THE ANTI-TRITHEIST FLORILEGIUM IN MSS BL ADD 14532 AND 14538 REVISITED*

BISHARA EBEID

CA' FOSCARI UNIVERSITY OF VENICE

ABSTRACT

In 1924, Giuseppe Furlani published an Italian translation of an anti-Tritheist florilegium he found in MS BL Add 14532. His translation focused mainly on the chapter titles in the florilegium and the quotations from the works of John Philoponus. In 1980, Albert van Roey published the Syriac Trinitarian fragments of Philoponus, found in various manuscripts, together with their Latin translation. Van Roey's contribution also presented the same florilegium, as found in MS BL Add 14538 as well as 14532, and identified most of the patristic passages quoted by the compiler. Both scholars, besides some inaccurate readings and some errors in identifications, paid attention only to the quotations of Philoponus, while the Trinitarian position of the compiler and his identity

This publication resulted from research funded by the European

Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 758732 – FLOS. Florilegia Syriaca).

remained unanalysed. In this study then, I aim to analyse the Trinitarian position of the complier, which offers important evidence of a relationship between the doctrine of Damian of Alexandria against Tritheism and some West Syrian circles. In doing so I will first present the florilegium, illustrate the profile of the compiler, his sources, and a probable date and place of his compilation of the florilegium as well as the doctrinal context in which this text was composed.

INTRODUCTION

In 1924, Giuseppe Furlani published an Italian translation of an anti-Tritheist florilegium he found in MS BL Add 14532. His translation focused mainly on the chapter titles in the florilegium and the quotations from the works of John Philoponus. In 1980, Albert van Roey published the Syriac Trinitarian fragments of Philoponus found in various manuscripts, together with their Latin translation. Van Roey's contribution presented the same florilegium, as found in two manuscripts, namely MSS BL Add 14532 and 14538, he also identified most of the patristic passages quoted by the compiler.2 In this study, I aim to present the florilegium, to examine the profile of the compiler, his sources, and a probable date for its compilation. A comparative analysis of the Trinitarian position of the florilegium's complier and that of Damian of Alexandria will also be productive in that it will further illustrate the second phase of the anti-Tritheistic controversy among Syrian Miaphysites and will call attention to probable contacts between the Syriac community where this

¹ G. Furlani, "Un florilegio antitriteistico in lingua siriaca" (Atti del Regio Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti IX: 8 [1924]), 661–677

² A. Van Roey, "Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon" (Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica, 11 [1980]), 137–145.

florilegium was composed and Damian of Alexandria, and will provide evidence that it was probably against this community that Peter of Callinicum wrote his *Contra Damianum*.

THE ANTI-TRITHEIST FLORILEGIUM

This anti-Tritheist florilegium is preserved, as far as I know, in two manuscripts of the British Library, namely MS BL Add. 14532 ff. 194r-207v and MS BL Add. 14538, 140r-145r. Recently I published a critical digital edition of this florilegium, including identifications of the patristic passages, the original Greek texts, where they exist, and other metadata.

The structure of the florilegium is as follows: a general title, an introduction, five chapters and a conclusion. The chapters also have the same structure, each has a title that can be considered an introduction to the contents of the chapter, followed by quotations from the Trinitarian writings of John Philoponus, and then others from various Church Fathers, like Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, and Severus of Antioch.⁵ The general introduction mentions that on comparison of the respective doctrines it will be clear to the reader, even if an intellectually simple person, that the doctrine of John Philoponus disagrees with the teaching of the Church Fathers.⁶ Moreover, in the introduction to each chapter,

³ According to Wright MS BL Add. 15432 was copied during the 8th century while MS BL Add. 15438 can be dated to the 10th century, see respectively W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired since the Year 1838*, vol. II (London: British Library, 1871), 955–967, 1003-1008.

⁴ https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/flos/ATR (accessed 15/07/2024).

⁵ See the digital edition in the link of the previous footnote. See also the names of the quoted Fathers identified by Furlani, "Un florilegio", 661–662; for the passages identified by van Roey and their original sources see van Roey, "Les fragments", 137–145.

https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|000a (accessed 15/07/2024).

the compiler presents the topics dealt with in the quotations, and expresses his own position with comments on them.

The tables that follow give the general title of the florilegium, the general introduction and conclusion. In addition I present:

1) the titles of the chapters; 2) the Fathers mentioned in each chapter, their quoted works, identification of these quotations; and 3) the main topics treated in the quotations. Footnotes, make reference to the editions of the original texts of the quotations in question and offer observations as well as some disagreements with the readings of both G. Furlani and A. van Roey. Roey.

(C:194r; E:140r) ئەھمە بىدىز كەيمۇس ھىسەن ھىسلىلىلىك، ئىمىس ئەھلىمەھ مەتىر ھۇخىلەس، لەلھ قىلامە بىلىسەن ئەھىلەن ھۆخگەن

Tomus that briefly demonstrates the opposition of John the Grammarian and his followers to the Divine Books and the Holy Fathers

 $^{^{7}}$ For the Syriac text note the following abbreviations: C = MS BL Add. 14532; E = MS BL Add. 14538.

⁸ It must be mentioned that Furlani translated all the passages by John Philoponus into Italian, while for the patristic quotations he gave Italian translations of the beginning and end of each passage without any precise identification of the Greek sources; for the Syriac sources, he gave details of the works of Severus of Antioch that had so far been edited. However, as mentioned in the introduction to this study, van Roey identified most of the patristic passages quoted in this florilegium.

₈ E: ≺*qury*⊐ro∞

²⁰ E: حعملیم

مستمام محدشهم (E:140V) متعبه محصوب ملام محدث ملائل محد حمومهم محدث مارال. معدد حمومهم محدث مارال معدد معرف معرب مارال معرب مارال معرب مارال معرب مارال مار

[Introduction]

We are expressly irate because of the wickedness of some persons that is demonstrated in the following chapters. However, in order not to fall into many words, since neither the ink nor time allows us, we will speak later on little things among the many blasphemies we are irritated by, and we will quote a few testimonies of the Holy Fathers to whom we are adherent, so that when these are compared to each other, their opposition [i.e. that of John and his followers] will be recognized even by those who are very simple [intellectually].¹²

₁₃[حمعت مترجمه]

14 مهمسلا منهم میسلا مین مهمسلام میسلام میسلام میسلام مین میسلام مین میسلام مین میسلام مین میسلام و میلام میسلام مین شده میسلام میسلام

¹¹ E: مىخىد

¹² See the next section regarding my decision to consider this text as introduction to the florilegium.

¹³ C, E: omitted.

¹⁴ C: < \dom\<.1

₁₂ C: ペ**かわ**ょべご

¹⁶ C: مصعدسه ا

¹⁷ C: ~ huind

تهمون که حدم: در محنوی دمون در نوسه مدید: ها محدهای متحد حلا و در مدنوی الله المان الله مدید:

[Chapter one]19

For while the Holy Fathers teach that one substance, [one] Divinity and [one] God is in three hypostases, that is, persons and properties, which is the foundation and the fulfilment of all Christians, and again they [the Fathers] call this same one substance of the hypostases principal (primary) substance, these [the adversaries] in the audacity of their heart go against the Holy Spirit and, in their impudence, call the substance, which the Holy Fathers name principal, non-principal. Not only this, but they also define that this substance and God and Divinity [i.e. the non-principal] is either only in mere thought or nothing, giving up hope of the Holy Spirit, who speaks through the Holy Fathers and inheres in Aristotle.

Quotations from John	Main topics
Philoponus	
1) On the Trinity ²⁰	Species, that is, common substance, or secondary substances, exist only in
2) On the Trinity ²¹	the mind.

¹⁸ C: 3007<

¹⁹ Because the title 'Chapter one' is missing in the two manuscripts, as we shall see in the next section, Furlani considered the introduction to the first chapter to be a part of the general introduction of the florilegium. Van Roey, however, considers the general introduction and that of the first chapter to be separate items. For references see below.

²⁰ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 148, no. 1.

²¹ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 148–149, no. 2.

_	
3) On the Trinity ²²	Hypostases, that is, singular substances, or
4) Against Themistius ²³	primary substances, are what really exist, since they are subsistent.
	The common substance, even if does not exist, is divisible, and therefore numerable through its hypostases, that is, the single existences that participate in it.
	God is neither one in number (as in the monotheism of the Jews) nor four hypostases (in the meaning, three hypostasis and one existing common substance).

Quotations from Church Fathers	Main topics
5) Basil of Caesarea On the Holy Spirit ²⁴	God cannot be a common quality existing only in thought.

 $^{^{\}rm 22}$ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 149, no. 3. $^{\rm 23}$ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 54: nos 18a and 18b.

²⁴ B. Pruche, ed., *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit*, Sources Chrétiennes 17 bis (Paris: Cerf, 1968), Chapter 17, section 41.17–21.

- 6) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on the Holy Spirit (Or. 31)²⁵
- 7) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on the Holy Spirit (Or. 31)²⁶
- 8) Severus of Antioch *Against the Grammarian*²⁷
- 9) Severus of Antioch Against the Grammarian²⁸

Even if humanity is one but there are many men, the Godhead is one and there are not many gods.

The common nature has a unity, which is only conceivable in thought.

The substance, in common sense, comprehends all its hypostases; hypostasis, however, is called substance, but without meaning that it comprehends all the hypostases.

معلصه درهةم

حلا به و و و در به معنا حدید می المه می المه می المه می در مطالعه می در مطالعه می در مطالعه می در می می در می در

-

²⁵ J. Barbel, ed., *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), Section 15.1–4.

²⁶ Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz*, Section 15.4–6.

²⁷ J. Lebon, ed., *Severi Antiocheni. Liber Contra Grammaticum orationes I- II*, CSCO IV.4 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1938), 218.17–22.

²⁸ Lebon, Severi Antiocheni, 219.14–22.

Chapter two

About the [fact] that while the Holy Fathers say that the one substance and the [one] worshipped Divinity is neither divisible nor countable in the three Holy hypostases, that is, persons and properties, of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, these [the adversaries] contend oppositely and confess that the one substance and the [one] worshipped Divinity is divisible and countable, even in the same substance and Divinity, so that, of necessity, they are constrained not to unify the Holy and consubstantial Trinity through anything.

Quotations from John	Main topics
Philoponus	
	Divinity is divisible.
1) On the Trinity ³¹	
	If it is said that the
2) Against Themistius 32	Godhead is three, it
	means that it is divided,
	according to number, into
	three realities.

Quotations from Church	Main topics
Fathers	

²⁹ C: ベめュンロ

³⁰ C. ~!

³¹ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 149, no. 4.

³² Van Roey, "Les fragments", 154–155, no. 19.

- 3) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on the Holy Spirit (Or. 31)³³
- 4) Ps.-Basil of Caesarea Against the Sabellians, Arius and the Anomoeans³⁴
- 5) Ps.-Basil of Caesarea Against the Sabellians, Arius and the Anomoeans³⁵
- 6) Athanasius of Alexandria Defence of the Nicene Definition³⁶
- 7) Severus of Antioch Letter to John and John the priests and abbots³⁷
- 8) Severus of Antioch Letter to the priests and abbots, Yonatan and

Godhead is undivided, one substance in three separate hypostases.

It is said, concerning God, one and one, but without meaning a division.

God, being immaterial, is one and undivided.

The Trinity is numerable in the hypostases but subsists outside number because it is one and the same substance.

The Holy Trinity is divided and distinct in hypostases, but not divided into one substance and one Godhead.

God is one substance. He exists and is known in three hypostases.

 35 PG 31, 608. Note that Furlani considers the two quotations as a single one, see quotation n. 13 in Furlani, "Un florilegio", 666.

³³ Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz*, Section 14.2–8.

³⁴ PG 31, 605.

³⁶ H. G. Opitz, ed., *Athanasius. Werke*, Band 2, Teili: *Die Apologien (Lfg. 1-*7) (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1940), Chapter 24, Section 1.5–8.

³⁷ E. W. Brooks, ed., *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts*, PO 12.2 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1915), 215.

Samuel and John, the	
stylites³8	

معلهء محلعه

Chapter three

Again about the fact that, while the Holy Fathers fought many struggles and [shed much] sweat to teach that the substance and the Divinity of the Holy Trinity is one and the same, [and] that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial, these [the adversaries] contending with much impiety against the Holy Spirit, who spoke through the Holy Fathers - do not confess one principal Divinity, but gods and divinities, and walking into error, they arrived at the absurdity of all this, to confess that God the Father and God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are different according to species (ἑτεροειδεῖς) and different according to substance (ἑτεροεύσιοι).

