

ied in 973-976 in the monastery of Shatberdi in Tao-Klarjeti, 203v-215r), Ath. 11 (10th century, 275v-288r) and Jer. 44 (12th-13th centuries, 235r-245v).²¹ The mss S 1141 and Jer. 44 lack folia,²² the Ath. 11 is the only manuscript that preserves the *Demonstration* in full and represents the text most faithful to the original. G. Garitte, describing the manuscripts, admitted that “les manuscrits J [= Jer. 44] et T [= S 1141] d’une part, et le manuscrit A [= Ath. 11] d’autre part représentent deux branches nettement différenciées de la tradition; des trois témoins, c’est A qui conserve le texte le meilleur et le plus fidèle à l’original; il est exempt de nombreuses omissions, modifications et corruptions qu’ont subies J et T; ces deux derniers manuscrits sont proches parents, mais n’ont pas entre eux de liens de dépendance directe; J est moins corrompu que T et a conserve maintes leçons attestées par A contre T.”²³ G. Garitte applied to his edition the Latin translation, the most precise translation available. He briefly touched upon the relationship between the old Georgian and Armenian renditions, though he did not define the Armenian manuscripts’ recension that served as a source for the Georgian translation.

ARMENIAN TRANSLATION AS THE SOURCE OF THE GEORGIAN TEXT. The homilies of Aphrahat, according to G. Garitte, were translated from Syriac into Armenian after approximately the 5th century. The early version, preserved in a relatively large number of manuscripts, was published by Antonelli.²⁴

There are two editions of the Armenian translation of the *Demonstrations*: 1. Antonellus, Nicolaus. *Sancti Patris Nostri Jacobi Episcopi Nisibeni Sermones*. Roma: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1756.²⁵ The edition was made on the basis of a single manuscript, Vat. Borg. arm. 59 (18th century, c. 1740),²⁶ where authorship is ascribed to Jacob of Nis-

²¹ The Georgian text is also preserved in the cod. A 165 (17th-18th centuries, 705-31), a copy of S 1141. It had not been considered in the editions.

²² S 1141 lacks folia between ff. 205/206 (1.18/3.1), Jer. 44 lacks the last part from 17.7 (Garitte 1964b, 302).

²³ Garitte 1964b, 304-05.

²⁴ Sasse 1879, 24-26; Garitte 1964b, 303.

²⁵ The edition has been reprinted in 1769 (Gallandius 1769, vol. 5, iii-clii), in 1765 (Venice) and 1824 (Constantinople).

²⁶ Lafontaine 1977, IX, XII. The cod. Vat. Borg. arm. 59 is copied from Venice, Mechitarists’ Library, cod. arm. 1551. There are two columns on each folia of the Vat. Borg. arm. 59, writ-

ibis.²⁷ A few important lacunas, alterations, and orthographic mistakes were identified in this edition;²⁸ 2) The most recent critical edition of the Armenian translation belongs to Guy Lafontaine.²⁹ The text was edited after the 12 most important manuscripts of the 13th-18th centuries, the earliest ones dating from the 13th-16th centuries (Venice, Mechitarists' Library 254/526), 15th-16th (Venice, Mechitarists' Library 194) and 1623 (Tubingue, Königsberg University Library, arm. Ma XIII 95).³⁰ This edition is applied with the Latin translation by Lafontaine. It represents an almost word-for-word rendition and is indeed precise and reliable. As for the Armenian translation, Lafontaine admits that, comparing it to the Syriac original, in

ten by the same hand, a column of the Armenian text and a column of its Latin translation, the translator of the Latin text being Khachatur Aragelean (Խաչատուր Առաքելեան), mentioned in the 1v of the ms: "Sermones de variis rebus Sancti Jacobi Nisibensis Episcopi, ex Lingua Armena traducti in linguam Latinam, a Cacciato Arachiel Sacerdote, et doctore armeno, Missionario Apostolico pro Armenis venetiis degentibus" (Lafontaine 1977, XII-XIII, IX; Lafontaine also quotes Tournebize 1924, col. 1436-38). Lafontaine indicates that Antonelli in his edition published both texts of the manuscript, Armenian and its Latin translation, and supplied them by his own notes and commentaries (Lafontaine 1977, XII).

