COMMENTARY

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The Commentary which follows must explain the contents of the preceding questions and answers. But before we do so, it is not superfluous to say a word about the translation and the manner in which the Commentary has been compiled, as it often happens that such explanations give either too much or too little.

Our translation has followed the original as far as possible. In cases insertions were made to get a text that was well to read for us, it has been done silently as the words were generally of small importance. The difference between the syriac and English idiom is so great that an absolutely literal translation (even if it were possible) would be practically unreadable. Yet we tried to translate the same syriac words by the same English equivalents. A number of technical terms in syriac denoting the eucharist have been simply transliterated. Often they are hard to reproduce in a western language, as the original has got a certain shade that has no identical word in another tongue. It seemed to us that those who use the translation alone can see here in what connections various words have been applied; a translation of these terms will be found here after.

As to the explanation the danger of too great fulness of detail was not imaginary in connection with the comparative method. It could be avoided for a good deal by continual references to the standard collection of parallels brought together by Prof. Hanssen in his "Institutiones etc." ii and iii. Undoubtedly everyone interested in our writing will have this indispensable book at hand, along with L.O.C. and L.E.W. which have been worked up in that book though they are not superseded by it.

The contents of this book are, as we pointed out (ch. iv and vi), closely linked up with the whole state of affairs of the nestorian church in the 10th century. Therefore it is often impossible and needless to look for parallels as they will fail owing to the fact that the Nestorian liturgy was different from those in other countries. The aim is only to adapt this writing when it is used in studying the Nestorian and Eastern churchlife.

The first thing that is needed is to compare it with the various other Nestorian sources we met before. As several of them are still unpublished, these texts had to be quoted in full. Because of their incidental character our Q.Q. are ill adapted to serve as a basis of extensive liturgical dissertations concerning the Eucharist as a whole. And we had to comment upon this book. So the present writer is quite aware of the fact that much had to be left open. Nevertheless I have tried to show on places that permitted it, how the responses and the suppositions of these Q.Q. throw light upon several problems of wider interest than can be examined here.

Much interest has been paid to Syriac and Coptic Jacobite parallels, a consequence of the fact that the Nestorians seem to have had a fairly regular intercourse with these churches, (at least we find that they have read the books of the others, cf. e.g. p. 21, n. 1 and the list of Elias Nisib., Opus Chronologicum, ed. E. W. Brooks, Parisiis, 1919, in: C.S.C.O., iii 7–8 (7, p. i–iv Praefatio), a fact
that is often neglected. In this way it may be possible to find relations of which we have no direct witnesses. For these parallels we used only printed texts, not Mss. Such a connection did not consist with the other churches and the parallels we find in those cases must be explained, if they are real parallels, in another way. If it was possible to compare these advices with writings from the "Ancient Church" we have noted them. For this is the only way to fix in what respect these Eastern churches have been traditional. But this principle is not carried through too far. When the word "Lamp" is met a big volume could be written on the liturgical and archaeological material about this useful article. It would hardly have anything to do with our Q.Q. Therefore such subjects were only investigated so far as a certain peculiarity was stated and this one was compared. Otherwise it seemed to be sufficient to refer to some encyclopaedias though they are not very complete on the Eastern side. On the other hand when somebody wants to deal with such an object in a monograph, he will be obliged to use these questions. In the same way words used for "Eucharist" (mysteries etc.) are used without the slightest reference to the "original" sense. Therefore it is needless to compare these words with terms of other churches in explaining our writing. Such a lexicographical research is wanted, but lies outside the scope of this book.

For the same reasons we did not look for parallels from other religions. Of course they can be found and may illustrate some points (e.g. burying in uncultivated soil). But such an investigation must be based upon more data than we were able to collect for the explanation of our book. The purpose of such an investigation must be: to fix the relation between Christianity and heathen religions. Moreover it is questionable whether we can speak here of pagan influences making themselves felt after a long time or of a usual form of thought that is neutral from the religious point of view. It should not be forgotten that several ages of Christian thinking and feeling had preceded our writing and that such a borrowing belongs to an earlier stage. The influence of the O.T. might have been considerable though it has never been properly traced. I am sure that the Law has deeply influenced certain parts of Christian living. This inquiry will, even if it is concerned only with a special point, never be limited to liturgical sources and one must be conscious of the historical connection and of the differences.

We have pointed out in ch. v that this book of Questions and Answers misses systematic order. But on the other hand, in perusing this writing of Isbyyabb iv one will find the same words and ideas over and again. The points of several questions show a certain similarity. It will be useful to explain them before we start upon an examination of the separate Q.Q.

