GREEK *μέν* IN EARLY SYRIAC

AARON MICHAEL BUTTS

YALE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

The analysis of ܡܢ in the following colon from the Odes of
Solomon *(2ⁿᵈ cent.) remains a* crux interpretum*: ܡܢ ܗܘܦܟܐ*
ܠܟܠ ܕܐܚܝܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܝܫܬܐ 'may it (= Your right hand) guard everyone
who is held in evil things' (18.7). This study proposes that ܡܢ in this
colon is best analyzed as ܡܢ man *'indeed', which is a loanword from*
Greek μέν. This is, thus, the earliest known attestation of Greek
μέν in Syriac, and it shows that the particle is attested already in the
earliest layer of Syriac literature (pre-4ᵗʰ cent.), even though it does
not become common until the height of Syriac-Greek contact in the
sixth and seventh centuries.

Throughout its history, Syriac has acquired more than a dozen
particles from Greek.[1] Among these is the particle *μέν* (Liddell and
Scott 1996: 1101-1102), which came into Syriac as ܡܢ *man*

---

[1] For a general overview of the Syriac-Greek contact situation, see
Taylor 2002. A bibliography of Greek loanwords in Syriac is available in
Voigt 1999-2000. The present author is currently completing a
monographic study of contact-induced changes in Syriac due to Greek
that is tentatively entitled *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in its
Greco-Roman Context.*

(Brockelmann 1928: 393; Payne Smith 1879-1901: 2151; Sokoloff 2009: 778). In Syriac, ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) can be used independently with the meaning 'indeed', as in (1).

(1) *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella* by Eliya (mid-6th cent.) (ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95)

ܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܟ ܚܒܖ̈ܝ، ܐܝܬܝ ܕܐܦ ܡܚܝ̈ܒܝܢܢ ܠܢ ܡܥܒܕܘܬܗ
ܐܝܬܝ،

'I **indeed**, like my colleagues, am his servant, as we ought to be' (73.5-6)

In addition, ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) can be used in conjunction with the particle ܕܝܢ *den* (< *ʾiðayn)[2] with the meaning 'on the one hand … on the other hand …':

(2) *Letter 13* by Yaʿqub of Edessa (d. 708) (ed. Wright 1867: *1-*24)

ܠܡܪܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܦ ܟܠܗ ܕܐܒܖ̈ܗܡ. ܠܐܒܖ̈ܗܡ ܕܝܢ ܝܚܝܕܐܝܬ
ܘܒܣܝܡܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܐܒܪܗܡ

'**On the one hand**, He (= God) expelled the vultures from the field of Abraham. **On the other hand**, He called out gently and pleasantly to Abraham, "Abraham, Abraham, …"' (5*.10-11)

While ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) is well attested at the height of Syriac-Greek contact in the sixth and seventh centuries,[3] it remains unclear when this particle first entered Syriac.

On several occasions, Brock (1975: 89 with n. 55a; 1996: 259) has pointed to the Syriac translation of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* (ed. Wright and McLean 1898), which must have been translated by at least the first decades of the fifth century,[4] as one

---

[2] For the development of Syriac ܕܝܢ *den* from earlier Aramaic *ʾiðayn under the influence of Greek δέ, see Butts Forthcoming.

[3] It is, for instance, found in Eliya's *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella*, 68.7; 73.6; 82.20, 21 (ed. Brooks 1907), Yuḥanon of Ephesus's *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 139.6 (ed. Brooks 1923-1925), the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, 13.11; 36.13 (ed. Reinink 1993), Isḥaq of Nineveh's *Part 2*, 10.35; 17.1; *passim* (ed. Brock 1995), Denḥa's *Life of Marutha*, 69.12; 81.2 (ed. Nau 1905: 52-96), and throughout the works of Yaʿqub of Edessa.

[4] The translation is preserved in one of the earliest dated Syriac manuscripts, St. Petersburg, Public Library, Cod. Syr. 1 (461/462). The translation must, however, predate this manuscript by at least half a

of the earlier Syriac texts attesting ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν). For the occurrence of the Greek particle in this text, he cites the following sentence:

(3) Syriac Translation of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* (ed. Wright and McLean 1898)

ܘܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܘܗܐ ܬܘܒ ܒܗ ܕܝܢ ܚܙܝܬ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܚܝ
ܗܘܝܬ . . .

