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PREFACE

This study has as its purpose the editing and translating of a portion of Cambridge University Library Additional 1971(II). This manuscript has long awaited such treatment and investigation. However, a full edition of Moshé bar Kēphā's Commentary on John would have to take into account the MS cited in Appendix A, and one discovered recently by Professor Arthur Vööbus (he photographed the first several folios of this latter MS). In this study we limit ourselves to the first 31 leaves of Additional 1971 (II).

In a secondary sense we are concerned with the textual tradition of the Syriac New Testament, and we have taken pains to identify all of Moshē bar Kēphā's scriptural citations. We are particularly interested in seeing what kind of traditions he preserves when he departs from the Peshitta text.

So this study has two aims: 1) the presentation of a portion of this major commentary by this rather renowned bishop of the Syrian Jacobite Church; and

vi
2) the identification of variant readings from the Old and New Testaments (but particularly the latter) in the Syriac textual tradition.

Many people and institutions have assisted me along the way, and I would like to gratefully acknowledge their help. Drs. Tjitze Baarda of the Free University in Amsterdam was my first instructor in Syriac, and it was he who suggested this study to me. He has been indispensable in his instruction and his encouragement. The Rev. James G. Fraser of Rosanna, Victoria, Australia, graciously and patiently helped me to begin the long process of polishing the translation. (He was at the time lecturing in religious studies at the University of St. Andrews.) I am most thankful for the gentle manner in which he wielded his critical talents and for his encouragement. Professor Arthur Vööbus of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago has given of his time, attention, and considerable acumen in Syriac textual studies most graciously and generously. To him I owe special thanks for providing the MS which forms the basis of Appendix A. And to Professor Albert C. Sundberg of Garrett Theological Seminary, my B.D. degree honors program advisor,
friend and goad, I give my deep gratitude for his advice in problems of translation and style.

The study itself was made possible financially by Garrett Theological Seminary and the (then) Methodist Church. The former awarded me the John H. Morava Fellowship upon my graduation. The latter awarded me a Dempster Graduate Fellowship (1967-68) through its Division of Higher Education of the Board of Education. To my Seminary and to the Church which I now serve as a parish minister, I offer my sincere thanks.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Divinity School and the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, Marquette University and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for the use of their libraries.

Finally, let me express my heartfelt thanks to the members of the Cudahy, Wisconsin, United Methodist Church who have patiently endured my split research student-pastor identity, and whose generosity has granted me the extra study time needed to complete this thesis.
### TABLE OF APPRECIATIONS

**Abbreviations Common in the Text:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Abbreviation</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;gospel&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب (and plural)</td>
<td>&quot;evangelist&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;he is&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;bishop&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;through his hands&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;without him&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;virgin&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;he appeared, was made manifest&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;believers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;about him&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;holy, sacred&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طالب</td>
<td>&quot;glory, splendour&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author also uses — for the purposes of justifying a line in the text.

**Abbreviations of Works Cited:**


MS - the Manuscript.


Other Abbreviations:
A - allusion
* - varies from Peshitta text.
F - folio
G - Greek
l. - line
mg - margin
p - page

Scriptural references follow the cross reference system of the editors of The Greek New Testament.¹
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INTRODUCTION
I. The Manuscript

In the years 1842-4 the Reverend George Percy Badger made an extensive mission through Mesopotamia and Kurdistan for the S.P.C.K. in search of Nestorian manuscripts.\(^1\) He brought back with him a great number of manuscripts, some Nestorian, some of a more orthodox nature. Among the latter was this Commentary on the Gospel of John by Moshē bar Kēphā.

The S.P.C.K. asked Professor Wright to examine the manuscripts in 1886. When he reported the importance of much of the collection "(embracing as it does a representative series of Nestorian and other Syriac works in good and often old copies such as no traveller of the present day could hope to bring together)"\(^2\), the Society decided to make the whole collection a free gift to

---


Cambridge University in 1887. This commentary was given the class-mark, Additional 1971 (II).

In their Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in Cambridge University, Wright and Cook described MS Add. 1971 (II) in this manner:

Add. 1971

Paper, about 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. by 6 7/8; 310 leaves, some of which are stained by water and torn, especially at the beginning and ends; 32 quires, usually of 10 leaves (\(\omega\) has only 9, whilst \(\varphi\) has 12), signed with letters; number of lines various, but usually from 23 to 29. Leaves are wanting after ff. 7, 268, 270, 272, 274, 285, and 304. This manuscript is written in good current Jacobite sàrta, and is dated A.Gr. 1507—A.D. 1196.

The MS itself is marked with a purchase date in Arabic on folio 1a, noting that the volume was purchased by the priest Šalībā, son of Behnām, son of Yūsuf, son of Šalībā in A.Gr. 1548 (A.D. 1237), on the eleventh day of the blessed month Ab.

II. Nature and Contents

The manuscript is an introduction and commentary on the Gospel of John. This study is limited to the first 31 leaves which comprise 27 introductory "chapters"

---

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 47.
and the commentary on the Prologue to the Gospel (John 1:1-18). As noted above a leaf is missing after folio 7, but some reconstruction has been possible through other MSS (see appendices A and B, pages 265 to 279).

Some parts of Moshe bar Kephā's commentary seem to reflect the very formal and traditional genre, the Syriac Polemical Midrash. This form consists of rhythmic prose but is more than simply an exalted prose style of the nature, for instance, of the Hebrew of the book of Ezekiel. Rather it takes the form of poetic midrash, an art form brought to full flower by Ephrem. Anton Baumstark calls this form the "didactic Midrash" in his discussion of Ephrem in his Geschichte der syrischen Literatur.

Ephrem took this art form from the school of Bardesānes, and gave it the name of certain "singable poetry whose long strophes are built from verses of varying length (sometimes similar, sometimes dissimilar). Ephrem departed and commented upon contemporary events poetically, "...intoned the dirge, and appealed

1Anton Baumstark, Geschichte der syrischen Literatur (Bonn: A. Marcus and E. Webers Verlag, 1922), pp. 39-40.

2Ibid., p. 39. (The translations are mine.)
for atonement, and, through treatment of various religious themes, offered teaching and edifying entertainment to his listeners".¹ This didactic Midrash was characterized by lyrical motion. Having a "prevalence of simple metrical construction, it is marked by an only rarely missing connection to the long strophe through an alphabetical acrostic, and a tendency to dramatic animation".² Baumstark indicates that these should be considered the "seeds" of religious plays which unfortunately never reached development.

Baumstark distinguishes the Ephremic Midrash from the Memra (a poetical homily) which is to be spoken, not sung. This latter form "is essentially the epic poem (be it didactic, be it narrative) of the East-Aramaic literature."³ Strophic structure is not altogether lacking in this form, "but what is lacking from the requisites of songlike discourses is the root-element of some kind of refrain. Moreover, a structure consisting of verses of the same number of syllables is

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., pp. 39-40.
³Ibid., p. 40.
Baumstark notes that Ephrem used a seven-syllable metre exclusively whereas five- and twelve-syllable metre have come into exclusive use since Ephrem.

In the MS before us in this study, the lines do not seem to be of exact syllabic length. See for examples lines 15 to 19 of folio 22a, page 76 ("lines, o = stress"): 

This may indicate that the commentary was originally set out in poetic lines, or at least followed loosely the pattern of the didactic Midrash (although Moshe bar Kephah's work seems closer to the Memra as defined above by Baumstark). This in turn might call for an attempt to restore the commentary to its conjectured original form, i.e., in poetic form. However, this study deals with Cambridge University Library MS Additional 1971 (II), and I am persuaded, therefore, that the text should be set out as it is found in the MS.

\[1\text{Ibid.}\]
III. The Author

Moshē bar Kēphā, the author of this commentary on the Gospel of John, died on February 12, 903 A.D., having served as a bishop of the united dioceses of Bēth Remmān, Bēth Kiyōnāyā and Mosul for about forty of his ninety-plus years. He had also served as periodeutus, or visitor, of the diocese of Taghrīth for ten years. When he was elected bishop in 863, he took the name Severus.

He was born near the town of Balad sometime in 813, a son of Simeon Kēphā and Maryam, the former a native of the village of Mashhad al-Koḥail which was on the Tigris across from el-Ḥadīthah, the latter from Balad. Early in his youth Moshē bar Kēphā came under the tutelage of Rabban Cyriacus, abbot of the convent of Mār Sergius on the Ṭūrā Ṣahyā, or Dry Mountain, near Balad, and to whom his Commentary on John is dedicated. Moshē joined this order and assumed monastic garb.

Moshē bar Kēphā possessed an active and fertile mind which produced commentaries on every book in the Old and New Testaments as well as several other works on the liturgy, heresy, theology, the sacraments, sermons,
monastic life, and even commentaries on the dialectics of Aristotle and the works of Gregory of Naziansus. For a more detailed listing of his extant works, we may consult Wright’s discussion in his *Syriac Literature*, and Baumstark’s description in his *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*.

IV. **Moshē bar Kēphā as a Commentator**

A. **His Method and Style**

Moshē bar Kēphā impresses us as an exegete who is unexpectedly pleasing to modern commentators. The layout for his commentary is thoroughly modern: a section of introductory "chapters" in which he deals with questions like "who, where, why, when, for whom," and the like precedes the commentary itself. The latter follows the still current style of considering the text phrase by phrase and verse by verse.

He is thoroughly traditional in his treatment of the introductory material. He accepts John as the disciple of Jesus, son of Zebedee, brother of James, native of Beth Saida, and author of the Catholic

---


2 Anton Baumstark, *op. cit.*, pp. 281-82.
Epistle (whose first verse he cites twice in this portion of his commentary). He closes his introductory concerns with a bit of linguistic analysis regarding John's use of "in the beginning," especially as he applied this term to "the Word." Perhaps we may view this last "chapter" as a connecting-link to the commentary itself.

Moshe bar Képhā also takes pains to list for his reader the contents of the Gospel of John. He divides the Gospel into 30 parts (see Appendix C) of varying lengths. Only one division seems a bit strange: the 28th section covers just four verses concerning the burial of Jesus. It seems to us that the immediately preceding section (concerning the breaking of the legs of the robbers and Joseph's request for Jesus' body) might have been placed together by a scribal error in numbering, especially since the former section has the formula, "about this," strangely placed in the middle of the section. It would make more sense to us, both in language and subject matter, to place Joseph's entreatment for the body and the burial together. But this is a minor matter and can only be conjecture on our part.
One other matter is worth noting. Voobus\(^1\) notes that Moshe bar Kepha was the first to use the name "Peshitta" for this version of the Syriac text. And indeed, we find Moshe bar Kepha using this term twice in his introduction (at the very end of folio 7b where the text breaks off) and a third time at the very beginning of the commentary itself (folio 8b).

When we turn to the Commentary itself we find Moshe bar Kepha involved in a running polemical debate with unnamed adversaries. Again and again he states the position which he wishes to attack with the formula, "they say." He rarely identifies the "they." Time after time he counters "their" position with, "but we say to them." Sometimes his replies run to several points, at least twice exceeding ten. His argument is detailed and lengthy.

As we noted above, his format in the commentary is rather modern. He takes a phrase at a time and comments upon it at greater or lesser length depending upon the weight of the matter. He even takes pains to lay down the text in a contrasting ink. He makes comparisons of

synonyms—see his discussion of the meaning of "in the beginning." (This discussion impresses us as a bit strange in its emphasis for he seems to accept "the Word" as readily understood by his readers. Today we find it necessary to give lengthy historical essays on the concept of the Word. And Moshe bar Kepha uses his discussion of "in the beginning" to introduce the concept of a pre-existent Word.)

He uses other methods of argument, among them one we would call *reductio ad absurdum* (see page 182 where he uses this method in discussing his opponents' use of "life"). He is not afraid to turn to the mythology of his day when he uses the example of the amaranth and the salamander which supposedly are able to endure fire without being changed (this is germane for his discussion on how the Word remained the Word while becoming flesh, p. 209). And he can use analogy with the Sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper to aid the same discussion.

All in all we gain the impression that Moshe bar Kepha is thoroughly scientific in the terms of his day in his exegetical style and methods. It appears that he is still influenced by the rules of exegesis drawn up
and developed by the Antiochene School of Diodor of the 4th century. The hermeneutics of this school called for "a healthy common-sense principle of exposition of Holy Scripture, which discarding allegorism on the one hand and course literalism on the other, sought by the help of criticism, philology and history, and other external resources, to discover and develop the true meaning of the sacred texts, as intended by the authors."

This school of thought recognized "...the human element as well as the divine..." and repudiated "the notion of inspiration which would reduce its authors to mere automatons." Diodor's students were drawn from across the range of Syrian and Near Eastern Christianity. Among the most noted was John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret—orthodox and heretic alike.

---


2. Of whom it has been said: "He seeks to discover not what the passage before him may be made to mean, but what it was intended to mean; not what recondite lessons or truths may be forced from it by mystical or allegorical interpretations, but what it was intended to convey; not what may be introduced into it, but what may legitimately elicited from it," (William Smith and Henry Wace, op. cit., p. 532).

3. Arthur Vööbus notes: "Thus he substituted a realistic method of exegesis for the highly speculative
The works of Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia were translated into Syriac and continued to wield a wide influence in Syrian exegesis, both Jacobite and Nestorian, for several centuries.

His awareness of the more scholarly Harclean Version (with its marginal readings) would seem to indicate some influence upon him by the several Greek-Syriac centers which fostered a continuing interest in textual matters and which prodded the continuous refining of the Syrian text (unfortunately, however, leading to successively more Hellenized textual versions, thus removing the Syriac genius layer by layer, as is witnessed by the progression from the Old Syriac Version through the Peshitta and on to the Philoxenian and Harclean versions).

B. Moshé bar Kēphā's Sources

1. We may discuss Moshé's sources under two headings: scriptural and non-scriptural. As we would approach. This was determined by pure grammatical and literary-historical analysis. Theodore carried out his work strictly, methodically and consistently and to the effect that the tropic speech, welcomed by those who want 'to fly but do not wish to go on the road,' was reduced to the literal meaning, making no allowance for any other meaning of the Scripture. However, he admitted typology as a valid hermeneutical principle," (History of the School of Nisibis, Louvain: Secré-tarist du Corpus SCO, 1969; p. 107).
expect he makes extensive use of scripture to interpret scripture. His acquaintance with the Bible is deep and thorough and enables him to cite with ease and rather striking accuracy verses from one end of the Bible to the other: Moses, the prophets, the Psalms, 1 Samuel and 2 Kings from the Old Testament; all four Gospels, Acts, Paul (including Hebrews) and 1 John from the New Testament places in his argument. Of course, in light of the fact that he wrote commentaries on every book of both testaments, we should not be surprised at this.

Not unexpectedly in the commentary before us he cites John to explain John. His citations range across several chapters in his commentary for the Prologue. He also contrasts Moses and John at several points: their use of "in the beginning;" the miracles which Moses and Aaron worked before Pharaoh and his magicians; and the miracles which Jesus worked (including those preserved by the other evangelists).

Moshé also cites the Greek text where it seems necessary for his argument (although the Greek is often quite corrupt; perhaps this is more the fault of the scribes who made this copy than Moshé himself). In "chapter 27" of the Introduction he has transliterated
"ἐν ἐξωθή" into Syriac (F.7b). In the Commentary he cites "δὲ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμᾶς ἵνα" in the margin of F.13b, "σὰς μαρτυρίαν" in the margin of F.15b, and "ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον" in the margin of F.16b. In the latter cases he cites the Greek to make clearer what the Syriac means.

When he turns to the Old Testament citations in the New Testament, in at least two places he returns to the Old Testament source, rather than citing the text as it appears in the New Testament: 1.) in citing Psalm 110:1a, "The Lord said to my lord, 'Sit at my right hand,'" (Mt 22:44a); and 2.) in citing Isaiah 7:14a, "Behold, a virgin conceives and bears a son," (Mt 1:23a).

Finally, let us add a word about Moshē’s New Testament canon in this portion of his commentary. The Peshitta canon of his day included 22 books (excluding 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and the Apocalypse 1). He

1 Arthur Vööbus comments on the Peshitta canon: "We know that the canon of the New Testament, used in the patriarchate of Antioch during the fourth century excluded the Apocalypse, Second Peter, Second and Third John and Jude. Later on the canon in Antioch was enlarged; it seems, before the beginning of the fifth century. But the canon which has been immortalized in the Peshitta is exactly the ancient canon in its shorter form" (Early Versions of the New Testament, Stockholm: 1951, p. 95).
makes use of the four Gospels, Acts, several letters of Paul (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Timothy; Hebrews [which he attributes to Paul]; and 1 John).

2. Moshe bar Kepha also makes use of several non-scriptural sources in his Commentary. In discussing the reason for John composing his Gospel he cites a tradition which he attributes to Eusebius (F. 7b, p. 78, and p. 144 in the translation). A thorough-going investigation of Eusebius (aided by the material gathered by Charteris) has failed to locate this tradition in Eusebius (see Appendix D).

He cites Cyril of Alexandria at the very beginning of his commentary (F.8b) in discussing the term "in the beginning." He cites Gregory of Nazianzus regarding the pre-existence of the Word (F. 7b, p. 82, and p. 151 of the translation). This is not surprising in light of the fact that Moshe prepared a commentary on Gregory's work. He cites Theodosius (F.7b, p. 82, and F.13b, p. 94 insert), in both places calling him Brother Theodosius. He refers to Philoxenus of M'bug (F.26b

---

He cites Josephus when discussing John the Baptist (F.24b, p. 116, p. 227). He mentions Ephrem in passing (F.26b, p. 120, p. 234). And he cites Mar Joannes in several places (F.7b, p. 82, p. 151, F.26b p. 120, p. 236) without further identifying him. This can be none other than John Chrysostom whose influence has been so profound in Orthodox commentaries. Moshē uses the Greek spelling—̓Ιωάννης: Joannes in contrast to the Syriac— חווא: Johannan—when referring to the Evangelist and the Baptist. In three places he cites his own works ("Commentary on Matthew," [F.1b, p. 70, p. 132], "On the Soul," [F. 4b, p. 76, p. 142], and "Speculations on Heavenly Things" [F.10a, p. 87, p. 162]).

C. Moshē bar Kēphā's Use of John Chrysostom

As noted above, Moshē refers to Mar Joannes in several places. We have identified this John as Chrysostom. A closer look at the Homilies of Chrysostom on the Gospel of John reveals striking parallels

---

between John and Moshē bar Kēphā in his introductory material and the commentary on the Prologue. We present here a representative number of passages from John Chrysostom's homilies on the Prologue and their parallels in Moshē's commentary.

1. Chrysostom, Homily II (p. 4):

"From what country then was he? From no country; but from a poor village, and from a land little esteemed, and producing no good thing. For the Scribes speak evil of Galilee, saying 'Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.' (John vii.52) And 'the Israelite indeed' speaks ill of it, saying, 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' And being of this land, he was not even of any remarkable place in it, but of one not even distinguished by name. Of this he was [one MS. 'not even distinguished by name had he not been of it. His,' &c.], and his father a poor fisherman, so poor that he took his sons to the same employment. He did not take his prey from the sea, but passed his time on a certain little lake. And as he was engaged by it with his father and his brother James, and they mending their broken nets, a thing which of itself marked extreme poverty, so Christ called him."
"As for worldly instruction, we may learn from these facts that he had none at all of it. Besides, Luke testifies this when he writes not only that he was ignorant, but that he was absolutely unlettered. (Acts iv.13). As was likely. For one who was poor, never coming into the public assemblies, nor falling in with men of respectability, but as it were nailed to his fishing, or even if he ever did meet anyone, conversing with fishmongers and cooks, how, I say, was he likely to be in a state better than that of the irrational animals? how could he help imitating the very dumbness of his fishes?"

Compare the material in "Chapters" 1 to 7 in the Introduction (p. 134-137) to Moshe's Commentary.

2. Chrysostom, Homily II (p. 6):

"For this reason too, he did not hide his teaching in mist and darkness, as they did who threw obscurity of speech, like a kind of veil, around the mischiefs laid up within. But this man's doctrines are clearer than sunbeams, wherefore they have been unfolded to all men throughout the world."

Moshe bar Kepha, "Chapter" 21 of the Introduction (p. 146):
"And we assert that he has not hidden his teaching in the gloom of cryptic phrases as did the philosophers, lovers of vain-glory, in their sayings. These were like whitened sepulchres from the outside, while within them the sayings were vanity and an abomination of profane mysteries. But he revealed his teaching, greater than the sun, so that men should profit from it altogether: men and elders and youths."

3. Chrysostom, Homily II (p. 7):

"Yes, it may be said, but why then does he leave the Father, and speak concerning the Son? Why? because the former was manifest to all, if not as Father, at least as God; but the Only-Begotten was not known; and therefore with reason did he immediately from the very beginning hasten to implant knowledge of Him in these who knew Him not."

Moshē cites this at the beginning of a section of "Questions and Objections" in the Commentary (p. 159):

"Why did the Evangelist neglect to speak about the Father, and speak first about the Son? And we say because the Father was revealed to all men and made known, if not as the Father, yet as God, but no man knew the Son."
4. Chrysostom, Homily III (p. 11):

"However, let us see the proofs which they produce to us. 'In the beginning,' it is said, 'God made the Heaven and the earth, and the earth was invisible and unformed.' (Gen. 1:1.2.) And, 'there "was" a man of Ramathaim Zophim? (I Sam 1.1)

Compare Moshe's discussions of "was" on pages 164-166 of the Commentary.

5. Chrysostom, Homily III (p. 12):

"...in the case of a man (it denotes) his being of a certain place, in that of the earth its being in a certain way. For he has not said absolutely 'the earth was,' and then held his peace, but has taught how it was even after its creation, as that it was 'invisible and unformed,' as yet covered by the waters and in confusion. So in the case of Elkanan he does not merely say that 'there was a man,' but adds also whence he was, 'of Armathaim Zophim.'"

Compare Moshe bar Kephä on pages 165-166 of the Commentary:

"So when Scripture says concerning Halquana, "he was from the wilderness of Duqa' (1 Sm 1:1), it did not wish to show about him that he was eternal (he who
was a creature like all men), but that he was from the people of the village of Duqa (since it sought to make known what his village was in this οἷς ἐστιν."  

6. Chrysostom, Homily III (p. 12):
"For if Moses feared lest any one should assert that the earth was uncreated [ἀγέννητον], much more ought John to have feared this respecting the Son, if He was indeed created."

Moshē bar Kēphā in his Commentary (p. 167) says:
"For if Moses hesitated with regard to that visible creation...; how much more ought John hesitate concerning the invisible creation...if the Word of God was made or created according to your interpretation?"

7. Chrysostom, Homily IV (p. 16):
"Why when all the other Evangelists had begun with the Dispensation; (for Matthew says, 'the Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David'; and Luke too relates to us in the beginning of his Gospel the events relating to Mary; and in like manner Mark dwells on the same narratives, from that point detailing to us the history of the Baptist;) why, when they began with these matters, did John briefly and in a later
place hint at them, saying, 'the Word was made flesh' (ver. 14); and, passing by everything else, His conception, His birth, His bringing up, His growth, at once discourse to us concerning His Eternal Generation?

"I will now tell you what the reason of this is. Because the other Evangelists had dwelt most on the accounts of His coming in the flesh, there was fear lest some, being of grovelling minds, might for this reason rest in those doctrines alone, as indeed was the case with Paul of Samosata."

And compare the material in Moshē bar Kēphā's "Chapter" 22 of the Introduction, pages 146-147.

8. Chrysostom, Homily V (p. 22):

"While John, as hastening to ascend to the Creator Himself, runs by both these things, and these on which Moses was silent, having comprised them in one little saying, 'All things were made by Him.' And that you may not think that he merely speaks of all the things mentioned by Moses, he adds, that 'without Him was not anything made that was made.'"

Moshē bar Kēphā echoes this on page 173 of his commentary:

"Moreover it is fitting to point out that by
this expression, 'all,' which John said, by it he signified all those things which Moses the Prophet said in many words."

9. Chrysostom, Homily V, (p. 72):

"When we have shut them out from these strange opinions, they who take all manner of pains to withstand the truth, say, (still clinging to the same reading.) 'Whatever came into existence by him was life, because,' says one, 'whatever came into existence was life.' What then do you say of the punishment of the men of Sodom, and the flood, and hell fire, and the thousand like things? 'But,' says one, 'we are speaking of the material creation.' Well, those too belong entirely to the material creation. But that we may out of our abundance refute their argument, we will ask them, 'Is wood life,' tell me? 'Is stone, life?' These things that are lifeless and motionless? Nay, is man absolutely life? Who would say so? his is not pure life, but is capable of receiving life.'

Moshe bar Kepha uses this argument on page 182:

"Therefore they assert that what the Evangelist named life here is 'everything which came into
being through the Word.' And we say to them that therefore your interpretation is like this: the death of the Sodomites, and the Flood, and Gehenna, and other things like these are life because all of these came into being by means of the Word. But they say, 'We are speaking about the creation which is life, and not about the punishments which were brought about by God.' And also with reference to this, moreover, we say: why then do you say life is stones, life is iron and sticks, life is earth and heaven and air and water, but not all of it is? And behold, all of these creatures, and yet not even men are called 'life,' but are receivers of life.'

10. Chrysostom, Homily V, (p. 22):

"...Let us then relinquish this reading, and come to the recognized reading the explanation.

"And what is that? It is to make the sentence end at 'was made,' and to begin the next sentence with, 'In Him was Life.'"

Moshē bar Kēphā takes up this argument on page 180 and elaborates using grammatical terms and analysis.

11. Chrysostom, Homily XII, (p. 41):
Often when any have seen a king richly decked, and glittering on all sides with precious stones, and are afterwards describing to others the beauty, the ornaments, the splendor, they enumerate as much as they can, the glowing tint of the purple robe, the size of the jewels, the whiteness of the mules, the gold about the yoke, the soft and shining couch. But when after enumerating such things, and other things besides these, they cannot, say what they will, give a full idea of the splendor, they immediately bring in: 'But why say much about it; once for all, he was like a king;' not desiring by the expression 'like,' to show that he, of whom they say this, resembles a king, but that he is a real king. Just so now the Evangelist has put the word AS, desiring to represent the transcendent nature and incomparable excellence of His glory."

Moshē bar Kēphā uses this same analogy in commenting on the same section of the Prologue (1:14b): see page 225.

12. Chrysostom, Homily XIII, (p. 44):

"...The Evangelist is very full in making frequent mention of John...for all the Jews held the man in great admiration, (even Josephus imputes the war to his
Moshē bar Kēphā also refers to Josephus in this context (p. 227):

"...the Jews held John the Baptist in great honour, and his message was received among them better than others. And also Josephus, the chronicler of the Jews, praises John the Baptist."

