vi. THE “QUESTIONS ON
THE EUCHARIST” OF ISHO’YABH IV
AND THEIR RELATION WITH THE
LITURGICAL TRADITION OF THE
NESTORIANS

We discussed in the previous chapter the formal side of our writing, and saw that its form did not answer the question whether the materials contained in it were traditional; on the contrary, everything pointed to assuming here real questions arising out of the liturgical practice of ± 1000 A.D. But to estimate more exactly its value for the knowledge of the history of the liturgy, it is necessary to examine the contents of the book. We must face this problem: do these questions and answers transmit the substance of the instruction of previous generations, of some centuries ago? In other words: is it allowed to use this work as a witness of the liturgical practice not only of the 10–11th, but also of the 7th or even 5th century?

The solution of this problem can only be tried by the way of an exact interpretation of the information given by the author about the kind of difficulties which threatened the liturgical life of his church and about the sources of his knowledge which enabled him to give this (right) answer.

i. Some sentences at the very beginning of the “Introduction” form the obvious starting-point. The Questioner describes the bad state of the church in his days because of the priests who are not instructed and do not follow the “Canons and Orders of the Service of the Altar”. If something happens during the performance of the liturgy, they do not care for it but they act as they like it (commentary). But this young priest himself comes to his teacher to learn the rules of the old men, in order that he might be right according to the standard of the church. These words may seem somewhat enigmatic. If they are read in the light of the whole work they become perfectly clear.

(1) We speak of the special regulations as given in our Q Q. It is a matter of course that the elements from which they are made existed centuries before; e.g. the Lord’s Prayer dates from the very beginning of Christianity, but Q. 195 sqq. are only possible after the time of Timothy; the same is true for the altar, Eucharistic Bread etc. But we ask here when the special rules of our Q Q. have been made. (2) The Introduction is an integral part of the book. There are no reasons to consider it spurious.
In the "Commentary on the Liturgy", written by the Jacobite Father Moses bar Kepha (cf. p. 86, n. 4) some similar tones are heard. He blames "many untrained and ill-instructed priests" because of an improper addition. He tells us, that some people say a "Gloria" in the Anaphora, although it "does not belong to the Qurābbāh, but has been introduced by the presbyters. This appears from the fact that the service-books of the presbyters are written according to the pleasure of each one and there is no agreement between them: for whereas the lectionaries of the Old and New (Testaments) do not vary in a single place, thou seest that the service-books of the presbyters contain frequent and considerable variations"—a statement which seems to me to be of the utmost importance for the (textual) criticism of the Jacobite liturgy. He uses the same qualification for those who "strike their hands upon their foreheads" at the "Kyrie". They who break the Coal "are un instructed and ignorant of the Mysteries of the Christians". In reading these words one should remember that Moses is exposing the spiritual meaning of the prayers and actions of the liturgy. But the latter are only mentioned in passing, and this book has a positive aim and not the negative one to correct those priests; so the notes upon them are rather incidental. At any rate the quotations show priests who had peculiarities both in their prayers and acts because of their ill-instruction while the service-books exhibited great variations.

Our treatise has been written about a century later. Does it combat the same irregularities, viz. changing of prayers and actions of the divine liturgy itself? What is the character of the events?

The ill-instruction of the priests, i.e., not following the "Canons and Orders" and giving a wrong solution of various occurrences, is evident from the questions. This definition implies that the right order is indicated in the books mentioned. They will be found in the "Takhsa" (cf. p. 38–39). This service-book contains the "Canons" of John bar Abgare which will be discussed later on in this chapter.

(1) Moses bar Kepha, in: Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy, ed. R. H. Connolly–H. W. Goddington, p. 36; cf. the quotation from John of Tell, p. 142. (2) Ibid., p. 39-40 (quoted by Dionysius b. Salibi, Expositio, ed. H. Labort, C.S.C.O. ii 33, Paris 1903, p. 61).—He uses the same word $\lambda\alpha\nu\nu\delta\nu$ = service-book as our author (Q. 1 and fol. 34a; cf. p. 125). (3) Ibid., p. 61–69 ("coal"—cf. commentary). (4) Cf. p. 133–135; it is clear that the present edition is a composition which contains several formularies which are much later than the time of Isho'yabb iii.
The "Orders" dealing with the matters of our Q.Q. are the Liturgy of the holy Apostles Addai and Mari for the liturgy proper; the Formularies for signing of the Altar with or without oil in cases of consecration or desecration, and the Order of Mixing (which was prefixed by Dr. Brightman to 'Addai' in L.E.W. but is not found before it in the MSS.). From the present edition it is quite clear what should be done. Many questions are, from this point of view, merely asking what one knows already; and the answer repeats simply what may be read in T. on various places. Yet it seems as though the Questioner was himself not quite sure in referring to the service-books since he is afraid of being mocked at and asks for exact indications. Besides this it is not superfluous to remark that there exists some difference between the 19th and the 10th century, between the printed text of T. which incorporates everything mentioned in various MSS. and the MSS. themselves as used in the churches.

It is a well-known fact that the oldest liturgical texts such as Serapion, Apostolical Constitutions etc. contain hardly any direction for the right performance of the liturgy besides the prayers. It is true: they are not service-books in the strict sense, but the lack of "rubrics" (the indication of the actions, generally written in red characters) is striking, the more because they are not found in the oldest MSS. either. These copies are generally very young, mostly after the 10th century. The rubrics as given in L.E.W. are not old, but actually modern. With regard to the Western Church Dom. J. Baudot wrote: "Chaque église particulièere possédait ses ordinaires ou coutumiers (in which the regulations for a solemn performance of the Mass are found); ces sortes de directoires semblent s'être répandues surtout à partir du xiiè et du xiiie siècle.

The same freedom and variety seem to have ruled in the Eastern Church and among the Nestorians.

It was pointed out before (p. 57) that the Nestorian MSS.

show variants in the prayers, but mainly in the rubrics. Even in the 15th century there were not uniformly ordered; while the prayers are practically the same, the directions they contain are different. There are additions (see ad Q. 94 and ad Q. 24). This fact is in accordance with the general rule that the prayers had been fixed before the rubrics (cf. also p. 127). The liturgy underlying the "Expos." follows in the main the present text of 'Addai', but not in every detail. An exact collation of the existing MSS. of the Eucharist has not yet been made. To compensate this defect to a certain extent we may refer to the critical study of the text of the Nestorian baptismal rite published by Dr. G. Dietrich in 1903 since this formulary offers a good parallel. A glance through his book shows the growth of the formularies and the insertion of various ceremonial notes. This ritual is generally ascribed to the great reformer Isho'yabh iii. But the actual situation of some centuries after his death is very well illustrated by the following notice. The MS. J2 which often exhibits remarkable and, for our purpose, illuminating additions, draws attention to a varying practice. This makes Dietrich observe: "Aus diesem Verhöhr der Zeugen ist soviel gewiss, dass Iso'yabh III keine bindenden Bestimmungen über die Krönung der Getauften und ähnliche damit verbundene Ceremonien gegeben hat. Beachte das völlige Schweigen der Codd. J1 Jahbi mal ß und das: 'wenn es beliebt'—auch jenes: 'das sei nach der Gewohnheit des Ortes' bei J2." There is a stock to which all sorts of expansions are added and it seems that each church or country had its own specialities. This offers a good parallel to the situation in the time of our Q. Q.

From these facts it is clear that the service-books in the time of our author varied in their rubrics. The rubrics were not the more important part of the liturgy. But at the same time the danger was not imaginary that the differences in practice would become greater and that every priest would perform his task on his own hand. The unity of the liturgy is threatened, a matter of great importance for a church of that type (cf. commentary). This diversity of the MSS.

(1) I compared the texts of T.; L.O.C.; Berol. 38 and various Nestorian Expositions. The result cannot be published here. (2) G. Dietrich, Die nestorianische Taufliturgie, Giessen, 1903. (3) G. Dietrich, a.a.O., S. 87. The additions are scattered over the whole formulary. (4) Cf. the state some ages before (time of Babai): "Each country, and town, and monastery and school had its own hymns and songs of praise and tunes, and sang it in its own way, and if a teacher of a scholar happened to be away from his own school he was obliged to stand
is one reason for the uncertainty. It is caused by another one. These variations in the MSS. show that they do not go back to the same archetype; and secondly that the common ancestor of the prayers did not contain such detailed rubrics as the present books. This is in accordance with the general observation made before and is made highly probable too by the way in which "Expos." speaks about the service-book which had been made obligatory for the Nestorian churches by Isho'yabh iii (see below ii c). Not everything had been regulated in them. Besides that it happened that a former practice was neglected or substituted by another one (cf. ad Q. 87). The Q.Q. reveal the dangerous places. It is noteworthy that the formulary of "Addai" with its prayers is not under discussion. The difficulties came from the outside; by certain circumstances the matter becomes so complicated that it has not been provided for in the service-books. For they can prescribe what the Officiant must do, what vessels are required, what Elements must be used for the Eucharist. But they can not know what hindrances are possible. It is to a certain extent always ideal, and it supposes the knowledge of many practical questions. So the "Formulary of Mixing" says that wine and water must be mixed in the chalice, but does not indicate the quantity; 'Addai' that everything must be ordered at the end, but not what must be done with the remaining particles. Some directions were given in the "Admonitions" or "Canons", but in spite of them there remained a great number of uncertainties and it is doubtful if the Canons were generally accepted (cf. p. 137-138).

From other sources it can be seen that these Q.Q. are linked up with the state of affairs in the Nestorian Church ± 950-1000 A.D., not only with regard to the outward circumstances (cf. ch.iv), but also to their contents. Q. 87 sqq. are a clear proof. If compared with T. it seems as though they are rather superfluous, since they agree exactly with T. They cannot be explained but by assuming that the matter had not been fixed in that time. This turns out to be the right solution. Timothy ii mentions a controversy about this very point in the 13th century. He writes, after having indicated that they must be signed as is done in our book: "We practise according to

[silent] like an ignorant man", in: Budge, R.G. ii, p. 293-Babai (± 700; A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 212-213) brought unity in singing as Isho'yabh iii (p. 125) had done for the services. - At the time of our treaties other divergencies were dangerous. But in all cases we observe local varieties which ask for uniformity.

(1) The full text is quoted in the Commentary in loco.
the prevailing Law (ἰσωπάτῳ) and the given Commandment (ἱερά χειρισμόν). This is according to the opinion of the Catholici and Patriarchs Mar Abraham and Mar Emanuel.” The other opinion is that of the Catholici Isho’yabha, Seliha Zakhha and Isho’Barnun. The wording of Timothy shows that he recurs to tradition of the 10th century in which Mar Abraham and Mar Emanuel reigned (p. 85) and that this tradition had replaced an older one. It does not become clear whether it formed already a part of the liturgy. But probably it was not so.

When the groups of questions as divided in the table p. 91-93 are examined, it becomes sufficiently apparent that they were not yet fixed. In the first group the “cardo quaestionis” is found in Q. 5, and it seems in Q. 6 as though the signing with oil is not generally known (see ii), while the Addition of ‘Abdiso’ is of the author’s time. The second group deals with cases which cannot be provided for; as to the reconsecration of the altar difference is made between “with or without oil”. Some of these cases are mentioned in the rubric T. p. 119, but not all (cf. ad Q. 1) and it is not certain when this rubric has made been. There is a formulary, ascribed to Isho’yabha iii, to do it “with oil”; another one “without” is anonymous. Prof. Baumstark assumed that this one was probably made by Elias i (1028–1049) who is credited with a regulation of altar-consecration.1 This would fit in very well with the fact that in the time of our writing it was not fixed and that the regulation was made by the Catholicos after the discussion in the school, because the need was felt. In the third group the preparation of the Elements is discussed. It is stated expressly by the “Expos.”2 that no such formulary had been given by Isho’yabha iii. It may be that the first one who laid down the rules for it was John v in his Canons which were not strictly followed (p. 137–138) and left a large playing ground. The date of the Formulary is absolutely unknown; but it is not incorporated in the MSS. of T., but drawn by the editors from a special source.3 An investigation into the matter of Q. 96 shows that the regulation such as it stands in T. and is given in this Q. has been decided by Elias of Nisibis († after 1049);4 once more a case which was open in the time of our author and required a definite rule. The question of the Lord’s Prayer had divided the church into

---

two camps, one following the commandment of Timothy i, the other party sticking to the old regulation of I. iii. It is mentioned in "Expos." and in that time it had not yet been decided (cf. ad Q. 105). The place that must be taken by the Cross etc. (group 6) is not prescribed by the formulary; freedom could lead to disorder and in the time of Timothy ii it seems to have been fixed.¹

These Q. Q. reflect this situation: the liturgical book did not contain provisions for all matters; and even if there was a rubric about a certain case, it was rather young or caused differences and other people followed another, often diametrically opposite, line.¹

In cases of doubt people used to go to some teacher, priest or bishop (cf. p. 104-105). The answer did not always satisfy the questioner. Therefore he wants "clear" or "exact indications", appealing to "the witness of the very old men, ancient of days" who do not live in his own time (cf. ch. iv and p. 140), but he asks his teacher who has seen and heard them (Introduction; various other places speak of this way of transmission). The teacher himself has asked, he says, many people and everyone gave his own answer (Q. 110 and ii 14, 17; "some people say"). This can be easily understood as some problems are rather difficult to solve (Q. 17, ii V. 5).¹ They need a careful examination (ii V.3) and the bad priests of his time neglected this (Introduction). Various practices are corroborated by a "proof" (Q. 89, 109, 116, 117, 123; ii 19; M. fol. 48b though the author considers it in some cases nothing but a pretext (ii 34). The author's style is rather succinct and he gives hardly any argument himself. In this respect he is a striking contrast with the answer of Isho'Barnun to Isaac of Beth Qatraye who gives many references to Scripture (p. 131). In some cases the author confesses that he does not know it himself, because he has neither seen it nor heard of it; he solves the difficulties by saying "according to my knowledge" (Q. 17; ii 20, 36, 38, 39 V.3 en 22). Of course, he uses this term in a way different from that in the Introduction where it indicates ill-instruction or laziness. He has investigated everything, but it was impossible to find the opinion of the old men. In some instances he leaves the decision to the questioner.