²⁷ In the foreword Antonelli questions the authorship of Jacob of Nisibis, nevertheless, to affirm it, he indicates to Athanasius of Alexandria and to Gennadius (*Lives of Illustrious Men*, ch. 1), who ascribes the homilies to "Jacob, surnamed the Wise, bishop of Nisibis" (Antonellus 1756, I-X), and finds out arguments to support his thesis from the *Demonstrations* themselves (Antonellus 1756, X-XVI). The foreword includes the 1st chapter, "Vita Sancti Jacobi Episcopi Nisibeni", from the *Historia Philothea* by Theodoret of Cyrus, and fragments from the writings of Armenian authors (Antonellus 1756, XIX).

²⁸ Lafontaine 1977, IX, XXIII.

²⁹ Lafontaine 1977, 1979, 1980. The edition, relying on the ms Erevan, Matenadaran 497 (1671), has the same order of homilies as that of the *Patrologia Syriaca*, and after XI homily, in XII-XIX *Demonstrations*, it differs from the order of Antonelli: Dem. 12A (of Lafontaine) = Dem. 14.1-3 (of PS), Dem. 13 = Dem. 19, Dem. 14 = Dem. 13, Dem. 15-18 = Dem. 15-18, Dem. 12B = Dem. 14.4-till the end; Dem. 19 = Dem. 12 (Lafontaine 1977, VII, XXIV).

³⁰ The twelve manuscripts of Lafontaine's edition are the following: E – Erevan, Matenadaran 496 (1669); F – Erevan, Matenadaran 497 (1671); N – New Julfa 387 (1797); R – Tubingue, Königsberg University Library, arm. Ma XIII 95 (1623); S – Rome, Vatican Library, arm. B 59 (1740); T – Rome, Vatican Library, arm. V 9 (1719); U – Venice, Mechitarists' Library 98 (18th century); V – Venice, Mechitarists' Library 194 (15th-16th centuries); W – Venice, Mechitarists' Library 360 (18th century); X – Venice, Mechitarists' Library 562 (18th century); Y – Venice, Mechitarists' Library 1357 (18th century); Z – Venice, Mechitarists' Library 254 (anc. 526) (13th-16th centuries) (Lafontaine 1977, VI, X-XVII). Lafontaine examines another 14 Armenian manuscripts in his "Post-scriptum" and admits that they do not adduce any new element to the edition (1977, XXV-XXVII).

რიტება“ (დჷსარყოქსან, “truth,” 6.1),³⁶ „მუშაკი“ (მჷსკ, “worker,” 6.1),³⁷ „აგარაკი“ (აგარასკ, “hamlet, farm,” 6.1) and „ვაჭარი“ (ქადანასკან, “merchant,” 6.1).³⁸ The usage and meaning of these calques are the same in the

რჷსჷთ ზღლ მსსლ მლ რღსრღ (“ad naturam suam, ad Christum, vadens”), “*Երբայ ի քունքիւր առ Քրիստոսս*” (“et abit ad naturam suam ad Christum”), „და მივიდის ბუნად თვისა ქრისტესას“ (“et it ad-principium suum Christum”; PS 1, 295/296⁹⁻¹⁰; Lafontaine 1979, 25₁₄/15₈, cf. Antonellus 1756, 222; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 315³⁸; Garitte 1964b, 351, 6). It should be noted that „ბუნი“ in the *Old Georgian Dictionary* is interpreted as „წამდვილი“ (“true, inhabitant,” Abuladze 1973, 37).

³⁶ There are three examples of this calque in 6.1. The first one reads: რჷსჷთ რღსლ რღთა (“Sal efficiamur veritatis”), “*Սիմუს աղ ճշմարտութեան*” (“Simus sal veritatis”), „ვიქმნეთ მარილ ჭებმარიტების“ (“Fiamus sal veritatis”; PS 1, 241₂/242; Lafontaine 1979, 1₁₆₋₁₇/1₁₆; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 304₁₈₋₁₉; Garitte 1964b, 310, 3). The next one: რჷსჷთ რღსლ რღთა (“quae est vinea vera”), “*գի նա ինքն է այգի ճշմարտութեան*” (“quod ille ipse est vinea veritatis”), „რამეთუ იგი თავადი არს ვენაკი ჭებმარიტი“ (“quae ille ipse est vinea vera”; PS 1, 244₁₉/243; Lafontaine 1979, 3₁₂/2₁₇₋₁₈; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 305₁₀; Garitte 1964b, 313, 9). The third passage says: რჷსჷთ რღსლ რღთა (A რჷსჷთ რღსლ რღთა) (“Accingamus lumbis nostris veritatem” (lumbos nostros aequitate et veritate A), “*Ունէցոցս գէշս սեր ճշմարտութեակք*” (“Comprimamus lumbos nostros veritate”), „მოვიმტკიცენეთ წელნი ზუენნი ჭებმარიტებითა და სიმართლითა“ (“Confirmemus lumbos nostros per-veritatem et iustitiam”; PS 1, 244₃₋₄/243; Lafontaine 1979, 2₂₁₋₃/2₆; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 304₃₈₋₃₉; Garitte 1964b, 311, 7).

