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*Introduction*

Between the years 815 and 817, at the court of the Armenian Prince Ašot Ibn Smbāt Msaker, a theological dispute between the Melkite Bishop of Ḥarrān Theodore Abû Qurrah\(^1\) and the Miaphysite Archdeacon Nonnus of Nisibis\(^2\) took place.\(^3\) The

---

\(^*\) This publication resulted from research funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 758732 – FLOS. Florilegia Syriaca).

\(^1\) Theodore Abû Qurrah was born in the city of Edessa between 740 and 755. He studied medicine, philosophy and theology and spoke Greek, Syriac and Arabic. In 795 he was consecrated Bishop of the city of Harrān. He was the theologian of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Thomas I, between 807 and 820. In addition, it is said that he travelled to Baghdad and participated in dialogues with Muslim scholars and with other Christian theologians of non-Chalcedonian confessions. Abû Qurrah died shortly after a dispute he had with the Caliph al-Maʾmūn, probably in the year 830. He wrote in Arabic, Greek and Syriac. For more details see Lamoreaux 2009. For his works see the English translation enriched with an introduction and comments by Lamoreaux 2005.

\(^2\) The information regarding Nonnus of Nisibis is concentrated on four historical incidents, the most important one being his meeting and disputation with the Melkite Abû Qurrah. One other historical event in which his name appears is the acts of a local Miaphysite synod that took place at Reshʿayna between 827–828. In this synod his testimony was used to depose the Miaphysite bishop of Nisibis Philoxenus. It is also recorded that during the Abbasid Caliphate of al-Mutawakkil and between the years 856 and 861, that is until the death of the Caliph, Nonnus was imprisoned with some other Christian theologians. In this period, he wrote his four surviving Syriac writings. The precise date of his death is unknown; the last historical event, where he was involved, occurred in 862 when he attended a synod the Armenian Church convoked in Shirakawan (Dorfmann-Lazarev 2004, 68–70). For more details on Nonnus see Penn 2011.

\(^3\) On the beginning of the Christian Theology in Arabic, see, among others, Griffith 2007, and Tännous 2018.
reason for this meeting was Abū Qurrah’s mission to convert the Miaphysites to Chalcedonianism. In fact, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Thomas (d. 820), in the year 812 asked Abū Qurrah to write a letter, which would be sent to the Prince of the Armenians, known today as Epistle to Armenians. This letter was also translated into Greek and sent to the Byzantine Emperor, an event that shows the political dimension of the mission of Abū Qurrah, which started immediately among the Miaphysites in Egypt, in Syria and finally in Armenia.

According to some historical sources, like that of Michael the Syrian and of the Armenian Chronicle of Vardan (1271), the Prince himself, before taking a final decision regarding the acceptance of the doctrine of Chalcedon, asked the aid of the Miaphysite and West-Syrian Patriarch Quryaqos (d. 817), who chose the Archdeacon Nonnus to be sent to the Armenians. Nonnus was young and without great experience in disputing and confuting other Christian confessions and teachings; thus, he asked the help of his master, the West-Syrian and famous theologian Ḥabīb Ibn Hidmah Abū Rāʾīṭah al-Takrīṭī. According to the same Abū Rāʾīṭah, however, Ašot himself asked his presence, but for some unclear reasons he refused to go to

---

4 For an English translation of this letter to the Armenians see Lamoreaux 2005, 83–95.
5 See in regards Keating 2003, 41.
7 See for details Keating 2006b, 38–40.
8 See Keating 2006b, 36–38.
9 On this important figure see Witakowski 2011.
10 He lived between the eighth and ninth centuries and was one of the most important apologists and theologians of his time. He was active at the centre of Tagrit, city situated in present-day Iraq between Baghdad and Mosul, and celebrated at that period its golden age; see Suermann 2006, 225–27. For this reason, he was known as ‘al-Takrīṭī’. Some Armenian chronicles use for Abū Rāʾīṭah the title vardapet, a title given usually to apologists and teachers of theology that corresponds to the Syriac malphnō. Abū Rāʾīṭah belonged to the generation of those Christian authors who felt the necessity to translate, express and even to write theology in Arabic, the new lingua franca; see Chapter 1 in Ebeid 2019. He then was involved in discussions with non-Miaphysite Christians, defending Miaphysite theology, as well as with Muslim scholars defending Christian doctrine against Islamic accusations. For more detail, see Keating 2006b, 32–56; see also Griffith 1980.
Armenia, and asked his disciple and relative Nonnus of Nisibis to go in his place. Abū Rāʾīṭah, in addition, who probably had already dealt and discussed such topics in previous writings, prepared a letter to be read before Ašot. In this letter, known today as Introductory Letter to Ašot Msaker: Refutation of the Melkites on the Union [of the Divinity and Humanity in Christ], Abū Rāʾīṭah starts by apologizing for not being present at the court, and then he exposit his defense of the Miaphysite doctrine against the one of Chalcedon. After hearing this letter it seems that Ašot decided to remain faithful to Miaphysite doctrine.

On the return of Nonnus and after having been informed by him about the meeting, Abū Rāʾīṭah wrote a second letter against, as he asserts, the false claims of Abū Qurrah, known today as Second Letter to Ašot Msaker: Evidence for the Threefold Praise of the One Who Was Crucified for Us (hereafter Second Letter to Ašot). In the first letter Abū Rāʾīṭah deals, as S. Keating notes, with some of the topics he had read in Abū Qurrah’s Epistle to Armenians, topics whose epicentre was the metaphysical problems and risks in the Trinitarian doctrine as a consequence of Christological teaching. By contrast, in the

11 See in this regard Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 65; while for possible reasons for Abū Rāʾīṭah’s rejection, see Keating 2006b, 36.
12 For this version of the events, see Keating 2006b, 35–36.
13 Abū Rāʾīṭah wrote in Arabic and his works have mostly an apologetic character and should be considered the starting point of Miaphysite Christian theological production in Arabic. His writings can be categorized into two main groups: 1) polemics against non-Miaphysite Christians, mainly Melkites; and 2) apologetic works in relation to Muslims. For a description of his works and their topics see Keating 2006b, 56–65; Keating 2009, 571–81. There are various editions of his writings: a critical edition of all his extant writings with German translation made by Georg Graf, see Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951. A new critical edition for his writings in relation to Islam with English translation was made by Keating 2009, 73–357. It must be also mentioned that there are partial editions of some of his writings made by Salim Daccache. In this paper I will follow the edition of Georg Graf.
15 For studies on this letter see Keating 2003. See also Suermann 1994.
16 Text number IV according to Graf’s edition: Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 73–87.
17 Cf. Keating 2006b, 44.
18 It must be mentioned that Abū Rāʾīṭah deals with the same topics in his work against the Melkites called ‘The Refutation of the Melkites’, text num-
second letter, it seems that Abū Rāʾīṭah chose to deal with some of those topics the Melkite Bishop developed before Ašot that were not discussed by him in the first letter, especially the accusation against the addition into the Trisagion hymn. Abū Rāʾīṭah also deals with that topic in another work entitled Evidence for the Threefold Praise for the One Crucified for Us (hereafter On the Threefold Praise).19

In this paper I study these two writings of Abū Rāʾīṭah in which he defends the addition into the Trisagion and, consequently, its Christological use and mainly its Theopaschite doctrine. My analysis will focus on the different argumentation our author presents in both texts, like the linguistic, biblical, liturgical, metaphysical, soteriological proofs, and above all the patristic testimonies he provides. Thus, the main purpose of the article is to present and analyse the patristic florilegium, i.e. collection of patristic quotations, Abū Rāʾīṭah provides at the end of his Second Letter to Ašot as an evidence of the correctness of his doctrine. In addition, I will deal with the probable sources of these quotations and the relationship between our author and the different patristic Syriac florilegia of the Miaphysite Church, which were composed for educational use and apologetical purpose.20

19 Text number V according to Graf’s edition: ABŪ RĀʾĪTA 1951, 88–93.
20 The ERC-Project: FLOS, Florilegia Syriaca, deals with different Syriac patristic florilegia. One of the main purposes of this project is to produce a digital critical edition of some of these florilegia, the original Greek of the patristic quotations where it exists, and a translation. Another objective is the study of the content of these florilegia, as well as their impact on the Arabic Miaphysite literature. For more information visit the official website https://www.unive.it/pag/40548/. Among these florilegia there are Christological florilegia (refuting the Chalcedonian and Nestorian Christologies); Anti-Julianist florilegia (refuting the doctrine of Julian of Halicarnassus) and Trinitarian florilegia (on the metaphysical function of the terms like substance, nature, hypostasis and person in Trinitarian doctrine, having as a basis Miaphysite Christology and its metaphysical background). It must be noted that there are already some studies on some of these different florilegia; see, for example, FURLANI 1924, VAN ROEY 1992, TER HAAR ROMENY 2007, and WATT 2018.
1. The Addition into the Trisagion Hymn