³⁸ Brooks, *A Collection*, 216–218.

³⁹ E: **ペかいべょ**つ

نة و ⁴⁰ E: خ

Quotations from John	Main topics
Philoponus	-
1) On the Trinity ⁴¹	If the hypostases are not recognized as single
2) Against Themistius ⁴²	substances it means that they are simply names and this leads to Sabellianism.
3) Against Themistius ⁴³	tino leddo to babellidinoini
4) Against Themistius ⁴⁴	The hypostases of the same substance are equal and similar in substance,
5) On the Trinity ⁴⁵	that is, they are not
6) On the Trinity ⁴⁶	different in substance, even if each has its own property which makes it
7) On the Trinity ⁴⁷	different from the other,
8) On the Trinity ⁴⁸	and therefore one might affirm that each hypostasis with its own property is different in species from the other hypostases that share the same common
	substance.
	The one common divine substance subsists in three

 $^{^{\}rm 41}$ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 149–150, nos 5a and 5b.

⁴² Van Roey, "Les fragments", 155, nos 20a and 20b.

⁴³ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 156, nos 21a and 21b.

⁴⁴ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 156, no. 22.

⁴⁵ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 150–151, nos 6a and 6b.

⁴⁶ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 153, no. 12.

⁴⁷ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 153, no.13.

⁴⁸ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 153, no. 14.

hypostases which are divided in number and in
species.

Quotations from Church Fathers	Main topics
9) PsAthanasius of Alexandria On faith ⁴⁹ 10) PsJulius of Rome (Timothy of Beirut, Apollinarist) Letter to Prosdocius ⁵⁰ 11) PsBasil of Caesarea Against the Sabellians, Arius and the Anomoeans ⁵¹	The hypostases of the Trinity are substantial. The Trinity is one in thought and reality. The substance of the one Father and the one Son and the one Spirit is one and the same. Even if the Father is God, the Son is God and the Spirit is God, they are not three gods.
	unce gous.

⁴⁹ This work has not survived in Greek. Van Roey noted that this passage was used by Damian of Alexandria in one of his synodical letters, as testified by Michael the Syrian, see footnote 15 in van Roey, "Les fragments", 139. It must be also mentioned that this same passage was used by Peter of Callinicum (see R. Y. Ebied, A. van Roey and L. Wickham, eds., *Peter of Callinicum. Anti-Tritheist Dossier*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 10 (Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, 1981), 77.17–20) and in the Trinitarian florilegium based on Peter's work (See quotation 1 in https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/TRI|037 [accessed 14/07/2024]).

⁵⁰ H. Lietzmann, Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule. Texte und Untersuchungen (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1904), 283.17–21.

⁵¹ PG 31, 605.

- 12) Gregory of Nyssa *On* the Holy Trinity, to Eustathius⁵²
- 13) Gregory of Nyssa On the Holy Trinity, to Eustathius⁵³
- 14) Gregory of Nyssa *On Not three gods', to Ablabius*⁵⁴
- 15) Gregory of Nyssa *On Not three gods', to Ablabius*⁵⁵
- 16) Gregory of Nyssa *On* the Holy Trinity, to Eustathius⁵⁶
- 17) Gregory of Nyssa On the Holy Trinity, to Eustathius⁵⁷

Because the Godhead is one, the substance is one.

The Divine substance is unchangeable and undivided, therefore all the names that indicate this substance, like Godhead, God, Holy, Good, Saviour, Just and Judge, are employed in the singular.

⁵² F. Müller, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni. Opera dogmatica minora*, vol. 1, Gregorii Nysseni Opera III.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 5.3–14.

⁵³ Müller, *Gregorii Nysseni*, 6.18–7.8.

⁵⁴ Müller, *Gregorii Nysseni*, 55.3–20.

⁵⁵ Müller, *Gregorii Nysseni*, 57.8–13. Note that both quotations, the one here and the previous one, are considered by van Roey as one passage, see van Roey, "Les fragments", 140, see also footnote 16 on the same page.

⁵⁶ Müller, *Gregorii Nysseni*, 6.6–11.

⁵⁷ Müller, *Gregorii Nysseni*, 6.15–17. Note that it was because of an error of the compiler, who, as we shall see below, considers this passage and the one before to derive from Gregory's letter to Ablabius, that van Roey was unable to identify them, see footnote 17 in van Roey, "Les fragments", 140.

- 18) Gregory of Nyssa Refutation of the Confession of Eunomius⁵⁸
- 19) Ps.-Athanasius of Alexandria *On Epiphany*⁵⁹
- 20) Ps.-Athanasius of Alexandria On Trinity 60
- 21) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on Athanasius (Or. 21)⁶¹
- 22) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on the Holy Spirit (Or. 31)⁶²

⁵⁸ W. Jaeger, ed., *Contra Eunomium Libri. Liber III (vulgo III-XII). Refutatio confessionis Eunomii (Vulgo Lib. II)*, Gregorii Nysseni Opera II (Leiden: Brill, 1960), Section 144.1–4.

⁵⁹This work is not preserved in Greek. Note that this passage, as van Roey correctly noticed (see footnote 18 in van Roey, "Les fragments", 140), was quoted in another Syriac source deriving from the Trinitarian controversy among Miaphysites (see G. Furlani, ed., *Sei scritti antitriteistici in lingua siriaca*, PO 14.4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1920), 691.12–14). See also below.

⁶⁰ This work no longer exists in Greek. Note that a small part of this passage, as van Roey noticed correctly (see footnote 19 in van Roey, "Les fragments", 141), was quoted in another Syriac source deriving from the Trinitarian controversy among Miaphysites (Furlani, *Sei scritti*, 698.10–14). See also below.

⁶¹ PG 35, 1096.

⁶² Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz*, Section 28.1–8.

23) Damasus of Rome Tomus, Profession of Faith to Paulinus⁶³

معلمهم وبمؤصم

Chapter Four

Again, while the Holy Fathers, enlightened by the Holy Spirit who spoke through them, put forward the word of consubstantiality to mean, through it [i.e. this concept], one substance and three hypostases of the Holy Trinity in order to cancel and abolish the polytheism of Arius and the atheism of Sabellius, these [the adversaries], with the arrogance of their great impiety, do not follow in the footsteps of the Holy Fathers, but they say that consubstantiality indicates the substances, and in

 $^{^{63}}$ P. Canivet, *Théodoret de Cyr. Histoire Ecclésiastique. Tome II (Livres III-V)*, Sources Chrétiennes 530 (Paris: Cerf, 2009), Book 5, Chapter 11, Sections 11 and 13. Note that van Roey did not identify any Greek source for this quotation, but indicated some probable Latin sources in the PL (see van Roey, "Les fragments", 141). The reason might be the fact that the passage is not from Damasus' *Synodical Letter* as the compiler maintains, but from his *Profession of Faith*, known also as Damasus' *Tome*. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that this passage is, in fact, a combination of two separate quotations from the same work.

consequence of this, they introduce gods and divinities to the con-divinity.

Q	uotations from John	Main topics
	Philoponus	_
		Even if the divinity of the
1)	On Theology 64	Son is like the divinity of the
		Father, the three divine
2)	On $Theology^{65}$	hypostases are not equal in
		genre and species.
3)	$On\ Theology^{66}$	
		To assert consubstantiality,
4)	On Theology 67	one must profess a
		multitude of substances.
5)	Konon of Tarsus,	
	Eugenius of Seleucia,	If it is stated that
	Theonas <i>Letter to</i>	consubstantiality is between
	their followers ⁶⁸	hypostases, it is because
		hypostases are substances.
6)	Konon of Tarsus,	
	Eugenius of Seleucia,	The one-in-number
	Theonas <i>Letter to</i>	substance cannot be
	their followers ⁶⁹	consubstantial.
7)	Konon of Tarsus,	
	Eugenius of Seleucia,	

⁶⁴ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 153, no. 15.

 $^{^{65}}$ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 153, no. 15. It is worth noting that van Roey considered the first two quotations to be one, while Furlani treated them as two separate quotations.

⁶⁶ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 153–154, no. 16.

⁶⁷ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 154, no. 17.

⁶⁸ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 141.

⁶⁹ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 141–142. Note that van Roey considered this passage as two different quotations while Furlani treated it as one.

Theonas Letter to	
their followers ⁷⁰	

Que	otations from Church Fathers	Main topics
8)	Epiphanius of Salamis <i>Anchoratus</i> ⁷¹	Even if the hypostases of the same common nature are distinguished, each
9)	Gregory of Nazianzus First oration on the $Son (Or. 29)^{72}$	through its own property(ies), this does not mean that they are different in species or nature.
10)	Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on the Holy Spirit (Or. 31) ⁷³	The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one in nature, and they are united in three hypostases.
11)	Basil of Caesarea <i>On</i> the Holy Spirit ⁷⁴	Affirming three hypostases in the Godhead does not
12)	Basil of Caesarea <i>On</i> the Holy Spirit ⁷⁵	mean three origins, or that

 $^{^{70}}$ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 142.

 $^{^{71}}$ K. Holl, ed., *Epiphanius. Ancoratus und Panarion*, vol. 1, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 25 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915), Chapter 6, Sections 4–8.

 $^{^{72}}$ Barbel, ${\it Gregor\,von\,Nazianz},$ Section 10.6–18.

⁷³ Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz*, Section 9.5–16.

⁷⁴ This quotation and the following four, as we shall see below, come from an elaborated and paraphrased Syriac translation of Basil's work, see D. Taylor, ed., *The Syriac versions of the De Spiritu Sanctu by Basil of Caesarea*, CSCO 576, Syr. 228 (Louvain: Peeters, 1999), 15.6–13. Note that neither Furlani nor van Roey noticed this element, see Furlani, "Un florilegio", 673; van Roey, "Les fragments", 143.

⁷⁵ Taylor, *The Syriac*, 15.16–18.

13) Basil of Caesarea *On* the Holy Spirit⁷⁶

the caused hypostases are imperfect.

14) Basil of Caesarea On the Holy Spirit⁷⁷ The three divine hypostases are one in nature and one in will.

15) Basil of Caesarea *On* the Holy Spirit⁷⁸ Consubstantiality declares both the oneness of the substance and the division of the hypostases.

16) Severus of Antioch Letter to Isidore the Count⁷⁹

מפלאם ביותבא

⁷⁶ Taylor, *The Syriac*, 24.23–25.

⁷⁷ Taylor, *The Syriac*, 72.7–17.

⁷⁸ Taylor, *The Syriac*, 79.12–17.

⁷⁹ Brooks, *A Collection*, 1915, 213.

بعلم. سمعت محمد معلمه معمد هم لعلد سده ملاسمه سملوسه.

Chapter Five

About the [fact] that while usually the divine Scriptures and the Holy Fathers split the concepts, which some persons misuse to establish their wicked thought, even if some of the ancient [Fathers] used them, and even if among those who have split them, there are some who have said them, these [the adversaries] in their audacity have despised the divine and medical economy. And after the excommunication of the pious patriarch Theodosius of Alexandria, whom they also say they accept, he who, following the Holy Fathers in all instructions, and by the action of the Holy Spirit, prohibited the application of both defined and indefinite number of substances or natures concerning the Holy and consubstantial Trinity, these [the adversaries], however, oppose, as always, the Holy Spirit, and after the excommunication of the pious [Theodosius], they [still] confess and teach substances and natures concerning the Holy Trinity. Thus, because of this they introduce consubstantial gods and divinities into the doctrine of Christians, as was clearly seen in the third chapter put down above.80

Quotations from John	Main topics
Philoponus	
	The Fathers avoid calling
1) On the Trinity ⁸¹	the three divine
,	hypostases substances
	because they do not want

 $^{^{80}}$ Furlani omitted the title and the introduction to the fifth chapter from his Italian translation, see Furlani, "Un florilegio", 673-674.

_

⁸¹ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 151, nos 7a and 7b.

2) Against Themistius ⁸²	to be understood that they mean dissimilar or unsubstantial substances.
	It is contradictory to confirm that the three hypostases in the Godhead are three lives and three lights but not three substances.

Qı	uotations from Church Fathers	Main topics
3) 4) 5)	Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on Athanasius (Or. 21) ⁸³ Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on the Last Farewell in the Presence of the One Hundred and Fifty Bishops (Or. 42) ⁸⁴ Cyril of Alexandria Against Julian ⁸⁵	The distinction between substance and hypostases (i.e. persons) is to avoid asserting three substances. The unity of the Godhead is preserved by professing one substance, and the trinity of the hypostases is confessed by asserting to each one its own property.

