



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Miscellanea Syriaca
Author(s)	Toda, Satoshi
Citation	Journal of the Graduate School of Letters, 10, 41-57
Issue Date	2015-03
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/jgsl.10.41
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/58207
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	10_04_toda.pdf



Miscellanea Syriaca*

Satoshi TODA

1. Eusebiana Syriaca: Syriac Translation of the Works of Eusebius of Caesarea

Since Eusebius' works are fairly well represented in Syriac, some of which were translated very early — most probably during the fourth century, i.e., in a period very close to the author's lifetime and when Syriac literature was still in its earliest stage —, Eusebiana Syriaca deserve special attention from diverse points of view. After making a survey of Syriac translations of

*Abbreviation:

BAUMSTARK = A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluß der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*, Bonn: Marcus & Webers, 1922 (repr. Berlin 1968).

CPG = M. GEERARD, *Clavis patrum graecorum*, vol. 2, Turnhout: Brepols, 1974.

CURETON = W. CURETON (ed.), *History of the Martyrs in Palestine*, London: Williams & Norgate, 1861

GCS = Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte

GRESSMANN, *Studien* = H. GRESSMANN, *Studien zu Eusebs Theophanie* (TU, 23.3), Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903.

GRESSMANN, *Theophanie* = H. GRESSMANN (ed.), *Eusebius Werke*. Bd. 3, 2. Teil: *Die Theophanie. Die griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der syrischen Überlieferung*, 2. Aufl. by A. Laminski (GCS), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992.

JSL = *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*

LEE = S. LEE (ed.), *Eusebius bishop of Caesarea, on the Theophania etc.*, London: printed for the Society for the publication of Oriental texts, 1842.

SCHALL = A. SCHALL, *Studien über griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960.

SCHWARTZ = E. SCHWARTZ (ed.), *Eusebius Werke*. 2. Bd. *Die Kirchengeschichte* (GCS), 3 vols., Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.

TSyr = R. Payne SMITH (ed.), *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1879–1901 (repr. Hildesheim, 2001).

TU = *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*

VOIGT = R. VOIGT, "Griechischer Wortindex zu Anton Schalls "Studien über griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen"", in: R. LAVENANT (ed.), *Symposium Syriacum VII* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 256), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1998, pp. 539–543.

WRIGHT-MCLEAN = W. WRIGHT, & N. MCLEAN (eds.), *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac*, Cambridge: University Press, 1898.

Chapter 1 originates from a paper read at the 16th International Patristics Conference held in Oxford in August 2011.

Chapter 2 originates from a paper read at the 11th Symposium Syriacum held in Malta in July 2012.

Eusebius' works, this chapter will discuss some problems concerning the situations in which those translations, more precisely those of earlier dates, were done.

1.1 A List of Eusebius' Works Translated into Syriac

A list of Eusebius' works translated into Syriac is conveniently provided by CPG¹. It is natural that several biblical manuscripts preserve Eusebius' *Epistula ad Carpianum* (CPG 3465)². The rest of his works in Syriac is normally preserved in only one or two manuscripts, which is not extraordinary, as the number of preserved Syriac manuscripts is relatively small.

Some works were translated very early. As is well known, the oldest dated Syriac manuscript, Add. 12150 (A.D. 411) now preserved in the British Library, contains Syriac translations of two of Eusebius' works: the *Theophania* (CPG 3488) and the *De martyribus Palaestinae* (CPG 3490)³. It is most probable that they were translated into Syriac during the fourth century. In this context the *Historia ecclesiastica* (CPG 3495) can also be mentioned, which probably was also translated into Syriac during the fourth century⁴.

As for Eusebius' works concerning the Bible, in addition to the aforementioned *Epistula ad Carpianum* the *Onomasticon* (CPG 3466) was also translated into Syriac. Its fragments were published for the first time in the journal *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*⁵, and published again by Stefan Timm in 2004, this time in transcription⁶. The *Quaestiones evangelicae* (CPG 3470) was also translated into Syriac; its Greek original was recently published with a French translation, and there the Syriac versions are briefly discussed⁷.

CPG says that fragments of the *Apologia pro Origene* (CPG 3476) were published in "P. DE

1 Eusebius' works, authentic and spurious, figure in CPG, pp. 262–275 (CPG 3465–3507).

2 The edition of the Syriac text of the *Epistula ad Carpianum* is: P.E. PUSEY & G.N. GWILLIAM, *Tetraeuangelium sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum versionem*, Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1901, pp. 2–4 (Syriac text). For manuscripts which attest the *Epistula*, see *ibid.*, p. xii. See also BAUMSTARK, p. 59 n. 8.

3 The edition of the Syriac text of the *Theophania* is LEE, *Theophania*; see also BAUMSTARK, p. 58 n. 7. The edition of the Syriac text of the *History of the Martyrs of Palestine* is CURETON; see also BAUMSTARK, p. 59 n. 1. Perhaps we should rather say 'three' translations of Eusebius' works instead of 'two', since CPG mentions Eusebius' another work preserved solely in Syriac, 'Laudatio martyrum omnium' (CPG 3493), which is also contained in the same manuscript Add. 12150 (See W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year 1838*, vol. 2, London: British Museum, 1871, p. 632). The correct information concerning this Syriac text (the information given in CPG is not correct) is: W. WRIGHT, "The Encomium of the Martyrs", *JSL*, n.s. 5 (1864), pp. 403–408 (Syriac text); B.H. COWPER., "The Encomium of the Martyrs. By Eusebius of Caesarea. English Translation", *JSL*, n.s. 6 (1864), pp. 129–133 (English translation). See also BAUMSTARK, p. 59 n. 2.

4 The edition of the Syriac text of the *Historia ecclesiastica* which is used in this article is WRIGHT-McLEAN, but there is also another edition published by Bedjan. See BAUMSTARK, p. 59 n. 4.

5 IGNACE EPHREM II RAHMANI, E. TISSERANT, E. POWER, R. DEVREESE (eds.), "L'onomasticon d'Eusèbe dans une ancienne traduction syriaque", *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 23 (1922–1923), pp. 225–270.

6 S. TIMM (ed.), *Eusebius von Caesarea. Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen* (TU, 152), Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005. Concerning the *Onomasticon*, the same scholar subsequently published another monograph: S. TIMM, *Eusebius und die Heilige Schrift. Die Schriftvorlagen des Onomastikons der biblischen Ortsnamen* (TU, 166), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

7 C. ZAMAGNI (ed.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Questions évangéliques* (Sources chrétiennes, 523), Paris: Cerf, 2008, pp. 16–18.

LAGARDE, *Analecta syriaca*, Lipsiae, 1858, p. 64 sqq.”, but I could not identify the text⁸. In the section ‘Apologetica’ of CPG, the aforementioned *Theophania* (CPG 3488) is the only work, of which Syriac translation is extant; other works, notably the *Praeparatio euangelica* (CPG 3486) and the *Demonstratio euangelica* (CPG 3487), do not seem to have been translated into Syriac at all. Perhaps they are too much oriented toward Greek culture (in the case of the *Praeparatio*), or toward the Jewish scripture (in the case of the *Demonstratio*); or perhaps they were simply too long to be translated.

The section ‘Historica’ seems to be a genre favored by Syriac Christians and in Syriac we have the *De martyribus Palaestinae* (CPG 3490), the *Laudatio martyrum omnium* (CPG 3493), and the *Historia ecclesiastica* (CPG 3495), all of which were mentioned above. Another historical work of his, the *Chronicon* (CPG 3494), is preserved in two translations, i.e. in Armenian and in Latin (the latter in the recension revised by Jerome), and since it is known that, in the case of Eusebius’ *Historia ecclesiastica*, its Armenian translation comes not from Greek but from Syriac⁹, one can wonder whether the same thing can be said with the *Chronicon*; in my view, this question needs to be examined from the Armenian side and not from the Syriac side, because Beyer says in a series of articles¹⁰ that, having been incorporated into the Syriac tradition of various chronicles, the Syriac tradition related to the *Chronicon* is extremely complicated. Of Eusebius’ later works of the same section ‘Historica’, notably the *Vita Constantini* (CPG 3496) and the *De laudibus Constantini* (CPG 3498), no traces of translation into Syriac have been detected¹¹.