After the Council of Chalcedon, and precisely during the years 465–471, in Antioch the Christological controversy between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites began to focus on the soteriological Theopaschism, that is, attributing to God the Word crucifixion, passions and death.\(^{21}\) During this controversy, Miaphysites, starting with the Patriarch of Antioch Peter the Fuller (471–488), interpolated the Trisagion hymn ‘Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us’, by adding at the end the expression ‘who was crucified for us’, giving to this liturgical hymn\(^{22}\) a Christological dimension.\(^{23}\) This interpolation should be considered one of the liturgical practices Miaphysites used so they could confirm their Christological doctrine.\(^{24}\)

There is no clear historical evidence regarding the origins of the Trisagion hymn. According to scholars like S. Brock, each confession in the East has its own tradition in this regard.\(^{25}\) This liturgical hymn however, and after its interpolation in the second half of the fifth century, was at the centre of the Christological controversy.\(^{26}\) When Miaphysites started their propaganda in diffusing their Theopaschite doctrine, using this interpolated hymn in liturgy, Chalcedonians began their polemics against this addition.\(^{27}\) As D. Viezure notes, at the beginning of the sixth century Chalcedonians started, as sign of their rejection of the addition, to give a Trinitarian interpretation of the Trisagion hymn.\(^{28}\) This argumentation continued to be at the centre of their polemic, especially after the Triumph of Neo-Chalcedonianism, under the reign of Justinian (527–565), and

---

\(^{21}\) On this topic, see Viezure 2009.

\(^{22}\) For the liturgical use of the Trisagion (especially in the East), see Janeras 2001.

\(^{23}\) See Varghese 2008; see also Viezure 2009, 79–88.

\(^{24}\) It must be said that both sides, Chalcedonians and Miaphysites, tried to give their Christological doctrines an echo in their liturgical hymns and rubrics. See Viezure 2009, 73; see also Kruger 2005.


\(^{26}\) In this regard, see Klum-Böhmer 1979.

\(^{27}\) See Viezure 2009, 121–29, 131–60; see also Viezure 2010.

\(^{28}\) See Viezure 2009, 154–55; see also Janeras 1967.
the establishment of the Neo-Chalcedonian Theopaschism. It must be mentioned, finally, that also the East-Syrian dyophysites, the so-called Nestorians, refused the Miaphysite addition, but their reasons were based solely on their total rejection of Theopaschism.

2. Abū Qurrah’s Theopaschism

In his surviving writings against Miaphysites (including Armenians) Abū Qurrah does not make any mention of the Trisagion hymn. Among his writings, however, one might find those passages where he defends the Neo-Chalcedonian Christology and the Neo-Chalcedonian Theopaschite formula which permits, according to him, to declare that the Son of God, being the real saviour of human beings, was really crucified and died for us according to his humanity, but not according to his divinity.

In fact, this element was central in his *Epistle to the Armenians*. He claims in that text that an Orthodox Theopaschite formula, which leads to correct soteriology, whose centre is Christ, Son and Word of God, is based on both the distinction between nature and hypostasis – made at Chalcedon and developed by the Neo-Chalcedonians – and the concept that in the

29 See Viezure 2009, 161–214. It must be noted that not all the Chalcedonians could accept a Theopaschite formula, therefore, the first polemics against the Christological Trisagion had also an anti-Theopaschite character. With the establishment, however, of the Neo-Chalcedonian Theopaschite formula, the polemic against the addition was focused solely on the Trisagion’s Trinitarian interpretation.

30 See, for example, a forthcoming paper of mine that will be published with the Acts of the XII Symposium Syriacum that took place in Rome, 19–21 August 2016. The volume of the Acts will be published with the Pontifical Oriental Institute.


32 Correct soteriology for Abu Qurrah means that the Son of God did not submit to all human characteristics out of necessity, but he chose and freely willed to do so in his human flesh united to his divinity in his hypostasis for our salvation; see Lamoreaux 2005, 92–94.

hypostasis of the Word the two natures, the human and the divine, were united with distinction and without confusion. This metaphysical distinction, in addition, is the basis, according to the same letter, for a correct Trinitarian dogma, which permits neither adding a fourth hypostasis into the Trinity, nor considering the three divine hypostases three gods, or one thing. And since God, taking as a basis Gregory of Nazianzus’ doctrine, is ‘a Monad adored in Trinity and Trinity in Monad’, Abū Qurrah affirms that the monad is of the nature while the Trinity is of the hypostases.

As said above, from the reactions of Abū Rāʾiṭah in his Second Letter to Ašot, it seems that at the court of the Armenian Prince Abū Qurrah, besides the points highlighted above, he had also polemicized against the addition in the Trisagion hymn and its Christological use. This polemic, as we shall see in the analysis below, was in close relationship with all the points presented above: metaphysics, Trinitarian doctrine, Christology and Orthodox Theopaschism. Through the reading of the introduction of Abū Rāʾiṭah’s Second Letter to Ašot, one gets the impression that Abū Qurrah followed in his argumentation the principle lex orandi, lex credenda. Therefore, Abū Rāʾiṭah felt the necessity to apply, in his confutation, also this same principle, following the preceding Miaphysite tradition like the one of Philoxenus of Mabbug, but to this topic I shall return later.

3. Abū Rāʾiṭah’s Defence

According to Abū Rāʾiṭah, the main arguments raised against the Miaphysite addition into the Trisagion are that (a) the hymn is Trinitarian and (b) with the addition, crucifixion would be

35 See Gregorius Nazianzenus, Patrologia Graeca 35, 1221. 43–46.
37 Abū Rāʾiṭah 1951, 73.
38 On the relationship between theology and liturgy, see Kavanagh 1984, 89–93.
39 See Michelson 2014, 156.
attributed to the Trinity. These, in fact, are the traditional Neo-Chalcedonian reasons for rejecting the Christological use of this hymn. Thus, to defend this use Abū Rāʾīthah offers an interesting apology that can be divided according to the following points: 1) linguistic proof; 2) proper use of metaphysics for Trinitarian and Christological doctrines; 3) biblical testimonies; 4) Christological-soteriological argumentation; and finally 5) Patristic testimonies. In my analysis I will follow this articulation, even if our author does not expose his arguments systematically since for him the points are related to each other.

3.1 Linguistic Proof

Abū Rāʾīthah asks his enemies on which linguistic bases they could affirm that the invocation ‘Holy God’ refers to the Father and means ‘Holy is the Father’, while ‘Holy Almighty’ refers to the Son and means ‘Holy is the Son’, and ‘Holy Immortal’ refers to the Holy Spirit and means ‘Holy is the Holy Spirit’. As a result, and from this point of view, the Trisagion hymn cannot be merely a Trinitarian invocation, as Melkites claim, but also Christological; therefore, he considers the addition valid.

In addition, it must be mentioned that Abū Rāʾīthah is aware that the Greek version, linguistically, differs a bit from the Syriac one, and therefore he takes into examination also the Greek to confirm his opinion.

40 Abū Rāʾīthah 1951, 88.
41 Abū Rāʾīthah 1951, 92.
42 Abū Rāʾīthah 1951, 93. As will be seen in the point ‘Christological-soteriological argumentation’, Abū Rāʾīthah does not consider the Trinitarian interpretation incorrect, but appropriate more to the angels who, unlike human beings, had no need for a saviour.

43 The Greek Chalcedonian version ‘Ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, Ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, Ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς’ might be translated with ‘Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us’, while the Syriac Miaphysite version ‘ܠܝܢܥܐܬܪܚܡܚܠܦܝܢ,ܐܨܛܠܒܕܡܝܘܬܐ،ܐܢܬܕܝܫܐܩܚܝܠܬܢܐ،ܐܢܬܩܕܝܫܐܗܐ’ is translated with ‘Holy art thou, O God; holy art thou, O Mighty; holy art thou, O Immortal who was crucified for us; have mercy upon us’; see Michelson 2014, 155.