¹ Particulars about these facts in the Commentary. (2) ii 16 quoted ad Q. 76; variety of opinion: Q. 29, 65, 89, 101 and elsewhere. (3) ii V. 5 = addition of V. to ii 5 (see p. 69). (4) Cf. ii 36: something which has not been done in our days but which the teacher has read in the Synodical Canons.
(Q. 116) or says that if somebody wants to act in another way, he may do so and our author is not inclined to quarrel with him about it (Q. 5, 16; ii 24, 39). Yet by far the greater part shows no traces of hesitation; the author knows exactly what is required.

Where did our teacher get his knowledge from? He has heard or seen it, he assures at numerous places. He himself refuses to be called one “versed in knowledge”, but he is “like one who has tried and seen things from the old men, ancient of days”. He bases his knowledge not upon a written tradition, but upon an oral one. The authority was a number of initiated persons, since not every man of old age serving in the church belonged to them, for the questioner remarks that his time is deprived of such men, a statement which would be somewhat strange if it should be taken in the literal sense. Several times their witness is called upon (Q. 37, 89, 110, 118, 123). Once they are called “Fathers” or “Ancients” (Q. 116). He speaks of tradition (Q. 36, 94; ii 34 in a disapproving manner). If these statements will yield the answer to the question put at the beginning of this chapter, the contents of the following points must be defined: how where these liturgical matters transmitted, orally or by writing—who are meant by the “old men”; do they form a warrant for an old tradition—what was the part played by the schools because the author is a schoolmaster—These terms suggest tradition. Is that true?

ii. Our Questions point to oral tradition. As a matter of fact it was found side by side with written regulations. In the 6th century the Patriarch Isbo’ Barnun answered to the question in what books it was written that the Purshana in the church is the Body of the Holy Virgin, that not everything that is traditional is written in books. Although this statement does not strictly belong to the field that is explored here (it is more or less mystagogical), it is so explicit that it forms a suitable starting-point. The books are depositories

(1) It is interesting to note similar expressions in the answers of John of Tella: “I think” (Can. 9, Lamy, p. 70; 23, p. 78; 46, p. 82); “one should not doubt” (Can. 8, p. 69–70; 1, 22, 12; 9, p. 70: 1, 22, 12); he prefers 9 what is better (Can. 8).—Expos. uses the same words and offers many different opinions, but since the subject-matter is quite different, they do not form a clear parallel. (2) Isho’ Barnun, ad Mascarum, Q. 55, in: Mingana Syr. 58, fol. 40b (Purshana = Eulogia in other churches; for the connection with Mary cf. L.E.W., p. 30: Prayer of Mary).
of Canon-Law. If it had not been written down it was called "custom" which had the same validity unless a canon made it impossible. The same Isho'Barnun ordered that it was allowed to go on fasting after using the Mysteries, except on Sundays because there was no canon forbidding it. Along with the Canons custom had a large and unlimited field. By decision of a Patriarch or of a Synod such a custom was made obligatory. But oral tradition is the mother of written orders which were made if required, e.g. by variety. This is the reason why the handbooks of oriental Canon-law generally miss systematic order; they do not contain all the rules; only those that settled a point of dispute.

This usage, familiar to the reader of the preceding pages, is found at the very beginning of the codification of churchmatters. It suggests even a parallel with the Jewish practice in post-exilic times, notably strong in the days of the N.T. Within the limits of the present investigation it is impossible to deal extensively with this idea of Tradition in liturgics. Yet it will not be superfluous to recall some facts. The first who gives a remarkable notice in this respect is Tertullian. He ranks custom with the Scripture and against those who demand written authority he points to some generally accepted facts. Augustin says the same: "In his enim rebus, de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura Divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt" and mentions: "quae non scripta, sed tradita custodimus". This teaching is in accordance with that of Basil, of whom it was said in the funeral oration by Gregory of Nazianza that he had made υποστήριξις

(1) It would be interesting to compare the development of canon-law in the (Eastern) church with that of the Law in Islam, see: I. Goldziher, Vorlesungen über den Islam, Heidelberg, 1910, ch. ii, Die Entwicklung des Gesetzes, S. 35-79, which offers striking parallels to the points discussed in the following pages.

These quotations show sufficiently how both were thought to be of the same validity though we observe in later times a growing tendency to quote prooetexts from Scripture. If circumstances compelled to do so, the custom was fixed in an official canon. When Can. xviii of Nicaea speaks of the rumour that deacons have given the Communion-bread to the priests it says: δι’ αυτὸς δὲ καὶ κοινόν αυτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔχει ποτέ ὁ δίκαιος, and immediately a canon is made to check such a wrong practice lest it might become tradition. In this connection it will be useful to quote some sentences from the introduction of Isho’yabhi in his letter answering the question of James of Darai on “die priesterlichen Ordnungen und kirchlichen Kanon en des Dienstes des geistlichen Lebens”. He will write because the subject had not been dealt with systematically by the Fathers. Nevertheless he writes himself according to the tradition: “Indem wir entsprechend der bei uns von den Vätern vermittelten apostolischen Überlieferung schreiben, weisen wir die anderen Überlieferungen zurück, die irgendwie durch irgend jemand Eingang gefunden, an verschiedenen Orten angenommen und von unvorsichtigen Leuten, die von solchen annehmen, die ohne gelernt zu haben, lehren, festgehalten wurden, von solchen, deren Überlieferungsgeschwätz das Organ zur Verführung vieler haltloser (Leute) is.” We learn from this quotation that there was a double custom; the right one may be learned (in the school?—see sub iv). Unfortunately the criterium which was applied to decide what was right or wrong is not so definite as to enable us to distinguish in a certain case between old and young. He also distinguishes between his answer and Canons: the latter are short “zur Einschüchterung der Ungehorsamen mit Anathemen”; the former are extensive in teaching and exposition, reproducing the doctrine of the Fathers and giving proofs from nature and Scripture. The former are discussed by teacher and pupil: „nicht in synodaler Form auf einer Väterversammlung in autoritativender Entscheidung unter Vielen aufgestellt.” By the incorporation in the Synodicon they also have

been ranked with Canones!—At the end of the Canons of his Synod (xxxii, O. Braun, Syntheses, S. 234) it is said that everyone of the subscribers bound themselves to read them once a year before their flock. Naturally they would always have them at hand.

So we find that Canon and Custom (or teaching of the Fathers) stood side by side (the Q, of Isho'yakh i are the deposit of the latter). The Canon is a definite commandment (exceptions by “necessity”, see commentary), the custom is not. It happened sometimes that Canon and Custom did not agree; Isho'yakh iii mentions in one of his letters such a case: “si vero apud vos per quosdam homines contra legem ecclesiasticam nunc prolatae sunt seniorum traditiones quae decretum a tua Paternitate legetime sanctitum abollent…” Their relation is parallel to that of Dogma and Doctrine; of which the former was only formulated to exclude wrong opinions. Only when abuses creep in, the right practice is regulated; otherwise it was handed down from generation to generation without being written down. This presents us from defining what exactly belongs to it or when a measure was introduced; for it might have been customary already for a long time before it became a Canon. This is the more conclusive in case of Orientals who have such a strong sense for oral transmission. It follows that it is impossible to get knowledge of these “Customs” but by indirect references. Something which has been written down at a late date, may be very old; but it is not necessarily so, because it is called “traditional”. This “Custom” is an absolutely in calculable factor. Yet it is important to see that the limits between Canon and Custom were vague from the outset. It remains the same through all ages, though the place of the limits may change. Another cause of complication forms the fact that some places developed peculiarities of their own (see p. 110 “Gewohnheit des Ortes”, and the freedom that seems to have existed and of which these pages show many examples). We now pass on to a survey of the contents of the written tradition since this will give us some hold and reveal us something more about the validity.

a. At the time the Persian Church separated itself from the Greek Church (see p. 22), it took over the regulations that had been

---

(1) Yet there are even at the present moment in the Roman Catholic Church (in which these matters are regulated much better than in the Oriental Churches in the past and present) “Gewohnheiten contrax legem”, cf. J. Braun, Lit. Handlexicon, S. 122, s.v. Gewohnheit. (2) Isho'yakh iii, Epistulae, ed. R. Duval, p. 114.
made at several synods of the Greek Church. We must keep in mind
as far as our subject is concerned, that already very soon several
synods were held and made regulations about questions that
occurred again and again, such as: who was to be admitted to the
Communion; is it allowed to take the Eucharistic bread home? These
Canons together with others were taken over by the Persians and
cauised them to have a common basis about these matters with
the Greeks. The Synod of Yabhallaha i (419–420) decided that
the following should be obligatory: the Apostolical Canons, those
of the Synod of Nicæa (325), Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Gangra, Antioch
and Laodicea (that of Chalcedon [451] was added by
Mar Abba).1 From the liturgical point of view one Canon of
Isaac (410), viz. xiii is important; he decided: “Auch im Dienste
des Abendlandes, den die BB. Isaak und Maruta uns gelehrt und
in dem wir alle in der Kirche von S. sie dienen sehen, wollen wir von nun an insgesamt ebenso dienen.” It contains:
Caruzutha's by the Deacons;2 reading of the Scripture, offering
of the oblation on one altar in all the churches, not in private
houses.3 So all matters were brought into agreement with Seleucia
and the West. The “Abendland” is the Church in the Roman
Empire.

The reference found about Mar Abba viz. “ordinavit ritum
ecclésiae”,4 is too vague to draw from it a definite conclusion. It
may simply be a reference to his translation of ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’
(cf. p. 41).

b. The letter of Isho'yabh i of Arzor has already been referred
to several times.5 He wrote to his correspondent that he did not
say all that could be said, but only what was asked. We may
summarize those that deal with the liturgy. The first prescribes that
the priests should draw near to the altar with “awe” and the priests
must be blameless.6 He gives a short survey of the service, men-

---

(1) O. Braun, Synadhos, S. 38–39; Mar Abba, ibidem, S. 138.—About this collection,
cf. G. Krüger, Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Tübingen, 1923, i, § 29, 8; the
(2) Cf. E.S.D.O., p. 294: The litany of the Deacon. (3) O. Braun, Synadhos,
S. 21.—For the reference to Isaac and Maruta compare Gismondi, i, p. 26:
“Interim (during the reign of Isaac) Marútas episcopus medicus non cessavit
orientalis fideles docere instituta universa ac decreta occidentali, quae in
eorum synodo communi consensu sanxerunt.” (4) Gismondi ii, p. 24; cf. A. Baum-
tioning the fact that the priest comes to the altar, kneels and kisses
it; he greets and blesses the people and their response; then he
speaks "entsprechend der Aufeinanderfolge des kirchlichen Ritus .
(das) in allen Kirchen Gottes gebetet wird" (not specified) and the
signs of the Cross are mentioned. The second orders that the cele-
brant must first of all receive the communion as he also needs
forgiveness. The order in which this must be done is given here.
The Can. 18 of Nicaea is repeated in Can. 3 here; but if there is
no other priest it must be done nevertheless, though in a special way
which is indicated. He .orbids a priest to officiate in anger (5) and
a minister may not prevent an other man with whom he is quarrelling
from receiving the sacraments (6). An adulterous priest must
be punished by excommunication (11). It will be seen that these
Canons are mainly dealing with the conditions for communion.

