

of an exemplar, and he described the designs more in the wording with which he was familiar.

The matter has a certain importance in view of Dom Quentin's suggestion (p. 431) that the *Turonensis* itself came from North Africa, 'un des derniers monuments de la civilisation chrétienne de l'Afrique'. His main reason is the realism with which some non-European beasts are drawn, e. g. the Camels, and the two Lions just let out of the Ark. I quite agree that these Lions are very different from the tame monsters which lick Daniel's toes in the pages of the *Legionensis* (p. 336). But the argument only proves that the pictures in our *Turonensis* were copied from an excellent model. No doubt there may not have been many steps between observation of nature and the extant pictures, but there was at least one. The evidence of the inscriptions seems clearly to point to the pictures having been designed for an Old Latin text, but the *Turonensis* is a Vulgate. A good parallel to the whole state of things is to be found in the Canterbury Psalter now in Trinity College Library, the Utrecht Psalter, and the ancient lost MS from which they are descended, all of which must have had the same set of illustrations, though the text of the Psalter is different.

In any case the Biblical knowledge of the admirable copyist who painted the pictures in the *Turonensis* was small. As v. Gebhardt points out he writes *Potamia* for *Mesopotamia*. More curious is 'Lampiton', which is given both in the upper and under writing as the name of the first city built by the Children of Israel. The Greek of Exod. i 11 has τὴν τε Πειθῶ καὶ Ῥαμεσσή (of course with variations in spelling): it seems to me very likely that an Old Latin text had *aedificabant civitates Farao*, ILLAM PITON *et Ramesse*. The first syllable of *illam* has dropped out like the first syllables of *Mesopotamia*, and our copyist thought that LAMPITON was all one name. *Ille* for the article is well attested in 'African' documents, so that this also points to North Africa as the original source of the illustrations in the 'Pentateuch of Tours'. But it does not at all imply the N. African origin of the main Biblical text, which seems to be, as Dom Quentin shews, a very pure form of the specifically Spanish tradition.

F. C. BURKITT.

## THE OLD LECTIONARY OF JERUSALEM.

THIS Note springs out of a very interesting study by Dr Anton Baumstark, of Bonn, about the Biblical Lessons,<sup>1</sup> exclusive of the Gospels, which are read in Syriac-speaking Churches. Dr Baumstark's

<sup>1</sup> *Nichtevangelische syrische Perikopenordnungen des ersten Jahrtausends*, a study in comparative Liturgiology by Dr ANTON BAUMSTARK (Münster, Aschendorf), 1921.

study is a general survey of a field of work hitherto only explored in a piece-meal fashion. He has mapped out the ground and indicated lines upon which further investigation may be made: if in what follows attention is chiefly directed to some points in which the present writer differs from him, it must not be forgotten that the data brought forward and grouped by Dr Baumstark have made the discussion possible.

I do not propose to deal here with the first two-thirds of Dr Baumstark's study, the part which treats of the Nestorian and the Jacobite rites. This part contains a great many interesting observations and conjectures, but it suffered from the fact that the most important document bearing on the subject was not published when Dr Baumstark wrote. It was indeed Dr Baumstark himself who drew attention to what he called 'a Syriac *Comes* of the sixth century' in the British Museum (p. 84), i. e. the Table of Lessons contained in B.M. Add. 14528. Dr Baumstark only knew this document from the description in Wright's Catalogue, and contented himself with remarking that 'a complete account of its contents cannot be too vehemently desired'. This has now been done: after reading what Dr Baumstark had said I have transcribed this ancient Table, together with the relevant Lectionary notes in the older Syriac Biblical MSS, and have published the result in a British Academy Paper.<sup>1</sup> From this body of evidence, not used by Dr Baumstark, we learn for the first time exactly how the Bible was read in the churches of Edessa and its neighbourhood at the beginning of the sixth century, before the Monophysite schism: the later uses of Nestorians and Jacobites must be studied in the light of this further knowledge.<sup>2</sup>

But the most important part of Dr Baumstark's investigations were concerned with the Malkite or Greek-orthodox Lectionary. From a liturgical point of view ancient Greek orthodox uses fall into two groups, those that follow Constantinople and those that follow the old customs of Jerusalem. The use of Constantinople we may suppose to be a development of the use of Antioch, but during the fifth and sixth centuries, a period of much liturgical development, the Patriarchate of Antioch became practically Monophysite and ceased to be Greek. Then came the Mohammedan conquests; for a considerable period the Byzantine Empire was shut off from the Christian East, and when in the tenth century Antioch was recaptured by a Christian army,

<sup>1</sup> *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, by F. C. Burkitt (Proc. of the British Academy, vol. xi, 1923).

