

# The Syriac Commentary of Dadisho' Qatraya on the *Paradise of the Fathers* Towards a Critical Edition

By

David Phillips

*Université de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve*

A part from the indications given by 'Abdisho's 14th century catalogue<sup>1</sup>, Dadisho' Qatraya - ܕܕܝܫܘܳܐ ܩܘܬܪܝܳܐ - (DQ), who probably flourished during the second half of the 7th century<sup>2</sup>, is only known to us through his surviving works. We learn from his cognomen that he originated from the Qatar region of the Persian Gulf<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> J.S. ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca orientalis Clementino-Vaticana* [...], III/1, Rome, 1719-1728, p. 98-99.

<sup>2</sup> A. SCHER, « Notice sur la vie et les oeuvres de Dadišô' Qatraya », *Journal asiatique* (Série 10) 7 (1906), p. 103-112, has demonstrated that Assemani (*Bibliotheca orientalis*, III/1, p. 98-99) incorrectly identified Dadisho' Qatraya with Dadisho' the abbot of the Mount Izla monastery. On the basis of internal evidence in the *Commentary on Abba Isaïah*, Scher was able to establish that DQ lived during the second half of the 7th century, in particular by the fact that DQ says that Babai the Great (†628) lived in "the generation preceding ours" (ID., p. 106-107).

His writings which, to current knowledge, have survived are: the *Commentary on Abba Isaiah* (DQI)<sup>4</sup>, the *Discourses on the Solitude of (the Seven) Weeks*<sup>5</sup>, the *Letter to Abkosh*<sup>6</sup>, and finally the *Commentary on the Paradise of the Fathers* (DQC). Only this last mentioned work, which is also the most voluminous, remains to be edited in its entirety.

His writings are those of a monk addressing other monks and constitute an important source for our knowledge of 7<sup>th</sup> century East Syrian monasticism. That he should have undertaken to write a lengthy commentary of ‘Enanisho’'s Syriac compendium of early Egyptian monastic texts doubtless shows the popularity of the *Paradise* among his contemporary monastics. A serious critical edition of the complete text of the *Paradise* is still a major desideratum and we shall have to rely in the meantime on Paul Bedjan's text<sup>7</sup>, completed with E. A. Wallis Budge's text and translation<sup>8</sup>. R. Draguet's critical edition of the *Lausiac History* provides information for the first part of ‘Enanisho’'s compilation<sup>9</sup>.

I had the opportunity several years ago to start investigating DQC on the basis of two of its principal manuscripts BL Add. 17264 (*siglum* A) and BL Add. 17263 (*siglum* B), but got no further than a preliminary examination. It seemed a pity that the most important work of such an interesting author should remain unpublished and I formulated the idea of starting such an undertaking. In 2002, on Sebastian Brock's suggestion, I got in touch with Bob Kitchen who immediately showed interest in collaborating on the preparation of a critical edition. A first draft of the edition was completed in 2007, which we decided to validate by undertaking an English translation, this task has been started by Bob Kitchen. In 2009, we were approached by Dominique Gonnet

<sup>3</sup> See S. BROCK, « Syriac writers from Beth Qatraye », *Aram periodical* 11-12 (1999-2000), p. 93-94.

<sup>4</sup> Edited with a French translation by R. DRAGUET, *Commentaire du Livre d'Abba Isaïe (logoi I-XV) par Dadišo Qatraya (VII<sup>e</sup> s.)* (Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientaliū [= CSCO] 326-327), Louvain, 1972.

<sup>5</sup> Edited with an English translation by A. MINGANA, *Early Christian Mystics* (Woodbrooke Studies 7), Cambridge, 1934, p. 70-143, p. 201-247 and more recently, with a Spanish translation, by Francesco del Río Sánchez, *Los Cinco Tratados sobre la Quietud (Šelyā) de Dadišo' Qatrayā* (Aula Orientalis. Supplementa 18), Barcelona, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> Edited with a French translation by A. GUILLAUMONT – M. ALBERT, « Lettre de Dadišo' Qatraya à Abkosh sur l'hésychia », in E. LUCCHESI and H.D. SAFFREY (eds), *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière: Antiquité païenne et chrétienne* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 10), Genève, 1984, p. 235-245.

<sup>7</sup> P. BEDJAN, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum. Tomus septimus vel Paradisus Patrum*, Paris, 1897. Hereafter referred to as AMS, VII.

<sup>8</sup> E.A. WALLIS BUDGE, *The Book of Paradise* [...], 2 vols., (Lady Meux Manuscripts 6), London, 1904 gives the text on the basis of a transcript of a single Mosul manuscript and an English translation; a revised translation was published in E.A. WALLIS BUDGE, *The Paradise or Garden of the Holy Fathers* [...], 2 vols., London, 1907 – it is to this edition that I will refer as “BUDGE”.

<sup>9</sup> R. DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques de la matière de l'Histoire Lausiacque* (CSCO 389-390, 398-399), Louvain, 1978.

and Bernard Meunier of *Sources chrétiennes* who not only showed an interest in seeing the publication of a French translation but also in the edition of the Syriac text itself. The French translation is being undertaken by Jean-Claude Haelewyck and myself and constitutes a second and parallel validation of the edition.

An excellent study on DQC was published by N. Sims-Williams in 1994<sup>10</sup>. This article describes the greater part of the material available for study at that time and has proven to be an invaluable starting point for our research.

My intention here will be to present the currently available material for the establishment of a critical edition of the Syriac text<sup>11</sup>.

## 1. The structure, title and authorship of the *Commentary*

### The structure

The text has come down to us in two major recensions which I will discuss later on in Section 3: a longer version (DQC) and an abridgement or epitome (DQE), to use Professor Sims-Williams's term<sup>12</sup>.

Although all the witnesses of the longer version are to a greater or lesser extent defective, the recent discovery of an almost complete copy (manuscript G) now allows us to have a practically complete picture of the text.