But before we do so, one point must be mentioned. Von Harnack wrote in 1909: "Die Entwicklung des Mysterienwesens und Cultus von Origenes bis zum 9. Jahrhundert gehört nicht in die Dogmengeschichte. Sie ist sammt den Auffassungen von Taufe, Abendmahl, Sacramenten und Bildern eine —noch niemals geschriebene— Geschichte für sich, die der Dogmengeschichte parallel läuft" (Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, ii, Tübingen, 1909, S. 444). It is possible to repeat these words in 1937, for this history has not yet been written. It is true for the Eastern Church in general, and the Nestorians do
not form an exception. Because of this defect, it is impossible to refer to a book describing the doctrinal background and setting of our Ο.Ο., viz. the Nestorian conception of the central Sacrament (cf. Elias Nisib., Beweis, S. 101: “Bei ihnen [heretics] und bei uns bildet das Abendmahl die Grundlage”). Isho’yabh iv does not mention it explicitly either, because it was self-evident for a Nestorian. We cannot think of giving such a description within the limits of the present book (many investigations on which such a description must be based, are still to be done; we have signalized the dangers which make this task so arduous); the following sketch is only provisional; because of this we refrained from a discussion of other interpretations. We have inserted very few references; the evidence will be found in reading the books on liturgy and canon-law mentioned in the preceding pages. This sketch has been made to illustrate the present book and not the Nestorian conception as a whole (e.g. the conditions for the believers who want to receive the communion etc. are not discussed).

The fundamental distinction in these Q.Q. is that between holy and profane (it is not: “mysteries,” the word by which many people express the idea of the Eastern cult; it is used several times to denote the Eucharist or the elements, L.E.W., p. 583; in Expos. ii, p. 6 this definition is read: “Mysterium’ nomen est alius rei, quae aliquid quod abest reprezentat atque imitatuar . . . Ita et mysteria ecclesiae: figuram alius rei praeteritus vel futurae depingunt. Quod praeretium est, per narrationem, quod autem futurum est, per fidem praequentes”; it is true that Isho’yabh iv knew this mystagogical interpretation, see Q. 94, 100, 104; but it cannot help to explain our treatises). Everything or person belonging to the sphere of God is holy; and every thing which misses this character is profane.¹ It should be remembered that according to the Eastern Christian conception the universe consists of these three spheres: the unseen kingdom of God; its counterpart, the unseen kingdom of Satan and his demons; and between them the created world which is the battlefield of the spiritual powers of God and Satan. “Profane” does not imply the idea that a thing bearing this character is possessed by demons; it is neutral, simply meaning: something missing the special character of Gods kingdom, viz. holiness.¹ “In primitive Semitic religion, holiness might be regarded as the nimbus or outflow of Deity which attached itself to everything that meditates in worship, whether persons or things, between the God and the worshipper” (O. C. Whitehouse, E.R.E., s.v. Holiness, vol. vi, p. 752). This very same definition is also the leading conception of the Nestorians of the 10th–11th cent. It was not weakened, but intensified by the authority of the Bible, mainly the legal parts of the O.T. (e.g. Lev. and Ez.; it is interesting to quote Browne-Maclean, p. 315: “The Mosaic law is looked on as almost, if not quite in force now. The book of Leviticus will be known thoroughly by those who can hardly pass an examination in Gospel history”). The Sacraments effect consecration (λαζ.λ.); they have all one end: to impart this holiness which puts men in a position to communicate with God (this is the reason

¹ άγιος-σελήνης, cf. G. Kittel, Theologisches Worterbuch zum N.T., Stuttgart, i, 1933; iii, 1937, s.v. ;
Syriac: λαζ.λ. and λαζ.λ. ² (2) It is interesting to notice that the distinction made in our treatises
is not that between “pure” and “impure” (see: G. Kittel, s.a.O., Stuttgart, iii, 1936, s.v. λαζ.λ.).
“Pure” is sometimes used for the state of persons going to communion, but it is not predominant.
why the various formularies are used as a proof, see ad Q. 3, 92, 114). The fundamental conception may be formulated with these words of Gregory of Nyssa (De
Baptismo Christi, quoted by Bingham, xi 10, 4): “Do not contemn the Divine laver, nor despise it as a common thing, because of the use of water. For great and
wonderful things are wrought by it. This altar before which we stand, is but
a common stone in its own nature, differing nothing from other stones, where-
with our walls are built; but after it is consecrated to the service of God and
has received a benediction, it is a holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be
touched by any but the priests and that with the greatest reverence. The bread
also is at first but common bread, but when once it is sanctified by the holy
Mystery, it is made and called the Body of Christ. So the mystical oil, and so
the wine, though they be things of little value before the benediction, yet,
after their sanctification by the Spirit, they both of them work wonders. The
same power of the word makes a priest become honourable and venerable,
when he is separated from the community of the vulgar by a new benediction.”
(cf. Epist. i, p. 28). It is interesting to see this sequence; bread and wine do
not form an exception. It is a well-known fact that the Eastern Church did
not fix the number of the Sacraments, and that the distinction between Sacra-
ments and Sacramentalia is not clear. The only point that matters is: the Holy
Spirit has taken them as vessels to impart what is hoped for (cf. in the Epiclesis,
ad Q. 15). By the benediction a certain person or thing has got a new quality.
The holiness is like a veil which qualifies a thing as belonging to God.

