FOLIA ORIENTALIA 61 (2024)
DOI 10.24425/for.2024.152392

Anna-Simona Barbara Üzel
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany | asb.uezel@fu-berlin.de

Bar Ṣalībī's Treatise on the Nestorians: Preliminary Remarks

Abstract This paper provides an overview of the treatise by Dionysios Yaʿqūḇ Bar Ṣalībī towards the Nestorians, illustrating a general overview of the content of the disputation. The objective of this contribution is to analyse the disparities in structure and content between the two tractates, both of which date back to 1207 and 1502, respectively. The examination will also consider the quotations used by the author, with a focus on the similarities and differences between the two manuscripts.

Keywords Dionysios Yaʿqūḇ Bar Ṣalībī, Syriac Renaissance, Nestorians, polemic-apologetic writing, Christological disputes; Peshitta

1 Introduction

The book of polemical writings (ܟܬܘܒܐ ܕܥܪܘܥܘܬܐ *kṯoḇo ḏ-ʾorūʿūṯo*) by Dionysios Yaʿqūḇ Bar Ṣalībī[1] (d. 1171) contains a collection of polemic-apologetic treatises against Muslims, Jews, Chalcedonians, Nestorians, and Armenians, and has become known to western scholars mainly through the manuscript collection and work of Alphonse Mingana (ca. 1878–1937) (Ebied 2011).

This significant corpus of polemical writings by Bar Ṣalībī represents one of the most extensive collections of its kind among Syrians. The work was authored by Bar Ṣalībī at the request of his own community and on his own initiative (Ms. SOP, fol. 303r).[2] The anthology can be seen as an expression of the author's faith and denomination, as a reaction to other confessional polemics, or as a traditional work of the time, which includes and reflects the last sci-

[1] I am adhering to the orthography of the 'Gorgias Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage: Electronic Edition' (Kiraz 2011), to the extent that it can be ascertained.

[2] 'Damascus Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate 160, 4/35', henceforth Ms. SOP.

© 2024 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

entifically recognised heyday of Syriac Christians of all denominations.[3] The treatise *Against the Nestorians*[4] which will be of interest here, consist of two *memre* ('tractates' or 'discourses', sg. *memro*).[5] To date, beside a short analysis of the treatise against the Nestorians by François Nau (1909: 298–320) which contains also some excerpts in French translation, neither an edition nor translation of this treatise is available.

2 Manuscripts

The manuscript 'Damascus Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate 160, 4/35' (previously 4/35) (henceforth Ms. SOP) serves as the basis for this study. It is compared to the 'Deir Zaʿfaran 97/1' manuscript (henceforth Ms. Z).[6]

2.1 'Damascus Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate 160, 4/35' (Ms. SOP)

The manuscript 'Damascus Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate 160, 4/35' is dated to approximately 1207.[7] The copyist of this manuscript is identified as Simon (ܫܡܥܘܢ Šimʿūn) and is known to have included himself on the final page of the

---

[3] The so-called Syriac Renaissance is variously categorised in the centuries 1000–1300, as evidenced by the works of Barṣwam (2012), Baumstark (1922), Wright (1895) and Wetzel (1995: 128).

[4] In this paper, the term 'Nestorians' will be utilised in accordance with Bar Ṣalībī's usage in his polemical writing to refer to followers of the Church of the East, respectively the Assyrian Church of the East (Winkler 2003: 11–12), as they are known today. In reference to Bar Ṣalībī's own community, the term ܝܥܩܘܒܝܐ *yaʿqūḇoye* 'Jacobites' will be utilised, without delving into their self- and external perceptions. It should be noted that even though he does not use the term Jacobites for his own community, the term *suryoye* Syriacs is employed in the chapters towards the ܝܘܢܝܐ *yawnoye* 'Chalcedonians' as Bar Ṣalībī named them, occasional references are made to a sentence reading: ܢܚܢ ܐܝܟ ܣܘܪܝܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܢܢܢ 'we, Syriacs reply' (Ms. SOP, fol. 75v). The term Jacobites was adopted by other Christian denominations. Tamcke (2008: 15) states that '[d]ie Bezeichnungen „Jakobiten" bzw. „Nestorianer" sind konfessionspolemisch'.

[5] I am following a simplified West Syriac transcription tradition, for example using an unmarked *o* instead of a long *a*.

[6] For any challenging words, I referred to the manuscript 'Amid Thoma Chori Bešareh (Başaranlar) 9/6 [R.5]' (henceforth Ms. ATB), a copy was supplied by monk Daniyel from the Saleh monastery in Turabdin, Turkey.

[7] In Ms. SOP, the copyist of this writing provides a list of the patriarchs from Peter (the so-called first patriarch of the Church) to the present time on fol. 334v. The list is concluded on fol. 335r with the name: ܡܝܟܐܝܠ ܕܗܘ ܝܫܘܥ ܕܒܪ ܐܚܘܗܝ ܕܡܪܝ ܡܝܟܐܝܠ ܕܡܬܩܪܐ ܡܝܟܐܝܠ ܕܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡ ܟܬܝܒ. '102: Michael, who is also known as Jesus. He is the son of the uncle of Michael, as previously mentioned.' The aforementioned Michael is understood to be Michael the Great. This patriarch was confirmed in 1518, according to the Greek calendar. A comparison of the manuscripts indicates that the other lists on the page were created by different authors. The following page continues the previous manuscript.

polemical treatise on the Nestorians (Ms. SOP, fol. 331v.). As indicated in the treatise on the Arabs/Muslims, the author also states at the conclusion of the text that he holds the priesthood.[8] The first tractate on the Nestorians begins on fol. 290v and ends on fol. 303r, while the second tractate begins on fol. 303r and ends on fol. 327r.[9] The manuscript pages are divided into two columns, each containing between 35 and 37 lines. The ancient Syriac is legible and predominantly unvocalised.