<sup>2</sup> When it is mentioned that there were sometimes as many as seventeen Lessons at one Sunday or Festival Service, taken systematically from all parts of the Bible and making a total of over 400 verses, it will be obvious to any one who has made a study of Church Bible-reading that this document reveals a state of things quite different from any use hitherto known in detail.

Byzantine Christianity had arrived at its complete developement. Its liturgy, its kalendar, its method of Bible-reading, were the same almost as to-day. Moreover, Constantinople was now the one great centre of Orthodox Greek Christianity. It was natural that Churches in full communion with the Ecumenical Patriarch should model their services on Constantinople.

It was otherwise in the end of the fourth century and the early years of the fifth. These were the palmy days of Christian Jerusalem. The sacred Sites had been beautified with Churches by the piety of Constantine and his family, and a stream of pilgrims came year by year from all over the Christian world, even from far away Spain and from Bordeaux, to worship at the Holy City. Christian ritual was then rapidly crystallizing into fixed forms, and the special character of the ritual elaborated at Jerusalem was the representation, the re-enactment, of the Gospel history in a liturgical form on the appropriate days at the very Sites themselves. Thus on Maundy Thursday 'they assemble at 1 p.m. in the holy shrine of the city and' after Bible-reading 'the sacrifice is offered . . . before the holy cross. And in the same hour they proceed to holy Sion . . . and in the same hour they go forth to the mount of Olives', singing Psalms.<sup>1</sup> It was, indeed, at Jerusalem that the rite of the Palm Sunday procession, commemorating the Entry into Jerusalem, was first organized. A 'record of the assemblies held in Jerusalem in the holy places of Christ, in which the number of the day of the month and the lesson of the day are set forth' (with the proper psalms) still survives in Armenian MSS and has been translated by F. C. Conybeare in *Rituale Armenorum* pp. 516-527.

The other main authority for this ritual is the account of the Spanish pilgrim Egeria or Etheria (*ci-devant* 'Silvia of Aquitaine'), who visited Jerusalem A.D. 383-385.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately Egeria gives no data as to the actual lections chosen, except that they were appropriate to the time and place. But all the evidence points to the accuracy of Conybeare's document, though it may have been accommodated here and there to the actual praxis in Armenia, particularly (according to Dr Baumstark, p. 155) in respect of the limits of Lent. Dr Baumstark adds, as a subsidiary authority, a Georgian *Kanonarium*, published in 1912 by K. S. Kekelidze.

The services and ceremonies at Jerusalem were not only described and copied out for their own intrinsic interest. To a very considerable extent, during the fourth and fifth centuries, they served as ritual models for other Churches. The influence of Jerusalem is perceptible in the

<sup>1</sup> Conybeare *Rit. Armen.* p. 521.

<sup>2</sup> For the date see Dr Baumstark in *Oriens Christianus* N. Ser., i 32-76 (1911): the old bishop of Jerusalem seen by Egeria was therefore none other than S. Cyril.

old Edessene Lectionary referred to above, though not altogether dominant. In the Armenian texts, on the other hand, the documents edited by Conybeare seem almost as much rubrics for the lessons to be read in Armenian churches as a description of the lessons read in Jerusalem. And it is the special merit of Dr Baumstark to have pointed out for the first time that the curious *Praxapostolos* (or non-evangelic Lectionary) in the Christian Palestinian-Syriac dialect, published by Mrs Lewis in 1897, is based on the old use of Jerusalem. It is 'eine degenerierte Form' (p. 171), but nevertheless it belongs to the Jerusalem use.

So far we can all follow Dr Baumstark. He has done a great service in shewing that the old name of 'the Jerusalem Syriac', though originally given through a linguistic error, has nevertheless a certain historical appropriateness. But I venture to think that his treatment of the Palestinian-Syriac literature, so far from being 'fast zu gründlich', as a friendly German critic seems to have said (see his Preface, p. ix), is really not quite 'gründlich' enough. I cannot quite believe that a treatment of the service books of this curious branch of the Orthodox Church which does not even mention the town of 'Ābūd, or the name of the late Prof. J. P. N. Land, can be quite thorough. The matter is interesting in itself and little understood by any except professed Aramaic scholars. I will therefore repeat some of the results at which I arrived in my paper on the Christian Palestinian Literature (*J. T. S.* ii 174-185), indicating the very slight modifications which later discoveries have necessitated.