We should observe that there is an apparent difference between persons and
things. Persons, once imparted with this holiness (priesthood) do not loose it,
except by very grave sins by which they become impure (sexual sins; heresy).
But things lose it every time when they are touched by something profane
(the oven is desecrated, see Q. 86; the altar is often desecrated or reconsecrated,
pasm.; the consecration is taken away by water, ad Q. 78; see below).

Holiness is not transmitted mechanically; if something profane is touched
by something holy it does not become holy; on the contrary, the holiness
is broken (cf. Haggai ii 12-13; ad Q. 10). It is not mana, as in the conception
of the Mass among the Melanesians, see: G. van der Leeuw, Phaenomenologie der
Religion, Tübingen, 1933, S. 6); it does not extend itself as an oil-stain. The
situation is like this: God, the Holy One, has given unto this world of men
who are separated from Him by their sins, canals of grace which restore the
broken connection. Jesus Christ in His work of Death and Resurrection is the
Restauration Himself. He has instituted the Sacraments which distribute the
grace after His ascension (cf. Isho'Barnun, ad Isa. Q. 9: consecration imparts
grace). On purpose I used the word “canal”. Grace is not a river “flowing
free”, but bound within the borders revealed by God according to His plan.
Certain elements, acts and prayers have been chosen and form these borders.
Everything which does not belong to this group prescribed by the Bible or
Canon law (Patriarchi guided by the Holy Spirit, p. 137) is wrong (see ch. vi, ii),
especially when it does not fit in with the leading dogmatical interpretation
(e.g. Expos.), seems to be an expression of heresy or betrays disrespect. It inter-
rupts the stream. To eliminate even the slightest interruption everything had
to be regulated (see ad Q. 52 sqq.). For it is a current idea that those objects
which had to serve as a vehicle of the Spirit, had a “proleptic” holiness. What
are the requirements for a valid Sacrament or with the words of ‘Abdisho’,
_Pearl_, iv 1: the holiness and sacramental nature of the Sacrament? “First: a
ttrue priest who has attained the priesthood rightly, according to the require-
ments of the Church. _Secondly_, the word and command of the Lord of the
Sacraments whereby He ordained each of them. _Thirdly_, right intention and
confirmed faith on the part of those who partake of them, believing that the
effect of the Sacraments takes place by a heavenly power”.¹ The Eucharistic
Sacrament is more frequently used than the others; it shows most clearly this
general conception. God acts in the Eucharist in the way of a certain order;
a deacon is not allowed to do the work of a priest. But it is wrong to think
that the Sacrament is merely a rite, cf. John bar Abgare, _Quaest. Ecd._, Q. xxvii:
“Christianus quidam de Oblatione minus recte sentiens dicit eam esse meram
legem, seu ritum quendam. Respondetur, communione privandam esse, donec
a peccato suo resipiscat, et poenitentiam ostendet, atque confiteatur Oblatonis
cellentiam, et convenientem eidem honorem, illumque esse Corpus et Sanguin-
em Christi, quo peccata delentur, et debita remittuntur.” This statement of
a Patriarch who was considered by our author as one of the leading authorities
in ritual matters, is interesting from various points of view. It shows most clearly,
a) that the Liturgy is more than a simple venerable rite, performed without
the faintest notion; b) that the Eucharist is looked upon as the “Body of Christ”,
and c) the aim of the Eucharist.

Some words must be said on b) and c). Does b) mean that the Nestorians
confessed the Transubstantiation? No! This is excluded by the doctrine of
the Sacrament as expressed by Gregory. _Expos._ ii, p. 61–62 is quite conclusive:
“quidam theologorum viri dixerunt haec mysteria esse proprium sensu corpus et
sanguinem Christi, non corporis et sanguinis eius mysterium... Quae cum
ita sint (the author has drawn the usual parallel with the Nestorian Christology),
etiam panis hie et vinum facta sunt corpus et sanguis, non natura, sed unione”.
This idea was generally accepted, see: Babai, _de Unione_, ed. A. Vanschade,
p. 232: “In its nature the bread which is placed upon the altar and is broken,
consists of wheat; but through the prayer of the priest and the brooding of the
Holy Spirit, it receives power ( Ipsum) and it is the Flesh of the Lord in power
and remission and forgiveness of sins; together with the Flesh of the Lord in
heaven one Flesh in unity.” c) The Eucharist imparts forgiveness. This
is not only a particularity of John, but it is also found in the quotation of Babai
and in a saying of some monks under Sabarisho” (O. Braun, _Synchron._, S. 289–290):
“Nachlassung unserer Schuld und Verzeihung unserer Sünden gemäß der
Verheissung unres Erlösers” (according to _Expos._ ii, p. 73–74: the communion
is a symbol of the last Judgment). Narasi, _Hom._ xxi, Conolly, p. 60, and; Elias
Nisib., _Beeotis_, S. 93 add to it: the resurrection of the dead. It is typical to see