The first tractate comprises 12 chapters. The second tractate is introduced with a brief introduction (referred to as Chapter 13). In this introduction, it is reported that the first tractate against the Nestorians had already taken place at an earlier point in time. Upon his arrival in Amid, Bar Ṣalībī observed a hostile attitude on the part of the Nestorians towards the Jacobites. In the introduction to the second tractate, he asserts that the Nestorians have taken control of the churches and are exploiting the people with violence.

ܡܫܠܛܝܢ ܒܟܢܫܝܬܢ ܘܡܕܚܦܝܢ ܠܥܡܐ ܒܚܘܛܪܐ.
(Ms. SOP, fol. 303r)

They take away our churches and drive the people out with a stick.

These misdeeds may have been the reason why the congregation in Amid requested that he compose a writing to them concerning the veracity of the faith. It is unclear why he did not present them with his initial tractate instead of writing a new one. The tractate then proceeds to Chapter 1.

It would appear that Chapter 14 should follow on fol. 317r; however, it would seem that the copyist has made an error and noted Chapter 24 instead. He notices the error from Chapter 17 (Ms. SOP, fol. 319v) onwards and then returns to the correct sequence of numbers. Chapter 18 is a short chapter in which the Nestorians wrote down their beliefs and presented them to King Chosrau (II) Bar Hormizd IV. In conclusion to the twelfth chapter, the author makes the aforementioned statement (Ms. SOP, fol. 320v). It would be the thirtieth chapter if the chapters of the first tractate were included. The second tractate ends with Chapter 24 (Ms. SOP, fol. 327r.). The second tractate is followed by a debate between a Nestorian named Thomas and a Chalcedonian named deacon Parthonius (ܡܪܬܘܢܝܘܣ ܕܝܩܢܐ). This debate takes place in Alexandria. The debate begins with Chapter 25 and ends with Chapter 27 on fol. 331v.

---

[8] ...ܕܡܩܕ ܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܕ... (Ms. SOP, fol. 278v).

[9] The chapters (290v–327r) correspond to 75 manuscript pages.

2.2 ‘Deir Zaʿfaran 97/1 [CFMM 00350]’ (Ms. Z)

The manuscript ‘Deir Zaʿfaran 97/1 [CFMM 00350]’ was written in 1501/1502. The copyist of this manuscript, Aziz (ʿAzīz) from Midyat,[10] notes,

ܚܢܢ ܡܪܝ ܠܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܢܝ ܕܡܝܕܝܬ ܕܥܒܝܕ ܟܬܒܐ ܕܡܪ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܕܒܝܬ ܡܘܢܐ ܕܡܝܕܝܬ ܩܪܝܒ ܠܟܦܪܐ.
(Ms. Z, fol. 100v)

> Please, pray for me, the weak one, ʿAziz from Midyat, who wrote (the manuscript) in 1813 of the Greeks in the monastery of Mor Abrohom near the village of Midyat.

A table of contents of the two tractates against the Nestorians can be found at the beginning of Ms. Z on the folios 14r–18r. In such summaries, the content of each individual chapter is described in two sentences. Alternatively, two sentences from the respective chapter are reproduced in their original form. The manuscript pages are divided into two columns, each containing approximately 33 lines. The script is written in an ancient Syriac, which is slightly larger than that of the previous manuscript.

The initial tractate consists of twelve chapters and can be found on folios 83v and 100v. The second tractate commences with a brief introduction and comprises 28 chapters, which begin on folio 101r and conclude on folio 144r.[11] It should be noted that within the present manuscript, each chapter of the second tractate is numbered twice, once for the independent numbering of each tractate and once for the numbering of the chapters from the first tractate onwards. The numbering sequence up to the eighteenth or thirtieth chapter is unproblematic. Subsequently, the following chapter is given the same number as the previous Chapter 30 (or 18) (Ms. Z, fol. 124v).[12] In this manuscript, the debate between the Nestorian Thomas and the Chalcedonian deacon Parthonius is incorporated into the second tractate. The dispute is beginning in Chapter 29 and concludes in Chapter 31 (fol. 144r–152r).

2.3 A general overview on the book of disputative writings

As previously stated, the book of disputative writings contains disputations against Muslims, Jews, Chalcedonians, Armenians, and Nestorians. The order of these treatises can be found in different places in the various manuscripts. The complete collection of polemics is entitled the second book, as the author refers

---

[10] Midyat is a district town in the province of Mardin, located in south-eastern Turkey.

[11] The chapters (83v–144r) correspond to 142 manuscript pages.

[12] It should be noted that from this point onwards, the chapter numbering will no longer correspond with that of Ms. SOP.

to the so-called first book as the book of theology.[13]

The polemic writing on the Chalcedonians, which comprises a treatise comprising 80 chapters, was written in Melitene.[14] This information can be found in Chapter 1 of the treatise on the Chalcedonians (Ms. SOP, fol. 017v). Bar Ṣalībī remained in Melitene between the years 1156 and 1165.[15] A more precise dating of this treatise has not been preserved.

The disputation on the Arabs/Muslims (ܐܪܒܝܐ / ܡܗܬܝܢ) is comprised of three tractates, which collectively comprise 30 chapters. In the initial chapter of the inaugural tractate, the author discloses that the theological discourse, the polemic writing on the Chalcedonians and the Armenians,[16] has already been concluded. The precise date of the composition of the chapters on the Armenians remains uncertain. Rabo indicates that these were composed in Marʿaš,[17] Melitene, and Amid.[18]

The single treatise on the Jews is the briefest of polemics, comprising nine chapters. The opening of the initial chapter on the Jews provides an explanation that the treatise on the Arabs/Muslims has already been completed and that the treatise against the Jews is now being written (Ms. SOP, fol. 278v). The treatise on the Jews was composed in 1165/66, as elucidated in Chapter 8 on the Jews (Ms. SOP, fol. 289v; cf. Ebied, Malki, and Wickham 2020: 12).

The initial tractate on the Nestorians was also composed in Melitene (Ms. Z, fol. 015r), although no more precise date is provided. As indicated in the introductory remarks to the treatise in question, the second tractate was composed in

---

[13] In this treatise, Bar Ṣalībī addresses theological treatises, the sacramentals, and the elements (see Rabo 2019: 39).