(333.9-10)

It is best to leave the Syriac untranslated for the moment and turn instead to the Greek *Vorlage*, which reads as follows:

(4) Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*

καὶ οὗτος μέν τις τοιοῦτος ἦν· πάλιν δ' ἂν ἑτέρους εἶδες ...

'On the one hand, this one, whoever he was, was thus. On the other hand, you may have seen others …' (8.7.5)

The demonstrative pronoun οὗτος in this sentence refers to a previously mentioned young man, while τις serves as an indefinite pronoun to avoid naming this definite referent: his identity is not important to Eusebius's narrative; only his heroic deeds in the face of persecution are.[5] Even though the Greek text clearly has the μέν - δέ construction, the ܡܢ in the Syriac translation is probably not to be analyzed as ܡܢ *man* (< μέν), but rather as ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *man d-hu* 'whoever he is', which is translating Greek τις.[6] According to this

_____

century since the Syriac version was the basis of an Armenian translation from the first decades of the fifth century (Van Rompay 1994: 73 n. 15; cf. Merx, *apud* Wright and McLean 1898: xiii-xvii).

[5] For this use of τις in Greek, see Liddell and Scott 1996: 1796 and especially Humbert 1972: §29.

[6] This meaning of ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *man d-hu* 'whoever he is' can be compared with ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *mɔn d-hu* / ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *mon d-hu* 'whatever it is' in the following Syriac translations of Gregory of Nazianzus's *Homily 38* (ed. Haelewyck 2005: 70-71): ܠܗܢܐ ܣܡ ܡܢ ܒܦܪܕܝܣܐ. ܡܢ ܕܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ (versio antiqua) and ܠܗܢܐ ܣܡ ܡܢ ܒܦܪܕܝܣܐ: ܡܢ ܕܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ (versio nova). The Greek *Vorlage* reads τοῦτον ἔθετο μὲν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ὁ

analysis, then, μέν is left unexpressed in the Syriac translation. Thus, the example in (3) does not seem to provide an early attestation of Syriac ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν).

An early attestation of Syriac ܡܢ (< Greek μέν) can, however, be found in the following passage from Ephrem (d. 373):

(5) *Prose Refutations*, Discourse 1 by Ephrem (ed. Overbeck 1865)

> ܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܪܟܐ ܡܩܒܠܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ. ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܕ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܘܡܬܩܒܠ ܠܐ ܝܕܝ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܢܫܟܚ
> ܠܐ ܢܕܘܢ̈ܝܗܝ,   . ܘܢܚܬܟܘܐ ܗܘ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܕܚܕ. ܗܘ, ܘܗܘ
> ܠܐ ܢܕܘܢ. ܐܚܪܬܐ, ܕܝܢ ܘܣܘܣ ܠܡܦܩܘ ܡܠܦܘܬܐ ܕܪܓܐ ܗܘ.[7]
> ܟܡ̈ܐ ܕܝܗ̈ܒܝܢ ܟܘ̈ܟܒܐ ܦܘ̈ܟܐ ܠܡ ܐ̈ܝܟܐ ܗܘ, ܕܝܢ ܟܘ̈ܢܝܐ ܗܘ,
> ܘܟ̈ܡܫܢ ܘܣܡܘ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܢܬܒ̈ܕܪ ܐ̈ܝ̈ܟܐ ܗܘ,

'hear then the opposite of this: if a man spares the gathered seed so as not to scatter it, **on the one hand**, it is thought that he acted wisely in sparing (it) so as not to scatter (it); **on the other hand**, when we see the scattered investment of the farmer being collected in capital and interest as well as the earth rewarding him, then that discernment which spared (the seed) so as not to scatter (it) (now) appears to be blindness' (33.21-27)

This attestation establishes the presence of ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) in Syriac by the time of Ephrem in the fourth century.