The *Commentary on the Paradise* takes the form of a fictitious dialogue in questions and answers between unspecified monastic brothers and, in manuscript G, Dadisho' himself, while in the other witnesses the interlocutor appears anonymously. Each question is systematically introduced by the formula ܩܘܩ « the brothers » or ܩܘܩ ܩܘܩ « the brothers say » and the reply equally systematically by the simple name of the author ܩܘܩܩܩܩܩ in MS G alone<sup>13</sup> while in the other witnesses by ܩܘܩܩ « the elder » (or ܩܘܩܩ « the teacher » or ܩܘܩܩ « a monk ») with or without the verb ܩܘܩ « say » and the literary convention has been maintained with absolute rigour throughout the entire work. Some-

<sup>10</sup> N. SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādišo' Qatrāyā's Commentary on the *Paradise of the Fathers* », *Analecta Bollandiana* 112 (1994), p. 33-64. We are personally indebted to Professor Sims-Williams for having let us have access to his copy of A in which the rubricated titles and section numbers show up clearly.

<sup>11</sup> Some of the material was presented in a paper read at the XIV<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford in 2003, but since then the discovery of a new witness (G) has modified the situation.

<sup>12</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādišo' Qatrāyā's Commentary », p. 35-36.

<sup>13</sup> In only one occurrence in G, f° 14r°, DQC I, p. 29, do we find ܩܘܩܩܩܩܩܩ in the questions and answers and in f° 46v° in the general introduction to DQC II which also takes the literary form of a dialogue.

times the questions are very long and the replies short, sometimes the contrary. Each question generally concerns some detail or aspect of one of the histories of the Fathers or the sayings attributed to them and the reply often uses the question as a pretext for the development of a general theme.

The work is divided into two parts: the first (DQC I) covers the first three books of ‘Enanisho’s *Paradise* (Palladius’s *Lausiaca History*, another collection of Palladius and the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, attributed to Jerome<sup>14</sup>) and originally comprised 108 questions-and-answers; its only two witnesses (G and A) however are damaged at the beginning and start respectively with question 2 and question 14; the second part (DQC II) corresponds to the fourth book of the *Paradise* (the apophthegmata). Its most complete witnesses (G and B) preserve respectively 291 and 283 questions-and-answers. G is the only witness not defective at the end and allows us now to learn the complete extent of the original text of DQC II.

Although the textual relationship between DQC and ‘Enanisho’s *Paradise* is fraught with problems and is unlikely to find an easy solution, it can be said, somewhat loosely, that Dadisho’ has written a running commentary to the text and follows, to a certain extent, the order of the recension found in Bedjan’s (and Budge’s) edition of the *Paradise*.

The opening title of DQC has been lost since all the witnesses are defective at the beginning. We learn however from the colophons to DQC I and DQC II what the intended structure is and this is corroborated by the intermediate titles to DQC I.

Colophon DQC I (G f° 46v° at the end of DQC I, 108)

ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ  
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ  
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲃⲟ

« Here ends the explanations of the exploits of the Fathers written in the *Book of Paradise* in three sections: two by Palladius and one by Jerome, composed in questions and answers by Mar Dadisho’ »

<sup>14</sup> In fact the text is anonymous and was written in Greek. The Greek text has been edited with a French translation by A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Histoire des moines en Égypte*, Brussels, 1971. We owe the Latin translation to Rufinus (edited by E. SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, *Tyrannius Rufinus: Historia monachorum sive De vita sanctorum partum*, Berlin, 1990).

<sup>15</sup> G *sine seyame*.

Colophon DQC II (G f° 169v° at the end of DQC II, 291)

ܥܠܡܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ  
 ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ  
 ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ  
 ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ

« Here ends the explanations of the exploits of the Fathers written in the *Book of Paradise* in four sections: three by Palladius and one by Jerome, composed in questions and answers by Mar Dadisho' Qatraya the Seer, gnostic<sup>17</sup> and theologian from the monastery of Rabkennare »

Thus for DQC I (the first colophon) we have 3 sections: 2 on Palladius and 1 on Jerome while for DQC taken as a whole (the second colophon summing up I+II) we have, quite logically, 4 sections: 3 on Palladius (2 in DQC I and 1 in DQC II) and 1 on Jerome.

This is echoed in the intermediate titles in DQC I which explicitly state that Dadisho' is successively commentating on each of the three sections of the (first book) of *The Paradise*:

ܥܠܡܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ

« Here ends the explanations of the exploits of the first part of *The Paradise* »

(G f° 16v° at the end of DQC I, 33)

ܥܠܡܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ

« Here ends the explanations of the second part by Palladius »

(G f° 36r° at the end of DQC I, 65)

ܥܠܡܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ

ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ

« Explanation of the third part of the exploits of the Fathers written by Jerome »

(G f° 36r° at the beginning of DQC I, 66)

As to DQC II, the introductory title (G f° 46v°) reads

<sup>16</sup> Correction of G which has ܥܠܡܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ.

<sup>17</sup> In the Evagrian sense of the word, of course. See A. and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique : Traité pratique ou le moine*, I, Paris, 1971, p. 38-63.

ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
 ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
 ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ

« Again by the same Mar Dadisho‘ the Seer, a commentary on the questions of the latter part of the *Book of Paradise* i.e. the questions of the brothers and the teaching of the elders »

There are 14<sup>18</sup> intermediate titles which closely follow the subject headings of ‘Enanisho’<sup>19</sup>s version of the apophthegmata and have been copied from it<sup>19</sup>:

- i. ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ (G f<sup>o</sup> 47r<sup>o</sup>; DQC II, 1 « On the flight from men and tranquillity and remaining continually in the cell »
- ii. ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ (G ff<sup>o</sup> 64v<sup>o</sup>-65r<sup>o</sup>; DQC II, 36) « On fasting and abstinence and on the other labours and self-denial »
- iii. ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ (G f<sup>o</sup> 69r<sup>o</sup>; DQC II, 53) « On the reading of the Scriptures and vigils and prayer »
- iv. ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ (G f<sup>o</sup> 72v<sup>o</sup>; DQC II, 60) « On how we should grieve and be sad for our sins »
- v. ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ (G f<sup>o</sup> 74v<sup>o</sup>; DQC II, 64) « On poverty »
- vi. ܐܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ  
ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ ܕܡܪܘܢܐ (G ff<sup>o</sup> 77r<sup>o</sup>-78v<sup>o</sup>; DQC II, 79) « On obedience to God and to our Fathers »

<sup>18</sup> In G, in A the first has been lost because of the defective beginning but it is also attested in B.