Finally, just for reference, mention can be made of a spurious work, *De stella magorum* (CPG 3507), attested in a sixth-century manuscript, Add. 17142¹².

1.2 Some Observations

One can wonder whether these early translations, i.e. the *Theophania*, the *De martyribus Palaestinae* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*, were done by one and the same translator, or piecemeal and independently. On this point Gressmann contrasts the way Greek is translated in the *Theophania* with the way in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, thus suggesting that the two works were translated independently¹³. However, since this question did apparently not interest Gressmann very much, he does not provide any clear argument. A more precise argument is needed.

It is well known that Eusebius often quotes his own works, and in the *Theophania*

8 On this, see also BAUMSTARK, p. 59 n. 9.

9 This fact is indicated in the title of the Armenian translation published in Venice in 1877. Another example of an Armenian rendering of a Greek original *via Syriac* is Basil of Caesarea’s *Hexaemeron*; see R.W. THOMSON, *The Armenian Adaptation of the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus*, Leuven: Peeters, 2001, p. 7.

10 G. BEYER, “Die evangelischen Fragen und Lösungen des Eusebius in jakobitischer Überlieferung und deren nestorianische Parallelen. Syrische Texte, herausgegeben, übersetzt und untersucht”, *Oriens Christianus* 20–22 (1925), pp. 30–70; 23 (1927), pp. 80–97, 284–292; 24 (1927), pp. 57–69.

11 F. WINKELMANN, *Die Textbezeugung der Vita Constantini des Eusebius von Caesarea* (TU, 84), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962, contains not a mention of any Syriac rendering of the two works.

12 The edition and the translation of the text is: W. WRIGHT, “Eusebius of Caesarea on the Star”, *JSL*, n.s. 9 (1866), pp. 117–136 (Syriac text); 10 (1867), pp. 150–164 (English translation). See also BAUMSTARK, p. 59 n. 10.

13 GRESSMANN, *Theophanie*, p. XXI.

The difference is so evident (e.g. different words are used for rendering the same Greek word) that no detailed analysis seems necessary. It is evident that the two translations were done independently. In passing it should also be mentioned that the translator of the *Theophania* apparently tried to maintain as much as possible the word order of the Greek original, thus distorting what is natural expression in Syriac.

Since there is no external evidence as to the translator(s), name(s), origin(s), etc., it is quite difficult to say anything about them or place(s) where their translation activity can be situated. Gressmann argues that the *Theophania* seems to have been translated in Edessa, the very place where the aforementioned manuscript Add. 12150 was written and compiled. His argument is based on a word which is a technical term related to the administration of the city¹⁵, and I have nothing to say against his argument.

One can wonder, on the other hand, if other early translations, the *De martyribus Palaestinae* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*, were made also in Edessa or rather in other place(s); comparison of biblical quotations contained in these translations might be revealing on this point. As far as I have noticed, the *De martyribus Palaestinae* contains almost no biblical quotations; at the beginning there are three quotations from chapter 8 of the Romans:

[illegible]

Rom. 8.37¹⁷

[illegible]

And at the end there is another quotation from chapter 2 of the first Corinthians:

I Cor. 2.9¹⁹ כִּי הָיָה חֵסֶד וְחַסְדֵּי הַיְיָ אֵלֵינוּ לְבָרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵסֶד וְחַסְדֵּי הַיְיָ אֵלֵינוּ לְבָרְכֵנוּ
בְּחֵסֶד וְחַסְדֵּי הַיְיָ אֵלֵינוּ לְבָרְכֵנוּ בְּחֵסֶד וְחַסְדֵּי הַיְיָ אֵלֵינוּ לְבָרְכֵנוּ.

These passages are all that I have been able to identify²⁰. And for reference, the text of the Peshitta runs as follows respectively²¹:

Rom. 8.35-36 ሰር ደብዳቤት ሰር ደብዳቤት ሰር ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት
 ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት ደብዳቤት

Rom. 8.37 حَسْبِيَ كُلُّ شَيْءٍ

Rom. 8.38-39 ඌන කල්ලිඳු ඌන කැරිඳු ඌන තුන ඌන තෙතන ඌන දු ඌන තෙත
 තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන
 තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන
 තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන ඌන තෙතන

15 GRESSMANN, *Studien*, p. 86 and GRESSMANN, *Theophanie*, p. XII. It is concerned with the word קִסֵּק, which Gressmann equates with τοπαρχία.

16 CURETON, p. 2 (Syriac text) ll. 16–19.

17 CURETON, p. 2 (Syriac text) ll. 20–21.

18 CURETON, p. 2 (Syriac text) ll. 24-27.

19 CURETON, p. 52 (Syriac text) ll. 8-10.

20 I realize that the *De martyribus Palaestinae* in Syriac presents diverse problems which cannot be dealt with in this paper; for one thing, comparison of proper names in the Syriac text with the Greek text might give some insight as to the making of this Syriac text. I intend to come back to the subject on another occasion.

21 Quotations are from the Syriac Bible published in 1979 by United Bible Societies, pp. 211–212 and p. 222.

I Cor. 2.9

חשב לה שזה נאמר לה שחבל לה להחזיק לה שלם חכם דולב
אלמלא לה שלם הישגם לה.

No clear textual resemblance can be observed²², and thus no clue whatsoever can be obtained from this comparison.

Next, the biblical quotations of the *Theophania* and the *Historia ecclesiastica* should be compared. Here one can say that less coincidence than divergence can be observed between the two; more precisely, the two following quotations from the Old Testament have been identified, and they are strictly the same²³:

Gen. 1.26:

Theophania

בבית אביא אצלך אצלך

Historia ecclesiastica

בבית. אצל כל חלוצי חסד.

Ps. 2.8:

Theophania

• ගුණගතික ක්‍රමය යනු විවිධ මට්ටම්

Historia ecclesiastica

የሰላም ጥሪ ለሁሉም

On the other hand, quotations from the New Testament differ²⁴, as is shown below:

Mt. 24.21 (see the underlined words):

[illegible]

Historia ecclesiastica

කතෘ තමා ඉ තථසාර කත ව්‍යාප්ති පුළුවන හි කත
.කත ව්‍යාප්ති පුළුවන තමා

Lk. 19.42-44 (different words are many):

Theophania

[illegible]

Historia ecclesiastica

١٠٠٠
 ١٠٠٠
 ١٠٠٠

Is it possible that quotations from the New Testament show such differences, if the two translations were done in the same place? It is difficult to answer this question positively. Thus I suggest that the Syriac translation of the *Theophania* and that of the *Historia ecclesiastica* originate from two different places, i.e., that the Syriac translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* originate from elsewhere than Edessa, although I cannot name any specific place.

1.3 Additional Remark

Eberhard Nestle was known not only as a textual critic of the New Testament, but also as a

22 Both texts of I Cor. 2.9 are almost identical, to be sure, but in Syriac this passage cannot be translated otherwise.

23 Gen. 1.26: LEE, p. 23 ll. 3-4; WRIGHT-MCLEAN, p. 8 ll. 14-15. Ps. 2.8: LEE, p. 134 l. 3 & l. 8, p. 159 l. 6; WRIGHT-MCLEAN, p. 134 ll. 6-7. This seems to indicate that, by the time when these translations were done, the text of the Syriac Old Testament had been well established.