[14] Melitene, Syr. ܡܠܛܝܢܐ, today's Malatya is located in south-eastern Turkey.

[15] The date of his episcopal consecration is a matter of controversial opinion. In Ms. SOP, folio 82r, one can find a note indicating the date 1148. The date in question is not in accordance with the opinions of Assemani (1721) and Baumstark (1922), who proposed 1154, or Wright (1895) and Brockelmann (1909), who suggested 1145. He was subsequently appointed bishop, initially of Marʿaš and subsequently at other locations, including Mabbug (Ms. ATB: 2). Following the attack on Marʿaš by the Armenians and the subsequent arrest of Bar Ṣalībī and other inhabitants of the city, he relocated to Melitene for a period of nine years following his liberation. It was not until 1165/1166 that he resumed his residence, this time in Amid.

[16] The author titles the polemic in Ms. SOP, fol. 13r with the words Phantasians or the Armenians ܦܢܛܐܣܝܐ ܐܪܡܢܝܐ. The Phantasians are followers of the teachings of Bishop Julian of Halicarnassus (d. around 520) and later opponents of Bishop Severus of Antioch. See 'Julian of Halicarnassus'. Accessed 31 August 2022. https://gedsh.bethmardutho.org/entry/Julian-of-Halicarnassus.

[17] Syr. ܟܪܡܢܡܪܝܐ or ܟܪܡܢ, today's Kahramanmaraş. The city is situated approximately 80 km northwest of Gaziantep.

[18] Syr. ܐܡܕ, today's Diyarbakir, situated in the southeast of Turkey, is approximately 385 km east of Kahramanmaraş.

the immediate aftermath of Bar Ṣalībī's arrival in Amida (1165/66) (Ms. SOP, fol. 303r). A more precise dating is not possible in this instance.
The opening chapter of the inaugural tractate on the Nestorians states that the polemic on the Jews has already been concluded (Ms. SOP, fol. 290v). Furthermore, in Chapters 3 and 12 of the first tractate on the Nestorians, it is stated that the polemic on the Chalcedonians has also been concluded (Ms. SOP, fol. 292r and Ms. SOP, fol. 302r). In light of the aforementioned information, it can be postulated that the collection of polemical writings was composed in Melitene between 1156 and 1165, with a few exceptions, such as the second tractate on the Nestorians and the missing information on the Armenians.

3 Content of the first and second tractate

According to Ms. SOP, the first tractate comprises twelve chapters, while the second tractate comprises 24 chapters (with the exception of the debate between the Nestorian Thomas and a Chalcedonian named deacon Parthonius).

In both chapters, the author addresses a variety of theological topics, including:

a. Is Jesus Christ human or God or both and how are they compatible?
b. When are his divinities and or his humanities visible and distinguishable?
c. How many nature(s) (ܟܝܢܐ), hypostasis(es) (ܩܢܘܡܐ), and person(s) (ܦܪܨܘܦܐ) are in Jesus Christ?[19]
d. Who gave birth to Christ, and how should she be called?
e. Is it a Trinity (ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ) or a Four-unity (ܪܒܝܥܝܘܬܐ)?

The only instances in which he shifts his focus to different topics are in the first (Ms. SOP, fol. 290v–291v) and twelfth (Ms. SOP, fol. 302r–303r) chapter of the first tractate. In Chapter 1, the author discusses the origins of Nestorius, his appointment as a bishop, and the subsequent spread of Nestorianism.[20] In Chapter 12, the author engages in a discussion of the consequences of the Synods of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451).

> Thereupon the emperor (Marcian) wrote to Dioscorus that he should accept the belief of the two natures (*kyonīn*). The blessed one replied: 'Even if they would cut off my hands and their blood spills over the letter, I will not do this.' Then Marcian

[19] I will translate the technical terms in the following way throughout this work and will always provide the Syriac equivalent transcription next to it: ܩܢܘܡܐ *qnūmo* for hypostasis (Lange 2011, p. 15f.), ܟܝܢܐ *kyono* for nature, ܦܪܨܘܦܐ *parṣūpo* for person and ܡܒܣܪܐ *mbasro* for incarnate.

[20] See Butts (2022: 309–316) and Kosiński (2007: 155–170).

> commanded (to accept the belief of the two natures) and Dioscorus went to Gangra[21] in Tarqi because he did not follow Marcian's riots and embellishments.[22]

In conclusion to the twelfth chapter, the author makes the aforementioned statement. Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria (d. 454) was deposed from the council of Chalcedon in 451, and no further historical information is given.

In all other chapters, Bar Ṣalībī concentrates on theological topics. He addresses a variety of issues and employs a range of methodologies to expose the erroneous understanding and interpretation of the Nestorian perspective.[23]

The author's argumentative style varies in its use of metaphors, quotations, comparisons, and different types of question-and-answer schemata.[24]
In this section, I will provide several illustrative examples:

1) In the second chapter of the first tractate, Bar Ṣalībī makes the accusation that the Nestorians are claiming that Mary gave birth to the Father by asking the *Jacobites* if they have another God besides the one Mary gave birth to. In conclusion, Bar Ṣalībī asserts that regardless of the response he provides, it would be inappropriate. Consequently, he responded with a citation,

> … if we say no, they rebuke that then the Father who was not born of Mary is not God. Against them, we say that the Father is not without the Son, for the Son said: I and my Father are one. (John 10:30)[25]

---

[21] Today known as Çankırı, it is the capital city of Çankırı Province in Turkey.

[22] Manuscript A, fol. 303r; manuscript B, fol. 100v.

ܗܘܝ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܕܬܪܟܝ ܕܐܬܝܐ ܠܬܪܟܝ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܨܒܐ ܡܪܝܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܢܣܛܘܪ ܕܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܝܐ ܐܙܠ ܠܓܢܓܪܐ ܕܬܪܟܝ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܨܒܐ ܡܪܝܢܘܣ ܒܪܝܘܬܗ ܘܡܬܝܠܝܬܗ.