<sup>19</sup> See AMS, VII, p. 1018. WRIGHT, *Catalogue British Museum*, 1079 in saying about A that « the contents are, therefore, in great part identical with those of Add. 17,174 and 14,583 » could be misleading, since these manuscripts contain the *Paradise* itself rather than DQC. It is the titles which are more or less identical and not the contents.

- vii. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 79r°; DQC II, 98)  
 « On careful vigilance over our thoughts,  
 words and deeds »
- viii. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 99v°; DQC II, 118)  
 « On love and mercy and receiving  
 strangers »
- ix. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 105v°; DQC II,  
 132) « On humility »
- x. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 117r°; DQC  
 II, 163) « On the war of fornication »
- xi. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 123v°; DQC II,  
 179) « On repentance »
- xii. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 127r°; DQC  
 II, 188) « On miracle workers »
- xiii. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 129r°; DQC II,  
 191) « On visionaries »
- xiv. **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
**ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ**  
 (G f° 134v°; DQC  
 II, 201) « Again general discourse of the  
 Fathers on all kinds of virtue »

There are in fact few divergences in these titles from Bedjan's text of the *Paradise*: the latter has a section **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ** « On perseverance » between v. and vi.<sup>20</sup> and the two sections xii. and xiii. count as one under the title of xii. Otherwise the only noteworthy difference in the titles is that n° xiv appears in Budge (and Bedjan) as **ܐܠܘܗܐܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ** « On the exalted greatness of the conduct of monasticism »<sup>21</sup>. Budge's text resembles that of Bedjan as far as the titles are concerned although the numbering of the logia vary somewhat between the two editions.

An analysis of the actual contents of the *Commentary* shows that, by and large, the sections which the titles announce do indeed correspond to the logia of the corresponding sections of the *Paradise* with however a number of divergences<sup>22</sup>. This analysis

<sup>20</sup> AMS, VII, p.504.

<sup>21</sup> AMS, VII, p. 688, BUDGE, II, p. 146.

<sup>22</sup> Under subject heading i: DQC II, p. 18 = BUDGE IVa, p. 253 (Budge subject heading viii); under ii: DQC II, p. 44 = BUDGE IVa, p. 284 (Budge subject heading viii); under vi, DQC II, p. 85-94 = Budge subject heading viii; under ix, DQC II, p. 132 = BUDGE IVa, p. 296 (Budge subject heading viii), DQC II, p. 143 = BUDGE IVa, p. 348 (Budge subject heading viii); under subject heading x: DQC II, p. 170 = BUDGE IVa, p. 268 (Budge subject heading

allows us to conclude that whereas DQC I only loosely follows the order of the text of the *Paradise* as it is known to us through Bedjan and Budge, DQC II tends to work systematically through the order of the logia according to the divisions which were given to them at some point in the editorial process.

While, taken together, books one to three of the *Paradise* are about the same length as the apophthegmata of book four, Dadisho' devotes four times more space in his *Commentary* to book four alone than to the first three books. This structure seems to derive from DQC's main centre of interest which is manifestly the apophthegmata rather than the historiographical elements in 'Enanisho'. It thus seems understandable that Dadisho', or his early scribes, grouped the shorter, one might almost say secondary, material concerning the first three books into one book and the lengthier material into one other, rather than keeping to the fourfold division of the *Paradise*. We thus have a twofold commentary of a fourfold work.

### The title

There are two different titles for DQC I and DQC II which appear in the colophon of DQC I and the opening title of DQC II in G: respectively **ⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲗⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ** « Explanations of the exploits of the Fathers » and **ⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲗⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ** « Commentary on the questions ». The intermediate titles in DQC I are coherent with its colophon in also using the term **ⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩ** (singular or plural). The specific title of DQC II is in some ways the one that is semantically closest to 'Abdisho's description which tells us that Dadisho' **ⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲗⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ** « commented on the Paradise » using the same cognate.

If we consider these two titles to be original, we can see how the other witnesses derived theirs from these.

The colophon of the first part in A f<sup>o</sup> 65r<sup>o</sup> is identical to that of G:

**ⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲗⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ ... ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ  
ⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲗⲉ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ**

« Explanations of the exploits of the Fathers  
which are written in the *Book of Paradise* ...  
composed in the form of questions and an-  
swers »

---

viii); under subject heading xi: DQC II, p. 185 = BUDGE IVb, p. 297, DQC II, p. 187 = BUDGE IVb, p. 252; under subject heading xii: DQC II, p. 190 = BUDGE IVa, p. 633 (Budge subject heading xiv); under subject heading xiv: DQC II, p. 191-201, only p. 190-192 correspond to Budge subject heading xiv.



However the introductory title to the commentary on the fourth part of the *Paradise* has ܩܘܨܬܐ ... ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ (f° 65v°) « explanations of the questions ... of the Book of Paradise ». Here the scribal tradition seemed more interested in an inner coherence of its own terminology by using ܩܘܨܬܐ both for DQC I and DQC II.

The specific title for DQC II is attested in BL Add. 14589 (*siglum* D) where the extract (DQC II, 117) is introduced by ܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ (f° 16r°) « again from the commentary of the Paradise » and the same title is to be found again in Bibliothèque nationale Syr. 201 (*siglum* F), f° 260v°.

A different title is attested in Vat. Syr. 126 (*siglum* h) f° 161v°: ܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ « questions of the brothers and answers of the elders ». This title quite clearly derives from the text attested by G in the colophon to DQC II.

### Authorship

Before the discovery of manuscript G, the authorship of the *Commentary* had been deduced<sup>23</sup> from the indications provided by manuscripts A and E taken together with what 'Abdisho' tells us. Now however we have a manuscript where not only is Dadisho's authorship clearly stated in the colophons, but his name is used throughout in the introductory formulae to the logia. The name of Dadisho's monastery appears as ܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ « Rabkennare » in G's colophon to DQC II and this is corroborated by DQI<sup>24</sup> where we learn that he lived successively in the monasteries of Rabkennare (ܩܘܨܬܐ), the monastery of the Blessed Apostles and that of Rabban Shabbour; the first two being situated in the mountains of Beth Huzzaye and the third near the city of Shushtar, at least according to Scher<sup>25</sup>. From G we also learn of the high esteem accorded to Dadisho' in East Syrian tradition since he is called « Seer » and « Theologian ». One wonders if ܩܘܨܬܐ might not be a title (it qualifies his name twice) on the model of the use, for example, for Joseph Hazzaya<sup>26</sup>.