 $^{^{82}}$ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 156, no. 23. 83 PG 35, 1124–1125.

⁸⁴ PG 36, 476–477.

⁸⁵ W. Kinzig, B. Wolfram, Ch. Thomas and H. Kaufholded, eds., *Kyrill von* Alexandrien: Gegen Julian Buch 6-10 und Fragmente, vol. 2, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte Neue Folge 21, (Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), Book 8, Section 18.8-14.

- 6) Cyril of Alexandria Against Julian⁸⁶
- 7) Basil of Caesarea Letter 38^{87}
- 8) Gregory of Nazianzus Apologetic Oration (Or. 2)⁸⁸
- 9) Gregory of Nazianzus Third oration on Peace $(Or. 23)^{89}$
- 10) Gregory of Nazianzus Third oration on Peace (Or. 23)90
- 11) Gregory of Nazianzus Second oration on Peace (Or. 22)91
- 12) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on Baptism (Or. 40)92

Each hypostasis is considered one God, if contemplated separately; each is God because of consubstantiality. The three hypostases are considered one God, if contemplated collectively; they are one God because of the Monarchy.

There is one nature, not in empty names, but in true beings.

Kinzig, Wolfram, Thomas and Kaufholded, Hubert, Kyrill von Alexandrien, Book 8, Section 27.19-27.

 $^{^{87}}$ Y. Courtonne, ed., Saint Basile. Lettres, vol. 1 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957), Section 1.

88 PG 35, 445.

⁸⁹ PG 35, 1161.

⁹⁰ PG 35, 1164.

⁹¹ PG 35, 1144.

⁹² PG 36, 417.

- 13) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on Baptism (Or. 40) 93
- 14) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration on New Sunday (Or. 44)94
- 15) Gregory of Nazianzus *Oration on the Lights* (*Or.* 39)⁹⁵
- 16) Gregory of Nazianzus Oration to Hero the philosopher (Or. 25)⁹⁶
- 17) Basil of Caesarea *On*the Holy Spirit⁹⁷
- 18) Basil of Caesarea *On* the Holy Spirit⁹⁸

⁹³ PG 36, 417.

⁹⁴ PG 36, 609.

⁹⁵ PG 36, 345.

⁹⁶ PG 35, 1224.

⁹⁷ This quotation and the one after, as we shall see below, come from an elaborated and paraphrased Syriac translation of Basil's work, see Taylor, *The Syriac*, 83.12–24. Note that this element was not noticed by Furlani nor by van Roey, see Furlani, "Un florilegio", 675; van Roey, "Les fragments", 144.

⁹⁸ Taylor, *The Syriac*, 85.21–86.26.

- 19) Basil of Caesarea *On*Not Three Gods⁵⁹
- 20) Basil of Caesarea *On Not Three Gods*
- 21) Severus of Antioch

 Against the additions of

 Julian¹⁰¹
- 22) Orthodox bishops in the East Letter to the Orthodox bishops in Constantinople¹⁰²
- 23) Athanasius of Alexandria *On the Opinion of Dionysius*¹⁰³

⁹⁹ This quotation and the one after, as we shall see below, come from an elaborated and paraphrased Syriac translation of Basil's work, as witnessed for example in MS BL Add 17143, f. 47v. This element too was not noticed by Furlani nor by van Roey, see Furlani, "Un florilegio", 675; van Roey, "Les fragments", 144.

¹⁰⁰ See MS BL Add 17143, f. 47v.

¹⁰¹ R. Hespel, ed., *Sévère d'Antioche. La Polémique Antijulianiste, II, A: Le Contra Additiones Juliani*, CSCO 295, Syr. 124 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1968), 78.21–79.16.

¹⁰² J. B. Chabot, ed., *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*, CSCO Syr. II.37 (Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1907), 190.9–192.19. Note, as will be discussed later, that this passage was identified by neither Furlani nor van Roey. The former considered it a passage from Severus' previous work and the latter a passage from Theodosius of Alexandria, see Furlani, "Un florilegio", 676; van Roey, "Les fragments", 145.

¹⁰³ Opitz, Athanasius. Werke, Chapter 6, Section 3.

Kyr in iter yay property as from the composition נופח איא ולבח בידה אום ומבום אנם ואולא حنف حد حسد منحل منه من منهمه، محدمك مطلق حبقاح محمقة ملقه بنتا محمه بدهمية ماهميا حتمد بعدم بله حديم والجنوب والمناهدة المامية השמשען הרשים ביים לא אין ווערשים ויערים ארז ארים ארז ווערשים ארז ملتقبه حصمحنه برم حسلم خفنم حش حدهمهم معادي دبعت معامله بخ برهاعه معاديه (E: תולדי בשני הואס היו בשנים היו הואס היו הואס היו הואס (۱45r مصلمت مختر تحسمی حد مهم مناملها ۱45r ححلهم خم محنم الله حدويم المتم حتيم ماةم حعيسة سی حس مر خدید محمدهمی در می سی براد حعتم خلف مهدد مالتمها دحله خم خدم مد מבעשה בשחבינה הן מלשהי ההלשחבר אישה מבוא مهمامالما متحه صمقح عنصحاء بسنعمء عصفه مدعمه معموم حماس المعتد المراجع والمراجعة والمراجعة مورحوم حم محمصه کلمه دم محمد معرفه من مرامه המשאה מתו שובמת הושמת הישם הלשמול השם ביצא הלבחום: אם לא כבות אכון ואמחות. אם כבלאא عسحهم حديد لل حدمه لحسعدهم عسحهم مد خلب תישום עשמע עדיים עשמה עיף עדי שישוע עישוע עישוע كالماعات معلت محقام معاقم معدم بمعمور معدة صيعة بالمام حمقاحة بالمام محمقه فيحلك المعتق محديم حمديس بيورين (C: 207v) عمرين مستحم השובה השומה אימים בשונים בישובה שרי נישובים השלשה בשל ביו אשה ביולה הבשלבה ביולם بدهوساده باساده حتته صحوب ۱٬۵۵۰ مرضا سموس بوعد، بعد محمد معمده محمد به معملال رس معنيه من عدد من عدد من ميد المام שוו צור תל יריטוניו מיר ביד טידישוו יישושע היישטיונים العن حيل المحمد الحدم الحنوب المعتملين ويعالم باس حام معتب محقونهم بنسوم ماتعه مام سلم تحديه حوابحه والم سراء الحواجه حداله حال الم

104 E: べんす

¹⁰⁵ E: حـــــــة

ملاء بهجم محتصوف ود مهم المعدد من محمد مناسم

הנים הם המה מבר אלימי בי אפינאים מארבין. לבולא האלימי אלימים מוכים על האלימי כל מארמים מוכים על האלימי כל מארים אלי מברא. האלימים אלי מבראים בי בינים למים בי לימים לאלים מוכים אלים מבראים בינים מוכים בינים בינ

[Conclusion]¹⁰⁶

Since, however, all heretics have the habit of hiding their evil thinking in order to deceive the listeners and make them believe that they want the truth, resembling in this the Evil who is the source of all wickedness, and many times they make wrong use of the Divine Scriptures and the doctors of the Mysteries to hide their impiety, and they make fraudulent apologies in order to escape what they are reproached for, like the Jews, who verbally demonstrate that they accept the Law and the Prophets, but in fact they deny them; and similarly the Ammonites who in words confess the true Son of God the Father, but in reality deny him, and Paul of Samosata and Nestorius and their followers, who being careful to mislead, they, in

-

¹⁰⁶ As we shall see below, I consider this part a conclusion of the florilegium agreeing to some extent with Furlani in this regard. Van Roey, however, does not include this passage in his analysis. For references see below.

words, do not confess two Sons and two Christs, but one, in reality, however, they are reproached for teaching two Sons and two Christs; then the Julianists, who in words confess that Christ suffered, but in reality demonstrate that they [follow] the opposite [doctrine]; so also those who dare to utter substances and natures concerning the Holy and consubstantial Trinity, in order to deceive those who listen [to them] and to escape from an evident confutation, they say just in words one God and one Divinity and one substance that is, nature, which they prove to confess to be nothing but a mere word in mere thought. [And] while they are blotting out to confess principally one God and one Divinity, one substance, that is, nature in three Holy hypostases of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as the Divine Scriptures and the Holy Fathers teach, they are evidently caught boldly confessing gods, divinities, substances and natures concerning the Holy and consubstantial Trinity, as was shown through the blasphemies set down [above]. No one should believe them, because in the Scripture[s] those who confess substances, natures, gods and divinities concerning the Holy and consubstantial Trinity are anathematized, although they say [that] these [gods] are consubstantial, as also the Holy Theodosius refused, who [now] is among the saints. No one must believe heretics, because, as with lambskin, they cover and conceal their wickedness through beautiful words [taken] from the Holy Scriptures, and they do not think what they [really] say and do not say what they [really] think, so that no one gets bored by them, they, in fact had learned this from the Evil, their father.

To prove, then, that this is so, we will cite, in order to conclude in a good way, the word of the Apostle Athanasius from the first discourse against the Arians, on when warning [the reader] from their wickedness, he says the following:

And however they may write phrases out of the Scripture, endure not their writings; however they may speak the language of the orthodox, yet attend not to what they say; for they speak not with an upright mind, but putting on such language like sheeps' clothing, in their hearts they think with Arius, after the manner of the devil, who is the author of all heresies. For he too made use of the words of Scripture, but was put to silence by our Saviour. For if he had indeed meant them as he used them, he would not have fallen from heaven; but now, having fallen, he acts evilness, in his mind.¹⁰⁸

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE FLORILEGIUM'S STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

The structure of florilegium, as is evident from the above presentation, is very clear. However, one must make some observations in this regard. First, taking into consideration what is mentioned in the introduction to the fifth chapter, namely the compiler's reference to what he has mentioned in the third chapter: "as was clearly seen in the third chapter put down above" (אהעבר בספלים הלולא הסגב בי הפלים הלולא הסגב בי הפלים הלולא הסגב בי ווער היים בי הולא בי מון אונים אונים בי הולא בי מון אונים בי מו

¹⁰⁷ As we shall see below, the quoted passage derives in fact from Athanasius of Alexandria's *Letter to the bishops* and not as the text maintains from his *First discourse against the Arians*.

¹⁰⁸ D. U. Hansen, K. Metzler and K. Savvidis, eds., *Athanasius. Werke*, Band I, Teil 1; *Die dogmatischen Schriften*, Lieferung 1: *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* (Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1996), Sections 2.1–3.3. The English translation of the passage by Athanasius, made from Greek, is taken from https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2812.htm (accessed 14/07/2024), slightly modified according to the Syriac.

have is indeed by him. Nevertheless, this does not mean that errors or anomalies cannot be found in this structure. In fact, after the florilegium's title, coloured in vermillion in both manuscripts, we have an introduction and then the quotations from John Philoponus' Trinitarian works followed by those of the Church Fathers. There is no mention, as happens in the other chapters, of any subtitle to indicate the first chapter. This, indeed, caused G. Furlani to consider the whole introduction as a preamble to the first chapter. 109 A. van Roey, on the contrary, separated the introduction into two parts, considering the first part a general introduction to the whole florilegium and the second an introduction to the first chapter; he also adds the bracketed subtitle 'Chapitre premier' before this second part of the introduction.¹¹⁰ Examination of the contents of the whole passage enabled me to agree with A. van Roey's conclusion. I have therefore indicated the first part of the passage as the florilegium's general introduction and the second as an introduction to the first chapter, and like van Roey, I have added the subtitle 'Chapter one'.

Having an introduction to the florilegium one might also expect a conclusion. In fact, the passage I consider to be the florilegium's conclusion was also, to some extent, considered as such by G. Furlani, who translated it into Italian, as he did for all the chapter introductions and for the passages by John Philoponus. A. van Roey, however, probably missed this passage and his analysis makes no mention of it. Returning to the manuscripts we note that both consider this passage to derive from Severus of Antioch: a note in the margin of Ms C states 'Of Severus' (in the margin of Ms C states 'Of Severus'); while Ms E has 'Of Saint Severus' (in the margin of Ms C states)

¹⁰⁹ Furlani, "Un florilegio", 662–663.

¹¹⁰ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 137–138.

¹¹¹ Furlani, "Un florilegio", 676–677.

¹¹² Van Roey, "Les fragments", 145.