24 Mt. 24.21: LEE, p. 155 ll. 9-10; WRIGHT-McLEAN, p. 129 ll. 6-8. Lk. 19.42-44: LEE, p. 151 ll. 2-5; WRIGHT-McLEAN, p. 130 ll. 2-6.

Syriac scholar who translated into German the Syriac version of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. In a response to various reviews of this German translation, Nestle pointed out that the same Greek word ἀσκητής is translated differently in three passages of the Syriac version: the first one by ܐܫܬܝܬܐ, the second by ܐܫܬܝܬܐ, and the third occurrence by ܐܫܬܝܬܐ²⁵. Whether Eusebius himself meant by the Greek word ἀσκητής a Christian monk or not is disputable, because the context in which ἀσκητής is used is concerned with the therapeutae of Philo. However, the three Syriac words surely point to Christian monks in diverse manners²⁶. The early Syriac translations discussed in this paper are interesting not only as early translations from Greek into Syriac, but also as witnesses, most probably of the fourth century, of the milieu in which they were done.

2. Some Observations on Earliest Syriac Translations

2.1 Prologue

From the very beginning, Christianity is involved in the problem of translation. It is evident that Jesus and his disciples spoke Aramaic. And yet, his sayings and those of his disciples are transmitted only in Greek; so are the apostle Paul's writings. Does this mean that Christianity is hellenized from its very beginning? Can we think of a kind of Semitic Christianity which is entirely devoid of influence from Greek culture? Here perhaps one might mention Aphrahat as a possible representative of such Semitic Christianity, but studying Aphrahat's Christianity will still not suffice, because his language contains a number of loan words from Greek²⁷, which means that, at least indirectly, even Aphrahat was under the influence of Greek culture. To be able to sound the depth of the influence of Greek culture upon the Semitic culture in which Christianity was born, the phase of contact between these two cultures *before* the birth of Christianity should be thoroughly studied; hence the importance of the study of Septuagint etc. However, the phase of contact *just after* the birth of Christianity is equally important, and this means that a thorough study of translation from Greek into Aramaic, especially into Syriac, is also indispensable.

When it comes to the problem of translation from Greek into Syriac in Christian milieu, evidently the Bible and its translations are of foremost importance for the obvious reason: for Syriac Christianity, as well as for other Christianities of the so-called Christian Orient, the Bible was the first book to be translated. And in this context I am convinced that the original language of *Diatessaron* of Tatian is most probably Greek²⁸, and thus the translation of *Diatessaron* from Greek into Syriac should probably be dated to the third century, and its status as the first Christian Bible in Syriac is yet to be confirmed. Having said this, of course I do not deny the capital importance of the Syriac Bible for the problem of translation from Greek into Syriac in

25 E. Nestle, 'Zur syrischen Übersetzung der Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 56 (1902), pp. 559–564.

26 A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, vol. 2: *Early Monasticism in Mesopotamia and Syria* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 197), pp. 34–35 mentions this same detail, but Vööbus wrongly says that the three Syriac words are the translations of the same word μοναχός (not ἀσκητής) (ibid., p. 34).

27 SCHALL, p. 113 counts 66 Greek loan words that are used by Aphrahat.

28 See TODA S., "Eusebius and Syriac Literature", *Parole de l'Orient* 36 (2011), pp. 515–524, at pp. 516–519.

general; however, problems surrounding the Syriac Bible are extremely complicated even if we take into consideration only the Sinaiticus and the Curetonianus and the Peshitta. In order to avoid complication as much as possible, the problems concerning the Syriac Bible will not be discussed here.

Syriac studies have a great advantage in the sense that not only Syriac literature has a long history from the third century onward (if we start from the *Book of the Laws of Countries* of Bardaišan), but it is attested by ancient *manuscripts*, the earliest of which date from the early fifth century. And the earliest dated Syriac manuscript, the famous Add.12150 of A.D. 411 now preserved in the British Library, contains several texts which are precisely translations from Greek into Syriac. So if we are to study seriously the problem of translation from Greek into Syriac, there is every reason to study in detail these translations of unquestionable antiquity; by “antiquity” the fourth century is meant, because no translation from Greek into Syriac can be safely dated prior to that century. Among the Syriac texts translated from Greek during that century, we can count all those translations which figure in the aforementioned manuscript; and also the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius of Caesarea, which was probably translated during the fourth century. For various reasons, this chapter has to limit itself to one aspect of the problem: it will deal mainly with the use of Greek loan words in these Syriac texts. More concretely, the *Theophania* of Eusebius, and the *Adversus Manichaeos* of Titus of Bostra will be studied in detail, both of which are preserved in the aforementioned manuscript Add. 12150²⁹. Each loan word will be compared with each corresponding Greek word in the original Greek texts, wherever such a comparison is possible³⁰.

2.2 Translation Techniques Observed in Earliest Translations

Mention must be made here of the famous study of Anton Schall³¹. In his book, Schall made a survey of Greek loan words in Syriac texts, and his study is based on a much broader basis than the present article. However, his analysis does not necessarily focus on the problem of translation, and this fact has some repercussion in his description of loan words. For exam-

29 For the *Theophania*, its Syriac version is edited in LEE, *Theophania*, and its Greek fragments were edited in GRESSMANN, *Theophanie*, pp. 3–35. For the work of Titus of Bostra, both the Greek original and its Syriac version were edited by Paul de Lagarde in 1859 (*Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos libri quatuor syriace* and *Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi servata sunt graece* respectively); the book I consult is a photomechanical reproduction into which the two books, Greek and Syriac, are merged (published jointly by Verlagbuchhandlung Otto Zeller & Antiquariat Otto Harrassowitz in 1967). The Greek text edited by de Lagarde ends at III 6, but subsequently III 7–30 (III 30 is interrupted in the middle) was edited by P. Nagel: P. NAGEL, “Neues griechisches Material zu Titus von Bostra (Adversus Manichaeos III 7–29)”, in: J. IRMSCHER & P. NAGEL (eds.), *Studia Byzantina, Folge II* (Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten, 44), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973, pp. 296–348. I regret to have been unable to consult the recent edition of A. ROMAN, P.-H. POIRIER et al. (eds.), *Titi Bostrensis Contra Manichaeos libri IV: Graece et Syriace* (Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca, 82), Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

30 I am aware that by saying this, a presupposition is tacitly posed that the Greek text in question which we have in hand (e.g. Titus’ Greek text) is the *Vorlage* (or identical with the *Vorlage*) of the Syriac translation in question (e.g. Titus’ Syriac version). To be sure, this presupposition can be problematic, but it is unavoidable in order not to complicate too much the discussion.

31 SCHALL, which should now be completed by VOIGT.

ple, Schall mentions the loan word ܠܡܥܪ (TSyr col. 307) and he links it with a greek word σχῆμα³², which is evidently correct, since the form ܠܡܥܪ derives from σχῆμα. However, the problem from our viewpoint is that, in the two Syriac texts mentioned above, the Syriac loan word ܠܡܥܪ usually translates the Greek word τρόπος (used in the expression τίνα τρόπον and the like) and not σχῆμα³³. A similar remark can be made about the word ܠܡܥܪ (TSyr col. 318): this word ܠܡܥܪ, which derives from the Greek word σκῦτος, usually renders the

32 SCHALL, p. 54 etc.; see VOIGT, p. 542 s.v. σχῆμα.

33 ܠܡܥܪ=τρόπος, in the *Theophania* (10 instances in all): Syr p. 95 l. 9=Gr p. 4 l. 6; Syr p. 106 l. 20=Gr p. 5 l. 22; Syr p. 113 l. 15=Gr p. 12 l. 7; Syr p. 141 l. 3=Gr p. 24 l. 17; Syr p. 141 l. 10=Gr p. 24 l. 23; Syr p. 141 l. 25=Gr p. 24 l. 27; Syr p. 151 l. 26=Gr p. 30 l. 4; Syr p. 153 l. 15=Gr p. 31 l. 17; Syr p. 167 l. 23=Gr p. 33 l. 19; Syr p. 198 l. 3=Gr p. 34 l. 12.