Further corroboration of the authorship of the *Commentary* comes from manuscript E which contains DQC I, 27: the extract is introduced by ܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ ܕܩܘܨܬܐ « a question from the Book of Mar Dadisho' ».

In the West Syrian manuscript tradition, Dadisho' was not so lucky. The colophon found at f° 65r° in A has the wording

<sup>23</sup> See SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādīšo' Qatrāyā's Commentary », p. 34.

<sup>24</sup> DQI XIII, p. 5 and XIV, p. 2 (DRAGUET, *Commentaire du Livre d'Abba Isaië*, CSCO 326, 183, 206-207 – for the text –, CSCO 327, 142, 159 – for the translation).

<sup>25</sup> SCHER, « Notice », p. 109, n.1.

<sup>26</sup> See R. BEULAY, *La lumière sans forme : introduction à l'étude de la mystique syro-orientale*, Chevetogne, [1987], p. 215-217.

[ ] « by the blessed Mar [ ] Qatraya from the monastery of [ ] ». The scribe has clearly left blank spaces for the author's name and monastery and there is a marginal note with the plea: « These names have been rubbed out. Oh reader, by your life, if you come across (another) copy, correct them in order to obtain forgiveness ». If the note was written by A's copyist, which is possible given the handwriting, and perhaps supported by the past tense «am, then the names were already missing in A's exemplar. Whatever may be the case, by the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the West Syrian scribal tradition having at some previous stage deliberately omitted the name of the East Syrian author no longer knew to whom the work should be attributed. It would seem that the sporadic appearance of the name « Philoxenos » to designate the usually anonymous elder (for example A f<sup>o</sup> 44r<sup>o</sup>) was only half believed in by the copyist since no attempt has been made to harmonize the colophon with this attribution; though later on in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions the attribution to Philoxenos became more widespread<sup>27</sup>.

## 2. Description of the manuscript witnesses

Altogether we now have at our disposal nine manuscript witnesses of Dadisho's *Commentary*; six of these are of some length (ABCGgh) and give us an idea of the structure of the text while the remaining three are short fragments (DEF).

I have grouped them into two families corresponding to the long and the short text, DQC and DQE; uppercase Latin letters are used for the former and lowercase Latin letters for the latter. The fragments DEF have been grouped with the longer version since the questions they contain are not attested in the two major witnesses of the short text (gh) but are attested in at least one of the witnesses of the long text. No one witness contains the longer text in its entirety and all the witnesses of this text are damaged to a greater or lesser extent.

Manuscript <i>sigla</i> used in the edition	MS location and shelf-mark	Contents	
		DQC I	DQC II
A	BL Add. 17264	14-108	1-85
B	BL Add. 17263		5-287

<sup>27</sup> See SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādīšo' Qatrāyā's Commentary », p. 38-39.

C	BL Or. 2311		46-261
D	BL Add. 14589		117
E	Cambridge UL Or. 1314	27	
F	Paris BN Syr. 201		106, 187, 246, 251
G	Baghdad Archbishopric of the Church of the East 210	[2]-108	1-291
<b>DQE</b>		= <i>DQC I</i>	= <i>DQC II</i>
g	BL Add. 17175	22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61, 67, 84, 94, 98 <sup>28</sup> , 100	3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 42, 46, 52, 75, 76, 79, 90, 93, 95, 250, 252, 253, 255, 256, 258, 259, 261, 262, 265, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286
h	Vat. Syr. 126	26, 29, 30, 31, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 98 <sup>28</sup> , 100	3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 253, 255, 256, 258, 259, 265, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279, 280, 281, 283, 284, 286

## 2.1 DQC

### G Archbishopric of the Church of the East Baghdad 210

This witness must be given pride of place despite the alphabetic order of its *siglum*. The latter is due to the fact that its existence only came to our knowledge in 2005 thanks to Sebastian Brock, to whom we are greatly indebted, and the collation of the other witnesses had been well under way by then, so it had to be given 7<sup>th</sup> place in the *sigla* despite the fact that it would largely have merited the first<sup>29</sup>.

Not only is it the single most complete copy of the longer text, but it is also an East Syrian manuscript and retains the indications of its true author together with explicit mentions of other East Syrian doctors such as Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius himself<sup>30</sup> and also East Syrian monastics such as Barhadbshaba, disciple of the Catholicos Sabrisho',

<sup>28</sup> Not « 95 » as stated in SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādišo' Qatrāyā's Commentary », p. 57.

<sup>29</sup> We are also extremely indebted to Rev. Shmoel Athniel and his team at the Archbishopric for having provided us very rapidly with first-rate photographs on CD of the whole MS despite the technical difficulties involved in opening the binding sufficiently.

<sup>30</sup> For example, f<sup>o</sup> 18v<sup>o</sup>, 159r<sup>o</sup>. As to the "opposite camp", we find the adherents of Cyril of Alexandria (the « Cyrilians » ܩܝܪܝܠܝܐ) treated as heretics f<sup>o</sup> 166r<sup>o</sup>.

and Jacob of Beth ‘Abe<sup>31</sup> – all of whom have, of course, been omitted or replaced in the West Syrian copies.

G is written in a fine *estrangela* hand on parchment with occasional East Syrian type elements in the writing<sup>32</sup> and consists of 175ff<sup>o</sup> with between 34 and 36 lines per page; there are some missing folios at the beginning and the end. There is an intermittent and occasional use of East Syrian vowels in the original hand. If there was an indication of date then it has perished with the lost leaves, but Giwargis Saliwa’s catalogue claims that the manuscript is « old »<sup>33</sup>; a palaeographic analysis of the manuscript by experts in the field would be extremely useful in order to determine an approximate date. Given that *estrangela* was still used in East Syrian manuscripts up to a late period<sup>34</sup>, it is not immediately evident even to guess at its antiquity. The colophons and titles are rubricated as are the introductory formulae (ܩܘܣܘܩܐ and ܩܘܣܘܩܐܐ) to each question and reply although the colour has faded in many places.