¹¹³ MS BL Add. 14532, f. 207r.

work from which this text was supposed to derive. However, on reading the contents of this passage, and considering that it was impossible to identify it or a part of it in the writings of Severus of Antioch that are known to us, it is clear that it contains some elements that cannot have been written by Severus, including the reference to the Tritheites and the mention of Theodosius of Alexandria as already deceased:

No one should believe them [i.e. Tritheites's blasphemies], because in the Scripture[s] those who confess substances, natures, gods and divinities concerning the Holy and consubstantial Trinity are anathematized, although they say [that] these [gods] are consubstantial, as also the Holy Theodosius refused, who [now] is among the saints.

We know in fact that Theodosius died in 567, thirty years after the death of Severus of Antioch, so to consider this passage as written by Severus is indeed out of the question. Consequently, it is more than probable that the source of both manuscripts had wrongly attributed this passage to Severus. Examination of its content leads, in fact, to conclude that it is, without doubt, the conclusion of the florilegium. What confirms this hypothesis is the way the compiler ends this passage, giving a quotation from Athanasius of Alexandria's *Letter to the Bishops* (wrongly considered by the compiler as the First discourse against the Arians) as support for his position. The compiler, in fact, introduces Athanasius' passage with the following way: "to prove, then, that this is so, we will mention, in order to conclude in a good way (سع عھنہمہ مخلصیہ ...", which means that this whole passage is indeed to be considered the florilegium's conclusion.

¹¹⁴ MS BL Add. 14538, f. 144v.

The aforementioned passage by Athanasius is not the only patristic quotation for which the compiler, or his source, gives wrong title of the work from which it derives. Quotation 18 of the third chapter is stated as deriving from Gregory of Nyssa's Against Eunomius, instead of the same author's Refutation of the Confession of Eunomius. In the same chapter, quotation 23 is also wrongly attributed to Damasus of Rome's Synodical letter to Paulinus, Bishop of Thessaloniki, whereas it actually derives from Damasus' Profession of Faith to Paulinus, known also as his *Tomus*; moreover, it is evident that the compiler, or his source, wrongly considers Paulinus to be the Bishop of Thessaloniki instead of Antioch. Although they occur frequently in the florilegia and in their sources, none of these errors were noted by G. Furlani¹¹⁵ or by A. van Roey.¹¹⁶ Neither did they note one another anomaly in the same chapter. The anomaly is found in quotations 12 to 17, which all derive from Gregory of Nyssa. The florilegium correctly attributes quotations 12 and 13 to Gregory of Nyssa's On the Holy Trinity, i.e. his Letter to Eustathius, and quotations 14 and 15 to Gregory's On 'Not three gods', namely his Letter to Ablabius, but quotations 16 and 17, which derive from Gregory's *Letter to Eustathius*, are ascribed to the same author's Letter to Ablabius. This error was noted by neither G. Furlani¹¹⁷ nor A. van Roey whose analysis admits explicitly that he could not identify these quotations (16 and 17) in the Greek version of the Letter to Ablabius. 118 Going back to the florilegium, one might maintain that the original order of the quotations was different, first those from the Letter to Eustathius, i.e. quotations 12, 13, 16 and 17, and then those from the Letter to Ablabius, namely quotations 14 and 15. However, taking all these elements together and the fact that all these errors are found in the same

 $^{\rm n_5}$ Furlani, "Un florilegio", 670.

¹¹⁶ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 141.

¹¹⁷ Furlani, "Un florilegio", 669.

¹¹⁸ See footnote 17 in van Roey, "Les fragments", 140.

chapter three, one might hypothesize that the source of the florilegium's compiler had already made these errors and imprecisions, which would mean that they were not made by the compiler himself. In my opinion, this hypothesis is more plausible than asserting that the copyist of the archetype of both manuscripts made these errors and created such anomalies.

THE PROFILE OF THE COMPILER

David Taylor notes that this florilegium quotes seven passages from the first Syriac translation of Basil of Caesarea's On the Holy Spirit; 19 namely quotations 11-15 in the fourth chapter and quotations 17-18 in the fifth chapter. This was a paraphrased translation, where the translator was more interested in interpreting the Greek text than translating it.120 This element was not noted by A. van Roey who comments that he could identify just a few phrases in the Greek text. 121 David Taylor also noted that one quotation from On the Holy Spirit in this florilegium, namely quotation 5 in the first chapter, comes neither from the first nor the second Syriac translation of the work,122 which means that the compiler used more than one source for his florilegium. ¹²³ In fact, the compiler refers to Basil's work in different ways, 'Of Saint Basil from the discourse to (4072 イナンペリ Amphilochius' ھے حصبتم for quotation 5 in the first chapter, and 'Of Saint Basil from the letter to Amphilochius concerning the Holy

 $^{^{119}}$ Taylor, The Syriac, xx.

¹²⁰ In this regards see Taylor, *The Syriac*, ix–xxxv.

¹²¹ Van Roey, "Les fragments", 143–144.

Taylor, *The Syriac*, xxxvi.

 $^{^{123}}$ See also the opinion of Furlani in this regard, Furlani, "Un florilegio", 661.

https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|001 (accessed 14/07/2024).

Spirit' (كلى مصماعت لله المرابعة المرابعة المرابعة المربعة ال

Moreover, I have noticed that quotations 19-20 in the fifth chapter, which derive from Basil of Caesarea's *On 'Not Three Gods'* are not faithful to the Greek text. Comparing them with a Syriac translation of this work – found in three manuscripts in the British Library, namely MS BL Add 17143, ff. 46v-48v (5th century); BL Add 14543, ff.134r-140v (6th century), and BL Add 14612, ff. 100r-105r (6th/7th century), ¹²⁶ which is also a paraphrased translation of Basil's work – shows that they were based on a similar paraphrased translation and not necessarily the version testified in these manuscripts. The point is demonstrated in the following table, where I present Basil's paraphrased translation according to MS BL Add 14543:¹²⁷

	Florilegium ¹²⁸	MS BL Add 17143
Quotation	איז בניאשים מאר של האיל	איר שוות יד עינע
19	لحومه يتسلو فوجيك	مرامصه والمساء والمسام
	בעיגולים עדי: שני דינ	سلله فهدي حشيهم سن
	אטיים באים שפטאא אמיני	משאיז אלייטד ביד אינט
	בבא ארשא רא בשמינד	בן אשוא לאיי אטטשש
	השקע אקוף החיז שים מאת	השמלידים אשנים אדם.
	בביות בן האלא אנהא	スピス tm² aia かえ

https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|004 and https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|005 (accessed 14/07/2024).

.

¹²⁶ On these manuscripts see respectively Wright, *Catalogue*, 416, 419–420; 696–701. See also S. Brock, "Basil's Homily on Deut. xv 9: Some Remarks on the Syriac Manuscript Tradition", in *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur 133, ed. J. Dummer (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987), 57–66.

For the other manuscripts and the texts they transmit in comparison with that of our florilegium, see https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|oo5 (accessed 14/07/2024).

See the previous footnote.

الهله حدورت سر حر تهربه عربياط حعور בבגלה האלה מנא בבג. حصابة بم حاهمه حمد ۵۵۵ عنه درتک عحس مدمحه مسعد حصح ۵۰ حصیه جماح حصر برماه، حدم المحت بصحنء حسه وبهلا ממני ואה אנרא يتعجب ويرمين كرحمد ححسه. حجمه وهرسه אב בגכא להובשו מהא سخاء، ۵۰ حماصعه ندک سيحد حهمت بهم ساح حهر سعم بربيابر ماميكه ¹²⁹.۲۱**نده**

באב מס ביו זגל זבים

עבמבים בין זגל זבים

עבמבים בין גל עבים

עבומא זאבייא

בי בבי איני בבייט

בי בבי איני בייט

בייט איז מאבי

בייט איז מאלי

مهد کنه دجه دجمه

∠ سحم سحدوب

لحصمت حركم لحم ددوس

יארשטא בי במשא אראי

والمراجع المحسنح

سعم مر عممهم، محم

אישישי ארא בארא: טבעיי

תצומסו השמולם :תובם הטה

ك حغم ١٠٠٠: ٥١٨ مغد حل

عند محامع حلء حهمصلع

יאטישא שישיאי בוא

مربع محتاح حمله

مدل مدیم در حمدسی محصور مدل مه دلحم در حمدر سه

Quotation

20

¹²⁹ MS BL Add 14543, f. 136rv.

حعل حسمعه بشاح محموديه محت مهمده بحمعهم المودك المعجومة حعط תשמזם תים תבת דמטניאיי מבוני אפש נושטא בפלה טע הוא יישאר سربع سحمر هم تحمه دحم אוני בבנטוא אם נמדגונא الحديم دع حونه وم المرابع בת אלמא מבור אנה. כן سحمح جخم بمحمود בת שווא כאוב מלובעל يهابح لحنيه يستحيه א תות שבהם ביש אורא שיבושא ציי ما عبلم محس ما مهد ב, כבן פסלסט בד אכבי דעד حام منه حام حنه مه سحعد حعمه תמש תל יהיא היש תית حميءه حمتكه حديها אין אטא אנון מ מה אים שלים מש אים בבלה שלא מנא שי وحد عدم سد من مه سحمر حبنه سحمر ستحصوب وست ححدونه سنه لسته נסגם בעה מבויא. עהא سحم سحمه المحمد וים מבמונים מוציה

המדמש אראי ומרא שמדף בשבישה מני מבבשהי كاعماء مهدره גשימבושא: כזע אכא שכון מוס המסוד איים אבש מא אוא בעד אמשוז سامه حسلہ ہیں۔ ہملہ פע אוטידי עשל אים הכיהונה לכיה בפים יידי דע ארשא מבחיב איני در بحده درامه در عدد عدد عدد مه حاته و مدنون مد האור דביני בשיבהואי הבר בישש מן תות זשםם حر شع دومته وحد ست. کے مر ملت کی ج בהלהם: בה אכיל העה מה בין איני שיברשטיי ביים ביים ححدهدمه مسر علم الم حمولد مع سعد حعمه תאוז: תיוש תיוש היו עוא אומש אליש איזשם איז מניא מים מכוץ מו איז שום. סוֹם מילי שם. מילי حسمة بحنة عملمة مهد מם. מבעל מינים של שני שני مص سعد بخدد محد תיים תשמשים תיים: יריזם מבמה הלא. עד בעד אישישים: בחד מביאי יודא מבעל מיבינים אלי בייני זייים. מבמהים היה מבוא ביי سه حسه حقاهملمه

	מפרא מיץ גא ביני
	سته همهر سنه همها ۱30

On the one hand, we can say that the translation transmitted in our florilegium follows the paraphrased version but not to the letter; on the other, however, it is totally different from the one contained in MS BL Add 18813, ff. 82r-85v (7th century), BL Add 14618, ff. 32v-35r (7th/8th century) and Cambridge Add 3175, ff. 156v-159v (10th/11th century), which is faithful to the original Greek translation.¹³¹ This can also be confirmed from the titles given to Basil's work in these versions. In fact, our florilegium calls it 'Discourse on Faith and against those who falsify it saying three gods concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit' حصحنه حل سمحده همر ملموحل سلم بمخيم سهه لسه بملامه) രുപ പോർ പ്രാവം പാർ : ചാറ പ്രതിം); MS BL Add 17143 and 14543 give the title as 'Second discourse on Faith' (בארבי א גאוֹב, האמביה); MS BL 14612 as 'Discourse on Faith' (הבל משביהא') المحدة المحدة (المحدة المحدة); BL Add 18813 and 14618 as 'Discourse on that it سماحته رجمانة), while in MS Cambridge Add 3175 it is entitled 'Discourse to those who accuse us of professing three gods' (منعمد مسابة ملاهم لل معتفية عوية لهما مريد).

A. van Roey failed to take account of this element in his analysis of the florilegium, where he again simply indicates that he could not find an exact correspondence in the Greek original. Consequently, it is more than plausible that the

¹³⁰ MS BL Add 14543, ff. 136v–137r.

¹³¹ On these manuscripts see respectively Wright, *Catalogue*, 729–731, 738; and W. Wright, *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901), 1218–1234. See also Brock, "Basil's Homily". For a comparison of the translation of the two passages in our florilegium and the one in these manuscripts see https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|oo5 (accessed 14/07/2024).