β. In the introduction to this letter he refers to a writing of
his which he had composed when he was a teacher "auf der hohen
Schule", at the request of the Bishops, in which he explained "klar
und distinkt": "wie der Priester zu der Taufe und der Darbringung
des Opfers im furchtbaren, Gott versöhnenden und die Getauften
heiligenden Priesterdienst hinzutreten soll, in dem wir jedem (Text)
worte seine Erklärung in einer Menge kurzer (Bemerkungen)
beifügten." Nothing of such a book is spoken of in the "Catalogue"
of 'Abdisho'; but this writer mentions 22 Q.Q. on the Mysteries.1
Prof. Baumstark identified these two books and supposed that in
V. fol. 93 one question of it had been preserved: whether the liturgy
may be brought out of the church (the latter suggestion had been
expressed before by Prof. Braun). This identification of three data
without having seen the part in question, is somewhat too prema-
ture. For even if the first clause of this sentence may be taken as
dealing with liturgical indications, yet it seems to be about the
liturgy proper and the priest, but not about accidentals such as the
Question in V. does. But the second part rules out the possibility of

(1) One of his arguments is Matt. 7:6: "Heilig und Perlen nennt er das h.
Sacrament unter dem Bilde kostbar geachteter (Dinge)". (2) O. Braun,
Synhades, S. 239. (3) B.O., iii i, p. 110-111; but Amr ascribes them to Isho-
yahbi of Gadaša (J. Labont, Christianisme, passim): "de Sacramentis Ecclesiae
in duas supra viginti interrogationes toto dumque responsiones distributum."
Of 1. i he wrote only these words: "canones edidit et sacramenta exposuit", in:
Gisondli ii, p. 31 and p. 28. (4) A. Baumstark, L.C., S. 126 and Ak. 10
(vielleicht); O. Braun, Synhades, S. 239, N. 1 (the number of the MS. is omitted);
R. Duval, Littérature Syriaco, p. 349, does not mention what is said in the
Synodicon at all.
this explanation and shows that we must think of a mystagogy. It cannot be said whether this is the same as the 22 Q Q.; but in Amr they are clearly distinguished. It is not impossible because they deal with the mysteries. On the other hand the form of the "question" points to actual difficulties in the service. This fits in very well with a subject as that of V. There are some incalculable points, especially as the expression of 'Abdisho' is far from clear. Before some of the data are rashly combined and identified, all the materials that are left should be examined.

We begin with Vat. Syr. 150. The authors referred to above started undoubtedly from the "Catalogue" of Assemani (cf. p. 65). It is not clear why they confined themselves to this one alone. If we take before us V. v we read that it is [אאאא] אא = "on emergencies". This item does not agree exactly with the description given by Isho'yab himself, nor does it look like that of 'Abd., for they are not in the form of questions. Their contents are:

1. the precautions for bringing the communion outside the church to a sick person (published by Assemani, B.O., iii 1, p. 244);
2. baking of the eucharistic bread by a single priest;
3. the place of the font of baptism;
4. consecration of the eucharist by a single priest is forbidden (only allowed by the 318 Fathers of Nicæa to hermits).

In V. these canons had a special heading. In M. the text had become somewhat confused as the heading and the first topic were omitted; consequencealy this piece is put very awkwardly between the Q Q. But with V. in hand it is quite clear (it is possible that the name of I. was crossed out in codex M., since it was the same name as that of the heading of C.).

In his collection of the ecclesiastical lawbooks of Alexandria Dr. Riedel inserted and translated "Befehl der Väter, der Vorsteher, der Gebieter." According to the editor they are nothing but a compilation from the Arabic times. They offer parallels to the Syriac text mentioned before. § 20 of them contains the canon about the communion of the sick (1), in every word agreeing with the Syriac text; and § 19 that one on the consecration by a single priest (4), but this recension is much longer. A striking difference between these two forms is that they are here introduced by the entry "sie haben befohlen und gesagt...". Is this the work of
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the Compiler? How were they brought into the Alexandrine collection and why have they another order?

Another important piece of evidence is contained in one of the MSS. of the Baptismal Service J.,). After the prayer of T. p. 65, l. 3 a long passage follows ending with the words: “The great matters of dispute solved by Mar Isho’yabh of Arzon before intelligent people, are brought to a close.” G. Dietrich thought the passage “leicht überarbeitet.”

Assemanni has given a report of the Arabic translation of the Synodicon by Elias Damascenus. It contains the following items: “14 Jesuabi statutum de Eucharistia. 15 Mosis in idem, nec non de Baptismo”. Together with no. 13 they are not found in the Syriac text. Assemanni’s statement was derived from Vat. Arab. 157 about which he did not furnish any other information, exception being made for his quotation of the decision of the said Moses whom he identified with Moses of Kashar mentioned by ‘Abdisho’ as the text stands it deals with the consecration by a single priest and communion outside the church; the sequence is the same as that of Riedel’s text; the former decision is very short. For the rest nobody seems to have asked who was the Isho’yabh of item 14 (that is the more striking because it might have been that it was I. iii and that his work contained something about the liturgical reformation). What is contained in this Arabic text?

The parts mentioned stand after two writings of George i (680-681), long after I. i. no. 13 (Ass.) begins like this (fol. 79b): “further they said”, introduction to a summary of the order of the Bishops at an official meeting. Next to it come the parts that interest us here (fol. 79b-81b). “It is handed down from Isho’yabh that he laid down as a rule and taught”:

1. a canon about the provisions to be made when eucharistic bread is left;
2. about the ablutions of the chalice;
3. (Introduction; likewise he said) about the consecration by a single priest, which is inconsistent with the church-law; joined to it is a

(1) Published by G. Dietrich, Nest. Taufliturgie, S. 94-99; neither this reference nor the other materials have been incorporated by Prof. Baumstark in his note on Isho’yabh i. (2) B.O., iii 1, p. 514.—About the Arabic translation cf. p. 20. (3) B.O., iii 1, p. 276 (the codex has here the classmark 37); A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 122-123, thinks this identification probable. (4) Thanks to the kind offices of Prof. Dr. R. R. Past I received the facsimiles. Prof. Dr. A. J. Wessinck had the extreme kindness to translate these parts. (5) Syr.: Breaks the Canon.
bit of polemics against the Greeks (Rûm); it was ordered by God that everything in the natural world should be done in pairs, as it is in heaven (Is. vi). The argument is reinforced by a quotation of Mar Moses from his book “The Beauty of the Works”: 1

4. (without introduction) about the communion of the sick; 2
5. further they[] taught (the usual introduction to all the following canons): about baking the eucharistic bread while there is no priest to consecrate it, 4 and drinking of the chalice;
6. the bread must remain on the altar until a priest comes to consecrate it; another person must be present for the “ordering”; otherwise the priest must wait and fast till somebody comes;
7. the following persons may not communicate: mad people; 5 people who have been excommunicated; heretics and mockers;
8. the deacon is allowed to “sign” the chalice if something was left, but not to say the formula: “this chalice is consecrated etc.”; 6
9. about Baptism in a special part of the church 7 that can only be entered by certain ranks of the clergy, and about laybaptism. 8

We have given in the notes the points of similarity between the various sources. It is clear that the division of Assemani (two treatises of I. and Moses) is definitely wrong; the Isho’yabh that seems to be quoted was i, as we may infer from V. while nothing militates against this statement; Riedel’s text is a descendant of the Synodicon with some correction; its quotation in a Jacobite context explains sufficiently that the proper name has been replaced by: “they”. It seems as though in V. all canons are ascribed to I. while in M. they are anonymous; in Arab. they are the decisions of a

(1) The Greeks allow: one priest in several villages (cf. ad Q. 36); the priests entering the altar with shoes (cf. ad Q. 39); the nuns to enter the altar (cf. ad Q. 29–30) and to communicate to the people (the Jacobites only, if there was no priest, Vetusta Doc. Liturgica, p. 7 = 33 tr.). (2) This agrees with Riedel, § 19 (S. 193–193); variants: Elias omits: “diejenigen, welche den Bestimmungen zuwider handeln und der Tradition widersetzen und diejenigen, welche ihnen die Erlaubnis dazu gegeben haben, sind gebannt, ausgeschieden” ; the quotation of Moses is cited, but introduced with “Einige Heiligen haben gesagt...”; is this tendentious? (3) Quite the same as Riedel, § 20 (S. 193) = V. The quotation of Assemani gives the impression that this Canon is also of Moses. It is clear from the context that it is not. (4) = V. and M. (5) This is a general rule in Eastern churches, Vetusta Doc. Liturgica, p. 6–7 = 32 tr., but cf. p. 133 n. 4. That the other categories were excluded from communion is natural. (6) Cf. ad Q. 21. (7) = V. and M. (8) The quotation by G. Dietrich, mentioned before, is a very large expansion of this Canon. It is not clear, where the words of I. i begin or whether the whole belongs to this Patriarch.
Synod that met under George i or afterwards. They used the traditions of I. i; his canons were once more underlined and expanded; and they profess to be in accordance with the tradition of the church. It is remarkable that Syr. and Arab. have deviations on some minor points as regards the author's name though Isho'yabhi is mentioned every time. Yet the evidence is too confused to make us say without any doubt: these canons were derived from the book: "Questions about the Mysteries" of Isho'yabhi; nor can we say that it was identical with that one referred to in the Introduction of his letter. But it is clear that the Questions were probably not mystagogical but practical and that Isho’yabhi wrote another book of interpretation.

We will stick to the Arabic text. It shows that there was in this respect a tradition that was cultivated. It dealt with cases of: preparation and ordering of the liturgy.

4. At this point we must record the liturgical work of the great Patriarch Isho’yabhi iii. His name has been mentioned before at several occasions as he is called the great reformer of the liturgy. He lived in the beginning of the 7th century and ruled from 648 (or 650)–657. This time is outwardly marked for the Nestorians by the change of government, since the Persian Sassanides must cede their reign to the Islam, inwardly by a reorganization of all forces, as the church had to face so many new problems. A monograph about this outstanding man and his work in these troublesome years is still wanting, though it would be an attractive task to write it. We cannot undertake it within the limits of the present investigation. We cannot even consider the whole of his liturgical work, but the scheme of this book imposes the questions: what was the character of his activity concerning the Eucharist; what has he bequeathed to posterity? After the paragraphs devoted by Prof. Hennsen to these points,1 it is not superfluous to put them again, since he does not offer all the materials available nor gives an answer.

The editions of the Eucharistic Liturgy which I have consulted

do not offer a single remark about Isho'yab's activity. But it should be said once more that a critical edition (p. 110) does not exist. So we do not know what may be contained in some MS. or other; at the present moment, however, the liturgy itself does not give us a clue. Among the writings of this author are no directions for the administration of the Eucharist, such as John v has given some centuries later in his Canons (p. 133-135), nor does his Book of Letters, published by Prof. Duval, offer any help, since it does not contain any letter dealing with Eucharistic problems or any reference to the liturgy or to his own activity about it. The result of the direct sources is rather disappointing; so we must see whether the indirect sources yield any result, as there must be some reason to mention his name in connection with the Liturgy.

The references of the Nestorian Chronicles are rather poor. Mari thought 13 lines sufficient honour to this Patriarch and did not write anything about a liturgical reform. Amr gives a longer note with the following detail which is of interest: “promovendis scientiis operam dedit, ordinantique officium per annos circulat, uti nunc se habet (14th century); sermones etiam, hymnosque composit, qui inter preces recitantur”. The words which I italicized, point to liturgical activity, but the Eucharist is not specially mentioned; the concluding words suggest that this office remained the same in the course of time. The summary in the “Catalogue” of ’Abdisho’ (± 1300) reads like this: “and he ordered an order of the churchbook of the ‘Circle of the Year’ and Baptism together with the Absolution and the Consecration of a new church and Ordination-formularies of all Orders etc.” Besides the Hudhra, about which we will speak presently, all the rituals specified here mention the name of I. in their MSS. and confirm the notice of ’Abdisho’. Our treatises refer twice to him: in Q. 1 in connection with the consecration of a new church; in M. fol. 34a in connection with Baptism.