The correspondence ܠܡܥܪ=σχῆμα can be observed in the *Theophania* in the following two passages: Syr p. 128 l. 22=Gr p. 18 l. 17; Syr p. 137 l. 6=Gr p. 24 l. 8.

In the *Theophania*, ܠܡܥܪ ܕܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ (Syr p. 112 l. 14) corresponds to καὶ ἡ τῷ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἀρχιερεῖ συσχηματιζομένη τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσηγορία (Gr p. 11 ll. 4-5); thus ܠܡܥܪ seems to be a part of the effort to translate συσχηματιζομένη.

ܠܡܥܪ=τρόπος, in TitBostr (69 instances in all): Syr p. 2 l. 24 (I 1)=Gr p. 1 l. 24; Syr p. 3 l. 8 (I 1)=Gr p. 2 l. 5; Syr p. 3 l. 13 (I 1)=Gr p. 2 l. 9; Syr p. 4 l. 13 (I 3)=Gr p. 3 ll. 2-3; Syr p. 5 l. 11 (I 4)=Gr p. 3 l. 33; Syr p. 9 l. 15 (I 13)=Gr p. 6 l. 38; Syr p. 12 l. 34 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 23; Syr p. 13 l. 2 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 26; Syr p. 13 l. 21 (I 17)=Gr p. 10 l. 5; Syr p. 15 l. 29 (I 19)=Gr p. 11 l. 36; Syr p. 17 l. 12 (I 22)=Gr p. 13 l. 6; Syr p. 19 l. 18 (I 23)=Gr p. 14 l. 29; Syr p. 21 l. 32 (I 26)=Gr p. 16 l. 27; Syr p. 21 l. 33 (I 26)=Gr p. 16 l. 29; Syr p. 23 l. 5 (I 28)=Gr p. 17 l. 31; Syr p. 30 l. 15 (I 37)=Gr p. 23 l. 35; Syr p. 32 l. 22 (I 42)=Gr p. 25 l. 28; Syr p. 34 l. 5 (II 3)=Gr p. 26 l. 34; Syr p. 36 l. 11 (II 5)=Gr p. 28 l. 24; Syr p. 36 l. 21 (II 5)=Gr p. 28 l. 32; Syr p. 36 l. 25 (II 5)=Gr p. 28 l. 37; Syr p. 36 l. 32 (II 6)=Gr p. 29 l. 4; Syr p. 38 l. 25 (II 8)=Gr p. 30 l. 18; Syr p. 42 l. 9 (II 15)=Gr p. 33 l. 15; Syr p. 42 l. 25 (II 15)=Gr p. 33 l. 29; Syr p. 45 l. 32 (II 18)=Gr p. 36 l. 9; Syr p. 46 l. 34 (II 20)=Gr p. 37 l. 2; Syr p. 48 l. 23 (II 21; ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ)=Gr p. 38 l. 15; Syr p. 49 l. 5 (II 22)=Gr p. 38 l. 31; Syr p. 49 l. 27 (II 22)=Gr p. 39 l. 13; Syr p. 50 l. 14 (II 22)=Gr p. 39 l. 34; Syr p. 51 l. 21 (II 23)=Gr p. 40 l. 35; Syr p. 51 l. 25 (II 23; ܠܡܥܪ ܠܡܥܪ)=Gr p. 40 l. 39 (πάντα τρόποι); Syr p. 52 l. 3 (II 24)=Gr p. 41 l. 11; Syr p. 52 l. 10 (II 24)=Gr p. 41 l. 19; Syr p. 53 l. 10 (II 24)=Gr p. 42 l. 13; Syr p. 55 l. 1 (II 27)=Gr p. 43 l. 31; Syr p. 55 l. 24 (II 28)=Gr p. 44 l. 14; Syr p. 56 l. 13 (II 29)=Gr p. 44 l. 37; Syr p. 56 l. 31 (II 31)=Gr p. 45 l. 15; Syr p. 57 l. 3 (II 31)=Gr p. 45 l. 23; Syr p. 58 l. 5 (II 33)=Gr p. 46 l. 19; Syr p. 59 l. 2 (II 36)=Gr p. 47 l. 10; Syr p. 59 l. 30 (II 37)=Gr p. 47 l. 36; Syr p. 59 l. 32 (II 37)=Gr p. 47 l. 38; Syr p. 60 l. 11 (II 37)=Gr p. 48 l. 11; Syr p. 60 l. 15 (II 37)=Gr p. 48 l. 14; Syr p. 64 l. 11 (II 42)=Gr p. 51 l. 21; Syr p. 65 l. 2 (II 43)=Gr p. 52 l. 5; Syr p. 65 l. 21 (II 43)=Gr p. 52 l. 22; Syr p. 65 l. 24 (II 43)=Gr p. 52 l. 25; Syr p. 66 l. 12 (II 44)=Gr p. 53 l. 9; Syr p. 67 l. 13 (II 45)=Gr p. 54 l. 3; Syr p. 67 l. 34 (II 45)=Gr p. 54 l. 23; Syr p. 69 l. 26 (II 47)=Gr p. 56 l. 3; Syr p. 70 l. 6 (II 48)=Gr p. 56 l. 18; Syr p. 70 l. 34 (II 49)=Gr p. 57 l. 4; Syr p. 73 l. 13 (II 53)=Gr p. 59 l. 1; Syr p. 76 l. 5 (II 56)=Gr p. 61 l. 21; Syr p. 79 l. 10 (II 62)=Gr p. 64 l. 9; Syr p. 84 l. 2 (III 5)=Gr p. 68 l. 19; Syr p. 88 l. 33 (III 14)=Gr Nagel p. 310 l. 19 (III 14,4); Syr p. 90 l. 13 (III 16)=Gr Nagel p. 316 l. 11 (III 16,3); Syr p. 90 l. 15 (III 16)=Gr Nagel p. 316 l. 13 (III 16,3); Syr p. 93 l. 11 (III 21)=Gr Nagel p. 326 l. 15 (III 21,5); Syr p. 93 l. 32 (III 23)=Gr Nagel p. 330 l. 3 (III 23,1); Syr p. 96 l. 9 (III 26)=Gr Nagel p. 338 l. 5 (III 26,2); Syr p. 98 l. 8 (III 29)=Gr Nagel p. 346 l. 4 (III 29,8); Syr p. 98 l. 18 (III 29)=Gr Nagel p. 346 l. 14 (III 29,13).

ܠܡܥܪ ܠܡܥܪ in TitBostr Syr p. 58 l. 21 (II 34) renders παντοίως in TitBostr Gr p. 46 ll. 33-34; likewise ܠܡܥܪ ܠܡܥܪ in TitBostr Syr p. 63 l. 30 (II 42) renders παντοίως in TitBostr Gr p. 51 l. 6. ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ in TitBostr Syr p. 13 l. 26 renders εὐσχημονέστερον in TitBostr Gr p. 10 l. 10. Possibly TitBostr Syr p. 79 l. 3 (ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ) renders λόγος in TitBostr Gr p. 64 l. 4. These usages of ܠܡܥܪ are not found in the *Theophania*, although it should be noted that the preserved Greek text of the *Theophania* is only fragmentary.

For ܠܡܥܪ ܠܡܥܪ (I 13; TitBostr Syr p. 10 l. 18), ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ (I 18; TitBostr Syr p. 14 l. 18) and ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ (II 5; TitBostr Syr p. 36 l. 13), one cannot find corresponding Greek words in TitBostr Gr.