¹³² Van Roey, "Les fragments", 144.

compiler was a Syriac-speaking Miaphysite. This is not the only factor that can support such a hypothesis. In fact, a considerable number of patristic quotations in this florilegium are also quoted in other texts written during the Tritheist controversy, namely (1) Theodosius of Alexandria's *On Trinity*;¹³³ (2) Various texts published by G. Furlani;¹³⁴ (3) Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian Corpus;¹³⁵ (4) a Trinitarian florilegium based mainly on Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian Corpus.¹³⁶

Theodosius of Alexandria's *On Trinity* was originally composed in Greek but it exists in various Syriac translations of which the oldest, used for comparison in this study, is copied in MS British Library Add. 14602, which dates, according to Wright, ¹³⁷ from the sixth or seventh century. ¹³⁸ G. Furlani demonstrated that the texts he published were originally composed in Syriac; ¹³⁹ I have demonstrated that the Trinitarian florilegium is based on the Syriac version of Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian Corpus on which L. van Rompay recently expressed his doubts as to whether it was originally composed in Greek. In his opinion, it is more plausible that Peter wrote his work against Damian of Alexandria directly in

¹³³ Chabot, *Documenta*, 40–79; A. van Roey and P. Allen, eds., *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 56 (Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 144–221.

¹³⁴ Furlani, Sei scritti.

¹³⁵ R. Y. Ebied, A. van Roey and L. Wickham, eds., *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni. Tractatus contra Damianum*, 4 vols, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 29, 32, 35, 54 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2003); Ebied, van Roey and Wickham, *Peter of Callinicum*.

https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/flos/TRI (accessed 14/07/2024).

¹³⁷ Wright, Catalogue, 952–953.

¹³⁸ For more details on this work, its contents, Syriac translations etc. see van Roey and Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, 105–143

¹³⁹ Furlani, *Sei scritti*, 675–678.

¹⁴⁰ B. Ebeid, "Metaphysics of Trinity in Graeco-Syriac Miaphysitism: A Study and Analysis of the Trinitarian Florilegium in Ms BL Add. 14532" (Studia graeco-arabica 11 [2021]), 83–128.

Syriac.¹⁴¹ In support of this position one might also add the fact that in *Contra Damianum*¹⁴² we find a quotation from a pseudo-Basil of Caesarea's *Against the Anomoeans* (CPG 2988),¹⁴³ a work that was originally composed in Syriac.¹⁴⁴ In addition, and as we shall see below, it seems that Peter of Callinicum wrote his work against the Syrian Miaphysite followers of Damian of Alexandria and his Trinitarian doctrine.

To return to our florilegium, the table below presents the quotations found both in our florilegium and in one or more of the Miaphysite texts relating to the Tritheist controversy, using Roman numerals to indicate the chapter in our florilegium, Arabic numerals for the number of the quotation in the chapter, and adding 'p' when the passage is quoted in partial form in one of these sources:¹⁴⁵

Theodosius of	Furlani's Texts	Peter of	Trinitarian
Alexandria		Callinicum	florilegium
		I:8 (p)	
		II:3 (b)	
		II:4 (P) x2	II:4 (P)
II:7		II:7 (p)	II:7
		(p) e:III	(p) e:III
			III:11 (p)
			III:15

¹⁴¹ See L. van Rompay, "Pierre de Callinique et les versions syriaques des Homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze. Un premier sondage" (Babelao 10-11 [2022]), 481–495.

Ebied, van Roey and Wickham, *Petri Callinicensis*, vol. 4, XXXIX.152–165.

¹⁴³ A. van Roey, "Une Homélie inédite contre les Anoméens attribuée à saint Basile de Césarée" (Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 28 [1997]), 179–192.

¹⁴⁴ See J. Noret and M. Geerard, *Clauis Patrum Graecorum. Supplementun*, Corpus Christianorum, (Brepols: Turnhout, 1998), 130, no. 2988 (14).

¹⁴⁵ For exact references, consult the online digital critical edition, https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/flos/ATR (accessed 14/07/2024).

	III:19 (p)		
	III:20 (p)		
		III:22 (p)	
	IV:8 (p)		IV:8 (p)
		IV:9 (p) x 2	IV:9 (p) x 2
		IV:10 (p) x 2	IV:10 (p)
	V:3 (p)	V:3 (p) x 2	
V:4		V:4 (p) x 3	
	V:7	V:7	
		V:12 (p)	
		V:12 (p)	
V:15 (p)		V:15 (p) x 3	V:15 (p) x 2

Comparison of the texts, in fact, leads us to maintain that the compiler of the florilegium under examination, as well as the other sources, used existing Syriac translations either in integral or in fragmental form. The following examples should clarify this point, starting with quotation 7 in the second chapter, which derives from Severus of Antioch's *Letter to John and John the priests and abbots*:

Anti-tritheist	Theodosius of	Peter of	Trinitarian
florilegium	Alexandria	Callinicum	florilegium
		त्यत <u>र</u> अहं त्येत	
		האמלי	
		يسەمىدى: يىسىرى	
		ניתו כבי	
		<i>جومعهم</i> م	
		س، مجا بعد	
		سلمب حصمة:	
		יאירו ירןי אלא	
		حسه مسه	
		<i>جومەمەم</i>	
		בז אינט אינא דים	
		حهمعمله حل ښلم	

		حباء ححدهوه	-
~9 <i>x</i> ≥.10	~ 4 مه مه مه م	بهمد بدنه	∴≺₽₹₽₽
حومتسوب ج	حومتسوب	6-2m4.2 6774.2	ھەھىسەك ھ
ம் ஷு	جع بموست	خللهم حتيلهم:	
حمتوحه. سنه	حمدة حكم، حش،	רלז נששה פיר	حمتمحہ شہ تع
ين عن بنون جي ن	נים ניתו אי ממי, בו	ندحم ومكن	נימצ אים סיטיר קצו יטינ
بعاه خصمحے	יירישטיריז יש	يمحبن وحبر	ישטידי דרי מטילי
حب حست	لدن حب حسب	بملب حعبوب	حسب منحہ ¹⁴⁹ د.
مىچى.146	مبحک، ¹⁴⁷	77×2. 4754	
		ممامع بىتىر	
		علسه محننه.	
		بم حمممله	
		ندومته	
		حومسوب ج	
		ىمەمەر.	
		حمده تحم، من عم	
		भ्कं प्रच भक्क प्रकाय	
		יהשמה: לבל	
		حب حست	
		فیحک، 148	

The second example is quotation 15 in the third chapter, which derives from Gregory of Nyssa's *On 'Not three gods', to Ablabius*, found similar in the Trinitarian florilegium based on Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian Corpus:

Anti-tritheist florilegium	Trinitarian florilegium	
حهل معمل المتوجب جا حاله	حجلا معتر يرامتوحك حورتوهمك	
تحله محققه حولتهمهم	क अक्र अवस्था त्या अवस्था	

https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|002 (accessed 14/07/2024).

¹⁴⁷ Chabot, *Documenta*, 69.27–30.

Ebied, van Roey and Wickham, *Petri Callinicensis*, vol. 2, IV.423–431.

¹⁴⁹ See quotation 10 in https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/TRI|002 (accessed 14/07/2024).

میده درانه درانه درانه در درانه در درانه در درانه در درانه در درانه درانه در درانه درانه

The fact that this quotation was not identified in the incomplete version of Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian corpus known to us today suggests that both florilegia were based either on the same source, which contains this fragment, or on the same integral Syriac translation of Gregory's *Letter to Ablabius*. The next example offers further support to my hypothesis. Quotation 7 in the fifth chapter, which derives from Basil of Caesarea's *Letter 38*, *concerning the difference between substance and hypostasis*, is found in one of Furlani's texts as well as in Peter of Callinicum's *Against Damian*. The text in all these sources is similar to that of an integral early Syriac translation:

Anti-tritheist	Furlani's Texts	Peter of	Early Syriac
florilegium		Callinicum	translation
حم <i>تح</i> 0، 4	ארבודסיי אף	44. لية على الم	لام <u>ت</u> ر∞، کلی
حه مع مةلعت	حتمامه رحه بم	cs. Vouce	حعاقہ رحہ عم
<i>べい</i> だって	جمالح	7 40043	:جىءج
<i>جەمىمكا</i>	Lyana	حىاحة حطاقه	~ganaA
רשטט≺י	לא עישטעי	کہ خدہ عب حے	לא השטעי
אסטיי אארי	אסיסיי אפןש	~97~	حيمته حهرت
מבריצה. בחה בה	ك هنعم: حسم	דישוטא: בשי	ك خونعم:

https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|003 (accessed 14/07/2024).

¹⁵¹ See quotation 1 in https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/TRI|038 (accessed 14/07/2024).

	במש בה במש	<i>ح</i> ه حصم	حة حسب	حسے
	حصحيمه	حصحيمهم	≺മണ്ടായാ	حصفديوب
פורצה מדמ; מדמ ההחסשה הו היה מדמ מדמ ההחסשה הו בהחסשה הו הו מנו במה בא הו מדמ במד מו במד במד מו במד במד מו במד במד מו במד	نعلب، ەھدەن	نعلم: ەھدەن	بعديه: مهدوني	نعلب وهدني
האספשא אם אם מנוכא אספשא אם מנוכא ואספשא אם מוניא ואספשא אם מוניא ולידין מנוט ולידין ולידין מנוט ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידין מנוט ולידין ולידיין ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידין ולידיין ולידין ולידין ולידיין ולידיין ולידיין ולידין ולידין ולידיין ול	حاء <u>م</u> صا	<i>-دعسعہ حا</i>	~ി₃ _െം	ح <i>د ن</i> ع حاء عصا
מנמכא נאכו: כל מנוטא אבו ואכין ואכין כל מונא אבי ואכן ואכן מונא אבי ואכן ואכין מונא אבי ואכן ואכין מונא אבי ואכן ואכין מונא אבי ואכן ואכין מונא ואכן וא אבי ואין מונא ואין ואין ואין מונא ואין ואין ואין מונא ואין ואין ואין ואין ואין ואין ואין ואי	פניגא נכנינ:	מבומל גיאונומיא	בישא מנומ	מנוע גאסטריו
 בק הובא אב הובא הצבוא הובא הבשאה בסבראה הובן בסברון באר במבראה הובן בסברון באר במבראה הובן בסברון בסברון	מא אישטאיז	പ്രാവന ദപ	~500~	ح ع م ع ع ع ع ع ع ع
צפוס להדבון: כל להדבון: פוס בל להדבון פוס ב דלם להלבון: פוס בל להלבון: פוס בל להלבון פוס ב דלם די מוס ב דלם די מוס ב בל בי מוס בי	יזשאז אשמים:	לבאכב: בא	יישרא ראטיים	רביה בא מינהא
שונה, דלה דלה מבשהול מבסבהול שלון מבסבהול דרוקיי שבן מבסבלון	שא אביש אב	هبعده حعبه	بعذ حبب نصو	بعدة لحتم
	معنه لكويم: مع	كتبعب: شيخا	ماء حس سيحا	പ _{്പ} എന്
הארץ שבן הארץ שבן הארץ שבן הארץ שבן הארץ שבן הארץ שבן הארץ שבוא מעד הארץ מעדא	പ് ഫത	4-جست بح	فحصحته سرعصح	ومحتفحه
حفحلم: ۲۶۸۷ ۲۶۸۵۲۶ ۲۵۵۲۶	فحودكم والمام	ליקוש מאיניזן	במ מארזז	רש מארז הש מארז
	לאט מאני <u>ז</u>	حمدلىم:	מסברים. ניאבט	محمدين يحمحه
$ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	محبح: نمهم	ראיז עזאיעז	רישטע איזייז	~zwz ~>>
وست منون المحنون المحنون وشر المحنون وشر المحنون وشر وحسفه شون المحنون وشر المحنون وشر المحنون وشر المحنون وشر المحنون وشر الملهم منون المحالم منون المحله منون المحله منون المحله منون المحله منون المحالم والمحالم والمح	ראשז רש	えよき えちらえ	מאברא מעד	えじき よちらく
ت الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الل	えよき えららえ	השני פתו	حصمته	ראטום ייים
rewern: half arises reptar arises reptar arises reptar arises reptar arises reptar arises	משי פרטמר	:منحمن	ישמי סשי	יאמי בינים. מהי
ποια και και και και και και και και και κ	נאמבים: ממי	ായയ പ്രചയാദ	ניקיע ילפשייי	نبهد بجموضء
حفحلم: معمل المعمل المعم	ניקיע : איז שבי <u>י</u>	حەيتە جەرب	حصقته حهره	حەقتە جەلاھ،
איר מישטאי ביבודא איר מישטאי ביליז איר מישטאי איר מישטאי איר מישטאי איר מישטאי איר מישטאיי איר מייע איר מייע איר	حصقته جوم 44	حفدلىم:	حفدلم:	حضطه وماسك
אסטינט איז בא פישביל צונים בא באסטיני איז פישביל צונים איז אר פישביל צונים איז אר פישביל צונים איז אסטינים איז	حفدلىع:	محامعه	محمامهم	ىكىد ∶ھىھەد؛
רשניצי איי איי איי איי איי איי איי איי איי	محاقعه	മ്പയല്∠.⁴	محد هیهوند؛	خە جەنە جىنى
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	مہر هبيوںد،	ריטג עזיזאם	حرمة حست	השבישטן היוש
	:איטֿד אזיז	حے mr.>	يمتوحك: حك	מלמבנים גוגם
Ed with your operation and your operation with the second	حع 13m مح	موهديه وراهم	השבינטט הינש	تنلقم حبلا
אסהיישא בשביל בודם מסבא באה באה באה באה	~p~10p	משבוץ דודם:	,	אז אייר איש
השבין דודם האשודא דניף אב אוף שף	يخهدنى داده	≺₃∞√≻	בינים אבי באד	הקש קחי שי
הולפה בלל איבוא הביא מהא איבוא ההביא איבוי בים.	وربعت حجلا	الارة لامياد الارة لامياد	てじて へょる	נייבה קיידי ביני
השינים אינ של הקי לחש אינ של החשיע היים	אייא איזש	स्पेल कार <i>च</i> र	שה שר בן:	حهد تعدر
המשהנה אות בהמדי אות הבימון המבשהנה אות שת הלו	भा५ <i>च</i> ५ ५८ ⁴	يتوبع بوسد	مميء بيوحم	
שלא הגישה בינ לפיני ביני בישה בילה ביל	سيء بي	בסמהנא כעה	ישייגי בייני	
איז בינ ובסבים אהיים אין איניים אין איניים אין איניים איני	بوشعن حمد	くみっぱのフィ	くみっぱのショ	س <i>ح خد</i> ه 152
רשבישא בדן אין אראיים אייים	حهة عمر	בדישאי ניכך	イゼスシ	