The contents of G can be said to form a coherent whole in that the works it transmits are all monastic texts:

ff<sup>o</sup> 1r<sup>o</sup>-46v<sup>o</sup>: DQC I, [2]-108

ff<sup>o</sup> 46v<sup>o</sup>-169v<sup>o</sup>: DQC II, 1-291

ff<sup>o</sup> 169v<sup>o</sup>-173v<sup>o</sup>: Dadisho‘ Qatraya *Letter to Abkosh*

ff<sup>o</sup> 173v<sup>o</sup>-175v<sup>o</sup>: Rabban Aphnimaran *The Chapters* (up to n<sup>o</sup>34)<sup>35</sup>

The manuscript is thus doubly important for the works of Dadisho‘ since not only does it supply the most complete text of DQC but it also provides a fourth and as yet critically unused witness for the *Letter to Abkosh*.

The questions and answers in DQC are not numbered at all. In order to determine which question is the first one to be attested, we have assumed that G has kept to the order of the questions and answers found in MSS A and B. This seems reasonable since when ABG are all extant they always have the same textual order in the questions, just as A and B provide exactly the same num-

<sup>31</sup> See E.A. WALLIS BUDGE, *The Book of Governors*, reprint, II, Piscataway, 2003, p. 75-78.

<sup>32</sup> Contracted forms of ܩܘܣܘܩܐ for example f<sup>o</sup> 19r<sup>o</sup> line 14 (ܩܘܣܘܩܐܐ) and f<sup>o</sup> 22v<sup>o</sup> line 17 (ܩܘܣܘܩܐܐ).

<sup>33</sup> Archbishop Giwargis SALIWA, *Mkbtutat maktaba mutraniya knissaat al-sharq fi Bagdad*, Baghdad, 2003, which to date we have been unable to consult. This information was kindly supplied again by Sebastian Brock.

<sup>34</sup> See R. DUVAL, *Traité de grammaire syriaque*, reprint, Amsterdam, 1969, p. 7.

<sup>35</sup> On Aphnimaran and his *Capita Scientiae*, see E.A. WALLIS BUDGE, *The Book of Governors*, II, Piscataway, 2003, reprint, p. 121-122 and R. BEULAY, *La lumière sans forme*, p. 34, p. 256.

bering of the questions. The first question attested and numbered in another witness (A) of the longer<sup>36</sup> form is DQC I, 14 (G f° 9r°, A f° 1r°). From this point, we have numbered backwards the preceding occurrences of the catchphrase ܩܘܨܘܢܐ ܩܘܨܘܢܐ which always introduces a new question. We arrive at the conclusion that G f° 1r° starts in the middle, or perhaps towards the beginning of what would be DQC I, 2.

#### A British Library Add. 17264<sup>37</sup>

After G, this is the second most complete witness to DQC in that it also contains, albeit partially, the two parts of Dadisho‘’s *Commentary*. Barring the excerpts made in the *Epitome* and the solitary extract of DQC I, 27 in E, it is also the only other witness, after G, which preserves the longer text of DQC I.

Like G it shows the underlying structure to the *Commentary*: its division into two parts, the first covering the first three books of ‘Enanisho‘’s *Paradise* while the second covers the fourth and last part. Unlike G however it is equipped with marginal numbering of the logia which runs continuously for books one to three of the *Paradise* and only starts again for book four of the *Paradise*.

The manuscript is written on paper in a 13<sup>th</sup> century *serta* hand. It consists of 142 folios several of which are damaged either by stains, tears or holes. Although the hand is clear and regular, the number of lines on each page varies from 18 to 25. The first two quires are lost and there are four folios lacking after folio 39; the end of the manuscript is not extant. There is some intermittent use of West Syrian Greek vowel signs and much more frequent use of double points ܘܘ to indicate the vowel ܘܘܐ as in the East Syrian vocalisation system. There is also a confusing profusion of diacritical points and punctuation signs very often not distinguished from the vowel signs by thickness so that when the lines are written closely together, it is sometimes hard to ascertain if the points refer to the line above or the line beneath. ‘*Aph‘el*’ forms are regularly distinguished by a single upper diacritical point. Abbreviations are a regular occurrence, in particular at the end of a line where the scribe started a word, then realized there was not enough space, stopped in the middle of the word placing an abbreviation sign on it and then continuing on the following line by rewriting the word in full. This could be taken as a sign of carelessness, but such a characteristic is not borne out by the rest of the text – homoeoteleuton, for example, has only been observed in a few places (9r°, 16v°, 25v°, 77r°, for example).

<sup>36</sup> DQC I, 2, 3, 4, 5-6 appear numbered in the shorter version attested by h, but they are too far removed textually from the longer version to provide a point of comparison and in addition the numbering system is *sui generis*.

<sup>37</sup> See W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum* [...], III, London, 1872, p. 1078-1079.

In each of the two parts of DQC, the questions are continuously numbered in the margins; the numbers have been rubricated, as have the introductory formulae of the questions and responses.

Manuscript A contains the first 6<sup>38</sup> of the 14 intermediate titles to DQC II described above; the others have been lost because of the damaged state of the exemplar. Whereas five have clearly been understood as titles and have been rubricated, the very first has not been distinguished from the rest of the text. The marginal numbering is continuous and takes no account of the headings.

### **B British Library Add. 17263**<sup>39</sup>


This is another paper manuscript written in 13<sup>th</sup> century *serta* and consists of 230 folios. Many of the leaves are torn and several are lacking; it is acephalous and the end is lost as well. There are few vowel signs. The manuscript contains the greater part of DQC II, sections 5 to 287 and is thus the second most complete witness after G to the second part of Dadisho's *Commentary*.

It is equipped with marginal numbers which correspond exactly to those of A.

### **C British Library Or. 2311**<sup>40</sup>

A 12<sup>th</sup> century paper manuscript of 168 ff<sup>o</sup> written in *serta* with two columns on each page. It contains logia 46 to 261 of DQC II. The beginning and end are badly mutilated. It is the fourth, and last, reasonably complete witness to the second part of the longer version of the *Commentary*. Like A and B it has marginal numbers and subject titles which correspond to theirs.