An even earlier attestation of ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) in Syriac may be found in the *Odes of Solomon*.[8] The form in question occurs

---

παράδεισος οὗτος 'He (= God) placed this one (= Adam) in paradise, whatever this paradise may have been' (ed. Moreschini and Gallay 1990: 126-129). The Greek clause ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ὁ παράδεισος οὗτος 'whatever this paradise may have been' expresses in a fuller way what Greek τις does in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*: Gregory is not interested in the precise identity of paradise in the same way that Eusebius is not interested in the precise identity of the young man. Thus, the Syriac translation of ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *mon d-hu* / ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *mon d-hu* in Gregory's *Homily* provides a close parallel to ܡܢ ܕܗܘ *man d-hu* in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*.

[7] The adverb ܗܝܕܝܢ *hᵓyden* is written here as two words (for this, see Payne Smith 1879-1901: 1002). In his *Letter on Syriac Orthography*, Yaʿqub of Edessa seems to imply that when written as two words *hᵓy den* is not marked for time (ed. Phillips 1869: 6.12-15).

[8] The verse numbering of the *Odes of Solomon* in this study follows Charlesworth 1973.

toward the middle of Ode 18 in the last colon of the following tricolon, which is cited according to the earliest Syriac witness, *viz.* N = ms. London, Brit. Libr. Add. 14,538 (10th cent. according to Wright [1870-1872: 2.1003-1008]):[9]

(6) *Odes of Solomon*

ܠܝܘܡܐ ܗܒ ܩܘܡܝ ܢܨܚܢ. ܘܢܩܒܠ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܐܬܪ. ܘܢܛܪ ܟܠ ܠܟܠ ܕܐܚܝܕ ܒܒܝܫܬܐ.

'May your right hand set our salvation to victory / may it receive from every place / and may it guard everyone who is held in evil things' (18.7)

The other Syriac witness, H = ms. Birmingham, John Rylands Syr. 9 (ca. 15th cent.), attests essentially the same reading of the last colon: ܘܢܛܪ ܟܠ ܡܢ ܠܟܠ ܕܒܒܝܫܬܐ ܐܚܝܕ. Despite the agreement in the manuscripts, no acceptable analysis of ܡܢ in this colon has yet been proposed.

   Charlesworth argues that ܡܢ in ܟܠ ܠܟܠ is to be analyzed as the preposition *men* "used idiomatically as 'on the side'" (1973: 80). This leads to his translation: 'Let it preserve (it) on the side of everyone who is besieged by misfortunes'. This interpretation is problematic for at least two reasons. First, the diacritic point(s) in both manuscripts are decidedly against analyzing ܡܢ as the preposition *men*. Second, Charlesworth's analysis is not in accordance with Syriac grammar. J. Payne Smith (1903: 280) does indeed give a meaning 'on the side' in her translation of her father's *Thesaurus*, but this is in the sense of 'on the side, of the party, in the name' ('a parte' in the Latin original [Payne Smith 1879-1901: 2156]), as in the following example:

(7) Peshiṭta Old Testament

ܟܠܗ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܗܠ,

---

[9] A facsimile edition of the two Syriac witnesses, as well as the Greek version of Ode 11 and the five Coptic quotations (Odes 1.1-5; 5.1-11; 6.8-18; 22.1-12; 25.1-12), is available in Charlesworth 1981. An additional facsimile edition of the other Syriac witness, ms. Birmingham, John Rylands Syr. 9, is available in Harris and Mingana 1916.

'Who is **on the side** of the Lord? Let him come to me' (Ex. 32:26)[10]

More importantly, however, Charlesworth's analysis is ungrammatical since the combination of the preposition *mɛn* and a second prepositional phrase introduced by *l-* is restricted to a handful of phrases in Syriac (cf. Nöldeke 1904: §156):

(8)

ܡܢ ܠܒܪ	*mɛn lḇar*	'from outside'
ܡܢ ܠܓܘ	*mɛn lḡaw*	'from inside'
ܡܢ ܠܬܚܬ	*mɛn ltaḥt*	'below'
ܡܢ ܠܥܠ	*mɛn l'ɛl*	'above'