13. Finally Chrysostom provides Moshē bar Kēphā with his "fledgling analogy" in Homily XIII (p. 44):

"As the mother birds do not teach their young all at once how to fly, nor finish their teaching in a single day, but at first lead them forth so as to be just outside the nest, then after first allowing them to rest, set them again to flying, and on the next day continue a flight much farther, and so gently, by little and little, bring them to proper height; just so the blessed John did not immediately bring the Jews to high things..."

Moshē bar Kēphā renders this on page 230 of the Commentary:

"For example, then, when a bird wishes to teach its fledglings to fly, it (does not) make them fly all at once, but on the first day a little and soon..."
makes them return so that they will not become weary. And another day a little more, and little by little it makes them completely able to fly. So also John did with the Jews concerning the Messiah."

On the basis of these examples chosen from across the whole of John Chrysostom's Homilies on John 1:1-18 and the parallel passages in this MS, we conclude that Chrysostom's influence was indeed great, lasting as it does (as preserved by Moshē bar Kēphā) for at least five centuries. We believe that this is incontrovertible evidence which serves to confirm Vööbus's statement: "In this respect the works of John Chrysostom in the Syriac translation must be particularly emphasized owing to the importance which attaches to them: ...his commentary on John, Add. 14, 561; Add. 12, 161..."¹

We must also conclude that John Chrysostom is Moshē's greatest source for his commentary (though Chrysostom is rarely acknowledged). The examples above are by no means an exhaustive collation of the two authors (such a study is beyond the scope of this thesis; indeed such a study would be a thesis in itself).

¹Arthur Vööbus, Early Versions of the New Testament, p. 84, footnote 1.
The material above serves to substantiate these conclusions.

D. Moshe bar Kephah's Antagonists

It may also be of value to briefly consider Moshe's antagonists insofar as he identifies them. He refers to pagans and heretics as classes without specifically identifying the form of paganism or heresy (F. 9b, p. 160 and F.13b, p. 179). He refers to the Nestorians by name as "those who confound the substances" (F.22a, p. 215-216) and "separators of unity" (F.22b, p. 217). He mentions the "Polinarians" (Apollinarians) "who say that the Word of God was joined to the body but was not joined to the rational soul, because the Godhead filled it instead of the soul" (F.22b, p. 227). Finally he refers to a group he calls the Arithmetiqu who apparently held that the "one who comes after me" and the "one who is before me" to whom John the Baptist referred were two entities (F.26a, p. 234).

It seems strange to us that Moshe does not specifically mention Islam in his commentary (to this point). The area along the Tigris extending from Mosul (near ancient Ninevah) on the north to Tagrith and Beth
Ramman on the south (somewhat near present-day Baghdad) had been Muslim since 650 A.D. He was writing two centuries following the Islamic conquest and surely the surrounding culture was thoroughly Islamic. Yet Moshe does not directly (or apparently even indirectly) confront those seemingly natural antagonists. We posit that he may have feared the dire consequences which may have resulted from such a confrontation.

E. Moshe bar Kephah's Place in the Syrian Commentary Tradition

It remains to be asked, "Where does Moshe bar Kephah fit into the Syrian commentary tradition?" While the question is a simple one, its answer is not. We have been able to find only one resource for attacking the question: an article by Anton Baumstark entitled "Die Evangelienexegese der syrischen Monophysiten."\(^1\) The article bears directly on the question and Baumstark has much to say about Moshe bar Kephah, but Baumstark's resources in the form of edited commentaries were scanty. Seventy years later the situation is still much the same. This is the case for Gospel

\(^1\)In Oriens Christianus, Vol. 2, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1902 (pp. 151-169 and 358-389).
commentaries generally and for commentaries on John specifically. It is not that manuscripts are not available for such a study: a quick reading of Wright's *Syriac Literature* or Baumstark's *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* shows the richness of the harvest in western libraries alone. It is still true, for the most part (and this study is only a bare beginning regarding Moshē bar kēphā on John), that this harvest awaits the reapers.

The paucity of material notwithstanding, let us briefly sketch the history of Gospel commentaries of the Syrian (Monophysite) tradition, following Baumstark's article and drawing upon it. Baumstark recognizes six divisions in his article: translations from Greek; early Syrian Monophysite exegetes; early catenae; other compilers and lesser commentators; later Syrian exegesis; and the closing period. Briefly, now, we will attempt an abbreviated outline:

1.) Translation material: Preceding all, but not really coming into his own until used by Jacob of Serug (d. 521), is Ephrem (d. 373). His commentaries on the Diatessaron have been preserved in Syriac, Armenian, Persian and Arabic. These are important for the older
textual readings (although some "updating" with the Peshitta has taken place). A.) The Alexandrian School is represented, not by Origen (nothing exegetical in Syriac translation has been found), but by Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) whose writings were introduced by Rabbula to counter the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Cyril is an important source for Monophysite Gospel commentaries, especially in Luke. Cyril is a precursor of Monophysite thought. B.) The Antiochene School is represented by John Chrysostom (d. 407). He is the first-rank exegetical authority for the Jacobite church (witness the evidence cited above in this MS), especially for the letters of Paul and the Gospels of Matthew and John. Severus of Antioch (d. 540) is known mainly for his δμιλίαις ἐπιθοράνιοι, homilies given from his patriarchal throne. These were translated by Paul of Callinicus and later by Jacob of Edessa. Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 390) had sermons which were translated into Syriac by 625 by the Abbot Paul of Cyprus. And Basil (d. 370) stands as an orthodox voice in the midst of these Monophysites. C.) Finally there are Nestorian Sources, primarily in the form of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428). His early influence is
primarily in that he is Antiochen. But Voöbus comments: "The corpus of the works of Theodore which covered many volumes was almost entirely translated. We are informed that only two works were not included... The second is the commentary on the Fourth Gospel..."¹

He finds greater use in later periods. Baumstark concludes the first section with brief discussions of Ephrem and Jacob of Serug (d. 521). He attributes to these men less distinct and less influential sources for the Jacobite commentary tradition. In Ephrem's case this is explained by the fact that his commentary was based on the Diatessaron of Tatian. In Jacob's case, most of his exegetical works were lost and only fragments in his correspondence have been preserved.

2.) Early Monophysite exegetes: Baumstark selects a few men of the so-called early period (which covers the 6th to the 9th centuries). The first representative of specifically exegetical literature for the Syrian Monophysites is Philoxenus (d. 523). Baumstark notes from Wright that two very old MSS of portions of his gospel commentaries are in the British Museum.

One, "The Commentary of Philoxenus of select passages of the Gospels, more especially on chap. I 1-18 of the Gospel of S. John" (Brit. Mus. Add. 14.534) is of immense importance for the sources of this section of Add. 1971(II). The next link in this chain is Jacob of Edessa (d. 708), whose importance partly derives because he cites Marutha of Tagrith (d. 648). Georgios, Bishop of the Arab tribes (d. 724) preserves both Philoxenus and Jacob. Next is our own Moshe bar Kepha (d. 903) who is the earliest Jacobite exegete for whom we are able to demonstrate that he commented on all the Gospels. He is also the first to produce a complete commentary on both Testaments and "damit die exegetische Litteratur seiner Kirche in gewisser Beziehung auf die von Aphrem und Theodoros von Mopsuestia eingenommene Höhe führte."\(^1\)

(Baumstark knows Wright's description of Add. 1971(II) but laments that Wright did not detail Moshe bar Kepha's sources.)

3.) Later Monophysite exegetes: the rest of the commentary tradition of the Jacobite church is commanded by two major commentators: Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171) and the legendary Bar-Hebraeus (d. 1286). The

\(^1\)Baumstark, op. cit., p. 164.
literary output of both men is extensive; Bar-Hebraeus' is downright overwhelming in its scope and amount. Dionysius cites most of the above, including Moshe bar Kēphā in his commentary on John (whose diagram is found in Appendix B).

So we discover, as far as Baumstark is concerned (and Wright in his Syriac Literature), that Moshe bar Kēphā has a very important place in this tradition, the more so because of the extent of his extant works. Many of the earlier writers, Greek and Syriac, are used by Moshe bar Kēphā. All of this serves to confirm his place as a central figure in this tradition.

Let us close with a brief summary of the theology we confront in Moshe bar Kēphā's commentary on John 1:1-18 (believing that this will act as preparation for more precisely placing him in his context, preliminary because this portion of the MS is such a small part of his output).

He regards the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper symbolically: "As the bread and wine which upon the altar become the body and blood of the Word of God, while they are not changed from their nature; while they are held (as) bread and wine, they are believed (to
be) the body and blood... As are the waters of spiritual baptism: while they are not changed from their nature, and while they appear (to be) water, they are believed that they are spiritual baptism." (pp. 209-210). He maintains the pre-existence of Christ (see his lengthy discussion on "in the beginning," i.e., John 1:1a, at the head of the commentary). He holds that Christ appeared to the forefathers of the faith throughout the Old Testament (see his discussion regarding "no one has ever seen God"). He believes that the Word became flesh without being changed in his nature from being (fully) God (Jn 1:14, pp. 209-211), i.e., his nature and substance were unaltered when he became flesh. He accepts the virgin birth (see page 246). He believes the substance of the Son and Holy Spirit are distinguished from but equal to that of the Father (p. 158), and that "there was no time when He (the Word) did not exist" (p. 159), and that he was begotten, not made (p. 160).

This theological sketch reveals nothing earth-shaking in its content. Because we are unable to contrast directly this theology and Christology with his forebearers and contemporaries, however, we hesitate to make detailed comparisons. Too much evidence is still
out, too many commentaries remain unedited, too much of the harvest is still in the field, too many precincts have not been heard from yet, our own knowledge of this large field is still too limited to make concrete conclusions in this area.

To summarize: Moshe bar Kephä falls into the mainstream of the Monophysite Gospel-commentary tradition. He earns his place by his use of the exegetes in this tradition and by the use of his comments by exegetes who follow him. His theology is not 'radical,' i.e., far out, but may be termed radical in a truer sense, i.e., root-like, root-grounded. He is not only a part of his context, but if Baumstark is correct, (as we believe him to be) a shaper of his tradition and an elevator of it.

F. Conclusions

On the basis of this discussion of Moshe bar Kephä as a commentator, we draw the following conclusions:

1.) He is a "scientific" commentator in many respects. That is, he does not lapse into allegorical methods. He follows his text, seeks to interpret it in the light of the best "science" of his day. He makes
use of others' arguments and examples where this is useful. Occasionally he creates his own analogies to illuminate his argument.

2.) He appears to be acquainted with a number of Patristic sources, apparently in both Syriac and Greek in translation. He willingly cites these Fathers when they can aid his cause. He ranges from the first century (Josephus—who is decidedly not a "father") to the seventh century (Thomas of Heraclea).

3.) He takes pains to address the theological climate and situation of his day. He sees his role as an apologist, at least to the degree of addressing Christian heresies, and the wider Christian community. But as we noted above, he does not appear willing to address his Muslim neighbours.

4.) Moshē bar Kēphā is deserving of his reputation as one of the greater luminaries in the Syrian galaxy of commentators (even though this galaxy in itself is a lesser one). He is diligent and thorough if not brilliant and compelling.

V. Biblical Quotations in the Manuscript

One of the reasons for studying a manuscript like this one is to take a close look at the state of the
Biblical text as indicated by the commentator's use of the text of his day, the various textual traditions which he knows and uses, and the variant readings which he preserves. For the sake of this study we shall look at the Old and New Testament citations in turn.

A. Old Testament Citations

Unfortunately, textual evidence for the Syriac Old Testament is not great. We shall compare Moshé bar Kēpha's citations with Lee, the Targums and the Masoretic Text, offering our conclusions for each citation or group of citations.

Moshé bar Kēpha cites Genesis 1:1 in two ways, both of which vary from Lee, Targum Onkelos and the Masoretic Text:

F.7b, 1.16 and F.8b, 1.6

MS:

Lee:

To:

MT:

Later he cites Genesis 1:1 in this way:

F.10a, 11.14 and 26-27 and F.11a, 11.20-21:

MS:

In the former variants Moshé bar Kēpha has
changed the indication of the direct object from א to ו in the latter he has omitted this altogether. Moshe bar Kepha may have preserved older Syriac versions for us here.

Genesis 1:2 or 1:2a (F.11a, 1.21; f.10b, 11.18 and 28):

MS: אָלֹהָנִי אֲוֹלָדְךָ
≠ Lee: אָלֹהָנִי אֲוֹלָדְךָ
≠ TO: לְאָלֹהָנִי אֲוֹלָדְךָ
≠ MT: לְאֶלֹהָנִי אֲוֹלָדְךָ

It would appear that Moshe bar Kepha has added אָלֹהָנִי to the Peshitta and that he has done much the same thing in citing 1 Samuel 1:1a (F.10b, 11.19-20 and F.11a, 11.2-3):

MS: וַיִּתֵּן חָרְבָּה לְאֶלֹהָנִי וַיָּשָׁלַח לְאֶלֹהָנִי גָּיוֹן וַיָּשָׁלַח לְאֶלֹהָנִי גָּיוֹן
≠ Lee: וַיִּתֵּן חָרְבָּה לְאֶלֹהָנִי וַיָּשָׁלַח לְאֶלֹהָנִי גָּיוֹן וַיָּשָׁלַח לְאֶלֹהָנִי גָּיוֹן
≠ MT: וַיִּתֵּן חָרְבָּה לְאֶלֹהָנִי וַיָּשָׁלַח לְאֶלֹהָנִי גָּיוֹן וַיָּשָׁלַח לְאֶלֹהָנִי גָּיוֹן

In citing Psalm 41:9b (10b) Moshe bar Kepha has added א to the Peshitta (F.27a, 11.11-12):

MS: יְשַׁלֵּחוּ אֶלֹהָנִי אֲוֹלָדְךָ
≠ Lee: יְשַׁלֵּחוּ אֶלֹהָנִי אֲוֹלָדְךָ

Moshe bar Kepha's citation of Psalm 82:6b preserves a fuller spelling of דָּמָא (F.27b, 1.21):
In citing Isaiah and Ezekiel Moshe bar Kepha sets down what appear to be free renderings of his own:

Isaiah 6:3b (F.23b, 1.17):

MS: סב יביכר תביש קסועה תביש קסועה
Lee: ליבי יביכר תביש קסועה תביש קסועה
TP: הקיר חור דקחתיו ויבוש ויבושת
MT: קיר חור יבושת ויבושת שבט חצורה

Isaiah 41:4b (F.7b, 11.4-5):

MS: סב יביכר תביש קסועה תביש קסועה
Lee: ליבי יביכר תביש קסועה תביש קסועה
TP: הקיר חור דקחתיו ויבוש ויבושת
MT: קיר חור יבושת ויבושת שבט חצורה

Isaiah 43:10d (F.12a, 11.22-23):

MS: סב יביכר תביש קסועה תביש קסועה
Lee: ליבי יביכר תביש קסועה תביש קסועה
TP: הקיר חור דקחתיו ויבוש ויבושת
MT: קיר חור יבושת ויבושת שבט חצורה
And Moshē bar Kēphā preserves an interesting contraction in citing Ezekiel 3:12b (F.23b, 1.19):

**MS:** אֵלֹהֵי אֱמוֹת וְשָׁלוֹם אֶת

**Lee:** אָלֹהֶים אֱמוֹת וְשָׁלוֹם אֵת

Considering these Old Testament citation variants as a whole, we conclude that Moshē bar Kēphā preserves nothing particularly significant with the possible exception of his use of Genesis 1:1 and his use of א forجد. In most cases he departs from and/or cites rather freely the Old Testament Peshitta text. He is least precise when citing the prophets, but even here it would appear that his variants have resulted more from a faulty memory of the precise text than a deliberate alteration or a significant counter-tradition.

B. New Testament Citations

Because the material available to us today for the Syriac New Testament tradition is rather rich, we can make a number of distinctions in Moshē bar Kēphā's use of these traditions in his Commentary on John. We will discuss this material historically, i.e., presenting the variants and our conclusions about them in order of their age: Old Syriac, Peshitta, Philoxenian/Harclean,
and variants attributable to Moshē bar Kēphā himself. As we shall see (and as we should expect) the largest number of variants we believe to fall to the Peshitta text; the commentary is based on the Peshitta text as the author himself says at the outset of the commentary (F.8b, p. 84) although it would appear that he preferred the Philoxenian/Harclean Version.

In making these evaluations the following criteria have been used:

I have presumed that the variants are based on or stem from the Peshitta text because of the date of the MS and the author's stated purpose of using the Peshitta text as the basis for his commentary;

Except:

a.) when there is concrete and demonstrable evidence that a given reading is from another textual tradition, i.e., Old Syriac or Philoxenian/Harclean; and

b.) where a variant differs from all known textual traditions, I have assigned it to Moshē bar Kēphā, either as a variant by his own hand, or as the preserver of some other textual tradition.

1. **Old Syriac Elements in the MS**

   We begin the oldest tradition preserved by Moshē
bar Kēphā, the Old Syriac. These variants are also the most significant by reason of their relative antiquity.

a.) When citing Matthew 3:11b, c at F.25b, 11.17 and 18, Moshē bar Kēphā preserves an old Syriac reading:

\[\text{MS: } \text{Sy}^\text{S}: \]

What we have here is actually a conflation of Matthew and Luke, for the second part of the citation is the Pe in Luke 3:16d:

\[\text{Pe: } \text{Sy}^\text{S}: \]

b.) At Matthew 18:10c we have an instance where Moshē bar Kēphā cites an Old Syriac reading. Some Feshitta MSS omit the first (Pusey and Gwilliam, p. 111, footnote), (F.29a, 11.22-23):

\[\text{MS: } \text{Pe and Sy}^\text{Em}: \]

\[\text{Pe and Sy}^\text{Em}: \]
When he cites John 1:29a, Moshe bar Kephah again preserves an Old Syriac reading (F.5b, 11.21-22):

**MS:**  אֶמְרְתָּנָה-לָהֶנָּה-לָהֶנָּה בַּעֲלָם-לָהֶנָּה

≠ **Pe:**  אֶמְרְתָּנָה-לָהֶנָּה-לָהֶנָּה בַּעֲלָם-לָהֶנָּה

≠ **Sy⁸:**  אֶמְרְתָּנָה-לָהֶנָּה-לָהֶנָּה בַּעֲלָם-לָהֶנָּה

≠ **Syem:**  אֶמְרְתָּנָה-לָהֶנָּה-לָהֶנָּה בַּעֲלָם-לָהֶנָּה

The second half of the citation shows affinity to no other version and we conclude that this is a free rendering by Moshe bar Kephah.
e.) Again when citing John 8:56 he preserves an Old Syriac reading (F.17b, 1.2):

MS: 

Pe: 

= SyS, em:

And in three places Ephrem (Leloir) preserves this passage:

~ Ephr. (XIV-4): 

(XIV-27): 

and (XVIII-1):

EphrArm. Abraham desideravit videre diem meum (XIV-4); vidit et gavisus est. (XIV-27); Abraham vidit diem et gavisus est (XVIII-12).

f.) In the diagram discussing "One" and "First," Moshe bar Kepha preserves an Old Syriac reading of John 13:21d in predicting Jesus' betrayal by Judas (F.8a, 1.5):

MS: 

Pe: 

= SyS, em:

And here the Philoxenian/Harclean also preserves this Old Syriac reading:
g.) Finally, when quoting John 6:47b, Moshe bar Kēpha preserves an element of the Old Syriac in his use of וְזֹז as against the כֶּל of the Peshitta (F.3b, 1.22):

MS: כֶּל אָבֵד כֵּן לֹא מְתוֹם לַלֻּכּוֹר

≠ Pe: כֶּל אָבֵד כֵּן לֹא מְתוֹם לַלֻּכּוֹר

= Syem: כֶּל אָבֵד כֵּן לֹא מְתוֹם לַלֻּכּוֹר

and also

= Sy°: כֶּל אָבֵד כֵּן לֹא מְתוֹם לַלֻּכּוֹר

2. Peshitta Variants in the MS

Next in line in the development of the Syriac text of the New Testament is the Peshitta or "simple" version, so named perhaps to distinguish it from the Philoxenian/Harclean with its marginal readings, and so forth. Although the Peshitta Version was in use before the split of the Syrian Church in A.D. 431, it did not acquire its name until the 9th century and Moshe bar Kēpha as noted above.

By far the greatest number of variants in this portion of the manuscript are related to the Peshitta text. For the sake of our analysis of them we shall consider them in five categories: a.) a word or words
omitted; b.) word order transposed; c.) a minor variant; d.) a word added; and e.) conflated phrases.

a.) Peshitta with a word or words omitted:

1.) Moshe bar Kepha omits  in citing Matthew 10:20 (F.3a, 11.10-11):

MS:  

~ Pe:  

2.) He drops a in quoting Matthew 19:4b (F.F. 7a-b, 11.24-1):

MS:  

~ Pe:  

3.) Twice in citing Mark 3:17 he omits and changes to  (F.2a, 11.14-15, and F.4b, 11.2-3):

MS:  

~ Pe:  

4.) When quoting John 5:21 Moshe bar Kepha omits and preserves a variant spelling of (F. 13a, 11.14-15):
5.) He again omits 𐤅𐤋 in citing John 5:26 (F.31a, 11.16-17):

MS: אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי. אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי.

∼ Pe: אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי.

Ephrem also omits the 𐤅𐤋, but differs in word order:

Ephr. (XIII-8): אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי.

6.) Moshe bar Kēphā omits אָבַּי and uses אָבַּי instead of אָבַּי in citing John 12:38a (F.30a, 1.18):

MS: אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי.

∼ Pe: (Sy:^sm): אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי.

7.) He omits אָבַּי, adds אֲדָא and transposes אֲדָא in citing John 14:30b (F.15b, 11.6-7):

MS: אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי.

∼ Pe: אָבַּי בָּאֵל מַעַרְשָׁי וְאֵלָהֵן וְמַעַרְשָׁי לַמֵּּי.

8.) Moshe bar Kēphā cites several words of John 17:5b from the Peshitta (F.23b, 1.8):
9.) In citing Acts 3:24, Moshe bar Kephah adds יד and omits פת (F.17b, 11.5-6):

MS: רכטב ורבדי יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל מילה.

= Pe: ... שלש אפסメ משמאל לברלאו משמעו: מירב

10.) And in citing Romans 8:2 he adds יד and omits הנ and ולעניאן (F.27b, 11.17-18):

MS: בך ו르בדי יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל יואל מילה.

= Pe: ... שלש אפסメ משמאל לברלאו משמעו: מירב

In these ten citations we believe the MS to be based on the Peshitta text with Moshe bar Kephah making some few omissions or additions, and that he preserves a significant variant at Romans 8:2.

b.) Peshitta with words transposed:

There is a second group of variants in which Moshe bar Kephah cites the Peshitta text but transposes the
word order.

1.) Moshē bar Kēphā in citing Matthew 3:11c transposes the word order and makes one slight change: for (F.27a, 1.7):

MS:  

∼ Pe:

2.) In citing Matthew 11:27b Moshē bar Kēphā transposes (F.31a, 11.11-12):

MS:  

= Pe:

3.) Moshē bar Kēphā transposes in citing Mark 12:8 (F.18a, 1.25), giving the crucifixion order:

MS:  

= Pe:

4.) When citing Luke 3:16d (F.26b, 1.15) Moshē bar Kēphā transposes the word order and changes to (F.27a):

MS:  

∼ Pe:

5.) He turns John 1:1b around (F.11a, 1.15):

MS:  

= Pe:

6.) He does the same thing in citing John 1:2 (F.
9a, 11.21-22):

MS:  

= Pe:  

7.) Again in quoting Acts 4:13c he transposes phrases (F.2b, 1.23):

MS: = Sahidic (II, 32)  

= Pe:  

8.) An extensive word transposition occurs in the citation of Ephesians 3:10 and אֶפָּסֶל is changed to אַפָּסֶל (F.4a, 11.7-8):

MS:  

= Pe:  

9.) In citing 1 Timothy 1:15b, Moshe bar Kepha transposes the word order, omits יְדֵיָם, and preserves a variant spelling of וְלָתָן (F.18b, 11.8-9):

MS:  

= Pe:  

In these nine instances Moshe bar Kepha has preserved variants of some significance, especially where
these changes in word order are found in other traditions.

c.) Peshitta with variant forms.

There is a third group of Peshitta variants which differ mainly in the use of minor variant forms such as spelling, the stated use of ע to indicate the direct object, a contraction and so forth. Again these are minor but we cite them for the sake of thoroughness.

1.) Moshe bar Kepha has ל for ל in citing Matthew 13:17 (F.30a, 11.9-11):

MS: 

≈Pe: 

2.) In citing Matthew 28:19 Moshe bar Kepha adds ע which is a common Peshitta variant (F.31a, 11.18-19):

MS: 

≈Pe: 

3.) When he cites Luke 1:35b, he changes the 3rd person feminine imperfect to the 3rd person masculine imperfect (י to י) (F.22a, 11.7-8):

MS: 

In this case Ishodad of Merv and the Philoxenian/Harclean have done the same thing (but there are other differences in the latter):

\[ \approx \text{Ishodad: (III, p. 11, 1.a): } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]

\[ \approx \text{Sy: } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]

4.) In citing John 5:1a Moshē bar Kēphā uses variant spellings in \( \text{מ"א} \) for \( \text{מ"א} \) (FF.5b-6a, 11.23-1); (both mean "a festival of the Jews"):

\[ \text{MS: } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]

\[ \approx \text{Pe: } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]

5.) In his use of John 5:17b Moshē bar Kēphā has replaced \( \text{א} \) ("also") with \( \text{ו} \) ("and") (F.13a, 11.15-16):

\[ \text{MS: } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]

\[ \approx \text{Pe: } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]

6.) Moshē bar Kēphā substitutes \( \text{ואא} \) ("so, thus") for \( \text{וב} \) ("and") in citing John 10:15a (F.13a, 11.9-10):

\[ \text{MS: } \quad \text{etc, etc...} \]
7. Moshē bar Kēp̄ā makes use of the pronominal suffix, *וֹמֶה*, in citing 1 Corinthians 1:24c (F.19b, 1.20); (both render "power of God");

MS: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא

≈ Pe: סַלָּא וּלָא

8. In citing 2 Corinthians 6:16c, he uses a very slightly different construction (F.23a, 1.3); (both mean, "shall be their God");

MS: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא לַעֲדָי

≈ Pe: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא לַעֲדָי

9. In quoting Galatians 3:10c, Moshē bar Kēp̄ā omits *וֹמֶה* and does not contract *וּלָא*, and changes the imperfect *לַעֲדָי* to the perfect *לַעֲדָי* (F.28a, 1.23);

MS: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא לַעֲדָי

≈ Pe: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא לַעֲדָי

10. We find another Peshitta-based variant when Ephesians 4:16a is cited at F.13a, 1.22. Moshē bar Kēp̄ā has substituted *וּלָא* for *וֹמֶה* and omitted *וֹמֶה*:

MS: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא לַעֲדָי

≈ Pe: נַחְשָׁנָא וּלָא לַעֲדָי

11. In citing Colossians 1:16a, Moshē bar Kēp̄ā
supplies a more definite \( \text{מְשַׁמֵּשָׁהששׁ} \) ("by the Messiah") for \( \text{מְשָׁמָשׁ} \) ("in him"), adds \( \text{לַלְגַּלְגַּל} \) ("whether"), does not contract \( \text{לֵאֶזֶר} \), and transposes the word order; (F.12b, 10):

MS: \[ \text{מְשַׁמֵּשָׁהששׁ} \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{לָלְגַּלְגַּל} \]

≈ Pe: \[ \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{מְשַׁמֵּשֶׁהששׁ} \text{לָלְגַּלְגַּל} \]

12.) Again in citing Colossians 1:16c, he supplies \( \text{מְשַׁמֵּשָׁהששׁ} \) ("by the Messiah"), and transposes the word order; (F.13b, 1.26):

MS: \[ \text{מְשַׁמֵּשָׁהששׁ} \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \]

≈ Pe: \[ \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{מְשַׁמֵּשֶׁהששׁ} \]

13.) In citing Hebrews 1:10a, Moshe bar Kephä does not use the pronominal suffix \( \text{אָה} \) in his citation (F.7b, 1.2):

MS: \[ \text{לָאָה} \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{אָהאָהאָהאָהאָהאָה} \]

≈ Pe: \[ \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{לָאָה} \text{אָהאָהאָהאָהאָה} \]

14.) In citing Hebrews 3:5a, 6a Moshe bar Kephä adds the particle \( \text{אָה} \) and supplies his own verb, (F.23b, 11.25-26):

MS: \[ \text{אָהאָהאָהאָהאָהאָה} \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{אָהאָהאָהאָהאָהאָה} \]

≈ Pe: \[ \text{כָּלָּמְשׁוּרָה} \text{אָהאָהאָהאָהאָהאָה} \]
15. In two places Moshe bar Kephä cites 1 John 1:1. Both are variations from the Peshitta, made by omitting some of the verbal forms and changing "Messiah" to "messiah":

F.18a, 11.7-8, MS: Moshe bar Kephä adds: "messias messias dä 100. 100 from dä messias messias, la100 sab dä dem tät."

