32, 2 Kgs 10.29, 17.16, although in these passages the LXX reads ‘two heifers’, δύο δαμάλεις, instead of ‘two calves’; 2 Chr 13.8; Hos 8.5, 6, 10.5, 13.2). Bar Ṣalibi, in his reworking of this passage (4.14.3), also refers to a calf. The mention here of a bull could be a simple error that has appeared during copying, or it could be evidence of an as yet unidentified exegetical tradition.

<sup>204</sup> Exod 32.4 Peshitta; (MT and LXX read ‘these are your gods’); see also Neh 9.18.

<sup>205</sup> See Judges 2.12-13.

<sup>206</sup> Ps 106.37-38.













...  
 .  
 .

[27] The Jew: Say what you have to (say)!  
 .

[28] The Christian: And if it was not to the Son and to the Spirit that God said ‘Let us make the human in our image, according to our likeness’,<sup>236</sup> or again, ‘Behold, Adam has become as one of us’,<sup>237</sup> or again ‘Come, let us go down and let us divide the languages’,<sup>238</sup> to whom did he say this? For the angels do not share his likeness, and they are not reckoned (as) ‘one of them’, and they are not makers of creatures, or givers of languages like him.<sup>239</sup>

[29] If, then, you should think, as is your wicked habit, that it is nothing, for it is not mentioned in the holy scriptures, how is it, again, (that) when the one God was revealed to Abraham, he was seen in three likenesses of a man, that one God who was revealed to him?<sup>240</sup> Are these (words) truth, then, or falsehood? How, then, do you not reject your scriptures, since the holy scriptures themselves teach one God in three persons (*qnomē*)? With regard to Abraham in those likenesses which were seen, and in the creation of the (first) human, and in the judgement which was issued against him, and

[27] The Jew: Say what you have to (say)!

[28] The Christian: And if it was not to the Son and to the Spirit that God said ‘Let us make the human in our image, according to our likeness’,<sup>236</sup> or again, ‘Behold, Adam has become as one of us’,<sup>237</sup> or again ‘Come, let us go down and let us divide the languages’,<sup>238</sup> to whom did he say this? For the angels do not share his likeness, and they are not reckoned (as) ‘one of them’, and they are not makers of creatures, or givers of languages like him.<sup>239</sup>

[29] If, then, you should think, as is your wicked habit, that it is nothing, for it is not mentioned in the holy scriptures, how is it, again, (that) when the one God was revealed to Abraham, he was seen in three likenesses of a man, that one God who was revealed to him?<sup>240</sup> Are these (words) truth, then, or falsehood? How, then, do you not reject your scriptures, since the holy scriptures themselves teach one God in three persons (*qnomē*)? With regard to Abraham in those likenesses which were seen, and in the creation of the (first) human, and in the judgement which was issued against him, and

*Festschrift für Martin Tamcke zum 60. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015), (187-242), §28d, where the terms are: sun (ܫܡܫܐ), illumination (ܫܘܫܘܢܐ), heat (ܫܘܫܘܢܐ); and the anonymous Arabic treatise ‘On the triune nature of God’ (second half of the 8<sup>th</sup> cent.): Gibson, Margaret D., (ed.), *An Arabic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Seven Catholic Epistles ... with a Treatise, On the Triune Nature of God* (Studia Sinaitica 7; London: C.J. Clay & Sons, 1899), p. 4 and ٧٦.

<sup>236</sup> Gen 1.26.

<sup>237</sup> Gen 3.22.

<sup>238</sup> Gen 11.7.

<sup>239</sup> Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Disputation*, §§28 is the source of Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 5.1.

<sup>240</sup> See Gen 18.1-2. See Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, §4.15 (ed. Ebied et al., 80).



כלהו קרי גלגל לליל. ודא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 חסא.

everyone one holy Trinity of one equal nature.

[33] כל קל מלמ מלל מ  
 ארר 246 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא  
 קדמא דקדמא דא. ודא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.  
 דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא.

