

Peter Tarras  
LMU Munich



### A new Arabic fragment of Jacob of Serugh's *On Epiphany*

The collection of Arabic manuscripts of St Catherine's Monastery at Mount Sinai, Egypt, is the most comprehensive archive of Christian Arabic manuscripts written before the year 1000 CE. Only some of these manuscripts were created in the Sinai monastery itself during this period. But all of them show us that from early on the monastery was an important nod in a network with other monastic and urban centres of Christian Arabic manuscript production. This corpus is therefore an outstanding source of the institutional and social history of early Christian Arabic scribality.

Unfortunately, very few of the manuscripts in this corpus have survived as complete codices. They were first worn out through use and later many manuscripts and manuscript fragments were stored away in a Genizah-like practice when they were no longer needed – at least that is how one could describe their safekeeping in a separate room, the discovery of which brought to light the so-called New Finds in 1975.<sup>1</sup> In the 19th and early 20th century, numerous manuscripts then fell victim to the biblioclasm of European manuscript hunters. Today, countless fragments (and in some cases entire codices) from St Catherine's Monastery can be found in European and North American collections. However, as we shall see, biblioclasm also happened within the monastery's walls in premodern times.

Against this background, it is remarkable that a comparably large number of colophons of these early Christian Arabic manuscripts have survived.<sup>2</sup> They allow us to contextualise them historically, in some cases very precisely. We know the names and places of activity of a whole series of scribes and can identify the manuscripts they copied with a fair degree of certainty.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Arianna D'Ottone Rambach, Konrad Hirschler, and Ronny Vollandt, "Introduction", in Arianna D'Ottone Konrad Hirschler, and Ronny Vollandt (eds), *The Damascus Fragments: Towards a History of the Qubbat al-khazna Corpus of Manuscripts and Documents*, Beirut: Texte und Studien, 140 (Beirut: Ergon, 2020), pp. 9-50, at pp. 13-19, esp. p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Miriam L. Hjälms and Peter Tarras, "Early Christian Arabic Colophons from the Palestinian Monasteries: A Comparative Analysis", in: George A. Kiraz and Sabine Schmidtke (eds), *Literary Snippets: Colophons Across Space and Time* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2023), pp. 119-168, at p. 121, n. 9.

<sup>3</sup> For studies of the work of single early Christian Arabic scribes, see Sidney H. Griffith, "Stephen of Ramlah and the Christian Kerygma in Ninth-Century Palestine", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36/1 (1985), pp. 23-45; idem, "Anthony David of Baghdad, Scribe and Monk of Mar Sabas: Arabic in the Monasteries of Palestine", *Church History* 58/1 (1989), pp. 7-19; André Binggeli, "Les trois David: copistes arabes de Palestine aux 9<sup>e</sup>-10<sup>e</sup> s.", in: André Binggeli, Anne Boud'hors, Matthieu Cassin (eds), *Manuscripta Graeca et Orientalia: Mélanges monastiques et patristiques en l'honneur de Paul Géhin*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 243 (Leuven, Paris, and Warpole, MA: Peeters, 2016), pp. 79-117; Peter Tarras, "Building a Christian Arabic Library at Mount Sinai: The Scribe Thomas of Fustat and the Manuscripts of His Workshop", forthcoming.

Within St Catherine's Monastery, the fragmented parts of the original manuscripts of these scribes have not only survived among the New Finds, but have also been preserved through forms of secondary use. I have recently drawn attention to a Christian Arabic fragment in the back cover of MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Syr. 274, which is a part of the table of contents of a manuscript copied by the famous scribe Antony David of Baghdad (Anṭūna Dāwūd b. Sulaymān al-Baġdādī) of the Monastery of Mar Saba in the Judean Desert (MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 428).<sup>4</sup> Another example is the fragment in the back cover of MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Slav. 7, which was very likely copied by a scribe from the Monastery of Mar Chariton. The hand is rather similar to that of other well-known Charitonian scribes, especially Stephen of Ramla (Iṣṭāfanā b. Hakam ar-Ramlī) or Michael the Deacon (Mihā'il al-Šammās).<sup>5</sup> These finds can prove to be important pieces in the puzzle of the history of early Christian Arabic scribality and the history of Christian Arabic literature more generally.

Here, I would like to demonstrate this by looking at another such find. It is a further fragment that was used in a secondary way in the back cover of a different manuscript. This fragment can again be attributed to a well-known scribe. The fragment survived as a pastedown in the back board of MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 516. It was taken from a codex copied by the scribe Thomas of Fustat (Tūmā al-Fuṣṭāṭī), who was active in the Sinai monastery at the end of the 9th and beginning of the 10th century CE. An extensive corpus of his manuscripts has survived to the present day.<sup>6</sup> This corpus preserves a great number of very interesting texts, especially since we find among them some of the oldest examples of Christian Arabic translation literature.

The fragment presented here is an example of this. It contains the end of Jacob of Serugh's (d. 520 or 521) homily *On the Baptism of Our Saviour in the Jordan* (d-ʿal ʿmaḏeh d-Pārōqan da-ḥ-Yōrdnān).<sup>7</sup> The text will henceforth be referred to as *On Epiphany*. In the

---

<sup>4</sup> See Peter Tarras, "Miscellaneous Identifications I: A New Fragment by the Scribe Antony David of Baghdad", *Membra Dispersa Sinaitica* (5 March 2024), DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.58079/vy9y>>. On MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 428 and its *membra disjecta*, see A. Binggeli, "Les trois David", pp. 85-87.