F.23a, 11.14-15, MS: Moshe bar Kephä adds: "messias messias dä 100. 100 from dä messias messias, la100 sab dä dem tät."

≈ Pe: "messias messias dä 100. 100 from dä messias messias, la100 sab dä dem tät."

These citations provide some interesting variants, especially in specifying "the Messiah" at Colossians 1:16.

d.) Peshitta with a word added.

In a few instances we find that Moshe bar Kephä has added a word (in addition to those instances already discussed above). In none of these instances is the meaning altered in any way.

1.) In citing Matthew 13:17b Moshe bar Kephä adds a second "ye" ("ye") (F.17b, 11.7-9):
2. In citing Mark 1:19c, he adds οοο (F.2b, 1.9):

MS: 

Pe: (and SyS,em)

3. In his use of John 1:3b, Moshe bar Kephah adds o ("and") (F.14a, 1.7):

MS: 

Pe: 


MS: 

Pe: 

5. In citing Acts 2:36b Moshe bar Kephah adds λολ indicating a citation (F.11a, 11.30-31):

MS: 

Pe: (-λολ)

6. In his quotation of 1 Corinthians 1:9a, Moshe bar Kephah adds λολ ("Father") to the Peshitta and transposes οαλ (F.13a, 11.18-19):

MS: 

Pe: 
7.) When he cites 1 Timothy 3:16d (F.29a, 1.25) he adds "God" which is found in several other traditions.

MS: ὁ ἄγνωστος θεός

Of these, 1 Cor 1.9a is most significant.

e.) Peshitta passages conflated.

In addition to instance a.) under the Old Syriac variants, we have identified two places where variant readings are actually conflations of parallel passages.

1.) In citing Matthew 13:55 Moshe bar Kephä inserts the Syr<em>em</em> and omits ἵνα ἀκούσοντος (F.25b, 11.9-10):

MS: ἐκ νωποῦ, ὅπερ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἰστόσισι (γαν) ὑπολογίζοντες

2 = Pe: (Mt) ἵνα ἀκούσατε ἐν τοῖς ἰστόσισι

1 = Syr<em>em</em>:

2.) At F.18a, 1.21 Moshe bar Kephä combines Matthew 15:24b and Matthew 10:6:

MS: ἵνα ἀκούσατε ἐν τοῖς ἰστόσισι

1 = Pe: (Mt 15:24b) ἵνα ἀκούσατε ἐν τοῖς ἰστόσισι

2 = Pe: (Mt 10:6b) ἵνα ἀκούσατε ἐν τοῖς ἰστόσισι

It is interesting to note in passing that by coincidence the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary preserves the reading given by Moshe bar Kephä:
3. *Philoxenian/Harclean Elements in the MS*

We now turn to variants which reflect the next step in the Syriac New Testament textual history, the Philoxenian/Harclean tradition which sprang to life in A.D. 508 in a new setting prepared for Philoxenus of M'tbug by his chorepiscopus Polycarp, and in A.D. 616 in a revision prepared by Thomas of HarkeI respectively. (The exact relationship of these two closely related versions is still a matter of debate.)

We have found nine variants which reflect the *Syh* textual tradition. As the reader will discover all are found in the first chapter of John's Gospel.

a.) In citing John 1:1c *Moshe bar Kephah* follows the Philoxenian/Harclean text (F.13a, 1.11):

\[\text{MS: } \text{Sy}^h : \]

\[\neq \text{Pe: } \]

\[= \text{Sy}^h : \]
b.) In the insert at F.13b, 11.23, we find a strange combination in the citation of John 1:3b, c, 4a:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MS:} & & \text{\&Pe:} & \text{Sy}^b: \\
& \text{looty}^2 \text{looty}^3 & \text{looty}^2 & \text{looty}^3 \text{looty}^2
\end{align*}
\]

We conclude that the MS \(\text{loot}^1\) and \(\text{Sy}^b\) \(\text{loot}^1\) are for all practical purposes identical, but that the \(\text{loot}^1\) is peculiar to Moshē bar Kēphā alone, having found no other tradition which even approximates this reading.

c.) Two similar readings of John 1:3c, 4a are also found in this insert at F.13b, 1.7\(^1\) and 1.8\(^2\) respectively. Again they combine a special tradition with the Philoxenian/Harclean:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1MS:} & \quad \text{looty}^2 \text{looty}^3 \text{looty}^2 \\
\text{2MS:} & \quad \text{looty}^2 \text{looty}^3 \text{looty}^2
\end{align*}
\]

d.) At John 1:8 we find a combination of the \(\text{Sy}^b\) and the Peshitta (F.14b, 11:23-24):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MS:} & \quad \text{looty}^2 \text{looty}^3 \text{looty}^2 \\
\text{Pe:} & \quad \text{looty}^2 \text{looty}^3 \text{looty}^2
\end{align*}
\]
The same variant is preserved at F.16b, 1.8 for John 1:8a:

MS:  

And again at f.16b, 11.11-12:

MS:  

E.) In citing John 1:26b we again encounter the Syⁿ (F.25b, 1.16):

MS:  

≠ Pe:  

= Syⁿ:

F.) And when he cites John 1:29c he follows the Syⁿ (F.25a, 11.20-21):

MS:  

≠ Pe:  

= Syⁿ:

4. Variants Assigned to Moshē bar Kēphā in the MS

In addition to those already noted above we have assigned seven variant readings as coming from Moshē bar Kēphā himself. All have some relationship to the Peshitta, but they preserve a reading we believe of great enough difference from any other tradition as to
merit separate consideration.

a.) In citing Matthew 10:5c, 6 Moshē bar Kēphā makes two changes (the most significant being 

Διδάξαι ["house"] for ἐκκλησία ["towns"] and transposes the word order (F.18a, 11.22-24):

MS:

�but ≠ Fe:

≠ Syh:

≠ Sy₂,em; wanting

b.) When citing John 2:1 Moshē bar Kēphā differs from all extant versions. (although a comparison with John 1:29a above in the discussion of the Old Syriac Version may provide a parallel construction) (F.5b, 11.22-23):

MS:

≠ Fe:

≠ Syh:

≠ Sy₂,em; wanting
c.) In citing John 5:23b Moshē bar Kēphā has created a parallel by transposing the phrases at F.12a, 11.15-16:

MS:  

≠ Pe:  

≠ SyC:  

≠ SyS:  

≠ SyEm:  

≠ SyH:  

d.) When citing John 5:34a Moshē bar Kēphā again renders his own reading (F.16a, 1.6):

MS:  

≠ Pe:  

≠ SyEm:  

≠ SyH:  

e.) Moshē bar Kēphā renders an independent variant in citing John 17:24b, 25a (F.17a, 11.28-29):
f.) Moshé bar Kēphā differs from all extant texts in treating Galatians 4:4b (F.22a, 1.12):

MS:
≠ Pe, Syₕ, em:
≠ Syₕ:

When citing Colossians 1:16c Moshé bar Kēphā differs from the Pe (FF.13b-14a, 11.28-1):

MS:
≠ Pe:
≠ Syₕ:

One other reading is worth noting. When ostensibly citing Matthew 1:23a (in a discussion of Matthew's use of Old Testament prophecy regarding Jesus' birth), Moshé bar Kēphā cites Isaiah 7:14 itself (while citing Matthew's text of Hosea and Jeremiah immediately following this instance). (F.24b, 11.7-8):

MS:
≠ Pe, Syₕ, em:
≠ Syₕ:
= Lee: (Is)

C. Conclusions

On the basis of the rather lengthy discussion of variants above let us draw the following conclusions:
1.) There is evidence here that the Old Syriac Version was known and used by Moshē bar Kēphā in the ninth century A.D., and that the scribes who made this copy of the manuscript in the twelfth century preserved at least some of these readings. Moshē lived in a rather more eastern area, less influenced by the textual changes in Syria and further west. This may help to explain the survival of the Old Syriac to this late date.

2.) The Peshitta was dominant. The commentary itself follows this textual tradition and the overwhelming number of citations and variants are related to this text type.

3.) Moshē bar Kēphā knew and used (and perhaps preferred) the Philoxenian/Harclean version. Its use is very limited, however. Moshē apparently held to his stated purpose to make a commentary which would be plain and easy to understand (page one of his introduction) and to follow the Peshitta version (page one of the commentary).

4.) In a small number of instances he created or preserved a tradition of his own. The most striking case in our opinion is at John 1:3b: ḫo oo.
5.) There was a rich textual tradition circulating throughout the Syrian Jacobite church. This noted bishop felt free to make use of the whole range, ancient to contemporary, so that his readers would benefit, gaining in increased understanding and enlightenment on the word of God.
AN ADDITIONAL NOTE

Subsequent research has brought to light the source for the first narrative regarding the occasion for the writing of John's Gospel which appears in Moshē bar Kēphā's introductory chapters, pages 76-77 in the text and 142-44 in the translation. This reason-for-writing is found in the introductory comments made by Theodore of Mopsuestia in his Commentary on John.\(^1\) This portion of the translation of Theodore's work is found almost word for word in Moshē bar Kēphā! While Moshē bar Kēphā does not acknowledge his source, on the basis of the close parallelism there can be no doubt that he was dependent on Theodore in this instance.

It is interesting to note that Ishodad of Merv preserves the same tradition in his Commentary on John

although in a somewhat abbreviated form. Mrs. Gibson identifies the source for this narrative as Theodore of Mopsuestia.

So we find Moshē bar Kēphā citing a block of tradition which originates in Theodore and is also preserved by his contemporary, Ishodad. The problem of course is that these are both men in the Nestorian tradition, one which Moshē bar Kēphā opposed as a Monophysite Jacobite. How can we account for this? The most straight forward answer would be to put this down simply as a bold-faced use by Moshē bar Kēphā of tradition preserved by the brightest sun of the commentators of his rivals, the "Interpreter." It would also be a singular usage of this source, for a check of the remainder of the commentary on John 1:1-18 by Theodore and Ishodad reveals no other borrowing from these sources. In light of Moshē bar Kēphā's free usage of John Chrysostom and several other sources, such a singular usage does not seem probable.

Let us therefore posit a theoretical answer. Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom were contemporaries and were fellow students of the great Antiochene teacher, Diodor of Tarsus. From Diodor both received this

---

tradition, and both preserved it in their own commentaries on John. Unfortunately Diodor's commentary has not been preserved, and John Chrysostom's exists only in as yet unedited MSS (see page 27 above). That of Theodore is before us (Vööbus notwithstanding: see page 32). But we do not believe that this tradition originates with him. It may not have originated even with Diodor. We do believe it would be found in Diodor and may be found in John Chrysostom, and that such a lineage is both a more reasonable and more acceptable source for Moshē bar Kēphā's tradition.
We now turn to the manuscript itself. There follow the sixty pages of text which comprise the basis for this study. These represent folios 1b through 31a (following Wright and Cook's pagination as suggested above on page 2) of Add. 1971 (II).

The manuscript appears to have been rendered in two colors of ink. Accordingly we will preserve and denote this by underlining the passages in red, both in transcription and the translation which follows. Square brackets ([]) enclose those places where the text is unclear or wanting.

Scriptural citations and allusions will be identified in the left-hand margin of the text. Where more than one citation occurs in a line of text, the identification will be found on the line below. Most marginal inserts found in the manuscript have been relocated on the bottom of the page and appropriately noted.

The reader will notice that this text section bears two and three systems of pagination: 1) The thesis page number at the top of each page; 2) the number and letter folio identification at the bottom of each page; and
3) Serta-letter pagination as found in the MS is located in the lower left-hand corner of the \textit{recto} side of each folio.

With these notes on mechanics, we are now ready to introduce the reader to Moshē bar Kēphā in person.
يَتَبَكَّرُ ِمِنْهُمَّ ابْنَاهُ مَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ فَلاَنَّ يَأْمُرُ بِهَا، وَيَأْمُرُ بِالْإِناَقَةِ وَالْمَعَالَةِ وَالْمَفَاتِرِ: فَيَتَبَكَّرُ ِمِنْهُمَّ ابْنَاهُ مَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ. 4

فَإِذَا ِمَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ فَلاَنَّ يَأْمُرُ بِهَا، وَيَأْمُرُ بِالْإِناَقَةِ وَالْمَعَالَةِ وَالْمَفَاتِرِ. 5

فَإِذَا ِمَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ فَلاَنَّ يَأْمُرُ بِهَا، وَيَأْمُرُ بِالْإِناَقَةِ وَالْمَعَالَةِ وَالْمَفَاتِرِ. 10

فَإِذَا ِمَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ فَلاَنَّ يَأْمُرُ بِهَا، وَيَأْمُرُ بِالْإِناَقَةِ وَالْمَعَالَةِ وَالْمَفَاتِرِ. 15

فَإِذَا ِمَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ فَلاَنَّ يَأْمُرُ بِهَا، وَيَأْمُرُ بِالْإِناَقَةِ وَالْمَعَالَةِ وَالْمَفَاتِرِ. 20

فَإِذَا ِمَنْ يُهْتَمُّ بِهِ فَلاَنَّ يَأْمُرُ بِهَا، وَيَأْمُرُ بِالْإِناَقَةِ وَالْمَعَالَةِ وَالْمَفَاتِرِ.
Note that the scribe uses Estrangula numerals.

Wright and Cook (op. cit.) mistakenly read this:
Mk 1:9c

A n 7:52
Jn 1:46a
Ac 4:13c*

1 MS reads: ἐ φθάσατέ ἐ σε μή μεθ’ ἀνθρώπουν.
2 MS reads: 1000.
1MS reads: دين، but see 1. 15.
الموارد 

1. إعداد الورقة 

2. ترتيب العمليات 

3. تحليل البيانات 

4. تطوير المفاهيم 

5. تقديم النتائج 

6. توقيع البروفيسور 

الموارد 

1. إعداد الورقة 

2. ترتيب العمليات 

3. تحليل البيانات 

4. تطوير المفاهيم 

5. تقديم النتائج 

6. توقيع البروفيسور
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة مسبقةً أيها. يمكنني فقط قراءة النص العربي من الصورة مسبقةً. يمكنني فقط قراءة النص العربي من الصورة مسبقةً.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي في الصورة.
See Appendix C.  

In margin: | ²| ³| ⁴

For R.S.V. chapter and verse equivalents.  

The scribe uses the Serta at here and below, on

1. 23

MS reads:  ³| ⁴
The scribe again uses the Serta, in Chapter 5.

See Appendix A, pp. 265-271, for another setting of this 'chapter'.

1 MS reads: үәжә.
2 The scribe again uses the Serta in Chapter 5.
3 See Appendix A, pp. 265-271, for another setting of this 'chapter'.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
(See Appendices A and B, pp. 267, 271, 273 and 274 for other settings of this diagram and its translation.)
بالله ورسوله، 15:30
أي: "إذا كان من أمراء الله، فكيف إذا كان من أبدانه؟"
لا لأبداً بل من يبطنون المعرفة العقلية والمعرفة
فة في قلوبهم. 8
لقد جاءنا هذا الأمر، وما يغيب عن أعيننا
افية، جعلناه لغراً للغائبين، وعمادًا للعمليين،
فأصبح العبدون المنكرين لهم أعداءً لا أعداءً، وتلك
10
وجوههم بالإضافة إلى وجههم في الدنيا. 11
فما كان من ذلك أحسن من أن يجعلوا بين
نفسهما وبين آبائهم ويتخذوا فيه ركناً، وتأملوا
15
فيضة الزهور، وأن يجعلوا فيها ركناً، وتأملوا
فيها ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
12
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
10
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
20
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
ركناً، وتأملوا في الفضائل، وأن يجعلوا فيها
rück

25

30
ينبض قلبي من طيف النور، فوسأُدعُي النور إلى أعلاه. إِنّي أَنفَقْتُ لِلَّهِ مِنَ مَا خُزِينِي مَالًا وَأَنفَقْتُ مَرَّةً أُحْزَنَتْ. 

5

لا تَنفَقْنَ عَلَى الشَّيْءِ الْبَيْضَاءَ مِنْ تَابِعِينَكُمْ، إِلَّا مَا حَمِّلَهُ عَلَيْهِ رَبُّهُ، وَلَا تَشْفَعِي لَهُمْ بِمَا كَانَ تَقْدِرُونَ.

10

خُذوا نَفْسَكُمْ مِنِّكُمْ، إِنّي لَمْ أُعْرِفُكُمْ أَخَوًا فَأَنفِقُوا عَلَى مَنْ يُطَهِّرُكُمْ بِالْعَمُّ وَالْوَسُّ وَالْمَنْتَجَةَ، وَأَنفِقُوا عَلَيْهِمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُقْرَبُونَهُمْ.

15

لا تَنفَقْنَ عَلَى الشَّيْءِ الْبَيْضَاءَ مِنْ تَابِعِينَكُمْ، إِلَّا مَا حَمِّلَهُ عَلَيْهِ رَبُّهُ، وَلَا تَشْفَعِي لَهُمْ بِمَا كَانَ تَقْدِرُونَ.

20

إِنّي لَمْ أُعْرِفُكُمْ أَخَوًا فَأَنفِقُوا عَلَى مَنْ يُطَهِّرُكُمْ بِالْعَمُّ وَالْوَسُّ وَالْمَنْتَجَةَ، وَأَنفِقُوا عَلَيْهِمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُقْرَبُونَهُمْ.

25

لا تَنفَقْنَ عَلَى الشَّيْءِ الْبَيْضَاءَ مِنْ تَابِعِينَكُمْ، إِلَّا مَا حَمِّلَهُ عَلَيْهِ رَبُّهُ، وَلَا تَشْفَعِي لَهُمْ بِمَا كَانَ تَقْدِرُونَ.

30

لا نَفَقُو، فَكَيْفَ يُطَهِّرُكُمْ بِالْعَمُّ وَالْوَسُّ وَالْمَنْتَجَةَ بِمَا كَانَ تَقْدِرُونَ. إِنّي لَمْ أُعْرِفُكُمْ أَخَوًا، فَأَنفِقُوا عَلَى مَنْ يُطَهِّرُكُمْ بِالْعَمُّ وَالْوَسُّ وَالْمَنْتَجَةَ، وَأَنفِقُوا عَلَيْهِمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُقْرَبُونَهُمْ.
Note the unusual contraction of:  "םלך".
...inserted in the margin.
In 1:3a

Inserted in margin: 

11b
...
is inserted above the line.
The smudge may have been corrected by the insert, perhaps by a later scribe.
1) This is inserted above the line.
2) | is inserted vertically between LoX and o o L.
وَكَيْلٌ مِّنَ الْمَلَائِكَةَ مَبْعَطْنَاهُ فَزَوَّنَهُ زَوُّنًا

بِعَلِيْكُمْ وَأَبَاكُمْ وَأَمْوَالَكُمْ مِّنَ الْأَمْوَالِ مِنَّا وَهُدِينَا بِهِ بَيِّنَانًا

وَكَفَّارَةَ الْكَفَاّرَةِ لِلَّذِينَ يَسُرُّونَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَالَهُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ

وَكَيْلٌ مِّنَ الْمَلَائِكَةَ مَبْعَطْنَاهُ فَزَوَّنَهُ زَوُّنًا

بِعَلِيْكُمْ وَأَبَاكُمْ وَأَمْوَالَكُمْ مِّنَ الْأَمْوَالِ مِنَّا وَهُدِينَا بِهِ بَيِّنَانًا

وَكَفَّارَةَ الْكَفَاّرَةِ لِلَّذِينَ يَسُرُّونَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَالَهُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ

وَلَنَزَوَّنَهُمْ لِلَّذِينَ يَسُرُّونَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَالَهُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ

بِعَلِيْكُمْ وَأَبَاكُمْ وَأَمْوَالَكُمْ مِّنَ الْأَمْوَالِ مِنَّا وَهُدِينَا بِهِ بَيِّنَانًا

وَكَفَّارَةَ الْكَفَاّرَةِ لِلَّذِينَ يَسُرُّونَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَالَهُمْ عِنْذَ رَبِّهِمْ
לַאֲמַלְמָה, צָאֵב, יִהְיֶה בָּדוֹא; וְלָא תִנְדַע, אִםֶּלֶךُ לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 5

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 64

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 7

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 8

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 9

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 10

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 11

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 12

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 13

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 14

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 15

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 16

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 17

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 18

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 19

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 20

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 21

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 22

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 23

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 24

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 25

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 26

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 27

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 28

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 29

וְיָסָדָה חַסָּדָה לָפֶלֶק אֶל לָשׁוּכָא אוֹשֵׂי מְעָרְחָו. 30

IUM reads: לַאֲמַלְמָה, צָאֵב... with IMA overlaid.

Gk Jn 1:7b 2 Inserted in margin: IMA MAJTYPHCN
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي المكتوب بالخط العربي التقليدي لهذه الصفحة من الكتاب.
I'll try my best to read it naturally.

In margin: ١‘كمbole...صلحص حاصل.’ ٢‘كمbole...صلحص حاصل.’
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي المكتوب في الصورة.
Cor15:9b

Tim1:15b
A Ga 1:23

Ro 10:3

god is inserted above the line.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي بشكل طبيعي. إذا كنت بحاجة إلى مساعدة في شيء آخر، فلنكن متاحين.
Cor 1:24

Proclaim the gospel from my mouth, and spread it by my authority. The saying is trustworthy, and I desire to emphasize it at your insistence. 

Rom 10:15

How can they believe if no one speaks to them in their language? 

Jon 1:12

Go at once and announce to the inhabitants of Nineveh, 'Whoever has not sinned will be saved!'

Job 23:13b

Your words are not in the heart of fools; they are the words of the wise. 

Ps 37:1

Put your trust in the Lord and take refuge in him; he will be your shelter and your fortress. 

1j is inserted above the line.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
1. In several places.

4. In sevveral places.

7. is inserted above the line.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
Ps 139:12

1

Inserted in margin: 110 110 110 110 110

2 MS reads: "139:12"

3 Inserted above the line: "139:12"
لا يمكن قراءة النص العربي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
23a

25

20

15

10

5
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
Mt 1:23a*
(5:7:14a)
Mt 2:18a (6:3:15)
Mt 2:15c (6:11:16)
Jn 1:32, 33

1 Inserted above the line.
118

\textit{MS reads: لا تأتي.}
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة. هل يمكنك أن تقدم النص بشكل آخر؟
The document contains text in Arabic script. It appears to be a page from a book or a manuscript, possibly a religious text, given the context and structure of the writing. The text is written in a traditional Arabic script, and it includes numerical and possibly some other forms of commentary or notes. The layout suggests it might be a page from a series of pages, possibly a collection of religious texts or a commentary on such texts.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة المقدمة. من فضلك قم بإعادة قراءة النص بشكل يمكنني فهمه.
123

إفْتِ يَنِمُّ مَنْ لَمْ يَسْمَعْ صَوْتَ كَلاَمِهِ مَعَ كَبْسَةٍ مِّنْ بَلَدِهِ. 2

فَمَنْ كَانَ ضَرِّبَ، فَلْيُصَلِّي عَنْهُ. 3

وَلَا تَغْلُغُوا فَيْسَ مَا نَغْلَغُهُ. 4

5

تَوَلَّ صَرْحَةُ لِيِّدَةٍ بِاللَّهِ. 6

وَلَا تَغْلُغُوا فَيْسَ مَا نَغْلَغُهُ. 7

وَلَا تَغْلُغُوا فَيْسَ مَا نَغْلَغُهُ. 8

25

1 The scribe has corrected his error. Apparently his eye returned to line 16.
124

Gn 18:18

Ex 33:18b

1 loc is inserted above the line.

2 yāw is inserted above the line.
בCog 5:8
Mt 18:10 כ*
תבמ 3:16 ד*

1. לקל is inserted above the line.
2. נב is inserted in the left margin.
3. ל Goldberg is inserted above the line.
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MS reads:  צ"אשכ כיאשכז.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
MS clearly reads:  

(fish).
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.

يرجى تقديم النص العربي بشكل جلي أو تقديم النص المكتوب بشكل شفاف للقراءة الصحيحة.
THE TRANSLATION
In the hope and trust and power of God—He who is in all from this time forth, and all in Him is boundless: and He is in all, and outside of all, and above all, and beyond all—we are writing a commentary of the sacred Gospel of John the Evangelist, which was made and collected by Mar Moshē who is called Bar Kēphā, Bishop of Bēth Rammān and Mosul.