[33] But these are (just) a few of the many proofs which the scriptures speak about the Son, and they call (him) Lord God,<sup>249</sup> and Word,<sup>250</sup> and Branch,<sup>251</sup> and Son,<sup>252</sup> and Glorious,<sup>253</sup> and Redeemer.<sup>254</sup> And they also proclaim the Holy Spirit (to be) the Sanctifier,<sup>255</sup> and the Giver of all these divine gifts to humans.<sup>256</sup> These (examples) we have brought (to you) in order that we might show you and rebuke you from your (own) scriptures that you have stiffened your neck<sup>257</sup> against the Messiah and against the holy doctrine which we have received from him.

[34] דא דא (.) דא דא דא דא דא  
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא  
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא  
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא

[34] The Jew: If it is true that the Messiah taught according to the will of the Law,<sup>258</sup> why do you, then, not keep the Law?

<sup>246</sup> ארר N<sup>c</sup>] ארר err N\*.

<sup>247</sup> דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא N\*.

<sup>248</sup> דא err N] leg דא.

<sup>249</sup> See, for example, Ps 47.6 which was understood as referring to Christ’s ascension ( דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא (כלל דא)).

<sup>250</sup> See, for example Ps 33.6 (דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא); Ps 119.89 (דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא); Isa 40.8 (דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא).

<sup>251</sup> Jer 23.5 (דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא), cf. Jer 33.15. *Šemhā* can also mean ‘radiance’, and is used of Christ with this alternate sense in Heb 1.3 ( דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא).

<sup>252</sup> See, for example, Ps 2.7 (דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא).

<sup>253</sup> See, for example, Isa 33.21 (דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא).

<sup>254</sup> The Peshitta translation of the Old Testament contains some 84 occurrences of the term *pāroqā*, ‘redeemer’. Some of the verses most frequently understood with reference to Christ include: Zech 9.9 ( דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא ), cited in Mt 21.5; Job 19.25 ( דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא ); Isa 62.11 ( דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא ).

<sup>255</sup> An Old Testament source for this is not obvious; in the New Testament the passages are clearer, such as Rom 15.16 ( דלכלתו קדמא דקדמא דא ); see also 2 Thess 2.13.

<sup>256</sup> Again, an Old Testament source for this is not clear, although Exod 31.3-5 could perhaps be read this way. In the New Testament see 1 Cor 12.4-11.

<sup>257</sup> See Jer 17.23.

<sup>258</sup> See Mt 5.17-18. See the note to the end of §37 below.







... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .  
... . . . . .

him. And because of this he also drove you away from him, just like your sacrifices, since a witness to these things that are said is also your present scattering among the peoples. For if he delighted in your sacrifices, it is evident that he would also gather you in from the peoples. But it is clear that up to this day he has not done this, because he does not delight in you, nor in your sacrifices.<sup>276</sup> But you also lie concerning the sabbath, (about) which you say ‘We keep (it)’.

[44] ... . . . .  
<sup>N94v</sup> | ... . . . .  
[4] ... . . . .

[44] The Jew: How do we lie in that which is seen by everyone, <sup>N94v</sup> (and) about which witnesses bear witness?

[45] ... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .  
... . . . .

[45] The Christian: Just as Moses, then, commanded concerning the sabbath day that it should be kept,<sup>279</sup> so (also) he commanded concerning the seventh year, saying: ‘You shall not sow your fields and you shall not prune your vineyards’,<sup>280</sup> and in the seventh year the harvests of the land shall be for the impoverished and for the poor.<sup>281</sup> And slaves who are the children of free-people shall be set free,<sup>282</sup> because it is a sabbath year for the land.<sup>283</sup> But (as for) you (and your claim), it is not seen that you keep this (sabbath) year, and you completely nullify all of the customary-

<sup>276</sup> See Hos 6.6.

<sup>277</sup> ... [N] leg ... ?

<sup>278</sup> ... [N] leg ... . While anti-Jewish polemical texts often argue that God has put an end to Jewish festivals (..., ‘ē<sup>2</sup>dē)—as for example Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 6.4 (Ebied *et al.*, p. 100), citing Hos 2.11 and Isa 1.14—it is not claimed that the Jews themselves have ended or nullified their festivals. In this passage it seems likely that the reference is to the Jews having nullified the laws and customary-practices (..., ‘yādē) associated with the sabbath year, and that an original reading ... (‘yādē), ‘customs’, has been misinterpreted by a later scribe as the common orthographic variant ... (‘ē<sup>2</sup>dē) for the standard form ... (‘ē<sup>2</sup>dē), ‘festivals’.