(1) Elias Nisib., _Beeotis_, S. 101: “Was für einen Nutzen können wir von dem Genus eines Abend-
mahls haben, von dem wir wissen, dass derjenige welcher es auf den Altar bringt, unzweifelhaft
und irreführend ist, sich in Sünde und Unwahrheit befindet, die rechten canonicen Regeln nicht
beachtet, noch nach dem wahren Kirchengeist handelt.” (2) To explain “nature” and “power”,
cf. Narasi, _Hom._ xxi, Conolly, p. 381b: “not in (His) nature does the Spirit, who does not move about,
come down: it is the power from Him that comes down and works and accomplishes all.” (3) The
Eucharist is considered in our treaties only as an act of God or the Church. Its character of
“sacrifice” on the part of men is not mentioned. A complete history of the Nest. doctrine could not
neglect the latter aspect. It may be said, however, that it is not preeminent. It is: oblation, before
the consecration. The Roman theory of sacrifice differs in many respects.
that in after times this idea has partly disappeared, while it is a leading idea of the exposition of Theodore Mops. We must stress this point, as the opinion is widely-spread that the Eastern Church had its doctrine formulated once for all by Ignatius, ad Ephes, 20, 9: φάρμακαν ἀμωματίαν, ἀντίθετος τοῦ μη ἀμωματίαν. It may be that this phrase expresses the opinion of the greater part of the Eastern Church; it cannot be called a definition of the Nestorian idea.

This consecration comes into being by the prayers and actions of the priest, the prayers being of greater importance (cf. p. 127, n. 5). Here we touch upon another generally accepted judgment, viz. that the Eucharist is a magical ceremony; if some special formula’s are said, the effect is guaranteed. It will be observed in reading the Nestorian books, that people felt a great difference between the Sacrament and magic (against which many severe canons were made, see: O. Braun, Synchodos, Index, s.v. Abergläube and other law books); it is remarkable that wonders with the Eucharistic elements, of which the Middle Ages have so much to say are hardly found, if any, among the Nestorians. Q. 2 describes the means of consecration in this way: “by the word of the priest it is bound or loosened”. But we must make a clear distinction. It is not said, that it happens by the word of any person; the word itself is not a charm; but it is the priest who acts and speaks “vice Christi” (cf. ad Q. 118), see: Narsai, Hom. xxi, Connolly, p. 48-49. “To bind or loosen” is to act with God’s authority (see: G. Kittel, a.a.O., ii, 1935, s.v. ἀκολουθοί, and: I. Goldziher, Vorlesungen, S. 56). Secondly: the Nestorians have always known that these prayers instituted by the Holy Spirit Himself had a meaning which they understood (e.g. ad Q. 110 sqq.). The effect is the answer of the Holy Spirit who “listens (to their invocation)”, even when wicked priests are praying. The personal virtue of the priest does not matter (cf. ad Q. 84). “For as the righteous do not bring down the Spirit through their righteousness, neither can sinners prevent His descent by their sins. This is a gift of grace given for the pardon of mankind…” He does not regard the actions of him who invokes, but the supplications of those who stand behind the priest” (Badger ii, p. 164, n. from the book, mentioned p. 95, n. 1). The Holy Spirit answers by coming down. Everything depends on His good pleasure. The priest is mediator. He can prevent it in one way, viz. by being disobedient to the rules of the Spirit.

Because of their holiness before (Q. 52 sqq.; proleptic) and after the Epicleisis the Elements of Body and Blood which are precious (Cass. xxi) must be honoured (it is the [type of the] Lord or King = Malkha, ad Q. 16), and must be handled with care. This is one of the most striking words in these treatises. It can be excellently explained by a quotation from Hieronymus, Epist. 60, in: M.S.L. 22, col. 596: “in omnes caeremonias pia sollicitudo disposita non minus, non malus negligebat officium”. On the other hand the element of “awe” or “fear” is missing. We stress this point because here we notice a difference between the older and younger Nestorian feeling towards the Sacrament (cf. E. Bishoi, in:

(1) Of the actions the Ιωάννης signing is of extreme importance; see ad Q. 15, 87-89 and ii 9 ad Q. 4. In Q. 16 there is a variant reading: καθότι. It is the making of the sign of the Cross (cf. B.C.A., n. v.), a very common action among the Christians and applied to all sorts of benedictions. Cf. ‘Abdun’ (Frai, iv 1) calls it a sacrament: “the sign of the life-giving (a standing adjective)!” Cross is that by which Christians are ever kept, and by it all the other Sacraments are sealed and perfected.”
Connolly, Narsai, p. 92–97 who points out that this feeling of “awe” is particular for the Antiochene preachers; among the Nest. we find it in Narsai and Isho'yabbi i). If anybody does not handle the elements with care, if he despises them by his greed (Can. vii) and insolence, he runs the risk that the holiness is injured (قانون), he makes a wound (Q. 84). These acts of carelessness consist in doing the wrong act at the wrong moment, in touching or using wrong elements. If something is holy, it becomes profane; if it is not holy, it cannot be consecrated. Negligence is the counterpart of this care. It was the habit of those priests who did not know the liturgy and were not real Christians. The blame or sin of such a mistake redounds upon the man who made it or made no effort to stave it off. But always upon him who was the “prima causa”, not upon the actual sinner. Some of these mistakes are made from audacity (sometimes a deviation from the order of the Formulae) because the officiants did not think of the greatness of their work or because they disapproved the things sanctified by the Spirit (which is the same as blasphemy). But however grave the mistake may be, a difference is always made between those who do it willingly or repeatedly, and others who do it by forgetfulness or against their will. The latter are always free; the former are rebuked and punished (see ad Q. 68–69). Again we see here that the Sacrament does not operate mechanically; but that an ethical factor on the priests side must be taken into account.

In our treatises we must say: Cult is “religio”, it is: “service” (البيان). The liturgy must punctually be done to effect the consecration, to prevent injury, to obey the commandments of the word of the Lord (written and unwritten tradition). We find that practices done by the priests on their own hand are not allowed (Q. 1), because every act and prayer has its particular place and meaning. Nevertheless we hear of many additions and changes; we observe an evolution of the liturgical practices (and it has not caused a great schism as in Russia, cf. N. Bonvetsch, Nikon, in: P.R.E. 3, xiv, S. 187). But these changes are made by Patriarchs and bishops (Espos. i, p. 115). If they are made to enhance the honour, due to the Sacrament, they are permitted. The same holds good for many practices which had not been regulated by law or tradition.

In this connection we must discuss the meaning of مقدسة and مصلح, two words which are used so many times, not only among the Nestorians but also in Jacobite books. Lamy (p. 64, n. 1) said that they are used promiscuously (along with مقدسة that is not found in our books); he translated مصلح by “justum est, fias est, oporiet, decet, convenit”, its meaning varying between “res praecipua” and “res conveniens”. Kayser (S. 86, on account of James Edess., Q. 4 where both words occur next to each other) defines the former by: “durch kirchlichen Gesetz und Sitte erlaubt”, the latter by: “der sittlichen Norm, dem göttlichen Gesetz entsprechend” (the equalization of the two halves is somewhat strange!). These two expositors did not adduce the Greek equivalents found in the Questions of Timotheus Alex. (ed. Pitra, Monumenta, i, p. 650–645, passim), viz. 歌意 = مصلح; 良好 = ∼ساتئ = προσέχει = مقدسة. These equivalents

1 Carelessness of the communicants enlarges their sins (loss) and deprives them of the benefit of the Sacrament (see before).
show that these words are not quite interchangeable and bring out their meaning. The former is stricter than the latter.

In some cases the requirements for a proper performance cannot possibly be or are not fulfilled. This is called: [\text{\textit{\textit{\textit{nec}}}}] = \textit{necessity}. It is generally distinguished from sickness. It happens in spite of the activity and vigilance of the priest; and comes from outward circumstances. \textit{Isho`Barnun, \textit{ad Isaac, Q. 4}} admits that: “necessity knows no law.” \textit{Isho`yabhi} wrote a book about such cases (p. 120). They were the cause of several letters (see ch. iii). It is not surprising that this word belongs to the “eisernen Bestand” of canonical literature. But its contents is unlimited and variable as life itself.

These few words must suffice to sketch the background of our treatises. But there is one more point to which we must draw the attention of the readers. It is a matter of fact that the very same ideas as found among the Nestorians occur in the books of the other churches too (cf. Timotheus Alex. ; John Tell.; James Edess.; and others quoted in the commentary). It is true, the whole Eastern Church, however divided, held the same conception of the Eucharist. And it does not surprise us to find that the liturgical part in polemical literature is very small. This fact would astonish us, observing the liturgical differences, if the wording of prayers, sequence of actions etc. were exclusively valued. But if such differences are mentioned, it has some \textit{dogmatical reason} (cf. Elias Nisib., \textit{Bateis}, S. 58–Moses b. Cepha, \textit{Commentary, p. 69, ed. Cordrington-Conolly}) or the opponents are accused of disrespect.