44 Abū Rāʾīthah 1951, 92–93.
3.2 Proper Use of Metaphysics

For our author a Trinitarian use of the Trisagion can be accepted only in the case that it was invoked to the Godhead, that is to the three divine persons together, since the being God, Mighty and Immortal is the common characteristic for the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. However, such an explanation cannot be realized according to the Chalcedonian Trinitarian doctrine and metaphysical system according to which substance and hypostasis are distinguished. Already in his first letter to Ašot, Abū Rāʾītah had dealt with this problem in detail, to which he also dedicates a long treatise known today as the *Refutation of the Melkites*.\(^{45}\) In these two works, however, there is no reference to Theopaschism and the addition into the Trisagion.

For Abū Rāʾītah, then, Melkites after Chalcedon cannot anymore consider the distinction between substance and hypostasis as the one between ‘common’ and ‘particular’, that is, the metaphysical system of the Cappadocians.\(^{46}\) If they do so, their distinction is neither true nor serious, but simply allegorical,\(^{47}\) since with their distinction they cannot claim that the one Godhead, as one nature and substance, is the same, without addition or omission, in each one of the three divine hypostases.\(^{48}\) In fact, the distinction between the common and the particular means that the three hypostases share everything that belong to the common Godhead, like holiness, glory, sovereignty and mighty; through the particular property, each hypostasis is distinguished from the others.\(^{49}\) Consequently, if Christians, with the Trisagion hymn, invoke God as Trinity, by necessity they must attribute being God, Mighty and Immortal to the three persons since these are common attributes. The Melkite metaphysical system does not permit this,\(^{50}\) since according to Abū Rāʾītah’s metaphysical system, the divine substance is the sum

---

\(^{45}\) Text number VII according to Graf’s edition; ABŪ RĀʾĪṬA 1951, 105–30.

\(^{46}\) On the Cappadocian thought, see, among others, the recent study of ZACHHUBER 2020, 15–71. See also TURCESCU 2005, HILDEBRAND 2007, and RADDÉ-GALLWITZ 2009.

\(^{47}\) ABŪ RĀʾĪṬA 1951, 74.

\(^{48}\) ABŪ RĀʾĪṬA 1951, 74.

\(^{49}\) ABŪ RĀʾĪṬA 1951, 75.

\(^{50}\) ABŪ RĀʾĪṬA 1951, 74.
total of its hypostases, that is, Godhead is the three hypostases and the three hypostases are the one Godhead. Melkites, however, distinguishing between substance and hypostasis, as Abū Rāʾīṭah understands their doctrine, cannot claim anymore the commonness of the divine substance for the three hypostases, because the Trinity for them is quaternity: from one hand the three hypostases and from the other the substance.\(^{51}\)

As a consequence, and because the Son, the second person of the Trinity, is God, Mighty and Immortal, and since he was so also during the crucifixion, the same Trisagion hymn can have a Christological dimension through the addition ‘who was crucified for us’. For Abū Rāʾīṭah the rejection of the hymn with the Christological addition means denying that the crucified was really God the saviour,\(^{52}\) a point that will be discussed further.

Finally, our author is aware that the Melkites can accuse Miaphysites of limiting being God, Mighty and Immortal only to the Son. To answer to a such hypothetical accusation Abū Rāʾīṭah refers to the Lord’s Prayer. In Matthew 6. 9–13 this prayer begins with ‘And pray to your heavenly Father…’, and ends with ‘to you is the reign, power, glory….’\(^{53}\) He wonders, since the prayer is addressed to the Father, whether the reign, power and glory are exclusive to him, or, instead, whether these attributes are shared also with the Son and the Holy Spirit. Abū Rāʾīṭah concludes this point highlighting that if a common attribute is associated in a prayer or a text just with one person of the Trinity, does not mean that the other persons do not share that attribute.\(^{54}\) Consequently, using the Trisagion with a Christological dimension does not mean rejecting the attribution of being God, Mighty and Immortal to the Father and the Holy Spirit.

\(^{51}\) It must be mentioned that in a forthcoming publication of mine I aim to analyse how Abū Rāʾīṭah understands the Miaphysite Trinitarian doctrine and how and for which reasons he polemizes against the one of the Melkites. The paper will be published in the acts of the conference ‘Florilegia Syriaca: Mapping a Knowledge – Organizing Practice in the Syriac World’ that took place at Ca’ Foscari university, Venice, 30 January – 1 February 2020.

\(^{52}\) Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 74.

\(^{53}\) It must be noted that the conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer in our text follows the Eastern versions which end with the phrase ‘to you is the reign, power, glory…’.

\(^{54}\) Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 75.
3.3 Biblical Argumentation

The reference to the Lord’s Prayer is not the only biblical passage used by Abū Rāʾiṭah to prove the correctness of his doctrine regarding the addition. His *On the Threefold Praise* should be considered a collection of biblical *testimonia* with which he tries to show that the Bible calls the Word ‘God’, ‘Mighty’ and ‘Immortal’. Before analyzing how he quotes and uses these verses it must be noted that Abū Rāʾiṭah, to be able to quote the Bible as proof for his doctrine, gives first a clear Christological interpretation for the Trisagion hymn and how its three attributes are seen in the Son of God:

Holy art thou, O God, who became man for us without change and remained God as he was; Holy art thou, O Mighty, who by manifesting weakness revealed what is more glorious than power; Holy art thou, O Immortal, who was crucified for us and wilfully bore death and received it in his body on the cross, and it was perceived that he died but [in fact] he did not die, have mercy upon us.⁵⁶

Abū Rāʾiṭah, then, concludes that if the Melkites do not accept this hymn as Christological, this means that they reject confessing that God was incarnate without change or division, that he himself was crucified for us and that he is truly God, Mighty and Immortal. Consequently, they deny the truth revealed in the Holy Scriptures⁵⁷ as attested in a) John 1. 1, which declares that the Word is God; b) the prophecy of Isaiah 9. 6, which offers proof that he, the Word, is Mighty; and c) the words of Moses in Deuteronomy 28. 66, which manifest that the Word is Immortal.⁵⁸ Moreover, and further buttressing his apology, Abū Rāʾiṭah quotes Hebrews 12. 1–2 and Acts 3. 15, and in this way tries to interpret the Bible with the Bible, or better to say, the Old Testament in the light of the New.

---


⁵⁶ قدوس الله الذى تأنس من اجلنا بغير تغيير وبقى على حال لاهوته. قدوس القوي الذى اظهر ما هو اعظم من القوة باظهاره الضعف. قدوس الذى لا يموت الذى صلب دوننا وصبر على الموت طوعاً وقدة في جسد على الصليب وظهر انه من ولد لايميت ارجمنا Abū Rāʾiṭa 1951, 89. Translation is mine.

⁵⁷ Abū Rāʾiṭa 1951, 89–90.

⁵⁸ Abū Rāʾiṭa 1951, 90.
Finally, to confute the accusation that the Trisagion is merely a Trinitarian hymn, Abū Rāʾīṭah refers to Revelation 4. 8, and especially to the hymn with which the angels glorify the Lord: ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God almighty, who was, and who is, and who is to come’. Our author explains that this hymn, although includes a trisagion, is not addressed to the Holy Trinity but to the Word: ‘who was’ means the eternal Word, ‘who is’ indicates his manifestation in flesh and ‘who is to come’ proclaims his second advent. In this way, this biblically attested Christological hymn validates the Christological addition into the Trisagion by Miaphysites.

3.4 Christological-Soteriological Argumentation

Abū Rāʾīṭah, following the Miaphysite tradition, accuses Abū Qurrah of being crypto-Nestorian. Even if the Melkites have declared Christ one hypostasis, this was simply a play on words, since they continued to profess two natures. Their doctrine therefore creates problematic consequences in the soteriological view of the Christian message: the saviour is one and he is God and not a human being. Consequently, Christ must be identified with God the Word the saviour and thus he cannot be professed of two natures, two hypostases and two wills. Even if the Neo-Chalcedonian soteriological view, as one might see it in the doctrine of Abū Qurrah presented briefly above, agrees with that of the Miaphysites, Abū Rāʾīṭah considers the duality of the natures a duality of subjects. If for the Melkites the one who endured crucifixion, suffering and death for our salvation was really, and not allegorically, the Son of God, i.e. truly God, Mighty and Immortal, then they would accept the Christological version of the Trisagion. It is evident that our author depends directly on the thought of Philoxenus of

59 Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 91.
60 See Ebeid 2019, 393–99.
61 Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 73–74.
64 In this regard, see the long discussion he makes regarding the question of who was the crucified in Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 82–83.
Mabbug in this regard, that he additionally develops it more and affirms that by refuting this version of the Trisagion, and accepting solely the Trinitarian – in which the glorified one is simply the Holy God, the Mighty and the Immortal, and not the crucified – the Melkites show themselves similar to the Jews, Muslims, Magi and even to the Manicheans, besides being actually Nestorians.