<sup>279</sup> See Exod 20.8-11, Deut 5.12-15.

<sup>280</sup> Lev 25.4.

<sup>281</sup> See Exod 23.10-11.

<sup>282</sup> For the manumission of Israelite slaves in the seventh year, see Exod 21.2, Lev 25.39-41, Deut 15.12.

<sup>283</sup> See Lev 25.4.

נהנה מן המלך. ואלו לעולם  
 יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.

practices.<sup>284</sup> And how is it not evident from these things that you also falsely keep the sabbath day? For given that you anger God during a whole year, through the cheating of the poor and of the slaves who are not liberated, how do you suppose that through one sabbath day—that which (itself) you nullify on account of your belly<sup>285</sup>—you appease God?

[46] שמ גם כל מלך המלך אל  
 נהנה מן המלך. ואלו לעולם  
 יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.  
 ואלו לעולם יעשה כבודו ויהיה נהנה מן המלך.

[46] We, however, with regard to these matters of God, do not (seek to) appease (him)<sup>287</sup> as you do, but we reckon all of these seven days which circle around (to be) the sabbath and (day of) rest of God. For thus also in the seventh year all the days of the year were reckoned as a sabbath. Just as in these seven days God made creation and (all) living things, and from then until now he has also worked and provided (for our needs) in them, and he is pleased with<sup>288</sup> Sunday as with the sabbath, so also—following the teaching of that Law which commanded that (the Jews) should offer up sacrifices and should circumcise boys on the sabbath day as on other days<sup>289</sup>—we honour all the days of the year and worship in all of them, and we render thanksgiving for our lives and our benefits to God our Creator and our Provider, and we

<sup>284</sup> See the note accompanying the textual emendation here.  
<sup>285</sup> Presumably this is a generic criticism of Jews for preparing food on the sabbath. If the author is still thinking of the Israelites in the wilderness (§43), see Exod 16.27-29.  
<sup>286</sup> נהנה מן המלך N\*]. נהנה מן המלך N.  
<sup>287</sup> This wording is awkward. It is possible that for נהנה מן המלך, ‘we appease’, we should read נהנה מן המלך, ‘we (do not) think (about these matters of God)’, which has been changed due to the influence of נהנה מן המלך, ‘you appease’, at the end of §45. But this is uncertain.  
<sup>288</sup> Or ‘takes rest on’.  
<sup>289</sup> For daily sacrifices, see Num 28.3, 10; 2 Chron 2.4, 31.3. For circumcision of a boy on the eighth day of his life see Lev 12.3; and for the Christian awareness that this could happen on the sabbath, see Jesus’ words in Jn 7.22-23. For similar arguments about God working on the sabbath, and the Law breaking the sabbath by allowing circumcision on it, and Christians (unlike Jews) worshipping God on every day of the week, see Bar Ṣalibi, *Against the Jews*, 2.11 (Ebied *et al.*, p. 54).

(ḥ)ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ  
 ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ  
 ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ  
 : ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ

constantly offer up (that) praise which is due  
 to him, and (we offer up) worship on account  
 of his deeds <sup>N95r</sup> and the majesty of his nature.

ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ  
 ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ  
 ḥḥḥḥ  
 ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ ḥḥḥḥ

END OF THE DISPUTATION  
 AGAINST THE JEWS  
 WHICH WAS PRODUCED  
 BY MAR IWANNIS.