Our treatises use a good many words to denote the Eucharist. Some of them which are somewhat particular are discussed in the commentary. But most of them are very common in the Eastern Church; so we may refer the readers to the excellent “Glossary” of Dr. Brightman in quoting what is necessary for our purpose (see the desideratum p. 188).

\textit{Paghra} (Body-Flesh)–\textit{D`ma} (Blood), see before—from the Gospels. (Mt. xxvi 26–28.)

\textit{Bukhra}, ‘firstbegotten’, Hebr. i 6 (it is interesting that Babai, \textit{De Unione}, who speaks frequently about Christ as the firstbegotten, p. 135, 139, 201, 210, never alludes to the liturgy) name of the Eucharistic host., \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 572.

\textit{Gmarita}, coal, \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 573 “a formal title of the consecrated particle” (cf. \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 584; four of them form a complete host.). \textit{Pearl}: Margarita is never used among the Nest.

\textit{Prishta}: Euch. bread.

\textit{Qurbana}: \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 579: “oblation, offering; (a) the concrete eucharistic oblation” (the first meaning viz. sacrifice is not found here).

\textit{Q\textsuperscript{t}v\textsuperscript{aj}: act of fraction}.

\textit{Q\textsuperscript{s}\textsuperscript{at\textsuperscript{h}: “broken portion”}, name of the Euch. bread.}

The Bread of the Nestorians is “round, leavened, cake, \(2 \times \frac{1}{4}\) in., stamped with a cross-croslet and four small crosses” (\textit{L.E.W.}, p. 572).
COMMENTS

Introduction: In the previous discussions of ch. iv and vi most of the points that are raised in these sentences have been investigated, and we may refer the reader to them for the explanation of most of the expressions. Some points however remained. Canons and orders are put between quotation-marks since it is indisputable that the canons are those of John Bar Abgare (p. 132-133) and the "orders" is the same word as used for the formularies in T. It is striking to notice that they are quoted anonymously. Does this happen because the respondent does know that the matters discussed here could not possibly be found in those books drawn up in order of I. iii (cf. ch. vi, iiic). The answer given by those neglectful priests who mock at the sacred things and the commands of the elders looks very much like that of Exodus ii 14. "The word of the Lord", cf. Matthew xviii 16 and John viii 17 (a quotation from Deut. xix 15): the questioner means to strengthen his point against his opponents by referring to this teacher. The good wishes at the end may express that it was thought that this theological knowledge was given by inspiration and could claim the prerogative of inspiration. Nevertheless this explanation is not very probable in view of what we found in ch. vi about tradition. Therefore it is simply an ordinary Eastern wish that is always uttered in somewhat excessive words and with a kind of repetition, especially in matters of high importance. "Your brotherhood" and "your love" (in the apology) are ordinary Eastern expressions to address somebody (cf. our: "Your Majesty"). The author describes in a vivid manner how troublesome he thinks his task. "Sea" may also be translated with "Lake". The translation "peaceful" was adopted for the sake of giving a close translation. In spite of industrious searching I have not found any proof that this comparison is traditional. Yet swimming is not a common sport in the East and travelling by sea not an ordinary occupation of those teachers. These observations make the invention by the author himself somewhat suspect. On the other hand it is not uncommon that people take their examples from places far away. "May their memory be a blessing" is a common addition to the names of the departed, cf. Budge, B.G. ii, p. 303, 458, 495, and: Proverbs x 7. "Doorkeeper" seems to be reminiscent to Psalm lxxxiv 11, for here it is a sign of humility though this order ranked among the (inferior) ecclesiastical orders in ancient times (cf. D.C.A., s.v. Doorkeepers).