Whereas you are occupied in the holy and sacred Scriptures, and are engaged in the study and continuous contemplation of them, and thereby you manifest in yourself the lovely likeness of Timothy, the disciple of Paul, the great one amongst the apostles, O, our admirable and beloved Cyrus, the Abbot, you have requested of us, in our lowliness, that we should make a commentary on the Gospel of John for you. Now, for reasons many and various, we have been persuaded by your request. While we are making this commentary in succinct and lucid words, as is our custom, so that it will be found plain and easy for the readers, (and) while we are not at all abbreviating the required consideration as far as it is in our power, nevertheless we entreat from the
Holy Spirit, who 'searches all and even the depths of God,' that He will direct and lead our understanding by the creative power which is in Him; and from the Word of God "who enlightens every man who comes into the world" (Jn 1:9b), that He will direct and explain our words through His divine guidance. And therefore we are (now) setting down for your (better) understanding those common and general chapters which should be placed before the Gospel as a whole. (We first dictated and wrote them in the Commentary of the Gospel of the blessed Matthew which we made for the pious Mar Ignatius, the Bishop.) These are the particular and special chapters which it is necessary to place before the commentary of the Gospel of the Apostle John (there are twenty-seven chapters or headings): The first chapter: Who is speaking in this book? The second chapter: Whose son is he? The third chapter: And what was his craft? The fourth chapter: And from which village was he? The fifth chapter: And from what region was he? The sixth chapter: Was he learned or untaught? The seventh chapter: Was it he who spoke or did another speak through him? The eighth chapter: Why did the Messiah call him "Bar Ra'ma"? The ninth chapter: Is what he spoke and wrote
true or not? The tenth chapter: Does he speak about mundane things or about divine things? Chapter eleven: In what city and in what place did he speak? Chapter twelve: What persons were his 'hearers'? Chapter thirteen: How ought they be 'hearers' of his teaching? Chapter fourteen: What various things do they gain who accept his teaching? Chapter fifteen: Concerning why the Messiah nicknamed him Bar Regeši: He called him Bar Regeši as the blessed Mark said, "Upon James the son of Zebedee and John, his brother, he placed the name Bar Regeši, which is 'Son of Thunder'" (Mk 3:17). Chapter sixteen: Where was his body placed and where is his soul dwelling? Chapter seventeen: What was the reason for his writing? Chapter eighteen: At what time did he write? Chapter nineteen: In what language did he write this Gospel? The twentieth chapter: And what was his intention in this record? Chapter twenty: What is the method of his thought here? Chapter twenty-two: Concerning why John did not do as these other three evangelists (did). Matthew began from the incarnation of the Messiah since he says, "The book of the genealogy of," etc. (Mt 1:1a); but Mark from His baptism; then Luke from the annunciation to Zechariah and also the annunciation to Mary when he told what the
angel said to Mary, "You will conceive and bear a son" (Lk 1:31a). But he (John) began from the eternity and divinity of the Word when he said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a).

Chapter 23: How many kinds of words about the Messiah are seen in this book? Chapter 24: For whom did John write this Gospel? Chapter 25: Concerning how many and which chapters and stories the blessed John spoke in this Gospel.

Chapter 26: Concerning this: how many parables and how many testimonies and how many sayings and how many signs there are in this Gospel of John.

Chapter twenty-seven: In how many ways was the expression Δόξα used; and how did John interpret it and apply it to the Word of God and say: "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a)?

The first chapter and the second and the third and the fourth and the fifth: We assert that it is John who is speaking with us in this Scripture. He was the son of Zebedee the fisherman. He was a very poor man, a needy fisherman. And it is evident that he was poor in it (his fishing) for these reasons: because he was not fishing from the Great Sea but from a small and little lake; and because of this which is written concerning them, "They were restoring their nets" (Mk 1:19c). And
that is clear because they were worn out and it happened that there was no money for them to buy other new ones; and because he was unable to teach his son another craft than that inferior craft of fishing. And together with these, he was from Beth Saida, a village so little, I would say, and so small that if John had not come from it, it would not be known even by name. Moreover he was from Galilee, a contemptible region, I would say, which was reviled constantly by the scribes, as it is said, "It is not possible that a prophet shall arise from Galilee" (A. Jn 7:52), and like that other one which is spoken, "Will anything good come from Nazareth" (Jn 1:46a)?

The sixth chapter and the seventh: Was he learned or untaught; and was it he who spoke or did another speak through him? And we assert that he was not learned, but rather, untaught and uninstructed. And this is evident for these reasons: because he was unlearned in the instruction of the books of the Scriptures, as Luke says in the Acts concerning the elders and scribes of the Jews who knew that the disciples "were untaught and did not know a letter" (Ac 4:13c); because he had no chance to go around in the cities
and to meet with learned men and to be educated; and because he was a fisherman and was occupied constantly in a dumb and silent manner. He spoke with no one except by chance with those buying fish or the fish-curers, men who were not learned in knowledge nor did they teach wisdom. When we learn then about John's father and John's own craft and his village and his region and about his lack of learning and his lack of knowledge, and this, that he could not read; and this, that he was not instructed in wisdom; and (when) we hear him declaring and saying, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God" (Jn 1:1), and the rest of all his teaching, we understand exactly and truly that it is not so much he that speaks these words, but rather it was the Holy Spirit who was working in him. And this is evident because the Lord said to His disciples, "It was not you (who) were speaking, but the Spirit of your Father who was speaking in you" (Mt 10:20). And moreover it is evident because when the Holy Spirit descended upon John and his companions in the upper room, He taught and instructed them and confirmed them in what they had heard from our Lord. And again He also revealed to them secret things which they did not know. For even when he, John,
was speaking with his mouth and tongue and lips and uttering these words, yet it was only the Holy Spirit who was directing his thoughts and words, and was working and speaking through him as through a pure and holy instrument. So then since the Holy Spirit spoke through him, who can doubt his words? And since the Holy Spirit speaks through him, what is he who does not accept these things which are spoken by him but one who rebels against God and renounces Him?

The eighth chapter: Why did the Messiah call him "Bar Ra'ma?" And we say because he thundered unexpectedly like a thunderclap and said these divine words which he spoke. But moreover He called him "Bar Ra'ma" because his teaching resounded throughout the whole inhabited world. But again He called him "Bar Ra'ma" because his voice was thundering greater than all thunderings. But again He nicknamed him "Bar Ra'ma"

3b to show that it was He who changed the name of Abram ("my father is exalted") and called him Abraham ("father of a multitude"), and the name of Sari and

called her Sarah (both mean "princess") and the name of Jacob ("supplanter") and called him Israel ("striver with God"). But again He called him "Bar Ra'ama" so that he would not forget the benefits of grace which He bestowed upon him, but would remember these continually, as He did to Simon ("God has heard") whom He called Peter ("rock"), and also Saul\(^1\) ("asked of") who was called Paul (Roman surname); for when He calls men to leadership or whatever office or to prophecy and to apostleship, there are times when He changes the names of some of them and calls them by other names, so that they will not forget His grace unto them, but that whenever they continually recall the changing of their names, they will recall also His grace and benefits unto them.

The ninth chapter: Is what he spoke and wrote true or not? And we assert that it is true and faithful. And this is evident from two things; because at supper he lay at the bosom of our Lord, and received instruction in theology from Him; and because the Holy Spirit who knows things of God faithfully in such a way as the spirit of man those which are in man—it is He

who descended upon him in the upper room with the rest of the disciples, his companions, and taught him secret things and true, and spoke through him as if through a pure and holy instrument.

The tenth chapter: Does he speak about mundane things or about divine things? And we assert that he does not speak about mundane and despicable and vile things, nor about the worthless and imperfect science of the foreign philosophers, but about godly and heavenly things, such as "In the beginning was the Word," etc. (Jn 1:1a); and about immortal life, such as, "Whoever believes in Me has eternal life," etc. (Jn. 6:47b).

Chapter eleven: In what city and in what place did he speak? And we say, at the beginning he was speaking in Ephesus, a place which was full of philosophers and sophists, the adversaries of truth, because he absolutely did not shrink from them, but he declared and said "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a); because, on the one hand, he enlightened the darkness of some of them, but others he put to flight and subdued their learning. But finally, in all of the uttermost parts of the inhabitable world he speaks by means of his writings, of which this Gospel is one.
Chapter twelve: What persons were his 'hearers'? And we assert that they were angels and men. For it is evident that his 'hearers' were also angels from the word of the blessed Paul who said, "The manifold wisdom of God has been made known to the principalities and powers" (Eph 3:10). And John spoke this manifold wisdom of God. So then his 'hearers' were also angels with men.

Chapter thirteen: How ought they to be 'hearers' of his teaching? And we assert that they have these four characteristics: one--they shall take trouble to gather together for his teaching when it is read; two--they shall keep still and cease from all their earthly ways and hindering thoughts as long as they are assembled; three--they shall hearken to this teaching gladly with understanding; four--they shall perform and fulfil what he speaks and commands.

Chapter fourteen: What various things do they gain who accept his teaching? And we say four: one--while they are still on earth, their minds dwell in heaven; two--they are set free from evil and do good; three--again, they inherit the kingdom of heaven and life eternal; four--they delight in God and (in) the people of
God. These great and unspeakable things, indeed, they gain if they listen to his teaching and do what he commands.

Chapter fifteen: Concerning why the Messiah nicknamed him Bar Regesi: He called him Bar Regesi as the blessed Mark said, "Upon James the son of Zebedee and John, his brother, he placed the name Bar Regesi, which is 'Son of Thunder'" (Mk 3:17). And we say concerning why He called him Bar Ra'ma we have already treated. Moreover He nicknamed him Bar Regesi because he perceived the coming-in-the-flesh and the incarnation of the Word of God. And he declared and said and committed to writing, "The Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us" (Jn 1:14a).

Chapter sixteen: Where was his body placed and where is his soul dwelling? And we assert that his body, on the one hand, was placed in the midst of Asia, but now, on the other hand, his soul is dwelling in the paradise of delights out of which Adam proceeded, where the souls of the prophets and apostles and martyrs who had practised the better way of life of the believers are. But after the resurrection it will be united with his holy body and will be raised above the firmament of
heaven. But this is clearly and fully known from that book which we made on the soul.¹

Chapter seventeen and eighteen: What was the reason for his writing, and at what time did he commit it to writing? We assert thus: after the Messiah had ascended into heaven, for a long time the apostles remained in Jerusalem and the cities round about it, while they were preaching and speaking the message of the gospel with those Jews who had believed in the Messiah, until the great Paul was chosen and set apart as a preacher to the Gentiles. But because the grace of God brought it about that they should not remain as preachers of the gospel in a small part of the earth, by His guidance He sent them to remote countries. And on account of the affair of Simon Magus, it (the Holy Spirit) prepared the blessed Peter to go to Rome, while other preachers went to other places for other reasons. So, for this reason the blessed John went to Ephesus and visited all of Asia, and he bestowed great, diverse benefits upon the inhabitants of that region. At this time, then, these three evangelists wrote their books--Matthew, I would

say, and Mark and Luke. And the faithful in every land were reading in their books and were learning from them those things which the Messiah had done in His life in the flesh. But the faithful in Asia thought that more than anyone John ought to write a Gospel, because he was with our Lord from the beginning, and He had deemed him worthy of greater love because of his virtue and chastity. And therefore they brought and presented to him these three books of the Gospel which Matthew and Mark and Luke had written, that they might learn from him what his opinion was concerning those things which were written in them. But he praised and extolled their accounts, and said that "They are true and accurate, but two matters were wanting in them which had not been written by them: on one hand, the matter about the divinity and eternity of the Messiah; but on the other hand, the account about those things which the Messiah performed and spoke from the beginning of His ministry until John the Baptist was cast into prison; because it was right that those who were writing about the Messiah's advent, should not neglect words about His divinity and His incarnation, lest after a time, men, being accustomed to words about His incarnation alone, might forget
His eternity and divinity." And therefore the faithful in Asia requested him to write for them those things which the other evangelists had neglected. He, then, was persuaded to grant their request and, therefore, when he began in his chronicle, he began in words about the divinity and eternity of the Messiah, and said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a). Others say that the apostles requested John to write. And we cite this from the account about John which Eusebius of Caesarea wrote which he found in a Greek book written thus: "On the one hand, after Matthew wrote, and Mark and Luke, the apostles wrote a letter and sent it to John and requested him to write also. And on the other hand, they also made it known concerning Paul, that he, too, had become a disciple and had entered among the number of the apostles. But he preferred not to write. At that time Peter and Paul arose and came to Ephesus. They rejoiced in great gladness with one another, and persuaded him that he also should write a gospel. And therefore he wrote."¹

Chapter nineteen and twenty: in what language did he write this Gospel, and what was his intention in this

¹Not identifiable in Eusebius, but see the material in Appendix D, pp. 281-86.
chronicle? And we say that he wrote in the Greek language. And his chronicle had this intention: to say those things which were neglected by those other three evangelists, even if he chanced to say some of the things which those three had said already because it suited him regarding the narrative with which he was concerned, bringing to it, for instance, that he would wish to speak words concerning the signs. And since he saw that the occasion of these words concerning the signs was that miracle by which the Messiah had satisfied many thousands (A Jn 6), he first introduced to his narrative that He is the Bread. And shortly afterward he brought in the words concerning the signs, even though the miracle of the bread had been well-told by those other evangelists. But again we assert that this chronicle of his had this intention: to tell everything which the Messiah effected and spoke in its order: putting the first things first, the intermediate in the middle, and the lattermost last. And this is evident because he said, "And on another day John saw Jesus coming" (Jn 1:29); and "on another day there was a wedding feast in Cana in Galilee" (Jn 2:1), etc.; and like this which he said, "After these things there was a festival of the
Chapter twenty-one: what is the method of his thought here? And we assert that he has not hidden his teaching in the gloom of cryptic phrases as did the philosophers, lovers of vain-glory, in their sayings. These were like whitened sepulchres from the outside, while within them the sayings were vanity and an abomination of profane mysteries. But he revealed his teaching, greater than the sun, so that men should profit from it altogether: men and elders and youths.

Chapter twenty-two: concerning why John did not do as those other three evangelists (did). Matthew began from the incarnation of the Messiah since he says, "The book of the genealogy of", etc. (Mt 1:1a); but Mark from His baptism; then Luke from the announcement to Zechariah and also the announcement to Mary when he told what the angel said to Mary, "You will conceive and bear a son" (Lk 1:31a). But he (John) began from the eternity and divinity of the Word when he said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a). And we assert that John began from the eternity and divinity of the Word, lest mankind, hearing constantly about His manhood only, might forget His divinity and eternity, and what
happened to Paul of Samasota who regarded the Messiah as a mere man, might happen to them. But when they hear words about His divinity and eternity, let them confess that it is God who became man without transformation. And for this reason he began and said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a).

**Chapter twenty-three:** how many kinds of words concerning the Messiah are seen in this book? And we say two kinds: sublime ones, I would say, and lowly ones. The sublime ones are like this: "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a); and like this, "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (Jn 14:9b); and like this, "I and my Father are one" (Jn 10:30). Then the lowly ones are like this which he said: "For as the Father has life in Himself, so He has granted the Son also to have life in Himself" (Jn 5:26); and like this, "And just now, behold, you seek to kill me, a man who has spoken of truth with you" (Jn 8:40a); and like this, "The Father is greater than I" (Jn 14:28e).

**Chapter twenty-four:** for whom did John write this Gospel? And we say for those faithful in Asia, and through them for all the faithful to the four corners of the earth.
Chapter twenty-five: concerning how many chapters and stories the blessed John spoke in this Gospel.\(^1\) And we say: in 30 which are these:\(^2\) 1. Now, he has written about the divinity and eternity of the Messiah.

2. About the sending-forth of John from God and those things which he said concerning Jesus; (Marginal note:) [and it also contains the choice of the apostles and the confession of Simon.] 3. About the wedding feast which was in Cana. 4. About those who were buying and selling in the Temple, whom Jesus drove forth from there. 5. About what things the Messiah said to Nicodemus. 6. About the dispute which one of the disciples of John had with a Jew concerning purification. 7. About the Samaritan woman with whom Jesus spoke. 8. About the servant of the ruler whom Jesus healed. 9. About the paralytic who had suffered for thirty-eight years whom Jesus healed, and about what words Jesus spoke to the Jews who were accusing Him because He had healed the paralytic on the Sabbath day. 10. Concerning those five loaves from which Jesus satisfied five thousand.

\(^1\) Differs from the title above. See page 134.

\(^2\) Appendix C, page 280, provides chapter and verse equivalents following The Revised Standard Version.
11. About Jesus' walking on the sea. 12. About the words which Jesus spoke to the Jews, those whom He satisfied beside the sea. 13. About those things which Jesus spoke to the Jews when He went up to the Festival of Booths. 14. About the man who was blind from his mother's womb, whose eyes Jesus opened, and those words which Jesus spoke to the Pharisees concerning this. 15. About those words which Jesus spoke to the Jews at the Festival of Lights. 16. About Lazarus whom the Messiah raised from the dead. 17. About this: the chief priests and Pharisees assembled to seek to kill Jesus. 18. About Mary who anointed Jesus. 19. About those things which Judas said when Jesus was anointed. 20. About the entry of our Lord into Jerusalem riding upon a colt. 21. About the Gentiles, foreigners, who went up to Jerusalem to worship at the feast and the words which Jesus spoke. 22. About the cleansing ceremony (in) which Jesus washed the feet of His disciples. 23. About the teaching which Jesus expounded to His disciples and the revelation concerning the Paraclete. 24. About Jesus' departure for the Mount of Olives and His arrest by the chiliarchs and Jewish guardsmen, and His being led away to Hanan and to Caiaphas, and those
who were there at the denial of Peter. 25. About this: the bringing of Jesus to Pilate and the things which were said and those who were there. 26. About the crucifixion and death of Jesus. 27. About the breaking of the legs of the robbers, those who were crucified with Him; about this: Joseph entreated the body of Jesus from Pilate. 28. About the burial of Jesus. 29. About the resurrection of Jesus. 30. About those things which Jesus declared to His disciples and spoke with them after His resurrection.

Chapter twenty-six: concerning this: how many parables and how many testimonies and how many signs and how many sayings there are in this Gospel of John. And we say that there are five parables in it, but (there are) fifteen testimonies, and again, (there are) eight signs. The sayings.\footnote{The text breaks off in this manner and there is no indication of any attempt to complete the comment.}

Chapter twenty-seven: In how many ways was the expression used; and how did John interpret it and apply it to the Word of God and say: "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a)?\footnote{See Appendix A, pages 266-271, for the material preserved in that MS concerning this chapter.} Now, the expression,
he explains in two ways: first he explains the origin (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)), and beginning (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde}}\)), and the first beginning (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)). But in a second way he explains: eternally (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)). On the one hand, that he explains (in the sense of) \(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\) ('from the beginning') is evident from what our Lord said in the Gospel, 7b "Have you not read, 'He who made (them), from the beginning (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)) He made them male and female'" (Mt 19:4b)? And again, "he who from the beginning (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)) was a killer of man" (Jn 8:44b). And also Paul said, "From the beginning (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)) you established the foundations of the earth" (He 1:10a). Therefore, these uses of the expression, \(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\), all mean 'from the beginning.' Again, that this is \(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\) ('from the beginning') is evident because Scripture says, "He who summoned the generations from the beginning (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\))" (Is 41:4a); and because it is said concerning the Gentiles, "The King of Assyria made them dwell in Samaria, since 'from the beginning,' (\(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\)) namely, since they dwelt in the land, they did not know the custom of its god" (2 Kgs 17:25-26). But again it is evident that he explains (it as) \(\text{\textit{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}}\) ('without beginning') because the pious Gregory the Theologian (of
Nazianzus) says in the First Discourse concerning the Son thus, "For who is it who is older than He who is from the beginning?". It is there he should cite this of the Son, "He is without beginning or He is not at all." For because he said, "There is nothing older than He who is from the beginning," he proved that this is, "without beginning," and there is nothing antecedent to him. And the pious Mar Joannes also confirms this when he explains what the Evangelist John said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), when he says in his discourse thus: Brother Theodosius says:¹

"In the tradition of the seventy which is among the Greeks, in the chapter about creation, it is written thus, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' (Gn 1:1), which is in Greek, ἐν ἀρχῇ. And again in the Gospel of John according to the translation of Thomas of Heraclea, it is written thus, 'In the beginning was the Word' (Jn 1:1a), and it is thus in Greek, ἐν ἀρχῇ. Since by this ἀρχῇ the Greeks mean "the origin" of anything: the origins of the nation [ ] and again they mean by this [the origin of tithing, and also the primacy of the archangel. ]

But the eye is the head of the body

¹It appears that this has been inserted by a later scribe. See Appendix A, p. 269.
But in the simple, or that is to say, the officially accepted, version, it is not because this expression in the simple, or that is to say, the official, version [Leaf wanting].

EACH OTHER AND SOMETIMES ARE NOT ALIKE.

He who has been the Cause and Beginning of every rational creature and of its soul also.

Sometimes it is found alone, like this, "[One of you] betrays me" (Jn 13:21b). And there was no second or third betrayer except that one alone.

And sometimes (it is found) with others, like this: One thousand, three thousand.

True: There is one who has a second, like this:

The first Adam and the Second Adam.

False: first one, then two. This first one arose out of and was familiar with the second kind of one, and therefore he resembles him in this way.

See Appendices A and B (pages 265 to 279) for parallel traditions for this diagram.
The sacred Gospel of John the Evangelist (this is according to the Peshitta version and not the sacred Heraclean), "In the beginning was the Word," i.e., This 𐤇𐤉𐤄𐤃𐤊 is "eternally," and this is what he means, "The Word existed eternally, i.e., beyond the beginning." But (it can be put) in another way: This 𐤇𐤉𐤄𐤃𐤊 is "without beginning," and this means, "At the beginning of time" in which God created the created things (as Moses says, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" [Gn 1:1]), this Word was "without beginning, beyond the beginning." But St. Cyril has defined it thus: " might mean 'Beginning but beyond it, beyond origin and time,' because it says, 'He was.' (For there is not origin and time beyond the beginning:"") But again (it can be put) another way, viz., because he said, 𐤇𐤉𐤄𐤃𐤊, he revealed that the Word is without beginning and beyond the beginning. For because he said, "He was," he made known that He existed always. But because he called Him, "the Word," he pointed out to us these thoughts: First, that the Word is begotten from the Father without pain and without flux and without mutilation as our word is begotten from thought. But second, he called Him the Word because He revealed and
made known to us concerning the Father, as He said, "All that I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you" (Jn 15:15c), just as our word has revealed and made known concerning these things which are hidden in our mind. Moreover, third, he called Him the Word to show that He is eternal, because there was never (a time) when the Father was separated from the Word, because if He was separated from the Word, He was separated also from wisdom and knowledge. Again it must be asked why he did not call Him Jesus or Messiah. And we assert: because these names symbolize the incarnation of the Word, but here it is right to speak about His everlast-ingness. But again, he did not call Him Jesus or Messiah because were men who are creatures not called by these names? Why did he not call Him the Son, since it is the good, exalted name by which the apostles were commanded to baptize men (Marginal insert:) [with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit, and moreover makes known that He is of equal substance with the Father? And we say:] because the name, Son, was understood corporeally with regard to bodies, corresponding to the opinion of the forefathers and corporeal sons. But again he did not call Him the Son lest evil-doers might
think that there was a time-span between the Father and the Son, and that the Father was prior to the Son according to their evil opinion! But again he did not name Him the Son lest the polytheists might think that just as it is among their gods: gods and goddesses, and servants and handmaids and sons, so it applies to our God. Because all of them had to be instructed in the origin of the Good News—they had been polytheists—because of this he did not call Him the Son, but named Him the Word for these considerations which we mentioned earlier. And moreover this ought to be made known: Thomas of Heraclea translated this text from the language of the Greeks thus, "In the beginning was the Word," i.e., therefore here especially either he calls God "the Father" or "the origin of times and created things." And if, on the one hand, he calls the Father, "Head," he means this: "the Word was in the Father," just as the Word Himself said, "I am in my Father and my Father in me" (Jn 14:11a). Or if, on the other hand, "the origin of times and created things," this Word existed eternally without beginning.

"And the Word was with God," i.e., now because he said, "He was" ( ὁ ὄν), and not, "it was"
(λογότητα), he showed that this is not the word which is spoken and broadcast in the air, but is the Second Person who exists from Him (God) and to Him. For (that) "it was" is very different from (this) "He was". "That," on the one hand, symbolizes the word which was broadcast through the air; on the other hand, "this" refers to the abiding and essential Hypostasis. Again, when he said, "with God," he did not speak as in a place or a region, for one does not say, "He exists in a place or a region." He is the creator of the place and the region. But because he says it, "with God" showed that the hypostasis of the Word is other than the hypostasis of the Father.

"And the Word was God," i.e., because he called Him and named Him "God the Word," he showed that He is equal in substance and in nature to God the Father, for it is not possible for One who was begotten by Him to be equal in substance to God the Father unless He is God.

"He was in the beginning with God," i.e., because he said, "In the beginning He was with God" (Jn 1:2), he pointed out that not a moment or an instant or a second elapsed between the substance of the Father and the substance of the Son, but that He existed eternally
and beyond the beginning. From Him He is and with Him He was. It is fitting, therefore, to know what John meant in these four phrases. He revealed six great thoughts and words, while he also silenced the different heresies of whatever manner he heard. Because he said, "He was in the beginning" (Jn 1:1a), he revealed here that the Word was eternal. And he silenced those who said, "There was (a time) when He was not." And because he called Him the Word, he made known that He is begotten from the nature of the Father. And he rejected those who say that indeed He was created. And because he said, "The Word was with God" (Jn 1:1b), he proved two things: first, that the Word is of an abiding substance; but second, that the substance of the Word is other than the substance of the Father. And in this he caused to be silenced those who were saying that the substance of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are of one substance. And in "the Word was God" (Jn 1:1c), he revealed two things: first, that the Word really and truly is God; and he brought to nought those who say that the Word of God is not God. But second, that He, the Word, is equal in substance and nature to God the Father; and he silenced those who say that He
was alien in substance and nature to the Father. And in "He was in the beginning with God" (Jn 1:2), he revealed two things: first, that there is no moment or instant or second between the Father and the Son, and that there was no time when He was not, but that He is without beginning. And he rejected those who say that there was a time when the Son did not exist. But second, because he also used the expression, "He is," in this text, he showed that he used this expression, "He is," four times so that each and every one of the Evangelists would have it once. I.e., "He was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), because these three others did not use this expression, "was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), and on that account John said it on their behalf and on his own behalf.

Questions and objections: the first question: why did the Evangelist neglect to speak about the Father, and speak first about the Son? And we say because the Father was revealed to all men and made known, if not as the Father, yet as God, but no man knew the Son. And therefore he sought to make Him known. But again we say that while he spoke about the Son, he was not silent about the Father, but introduced Him by way of analogy with the Son. For because he named Him the Word, he
made known truly that the Father is the Word. But again men ask when they say: why did the Evangelist not say, "In the beginning was the Son," but substituted for the name, "Son," putting, "the Word"? And this question, behold, was unravelled above. But once again we say this: it was written on account of those believers instructed in paganism. For these (people), while they were pagans, said that some god or another had begotten some other god by some goddess or another. And since he desired to uproot these profanities and wicked things from them, he substituted for the name, "Son," putting, "the Word." But again, since he desired to make known that the Son was not begotten by the Father in pain and flux, he called Him the Word. For the Word of God was begotten from God the Father without pain or flux just as our word is begotten from our mind.