[23] Bar Ṣalībī does not hesitate to use terms to address the Nestorians among other things as being *ṭoʿayo* 'falsifier' (Ms. SOP, fol. 291v), ʿurbē ḏ-nesṭoryanū 'ravens of the Nestorians' (Ms. SOP, fol. 292r.), *sorūḇē* 'denier' (Ms. SOP, fol. 295v), ʾarṭīqū 'heretics' (Ms. SOP, fol. 311 v), *taʿlē šīṭē* 'miserable foxes' (Ms. SOP, fol. 320r) or accuses them of blasphemy *mgadpīn* 'they blaspheme …' (Ms. SOP, fol. 291v) and several others.

[24] The five most prevalent schemata are as follows: 1: Rhetorical questions (i.e., questions that are not answered for various reasons); 2: questions posed from the perspective of the Nestorians; 3: questions answered by means of quotations, metaphors, and the phrase 'others and/or others'; 4: The method is a question that offers only two answer options. The response must either align with the author's perspective or diverge from it; 5: Inquiries where the provided response options do not align with the author's actual beliefs.

[25] Ms. SOP, fol. 292r; Ms. Z, fol. 85v.

ܐܝܟ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܠܗ. ܡܢܘ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܕ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܕ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܡ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ. ܠܗܘܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܐ. ܕܒܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܢܐ ܘܐܒܝ ܚܕ ܢܗܘܢ.

In accordance with the interpretation of Bar Ṣalībī as espoused by the Nestorians, Mary is regarded as the mother of the Father. To elucidate this further, he adds,

> ܘܐܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܡ. ܐܝܟ ܕܢܐ. ܠܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܟܦܢܐ ܡܢܗܘ ܘܢܐ. ܡܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ. ܗܘܐ ܕܢܐ ܬܪ ܡܪܝܡ ܗܘܐ
> ܘܢܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܡ. ܗܠܐ ܐܦܢܝܢ ܘܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܗܘܐ. ܗܘܐ ܕܢܐ ܡܪܝܡ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ. ܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܡܪܝܡ
> ܘܐܝܟ.
> ܗܠܐ ܡܪܝܡ ܘܐܝܟ. ܘܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܕܢܐ ܐܝܟ.
> (Ms. SOP, fol. 292r; Ms. Z, fol. 85v)

> Though the Father was not born of Mary like the Son, yet the Son's root was not severed from that of his Father when he was born of the Virgin. As it is said, the Son descended from heaven (cf. John 3:13). We do not say that the Son is without the Father. So, it is said that the Son was born of a Virgin, it is not said that the Father was born. We are not compelled to say that therefore the Father is without the Son.[26]

Instead of providing a clear and unequivocal statement at the outset that his community believes in a single God and that the Son was conceived by the Father before time and subsequently born by Mary, the author employs two quotations and a metaphor. Bar Ṣalībī supports and concludes his argument with the metaphor of the fire (Father) and the shine and the ray (Son). He posits that the shine and the ray are part of the fire, existing in conjunction with it, and that the fire can be perceived through the shine and the ray.

2) The author employs the same quotations to illustrate disparate aspects. In the two *memre* Bar Ṣalībī quotes John 10:30, 'I and my Father are one,' nine times. In the previous example, the quotation is employed to illustrate the connection between the Father and the Son. In Chapter 4 of the first tractate, however, the quotation is reused with two additional quotations, with the intention of excluding the possibility of a separation between the two natures.

> It is also written: I and my Father are one (John 10:30); my Father is still working even now, and so I am working (John 5:17). Now tell us: the one who said, 'My Father and I are one', is it the one who said: My Father is greater than I (John 14:28), or another and another [And if you say another or another, as Nestorius, Leo and

[26] Bar Ṣalībī repeats often in the tractate that the Father and the Son are ܒܪ ܩܝܢܐ *bar kyono*, which could be translated as *consubstantial*. In Chapter 6 of the first *memro* (Ms. SOP, fol. 296r), he emphasises that the Father and the Son are not ܒܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ *bar ūsiya*, which I also translate as *identical*. The difference Bar Ṣalībī sees in both terms indicates that the Father is not born of Mary but the Son.

> Theodoret[27] said, then there are two Sons].[28] If you say that he is exactly him, how do you separate natures (*kyone*) after unity?[29]

The use of Bible quotations appears to be a relatively simple process for Bar Ṣalībī. All quotations attest to the unity of the Son and the impossibility of separating him into natures. To gain a deeper understanding of Bar Ṣalībī's statements, it is beneficial to examine other chapters in which he discusses related topics, such as the example from above and the statement from Chapter 7 of the first tractate. The word tenses (*zabne*) signify to Bar Ṣalībī both before and after the incarnation of the Son.

ܐܘܡ ܟܬܒܬ. ܘܩܫܝܠ. ܡܢ ܩܠܐ ܐܝܟܡܐ ܟܬܒܐ. ܟܕܡܬܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܐܬܝܡܐ ܘܡ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܟܬܒܐ.
(Ms. SOP, fol. 296v; Ms. Z, fol. 91v)

> It is necessary to know that teachers divide them into utterances, also words [and] tenses. But heretics divide them into words [and] natures.

He previously employed a comparable assertion in the third chapter, wherein he posited that the *Nestorian teachers* had divided them into utterances and subsequently divided Christ into two natures, hypostases, and sons.[30]

3) In Chapter 7 of the first tractate, Bar Ṣalībī employs a different method to express the unity of one Saviour. He divides the words that 'our Saviour' (*porūqan*) said or were said about him into three categories: in *milk*, *greens*, and *bread*. In the category 'milk',[31] he employs quotations from the Acts. The following verses are 2:36, 2:22 and 17:31. He posits that the use of these humble words is beneficial to avoid the initial confusion that 'He is God.' He states that the apostles sought to reveal that 'He is God' gradually, initially demonstrating that Christ is righteous (*zaddīqo*) and from God.