This does not mean that our author rejects the Trinitarian Trisagion, but that he considers the Trinitarian version more appropriate to the angels, who chant it continuously to God according to the vision of Isaiah 6. 1–3. The angels, in fact, had no need for a saviour. Humankind, however, was saved by God himself through the cross; therefore, it is more appropriate for human beings, who believe in the salvific action of God the Word, to invoke the Christological version of the Trisagion. This is the reason for which the angelic hymn was interpreted Christologically in the Book of Revelation, as we saw above, and as consequence, the Miaphysites, besides the famous Trisagion hymn, chant that of Isaiah ‘Holy, Holy, Holy’ also with the addition ‘who was crucified for us’. According to the interpretation of Abū Rāʾīṭah, this latter hymn – with the addition – remains Trinitarian and becomes, at the same time, Christological: Holy art thou, O Father, Holy art thou, O Spirit, Holy art thou, O Son who was crucified for us.

To demonstrate the correctness of his position our author a) gives some biblical testimonies, like John 1. 18, Revelation 1. 7–8, and 2. 8. b) He quotes a passage of the Nicene Creed highlighting that the Creed professes that the saviour who came down from heaven is the Son of God who was crucified

---

65 See the opinion of Philoxenus when he defends the Trisagion against the polemic of Habib in Michelson 2014, 158.
66 Our author never mentions the Muslims by name, one of the titles he uses for them, and used in this passage, is ahl al-tayammun, i.e. the people of the south, see Keating 2006b, 63–64.
67 Abū Rāʾīṭah 1951, 92.
68 Abū Rāʾīṭah 1951, 93.
69 Abū Rāʾīṭah 1951, 77.
70 Abū Rāʾīṭah 1951, 91–92.
c) He refers to liturgical hymns from other traditions, where the Trisagion is also used as a Christological hymn, developing in detail the affirmation of Philoxenus of Mabbug according to which the Trisagion with the addition is not an innovation but a common hymn received in all the churches everywhere.  

For this last point Abū Rāʾītah mentions as an example the Maronites, who were Syrian Christians that accepted Chalcedon, but not the doctrine on the two wills and energies in Christ, and affirms that they use the same Trisagion with the same addition. This demonstrates that the Christological version of the Trisagion was not exclusive for the Miaphysite, as Melkites and Nestorians usually claim. He also refers to the Ὅ Μονογενὴς Υἱὸς hymn, composed by Justinian the Emperor, with which he wanted to proclaim the victory of the Neo-Chalcedonian Theopaschite formula. Abū Rāʾītah wonders how the Melkites accept for themselves to chant a hymn addressed to the Son of God, with which they praise his salvific action, while they prohibit the Miaphysetes from doing the same thing with the Trisagion. He finally mentions the hymn of Isaiah, according to the version of the Book of Revelation, that is, the Sanctus hymn. Melkites also chant this hymn during

71 Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 75–76.
72 For the opinion of Philoxenus see the quotation and the comment made by Michelson 2014, 158.
73 It is a common opinion among the Melkites, Miaphysetes and Nestorians that the Maronites were Syrians who accepted Chalcedon but refused the doctrine on the two wills, see for example Ebeid 2019, 137, 282, 433. See also, among others, Ajam 1906, Gribomont 1974, Brock 1985, and Carcione 1990.
74 The Maronites used the Trisagion hymn with the addition until the sixteenth century, that is, until the Latinization of their liturgy. We have, in fact, the testimony of Thomas, the Maronite Bishop of Kafrtāb, who at the end of the eleventh century writes an apology against the accusations of the Melkites, where he also defends the addition in the Trisagion, see Chartouni 1986. Today, after Vatican II, they sing the Trisagion with the Christological addition during the feasts of the Lord, but throughout the rest of the year they chant it without the addition. For the use of the Trisagion hymn with the addition by the Maronite Church, see Hayek 1964, 87, El-Hayek 1974.
76 See Viezure 2009, 214. See also Janeras 2013.
77 Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 80–81.
their Eucharist prayer, precisely during the anaphora,\textsuperscript{78} so Abū Rāʾīṭah wonders again how they could permit themselves to use the hymn Christologically while at the same time polemicize against the Christological version of the Trisagion chanted by the Miaphysites.\textsuperscript{79} For our author, consequently, all these liturgical elements support the correctness of the position of the Miaphysites.

3.5 Patristic Testimonies

During and after the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries, the agreement with the previous great Church Fathers, the so-called \textit{consensus patrum}, was one of the main proofs of the Orthodoxy of one’s own doctrine. This method was followed also by Miaphysite authors like Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, Theodosius of Alexandria and Peter of Callinicum, who in their polemic and apologetic works either quote directly different Church Fathers, or, in other cases, refer to them and their doctrine indirectly, to demonstrate the concordance between them and the patristic tradition.

From the second half of the eighth century, and probably under the leadership of Quryaqos of Antioch, one might note another ‘new’ element that took place among the Miaphysites, a consequence of the use of the method of the \textit{consensus patrum}: the composition of various patristic florilegia.\textsuperscript{80} These florilegia provide collections of direct patristic quotations presented thematically and categorized in chapters, so that each chapter deals with one topic declared in its title.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{78} On the Sanctus hymn and its use in the Christian eucharistic prayer, see, among others, \textsc{Taft} 1991, \textsc{Taft} 1992, and \textsc{Spinks} 1991.

\textsuperscript{79} \textsc{Abū Rāʾīṭa} 1951, 81–82.

\textsuperscript{80} On the Miaphysite florilegia see the references mentioned in footnote 20. In addition, it must not be forgotten to mention that Patristic and Dogmatic florilegia were used also by Chalcedonians in the same way and for the same aim, see \textsc{Richard} 1950, and \textsc{Richard} 1951.

\textsuperscript{81} Among the manuscripts that contain Miaphysite Syriac Patristic Florilegia, see British Library, Add MS, 14532; British Library, Add MS, 14533; British Library, Add MS, 14538; British Library, Add MS, 12154 and British Library, Add MS, 12155.
Abū Rāʾīṭah, to come back to our author, provides a Christological Patristic florilegium at the end of his Second Letter to Ašot. Scholars who have studied his writings and thought unfortunately did not seriously consider his patristic material; in fact, they even did not raise the question regarding its importance for him and his probable sources. They limited themselves to referring to his use of some Church Fathers, mentioning their names and the context of their mentions.\textsuperscript{82} However, the Fathers for Abū Rāʾīṭah, especially in his polemics against Melkites, are of great importance, therefore, their presence in his writings cannot be disregarded. In fact, we read in the introduction he makes to the Christological Patristic florilegium the following:

And we must add to this discourse some testimonies of some pure Fathers, who are accepted generally by all believers and especially by Abū Qurrah and his partisans, who attribute murder, death, sacrifice and suffering to God the creator who neither dies nor suffers. And this was from their side [i.e. of the Fathers] as a clarification, without feeling disdain or shame, to fortify the certitude of the believers in that [i.e. Theopaschism]. So, we inform those who disagree with us that we follow the imams of truth and the conclusions of the ancestors who preceded us in this ancient doctrine. We follow their opinion. We affirm and we follow the example of what they followed as example. We consider good what they considered good, and we consider bad what they considered bad in each art and confession concerning the oneness of God, his salvific incorporation and incarnation and that he is the creator and saviour. This means [considering bad] each one who disagrees with us regarding the pure Fathers through his expression or through his tongue; opposing them means having resentment for all of them, in the correctness of the meaning and its sincerity.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{82} See, for example, Keating 2019, 158, 167, Keating 2003, 50–52, and Suermann 1994, 169.

\textsuperscript{83} «والقتل وشياضه المضيفة الصلب عامة ومن ابى قرة وهم الذين لا يموت ولا يتألق إنما يتألقون خالفهم ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، وأكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما ظل في ضيامى البلاط، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أكل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، أ كل الأشياء إلى الله، وذوا ما استحسنوه وذوا ما استحسنوه في كل شيء من الله، ولكل واحد من آباء القول من يحرفه شياصه يتجه إلى الله وتألم، A B O R A ʾ I Ṭ A, 83–84. Translation is mine.
This passage, along with the conclusion of the letter (as will be seen below), makes evident the great importance of the authority of the Fathers for our author. In his polemics against the Melkites he refers to those Fathers accepted by both Miaphysites and Melkites and consequently gives these Fathers more weight and significance: their doctrine is the criterion of Orthodoxy and therefore, it must be followed really and not just with words.