Index of Biblical Citations<sup>290</sup>

Gen 1.26	C§28	<i>Josh 5.4-5</i>	C§37, 38
Gen 3.22	C§28	<i>Josh 5.9</i>	C§39
<i>Gen 4.8</i>	E§41	<i>Judg 2.12-13</i>	C§12
<i>Gen 8.20</i>	E§6	<i>1 Sam 15.22</i>	C§41
Gen 8.21	E§6	<i>1 Kgs 21.10-13</i>	E§42
Gen 11.7	C§28	<i>Job 19.25</i>	C§33
<i>Gen 17.10-14</i>	C§37	<i>Ps 2.7</i>	C§33
<i>Gen 18.1-2</i>	C§29	<i>Ps 2.10-12</i>	C§16
Gen 19.24	C§31	<i>Ps 22.17-18</i>	E§38
Gen 49.10-11	C§16	<i>Ps 22.19</i>	E§14
Gen 49.10	E§21, C§20	<i>Ps 24.10</i>	E§45
Gen 49.11	E§30	<i>Ps 33.6</i>	C§33
Exod 6.2-3	C§31	<i>Ps 47.6</i>	C§33
<i>Exod 12.1-3</i>	E§18	<i>Ps 50.14</i>	C§41
<i>Exod 16.3-12</i>	C§43	<i>Ps 69.22</i>	E§35
<i>Exod 20.8-11</i>	C§45	<i>Ps 78.65</i>	E§11
<i>Exod 21.2</i>	C§45	<i>Ps 106.37-38</i>	C§12
<i>Exod 23.10-11</i>	C§45	<i>Ps 119.89</i>	C§33
Exod 32.4	C§12	<i>Isa 1.4</i>	C§12
<i>Lev 12.3</i>	C§46	<i>Isa 1.10</i>	E§2
Lev 25.4	C§45	<i>Isa 2.3</i>	E§31
<i>Lev 25.39-41</i>	C§45	<i>Isa 6.3</i>	C§32
<i>Num 28.3</i>	C§46	<i>Isa 7.14</i>	E§20, C§18
<i>Deut 5.12-15</i>	C§45	<i>Isa 11.10</i>	C§16
Deut 6.4	C§25, 26	<i>Isa 33.21</i>	C§33
<i>Deut 15.12</i>	C§45	<i>Isa 40.8</i>	C§33
Deut 30.6	C§37	<i>Isa 43.23</i>	E§4
Josh 1.5 ('Jer')	E§16	<i>Isa 43.24</i>	E§8

<sup>290</sup> In this Index a prefixed E indicates the Pseudo-Ephremic disputation, and C the Pseudo-Chrysostomic disputation. Italicised references indicate biblical allusions, and non-italicised references indicate formal citations. Allusions can sometimes be understood as referencing multiple passages, and here only the most likely are given. Non-specific Gospel allusions are referenced to Matthew.

Isa 50.6	E§33	Wisd 2.12-20	E§39
Isa 53.5	E§36		
Isa 53.7-8	E§34	Mt 1.23	E§20
Isa 53.7	C§18	<i>Mt 3.10</i>	E§1
<i>Isa 62.11</i>	C§33	Mt 4.2	E§3
[ <i>Isa trad.</i> ]	E§43	Mt 4.6	E§52
Jer 11.13	C§12	Mt 4.7	E§52
Jer 11.19	E§37	Mt 4.8-9	E§52
<i>Jer 23.5</i>	C§33	Mt 4.10-11	E§52
Jer 23.24	E§24	Mt 9.11	E§3
Jer 29.10	C§22	Mt 14.36	E§12
<i>Jer 38.6</i>	E§16	<i>Mt 19.17</i>	C§41
Ezek 3.3	E§26	Mt 21.13	E§52
Dan 7.9	E§13	Mt 21.18	E§3
Dan 7.13	E§28	<i>Mt 22.32</i>	C§2, 6
Dan 7.13-14	E§27	<i>Mt 23.35</i>	E§44
Dan 9.2	C§22	Mt 26.17	E§3
Dan 9.25-27	C§18	<i>Mt 27.45</i>	E§42
Dan 9.26	E§22	<i>Mt 27.51</i>	E§43, 44
Hos 3.4-5	C§21	Mk 4.38	E§10
<i>Hos 3.4-5</i>	C§24	Lk 7.36	E§3
<i>Hos 3.4</i>	E§21	Lk 19.30-31	E§52
Hos 6.6	C§41	Lk 22.8	E§3
<i>Hos 6.6</i>	C§43	<i>Lk 23.45</i>	E§41
Zech 9.9-10	E§28	Jn 1.12	E§50
<i>Zech 9.9</i>	C§33	Jn 4.6	E§7
Mal 2.17	E§9	Jn 10.30	E§15

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Ancient Texts

‘Abdišo’ bar Brika, *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writings*:

Assemani, Joseph Simonius, (ed. & trans.), *Bibliotheca orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, vol. 3.1 (Rome: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1725), p.1-362.