(1) Isho'yab iii, Liber Epistularum, ed. R. Duval, Parisius, 1904, C.S.C.O., ii, 64. (2) Giamondi i, p. 55.-It may be remarked that the reference of Hansens, o.c., iii, p. 628 to Giamondi i, p. 49 and ii, p. 26 are wrong. These pages do not deal with the third patriarch of that name. (3) Giamondi ii, p. 32; see the previous note.—About: “promovendis scientiis” cf. p. 145. (4) Yet the reformation of the High Monastery (p. 148-149) also affected it; we must understand this sentence to mean that the general scheme was Isho'yab's. (5) B.O., iii 1, p. 139-140. (6) Cf. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 199-200 notes passim.
Is this coincidence with 'Abdisho' merely accidental? Neither of these writers says a word about the Eucharist. Or must we interpret the fact that the author of the "Questions" refers to his great namesake at the beginning of his treatises, in this way that all the following teaching was derived from the Churchbook of Isho'yabah? The former possibility seems to be preferable; for, if the latter supposition were right, we should have expected this reference in the Introduction and not connected with a question on a particular rite. However this may be, I believe that the author of our Q.Q. had not this reason; but that it was impossible for him to connect the name of I. iii with the Eucharistic questions as these points were not dealt with in the churchbook. The chapters in the "Book of the Govenari" dealing with the lifetime of I. iii do not contain much about the Patriarch himself, since the work is concerned with monasticism and not with the history of the church as a whole. Nothing but the Hudra is ascribed to him; it is called here:  דודא = churchbook of the canons (it appears from the context that the Hudra is intended).  "Hud(ḥ)rā (Kreislauf), eigentlich Penqīd(h)ītā (קדוד, Tafel) der Kanones des ganzen Jahreskreislaufes" heisst das grosse Choralbuch des nestorianischen Ritus, das auf die Sonn- and Festtage des Kirchenjahres und die Werktag des Ninevitenfastens und der voroerlichen vierzigtaegigen Fastenzeit die älteren wechselnden Gesangstücke für das kirchliche Tagzeitengebet und die Eucharistiefeier enthält". Prof. Baumstark distinguished this book from the Tākhsa which contained the various formularies for the priests (its contents, see p. 109), some of which were fixed by Isho'yabah iii, but up till now we did not hear anything about the Eucharist. Thomas of Marga refers to him in another place which is generally overlooked. In describing the work of Babai (± 700) he says in the sequence of the words quoted on p. 110, n. 4: "As before the time of Mār Isho'yabah of Adiabene the Catholicoi, the orders of the services were performed in a confused manner in every place, and by the means of this man the services of all the churches acquired connected order, so also etc." This

(1) Budge, B.G. ii, p. 131-179. (2) Budge, B.G. ii, p. 176-177, quoted ad Q. 106. (3) Cf. ad Q. 11. (4) A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 198. (5) Budge, B.G. ii, p. 203; the Syriac text reads as follows, B.G. i, p. 142:
text tells us that there was a great confusion in the Nestorian church with regard to the services themselves, not about the singing which was the point in the time of Babai; probably every church and country had developed his own liturgy and the unity was broken. It was the great merit of Isho'yahb iii to have unified all the local varieties. The particular word “takhsa” which is used here can denote the order of every service, either Baptism, Eucharist etc. or Daily Office, but preferably the former (T. is the name of the Nestorian Euchologium). Though this text does not specially mention the Eucharist, it seems to be included and in general this notice is of great value. With it one sentence of the Chronicle of Seert fits in very well. It is told in the history of Ephraim: “Il (Ephraim) composa une messe dont se servent encore les Melchites. Les Nestoriens céleraient aussi cette messe à Nisibe jusqu’aux jours du métropolite Jésuyab qui, lorsqu’il réglait les prières, choisit trois messes et prohiba les autres.”¹ This fact can easily explain why the Eucharist is not mentioned in other places which tell something of the liturgical activity of I.: while he himself took a part in the conception of the formularies catalogued by ‘Abdisho’, he confined himself with regard to the Eucharist to stopping the local varieties and selecting three existing formularies. But there are two other notices found in the literature which point into another direction. The Nestorian canonist Ibn-at-Tayyib († 1043, in the time of our treatises) observes in his Arabic Nomocanon: “La messe des apôtres a été composée par Addai et Mari, et le catholico Jesús-ib l’a abrégée”;¹ the same seems to be intended in the Chronicle of the Jacobite patriarch Michael (± 1150): “and he abridged the liturgy of Nestor, since it was very prolix.”¹ As far as I know it has been impossible to detect rests of the unabridged liturgy (‘Fragment’ and the text of Abraham b. Lipheh, cf. p. 55, n. 5??) and these texts do not help us to determine the character of the curtailment. The MSS. do not help us either.

¹ Chronique de Séert, ed. A. Scher Paris 1908, P. O. iv, p. 295–The three masses p. 29, n. 3.–Does this reveal something about the origin of ‘Addai’? Dom. Engberding (cf. p. 54) has overlooked this text, though it confirms his view. (2) This Synodicon has not yet been published. The quotation in: L.O.O., p. 338 and n. 1. (3) Michael i, Chronicum, ed. J. B. Chabot, Parisiiis, 1898, iv, p. 776a (tr. iii, p. 521)–Prof. A. Baumstark, L.G., s. 199 suggested that “dies angesichts der breiten Ausführlichkeit gerade dieses Formulars (‘Nest.’) nur auf einem Missverständnis beruhen (kann) und es muss vielmehr an die Apostelanaphora gedacht werden, deren überliefelter Text in der Tat den Eindruck starker Kürzung macht”. Such a mistake would be easy for a Jacobite. (4) A monograph
Last of all we must pay attention to those places where I. is named in the “Expositio”. At the very beginning in his apology (Expos. i, p. 16–18) the author declares that he wants to be in everything in accordance with I. He has been asked about the reasons of the offices of the church. There are different interpretations (Expos. i mentions a good many of them; it is striking that they are not found in such a large number in the explanation of the Eucharist). To find the right path he wants “normam a sanctis patribus statutam tenere et exsequi, qui suis interpretationibus restrictis nonnulla tacerunt ut aliorm laboribus aliquid relinquercnt: id quod et beati Isō'yāḇh patriarchae consilium fuit, qui Codicem illum insigem canorum instruxit.”

By this I. gained the victory over the heretics “qui in ignorantia haeresim suam tenent, et officia neglecterent persolvent. In ritibus ergo atque canonibus explicandis qui in Codice descripti et innexi sunt” our author has followed his great forerunner. He describes the plan of his work in the following words: “a re chronologica incipiemus; deinde orationum nostrarum commentaria aggrediemur.” In executing this plan he discusses the chronological questions in liber i; ii and iii deal with the Daily Offices; iv with the Eucharist; v with Baptism; vi with the Consecration of a new Church and vii with the Funeral and Marriage-services. In comparing the plan and its execution we must conclude that the contents of liber ii–vii are summarized under the head: orationes. The consecration-formulary was at the end of the Churchbook (I. vi, c. i). We can be sure that the Eucharist as commented upon by this anonymous author was contained in it, because he says at the beginning of book vi: “Dei adiutorio absolutae sunt omnes expositiones officiorum quae in cyclo (fudhrā) anni postae sunt.”

on the work of Isho’yāḇh iii must fix the relation between ‘Addai’ and Nāra, Hom. xvii. (if genuine); and the investigation has to be extended over the other formularies as well.

(1) Timothy ii does not mention him a single time; the Isho’yāḇh being quoted was i. (2) Sometimes he combats his predecessors, cf. e.g. Expos. ii, p. 34: “Abraham bar Lipheh in dementia sua”. (3) Expos. i, p. 17: ḫudhrā. (4) Expos. i, p. 18: ḫudhrā. (5) The prayers are defined in the next sentence: “primum mensium, hebdomadarum ac dierum, expositionem instituimus: deinde medio loco ponemus cantiones, et mystica praeteriti, praesentis et futuri temporis cantica, donec in portu quiescamus illo, ubi tempus nullum est etc.” (6) Expos.
Our author wants to follow closely the book of Isho'yabh, of which the prayers seem to be the most important part. Did the book of I. contain very specified indications of the actions of the priests? The following sentences can give us an answer: “beatus Isho'yabh de eis rebus sollicitus fuit, atque praecrispsit, quae mysteria experimenter, neque de factisipsis adeo curabit” and when he speaks about the “Pax” (L.E.W., p. 283) given by the deacon “qui proclamavit” (which is sometimes done, but had not been prescribed by I.) he says: “et ecce, quamvis apud nos ille diaconus hanc pacem annuniet qui et proclamationem fecit, tamen, uti superius dixi, beatus Isho'yabh ca omnia praecrispsit, quae typum aliquem regni experimenter, neque curae fuit ei ut omnia quae scripsit plene perferentur, ita ut nihil aut adderetur aut demeretur.” That everything which had been ordered by I. had a typological meaning is the favorite dogma of our author which guides his own interpretation (cf. e.g. n. 5 of p. 127 and Expos. i, p. 126; ii, p. 75, 88, 91 etc.). These words combined with the fact that he calls the rituals “prayers” can only mean that the servicebook of I. contained the prayers together with the directions which were most needed, but that it left a great freedom to the officiating priests with regard to the rubrics, a fact which agrees with the supposition of p. 110. There are strong reasons to believe that the text which can be reconstructed from this Commentary offers the text of I. himself and not that of the author’s time. For he says that it is not wise to transgress the rules laid down by I. (“Sine ergo res debito more procedunt, et quo modo docuit beatus Isho'yabh… Quidquid ergo nobis non praecipitur, hoc facere non debemus.”) The evidence of the following sentence seems to me conclusive: “Officium mysteriorum scrutare, et hact omnia ante oculorum tuorum aciem finge, dum ritus perlegis quos praecrispsit beatus Isho'yabh, etiam non peranguntur.” “There are some places where the practice of his time has more than that of I. and they are duly marked: ii, p. 36 I. has not given an order for the preparation of the elements; ii, p. 53 (quoted before); ii, p. 82–83 on the addition of the Lord’s Prayer by Timothy i (see commentary ad Q. 105 sqq.). Once only he records an ii, p. 106 and ii, p. 66, quoted on p. 129, n. 1.

(i) Expos. ii, p. 32. (2) Expos. ii, p. 53; about the end of the sentence cf. the commentary ad Q. 1. (3) Expos. ii, p. 102. (4) Expos. ii, p. 74. (5) Perhaps it is not out of place to stress the fact, that Expos. contains only very few historical particulars.
addition which I. himself has made to the older liturgy and he tells us that there were many people who opposed to it and churches where it was not said even in his own time, because they wanted to preserve the tradition. The same fate occurred to the addition of Timothy i. Why are these additions and changes of the tradition allowed while others are not? Because they have been made by men guided in a special way by the Holy Spirit. The author appeals to Paul's dictum in Rom. xiii 1 and continues: "Si ergo omnibus potestatis subditi esse iubemur, cur non huic se subiciunt, qui a Spiritu constitu tus fuit ut nos regeret? Cum enim Timotheum repudiarint, repudiarunt et Isö'yabh: etenim ambo pariter patriarcarum fuerunt." But changes made by the priests on their own authority are wrong. It must be noticed that Expos. does not say anything about a reformation of the Eucharistic liturgy by I., while he mentions an older practice.

These are the facts that can be derived from the study of the "Expositio". They are, I think, sufficiently interesting to pay some attention to them. As a matter of fact this book gives the fullest information and it is somewhat strange that it had generally been ignored. Summarizing the results we find the following data: the author has closely followed the ritual of I. iii; it was contained in a book which comprised both Ūdhra and Takhsa (according to the terminology of Prof. Baumstark) and which is generally called Penōthia; the number of the rubries was comparatively small; additions to these actions may be made, though it is better to stick to the prescripts of I.; additions to the prayers may only be made by the Patriarch.

Reviewing the evidence of the preceding pages we get this

(1) Expos. ii, p. 66: "Sicendum tibi est, frater noster, quod haec proclamatio (caruntha, L.E.W., p. 294-295) non est ex prae scriptione antiquorum et apostolorum, sed beatus ipse Isö'yabh eam prae scriptit et instituit per Codicem suum, ita ut vix ac molestia accepta sit ab is qui veritati resistunt et doctoribus. Sed et multi diu manebant ecclesiae nec eam dicebant; et ferunt etiam, esse usque ad hodiernum diem ecclesias quae non eam proclamant." (2) Expos. i, p. 122-123. (3) It will be remarked that he does not say anything of Baptism either. But his activity concerning Baptism did not consist in a partial change, but: "dieser allein hat das unsterbliche Verdienst, an Stelle des alten nestorianischen Katechumenenauftubals das jetzt noch gebräuchliche Kinderauff viral eingeführt zu haben" (G. Dietrich, Tawliturgie, S. xvii). In explaining the ritual there was no reason for Expos. to mention the older one; I. iii had made a new beginning. (4) It may be that the use of Ūdhra etc., which we found before, must be explained from this point of view and not in that strict sense as Prof. Baumstark did.
rough picture of Isho’yabh’s activity: when he got his highly responsible office, there existed a great confusion among the Nestorians; he put in order a churchbook which contained the Daily Offices and rituals, some of which were new, while the three Eucharistic formularies were selected from a vaster number (and abridged?) Because they were real liturgies, they were called „prayers”, for the liturgy is always the work of the “Ecclesia Orans.” He did not decide the questions of admission to the communion and so many practical questions which might arise during the service. His few rubrics left a fairly large field uncovered (take e.g. the preparation of the elements) the custom filled the gap. But this undefined custom might be the source of much trouble; and Isho’yabh’s successors fixed afterwards several rules (see below), and as they never appeal to the great Patriarch, while the Eastern people are so traditional we may find here an affirmation of our view that he had not given rules about it. The time of our Q.Q. again showed confusion, because these matters had not been fixed in writing.

d. The following churchman of whom something of this kind is preserved was Timothy i (780–823). In connection with other decrees about ecclesiastical orders he prescribed what should be done when a layman was angry and refused to accept the communion from a priest (14) and that it is forbidden to preserve the eucharist to the next day, in proof he refers to the paschal Lamb and Manna.

e. Several of the writings of the successor and former opponent of Timothy, Isho’Barnun (823–828). They are not found among those published already by Prof. Sachau; we consulted them in codex Mingana Syr. 586 and 587 (these MSS. contain the same matter, I believe, as Vat. Borgia 81 (K. VI 3).

