IN SEARCH OF SOURCES FOR IBN AL-ṬAYYIB'S *THE PARADISE OF CHRISTIANITY*: THEODORE BAR KONI'S *SCHOLION*

AARON MICHAEL BUTTS

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

In his *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, Graf characterizes Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* as "das grösste exegetische Sammelwerk in der christlichen arabischen Literatur."[1] Despite this assessment, this commentary remains understudied.[2] Among the many areas that remain virtually unexplored is an analysis of the sources on which Ibn al-Ṭayyib based his commentary. The present study aims to show that Theodore Bar Koni's *Scholion* was one of the primary sources used by Ibn al-Ṭayyib in the question-and-answer part of his *Paradise of Christianity*.[3]

IBN AL-ṬAYYIB: LIFE AND *OEUVRE*

Ibn al-Ṭayyib (d. 1043), whose full name was Abū al-Faraj 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ṭayyib, was among the most notable Christian intellectuals of Baghdad in the first half of the eleventh century.[4] He worked at the 'Aḍudiyya Hospital in Baghdad and served as secretary to both Catholicos Yūḥannā b. Nāzūk (r. 1012-1022) and Catholicos Eliya I (r. 1028-1049). He was a student of al-Ḥasan b. Suwār b. al-Khammār (d. after

1017), who himself was a student of Yaḥyā b. 'Adī (d. 974). Ibn al-Ṭayyib's students include 'Alī b. 'Īsā al-Kaḥḥāl (d. after 1010), Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 1044), and Ibn Buṭlān (d. 1066). He was also a contemporary of Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), who was acquainted with his works.[5]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *oeuvre* includes more than forty items, all in Arabic, that span the fields of philosophy, medicine, theology, exegesis, and canon law. In philosophy, he wrote commentaries on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry,[6] as well as on several works by Aristotle, including the *Categories*.[7] In medicine, he wrote several treatises in addition to commentaries on Hippocrates and Galen. In canon law, he wrote *The Law of Christianity* (*Fiqh al-naṣrāniyya*), which is among the most important Arabic compilations of juridical literature for the Church of the East.[8] He also wrote at least a dozen (short) theological treatises on a variety of topics.[9] In exegesis, Ibn al-Ṭayyib wrote separate commentaries on the Psalms and the Gospels.[10] It should also be noted that he may well have translated the Diatessaron into Arabic.[11] Ibn al-Ṭayyib's most important exegetical work—and arguably one of his most significant works

in general—is his *Paradise of Christianity* (*Firdaws al-naṣrāniyya*).

The Paradise of Christianity is a commentary on the entire Bible in two parts. One part, which is preserved in ms. Vatican Arab. 37, presents a running commentary on most of the Bible. Only the Genesis portion of this part of the commentary has been edited.[12] Isho'dad of Merv is one of the primary sources for this part of *The Paradise of Christianity*, at least for Genesis.[13] Another part of *The Paradise of Christianity*, which is preserved in ms. Vatican Arab. 36, is a series of questions and answers on the entire Bible.[14] This part remains entirely unedited.[15] It is the question-and-answer part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*—especially its sources—that is of primary concern in this study.

IBN AL-ṬAYYIB'S QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: A SAMPLE COMMENTING ON GENESIS

The entirety of the question-and-answer part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* remains unedited. Thus, before investigating its sources, it is necessary to present an edition of a selection of this text. A section of the commentary dealing with various parts of Genesis, especially the latter chapters, has been chosen as a sample. The edition is based on ms. Vatican Arab. 36, ff. 72r-73r (13th-14th century).[16] The edition presents the text in a slightly standardized form: correcting diacritical points; removing *hamza* where it is unexpected; not indicating vowels, *shadda*, and *sukūn*; and introducing paragraph divisions. No attempt has, however, been made to re-write the text in Classical Arabic. Several emendations have been suggested in the edition. These are at times corroborated by an Ethiopic translation of the question-and-answer part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Chris-*

tianity, which is available in ms. EMML 1839.[17] Bar Koni's *Scholion,* which, as will be argued below, is the Syriac source of this section of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*, also corroborates several emendations.[18]

TEXT

والعلة في بيع يوسف شر اخوته وكيما يعد القوت لاهله في وقت البلا فيكون ذلك بالتدبير الالهي. وكيما يكون علامة المسيح المخلص الذي باعه اليهود للموت واسلموه للصلب وفي ذلك سر تدبيره[19] لخلاص العالم. واخوة يوسف واليهود ما اعتمدوا الا الشر وفي انتهايه[20] ظهر الخير. القمر مثال امه. ولو بقيت لسجدت وناب الاب منابها.

وبركات يعقوب لاولاده تجري مجرى النبوات اما روبيل فجعل مفرشه مدنسا باضطجاعه مع بلها كنته[21] بل اذكره لجهالته. ولم يلعنه لما ظهر منه في معنى يوسف اخيه وانه لم نوثر مساعدة اخوته. وشمعون ولوي عيرهما للحرب الذي فعلوه مع اهل شخيم بسبب دينا اختهم وايهودا[22] اسبغ عليه البركات والنبوة لان من نسله يظهر المسيح. وزبولون احله على ساحل البحر. وفي هذا دلالة على انه ينتفع[23] من المتاجر[24] في السفن. وايساخر جعل له خصب الارض التي شانه ان يفلحها وياكل ثمارها. ودان تنبا عليه بالحكم على شعبه بشمشون الجبار. وجاد تنبى عليه باللصوصية واشير بسمين الحنطة. وانه يقيم المير للملوك من عمله. ونفتالي تقدم اعطا ارضه الغلات والرسل والحجة. ويوسف كلله بالفوز لما فعل به اخوته. وبنيامين تنبى عليه بالمشابهة للحيوان في بهيميته وهذا عرض له

الاحقاب التي كانت من ابرهيم الى موسى سبعة وسنوها خمس ماية خمسة

واربعين سنة الى موت موسى وفي الخامسة
والسبعين من عمر ابرهيم اهله اللـه للرويا
الالهية

العادمة للقرون البلق وقيل ان العصا التي
كان[25] يغوصها يعقوب في الماء كان عليها
اسم ادوم وهذا محال لان الكتابة لم تكن
ظهرت ولم كملت كتابة لم[26] يتعاهد لابان
ويعقوب على تل من حجارة والملك الذي
حارب يعقوب لما هرب من بيت لابان يشجعه
ويزيل عنه المخافة من عيسوا فالجهاد
الأصعب يزيل الجهاد الأسهل فانه اذا قهر
الملك فكم اولى ان يقهر الانسان تفسيره
مبصرا للـه[27]. ولوجع وركه من الجهاد لا
ياكل اليهود الى الان عرق النسا بل يخرجونه.
واله ابيه الذي حلف به هو اللـه وليس كما قال
قوم اله غريب ومن بعد موت سرا تزوج
ابرهيم بقنطورا. واولد منها عدة اولاد وانفذ[28]
الى المشرق. ومع خروج يعقوب من بيت
لابان بامر[29] اللـه لم ينزل عيسوا. وابرهيم
اختتن له وله ثمان وتسعين سنة.

TRANSLATION

[Gen. 37:25-28] The cause of the selling of Joseph (is) the evil of his brothers and so that he could prepare nourishment for his people in the time of distress, for this would come about by the divine economy, and so that it[30] would be a sign of Christ the saviour whom the Jews sold for death and handed over for crucifixion. In this is the mystery of his[31] economy for the salvation of the world. The brothers of Joseph and the Jews only intended evil. At its conclusion, good appeared. [Gen. 37:9-10] The moon is a symbol of his mother. Had she remained, she would have bowed, but the father was her replacement.

[Gen. 49:1-28] The blessings of Jacob for his sons are analogous to prophecies. [Gen. 49:3-4] As for Reuben, he made his bed defiled in lying with Bilhah his daughter-in-law,[32] yet he reminded him of his foolishness. He did not curse him for what came about by him in the matter of Joseph his brother and that he did not choose to help his brothers. [Gen. 49:5-7] As for Simeon and Levi, he reproached them for the battle that they made with the people of Shechem on account of Dinah their sister.[33] [Gen. 49:8-12] As for Judah, he showered him with blessings and prophecy because from his offspring Christ would appear. [Gen. 49:13] As for Zebulon, he made him settle at the shore of the sea. In this was a demonstration that he would delight in[34] merchandise[35] in the boats. [Gen. 49:14-15] As for Ishakar, he made for him abundance of the land such that he would cultivate it and eat its fruits. [Gen. 49:16-18] As for Dan, he prophesied for him the judgment of his people through Samson the giant. [Gen. 49:19] As for Gad, he prophesied for him robbery. [Gen. 49:20] As for Asher, (he prophesied for him) the fat of wheat and that he would establish provisions for kings from his work. [Gen. 49:21] As for Naphtali, his land first gave fruits, emissaries, and a cause.[36] [Gen. 49:22-26] As for Joseph, he crowned him with victory for what his brothers did to him. [Gen. 49:27] As for Benjamin, he prophesied a resemblance to animals on account of his brutality, and this happened to him.

The generations that were from Abraham to Moses are seven, and their years are 545 until the death of Moses. [Gen. 12:24-7] In the seventy-fifth year of Abraham, God prepared him for a divine vision

[Gen. 30:35]… lacking horns and spotted… [Gen. 30:37-39] It is said that the branch that Jacob was dipping into the water had on it the name of Edom.[37] This is impossible because writing had not (yet) appeared, and a document had not (yet) been concluded. (If this was not the case,) why would Laban and Jacob make a

covenant at a hill of stones?[38] **[Gen. 32:25-32]** The angel who fought Jacob[39] when he fled from the house of Laban was encouraging him and removing from him fear of Esau, for the difficult struggle (i.e., with the angel) would remove the easy struggle (i.e., with Esau). For, if he could defeat an angel, then how much more suitable would it be for him to defeat a human. **[Gen. 32:28]** The interpretation of it (i.e., the name of Israel) is 'seeing God'. **[Gen. 32:32]** Because of the pain of his hip from the struggle, the Jews do not eat even now the sciatic nerve, but they remove it. **[Gen. 31:42]** 'The god of his father' by which he swore is God, and it is not as some people say a foreign god. **[Gen. 25:1-6]** After the death of Sarah, Abraham married Qantura. He bore from her numerous children, and he sent (them)[40] to the East. **[Gen. 31-32]** With Jacob's departure from the house of Laban by the command of God, Esau did not attack (him). **[Gen. 17:24]** Abraham was circumcised when he was ninety-eight years old.

This section in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* contains exegetical material that corresponds to four questions in the *Scholion* of Theodore Bar Koni's:

- What is the cause of the selling of Joseph? (ܡܢܘ ܗܘ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܡܙܕܒܢܘܬܗ ܕܝܘܣܦ)[41]

- What is the cause of the blessings of Jacob for his sons? (ܡܢܘ ܗܘ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܒܘܪܟܬܗ ܕܝܥܩܘܒ ܕܠܒܢܘܗܝ)[42]

- How many generations were there from Abraham until Moses and the exodus of the people? How many were their years? (ܟܡܐ ܗܘܘ ܕܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܡܘܫܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܟܡܐ ܗܘܘ ܐܦ ܫܢܝܗܘܢ)[43]

- How old were Isaac and Ishmael?

How were [the patriarchs][44] buried? (ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘܘ ܡܬܩܒܪܝܢ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܘܐܝܟܢ ܐܬܩܒܪ ܗܢܘܢ)[45]

These four questions are subsumed into a single section in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*.[46] The remainder of this study treats each of these four questions individually.

As will become clear below, some of this exegetical material is also found in Isho'dad of Merv's running commentary on Genesis,[47] and less of it is found in the anonymous commentary on Genesis-Exodus 9:32 preserved in ms. (olim) Diyarbakır 22,[48] which served as one of Isho'dad's main sources. Though this section in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* at times contains similar exegetical traditions to these two running commentaries, it will be shown that it is based most directly on Theodore Bar Koni's *Scholion*.

QUESTION ON THE CAUSE OF THE SELLING OF JOSEPH

This section in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* begins with the Joseph narrative and more specifically the cause for Joseph's brothers selling him (Gen. 37:25-28):

<div dir="rtl">والعلة في بيع يوسف شر اخوته</div>

'The cause of the selling of Joseph (is) the evil of his brothers.'