In each of these cases, the element following *mɛn* is to be analyzed synchronically as an adverb (so also Coakley 2002: 52), as is shown by the fact that a following complement must be introduced by an additional preposition.[11] Diachronically, of course, each of these has its origin in the preposition *l-* plus a substantive or preposition. It is, however, only after they were grammaticalized as adverbs that they could fill the syntactic slot after *mɛn*, just as other adverbs, e.g., *mɛn hɔrkɔ* 'from here'. Outside of the limited phrases in (8), *mɛn* is never followed in Syriac by a prepositional phrase headed by *l-*. Thus, Charlesworth's interpretation can be ruled out based on the diacritic point(s) of ܡܢ and on the lack of grammaticality of the phrase **mɛn lkol < *mɛn* 'from' + *l-* 'to' + *kol* 'all, every'.[12]

In the *editio princeps* of the *Odes of Solomon*, Harris and Mingana (1920: 297) take a different approach to this problem and propose to emend ܡܢ ܠܟܠ to ܡܢ ܠܟܠ ܕ producing the common idiom ܟܠ ܡܢ ܕ 'whoever'.[13] This emendation, however, runs counter to the text-critical principle of *lectio difficilior potior*, as Charlesworth (1973: 80)

---

[10] Translating Hebrew *mi la-YHWY 'elȳ* 'Who is on the LORD's side? Come to me!' (NRSV).

[11] In other contexts, ܠܬܚܬ and (rarely) ܠܬܚܬܝܬ, e.g., ܠܬܚܬܝܬ ܕܐܪܥܐ 'below ground' (cited in Sokoloff 2009: 1639), are compound prepositions that can govern a complement of their own.

[12] Franzmann (1991: 139-143) also analyzes ܡܢ as the preposition *mɛn*, and so her analysis can be ruled out for the same reasons.

[13] This suggestion has subsequently been adopted by, *inter alii*, Azar 1996: 124, 207 and Lattke 1999-2005: 2.68 ("vielleicht"), 2.78 with n. 3; 2009: 252, 259-260 with n. 107.

has pointed out. In addition, it must be stressed that it is an emendation, which goes against the only two Syriac witnesses.[14]

If the text of both manuscripts is to be taken seriously, another option is to analyze ܡܢ in ܘܡܛܠ ܗܢ ܠܚܠ ܕܢܬܥܒܕ ܐܢܬܬܐ as the particle ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν). This analysis would fit with the diacritic point(s) in both manuscripts (in contrast to Charlesworth). Syntactically, it would not be a problem since ܡܢ occurs in second position in Syriac, as it does in Greek. Semantically, it would simply mean 'indeed' as in the example from the *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella* cited in (1). Finally, it would make sense of the text as it stands without resorting to emendation (in contrast to Harris and Mingana).

A potential weakness with this analysis is that this would be the earliest attestation of ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) in Syriac, predating Ephrem by around two centuries.[15] It should be noted, however, that Greek particles are attested in the earliest layer of Syriac literature (pre-4th cent.). The particle ܐܝܩܐ *ʾyqʾ* 'in vain' (< εἰκῇ [(Liddell and Scott 1996: 484)]), for instance, is attested already in the *Acts of Thomas* (220.10; ed. Wright 1871a), which probably dates to the first half of the third century.[16] Or, to take an even earlier

---

[14] In the first volume of the *editio princeps*, Harris and Mingana (1916: 40 [Syr.]) erroneously read H as ܠܚܠ ܡܢ and gave the variant reading of N as ܠܚܠ ܡܢ. In the accompanying volume (1920: 297), they corrected this error and read both manuscripts as ܡܢ ܠܚܠ. Though the earlier, erroneous reading was corrected in the second volume, one wonders if it unduly influenced their decision to emend the text.

[15] Most scholars date the *Odes of Solomon* to the second century, though slightly later dates are occasionally suggested (see Lattke 1993b [= 1979-1998: 4.113-131]; 1995: 20-35; 2009: 6-10 with additional references). It should also be noted that it continues to be disputed whether the original language of the *Odes of Solomon* is Greek or Syriac (see Charlesworth 1998: 78-136; Lattke 1995: 16-18; 2009: 10-11 with additional references).