(1) The same is said among the Byzantines about the work of Basil and Chrysostom with regard to the Liturgy of James (Pseudo-Proclus, in: M.S.G. 63, col. 849–852, whose verdict is generally rejected at present, see: Pl. de Meester, D.A.C.L., s.v. Grecques [liturgies], t. vi, col. 1597). Is Dom. Engelberding (cf. p. 54) right in his inference from this similarity, that the statement of Ibn-at-Tayyib is without any value?—The question whether I. iii has been influenced from Byzance (p. 41) does not affect the theme of our investigation.
(3) E. Sachau, Syrische Rechtbücher, Berlin, 1908, ii, S. 68(60) and 70(71).
α. Letter to Isaac, visitor of Beth Katraye (587, fol. 360a–367b). After a long introduction the Q Q follow, all about liturgical matters, though not exclusively on the Eucharist. They are treated very fully, stating several mystagogical reasons. It is sufficient for our purpose to summarize those on the eucharist. Q. 1: whether the “Treasury” (cf. ad Q. 16) may remain on the altar for several days; the answer is in the negative; he refers to the paschal Lamb as a symbol (Ex. xii 10); it is a King that cannot be despised and another symbol is found in the Manna (Ex. xvi 19). But in any case it is better to keep it for one night than to take it unlawfully, since nobody may take more than 5 Ge-murta’s; then he gives the acts of penitence for those who have trespassed. The remaining particle must be given to the communicants or be buried in uncultivated soil or in the wall of the sacristy. The chalice must be “ordered” (cf. ad Q. 18) by the priests and deacons, and prayers must be offered, the punishment must be the same. The last argument is drawn from the scapegoat (but this reference is not very clear). Q. 2: what must be done if a believer or foreigner touches the altar? Answer: If an outsider enters forcibly the memory of it must be blotted out by prayers (with reference to Nicodemus and Joseph, John xix 38–39); oil is not needed. If it was a layman who touched it nothing had to be done, since it did not happen from disrespect. Q. 4: If the Qudasha is consecrated twice on the same altar, not from necessity, it must be corrected by fasting, as it was done from greed. The Q. 6 of the MS. contains two questions; the latter gives several mystical reasons why the Qudasha may not be said on the Saturday following Good Friday. Q. 8: If an altar is left without mass for 7 weeks, it need not be reconsecrated, only some hymns should be said. Q. 9: The portable altar must be kept with the same honour as the ordinary altar, though it is not quite its equal as it may be removed from its place.

β. Letter to the deacon Macarius (586, fol. 431b–441b). It contains 74 Q Q on various points. The answer is usually very short, nothing but a direction as to what has to be done. The following items are important for the liturgy: (Q. [?]: The Euch. Br. should not be left on the altar; in case of necessity for 3 days

(1) It may be seen already from the foregoing quotation of Timothy i, that paschal Lamb and Manna are favourite prototypes of the eucharist. They are found over and over again in Patristic literature. Of course they originate from John vi and John i 29, xix 34–35.
Q. 17: Everything may be done after the communion because it is only given to blot out sin. Q. 21: On Saturday of the Holy Week mass is not said; but after communicating in the night of Sunday the fast may be broken. Q. 23: When a drop of the Wine is spilled the place must be washed and this water must be smeared on the altar or given as a "grace" to communicants. Q. 25: It is allowed to cut one's hair and to enter a building before and after the communion. Q. 26: It is not strictly forbidden to talk with pagans. Q. 27: It is not allowed to eat anything in the church. Q. 28: It is possible to fast after the communion except on Sundays. Q. 29: If somebody cannot digest food he may not communicate lest he should vomit. Q. 31: No one may communicate unless he is sinless, or confesses his sins. Q. 34: No priest may leave a host on the altar after the service, or take it alone. Q. 35: If much consecrated bread is left several priests must "order" it, everybody taking no more than 5 Gemurta's. Q. 36: During the "ordering" it is not allowed to go out and speak with anybody. Q. 42: The communion may be brought to a sick man or to a prisoner only if he is a believer. Q. 45: If somebody cannot break the fast by communion he must fast some days longer and wash his cross and drink the water with prayers. Q. 47: Such a believer may not go to the churches of the heretics. Q. 55: It is not allowed to leave the Qudasha on the altar for three days. Q. 56: It is allowed to take medicine after communion. Q. 57: If one knows his sin but not the reconciliation while communicating, he must be without doubt. Q. 58: If somebody does not want to be reconciled with his brothers, one may take the communion though there exists some quarrel. Q. 62: The Lords Prayer must be said at the beginning and end of every service. Q. 65: The Purshana is the body of Mary. Q. 66: If somebody is not able to communicate he must fast till the evening; then take a Ḥenana and eat bread; the service should be said at the ordinary time, though some say only the first part of it, until: "Let us all stand up as is right" (L.E.W., p. 262). Q. 67: It is not allowed for a priest to perform the service unless he has served

(1) It is not found in the form of B.O. in the letter I read, see Q. 55. Did I write two letters to Macarius? (cf. p. 102, n. 4). (2) Ḥenana "was composed of the dust of some martyr and oil and water", cf. Budge, B.G. ii, p. 600, n. 1 - p. 601; it was also known among the Jacobites and already mentioned in the Canones of Rabbula († 435), see C. Kayser, S. 108.
at night. Q. 68: Priests or deacons are not allowed to abstain from the service for one year unless they are old. Q. 69: Fasting on Friday and Wednesday for priests is not prescribed by canon but is a tradition. Q. 70: One may receive the communion daily if one is pure. Q. 71: Nightly pollution does not prevent from communion, if it does not arise from dirty thoughts. Q. 72: The menstruation does not prevent from communion.

If we survey these questions it will be seen that they are dealing mostly with the conditions for communion, while some are directions about the service of the priests. It will be noticed that some points occur in both letters, though the former gives more reasons for its decision. The same will be seen in comparing Q. 45 and 47 with the regulation (§ 126) of the same Patriarch, published by Sachau. Some of these Questions offer parallels to the book of Isho’yab and will be printed at the proper places of the commentary.

f. In connection with the foregoing questions we find some others about whose author it is only said that he was not Isho’-Barnun: codex Ming. Syr. 586, fol. 444a, Q. 13: Somebody possessed by the devil may receive the communion if he does not blaspheme, but if he praises and prays and fasts. He may not drink liquors.

g. The Admonitions or Canons of John v Bar Abgare have systematized, so it seems, the work of former generations. We saw before that he bound himself to raise the standard of the church by examination of the future priests (cf. about his life, p. 84–85). Nothing is said about the time and reasons when these canons were divulgated. Prof. Baumstark surmised that they originated from a Synod that was held during his life. This statement may find some support in Canon i, iii and xix. If we compare them

(1) Did he not know Can. Apost. 69, ed. F. X. Funk, i, p. 384? (2) This subject is discussed over and over again, cf. Timotheus Alex., Resp. 7, ed. Pitra, Monumenta, i, p. 631, and Jac. Edes., Canon 5 (cf. Kayser, S. 89–99) who held an opposite view; it is connected with the idea of women and their place in religion; it cannot be denied that the answers of the latter are derived from the O.T. (3) A.A.O., ii, S. 174(–175). (4) Cf. Tim. Alex., Resp. 3, ed. Pitra, id., i, p. 630, and p. 122, n. 5; cf. the interesting discussion of Moses bar Cepha, o.c., p. 33. (5) These Canons are called: “Cautelae Missae” by Browne-Maclean, p. 261 sqq, and mentioned as such by F. Heller, Urkunde und Ostkirche, S. 450. (6) “It seemed good to the Holy Spirit to order through the Holy Fathers”. can. iii–The same introductory clause, as found in all these canons, is
with the letter of Isho’Barnun to Macarius we find that several topics are similar (xvii = Q. 36; xviii = Q. 42; xix = Q. 55 and to Isaac Q. 1; xx = Q. 34 and Q. 35; xxiii = ad Isaac Q. 1; xxvii = Q. 67). The difference is that the Canons are more extensive and have more particulars, as may be expected from a lawbook. But the similarity of topics and the direction in which the answers are given is quite clear. From this fact we may infer that he canonized in the same way other traditions which are now found in the Canons. They are very easily accessible in the “Bibliotheca Orientalis”, so we need not give a detailed analysis though they are of extreme importance for the history of the liturgy. There is another edition in the Takhsa with a different numbering (Assemmani inserted a translation of an Arabic canon which is wanting in the Syriac texts v; the following numbers differ accordingly); Ass. xii = not T. xiii, but T. xv; consequently A. xiii = T. xi etc. till Ass. xvii = T. xvi etc.); we follow T. since it is the official edition. 1 B.O. and some MSS. have the author’s name; T. and other MSS. are anonymous. But the latter fact cannot make us believe that the name of the Patriarch is spurious. The fact mentioned in p. 133, n. 6 points to the same author and it is easier to assume that his name was left out in the service-books than that it was invented afterwards.

Canon i–ii deal with the altar that must be fixed and should not be of wood; may not be laid bare nor washed. Canon iii–iv prescribe who must mix the Euch. Br., sum up the ingredients. Canon v–vii: about the state and number of the bread that had to be brought on the altar. Canon viii–ix: on the kind of wheat flour used for the bread. Canon x: the sacristy must be swept once a week. Canon xi: an Eulogia may not be given to a pagan. Canon xii: a lamp must burn before every altar. Canon xiii: reserving of something of the Euch. Br. Canon xiv: the Euch. Br. may not be baked for two days or pass over the night. Canon xv: some leaven must be reserved in kneading. Canon xvi: 3 hosts must be on the altar, or at least 2. Canon xvii: a priest may not leave his service.

also seen in other non-Eucharistic decisions inserted in the Nomocanon of ‘Abdisho’, iv 1, v 6–7, 10 etc. I believe that they were of the same Synod and that those of the Eucharist were brought together and transmitted as a separate body, because they had a special interest for the priests.

(1) The edition of T. is not mentioned by Prof. Baumstark, L.G., S. 235, Ak. 7 where he also enumerates the MSS.; Mingana Syr. 121 should be added (it has a numbering of the canons which differs from the editions; it is anonymous).
Canon xviii: communion may not be brought outside the church except for some reasons. Canon xix: the Eucharist may not be left on the altar for two days. Canon xx: the ordering of Bread and Chalice without greed. Canon xxi: a priest may not "order" alone. Canon xxii: if Euch. Br. must necessarily be left the priest must "order" with a believer or leave it on the altar during the night with great care. Canon xxiii: how the particles must be received. Canon xxiv–xxv: on the mixture of the chalice. Canon xxvi–xxvii: the conditions which the priests must fulfill before doing service. Canon v Arab. deals with the instruments and vestments of the priests during the preparation of the Euch. Br.

It should be noticed that the introductory formulas are extremely severe: the canons are ordered by the Holy Spirit and are in (according to) the word of the Lord. The highest authority in the church is invoked to protect the contents (cf. p. 137).

β. In his Arabic letter: "Quaestiones Ecclesiasticae" he has several Eucharistic points.1 Q. 2: A priest goes to the altar while quarreling with another (heading). Q. 3: Communion of boy or girl after baptism. Q. 6: The altar must be fixed and of stone. Q. 10: The deacon may bring the elements to the altar, if no priest is present. Q. 11: The deacon may not give the communion. Q. 12: The priest must enter the altar with special sandals. Q. 13: If only two priests are present and give the communion to each other it may not be given to anybody else who comes in. Q. 14: The sacrament may not be consecrated in the hands of the deacon except by special permission. Q. 15: The Archdeacon may be permitted to consecrate the altar. Q. 19: On the communion of children who are not fasting (after baptism only). Q. 20: The treatment of the altar that had been desecrated by enemies. Q. 25: Deacons and priests may not serve unless with sandals. Q. 26: The elder priests must precede the younger. Q. 27: The liturgy is more than a mere rite. Q. 28: The Euch. Br. must be baked in a special place in the church.