-

 $[\]frac{152}{\rm https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|oo5}$ (accessed 14/07/2024).

אר איינייטע איי	هایم خدی	ペポンペン
153.√ p¥==>	¹54. ~ ↓	<i>במבשניס</i> קא
		<i>حملا</i> سح
		خدہ لمب.155

The last example is quotation 15 in the fifth chapter, which derives from Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oration on the Lights (Or. 39)*. This passage is quoted once in Theodosius of Alexandria's *On Trinity*, three times in Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian Corpus, and twice in the Trinitarian florilegium:

Anti-tritheist florilegium	Theodosius of Alexandria	Peter of Callinicum 1	Peter of Callinicum 2	Peter of Callinicum 3	Trinitarian florilegium 1	Trinitarian florilegium 2
ス 邑人	ス色入	ス色入	ス色ス	え邑え	え邑え	え邑え
دع.	۲.,	۲۰۰۶	دع	۲۰.۶	بع و	<i>د</i> ء
%p≥~	%y>~	ישהעי	%y>~	% √20~	אמרי	אמרי
יישיביי	i>>ı⊄ı	ごりては	i シペコ	i ジベコ	ごろんご	ごろんご
:ح ن ہ	. کا ہ	אנא כעז.	. کا ک	· حام	: <i>ح</i> اہر	: <i>حا</i> لا
					حس:	
≺iതവ	്നബ	سلملمح	്നബ	്നവ	≺iതവ	≺iതവ
∾ർമ്പ്	محدنم	۵	مهمام	سنصلانهم	مناظمه	مناظمح
.~ <i>6</i> 7 <i>8</i> ~°					۵.	
~979~	ᡊ᠘᠘ᡒ	~&7%~	∵≺₽7₽¬°	ᡊᠰ᠘ᠰᢇ	·≺₽ア₽⊃º	ᡊᢐ᠘ᠰᠵ
خ	∼ ₽7₽⊃	خ	~&7%~	~878~	~&7%~	~979~
خومهم يت	ھے	حملته	خ	ھے	خ	مخع
مح	دونتلته	ومعة مد	حهتلعهم	حوملته	حوملته ب	حوملته

¹⁵³ Furlani, *Sei scritti*, 727.3–11.

¹⁵⁴ Ebied, van Roey and Lionel, *Petri Callinicensis*, vol. 2, X.275–285.

¹⁵⁵ M. F. G. Parmentier, "De differentia essentiae et hypostaseos (CPG 3196) in Syriac Translation", in *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 12, ed. H. R. Drobner and Ch. Klock (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 18.3–16.

حقدہ حک.	همت مد	:جوسوت	ہتے ہد	ہت≂ ہ۔	שה טיי	ہمت مح
~	حمدة حك.	x	حمته حک.	حمدہ ھے۔	حمته حه.	حمتهم.
بوسوغ	ம்	بعدر مصسغ	~	~	٨	K
ಬ್ಳ	لابستج	يمرا	بمسخ	بمسخ	بحصية	بحسب
ەد نج	بمحا	لحمن	يمحا	يمحا	ಬ್ಗ	ಬ್ಗ
حعقحقع	لحمن	ەب لىخم ا	لحمن	لحمنې	لخعيب	لخمي
<i>~∆</i> o.	مح	حعمحتهم	مح	مح	مح	مح
מכנים בשי	حعقحةعت	نعكر حا :	حعقحقع	.~ <u>20</u> ~=2	حقيحة	حعوجها
		מבונע				
حجي	in	чарт 17-2	מבות בשי	in	żuż	מכניע איז
موجوعة	בהבונה	حريكة	77~	77~	77~	77~
~ سنع∴	77>	المع بيم	عتجت	عىجە>	عوجها	×ھڃھ≻
~>>>	حوتها	حصه	موحوعه	حاسنسه.	حاسنت	حبسهم
ښترحت	بعممه	r.Lin er.	ראי במבא	حصہ	حصح	سەخ.
 2	~>>	Ĺṁ	ஞ்.எ≺்.எ	ښتيرکي	ட ஆன் கா	ح مح
ښترځ	ா∠மகள்	حهتج مهتج	25.	7.5	حيين	ښتركي
د وبحبوب	د 4 حمل	حقهم	ښت≺ح	ښتېځ	سهتجنه	7.5
<i>جا</i> کہ	ഫ്ര					
حتهم.	LPapL		حهتح	جمهم	هلاك مس	سهتجه
eur rus	حفهم.		<i>جلہ</i> .	يولك. دست جروب دوبروب دوبروب	<i>د</i> ء	حهتح
ححروب	ست تب		حس. جب	1.5	トタアシ コ	ج4≈.
نجتصوبرء	ححروب		ححروب	ححروب	نجتصوبرء	حسد دنع
مح	K-000K-1		רד®ט≺.²	نجتمونج،	ومحوسر	ححلهہ
₽0w7<-2	ومحوسر		159		₽º@7<.⁴	₹2000×3
.ہر	مساح			₽ow7≺²	.۲	162 💠
	.۲			بر مصاحة	<i>خ</i> لمهلح	
حطة قعلم	حدنعهم				حاء نمير	
حملمه	حا نمع			حاء نعر	حمامع	
۲:m2	حهونع			حمامه	KWZL27	
ت محن	みん				אוכין.	

Ebied, van Roey and Wickham, *Petri Callinicensis*, vol. 3, XXIII.80–85.

Ebied, van Roey and Wickham, *Petri Callinicensis*, vol. 2, I.76–81.

See quotation 2 in https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/TRI|023 (accessed 14/07/2024).

ەنمە	لان حرب 12 m.u.		بادر	ەھبومە	
مركامه	. i >>><		ەھبومە	مرکامه	
ь. ur.>	وحوحت		مرلعه	ъ. д	
in	~		н	in	
~φoω7~	محدنعك،		že ž	~979~	
-479-	њ. з		<u> </u>	~ <i>γοω</i>]~	
<i>∼</i> ₽7₽°	į		<i>へ</i> ₽ºº/	~97 <i>9</i> ч° ÷	
ur. co/Le	യൌഴുഴാ		~ 979° :	<i>⊶</i> . ∞	
تحصم	•		<i>⊶</i> . ∞	تحص	
~ β0ω]~	: <pre>~</pre>		ترحمه	.പ്രമെച്ച	
156	യൌറ്റഴാ		.പ്രമെച്ച	,⇔ o⊷	
	.m =		,⇔ o~	بمومة	
	تحص		بمامة	~4°4°	
	ペタロリン		~み~み~	لححمد	
	ب مامحمو		لححمدن	ښ <i>ه خې</i> ښ	
	க்க _ோ ன்		ښ <i>ه خ</i> ېښ	<i>~₽º@</i>	
	べむな		<i>へ</i> ₽ººग/	161.	
	:יאכילי		160		
	പര				
	צטרי				
	~ <i>φοω</i>]~				
	157				

All this clearly leads to the conclusion that the compiler of the anti-Tritheist florilegium was a Syrian Miaphysite who was directly involved in the Tritheistic controversy and who had access to various patristic texts, mainly those which already existed in an integral or partial Syriac translation, and that were in use among the different parties involved in the controversy.

¹⁵⁶ https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/ATR|005 (accessed 14/07/2024).

¹⁵⁷ Chabot, *Documenta*, 72.24-73.2.

¹⁶⁰ Ebied, van Roey and Wickham, *Petri Callinicensis*, vol. 4, XLVII.372–380.

¹⁶¹ See quotation 8 in https://www.florilegiasyriaca.eu/texts/TRI|001 (accessed 14/07/2024).

WHERE AND WHEN THE FLORILEGIUM WAS COMPILED

One another extremely important detail, noted by neither A. van Roey nor G, Furlani, remains to be highlighted. As seen above, the compiler of our florilegium mentions Theodosius of Alexandria as already dead but does not make any direct quotation from his On Trinity, even though he considers his own position to be in agreement with that of Theodosius, and that the Tritheites wrongly consider themselves followers of Theodosius. The texts published by G. Furlani also share the same characteristics as our florilegium: they place Theodosius among the saints, regard his doctrine as orthodox, without making any quotation from it, and they claim that the Tritheites, although they claim to follow Theodosius' teaching, in truth they do not do so. 163 On the contrary, the work of Peter of Callinicum, and consequently the Trinitarian florilegium based on it, quotes numerous passages from Theodosius' On Trinity. These various factors lead me to maintain that our florilegium was composed in the same period and place as the texts published by G. Furlani. What strengthens this hypothesis is that both our florilegium and the texts published by G. Furlani are silent concerning the controversy between Damian of Alexandria and Peter of Callinicum, so these texts must date from before the controversy.

To add detail to this hypothesis, another element must be taken into consideration: our florilegium quotes an extract from the letter sent by the 'Orthodox [i.e. Miaphysite] bishops in the East [i.e. Mesopotamia] to the Orthodox [i.e. Miaphysite] bishops in Constantinople', that is, quotation 22 in the fifth chapter. In both manuscripts this extract appears to be a continuation of the previous passages (quotation 21) from

¹⁶³ See, for example, Furlani, Sei scritti, 737–738, 759.

Severus' work *Against the additions of Julian of Halicarnassus*,¹⁶⁴ an element that led G. Furlani to consider it as such.¹⁶⁵ A. van Roey, however, noted that it is a new passage, correctly understanding that it is related to Theodosius of Alexandria and identifying the direct quotations from Theodosius' *On Trinity* mentioned in it. What he did not notice, however, is that the whole extract belongs to another text and is not by Theodosius himself.¹⁶⁶

The aforementioned letter, from which this extract derives, was composed to defend the writings of Theodosius from misinterpretations by the Tritheites, ¹⁶⁷ a characteristic shared by our ant-Tritheistic florilegium, and the aforementioned texts published by G. Furlani. What distinguishes this letter is that it quotes some passages from Theodosius' *On Trinity*. These passages differ, to some extent, from the Syriac translations of Theodosius' work that are known to us. This is demonstrated in the following table, which compares the first and second quotations from Theodosius' work in the extract of our florilegium, with three different Syriac translations of Theodosius' *On Trinity*:

Theodosius in	The earliest	The second	The third
the florilegium	known Syriac	earliest known	earliest known
	translation of	Syriac	Syriac
	Theodosius	translation of	translation of
		Theodosius	Theodosius

¹⁶⁴ In MS BL Add. 15432, this extract begins in folio 206r; while the folio where it is copied in MS BL Add. 15438, namely folio 144v, is damaged, even though it is clear that it was indeed considered a continuation of Severus' quotation.