Who and what, then, were the Christians who used the Palestinian-Syriac Literature? The language itself is a dialect of Aramaic very similar to that used by Jews and Samaritans in Palestine before Arabic became the common speech of the East. It might seem at first sight that in studying these documents we were investigating the history of primitive Christianity; we might fancy we were tracing the fortunes of communities founded by the Apostles, and still speaking their language. This hope is not at all borne out by the facts. The Christian Palestinian Literature has no signs of long ancestry or national vitality. It consists exclusively of rather slavish translations from the Greek, and nothing has been found in it which would not be required for public services in Church or the public instruction of Christians.

Moreover the areas in which this Ecclesiastical dialect was used seem to have been very limited. The only real 'Gemeinde' or community known to us that used it, apart from exotic congregations of monks living away from their parents' homes, is that of 'Ābūd, a large village situate at an equal distance from Jerusalem and from

Jaffa, and due NW. of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Further, there is nothing which suggests that this organization of Semitic Palestinian Christians is older than Justinian.<sup>2</sup> The two places where we know that MSS in this dialect were preserved for use are the monasteries of Sinai and of the Black Mountain north of Antioch,<sup>3</sup> for the fragments from the Nitrian Library and from the Cairo Geniza appear to have reached their destination only as writing material to be made into palimpsests or as curiosities.<sup>4</sup> The monasteries of the Black Mountain owe their origin to the recapture of Antioch from the Saracens in A.D. 969; it was there that the famous Gospel Lectionary in the Vatican was written. For the earlier documents we only know of the great orthodox sanctuary of Sinai.

Dr Baumstark, ignoring all this, treats Mrs Lewis's *Apostolos* and the MS containing the Liturgy of the Nile now in the British Museum as belonging to the otherwise utterly unknown 'syro-palästinensischen Melkitengemeinde Ägyptens', whereas I regard 'the Syro-palestinian Malkite communities of Egypt' as a long name for the same set of Sinai monks to whom belonged the MSS and fragments in the Palestinian dialect that have actually come from the Library at Sinai or still remain there.

Mrs Lewis's *Apostolos* is late, not so old as the Vatican Lectionary (A.D. 1029), and, as was said just now, it represents a degenerate form of the use. A main object of this Paper is to call attention to the fact that fragments of at least two more ancient Palestinian Lectionaries survive, and that they attest a purer and more original form. One of these documents has been known to scholars since 1875 as Land's *Fragmenta Biblica Petropolitana*: in the light of Dr Baumstark's results and of the researches of Dr Hugo Duensing, to be mentioned below, it is possible to do a good deal towards reconstructing and augmenting these fragments and, what is more important, the rite which they attest can be determined with some precision.

The reconstruction of Land's Old Testament Lectionary is a somewhat complicated process. To make it clear it is necessary to describe the documents in some detail. Those that concern us are:—

1. Tischendorf's Georgian MS at Petrograd, used by Land in 1875.
  2. Duensing's MSS, published in 1906.
  3. Mrs Bensly's Homilies (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*), 1896.
  4. Mrs Lewis's Lectionaries (*Studia Sinaitica* vi), 1897.
- (1) Land's *Anecdota* is a collection, familiar to all Aramaic students. Vol. iv contains, among other things, the only other Palestinian docu-

<sup>1</sup> *J. T. S.* ii 174.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 176-178.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 177, 183: see Wright *CBM* i 379.

ments known for many years besides the Vatican Gospel Lectionary. Land's authorities were some London fragments (B.M. Add. 14664 and one leaf of Add. 14450), which seem to have reached the great Nitrian Library after the sale of Sultan Bibars's booty from Palestine, and a MS in two volumes which Tischendorf had brought to Petersburg 'from the East', i.e. from the Monastery on Mount Sinai. This MS is palimpsest, the upper writing being in the Georgian language. It now consists of 129 leaves, cut and folded to make a book of smaller size than any of the original MSS: a full index of the leaves is given in Land's *Introd.* pp. 186-189. Of the Palestinian MSS Land distinguishes two Gospel codices (P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>), some Acta Sanctorum, 63 Fragments of 'Theologica', and the Old Testament Lectionary, which I shall call Pl.