<sup>5</sup> An image of this fragment is printed in Nicholas Pickwoad, "The Saint Catherine's Monastery Library Conservation Project and the Slavonic Manuscripts", in Cyril Mango, Marlia Mango, Earleen Brunner, and Father Justin (eds), *St Catherine's Monastery at Mount Sinai: Its Manuscripts and their Conservation: Papers Given in Memory of Professor Ibor Ševčenko* (London: Saint Catherine Foundation, 2011), pp. 71-80, fig. 11.8. The hand in this fragment is identical to the one responsible for MS St Andrews, St Andrews University Library, 14, which Miriam L. Hjälml recently compared to the hands of Stephen of Ramla and Michael the Deacon; see Miriam L. Hjälml, "Lost and Found: Christian Arabic *Membra Disjecta* in the Mingana Collection", in: Israel Muñoz Gallarte and Marzena Zawadowska (eds), *Lost and Bound: Reconstruction Techniques in Fragmentary Manuscripts of the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, Aramaeo-Arabica et Graeca, 5 (Salamanca and Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca and Editorial Sínderesis, 2022), pp. 125-154, at pp. 136-139; Miriam L. Hjälml, "A Paleographical Study of Early Christian Arabic Manuscripts", *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 17 (2020), pp. 37-77, at p. 57; see also M. L. Hjälml and P. Tarras, "Early Christian Arabic Colophons", p. 134, esp. n. 38.

<sup>6</sup> See P. Tarras, "Building a Christian Arabic Library".

<sup>7</sup> For the different titles under which this text was transmitted in Syriac, see Khalil Alwan, *Les œuvres de Jacques de Saroug dans la tradition arabe: Inventaire des manuscrits arabes*, Series Syro-Arabica, 10 (Cordoba/Beirut: CNERU/CEDRAC, 2019), p. 125; Roger-Youssef Akhrass, "A List of Homilies of Mar

Christian East, Jacob was a very influential author. More than 700 metrical homilies (*mēmre*) are ascribed to him, and around 400 homilies appear to have been preserved in Syriac manuscripts under his name.<sup>8</sup> Parts of his homiletic corpus were also transmitted in other linguistic traditions of the Christian East, e.g. in Armenian, Coptic, Gəʿəz, and Georgian.<sup>9</sup> Roughly 100 homilies are attested in Arabic translation.<sup>10</sup> The earliest Arabic translations of Jacob's homilies are preserved in manuscripts of the 9th to 11th centuries CE. A peculiar feature of these manuscripts is that they all seem to have been written in the Sinai

Jacob of Serugh", *Syriac Orthodox Patriarchal Journal* 53 (2015), pp. 87-161, at p. 89. The Syriac text is edited in Paulus Bedjan, *Homiliae Selectae Jacobi Sarugensis*, vol. 1 (Paris/Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1905), pp. 167-193. The Syriac text together with an English is also available in Thomas Kollamparampil, *Jacob of Serugh's Homily on Epiphany*, Texts from Christian Late Antiquity, 4, Jacob of Serugh's Metrical Homilies, Fascicle 2 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008). For a modern Arabic translation, see Miḥā'il Aṭanāsiyūs, *Kitāb Mayāmir ay Mawā'iz as-Sarūgī* (Cairo: Maṭba'at Miṣr bi-l-Faḡāla, 1905), pp. 333-343.

<sup>8</sup> See R.-Y. Akhrass, "A List". For other bibliographical aids, see Arthur Vööbus, *Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Mēmre-Dichtung des Ja'qōb von Serūg*, 4 vols, CSCO, 344-345, 421-422, Subsidia, 39-40, 60-61 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1973); Khalil Alwan, "Bibliographie générale raisonnée de Jacques de Saroug", *Parole de l'Orient* 13 (1986), pp. 313-383; Sebastian P. Brock, "Jacob of Serugh: A Select Bibliographical Guide", in: George A. Kiraz (ed.), *Jacob of Serugh and His Times: Studies in Sixth-Century Syriac Christianity*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies, 8 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2010), pp. 219-244.

<sup>9</sup> For Armenian, see e.g. Andy Hilken, "The Armenian Reception of the Homilies of Jacob of Serugh: New Findings", in: Madalina Toca and Dan Batovici (eds), *Caught in Translation: Versions of Late Antique Christian Literature*, Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity, 17 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020), pp. 64-84; Andy Hilken, "The Manuscripts of the Armenian Homilies of Jacob of Serugh: Preliminary Observations and Checklist", *Manuscripta* 64/1 (2020), pp. 1-71. For Coptic, see e.g. Alin Suciu, "The Sahidic Version of Jacob of Serugh's *Memra* on the Ascension of Christ", *Le Muséon* 128 (2015), pp. 49-83. For Gəʿəz, see Witold Witakowski, "Jacob of Serug", in: Siegbert Uhlig (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, vol. III: *He-N* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), pp. 262-263; Tedros Abraha, "Jacob of Serug in the Ethiopic Tradition under Review and New Clues about the Background of the Gəʿəz Anaphora Ascribed to Jacob of Serug", in: Rafal Zarzeczny (ed.), *Aethiopia fortitudo ejus: Studi in onore di Monsignor Osvaldo Raineri in occasione del suo 80° compleanno*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 298 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2015), pp. 463-478. For Georgian, see e.g. Tamara Pataridze, "La version géorgienne d'une homélie de Jacques de Saroug *Sur la Nativité*: Étude et traduction", *Le Muséon* 121 (2008), pp. 373-402.

<sup>10</sup> See Georg Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. 1: *Die Übersetzungen*, Studi e testi, 118 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1944), pp. 444-452; K. Alwan, *Les œuvres*. On the Arabic transmission of Jacob's homilies, see Georg Graf, "Maymar ḡayr ma'rūf li-Mār Ya'qūb al-Sarūgī", *al-Maṣriq* 48 (1954), pp. 46-49; Joseph-Marie Sauget, "L'homélie arabe de la Bibliothèque Ambrosienne (X.198 Sup.) et ses *membra disiecta*", *Analecta Bollandiana* 88 (1970), pp. 391-475; Joseph-Marie Sauget, "La collection homilético-hagiographique du manuscrit *Sinai arabe 457*", *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 22 (1972), pp. 129-167; Samir Khalil Samir, "Un exemple de contacts culturels entre les églises syriaques et arabes: Jacques de Saroug dans la tradition arabe", in René Lavenant (ed.), *III<sup>e</sup> Symposium Syriacum 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures (Goslar 7-11 Septembre 1980)* (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983), pp. 213-245; Aaron M. Butts, "The Christian Arabic Transmission of Jacob of Serugh (d. 521): The *Sammlungen*", *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 16 (2016), pp. 39-59; Aaron M. Butts, "Diversity in the Christian Arabic Reception of Jacob of Serugh (d. 521)", in: Barbara Roggema and Alexander Treiger (eds), *Patristic Literature in Arabic Translations*, Arabic Christianity, 2 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2020), pp. 89-129; Aaron M. Butts and Ted Erho, "Jacob of Serugh in the Ambrosian Homiliary (ms. Ambros. X.198 sup. and its *membra disiecta*)", *Δελτίο Βιβλικῶν Μελετῶν* 33 (2018), pp. 37-54; Vasiliki Chamourgiotaki, *Eine frühe arabische Übersetzung der Homilie Jakobs von Sarug "Über das Herrenwort Ihr sollt überhaupt nicht schwören": Syrische und arabische Edition mit Übersetzung*, MA thesis (Berlin: Freie Universität, 2020), esp. app. 5-6.