But again men ask us what the expression Διάσημος means. And when we answer them: it represents two types of things, I would say, then, "the origin" and "the eternal," they say: "In what way has the Evangelist interpreted that it is in that way, namely of eternity," i.e., Διάσημος, or that is to say, the Word existed eternally?" Further, they retort
and say, "In some way also the origin is exalted over the Word, i.e., ὁ λόγος, or that is to say, 'at the origin of creation,' the Word was coming into being.

And if the origin is exalted over Him in that way, the Word of God has an origin." And we say to them: even if ὁ λόγος means "the origin," yet you do not understand this which he went on to say, "He was." And again you do not comprehend this, that he called Him the Word. But when he said, "in the beginning," he went on to say, "He was," i.e., this One existed at the origin of all creatures. And in "the Word" he showed that He is without beginning and eternal. And again, just as (when) the prophet said concerning the Father, "From age to age You are" (Ps 90:2b), he set no limit upon the Father, so when the Evangelist said concerning the Son, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), he set no limit or origin on Him, but (said) that He is eternal and without origin. They retort and say, "Behold, the Prophet himself also used that ὁ λόγος about the creatures and said: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' (Gn 1:1). So also John the Evangelist said: 'In the beginning was the Word' (Jn 1:1a), and that expression ὁ λόγος was used. So then the Word
is a creature like the rest of the creatures." And first he says: the expression, אֲדֹمֶה, is used in two ways: eternally, I would say, and symbolically, as we demonstrated in "Speculations on Heavenly Things." Moses, on the one hand, in the manner of the beginning, wrote concerning creatures. But John the Evangelist, in the manner of eternity, wrote about the Word. And therefore the Word was not a creature but the Creator. And yet again we say: and even if it should be that this expression, אֲדֹמֶה, is used concerning the creation and the Word of God, still these expressions which follow the אֲדֹמֶה which was written concerning created things, show that what was created was the heaven and the earth. But these expressions which follow the אֲדֹמֶה which was written concerning the Word of God, show that the Word of God is eternal and without origin. And even if it should be that this, אֲדֹמֶה, is the same expression, but just as he had understood, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gn 1:1), is Moses*. "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), is John's. For even if this

*See Anton Baumstark, Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, p. 282, footnote 2.
is identical with that, and it is the same expression which is written in the two verses, about the heaven and the earth, I say, and about the Word of God, still that expression, "He created," which follows the of Moses is distinguished from this expression, "He was," which follows the of John. Therefore when Moses said, and continued with that expression, "He created," he showed that the created things are the heaven and the earth. And when John said, , and he continued it, "He was," he revealed that the Word is eternal. For he did not say, "In the beginning the Word was created," nor that "the Word was made," nor that "the Word came into existence," but that the Word was! And by means of this he revealed that He is without origin.

These two expressions, then, this "created" I say, and that "was," indicate that which followed them: whether it is a created thing or whether He is eternal and without origin; but just as he had understood. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gn 1:1). This expression, "created," shows therefore that the heaven and the earth are the created things. "in the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a). This expression,
"was," shows therefore that the Word is eternal and without origin. So then even if it is written concerning the created things and the Word that the expression \( \Delta \nu \zeta \zeta \) is the same (one), yet that expression, "created," which follows the \( \Delta \nu \zeta \zeta \) of Moses shows that the heaven and the earth are created things. And this expression, "was," which follows the \( \Delta \nu \zeta \zeta \) of John makes clear that the Word is eternal and without origin.

But again they retort and say, "Concerning that \( \text{o\text{o}o\text{o}} \) ("he was") which the Evangelist wrote concerning the Word—if through this he revealed that He is eternal and without origin, then even the earth was eternal because Moses wrote about it that ' \( \text{o\text{o}o\text{o}} \) ("it was") without form and void' (Gn 1:2a); and Halqana should be eternal, too, because Scripture says about him, ' \( \text{o\text{o}o\text{o}} \) ("There was") a certain mighty man from the wilderness of Duqa' (1 Sm 1:1a)." And we say to them that the expression, \( \text{o\text{o}o\text{o}} \), when spoken about God is distinct from when it is spoken about man or about any other of the created things. On the one hand, when the expression, \( \text{o\text{o}o\text{o}} \), is spoken about God, it makes clear that He is without origin and
without end, and that He truly exists. But on the other hand, when it is spoken about man or about any other of the created things, it refers to time which passes away. But again we say that Moses first said about the heaven and the earth, "it was created," because he said: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gn 1:1). And then, after he had revealed that it is created, he said: "It was without form and void" (Gn 1:2a). And he did not wish to show that it was eternal. For how could he show that it was eternal when already he had said that it was created, but was void and dried up (Marginal diagram:)

"In the beginning/God created," etc., is Moses'. This is the same expression. We contrast. This demonstrates that heaven and earth were created. This demonstrates that there was no (time) when the Word was not.

"In the beginning/was the Word," this is John's.

and invisible and unprepared because he wished to make known that it was hidden in the waters? So when Scripture says concerning Halqana, "He was from the wilderness of Duqa" (1 Sm 1:1), it did not wish to show about him that he was eternal (he who was a creature like all men), but that he was from the people of the village of Duqa (since it sought to make known what his village was
in this world. But when the Evangelist said, concerning the Word, he made known that He is eternal and without origin and without end and He truly exists. So then, you should not compare the incomparables, and you should not mix the irreconcilibles: the Creator, I say, with the creature, and words which do not at all belong to each other.

But again they retort and say, "The name, 'God,' the Evangelist applied to the Word of God; Scripture applied it to the creature, like this: 'I make you as god to Pharaoh' (Ex 7:1b), and 'I said that you are gods' (Ps 82:6b)." And we say to them that the name, "God," on the one hand, with regard to "creatures," is spoken by grace; but on the other hand, with regard to the Word of God, is spoken by nature.

But again they retort and say, "Even if the Evangelist said concerning the Word that 'He was with God,' (it was) only when He was made and created that He was with Him, and not since He was begotten." And we say to them that if He came into existence according to your interpretation, why did the Evangelist not say: "in the beginning God made the Word," or "In the beginning God created the Word?" For if Moses, on the one hand,
hesitated concerning the earth, lest man should think about it that it is eternal and without origin, and because of this he first said, "God created the heaven" (Gn 1:1a), and afterward said, "the earth was without form and void" (Gn 1:2a); how much more, on the other hand, ought John hesitate to say, "In the beginning God created the Son," or "God made the Word," since He was the Creator and the Maker? For if Moses hesitated with regard to that visible creation which he freely proclaims and makes known concerning its Maker like this, "The heavens are telling the glory of God, and what He has made on every hand the firmament declares" (Ps 19:1); how much more ought John hesitate concerning the invisible creation and say, "In the beginning God made the Word," if the Word of God was made or created according to your interpretation? Yes, indeed, Peter applied it to this One, "The Lord and Messiah, the servant of God, this Jesus whom you have crucified" (Ac 2:36). And we say to them that if the Word is made and created according to your interpretation, and "everything came into being through Him" (Jn 1:3a), as the Evangelist said, so then He made and created it. It is impossible and also wicked to think this. But again we say to them: it is evil
that one should worship the creation, evil greater than this--one should make the Creator a creature. Also on this account He was humbled and became man and suffered and died in the flesh; and that Creator rose, that in this way He should deliver us from the worship of idols and the reverence of creatures. Therefore the Word of God is not made and created, and it is not right to worship (while we believe that He is a creature) except the Creator and God eternal.

But again they retort and say, "How could the Evangelist say concerning the Word, 'He was in the beginning with God' (Jn 1:2), and then say afterward, 'He was in the world' (Jn 1:10a)? And if He was in the world, how was it possible to be in the beginning creator-like and with God? And if He was with God in the beginning, how was it possible to be in the world?" And we say to them: because He is limitless. For being limitless permitted Him to be with God the Father. And He is in the world and above the world and beneath the world since that which is limitless is bounded by nothing. For He is not limited in nature nor in mind nor in word, nor in origin nor in conclusion nor in any of the ways in which actions (doers) are limited. And again the Word of God is not
limited by anything: neither by place nor by position nor by era nor by anything else as anything which is is limited, and He is the Creator of everything.

But again they retort and say, "If the Word is the Son, He is an offspring of the Father."

And we have much that we would say to them about this. The first is that these opinions of yours are human, and they are speaking about the creature, but here our word is about God the Creator. Second, now look, He is the Light of the Sun of suns and not an offspring from Him. And if (He is) thus in fleshly forms, how much more is He able to be in spiritual forms. And also on that account the blessed Paul called Him, "The splendour of God the Father" (A He 1:3a), because by "splendour" he made known that He was from the Father and is consubstantial with Him, and not after Him (in time) and not an offspring from Him. But moreover, third, we say that this "earlier" and "later," and "elder" and "younger" are expressions of times and moments; but the Word of God, or that is to say, the Son, made them:

12a the times and intervals and moments and seconds, and the world and everything that is in it, just as John said, "Everything came into being through Him" (Jn 1:3a).
Therefore the Son was not an offspring from the Father.

But fourth, for again we say to them: if you believe that you apprehend the origin of the Son, take heed lest you should also make an origin for the Father, just as now you have arrived at an origin for the Son (because your reasoning progressed from Him and to the world).

We also ask you: how much prior is the Father in His existence to the Son? Would you say there are many moments, or a shorter duration? Thus you have placed the Father under an origin also, but you are not able to measure that duration (which was) between them until you establish the origin of the two of them, because you seek to understand how the Father is prior to the Son. And this can not be made known to you unless you established an origin for the Father previously.

Similarly, no man is able to learn to what extent Abraham preceded Moses unless he first knew the origin of Abraham (when he came into being). So then it is clear that even if you establish an origin for the Father, how did it come into your hands (how did you arrive at this)? And therefore what the Son said shall apply to you, "He who does not honour the Father, does not honour the Son; and whoever does not honour the Son, does not honour the
Fifth, but again we say to them: if there is anything between the Father and the Son, as you said, what John said is false, "Everything came into being through Him" (Jn 1:3a). But because he said this—"everything came into being through Him" (Jn 1:3a)—what he revealed is true. So then what you said, "There is a moment or an instant or a time or a second between the Father and His Son," is false. Sixth, but again we say to them: if the Son is an offspring of the Father, as you said, the prophet who spoke as one from the presence of the Father, "Before Me no other godly thing existed and after Me shall be no god" (Is 43:10), is false. And if the prophet is true, how is what you have spoken falsely, "The Son was the offspring of the Father," also true? And moreover we say, if (He was) the offspring of the Father, why did the Evangelist not say this? So then I have made known by means of all these things that the Son was not the offspring from the Father, but was eternal, without beginning or ending, just like the Father and the Holy Spirit.

"Everything came into being through Him," i.e., After the Evangelist had spoken about the eternity and
divinity of the Word, and that His substance existed, and that He was begotten by the Father, and that He was equal to Him in substance, the time came to speak about His creative power. And why did He speak about His creative power? Now we say: just as He asserted that He is God. Now, just as the holy prophets, by the creative power of God, asserted His divinity, and the interpretation of it by which the idols were exposed when they said, "The gods who did not make heaven and earth shall perish" (Jr 10:11), so also the Evangelist by the creative power of the Word confirms and asserts that He is God.

And therefore he says: "Everything came into being through Him," i.e., because He said, "everything" he included everything which is created—the corporeal and the ethereal; the earth, I say, and those things which are on it; the waters and those things which swim in them; and the air and all things which fly in it; the fire and the firmament and the light which is in it; and even the angels and the archangels and the principalities and the powers, and the hosts and the dominions and the thrones and the cherubim and the seraphim (of whom the apostle Paul also said, "By the Messiah everything was
created whether in heaven or in earth" [Col 1:16a]).
Moreover it is fitting to point out that by this expres­sion, "all," which John said, by it he signified all those things which Moses the Prophet said in many words. Moses, on the one hand, when he wished to speak about the creation which was created by the Creator, said: 'In the first day God created the heaven and the earth, and the light, etc. And in the second day He created the firmament; in the third day He created the grasses and the grains and the trees; and in the fourth the sun and the moon and the stars; and in the fifth the creeping things and the birds and the flying things; and in the sixth the cattle and the animals and men' (A Gn 1:1-31). But, on the other hand, John included all of these things and others which Moses did not talk about in that one little word, "all."

And he set down those things and said, "Everything came into being through Him," i.e., but why Moses spoke about these things in great length needs to be investig­ated. John included them in that one little word, "all," and we say: because our instruction in the mid­rash from the record of Moses came first, this "all" is enough. But again because he was hastening to begin
with the subject of the Messiah, he did not say many things except this "all" which is a little word. But again because he wanted to speak about the Creator and not about the creatures, he did not use lengthy phrases about the creatures, but only this one little word, "all," in which he included and defined all of the creatures.

"Everything came into being through Him," i.e., now, men who are heretics, when they dare to separate the Son and the Spirit from the Father in nature, say that these are three expressions: "from Him," and "through Him," and "in Him," since this "from Him" they lay upon the Father; but this "through Him" they use about the Son; moreover this "in Him" is about the Holy Spirit. And they say that the creation is 'from' the Father as from the efficient cause, like the chair from the workman. And it was 'through' the Son as by the organic cause, like the chair through the axe. And it was 'in' the Spirit as in a place and in a time, like the chair which was hewn in that place and which was fashioned in that time. And on that account they say: "As the workman is distinguished from the axe and the axe from the place and the time, so the Father is distin-
guished from the Son in nature, and the Son from the Holy Spirit." And first we say to them: it is evident that the Son is equal in nature to the Father because the Son Himself said: "I and my Father are one" (Jn 10:30); and "just as my Father knows Me, so I myself know my Father" (Jn 10:15a). And also because the Evangelist called the Son, God, "And God was the Word" (Jn 1:1c). For all of these explain to us and teach us the equality of the nature of the Son with the Father. Again it is evident that His creative energy and the Father's is one, and that He is not less than the Father in this because He said: "Even as the Father has raised up the dead and revived them, so also the Son revives those whom He wishes" (Jn 5:21); and "my Father is working until now and I myself am working" (Jn 5:17b). For it is not possible that these things should be said about any of the creatures. Thereafter we say to them: just as this "through Him" is applied to the Son, so also it is applied to the Father. For Paul said, "Trustworthy is God the Father that you were called through Him to the fellowship of His Son" (I Cor 1:9a). And moreover just as that "from him" is applied to the Father, referring to the glory, so also it is applied to the Son.
For thus said Paul concerning the Son, "From Him the body grows and is linked together in all its members" (Eph 4:16a). And this "from Him" is also applied to the Holy Spirit, for the angel said concerning Mary, "For He who is begotten in her is from the Spirit which is Holy" (Mt 1:20d). And therefore we say that this "from Him" and "through Him" and "in Him" are not different natures but they reveal the hypostases. So then it is evident from all these things that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are equal in nature, or that is to say, are one nature and not alien in nature.

"Everything came into being through Him," i.e., men indeed say that the Evangelist spoke here about the wonders which came to be through the Word of God: the cleansing of the lepers (A Lk 17:11-19), and the opening of the blind (A Jn 9:1-41), and the strengthening of the paralytic (A Mk 2:1-12), etc. And we say to them that their thought is not true. But he spoke about the creatures which came into being through Him. And this is clear because after these things he continues and says, "He was in the world and the world came into being through Him" (Jn 1:10a). So then here he speaks about the creatures which came into being through Him.
"And without Him not even one thing came into being which came into being," but that is, 1 [Brother Theodosius said: "When we sought the right reading of this text (Jn 1:3b), we found that it was written thus, 'And without Him not one thing came into being; and that which came into being through Him was life; and the life is the light of mankind,' etc. (Jn 1:3, 4). And these things, while we are in disagreement with that saint, Mar Moshē—worthy is he of remembrance—nevertheless, because we are anxious to be accurate, this is what the Evangelist is saying. Therefore in that which he said, 'Everything came into being through Him, and without Him not one thing came into being' (Jn 1:3a, b), he explained that the Word, which is above all beings visible and invisible, that all of them came into being "through Him," the Word, as the Creator and not as the instrument. And again after this he went on to say, 'That which came into being in Him was life' (Jn 1:3c, 4a). I.e., life did not come into being in Him creatively like the rest of the beings, but

1As on page 152, it appears that a later scribe has again inserted the thoughts of this Brother Theodosius. Here, however, he is careful to note this by placing these comments perpendicularly to the text.
ο μέγιστον εν αὐτῷ ζωή ἡ, i.e., 'That which was in Him, was life'. So then if it is thus in Greek, so it should read in the Peshitta: 'That which was (ὁωι) in Him, was (ὁωι) life,' and not, 'came into being' (ὁωι). Therefore because the Greek says, 'was' (ὁωι), 'was' (ὁωι) is right, and not, 'came into being' (ὁωι).

And these things and those which are stated by us on the margin of the page, concerning this verse, are enough. I.e., it should not be divided as Mar Moshë says, but should read, 'And not one thing came into being without Him; that which was in Him was life,' as was said by us above. And let it be known that Thomas of Heraclea agrees with this." because he said, "Everything came into being through Him" (Jn 1:3a) (and this expression, "everything" [ὡσ], [is used] only when speaking about a multitude [of things], because anything else would be confusing), he took precautions for its meaning and said, "Not one thing from these things which came into being, came into being without Him," as we said. But again in another way, to wit: Because, on the one hand, he said, "And without Him not even one thing came into being" (Jn 1:3a, b), he revealed this: not only those things which Moses spoke about, but also the
other creatures which he did not mention (the angelic powers) did not come into being apart from the Word, but were created and came into being through Him. Henceforth it is evident that this expression, "everything" (Ὁ), includes and comprises all those created things which Moses spoke about, and those things which he did not mention (as well). For because he went on to say, "Anything which came into being" (Jn 1:3a), he repressed the heretics who say, "The Holy Spirit was created through the Son." Now the Holy Spirit is the Creator and is not created and does not come into being. Likewise, on the other hand, the blessed Paul also wrote when he said, "By the Messiah everything was created" (Col 1:16a). And lest one should think that the Holy Spirit, who is invisible, was also created, he went on to say, "Whether thrones or dominions or powers," etc. (Col 1:16b).

So then through that predicate, "anything which came into being" (Jn 1:3b), he excluded the Holy Spirit from the creatures and showed that He is not made. And if He is not created and made, it is evident that He is the Creator. Therefore the heretics, when they wish to show that the Holy Spirit is a creature according to their
wicked opinion, divide this text by means of the punctua-
tion mark (nuq'za), since they join it to that text which
follows it, and so they say, "and without Him not
even one thing came into being" (Jn 1:3b). And here
they put down the point (nuq'da) and divide, since they
take the end of it and join it to that which follows it
thus, "anything which came into existence, had life in
Him" (Jn 1:3c, 4a), while they say that here the Evan-
gelist calls "life" the Holy Spirit. So then indeed the
Holy Spirit came into being and was created by the Word.

And we say many things to them. One, concerning
"not even;" after this text is divided by the points as
you have divided it, it allows the thought that the
Holy Spirit is created. But second, we say, if it is
so like your interpretation, that the Holy Spirit is a
creature, the Evangelist would have revealed this and
said, "The Holy Spirit was created by means of the
Word," and he would not have concealed it. Moreover,
third, we say to them, we shall make known to you that
the Evangelist was not concerned to speak here about
the Holy Spirit, but to bring tidings about the Word of
God. But fourth, (supposing) that we divided this text
as you said and read it as you have read, then see the
many absurdities collected about you from this.

"That which came into being in Him was life," (Jn 1:3c, 4a), i.e., you say the Evangelist called the Holy Spirit life here. Look! This "life" was called "light" shortly afterward, for he said: "The life is the light of men" (Jn 1:4b). So then according to your interpretation this light of men is the Holy Spirit. But again he said shortly afterward, "There was a man who was sent from God called John to testify about the light" (Jn 1:6, 7b). And this light which John bore witness about, "He took flesh and was born"? It is impious to think this of it! And why indeed is the Holy Spirit not life and light? And we say that He is, but he did not call the Holy Spirit life and light here. For behold, God also is called a Spirit, "God is a Spirit" (Jn 4:24a), but because of this we do not think of God wherever the Spirit is mentioned. And the Son also is called "the power and wisdom of God the Father" (A 1 Cor 1:24b), but we do not think of the Son wherever power and wisdom are mentioned. And the Holy Spirit also is called the Paraclete, but we do not think of the Spirit wherever the Paraclete is mentioned, for indeed even the Son has been called the Paraclete
(A 1 Jn 2:1c). So then it has been made known clearly that the Holy Spirit is not a creature. Therefore when they failed to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit is a creature, they wrote that "life" is what came into being in the created Word. "That which came into being in Him was life" (Jn 1:3b, 4a); therefore they assert that what the Evangelist named "life" here is "everything which came into being through the Word." And we say to them that therefore your interpretation is like this: the death of the Sodomites, and the Flood, and Gehenna, and other things like these are life because all of these came into being by means of the Word. But they say, "We are speaking about the creation which is life, and not about the punishments which were brought about by God." And also with reference to this, moreover, we say: why then do you say life is stones, life is iron and sticks, life is earth and heaven and air and water, but not all of it is? And behold, all of these creatures, and yet not even men are called "life," but are receivers of life. And again we say to them that if your interpretation is that the Evangelist calls a creature life and light here, why was John the Baptist not the light? Since he was one of the
creatures, therefore John the Baptist said about himself, "I am not the light" (A Jn 1:8 and 20). Moreover the Evangelist also said concerning him, "He was not the light, but (came) to bear witness to the light" (Jn 1:8).

"In Him was life," i.e., after he spoke about the creative power of the Word of God, and showed that He is the Creator, he proceeded to speak about the blessings which came from Him to men at the time of His incarnation. And therefore he said, "In Him was life," i.e., here he calls "life" not those who are living by it, and men and angels and beings being moved without the Word, but faith in Him. And this says that in Him men have this (faith) that they might believe in Him and might make it known that He is God.

"In Him was life, and the life is the light of men," i.e., it is evident therefore that he does not call "life" the life of the men living and being moved by it, but faith in the Word of God who took flesh, because he calls this "life" "the light of men." And indeed the life and light of men is in the steadfastness of faith in the Messiah. But again it is evident that he does not call the common life of men "life,"
because in this (common) life men are not distinguished from dumb animals. And for what reason, then, did he call that "life" "the light of men" if it is not that he called "life" faith in the Word who took flesh? Now, at the time of His incarnation, when men believed in Him, they were saved by Him from the death of sin, and were enlightened by Him from the darkness of error; and in the same way from that time forth and even now and until the end of the world do those live who believe in Him. So then he calls the life and light of men faith in Him. And see! He did not say, "Life is the light of the Jews," but of mankind generally, that he might show that not only the Jews lived and were enlightened by faith in the Word after He took flesh, but also the Gentiles.

But again it is possible to explain these texts otherwise: "In Him life came into being," i.e., here he calls "life" the Word's concern for the creatures. And he says this, "In Him is the concern for the creatures and the creatures live in Him." For, as unless He had created the creatures, they would not have existed, so if there was no concern for them, they would not (continue to) exist. So, when you hear that "in Him
life came into being" (Jn 1:4a), do not think that this is fabricated. For this (which he said) concerning the Father, he also said of the Son, "For just as the Father has life in Himself, so also He granted to the Son that He shall have life in Himself" (Jn 5:26), etc.

"And the life is the light of men," i.e., that as the light enlightens men, so the concern of the Word of God preserves men and the rest of creation. But again, as the light enlightens men while not failing, so the Word of God also creates the creatures and concerns Himself about them while He remains unwanting (i.e., lacking in nothing).

"And the light was shining in the darkness," i.e., now, on the one hand, he calls the light the Word of God, but names flesh and the world and error and death darkness. And he says this, "The Word enlightened our flesh because He was united to it and sanctified it." Again He enlightened the world because He said, "I am the light of the world" (Jn 8:12b). He enlightened error and, that is to say, consumed it, because when His Gospel came down, the error of idolatry was consumed and came to nought. Again He enlightened death because when He descended into Sheol, He brought
up from there the souls who were being held in it, and because "He brought death to an end by means of His death" (A He 2:14), and also because He granted to us the hope of adoption (A Ga 4:5).

"And the darkness did not apprehend it," i.e., here he names Satan, or that is to say, Death, darkness. For Satan did not apprehend it because he strove to lead (men) astray from the right and could not. As He said, "The ruler of this world is coming, and in me he has no part" (Jn 14:30b). And again not even death overcame Him because He did not remain in death, but He rose and was raised to immortality. But he who wishes to be enlightened by this light shall believe steadfastly in the Father and in the Son and in the Spirit, and shall keep the Commandments.

But again it is possible to interpret these texts in another manner, viz.: "In Him life came into being," i.e., what the Jews wrought by Him through suffering is the life of men. "And the life is the light of men," i.e., in those pains which He suffered, by means of them we found new life, because by His crucifixion and His sufferings the eyes of the Gentiles, who were blind and were dwelling in idolatry, were opened, and they
beheld and recognized that the graven images are not
gods, and they forsook them and worshipped the true God.

"And that light shines in the darkness," i.e.,
that upraised, shining light was shining on the blind,
darkened mind of the Jews, and proclaiming and saying,
"I was not sent except to the lost sheep from the house
of Israel" (Mt 15:24b). "And the darkness has not
apprehended it," i.e., and that blind, darkened mind of
the Jews did not apprehend Him because His divinity was
concealed in the flesh, while it also desisted and ab-
stained from faith in Him.

"There was a man who was sent from God named
John," i.e., after he had spoken about the Word, he now
speaks about His proclamation. Now, when you hear what
he says, that John "was sent from God," do not think
that he himself is speaking, but God who sent him. And
there is nothing human in his words, but (they are)
divine. Because of this he also was named "The Messen-
ger," (but do not think) this is from the messenger
(who shall not speak anything for himself) but from Him
who sent him. So then let us accept his words. Again,
what he said, "There was a man," did not tell about his
generation or his being begotten, but about the One who
This one came for a testimony that he might bear witness (Marginal insert in Greek: [INΑ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΗ] "in order to bear witness") about the light," i.e., here he calls the Word of God "light," as he said, "Because of this John the Baptist came: in order to bear witness about the Word."
(Marginal insert:) ["Chapter 4: concerning the One who sent him—that John is from God and what he said concerning Jesus."]