The words for the complete ones (adults) are similar in form to the 'greens', which are derived from John 5:30 and 10:35. The quotations should reproduce

---

[27] Theodoret of Cyrrhus; earlier (first tractate, Chapter 1; Ms. SOP, fol. 291) Bar Ṣalībī introduces him as the cousin of Nestorius. Different spellings can be found in Ms. SOP, fol. 291r: ܬܐܘܕܘܪܛܘܣ and ܬܐܘܕܘܪܛܘܣ.

[28] Addition from Ms. Z, fol. 87v, which is missed in Ms. SOP. Nestorians do not talk about two sons; see Braun (1975: 322).

[29] Ms. SOP, fol. 293v; Ms. Z, fol. 87v.

ܗܘ ܐܠܗ ܗܘ ܡܢ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܬ ܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܢ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܬ ܦܪܫ ܛܒܝܥܬܐ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܗܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܬ ܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܢ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܬ ܦܪܫ ܛܒܝܥܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ.(ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܐܝ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ: ܬܐܘܕܘܪܛܘܣ ܡܠܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܬ ܦܪܫ ܛܒܝܥܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ). ܗܘ ܐܝ ܕܐܢ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܐܝ

the idea that 'He' makes his soul comparable to the Sons of Grace (*mpāaḥḥem napše(h) ʿam bnayo ḏ-ṭaybūṯo*), who are the people.

The final classification is that of the 'bread', in which the author employs five quotations from John: 10:30, 14:10, 16:28, 8:58 and 6:51 (Ms. SOP, fol. 296r f.; Ms. Z fol. 91r f.).

As previously stated, the examples in the 'milk' category are humble words, while those in the 'bread' category are glorious words. Both humble and glorious words were uttered about the 'Saviour.' The glorious sayings encompass themes pertaining to the deity of Jesus Christ, whereas the humble sayings address themes related to his humanity. The implication is that these words, both the humble and the glorious, were spoken about one. The glorious words are consistent with the deity prior to the incarnation, while the humble words align with him during the incarnation. As previously stated,

> It is necessary to know that teachers divide them into utterances, also words [and] tenses (*l-zaḇne*). But heretics divide them into words [and] natures (*la-kyone*).[32]

4) In the third chapter of the second tractate, the question of the birth of God is once again addressed.[33] His response is not entirely satisfactory, as it relies on two quotations to answer the question. The author makes two references to the Book of Isaiah, Chapter 9:5 and 6. The response provided by Bar Ṣalībī does not provide substantial insight into this topic. The citations do not address the question of the birth of God and proceed to the subsequent topic.

5) In Chapters 4 and 10 of the second tractate, he addresses the question, how could the Word become flesh and remain God? In the preceding example, he employed unambiguous quotations from the Old Testament. The question remains unanswered, yet the examples differ.

Chapter 4:

> ܠܢܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܝܟܡܐ ܕܡܫܐ ܐܬܗܦܟ ܠܚܝܐ ܘܩܐܡ ܚܕ ܠܡܚܙܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܫܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܐܝܟܡܐ ܡܝܐ ܗܘܘ ܕܡܐ ܘܩܐܡܘ ܡܝܐ ܐܝܟܡܐ ܥܡܘܕܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܝܢܝ ܒܢܝ ܥܒܪܐ ܘܚܫܘܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܝܢܝ ܡܨܪܝܐ.
>
> (Ms. SOP, fol. 306r; Ms. Z, fol. 105v)

> Against them we say: How the rod of Moses became a serpent and remained a rod, appearing to the magicians as one (serpent), but to Moses as two. How water became blood and water remained, how a pillar was light in the eyes of the Hebrews and darkness in the eyes of the Egyptians.

---

[32] Ms. SOP, fol. 296v; Ms. Z, fol. 91v.

[33] Ms. SOP, fol. 305r; Ms. Z, fol. 104r.

ܐܡܪܢܝܢ ܠܗ. ܟܕ ܡܬܝܠܝ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ. ܕܟܠ ܕܡܬܝܠܝ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ. ܐܦܠܘ ܕܡܬܝܠܝ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ. ܐܦܠܘ ܕܡܬܝܠܝ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ. ܐܦܠܘ ܕܡܬܝܠܝ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ.

Chapter 10:

ܐܝܟܡܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܒܣܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܩܛܠ ܘܕܡܝܐ ܕܢܝܠܘܣ ܗܘܘ ܕܕܡܐ ܠܡܨܪܝܐ ܘܠܡܝܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܠܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܕܥܡܘܕܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܚܫܘܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܨܪܝܐ. ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܐܝܟܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܦܠܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܫܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ.

(Ms. SOP, fol. 312v; Ms. Z, fol. 114r)

We say how the fire in the thorn bush was kindled but not burned, and how the water in the Nile became blood for the Egyptians and flowing water for the Hebrews, and how the pillar shone for the Hebrews and was dark to the Egyptians. We do not know how these happened, neither do we know how the Word became flesh.

The presentation of analogous examples on the same topic in a single chapter serves to illustrate the significance of the topic in question. The most intriguing aspect of these scriptural testimonies is that, at the conclusion of the aforementioned example in Chapter 10, Bar Ṣalībī states, 'We do not know how these happened.' This implies that one must either adhere to the tenets of the Old Testament, which espouses the miracles of the Word becoming flesh and remaining God or reject them.

6) In the same chapters (4 and 10), Bar Ṣalībī revisits the theme of the Incarnation, demonstrating how the Word became flesh and remained God. He employs a variety of illustrative examples drawn from daily life.

Chapter 4:

ܢܘܪܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ ܕܡܫܚܠ ܩܛܪܢܐ ܘܡܪܩܕ ܛܝܡܐ ܘܡܨܪܦ ܕܗܒܐ ܘܡܚܪܩ ܒܥܝܪܐ ܘܡܚܪܩ ܒܥܦܪܐ ܕܡܝܐ ܕܢܝܠܘܣ ܕܗܘܘ ܠܕܡܐ ܠܡܨܪܝܐ ܘܠܡܝܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܠܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܕܥܡܘܕܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܚܫܘܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܨܪܝܐ. ܘܐܝ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܝܠܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐܝ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܗܘ ܒܦܓܪܐ.