monastery.<sup>11</sup> Their codicological characteristics suggest that they were written for internal use within this monastery. Hence, their primary readers were Sinai's arabophone monks.

The new fragment exhibits one of these translations. Fortunately, it allows us to recover at least part of the previously lost text of this homily. *On Epiphany* was transmitted in Arabic in three recensions.<sup>12</sup> The oldest recension, recension B, was thus far known only from two fragments in two Sinaitic manuscripts: (1) MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 457 (9th/10th c.), f. 42v; (2) MS Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, X 198 sup. (11th c.), ff. 28r–29v.<sup>13</sup> The first manuscript preserves no more than a partly illegible title and one line of text (verses 1–2). In the second manuscript, the title was cut out at the bottom of the recto of folio 28. The verso of this folio preserves 17 lines from the beginning of the text.<sup>14</sup> Folio 29, again, exhibits mutilation and only two lines of text (verses 483–488/491) are preserved at the bottom of the recto; the verso used to contain the end of the text, as can be deduced from the subsequent title and text at the bottom, a homily by Ephrem on the same topic. Both manuscripts attest to no more than ca. 8 % of the Arabic translation. The new fragment allows us to recover an additional 30 verses, almost doubling the accessible amount of text (now ca. 15 %).<sup>15</sup>

In what follows, I will offer a description of the new fragment and provide a diplomatic edition and English translation. The Arabic text will also be compared to its Syriac *Vorlage*. I would like to express my gratitude to St Catherine's Monastery and especially Father Justin Sinaites, Librarian of St Catherine's Monastery, for permission to use the image reproduced at the end of this contribution.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> According to J.-M. Sauget, "La collection", pp. 140–141 one cannot tell if these manuscripts were produced on Mount Sinai or in the monastery of Mar Saba in the Judean Desert. In fact, the Christian Arabic scribes of both monasteries had strong ties, with the Sabaites probably taking a leading role; cf. Willi Heffening, "Die griechische Ephraem-Paraenesis gegen das Lachen in arabischer Übersetzung I", *Oriens Christianus*, III. Series, 2 (1927), pp. 94–119, at p. 102. Still, as we shall see below, the palaeographical evidence proves the Sinaitic origin of the earliest manuscripts transmitting Jacob's homilies in Arabic.

<sup>12</sup> See Kh. Alwan, *Les œuvres*, pp. 126–128.

<sup>13</sup> J.-M. Sauget, "L'homélie", pp. 432–433; idem, "La collection", p. 146; S. Kh. Samir, "Un exemple", pp. 221–222; 236–237; Kh. Alwan, *Les œuvres*, pp. 125–130. One *membrum disjectum* of MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 457 was identified by Sauget: MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Ar. 1826; see J.-M. Sauget, "La collection". Additionally, several *membra disjecta* of the Ambrosiana manuscript have been identified. These are: MS Birmingham, Cadbury Research Library, Mingana Collection Chr. Ar. Add. 133 (2 ff.); MS London, British Library, Or. 5019 (15 ff.); MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod.arab. 1067 (3 ff.); MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. NF M 46 (7 ff.); see J.-M. Sauget, "L'homélie"; Pier F. Fumagalli, "The Arabic Manuscripts of the Ambrosiana and the 'Homiliarium' *Ambr. X 198 sup.*", in: J.-M. Sauget (ed.), *Arabic Homilies on the Nativity*, Fontes Ambrosini, New Series, III (Milan: Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 2000), pp. 53–73.

<sup>14</sup> The first line starts with verse 1: *عمل المسح المتحن عرس لكنيسة الامم*, which translates: *سلكه سلكه سلكه*, *لانه ما سلك على قدره*. The last legible line (17) preserves the beginning of verse 43: *له حبه حبه حبه*, which translates: *له حبه حبه حبه*.

<sup>15</sup> It also allows us to recover the text's *desinit* whose absence from the other two manuscript witnesses was lamented by Kh. Alwan, *Les œuvres*, p. 126, n. 7. It reads: *رحمتك تحل على نقصنا الى دهر الداهرين امين*.

<sup>16</sup> I would also like to thank the following persons for their help and advice: Roger Akhrass, Aaron M. Butts, Vasiliki Chamourgiotaki, Alexander Treiger. I am grateful to Dawn Childress, Librarian for Digital Collections and Scholarship at UCLA's Digital Library Program, for her kind support.

*Description*

*Provenance and date:* The secondary use that ultimately preserved the fragment certainly post-dates the production of MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 516. A *membrum disjectum* of this manuscript is found in the Mingana Collection: MS Birmingham, Cadbury Research Library, Mingana Collection Chr. Ar. Add. 143. In his catalogue, Alphonse Mingana describes the contents of this single leaf as "the end of the life of the emperor Jovian, in connection with a miracle performed on a sick girl".<sup>17</sup> However, the text is, in fact, an early Arabic translation of the Syriac *Julian Romance*.<sup>18</sup> It was copied by an Egyptian scribe named Sa'īd b. Iṣṭafanā in the month of Thout (August/September) of the year 316 AH (928 CE).<sup>19</sup> This date is not directly related to the age of the new fragment. From a palaeographical viewpoint, however, we can assume that the new fragment (or the codex from which it derived) is maybe some decades older. MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 516 and the fragment in its back board, thus, roughly fall into the same period of origin.