This is based on the question and first answer given by Bar Koni in his *Scholion*:

ܡܢܘ ܗܘ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܡܙܕܒܢܘܬܗ ܕܝܘܣܦ. ܩܕܡܐܝܬ ܚܣܡܐ ܘܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܐܚܘܗܝ, ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܦ ܟܬܒܐ ܕܚܣܡܘ ܒܗ ܐܚܘܗܝ,

'What is the cause of the selling of Joseph? First, the jealousy and evil of his brothers, as the scripture teaches, "His brothers envied him" (Gen. 28:12).'[49]

The same cause is found almost verbatim in Isho'dad of Merv's running commentary:

ܣܪܟ ܚܒ̈ܝܫܐ ܘܚܣܡܐ ܕܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ، ܛܢܘ
ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ،

'First, the evil and jealousy of his brothers: "his brothers envied him" (Gen. 28:12).'[50]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib compresses the reason given in the two Syriac commentaries, adapting the two words 'jealousy' and 'evil' in Syriac into a single word 'evil' in Arabic. In addition, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not include the scriptural citation. Removal of a scriptural citation as well as condensing material are recurring tendencies in the authorial process of Ibn al-Ṭayyib.

The second cause that Ibn al-Ṭayyib gives for the selling of Joseph is the following:

وكيما يعد القوت لاهله في وقت البلا

'…and so that he could prepare nourishment for his people in the time of distress.'

This is based on the second reason given by Bar Koni, which is, however, longer:

ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܕܢܥܬܕ ܢܝܠܬ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ܠܒܝܬ
ܐܒܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ ܕܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ، ܠܐ
ܗܘܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܙܒܢܬܘܢܢܝ ܠܗܪܟܐ
ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܚܣܡܐ ܠܗܘ ܥܒܕܟ.
ܘܠܚܝܣܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܥܘܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܕܢܥܒܕ
ܒܐܪܥܐ. ܡܛܠ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܝܢܗ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܥܬܝܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܒ̈ܪܝܐ ܠܡܚܬ
ܠܚܝ ܐܢ. ܘܠܡܫܬܥܒܕܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܪ ܗܢܐ ܡܠܬ
ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܚܕ݂ܐܬ݂ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܚܬܬܗܘܢ ܗܘ
ܒܝܕ ܟܦܢܐ. ܘܥܢܐ ܠܝܘܣܦ ܩܕܡ ܡܫܪܪ
ܡܕܪܝܫܗܘܢ. ܘܥܒܕܗ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܫܕܪܢܘܬܗ
ܕܬܗܪܐ [51] ܡܠܝܐ. ܩܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܓܠܝܢܐ
ܕܚܝܠܗ. ܘܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܕܬܬܓܠܐ ܡܪܚܘܬܐ
ܕܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܝܘܣܦ.

'Secondly, so that he could prepare in advance nourishment for the house of his father, as he said to his brothers, "It is not you who sold me here but God in order to establish a remnant for you and to enliven a great salvation for you in the land" (Gen. 45:7-8). For, because, according to the judgment of God, the Hebrews would go down into Egypt and be enslaved, according to the word of God, he prepared their descent by way of a famine (and) rightly sent Joseph before them. He made the sending of him full of wonder, first as a revelation of his power, and second so that the audacity of the brothers of Joseph might be revealed.'[52]

Once again, this material is found with similar wording in Isho'dad of Merv's commentary:

ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܕܢܥܬܕ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܠܢܦܫ̈ܬܗܘܢ.
ܘܠܚܝܣܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܐܟ̈ܐܝܟ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܗܘ ܐܡܪ. ܥܢܐ ܠܗܪ ܡܕܪܝܫܗܘܢ
ܠܓܒܪܐ. ܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܫܕܪܢܘܬܗ ܠܕܬܗܪܐ
ܣܪܟ ܠܓܠܝܢܐ ܕܚܝܠܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ. ܘܕܬܪܬܝܢ
ܕܕܟܝܘܬܗ ܕܝܘܣܦ. ܘܕܬܠܬ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ
ܕܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ،

'Secondly, so that he could prepare nourishment for their lives and to enliven a salvation for them in the land, as it said, "He sent before them a man" (Ps. 50:17), making the sending of him full of wonder, first as a revelation of the power of the Lord, second (as a revelation of) the purity of Joseph, and third (as a revelation of) the evil of his brothers.'[53]

Isho'dad of Merv attests the same tradition as is found in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, but in a shorter form. Likewise, Ibn al-Ṭayyib provides the same cause as the two Syriac commentaries, but essentially forgoes all of the explanation that follows this cause. It should be noted, however, that Ibn al-Ṭayyib specifically mentions 'the time of distress', which is more or less explicitly stated by Bar Koni (i.e., the enslavement in Egypt) but only implied in Isho'dad of Merv's commentary.

After providing these two causes for the sale of Joseph by his brothers, Ibn al-Ṭayyib proceeds to discuss how God was at work in these events:

فيكون ذلك بالتدبير الالهي. وكيما يكون علامة المسيح المخلص الذي باعه اليهود للموت واسلموه للصلب وفي ذلك سر تدبيره لخلاص العالم. واخوة يوسف واليهود ما اعتمدوا الا الشر وفي انتهايه ظهر الخير.

'…for this would come about by the divine economy, and so that it would be a sign of Christ the saviour whom the Jews sold for death and handed over for crucifixion. In this is the mystery of his[54] economy for the salvation of the world. The brothers of Joseph and the Jews only intended evil. At its conclusion, good appeared.'

A similar exegetical tradition is found in Bar Koni's *Scholion*:

ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܓܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܘܣܦ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܪܘܩܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ܂ ܕܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܡܚܐ ܢܣܟ ܠܥܠܡܐ܂ ܒܡܘܬܗ܂ ܝܗܘܕܝܐ ܒܝܢ ܚܣܡܗܘܢ ܘܗܟܢ، ܠܡܘܬܐ܂ ܘܗܟܢ ܐܦ ܙܒܢܘܗܝ܂ ܐܦܢ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܠܝܘܣܦ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܝܢ ܥܠܬܐ ܠܛܒܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܗ܂ ܠܐ ܣܒ̈ܝ ܘܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܪܓܬܗܘܢ܂[55] ܙܩܦܘܗܝ ܠܡܪܢ܂ ܘܠܐ ܥܕܪܘ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܘܒܕܘ ܓܥܒܘܬܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ܂ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܓܠܝ̈ܘܬ܂ ܘܒܛܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܥܠܘ ܗܘܘ܂ ܐܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܦܟ ܠܛ̈ܒܬܐ.

'For, these things with Joseph well resemble those with our saviour Christ, who would make alive the world through his death. The Jews in their jealousy sold him for death, and so also they sold Joseph in their evil. God made it a cause for good through his economy. The Jews, who crucified our Lord, did not confer good on the world, for they completed their desire, and the sons of Jacob (did not confer good) on Joseph their brother, who became king in Egypt. Both of them were inclined toward

harm, but God brought these things to our benefit.'[56]

Almost the same material is again found in Ishoʿdad of Merv's running commentary:

ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܘܣܦ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܪܘܩܢ. ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܦܪܘܩܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܚܐ ܢܣܟ ܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܢܣܟ ܠܥܠܡܐ܂ ܒܡܘܬܗ. ܝܗܘܕܝܐ ܒܝܢ ܚܣܡܗܘܢ ܙܩܦܘܗܝ، ܘܗܟܢ ܐܦ ܙܒܢܘܗܝ ܒܝܢ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܕܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܝܘܣܦ، ܙܒܢܘܗܝ܂ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܢܫ̈ܝܢ ܐܬܦܠܓܬ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܙܩܦܘ ܠܡܪܢ ܠܐ ܥܕܪܘ ܠܥܠܡܐ܂ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܗܒ ܐܝܟܐ ܪܓܬܐ ܚܠܡܬܗܘܢ. ܘܒ̈ܢܝ ܡܥܩܒ ܠܐ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܝܘܣܦ܂ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܨܪܝܢ. ܗ̈ܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܠܝܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ܂ ܐܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܝܢ ܚܛܠܗ ܠܝ ܒܢܟ̈ܠܗܘܢ ܘܠܡܠܘܡܒܠܟ ܐܗܦܟܗ.

'These things with Joseph resemble those with our saviour, for in such a way that our saviour would make alive the world through his death, the Jews in their evil crucified him. When the evil of Joseph's brothers sold him, the selling of him was distributed for a beneficial cause. The Jews, who crucified our Lord, did not confer good on the world, for they completed their desire, and the sons of Jacob (did not confer good) on Joseph, who became king of Egypt. Both of them were inclined toward harm, but God nullified their cunning and turned it to the opposite.'[57]

All three of the authors develop a similar argument, especially in comparing the ordeal of Joseph at the hands of his brothers with that of Jesus at the hands of the Jews. Nevertheless, it is clear that Ibn al-Ṭayyib is dependent on Bar Koni here, since they both attribute these events explicitly to the divine economy (التدبير = ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ). Ishoʿdad, in contrast, does not mention the divine economy. In addition, once again, Ibn al-Ṭayyib removes details found in Bar Koni, even though he does relay the same general themes.

After this discussion of the causes for selling Joseph, Ibn al-Ṭayyib moves to the meaning of the moon in Joseph's dream (Gen. 37:9-10):

القمر مثال امه. ولو بقيت لسجدت وناب الاب منابها.

'The moon is a symbol of his mother. Had she remained, she would have bowed, but the father was her replacement.'

This is very similar to the explanation given by Bar Koni:

ܘܗܘ ܣܗܪܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܣܓܕ ܠܗ ܥܡ ܫܡܫܐ
ܘܕܚܕܥܣܪ ܟܘܟܒܐ. ܥܠ ܐܡܗ ܪܡܙ. ܕܐܠܘ
ܥܐܫܬ ܐܦ ܗܝ ܗܘܬ ܣܓܕܐ ܠܗ. ܣܓܕܬ
ܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܝܕ ܐܒܘܗܝ,

'"The moon," which he says, "bowed to him with the sun and the eleven stars" (Gen. 37:9), hints at his mother, for, had she lived, she also would have bowed to him. She did, however, bow to him through his father.'[58]

Similar exegetical material is found in the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22:

ܘܗܘ ܣܗܪܐ ܥܡ ܕܐܡܪܝ ܕܣܓܕ ܠܗ ܥܡ ܫܡܫܐ
ܘܕܚܕܥܣܪ ܟܘܟܒܐ. ܕܒܚܠܡܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܚܙܐ.
ܒܕ ܒܣܗܪܐ ܠܗ[59] ܘܒܫܡܫܐ ܪܡܙ ܥܠ
ܐܒܘܗܝ, ܘܐܡܗ. ܘܒܟܘܟܒܐ ܥܠ ܚܕܬܗ ܥܠ
ܐܚܘܗܝ. ܐܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܗ ܚܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܦ ܗܝ ܗܘܬ ܣܓܕܐ
ܣܓܕܬ ܠܗ ܒܝܕ ܐܒܘܗܝ, ܡܛܠ ܕܓܒܪܐ
ܘܐܢܬܬܐ ܚܕ ܐܢܘܢ ...

'"The moon," which he says, "bowed to him with the sun and the eleven stars" (Gen. 37:9)— what he saw in another dream: he refers with the moon and the sun to his father and his mother and with the stars to his brothers. For, had his mother been alive, she also would have bowed to him. She did bow to him through his father, for a man and a woman are one flesh (Gen. 2:24) …'[60]

A connection with Gen. 2:24 is also found in Isho'dad of Merv's running commentary:

ܘܐܦ ܟܕ ܚܠܝܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܡܗ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܣܓܕܬ ܣܓܕܬ ܐܦ ܗܝ, ܒܝܕ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܠܗ.
ܐܝܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܓܒܪܐ ܘܐܢܬܬܐ ܚܕ ܐܢܘܢ
ܒܣܪ ...