γ. Some other canons of the same Bishop have been preserved by the Nomocanon of 'Abdisho', viz. on the communion of a woman and of one possessed.1

---

1 Ed. B.O., iii 1, p. 249–251 (28 Q.Q., not everyone of them has been translated; of several the heading alone is given). (2) 'Abdisho', Nomocanon, v 16, Mai, p. 252.
Here we must commemorate the work of George of Arabela. We have seen before that much of what was once ascribed to him is not his (see p. 75). But in V. = M. some answers of his are found: 1. The fast of Lent may not be broken before a fortnight after Easterday, if somebody communicated on Maundy Thursday, but not on Easterday. If he did not take it on either day he must be abstinent till Ascension-day though he needs not fast. 2. The Gemurta immersed in the chalice may be taken to a sick man on Easterday under great precaution (refers to Canon xviii). 3. On the case when there is dearth of bread and vegetables in the fast.

It is not necessary to speak anymore about the collection of traditions found in our Q Q.; we may refer to the commentary and to what has been said about them in this introduction. Much of the material found in the rest of the codices V. = M. has been published in the commentary (we hope to be able to publish the remaining sections of the book of Isho’yabh iv in the near future). The commentary shows the degree of dependence upon older traditions.

We have made the above summaries of the various writings because it seemed not to be out of place to have the whole body of Nestorian tradition about these points in a short form. For it is remarkable that the Nomocanon of ‘Abdisho’ does not contain any special section on the Eucharist, whereas a section on this subject is found in the word of his competitor in the Jacobite Church Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon iv. The only remark of Timothy ii in this direction is about reservation the Eucharist, for which he refers to the Canons.1

Is this defect in ‘Abdisho’ for some purpose? For his book contains many remarks about the priests in Section vi. It might have been either because it was sufficiently regulated elsewhere or because it was not thought worth while. The latter possibility can safely be ruled out as it is opposed to the whole spirit of Eastern Christendom. Probably he thought the directions of the rubrics of the liturgy and the canons, supplemented by the answers found in the letters mentioned before which were inserted in the canonical books of the Synodicon, were quite sufficient.

(1) Among the Jacobites the tradition is very strong and easy to establish, cf.: Johannes of Tellia, who quotes others, James of Edessa, Bar Hebraeus who marks the author’s name in every entry. (2) Quoted ad Q. 16.
In reviewing the tradition about these points we saw that the canons probably used writings or traditions of some predecessors. But on the other hand it is remarkable that we find so very few cases of overlapping. This is the more striking as in other instances we find the same orders given over and over again, as may be seen from reading the various books of Canon-Law. It cannot be proved that the treatises to which our study is devoted were composed from extracts of older books. The few cases of repetition can easily be explained from the particular situation.

The question arises in what respect these Canons and prescriptions of the Bishops were thought to be valid. There are reasons to believe that many of them were not so well known or obeyed as one is inclined to suppose. We have already referred to two interesting cases of addition; especially the history of the time of Timothy i is striking and the answer of the writer of Expos. is highly instructive. His idea is that the authority of all the Bishops is the same viz. inspired by the Holy Spirit, and that there can be an evolution of these matters while the other groups did not acknowledge any progress or expansion of what had been fixed centuries before. Our Q. Q. too show in many places that people did not care about the Canons. It is easy to understand that this happened to private letters as those of Isho'Barnun as these were personal before they were incorporated in the Law Books. But here we have another case. We pointed out already that the form in which they were made obligatory is very severe. Generally those decrees are introduced by the ancient church as regulations of the Apostles. But for the Nestorians the regulations of the Apostles can be expanded by a decree of a Patriarch. The Patriarch himself is inspired; therefore John v appeals to the Holy Ghost and Jesus Christ Himself (cf. Act. xv 28). Probably these strong words were necessary too. I do not consider Q. 49 as evidence of neglect, where it is said that the Canon holds only good in the Monasteries, but not in the other Churches, since this is a clear example of "force majeure" (see commentary). But when in Q. 48 it is asked what should be the quantities of wine and water in the chalice, it can only be understood when Canon xxiv was unknown. Several other cases may be found where the teacher simply reproduces the con-

(1) See p. 128–129. (2) Expos. ii, p. 66, quoted p. 129, n. 1.—Or by a synod of bishops who declared a certain custom valid and obligatory, see p. 122, "they" and the quotation on p. 115.
tents of various Canons (ii 26–27 and cf. Commentary passim). It shows that these Canons had authority for our teacher but the fact that he has to repeat them, shows that they were not generally known a century after their divulgation. Of course this is connected with the lax ideas and stupidity of the priests of that time. But on the other hand that would not have existed if these Canons had been known and enforced.

It is clear that the subject-matter of our questions is somewhat different from that of the Canons. The latter deal with the ordinary services and acts, while the former treat difficulties that arise where the ordinary service is disturbed. What is the origin of these directions? In some places the "proof" is given from analogy. But most times no such proof is given and we must assume that it is "custom" (cf. p. 115) or "according to the old men".

iii. What is meant by this category of old men or of the Fathers? In other words how far does this go back and can it serve as a principle to fix that the subject matter of these Q.Q. really belongs to former ages?

There is some reason to put this question. It seems easy to find the explanation; it is only necessary to reproduce the general opinion about the traditional character of Eastern Christendom. Within the limits of this tradition the Fathers hold a predominant place. Among the sources of knowledge and witnesses of the truth they are numbered since the end of the 4th century along with the Councils. At first the word denotes only those who followed the Apostles; later (5th century) especially the teachers of the 4th were considered as such and after the 7th Council all the previous centuries and their teachers were "antiquity" and adorned with the crown of Authority. These teachers were inspired by God (Σεφονευετοι). Actually it remained a rather uncertain and undefined category. Yet that teaching was orthodox, "für die man sich auf die Väter von Athanasius bis Cyrill berufen konnte". At the Councils the statements of the Fathers were simply counted. This habit is one of the reasons to compile the

(2) Cf. in the _Ephes._ where the teachers are called: Ἡγιασμένοι, Ἡγιασμένοι διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (text i, p. 87) or: Ἡγιασμένοι, Ἡγιασμένοι (i passim) = Σεφονευετοι (on this word see J. B. Lightfoot, _The Apostolic Fathers_, Part ii, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, London, 1889, ii, p. 21–22.
(3) A. von Harnack, a.a.O., S. 97.
collections of excerpts, that favourite form of Theology in after times. One will have to reckon with fraud. But it will be seen that as far as dogmatics are concerned the Fathers are men who possessed the truth once for all. We find the same opinion among the Nestorians (Babai).

Something similar (which forms a transition to the way in which they are introduced in our treatises) is found in Mysticism. Prof. Wensinck quotes a saying of Isaac of Nineveh to the effect that Isaac writes what he has learned from contemplation of the Scriptures and the Instruction of the Fathers, while he himself had experienced only a very small part of it. Prof. W. points out that this is a general characteristic: “Nearly all of them confess, that their own time is void of the highest mystic experience and that they themselves are longing to reach what their predecessors seem to have reached.” The way in which these Fathers are spoken of in this book and by Dadisho shows that the writer has specially in view the Monk-Fathers as Evagrius and others. It will be known that “Father” is an ordinary name in the fellowships of the Monks for the older members and so the language is somewhat ambiguous. Authority is dependent on age and the dead Fathers have the greatest authority. In this case Father generally points back to the origin of the ascetic (and mystic) movement.

As a matter of fact whatever field is considered, everywhere this reverence for the forefathers in contrast with the time of the writer is found. It goes so far that Leontius of Neapolis in the Introduction to his “Life of John the Almsgiver” protests forcibly against it. He says, he wrote his book to show that in his own lifetime (6th century) there were also people of very great godliness. “Dogma und Recht sind geschaffen durch die alten Konzilien”; thus the opinion of the East towards these questions was summarized by Prof. Baumstark. It is this tradition that gives Eastern Christendom such an oldish aspect. Can the same rule be applied to the liturgy and its accidentals? This seems to be pre-eminently a matter of

(1) Babai, Liber de Unione, ed. A. Vaschalde, C.S.C.O. ii 61, p. 5, cf. p. 305, 306 etc. (2) A. J. Wensinck, Mystic treatises of Isaac of Nineveh, p. xxii. (3) Cf. W.S. vii a, p. 70–143 passim; we give only these examples that can easily be augmented by others from all sources related to ascetism and mysticism in every branch of the Church. (4) Compare the Jewish: נָּהֲרָה (5) Leontius of Neapolis, Leben des heiligen Johannes des Barmherzigen, ed. H. Gelzer, Leipzig, 1893, S. 1–2. (6) A. Baumstark, Grundgegengänze morgenländischen und abendländischen Christentums, Rheine, 1932 S. 41.
tradition. Is it necessary to give examples? Firmilian speaks of cases “which are handed down from the beginning”.¹ The great teacher Theodore speaks in several places of the regulations found in the church from the beginning.² Ishoyabh i answering James of Darai says that he wants to write “entsprechend der bei uns von den Vätern vermittelten apostolischen Überlieferung” and that these Fathers were not his immediate predecessors is shown by the sequence.³ On the same line lies the statement of the author of the “Expositio”;⁴ it is clear that there the “maiores” and “patres” lived many years, even centuries before (Ishoyabh iiii; Bar Lipheh).

All conditions of analogy of several departments are there to justify the conclusion: these “ancients” are a traditional category covering either real tradition or pseudepigraphical contents. This is the traditional opinion. Yet in this case it is wrong. Behind this name stands immediate oral tradition. The “Fathers” lived in the same time as our author.

This is shown by the way in which is spoken of the Elders in the “Historia Monastica” of Thomas of Marga: “I will set down in consecutive order what I have learned from the Elders whom I have met, and from these things which are already written down”.⁵ Here we find the two sources of tradition together. The same can be applied to its use in our QQ. It is not sufficiently clear from the wording of Q. 116.⁶ But it is proved by the usage of “hear” and “see”. If the solution of a difficulty was doubtful, one went to bishops or teachers (p. 104–105). The evidence of the quotation from M. fol. 47–48 (see p. 80–81) is conclusive: The teacher is asked how the “ancients” signed, the synonym of this word is “heads of the church from the day on which I entered etc.”; he states that George asked the old men about his immediate predecessors; the Fathers who are mentioned later on are the Bishops who lived in the time of Mar Mari and George.⁷ The same result is produced, by a close

(1) Cyprianus, Epistula 75, 6, ed. Hartel, p. 813–814. (2) Theodorus Mops., Liber ad Baptistandas ii, W.S. vi, p. 35, 90–92, 120. (3) O. Braun, Synodos, S. 259. (4) Expos. i, p. 17, 127 and passim; cf. the wording of Timothy ii, quoted ad Q. 89. (5) Budge, B.G. ii p. 208; in every place in which Thomas speaks of “Elders”, he means people he has met. (6) When Isho’ Barnun, ad Isaac Q. 9 writes that the “ancients” had no tabula, it is not intended to be a category of authority; it is merely a historical reference to the times in which persecutions were unknown. (7) This is on the same line as the use of “Fathers” in the synodical Canons; a common word for the Bishops and other High Officers of the Church.
interpretation of Q. 87–89 (see the commentary) and ii 23–24 (ad Q. 11); the practice followed by our author is that of the teachers of the 10th century while the other manner was supported by older churchmen! (on the teachers of the 10th cent. see p. 84–88 especially p. 85).

From this we must conclude that there is no reason whatever to trace the decisions given here (of course not their suppositions!) further back than one or two generations. In this way we come to ± 920–940. We do not possess any guarantee that older decisions are underlying them. For when we use the argument that the “old men” of our author had been instructed in the same way by their spiritual Fathers, it is not based upon facts but merely hypothetical. We cannot say about it: this was the traditional treatment of the Nestorian Church, as long as we have no more facts at our disposal; but only: this was a certain liturgical tradition in that church, which is often young. Along side with it there existed others that are disputed. We find a strict and lax practice and this writing seems to be an exponent of the former. A further question we must put in this connection, is: What was the place of the school?

iv. Our treatises originate from the school. It appears that the discharge of the priest’s functions required a great amount of knowledge. The people deviating from the usages as reproduced by our teacher, act from ignorance; the new priests are not well instructed (see Introduction). This word is explained by a peculiar addition in V.; it says they were not instructed “in the sanctuaries”. It shows that the future priests got their lessons in that part of the church, viz. during the service. The same observation can be made in our treatise when our author says that he has seen it or heard from the ancients before whom he served in the church. On the other hand we saw (p. 149) that people asked advice from the clergy and from the teachers. We shall go somewhat further into this matter about the Instruction of the clergy.