Greek word μάστιξ and not σκῦτος³⁴. These two cases seem to suggest that behind these renderings lies a long history of practice of translation from Greek into Syriac, and that this practice was already well established at the time when these Syriac translations were done.

The following observations seem to confirm this impression.

(a) It is quite understandable that ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ (TSyr col. 753) is used to render the root γεν- of the word γένος etc.³⁵; however, it is also used in the expression ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (“of all sort”), when the Greek text has the adjective ποικίλος or the words of the same root. This rendering is all the more interesting, because in most cases the notion of multiplicity is expressed by another word (usually it is ܠܡܢܝܐ or ܠܡܢܝܐܐ). Thus the expression ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ is used, as it were, simply to indicate the existence of the adjective ποικίλος or the words of the same root in the Greek original³⁶.

(b) Normally the word ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ (TSyr col. 1465) is considered to render either τάξις or τάγμα, and this is of course the case with the *Theophania* and the *Adversus Manichaeos*³⁷.

34 More precisely, the Syriac word always appears in the expression “ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܠܡܢܝܐܐ”: TitBostr Syr p. 61 l. 12 (II 38; ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܠܡܢܝܐܐ ܕܥܡܐܐ) = TitBostr Gr p. 49 l. 6 (καὶ διαβάλλοι μάστιγα); TitBostr Syr p. 63 l. 18 (II 41; ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܠܡܢܝܐܐ ܕܥܡܐܐ ܕܥܡܐܐ) = TitBostr Gr p. 50 l. 34 (μάστιγος δίκην φαινομένης); TitBostr Syr p. 63 l. 23 (II 42; ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܠܡܢܝܐܐ ܕܥܡܐܐ) = TitBostr Gr p. 50 l. 39 (τὴν παρακειμένην μάστιγα). Reference to “Tit. Bostr.” given in TSyr col. 318 (“Tit. Bostr. 61. 12, 18, 23”) should be corrected accordingly.

35 ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ = γένος, in the *Theophania* (7 instances in all): Syr p. 111 l. 14 = Gr p. 9 l. 21; Syr p. 111 l. 18 = Gr p. 10 l. 1; Syr p. 113 l. 10 = Gr p. 12 l. 2; Syr p. 113 l. 18 = Gr p. 12 l. 11; Syr p. 125 l. 22 = Gr p. 16 l. 30; Syr p. 129 l. 2 = Gr p. 18 l. 25; Syr p. 134 l. 26 = Gr p. 22 l. 17.

ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ = γένος, in TitBostr (15 instances in all): Syr p. 9 l. 27 (I 13) = Gr p. 7 l. 8; Syr p. 9 l. 33 (I 13) = Gr p. 7 l. 12; Syr p. 20 l. 28 (I 24) = Gr p. 15 l. 32; Syr p. 20 l. 31 (I 24) = Gr p. 15 l. 34; Syr p. 31 l. 32 (I 40) = Gr p. 25 l. 6; Syr p. 55 l. 15 (II 28) = Gr p. 44 l. 5; Syr p. 57 l. 32 (II 32) = Gr p. 46 l. 12; Syr p. 66 l. 16 (II 44) = Gr p. 53 l. 13; Syr p. 66 l. 27 (II 44) = Gr p. 53 l. 24; Syr p. 66 l. 29 (II 44) = Gr p. 53 l. 26; Syr p. 70 l. 5 (II 47) = Gr p. 56 l. 17; Syr p. 75 l. 30 (II 56) = Gr p. 61 l. 10; Syr p. 78 l. 34 (II 62) = Gr p. 63 l. 38; Syr p. 80 l. 13 (bis) (II 64) = Gr p. 65 l. 10; Syr p. 82 l. 32 (III 1) = Gr p. 67 l. 16.

ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ = εἶδος can be observed in TitBostr: Syr p. 10 l. 10 (I 13) = Gr p. 7 l. 24.

ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ = ὁμογενής can be observed in TitBostr: Syr p. 13 l. 24 (I 17) = Gr p. 10 l. 8.

ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ = συγγενής can be observed in TitBostr (4 instances in all) : Syr p. 18 l. 27 (I 23) = Gr p. 14 l. 9; Syr p. 19 l. 12 (I 23) = Gr p. 14 l. 23; Syr p. 20 l. 33 (I 24) = Gr p. 15 l. 35; Syr p. 83 l. 11 (III 2) = Gr p. 67 l. 30 (ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ).

ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ = συγγένεια can be observed in TitBostr: Syr p. 21 l. 10 (I 24) = Gr p. 16 l. 6; Syr p. 74 l. 3 (II 54) = Gr p. 59 l. 26.

ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐܐ = ἄλλογενής, in the *Theophania*: Syr p. 153 l. 4 = Gr p. 31 l. 4; Syr p. 153 l. 13 = Gr p. 31 ll. 14-15.

36 ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ as the expression used to indicate the existence of the adjective ποικίλος in the Greek text, in TitBostr (10 instances in all): Syr p. 33 l. 13 (II 2) = Gr p. 26 l. 11 (with no adjective); Syr p. 48 ll. 12-13 (II 21) = Gr p. 38 l. 6 (ποικιλία itself is expressed by ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐܐ); Syr p. 48 ll. 33-34 (II 21) = Gr p. 38 l. 24 (τὸ ποικίλον itself is expressed by ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐܐ); Syr p. 64 l. 23 (II 43) = Gr p. 51 l. 32 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ); Syr p. 64 l. 25 (II 43) = Gr p. 51 l. 36 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ); Syr p. 64 ll. 28-29 (II 43) = Gr p. 51 l. 33 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ); Syr p. 66 l. 30 (II 44) = Gr p. 53 l. 26 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ); Syr p. 67 l. 10 (II 44) = Gr p. 54 l. 2 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ); Syr p. 69 l. 28 (II 47) = Gr p. 56 l. 5 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ); Syr p. 79 l. 6 (II 62) = Gr p. 64 l. 6 (with the adjective ܠܡܢܝܐܐ). This usage of ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ is not found in the *Theophania*, although it should be noted that the preserved Greek text of the *Theophania* is only fragmentary.

37 ܡܫܝܬܝܟܐ = τάξις, in TitBostr: Syr p. 32 l. 6 (I 40) = Gr p. 25 l. 14 et passim.

However, various other usages (including verb of this root) are also attested³⁸, which suggests that ܠܡܠܝܬ had become totally Syriacized by the end of the fourth century. One can also note that the Greek word λόγος is translated by the expression ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ³⁹. Furthermore, there is a word ܠܡܠܝܬ (TSyr col. 1467) which is a Syriac derivative of ܠܡܠܝܬ and although it is linked with various Greek words such as ταγή, συνταγή, σύνταγμα, ἑκταξίς etc. in TSyr, this ܠܡܠܝܬ is, morphologically speaking, no transcription of any Greek word at all⁴⁰.

(c) ܠܡܠܝܬ (TSyr col. 2383), which is a Syriacized transcription of νόμος, can be mentioned here. The fact that ܠܡܠܝܬ is used to render νόμος, and that it is also used to express the same word in a compound like ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ⁴¹ shows a high degree of Syriacization of this word. Furthermore, ܠܡܠܝܬ is used to render the adjective νόμιμος⁴².