³⁷ The first example reads: რჷსჷთ რღსლ რღთა (“Solertes operarii efficiamur”), “*Սիցոցս մշակք ժրագուխք*” (“Simus operarii diligentes”), „ვიქმნეთ მუშაკ მალე-მოქმედ“ (“Fiamus operarii celeriter facientes”; PS 1, 244₁₃₋₁₄/243; Lafontaine 1979, 3₈/2₁₃₋₁₄; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 305₆; Garitte 1964b, 312, 9); The second one: რღსლ რღსლ რღთა რღ (“nec simus operarii otiosi”), “*մի լիցոցս մշակք դատարկք*” (“ne simus operarii otiosi”), „წუმცა ვართ მუშაკ მოვალე“ (“ne simus operarii vacantes”; PS 1, 244₁₆₋₁₇/243; Lafontaine 1979, 3₁₀/2₁₅₋₁₆; Giunashvili and Gigineishvili 1979, 305₈; Garitte 1964b, 312, 9).

³⁸ The Georgian text preserves few examples of the last two calques: რღსლ რღსლ რღთა რღ (“Qui rura et mercatum amat”), “*Որ սիրէ գագարასկս և գկადանս*” (“Qui amat agros et mercatum”), „რომელს უყუარს აგარაკები და სავაჭრობ“ (“Qui diligit agros et mercatum”; PS 1, 248₉/247; Lafontaine 1979, 4₄₋₅/3₈; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 305₃₉; Garitte 1964b, 315, 14). The next one reads: თიჯა რღსლ რღსლ რღთა რღ (“Qui cupit mercator fieri villam sibi cum thesauro qui in ea est emat”), “*Որ կասի քადანასկան լինել, գնեսցէ*

sentence in the Georgian version that does not correspond to either the Syriac original or the Armenian rendition, and since the Georgian text, in general, represents the literal translation, this sentence must not have been augmented but rendered from the Armenian source:

- 6.1. „და მივართუთ მას შესაწევნელი აღთქმად, სიმართლჳ და ვერწმუნნეთ აღთქმასა. და განვერნეთ ცეცხლსა მას უშრეტსა.“
 (“et afferamus ei adiutoriam promissionem, iustitiam, et fideles-simus promissioni et effugiamus ignem inexstinguibilem”).⁴⁵

THE RECENSION. The aforementioned differences draw our attention to the recensions of the source of the Georgian rendition – the Armenian translation. The editor of the Armenian text, Lafontaine, specifies five recensions: the UV (both include 1-9 hom.), EF (19-19 hom.), WY (18-18 hom.), NSTX (NST – 19, X – 17 hom.), and RZ (R – 19; Z – 8.8, 10.5) recensions.⁴⁶ From these recensions the lacking parts of the 1st and 2nd chapters⁴⁷ of the Armenian version are preserved only by the UV recension. The rendition of the aforementioned part of the Armenian text is represented in the Georgian translation; nevertheless, the Georgian text shows a number of differences from the source. Thus, in the following sentence, the Syriac ܩܘܝܢܘܬܐܝܗ (“qui apparebit”) is translated into the Armenian as “յայտնութեան նորա” (“apparitionis eius”), the reading of the V ms being: “լարութեան նորա և յայտնութեան” (“virtutis eius et apparitionis”). The Georgian „გამოჩნებისა მისისაჲ“ (“apparitionis eius”) follows the main text of the translation and not the reading of the V ms:

(“Qui confidentiam in Dominum suum reposuit, arbori iterum similis erit super flumen constitutae”), “Որ յոյս իւր ի տէր է, դարձեալ նման է ծառոյ որ հաստատեալ է ի վերայ սիւղոյ” (“cuius spes in Domino est, rursus similis est arbori quae fermata est super gramen”; PS 1, 253/254¹⁻²; Lafontaine 1979, 4¹⁷⁻¹⁸/4¹⁹⁻²⁰); (4) ԾԻԾ ԴՅԾ ԸՅԾ ԵՅԻՐԻ Ե (“Quem Sponsus invitavit, praeparat animam suam”), “Որ հրապրեցաւ ան փեսայն, հանդերձեցէ զանձն իւր” (“Qui invitatus est apud Sponsum, parat se ipsum”; PS 1, 253⁴-5/254; Lafontaine 1979, 5¹⁹⁻²⁰/4²¹⁻²²).

⁴⁵ Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 305³⁵⁻³⁷; Garitte 1964b, 315, 13.

⁴⁶ Lafontaine 1977, XIX-XXI.

⁴⁷ More than half of the first 2 chapters, from almost the beginning of the first chapter till the middle of the second, is missing in most of the Armenian manuscripts (cf. Antonellus 1756, 205; Lafontaine 1979, 2¹⁷⁻⁶/2³⁻⁴³³).

the Georgian version differs from the Syriac ܘܪܘܢܐ (“our Lord”), as well as from the Armenian “տեսան մերոս”/“տեսան մերոյ” (“*Domini nostri*”) of the main text and the readings of the U and V mss in the same sentence, and says „უფლისა თვისისა“ (“*Domino suo*”).

6.1. $\text{სიმუს ვასა ონორის ოფილიტატემ სუამ რეკირატ}$

(“*Simus vasa honoris, ut nos Dominus ad utilitatem suam requirat*”).

“ნუჩიგოჲ ანაყოჲ აჲსთასაგოჲ *տեսան მეროս*: ნახეგოჲ კამნაჲსი სოჲსი მერ” [*ყასთოჲ* აჲსთასაგო ო აქსო *տեսან მეროჲ* UVs].

(“*Simus vasa utilia Domino Nostro; quaestum faciamus in omnibus, quae nobis data sunt*” [“*honoris utilia ad necessitate Domini nostri UVs*]).

„ვიქმნეთ ჭურ პეტოხან, საჭმარ უფლისა თვისისა.“

(“*Fiamus vas pretiosum, utile Domino suo*”).⁵⁰

The Georgian translation frequently shows itself to be closer to the Syriac A manuscript version (BL Add. 14619, 6th century). Thus, for example, in the next sentence, the Georgian „სიმართლითა“ (“*iustitiam*”) has no correspondence in the Armenian text and reflects the reading of the Syriac A ms: $\text{რეკინგამუს ლუმბის ნოსტრის ვერიტატემ, ნე დებილის ინაგონიენიამუს}$ (“*Aequitate*”).

6.1. $\text{რეკინგამუს ლუმბის ნოსტრის ვერიტატემ, ნე დებილის ინაგონიენიამუს}$

[*A ახაჲს რეკინგამოს რეკინგამოს რეკინგამოს*]

(“*Accingamus lumbis nostris veritatem, ne debilis in agone inveniamur*” [lumbos nostros *aequitate et veritate* ne forte inveniamur A]).

“ოიუტეგოჲ კილესი მერ *დუმარპოთხანს*, კი მჲ ქელსა კოსანჲგინჲს ო კასანერაჲსა.”

(“*Comprimamus lumbos nostros veritate ne relictus inveniamur in praelio*”).

„მოვიმტკიცებეთ წელნი ჩუენნი *ჭეშმარიტებითა და სიმართლითა*, რადთა არა დაქსნილ ვიპოვნეთ ღუაწლსა მას ბრძოლისასა.“

(“*Confirmemus lumbos nostros per-veritatem et iustitiam, ut non dissolute inveniamur in-praelio belli*”).⁵¹

⁵⁰ PS 1, 241⁶⁻⁸/242; Lafontaine 1979, 2³⁻⁴/119; Antonellus 1756, 204; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 304²¹⁻²²; Garitte 1964b, 310, 4.