¹⁶⁵ Furlani, "Un florilegio", 676.

Van Roey, "Les fragments", 144–145.

¹⁶⁷ Chabot, *Documenta*, 189–195.

حلة , تك اتف	בל הי, גלה וגם	באל היו דף וגם	בל הי, גלה וגם
لاحتتك	∠117≥ 3	מישטטאיז איזיאיז	מישטעע איזיאטיי
യ≺ മൗതയ്≺ൂ	مح معمودء	<u>رئات</u> لائتاء ملا	سبنه میته هر مرده مرده مرده می
بحتتء	<u> دیر</u> ک (۲ <u>۳۵ ک</u>	<i>جوموموم</i>	حه موليه علم
<i>جوم معمر</i> م	<i>جومەمەم</i>	םגיבוס : כניבי מני	مەرىخە . مەركە سە
تعمع حومعه. معرع حومعه	מניבוף אינים: מניבינ	حهمىهىلم رح	حه موليه وحه
01.21 ce 162	سە ھے	<i>へを</i> しり くらしん	<u> </u>
אנשא ייני בא	<i>جومعهم</i>	حا :معالم	حاه نمعة
<i>جوم معمر</i> م	ス 見え えをしり	ריים; רלם רביר	حيه نا ه حد
سويعيت	പ്രചർപ	מיים איש אישיים	ح <i>د</i> يه
حا .غصعة،<	20 2		¹⁷⁰ .ര ൂമാ റ്റ്
حراه نحاح	לציזם לייטן		
جدیت جده	168 ia-b r		
ndear.			
لبرات لبسرح	حتم حصت	سرته مساح نواس	حدمت لسلم خم
سحمر حدب	سعمه بهاسجي	בא אפאמי:	ישאמי בני
·iンとかん	حب للاسمم	לאינטיקא גיענ	בשה ארטיינין
76ana4> 14.	ىن، <i>بىلى، ⊶لىت</i>	∵≺മി≺	תשמתם .תפשת
ייאשארי זייז	スま 人ちの人り	איזיי אידיסטארטיז	יני א טידא מיני
حستہ ہے	۵حکیلی ستن	סבבערא מדי.	היי אמים
יאניסט אישטא	62 ≺9797 1	حهره حيصصه	הידדים המקט
ביז האקאה	متعجب مجيمته	ضحوب وهورس	سع ەھىدسىم.
متەھى	سه وهمدسه	טירא ונס ניבחיא	س حاه حسه
.√4æ≥	سع. 20∞سب	בינערי ביתייבה	השיישים הקים
ەھغەدىد.	יזיי ירקט	え 0~	רל היז דלם
05.70 m	حاه حعسهم	בישייבא יוסבך	<i>حاه</i> .حصمه
حاه حسه	באייבאי ווים	∴KqowJK 77	، بەھەدك جك
حراه نحسهم	يتفحك حك	שנט גיא כד	a~∵~µaשק~
יתשישי ת	פע המטשות	רזיזט ירישטע	יילויסט עישטע
رشم ويفحك حك	حمو حل	∼ <i>₽σ•₽</i> ₹₽²	graza Lgzzzaz
.പ്രമെപ്പ	מת ⊹תשמת	مدمعه حمعته	人もの人し

Chabot, *Documenta*, 40.13–16.

169 van Roey and Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, 148.2–5.

170 van Roey and Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, 184.3–6

השטה קידטת	حد میں	רלר . השמה	त्येत्र .त्रककक्रिक
وحيدك	ج <i>ومع</i> ته	حصقته ہے جات	்கம்சும் പയം
~, שטי שיק קיי	ومعده	مسعد عمساء	حد متهجہ
ومغو جوهعته	~4a4r~	حقيء قط	معمية هتممه
רלור . רטעם	.~केवन्क्रमेक	هوسر ₁₇₂	مرسه برسه الم
سرحه			
متوحہ حلسہ۔	حلعص		
ومحاصر	⊀عتقح≻		
حقيء	ومحوس		
دله بوسخ «	<i>- دفت ع</i> م		
	ىلەس ىد .		

It is more than plausible that the letter was composed before the first Syriac translation of Theodosius' *On Trinity* was realised, and that its composers translated the relevant passages from Theodosius directly from Greek. If we now take into consideration that the letter is copied in the same manuscript that contains the earliest Syriac translation of Theodosius' *On Trinity*, I am led to conclude that both texts were produced by the same community. Consequently, our florilegium can also be dated to this same period, that is, before the first translation of Theodosius' *On Trinity* into Syriac was made, in other words, some time in the second half of the sixth century.¹⁷⁴

Finally, for the place where our florilegium was composed, one might suggest that the compiler belonged to the Miaphysite community of Mesopotamia, probably in Edessa. To explore this suggestion further, we need to take into consideration the

¹⁷¹ Chabot, *Documenta*, 52.21–28.

van Roey and Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, 159.319–324.

¹⁷³ van Roey and Allen, *Monophysite Texts*, 194.320–195.325.

¹⁷⁴ To understand my hypothesis on dating this florilegium, one must take into consideration that Theodosius died in 567, Philoponus in 570, Peter of Callinicum in 591, Damian of Alexandria in 605; the controversy between the last two persons ended through a synod in 616, i.e. after the death of both.

doctrine of this florilegium, reading it in the general context of the Tritheist controversy and examining its probable relationship to the Trinitarian teaching of Damian of Alexandria.

THE FLORILEGIUM AND DAMIAN OF ALEXANDRIA

Scholars today distinguish more than one phase in the Tritheist controversy;¹⁷⁵ Theodosius of Alexandria's reaction and his composition of *On Trinity* belong to the first phase; here he disagreed with the doctrine of the first Tritheites but did not regard it as heresy. The position of Theodosius did not resolve the problem but divided Miaphysites into two groups, those who agreed with him and those who disagreed. It is worth noting that during the second phase, some Tritheites used the work of Theodosius as proof of the correctness of their doctrine. The above argumentation on the use of Theodosius is indeed evidence supporting this element.

The aim of our florilegium, to return to our text, is explicit in its title, namely, to demonstrate that the doctrine of John

¹⁷⁵ In regards see, among others, A. Grillmeier, "The Tritheist Controversy in the Sixth Century and its Importance in Syriac Christology", in Christ in Christian Tradition, vol. II/III: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch from 451 to 600, eds. A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 268-280; H. Martin, La controverse trithéite dans l'Empire byzantin au Vie siècle, PhD Dissertation (Leuven: Catholic University of Leuven, 1960); A. van Roey, "La controverse trithéite depuis la condemnation de Conon et Eugène jusqu'à la conversion de l'évêque Elie", in Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P. zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979 überreicht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 211, eds., W. C. Delsman, J. T. Nelis, J. R. T. M. Peters, W. H. Ph. Römer and S. A. S. van der Woude, (Kevelaer: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 487-497; A. van Roey, "La controverse trithéite jusqu'à l'excommunication de Conon et d'Eugène (557-569)", (Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 16 [1985]), 141-165.

Philoponus and his followers contradicts the Scriptures and the patristic tradition. We are informed by the florilegium's introduction and conclusion, moreover, that the compiler aims to demonstrate that the claim of his adversaries, i.e. the Tritheites, that they follow Theodosius' teaching, is merely verbal; in truth their doctrine is in contradiction with that of Theodosius.

According to the passages quoted from John Philoponus and his followers one can assert that their doctrine consists of the following points: (1) since the hypostasis is an individual concrete substance, and since Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three hypostases, they are consequently three concrete individual substances; (2) the general substance is an abstract reality, it has no real existence and exists only in the mind; (3) the unity in the Godhead is seen only in mental abstraction, i.e. at the level of the general substance; (4) the three divine hypostases are three consubstantial divinities: consubstantiality occurs between individual substances belonging to the same general substance; (6) each concrete substance differs from the other concrete substances of the same general substance on account of its own characteristics, and therefore (7) each concrete substance, with its property, is considered a different species. 176

¹⁷⁶ For more details on John Philoponus' doctrine and that of the Tritheites see Ebeid, "Metaphysics", 92–93. See also J. Zachhuber, *The Rise of Christian Theology and the End of Ancient Metaphysics: Patristic Philosophy from the Cappadocian Fathers to John of Damascus* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 145–169; T. Hainthaler, "John Philoponos, Philosopher and Theologian in Alexandria", in *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. II/IV: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, eds., A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1996), 131–138; C. Erismann, "The Trinity, Universals, and Particular Substances: Philoponus and Roscelin" (Traditio 53 [2008]), 277–305; J. Zachhuber, "Personhood in

To confute this doctrine, the compiler, through the introductions he gives to the five chapters, affirms that (1) the divine substance is one; (2) it exists really and not in mere thought; (3) it should be considered according to what Aristotle defines as substantia prima; (4) it is subsistent, that is, one concrete and single substance; (5) it is neither divisible nor countable in the three hypostases; (6) consubstantiality indicates hypostases and not single and concrete substances; and (7) substance is distinct metaphysically from hypostases, which are identified with persons and properties; (8) consubstantiality in the Godhead indicates the unity of the hypostases, that is, the one and truly existing substance, (9) which is one and the same in the three hypostases, and therefore (10) they are consubstantial. However, and (11) although the hypostases are identified metaphysically with the properties, Sabellianism is rejected; thus, one might conclude that (12) persons-hypostases-properties are not understood as masks, but as substantial, i.e. not-abstract realities.

It is evident that the compiler's metaphysical system is not the one established by the Cappadocians, which is based on the distinction between Aristotle's second substance, for the common and shared, and the first substance, for the single and concrete realities, i.e. the hypostasis.¹⁷⁷ It is clear, then, that even

Miaphysitism. Severus of Antioch and John Philoponus", in *Personhood in the Byzantine Christian Tradition: Early, Medieval, and Modern Perspectives*, eds., A. Torrance and S. Paschalides (New York: Routledge, 2018), 29–43; H. Martin, "Jean Philopon et la controverse trithéite du Vie siècle" (Studia Patristica 5 [1962]), 519–525.

¹⁷⁷ On the Trinitarian doctrine of the Cappadocians, see among others, Ph. Kariatlis, "St Basil's Contribution to the Trinitarian Doctrine. A Synthesis of Greek Paideia and the Scriptural Worldview" (Phronema 25 [2010]), 57–83; A. Radde-Gallwitz, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Ch. A. Beeley, Gregory of

if the compiler quotes the Cappadocians and other important Church Fathers, in order to support his own doctrine as expressed in the chapter introductions of the florilegium, he differs from these patristic doctrines. Comparing his doctrine with that of Damian of Alexandria, one might maintain that the florilegium is to be regarded as the first steps of the Trinitarian teaching of a Miaphysite current with which Damian probably had some direct or indirect relationships. The better to understand this hypothesis, one must take into consideration the main metaphysical principles of Damian's doctrine. These principles may be summarised as follows:

(1) There is a clear distinction between substance and hypostasis; (2) substance is the common and constituent element of being and (3) it exists concretely and not only in the mind; (4) hypostases are identified with the characteristic, also called hypostatic properties; as a consequence, (5) there is no distinction between 'name' and 'things'; (6) hypostases are distinct and incommunicable, but (7) each becomes substantial through participation in the substance, i.e. the common and constituent element of being, and (8) it consequently gains a substantial component; therefore, (9) it is not an abstract reality.¹⁷⁸

Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God. In Your Light We Shall See Light, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); S. Hildebrand, The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea. A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007); L. Turcescu, Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons, American Academy of Religion, Academy Series (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹⁷⁸ This summary is based on Ebeid, "Metaphysics", 95; for more details on Damian's doctrine see A. van Roey, "Le traité contre les Trithéites (CPG 7245) de Damien d'Alexandrie", in *Philohistôr: Miscellanea in Honorem Caroli Laga Septuagenarii*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 60, eds. A. Schoors and P. van Deun (Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 229–250; D. Krausmüller, "Properties

Comparing the doctrine of Damian and that of the florilegium, it is clear that the former is a development of the latter. Moreover, considering that we are sure that at least one of the quotations in the florilegium, namely quotation 9 in the third chapter, was used in one of Damian's synodical letters,179 this strengthens the hypothesis concerning the relationship between Damian and the milieu where the florilegium was composed. As for Damian, we also know that he was a Syrian Miaphysite from the region of Edessa. In fact, his brother was the prefect of the city. 180 Although he moved to Egypt at an early age, became a monk there, then a bishop and finally a patriarch, he continued to have contacts with the Syriac Miaphysite communities in his native area,181 and therefore it is very plausible that he belonged to, or at least had contacts with, the community of the florilegium. This is another element that supports what I have maintained above concerning the place where the florilegium was composed.