This assumption is supported by palaeography (see below). The new fragment is written in the hand of the well-known scribe Thomas of Fustat of the Sinai monastery who was active in the second half of the 9th and the early 10th century CE. Thomas is probably best-known for being responsible for the *scriptio superior* of two famous palimpsests, the Mingana-Lewis Palimpsest (MS Cambridge, University Library, Or. 1287 + *membra disjecta*) and the Codex Arabicus (MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 514 + *membra disjecta*).<sup>20</sup> Further, there is reason to assume that the secondary use of the fragment possibly dates to the 12th century CE. The early Sinaitic manuscripts that preserve Jacob of Serugh's works, on the one hand, testify to a profound admiration of his religious poetry; on the other hand, especially their physical features betray a growing uneasiness with respect to his theological position. As a miaphysite, Jacob represented non-Chalcedonian Christianity. Still, little, if anything, of this non-Chalcedonianism transpired his homiletic compositions,

<sup>17</sup> Alphonse Mingana, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, vol. III: *Additional Christian Arabic and Syriac Manuscripts*, Woodbrooke Catalogues, III (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 1939), p. 47.

<sup>18</sup> See Uri Ben-Horin, "An Unknown Old Arabic Translation of the Syriac Romance of Julian the Apostate", *Studia Hierosolymitana* 9 (1961), pp. 1-10.

<sup>19</sup> A. Mingana, *Catalogue*, pp. 47-48. Mingana read the date as 716 according to the Coptic era of the Martyrs, corresponding to 999/1000 CE. However, he also pointed out that the date, written in Greek/Coptic numerals, could be read as the Muslim era date 316 (TIG'), which corresponds to the year 928 CE. See A. Mingana, *Catalogue*, p. 47, n. 2. After careful examination of the date, I have adopted this second reading, especially since the first, decisive numeral, is clearly written like a Greek T (= 300).

<sup>20</sup> See Grigory Kessel, Grigory, "A Catacomb of Syriac Texts: Codex Arabicus (Sin. ar. 514) Revisited", in: Claudia Rapp, Giulia Rossetto, Jana Grusková, and Grigory Kessel (eds), *New Light on Old Manuscripts: The Sinai Palimpsests and other Advances in Palimpsest Studies*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse: Denkschriften, 547 = Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 45 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2023), pp. 101-129; Alain George, "Le palimpseste Lewis-Mingana de Cambridge, témoin ancien de l'histoire du Coran", *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1 (2011), pp. 377-429, at pp. 407-408; Miriam L. Hjälml, "A Paleographical Study of Early Christian Arabic Manuscripts", *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 17 (2020), pp. 37-77. See also Peter Tarras, "Library".

such that the Melkites of Mount Sinai apparently saw no problem in reading, transmitting, and translating his works – at least for some time. In most part, the early Arabic translations of Jacob’s homilies survive only fragmentarily. This is due to a shift in attitude towards this author, which might have taken place in the 12th century, as Samir Khalil Samir hypothesised.<sup>21</sup> Whatever the exact historical background, the manuscripts give ample proof of censorship, which involved decided mutilation of books: folios and whole quires were cut out or otherwise removed and Jacob’s name was erased or substituted in titles and tables of contents. If we follow Samir’s hypothesis regarding a 12th-century date for the mutilation of codices containing Arabic translations of Jacob of Serugh’s works at Sinai, the re-use of the fragment might date to the same century or later.

*Codicology:* The writing support is parchment. The single leaf was glued to the back board with the flesh side, displaying now the hair side (the parchment has considerably darkened; hair follicles can be seen in some places). There are no signs of quire signatures or foliation. The outer margin was cut. The outer upper corner is covered by parts of folio 95 that stick to the cover. The fragment exhibits further damage through tears, holes, and dampness. MS Sinai, St Catherine’s Monastery, Ar. 516 measures 236 × 180 mm.<sup>22</sup> The fragment has roughly the same dimensions. It exhibits 18 lines of writing in black-brown ink, only few of which have been preserved entirely.

Another noteworthy feature is ‘Thomas’ use of two types of textual dividers: two vertically arranged dots and four dots arranged in the shape of a cross. Identical textual dividers were used by him in MS Sinai, St Catherine’s Monastery, Ar. 457 (see table 1). The bottom has a comparably large margin of the height of ca. five lines. The same *mise-en-page* is also found in MS Sinai, St Catherine’s Monastery, Ar. 457 (and other manuscripts produced by Thomas).

---

<sup>21</sup> S. Kh. Samir, “Un exemple”, pp. 243-244. See also J.-M. Sauget, “L’homélaire”, pp. 473; J.-M. Sauget, “La collection”, pp. 140; Kh. Alwan, *Les œuvres*, pp. 99-100.

<sup>22</sup> This information is derived from the website Sinai Manuscripts Digital Library: <https://sinaimanuscripts.library.ucla.edu/catalog/ark:%2F21198%2Fz16t25bb> (last accessed: 10 May 2024). It must be noted that the measurements given there slightly differ from those in the catalogues (which, at times, also slightly differ among each other). See Margaret Dunlop Gibson, *Catalogue of the Arabic Mss. in the Convent of S. Catharine on Mount Sinai*, Studia Sinaitica, III (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1894), p. 102 (220 × 150 mm); Aziz S. Atiya, *The Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai: A hand-list of the Arabic manuscripts and scrolls microfilmed at the library of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1955), p. 19 (225 × 160 mm); Murad Kamil, *Catalogue of all manuscripts in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970), p. 50 (225 × 160). Mingana, *Catalogue*, p. 47 records for his fragment: 223 × 162 mm.





Sin. ar. 457	New Fragment	Sin. ar. 457	New Fragment
			

Table 1: The two types of textual dividers as found in the new fragment in comparison to MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 457, f. 42v.