In the next example, the Georgian „ვობჳათ“ (“aequiremus”) also corresponds to the reading of the Syriac A ms, ܠܒܘܠܘܢ (“habeamus”), contrary to the main Syriac text (ܠܘܥܡܘܨ “vocemus”) and to the Armenian version (կոչեսցուք “vocemus”).

6.1. 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 : 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆 𐌕 [A ܠܒܘܠܘܢ] 𐌕𐌆𐌆 𐌕 𐌕𐌆𐌆

(“Patrem neminem *vocemus* (*habeamus* A) nobis super terram, ut simus filii Patris qui in caelis est”).

“Հայր մի *կոչեսցուք* յերկրի զի լիցուք որդիք հարն երկնաորի.”

(“Patrem ne *vocemus* in terra, ut simus filii Patris caelestis”).

„მამად არა *ვობჳათ* ქუეყანას ზედა, რადთა ვიქმნეთ შვილ მამისა მის ზეცათადას.“

(“Patrem non *aequiremus* super terram, ut fiamus filii Patris caelorum”).⁵²

However, not all the readings of the Syriac A ms have correspondences in the Georgian text. The next sentence serves as an example:

6.1. 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆 𐌕 [A ܠܘܥܡܘܨ] 𐌕𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆 𐌕𐌆𐌆𐌆 𐌕

(“Qui templum Dei vocatus est, *corpus suum* [animam suam A] ab omni purget immunditie”).

“Որ կոչեսցաւ տաճար Աստուծոյ, սրբեսցէ *գմարսին* իւր յասնայն պղծութենէ.”

(“Qui vocatus est templum Dei, purificet *corpus suum* ab omni immunditia”).

„რომელი იწოდა ტაძრად ღმრთისა, წმიდად იპყრენინ *კორცნი* თჳსნი ყოვლისაგან ბილწებისა.“

(“Qui vocatus est templum Dei, ut purum teneat (litt.prehendat) *corpus suum* ab omni foeditate”).⁵³

Thus, the 10th century Georgian translation of the VI homily, rendered by an anonymous translator from the Armenian source, mostly represents its faithful rendition, though it also reveals a number of significant differ-

⁵¹ PS 1, 243/244-5; Lafontaine 1979, 2-3/26-7; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 304³⁸⁻⁴⁰; Garitte 1964b, 311, 7.

⁵² PS 1, 244²⁴⁻²⁵/246; Lafontaine 1979, 3¹⁵⁻¹⁶/220-21; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 304¹⁴⁻¹⁵; Garitte 1964b, 311, 7.

⁵³ PS 1, 251¹⁸⁻²⁰/251¹⁰⁻¹²; Lafontaine 1979, 4⁸⁻⁹/57-8; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 306³⁵⁻³⁶; Garitte 1964b, 318-19, 20.

CONCLUSION. At this stage of our preliminary study, it can be stated that from two Georgian translations of the homilies (VI and VIII) by Aphrahat the Persian Sage, the translation of the VI homily rendered by an anonymous translator in the 10th century, essentially represents a faithful and word-for-word rendition of the Armenian source. Nevertheless, the Georgian text reveals significant differences from the recensions edited by Lafontaine, even from the UV recension that stands closer to it, and maintains correspondences to the Syriac A ms recension (BL Add. 14619, 6th century) reflected in the Georgian, presumably through the unknown Armenian source, – the recension, not considered in the edition of Lafontaine. The second, modern translation of the VIII homily, *On the Resurrection of the Dead*, rendered by Lasha Bezhanishvili from the English source, is good enough to understand the content of the text, though for scholarly purposes it must be referred to with caution, since, having the English translation as the direct source, it is not always sufficiently precise.

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AbouZayd, Shafiq. 1993. *Ihdayutha: A Study of the Life of Singleness in the Syrian Orient: From Ignatius of Antioch to Chalcedon 451 AD*. Oxford: ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies.

Abuladze, Iliia, ed. 1973. *Dzveli k'art'uli leksikoni* [Dictionary of the Old Georgian Language]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Antonellus, Nicolaus. 1756. *Sancti Patris Nostri Jacobi Episcopi Nisibeni Sermones*. Roma: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.

Baarda, Tjitze. 1980-1981. "Another Treatise of Aphrahat the Persian Sage in Ethiopic Translation: A Short Note." *New Testament Studies* 27/5: 632-40.