(2) In 1893 Mrs Bensly copied out at Sinai 13 leaves of an ancient MS of Homilies in the Palestinian-Syriac language, which she found in the binding of a late Aramaic MS. The writing is very similar to Land's *Theologica*: there is no reason to doubt that these leaves once formed part of the same MS as the fragment of a Homily of St Chrysostom which is No. 8 of Land's 'Theologica'.

(3) Dr Hugo Duensing published in 1906 a valuable work called 'Christlich-palästinisch-aramäische Texte und Fragmente', in which he edited Palestinian-Syriac texts from five MSS in a private collection. It is evident that this collection also came ultimately from Sinai, for one of the five MSS was a Palimpsest with a Georgian text as the upper writing, while the lower text contains Palestinian fragments taken from the same MS as Land's 'Theologica' (Duensing, p. 42).<sup>1</sup> Moreover Dr Duensing succeeded in identifying the greater part of these 'Theologica': of the 63 fragments printed by Land no less than 49 come from a MS of the Catecheses of St Cyril of Jerusalem. Three others, nos. 2, 17, 46, Duensing shews to be Biblical: he might have added 24 and 25, which come from Job ix 12-34. Thus only eight of Land's Fragments remain unidentified (nos. 3 and 4, 6 and 7, 12, 13, 19 and 20), all of which are clearly taken from some collection of Sermons; of these fol. 13 belongs to some of Duensing's unidentified fragments.

Duensing's Biblical fragments, so far as they concern our present enquiry, will be noticed below.

(4) Mrs Lewis's Lectionary (Ll) was acquired by her in Cairo in 1895. On p. cxxxviii f of her book (*Studia Sinaitica* vi) she publishes

<sup>1</sup> Duensing, p. 71 ff (the texts grouped under B). The first text called A (p. 72) and conjectured by Duensing to be from a Life of Rabbula comes from the Story of the Man of God (Amiaud's *St Alexis* p. 2 line 21 for the 'verso', and p. 2 line 2 for the 'recto').

the text of a palimpsest leaf of another Lectionary (Ll<sub>2</sub>), which she bought in Cairo about the same time: possibly it once formed part of the same collection as the second facsimile published by Duensing. In any case, as will be seen, it is a fragment of exceptional interest.

As remarked above, it is Dr Baumstark's great merit that he perceived that the Palestinian Lectionary follows in the main the old use of Jerusalem and is to be regarded as a branch of it. The main authority for this use is Conybeare's Old Armenian Lectionary in *Rituale Armenorum*: in attempting to reconstruct Land's MS, therefore, the most practical method is to take Conybeare's document as our standard and see whether the fragmentary indications in Land's scattered leaves do not agree with it. Of the 129 leaves in the two Georgian volumes (see Land's *Introd.* pp. 186-189), if we leave out the leaves of the two Gospel MSS P<sub>1</sub> (22 leaves) and P<sub>2</sub> (13 leaves) and all the Cyril of Jerusalem and other 'Theologica', we have left foll. 11, 12, 14, 24, 25, 38, 41, 48, 60, 63, 68, 106, 107, 108, 109, 127-16 leaves in all—and fol. 55, which contains a text from the Gospel, to be noticed later. Of the 16 leaves the pairs 68 and 63, 38 and 106, 107 and 48, 41 and 60, fit together and make single leaves of the old MS. Thus 12 leaves of the old MS would be preserved, whole or in bits, if they all belong to the same codex. Land (*Introd.* p. 206) seems to have thought they all came from the same codex, but in the case of detached leaves such as these a doubt is always possible.

Foll. 11, 12, 24 contain texts from Isaiah<sup>1</sup>: it is a little difficult to believe that fol. 11, which contains Isa. xiv 28-xv 5, can ever have formed part of a Lectionary. Fol. 12 r contains Isa. xi 6-10, which is read on the vigil of Epiphany, but as Land (*Introd.* p. 187) says 'Fol. 11 et 12 conjuncta' it must go with its fellow: as a matter of fact on counting the lines in Swete's LXX it appears that if fol. 12 and 11 are a conjugate pair, then the intervening text of Isaiah would exactly fill three conjugate pairs, i. e. six leaves, forming the interior of a quire. It is better, therefore, to regard fol. 12, 11, 24 as fragments of a MS of the full text of Isaiah, not of a Lectionary.

It is most likely also that fol. 25, which contains a bit of Acts xiv, is a loose leaf of a codex of Acts. But the remaining eight leaves all formed part of the same Lectionary, a codex which contained Lessons from all parts of the Bible except the Gospels. Thus it was a MS of the same general character as Mrs Lewis's Lectionary (Ll), but its date may be put in the seventh century and, as we shall see, it stands nearer than Ll to the original Jerusalem use, as represented by Conybeare's Armenian.