### **D British Library Add. 14589**<sup>41</sup>

An 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> century *serta* palimpsest written on vellum containing miscellaneous texts. Ff<sup>o</sup> 16r<sup>o</sup>-17v<sup>o</sup> contain DQC II, 117. The number of the logion is given as such by the manuscript:  « again from the commentary of the Paradise, 117 ». That there is no specification of the fact that the numbering refers to the second part of the *Commentary* but simply to the “commentary” might perhaps indicate that the *Commentary* on the apophthegmata may have been transmitted independently of the first part and have been considered to be the sum total of the *Commentary* in certain traditions. Quite clearly the fact that an isolated excerpt should keep the correct number of

<sup>38</sup> At ff<sup>o</sup> 66r<sup>o</sup>, 100r<sup>o</sup>, 115v<sup>o</sup>, 121r<sup>o</sup>, 125v<sup>o</sup>; at 134v<sup>o</sup> the title is partly lost.

<sup>39</sup> See WRIGHT, *Catalogue British Museum*, III, p. 1079-1080.

<sup>40</sup> G. MARGOLIOUTH, *Descriptive list of Syriac and Karshuni MSS. in the British Museum acquired since 1873*, London, 1899, p. 8.

<sup>41</sup> See WRIGHT, *Catalogue British Museum*, II, p. 858.

the logion shows that the numbering system was well established and widely used.

### E Cambridge University Library Or. 1314<sup>42</sup>

This is the only other clearly East Syrian manuscript after G containing material for DQC. It is a 19<sup>th</sup> century paper copy containing a chronological treatise followed by a selection of religious texts of which DQC I, 27 at f<sup>o</sup> 131r<sup>o</sup>v<sup>o</sup>.

### F Paris Bibliothèque nationale Syr. 201<sup>43</sup>

Another 13<sup>th</sup> century paper exemplar. The manuscript principally contains discourses of Philoxenos on the Christian Life and the *Liber Graduum*. The manuscript is in very poor physical condition and the pages have been dispersed among several libraries. At four different places (f<sup>o</sup> 105v<sup>o</sup>, 139v<sup>o</sup>, 173v<sup>o</sup> and 260v<sup>o</sup>), four extracts of DQC II (106, 187, 246 and 251) have been added afterwards. The logia have no similarity in content to the texts into the vicinity of which they have been projected – the second scribe has simply been using space left unwritten on in the original text. The order of occurrence of the four scattered logia (106, 251, 246, 187) does not follow that of DQC II.

DQC II, 106 (f<sup>o</sup> 105v<sup>o</sup>) is only partially reproduced by the scribe, the blank space available being too small; the copyist has continued to write in the margin but gives a text which does not seem to have anything to do with the logion. The fragment is not introduced in any way and simply starts with the *incipit* ܐܒܝܢ ܥܘܢܐ « Abba Poemen said ».

DQC II, 187 (f<sup>o</sup> 260v<sup>o</sup>) is introduced by ܐܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܢ « from the Book of Paradise » and concluded by ܐܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܢ « this is from the commentary of the Paradise ».

DQC II, 246 (f<sup>o</sup> 173v<sup>o</sup>) is introduced by ܐܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܢ « from the explanation of the Paradise », but there is no concluding formula.

DQC II, 251 (f<sup>o</sup> 139v<sup>o</sup>) there is no introduction or concluding formula; the excerpt starts with the *incipit* ܐܒܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ « Abba Anthony said ».

It is thus only the last of the logia in F's order which is provided with both a title and colophon.

<sup>42</sup> See A.E. GOODMAN, « The Jenks Collection of Syriac Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge » *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 4 (1939), p. 594.

<sup>43</sup> H. ZOTENBERG, *Catalogues des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaites) de la Bibliothèque nationale*, Paris, 1874, p. 152.

This witness, albeit among the shortest, has no less than three different designations for the *Commentary*: ܠܘܠܐ « commentary », ܠܘܠܐ « explanation » and interestingly enough simply ܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ « the Book of Paradise ». This last title could give the impression that the boundary between ‘Enanisho’s work and Dadisho’s *Commentary* may not have been always clearly defined – a situation which could then be comparable with that of witness h where the *Commentary* immediately follows the *Paradise* itself without its being distinguished as a commentary on the preceding text. It may on the other hand simply be a kind of shorthand designation of the title in F which indicates elsewhere that the extracts are taken from the *Commentary*.

## 2.2 DQE

### g British Library Add. 17175<sup>44</sup>

A vellum manuscript of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, according to the writing, consisting of 66 folios; many of the leaves are stained or torn. The beginning and end are missing and there are no subdivisions into books. No numbering system has been applied to the questions and answers, but each question-and-answer group has been supplied with a title written vertically in the margin. This latter characteristic is unique to this witness.

The copy is an abridgement of DQC: it contains 29 logia taken from DQC I and 54 logia from DQC II. The poor physical state of the first folios often renders the legibility of the text difficult. Until the discovery of G, the initial logia (ff<sup>o</sup> 1r<sup>o</sup>-19v<sup>o</sup>) were not immediately identifiable in DQC and Sims-Williams suggested<sup>45</sup>, that they were “based on lost material” from DQC I. His hypothesis has been vindicated by the material now made available by G: the initial logia in g do indeed find parallels in DQC as attested by the Baghdad manuscript.

Taken as a whole, the order of the other clearly identifiable logia taken from DQC greatly differs from their original order there, moving from DQC I to DQC II in an apparently haphazard fashion; we can however discern four series which constitute groups of logia in almost consecutive order:

- Series 1 (ff<sup>o</sup> 18v<sup>o</sup>-36v<sup>o</sup>) contains DQC I, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47-56
- Series 2 (ff<sup>o</sup> 37v<sup>o</sup>-47v<sup>o</sup>) contains DQC II, 284-286, 283-280 (reverse order), 278, 279, 276-

<sup>44</sup> See WRIGHT, *Catalogue British Museum*, III, p. 1080.

<sup>45</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādišo’ Qatrāyā’s Commentary », p. 36-38.



273(?) – reverse order –, 270, 271, 269, 268, 265, 261, 262, 258, 255, 256, 259, 253, 252, 250.

- Series 3 (ff<sup>o</sup> 47v<sup>o</sup>-51r<sup>o</sup>) contains DQC I, 61, 67, 84, 94, 98, 100
- Series 4 (ff<sup>o</sup> 52r<sup>o</sup>-66v<sup>o</sup>) contains DQC II, 3-5, 10, 11, 21, 23, 24-35, 42, 46, 52, 75, 76, 79, 90, 93, 95.