A striking feature of this introduction that is also found elsewhere in our treatise Q. 120 (cf. also ii 10) is the note of humility and personal ignorance opposite to the greatness of him who is asking on one hand and on the other hand the haughtiness and conceitfulness (which is mere stupidity) of those people who do not care for the traditions of the Ancients (cf. Isho'yabbi iii, Epistulae, ed. R. Duval, p. 202-203 (tr.) who accuses some people of heresy because they are ignorant of the laws of God and "insane" [nevertheless they are Nestorians]; before p. 151 n. 1). These characteristics together are often found in other places in Eastern literature. They may be called the usual adjectives for people who are not in accordance with the speaker. Humility is the great virtue in Judaism, both in the O.T. and afterwards, cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism, ii, p. 245-246; 273-275 who refers to several places of the O.T. and the Apocrypha. The first Epistle
of Clemens with its stress upon humility is another instance, at the very beginning of Christianity. Time and again it is to be read in the Refutation of heretics, e.g. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. iv 26, 2 (ed. Siéreyn, i, p. 645), who are lacking it, because they oppose in every part the truth of the Church. Dom. Lecerq calls this repeated stress upon humility a mere "clause de style", D.A.C.L., s.v. Humilitis, t. vi, col. 2791. It is hardly necessary to give here a great array of examples, showing how this humbleness is thought to be the right Christian attitude, because it is found so often; some from the Nestorian Church will suffice. It is clearly expressed in this sentence: "It is evident that meekness and humility are the most excellent of all virtues which are cultivated and perfected by the body and soul... there is nothing worse than pride and arrogance" (Budge, B.G. ii, p. 60). A bishop governs his diocese "with all the humility which befits the governors of the flocks of Christ" (Budge, B.G. ii, p. 282) cf. also B.G. ii, p. 436 and the introductions to every separate Life; O. Braun, Synhados, S. 40 ff; 58-69; 122. It is evident that though the Eastern mind tend to meekness and the Christians had learned it from their Lord (Mt. xi 29), its use had become highly traditional and lost a good deal of its power. Such an "apology" of a "modest old man", full of the expressions of humility was usual; cf. e.g. Daisios', in: W.S., vii, p. 56-77, and Eph. i, p. 16-18.

The text of the addition in V. (p. 158, n. 7) is not easy to read; I do not see quite what is meant here.

Q. 1. The point of this question is shown in the differences of practice discussed in the next Q.Q. "Metropolitans and Bishops" see besides the Handbooks Labourt, Christianisme, p. 326-329. About Ischoyabb iii and his church-book see the references in: ch. vi, iic. In the present (N.B. p. 109-110) form of T. there are two formularies of altar-consecration, one with and the other without oil, the former being ascribed to I. iii. The former consists of hymns, prayers after which the oil is put upon the altar and signed several times (Q. 3), followed by anointing of the altar with the oil (Q. 6) and ending with prayers and hymns. The latter uses other words and misses of course the anointing, the altar being simply signed (cf. Badger ii, p. 349). "The former is only for new churches, or for churches rebuilt, or when for some grave cause the church has to be rededicated. The latter, which may be performed by priests commissioned by a bishop, is for more ordinary occasions. Consecration with the Syrians is not looked on by the Syrians so much as a 'baptism of the church', a formal dedication once for all to God which may not be repeated, but rather as a blessing of the building" (Browne-Maclean, p. 303).

-Similar rites of consecration with oil are found in other departments of the Church, cf. P. de Poncet, D.A.C.L., s.v. Dédicace des Eglises, t. iv, col. 397-398; but for the present purpose it is superfluous to compare them, since the distinction made here is typically Nestorian. Because it is of some importance for the understanding of the Q.Q., which follow in the course of this treatise, we may translate here the rubric of T., p. 119: "If one of the Bukhuras should be left in the oven, or a Gemurtha falls from the hands of the priests in the altar or a beetle or any other insect falls into the mixture, or they bring a mixture without water or water without wine, or the foot of a child comes into the altarplace or the girdle is loosened in the altarplace, all these do
not need the consecration with oil. Further if water is spilled in the altarplace or the chalice is spilled over the altar or a dead mouse is found in the chalice or a beetle or mouse eats from the Paghra or the chalice is broken in the altar or a thief enters the altarplace or an altar-cloth is stolen or a Bukhra or vessels, these (accidents) need consecration with oil.” There exists a monograph of J. F. Irving, The ceremonial use of oil among the Nestorians, London, 1903 which I was unable to consult, but found quoted in: D.A.C.L., t. vi, col. 2791.