[16] For the date, see Bremmer 2001: 73-77. The word is also found in both manuscripts of the Old Syriac gospels at Mt. 5:22 (ed. Kiraz 1996; cf. Brock 1967: 398) as well as throughout fourth-century Syriac literature: Aphrahaṭ's *Demonstrations*, 1.568.8, 9 (ed. Parisot 1894-1907); *Book of Steps*, 288.20; 508.8 (ed. Kmosko 1926); Ephrem's *Prose Refutations*, 44.4; 53.24 (ed. Overbeck 1865), *Maḏrɔše against Julian the Apostate*, 87.28 (ed. Beck 1957b), *Maḏrɔše on Nisibis*, 53.1; 122.7; 124.10 (ed. Beck 1963).

example, ܬܟ *ṭk* 'perhaps' (< τάχα [Liddell and Scott 1996: 1762]) occurs already in the Peshiṭta of the Pentateuch at Ex. 32:30 and Num. 23:3, which was translated (from Hebrew) by the middle of the second century.[17] While Greek particles are not otherwise found in the *Odes of Solomon*, this text does contain twelve Greek loanwords that occur a total of twenty-four times.[18] Twenty-two of the tokens and eleven of the types are nouns:[19]

(9)   ܐܐܪ *ʾʾr* 'air' (5.5) < ἀήρ (Liddell and Scott 1996: 30)

      ܐܟܣܢܝܐ *ʾksnyʾ* 'foreigner' (17.6) < ξένος (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1189)

      ܓܢܣܐ *gnsʾ* 'race' (41.8) < γένος (Liddell and Scott 1996: 344)

      ܠܡܐܢܐ *lmʾnʾ* 'haven' (38.3) < λιμήν (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1050)

      ܡܘܟܠܐ *mwklʾ* 'bars' (17.10) < μοχλός (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1149)

---

[17] For the date, see Weitzman 1999: 248-258. The word is also found in the Sinaiticus manuscript of the Old Syriac gospels at Mk. 11:13 (ed. Kiraz 1996; cf. Brock 1967: 421) as well as in fourth-century Syriac literature: Aphrahaṭ's *Demonstrations*, 1.632.9; 1.696.14; 1.753.20; 2.133.18 (ed. Parisot 1894-1907) and Ephrem's *Prose Refutations*, 34.6 (ed. Overbeck 1865), 2.24.46 (ed. Mitchell 1912-1921); *Memrɔ on our Lord*, 31.9 (ed. Beck 1966); *Maḏrɔše on Nisibis*, 22.9 (ed. Beck 1961), 90.9, 15 (ed. Beck 1963); *Maḏrɔše against Heresies*, 9.4; 44.3; 142.25 (ed. Beck 1957a); *Letter to Publius*, 285.14; 293.18 (ed. Brock 1976); etc.

[18] Previous treatments are available in Franzmann 1991: 3 [incomplete]; Lattke 1993a. Lattke (1993a) includes two words that are probably not Greek loanwords: 1. ܦܪܕܝܣܐ *prdysʾ* 'paradise' (11.16, 18, 23, 24; 20.7) is not a loanword from Greek παράδεισος (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1308) but from Iranian *paridaiḏa-* (so already Jeffery 1938: 224 n. 5; Brock 1967: 424; cf. Ciancaglini 2008: 237; for the Iranian form, see Hinz 1975: 179 [with the remark of Zadok 1976: 215]; Tavernier 2007: 447); 2. ܣܦܣܝܪܐ *spsyrʾ* 'sword' (28.5) is not a loanword from Greek σαμψήρα (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1582) but from an Iranian source, such as Manichaean Middle Persian *safsēr* 'sword' (Boyce 1977: 81) or Middle Persian *šafsēr / šamšēr* 'sword' (MacKenzie 1971: 78-79) (cf. Ciancaglini 2008: 225).

[19] Type refers to a pattern, whereas token refers to actual instances of said pattern.