(d) The word ܠܡܠܝܬ (TSyr col. 3116), or rather the root ܠܡܠܝܬ itself, is used to translate the Greek noun ܠܡܠܝܬ or various words derived from the same root. The use of the root ܠܡܠܝܬ shows so great a variety⁴³ that one can say that this root itself had become totally Syriacized by the

38 Various usages of ܠܡܠܝܬ (see also the next note), in TitBostr: Syr p. 21 l. 12 (I 24; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 16 l. 8 (ἀνίστατον); Syr p. 34 l. 4 (II 3; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 26 ll. 32-33 (ἀκοσμία); Syr p. 69 ll. 12-13 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 55 l. 30 (= νόμος); Syr p. 81 l. 17 (II 66; ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 66 l. 8 (= εὐτακτον); Syr p. 87 l. 12 (III 11; ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr Nagel p. 306 l. 3 (III 11,5; τεταγμένα). In the *Theophania*: Syr p. 107 l. 22 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 7 l. 1 (οἰκονομέομαι (?), cf. GRESSMANN, *Studien*, p. 29*); Syr p. 167 l.13 (ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 33 l. 6 (τάγματα).

39 Examples of λόγος translated as ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ, in TitBostr: Syr p. 48 l. 22 (II 21) = Gr. p. 38 l. 15; Syr p. 53 l. 7 (II 24) = Gr p. 42 l. 9. ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ rendering ἄλογος, in TitBostr: Syr p. 79 l. 28 (II 63) = Gr p. 64 l. 28; Syr p. 81 l. 29 (II 66) = Gr p. 66 l. 18.

40 Various usages of ܠܡܠܝܬ, in TitBostr: Syr p. 12 l. 15 (I 16) = Gr p. 9 l. 5 (= διάθεις); Syr p. 12 l. 20 (I 16) = Gr p. 9 l. 10 (= εὐταξία ?); Syr p. 16 l. 12 (I 19) = Gr p. 12 ll. 12-13 (= εὐταξία); Syr p. 78 l. 15 (II 61) = Gr p. 63 l. 19 (= σωφρονισμός).

41 ܠܡܠܝܬ = νόμος, in the *Theophania* (3 instances in all): Syr p. 115 l. 10 = Gr p. 14 l. 9; Syr p. 149 l. 1 = Gr p. 27 l. 3; Syr p. 152 l. 23 = Gr p. 30 l. 24. In TitBostr: passim.

ܠܡܠܝܬ = νομοθέτης, in the *Theophania*: Syr p. 130 l. 13 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 20 l. 4; Syr p. 135 l. 15 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 23 l. 7 (νομοθέταις).

ܠܡܠܝܬ = νομοθετέω, in the *Theophania*: Syr p. 135 l. 15 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 23 l. 6 (ἀντινομοθετέω). In TitBostr: Syr p. 49 ll. 15-16 (II 22; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 39 l. 3 (νενομοθέτηται); Syr p. 49 l. 24 (II 22; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 39 l. 3 (ὁ τῇ φύσει νενομοθετημένος); Syr p. 75 l. 28 (II 56; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 61 l. 7 (νενομοθετημένης); Syr p. 75 l. 31 (II 56; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 61 l. 11 (νομοθετοῦντες); Syr p. 78 l. 19 (II 61; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 63 l. 23 (νομοθετήσαντος); Syr p. 94 l. 18 (III 23; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr Nagel p. 332 l. 4 (III 23,11; ἐνομοθετέθη).

42 ܠܡܠܝܬ = νόμιμος, in the *Theophania*: Syr p. 134 l. 21 = Gr p. 22 l. 12 (νόμιμα). In TitBostr: Syr p. 77 l. 1 (II 58; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 62 l. 11 (= νόμιμος); Syr p. 77 l. 6 (II 59; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 62 l. 16 (= νομίμως).

ܠܡܠܝܬ = νομικός, in the *Theophania*: Syr p. 128 l. 26 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 18 l. 21 (νομικῶν).

ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ in TitBostr Syr p. 77 l. 2 (II 58) renders παρὰ νόμος (TitBostr Gr p. 62 l. 12). In the *Theophania* ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ in Syr p. 134 l. 19 renders παρὰ νόμου (Gr p. 22 l. 9).

ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ in TitBostr Syr p. 94 l. 19 renders διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς (TitBostr Gr Nagel p. 332 l. 4 (III 23,12)). In the *Theophania* ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ in Syr p. 141 l. 8 renders νομοδιδασκάλων (Gr p. 23 l. 6).

ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ in TitBostr Syr p. 28 l. 6 (I 34) renders τὸν ἡδουκῶτα (TitBostr Gr p. 21 l. 37).

43 The following enumeration of the words deriving from the root ܠܡܠܝܬ is not intended to be exhaustive. In the *Theophania*: Syr p. 113 l. 1 (ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 11 l. 19 (πείσμα); Syr p. 113 l. 6 (ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 11 l. 24 (λόγοις); Syr p. 114 l. 1 (ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 12 l. 20 (πείσαντες).

In TitBostr: Syr p. 17 l. 22 (I 22; ܠܡܠܝܬ ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 13 ll. 13-14 (ἀπιθάνον); Syr p. 29 l. 33 (I 36; ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 23 l. 18 (τὸ πιθάνον); Syr p. 56 l. 4 (II 29; ܠܡܠܝܬ) = Gr p. 44 l. 28 (πειθοῖ); Syr p. 82 l. 12 (III 1;

end of the fourth century.

(e) The usages of the word ܠܬܝܠܐ (TSyr col. 3273), which is originally a Syriacized transcription of the Greek word πόρος, are still more complicated. There are several instances where ܠܬܝܠܐ is used to render ἐπίνοια⁴⁴, but generally speaking ܠܬܝܠܐ, which probably means “means” or “trick” (in the wide sense of the term), renders a great variety of words⁴⁵; this shows that ܠܬܝܠܐ had become totally Syriacized by the end of the fourth century.

Other loan words should be briefly discussed here. The Greek word ὕλη is transcribed consistently as ܠܬܝܠܐ (TSyr col. 1004), and not ܠܬܝܠܐ (TSyr col. 990) in these Syriac texts⁴⁶. ܠܬܝܠܐ

ܠܬܝܠܐ)=Gr p. 67 l. 5 (πιθανότητι); Syr p. 89 l. 29 (III 15; ܠܬܝܠܐܝܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ)=Gr Nagel p. 314 l. 12 (III 15,11; ἀπειθεία); Syr p. 89 l. 33 (III 15; ܠܬܝܠܐܝܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ)=Gr Nagel p. 314 l. 16 (III 15,14; ἡπειθήσεν); Syr p. 90 l. 19 (III 17; ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ)=Gr Nagel p. 318 l. 2 (III 17,2; ἀπειθείας); Syr p. 90 l. 30 (III 17; ܠܬܝܠܐܝܬܝܠܐ)=Gr Nagel p. 318 l. 13 (III 17,6; πεῖθω).

44 Of course there is no morphological relation at all between asrwp and ἐπίνοια.

ܠܬܝܠܐ=ἐπίνοια in TitBostr (11 instances in all): Syr p. 11 l. 27 (I 14)=Gr p. 9 l. 26; Syr p. 31 l. 11 (I 40)=Gr p. 24 l. 27; Syr p. 59 l. 5 (II 36)=Gr p. 47 l. 12; Syr p. 59 l. 7 (II 36)=Gr p. 47 l. 15; Syr p. 59 l. 10 (II 36)=Gr p. 47 l. 17; Syr p. 59 l. 23 (II 36)=Gr p. 47 l. 29; Syr p. 59 l. 33 (II 37)=Gr p. 47 l. 39; Syr p. 60 l. 33 (II 37)=Gr p. 48 l. 31; Syr p. 72 l. 7 (II 51)=Gr p. 58 l. 2; Syr p. 72 l. 12 (II 51)=Gr p. 58 l. 7; Syr p. 73 l. 9 (II 53)=Gr p. 58 l. 36. This usage of ܠܬܝܠܐ is not found in the *Theophania*, although it should be noted that the preserved Greek text of the *Theophania* is only fragmentary.