3.5.1 Abū Raʾīṭah’s Patristic Christological Florilegium

Abū Rāʾīṭah, in the introduction to his florilegium, declares that the main topic of the patristic material is Theopaschism, that is, attributing to God the Word passions and death. The comparative table that follows presents the patristic quotations together with their Greek originals, when it was possible to find these. In his German translation of the critical edition of the writings of our author, G. Graf has identified some of these quotations; ⁸⁴ I aim here to significantly extend Graf’s work, by identifying also the possible sources of Abū Rāʾīṭah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abū Rāʾīṭah’s Christological Patristic Florilegium ⁸⁵</th>
<th>Gregory the Ancient, known as Thaumaturgus, the Bishop of Caesarea, said in his seventh ⁸⁶ anathema:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>قال اغريغوريوس القديم الموصوف ذا العجاب اسفف قيسارية في الحرم السابع من حرومه:</td>
<td>εἴ τις λέγει ἄλλος ὁ παθὼν, καὶ ἄλλος ὁ μὴ παθὼν, καὶ μὴ ὀμολογεῖ αὐτὸν τὸν ἀπαθὴ θεὸν λόγον καὶ ἀτρέπτων αὐρικὶ Ἰδίᾳ παθόντα ἀτρέπτως, καθὼς γέγραπται ἀναθεματίζομαι. ⁸⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁸⁴ See Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 104–07.
⁸⁵ Abū Rāʾīṭa 1951, 84–86. Translation is mine.
⁸⁶ Sixth and not seventh.
⁸⁷ Gregorius Thaumaturgus 1950, 155. 1–3.
### Abū Rā‘īṭah’s Christological Patristic Florilegium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>And the pure Athanasius, the lamp of all the Church and its light, the Patriarch of Alexandria, says in his discourse on the salvific cross:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Ἀμέλει, κρινόμενος ὑπὸ Πιλάτου, ἔχρηματιζε τῇ τοῦτοῦ γυναικί· ἵνα τῇ μὲν σωπῇ τὴν ἀνδρίαν κατα- πλαγῇ· τῷ δὲ χρηματισμῷ γινώ- σκῃ.] 88 ὁτι οὐκ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν κρίνει. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>And the pure Basil, the Bishop of Caesarea, who through his thought cared for the Church in all parts of the earth, the East and the West, said in his discourse on Julitta the martyr:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through the death of the God of all in the incarnation, He extended life to all people. 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>And Gregory the Theologian said in his discourse on the pure Pascha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ἐδεήθημεν Θεοῦ σαρκοῦμεν καὶ νεκροῦμένου, ἵνα ζήσωμεν. 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>And from his saying also:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Πολλὰ μὲν δὴ τοῦ τότε καιροῦ τὰ θαύματα-Θεὸς σταυροῦμενος, ἢλιος σκοτιζόμενος, καὶ πάλιν ἀναφλεγό- μενος ἐδεί χάρ τι τὴν Κτίστη συμπαθεῖν καὶ τὰ κτίσματα. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>And from his saying also:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καίτοι τί τοῦτον παραδοξότερον, Θεὸν σταυροῦμενον βλέπειν. 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

88 This part of the quotation is omitted in the Arabic text, the author just mentions one word from it, i.e. ‘Pilate’.

89 Ps.- Athanasius Alexandrinus, Patrologia Graeca, 28, 209. 6–9.

90 Unidentified. As will be seen below, this probably is a Ps.-Basilian homily, since in Syriac it is called On Julitta the martyr and against Apollinaris.

91 Gregorius Nazianzenus, Patrologia Graeca, 36, 661. 36–37.

92 Gregorius Nazianzenus, Patrologia Graeca, 36, 661. 42–45.

93 Gregorius Nazianzenus 1908, 64. 2. 5–6.
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And that is from his saying:

μήπου τὸν λογισμὸν ὀκλάσῃς, αἵμα Θεοῦ, καὶ πάθος ἄκουσιν, καὶ θάνατον, [μήπου περιενεχθῆς ἄθεως, ὡς Θεοῦ συνήγορος] 94 -ἀλλ’ ἀνεπαισχύντως καὶ ἀνενδοιάστως, φάγε τὸ σῶμα, πίε τὸ αἷμα, εἰ τῆς ἱερής ἐπίθυμητικῶς ἔχεις 95

And from his saying also:

Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῷ φθόνῳ τοῦ πονηροῦ θάνατος εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ ὑφεῖλε διὰ τῆς ἀπάτης τὸν ἄνθρωπον, διὰ τοῦτο τῷ ἡμετέρῳ πάθει πάσχει Θεὸς, γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος 98

And from his saying in a discourse he gave on the New Sunday:

Τῶν γὰρ Εὐαγγελίων τὸ κεφάλαιον ἐντεῦθεν ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπον, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ ἀναστῆναι. Τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Γαβριὴλ εὐηγγελίζετο τῇ Παρθένῳ, τοῦτο καὶ οἱ προφῆται τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἅπαντες 99

And John the pure, known as Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, said in the 38th discourse of his commentary on the First Letter to the Corinthians:

Τῶν γὰρ Ἐυαγγελίων τὸ κεφάλαιον ἐντεῦθεν ἔχει τῇ ἀρχῇ, ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπον, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ ἀναστῆναι. Τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Γαβριὴλ εὐηγγελίζετο τῇ Παρθένῳ, τοῦτο καὶ οἱ προφῆται τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἅπαντες 99

(cont.)

94 The phrase between [ ] is omitted in the Arabic text.
96 Gregorius Nazianzenus 1974, Section 22. 4–5.
97 Gregorius Nazianzenus 1963, Section 5. 24.
98 Gregorius Nazianzenus, Patrologia Graeca, 36, 612. 18–22.
99 Joannes Chrysostomus, Patrologia Graeca, 61, 322. 55–323. 1.
Abū Rāʾiṭah’s Christological Patristic Florilegium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Arabic Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ومن قوله في سالم ثالث له تفسير رسالة العبرانيين فيها أن لا نزه في المحتجزة المحتاجة يقول عظة منه للناس</td>
<td>And from his saying in the third discourse of his commentary on the Letter to the Hebrews in which it is said not to be indifferent toward humiliated and needy people, but to preach a sermon to them:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>وإن ميلاطون أيسف اطيقا قال: إن ناصب الأرض انتصب على خشبية وتبُصُّر الرب في جسد عمار والأنثى قتل ذلك البر إسرائيل.</td>
<td>And Meletius Bishop of Antioch, said:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>وإن أفرام السرياني المثلان قال في مصحف له رد فيه على اليهود متعجبا لهم مستعذما الفعلهم قال: انظر إلى قلة عقل تلك الأمة ما أعظمه انها صلبت الله ولد تجزع.</td>
<td>And Ephrem the Syrian, the doctor, said in the book in which he refuted the Jews and marveled at their action: Look at the weak-mindedness of that nation how great it is, they crucified God and did not afraid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 Not Hebrews but Colossians.
102 As will be seen below, I think that the passage here is attributed to Melitus of Antioch. One should mention the opinion of G. Graf who sees in the Arabic Aṭīqā a syriacism, that is the Syriac name of Sardis, and therefore he thinks that our author means here Melito of Sardis, see Abū Rāʾiṭah 1951, 106–97, footnote 11.
103 Unidentified. Unfortunately, the writings of Meletius do not survive in the Greek original, although they are preserved as quoted fragments in works of other authors (cf. Clavis Patrum Graecorum 3415–20). However, in the Georgian language nine homilies are preserved, four related to the passion of God the Word, namely, De traditione domini; De interrogation domini et de crucifixione; De crucifixione and De resurrectione (cf. Clavis Patrum Graecorum 3425). It is probable, then, that the quotation made by our author cites one of these works. See also the opinion of Graf in the same previous reference on the similarity between this passage and other passages attributed to Melito of Sardis.
104 Unidentified.
The quotations are presented in chronological order, from the earliest Father to the most recent, except for the last two who probably preceded John Chrysostom. The purpose of the florilegium is declared once again at its end, where the author additionally underlines that there are many more patristic testimonies but that he had to avoid prolongation: Miaphysites follow faithfully the patristic tradition and doctrine without inventions or interpolation. Abū Rāʾītah also asks the Prince of Armenia to examine the doctrine of Abū Qurrah using as an instrument of analogy the patristic florilegium he provides; if he does so, Ašot will discover that the Melkite Bishop talks indeed with the spirit of the anti-Christ.