But perhaps one retorts and says, "Now the Word of God needed John to bear witness about Him." And we say that the blasphemy is not great, however, that one should say that the Word needed the testimony of John. For it is evident that the Word did not need John, because He is God by nature, and He who enriches everyone is full and not lacking. But again because the Word Himself said to the Jews, "I do not receive testimony from men" (Jn 5:34a). So then not because the Word needed the testimony of John, but (because) men needed the testimony of John. And this is evident because the Evangelist goes on to say: "That every man should believe through him," i.e., for this
reason John testified about the Word: for men that they should believe in Him, for by means of John the Baptist many men believed in the Word of God. But one may retort again and say, "For what reason did men need John to testify to that end that they should believe in the Word of God?" And we say, "Because His divinity was concealed in the flesh, for the Word was not manifested to mankind." When he testified about His advent (because there was no one who was bearing their glorious nature), His divinity was manifested to every man. And therefore when giving heed to their advantage, He took flesh and concealed His divinity in the flesh. And at that time it was essential that John, who is of their nature and whose speech agrees with theirs, should testify about Him to men so that they might believe in Him. But if one retorts again and says, "How did He consent that John, a man and a servant, should testify about Him, since He is the Lord by nature?" And we say, "Do not wonder at this. Now, in that way He consented to take flesh on our behalf; in this (way) He consented that John should testify about Him." But again in that way that He consented to come to him and consented to be baptized by him, even if He is unneeding and the
giver of gifts, (A Ps 68:18c, Eph 4:8b) so He consented to this, that he should testify about Him. But again he said, "Thus it is fitting that 'He should fulfill all righteousness'" (Mt 3:15c).

Thus this is the testimony: "He was not the light, but (came) that he might bear witness to the light," i.e., 'you should not think that John was the light, but the Word of God (was). For the question is, "When he said about John that 'he came to bear witness about the light,' why was it necessary to testify and say: 'John was not the light' (Jn 1:8a), since this is evident that John is other than the light, He about whom he was testifying?" And we say, "Because how many times greater is He who is witnessed to than he who testifies about Him." And it also is apparent that He is truer than he. Lest any man, therefore, think this opinion about John the Baptist, he weeded this out by its roots. And therefore he went on to say, "He was not the light" (Jn 1:8a), since he showed who it was who was testifying, and who it was about whom (his) wit[ness] was being borne, and how much difference there is between them, as there is between the creature and the Creator, and between the master by nature and the servant by
nature. (Marginal insert:) [But again he went on to say, "he was not the light" (Jn 1:9a), to show that John came to testify about Him, not because the Word needed John's testimony, but on account of the Jews and the rest of mankind, that they might believe through him, as we said above.] But again he went on to say, "he was not the light" (Jn 1:8a), in order to contradict the Jews who accepted John and crucified the One that he testified about. If you accepted him who was not the light, how much more was it right that you should accept that light which he had testified about; and not only did you kill Him, but you crucified Him.

"For He was the true light which enlightens every man who comes into the world," i.e., (Marginal insert:) [(Greek) "Coming into the world," (Syriac) i.e., "was coming into the world" says the Greek and not, "came."] he indeed called Him the light, just as He said: "I am the light of the world" (Jn 8:12b). But because he added, "true," he distinguished it from the light which exists and fails. Again he also distinguished it from John the Baptist, that he was not called the light, but the lamp which shines, as our Lord said concerning him, "He was the lamp which shines" (Jn 5:35a). And by
what does He enlighten every man? It is evident that by faith in Him. And how did he mean, "He enlightens every man" (Jn 1:9b), since all of mankind was not enlightened by faith in Him? And we say: as by his presence He enlightens all men, the Jews, I say, and the Arameans, and the Greeks and the barbarians together with the enslaved and the sons of the free; and there is nothing which hinders one who enters it (i.e., His presence). But if there are any men who blinded them from faith in Him, for example, (Marginal insert:) [the blame concerning the Jews is certain to them, for the Jews blinded them from faith in Him, for example] the sun by its presence enlightens every man, but if there is a man who shuts his eyes or whose sight is weak, the blame is not the sun's, for it enlightens every man; but the blame is theirs whose eyes are shut or were offended by something in their sight. So the sound of thunder resounds to every sense of hearing under it, but if a man shuts up his ears or his sense of hearing is dull, this blame is his own and not the thunder's. Again that which he said, "came into the world" (Jn 1:9c), about whom indeed did he say it: about the light or about every man? And some say about
every man, i.e., every man who enters and comes into the world, this light of truth enlightens him. And therefore they say the point (nuq'eqza) is placed above this line, and it is read thus: "He is the true light which enlightens every man who comes into the world," as he said. But others say that this, "came into the world," is said about the light, i.e., He was the true light who took flesh and came into the world, as the Word Himself said, "I am the light coming into the world" (Jn 12:46a). And therefore they say that the point (nuq'eqza) is set below that which read thus: "He was the true light which enlightens every man, and He was coming into the world" (Jn 1:9). And we think this meaning to be right because it is true.

But again it is possible to interpret this text in another way, thus: "For He was the true light which enlightens every man who comes into the world," i.e., in the first place, because this light took flesh and came into the world, and after He took flesh and came into the world, He was enlightening and is enlightening every man and all of the world by caring for it. "He was in the world and the world came into being through Him," i.e., these two phrases and that one which follows
them, the Evangelist said them concerning that time which was before the incarnation and manifestation of the Word. And therefore he says: "He was in the world," i.e., He was not in the world contemporaneously with the world (God forbid!), but as the Creator in His creation. And this is evident because he goes on to say: "And the world did not know Him," i.e., do not think that this which is said to you concerning Him ("He was the true light which came into the world" [Jn 1:9a, c], says to you that He came from non-existence to existence, but from 'being concealed' to 'being revealed,' and from 'not being incarnate' to 'being incarnate.' And take an example about this: because He was in the world naturally, like a Creator in His creation prior to taking flesh and being revealed (Marginal insert:) [to men. "And the world came into being through Him," i.e., do not marvel that it tells you that He was in the world before He took flesh and was revealed.] For behold He created and made the world, as it says above, "everything came into being through Him" (Jn 1:10b).

"And the world did not know him," i.e., and here he calls the world the assembly of those men who are laying
hold of earthly things. And this is evident because he did not say, "no man knew Him;" he said, "The world did not know Him" (Jn 1:10c). So the Messiah also says, "My Father, you are holy and the world does not know you" (Jn 17:25a). So then those who are entangled in earthly things did not know even His Father. "And the world did not know Him," i.e., the assembly of contemptuous men who are laying hold of worldly things did not know Him, but virtuous men knew Him. Our Lord Himself said, "Abraham was eagerly waiting to see my day, and he saw and rejoiced" (Jn 8:56). And again when He was seeking to convince the Jews concerning what David says, and how in spirit David called Him the Lord, when He said: "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit down at my right hand!'" (Mt 22:44a; Ps 110:1a). And the Apostle Paul said concerning the prophets, "From Samuel and those who followed him, they spoke and proclaimed about these days" (Ac 3:24). Unless perchance one retorts and says: But how did the Lord say, "Many prophets and righteous men yearned to see something you have seen and they did not, and (to hear) something what you yourselves have heard and they did not hear" (Mt 13:17b)? And we say that from all of these texts this is evident:
the prophets knew Him, and because of this, they were yearning for anyone acquainted with Him or anything reported about Him or which had entered the longing heart, and not (for) anything that was not acquainted with Him, or did not report Him, or had not entered the longing heart. So then they knew the Son of God who was preparing to take flesh and to come to men. But who are these who did not know and did not hear? And we say of these that the Lord Himself explains them when He says, "You yourselves now see these things and hear (them)" (Mt 13:16), i.e., this, that you see me in the flesh, and now hear human expressions when I discourse with you. These therefore neither saw nor heard, but they beheld Him by means of revelations. And on that account they knew Him. So then, do not think that because He was not known to every man before He was revealed, (because of this) He is temporal or created. For moreover not even every man knew His Father, for example, all of those who worshipped idols, and those who asserted that the world itself is eternal. But again even now not every man knows the Word, that He is God. But again the worldly shall never know Him, but only one of the virtuous and those who are worthy of Him, they shall
recognize Him. So then, He is eternal and He is God, even if the world does not know Him.

"He came to His own, and His own did not receive Him," i.e., here the Evangelist speaks about the time of the Word's incarnation and manifestation, and whence and whereto he says that He came, that all be fulfilled by Him. And this is not comprehended by the whole:

What place is suitable for His residing, and what place is filled by His advent (that Creator of 'place,' for He is above all, and below all, and within all, and outside of all without limit). What therefore did he call His advent in saying, "He came"? And we say: here he called it His 'manifestation in the flesh.' Before, on the one hand, He was invisible and incomprehensible. Afterward, on the other hand, He took flesh and appeared in the flesh, as the same John the Evangelist said in his Catholic Letter, "We bring tidings to you of that One who is from the beginning, that One whom we have seen with our eyes and touched with our hands" (1 Jn 1:1). So then he called the advent 'His manifestation in the flesh' and said, "He came." And for what reason did He come? Not because of His own need, for He is without wants and is complete in every-
thing, like God; and upon others He pours out His grace and grants His favours. But He came for the sake of His acts of healing and the redemption of His servants.

And who are those He called His own (to whom He came and they did not receive Him)? And we say He calls all men His own because they are His creation. But especially He called the Jews His own, as the beloved people and the elect inheritance. But the Jews did not receive Him. And see what accusations are brought against them because they did not receive Him: first, that they did not follow Him, but that He came to them. But second: beforehand the prophets prophesied to them about His advent, and they read in the Scriptures and they preached to them that He was coming, and when He came, they did not receive Him. Again third: they beheld that He did miracles and wonders, and they did not receive Him. But fourth: they were listening to Him when He said, "I was not sent out but to the lost sheep from the house of Israel" (Mt 15:24), and they did not receive Him. And again He said to His disciples, "Do not go on the road of the Gentiles, and do not enter the house of the Samaritans, but go especially to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt 10:5, 6), and
they did not receive Him. But fifth: not only that they did not receive Him, but "cast Him out from the vineyard and killed Him" (Mk 12:8). Again sixth: that after all of these offenses and wicked deeds which they did, He granted to them a place of repentance, that if they wished, they could repent and be pardoned and received by Him through faith in Him, while He numbered them with His beloved who received Him and believed in Him. And you have the example of Paul who persecuted the Messiah after the crucifixion and His disciples with Him. And although he did not draw nigh to Him and believe in Him, not only did He pardon his sins but He even deemed him equal to His beloved and His disciples. And not only did He do this with him, but He made him the preacher and teacher and apostle to the Gentiles and the nations. But Paul not only was not ashamed to tremble in his sins, but he boasted in them. And he shows the multitude of the blessings of God to mankind when he says thus, "I am not worthy to be called an apostle because I persecuted the church of God" (1 Cor 15:9b). And again, "the Messiah came to save sinners of whom I am the first (1 Tm 1:15). And again he said, "They have heard about my earlier dealings in Judaea, that
more and more I persecuted the church of God and plundered it, while great hope was granted to penitent sinners in these words" (A Ga 1:23). Now, for what reason did the Jews not receive the Word of God when He came to them? And we say: because of their pride and their boastfulness, just as the same Paul said, "Because they sought to establish their (own) righteousness, they did not know the righteousness of God, and did not submit" (Ro 10:3). Again it is asked: why did the Word of God not compel men to receive Him when He came to them? And we say that He did not compel them for many reasons: first, because He did not need their faith and their service, as we (do), because we need to compel the slaves with respect thereto, that they should serve us. But second, He did not compel them, so that He would not violate the liberty and free will which He granted them in the beginning when He created them. Again third, they would not receive His grace if He drove them forcefully to believe in Him(slef), just as those guests whom he compelled to come to his marriage feast and his banquet (A Mt 22:1-14; Lk 14:16-24) do not receive the grace of the bridegroom, because of that force by which they were driven; and it was not the
marriage feast and banquet they were contemplating, but mourning and the house of weeping. But fourth, He did not compel them because of this, that forced belief is tantamount to no belief.

"But to those who received Him, He granted to them the power to become sons of God," i.e., this reward He granted to those who received Him: that is, to become sons of God the Father, and brothers of Him, the Word who took flesh, through baptism, for in truth this is the great reward itself. But he mentioned "power" because this is in our power and in our freedom, that if we wish, we may become sons of God, and if we wish, otherwise. And it is asked: why did he not speak about the suffering of those who did not receive Him as he spoke about the reward of those who did receive Him? And we say that a word was spoken by Him concerning the punishment of these. This then is the prior punishment which these receive: their souls were deprived of this, to become sons of God the Father, and brothers of our Lord Jesus the Messiah; while it also reserved for them the other punishment more terrible than this: fire without quenching and unending Gehenna.

"But to those who received Him, He granted the
power to become sons of God," i.e., whether they were 
slaves or sons of the free, or Greeks or barbarians, or 
wise men or fools, or reputable or disreputable men, or 
rich men or poor: all of them are equal because they 
were baptized and became sons of God the Father and 
brothers of Him, the Word who took flesh. And when he 
explains in what way those who received Him became sons 
of God, he says: "to those who believed in His name, 
those begotten not from blood, and not from the will of 
the flesh, and not from the will of man, but from God," 
i.e., here he is making an analogy of our first birth 
which is by woman, with our second birth which is by 
baptism. And he compares the exalted nature of this 
with the contemptibility of that, in order that we may 
have great and exalted thoughts about the one (our 
second birth), while we keep it (our second birth) with­out corruption with great care. And he says this of 
those who are begotten here in this second birth which 
is by baptism, those begotten not from blood like 
birth from a woman, but by water; and not from the de­­
sire of the flesh like our birth from a woman, but from 
the desire of the Holy Spirit; and not from the will of 
man like our birth from a woman, but from the will of
God. So then let us be careful of this angelic clothing which we put on from this birth by baptism, and let us not stain it with sins, lest it should happen to us as (it did) to him who was wearing filthy clothes at the wedding feast (A Mt 22:11-14).

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," i.e., after he said that those who received Him were begotten from God and became His sons, he declares the reason by which they have all of this glory, and he says, "This is it: 'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us,' i.e., this is the reason that the Word became flesh and was born from a virgin: so that He could beget us by baptism and make us sons of God." So then because of this the Word became flesh, so that He could make us spiritual beings. And because of this He was born of a woman, that He should beget us from God by baptism. And because of this He became a man, that He should make us sons of God by grace, and because of this He descended to earth.

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," i.e., by means of our eating His body and our drinking His blood, He dwelt and dwells in us.

\[1\] The MS appears to be thus.
Concerning this, after that (text), "He granted to them the power to become sons of God" (Jn 1:12b), he (John) put "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), in order that the two of them should be enquired into one after the other, the former and the latter. Just as men became sons of God while they were not changed, so "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a) while He was not changed. Again the heretics retort here and say, "In what way is it possible that the Word should become flesh?" And we say to them thus: those things which are impossible for us are possible for God (A Mk 10:27). A man may justly ask about the potter how it is possible for him to make a life-like man from clay; or concerning the goldsmith, how it is possible for him to cast a life-like horse from gold or from silver. But about God a man does not ask how it is possible to become flesh, because everything makes plain His power and His will, as it is written, "Nothing is difficult for God" (Lk 1:37), and "all that the Lord desires, He makes" (Job 23:13b), etc. So then this was possible. And this (text), "and the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), is how it is possible that the Word of God could become flesh. You should not question it with us, but with God the
Word who became flesh, and with John the Evangelist who said and also wrote it. For because you said, "How is it possible for God the Word to become flesh?", you expressly attributed our weakness to Him. For He is "the power of God" (1 Cor 1:24) the Father, as Paul said. And therefore those who ask questions concerning Him, how it is possible for Him to become flesh, attribute our weakness to Him.

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among [in] us," i.e., some subvert here when they say, "We wish to know and to understand how the Word became flesh." And we say many things to them. First and foremost, just as His being and His creative power are not understood. But second, just as we do not know and understand how He was begotten by the Father, so we do not know how He became flesh. Moreover third, just as we do not understand how He created the creation from nothing, so we do not understand how He became flesh. However, fourth, this we know: fire seized hold of the bush, but how that bush was not burned up we do not know (Ex 3:3, 4). Fifth, this we know: the staff of Moses became a serpent, but how it came to be we do not understand (Ex 4:2-5). Sixth, we know that the waters of the Nile...
were blood to the Egyptians but water to the Hebrews, but how they were (so) we do not know (Ex 7:14-24). We know that hail-stones and fire were cast down from above together in Egypt, but how they did not obliterate each other, since fire and hail-stones are contradictory, we do not know (Ex 9:22-26). Now, on one hand, the pillar of fire which was shining upon the Hebrews, on the other hand, was obscuring the Egyptians in darkness, we know, but how this wonder came to pass, we do not know (Ex 14:19-20). But we know that a rock (Ex 17:5-7) and the bone of an ass (Jdg 15:14-20) supplied water, but how they supplied the water we do not know. We know that wood sank and iron floated in the Jordan, but how this happened we do not know (2 Kgs 6:4-7). We know that our Lord created new eyes in clay, but how He created them we do not know (Jn 9:6-7). We know moreover that He changed water to wine, but how He changed (it) we do not know (Jn 2:1-11). We know that He satisfied thousands from a few loaves of bread, but how He satisfied them we do not know (Jn 6:1-14). And we know that He departed while the virgins watched (Mt 28:1-10), and from the grave while the seals were preserved (Mt 28:2-4), and entered the upper-room while the doors were
shut (Jn 20:19-23), but how these three came to pass we do not know. So then how He became flesh we do not know and do not understand. So this, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), is a wonder, and a wonder is not understood, and if it is understood, it is not a wonder. Because of the objection, not because we do not know and do not understand how the Word became flesh, should we say, "He did not become flesh"? For we do not understand many things, and we do not deny them. For we do not understand the number of angels and stars and men, or the waters of healing and the grains of mustard, and because we do not understand the number of these, we do not deny their number. (Marginal insert:) [And because we do not understand the weight of the world, do we deny that the world has weight?] And because we do not understand the measure of the sea, we do not deny its measure, and the rest which like these one discovers many things. Seventh, John the Evangelist also said and wrote: "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), but how He came to be he did not say, but was silent about it. Eighth, because the craft of the potter is greater, it is hidden from the clay, and the knowledge of the carver than the image which is fashioned, this is hidden from
the fabrications, this is (hidden), how the Word became flesh. And therefore Paul said, "O the depths of the plan and the wisdom" (Ro 11:33a), etc. Ninth, how is all of Him in His Father, and (how) does all of Him dwell in the womb of Mary, and (how) was all of Him born in the flesh infinitely, and (how) is all of Him in this whole universe (if it is right to use this expression about Him, "all of Him," I do not know)? And how did He come to the place in which He is, while after being in the place from which He came? Tenth, even as those who were investigating why Jacob was chosen from the womb and Esau was rejected (A Gn 25: 19-23), and Ishmael was driven out and Isaac took possession (A Gn 21:8-14), Paul called them the potter's clay, because the clay did not perceive what the potter was making (A Ro 9:21), surely it is right to call those who dare to investigate how the Word became flesh heretics. Eleventh, this, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), is a wonder more exalted and sublime than all the wonders which God performed, whether former or intermediate or latter. And then, just as we believe them to have happened truly, and although their method is not understood (how they came to pass), so we believe
this happened (the Word is flesh), but how it happened we do not know. Twelfth, however, the Evangelist did not write it that you should investigate how the Word became flesh, but you should believe in it that it happened. And our Lord said, "life is granted to faith" (A Jn in several places) and not to investigating and disputing. The same hail-stone was a coal of fire in Egypt, and do not think that the hail was set on one side and fire on the other side, but one stone which compounded and joined both fire and hail. The great wonder is that contrary and destructive natures were compounded each with the other and were preserved (Ex 9:22-26).

But again they retort, "How did the Word become flesh since He was not changed?" First we say to them, as He knows and has the power. Second, as He appeared in forms to the prophets without being changed. Third, as He existed while He was not (flesh), so He was (flesh) while He exists without change or alteration. Fourth, as the amaranth and the salamander which are seized by the fire while they do not change from their inflammability. Fifth, as the bread and wine which upon the altar become the body and blood of the Word of
God, while they are not changed from their nature: while they are held (as) bread and wine, they are believed (to be) the body and blood. Sixth, as are the waters of spiritual baptism: while they are not changed from their nature, and while they appear (to be) water, they are believed that they are spiritual baptism. Seventh, as men believe that while they are sons of men, they are sons of God while they are not changed from their nature as men. Eighth, we see the nature of the three of them by the eyes of the body, and we see their essence by the eyes of the soul. Ninth, thus the Word of God became flesh while He was not changed because He is God. And He became a man while He was not changed because He is a spiritual being. Tenth, and it is evident that when He became flesh He was not changed because He is God. And therefore He became flesh while no change came upon Him because "nothing is difficult for God" (Lk 1:37), and "all that the Lord desires, He does" (Job 23:13b). Eleventh, and moreover it is evident because He is from unchangeable substance and His nature is absolutely unchanging. And, therefore, He became flesh while He was not changed. But creatures (are) because their nature is changeable, since they
have been changed. What is unchangeable is His substance, and even His being is unchangeable. What is changeable is its substance; it changes and also its being. He who says that if the Word became flesh, He was changed, the change comes upon His divine nature. Twelfth, God is in His substance prior to creating the creation. And after He created the creation, He is in His creation. And just as this, He is in His creation, does not abrogate that, He is in His substance, that, He is in His substance, does not abrogate this, He is the Word. And not even this, He is the Word, abrogates that, the Word became flesh. Thirteenth, "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among [in] us," i.e., some say, "How did He 'become' while He was not altered?" And we say to them, as the waters truly became blood while they were not changed from their nature. And that they truly became blood, the Egyptians testified that they were drawing blood, whether from the river or from other places. The Hebrews testified that they were drawing water, whether from the river or from other places (Ex 7:20-24). Fourteenth, and as the staff truly became a serpent (Ex 7:8-12) while it was not changed in its nature. But the testimony that it
truly became a serpent is this: it fled from Moses to the bush at first; and this: it devoured the staffs of the magicians in Egypt. And this, that it was not changed from its nature, testifies that Moses lifted it in his hand and it did not flee from him to the bush. The staff which was a serpent was a simple wonder. But before Pharaoh it was a double wonder, because when Moses [dropped it], the staff became a serpent, and Pharaoh and the Egyptians, on the one hand, saw only a serpent. On the other hand, Moses and Aaron saw the staff and the serpent at the same time. While Pharaoh and the Egyptians, on the one hand, were seeing its being (Marginal insert:) [only, on the other hand, Moses and Aaron were seeing its being] and its transformation. Again it is a double wonder, and if one does not believe this, it is hidden to him: it devoured the staffs of the magicians while it did not grow and was not different about anything which it was, since it was devouring them not as serpents but as staffs. For their staffs were not serpents in truth, but in imagination and illusion. And as it is unexplained, it is a miracle: this, how the serpent devoured the staffs while it did not grow and did not become thick, and was not
far from its original size, and was not even counting the staffs which were being devoured, nor how it became a serpent while it was not changed from this, that it is a staff. So this is greater than that, and it is not possible to understand how the Word became flesh. But again as the light truly became darkness while it was not changed (Ex 10:21-23). And that it truly became darkness, (there is) this testimony: it became dark to the Egyptians. And that it was not changed from its nature, (there is) this testimony: it was giving light to the Hebrews. And if this light became darkness while it remained light: behold, it is a wonder! And on the one hand, if it was covering the Egyptians in darkness, but on the other hand, it was giving light to the Hebrews: behold, it is a wonderful thing! And if the light was within the darkness: behold, it is a wonder! And do not think that it was one thing and another, but that light which was shining upon the Hebrews, itself was covering the Egyptians in darkness. (Marginal insert:) [And that darkness which was covering the Egyptians,] the same was shining upon the Hebrews, and not one part and another: while one part was shining, the other was covering with darkness, but all of
it was shining and all of it was covering with darkness. It was the same and was not one thing and another. And perchance this is, or resembles that which is written, "Darkness shall cover you, and night shall shine like day, and darkness like the light" (Ps 139:12), in one and the same place, and in one and the same house, and one and the same spot. The Hebrews see and come in and go out, and the Egyptians are taken into bondage and are bound in darkness. And if it was not so, Moses would not have counted the days of that darkness.

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," i.e., but again they retort and say, "Whence is it known that the Word became flesh?" And we say to them that since he dealt with this, it is not right that we should ask about the testimony. And as it is not right to seek testimony concerning "He is God," so also not concerning this, "He became flesh." Moreover, we know that He became flesh because John the Evangelist said and testified that "He became" (Jn 1:14a). So also Paul the Apostle, like him, was speaking the truth when he said, "God sent His Son and He came from a woman" (Ga 4:4b). And moreover about His Son, He who was begotten in the flesh from the seed of the house of David
(A Mt 1:17). And again, because indeed men were made partakers in flesh and blood, He also was made a part-taker in the form of these things, that by His death He should bring him to an end who possessed the power of death (which is Satan). And yet again Gabriel said to Mary, "The Holy Spirit will come and the Power of the Exalted will rest upon you" (Lk 1:35). But again he said, "He who has been begotten in her is from the Holy Spirit" (Mt 1:20c). And since these three things say and testify (to it), who is he who does not believe but he who is an infidel and impious? And if He did not become flesh first in the womb, this (text) is not suitable for Him, "He was born from a woman" (Ga 4:4b).

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among [in] us," i.e., why did He become flesh? And we say, indeed He is God by His nature, and complete and not wanting at all. And He became flesh in order to make us sons of His Father. He became lowly and a dweller on earth in order that God could fashion us by grace. He became mortal in order to make us immortal. I.e., "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a) while He was not changed in His nature, nor received any addition with regard to His substance. For He was not changed in His
substance as those who confound the substances say, nor was His substance added to as the Nestorians say.

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among [in] us," i.e., and they say that this needs interpretation: this, namely, "He took flesh," and this, "He became flesh," means that He dwelt in the flesh; and this, "He became flesh," means that He dwelt in a man. The Evangelist said none of these, but that "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a). Why do we leave out that which is written and take up that which is not written? The Evangelist wrote this, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a). But he did not write these other things. So then interpretation and expansion and omission and alteration of this, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), is not needed. But according to his reading, so let us consider it closely, and so let us believe that it was so. But the Evangelist wrote it that we should believe in it, and not add to it or subtract from it, or alter it or interpret it (A Jn 19:35). And if they say that "becoming" is not appropriate for God, we say that neither "being born from a woman," nor "growth in stature" are appropriate for Him, since He was "in" these.

"He dwelt in us," i.e., this, "He dwelt," they
say (means) that He dwelt in and inhabited the virgin. But again they say that it (means) He dwelt in and inhabited the flesh. But again they say that He dwelt in and inhabited a man. If it is in a virgin that He dwelt, as you said, the Evangelist would have said, "The Word became flesh and dwelt in her," and if He dwelt in the flesh, which you said, he would have said, "The Word became flesh and dwelt in it." And if it was in a man that "He dwelt in us" (Jn 1:14b), he would have said, "The Word became flesh and dwelt in a man." But he did not say so and it is not one of these; rather, "the Word became flesh and dwelt in us" (Jn 1:14). This interpretation is concealed from the Nestorians, separators of unity, and helps the opinion of those who confound the substances, those who say that the natures were mixed and confused in each other like the wine and the water, and not the Polinarians who say that the Word of God was joined to the body but was not joined to the rational soul, because the Godhead filled it instead of the soul.