Habbi, Joseph, (ed. & trans.), *Abdišo’ Šob († 1318)*, *Catalogus Auctorum* (Baghdad: Publications of the Iraqi Academy, 1986)

Badger, George P., (trans.), *The Nestorians and Their Rituals* (2 vols.; London: Joseph Masters, 1852), vol. 2, p. 361-379.

Stadel, Seth M., (trans.), *The Catalogue of Books of ‘Abdisho’ bar Brikha: Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (forthcoming).

*Anonymous anti-Jewish Dialogue Poems*:

Brock, Sebastian P., *The People and the Peoples: Syriac Dialogue Poems from Late Antiquity* (Journal of Jewish Studies, Supplement Series 3. Oxford: Journal of Jewish Studies, 2019).

*Anonymous anti-Jewish Florilegium*:

Minov, Sergey, ‘An Unpublished Syriac Collection of the Old Testament Testimonia against the Jews from the Early Islamic Period’, in Emiliano Fiori & Bishara Ebeid, (eds), *Florilegia Syriaca: Mapping a Knowledge-Organizing Practice in the Syriac World* (Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 179; Leiden: Brill, 2023), p. 20-73.

Anonymous, *Treatise on the Triune Nature of God*:



Beck, Edmund, (ed. & trans.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermones, II* (CSCO 311-312, Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1970).

Ephrem, *Sermons on Faith*:

Beck, Edmund, (ed. & trans.), *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermones de Fide* (CSCO 212-213; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1961).

Pseudo-Epiphanius, *The Lives of the Prophets* (Syriac):

Nestle, Eberhard, (ed.), *Syrische Grammatik, mit Litteratur, Chrestomathie und Glossar* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Porta Linguarum Orientalium 5. Berlin: H. Reuther, 1888), p. 86–107.

Hall, Isaac H., (trans.), ‘The Lives of the Prophets’, *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 7 (1887), p.28-40, 63-64.

Gospels, Harklean:

White, Joseph, (ed. & trans.), *Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana ex codd. mss. Ridleianis in bibl. coll. Nov. Oxon. repositis nunc primum edita* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1778).

Kiraz, George K., & Juckel, Andreas, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîṭā and Harklean Versions* (4 vols.; NTTs 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996).

*Greek Philosophers, Syriac Sayings of*:

Arzhanov, Yury N., *Syriac Sayings of Greek Philosophers: A Study in Syriac Gnomologia with Edition and Translation* (CSCO 669; Leuven: Peeters, 2019).

Isaac of Antioch, Homilies:

Bedjan, Paulus, (ed.), *Homiliae S. Isaaci, syri Antiocheni* (Paris / Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1903).

Jacob of Serugh, Homilies against the Jews:

Albert, Micheline, *Jacques de Saroug. Homélie contre les Juifs* (Patrologia Orientalis 38.1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976).

Cosgrove, Isaac K., ‘Three Homilies against the Jews by Jacob of Sarug, edited with introduction, translation and notes’ (PhD dissertation, University of London, 1931).

Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*:

Bobichon, Philippe, (ed.), *Justin Martyr, Dialogue avec Tryphon* (Paradosis 47; 2 vols.; Fribourg: Fribourg Academic Press, 2003)

Narsai, *Homilies*:

Mingana, A. (ed.), *Narsai doctoris syri homiliae et carmina* (2 vols.; Mosul: Typis Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1905).

Philoxenus of Mabbug, *Homilies*:

Budge, Ernest A.W., (ed. & trans.), *The Discourses of Philoxenus Bishop of Mabbôgh, A.D. 485–519* (2 vols.; London: Asher & Co., 1894).

Philoxenus of Mabbug, *Treatise on the Trinity*:

Brière, Maurice, & Graffin, François, (eds), *Sancti Philoxeni Episcopi Mabbugensis Dissertationes decem de Uno e Sancta Trinitate incorporato et passo (Mēm̄rē contre Ḥabib). V. Appendices I. Tractatus II. Refutatio III. Epistula dogmatica. IV. Florilegium* (PO 41.1; Turnhout: Brepols, 1982).

Sergius the Stylite, *Disputation against a Jew*:

Hayman, A. Peter, *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew* (CSCO 338-339. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1973).