<sup>1</sup> The extract from fol. 24 (end), printed by Land *Introd.* p. 188, is really Isa. xxx 23, 24.

Arranging the detached leaves in the order of the Kalendar we get

| Land     | Georgian MS | Legible in Pl                           | Armenian Lect.          |
|----------|-------------|---|-------------------------|
| p. 222   | fol. 108    | Deut. vi <sup>1</sup> 4-16              | F. 1st wk. of Lent      |
| 223      | 109         | Isa. xl 1-8 <sup>2</sup>                | " "                     |
| 165      | 127         | Deut. vii 25, 26                        | F. 2nd wk. of Lent      |
| 185-6    | 68+63       | Job ix 12-34                            | " "                     |
| 165, 222 | 38+106      | Deut. xiii 6-17                         | F. 6th wk. of Lent      |
| 223, 182 | 107+48      | Job xxi <sup>1</sup> 1-22               | " "                     |
| 167      | 41+60       | Prov. ix <sup>1</sup> 1-11 <sup>2</sup> | T. in Holy Week, 4 p.m. |
|          |             | Isa. xl <sup>1</sup> 9-12               | " "                     |
| 172-3    | 14          | Phil. ii 15-18 <sup>2</sup>             | Good Friday, midday     |
|          |             | Ps. xl (xli) 6                          | " "                     |
|          |             | Isa. l <sup>1</sup> 4 ff                | " "                     |

No rubric is legible at the head of Prov. ix 1-11 or Isa. l 4 ff, but before Job xxi 1 we read 'Second Lesson, from Job',<sup>3</sup> and before Isa. xl 9 'Third Lesson, Isaiah the Prophet', while before Deut. vi 4 is 'Friday, in Holy [Si]on: First Lesson, from Deuteronomy'.<sup>4</sup> This last rubric exactly corresponds with Conybeare's Armenian, which has (p. 518): 'In the holy quadragesima in the first week . . . Friday, at the tenth hour they assemble in holy Sion, and this canon is performed: *Deut.* 6<sup>4</sup>-7<sup>10</sup>: *Job* 6<sup>2</sup>-7<sup>13</sup>: *Isa.* 40<sup>1-8</sup>: *Ps.* 41<sup>4</sup>.' Further, the fact that Isaiah xl 9 ff follows Prov. ix 1-11, as in the Armenian services for T. in Holy Week, and that Psalm xl and Isa. l 4 ff follow Phil. ii, as in the Armenian for Good Friday, makes it clear that our fragments followed the old use of Jerusalem very closely.

Mrs Lewis's Lectionary (Ll) has the Lections for Friday in the sixth week and those for Tuesday and Friday in Holy Week, but not the earlier ones.<sup>5</sup> Fragmentary therefore as Pl is, it contains two pairs of Lessons which agree with the Armenian (i.e. with the old Jerusalem use) though absent from Ll.

Now let us turn to Ll<sub>2</sub>, the single palimpsest leaf of a Palestinian-Syriac Lectionary, edited by Mrs Lewis on pp. cxxxviii-ix of her book. The upper writing is Jacobite Syriac of the ninth cent. The lower writing is 'bold and upright'; no doubt it is an ancient fragment, perhaps of the seventh cent.

<sup>1</sup> Beginning of a Lection.

<sup>2</sup> End of a Lection.

<sup>3</sup> ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܝܘܒ

<sup>4</sup> ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܝܫܝܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܕܝܫܝܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܘܬܪܘܢܘܡ . . .

• • ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܝܫܝܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܕܝܫܝܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܘܬܪܘܢܘܡ. The restoration is quite certain, though it did not occur to Land.

<sup>5</sup> Isa. xl 1-8 occurs in Ll §§ 32 and 62, but these are not for the first F. in Lent.



To appreciate the importance of  $L_2$ , we must note the order in which the texts occur. The fragment is a single leaf, of which the inner upper corner has been torn away. The writing is in two columns, the contents being as follows :

Job vii . . -21. *3rd Lesson, from Isaiah the Prophet.* Isa. xl 1-8. Psalm xl (= xli Heb.) Blessed is he that considereth, &c. *Respond,* I said, Lord, have mercy, &c. (*ver.* 4).