The other two manuscripts mentioned above, which preserve parts of the early Arabic translation of *On Epiphany*, can give us an idea of the amount of folios required by that text. In MS Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, X 198 sup. the entire text must have covered approximately ten pages or five folios. This estimation accords with Sauget's calculation that four folios are missing from quires 7 and 8 to which folios 28 and 29 belong respectively.<sup>23</sup> With respect to MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 457, Sauget calculated that six folios are missing from the 8th quire to which folio 42 used to belong.<sup>24</sup> It is not unreasonable to assume that the text of *On Epiphany* occupied these six folios. In fact, since this manuscript and the new fragment were written by the same scribe and share the same *mise-en-page* as well as roughly the same dimensions,<sup>25</sup> one may speculate that the fragment comes from this manuscript. It would then probably constitute the last folio of quire 8 and, together with f. 41, it would have formed the outer bifolio of a quaternion. However, this can only be corroborated on the basis of autoptic inspection.<sup>26</sup>

*Palaeography:* The new fragment is written in the characteristic hand of the Sinaitic scribe Thomas of Fustat. The palaeographical features of this hand have been described in a number of previous publications.<sup>27</sup> For this reason, a detailed palaeographic description is

<sup>23</sup> J.-M. Sauget, "L'homélieaire", p. 405.

<sup>24</sup> J.-M. Sauget, "La collection", p. 132.

<sup>25</sup> For MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 457, our catalogues give the following numbers: 220 × 170 mm (Gibson, *Catalogue*, p. 89); 225 × 170 mm (A. S. Atiya, *Hand-list*, p. 15); 225 × 170 mm (M. Kamil, *Catalogue*, p. 32).

<sup>26</sup> Other fragments from the same manuscript corpus are also possible joins. For instance, Sauget observed that the shelfmark MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 457 also contains four external fragments that originally pertained to different codices; J.-M. Sauget, "La collection", pp. 134-136. He was able to identify two of these: fragment 3 (f. 5r-v) pertains to MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 461; cf. also Miriam L. Hjälms, "Lost and Found: Christian Arabic Membra Disiecta in the Mingana Collection", in: Israel Muñoz Gallarte and Marzena Zawadowska (eds), *Lost and Bound: Reconstruction Techniques in Fragmentary Manuscripts of the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, Aramaeo-Arabica et Graeca, 5 (Salamanca and Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca and Editorial Sínderesis, 2022), pp. 125-154, at pp. 129-136. Fragment 4 (ff. 6r-11v) pertains to MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 460. Fragment 2 (f. 4r-v) shares similar features as the new fragment. However, the parent codex as well as the text of fragment 2 remain unidentified.

<sup>27</sup> See Johannes Oestrup, "Über zwei arabische Codices sinaitici der Strassburger Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 51/3 (1897), pp. 435-471, at p. 454; David S. Margoliouth, "Introductory Observations", in Agnes S. Lewis and Margaret D. Gibson, *Forty-*

not necessary here and we can limit ourselves to a few specific features. Recently, Miriam Hjälml placed 'Thomas' hand in the category of Christian Arabic transitional New Style scripts, which is a type of script characterised by vertical extension and a tendency towards straight lines.<sup>28</sup> This last feature is a precursor of Nashī, which is why it is not surprising that 'Thomas' hand was previously categorised as Nashī. As I have pointed out elsewhere, none of these earlier studies seeks to identify features that pertain to 'Thomas' hand alone.<sup>29</sup> Instead, his hand is regularly compared to that of one of his contemporary Antony David of Baghdad.<sup>30</sup> To be sure, coeval scribes like Thomas and Antony David who, in addition, worked in two closely interconnected scribal settings did not seek to develop a personalised, individualistic style. Still, this does not exclude the presence of personal features.

Willi Heffening was the first to draw attention to the differences in the hands of the two scribes. In general, he observed that 'Thomas' hand is less graceful ("zierlich") and has less sweeping ascenders ("Schwung in den Oberlängen"); he described it as thicker and more chunky ("klobiger"). More significant are his observations on the shapes of individual letters: the head of 'Thomas' *alif* is club shaped;<sup>31</sup> isolated *hā'* and *ayn* have vertical descenders and exhibit twirls that end to the right; isolated and final *lām* always descends

---

*One Facsimiles of Dated Christian Arabic Manuscripts with Text and English Translation*, Studia Sinaitica, XII (Cambridge: University Press, 1907), pp. ix–xvi, at p. xiii; Willi Heffening, "Die griechische Ephraem-Paraenesis", pp. 101–102; Jean Mansour, *Homélies et légendes religieuses: Un florilège arabe chrétien du Xe s. (Ms. Strasbourg 4225)*, PhD Dissertation (Strasbourg: Université Marc Bloch Strasbourg, 1972), p. xviii; Alain George, "Le palimpseste Lewis-Mingana de Cambridge, témoin ancien de l'histoire du Coran", *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1 (2011), pp. 377–429, at pp. 407–408; Miriam L. Hjälml, "A Paleographical Study of Early Christian Arabic Manuscripts", *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 17 (2020), pp. 37–77, at pp. 64–69; M. L. Hjälml and P. Tarras, "Colophons", pp. 152–153. See also P. Tarras, "Library".

<sup>28</sup> M. L. Hjälml, "A Paleographical Study".

<sup>29</sup> Cf. P. Tarras, "Building a Christian Arabic Library".