A comparison, to go back to the florilegium, between the Arabic text of Abū Rāʾītah and the original Greek reveals that our author does not translate from the Greek. The text includes numerous discrepancies. In quotation 1, the Arabic text claims that the anathema of the Thaumaturgus is the seventh, while the Greek text indicates the sixth. In quotation 12, the Arabic text purports to cite Chrysostom’s commentary on the Letter to the Hebrews, but in fact the quotation comes from the commentary on the Letter to the Colossians. Likewise, quotations 2 and 7 involve omissions. In addition, as already Georg Graf noted, the Arabic text contains some syriacisms. Consequently, one must assume that Abū Rāʾītah does not quote from the Fathers’ works according to their complete version in Greek but follows an already existing Syriac translation of these patristic quotations.

The method, indeed, that Abū Rāʾītah applies in his florilegium is almost similar to that of the florilegia and the patristic sources on which they are based, that is, the polemical writings of the aforementioned Miaphysite Fathers. He starts by mentioning the name of the Father, sometimes with a known

105 Abū Rāʾītah 1951, 86.
107 See for examples the footnotes in Abū Rāʾītah 1951, 85 and 106. In addition, one, reading Abū Rāʾītah’s general texts and the Arabic text of the patristic quotations notes a difference in the use of the language, the syntax, and also the errors in grammar.
appellative; for some authors, he then presents the titles of their works and sometimes adds a precise detail regarding the quotation, identifying the book or/and chapter of its origin. In addition, one may note his technique when successive quotations come from the same Father. Without repeating the Father’s name, Abū Rāʾiṭah says ومن قوله (‘and from his saying’), which probably corresponds to the Syriac مِنْ بِيْنِيْهَا (‘of him [the same author] from’) or to the Syriac مِنْهُ (‘and again’).

However, in four cases, quotations 6, 7, 8 and 9, Abū Rāʾiṭah does not indicate that subsequent quotations come from different works by the same Father, namely Gregory of Nazianzus; by contrasts, quotation 10 indicates the precise source from Gregory’s works, and the quotations of John Chrysostom, i.e. quotations 11 and 12, show the same precision. In addition, the introductory phrase of quotation 7 is problematic. We read, in fact، وذلك من قوله (‘And that is from his saying:’), where the demonstrative pronoun ذلك should indicate or refer to a statement, a comment or an affirmation said before the quotation. In our case, which is the only one in this florilegium, there is nothing before this pronoun. It seems that the original quotation was used by one author in a polemic work as a proof of a comment or a statement on something he said before,108 and that Abū Rāʾiṭah, or his source, has selected this quotation, translated it, and then mentioned it in his florilegium without paying attention to this detail, i.e. the demonstrative pronoun.

3.5.2 Probable Sources for Abū Rāʾiṭah’s Florilegium

The use of the word شهادات (‘testimonies’) for the patristic quotations, along with all the elements noted above, as well as Abū Rāʾiṭah’s affirmation in the introduction that the patristic testimonies he has at hand contain material on Trinity, Incarnation and Salvation, led me to wonder whether I could find his florilegium in one of the Syriac Christological and patristic florilegia of the Miaphysite Church. Checking the sources,

108 See the examples I give below in footnote 142 by which I explain Peter of Callinicum’s style of quoting the Fathers and commenting on them.
I found in the British Library, Add MS, 14532,\(^{109}\) and within the Christological florilegium it contains,\(^{110}\) a chapter, namely, chapter 64 (‘64’),\(^ {111}\) that deals with the suffering of God the Word in flesh. The patristic quotations there are almost identical to those provided in our author’s florilegium. In fact, a comparison between the introduction Abū Rāʾiṭah provides for his florilegium and the title of chapter 64 shows that both texts deal with the same topic and have the same purpose: to demonstrate the correctness of Theopaschism through the patristic tradition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The introduction of Abū Rāʾiṭah</th>
<th>Title of chapter 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وقد ينبغي لنا أن نتبين هذا القول بعض شهادات بعض الآباء الطاهرة المقبولة من المؤمنين عامة ومن أبي قرة وشياعه، المضيفة الصليب والقتل والموت والذبح واللازم إلى الله الباريء الذي لا يموت ولا يألم...</td>
<td>Testimonies of [some] holy Fathers who confess that God the Word suffered and died for us in the flesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And we must add to this discourse some testimonies of some pure Fathers, who are accepted generally by all believers and especially by Abū Qurrah and his partisans, who attribute murder, death, sacrifice and suffering to God the creator who neither dies nor suffers.

The key words in both passages are evident: ‘testimonies of some Fathers’ and the ‘suffering and death of God’. The following table compares the patristic quotations in Abū Rāʾiṭah and those in chapter 64. Note that I placed in square brackets [ ] the parts that are present in one text and omitted in the text compared:

\(^{109}\) According to the Catalogue of the Syriac manuscripts in the British museum, this manuscript (DCCCLVIII) has the title ‘\(\text{ܡܫܚܠܦܬܐ ܕܐܒܗ} \)’, A volume of Demonstrations from the holy Fathers against various Heresies”, it is composed of 221 leaves and contains different florilegia of various topics. According to W. Wright this manuscript was copied during the eighth century, for details see Wright 1870–2, 955–67.

\(^{110}\) Add MS, 14532, 1va−36ra.

\(^{111}\) See Add MS, 14532, 11ra−12ra.

\(^{112}\) Abū Rāʾiṭa 1951, 83. Translation is mine.

\(^{113}\) Add MS, 14532, 11ra. Translation is mine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abū ṭā’tah’s quotations</th>
<th>Chapter 64’s quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. أن الذي انفخ فيه بيلاتس حكمه الا لا انسان</td>
<td>أن الذي انفخ فيه بيلاتس حكمه الا لا انسان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. واغريفوريس ذا التلقين الإلهي قال في ميمر له في الفصح الطاهر</td>
<td>واغريفوريس ذا التلقين الإلهي قال في ميمر له في الفصح الطاهر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ومن قوله أيضاً ما أكثر عجبب ذلك الزمان الإله يصلي</td>
<td>ومن قوله أيضاً ما أكثر عجبب ذلك الزمان الإله يصلي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114 Add MS, 14532, 11va.  
115 Add MS, 14532, 11vb.  
116 Add MS, 14532, 11ra.  
117 Add MS, 14532, 11rb.  
118 Add MS, 14532, 11rb.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abū Rāʾīthāʾ’s quotations</th>
<th>Chapter 64’s quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ومن قوله أيضاً</td>
<td>لا يعجزك اتفرك البينة إذا سمعت بدم الله وألم بشرت بالله، وموت الله، بل كون أكلاً لجسد وشراباً للدم انا كنت راغبا في الحياة غير شاك ولا انف.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اي شيء أعجب من الاصلب</td>
<td>لا يعجزك اتفرك البينة إذا سمعت بدم الله وألم بشرت بالله، وموت الله، بل كون أكلاً لجسد وشراباً للدم انا كنت راغبا في الحياة غير شاك ولا انف.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ومن قوله أيضاً</td>
<td>لا يعجزك اتفرك البينة إذا سمعت بدم الله وألم بشرت بالله، وموت الله، بل كون أكلاً لجسد وشراباً للدم انا كنت راغبا في الحياة غير شاك ولا انف.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ومن قوله في ميمر قاله في الأف الجدود قال من أجل أن الموت يشمل كافة بجسد الإنسان واستيلائه عليه مباح مثل ذلك بالذکر، للذکر، للذکر، للذکر، للذکر، للذکر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ومن قوله في ميمر قاله في الأف الجدود قال من أجل أن الموت يشمل كافة بجسد الإنسان واستيلائه عليه مباح مثل ذلك بالذکر، للذکر، للذکر، للذکر، للذکر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وإن بحنا (الموصوف فم الذهن) الطاهر بطريرك قسطنطينية قال في ميمر الثمانية والثلاثين من تفسير الرسالة الأولى إلى الفراعين: إن إعاقة الأنجيل بشريني أن الله صار إنساناً وصلب وقامت وبشل جبرائيل للبتول وذلك تنبت الأنباء ونشر المرسلون.</td>
<td>إن إعاقة الأنجيل بشريني أن الله صار إنساناً وصلب وقامت وبشل جبرائيل للبتول وذلك تنبت الأنباء ونشر المرسلون.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

119 Add MS, 14532, 11rb.  
120 Add MS, 14532, 11rab.  
121 Add MS, 14532, 11rb.  
122 Add MS, 14532, 11rb.  
123 Add MS, 14532, 11vrb.  