Hardly anything is known about the way in which it was given in the times of Christian antiquity. From the beginning of the

(1) The remarks by the Chronists on the Patriarchs quoted before p. 19 should be compared. About ‘Abdiashe’ ii it is told that he changed the recital of the Lord’s Prayer “ignarus cum esset canorum ecclesiae” (Gismondi i, p. 121); many remarks are to the same effect. (2) At any rate I did not find any help in the ordinary handbooks nor in D.C.A. ii, s.v. School, and: D.A.C.L., s.v. Ecole, t. iv, col. 1739–1789; Bingham, vi 3, 3 quotes something of Jerome and of the 4th
Jacobite church we have a precept of John of Tellia to his Monks, which may give us an idea of this matter, canon 13: "we have heard that some priests who do not know exactly the liturgy transgress audaciously; they draw near in the awe-inspiring time to offer and they become confused in their prayers and are a source of mockery and scandal at that moment for those who meet for prayer. Therefore nobody shall dare to do so before having learned the whole Mass accurately and having repeated it before somebody who knows it well."

Of course this canon does not deal with the same matters as our Q.Q.; but it offers a case of the ignorance of priests and the way to stop it by requiring an examination. The way in which it was taught (the Bishop has the prayers specially in view) is not indicated. The editor Kuberczyk referred to Nestorian parallels from the Canons of Timothy (13th century). But it should be observed that there is rather a great difference of time between them. Do we hear anything more about the liturgical activities of the schools and the Instruction of the clergy among the Nestorians? The question is not difficult to answer.

Fairly much is known about these points. Assemani already devoted a chapter to them. He gave a long list of names of places where a school had flourished for some longer or shorter time with the names of teachers or of students; among them those of Nisibis, Seleucia, and of Mar Mari at Dorkoni are specially noteworthy. From his collection it appears that many such institutes were scattered over the country. He has also collected statements and regulations about their teaching. Of course this is done without much historical insight. Most of these schools are known by name; they were in the cities and villages, in the houses of the Bishops and priests and in the monasteries; both clerics and laymen were instructed there. Of course it surpasses the limits of our investigation.

Council of Toledo (633) can. 25: "Sciant sacerdotes Scripturas Sanctas, et canones meditentur." But this does not say anything about liturgical study, and is rather late.-I know the thesis of H. R. Nele, *Die theologischen Schulen der morgenländischen Kirchen während der ersten Jahrhunderte in ihrer Bedeutung für die Ausbildung des Klerus*, Diss. Bonn, 1916, only by name. The famous school of Alexandria did not produce liturgical books.-E. R. Hayes, *l’École d’Edesse*, Paris, 1930, derives all facts concerning the inner history from the sources about the daughter of Edessa, Nisibis and has nothing of its own. It shows sufficiently that we do not know about this subject next to nothing, except the information of Nisibis.

to deal with their outward history. This is not even possible as from most of them only the name or a single fact are known. Many of them existed only for a certain time, and were not of great significance.

The most famous among them was the school of the Persians in Nisibis. During the last 40 years a good number of documents with important data have been published about its origin and organization. It is not necessary for our subject to enter into the questions connected with it; we may refer the reader to the latest discussion of these points by Liz. Th. Hermann, who mentions all the sources and literature about this institution. After a careful examination of the first years of its existence Mr Hermann says: “Mit der gleichen Eindeutigkeit, mit der die Quellen die Entstehung der Schule von Nisibis erkennen, werden wir leider nicht über die sog. Akademie der Perser unterrichtet und nicht nur das, auch über die an ihr entfaltete Unterrichtstätigkeit vermögen wir uns kein rechtes Bild zu machen.” Several titles of functionaries are mentioned in the Canones published by Prof. Guidi and return in the “Book of the Foundation of the School”. It seems as though exegesis of the Bible and philosophy were the main studies. As far as the liturgy is concerned, one officer is called the μαθηματικός = teacher of reading. Prof. Baumstark summarizing the general opinion, says: he was the man “dem die Einübung der liturgischen Textesrezitation einschliesslich des Gesanges und des gesamten Chordienstes oblag”.

It may be, however, that the μαθηματικός = teacher of Meditation, had also something to do with this department. The explanation of this name is very obscure and several opinions have been uttered without success. μητός means: to meditate, to read syllable by syllable, to study and to take in something by murmuring (this Eastern way of learning is well known). But this meditation was somewhat different from our idea. In the Canon x of Selunica under Isaac (410) it was pre-

---

scribed: “Dass jeder ein Exemplar dieser Kanonen besitzen soll, dieselben zu meditiren und aus ihnen die Rechte festzustellen etc.”; this connection cannot mean anything but: to consider how the older Canons might be used in the practice of the present day. In other regulations we find it used for “reading” (cf. p. 147, n. 1). It may be that it has something to do with the explanation of the liturgy in the mystagogy and with practical theology.

Of the liturgical activities in this school we hear that Narai wrote some poems spoken of before (p. 42), but they are different in character from the subjects we are looking for here. On the same line, though with a slightly different nature are the kind of writings known as: “de Causis Festorum” which were fully discussed by Prof. Baumstark. They seem to have been lectures dealing not with the festivals themselves, but with their connection with the Economy of Christ. The first who delivered them was Mar Abba the Exegete and after him Thomas of Edessa at the instance of the “reading-master” Moses. They produce hardly anything of interest for liturgical practices, only on the receiving of the communion in hand, and on the serving of the priest while fasting. Their main interest is found on the side of dogmatics. In passing we may note, that the first book of the “Expositio” of several centuries later seems once more to take up the same theme.¹

The two names of Abba and Thomas have been mentioned before (and this is important to notice) as the translators of the Greek liturgies into Syriac (see p. 41).

It is worth while to mention in this connection also Isho’yabh i. He had been a teacher in Nisibis himself. In the Introduction of his letter to James of Darai, that has been quoted several times, he says that he will write about points that had not been made sufficiently clear by the Fathers and Brothers. Then he goes on: “Auch sollst du wissen, dass, als wir auf der hohen Schule waren, der ἐκχύλων der Forschung, wir auf die Bitte . . . . geschrieben”. The contents of his writing were quoted on p. 119 where it was pointed out, that it was probably a mystagogy. But on the other hand we may consider this letter, with its “reasons”, as a specimen of the way in which these matters were treated at the schools.

¹ O. Braun, Symbados, S. 20 (italics are mine). (2) A. Baumstark, Die nestorianischen Schriften “de causis festorum”, in: O.C., 1901, S. 330-344, an extremely important article on Nestorian theology. For the liturgical practices cf. S. 337, n. 3-4.
Isho'yahb writes to his correspondent as a teacher to his pupil, as he confesses himself, and the teacher himself had learned the traditions very well. Whether there is a connection of his canons mentioned before, with the school is not possible to decide, but it is not probable. They seem to be decisions of a Bishop rather than of a teacher.

It lies outside the scope of the present investigation to deal with the history of the growth and decline of these institutes nor with the founders and teachers of some of them. The Chronicles, published by Gismondi, and the "Book of the Governors" are full of passing references. They had all their times of growth and decline. It is noteworthy to see how many times the laxity of discipline is spoken of. The successive Patriarchs tried to keep up or to restore the high standard of study and life; but without much success. At present we look only for liturgical activities.

A remarkable story is told us from the time of Isho'yahb iii. Immediately after his accession this Catholicos enlarged the monasteries and after that "wished to build a school near his cell, and to provide it with all that was necessary and to bring to it teachers and masters and expositors, and to gather many scholars," in order that the pupils of the school might enter the monastery. But the monks did not like it and they prayed him not to put this plan into execution. Their argument was: "It is not good for us monks, while dwelling in our cells, to be disturbed by the sound of the chanting of the psalms and the singing of the hymns and the offices, and by the noise of the voices of the schoolboys... We are destined for weeping and mourning, while we dwell in our cells... Mar Jacob, our Father... did not command us that one should teach the other to sing and to read the offices from books." Of course this is only the audible part of the school. At any rate it is important to hear that the singing of the various services was actually taught at these Institutes. By their appeal to their own Father it is shown that this teaching was not quite incompatible with the monastic order in general. The activities of Mar Babai (beginning 8th century) may be recorded here. It is told: "when this blessed man had come to the country of Maryâ, he first of all gathered together the scholars and founded the Ḫudra and revised and corrected the codices". He founded a number

of new schools and corrected the older ones; he raised funds to run them properly. "Twice a year he visited all the schools, in order that laxity of discipline might not enter into them, and that the musical training and canons and orders of services which he had made his disciples acquire might not be destroyed." The interpretation of this last sentence is somewhat doubtful. Are "Canons" the appointed hymns, or: the rules of the Church; or are the \textit{leitourgies orders} (in general) or those services, collected in T.? After the words just quoted follows: "and thus this manner of singing was called the 'musical system of Rabban Bābhāi'". Does this imply that "Canon" and "Orders" had also a musical meaning? On the other hand the logical order in Syriac is generally not very strict; so it is not improbable that it is only an explanation of the "musical training" before, and that Canons and orders have the latter meaning of those offered before. Regarding the discussions on liturgical matters we do not hear anything about them. This quotation shows that this study of the liturgy formed an integral part of the course. We may infer that the future priests were not only taught the prayers, but also the actions that had to be made during the service. The danger of slackening is imminent and the Patriarch does his utmost to stop it. But it does not become clear, how the liturgy was taught.

We must now look at some regulations that are for the greater part found in 'Abdisho', \textit{Nomocanon}, vi 3 and which were copied by Assemani. The first is of uncertain date; it gives the subject matter divided over three years. The time-table contained writing of the Mautēba's and from the Scriptures of Paul and the Pentateuch; together with choirsinging and reading of the Lessons they must learn the funeral (hymns). In the second year the pupils go on with the Mautēba's and from the Scriptures Psalter and Prophets; along with the Lessons they must learn the Anthems of the Mysteries. The last year comprises the third part of the Mautēba's and the New Testament; together with the Lessons they are taught the Antiphons.\footnote{Budge, \textit{B.G.} ii, p. 296-297. \textit{Cf. ad Q.} 4-5. \textit{Cf. ad Q.} 114. 
\textit{4} That the priests learned the services by heart may be illustrated by the story of the pasturer of camels who had been taken captive by the Arabs and lived in the desert, who recited every day the service of one festival of the Lord, Budge, \textit{B.G.} ii, p. 274-277. -- The powers of the Syrians are prodigious in this respect, cf. Browne-Maclean, p. 209 and p. 165. -- The minimum of the requirements for the clergy in town and in the country, see: \textit{Canon} 3 of Synod . . ., in: 'Abdisho', \textit{Nomocanon}, vi 4.}
The date of the following regulation is quite fixed. After the death of Isho'Barnun the affairs had gone the wrong way and when in 834 Sabarisho'ii had paid a visit to the schools he found that they were almost ruined: only very few old doctors had remained: the young students were ignorant and did not serve the daily offices. The Patriarch saw that the people did not want to obey his commandments to improve this abuse. So he gave again an order: he made a table of the hymns that should be sung on the Sundays of the year and which had to be copied at the schools and sent to the priests. He repeated the preceding programme and impressed it once again upon them. Twenty years afterwards Theodosius (853-858) refers to these regulations and gives some more precepts: the writers and surgeons must read the exposition of the New Testament and the “Book of the Mysteries” of Theodore; those who stand for the priesthood must read the Homilies of the whole year by several writers of former times. This is substantially the same as the requirements put down in the Nomocanon of Ibn at Tayyib. From the declaration given by John v (see p. 85) we see that his standard was somewhat lower as he asked only the reading of the Bible what was “secundum canones”. If we survey this evidence and ask what is its result for the question we put at the beginning we must come to the conclusion that it is very scarce. We are informed that the future priests wrote, read and learned the books required for the Offices; but nothing is told of their study of the matter found in the rubrics nor of discussion of liturgical questions (though it will be remembered that the texts of the prayers occupy a far greater place than the actions and required more study). To speak in the terms of the Statutes of Nisibis, it is all about the work of the reading master (Meqarjana) perhaps of the meditation master (M'hajjana).

Yet it seems that the description of this evidence is not quite complete. In the letter of Isho'Barnun to Macarius it is said that “some teachers say…” It is not sufficiently clear to what class of teachers he is referring, anyhow we shall keep it in mind. It may be that it is a witness of the liturgical activity in the school. The “Expositio” shows also that the schools had their different opinions. The author speaks about the division of the ecclesiastical

(1) In the regulation of Theodosius <7 is used for the work that had to be done by the pupils. About Sabarisho' and Theodosius, see A. Baumstark, L.C., S. 235. (2) Quoted in: B.O., iii 1, p. 244.
year (Hudhrā) and the anthems and points out that they differ in respect of the "week of Dedication"; for which every school had its own order, but it seems that we must infer from the words of the author that these differences existed only in matters that were not regulated by Isho’yabh iii. Another instance to the same effect is found in his discussion of the order of the Night Office. This statement of his about the field in which liturgical discussions were held is important; as always the authority of I. iii is un-assignable. It is important to notice that we do not find such differences in the Eucharistic part of Expos. Whatever is not decided by his regulations is free (see Q. 1).