45 Various usages of ܠܬܝܠܐ in TitBostr (other than enumerated in the preceding note): Syr p. 13 l. 19 (I 17)=Gr p. 10 l. 4 (σπουδαζόμενον); Syr p. 29 l. 33 (I 36)=Gr p. 23 l. 18 (μεταχείρησις); Syr p. 66 l. 13 (II 44)=Gr p. 53 l. 9 (μεμηχανημένην?); Syr p. 82 l. 13 (III 1; ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ)=Gr p. 66 l. 37 (πouκίλωζ?).

There are cases where correspondence between ܠܬܝܠܐ and any specific Greek word cannot be established. In TitBostr: Syr p. 21 l. 35 (I 26; ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ) should correspond to Gr p. 16 l. 31 (οὐδαμῶς οὐτε κατεπόθη), but word-for-word correspondence cannot be established; Syr p. 23 l. 15 (I 29; ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ) should correspond to Gr p. 17 l. 39 (μηδαμῶς?); Syr p. 30 l. 3 (I 36; ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ ܠܬܝܠܐ) should correspond to Gr p. 23 l. 23 (πλεῖονι σπουδῇ).

For ܠܬܝܠܐ (II 56; TitBostr Syr p. 76 l. 10), I could not find any corresponding Greek word in TitBostr Gr.

46 ܠܬܝܠܐ=ὕλη, in TitBostr (60 instances in all): Syr p. 5 l. 35 (I 6)=Gr p. 4 l. 16; Syr p. 11 l. 16 (I 14)=Gr p. 9 l. 18; Syr p. 12 l. 7 (I 15)=Gr p. 8 l. 37; Syr p. 12 l. 25 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 13; Syr p. 12 l. 32 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 20; Syr p. 12 l. 32 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 21; Syr p. 13 l. 3 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 27; Syr p. 13 l. 9 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 33; Syr p. 13 l. 11 (I 17)=Gr p. 9 l. 35; Syr p. 13 l. 21 (I 17)=Gr p. 10 l. 5; Syr p. 13 l. 31 (I 17)=Gr p. 10 l. 16; Syr p. 14 l. 14 (I 18)=Gr p. 10 l. 31; Syr p. 19 l. 14 (I 23)=Gr p. 14 l. 25; Syr p. 21 l. 9 (I 24)=Gr p. 16 l. 6; Syr p. 22 l. 18 (I 27)=Gr p. 17 l. 9; Syr p. 23 l. 7 (I 28)=Gr p. 17 l. 33; Syr p. 23 l. 13 (I 29)=Gr p. 17 l. 37; Syr p. 24 l. 10 (I 29)=Gr p. 18 l. 30; Syr p. 24 l. 22 (I 29)=Gr p. 19 l. 1; Syr p. 24 l. 28 (I 29)=Gr p. 19 l. 7; Syr p. 25 l. 12 (I 29)=Gr p. 19 l. 24; Syr p. 25 l. 15 (I 30)=Gr p. 19 l. 26; Syr p. 25 l. 16 (I 30)=Gr p. 19 l. 27; Syr p. 25 l. 24 (I 31)=Gr p. 19 l. 34; Syr p. 25 l. 32 (I 31)=Gr p. 20 l. 2; Syr p. 25 l. 34 (I 31)=Gr p. 20 l. 4; Syr p. 27 l. 20 (I 32)=Gr p. 21 l. 18; Syr p. 28 l. 1 (I 34)=Gr p. 21 l. 33; Syr p. 29 l. 18 (I 35)=Gr p. 23 l. 3; Syr p. 29 l. 30 (I 36)=Gr p. 23 l. 15; Syr p. 30 l. 4 (I 36)=Gr p. 23 l. 24; Syr p. 30 l. 21 (I 38)=Gr p. 24 l. 1; Syr p. 30 l. 31 (I 39)=Gr p. 24 l. 11; Syr p. 30 l. 35 (I 39)=Gr p. 24 l. 15; Syr p. 31 l. 9 (I 40)=Gr p. 24 l. 25; Syr p. 31 l. 14 (I 40)=Gr p. 24 l. 29; Syr p. 31 l. 29 (I 40)=Gr p. 25 l. 3; Syr p. 32 l. 20 (I 42)=Gr p. 25 l. 26; Syr p. 33 l. 3 (II 1)=Gr p. 26 l. 3; Syr p. 41 l. 17 (II 14)=Gr p. 32 l. 27; Syr p. 50 l. 32 (II 23)=Gr p. 40 l. 11; Syr p. 51 l. 20 (II 23)=Gr p. 40 l. 34; Syr p. 54 l. 6 (II 26)=Gr p. 43 l. 3; Syr p. 55 l. 11 (II 28)=Gr p. 44 l. 2; Syr p. 67 l. 17 (II 45)=Gr p. 54 l. 7; Syr p. 67 l. 18 (II 45)=Gr p. 54 l. 9; Syr p. 67 l. 27 (II 45)=Gr p. 54 l. 18; Syr p. 74 l. 25 (II 55)=Gr p. 60 l. 9; Syr p. 75 l. 1 (II 56)=Gr p. 60 l. 19; Syr p. 78 l. 15 (II 61)=Gr p. 63 l. 19; Syr p. 83 l. 5 (III 2)=Gr p. 67 l. 25; Syr p. 84 l. 1 (III 5)=Gr p. 68 l. 19; Syr p. 84 l. 10 (III 6)=Gr p. 68 l. 28; Syr p. 84 l. 16 (III 6)=Gr p. 68 l. 34; Syr p. 84 l. 18 (III 6)=Gr p. 68 l. 36; Syr p. 84 l. 20 (III 6)=Gr p. 68 l. 38; Syr p. 84 l. 21 (III 6)=Gr p. 68 l. 38; Syr p. 87 l. 1 (III 10)=Gr Nagel p. 304 l. 12 (III 10,15); Syr p. 87 l. 30 (III 12)=Gr Nagel p. 308 l. 4 (III 12,1); Syr p. 87 l. 33 (III 12)=Gr Nagel p.

can be an archaic spelling, but it can also be a peculiar transcription of the scribe of this manuscript. Needless to say, frequent use of this word in the *Adversus Manichaeos* is due to the need of refuting the Manichaean doctrine on matter; thus the context of refutation is less philosophical than religious.

The Greek word ἄγων is transcribed as ⲁⲓⲱⲛ (TSyr col. 24)⁴⁷ or ⲁⲓⲱⲛ (TSyr col. 137)⁴⁸; according to TSyr, the latter form is more archaic (“Haec forma passim legitur in codd. antiquioribus, e. g. in Tit. Bostr., et Euseb. Mart. Pal, ap. Mus. Brit.”).

In the *Adversus Manichaeos* ܡܢܚܝܐ (TSyr col. 274) is used once to render ἀνάγκη (Syr p. 6 l. 32 (I 6)=Gr p. 5 l. 2), but usually the same Greek word and the words of the same root are translated by Syriac words ܡܠܟܐ and ܡܠܝܬܐ and their derivatives.

ܠܚܝܬܐܢܐ, which is a Syriac derivative of ܠܚܐܢܐ (TSyr col. 293) which in turn is a Syriacized transcription of the Greek word ἄσματος, is used to translate γαστρομαργία (and not ἄσωτία) in the *Adversus Manichaeos*⁴⁹.

To my knowledge, ܠܡܢܥܠܐ (TSyr col. 296), which is a Syriac transcription of στοιχείον⁵⁰, is the only word that is used in a philosophical context; it is frequently mentioned in the expression like “the four elements”. However, in the *Adversus Manichaeos*, Titus mentions this word in refuting Manichaean doctrines; thus the context in which it is used is religious.

From our viewpoint, one does not need to pay special attention to the word ܬܫܪܝܬܐ (TSyr col. 385), which is a Syriacized transcription of ἄρχων (mainly in the plural) and which can be interesting from e.g. Gnostic viewpoint. Needless to say, this word is used in the context of refuting Manichaean doctrines.