(Ms. SOP, fol. 306r; Ms. Z, fol. 105v)

Fire is known to melt tar, harden mud and clay, melt and purify gold, burn animals and birds, but the salamander is also a flesh-bearing animal and carries fire within it.

Chapter 10:

ܐܝܟܡܐ ܕܐܡܪܐ ܘܕܣܠܡܢܕܪܐ ܡܬܚܒܪܝܢ ܥܡ ܢܘܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܢܝܢ ܒܦܓܪܗܘܢ. ܐܝܟ ܕܠܚܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܢܐ ܒܟܝܢܗ ܡܬܗܦܟ ܠܦܓܪܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܡܐ ܕܢܝܠܘܣ ܗܘܐ ܠܕܡܐ ܠܡܨܪܝܐ ܘܠܡܝܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܠܥܒܪܝܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܚܫܘܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܨܪܝܐ. ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܦ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܒܦܓܪܐ.

(Ms. SOP, fol. 312v; Ms. Z, fol. 114r)

Just as the lamb[34] and the salamander unite with the fire but do not change through combustion, just as the bread, unchanged in its nature, becomes the body, just as

[34] Pape (1954), p. 126, Greek: 'lamb' ܐܡܢܐ.

> the baptismal water becomes spiritual (holy), unchanged from your point of view, and just as people become Sons (i.e., children) of God, so the Word became flesh, unchanged, for the reason that he is God.

In the Physiologus (Treu 1981: 60f.), the salamander is presented as an animal that does not burn. He thus compares the Word that becomes flesh and remains God with an *amnīṭūn w-salamandro*. Alternatively, the author could have drawn a parallel with the thorn bush, which burned but did not incinerate. In the Syriac tradition, it is common to compare the presence of God in the thorn bush with the presence of the Word in Mary (Zingerle 1873: 51). It is noteworthy that Bar Ṣalībī did not adopt this approach, instead opting for a reptile as a subject of comparison. The comparison with the thorn bush may be more in keeping with his style. This may also be indicative of his extensive authorship.

Chapter 18 represents a new beginning, though it is not a third tractate in the traditional sense. Rather, it represents a fresh beginning, commencing with the Nestorian confession. From Chapter 20, a new structural framework becomes evident. At the beginning of this chapter, a reference is made to the fact that questions from the Nestorian scriptures of faith will be written down and will have to be solved with the help of the Holy Spirit (Ms. SOP, fol. 321v; Ms. Z, fol. 129r). Fewer questions will be posed, yet the responses will be more comprehensive and detailed.

It is evident that Bar Ṣalībī repeats some of the topics in both tractates with the objective of placing greater emphasis on specific theological issues. He proceeds from one topic to another, sometimes without providing a detailed clarification of his position.[35]

4 Quotations

Bar Ṣalībī presents his arguments with a wealth of quotations from the Bible. Additionally, he cites various church fathers,[36] Nestorian synods[37] and Nestorian Catholicoi, including Aba I (d. 552), Yawsef (d. 566), and Sabrishoʿ I (d. 604) (Winkler 2003: 70–76), as well as Aristotle (Ms. SOP, fol. 295r).[38] In Chapter 3 of the first tractate, he employs 44 quotations (Ms. SOP, fol. 292r–293r). This

[35] This seems to be known and noted from other works of Bar Ṣalībī as mentioned in Schlimme (1977, 2: 812).

[36] The text contains quotations from various Church Fathers, including Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 523), John Chrysostomos (d. 407), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

[37] Such examples can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the second tractate. For more on this, see Chabot (1902) and Winkler (2003).

[38] For more on this, see King (2010).

represents the highest number of citations in a single chapter of this work.[39] It is challenging to ascertain from which version of the Bible Bar Ṣalībī quotes, in which Florilegia he read, or whether he was familiar with some of the quotations by heart. It should be noted that there may be differences between the examples and the Peshitta, as well as differences in terminology.

1) Luke 2:11

Ms. Z (Ms. Z, fol. 89v)	ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܐܬܝܠܟܘܢ ܝܘܡܐ.
Ms. SOP (Ms. SOP, fol. 295r)	ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܐܬܝܠܟܘܢ ܝܘܡܐ.
Peshitta (Leiden)	ܐܲܡܲܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܐܬܝܠܟܘܢ ܗܘܝܬ ܕܢܬܐ ܕܕܘܝܕ. ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܝܲܠܕܐ ܡܪܝܐ.

The initial example illustrates a classic example in three distinct versions. While the content of each example differs, the central message—that the Lord and Savior will be born in the city of David—remains consistent.

2) Acts of the Apostles 2:36

Ms. SOP and Ms. Z (Ms. SOP, fol. 300r; Ms. Z, fol. 96v)	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܒܕܘܗܝ ܐܝܬ.
Peshitta (Leiden)	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܥܒܕܘܗܝ ܐܬܐ.

The second example is demonstrably distinct. The manuscripts are identical, with the exception of one discrepancy with the Peshitta. The discrepancy lies in the distinction between the terms ʾaloho ('God') and ʾ*abo* ('Father'), which could potentially lead to confusion. In Chapter 10 of the first tractate, the text discusses, among other things, the concept of one Christ, one Lord, one Son, one constructed hypostasis (*qnūmo mrakkḇo*) and one fleshly nature (*wa-ḵyono mbasro*), as well as the idea that the Lord is God, Jesus Christ. The following eight quotations are presented to substantiate the argument that the Lord is God, Jesus Christ. The first is Acts 2:36, followed by John 6:44, Isaiah 54:5, Isaiah 48:2, Isaiah 48:17, Isaiah 54:5, Jeremiah 30:18 and Jeremiah 31:1. It is possible to hypothesise that Bar Ṣalībī simply wrote the word without paying sufficient attention, resulting in a simple mistake. Alternatively, it could be posited that he deliberately chose to write 'Father' instead of 'God.' This case is presented twice in this polemical writing. If the substitution was intentional, the reason for the change remains

[39] The entire text of Ms. SOP contains approximately 460 quotations.

unknown. One hypothesis for this alteration is that it was intended to inform the author's community that if Christ is the Lord, then the Father is also the Lord and the sender of the Son, and that they are one, as it is written in John 10:30.