<sup>30</sup> On Antony David and his manuscript corpus, see J. Oestrup, "Über zwei arabische Codices sinaitici"; Ignaz Kračkovsky, "Новозавѣтный апокрифъ въ арабской рукописи 885–886 года по Р. Хр. [A New Testament Apokryphon in an Arabic Manuscript of the Year A.D. 885–886]", *Византийский Временник* 14/2–3 (1907), pp. 246–275; W. Heffening, "Die griechische Ephraem-Paraenesis"; Michel van Esbroeck, "Un feuillet oublié du codex arabe Or. 4226, à Strasbourg", *Analecta Bollandiana* 96 (1978), pp. 383–384; S. H. Griffith, "Anthony David"; A. Binggeli, "Les trois David"; Miriam L. Hjälml, "From Palestine to Damascus to Berlin: Early Christian Arabic texts from the Qubbat al-khazna in the Violet collection", in: Arianna D'Ottone Rambach, Konrad Hirschler, and Ronny Vollandt (eds), *The Damascus Fragments: Towards a History of the Qubbat al-Khazna Corpus of Manuscripts and Documents*, Beirut Texte und Studien, 140 (Beirut: Ergon Verlag, 2020), pp. 245–264, at pp. 252–255; Miriam L. Hjälml and P. Tarras, "Colophons", pp. 143–144; Ariana D'Ottone, "Sharing the Written Space: Contact & Interaction between Arabic and Other Cultures/Scripts", in: Antoine Borrut, Manuela Ceballos, and Alison M. Vacca (eds), *Navigating Language in the Early Islamic World: Multilingualism and Language Change in the First Centuries of Islam*, Interdisciplinary Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2024), pp. 403–423; Peter Tarras, "Miscellaneous Identifications I".

<sup>31</sup> A. George, "Le palimpseste", p. 407 emphasises that there is indeed a certain variety of forms for this letter. In addition to the club shape at the upper end, loops ending on the left are also common. Sometimes the loop is only a slight thickening.



below the baseline;<sup>32</sup> the body of *tā'* exhibits less horizontal extension and is more cobby (“gedrungener”); the ligature *ḡim* looks differently (that of Antony David looks like a flattened 3 with the centre point on the baseline). Alain George added further descriptions for the shapes of the letters *hā'*, *dāl*, *ḡim*, and *mim*.<sup>33</sup>

Particularly characteristic of Thomas, in my view, is the observation George makes for final *ḡim* (and *hā'* and *ḡā'* respectively), namely that it is reminiscent of a *mim* in modern Arabic script and resembles a distorted Z leaning to the right, with two acute angles. In the table below (table 2), our attribution can be checked once more by comparing the letters mentioned with the same letters from MS Sinai, St Catherine’s Monastery, Ar. 457.

















<i>alif</i>	<i>ḡim/ḡā'</i>	<i>dāl</i>	<i>tā'</i>	<i>ʿayn</i>	<i>lām</i>	<i>mim</i>	<i>hā'</i>
							
							

Table 2. Characteristic letter shapes in the new fragment (first row) and in MS Sinai, St Catherine’s Monastery, Ar. 457 (second row).

*Text:* The new fragment preserves the end of Jacob of Serugh’s *On Epiphany*. The Arabic title of the text is attested in the table of contents of the Ambrosiana manuscript (= MS London, British Library, Or. 5019, ff. 1v–4v).<sup>34</sup> It reads: “On the Baptism of our Lord Christ” (*ʿalā maʿmūdīyyat rabbīnā al-Masīḥ*). In order to take stock of the preserved text, I refer to the verse division as it can be found e.g. in Kollampampil.<sup>35</sup> The new fragment comprises verses 491–530, although not all of them are complete and some have been omitted. Verse 497 is lost due to damage. Verses 488 and 491 appear to have been contracted in the translation; similarly verses 492 and 493. Verses 519–523 (as well as 531–532) were completely omitted. The new fragment overlaps with the Ambrosiana manuscript at only one verse (488/491), which was exploited below to reconstruct the

<sup>32</sup> This observation does not seem entirely correct. Isolated and final *lām* goes below the baseline in some cases and in certain combinations with other preceding letter (e.g. in the words *kull* or *minaḡl* [منجل]), but in others the horizontal stroke usually sits on the line (e.g. in the words *qawl* or *qāla*).

<sup>33</sup> A. George, “Le palimpseste”, pp. 407–408.

<sup>34</sup> See J.-M. Sauge, “L’homélie”, p. 411.

<sup>35</sup> Th. Kollampampil, *Jacob of Serugh’s Homily on Epiphany*.

damaged first line. I have also used MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 401 for comparative means. This latter manuscript, according to Alwan, exhibits recension A.<sup>36</sup> Our fragment seems to indicate that this recension is based on recension B (see the note on verse 511 below).

*Diplomatic Edition and Translation*

Translation	Text	lines
[488/491] [... this is] my beloved son [...] [492/493] [...]	<sup>37</sup> [...] هذا ا[... بنى الح[بيب [...] [491/488] [...] [493/492]	1
[...] deliver mankind, it did not diminish when he descended in the water. [494] So he refrained [...] [495] [...]	[...] [نقذ بنى البشر: لم يصغر عندما رل في الما [...] [494] فيمت[نع [...] [495]	2
[...] his descent and after his descent. [496] And with joy his father was near to him since [his] childhood [...] [497] [...]	[...] نزوله وبعد نزوله: [496] وفرح كان الاب يقربه من ص[باه [...] [497]	3
[498] And in it [i.e. Christ's baptism] the priesthood was perfected. [499] And from it the deposit proceeded, which [...]	[498] وفيها يتم الكهنوت: [499] ومنها مخرج الود[عة] الذي [...] [499]	4
[500] And he sent his son to receive it in the water from John. [501] And it was handed down from [...]	[500] وبعث ابنه لياخذها بالامياه من يوحنا: [501] وتوا[صيت] من [...] [501]	5
the sons of Levi. [502] And the Lion's whelp arose from the house of Judah <sup>38</sup> and took it from [him]. [503] [... on Mount]	بنى اللوان * [502] وقام جرو الاسد من بيت يهوذا اخذها من[ه] [503] [...] على طور	6
Sinai from the Exalted One. [504] And through John it overflowed from our	سينا من العلى * [504] وحل بيدى يوحنا من مخلصنا ايضا هناك: [505] من البدى اخذ [الاب [...] [505]	7

<sup>36</sup> See Alwan, *Les œuvres*, p. 126.