It is natural that ܬܦܘܨ (TSyr col. 1448), which is a Syriacized transcription of τύπος, is used to render the very word τύπος⁵¹; however, it is sometimes used to render τρόπος as well⁵².

308 1. 7 (III 12,1).

ⲛ of TitBostr Syr p. 32 l. 33 (I 40) renders κακία of TitBostr Gr p. 25 l. 11.

For $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{m}$ of TitBostr Syr p. 13 l. 1 (I 17), p. 16 l. 22 (I 20), p. 19 l. 28 (I 24), p. 20 l. 6 (I 24), p. 22 l. 24 (I 27) I could not find corresponding Greek words in TitBostr Gr.

For 3 instances of A_{∞} noted in the index to the *Theophania* in GRESSMANN, *Studien*, p. 21* (Syr p. 3 l. 15; p. 4 l. 4; p. 43 l. 2), no parallel Greek text is extant.

47 in TitBostr: Syr p. 91 l. 30 (III 18)=Gr Nagel p. 322 l. 4 (III 18,11). This form is not found in the *Theophania*.

48 𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 in the *Theophania* (the corresponding Greek word is ἀγών, unless otherwise stated): Syr p. 107 l. 24 = Gr p. 7 l. 2 (δράματος); Syr p. 108 l. 14 = Gr p. 7 l. 21; Syr p. 109 l. 21 = Gr p. 8 l. 1; Syr p. 113 l. 2 = Gr p. 11 l. 21. This form 𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 is not found in TitBostr.

49 ⁶¹ ~~κθαλασσιν~~ = γαστριμαργία, in TitBostr: Syr p. 24 l. 20 (I 29) = Gr p. 18 l. 38; Syr p. 76 l. 34 (II 58) = Gr p. 61 l. 9.

In this context it should be noted that **Ἀποστολ** in TitBostr Syr p. 63 l. 7 is an error of copy (the correct word should be **Ἀποστολ**, which is the plural of **Ἀποστολ**, i. e. ἱεραπόσ = TitBostr Gr p. 50 l. 24).

50 $\kappa\sigma\tau\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ = στοιχεῖον, in TitBostr: passim.

In one passage of TitBostr, ܬܫܡܐ is used to render $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$: Syr p. 73 l. 8 (II 53) = Gr p. 58 ll. 35-36.

51 כִּפְּסָא = τύπος, in TitBostr: Syr p. 47 l. 28 (II 21) = Gr p. 37 l. 27 and passim.

52 **ⲕⲉⲁⲣⲁⲗⲱ** = τρόπος, in TitBostr: Syr p. 48 l. 23 (II 21; **ⲕⲁⲥⲁⲣⲁⲗⲱ ⲕⲉⲁⲣⲁⲗⲱ**) = Gr p. 38 l. 15 (= τρόπος); Syr p.
59 ll. 29–30 (II 37; **ⲕⲁⲥⲁⲣⲁⲗⲱ ⲕⲉⲁⲣⲁⲗⲱ**) = Gr p. 47 l. 36 (= τρόπος); Syr p. 79 l. 33 (II 63; **ⲕⲉⲁⲣⲁⲗⲱ**) = Gr p. 64

The Greek word κίνδυνος is transcribed as ܟܝܢܕܝܢܘܨ (TSyr col. 3605 s. v. ܟܝܢܕܝܢܘܨ), as if it were a personal name⁵³.

2.3 Distinguishing Different Translations

So far we have seen various techniques of translation, without making any distinction between the texts. Another obvious question concerning the problem of translation is who translated such and such text; in our case, we can pose the question whether the *Theophania* of Eusebius of Caesarea and the *Adversus Manichaeos* of Titus of Bostra were translated by one and the same person, or these two translations were made by different persons. On this point, a detailed study of Gressmann on the *Theophania* suggests that the latter is the case⁵⁴, and we can adhere to his view because of the following argument other than that provided by Gressmann: whereas in the *Adversus Manichaeos* the Greek word οὐσία is rendered in Syriac by ܐܘܨܝܐ (TSyr col. 173), in the *Theophania* the same Greek word seems to be rather transcribed as ܐܘܨܝܐ (TSyr col. 78)⁵⁵. Thus it is evident that the *Theophania* of Eusebius of Caesarea and the *Adversus Manichaeos* of Titus of Bostra were translated by different persons.

As for the place(s) of translation, mention has been made above of Gressmann's argument that the *Theophania* seems to have been translated in Edessa, and of my suggestion that the Syriac translations of the *Theophania* and the *Historia ecclesiastica* originate from two different places, i.e., that the Syriac translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* originate from elsewhere than Edessa. Can we say, then, from where the Syriac translation of the *Adversus Manichaeos* of Titus of Bostra originate? It seems premature to say anything precise on this point, since the difference of translators does not necessarily imply the difference of places.

2.4 Final Remarks

At the end of this small investigation, some general observations can be made *à titre d'exemple*. We have seen that, at the time when these above-mentioned translations were made, probably during the fourth century, some loan words borrowed from Greek were so highly integrated into Syriac (or rather totally Syriacized) that they were used to render a variety of Greek words. And one can say that the nature of these words (e.g. ܐܘܨܝܐ, ܐܘܨܝܐ, ܐܘܨܝܐ, ܐܘܨܝܐ, ܐܘܨܝܐ; perhaps also ܐܘܨܝܐ can be included here) is neither specifically philosophical nor speculative (ܐܘܨܝܐ would be an exception); they are rather common words. And this impression more or less coincides with the impression I got when studying the Greek loan words which figure in the *Book of the Laws of Countries* of Bardaisan (although in the case of

l. 33 (= τρόπος); Syr p. 88 l. 26 (III 13; ܐܘܨܝܐ) = Gr Nagel p. 310 l. 12 (III 13,11; = τρόπος).

53 ܟܝܢܕܝܢܘܨ = κίνδυνος, in TitBostr: Syr p. 31 l. 22 (I 40) = Gr p. 24 l. 36; Syr p. 34 l. 32 (II 4) = Gr p. 27 l. 21; Syr p. 35 l. 1 (II 4) = Gr p. 27 l. 25; Syr p. 94 l. 23 (III 23) = Gr Nagel p. 332 ll. 8–9 (III 23,14).

ܟܝܢܕܝܢܘܨ in TitBostr Syr p. 39 l. 32 seems to render κινδυνεύει (TitBostr Gr p. 31 l. 17).

54 GRESSMANN, *Studien*, p. 45 n. 2. His argument is based on the fact that in the Syriac *Adversus Manichaeos* one Greek word is rendered by two Syriac words, a technique which cannot be found in the *Theophania*. And he adds: "Nebenbei bemerkt folgt aus dieser Thatsache, dass die Übersetzer beider Schriften verschieden sein müssen".

55 ܐܘܨܝܐ = οὐσία, in the *Theophania* (3 instances in all): Syr p. 7 ll. 9, 17 = Gr p. 3 ll. 2, 17; Syr p. 113 l. 25 = Gr p. 12 l. 18.

Bardaiṣan, another category, i.e., astrological, also comes to the fore).

To say anything further is still too premature. In order to continue our investigation, not only it is necessary to extend the investigation to the way in which *Syriac* words render Greek words, but also we need to study Aphrahat from our viewpoint, paying special attention to the Greek loan words used in Aphrahat's works. There are other early translations which could not be dealt with in this paper for diverse reasons. When all these tasks will have been accomplished, still I am not quite sure if we arrive at some solid conclusions or not. But in any case, I am convinced that, in the twenty-first century when all the major texts have already been edited, the problem of translation is, if not the most important, at least among the most important problems that our discipline should deal with, especially because translation is at the core of Christian tradition from the very beginning.