ܦܢܩܝܬܐ *pnqyt'* 'collection, volume' (23.21) < πινακίδιον (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1405)

ܦܪܨܘܦܐ *prṣwp'* 'face, person' (8.13; 11.14; 15.9; 17.4; 22.11; 25.4; 31.5; 42.13) < πρόσωπον (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1533)

ܩܘܒܪܢܝܛܐ *qwbrnyṭ'* 'helmsman' (16.1) < κυβερνήτης (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1004)

ܩܝܢܕܘܢܘܣ *qyndwnws* 'danger' (38.5; 39.8) < κίνδυνος (Liddell and Scott 1996: 952)

ܩܝܬܪܐ *qytr'* 'cithern' (6.1; 7.17; 14.8; 26.3) < κιθάρα, κίθαρις (Liddell and Scott 1996: 950)

ܬܓܡܐ *tgm'* 'legion, troop; order, command' (35.4) < τάγμα (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1752)

In the *Odes of Solomon*, there is also one verbal root that is ultimately of Greek origin, and it occurs two times:

(10) ܦܝܣ √*pys* Ct 'to obey' (8.17; 39.8) < πεῖσαι (Liddell and Scott 1996: 1353-1354)

Given that there are a number of Greek loanwords in the *Odes of Solomon* and that there are Greek particles in the earliest layer of Syriac literature (pre-4th cent.), the early date of the *Odes of Solomon* would not seem to be a sufficient reason for rejecting the analysis of ܡܢ in ܘܗܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܠܚܠ ܕܚܬܢܬܐ ܐܪܙܐ as the particle ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν). Rather, this proposal allows for an acceptable grammatical analysis of the word in question without resorting to emendation. Thus, it is proposed that ܡܢ in ܘܗܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܠܚܠ ܕܚܬܢܬܐ ܐܪܙܐ (Ode 18.8) is the earliest known attestation of ܡܢ *man* (< Greek μέν) in Syriac.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Azar, E. 1996. *Les Odes de Salomon*. Paris.

Beck, E. 1957a. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses* (CSCO 169-170). Louvain.

_____. 1957b. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Paradiso und Contra Julianum* (CSCO 174-175). Louvain.

_____. 1961. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Carmina Nisibena*, vol. 1 (CSCO 218-219). Louvain.

_____. 1963. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Carmina Nisibena*, vol. 2 (CSCO 240-241). Louvain.

_____. 1966. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Sermo de Domino Nostro* (CSCO 270-271). Louvain.

Boyce, M. 1977. *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Leiden.

Bremmer, J. N. 2001. "The *Acts of Thomas*: Place, Date and Women," in his *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*. Louvain. 74-90.

Brock, S. P. 1967. "Greek Words in the Syriac Gospels (*vet* and *pe*)," *Le Muséon* 80 (1967): 389-426.

_____. 1975. "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," in A. Dietrich (ed.), *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*. Göttingen. 80-108. (= Brock 1984: IV)

_____. 1976. "Ephrem's Letter to Publius," *Le Muséon* 89: 261-305.

_____. 1984. *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London.

_____. 1995. *Isaac of Nineveh (Isaac the Syrian). 'The Second Part', Chapters IV-XLI* (CSCO 554-555). Louvain.

_____. 1996. "Greek Words in Syriac: Some General Features," *Scripta classica Israelica* 15: 251-262. (= Brock 1999: XV)

_____. 1999. *From Ephrem to Romanos. Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*. Aldershot.

Brockelmann, C. 1928. *Lexicon Syriacum* (2nd ed). Halis Saxonum.

Brooks, E. W. 1907. *Vitae virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum* (CSCO 7-8). Louvain.

_____. 1923-1925. *John of Ephesus. Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 1-3 (PO 17.1; 18.4; 19.2). Paris.

Butts, A. M. Forthcoming. "Between Aramaic *ʾiḏayn* and Greek δέ: The Linguistic History of Syriac *den*," in H. Teule, E. Keser-Kayaalp, K. Akalın, N. Doru, M. S. Toprak (eds.), *Syriac in its Multi-Cultural Context* (Eastern Christian Studies). Louvain.

Charlesworth, J. H. 1973. *The Odes of Solomon*. Oxford.