'Even though his mother had already died, she also bowed to him through the bowing of Jacob, for a man and a woman are one flesh (Gen. 2:24) …'[61]

All four of these commentaries relay the same explanation that the moon is Joseph's mother, and that, since she was already dead, she bowed to Joseph through his father, thereby fulfilling Joseph's dream. The commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22, followed by Isho'dad, cites Genesis 2:24 to explain how Joseph's father could take his mother's place. Bar Koni does not transmit this tradition, and thus it is also not found in Ibn al-Ṭayyib. Bar Koni does, however, cite Gen. 37:9, as does the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22 (though not Isho'dad of Merv). Ibn al-Ṭayyib leaves out this scriptural citation from Bar Koni's *Scholion*, a practice that was already noted above. In addition, he makes more explicit what is implicit in the *Scholion* by changing 'she bowed to him through his father' to the direct statement that Joseph's father replaced her. Apart from these minor changes, Ibn al-Ṭayyib is close to an Arabic translation of Bar Koni's *Scholion*, even preserving the counterfactual conditional sentence (Syriac ܐܠܘ = Arabic... لو ... ل).

Even if he shares exegetical traditions with the running commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv and of ms. Diyarbakır 22, Ibn al-Ṭayyib is clearly dependent on Theodore Bar Koni's *Scholion* in this question dealing with the Joseph narrative. With this material, Ibn al-Ṭayyib's authorial process consists of translating the Syriac source into Arabic, often in an abridged form. The abridgement at times involves deleting explanatory material as well as often removing additional scriptural citations. Occasionally, Ibn al-Ṭayyib adds a clarify-

cation to his Syriac source, though this is not as common as his condensing of material.

QUESTION ON JACOB'S BLESSINGS FOR HIS SONS

In his *Scholion*, Bar Koni proceeds to a new question on 'What is the cause of the blessings of Jacob for his sons?' (ܗܘ ܗܘ ܠ), commenting on Genesis 49:1-28.[62] Ibn al-Ṭayyib also turns to the blessings of Jacob, but he does not mark this transition with a new question. Rather, he simply begins with the following:

وبركات يعقوب لاولاده تجري مجرى النبوات

'The blessings of Jacob for his sons are analogous to prophecies.'

Bar Koni also connects Jacob's blessings to prophecies:

ܗܘ ܗ, ܠܗܐ ܕܬܐܝܕܘ ܕܡܡܝܕ ܕܠܗܐ
ܕܘܗܘ, ܟܦ ܟܘܘܡܝ ܕܘܐܬܝܐ ܠܚܝܝ
ܗܘ, ܐܠܟ ܥܢܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܐ ܕܬܗܐܝܟܐ ܕܘܡܝ
ܗܘܝܡ ܗܘܐ ܟ.

'What is the cause of the blessings of Jacob for his sons? Even though they bore the form of blessings, actually a hint of prophecy was indicated by them.'

Once again, Ibn al-Ṭayyib can be seen abridging Bar Koni. Ibn al-Ṭayyib, following Bar Koni, proceeds to provide a prophetic exegesis for Jacob's blessings for each of his sons. The exegesis of Ibn al-Ṭayyib is very close to that of Bar Koni's *Scholion* for most of Jacob's sons, though it departs from it with a couple of them.

Following the biblical text (Gen. 49:3-4), Bar Koni begins with Jacob's oldest son Reuben:

ܠܘܐܒܠ ܕܝ ܟܘܗܘܐ ܚܠ ܕܝܠܟܝ ܐܠܝܟܫܝ
ܟܘܕܝܚܟܟ ܕܚܝ ܚܠܟ ܕܘܐܝܗܘܐ. ܟܘܘܡܗ
ܠܗ ܕܝ ܠܥܡܠܝܗܘܐ. ܠܟ ܕܝ ܠܝܠܐ ܚܝܠܠ
ܝ ܚܠܟ ܕܘܗ, ܚܝ ܚܘܗܘܐ ܕܘܡܘܗܗ.

'As for Reuben, his first born, because he defiled his bed in lying with Bilhah his handmaid, he reminded him of his transgression. He did not curse him on account of the favour that he showed in the matter of Joseph.'[63]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib relates the following about Reuben:

اما روبيل فجعل مفرشه مدنسا باضطجاعه مع
بلها كنته بل اذكره لجهالته. ولم يلعنه لما ظهر
منه في معنى يوسف اخيه وانه لم يوثر
مساعدة اخوته.

'As for Reuben, he made his bed defiled in lying with Bilhah his daughter-in-law, yet he reminded him of his foolishness. He did not curse him for what came about by him in the matter of Joseph his brother and that he did not choose to help his brothers.'

Ibn al-Ṭayyib closely follows Bar Koni here. Even the fronting of 'Reuben' in the Syriac text is reproduced in Arabic by the *'ammā ... fa-* ... construction. Ibn al-Ṭayyib, however, adds further explanation for Reuben's role in the Joseph saga noting that Reuben did not help his brothers. In this, Ibn al-Ṭayyib departs from his tendency either to reproduce or to abbreviate Bar Koni's *Scholion*. Another change between Bar Koni and Ibn al-Ṭayyib is the description of Bilhah: Bar Koni describes her as 'his maid-servant' (ܐܗܘܕܚܗܘ), whereas Ibn al-Ṭayyib has a word (كنته) that could mean either 'his sister-in-law' or 'his daughter-in-law'.[64] It is difficult to explain why Bilhah's description as a 'maidservant' was changed to 'daughter-in-law' or 'sister-in-law'. This does not follow the Arabic biblical text (Gen. 35:22). The earliest dated Arabic Pentateuch manuscript (ms. Sinai Arabic 2 [939/940]), for instance, has سرية 'concubine' here.[65] It is also not found in the running commentary part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*, where Bilhah is also described as a 'concubine' (سرية).[66]

Following the biblical text (Gen. 49:5-7), Bar Koni treats Jacob's blessing of Simeon and Levi together:

ܘܠܫܡܥܘܢ ܘܠܘ, ܡܣܒ ܚܠܠ ܣܬܟ ܕܚܒܕܐ
ܕܥܒܕܘ ܚܠܠ ܐܢܟ ܣܚܝܡ. ܘܐܟ ܚܩܘܗ
ܠܬܟ ܚܩܪ ܠܗ. ܐܬܕܘܕܥܗ ܠܡ ܚܩܐ
ܟܐܗܝܘܟܐ ܘܩܛܠܘ ܠܫܚܝܡ.

'As for Simeon and Levi, he reproached them for the slaughter that they made in Shechem on account of Dinah their sister. The prophet Hosea also mentioned it: "The priests joined in the path and killed Shechem" (Hosea 6:9).'[67]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib provides the following comments on Simeon and Levi:

وشمعون ولوي عيرهما للحرب الذي فعلوه
مع اهل شخيم بسبب دينا اختهم

'As for Simeon and Levi, he reproached them for the battle that they made with the people of Shechem on account of Dinah their sister.'

Ibn al-Ṭayyib closely follows Bar Koni's *Scholion*, though he does not include the passage from Hosea, following his tendency to remove additional biblical citations.

Bar Koni provides a Christological interpretation for Jacob's blessing of Judah (Gen. 49:8-12):

ܕܠ ܝܗܘܕܐ ܕܢ ܢܣܒ ܒܟܪ ܕܒܐܬܕܘܟܐ ܐܦ
ܕܒܘܐܬܘܟܐ. ܐܝܟ ܐܝܢܟ ܕܢ ܡܘܬܠܗ ܚܠܢܐ
ܘܡܘ ܠܬܒܝܕ ܚܢ, ܝ ܡܫܝܟ ܘܕܢܚܡܐ.

'As for Judah, he showered him with blessings and also prophecy, as the one from whose generation our Lord Christ would shine forth in flesh.'[68]

The same Christological interpretation is repeated in Ibn al-Ṭayyib:

وايهودا اسبغ عليه البركات والنبوة لان من
نسله يظهر المسيح.

'As for Judah, he showered him with blessings and prophecy be-

cause from his offspring Christ would appear.'

Ibn al-Tayyib closely follows Bar Koni's *Scholion* here, though he does omit 'in flesh'.

The first part of Bar Koni's interpretation of the blessing for Zebulon paraphrases the Peshiṭta (Gen. 49:13), while the second introduces the interpretation:

ܠܬܘܠܘܢ ܐܘܬܒܗ ܚܠ ܣܦܐ ܬܝܡܡܐ. ܐܝܟ
ܕܠܐܝܢܐ ܕܢܬܒܣܡ ܒܬܓܘܪܬܐ ܚܠ ܝ̈ܠܠܦܐ
ܕܒܣܦܝܢܐ.

'As for Zebulon, he made him settle at the shore of the seas, as one who would delight in merchandise in the boats.'[69]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib follows this same structure:

وزبولون احله على ساحل البحر. وفي هذا
دلالة على انه ينتفع من المتاجر في السفن.

'As for Zebulon, he made him settle at the shore of the sea. In this was a demonstration that he would benefit from the merchandise in the boats.'

Ibn al-Ṭayyib closely follows Bar Koni's *Scholion* here. Unlike Bar Koni, however, Ibn al-Ṭayyib makes explicit that the second part is an interpretation of the blessing by adding 'in this was a demonstration that…'. The translation 'he would delight in merchandise' is based on two emendations to Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Arabic text: ينتقم من 'he would avenge himself on' to ينتفع من 'he would benefit from' and المتاخر 'that which is last, later, behind' to المتاجر 'merchandise'. Both of these emendations are minor, and both are supported by Bar Koni's *Scholion*. It is, however, interesting to note that the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839 reads:

ወለዛብሎን፡ሠርዓ፡ለዕለ፡ጽንፈ፡ባሕር፡
ወአንደር፡ወበዝንቱ፡ያጤይቅ፡ከመ፡ለሊሁ፡
ይትቤቀል፡እምእለ፡ተድኅሩ፡በውስተ፡ሐመር፡፡

'As for Zebulon, he established him and caused him to reside at the shore of the sea. In this, he showed that he would be avenged by those things that were left behind in the boat.'

The Ethiopic translator, then, was translating an Arabic *Vorlage* similar to that found in ms. Vatican Arab. 36.

Bar Koni provides the following interpretation for Jacob's blessing of Issachar (Gen. 39:14-15):

ܠܐܝܣܟܪ ܕܒܣܘܓܐܐ ܘܒܢܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ. ܕܢܦܠܚ ܠܚܩܠܐ ܘܠܡܐܟܠ ܦܐܪ̈ܝܗ.

'As for Ishakar, (he prophesied that) in the abundance and tranquility of the land he would cultivate and eat its fruits.'[70]

A similar interpretation is found in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*:

وايساخر جعل له خصب الارض التي شانه
ان يفلحها وياكل ثمارها.

'As for Ishakar, he made for him abundance of the land such that he would cultivate it and eat its fruits.'

Ibn al-Ṭayyib supplies a verb in the main clause, which is only implied in Bar Koni. In addition, he condenses the two words 'abundance' and 'tranquility' in Syriac into the single word 'abundance' in Arabic.

Bar Koni connects the prophecy of Dan (Gen. 49:16-17) with Samson:

ܠܕܢ ܗܘ ܟܐܢ ܕܝ ܕܢܕܘܢ ܠܥܡܗ ܠܚܩܡܗ. ܒܝܕ ܫܡܫܘܢ ܓܢܒܪܐ.

'As for Dan, (he prophesied) that he would judge his people through Samson the giant.'[71]

The same connection is found in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*:

ودان تنبا عليه بالحكم على شعبه بشمشون
الجبار.

'As for Dan, he prophesied for him the judgment of his people through Samson the giant.'

Ibn al-Ṭayyib closely follows Bar Koni. There are, however, a couple of differences. He again provides a verb for the main clause, which is only implied in Bar Koni's *Scholion*. In addition, Ibn al-Ṭayyib is not able to preserve the play between Dan's name and the verbal root √*dwn* 'to judge', which is found in the *Scholion*, the Peshiṭta, and even the Hebrew text, since this is not the usual meaning of this root in Arabic.

Bar Koni provides two different interpretations for Jacob's blessing of Gad (Gen. 49:19):

ܠܓܕ ܕܗܘܐ ܓܝܣܐ. ܐܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܘܢܝܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܓܒܐ ܕܡܬܓܝܣ.

'As for Gad, (he prophesied) that he would be a robber, or as the Greek says, one who is robbed.'[72]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib, in contrast, provides a single interpretation:

وجاد تنبى عليه باللصوصية

'As for Gad, he prophesied for him robbery.'

This, then, is another instance in which Ibn al-Ṭayyib condenses the material in Bar Koni's *Scholion*. In addition, Ibn al-Ṭayyib again adds the verb 'he prophesied', which is only implied in the Syriac.