Another important piece of evidence may be found in the quotation from M. fol. 46b sqq. (before p. 80). There the writer tells us that he was once in the High Monastery and in that time some people were consecrated "according to the precepts of the scholars". The ritual of consecration was the same as that of George of Arbela. In this case the author reproduces the opinion of those scholars. In Q. 7 he refers to an addition made by the Patriarch 'Abdisho' i with great approval; this 'A. had been a pupil of the same High Monastery. These two facts make me think that the author of our work had some connection with (was once a pupil of) this Institute.

What was this High Monastery? All that can be known about this place which had a great influence upon the fixation of liturgical matters was collected some years ago by Prof. A. Rücker. It is not out of place to summarize here his article. He starts with the remark that many East Syrian MSS. show the Colophon: "According to the rite of the High Monastery or the Cloister of Mar Gabriel and Mar Abraham near Mosul." It occurs specially in the Hudhrā, Gazza and Kashkul (never in "Before and after"), lectionaries and the ritual of Marriage and Funeral. About the Psalter and the Takhsha Prof. Rücker says that it is not found there "in

(1) One of the seven "Weeks" of seven Weeks in which the Nestorian year is divided, see ad Q. 37. (2) Expos. i, p. 29, cf. p. 128. (3) Expos. i, p. 160. (4) A. Rücker, Das "Obere Kloster" bei Mosul und seine Bedeutung für die Geschichte der ostsyrischen Liturgie, in: O.C., 1932, S. 180–187.—Something, but of course without the scientific apparatus, is given by G. P. Badger ii, p. 17, N. *; he says: "it is still a common practice among the Chaldeans who seek a special blessing to resort to these ruins, where after lighting a taper near where the altar is supposed to have stood, they offer up their prayers to Almighty God." (5) For these names see the Introduction to E.S.D.O., p. xi.
welchen wohl höchstens noch die Rubriken und die in den Brevier-
handschriften stehenden Gesangstexte der Messe Anlass zu Neu-
regelungen boten; wenn einmal sogar in einer Handschrift (Cambr.
Add. 2045) dieses Sacredotales die Bemerkung steht dass dieser
Taksa dequrbanë nach dem Brauch des Oberen Klosters niedergeschrieben sei, so kann das nur auf die sonstigen Beigaben des
Buchs beziehen, oder die Notiz ist von einem gedankenlosen
Schreiber aus andern liturgischen Buchtypen auch auf dieses
übertragen worden” (S. 182-183). He sketches the history of
this Monastery and mentions several names of teachers. Under
and after Yabhallaha ii (± 1200 A.D.) it is mentioned no more.
It was situated in the North East of Mosul (for the exact place
see the article). In the end Prof. Rücker points out that nothing
is found about it in the “Expositio” and asks whether Timothy ii
furnishes some data.

These are the results of the material collected by Prof. Rücker.
In connection with our subject we may be allowed to add some
remarks. The question about Timothy must be answered in the
negative. Assemani’s account is fairly reliable and for so far we com-
pared the book we did not meet with anything of the kind. Regarding
the “Expositio” I, I am not so sure; it is certain that the Monastery
is not mentioned by name, but it is possible that a careful
investigation of its former part about the Daily Offices would
furnish some data (it goes beyond the limits of this book to do
so here). Prof. Rücker thinks it disputable “ob wir überhaupt
einen bestimmten Zeitabschnitt nähmhaft machen können, indem
die Reform vollendet wurde.” (S. 187). This is as a matter of fact
all that can be said at present about its liturgical reformation. At any
rate it is clear even from this poor information that its influence was
considerable. It seems to have been a sort of standard for the
rest of the church and so it is looked upon in our treatise too. I
believe we may assume that our author also gives instruction that
runs parallel with that of this Monastery.

We must not forget that it appears from the “Introduction” that
the Liturgy was learned by seeing the performance of the service
by older priests, along with oral instruction (hearing) which
refers with all probability to the work of the schools.

From these data our knowledge of the schools of the Nestorians is greatly
enlarged, although it belongs only to the 10th century. For while the
texts given by Assemani only show the learning or reciting of
liturgical books, the others we cited indicate that what was left undecided by Isho'yabhi iii, and not formulated was the subject of discussions in the schools. The school served practical life and was not merely instructing the students in antiquated matters. For once this type of religion being accepted it was an imperative necessity to perform the service with the utmost care. From the way in which Isho'yabhi i wrote to his correspondent we can safely deduce that this kind of teaching had been given already centuries before our author lived, though everything was not so well defined as seems to have been the case after 1. iii. But this fact does not imply anything about the antiquity of our Q Q. For it is sure that even in the 10th century older traditions were abandoned (cf. the case referred to by Timothy ii, ad Q. 87–89). But in view of the poor state of the tradition (mainly oral instruction—perishing of writings) it is almost impossible to give a definite answer to the question when these matters have been fixed for the first time. Even if parallels in other churches can be found it is not strictly necessary that both go back to the same origin. It may be that one fact is derived from one other and why should it be out of the question that the same things arose independently of each other.

It was pointed out before (p. 111) that these Q Q. are closely connected with the state of affairs in the Nestorian Church ± 950–1000 A.D. From the evidence exhibited on the preceding pages and in the commentary it appears that these matters were not fixed, but circulated in oral tradition. The latter does not go back a long time. This much we can see from the historical, not hypothetical evidence (cf. § ii and iii). It cannot be settled what points were handed down from generation to generation and what was freshly formulated. The question put at the beginning of this chapter must receive a negative answer. It is only in some cases that one is allowed to vindicate an old tradition, merely if facts can be adduced which prove its existence in former times. It is necessary to stress this point, since often a rule is applied in liturgical study to derive practices of the 13th or 19th century simply from the 4th or 5th century appealing to the tenacity of Eastern traditionalism and pointing to the similarities of life in the O.T. and in the 19th or 20th century in the East. But because the rules of the present-day Nestorian Church agree with those of the 10th
century, it is not proved that the standards of the 10th and of the 5th century were the same. On the contrary facts show that some very important changes have taken place, first of all the fixation of the formularies by Isho'yabib iii which got a binding authority and were expanded during later ages (see ch. vi, i). To make "Rückschlässe" is safe only in cases of well-known compilers such as Bar Hebraeus and Dionysius Barsalibi who faithfully mention their authorities. Our treatises cannot be claimed to be from some centuries before its publication, though some prayers and cult-objects which are spoken of were used already in the 5th or 7th cent. They warn us for hasty appeals to Eastern tradition. The book pretends to stand on the line of (incalculable) tradition and combats slackening. Everything must be maintained as strictly as possible, in honour of the holiness of the Sacrament. But there are indications that another tradition stands behind the practices of the "opponents" (cf. ad Q. 89). The standard of distinction between right and wrong tradition is not made apparent.

Now it becomes also plain why these discussions are held about the "framework" of the liturgies and not about the anaphora-part of liturgy. The latter had been definitely settled since Isho'yabib iii; it was recited by every priest. Nothing more could be said about it. It was the norm of every one. But the framework could be performed in a lax or in a strict way. It could not be learned from the books, but had to be seen or heard in the church or school. Everyone who did not learn it was "ignorant" and in fact a heretic.1

If we rightly assumed that these treatises had some connection with the High Monastery (and there are sufficient reasons to do so), we do get in this way an insight into the activity exercised by this institution concerning the Eucharist. This reformation could not be very radical, as it was bound by the limits of I. iii, it could only lay down rules

---

1 Cf. this remark of Expos. ii, p. 102 (against people who trespass against the Baptistical rules of Isho'yabib): "Sed dic mihi, tu, quisquis canones Isho'yabib transgrederis, num virtutem intelligis eorum quae in canonibus prescribuntur? Quod si intelligis, et si sapienter sunt constituta, noli eadem transgrexi; sin vero minus sapientia, noli omnis in illius canonibus ambulare, sed in tuis ipsius . . . Si autem intelligis, commentarios prius scrutare, deinde innova; et noli in ignorantia manere."—It appears that ignorance has various aspects: of the facts which had been prescribed, of the written tradition and of the mystagogical meaning. Heresy and ignorance belong together, Expos. i, p. 18 (quoted at p. 127), just as heresy and pride (see ad Introduction).
for the accidentals although they seem to be inserted into the body of our present MSS. of the liturgy. It should not be forgotten that the Eastern Church did not and does not know what the Western Church got in the "Congregatio ss. ritum" (since 1588). Yet a part that can in some respects be compared with it, seems to have been played by the High Monastery and other schools such as that of S. Mari where Isho'yabh iv taught. Then we see that the supposition of Prof. Rücker quoted before, to the effect that it was merely rubricistic, was quite to the point. It is of great importance in view of the young date of the MSS. that it can also be concluded from the sources that the liturgy itself was not a subject of discussion, and that the only great liturgical reformation of which we hear in the Nestorian church did not affect it! This statement remains true, though Prof. Baumstark says: "Freilich lässt sich auch dieser (der Text der Apostelanaphora) nicht uneingeschränkt für I. in Anspruch nehmen, da seiner nicht über das 15. Jh. zurückzuverfolgenden Vulgärgestalt eine noch im 13. und 14. gebräuchlich gewesene altertümlichere Form gegenübersteht.") The latter statement requires an exact collation of those different texts; the former is a (negative) conclusion from the study of the treatises. The result of both can only be made out in a critical history of the text of the Nestorian liturgy. For the moment we keep to the above, since we try to fix the importance of our treatises for the history of the liturgy.

Additional Note: Based upon the above facts, we may venture to offer an explanation of some very peculiar places in T. It must strike every one reading this text (or that of Brightman) that at several occasions it seems as though it polemizes. Nothing of that kind is found, as far as I am aware in any other Missal, nor that somebody seems to be addressed in the second person singular. The following cases I have in view: T. p. 9 = Br. p. 272: "Here I inform thy love, o my lord..." = Berl. fol. 83a; not in Ren. p. 581. T. p. 10 = Br. p. 274: "And know that..." = Berl. fol. 83a-b; not in Ren. p. 582. T. p 22 = Br. p. 289: the priest must draw near to the signing "with his hands outstretched and

(1) It did not give rise to different "schools" of permanent influence nor to a divergent practice or schism. (2) In this respect there is a difference between the Nestorian and the Jacobite liturgical difficulties (cf. p. 101, n. 3). (3) A. Baumstark, L.C., S. 199-200. (4) T. = Takhsa; Br. = Brightman, L.E.W.; Berl. = Cod. Berolin. Syr. 38; Ren. = Renaudot, L.O.C., ii.
not folded as illiterate men do" = Berl. fol. 92a (the text is somewhat effaced, but it was in it); not in Ren. p. 587. T. p. 23 = Br. p. 291: "And some here sign the periaste with their thumb at the time of the breaking: but do thou beware of such an audacity etc.; ... as others are wont to do..." = Berl. fol. 93a;’ not in Ren. p. 588. (We may also compare the Ritual of Ordination, in Badger ii, p. 322: "Be it known unto thee, our brother, etc."; T. p. 75 = Diettrich, Tauffit., S. 52: "Und wis, dass ohne Konsekration überhaupt keine Taufe volzogen wird"; and the additions to the Liturgy of Baptistism of the MS. J; in: Diettrich, a.a.O., S. 63, 74, 81, 101 and J Jahb, a.a.O., S. 69; the former MS. has the heading: "Ferner die Ordnung der heil. Taufe, die von dem Katholikos Mār Išō'yābb... verfasst und darnach von dem Katholikos [Patriarchen] Mār 'Eliyā ausgelegt wurde." [S. xii; iουλ] = to explain, not of mystagogical exegesis, but of specification of rubrics] This clearly shows the origin of the additions, viz. made by a particular Patriarch. This Elias might have been not the third of that name, as Mr. Diettrich assures without any proof, but the first one 1028–1049, who is said to have made some liturgical regulations. That would bring us into the text of our treatises!) It is obvious that the text of these passages was not fixed, as appears from other rubrics too. It is not possible to say whether the text of Ren. is the original one or merely an abridgement of the others. At any rate these places cannot be explained, unless by assuming that they originate from a liturgical school in which some often occurring faults are indicated (cf.: Illiterate men!) This point cannot be illustrated from other sources. But its tone is very much akin to that of the people speaking in our treatises, so that we seem to be justified in concluding that they arose from the same environment.

(1) Cf. the commentary ad Q. 96. (2) A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 286–287; on S. 289 he expresses his doubt concerning D's identification.