(cont.)
Through a linguistic examination, it is evident that the Arabic is a translation from Syriac, even though sometimes the translation is literal and other times a bit liberal. In two cases, namely quotations 2 and 7, one might note an omission in the Arabic text, which is, in my opinion, more a summary of the original quotation than an intentional omission. While quotations 4, 5, 10, 11 and 12 are exactly the same in Arabic and Syriac, quotations 3, 6 and 14 must be considered a partial translation of the Syriac. One might also note that the error of Abū Rāʿīṭah in quotation 12, where he maintains that it comes from the commentary of the Chrysostom on the Letter to the Hebrews and not to the Colossians, does not exist in chapter 64, while the rest of the details given are equivalent in both texts. One notes a similar equivalence in the second quotation from Chrysostom,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abū Rāʿīṭah’s quotations</th>
<th>Chapter 64’s quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ومن قوله في ميمر ثالث له تفسير رسالة[العبرانيين] فيها أن لا نزهد في المحترقة المحتاجة بقوز عطة منه للناس اتزهدون في الذي من احنا صار الله عبدا وذبح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>وان ميلانون اصف اطنقا قال ان نصب الأرض انصب على خشبة وتنفيذ الرعب في جسد عار والاله قتل ملك البر اسرائيل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>وان أفرام السرياني الملفان قال في مصحف له رد فيه على اليهود [معتجا لهم مستعضاً لتعليم قال] انظر الى قلة تلك الأمة ما أعظمها انها صلبت الله ولم تجزع</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124 Add MS, 14532, 11vb.
125 Add MS, 14532, 12ra.
126 Add MS, 14532, 11vb.

© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE PRINTED FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY.
IT MAY NOT BE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHER.
that is, quotation 11, where the text corresponds precisely in author, work’s title, discourse number and content. Moreover, in quotations 2, 4, 10 and 14 there is concordance regarding the authors and the titles of their works. In addition, the title given for the work attributed to Basil of Caesarea in quotation 3 is worthy of note. In Syriac it is called *Discourse (or Homily) on the martyr Julitta and against Apollinarius*, while in Arabic it is just called *Discourse (or Homily) on the martyr Julitta*. Certainly, the text does not come from the Greek homily of Basil entitled *In martyrem Iulittam*; it seems that it is a *Ps.-Basilian* homily known already to other Syriac sources, like the Miaphysite florilegium of Edessa.\(^{127}\) Both sources, finally, attribute quotation 13 to Meletius of Antioch without indicating the work’s title.

From the comparison above, one surmises that Abū Rāʾīṭah translates with the phrase ‘and from his saying’ three different Syriac expressions: ܕܡܲܐܒܐ (‘and again’) like in quotation 5; ܕܗܕܲܐ (‘of the same’), like in quotation 8 and ܕܗܕܲܐ ܕܡܲܐܒܐ (‘and again of the same’) as it is attested in quotation 6. It is probable, then, that the translation of three Syriac variations with the same Arabic expression results in the confusion about quotations 6, 7 and 8, wrongly supposing that are all of them come from the same work by Gregory of Nazianzus. Such an error, which seems not to have occurred intentionally, should confirm once again my opinion that Abū Rāʾīṭah did not use the Fathers’ works in their complete form, but instead used a source that

\(^{127}\) It must be noted that in the Syriac florilegium there are two quotations attributed to this work of Basil, i.e. *In martyrem Iulittam et adversus Apollinarianum*. The first quotation is, in fact, a passage from Ps.-Athanasius’ *De s. trinitate dialogi v.* (see *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* 2284). The second quotation, present also in Abū Rāʾīṭah’s florilegium, was not identified in this work of Ps.-Athanasius. These two quotations are also attributed to Basil in the Miaphysite florilegium of Edessa, cf. Rucker 1933, 45 (the second quotation) and 78–79 (the first). In this florilegium, however, the passage quoted by Abū Rāʾīṭah is attributed to Basil without a title, while the other one, which is present in the Syriac florilegium and not in Abū Rāʾīṭah, has the title ܡܪܘܲܢܝܐ ܐܦܘܬ (‘Adversus Apollinarium’). It is clear then, that there were two different works attributed to Basil but that in the Syriac florilegium they were considered to be of the same work entitled *In martyrem Iulittam et adversus Apollinarium*. In Abū Rāʾīṭah, one of them is quoted and is considered to be a passage from Basil’s *In martyrem Iulittam*. Neither quotation comes from Basil’s *Homilia in martyrem Iulittam* (see *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* 2849).
contains some of their quotations. On the other hand, considering this error unintentional can be explained by quotation 4: according to the Syriac florilegium, the quotation is preceded by ܒܬܘܒ (‘and again’), which indicates that it is a quotation of the previous author from the same previous quoted work (in this case Gregory of Nazianzus’ Oration on Pascha). Abū Rāʾīṭah, for his florilegium, was interested in this second quotation and not the first. Paying attention to context, he introduced his quotation not with the expression ‘and from his saying’, as he usually translates the Syriac ܒܬܘܒ, but with the correct information concerning the author and the work’s title.

There are some final elements that one might note. Two of Abū Rāʾīṭah’s quotations are not found in chapter 64, while in the latter we find some more quotations that the florilegium of our author does not mention, as the following table demonstrates:\textsuperscript{128}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Patristic quotations of chapter 64 in BL, Add MS, 14532 & Order in Abū Rāʾīṭah \\
\hline
1. Gregorius Nazianzenus, In Sanctum pascha (or. 45) & Gregorius Thaumaturgus 10 \\
2. Gregorius Nazianzenus, In Sanctum pascha (or. 45) & 15 \\
3. Gregorius Nazianzenus, In Sanctum pascha (or. 45) & 2 \\
4. Gregorius Nazianzenus, Funebris oratio in laudem Basili Magni (or. 10) & 3 \\
5. Gregorius Nazianzenus, De pauperum amore (or. 14) & 4 \\
6. Gregorius Nazianzenus, In novam Domenicam (or. 44) & 1 \\
7. Gregorius Nazianzenus, ad Cledonium Epistula 101 & 7 \\
8. Basilius Caesariensis, De Spiritu Sanctu & \\
9. Antiochus Ptolemaïdis, Oratio in 'Beatus qui intelligit super egenum et pauperem' & \\
10. Ps.-Athanasius Alexandrinus, De Passione et cruce Domini & \\
11. Johannes Chrysostomus, In epistulam i ad Corinthios & \\
12. Johannes Chrysostomus, In epistulam ad Colossenses & \\
13. Ephraem Syrus, Adversus iudaerorum & \\
14. Basilius Caesariensis, In martyrem Iulittam et adversus Apolinarium & \\
15. Basilius Caesariensis, In martyrem Iulittam et adversus Apolinarium & \\
16. Eustathius Antiuchenus, Oratio coram ecclesia, in: Verbum caro factum est & \\
17. Meletius Antiuchenus, unmentioned & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{128} I indicate in italics those quotations that are present in Abū Rāʾīṭah’s florilegium.
The change of the Fathers’ order in Abū Rāʾīṭah’s florilegium is explained, as said above, by his chronological recategorization. In addition, our author’s choice not to include all the quotations from chapter 64 can also be explained. He chose those quotations that, according to his opinion, were adequate and belong to common Fathers with the Melkites. What is interesting, however, is the change of the order of the quotations from Gregory of Nazianzus, a change that, along with the other reasons explained above, can clarify more the confusion about the works from which they originate.

Unfortunately, the comparison with chapter 64 does not resolve the reason why Abū Rāʾīṭah, in his introductory phrase to quotation 7, begins with the demonstrative وذٰلك (‘and that’). As consequence, finally, one might say that our author does not really follow the Christological florilegium contained in BL, Add MS, 14532, but instead follows another; one might also plausibly argue that he had access to common sources with this patristic florilegium.

Having noted the similarity in thought between Abū Rāʾīṭah and Philoxenus of Mabbug one probably can maintain that our author used the patristic florilegium Philoxenus provides in his *Dissertationes decem de uno e sancta trinitate incorporato et passo*, a work written to support the Theopaschite doctrine and the addition into the Trisagion against the accusations attributed to a certain Ḥabīb, an East-Syrian monk from the north of Mesopotamia. While the method Philoxenus has used to create his florilegium is similar to the one of Abū Rāʾīṭah – especially when he makes a number of quotations from one Father, without mentioning always the change of the work cited, introducing new quotations simply with هو (‘of the same/him’) – I was able to identify just two common quotations: the one from Gregory of Nazianzus’ *ad Cledonium* and the one of Ephrem the Syrian, quoted without any indication of its title.