Bar Koni's interpretation of Jacob's blessing of Asher is little more than a rephrasing of the Peshiṭta text (Gen. 49:20):

ܠܐܫܝܪ. ܫܘܡܢܐ ܕܠܚܡܐ. ܗܘ ܚܩܠܐ ܕܢܬܠ ܦܘܢܝܐ ܠܡܠܟܐ ܡܢ ܦܘܠܚܢܗ.

'As for Asher, (he prophesied for him) the fat of food and that he would give provisions to the king from his labour.'[73]

A similar interpretation is found in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*:

واشير بسمين الحنطة. وانه يقيم المير للملوك من
عمله.

'As for Asher, (he prophesied for him) the fat of wheat and that he would establish provisions for kings from his work.'

In contrast to the case with Dan and Gad, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not supply a verb in the main clause. Ibn al-Ṭayyib, however, departs from Bar Koni's *Scholion* in making both 'provisions' and 'kings' plural, in contrast to the singulars in the Syriac.

Bar Koni's interpretation of Jacob's blessing for Naphtali is more removed from the biblical text (Gen. 49:21) than those previously discussed:

ܠܢܦܬܠܝ ܗܒ ܚܡܕܬܗ ܟܠܠܬܐ ܕܝ ܐܝܟܢ
ܗܒܕ ܠܗ ܘܒܗ ܚܠܠܗ. ܐܝܟ ܗܘ
ܕܐܝܟ ܕܓܘܐܬܐ ܟܒܕ.

'As for Naphtali, he gave him the first fruits from his land, and by this he crowned him as one would serve as an emissary.'[74]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not follow Bar Koni's *Scholion* as closely for Naphtali as he does with some of Jacob's other sons:

ونفتالي تقدم اعطا ارضه الغلات والرسل والحجة.

'As for Naphtali, his land first gave fruits, emissaries, and a cause.'

There are a number of differences here between Ibn al-Ṭayyib and Bar Koni. Though it remains unclear how it exactly happened, the word 'first' in 'first fruits' (ܚܡܕܬܗ ܟܠܠܬܐ) in Bar Koni's text ultimately became an auxiliary verb of 'to do first' (تقدم) in Ibn al-Ṭayyib. The genitive relationship between 'fruits' and 'land' in the *Scholion* was also removed in Ibn al-Ṭayyib. In its place, 'his land' is probably to be understood as the subject of the verbs, though the gender discrepancy is to be noted.[75] Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not include the verb 'he crowned him' in Bar Koni, but does still preserve the prophecy of Naphtali being a messenger. Ibn al-Ṭayyib, however, adds 'a cause' (الحجة)

at the end of the list, which could alternatively be understood as 'pilgrimage'. Without any additional context, this addition is difficult to understand.[76] The end result of these changes is that Ibn al-Ṭayyib's commentary is removed from Bar Koni's *Scholion*, even if it is still ultimately based on it.

Bar Koni offers a simple interpretation of Jacob's lengthy blessing for Joseph (Gen. 49:22-26):

ܘܟܬܐܬܐ ܝܗܒ ܠܝܘܣܦ ܒܙܟܘܬܐ
ܘܒܝ ܣܟ ܕܠܘܒܕܠ ܐܢܘܢ ܨܠܐܕܟܒ
ܝ ܒܐܗ.

'He gave Joseph speech in victory and in glory with which he adorned him against his brothers, the enemies.'[77]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib's comments on Joseph are even shorter:

ويوسف كلله بالفوز لما فعل به اخوته.

'As for Joseph, he crowned him with victory for what his brothers did to him.'

Somewhat surprisingly, the verb 'to crown' is found here in Ibn al-Ṭayyib, as opposed to Syriac 'to give'. This is especially noteworthy since in the previous blessing for Naphtali the Syriac had a verb 'to crown' whereas the Arabic did not. Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not include the idea of 'speech' (ܟܬܐܬܐ), the meaning of which—it should be noted—is not entirely clear in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, and also reduces the two Syriac words 'in victory' and 'in glory' to a single 'in glory' in Arabic. The structure of the final subordinate clause is also entirely different between Bar Koni and Ibn al-Ṭayyib. Thus, as with the previous passage on Naphtali, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not follow Bar Koni's *Scholion* here as closely as he does in the other blessings.

Bar Koni concludes his exegesis of Jacob's blessings with Benjamin (Gen. 49:27):

ܠܒܢܝܡܝܢ ܕܐܬܒ ܢܥܡܠܡ ܠܚܝܘܬܐ
ܘܢܕܡܐ ܠܗ ܒܚܝܘܬܢܘܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܝ
ܒܢܝܡܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܝܘܬܝ.

'As for Benjamin, (he prophesied)
that he would be given over to an
animal, and that he would re-
semble it (in) beastliness. This
happened through Benjamin.'[78]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib's interpretation is slightly
more condensed:

وبنيامين تنبى عليه بالمشابهة للحيوان في
بهيميته وهذا عرض له

'As for Benjamin, he prophesied a
resemblance to animals on account
of his brutality, and this happened
to him.'

As in the case of the blessings for Dan
and Gad, Ibn al-Ṭayyib supplies a verb in
the main clause, which is only implied in
Bar Koni. The syntax and structure of Ibn
al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*
also departs rather significantly from Bar
Koni's *Scholion* with the transfer of the
two Syriac verbs into a series of pre-
positional phrases.

Ibn al-Ṭayyib's use of Bar Koni's
Scholion varies in this question on Jacob's
blessings for his sons: with some of the
blessings, Ibn al-Ṭayyib presents almost an
Arabic translation of Bar Koni's Syriac text,
whereas in others he is only loosely based
on it. Several of the tendencies seen with the
previous question are found again with this
question, including the removal of scriptural
citations and the inclination to abridge.

Before moving to the next question in
Bar Koni, it should be noted that Ibn
al-Ṭayyib also comments on the blessings
of Jacob in his running commentary.[79]
While this is not the place to analyze all of
the blessings, it is worthwhile to look at a
couple of them to compare his method in
the running commentary part of *The
Paradise of Christianity* with that of the
question-and-answer part. Ibn al-Ṭayyib
provides the following comments on
Jacob's blessing of Naphtali (Gen. 49:21):

ونفتالي رسول مسرع لاخوته بسبب خصب
ارضه. وله عبارة حسنة في الرسائل ويأتي
بالبشارات

'Naphtali is a quick messenger for
his brothers because of the fertility
of his land. He has fine expression
in his messages, and he comes
with good news.'[80]

Though the ideas are similar to those
found in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, which is
quoted above, closer parallels are found in
the running commentaries of Diyarbakır 22
and of Isho'dad of Merv. The commentary
in ms. Diyarbakır 22 provides the follo-
wing comments on Gen. 49:21:

ܢܦܬܠܝ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܙܓܕܐ ܡܠܝܠܐ ܡܗܕ ܣܒܪܬܐ
ܛܒܬܐ ܠܐܚܘܗܝ، ܡܛܠ ܚܨܝܢܘܬ ܐܪܥܗ ܐܝܟ.
ܘܐܦ ܒܪܩ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܢܦܬܠܝ ܣܒܪ ܥܪܘܩܬܐ ܛܒܬܐ
ܣܒܪܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ. ܕܥܪܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ
ܚܡܬܗ ܕܣܝܣܪܐ.

'Naphtali, a quick messenger, gives
good news to his brothers because
of the fertility of his land. Also,
Baraq, who was from Naphtali,
announced good news to those
who were fleeing from the ferocity
of Sisera (Jg. 4:6-22).'[81]

An even closer parallel to the running
commentary part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The
Paradise of Christianity* is found in
Isho'dad of Merv's commentary:

ܢܦܬܠܝ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܙܓܕܐ ܗܘ ܡܠܝܠܐ ܠܣܒܪܬܐ،[82]
ܡܛܠ ܚܨܝܢܘܬ ܐܪܥܗ. ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ
ܝܕܥܗܝ ܠܚܘܝ. ܥܕ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܙܓܕܐ ܡܠܝܠܐ
ܚܠܡ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܘܥܠܡ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܙܓܕܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܐܟܐ
ܡܢ ܢܦܬܠܝ ܗܘܘ. ܐܦ ܗܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܕܗܘܐ ܢܦܬܠܝ.
ܡܩܒܐ ܥܪܩܬܐ ܛܒܬܐ ܣܒܪܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܥܪܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܚܡܬܗ ܕܣܝܣܪܐ.
ܚܬܢܟ. ܢܦܬܠܝ ܦܐܟܐ ܣܒܐ ܕܝܗܒܐ
ܕܓܠܠܠܐ ܐܝܪܐ ܦܐܟܐ ܣܒܐ ܕܝܗܒܐ
ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܐܝܪܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܪܐ ܣܒܐ ܐܝܪܐ
ܘܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܐܝܪܐ ܣܒܐ ܕܓܠܠܠܐ ܐܝܪܐ ܚܘܒ
ܠܐܟܐ.

'Naphtali is a quick messenger for
his brothers because of the fertility
of his land. Also, when Gideon
conquered Midian, he sent quick
messengers throughout all of Israel
(Jg. 7:24), and most of these

messengers were from Naphtali. Also, Baraq, who was from Naphtali, announced fine news to those who were fleeing from the ferocity of Sisera (Jg. 4:6-22). The Hebrew:[83] "Naphtali, a gentle stem, who adds beauty through his fruits." That is, his land is good, and he brings to his people the fine expression of fruits.'[84]

The first sentence in Ibn al-Ṭayyib is a word-for-word translation of Ishoʿdad of Merv's commentary. Ibn al-Ṭayyib, then, passes over Ishoʿdad's comments concerning Gideon and Baraq, both of whom are associated in the biblical text with Naphtali. In his last sentence, Ibn al-Ṭayyib adapts the reading that Ishoʿdad attributes to the Hebrew, but which is actually from the Septuagint. He does not, however, preserve any indication of the source of this alternative reading. Thus, in this example from his running commentary, Ibn al-Ṭayyib is an Arabic abridgement of the commentary by Ishoʿdad of Merv, much in the same way that his question-and-answer commentary makes use of Bar Koni's *Scholion*.

It should be pointed out that Ishoʿdad of Merv is not the only source that Ibn al-Ṭayyib employs in his running commentary. Ibn al-Ṭayyib, for instance, provides the following commentary on the blessing of Asher (Gen. 49:20):

اسير يعطي الغذا[85] للملوك والاقوات والدهن والخمر والطيب الذي يكون في ارضه.

'Asher gives nourishment to kings: foodstuffs, oil, wine, and perfume, which will be in his land.'[86]

This is not found in Ishoʿdad of Merv's commentary, but a similar locution is found in Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis*:[87]

ܕܐܫܝܪ ܐܦܠܟ ܐܢܘܗ. ܗܘ. ܕܐܒܪ̈ܐ ܡܠܟ̈ܐ ܢܝܩܘܡ ܫܡܫܟ ܢܗܠܟ ܗܘ. ܕܐܝܟ ܐܦܫܟ ܗܘܐ ܐܕܝܠ ܠܬܠܟ. ܠܡܠܟ̈ܐ ܢܬܠ ܘܚܡܪ̈ܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܠܚܡ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܝܪܬܘܬܗ.

'"As for Asher, his land is good" (Gen. 49:20). That which Moses said, "He will dip his foot in oil" (Deut. 33:24). It seems that it was the land of Apamea. "He will give nourishment to kings" (Gen. 49:20) with pure oil and wines of exquisite taste, which will be in his inheritance.'[88]

Almost the same wording is found in the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22:

ܐܫܝܪ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܕܡܬܚ ܬܦܘܩܬܗ ܠܡܠܟ̈ܐ ܠܡܠܟ̈ܐ ܢܬܠ ܘܚܡܪ̈ܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܠܚܡ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܐܪܥܗ.

'Regarding Asher, it says, "He will give nourishment to kings" (Gen. 49:20) with pure oil and wines of exquisite taste, which will be in his land.'[89]

Thus, this is a case in which the running commentary part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *Paradise of Christianity* is not dependent on Ishoʿdad of Merv's commentary, but on Ephrem's *Commentary* or possibly the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22 (or one like it).[90]

QUESTION ON BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY

Following the question on Jacob's blessings for his sons, Bar Koni turns to a new question in his *Scholion*:

ܟܡܐ ܕܪ̈ܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܡܘܫܐ ܘܡܦܩܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܘܟܡܐ ܗܘܝ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ.