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among [in] us," i.e., this text is the beginning and source of the providence which is in the flesh of the Word of God.
And those who confess faith in the Messiah rightly, make the beginning of their doctrine about the Messiah from here. But these who do not rightly profess faith in Him, make their doubts about Him from here. And from here, from the Christ, they are called Christians, like the Israelites are named from Israel, and the Levites from Levi, because Christianity is established by faith, and this, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), is accepted by faith.

"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among [in] us," i.e., the Word does not need interpretation and expansion and contraction, but we accept it by faith. This, "He became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), says that He was joined to the flesh while He was not changed. And when He was joined to the flesh, this is evident: (He was joined) to the rational soul also, because it was the custom of Scripture to call one part the whole. And this, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a), is not natural and not customary. This, "He dwelt in us" (Jn 1:14b), means that for this He became flesh: in order to make us temples and to dwell in us and inhabit us. And as He is in His Father in His substance, as He said, "I am in my Father and my Father in Me" (Jn 14:10a), so He is in us. And because He partook of our flesh, after He
became flesh, He dwelt in us as in temples by means of
the Holy Spirit, as Paul said, "Do you not know that you
are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God inhabits
you?" (1 Cor 3:16). For after the Word became flesh, He
dwelt in us by means of His body and His blood which we
eat and drink. And again He dwells in us truly as He
said before through the prophet, "I will abide in them
and I will walk in them and I will be their God" (2
Cor 1:16c; A Lv 26:11a).

"And we beheld His glory, glory as the only 1 Son
from the Father," i.e., although He became flesh, yet
He was not changed because He is God. Nor did it bring
the glory of His divinity to nought, but it continued
just as He exists without alteration, while His baseness
did not conceal His greatness, and His humiliation did

1Following Dale Moody, "God's Only Son: the
Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Ver-
sion" in The Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 72
(Philadelphia: 1953) pp. 213-219. "However, the most
thorough study of monogenes is a doctoral dissertation
by Francis Marion Warden, Monogenes in the Johannine
Literature (1938). This exhaustive study...demon-
strates beyond reasonable doubt that monogenes means
'uniqueness of being, rather than any remarkableness of
manner of coming into being, or yet uniqueness result-
ing from any manner of coming into being' (pp. 35-36)"
(p. 214). And, "Monogenes is used in the Septuagint to
translate the Hebrew yachid (cf. Amos 8:10; Zech 12:
10), which has the literal meaning of 'dear one' or
'one and only'" (p. 217).
not cover His splendour. And this is evident because "I and the other apostles 'beheld His glory, glory as the only Son from the Father'" (Jn 1:14c). And also after He became flesh, the Evangelist said that for three reasons, then, "the Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14a). First, in order to beget in us the divine birth from baptism and to make us sons of God His Father. But second, in order to dwell in us. Moreover, third, so that men would be able to see Him as John himself said in his Catholic Letter: "We bring tidings to you of that One who was from the beginning, that One whom we have seen with our eyes and touched with our hands" (1 Jn 1:1). For if He had not become flesh, men would not have been able to see Him. Therefore, if the sons of Israel were not able to see Moses, who was a servant and a man, without veiling his face (Ex 34:29-35), how much more were men unable to see this One who is the God and Lord and Creator of Moses and also so everything transient, apart from the flesh.

"And we beheld His glory, glory as the only Son from the Father," i.e., this, "we beheld" the Evangelist said on behalf of himself and on behalf of his fellow apostles: "I and all my fellow apostles 'beheld
His glory' (Jn 1:14c), since he describes the glory of the Word which became flesh (in) these four ways: first, this: when He became flesh, it was made known also that He is God. And He was not inferior and terrestrial, but it was made known that He is exalted and heavenly. But second, (it was made known) by the wonders and miracles which He performed when the embryos which were in the wombs leapt for joy at meeting Him (A Lk 2:14). And then the star drew near and brought the magi to Him and they presented offerings (A Mt 2:1-11). And the lepers whom He cleansed (Lk 17:11-19), and the sick whom He cured (Mk 1:30-31), and the demons which He banished (Mk 5:1-13), and the blind to whom He gave sight (Mk 8:22-26), and the hungry whom He satisfied (Jn 6:1-14), and the paralytics whom He made to stand (Mt 9:2-8), and the deaf whom He made to hear (Mk 7:32-35), and the hands which He extended (Mk 3:1-5), and the eyes which He created (Jn 9:1-7), and the harlots whom He purified (Jn 8:10-11), and the sinners and publicans whom He justified (Lk 5:27-32), and the dead whom He raised (Jn 11:38-44), and the bound whom He set free (Lk 13:10-17). And while He was hung up on the cross, the Adversary whom He exposed, the sin which He
attacked on the cross, and the bond of the sin of Adam which He destroyed, and the sun which He covered (Mt 27:45), and the curtain and also the stones which He rent and tore asunder (Mt 27:51). And the grave which He opened (Mt 27:52-53), and the dead which He raised and Sheol which He demolished, and death which He brought to nought, and Paradise which He opened, and the soul of the robber which He caused to enter therein with the souls which He raised up from Sheol (Lk 23:42-43). But the third way that is His glory is this: the Father proclaimed, "This is my beloved Son" (Mt 3:17), and the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon Him (A Jn 1:32). And again, when He said to His Father, "Glorify me in that glory which I have with you" (Jn 17:5), the Father proclaimed, "I have glorified and again I will glorify" (Jn 12:28). The fourth way that is the glory of the Word is this: when He became flesh, He renewed by His substance everyone who was gladdened without having seen (A Jn 20:29), the spiritual and the bodily, the exalted and the humble. All of these kinds of glory, then, John called the glory of the Word, since therefore all of these were one in the eyes of the Evangelist and his fellow disciples.
Concerning this he said: "We beheld His glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father," i.e., again because he said, "as the only Son from the Father" (Jn 1:14c), he separated the glory of this One from the glory of the angels and the prophets. For the seraphim also appeared in great glory to Isaiah within the Temple when they called, "Holy, Holy, Holy! Lord Almighty Sabaoth!" (Is 6:3b; Re 4:8). And again the cherubim appeared in wondrous glory to Ezekiel in the chariot when they said, "Bless the honour of the Lord from His place!" (Eze 3:12b). And again the angels appeared in glory to Daniel (Dn 12:5). And again Moses appeared in glory to the Egyptians (A Ex 7:1) and the Hebrews (Ex 34:29-30). And Elijah and Elisha appeared in the glory of miracle-working to the Jews (A 2 Kgs 18:20-39 and 2 Kgs 6:1-7). And Daniel and the children of the house of Hanan appeared in great glory to the Babylonians (Dn 3:25). But the glory of all of these is of servants and creatures, but the glory of this only Son is the glory of the Lord and Creator. Because of God it was made known that it is as the blessed Paul said, "On the one hand Moses was faithful like a servant, but on the other hand the Messiah appeared like a son" (He 3:5a, 6a).
So then because He spoke as the only Son, he distinguished His glory from the angels and prophets and the rest of the creatures. Again he called the Word the only Son because from His Father only that Eternity was born in His birth, but not from a mother as well. But again he called Him the only Son because He alone was born from the Father, since He had no brothers in that birth. But again he named Him the only Son because He was not born in pain and flux and mutilation. But again he spoke of Him as the only Son because of the singular way He was begotten from the Father.

"And we beheld His glory, glory as the only Son from the Father," i.e., some ask concerning that expression as when they say, "Why did the Evangelist say, 'as the only Son'? Is the Word not the only Son from the Father? And if not, why did he (the Evangelist) make (Him) known as the only Son?" And we say that he composed nothing equivocal of the Word, but he spoke truthfully. And this is the meaning of what he said, as it were, "And although the Word became flesh, yet we have seen His glory not like the glory of the flesh, nor the glory of man, but like 'the glory of the only Son from the Father'" (Jn 1:14c). Accordingly one
should say that although He became flesh, yet the glory of His divinity persisted as He is without change and without alteration. But again we say that when he said, "as the only Son," he did not speak it as in comparison with another only son, but that truly this Word, He is "the only Son from the Father" (Jn 1:14c). While with regard to this, "as the only Son," he meant it in the usual sense and in the Scriptural sense. On the one hand, in the usual sense: for example, a man who has seen the king and wishes to make him and his glory known, he honours him and makes him known in his report when he says thus, "I saw him while sitting in a glorious throne, and clothed in garments exceedingly costly; and moreover the golden diadem, radiant in pearls, was placed on his head; and the attendants who tend and stand around him; and the tributes which are collected and offered to him from every place." And since it is not possible to relate all of the laudatory words which are due to him, because he would be overcome by their multitude and magnificence, he says, to put it briefly, "I saw him like a king." It was not as though he were comparing him with another king because he said, "like a king," but that he truly is king. Similarly the
Evangelist spoke. When he said, "the only Son from the Father," he did not speak as though he compared Him with another only son from the Father, but he showed that He is the only Son from the Father truly. As Scripture said then, so it is written.

"Full of grace and truth," i.e., see then that he did not say He was filled with grace and truth as think the heretics—that He received and was filled with grace and truth, (superscribed insert;) [but that by His name He is full of grace and truth.] And indeed he said that "He is full" of grace because He performed all those things which He performed for us by His grace, and not because we are worthy by reason of (being) servants. But moreover he said, "He is full" of truth, because truly God is in His nature, and truly He became flesh while He was not changed. Therefore he gives the name, "truth."

"John testified about Him and proclaimed and said," i.e., those other Evangelists brought testimonies about our Lord from the ancient prophets like this: when on the one hand He was begotten, he (Matthew) cited testimony from the prophet Isaiah and said, "Behold, a virgin conceives and bears," etc.
(Mt 1:23a, Is 7:14a). But on the other hand when Herod acted treacherously concerning the infants and killed them, he cited from Jeremiah and said, "A voice was heard in Rama," etc. (Mt 2:18a, Jr 31:15). And when He went up from Egypt, he cited from the prophet Hosea and said, "From Egypt I have called my Son" (Mt 2:15c, Ho 11:1). But this Evangelist cited testimony from John the Baptist concerning our Lord. John the Baptist utters and says (the testimony recorded) above and below. Why indeed did he do these things? And we say because of many things. First, because of the virtue and holiness and excellence and greatness of the man. But second, because of this: the Jews held John the Baptist in great honour, and his message was received among them better than others. And also Josephus, the chronicler of the Jews, greatly praises John the Baptist. 1 Moreover third, because the testimony of John

1See Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Book XVIII, Chapter 5, Section 2: "2. Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment of what he did against John, that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism..." (William Whiston, trans., The Works of Flavius Josephus, Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, p. 540).
the Baptist reveals more openly about the Messiah than
the other testimonies, because the testimony of the
prophets was ancient, but that of John was new. And on
the one hand, they had not seen Him in the flesh, but,
on the other hand, he saw Him in the flesh and also
baptized Him. However fourth, because the testimony
of those from heaven and from God the Father, as the
Father Himself said, "Which of you saw that the Spirit
of God was descending upon Him and making known about
Him" (A Jn 1:32, 33), as it were? And therefore because
of these reasons the Evangelist cited the testimonies
about our Lord.

"John (to wit) testified about Him and proclaimed,
and said," i.e., because he said and proclaimed this,
he made known that in openness and boldness he testified
about Him and preached, and not secretly. And for what
reason was the testimony about Him from heaven, unless
from John the Baptist? And we say that the testimony
about Him was from heaven (in) three ways. First, in
the River Jordan when the Father called out and said,
"This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (Mt
3:17b). But second, on the mountain when Moses and
Elijah appeared and the Father called out from the
cloud, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; listen to Him" (Mk 9:7c; Mt 3:17b). Moreover third, in Jerusalem when a voice from heaven was heard that the Father called out and said, "I have glorified and again I shall glorify" (Jn 12:28c). But it was also useful that there should be testimony from John the Baptist about Him concerning the Jews, that they might believe, because John, on account of his virtue and the excellence of his ways, was a person trustworthy to them. But again because they were accustomed to John's language. He was a man like them and of their nature. He was better than the voice which had come to them from heaven. On this account the testimony of John was useful to them. For example then, if the Word had not become flesh, no man would have been able to receive Him. So also in the voice of John who is a man, men more easily receive the testimony about Him.

But what is the testimony of John the Baptist about the Word who became flesh? He said: "This is He of whom I said, 'He comes after me and was before me, because He existed before me,'" i.e., until now the testimony of John is secret; until now it is neglected and disparaged. And for what reason did he not testify
and say, "This is the Son of God," or "This is the only Son," or "This is the Messiah, the Son of the Living God"? And we say that these testimonies bear witness to Him afterward, just as he said, "Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (Jn 1:29c). And just as he said, "Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, and whoever does not obey the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God will abide upon him" (Jn 3:36). With this hidden and disparaged testimony, then, he bore witness about Him, so that little by little he acquainted the Jews with the testimony about Him, while beginning with little things and ending with great things about Him. For example, then, when a bird wishes to teach its fledglings to fly, it (does not) make them fly all at once, but on the first day a little and soon makes them return so that they will not become weary. And another day a little more, and little by little it makes them completely able to fly. So also John did with the Jews concerning the Messiah. In the beginning he hid his testimony and said it simply. But shortly afterward he revealed it little by little until he testified that the Son is God. And we say that he began with the hidden and simple testimony at this
point, in order to show that the Messiah was greater than he, and to bring to an end the opinion which there was about him—that he was greater than the Messiah. Because of many things, therefore, the Jews thought about John that he was greater than the Messiah: on the one hand, because John was the son of famous priests, but the Messiah was the son of obscure parents: "Was He not the son of Joseph the carpenter, and His mother Mary, and His brother[s] James and Joses?" (Mt 13:55).

Again John was an abstainer, but the Messiah "(came) eating" (A Lk 7:33-34). And that one was a hermit and was clothed in hair and girded with a leather strap, but this One was not so (A Mk 1:6). That one was baptizing, but this One was baptized by him. And that one was testifying, but this One was being testified to. And because of (this) they thought about John that he was greater than the Messiah. This authority was his in the beginning so that he might show that the Messiah was greater than he. And about this he was saying, "I am baptizing you in water, but He who comes after me is greater than I. I am not worthy to loosen the straps of His shoes" (Jn 1:26a, 27a, b). So then because he wanted to bring the false opinion of the Jews to an
end, and wanted to show that the Messiah was greater than he, he dealt with this in the simple testimony here. For (the benefit of) those who to that point were not convinced that the Messiah was greater than John (even though they were hearing that He is the Son of God, and even though this 'greaterness' existed at the beginning), he should at this time make Him known as being greater than John the Baptist.

"This is He of whom I said, 'He comes after me but was before me, because He existed before me,'" i.e., because he said, "This is He," either he makes known that while Jesus was near and at his side, he said, "This is He," or (he makes known) that from afar he saw that He was coming and stretched out his hand in front of him and said, "This is He." For because he said, "He of whom I said," he showed that before the Jews saw Him, he spoke to them concerning Him and testified about Him many times. And this John the Baptist did wisely, in that he did not immediately testify about Him as soon as the Jews saw the Messiah. Because if he had acted thus, either they would not receive his testimony, or they would ridicule Him when they saw that the contemptible form of the Messiah is greater than
any man, so that even Samaritans and fornicators and publicans were being drawn steadfastly to Him. But then many times before they saw Him, he announced to them concerning Him and testified about Him, so that their hearing had become accustomed to this testimony and it was firmly fixed in their mind, so that they might receive Him easily and gloriously when they saw Him. But again because He said, "I said," as to men who were making preparation to see Him. Because of the proclamation and testimony of John he said it about Him. Again because he said, "He comes after me," he revealed about himself that he is the ambassador who comes 'after' the king. While the king does not come because the ambassador was sent out, still because the king was promising to come, the ambassador was sent out. But again he said, "He comes after me," because the birth of John the Baptist is earlier than the fleshly birth of the Messiah of God from the virgin by six months (according to that which the angel said to Mary, our Lady, etc., [about] Elizabeth, "This is the sixth month for her, the one who was called sterile" [Lk 1:36b]). And because His fleshly birth was six months after the birth of John the Baptist, on account of that John said, "He
comes after me." But however, the Word's divine birth, He who was begotten by the Father, is before John. And He who has no beginning is prior to the whole of creation. But again, he said what he said, "And He was before me," not about honour but about nature. But again, because he said, "Because He existed before me," he showed that the age of his own birth is not like that bodily one of the Word. So the divine birth of the Word was before the fleshly birth of John, and He is without beginning and without time before him, just as it suited God the Creator to exist before His creation. And he saw that the One of whom he said, "He comes after me," is the One of whom he said, "He is before me," and not two entities as the Arithmetiqu¹ say.

But again, this text is distorted in other ways thus: "This is He of whom I said, 'He comes after me and was before me, because He existed before me,'" i.e., "He comes after me" in this, that He became a man, and "He was before me" in spirit, because "He is before me" in His divinity. And on the one hand, these are the interpretations of those mentioned: Mar Ephrem and the pious Philoxenus of M'bug. But on the other hand,

¹I have been unable to identify this group.
the pious Mar Joannes interprets in another manner
thus, i.e., John did not speak this, "He comes after me," about the birth of the Word from the virgin. For if he had been speaking about this, he would have said, "He came after me," because indeed the Word of God was born from Mary, while these (words) were spoken by John. But he said this, "after me comes," about the preaching (of Jesus), i.e., "after me comes" His preaching and His proclaiming in public and His preaching abroad. "And He was before me," i.e., He was ahead of me in honour and greatness.

"This is He of whom I said, 'He comes after me, and He was before me, because He existed before me,'" i.e., do not think that because I preceded (His) preaching and public proclaiming I am greater than He. But He is greater than I because He is ahead of me in greatness and honour, and I am much less than He, so far (so) that "I am not worthy to loosen the straps of His shoes" (Jn 1:27c; Lk 3:16d; Mk 1:7c). Thus indeed Mar Joannes interprets these texts.

"This is He of whom I said, 'He comes after me, and He was before me, because He existed before me,'" i.e., the heretics say, "This, 'He was before me,' which
John (the Baptist) said, John (the Evangelist) himself says about the essence of the Word of God who existed before the ages and before John (the Baptist)." And Mar Joannes himself says these things to them thus: and concerning this he (Mar Joannes) sought to say, "He added this which followed it needlessly (this, 'because He was before me,' I would say), for whoever says thus is devoid of understanding." Is it not known whether the Word existed prior to the nature of John? And moreover, if he wished to speak about the existence of the Word of God according to your interpretation, would it have been right for him to say, "And because He existed before me, He is before me," and not to say, "He existed before me, because He is before me"? Because all those things which came into existence, came into existence not because they existed, but because of the opposite, i.e., because they came into existence, they exist. And again, if he wished to say this, he ought to have said, "That One who comes after me was before me, because He existed before me." So then John did not say this, "He was before me," about the eternal coming-into-existence of the Word. For the Word does not "become" and is not created. But this is the meaning of his interpretation,
for this is what he said: "After me He comes, and He was before me, because He existed before me," i.e., even if I had come earlier and preached to you, you should not think that I am greater than He, but that He is greater than I in greatness and honour. And in all of this I am less than He, so far that "I am not even worthy to carry His shoes" (Mt 3:11c). However, they retort again and ask if it is thus he was intending to say, "'After me He comes and he was prior to Him,' and not 'He came into existence'!" And Joannes used to say to them: "Scripture is wont to speak of the things to come (the future) like these things of the Hebrew scriptures, such as 'As the lamb was led to slaughter' (Ac 8:32c; Is 53:7), and 'they pierced my hands and feet' (Ps 22:17c) and 'he in whom I trusted ate my food, and acted very deceitfully against me' (Ps 41:9b; Jn 13:18c), etc."

"And from His fullness we have all received,"
i.e., Philoxenus, then, and others with him ask, "Is this also the word of John the Baptist?" But Mar Joannes says, "This is John the Evangelist's." We adhere to Mar Joannes's, then.

"And from His fullness we have all received,"
i.e., He is the fullness of others. He is the One received and not the recipient. He is the One granted and not the partaker. And moreover while He grants and fills others, He does not end lacking of His fullness. For example, the font of fire: ten thousand lamps and torches are lighted from it while it is not diminished. So He, the Word who became flesh, granted from His fullness to others while not diminishing.

"And from His fullness we have all received," i.e., you should not think that only we twelve apostles, who were intimate with Him, received from His fullness, but also John the Baptist who baptized Him, and the 72 (A Lk 10:1) others, and the 300 (A ??) others who believed, and the 3,000 (Ac 2:41) others, and the 5,000 (Jn 6:10) others, and the 500 (A 1 Cor 15:6) others with great numbers of the Jews and multitudes of believers. From His fullness all of us, we and they, have received. So then one should not think about us of the Twelve that in adulation we testify about Him, for behold, all of the other companions testify the same. And what did we receive from His fullness? And this is evident: we received the Holy Spirit, that One by whom we perform mighty deeds and miracles, and also
we prophesy.

Moreover he goes on to say another thing about that which we received from His fullness: "And grace instead of grace," i.e., which grace instead of which? This is evident: instead of that ancient grace, this new grace. By grace, therefore, the Jews were ransomed from the slavery of Egypt and Pharaoh, and were led to the land of the promise (by grace and not by means of their works). And by grace we were redeemed from the sin represented by Egypt and from the Adversary represented by Pharaoh, and were summoned to the kingdom of heaven (and not by our works). And however, even if there are two graces, yet this grace which we have received from the fullness of the Word is much greater and higher than that which the Hebrews received from God through Moses. On the one hand, because the grace which redeemed them (those then who were sinning) was stoning them and killing and doing way with (them). But on the other hand, the grace which redeemed us, because we sin did not stone and kill us, but granted to us an opportunity for repentance. So then the grace which we received is greater and higher than that which they received. Thus there are two laws: first, that ancient
one which they received; but second, this new one which we received from the fullness of the Word, as Paul said, "The law of the Spirit of life has set you free from the Law" (Ro 8:2). And this law of ours is higher than theirs. Thus it established that there are two sons: one theirs, and the other ours. And they also were called sons of God, like this, "My son is the firstborn of Israel" (Ex 4:22b). And like this, "All of you are sons of the Most High" (Ps 82:6b). But it established this: our sons are greater and higher than theirs. Because theirs, on the one hand, were in name only; ours, on the other hand, were both by the very deed of regeneration here (on earth), and also in unspeakable rewards. So there are also two temples, as well as two sacrifices, and two faiths, and two circumcisions, and two righteousnesses, as the Apostle said, "In the righteousness of the Law I was blameless" (Php 3:6b), and "from faith to faith" (Ro 1:17b), etc. But all of these things which we received from the fullness of the Word who became flesh are higher and greater than those which they received

[(Quire) "Gamel" (Note:) "Collated"]

from God through Moses.
And after wondering at the greatness of these things which he was given, he says: "Because the Law was given through Moses, but truth and grace came into being through Jesus the Messiah," i.e., therefore John the Baptist and John the Evangelist proceeded to the hearers with a higher knowledge concerning the Messiah. The Baptist, on the one hand, compared Him with himself and said, "He is before me" (Jn 1:15d, 30a), and "greater is the Exalted" (Jn 1:30b). But the Evangelist, on the other hand, compared Him with Moses and said, "He is greater and higher than he" (A ??). Since up to this point they would have been short of the glory and high estate of the Messiah, if the Evangelist had compared the person of the Messiah with the person of Moses, he compared these marvels which came to pass through Moses and through the Messiah with each other, so that when these marvels were revealed and made known, the ungrateful Jews should have had the proper opinion concerning the Messiah. And therefore He established the Law in one of the elect, and truth and grace in another of the elect. Thus this is what was granted in one of the elect, and that is what came to be in another of the elect: "The Law was granted
through Moses; truth and grace came into being through Jesus the Messiah" (Jn 1:17). Now we shall see how the Law, which is a type, was granted through Moses, and how truth and grace came into being through Jesus the Messiah. And we say that God said to Moses, "Say to the sons of Israel: 'Take a lamb for every house and slay it'" (A Ex 12:1-6). But the Messiah is not so, but He is the substance of the sacrifice and the offering on our behalf to the Father. And Moses, on the one hand, stretched forth his hands upon the mountain by means of a staff, while Aaron and Hur were supporting them (A Ex 17:12). But, on the other hand, the Messiah stretched forth His hands upon the cross, and the two robbers with Him were in the likeness of Aaron and Hur. And Moses, on the one hand, said, "Cursed be all who do not do everything which is written in this Law" (Dt 27:26; Ga 3:10c). But on the other hand, "the Messiah became a curse for us" (Ga 3:10d). (So) you see how the Law was granted through Moses and how truth and grace came into being through Jesus the Messiah. Thus this is what was granted and that is what came into being: on the one hand, this, "was granted," is spoken about a certain servant, that something was granted through him.
But on the other hand, that, "came into being," is of God and the Lord and the King, that something came into being through Him over which He had the authority: "You should not be angry with your brother in vain" (A Mt 5:22), and "your sins are forgiven you" (Mk 2:5c; Mt 9:2d; Lk 5:20c). And which grace did we have through Jesus the Messiah? And we say: the birth of renewal and adoption, and the gift of the Holy Spirit; and moreover the repentence which followed sin, and the rest like these. So then as the truth which was granted through the Messiah is higher than the 'typological' Law which was granted through Moses, and as the grace which the Messiah gave is greater than the justice which was granted through Moses, so the Messiah who is the Lord is higher and more exalted than Moses who is the servant.

"Because the Law was granted through Moses, but truth and grace came into being through Jesus the Messiah," i.e., because this is said, "We received the prior grace of the Law which was granted through Moses from God, and this other grace which the Messiah bestowed upon us," because on the one hand, Moses did not grant this, but God granted it through him; but on
the other hand, the Messiah Himself gave it. And Moses—the model was granted through him, or, that is to say, the 'typological' Law; but the Messiah granted truth. And on the one hand, Moses—the justice of the Law was granted through him; but on the other hand, the Messiah granted the grace of the Gospel. So then Moses is the servant and the Messiah the Lord. And that one, on the one hand, is a creature, but this One the Creator. And this is evident from a comparison of the things which were granted through the hands of that One from God, who granted this by His own authority.