Thomas of Edessa, *Explanation of the Nativity*:

Possekkel, Ute, & Coakley, James F., *Thomas of Edessa's Explanations of the Nativity and Epiphany* (Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021)

Timothy, Catholicos, *Disputation with al-Mahdī*:

Heimgartner, Martin, (ed. & trans.), *Timotheos I., Ostsyrischer Patriarch: Disputation mit dem Kalifen al-Mahdī* (CSCO 631–632; Louvain: Peeters, 2011).

Mingana, Alphonse, 'The Apology of Timothy the Patriarch before the Caliph Mahdi', *Woodbrooke Studies 2* (Cambridge: Heffer & Sons, 1928), p.1-162.

Titus of Bostra, *Against the Manichees*:

Poirier, Paul-Hubert, Roman, Agathe, Schmidt, Thomas S., Crègeur, Eric, & Declerck, José H., (eds), *Titus Bostrensis. Contra Manichaeos libri IV graece et Syriace cum excerptis e Sacris Parallelis Iohanni Damasceno attributis* (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 82. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

### Secondary Literature

Audo, Toma, *Sīmtā d-lišānā sūryāyā* (2 vols.; Mosul: Dominican Press, 1897).

Becker, Adam H., 'Syriac Anti-Judaism: Polemic and Internal Critique', in Aaron M. Butts & Simcha M. Gross, (eds.), *Jews and Syriac Christians: Intersections across the First Millennium* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 180; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), p. 47-66.

Beit Arié, Malachi, 'Quantitative Typology of Oriental Paper Patterns', in Monique Zerdoun, (ed.), *Le papier au Moyen Âge: histoire et techniques*, (Bibliologia 19; Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), p. 41-53.

Binggeli, André, & Françoise Briquel Chatonnet, Muriel Debié, Youssef Dergham, Alain Desreumaux, Jibrail Dib, (eds), *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et garshuni du patriarcat syriaque-catholique de Charfet (Liban) I. Fonds patriarcal (Raḥmani) 1-125* (Publications patriarcales de Charfet: Dar'un-Harissa, 2021).

Brock, Sebastian P., 'The Mysteries Hidden in the Side of Christ', *Sobornost* 7:6 (1978), p. 462-472.

Brock, Sebastian P., 'Clothing metaphors as a means of theological expression in Syriac tradition', in Margot Schmidt, (ed.), *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Regensburg, 1982), p. 11-38.

Brock, Sebastian P., 'Passover, Annunciation and Epiclesis: Some Remarks on the Term *aggen* in the Syriac Versions of Lk. 1:35', *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982), p. 222-233.

Brock, Sebastian P., 'The Genealogy of the Virgin Mary in Sinai Syr. 16', *Scrinium* 2 (2006), p. 58-71.

Brock, Sebastian P., 'The Lives of the Prophets in Syriac: Some Soundings', in Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, (eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), p. 21-37.

Brock, Sebastian P., & Van Rompay, Lucas, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts and Fragments in the Library of Deir al-Surian, Wadi al-Natrun (Egypt)* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 227. Leuven: Peeters, 2014).

Coxe, Henry O., *Catalogus codicum mss. qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur. Pars I* (Oxford: E typographeo academico, 1852), Section 7: 'Catalogus codicum mss. collegii Novi'.

Debié, Muriel, 'Clavis de textes syriaques de controverse', in Ruani, Flavia, (ed.), *Les controverses religieuses en syriaque* (Études syriaques 13. Paris: Geuthner, 2016), p.385-446.

Di Rienzo, Annunziata, 'Gli Actus Silvestri nella tradizione in lingua siriana: il testimone contenuto nella manoscritto BL Add. 12,174', *Adamantius* 22 (2016), 328-348.

Drăghici, Bogdan-Gabriel, 'Competing Orthodoxies: Dionysius Bar Ṣalībī's *Treatise Against the Chalcedonians*' (DPhil dissertation, Oxford University, 2023).

Harkins, Paul W., *St. John Chrysostom: Discourses against Judaizing Christians* (The Fathers of the Church 68. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1979).