'How many generations were there from Abraham until Moses and the exodus of the people? How many were their years?'[91]

This question is significantly longer than the previous two questions. In Scher's edition of the Syriac, the question on the cause of the sale of Joseph runs twenty-four lines and the question on the cause of Jacob's blessings for his sons runs twenty-five lines, whereas this question totals seventy-four lines. Thus, it is three times as long as either of the previous questions! It

begins with Abraham and proceeds to Jacob, then to Joseph, then to the slavery in Egypt, and finally to Moses and his death.

As was the case with the question on Jacob's blessings, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not indicate that a new question has begun; rather, he simply turns directly to what will be part of the answer in Bar Koni:

الاحقاب التي كانت من ابرهيم الى موسى سبعة وسنوها خمس ماية خمسة واربعين سنة الى موت موسى

'The generations that were from Abraham to Moses are seven, and their years are 545 until the death of Moses.'

This corresponds to the first part of Bar Koni's answer:

ܟܡܐ ܕܪܐ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܘܥܕܡܐ ܠܡܘܫܐ ܘܡܦܩܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܘܟܡܐ ܟܢܝ ܥܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܪܐ ܥܕܟܐ ܘܩܕܡܐ ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܚܒܝܢ ܘܫܢܝܐ ܚܡܫ[92] ܡܐܘܬܐ ܘܐܪܒܥܝܢ.

'How many generations were there from Abraham until Moses and the exodus of the people? How many were their years? The generations are seven, and the years are 545 until the passing away of Moses.'[93]

As already noted, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not include the question of Bar Koni, but rather transforms it into a declarative sentence. Apart from this, Ibn al-Ṭayyib provides almost a word-for-word translation of Bar Koni's *Scholion*.

The only other material that Ibn al-Ṭayyib includes from this question in Bar Koni's *Scholion* is the following:

وفي الخامسة والسبعين من عمر ابرهيم اهله اللـه للرويا الالهية

'In the seventy-fifth year of Abraham, God prepared him for a divine vision.'

This is based on a sentence in Bar Koni's *Scholion* only several lines from the beginning of the question:

ܟܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܒܪ ܫܒܥܝܢ ܘܚܡܫ ܫܢܝܢ ܐܒܪܗܡ، ܠܓܠܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ.

'When he was seventy-five years old, Abraham was deemed worthy of a divine revelation.'[94]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib is clearly based on this sentence from Bar Koni. There are, however, several changes: the Syriac subordinate clause indicating Abraham's age is changed into a prepositional phrase in Arabic, and the passive verb without an agent in Syriac is changed into God's direct action in Arabic.

Between these sentences in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, there are the following lines of Syriac:

ܒܫܢܬ ܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܘܬܠܬ ܕܢܝܢܘܣ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܬܘܪܝܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܗܘܐ ܐܒܪܗܡ. ܘܚܝܐ ܡܐܐ ܘܫܒܥܝܢ ܘܚܡܫ ܫܢܝܢ.

'In year forty-three of Ninos, king of the Assyrians, Abraham was born, and he lived one hundred and seventy-five years.'[95]

This material is not found in Ibn al-Ṭayyib. In addition, Bar Koni continues for another sixty-six lines of Syriac text in Scher's edition, and none of this is represented in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*. In this question, then, Ibn al-Ṭayyib adopts a different approach from that which was seen in the previous two questions. Seventy-four lines of Syriac text in Scher's edition of Bar Koni's *Scholion* become no more than thirty words in the Arabic text of Ibn al-Ṭayyib! Thus, a vast majority of the Syriac material in this question is not transmitted into Arabic. This contrasts with the two questions discussed previously, in which Ibn al-Ṭayyib relayed most of the exegetical material in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, even if abridging and adapting it.

QUESTION ON JACOB (AND ABRAHAM)

Following these few sentences involving the chronology of Abraham, Ibn al-Ṭayyib

moves to a series of comments primarily about Jacob (esp. Gen. 30-32) but also a couple on Abraham as well. Each of these statements in Ibn al-Ṭayyib derives directly from passages in the following question from Bar Koni's *Scholion*:

ܒܪ ܟܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܫܢܝ̈ ܐܝܣܚܩ ܘܐܝܫܡܥܝܠ ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܬܩܒܪܘ

'How old were Isaac and Ishmael? How were [the patriarchs] buried?'[96]

This question, which comprises sixty-seven lines of Syriac text in Scher's edition, discusses various topics, including the age of the patriarchs at their deaths, the story of Jacob and Laban, the meanings and/or etymologies of several words, Abraham's children after Sarah's death, the circumcision of Abraham, Ishmael, and Isaac, and Joseph's wife Asyat (ܐܣܝܬ). As with the previous question, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not relay all or even most of the material in the question. Rather, he makes a selection.

This section in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* begins abruptly with the following words:

العادمة للقرون البلق

'… lacking horns and spotted…'

Without context, the word translated as 'horns' could also mean 'centuries'. In its context within Ibn al-Ṭayyib, the adjective 'lacking' (العادمة) would seem to be modifying the immediately preceding 'divine vision' (للرويا الالهية) from the previous question. This is, in fact, how the Ethiopic translation of Ibn al-Ṭayyib in ms. EMML 1839 understands it:

…በራእይ:አምላካዊ:እንተ:አልባቲ:አቅርንተ። ወፍካሬ:አቅርንተስ:፻:ዓመት:ውእቱ።ወእሙ: እኪ:፸:ወ፪:ዓመት።

'…a divine vision which was lacking centuries. The interpretation of centuries is one hundred years or seventy-two years.'

The Ethiopic translation deletes the word for 'spotted' and connects 'lacking of centuries' to the textually adjacent 'divine vision'. In addition, the text adds an exegetical note clarifying the meaning of the Ethiopic word *qärn* as 'centuries', since it does not usually have this meaning. Despite its creativity, the Ethiopic text does not make sense as it stands: what is a vision lacking centuries?!? A solution to this *crux* can, however, be found in Bar Koni's *Scholion*. Ibn al-Ṭayyib is dependent here on the following passage that discusses the words 'bald' (ܩܪܚܐ) and 'spotted' (ܪܩܥܬܐ) in the Peshiṭta text of Gen. 30:35:

… ܡܛܠ ܩܪܚܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܩܪܢ̈. ܘܪܩܥܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܓܘܢܝ̈ …

'… because the "bald ones," which **lack horns, and the spotted ones**, which have multiple colors…'[97]

This collocation of 'without horns and spotted ones' (ܕܠܐ ܩܪܢ̈. ܘܪܩܥܬܐ) is clearly the source of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's 'lacking horns and spotted' (العادمة للقرون البلق). Thus, at some point in the history of one of the texts, some material fell out, resulting in the entirely incomprehensible locution 'lacking horns and spotted' that is found in ms. Vatican Arab. 36.

Ibn al-Ṭayyib continues directly with the following remark about the rods that Jacob set up in front of the water troughs of Laban (Gen. 30:37-39):

وقيل ان العصا التي كان يغوصها يعقوب في الماء كان عليها اسم ادوم وهذا محال لان الكتابة لم تكن ظهرت ولم كملت كتابة

'It is said that the branch that Jacob was dipping into the water had on it the name of Edom. This is impossible because writing had not (yet) appeared, and a document had not (yet) been concluded.'

This is based on Bar Koni's *Scholion*:

ܡܬܐܡܪܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܕܚܠ ܗܘ̇ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܐܩܒ̈ܐ ܗܢܝ̈ܢ
ܘܡܡܝ̈ܕ ܚܬ̈ܟܠܝ ܕܡܝ̈ܐ. ܥܡ ܐܝܘܢܝ. ܟܠܗ
ܚܠܝܡܝ. ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܥܕܟܝܠ. ܩܠܠ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ
ܐܘܬܝ̈ܐ ܕܩܦܐ ܠܕܚܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܟ̈ܘܡ.

'It is said that Jacob carved the name Adonai on those rods that he stuck into the flow of water. This is not, however, true, because the letters of writing had not yet come into existence.'[98]

The same exegetical material is found in Ishoʻdad of Merv's running commentary:

ܘܐܢܫ̈ܝ. ܕܒܩܠܦ̈ܐ ܕܐܩ̈ܒܐ ܥܡ ܐܝܘܢܝ ܐܝܡܝܪ
ܗܘܐ. ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܝ̈ܟܐ ܗܕܐ. ܚܘ̇, ܕܐܦܠܐ
ܟ̈ܬܒܬܐ̈ ܗܘܬ, ܠܕܚܠܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܕܐܝ̈ܪ̈ܝ
ܕܒܓܠܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܕ ܦܪ̇ܐ ܚܠܦ ܥܡܗ ܥܡ
ܐܝܘܢܝ.

'Some (say) that on the strips of rods was inscribed the name Adonai. This is not, however, established, since writing had not yet come into existence, but we could say that he was in (a state of) revelation when he read on it the name Adonai.'[99]

Ishoʻdad is responding here directly to one of his sources, namely the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22, which states:

ܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܕܒܩܠܦܬ̈ܐ ܕܐܩ̈ܒܐ ܥܡ ܐܝܘܢܝ
ܐܝܡܝܪ ܗܘܐ.

'It is likely that on the strips on the rods the name Adonai was inscribed'.[100]

Both Bar Koni and Ishoʻdad, then, are responding to the tradition preserved in the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22. The wording of Ibn al-Ṭayyib makes it clear that he is dependent here on Bar Koni: note, for instance, the beginning 'it is said' (ܡܬܐܡܪܐܝܬ = قيل). Somewhere in the course of transmission, however, the name allegedly written on the rods changed from Adonai in the Syriac tradition to Edom in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. Edom does not, however, make sense in this context.

Interestingly, the Ethiopic translation of the Arabic in ms. EMML 1839 has neither Adonai nor Edom, but Adam:

ተበህለ፡እስሙ፡በትር፡ዘኮነ፡ይጠምዖ፡
ያዕቆብ፡ውስተ፡ማይ፡ነበረ፡ላዕሌሃ፡ስሙ፡
አዳም፡

'It is said that the branch that Jacob dipped into the water had on it the name of Adam.'

At least two scenarios could explain these data: Adonai in Syriac may have been changed to Adam in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *Urtext*, as is attested in the Ethiopic translation, and was only later corrupted to Edom, as is found in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. Or, Adonai could have been corrupted to Edom in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *Paradise of Christianity*, and it was then changed to Adam in the Ethiopic translation, because the Arabic *Vorlage* did not make sense. It is difficult to adjudicate between these two options, though the latter seems slightly more likely, since it can account for the *o*-vowel in the second syllable of both Adonai and Edom. Regardless, the change in the Arabic may have been motivated by a loss of understanding of the original Hebrew term Adonai.[101]

After discussing the fact that writing did not appear on these rods, Ibn al-Ṭayyib states:

لم يتعاهد لابان ويعقوب على تل من حجارة

'(If this was not the case,) why would Laban and Jacob make a covenant at a hill of stones?'

The most straightforward translation of this sentence would probably be: 'Laban and Jacob did not make a covenant at a hill of stones'. This would, however, be strange since the biblical text states that Laban and Jacob did in fact make a covenant at a mountain of stones (Gen. 31:41-52). This *crux* can be explained by recourse to Bar Koni's *Scholion*. Immediately after commenting on the writing of the name Adonai on the reeds, Bar Koni states:

ܘܐܢ ܠܐ ܠܡܢܐ ܥܠ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܘܠܒܢ ܒܢ
ܩܝܡܐ ܘܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܣܝܡܐ ܘܡܬܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ܂
ܠܗ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ܂

'If (this was) not (the case), why did
Laban and Jacob make a covenant
and ratify an agreement on a heap of
stones?'[102]

In context, Bar Koni's argument is as
follows: had writing already been invented,
Laban and Jacob would not have needed to
go through such an elaborate scenario of
stacking rocks to ratify an agreement, and
therefore it can be deduced that writing had
not yet been invented, and therefore the
name Adonai could not have been written
on the rods. Given the Syriac source, it
seems that Arabic لم should not be analyzed
as the negation *lam*, but as *li-ma* 'why', the
short form of *li-mā*. According to this
analysis, لم in Ibn al-Ṭayyib is a literal
translation of Syriac ܠܡܢܐ 'why' (this is the
interpretation adopted in the edition
above). Somewhere between Bar Koni's
Syriac text and Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Arabic one,
the protasis 'If (this was) not (the case)'
fell out, leaving only the apodosis in Ibn
al-Ṭayyib. This accounts for the situation
in the earliest layer of the Arabic text. At
some point, however, لم could have been
reinterpreted as a negation, possibly in an
unmarked rhetorical sentence: 'Laban and
Jacob did not make a covenant at a hill of
stones' or better 'Did Laban and Jacob not
make a covenant at a hill of stones?'. This
is in fact how the Ethiopic translator
understood the Arabic text:

ወኢተካየዱ፡ላባ፡ወያዕቆብ፡ለዕለ፡መገረ፡
እብን፡[103]

'Laban and Jacob did not make a
covenant at a hill of stone(s)' or
better 'Did Laban and Jacob not
make a covenant at a hill of
stone(s)?'