Bert, Georg, ed. and trans. 1888. *Aphrahat's, des Persischen Weisen Homilien*. TU 3-4. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Bezhanishvili, Lasha, trans. 2011. *Cminda Afraati, sparsi brdzeni, 'mkvdart'a agdgoma-ze'* [St. Aphrahat the Persian Sage, *On the Resurrection of the Dead*].

<http://documentsingeorgian.wordpress.com/2011/11/08/წმინდა-აფრათის-სპარსი-ბრ/>

Bonwetsch, Gottlieb Nathanael, ed. 1907. *Die unter Hippolyts Namen überlieferte Schrift über den Glauben. Nach einer Übersetzung der in einer Schatberder Handschrift vorliegenden Georgischen Version.* TU 31/2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Gallandius, Andrea, ed. 1769. *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum Antiquorumque Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.* Venice.

Garitte, Gerard. 1964a. "L'Entretien VI d'Aphraate en géorgien." *Bedi Karthlisa* 17-18: 82-87.

— 1964b. "La version géorgienne de l'Entretien VI d'Aphraate." *Le Muséon* 77: 301-66.

— 1980. *Scripta Disiecta* II. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain.

Gigineishvili, Bakar and Elguja Giunashvili, eds. 1979. *Shat'berdis K'rebuli X sauk'unisa* [Shatberdi Collection of the 10th century]. The Monuments of the Old Georgian Literature. Vol. I. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Khoudabashyan, Alek'sandr, ed. 1986. (= Խոսկարաշյան, Ալեքսանդր. 1986. *Հայ-Ռուսերէն Բառարան*. Երևան). *Hay-rōwseren bařaran* [Armenian-Russian Dictionary]. Erevan.

Lafontaine, Guy, ed. 1977, 1979, 1980. "La version arménienne des oeuvres d'Aphraate le syrien." CSCO 382-83, 405-06, 423-24, *Arm.* 7, 9-10, 11-12. Louvain: Louvain Secretariat du CorpusSCO.

Lehto, Adam, ed. 2010. *The Demonstrations of Aphrahat, the Persian Sage.* Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 27. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

NPNF = Gwynn, John, ed. and transl. 1898. *Aphrahat, Select Demonstrations.* A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series. Vol. 13. New York: The Christian Literature Company.

Parisot = PS.

Payne Smith, Jessie, ed. 1976. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pereira, Franciscus Maria Esteves, ed. 1906. "Jacobi, episcopi Nisibeni, *Homilia de adventu regis Persarum adversus urbem Nisibis.*" In *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag (2 März, 1906) gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern und in Ihrem Auftrag herausgegeben*, edited by Carl Bezold, 877-92. Gieszen: A. Töpelmann.

Pierre, Marie-Joseph, ed. 1988, 1989. *Aphraate le Sage Persan: Les Exposés*. Traduction du syriaque, notes et index. Sources Chrétiennes 349 and 359. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

PS = Parisot, Joannes, ed. 1894, 1907. "Aphraatis Sapientis Persae *Demonstrationes*." *Patrologia Syriaca* 1-2. Paris: Firmin Didot.

Sasse, C. I. Franciscus. 1879. *Prolegomena in Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Sermones Homileticos*. Lipsia: Aphraates.

Sauget, Joseph-Marie. 1979. "Entretiens d'Aphraate en arabe sous le nom d'Éphrem." *Le Muséon* 92/1-2: 61-69.

Tournebize, François. 1924. "Aragélian Khatchatur." In *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique* 3: 1436-38.

Vööbus, Arthur. 1958. *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*. Vol. I: *The Origin of Asceticism, Early Monasticism in Persia*. CSCO 184, subs. 14. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO.

Wright, William, ed. 1869. *The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage, edited from Syriac Manuscripts of the 5th and 6th centuries in the British Museum*. London: Williams and Norgate.

— 1871. *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum II*. London: Longman.

Yousif, Pierre and Khalil Samir. 1986. "La version arabe de la troisième démonstration d'Aphrahat (sur le jeûne)." In *Actes du deuxième Congrès International d'Études Arabes Chrétiennes*, edited by Khalil Samir, 31-66. Rome: Pontificium Institutum di Studiorum Orientalium.