Series 1 abridges DQC I, 22-56 (and so perhaps 1-60); series 2 abridges DQC II, 250-286 in almost exactly the reverse order of the logia in DQC; series 3 abridges DQC I, 61-100 (and so perhaps 61-108) and finally series 4 abridges DQC II, 3-95 (and so perhaps 1-95).

For the time being, I can simply note the phenomenon without being able to offer an explanation; the groups correspond neither to the divisions of the *Paradise* itself nor to any immediately apparent logic concerning the contents of the logia.

The method of abridgement is that of bodily extraction of the question-and-answer logia. The text of each logion is fundamentally the same as that attested in the witnesses of DQC, the variants are generally limited to occasional words or introductory formulae and there has been no major revision or remodelling of the logia retained in the *Epitome*.

#### **h Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana Syr. 126<sup>46</sup>**

This is among the oldest of our available witnesses, described by Assemani as « codex antiquus », and is the second and only other one with G to be written in *estrangela* script. It is written in three columns and the introductory formulae, titles and marginal numbers are rubricated.

The manuscript is a vast compilation of monastic texts. It starts with the text of ‘Enanisho’s *Paradise* itself which is then immediately followed by what is in fact an abridgement of Dadisho’s *Commentary* under the title « Questions of the brothers and answers of the elders » (f<sup>o</sup> 161v<sup>o</sup>). The manuscript then continues with other miscellaneous ascetic treatises.

Bedjan, who had used Vat. Syr. 126 for his edition of the *Paradise*, edited this text of DQE as a kind of appendix<sup>47</sup>. He already noted in his introduction the possibility of a relationship between these questions and answers and the text of BM Add.

---

<sup>46</sup> S.E. ASSEMANI and J.S. ASSEMANI, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum Catalogus in tres partes distributus. Partis primae Tomus secundus Tomus tertius complectens codices chaldaicos sive syriacos*, III, Rome, 1758-1759, p. 156-178 and especially p. 170-171.

<sup>47</sup> AMS, VII, p. 895-963.

17264<sup>48</sup> (manuscript A in my notation), that is to say with DQC. Budge followed Bedjan's example and included a translation of the text in his translation of the *Paradise*<sup>49</sup> on the basis of Bedjan's text and *not* on his transcription of the Mosul manuscript from which DQE is absent<sup>50</sup>. Thus scholars have had at their disposal for some time a short (in fact the shortest) version of Dadisho's *Commentary*, although not identified as such when published.

Ff<sup>o</sup> 161v<sup>o</sup>-174r<sup>o</sup> of manuscript h contain an even shorter selection of logia than g: 19 from DQC I and 34 from DQC II. This selection has been combined with some material taken apparently from Isaac of Nineveh (§ 6-7) and John the Solitary (§ 71-104)<sup>51</sup>; § 105-125 have been given the title ܐܘܢܐܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ « again, questions concerning the visions of the intellect ». Altogether, of these 125 numbered sections § 1 to § 37 and § 44 to § 70 are from Dadisho's *Commentary*. The extraneous elements have been fitted into the same literary mould as the rest with the same introductory formulae ܐܘܢܐܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ « the brothers say » and ܐܘܢܐܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܐ « the elder says » and numbered like the other logia to form what looks like a coherent whole.

All the identifiable DQC logia found in h are also found in g and roughly in the same order.

The initial ten logia (§ 1-10) manifest certain distant similarities with the opening texts of Gg. The texts of h are however very divergent from those of Gg and notably much shorter. In the critical apparatus of the edition, these logia in h have had to be relegated to the apparatus in their entirety because they constitute at the most a loose summary of the longer text.

### 3. The recensions of the text

Having described the Syriac material available to us, we can now turn to the question of the recensions of Dadisho's *Commentary*.

The long and short texts, DQC and DQE, manifestly constitute two major text types.

Within DQC we do not seem to have evidence of different recensions: to judge both from the major witnesses, ABCG, and the fragmentary excerpts, DEF, there are no divergences of sufficient moment to separate out different text types – we are dealing with one essentially homogenous text inside of which there are, of

---

<sup>48</sup> AMS, VII, xi and thus before Draguet *pace* SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādišo' Qatrāyā's Commentary », p. 36.

<sup>49</sup> BUDGE, II, p. 283-327.

<sup>50</sup> BUDGE, *The Book of Paradise*, London, 1904, I, xv-xvi.

<sup>51</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS, « Dādišo' Qatrāyā's Commentary », p. 36 n. 12, p. 56 n. 63.



gives rest and gladdens the perfect through  
purity of the heart and impassibility through  
revelations of light »

While in h (f° 172v°) we read:

כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא  
כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא  
כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא  
כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא כחמההא

« Continually dwelling in the cell has two  
properties, one is hot and burning, the other  
is luminous and gladdening. To beginners it  
is constraining and wearying through the  
abundance of combats and irksomeness;  
while to the perfect it gives rest and glad-  
dens through purity of the heart and im-  
passibility through revelations of light »

Manuscript h has abbreviated the twofold metaphor of DQC and just kept the two properties without the comparison with fire, judging the image unnecessary.

We can add that, generally speaking, h is the witness which is the most often the most divergent when there is an otherwise general consensus among other manuscripts as far as individual variants is concerned. This fact together with the abbreviation of the texts of the logia allow us to conclude quite safely that it represents another recension of the shorter text of the *Commentary*. We thus have two recensions of DQE, one represented by g, which I will call DQE<sup>1</sup> and another, represented by h, which I shall designate as DQE<sup>2</sup>.

The question therefore arises as to whether DQE<sup>2</sup> is an independent recension of DQC or whether it is a recension based itself on DQE<sup>1</sup> or a parent of it. I think that the reply is clear: DQE<sup>2</sup> is based on DQE<sup>1</sup> firstly and principally because the logia follow more or less the same order in both recensions and this order is completely at variance with that of DQC as pointed out above. Secondly there are several noteworthy agreements between g and h against GA(BC)<sup>52</sup> though the two witnesses are far from following each other constantly.