Thus, the earliest layer of the Arabic
text, which reflected the Syriac more
closely, was understood differently at a

later time, as is witnessed by the Ethiopic
translation of the Arabic in ms. EMML
1839.

Ibn al-Ṭayyib proceeds to a discussion
of Jacob's wrestling with the angel (Gen.
32:25-32):

والملك الذي حارب يعقوب لما هرب من بيت
لابان يشجعه ويزيل عنه المخافة من عيسوا
فالجهاد الأصعب يزيل الجهاد الأسهل فانه اذا
قهر الملك فكم اولى ان يقهر الانسان

'The angel who fought Jacob when
he fled from the house of Laban
was encouraging him and re-
moving from him fear of Esau, for
the difficult struggle (i.e., with the
angel) would remove the easy
struggle (i.e., with Esau). For, if he
could defeat an angel, then how
much more suitable would it be for
him to defeat a human.'

This derives from the very next passage
in Bar Koni's *Scholion*:

ܡܠܐܟܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܬܟܬܫ ܥܡܗ ܟܕ ܥܪܩ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ
ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܠܒܢ܂ ܐܝܟ ܕܢܪܝܡ ܡܢܗ
ܕܚܠܬܐ ܕܥܣܘ܂ ܘܕܢܚܣܠܝܘܗܝ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܢܥܙܐ ܗ،
ܕܢܥܒܪ ܪܒܬܐ܂

'As for the angel with whom he
(i.e., Jacob) fought when he fled
from the house of Laban, (this
was) so that he would remove from
him the fear of Esau, and that he
would expel a small (fear) by a
great fear.'[104]

Similar exegetical material is found in
Ishoʿdad's running commentary:

ܡܠܐܟܐ ܐܬܟܬܫ ܥܡܗ ܠܐ ܒܚܠܡܐ ܐܠܐ
ܟܕ ܥܝܪ܂ ܕܢܚܣܠܝܘܗܝ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܚܠܬܐ ܩܫܝܬܐ ܘܪܒܬܐ
ܢܥܙܐ ܠܗ، ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܣܥܘܪ ܕܚܝܠ ܗܘ ܘܡܚܣܠܐ܂

'The angel fought with him, not in
a dream but while he was awake,
so that he might expel through the
harsh and great fear of him (i.e.,
the angel) that (fear) that is small
and meek from Esau.'[105]

The same general idea is also found in
the commentary in ms. Diyarbakır 22,
though with significantly different wording:

ܘܗܘ ܚܠܐܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܗ ܗܘܐܐ ܢܡܐܚܠܬܐ
ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܗܝ̣ܐ ܣܠܚ. ܕܢܠܦܘܗܝ
ܕܠܐ ܢܕܚܠ ܡܢ ܥܣܘ.

'The angel made him believe that he (i.e., the angel) did not prevail over him (i.e., Jacob) in order to teach him (i.e., Jacob) not to fear Esau.'[106]

Once again, the exegetical content of the four texts is similar: Jacob's struggle with the angel showed Jacob that he had no reason to fear Esau. The wording of the passages, however, shows that Ibn al-Ṭayyib based his commentary on Bar Koni's *Scholion*: both, for instance, begin with a relative clause modifying 'the angel'. Ibn al-Ṭayyib adds the further clarification that 'if he could defeat an angel, then how much more suitable would it be for him to defeat a human'. This represents one of the rare instances in the selection treated in this study in which Ibn al-Ṭayyib adds to what is found in Bar Koni.

Immediately following this passage, Ibn al-Ṭayyib has the following statement:

تفسيره مبصرا الله.

'The interpretation of it is "seeing God".'

In Ibn al-Ṭayyib's text, there is no context within which to understand this statement. Once again, however, an obscure statement in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* becomes clear with recourse to Bar Koni's *Scholion*, the very next words of which read:

ܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܚܙܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ

'Israel (means) "he saw God".'[107]

The name 'Israel' (Gen. 32:28), then, seems to have been omitted in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's text, at least as it is witnessed in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. It should be noted that 'Israel' is also absent in the Ethiopic translation of Ibn al-Ṭayyib in ms. EMML 1839:

ወፍካሬ፡ስሙ፡ሰ፡ረአዬ፡እግዚአብሔር፡ውእቱ።

'The interpretation of his name is "seer of God".'

The Ethiopic text does, however, include 'his name' (ስሙ፡), which is not found in the Arabic text, at least as it is preserved in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. Perhaps the Ethiopic text witnesses here to an earlier version of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*, or alternatively the word could have been added by the Ethiopic translator in an attempt to make sense of the obscure Arabic *Vorlage*.

After commenting on the etymology of the name Israel, Ibn al-Ṭayyib moves to a discussion of Gen. 32:32:

ولوجع وركه من الجهاد لا ياكل اليهود الى الان عرق النسا بل يخرجونه.

'Because of the pain of his hip from the struggle, the Jews do not eat even now the sciatic nerve, but they remove it.'

In his *Scholion*, Bar Koni moves directly to an explanation of the same verse, stating the following:

ܓܝܕܐ ܕܚܠܨܐ. ܓܝܕܐ ܕܕܦܢܐ ܕܩܪܝܒ
ܠܥܛܡܐ ܕܘܟܬܐ. ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܐܟܠ
ܠܗ ܝܗܘܕܝܐ. ܚܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܓܝܕܐ ܗܘ.
ܘܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܠܕܘܟܪܢܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܕܓܕܫ ܠܪܝܫ
ܥܡܗܘܢ.

'The tendon of the hip is the tendon of the flank, which is near to the thigh, the place of the anus, which Jews do not eat, first because it is a tendon, and second as a remembrance for what happened to the head of their people.'[108]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib's comments are not dependent on Bar Koni here. Ibn al-Ṭayyib is also not dependent on the running commentary of Ishoʿdad of Merv or that in ms. Diyarbakır 22.[109] Rather, Bar Koni's exegesis is a slightly expanded rewriting of the Arabic biblical text. The earliest dated

Arabic Pentateuch manuscript (ms. Sinai Arabic 2 [939/940]), for instance, reads as follows for Gen. 32:32:

فمن اجل ذلك لا ياكلون بني اسرايل عرق
النسا...

'For this reason, the Israelites do not eat the sciatic nerve…'

Thus, Ibn al-Ṭayyib glosses 'this' in the biblical text with 'the pain of his hip from the struggle' and changes 'Israelites' to 'Jews'. He then adds 'until now' as well as the final clause concerning the removal of the sciatic nerve. Despite these changes, in its structure and even in its wording, Ibn al-Ṭayyib follows the Arabic biblical text. The fact that Ibn al-Ṭayyib comments on this verse at this particular point in his commentary—between comments on Gen. 32:28 and Gen. 31:42, 53—points, however, to his dependence on Bar Koni's *Scholion*.

The next remark in both Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* and Bar Koni's *Scholion* deals with the phrases 'god of my father, the god of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac' (Gen. 31:42) and 'fear of his father Isaac' (Gen. 31:53). On the former, Ibn al-Ṭayyib comments:

واله ابيه الذي حلف به هو الله وليس كما قال
قوم اله غريب

'"The god of his father" by which he swore is God, and it is not as some people say a foreign god.'

Bar Koni remarks on the latter:

ܕܬܠܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܒܘܗܝ, ܘܒܗ ܚܕ: ܠܗ ܐܝܟ
ܕܝ ܚܕܐ 110 ܝܩܝܢܝ: ܘܗܠܝܢ ܒܢ ܚܕ ܐܠܗ
ܕܥܙܝܪ: ܠܐܝܟܘܐ ܗܠܕ ܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܠܗ ܠܐܠܗ ܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܚܕܟ.

'"The fear of his father" by which he swore is not as some people think that, besides the one true God, Isaac worshipped another, but he called that God thusly.'[111]

Similar exegetical material is also found in the running commentary of Ishoʿdad:

ܗ, ܕܐܠܗܘܬ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ ܘܕܚܠܬܐ ܕܐܝܣܚܩ.
ܚܕܐ ܗ, ܕܕ ܚܠܝܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܚܕܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܬ ܕܐܬܥܡ ܕܠܒܣܠܐ ܐܝܣܚܩ
ܠܠܕ ܚܝܣܘܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ.

'The phrase "god of Abraham and fear of Isaac" is a single item that is divided, as is customary of scripture. It is not, as the folly of some would have it, that Isaac worshipped another fear apart from God.'[112]

The structure of Ibn al-Ṭayyib is most similar to Bar Koni's *Scholion*. Ibn al-Ṭayyib has, however, simplified the material in Bar Koni and removed the reference to Isaac.

Following this discussion of Gen. 31:42 and 53, Bar Koni devotes six lines of Syriac text in Scher's edition to discussing the meaning of Panuel (Gen. 32:31), the meaning of Mahanaim (Gen. 32:2), the meaning of the word *masmā* 'he was lame, blind' (Gen. 32:31), the meaning of Gen. 31:54, the meaning of Luz (Gen. 28:19), and finally Jacob's purchasing land in Canaan (Gen. 33:19). He then provides a summary of Genesis 25:1-6:

ܒܬܘܗܡ ܕܝ ܡܢ ܡܘܬ ܕܣܪܐ ܕܒܪ ܐܒܪܗܡ. ܠܩܝܡ
ܕܘܕܩܘܪܐ ܩܝܢܛܪܐ. ܘܐܬܝܠܕ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܚܢܗ.
ܘܗܡܪܢ ܘܝܩܫܢ ܘܡܕܢ ܘܡܕܝܢ ܘܐܫܒܩ ܘܫܘܚ.
ܘܝܩܫܢ ܐܘܠܕ ܠܫܒܐ ܘܠܕܪܢ. ܘܒܢܝ ܗܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܫܘܕܝܡ ܘܠܛܫܝܡ ܘܐܡܝܡ. ܘܒܢܝ ܡܕܝܢ. ܚܦܐ
ܘܚܦܪ. ܘܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܒܝܕܥ ܘܐܠܕܥܐ. ܘܫܕܪ
ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐܪܥ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ.

'After the death of Sarah, Abraham took the maidservant Qentura. There was born to him from her Zamran, Yaqshan, Madan,[113] Medyan, Ashbaq, and Shwaḥ. Yaqshan begat Shba and Daran. The sons of Daran were Shudim, Laṭshim, and Amim. The sons of Medyan were ʿEpa, Ḥapar, Ḥnok, Abidaʿ(m), and Eldaʿa. He sent them to the land of the East.'[114]

In contrast to Bar Koni, Ibn al-Ṭayyib moves directly from the discussion of Gen. 31:42 and 53 to the following comments on Gen. 25:1-6:

ومن بعد موت سرا تزوج ابرهيم بقنطورا. واولد منها عدة اولاد وانفذ الى المشرق.

'After the death of Sarah, Abraham married Qantura. He bore from her numerous children, and he sent (them) to the East.'

Thus, Ibn al-Ṭayyib does not include multiple lines of Syriac in Bar Koni. In addition, he removes all of the genealogical information found in Bar Koni replacing the names with 'numerous children'. This illustrates his tendency to abridge the Syriac material in Bar Koni.

From the discussion of Gen. 25:1-6, Ibn al-Ṭayyib proceeds to comment on Gen. 31-32:

ومع خروج يعقوب من بيت لابان بامر اللـه لم ينزل عيسوا.

'With Jacob's departure from the house of Laban by the command of God, Esau did not attack (him).'