3) Comparison to Luke 1:35

Ms. SOP and Ms. Z (Ms. SOP, fol. 312r; Ms. Z, fol. 113rf)	ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܟ ܡܢܟ
Ms. SOP: first tractate, Chapter 3 (Ms. SOP, fol. 293r)	ܗܘ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܟ...
Ms. SOP: second tractate, Chapter 19 (Ms. SOP, fol. 320vf)	ܗܘ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܢܟ...

The preceding example serves to illustrate the significance of the words *bek̲*(*y*) and *mennek̲*(*y*). These words are distinguished in the versions of the Syriac Bible and by Bar Ṣalībī. The word *bek̲*(*y*) is employed in the Syriac Peshitta edition of Leiden (Kaufman s.d.), whereas *mennek̲*(*y*) is not. In Chapter 19, Bar Ṣalībī presents a Nestorian interpretation where he differentiates between 'in thee' and 'of thee'. Baarda posits that Bar Ṣalībī's utilisation of the term *bek̲*(*y*) signifies that 'He existed already before he was born.' Baarda (1963: 225–229) notes that certain Greek manuscripts lack the phrases 'of thee' or 'in thee', only containing the phrase 'he that is born is holy.' Nevertheless, Bar Ṣalībī asserts that the phrase 'born in thee' is equivalent to 'conceived in thee' in its meaning for him.

In certain instances, Bar Ṣalībī designates phrases as biblical quotations by citing Jesus, which are not authentic quotations from the Bible but rather testimonies from other biblical commentaries. He identifies these statements as quotations, although in reality, he is offering an interpretation. Both examples may be interpreted as references to the quotation from John 5:17–19 and the remainder of the fifth chapter. In Chapters the 12 and 13 of the second tractate, the author employs false quotations exclusively. The rationale behind this decision is not readily apparent. The following two examples illustrate this phenomenon.

Ms. SOP: second tractate, Chapter 12 (Ms. SOP, fol. 316r)	ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܐܒܝ ܥܕܡܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܠܝ ܡܕܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܠܝܢ ܐܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܫܬܠܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܟܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܟܘܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܒܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܡܨܬܝܐ ܠܝ ܐܠܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܡܨܬܝܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܒܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܡܨܬܝܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܒܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܡܨܬܝܐ ܠܝ ܐܠܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܡܨܬܝܐ ܠܟܘܢ.
Ms. SOP: second tractate, Chapter 13 (Ms. SOP, fol. 317r)	ܐܢܐ ܘܐܒܝ ܚܕ ܡܫܬܠܝܢ. ܡܬܚܙܐ ܠܢܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܗܘ ܕܐܒܐ.

5 Conclusion

In this concise overview, I have presented an overview of the two tractates of Bar Ṣalībī towards the Nestorians. Bar Ṣalībī does not engage in direct dialogue with the Nestorians. The outline is incomplete and unable to encompass all the topics addressed in the text. Nevertheless, it offers insights into his arguments and approach towards other Christian denominations. It is reasonable to posit that he had no proven interaction with Nestorians during his tenure in Melitene and the composition of the first tractate. In the second tractate, however, it appears that the community he had taken over had encountered issues with the Nestorians. The reason for the author's failure to present his well-structured and shorter first *memro* to his community in Amid remains unclear.

The structure of the chapters is largely consistent throughout the text. The author's interrogation of various subjects, which could potentially give rise to discord between different denominations and prompt disparate responses, serves to define the overarching structure of the work. His style is similar to that of other polemical writings against other religions and Christian denominations, and on occasion he employs the same statements and quotations in more than one polemical writing.

The majority of Bar Ṣalībī's works address theological, liturgical, and biblical topics, as well as offering commentary on philosophical issues and the works of the Church Fathers. However, the polemical nature of his writing appears to have been motivated by a different intention. The period in which Bar Ṣalībī lived and worked was a time of conflicts in the multicultural mediaeval society around him. This was a time of protection of one's own religious heritage, but also a time of inter-religious dialogue (Teule 2010; Tubach 1996; Weltecke 2003). A variety of reasons could have motivated him to compose this treatise, although the ultimate motivation remains incompletely understood. Concurrently, it is possible that the writing of polemical treatises was a tradition, as evidenced by the example of Metropolitan Elias of Nisibis from the 11th century,[40] which displays similar structural characteristics to those observed in Bar Ṣalībī's work. It is possible that Bar Ṣalībī felt compelled to respond to these polemical writing in a treatise due to the influence of this particular text and the prevailing intellectual climate of the time.

Bar Ṣalībī's theological understanding appears to be both straightforward and intricate. It seems that his objective is to reinforce the faith of his own community. The concept of initiating a dialogue does not appear to be a viable option for him, despite the observation he made previously that the Nestorians are 'a part of our nation that is falling apart'.[41] Nevertheless, the notion that the Nestorians and

---

[40] Cf. Horst (1886). He wrote treatises against Muslims, Jews, Jacobites and Melkites.

[41] Ms. Z, fol. 143v ܡܢ ܟܬܒܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܐ ܘܢܣܛܘܪܝܐ. This chapter does not exist in Ms. SOP.

Jacobites are a unified community does not prompt him to undertake any action to facilitate this encounter. His writing and argumentation demonstrate that he is, above all, a Syriac Christian of the *Suryoyo* tradition. This indicates that there is no clear distinction between his faith and his ethnicity. Otherwise, he would not have mentioned that the Nestorians are falling apart from the mutual nation.