<sup>52</sup> For example, in the order gh against AG (or BC): DQC I, 30: *om* כחמההא, *add* כחמההא; DQC I, 39: כחמההא against כחמההא; DQC I, 44-46: כחמההא against כחמההא (several times with or without *seyame*); DQC I, 44: כחמההא against כחמההא; DQC I, 48: *om* כחמההא DQC I, 52: כחמההא against כחמההא; DQC I, 100: כחמההא against כחמההא; DQC II, 11: כחמההא against כחמההא (+B); DQC II, 32: כחמההא against כחמההא

#### 4. Principles of the critical edition<sup>53</sup>

All the Syriac witnesses have now been collated and drafted into a provisional version of the critical edition. The text edited will be that of DQC in an eclectic form with the rejected variants consigned to the apparatus; the latter will thus be a negative one, the extant witnesses to any given section always being indicated at each page.

Since DQE only provides intermittent and non-continuous support to the text of DQC it has been necessary to equip the text with folio notation showing exactly when the witness of g or h begins and ends.

It has been decided to include all orthographic variants in what will become an independent *index orthographicus*<sup>54</sup>. The value of these variants may seem minor as far as the transmission of the text of Dadisho‘’s *Commentary* itself is concerned, but I think that such information may at some stage prove useful in the general study of the evolution of the Syriac language. For purely conventional reasons, the forms retained in the body of the text will be those of the “major” manuscripts: G, A, B or C in that order of preference with the exception of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural *Pe‘al* where the forms with a final *naw* have been preferred.

Another, and perhaps more unusual, decision concerns the inclusion of palaeographic information in yet another separate apparatus. Because of the poor state of several of the manuscripts at various points, making certain words or passages illegible or only partly legible, it has seemed wise to indicate the degree of certainty as to the support provided by a given witness. Judicious use has thus been made of square brackets: [ ] indicating an illegible text while [⌞] indicates that the letter is only partly clear. This results in the fact that the apparatus will, in many cases, repeat the lemma simply adding brackets around the part of the word which is not clear. Yet it seems preferable, in order to be completely rigorous in the presentation of the readings, to warn the reader that there is a degree of doubt – albeit remote in many cases – as to the support provided for a reading.

It has yet to be seen how, and if, the two secondary apparatuses will be made available to readers either in the printed edition or in a parallel, perhaps electronic, resource.

---

ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ; DQC II, 33: ܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ; DQC II, 256: ܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ (BCG); DQC II, 276 ܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ (BG).

<sup>53</sup> I am greatly indebted to Sebastian Brock who made a number of pertinent comments on this aspect during the Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford in 2003.

<sup>54</sup> A possible model for this could be D.G.K. Taylor’s *index orthographicus* in his *The Syriac Versions of the De Spiritu Sancto by Basil of Caesarea* (CSCO 576), Louvain, 1999, p. 183-195.

Diacritical points are probably one of the worst bugbears of any Syriac critical edition. Not only are the theoretical systems so greatly heterogeneous as such, but the manuscripts – the real manuscripts with which we have to work – are in general wildly inconsistent within themselves<sup>55</sup> and rarely employ the same points in the same way throughout. The same has to be said for punctuation signs which very often get confusingly mixed up with the diacritics because the differences of thickness in writing are often not respected; add to this the fact that lines of text are not infrequently cramped together so that one often hesitates between considering a point as being the lower point of a line or an upper point of the line underneath.

I have decided to apply the following principles: Firstly, only diacritical points actually present in at least one witness are indicated; no attempt at applying a theoretically coherent system has been made; divergence from the choice made in the text by other witnesses is recorded in the apparatus; in general I have retained the variants which do provide diacritical marks if there is no other reason for preferring a variant without. Secondly, only the upper diacritical points indicating *Pe'al* participle or *Pa'el* (*Pai'el*, *Shaph'el* etc.) *Ethpa'al* (etc.) have been retained; the upper diacritical point to indicate *'Aph'el* found notably in A has not been recorded. The upper point on ܦܐܝܝܠ, ܫܦܝܝܠ, ܫܦܝܝܠ, and ܫܦܝܝܠ are indicated. Thirdly, for the sake of simplicity, the lower diacritical point is never indicated, neither in the text nor in the apparatus. Its presence, unlike the upper point, usually adds no information which cannot be otherwise deduced from the consonantal form<sup>56</sup>.

I note one difficulty arising from the fact that the witnesses' vowel signs are not, of course, indicated in the edition. There is a quite frequent use of a combined upper and lower point to indicate the ܦܐܝܝܠ vowel in a number of witnesses in the original handwriting; the presence of this vowel can betray the indication of a *Pa'el* form. This means that if witness X has a diacritical point indicating a *Pa'el* while Y has the ܦܐܝܝܠ vowel points, which in fact indicate the same reality and can have relieved the scribe from writing the diacritic which would have been a double indication, the apparatus will simply record the absence of the diacritic in Y as though it had no indication of the *Pa'el* at all; I find this somewhat unsatisfactory.

The punctuation adopted is that of G, A, B or C in that order of preference unless the punctuation is completely aberrant or if the legibility of a witness makes using its punctuation easier. The source of the punctuation is not indicated in the edition nor is any

---

<sup>55</sup> J.B. SEGAL, *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac* (London Oriental Series 2), London, 1953, p. 1-3.

<sup>56</sup> The same choice was made by J.-Cl. Haelewyck in his edition of the *Oratio 40* of Gregory of Nazianzenus – *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera. Versio syriaca*, 1, *Oratio XL* (Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 49. Corpus Nazianzenum 14), Turnhout, 2001, xxiv.

divergence from the punctuation chosen for the text. In other words: the same choice has been made here as was the case for the diacritical points, and no attempt to achieve an abstract theoretical coherence has been aimed at.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to give a brief overview of the material available for a critical edition of the text of Dadisho's *Commentary* on 'Enanisho's *Paradise* and the way in which it is proposed to present it.

Many other avenues of research lie before us: the relationship of DQC with the *Paradise* itself and the light it can shed on the history and composition of its text; the relationship between DQC and Dadisho's other extant works, especially DQI; the lengthy quotations of otherwise lost works such as those of Theodore of Mopsuestia; the Ethiopic version of Dadisho' and its Arabic intermediary.

We hope to shed new light on Dadisho' studies by tackling his last surviving work to be made fully accessible to the scholarly world.