This is based on the next sentences in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, which are, however, much longer:

ܦܠܘܚܟܐ ܐܝܢ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܗܐ ܠܟ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ
ܐܬܦܩܕ ܕܢܦܘܩ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܠܒܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܘ
ܡܢ ܗܘ, ܕܒܠܟܐ. ܗܘ ܝ ܠܢܐܬܐ ܐܢܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܐ,
ܘܗܡ ܡܩܬܟܐ ܕܝܢܕ ܠܚܡܗ. ܐܥܐ ܠܢܩܐ,
ܘܚܢܘܗ, ܦܠܝܚ. ܘܒܠܟܐ ܠܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܐܟ
ܦܠܘܚܟܐ ܗܘܠܡܗ. ܕܗܢ ܠܟ ܐܬܐܝܢ, ܠܐ
ܠܠܒܠܟ ܕܐܝܙ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܝ ܕܟܐܠܗܟܐ ܠܐ ܐܟܢܕ.
ܗܘ ܐܡܝܪ. ܕܐܝ ܝ ܗܠܝ ܟܐܠܗܟܐ ܠܐ ܡܟܗܢܝܢ.
ܐܘܬܝ ܠܐ ܡܟܗܝܣܘܢ ܘܐܣܗܝ.

'Although the blessed Jacob was commanded by God to go out from the house of Laban (Gen. 31:3), he did not forsake that which is necessary and belongs to human craft, and (thus he went) with presents that he sent to Esau (Gen. 32:13), and he also divided his women and children (Gen. 32:7-8; 33:1). For, the blessed Paul did thusly: although he received a revelation that none of those on the boat would perish, he (still) said, "If these men do not remain on the boat, you will not be able to live" (Acts 27:31).'[115]

Bar Koni is explaining that Jacob gave gifts to Esau and divided his family through his human ingenuity and not because he did not trust in the promise of God.[116] To support this, he cites the story of Paul, who displayed his own ingenuity in telling the soldiers and centurion to stay on the boat lest they die, even though Paul already knew that they would survive thanks to an earlier vision from God. This entire line of argument along with the citation from Acts is not included in Ibn al-Ṭayyib. Rather, Ibn al-Ṭayyib takes his cue from Bar Koni but summarizes in a single sentence in Arabic. In doing this, however, he ignores the problem that Bar Koni is attempting to explain.

Ibn al-Ṭayyib concludes this section by restating Gen. 17:24:

وابرهيم اختتن له وله ثمان وتسعين سنة.

'Abraham was circumcised when he was ninety-eight years old.'

This is based on the very next sentence in Bar Koni:

ܐܬܓܙܪ ܐܝܢ ܗܘ ܟܐܢ. ܟܕ ܠܬܥܣܝܢ ܗܘܐ
ܘܬܫܥ ܫܢܝܢ.

'Abraham was ninety-nine years old when he was circumcised.'[117]

Ibn al-Ṭayyib changes the age of Abraham's circumcision from ninety-eight to ninety-nine.[118] In addition, Ibn al-Ṭayyib rewrites the Syriac by making the verb 'to be circumcised' the main verb and changing the statement on his age into a subordinate clause.[119] Following the remark on Gen. 17:24, Bar Koni continues with another ten lines of Syriac. None of this is, however, found in Ibn al-Ṭayyib, which ends with the comment on Gen. 17:24.

This question leaves no doubt that Bar Koni's *Scholion* was a principal source for the question-and-answer part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*. Throughout this question, Ibn al-Ṭayyib

follows exactly the order of presentation in Bar Koni's *Scholion*, even including the discussion on Abraham's children after Sarah (Gen. 25:1-6) and Abraham's circumcision (Gen. 17:24), which are abrupt departures from the other material on Jacob (Gen. 30-32). In some passages in this question, Ibn al-Ṭayyib is a word-for-word translation of Bar Koni's *Scholion*. In others, such as that dealing with Gen. 32:32, he takes his initial cue from Bar Koni, but provides an exegesis that differs from that in the *Scholion*. This is similar to the questions treated previously. In contrast to the previous questions, however, this question contains several passages that are incomprehensible without Bar Koni's *Scholion*. The locution '… lacking horns and spotted…', for instance, is completely unintelligible as it stands in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's text, at least as it is transmitted in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. This is confirmed by the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839, which connects these words with the previous question instead of the current question. Or, to take another example, how would a reader of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Arabic text know that the comment 'its interpretation is "seeing God"' refers to the name Israel? There is no clue in the text itself. These passages raise a series of questions regarding the function(s) of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity* within the Arabic-speaking Christian community: How was this commentary used? Did it presume knowledge of the Syriac exegetical tradition? Or even perhaps access to the original Syriac of Bar Koni's *Scholion*? Further research based on a full edition of the Arabic text is needed before such questions can begin to be answered.

CONCLUSION

Already in his *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, Graf noted that Ibn al-Ṭayyib never names the sources for his *Paradise of Christianity*: "Im ganzen um-fänglichen Kommentarenwerk des 'Para-dieses der Christenheit' nennt der Vfr. keine Quellen."[120] The present study has aimed to remove one of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's sources from the realm of anonymity: Theodore Bar Koni. For the sections of *The Paradise of Christianity* treated in this study, the *Scholion* of Theodore Bar Koni is the principal source used by Ibn al-Ṭayyib. Ibn al-Ṭayyib's most common methods for incorporating material from this source are word-for-word translation, at times leaning toward a source-oriented (literal) translation, as well as abridgment, often removing biblical citations, con-densing explanations, and replacing two Syriac words with a single Arabic one. In some cases, Ibn al-Ṭayyib skips over entire lines or even pages of Syriac text in Bar Koni's *Scholion*. Ibn al-Ṭayyib also occasionally presents an interpretation of a passage that departs from Bar Koni's, even though he takes his cue as to which passages should be commented upon from the *Scholion*.

Both parts of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*, then, are based on Syriac sources. Ishoʿdad of Merv's com-mentary is the principal source, at least for Genesis, for the running commentary part of *The Paradise of Christianity*, which is preserved in ms. Vatican Arab. 37. Bar Koni's *Scholion* is the principal source, at least for the selection treated in this study, for the question-and-answer part of *The Paradise of Christianity*, which is pre-served in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. Both of these statements must remain qualified until additional studies, ideally based on full editions of both parts of the commentary, appear. For now, however, it is clear that the two great works of East-Syriac biblical exegesis—Ishoʿdad of Merv's commentary and Theodore Bar Koni's *Scholion*—find a new Arabic context in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*.

NOTES

* I would like to thank Simcha Gross (Yale University), George Kiraz (Beth Mardutho: Syriac Institute), Geoffrey Moseley (Yale University), and Lucas Van Rompay (Duke University) for their help with this study.

[1] G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* (Studi e testi 118, 133, 146, 147, 172; Vatican, 1944-1952), vol. 2, 162.

[2] In a recent reference article, Faultless writes, "much remains to be discovered of this remarkable solo achievement" (Julian Faultless, "Ibn al-Ṭayyib," in *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographic History. Volume 2 [900-1050]*, ed. David Thomas and Alex Mallett, with Juan Pedro Monferrer Sala, Johannes Pahlitzsch, Mark Swanson, Herman Teule, and John Tolan [History of Christian-Muslim Relations 14; Leiden, 2010], 682). The most thorough study is J. C. J. Sanders, *Inleiding op het Genesis-kommentaar van de Nestoriaan Ibn at-Taiyib* (Leiden, 1963). See also P. Féghali, "Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib et son commentaire sur la Genèse," *ParOr* 16 (1990-1991) 149-62.

[3] This was already noted in passing in Roger W. Cowley, *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation. A Study in Exegetical Tradition and Hermeneutics* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 38; Cambridge, 1988), 120 and Aaron Michael Butts, "Embellished with Gold: The Ethiopic Reception of Syriac Biblical Exegesis," *Oriens Christianus*. Forthcoming.

[4] For this author, see A. M. Butts, "Ibn al-Ṭayyib," in S. P. Brock, A. M. Butts, G. A. Kiraz, and L. Van Rompay (eds.), *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage* (Piscataway, 2011), 206-207; Julian Faultless, "Ibn al-Ṭayyib," 667-697; Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. 1, 152-155, vol. 2, 160-77. More generally, see S. K. Samir, "La place d'Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib dans la pensée arabe," *JEastCS* 58 (2006) 177-193.

[5] An interesting memoir recounts the story of Avicenna attempting to acquire books by Ibn al-Ṭayyib, but Ibn al-Ṭayyib thwarting the sale because he did not want Avicenna to obtain them (see Dimitri Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works* [Leiden, 1988], 64-72).

[6] The Arabic is edited in K. Gyekye, *Ibn al-Tayyib's Commentary on Porphyry's Eisagoge. Arabic text edited with introduction and a glossary of Greek-Arabic Logical Terms* (Beirut, 1975), and an English translation is available in K. Gyekye, *Arabic Logic. Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Commentary on Porphyry's Eisagoge* (Albany, 1979).

[7] His commentary on the *Categories* is edited with a German translation in C. Ferrari, *Die Kategorienkommentar von Abū l-Farağ 'Abdallāh ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib. Text und Untersuchungen* (Leiden, 2006). The Arabic text is also available in 'Alī Ḥusayn al-Jābirī et al., *al-Šarḥ al-kabīr li-maqūlāt Arisṭū* (Baghdad, 2002).

[8] This is edited with a German translation in W. Hoenerbach and O. Spies, *Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib. Fiqh al-naṣrānīya* (CSCO 161-162, 167-168; Louvain, 1956-57).

[9] See Y. T. Langermann, "Abū al-Faraj ibn al-Ṭayyib on spirit and soul," *Le Muséon* 122 (2009) 149-58; P. P. Sbath, *Vingt traités philosophiques et apologétiques d'auteurs arabes chrétiens du IXᵉ au XIXᵉ siècles* (Cairo, 1929), 179-80 (with a French translation in G. Troupeau, "Traité sur la science et le miracle et fragments du Traité sur les fondements de la religion de 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ṭayyib," in *Études de civilisation médiévale, IXe-XIIe siècles* [Poitiers, 1985], 177-84); G. Troupeau, "Le traité sur l'unité et la Trinité de 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ṭayyib," *ParOr* 2 (1971) 71-89; idem, "Le traité sur l'union de 'Abd Allāh Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib," *ParOr* 8 (1977-78) 141-50; idem, "Le traité sur les hypostases et la substance de 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-Ṭayyib," in J. M. Barral (ed.), *Orientalia Hispanica* (Leiden, 1974), 640-44.

[10] These are edited, but not in critical editions, in Y. Manquriyūs, *Tafsīr al-mašriqī* (Cairo, 1908-1910); Y. Manquriyūs and Ḥ. Jirjis, *al-Rawḍ al-nadīr fī tafsīr al-mazāmīr* (Cairo, 1902). The first part of the prologue to the commentary on the gospels is edited in Kh. Samir, "Nécessité de la science. Texte de 'Abdallāh Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib (m. 1043)," *ParOr* 3 (1972) 241-59; idem, "Nécessité de l'exégèse scientifique. Texte de 'Abdallāh Ibn aṭṬayyib," *ParOr* 5 (1974) 243-79. A short

excerpt from this commentary is edited in G. Troupeau, "Le traité sur la Trinité et l'unité de 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ṭayyib," *Bulletin d'études orientales* 25 (1972) 105-23. For his commentary on the gospels, see also J. Faultless, "The two recensions of the Prologue to John in Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *Commentary on the Gospels*," in D. R. Thomas (ed.), *Christians at the heart of Islamic rule. Church life and scholarship in 'Abbasid Iraq* (The History of Christian-Muslim Relations 1; Leiden, 2003), 177-98.

[11] See the discussion in Peter Joosse, "An Introduction to the Arabic Diatessaron," *Oriens Christanus* 83 (1999) 72-129 as well as still T. Baarda, "The author of the Arabic Diatessaron," in T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn, W. C. van Unnik (eds.), *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1978), 61-103 (reprinted in T. Baarda, *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus* [Amsterdam, 1983], 207-49).

[12] It is edited with a French translation in J. C. J. Sanders, *Commentaire sur la Genèse* (CSCO 274-275; Louvain, 1967). An unsystematic comparison of this edition with ms. Vatican Arab. 37 shows that it unfortunately contains numerous misreadings of the Arabic. This can be illustrated by fn. 85 below as well as footnotes 34-41 in Butts, "Embellished with Gold."