*In the second week of the holy Quadragesima, Monday, at the Anastasis. First Lesson, from the First Kingdom, from the beginning of it.*  
1 Sam. i 1- . . .

It would be difficult to have picked out a more characteristic leaf, for the most curious feature of the Jerusalem use is that there are Lessons for every week-day (except Saturday) in the second week of Lent, while in the other weeks Lessons are only appointed for Wednesdays and Fridays. We see the same arrangement in  $L_2$ , and the same Lessons are appointed.  $L_2$  therefore, so far as it goes, agrees exactly with the use of Jerusalem, as also we found that  $P_1$  did. On the other hand this peculiarity of the Lenten Lessons is not represented in  $L_1$ , the late MS which forms the bulk of Mrs Lewis's book and which alone was considered by Dr Baumstark.<sup>1</sup>

The main historical deduction to be made is that the Palestinian-Syriac church originally followed the ritual customs of Jerusalem very closely, and that the divergences from it in the later documents are due to the general decay of Jerusalemite influence which followed the Mohammedan conquest and to the ever more preponderating authority of Constantinople over all Orthodox communities.

In conclusion a few remarks may be made on one or two of the ancient fragments of Gospel MSS published by Land and by Duensing. Land's  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are fragments not of a Lectionary but of complete Gospel codices, or 'Tetraevangelia' as they are sometimes called. But about fol. 55 of the Georgian MS Land remarks (*Introd.* p. 188): 'Videtur e Diatessaro nescio quo petitum esse'. This excites expectation, but when we come to the edited text (p. 217) we find only

. . . that the scriptures of the Prophets might be fulfilled. And then all the disciples left him and fled. [And a] certain youth was [following] after him, clothed . . .

In the lower margin are the words 'Luke John'.

This is no Diatessaron, but only Mk. xiv 49<sup>b</sup>-51<sup>a</sup>, with the Syriac Eusebian Canons at the foot of the page. Probably the words

<sup>1</sup> He ought to have noticed  $L_2$  on p. 157 (middle).

'Matthew 363' once stood there also, but are now illegible or torn away. What misled Land was the fact that by the addition of 'of the Prophets' in *ver.* 49 and of 'then' in *ver.* 50 the fragment agrees with Matthew xxvi 56 f rather than with Mark, but a glance at Tischendorf will shew that a respectable number of authorities headed by the Harclean Syriac and the Ferrar Group also have these harmonistic readings, so that all that is required is to add the voice of the Palestinian-Syriac, *quantum valeat*, to their testimony in the apparatus to Mk. xiv 49 and 50. Possibly this fragment of Land's is a bit of the same MS of the Four Gospels, also provided with Eusebian Canons, from which Duensing edited the leaf containing Lk. ix 7-19 (Duensing, p. 145 f).

Some of Duensing's fragments came from a codex of Acts: he has edited Acts xiv 5-9, 15-17; xvi 23-25, 33-35; xxi 28-30, 38-39. Small as these bits are they overlap Land's text, which contains Acts xiv 6-13. It is noteworthy that the texts are quite different. Thus in Acts xiv 8 *ἀδύνατον* is rendered **ܕܝܢܐ** in Land's MS, but **ܕܝܢܐ** in Duensing's: the latter is the common rendering (Joel iii 10; Rom. viii 3, xv 1).

The Lectionary rubrics in P<sub>1</sub> are puzzling and badly preserved. Unlike those in the Gospel Lectionaries they are in Palestinian-Syriac not in Carshuni (Arabic in Syriac letters), and they do not seem to agree entirely with the Byzantine system. Their discussion must be left for another time.

F. C. BURKITT.

## THE JACOBITE SERVICE FOR HOLY SATURDAY.

THE Service described in this Paper is contained in Denzinger *Ritus Orientalium* ii 552 f, but it seems to be not so well known as it deserves, and there is a further point of special interest in the annotations of the scholar Ṣalībā bar Ḳarūn, mentioned below, for whom B. M. Add. 17230 was written. This MS is dated A. D. 1337 (Wright *CBM* ccclii) and contains services for various special occasions, viz. 1. The Blessing of the Water on Epiphany Night; 2. The Consecration of the Branches on Palm Sunday; 3. The Service for Monday in Holy Week called 'Near the Haven'; 4. The Washing of Feet on Maundy Thursday; 5. Good Friday, at none; 6. Holy Saturday, after none; 7. The Asking of Peace, i. e. the Greeting or Kiss, on Easter Sunday, after matins; 8. Services for Pentecost after mass.