CONCLUSION

Revisiting the anti-Tritheist florilegium in MSS BL Add 14532 and 14538 and reading it in its doctrinal context has helped us, not just to date it and locate the place where it was composed, that is, during the second half of the sixth century among the Miaphysite community in Mesopotamia, probably in the region of Edessa, but also to add clarity to the profile of the compiler

Participating in Substance: The Trinitarian Theology of Severus of Antioch and Damian of Alexandria" (Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture 12 [2018]), 15–29; Zachhuber, *The Rise*, 171–179.

¹⁷⁹ See footnote 15 in van Roey, "Les fragments", 139.

¹⁸⁰ See Th. Hainthaler, "Damian, head of the 'Monophysite' world", in Christian Tradition, vol. II/IV: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451, eds., A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1996), 75.

¹⁸¹ See Hainthaler, "Damian", 76–77.

and his community: an anti-Tritheistic Syrian group claiming to be followers of Theodosius of Alexandria, who regarded the divine substance as one concrete and singular substance, i.e. according to what Aristotle defines as *substantia prima*, and considering the hypostases as properties and persons. These details shed more light on the Tritheistic controversy among Syrian Miaphysites in its second phase, that is, after the death of Theodosius of Alexandria and before the controversy between Peter of Callinicum and Damian of Alexandria.

In fact, considering that the texts published by G. Furlani, which were probably composed in the same period and place as our florilegium, do not share the doctrine our florilegium professes, but one that can be seen the first steps in the teaching developed by Peter of Callinicum, the adversary of Damian, one might conclude that the controversy between these two Miaphysite theologians, which caused a schism between the two sees of the Miaphysite Church, Alexandria and Antioch, started as two different Syriac Miaphysite reactions against Tritheism, originating in Mesopotamia. Eventually the different approaches became two different currents, so some modern scholars are not totally wrong to maintain that Peter of Callinicum's Against Damian was written directly in Syriac, since, in my opinion, it was composed to oppose the Syriacspeaking Miaphysites, followers of Damian, that is, those of the milieu where our anti-Tritheistic florilegium was composed and transmitted. The fact, finally, that our florilegium is contained in two manuscripts that also copy the Trinitarian florilegium based on Peter of Callinicum's Trinitarian doctrine¹⁸² reflects the coexistence of these two reactions/currents against Tritheism among Miaphysites, which started before the controversy between Peter and Damian, and continued even after it ended

¹⁸² In MS BL Add. 14532, f. 94v–133v and in MS BL Add. 14538, f. 119v–133v. See also Ebeid, "Metaphysics", see also https://www.florilegiasvriaca.eu/flos/TRI (accessed 14/07/2024).

with the victory of Peter's position in a synod that took place in 615 after the death of both patriarchs. 183

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

```
BL Add 14543 (6<sup>th</sup> century).
BL Add 14612 (6<sup>th</sup> / 7<sup>th</sup> century).
BL Add 14618 (7<sup>th</sup> / 8<sup>th</sup> century).
BL Add 17143 (5<sup>th</sup> century).
BL Add 18813 (7<sup>th</sup> century).
BL Add. 14532 (8<sup>th</sup> century).
BL Add. 14538 (10<sup>th</sup> century).
Cambridge Add 3175 (10<sup>th</sup> / 11<sup>th</sup> century).
```

Sources and Studies

Barbel, J., ed. *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden.* Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963.

Beeley, Ch. A. Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God. In Your Light We Shall See Light, Oxford

¹⁸³ It can be maintained that these two approaches to Trinitarian doctrine continued to coexist among Miaphysites for centuries, since we find the west-Syrian Abū Rāʾiṭah al-Takrītī (d. 835) sharing the doctrine of Peter of Callinicum (see B. Ebeid, "Patristic Tradition, Trinitarian Doctrine, and Metaphysics in Abū Rāʾiṭah al-Takrītī's Polemics against the Melkites", in Florilegia Syriaca. Mapping a Knowledge – Organizing Practice in the Syriac World, Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 179, eds., E. Fiori and B. Ebeid (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2023), 228–306; B. Ebeid, "Abū Rāʾiṭah al-Takrītī's Trinitarian Doctrine: Between Miaphysite Tradition and Islamic Challenge" (Adamantius 27 [2021]), 6–28) and the west-Syrian Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī (d. 974) sharing the doctrine of Damian of Alexandria (see B. Ebeid, "The Divine Substance as Aristotle's Substantia Prima: Yaḥyā b. 'Adī and his Trinitarian Doctrine", (Le Museon 136 [2023]), 509–548).

- Studies in Historical Theology. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Brock, S. "Basil's Homily on Deut. xv 9: Some Remarks on the Syriac Manuscript Tradition." In *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur 133, ed. J. Dummer. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987.
- Brooks, E. W., ed. *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts*, PO 12.2. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1915.
- Canivet, P. Théodoret de Cyr. Histoire Ecclésiastique. Tome II (Livres III-V), Sources Chrétiennes 530. Paris: Cerf, 2009.
- Chabot, J. B., ed. *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*, CSCO Syr. II.37. Paris: Typographeo Reipublicae, 1907.
- Courtonne, Y., ed. *Saint Basile. Lettres*, vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957.
- D. Krausmüller, "Properties Participating in Substance: The Trinitarian Theology of Severus of Antioch and Damian of Alexandria." *Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture* 12 (2018): 15–29.
- Ebeid, B. "Abū Rā'iṭah al-Takrītī's Trinitarian Doctrine: Between Miaphysite Tradition and Islamic Challenge." *Adamantius* 27 (2021), 6–28.
- Ebeid, B. "Metaphysics of Trinity in Graeco-Syriac Miaphysitism: A Study and Analysis of the Trinitarian Florilegium in MS BL Add. 14532." *Studia graeco-arabica* 11 (2021), 83–128
- Ebeid, B. "Patristic Tradition, Trinitarian Doctrine, and Metaphysics in Abū Rā'iṭah al-Takrītī's Polemics against the Melkites." In *Florilegia Syriaca. Mapping a Knowledge Organizing Practice in the Syriac World*, Vigiliae Christianae

- Supplements 179, eds. E. Fiori and B. Ebeid. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2023, 228–306.
- Ebeid, B. "The Divine Substance as Aristotle's Substantia Prima: Yaḥyā b. 'Adī and his Trinitarian Doctrine." *Le Museon* 136 (2023), 509–548.
- Ebied, R. Y., A. van Roey and L. Wickham, eds. *Peter of Callinicum*. *Anti-Tritheist Dossier*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 10. Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, 1981.
- Ebied, R. Y., A. van Roey and Wickham L. eds., *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni. Tractatus contra Damianum*, 4 voll, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 29, 32, 35, 54. Turnhout: Brepols, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2003.
- Erismann, C. "The Trinity, Universals, and Particular Substances: Philoponus and Roscelin." *Traditio* 53 (2008), 277–305.
- Furlani, G. "Un florilegio antitriteistico in lingua siriaca." Atti del Regio Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti IX: 8 (1924), 661–677
- Furlani, G., ed. *Sei scritti antitriteistici in lingua siriaca*, PO 14.4. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1920.
- Grillmeier, A. "The Tritheist Controversy in the Sixth Century and its Importance in Syriac Christology." In *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/III: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch from 451 to 600, eds. A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 268–280.
- Hainthaler, T. "John Philoponos, Philosopher and Theologian in Alexandria." In *Christ in Christian Tradition, vol. II/IV: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, eds. A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1996, 107–146.

- Hainthaler, Th. "Damian, head of the 'Monophysite' world." In *Christ in Christian Tradition, vol. II/IV: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, eds., A. Grillmeier and Th. Hainthaler (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1996), 75–81.
- Hansen, D. U., Metzler, K. and Savvidis, K., eds. Athanasius. Werke, Band I, Teil 1; Die dogmatischen Schriften, Lieferung 1: Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1996.
- Hespel, R. ed., *Sévère d'Antioche. La Polémique Antijulianiste, II,* A: Le Contra Additiones Juliani, CSCO 295, Syr. 124. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1968
- Hildebrand, S. *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea. A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth.* Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Holl, K., ed. *Epiphanius. Ancoratus und Panarion*, vol. 1, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 25. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915.
- Jaeger, W., ed. Contra Eunomium Libri. Liber III (vulgo III-XII). Refutatio confessionis Eunomii (Vulgo Lib. II), Gregorii Nysseni Opera II. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
- Kariatlis, Ph. "St Basil's Contribution to the Trinitarian Doctrine. A Synthesis of Greek Paideia and the Scriptural Worldview." *Phronema* 25 (2010): 57–83.
- Kinzig, W., Wolfram B., Thomas Ch. and Kaufholded H., eds. *Kyrill von Alexandrien: Gegen Julian Buch 6-10 und Fragmente*, vol. 2, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte Neue Folge 21. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.
- Lebon, J., ed. *Severi Antiocheni. Liber Contra Grammaticum orationes I-II*, CSCO IV.4. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1938.

- Lietzmann, H. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*. Texte und Untersuchungen. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1904.
- Martin, H. "Jean Philopon et la controverse trithéite du Vie siècle." *Studia Patristica* 5 (1962): 519–525.
- Martin, H. *La controverse trithéite dans l'Empire byzantin au Vie siècle*, PhD Dissertation. Leuven: Catholic University of Leuven, 1960.
- Müller, F., ed. *Gregorii Nysseni. Opera dogmatica minora*, vol. 1, Gregorii Nysseni Opera III.1. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Noret, J. and Geerard M. *Clauis Patrum Graecorum. Supplementun*, Corpus Christianorum. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- Opitz, H. G., ed., *Athanasius. Werke*, Band 2, Teil 1: *Die Apologien* (*Lfg.* 1-7).(Berlin: De Gruyter, 1940.
- Parmentier, M. F. G. "De differentia essentiae et hypostaseos (CPG 3196) in Syriac Translation." In *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 12, ed. H. R. Drobner and Ch. Klock. Leiden: Brill, 1990, 17–55.
- Pruche, B., ed. *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit*, Sources Chrétiennes 17 bis. Paris: Cerf, 1968.
- Radde-Gallwitz, A. *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*, Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Taylor, D. ed., *The Syriac versions of the De Spiritu Sanctu by Basil of Caesarea*, CSCO 576, Syr. 228. Louvain: Peeters, 1999.
- Turcescu, L. *Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons*, American Academy of Religion, Academy Series. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Van Roey A. "Une Homélie inédite contre les Anoméens attribuée à saint Basile de Césarée." *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 28 (1997), 179–192.

- Van Roey, A. "La controverse trithéite jusqu'à l'excommunication de Conon et d'Eugène (557-569)." *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 16 (1985): 141–165.
- Van Roey, A. "La controverse trithéite depuis la condemnation de Conon et Eugène jusqu'à la conversion de l'évêque Elie." In Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P. zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979 überreicht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 211, eds. W. C. Delsman, J. T. Nelis, J. R. T. M. Peters, W. H. Ph. Römer and S. A. S. van der Woude. Kevelaer: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982, 487–497.
- Van Roey, A. "Le traité contre les Trithéites (CPG 7245) de Damien d'Alexandrie." In *Philohistôr: Miscellanea in Honorem Caroli Laga Septuagenarii*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 60, eds. A. Schoors and P. van Deun. Leuven: Peeters, 1994, 229–250.
- Van Roey, A. "Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon." Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 11 (1980): 135–163.
- Van Roey, A. and Allen P., eds. *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 56. Leuven: Peeters, 1994.
- Van Rompay, L. "Pierre de Callinique et les versions syriaques des Homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze. Un premier sondage." *Babelao* 10-11 (2022]), 481–495.
- Wright, W. A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge, vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901.
- Wright, W. Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired since the Year 1838, vol. II. London: British Library, 1871.
- Zachhuber, J. "Personhood in Miaphysitism. Severus of Antioch and John Philoponus." In *Personhood in the Byzantine Christian Tradition: Early, Medieval, and Modern Perspectives*,

eds. A. Torrance and S. Paschalides. New York: Routledge: 2018, 29-43.

Zachhuber, J. The Rise of Christian Theology and the End of Ancient Metaphysics: Patristic Philosophy from the Cappadocian Fathers to John of Damascus. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.