Hayman, A. Peter, 'The Image of the Jew in the Syriac Anti-Jewish Polemical Literature', in Neusner, Jacob and Frerichs, Ernest S., (eds.), *To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews and 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 423-441.

Houtman, Alberdina, 'The Targumic Versions of the Martyrdom of Isaiah', in Baasten, Martin F.J., and Munk, Reinier, (eds), *Studies in Hebrew Literature and Jewish Culture* (Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought 12; Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), p. 189-201.

Jacobs, Bert, 'Syriac Testimonies against the Muslims: The Qur'ānic and extra-Qur'ānic Quotations in Dionysius bar Ṣalībī's *Disputation against the Muslims*' (PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2021).

Jansma, Taeke, 'Ephraem on Genesis xlix, 10: An enquiry into the Syriac text forms as presented in his Commentary on Genesis', *Parole de l'Orient* 4 (1973), p. 247-256.

Lange, Christian, 'The Descent of Mary and the Syriac Commentary on the Diatessaron', *The Harp* 15 (2002), p. 107-116.

Levey, Samson H., *The Messiah, an Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targumim* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974).

Mayer, Wendy, 'Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews', in Chris L. de Wet & Wendy Mayer, (eds), *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives* (Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill), p. 58-136.

Minov, Sergey, 'The Syriac Reception of John Chrysostom's *Homilies against the Jews*: First Soundings', in *Vigiliae Christianae* (forthcoming).

- O'Keefe, John J., 'Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology', *Theological Studies* 58 (1997), p. 39-60.
- Poole, William, 'The Receipt of Manuscripts in New College Library 1624-1852', *New College Notes* 8.11 (2017), p.1-10.
- Rabo, Gabriel, *Dionysius Jakob Bar Šalibi. Syrischer Kommentar zum Römerbrief: Einleitung, Edition und Übersetzung mit einem Verzeichnis der syrischen Handschriften zu seinen sämtlichen Werken* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, I. Reihe: Syriaca 56. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2019).
- Ridley, Gloucester, *De Syriacarum novi foederis versionum indole atque usu dissertatio; Philoxenianam cum simplici e duobus pervetustis codd. mss. ab Amida transmissis conferente* (London: Clarke, Whiston, White & Dodsley, 1761).
- Roggema, Barbara, 'Polemics between Religious Minorities: Christian *Adversus Judaeos* from the Early Abbasid Period', in Clara Almagro Vidal, Jessica Tearney-Price, & Luke Yarbrough, (eds), *Minorities in Contact in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 33. Turnhout: Brepols, 2020), p. 119-133.
- Rosenkranz, Simone, *Die jüdisch-christliche Auseinandersetzung unter islamischer Herrschaft: 7.-10. Jahrhundert* (Judaica et Christiana 21; Bern: Peter Lang, 2004).
- Sadowski, Michał, *The Trinitarian Analogies in the Christian Arab Apologetic Texts (750-1050)* (Syro-Arabica 7; Cordoba: CNERU / Beyrouth: CEDRAC, 2019).
- Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)* (4th ed.; Europäische Hochschulschriften. XXIII.172; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999).
- Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (11.-13. Jh.): mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum 4. Laterankonzil* (2nd ed.; Europäische Hochschulschriften. XXIII.335; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991).
- Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (13.-20. Jh.)* (Europäische Hochschulschriften. XXIII.497; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994).
- Shchuryk, Oleh, 'Lebēs pagrā as the Language of "Incarnation" in the Demonstrations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 83 (2007), p. 419-444.
- Shepardson, Christine C., *Anti-Judaism and Christian Orthodoxy: Ephrem's Hymns in Fourth-Century Syria* (Patristic Monograph Series 20. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008).
- Sony, Behnam M.B., *Fihris al-makhṭūṭāt al-baṭriarkiyya fī Dayr al-Šarfe, Lubnān* (Beirut: Šarikat alṭab' wa-al-našr al-lubnānī, 1993).
- Viezure, Dana I., 'Verbum Crucis, Virtus Dei: A Study of Theopaschism from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to the Age of Justinian' (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 2009).
- Williams, Lukyn, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935).
- Wilken, Robert L., *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).
- Wright, William, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired since the Year 1838* (3 vols.; London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1870-1872).
- Zotenberg, Hermann, *Catalogues des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaites) de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1874).