<sup>37</sup> MS Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, X 198 sup., f. 29r reads: هذا اى الحب. Cp. also MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 401, f. 147v:20. In the Ambrosiana manuscript, the verse follows verse 487, but as a translation of verse 488 it is rather free, turning the third person into the first in accordance with Matthew 3:17. This biblical verse is quoted twice by Jacob (verses 104 and 367). Verse 488 was possibly translated in agreement with these occurrences. Moreover, *ibni l-habib* appears to be the lexical equivalent of *kaḏ ḥabbibāh* (reading *bar* instead of *kaḏ*) from verse 491 and not *rhūmā* from verse 488.

<sup>38</sup> Genesis 9:49.

Saviour there as well. <sup>[505]</sup> From the beginning [the Father] took [...] <sup>[506]</sup> [...]	[...] <sup>[٥٠٦]</sup>	
follow a path as the alien one. <sup>[507]</sup> That priesthood which was given from the house of Aaron. <sup>[508]</sup> The Apostles	يسلك في طريقه مثل الغريب * <sup>[٥٠٧]</sup> تلك الكهنوت التي اعطيت من بيت هرون والسليحيه[ون] * <sup>[٥٠٨]</sup>	8
were given it as the Saviour had given it to them. <sup>[509]</sup> The great, the head of the priests, was not lacking in	اعطوها كما اعطاهم اباها المخلص * <sup>[٥٠٩]</sup> لم يكون العظيم راس الكهنه ناقص من	9
priesthood. <sup>[510]</sup> Thus, he came and took it at the baptism and then he gave it. <sup>[511]</sup> But so as not to confound the path [...]	الكهنوت <sup>[٥١٠]</sup> فجاء واخذه من المعموديه وحينئذ اعطاها: <sup>[٥١١]</sup> ولكن ليلا يبلبل الطريق [...]	10
he is the head <sup>39</sup> of the fathers. <sup>[512]</sup> The Father renewed the old things. <sup>[513]</sup> Not because he was lacking and in need of anything. <sup>[514]</sup> It was that [...]	هو راس الابا * <sup>[٥١٢]</sup> الاب جدد العتيقه <sup>[٥١٣]</sup> ليس لانه كان ناقص ولا محتاج الى شئ * <sup>[٥١٤]</sup> قد كانت [...]	11
all waters and rivers. <sup>[515]</sup> And all the nature of water is from the sea and [the sea] is not lacking. <sup>[516]</sup> And the power of water is not [...]	جميع الامياه والانهار: <sup>[٥١٥]</sup> وكل طباع الما من البحر وليس ينقص: <sup>[٥١٦]</sup> وقوه الاميا ليس [...]	12
by coming together in it [i.e. the sea]. <sup>[517]</sup> Christ was not in need of receiving [from] the hand of Aaron. <sup>[518]</sup> And it [i.e. the priesthood] was imposed upon him. And not insufficient and not [...]	باجتماع فيه * <sup>[٥١٧]</sup> لم يكون المسيح محتاج ليقبل يد هرون <sup>[٥١٨]</sup> وتضع عليه ولا ناقص ولا [...]	13
into the right [hand] of John. And the kingship was not in need of the house of David. <sup>[524]</sup> His kingdom was greater than the sea and [it is sufficient ...]	الى يمين يحننا <sup>40</sup> * <sup>[٥٢٤]</sup> ولا كان الملك محتاج الى بيت داود * ملكوته هي اعظم من البحر واغنا [...]	14
<sup>[525]</sup> He ascended as he descended by sanctification and as he willed. <sup>[526]</sup> And he	<sup>[٥٢٥]</sup> طلع كما نزل بالتقدس وكما هوى: <sup>[٥٢٦]</sup> واخذ الصوت من والده * <sup>[٥٢٧]</sup> احدث الروح [...]	15

<sup>39</sup> The translator seems to have read **ⲉⲓⲁ** instead of **ⲉⲓⲁⲓ**. Cp. MS Sinai, St Catherine's Monastery, Ar. 401, f. 148v:13: **هو راس واول الاباء**. Since recension A keeps the mistranslation and adds text in order to make sense of it, this suggests that recension A is dependent upon recension B.

<sup>40</sup> The phrase **الى يمين يحننا** does not correspond to anything in between verses 518 and 524. As noted above, the translation omits verses 519 through 523 altogether.

took the voice from his begetter. <sup>[527]</sup> The Spirit encircled [...]		
the Christ, the baptised bridegroom. <sup>41</sup> <sup>[528]</sup> And the church believed that he was the Lord and prostrated [before him] <sup>[529]</sup> [...]	المسيح الختن المعتمد: <sup>[528]</sup> وامنت الكنيسة انه هو الرب وسجدت قد [امه] <sup>[529]</sup> [...]	16
the perfect one who came to baptise the insufficient ones by the waters. <sup>[530]</sup> Your perfect tenderness, which is filled [abundantly with]	التام الذى جا الناقص بالامياه ليعتمد ❖ <sup>[530]</sup> تحننك التام الممتلى كـ[ثيره]	17
your mercy, overflowing upon our insufficiency, forever and ever, amen.	رحمتك تحل على نقصاننا الى دهر الدهارين امين	18

### Commentary

Even if the new fragment only gives us a comparatively small and partly fragmentary text sample, some general observations can be made regarding the Arabic translation. The translation remains close to the original, but this does not result in a completely literal translation. In the broad spectrum between literalness and free paraphrase, it has nevertheless a clear tendency towards literalness. This can be observed on the levels of syntax, vocabulary, and style.