Acknowledgements

This article outlines some of the results of my doctoral dissertation on Bar Ṣalībī's treatise regarding the Nestorians so far, which was developed under the supervision of Prof. Shabo Talay at the Institute of Semitic Studies, Freie Universität Berlin.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

ORCID

Anna-Simona Barbara Üzel https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1687-3375

References

Primary sources: Manuscripts

Ms. SOP = 'Damascus Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate 160, 4/35'. Unpublished manuscript, 1207.

Ms. Z = 'Deir Zaʿfaran 97/1'. Unpublished manuscript, 1501/1502.

Ms. ATB = 'Amid Thoma Chori Bešareh (Başaranlar) 9/6 [R.5]'. Unpublished manuscript, s.d. (17th/18th century)

Secondary sources

Baarda, TJ. 1963. 'Dionysios Bar Ṣalīḇ(ī) and the Text of Luke 1,35'. *Vigiliae Christianae* 17: 225–229.

Barṣawm, Afrem. 2012. *Geschichte der syrischen Wissenschaften und Literatur: Band II. Eichstätter Beiträge zum christlichen Orient, aus dem Arabischen übersetzt von G. Toro und A. Gorgis, basiert auf der 2. Auflage der syrischen Ausgabe Ḥalab 1956*. Eichstätter Beiträge zum Christlichen Orient 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Baumstark, Anton. 1922. *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluss der Christlich-palästinensischen Texte*. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Webers Verlag.

Braun, Oskar, ed. 1975. *Das Buch der Synhados oder Synodicon orientale: Die Sammlung der Nestorianischen Konzilien, zusammengestellt im neunten Jahrhundert: nach der Syrischen Handschrift, Museo Borgiano 82, der Vatikanischen Bibliothek*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.

Butts, Aaron M. 2022. 'Simeon of Beth Arsham, Letter on Bar Ṣawmā and the Heresy of the Nestorians'. In *The Cambridge Edition of Early Christian Writings. Volume 4: Christ: Chalcedon and Beyond*, edited by Mark DelCogliano, 309–316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chabot, Jean Baptiste. 1902. *Synodicon orientale ou recueil de synodes nestoriens*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Ebied, Rifaat Y. 2011. 'Dionysius Bar Ṣalībī's Works in the Mingana Collection of Syriac and Arabic Manuscripts, with Special Emphasis on His Polemical Treatise, "Against the Muslims"'. *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 8: 49–64.

Ebied, Rifaat, Malatius M. Malki, and Lionel R Wickham. 2020. *Dionysius Bar Ṣalībī's* Treatise Against the Jews: *Edited and Translated with Notes and Commentary*. Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 15. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Horst, Louis. 1886. *Des Metropoliten Elias von Nisibis Buch vom Beweis der Wahrheit des Glaubens*. Colmar: Eugen Barth.

Kaufman, Stephen A., et al. S.d. 'Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project'. Accessed 31 August 2022. https://cal.huc.edu/.

King, Daniel. 2010. *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle's Categories: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus 21. Leiden: Brill.

Kiraz, George Anton, ed. 2011. 'Gorgias Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage: Electronic Edition'. Accessed 31 August 2022. https://gedsh.bethmardutho.org/index.html.

Kosiński, Rafał. 2007. 'The Life of Nestorius as Seen in Greek and Oriental Sources'. In *Continuity and Change: Studies in Late Antique Historiography*, edited by Dariusz Brodka and Michał Stachura, 155–170. Cracow: Jagiellonian University Press.

Lange, Christian. 2011. *Die altorientalischen Kirchen: Glaube und Geschichte*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Nau, François. 1909. 'Analyse du traité : écrit par Denys Bar Salibi contre les Nestoriens'. *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien Deuxième Série* 4 (14): 298–320.

Pape, Wilhelm. 1954. *Griechisch-Deutsch Wörterbuch: Nachdruck der dritten Auflage bearbeitet von M. Sengebusch: Erster Band A-K*. Graz: Akademische Druck- U. Verlagsanstalt.

Rabo, Gabriel. 2019. *Dionysius Jakob Bar Ṣalibi: Syrischer Kommentar zum Römerbrief: Einleitung, Edition und Übersetzung mit einem Verzeichnis der syrischen Handschriften zu seinen sämtlichen Werken*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schlimme, Lorenz. 1977. *Der Hexaemeronkommentar des Moses bar Kepha*. 2 vols. Göttinger Orientforschungen, Reihe 1, Syriaca 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tamcke, Martin. 2008. *Christen in der islamischen Welt: von Mohammed bis zur Gegenwart*. München: C.H. Beck.

Teule, Herman. 2010. *The Syriac Renaissance*. Leuven: Peeters.

Treu, Ursula. 1981. *Physiologus: Frühchristliche Tiersymbolik*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Union Verlag.

Tubach, Jürgen. 1996. 'Die syrischen Kirchen vor und nach den Kreuzzügen'. In *Die Folgen der Kreuzzüge für die orientalische Religionsgemeinschaft: Internationales Kolloquium vom 16.–18.10.1996 in Halle/Saale.*, edited by Walter Beltz, 183–206. Halle: Institut für Orientalistik, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.

Weltecke, Dorothea. 2003. *Die Beschreibung der Zeiten von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199): Eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographiegeschichtlichen Kontext*. Leuven: Peeters.

Wetzel, Klaus. 1995. *Kirchengeschichte Asiens*. Wuppertal and Zürich: Brockhaus.
Winkler, Dietmar W. 2003. *Ostsyrisches Christentum: Untersuchung zu Christologie, Ekklesiologie und zu den ökumenischen Beziehungen der Assyrischen Kirche des Ostens*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
Wright, William. 2016. *A Short History of Syriac Literature*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers (1st ed.: London: Black, 1894).
Zingerle, P. Pius. 1873. *Ausgewählte Schriften des Hl. Ephräm von Syrien*. 2nd vol. Kempten: Kösel.