_____. 1981. *Papyri and Leather Manuscripts of the Odes of Solomon*. Durham.

_____. 1998. *Critical Reflections on the Odes of Solomon*, Vol. 1. *Literary Setting, Textual Studies, Gnosticism, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 2). Sheffield.

Ciancaglini, C. A. 2008. *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. Wiesbaden.

Coakley, J. F. 2002. *Robinson's Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar* (5th ed.). Oxford.

Franzmann, M. 1991. *The Odes of Solomon. An Analysis of the Poetical Structure and Form* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 20). Freiburg.

Haelewyck, J.-C. 2005. *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera. Versio syriaca III. Orationes XXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX* (Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 53 – Corpus Nazianzenum 18). Turnhout – Louvain.

Harris, R. and A. Mingana. 1916. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, vol. 1. Manchester.

_____. 1920. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, vol. 2. Manchester.

Hinz, W. 1975. *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. Wiesbaden.

Humbert, J. 1972. *Syntaxe grecque* (3rd ed.). Paris.

Jeffery, A. 1938. *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qurʾān*. Baroda.

Kiraz, G. A. 1996. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels*. Leiden.

Kmosko, M. *Liber Graduum* (Patrologia Syriaca 1.3). Paris.

Lattke, M. 1993a. "Die griechischen Wörter im syrischen Text der *Oden Salomos*," *ARAM* 5: 285-302. (= Lattke 1979-1998: 4.133-150)

_____. 1993b. "Dating the *Odes of Solomon*," *Antichthon* 27: 45-59. (= Lattke 1979-1998: 4.113-132)

_____. 1979-1998. *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*, 1-4 (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 25/1-4). Freiburg.

_____. 1995. *Oden Salomos* (FC 19). Freiberg.

_____. 1999-2005. *Oden Salomos. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, 1-3 (Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 41.1-3). Göttingen.

_____. 2009. *Odes of Solomon. A Commentary* (Hermeneia). Minneapolis.

Liddell, H. and R. Scott (revised by H. Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie). 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford.

MacKenzie, D. N. 1971. *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary.* London.

Mitchell, C. 1912-1921. *Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan* (2 vols.). London.

Moreschini, C. and P. Gallay. 1990. *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41* (CS 358). Paris.

Nau, F. 1905. *Histoires d'Ahoudemmeh et de Marouta* (PO 3.1). Paris.

Nöldeke, Th. 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar. Translated from the second and improved German edition by James A. Crichton.* Leipzig.

Overbeck, J. J. 1865. *S. Ephraemi Syri Rabulae episcopi Edesseni Balaei aliorumque Opera selecta.* Oxford.

Parisot, I. 1894-1907. *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes* (Patrologia Syriaca 1, 2). Paris.

Payne Smith, R. 1879-1901. *Thesaurus Syriacus.* Oxford.

Phillips, G. 1869. *A Letter by Mār Jacob, Bishop of Edessa on Syriac Orthography.* London.

Reinink, G. J. 1993. *Die syrische Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius* (CSCO 540-541). Louvain.

Sokoloff, M. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum.* Winona Lake – Piscataway.

Tavernier, J. 2007. *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.)* (OLA 158). Louvain.

Taylor, D. G. K. 2002. "Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia," in J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*. Oxford. 298-331.

Van Rompay, L. 1994. "Some Preliminary Remarks on the Origins of Classical Syriac as a Standard Language," in G. Goldenberg and Sh. Raz (eds.), *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*. Wiesbaden. 70-89.

Voigt, R. 1999-2000. "Griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen: Eine Bibliographie," *Graeco-Arabica* 7/8: 555-570.

Wright, W. 1867. "Two Epistles of Mār Jacob, Bishop of Edessa," *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record* 10: 430-460.

_____. 1870-1872. *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1838*. London.

_____. 1871a. *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. London.

_____. 1871b. *Fragments of the* ܟܬܒܐ ܕܣܘܪܝܐ ܬܘܪܨ or *Syriac Grammar of Jacob of Edessa*. Clerkenwell.

Wright, W. and N. McLean. 1898. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphili, 265-339, Bishop of Caesarea*. London.

Zadok, R. 1976. Review of Hinz 1975. *BiOr* 33: 213-219.