130 For more details, see my forthcoming publication mentioned here in footnote 30.
131 Quotation number (220), Philoxenus Mabbugensis 1982, 120.
132 Quotation number (187), Philoxenus Mabbugensis 1982, 114. See also Graffin 1974, 286 quotation number 186 and footnote 2.
Another important work that might be a plausible source for Abū Rāʾīṭah is Severus of Antioch’s _Contra impium Grammaticum_, where in chapter 41 of the third oration, Severus provides patristic quotations which witness that God the Word is the one and the same who performed the miracles and suffered the passion.\(^{133}\) In this chapter I was able to identify quotations 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9,\(^{134}\) that is, all the quotations of Gregory of Nazianzus except the final, number 10. Their order in Severus, however, does not correspond to the one followed by Abū Rāʾīṭah. Moreover, Severus’s version of quotation 7 does not resolve the problematic appearance of the pronoun ‘that’ in its introductive phrase. Nevertheless, it is worthy to note that quotation 9, which is not present in chapter 64 of the Christological florilegium, is mentioned by Severus, where Abū Rāʾīṭah quotes only its final sentence.\(^{135}\)

It is evident then that the florilegia of Philoxenus and Severus could not be direct sources for Abū Rāʾīṭah, and probably not even for the Christological florilegium copied in BL, Add MS, 14532. In fact, Emiliano Fiori, who studied recently this Christological florilegium, its content and context, maintains that one of its sources may be Peter of Callinicum’s _Tractatus contra Probum et Iohannem archimandritam_ (cf. _Clavis Patrum Graecorum_ 7254).\(^{136}\) That Christological treatise, which is no longer extant, featured many patristic quotations to prove the Orthodoxy of the Miaphysite Christology against that of the Neo-Chalcedonians, represented by two Miaphysites converted to Chalcedonianism, namely, Probus and John.\(^{137}\)

In addition, taking into consideration the opinion of Albert van Roey,\(^{138}\) I might conclude that the Trinitarian florilegium, copied also in BL, Add MS, 14532,\(^{139}\) is based on the Trinitar-

\(^{133}\) See _Severus Antiochenus_ 1938, 280–338.

\(^{134}\) _Severus Antiochenus_ 1938, 301, 301, 304, 301, 305, 302.

\(^{135}\) _Severus Antiochenus_ 1938, 302.

\(^{136}\) Emiliano Fiori’s opinion was presented during the conference ‘Florilegia Syriaca: Mapping a Knowledge – Organizing Practice in the Syriac World’ that took place at Ca’ Foscari university, Venice, 30 January – 1 February 2020, and will be published in a forthcoming publication.

\(^{137}\) On this treatise, see _van Roey_ 1978.

\(^{138}\) See _van Roey_ 1992.

\(^{139}\) For the Trinitarian florilegium, see Add MS, 14532, 94vb–133va.
ian work of the same Peter, namely, his Contra Damianum.\textsuperscript{140} Since this last work survives in a Syriac translation,\textsuperscript{141} one might have an idea of how Peter of Callinicum quotes the Fathers and with which mechanism he comments on them.\textsuperscript{142} As a consequence, and if the demonstrative pronoun in Abū Rāʾiṭah’s quotation 7 is original and not an error made by a copyist, it would be plausible to maintain that our author had at hand, in addition to a Christological patristic florilegium, the sources used for compiling this kind of florilegium,\textsuperscript{143} that is, some Christological-polemical works as Peter of Callinicum’s Christological treatise and those composed during the sixth and seventh centuries, especially at the period of the Controversy against Proba and John Barbur.\textsuperscript{144}

**Conclusion**

This contribution has offered an analysis of Abū Rāʾiṭah al-Takrītī’s two apologetical works, his Second Letter to Ašot and his treatise On the Threefold Praise, in which this Miaphysite author defends the Christological Trisagion hymn against the accusations of the Melkites, represented by the Bishop of Ḥarrān Theodore Abū Qurrah. It has been seen that, despite the fact that his arguments are based on his tradition, one might identify some original elements, like the development of the principle *lex orandi, lex credendi*, by which our author tries to

\textsuperscript{140} In regards see my forthcoming paper on this Trinitarian florilegium, its content, and its relationship to Peter of Callinicum’s *Contra Damianum*.


\textsuperscript{142} I give here some examples of how Peter of Callinicum comments some of his patristic quotations, which could explain the original function of pronoun ‘that’ in the introduction of quotation 7 in Abū Rāʾiṭah’s florilegium: “...ܐܡܪܘܟܕܒܕܡܘܬܐܢܕܝ̇ܒܗ”, “And likewise, too, by having said...”; “...ܗܥܡܕܝܢܬܘܒ”, “And again in addition to this...”;

“...ܡܠܐܣܝܐܕܩܕܡܝܐܝܟܢܐܓܝܪܡܠܐ̣ܣܝܐ”, “But again in the passage afterwards...”;


\textsuperscript{143} In my forthcoming paper, mentioned here in footnote 140, I present another evidence and more argument concerning this hypothesis, through the analysis I make of the Trinitarian florilegium provided by the same Abū Rāʾiṭah in another work of him.

\textsuperscript{144} On this controversy and its context, see Hainthalēr 2004.
find liturgical elements in other Christian traditions to confirm his own. Moreover, Abū Ṣāʾīṭah’s means of correlating correct worship with the Miaphysite metaphysical system and soteriological view, based on the acceptance of Theopaschism, is original. In this way, the Christological Trisagion hymn becomes an indication of Orthodox doctrine.

Also apparent in Abū Ṣāʾīṭah’s thought against the doctrine of the Melkites is that consensus with the patristic tradition and doctrine constitutes the primary criterion for Orthodoxy. This criterion drives his patristic and dogmatic florilegium in the *Second Letter to Ašot*. The selected patristic material functions on one hand, as proof for the correctness of his own doctrine, and on the other, as an instrument to indicate the invalidity of the polemics of Abū Qurrah.

Finally, through the examination of this florilegium, its structure and content, it has been demonstrated that our author translates from a Syriac version and not from the original Greek. Comparing Abū Ṣāʾīṭah’s patristic material with one Syriac patristic Christological florilegium copied in BL, Add MS, 14532, revealed that 12 of his 14 patristic quotations are present in chapter 64 of the aforementioned florilegium. The comparative analysis between the Syriac and Arabic versions of these quotations convinces me that either our author had in hand this florilegium with some other sources, or another florilegium, and that he had access to the sources of these patristic florilegia of the Miaphysite Church.
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Abstracts

This paper aims to highlight the original points the West-Syrian and Miaphysite theologian Abū Rāʾīṭah al-Takrītī (d. 838) uses to defend the addition into the Trisagion hymn: his liturgical arguments, his biblical arguments, and his means of relating Theopaschism to what he maintains to be a proper metaphysical system. The main purpose of the essay, however, is to analyse the patristic quotations Abū Rāʾīṭah provides to support his position and to demonstrate its orthodoxy. A comparative analysis of these quotations with some Syriac florilegia compiled by Miaphysites between the eighth and ninth centuries demonstrates that Abū Rāʾīṭah had access to such florilegia and their sources and used them into creating his own florilegium.

Keywords: Miaphysite, Theopaschism, Patristic Syriac Florilegia, Trisagion, Christology, Abū Rāʾīṭah al-Takrītī.
Questo articolo intende evidenziare i punti originali nell’apologia per l’aggiunta nel Trisagion scritta dal teologo siro-occidentale e miafisita Abū Rāʾīṭah al-Takrītī (m. 838), in particolare le sue argomentazioni liturgiche e bibliche e il modo in cui lega il Teopaschismo con quello che egli ritiene il corretto sistema metafisico. Lo scopo principale dell’articolo è di analizzare le citazioni patristiche che egli fornisce a sostegno della sua posizione e per dimostrare la sua ortodossia. Attraverso un’analisi comparativa di queste citazioni con florilegi siriaci compilati da miafisiti tra l’VIII e il IX secolo si dimostra che Abū Rāʾīṭah aveva accesso a tali florilegi e alle loro fonti, e che le ha usati per creare il suo florilegio.

*Parole chiave:* Miafisiti, Teopaschismo, Florilegi patristici siriaci, Trisagion, Cristologia, Abū Rāʾīṭah al-Takrītī.