"No one has ever seen God," i.e., the message of the Evangelist is bringing good tidings here, that he is not agreeing with those old things which have been written rashly, in this which was written there: God appeared to Adam and he spoke with Him, and he also heard the sound of His footsteps (A Gn 3). And again of Abraham it was written that "God appeared to him like a man" (A Gn 12:7). And to Jacob He appeared while he was resting upon the foot of the ladder, and because of this he was called Israel, because he saw God (A Gn 28). And He spoke with Moses, not face to face, and (Moses) said to Him, "Show me your glory and under-
standing" (Ex 33:18b). And He appeared to Isaiah while He was sitting upon the throne (Is 6:1), again to Ezekiel upon the chariot of cherubs (Eze 10), and to Amos while standing by the wall which is adamant (Am 7:7), and to Micah while sitting upon His throne (Mic 1:2), and to Daniel like the Ancient of Days (Dn 7:13, 22). But the Evangelist said: "No one has ever seen God," and we say that these are not contrary to each other, but are two truths. That [one was written] in the Old Testament--they had seen God. This one [was written in the Gospel,] "No one has ever seen God," because this which the Evangelist said, he said [about] His nature. For in truth, the nature of God is invisible and incomprehensible not only to men who are corporeal, but even to angels and souls and demons who are spiritual. But they testified about His nature which is invisible that He appeared in a multitude of many forms to the prophets. For if He had a natural form, He would have been seen in it always, like a man who is seen always in one natural form. But that which is written in the Old Testament, that God appeared to them, is also true. But he showed that the revelation is not in various forms as they were endeavouring to see it.
For the revelation concerning this was called the revelation which makes known that something which was hidden has been revealed. For if He was not hidden, this would not suit Him, that He was to be revealed. And because He was hidden and unknown in His nature and in His essence, when He appeared, he called Him the visible revelation, because He did not appear in one way (only), but variously in several ways. And about this we mention His visible forms. So then, there are two truths: this which the Evangelist said, "He did not appear to a man." And that which the Old Testament said, "He appeared to men." On the one hand, because He did not appear to a man in His nature, He is invisible. And because He appeared in His revelations, He is revealed in those things in which He wishes to be revealed. But if one retorts and says, "Our Lord said, 'Blessed are those who are pure in their heart: they shall see God' (Mt 5:8); and again, 'Their angels have always seen the face of my Father who is in heaven'" (Mt 18:10c), we say that he spoke concerning the perception of the mind, or that is to say, the continuous musing which is in it. But again if one says, "Behold, Paul said: 'God appeared to the angels'" (1 Tm 3:16d),
we say that He appeared to them in the flesh when He became a man. So then, a man has never seen God. And therefore, on the one hand, men who say that here the Evangelist calls God, God generally who is Three Holy Substances, their interpretation remains true, too. Others, on the other hand, say that here he names God, God the Father, while their interpretation remains true as well, because the nature of His divinity is not visible to men, nor even His essence.

"No one has ever seen God," i.e., indeed, some say that it is evident that here the Evangelist calls God, God the Father, from these proofs: because he goes on to say after this, "God's only One, He who is in the bosom of His Father, He tells us" (Jn 1:18b). And just as the Son tells us what pertains to us, so also the same Son appeared to those ancestors in various forms. This is evident because the Father does not have another substance, because the Father is the cause of the Word, the Mediator between Him and things made and created. But the Son, because He is begotten from the Father and the Father is His cause, it was suitable for Him to become the Mediator between God the Father

1Following Moody, op. cit.
and mankind, that by means of various forms He might be revealed and become visible to them. And now finally this same Son also has become flesh and has become man and has become the Mediator between God and men. And just as He who appeared earlier in various forms is not less than the Father, so the One who was revealed at last and who became a man is not less than the Father, or allows the opinion that the Son has another nature than His. And as they do not think the Father and the Son are of two natures, in this regard, that One begot and One was begotten; and so not that the Father sent and the Son was sent; and the Son was seen and the Father remained invisible; and the Father remained spiritual and the Son took flesh; and the Father willed and the Son obeyed the will of the Father, making Him another nature. But the two of them are one nature thus and in the beginning. And moreover, in the beginning of creation God said: "Let there be light, and there was light" (Gn 1:3); and, "Let there be firmament" (Gn 1:6b), and it was so. And on the one hand, the voice is the Father, but on the other hand, the doer is the Son, not because the command of the Father was unable to bring the natures into being or afterward
that they were not set in order and established, but that by this model he should reveal this about the Trinity of Holy Substances: He brings about faith in Him and drives out the polytheism of the Gentiles and brings to nought the foolish pre-eminence of the Jews.

30a But again, the Father did not take flesh and was not born from the virgin. For if He took flesh and was born from the virgin, how did Scripture refer to Him? It called Him the Son. Behold, He is the Father. And yet it had called Him the Word. Behold, He is not another, as the Word from Himself. But just as it was seemly that He is the One who is, and the Son, that He should take flesh and be born from the virgin, so it was seemly for the Son that He also should appear in (different) forms to our forefathers through revelation. But again it is evident that the Son appeared to our forebearers through revelations because the Son Himself said to the Jews, "Abraham, your father, earnestly desired to see my day, and he saw and was glad" (Jn 8:56). And because He said to the disciples, "For Amen, I say to you: many prophets and righteous men yearned to see something which you have seen, and they did not see, and to hear something which you have heard, and
they did not hear" (Mt 13:17). But because the prophets and righteous men first heard and saw the forms of the Son through revelations, they yearned to see His incarnation. Again because they heard His words through His revelations and forms, they yearned to hear words about His incarnation. And again the Evangelist himself, when he wished to show that it is the Son who appeared through revelation to the prophet Isaiah in the Temple, said concerning Jesus thus, "And after all of these signs He worked before the Jews, they did not believe in Him (Jn 12:37), that the word of Isaiah should be fulfilled which he said (Jn 12:38a), 'Their eyes have been blinded and their heart has been darkened, (so) that they shall not see with their eyes and understand in their heart, and return and I shall heal them.' These things Isaiah said when he beheld His glory and spoke about Him" (Jn 12:40, 41). And again it is evident that it is the Son who appeared in revelations and forms to the fathers, from that stone which Daniel saw which was not hewn by hands (Dn 2:34), since that stone was the Messiah Himself. And the mountain which was hewn by Him is the family of the house of David. But he said that it was without hands because without seed
He took flesh from the family of the house of David. But again the image of His wound and His misery is that stone: they are the forms of the idols which they think are gods, those which Satan cast and set up in the world. So then indeed the Son is the One who appeared in forms and revelations to the prophets and to the forefathers and to the righteous men. And He was also revealed upon Mount Sinai and gave the Law to Moses, as the pious Severus said in that chant which he composed about the Mother of God, "For the Word of God the Father is that One who descended upon the top of Mount Sinai, who imparted the Law to the people." And from now on with regard to the two laws: that old one and this new one—the same Son gave them. So also with reference to these two graces, concerning which the Evangelist said, "We received grace instead of grace" (Jn 1:16b). So then indeed this is evident that all these revelations which came to the fathers were of the Son, since the Son is the Word and the only One, and the Messiah and Jesus, who was begotten from the Father eternally. And again He is the One who was begotten from Mary temporally. And also the Holy Spirit was revealed from time to time in forms, but was
revealed upon the Son in the Jordan in the form of a dove (Mt 1:10); and was revealed upon the apostles in the upper-room in the form of tongues of fire (Ac 2:3). So this which the Evangelist said: "No one has ever seen God," i.e., speaks about the substances of the Father as these famous and learned men say, and their interpretation is true and it also stands acceptable.

"God's only One, He who is in the bosom of His Father, He told it," i.e., and what is the bosom God the Father has? The Father! For the bosom of the body is a veil. And yet why does he call it "the bosom of the Father"? He is in the bosom because He is the Word of the Father; and He made known that He was equal to Him in substance. And he says this, "God's only One, He who was from the substance of the Father, and was equal to Him in nature, He told us." But again, "in the bosom of the Father" veils the appearance of the Father and the Son and the Spirit. And he says this, "God's only One' who was revealed in the flesh and abode in that which is unseen and is invisible like the Father, 'He told us' about the concealment and invisib-
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bility of the Father." For as someone who is set in the bosom is concealed from view, so the existence of the divinity of the Son was concealed from view, that which was revealed in the flesh to the eyes of the body. But again "in the bosom" made this clear, that the Father was limiting the Son when He became flesh without being changed from this, that He is God. And he says this, "'the only One of God' when 'He was in the bosom' and 'told us,' was not changed and was not limited from this: He is God infinitely. But when He discoursed with us and spoke in the flesh upon the earth, He was also in heaven in the bosom of the Father, His begetter, and He was in everything infinitely."

Again, (it is) because "the bosom" is the relationship which restores and is inseparable from Him. For the bosom is joined to that One to whom the bosom belongs always. But this which was requited seventy times seven in their bosom, the reproach whereby they insulted you, the Lord, i.e., He made Him their reproach which is not (taken) from them, but which is joined to them always. And the Evangelist says this, "The divine, only Son who is not separate from His father, but is united to Him eternally, 'He told us.'" But
again "in the bosom," the Son showed us the fidelity and the accuracy of those things which He told us. And he says this: "'God's only One, He told us' accurately and truly about those things of the Father, as He said, 'No one knows the Son but the Father, nor does anyone know the Father but the Son'" (Mt 11:27b). So then all of these condemn those who have not received Him. And these things indeed are about that "bosom." But again, it is asked, "What did this only Son tell us?" And we say: about the concealment and invisibility of His Father. But again He told us that God is Three Holy Substances. And this is evident from that word which He spoke, "Just as the Father has life in Himself, so He also granted to the Son to have life in Himself" (Jn 5:26), and that Spirit which proceeded from the Father. Again, He said to the disciples; "Go, therefore, make disciples of all peoples and baptize them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28:19b) into this true and orthodox faith. But again He told us, then, that He is God and He is one and He is eternal. These things were spoken to Moses and the prophets, and behold, although it is their Scriptures, nevertheless that (word) that God is three substances,
Father and Son and Holy Spirit, was not said by revelation but (by) that only One "who is in the bosom of His Father." And some, therefore, say as from the authority of the Greeks, so they read this text. "The only Son, He who is in the bosom of His Father, He told us" about the secrets of the Father to which he gives the name, "bosom."
FACSIMILES
Finally, we present six facsimile pages which serve to illustrate various aspects of MS Add. 1971 (II), including marginal inserts and the use of Greek. The folios which follow are:

1b, page 70
8a, page 83
8b, page 84
13b, page 94
15b, page 98
16b, page 100
APPENDIX A

In the Houghton Library of Harvard University we find a manuscript containing commentaries by Moshé bar Kēpha including one on the Gospel of John. James T. Clemons¹ describes the MS in this manner:

"74.3967, 29 (29) Moses Bar Kepha. Commentaries, including John. Paper; a.i.a." (additional information available).²

According to personal unpublished notes of Professor Arthur Vööbus, this MS bears a date of A.G. 1809/10 which is A.D. 1498/99. We present here the material from this MS for "Chapter 27" of the introduction to the commentary and the diagram concerning "One" and "First," pages 8 and 9 as noted on the MS or folios 1a and 1b of quire 2. As noted on the transcription, the material in this MS is identical to Add. 1971 (II) to line 23 of the Chapter 27 material, then the two diverge, and then preserve an identical tradition regarding the

---


²Ibid., p. 238.
The text is identical to MS Add. 1971 (II) to this point. It appears that a scribe has altered Add. 1971 (II) by inserting material from Brother Theodosius (see above, page 152), and that this MS preserves Moshe bar Kēphā's comments.
خالى
Chapter twenty-seven: In how many ways was the expression \( \text{τὸν Λόγον} \) used; and how did John interpret it and apply it to the Word of God and say: "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a)? Now, the expression, \( \text{τὸν Λόγον} \), he explains in two ways: first he explains the origin (\( \text{αἴων} \)), and the beginning (\( \text{αἰῶνι} \)), and the first beginning (\( \text{αἰῶνιος} \)). But in a second way he explains: eternally (\( \text{αἰωνίως} \)). On the one hand, that he explains (in the sense of) \( \text{ἀρχὴν} \) ('from the beginning') is evident from what our Lord said in the Gospel, "Have you not read, 'He who made (them), from the beginning (\( \text{κτίσας} \)) He made them male and female!'" (Mt 19:4b)? And again, "he who from the beginning (\( \text{κτίσας} \)) was a killer of man" (Jn 8:44b). And also Paul said, "From the beginning (\( \text{κτίσας} \)) you established the foundations of the earth" (He 1:10a). Therefore these uses of the expression, \( \text{τὸν Λόγον} \), all mean 'from the beginning.' Again, that this is \( \text{τὸν Λόγον} \) ('from the beginning') is evident because Scripture says, "He who summoned the generations from the beginning (\( \text{κτίσας} \))" (Is 41:4a); and because it is said concerning the Gentiles,
"The King of Assyria made them dwell in Samaria, since 'from the beginning,' (אֲדֹנָי יָשָׁב בְּשָׁם), namely, since they dwelt in the land, they did not know the custom of its god" (2 Kgs 17:25-26). But again it is evident that he explains (it as) הֲלֹא יָשָׁב ('without beginning') because the pious Gregory the Theologian [of Nazianzus] says in the First Discourse concerning the Son thus, "For who is it who is older than He who is from the beginning?" It is here that he should cite this of the Son, "He is without beginning or He is not at all." For because he said, "There is nothing older than He who is from the beginning," he proved that this is, "without beginning," and there is nothing antecedent to him. And the pious Mar Joannes also confirms this when he explains what the Evangelist John said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), when he says in his discourse thus:¹ "On the other hand, לִבְּשָׁם ('In the beginning') does not mean anything other than this: He exists forever and is eternal." And moreover since he commends John in another place, he understood why he said, "From this consider how far the origin of his word is drawn up beyond your understanding, and how

¹The two MSS diverge at this point.
far it is removed from your mind: His Son is beyond your mind, I would say, higher than all creatures; above the earth and higher than the waters and the heavens; higher than the angels and the cherubim and seraphim; higher than the thrones and rulers and leaders." So then I have made known that the expression, \( \text{\textcircled{1}} \), is translated in two ways: first, \( \text{\textcircled{2}} \) and \( \text{\textcircled{3}} \); and second, \( \text{\textcircled{4}} \). And on one hand, Moses the Prophet takes this expression, \( \text{\textcircled{5}} \), in the way of \( \text{\textcircled{6}} \). And therefore, when he says, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gn 1:1), this means that at the origin of these bodily and visible creatures, God created heaven and earth. But on the other hand, John the Evangelist took the expression, \( \text{\textcircled{7}} \), in this way: eternally. And he applied it to the Word of God. And therefore when he said, "In the beginning was the Word" (Jn 1:1a), this meant that the Word was eternal. And since this is good, this can be taken about him in the second way as we have shown through God. These are the twenty-seven chapters which ought to be placed before the Commentary of the Gospel of the blessed John.

The senses of the soul are: Male-mind, under-
standing, thought, discernment of conscience; and Fe-
male-wisdom, knowledge, thought, judgment, intelligence.

There are four titles that partly resemble each other and partly do not resemble (each other). Partly-

*He who has been the Cause and Beginning of every rational creature and of its soul also.

Sometimes it is found alone, like this, "One of you betrays me" (Jn 13:21). And there was no second or third betrayer but he alone.

One:
- And sometimes (it is found) with others, like this: one thousand, three thousands.

True: There is one who has a second, like this: the first Adam and the Second Adam.

First:
- False: first one, then two. This first one arose out of and was familiar with the second kind of one, and therefore he resembles him in this way.
APPENDIX B

The diagram found on folio 8a in Add. 1971 (II) also appears in close parallel in a commentary by Dionysius Bar Salibi in a MS in the Trinity College Library, Dublin (MS 1512, Dionysius (Jacob) Barsalibi, Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelia. A.Gr. 1509; A.D. 1198.) On page 476, column b we find:

---

تُوَّجَ لِأَلْدَاءِ أَكَفَّارَهُمْ مَعَ مَذَابٍ أَخْرَىٰ.

ذَٰلِكَ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ۖ ۖ
There is the division concerning "one" and the rest. There are four kinds of titles which sometimes resemble each other and sometimes do not.

Sometimes it is found alone, like this, "One of you betrays me" (Jn 13:21), since there was no second or third betrayer beside Judas.

**ONE:**

And sometimes (it is found) with others, like this: One thousand, two thousands, three thousands.

True: there is one who has a second, like this: the first Adam.

**FIRST:**

False: (there is) one, then shortly (there are) two. And this is from the second kind of one: This first one arose out of and was familiar with him. And therefore he resembles him in this way.
SOME NOTES ON THESE DIAGRAMS

When we compare and contrast the three diagrams we notice the following: 1.) The title is identical in all three diagrams (in the case of Add. 1971(II), what remains is identical). 2.) The two Moshe bar Kepha MSS contain a modifying or explanatory phrase regarding the one who is the "Cause and Beginning" for the title; the Dublin MS of Dionysius bar Salibi does not contain this line. 3.) In the "One" section, the Dionysius bar Salibi tradition identifies the betrayer specifically as Judas; the three agree in all other aspects of the first line. 4.) The Dionysius bar Salibi MS adds "two thousands" to the second line concerning "ONE." 5.) Under the "FIRST" heading the Dionysius bar Salibi MS speaks only of "the first Adam;" the Moshe bar Kepha MSS refer also to the "second Adam." 6.) The widest divergence under the "False" contrast comes in the Dionysius bar Salibi MS which adds: "And this is from the second kind of one." 7.) The rest of the example is identical in all three MSS.

Regarding the placement of this diagram in the
respective MSS, we note that it is found at the end of the Introductory "chapters" in Moshê bar Kēphā, but that Dionysius bar Salibi places it in the midst of his treatment of John 1:1. In the latter it is marked out with two-colour outlining, an indication that this was a special body of tradition not specifically related to the commentary itself.

It is of interest to note that Dudley Loftus\(^1\) in his Latin translation of the Dionysius bar Salibi MS does not treat this diagram at all and does not note that he has omitted this diagram. Was he at a loss to know what to make of this?

"Principium tripliciter distinguetur, primo principium eorum quae consequuntur, non tamen existens causa eorum omnium (e.g.) accipiuntur primitiae ab a reis aut torcularibus et primitiae vestras tribuite Domino..."

In the Dionysius bar Salibi MS in Syriac we find:
"The beginning is divided into three parts: the division concerning 'one' and the rest," after the diagram and

---

\(^{1}\)MS Fell 7 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford:
"Dionysii Bar-Salibaei expositio, α. in Lucae evang., fol. 1; Ρ. in Joannis, fol. 105," in the Catalogue of MSS in the Bodleian Library, col. 413.
another example, the MS continues: "The origin of these things which follow it..."

This omits the diagram under consideration here (although Loftus' translation is of the Dublin MS of Dionysius bar Salibi which we have cited above).

What does this diagram try to convey? It is contrasting the term "one" with the term "first," especially as these apply to the Word. The first example in the diagram seems to explain "one" as "loneness," or "singularity," or "soleness." The second example speaks of "one" as a part of a series, or as the number is used normally: thus the "one thousand, three thousand" example. In discussing "first," however, the diagram distinguishes between acceptable and not acceptable uses of this term. Acceptable usage of "first" may be in contrast to "last" (or "second") as in the example (from Paul) concerning the first Adam and the last Adam.

This conjures up the whole imagery of sin coming by one man contrasted with salvation coming by one man, and "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." The usage of "first" which is not acceptable according to the diagram is in a progression or a growing out of a "first" by a "second" and a "third"
and so forth.

Prior to this diagram in Dionysius bar Salibi, he discusses the relationship of "one" and "first" with an example drawn from the construction of a building: "For example, a man may place a stone into a building. This stone alone is called 'the original.' But when he places a second stone, this stone is now called 'the first'" (Column 475d; the diagram appears in columns 476a and 476b). It seems to me that this a related to the "true" or "acceptable" usage of "first" in the diagram, and to the imagery from Paul noted above.

Again, the diagrams all occur in the context of a discussion of the meaning of "in the beginning." It would seem that the diagram was meant to aid this discussion in some way. But how? In pondering the diagrams and their contexts, we have gained the impression that the uniqueness of the Word, of Christ, lies behind the diagrams. But neither author and none of the MSS provide a key by way of an introductory comment to unlock the meaning behind the diagram. We believe that this diagram was not original with either Moshē bar Kēphā or Dionysius bar Salibi, but that it had become traditional to include it with commentaries on the
the Gospel of John in the Syrian commentary tradition. Perhaps the key lies with Philoxenus or some other earlier commentator whose work is still unknown to us.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:19-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2:12-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3:1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3:22-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4:1-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4:43-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5:1-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6:1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6:16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6:22-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7:1-8:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9:1-10:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10:22-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11:1-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11:45-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12:1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12:4-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12:12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12:20-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13:1-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>14:1-17:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15:1-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15:18-19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>16:19-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>17:19-31-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18:19:39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>20:1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20:19-21:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the chapter and verse equivalents according to the Revised Standard Version Bible for the thirty divisions which Moshe bar Kēphā lists on FF. 6b - 7a (pp. 148-150).
APPENDIX D

Because Moshe bar Kephah attributes his second tradition about how John came to write his Gospel to Eusebius and this is not identifiable in Eusebius or in any other of the writers who are known to preserve this source-theory, we wish to present some evidence regarding the authorship of the Gospel of John. Our discussion will not be exhaustive: the standard commentaries on John each have a detailed treatment of the authorship of John. But we do present all relevant material from Eusebius' works. Our study has been guided and aided by Charteris, and his presentation of early citations regarding John.

First, we present the sections in Eusebius which bear on this subject.

Ecclesiastical History, III xxiv, 6, pp. 251-253:


2All quotations from Eusebius are taken from The Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I, Kirsopp Lake, trans., Cambridge, Mass.: 1953 (1926); and Vol. II, J. E. L.
"Matthew had first preached to Hebrews, and when he was on the point of going to others he transmitted in writing in his native language the Gospel according to himself, and thus supplied by writing the lack of his own presence to those from whom he was sent, and Mark and Luke had already published the Gospels according to them, but John, it is said, used all the time a message which was not written down, and at last took to writing for the following cause. The three gospels which had been written down before were distributed to all including himself; it is said that he welcomed them and testified to their truth but said that there was only lacking to the narrative the account of what was done by Christ at first and at the beginning of the preaching. The story is surely true."

This appears closer to the first tradition cited by Moshē bar Kēphā (see pages 142-144).

Ecclesiastical History, III xxiv, 8, pp. 253-255:

"It is at least possible to see that the three evangelists related only what the Saviour did during one year after John the Baptist had been put in prison and that they stated this at the beginning of their narrative. At any rate, after the forty days' fast, and the temptation which followed Matthew fixes the time described in his own writing by saying that 'hearing that John had been betrayed, he retreated' from Judaea 'into Galilee.' Similarly Mark says, 'and after John was betrayed Jesus came into Galilee.' And Luke, too, makes a similar observation before beginning the acts of Jesus saying that Herod
added to the evil deeds which he had done by 'shutting up John in prison.' They say accordingly that for this reason the apostle John was asked to relate in his own gospel the period passed over in silence by the former evangelists and the things done during it by the Saviour...."

"...(that is to say, the events before the imprisonment of the Baptist), and that he indicated this at one time by saying, 'this beginning of miracles did Jesus,' at another by mentioning the Baptist in the midst of the acts of Jesus as at that time still baptizing at Aenon near Salem, and that he makes this plain by saying, 'for John was not yet cast into prison.' Thus John in the course of his gospel relates what Christ did before the Baptist had been thrown into prison, but the other three evangelists narrate the events after the imprisonment of the Baptist. If this be understood the gospels no longer appear to disagree, because that according to John contains the first of the acts of Christ and the others the narrative of what he did at the end of the period, and it will seem probable that John passed over the genealogy of our Saviour according to the flesh, because it had been already written out by Matthew and Luke, and began with the description of his divinity since this had been reserved for him by the Divine Spirit as for one greater than they."

Again this seems closer to the first account of Moshe bar Kephā referred to above.

Ecclesiastical History, V viii, p. 455, preserves a tradition from Irenaeus:

"Now Irenaeus was one of these, so let us quote his words, and in the first place those which refer to the sacred Gospels, as follows: 'Now Matthew published among the
Hebrews a written gospel also in their own tongue, while Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome and founding the church. But after their death Mark also, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself handed down to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter, and Luke also, who was a follower of Paul, put down in a book the gospel which was preached by him. Then John, the disciple of the Lord, who had even rested on his breast, himself also gave forth the gospel, while he was living at Ephesus in Asia."

Clement of Alexandria is cited at Ecclesiastical History, VI xiv, 7, p. 49:

"But that John, last of all, conscious that the outward facts had been set forth in the Gospels, was urged on by his disciples, and, divinely moved by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel. This is Clement's account."

This seems closer to the account under consideration, particularly in the "was urged by his disciples."

Finally Origen is quoted at Ecclesiastical History VI xxv 7:

"And in the fifth of his Expositions on the Gospel according to John the same reference to the epistles of the apostles: But he who was made sufficient to become a minister of the new covenant, not of the letter but of the spirit, even Paul, who fully preached the Gospel from Jerusalem and round about even unto Illyricum, did not so much as write to all the churches that he taught; and even to those to which he wrote he sent but a few lines. And Peter, on whom the Church of Christ is built, against which the gates of Hades
shall not prevail, has left one acknowledged epistle, and, it may be, a second also; for it is doubted. Why need I speak of him who leaned back on Jesus' breast, John, who has left behind one Gospel, confessing that he could write so many that even the world itself could not contain them; and he wrote also the Apocalypse, being ordered to keep silence and not to write the voices of seven thunders? He has left also an epistle of a very few lines, and, it may be, a second and a third; for not all say that these are genuine. Only, the two of them together are not a hundred lines long."

We also present the tradition preserved in Canon Muratori regarding John and his Gospel:

"The fourth gospel is by John, one of the disciples. When his fellow-disciples and his bishops exhorted him he said, Today fast with me for three days, and let us recount to each other whatever may be revealed to each of us. That same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should write down all things under his name, as they all called them to mind. So although various points are taught in the several books of the gospels, yet it makes no difference to the faith of believers, since all things in all of them are declared by one supreme Spirit, concerning [our Lord's] nativity, his passion, his resurrection, his converse with his disciples, and his twofold advent, the first in despised lowliness, which has taken place, and the second glorious with kingly power, which is yet to come. What wonder then if John so boldly sets forth each point, saying of himself in his epistle, What we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things we have written? For so he avows himself to be not only an eye-witness and hearer but also a writer of
all the wonderful works of the Lord in order.\textsuperscript{\textordmasculine 1}

Of all of these witnesses Clement and Canon Mura-tori, with references to John's writing at the urging of other apostles, come closest to Moshe bar Keph\textsuperscript{\textordmasculine 2}a's narrative. But none are as detailed or involve a personal visit by Peter and Paul with John in Ephesus which occasioned his writing. Accordingly we conclude that the material identified as coming from Eusebius is not attributable to him on the basis of our present knowledge of Eusebius; and that Moshe bar Keph\textsuperscript{\textordmasculine 2}a preserves a very interesting and as yet unidentified tradition concerning the authorship of the Gospel of John.\textsuperscript{\textordmasculine 2}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item But see the Additional Note above, pp. 66a-c.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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