At the level of syntax, there are some examples where the translation is almost completely congruent with its *Vorlage* (e.g. verse 500: *wa-ba'ata bnahū li-ya'budhā bi-l-amyāh min Yuhannā = w-šadreh la-breh d-nashrah b-mayyā men Yūhanān*; verse 502: *wa-qāma ġarw al-asad min bayt Yabūdā aḥaḍahā minhū = w-qām [h]wā ġuryā d-beṭ Ībūdā w-šaqlāh meneh*). The linguistic proximity between Syriac and Arabic naturally makes it easier to form analogous sentences. But Jacob employs some stylistic devices, e.g. the relatively free use of word order, which the translator also had to deal with. In general, the translator has tried to maintain the word order of the original. Sentences that begin with the verb in the initial position in the *Vorlage* usually also begin with the verb in Arabic. In a number of cases Jacob makes use of extraposition, e.g. by placing the subject in the initial position. This is mirrored in the translation (e.g. verse 529: *at-tāmm alladī ḡā'a* etc. = *gmīrā de-tā* etc., “the perfect one who came”). But the translator also undid extrapositions. In verse 503, for instance, he leaves

<sup>41</sup> Several scholars have pointed out that the Syriac word *ḥaṭnā* that begins the homily (verse 1) has been mistranslated. See Kh. S. Samir, “Un exemple”, p. 221, n. 30; J.-M. Sauget, “L’homélie”, p. 432; Kh. Alwan, *Les œuvres*, p. 128, n. 4. The translation there is *المتحن*, i.e. either *al-mutaḥannin* (“the one who feels pity”) or *al-mutaḥannan* (“the one who is pitied”). The latter is close in spelling and meaning to Syriac *meḥanānā*, a possible misreading for *mḥaṭnā* (“taking in marriage”). Alwan suggests a misreading of *ḥanānā* for *ḥaṭnā*. In any case, Samir’s suggestion that the scribe replaced the lesser known *al-ḥatan* with the better known *al-mutaḥannin*, is not convincing and does not explain the correct translation here.

the verb in the initial position: *wa-ḥalla bi-yaday Yūḥannā* etc. (“and it overflowed through John”) vs. *wa-ḥ-Yūḥannān ... eštappa* (“and through John ... it overflowed”).

As far as clauses are concerned, no major changes can be detected in the translation. Coordinated clauses are translated as coordinated clauses and subordinate clauses as subordinate clauses (e.g. verse 513: *laysa li-annahū* etc. = *law ‘al d-* etc.). Only in one case (verse 524) the temporal subjugation *kaḏ* seems to have remained untranslated.<sup>42</sup> The Syriac relative pronoun *d-* is translated as *allaḏi/allati* (verses 507, 529). If *d-* is used as a conjunction and followed by a verb in the *Vorlage*, the Arabic translator once uses the conjunction *fa-* (verse 494), once the causal conjunction *li-allā* (= *d-lā*, verse 511).

At the level of vocabulary, we can note that the translator could draw on a whole series of cognate roots: *balbala* (*balbel*); *ḡarw* (*ḡuryā*); *ḥabib* (*hbibā*); *ḥatan* (*ḥatnā*); *silḥina* (*slḥē*); *‘atiqa* (*‘attiqāta*); *qabila* (*qabbel*); *taqdis* (*qadišā*); *qāma* (*qām*); *wālid* (*yālūdā*). Some were already derived from Syriac, e.g. *ma‘mudiyya* (*ma‘mudīta*).<sup>43</sup> Cognates seem to have been used where available, but not as a default option. For instance, the Syriac noun *šilā* (“path”) in verse 506 was not translated with the Arabic cognate *sabīl*; instead, the translator chose the expression *ṭariq*. The translation generally displays lexical consistency. Only in one instance, the Syriac expression *bar* (“son”), which is generally rendered by the Arabic expression *ibn*, was translated as *šiban* (or *šabā*), “childhood” (see verse 496).

Somewhat greater deviations from the *Vorlage* can be observed on the stylistic level. The translator clearly made use of additions and omissions. As noted above, verses 492-493 seem to have been contracted and we come across a whole series of verses that appear to have been omitted from the translation. Smaller units can also be omitted. For example, the subject does not appear in verse 513. The Syriac has the Greek loan word *ὠκεανός* (< *ὠκεανός*) in this place. The translator probably did not have any problems understanding this term. Rather, a comparison of God with the ocean seems to have been avoided deliberately in order to obtain the clearest and most precise theological statement possible (God has no lack at all). Smaller additions have a clarificatory function, e.g. *ḡarw al-asad* (“the lion’s whelp”) vs. *ḡuryā* (which itself means “lion’s whelp” in Syriac and is commonly used in Jacob as a reference to Christ).<sup>44</sup> We also find extreme contractions such as in verse 512: *al-āb ḡaddada l-‘atiqa* (“the Father renewed the old things”) vs. *meneb dileb ‘ḥaḏ ḥuddātā l-‘atiqāta* (“from what belonged to Him did He make the renewal of old things”).<sup>45</sup> While the prepositional phrase *meneb dileb* is entirely omitted, the verb *‘ḥaḏ* and its direct object *ḥuddātā* are contracted and expressed by the Arabic verb *ḡaddada*. At the same time, the translation makes the subject (*al-āb*) explicit. In verse 488/491, the translator turned indirect speech into direct speech. This is very likely a case of the influence of parallel

<sup>42</sup> However, as the preceding verses have been omitted from the translation, we do not know how this verse relates to them syntactically. In verse 492, *kaḏ* is translated as *‘indamā*.

<sup>43</sup> See Georg Graf, *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum, 147, Subsidia, 8 (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1954), p. 79

<sup>44</sup> See Thomas Kollampampil, *Salvation in Christ According to Jacob of Serugh: An Exegetico-theological Study on the Homilies of Jacob of Serugh on the Feasts of Our Lord*, Gorgias Dissertations in Early Christianity and Patristics, 49 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2010), p. 113, n. 7.

<sup>45</sup> Tr. Th. Kollampampil.

passages (verse 104 and 367), especially since this is a citation of a biblical verse that is of fundamental importance for the whole topic of the homily.

In conclusion, the observations made here are only a selection of points that can be discussed with regard to the Arabic translation of Jacob's homily *On Epiphany*. In a next step, all three fragments of the homily should be edited, which I intend to do in the near future. However, with very few exceptions, we still lack editions of comparative texts from the earliest Arabic translations of Jacob's work. It would be important to find out whether they all came from the pen of one or more translators. Only then can we better judge the style and approach of the translation.





Arabic 516

**Abstract:**  
**Keywords:**

**Resumen:**  
**Palabras clave:**