[13] See Sanders, *Inleiding op het Genesis kommentaar*; idem, *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, ii-iii ('la source principale'); Cowley, *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation*, 66; Féghali, "Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib et son commentaire sur la Genèse"; Faultless, "Ibn al-Ṭayyib," 669, 681; S. H. Griffith, *The Bible in Arabic: The Scriptures of the "People of the Book" in the Language of Islam* (Princeton, 2013), 150-151; Butts, "Embellished with Gold."

[14] Faultless' characterization of this commentary as "containing the remaining materials" and "the New Testament and all miscellaneous material" ("Ibn al-Ṭayyib," 681-683) is inaccurate. A more careful description can, however, already be found in Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. 1, 163.

[15] Thus, contrary to statements found in the secondary literature, not all of the material dealing with Genesis in *The Paradise of Christianity* has been edited: the running commentary part has been edited by Sanders,

but the question-and-answer part that deals with Genesis remains unedited.

[16] For this ms., see Ang. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, Vol. 4.2 (Rome, 1831), 78; Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. 2, 162.

[17] An edition of the section of the Ethiopic translation of this commentary that covers the same material as the present study is in progress by the present author.

[18] Bar Koni's *Scholion* survives in two recensions: the Siirt (edited in A. Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī. Liber Scholiorum* [CSCO 55, 69; Louvain 1910-1912], with a French translation in R. Hespel and R. Draguet[†], *Théodore bar Koni. Livre des scolies [recension de Séert]* [CSCO 431-432; Louvain, 1981]) and the Urmia (edited with a French translation in R. Hespel, *Théodore bar Koni. Livre des scolies [recension d'Urmiah]* [CSCO 447-448; Louvain, 1983] [additions only]; the section on the 'Pauline' epistles was independently edited with a German translation in L. Brade, *Untersuchungen zum Scholienbuch des Theodoros bar Konai* [GOF I.8; Wiesbaden, 1975]). There is no difference between the two recensions for the selection treated in this study, and so the study uses the Siirt recension as edited by Scher (*Theodorus bar Kōnī*) and translated into French by Hespel and Draguet (*Théodore bar Koni*).

[19] Ms. تدبيري. It should be noted that the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839 has ሥርዓት፡ 'economy' without a pronominal suffix.

[20] Ms. انتايه, though the order of *tā'* and *nūn* could be reversed. The emendation to انتهايه is corroborated by the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839, which has ደኃሪተ፡ለዝቲ፡ 'the end of this'.

[21] While the *rasm* is certain, the dots in the manuscript are not. The reading كنته 'his sister-in-law, his daughter-in-law' is corroborated by the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839, which has መርዓቱ፡ 'his bride, daughter-in-law, spouse'.

[22] Perhaps read وياهودا, though note that the East-Syriac form is ܝܗܘܕܐ /ihudā/.

[23] Ms. ينتقم. This emendation is supported by Bar Koni's *Scholion*, which has ܢܬܒܣܡ 'he would delight' (Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.2). The Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML

1839, however, has ይትቤቀል፡ 'he would be avenged', and so it was translating an Arabic *Vorlage* similar to ينتقم, as is found in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. See the discussion below.

[24] Ms. المتاخر. This emendation is supported by Bar Koni's *Scholion*, which has ܬܐܓܘܪܬܐ 'merchandise' (Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.3). The Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839, however, has እምእለ፡ተድኅሩ፡ 'those things that were left behind', and so it was translating an Arabic *Vorlage* similar to المتاخر, as is found in ms. Vatican Arab. 36. See the discussion below.

[25] Ms. كانت. This may be a case of attraction to the preceding relative pronoun (for attraction in Middle Arabic, see J. Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic* [CSCO 267, 276, 279; Louvain, 1966], §188).

[26] Probably a short form of لما, corresponding to ܠܡܢܐ 'why' in Bar Koni's *Scholion* (Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.13). See below for discussion.

[27] Before this word, ما has been crossed out in the manuscript.

[28] A marginal note adds the direct object, i.e., وانفذهم.

[29] Ms. تامر. This emendation is corroborated by the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839, which has በትእዛዘ፡ 'by the command of', with the cognate preposition *bä-*.

[30] Or, 'he'.

[31] The ms. reads 'my'.

[32] Or, 'sister-in-law'. See Gen. 35:22.

[33] See Gen. 34.

[34] The ms. reads 'he would avenge himself on'.

[35] The ms. reads 'that which is last, later, behind'.

[36] Or, 'pilgrimage'. See below for discussion.

[37] Possibly emend to 'Adam'. See below for discussion.

[38] Or, 'Laban and Jacob did not make a covenant at a hill of stones', or 'Did Laban and Jacob not make a covenant at a hill of stones?'. See Gen. 31:41-52. See below for discussion.

[39] Or, 'whom Jacob fought'.

[40] The direct object is added in a marginal note in the ms.

[41] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 138.13-139.11 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 143-144 (FT).

[42] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 139.12-140.14 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144-145 (FT).

[43] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.15-143.12 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145-146 (FT).

[44] Reading a variant in the manuscript tradition, following Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 146 n. 9.1.

[45] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 143.13-146.8 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 146-148 (FT).

[46] This tendency was noted already in Cowley, *Traditional Interpretation*, 120.

[47] The Old Testament portion of this commentary is edited with a French translation in J.-M. Vosté and C. Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv. Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament*, I (CSCO 126; Louvain, 1950); C. Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv. Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament*, I, II-VI (CSCO 156, 176, 179, 229-230, 303-304, 328-29, 433-34; Louvain, 1950-1981).

[48] This is edited with a French translation in L. Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Diyarbakir 22* (CSCO 483-484; Louvain, 1986).

[49] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 138.13-15 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 143 (FT).

[50] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 202.14-15 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 218.11-13 (FT).

[51] Probably read ܣܕܐ ܟܝܡ ܕܠܚܘܕܟܐ, following Scher (*Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 138).

[52] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 138.15-25 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 143-144 (FT).

[53] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 202.15-19 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿad de Merv*, 218.13-18 (FT).

[54] The ms. reads 'my' (تدبيري).

[55] The edition reads ܐܪܝܣܐ (*sic*). It should be noted that this reading is cited without comment in M. Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake – Piscataway, 2009), 1490-1491.

[56] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 138.25-139.14 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[57] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 202.19-28 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 218.218.19-29 (FT).

[58] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 139.15-16 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[59] Read ܚܕ following Van Rompay.

[60] Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32*, 1.109.17-22 (Syr.), 2.140.13-18 (FT).

[61] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 200.18-20 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 215.33-35 (FT).

[62] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 139.12-140.14 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144-145 (FT).

[63] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 139.14-17 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[64] The translation of 'daughter-in-law' has been chosen here based on the fact that كنته is translated by መርዓቱ: 'bride, daughter-in-law, spouse' in the Ethiopic translation of the question-and-answer part of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's *The Paradise of Christianity*, as found in Ms. EMML 1839.

[65] Images of this important ms. are available online at <http://www.e-corpus.org/eng/ notices/105117-Sinai-Mf-UCL-Arabe-2-Ancien-Testament-.html>.

[66] Sanders, *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, 97.10 (Arabic), 92 (FT).

[67] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 139.18-21 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[68] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 139.21-140.1 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[69] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.1-3 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[70] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.3-5 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[71] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.5-6 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 144 (FT).

[72] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.6-7 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[73] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.7-9 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[74] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.9-11 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[75] This is how the Ethiopic translation in ms. EMML 1839 understood the Arabic: ወንፍታሊምስ፡አቅደመት፡ወወሀበት፡ምድሩ፡ፍሬ፡በምክንያተ፡ መላእክት። 'As for Nephtali, his land first gave forth fruit in a pretext for messengers', where the nominative ምድሩ፡ must be the subject of the verbs. Alternatively, the Arabic (but not the Ethiopic) could be analyzed as a double accusative construction, i.e., 'He (i.e., Jacob) gave his land fruits …'.

[76] It may, however, ultimately be related to the similarity between ܚܠܠܐ 'produce' and ܥܠܠܐ 'cause', the latter of which could be translated by Arabic الحجة (as well as the cognate العلة).

[77] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.11-13 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[78] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.13-14 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[79] Sanders, *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, 97.4-101.7 (Arabic), 92-95 (FT).

[80] Sanders, *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, 100.1-2 (Arabic), 94 (FT).

[81] Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32*, 125.20-24 (Syr.), 163 (FT).

[82] The edition has ܐܣܝܘܗܝ.

[83] As Van den Eynde notes (*Išoʿdad de Merv*, 237 n. 8), this is not the text of the Hebrew but of the Septuagint: νεφθαλι στέλεχος ἀνειμένον ἐπιδιδοὺς ἐν τῷ γενήματι κάλλος 'Nephtali, a stem let go, giving beauty by produce'.

[84] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 218.13-21 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 237 (FT).

[85] Sanders reads غذا, but ms. Vatican Arab. 37 has the definite article.

[86] Sanders, *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, 100.3-4 (Arabic), 94 (FT).

[87] This was already noted by Sanders, *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, 94 n. 7 (FT).

[88] R.-M. Tonneau, *Sancti Ephraem Syri. In Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii* (CSCO 152-153; Louvain, 1955), 116.3-6 (Syr.); E. G.

Mathews and J. P. Amar, *St. Ephrem the Syrian. Selected Prose Works* (Washington, D.C., 1994), 206 (ET).

[89] Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32*, 125.18-19 (Syr.), 163 (FT).

[90] Such as the so-called Anonymous Commentary on the Pentateuch, preserved in a number of manuscripts and partly edited and translated into English in A. Levene, *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis. From a Syriac Ms. on the Pentateuch in the Mingana Collection. The First Eighteen Chapters of the Ms. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Notes; and Including a Study in Comparative Exegesis* (London, 1951).

[91] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.15-143.12; Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145-146.

[92] Read ܠܚܡܘܬܗ following Scher.

[93] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.15-19 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[94] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.21-22 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[95] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 140.19.21 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[96] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 143.13-146.8 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 146-148 (FT).

[97] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.7-8 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 147 (FT).

[98] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.10-13 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 147 (FT).

[99] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 192.23-36 (Syr.), Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 206-206 (FT)

[100] Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32*, 101.6-7 (Syr.), 192 (FT).

[101] Compare the misunderstanding of the tetragrammaton in a Syriac context discussed by Jacob of Edessa in a Scholion to his translation of the *Cathedral Homilies* by Severus of Antioch (M. Brière, *Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche. Traduction syriaque de Jacques d'Édesse. Homélies CXX à CXXV* [PO 29.1; Paris, 1960], 190-207).

[102] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.13-15 (Syr.), Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 147 (FT).

[103] Perhaps read ܐܒ̈ܢܐ 'stones'.

[104] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.15-18 (Syr.), Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 147 (Syr.).

[105] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 195.10-13 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 209 (FT).

[106] Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32*, 103.13-14 (Syr.), 132 (FT).

[107] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.18 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 147 (FT).

[108] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.19-21 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 145 (FT).

[109] For Ishoʿdad, see Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 196.2-10 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 210 (FT); for ms. Diyarbakır 22, see Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32*, 104.20-105.2 (Syr.), 133-134 (FT).

[110] Read ܕܡܒܘܥ following Scher.

[111] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 144.22-145.3 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 147 (FT).

[112] Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 194.11-14 (Syr.); Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 208 (FT).

[113] The edition has 'Maran'.

[114] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 145.9-15 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 148 (FT).

[115] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 145.15-22 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 148 (FT).

[116] This point is made even more explicitly in the running commentary of Ishoʿdad of Merv (Vosté and Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 196.10-18 [Syr.]; Van den Eynde, *Išoʿdad de Merv*, 210-211 [FT]).

[117] Scher, *Theodorus bar Kōnī*, 145.12-13 (Syr.); Hespel and Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni*, 148 (FT).

[118] It should be noted that this change is not found in the earliest dated ms. of the Arabic Pentateuch, ms. Sinai Arabic 2 (939/940).

[119] It should be pointed out that the use of *l-* in وابرهيم اختتن له 'Abraham was circumcised' is unusual for Arabic. Given Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Syriac background, this could well be a replication of the so-called *dativus ethicus* construction in Syriac (see J. Joosten, "The Function of the So-called Dativus Ethicus in Classical Syriac," *Orientalia* 58 [1989] 473-492). Nonetheless, this construction is not found in the Syriac source, and thus it would not be due to translation, but possibly a feature of Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Arabic idiolect.

[120] Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. 2, 163.