“Not adding to or taking away from” is a typical feature of orthodoxy, cf. Deut. iv 9, xii 32 where the law of God is sanctioned by this command, and Revelation xxii 18-19 with its grave penalties for those who dare touch the book of the Seer. The same is said by Polycrates (2nd cent.) ap. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv 24, 2 ed. Schwarz, i, p. 490. It is perfect, exactly like the Trinity to which nothing can be added or from which nothing can be taken (Babai, De Unione, ed. A. Vaschalde, p. 295). In Canon 12 of Athanasius, ed. Riedel-Crum, p. 24 the text Deut. xii 32 is quoted in view of the singing of Psalms (the editors refer in a footnote to Athanasius, in: M.S.G. 26, col. 1437 on the canonical Scriptures, Can. Laod. 59 and Can. Basil. 97). Cf. the statement of the Byzantine Patriarch Photius, Epist. 13, in: M.S.G. 102, col. 754 D., that even the slightest deviation from the liturgical practice leads to contempt of the dogma. For the Nestorians we may refer to the following writers: about dogmatics, Elias of Nisibis, Bezaeis, S. 22, 98 and John Bar Abgare’s Promise: “si quid in fide ecclesiae mutavero aut addidero aut dempsero, futurum hoc mihi esse in opprobrium” (Gisondii ii, p. 47-48); for the liturgy: ‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon, v 2 (cf. ad Q. 106) about the Horae and cf. Q. 122. The sentence quoted on p. 126 is in flat defiance of the general rule which is reflected in its wording. But the author of Eshpos has clearly written it to save his own theory of explanation (viz. that I. iii expressed a type of the Kingdom of Heaven in the liturgy). Extremely important is the rule laid down by John Bar Abgare, in: ‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon, v 6: “Placuit spiritui sancto, et precapit, ut nemo fidelis, quicunque fuerit, diaconus, aut presbyterus in ecclesia, et in tempore ministerii et in eius ordinationibus, ac temporibus (distino cultui assignatis) ullo pacto pracciapiat, aut loquitur, aut dicat, neque silicet addendo negare diminuendo in his qui divine perficiuntur.” Our author reflects these words. In spite of these strong rules it seems as though the whole of this ritual was not essential, for Q. 2 shows that some people performed it in an other way and our author does not rebuke them. He acknowledges that it depends on one’s knowledge and on those who perform it. Essential is to make the sign of the cross or to say the words. See p. 189 sqq. about the consecration.

Q. 3. According to T. it is really done three times. The oil is brought upon the altar, p. 131, and the signings are found in the rubrics on p. 132, 133, 134. We find here that all formularies must be treated in the same way and that they are to a certain extent parallel (see p. 190). The point that matters is the number: three. The same insisting upon this number is found in Q. 5, 67, 90. In commenting upon the last place a reference to the Jacobite commentators will be included showing that they too wanted a multiple of three. The commentators always hint to the Trinity. This reference forms I think a sufficient explanation of this insistence of Eastern people and Eastern rituals on the number three. Once the mystagogical explanation being adopted in one
sense or another, it is quite natural that it should influence the rite itself to
make it more impressive and in accordance with its explanation whenever it
did not fit properly. The symbol of the Trinity was of course directly at hand
showing forth the essence of Christianity. Whenever the number of acts is
about the same as has been discussed and when there are differences between
churches it is always for dogmatical reasons that they combat one another.
This is the primary reason. It seems to me to be quite superfluous to surmise
here influence of ideas connected with the number three in other religions (cf. about
the symbolical meaning of the numbers, three included: F. Cabrol, D.A.C.L.,

Q. 4-5. The turning point of these questions lies in the number of the sig-
nings which should be three. It seems to be supposed by the author that the
signing is bound up with the “prayer of inclination”. This is called in Syriac a
Ghanta = a prayer said in a low voice (as is always said in the rubrics). “Canon”
is the end of those Ghanta’s which is said aloud; the various meanings of
“Canon”, see in: E.S.D.O., p. 292 (rule; prayer; antiphonal chant), and:
F. Cabrol, D.A.C.L., s.v. Canon, t. ii, col. 1847.

In T. the manner of signing is according to Q. 5. The sequence of the prayers
given in 5 corresponds to T. resp. p. 141, l. 14 (prayer ascribed to Narcissus),
the sign over himself being found p. 142, l. 4 (mentioned twice in Q. 5); the
placing of the vessel etc., p. 142, l. 5; the cry of the arch-deacon, p. 142, l. 12;
but in T. it is found after the benediction of the priest and the sign over
the oil, p. 142, l. 7–8; 2nd sign, p. 142, l. 26 (prayer)–p. 143, l. 18; the 3rd
one, p. 143, l. 21 (prayer)–p. 144, l. 17; the 4th sign is p. 144, l. 18–19. The
places mentioned in Q. 5 are: p. 143, l. 71; 2nd: p. 143, l. 21–p. 144, l. 17 (this
being the only one Ghanta, while the prayers mentioned in Q. 5 and T. are
all such prayers); the 3rd: p. 144, l. 18–20 (though the rubric in T. indicates
that it should be said softly).

The difference is of no great importance to our author; see p. 193. This
observation is of some moment with regard to the so called magical practices of the liturgy
where everything must be done according to a fixed number and where the
validity was dependent on it. The end of Q. 5 may be compared with the
question in Q. 89 sqq. That it could be used as a proof see p. 190.

The addition in V. (p. 159, n. 3) not in T. That the Nestorians signed with three
fingers is also expressly stated in the rubric p. 145 and introduced by the formula: “and be it known to you, o Brother that all signings of the rest must
be signed with three fingers”. (p. 000) It is well known that the number of
the fingers was thought to express a kind of confession. The Jacobites used
only one finger because of the one nature, and the Melchites or Byzantines
used two fingers, cf. Elias Nisib., Benei, S. 29; he goes on: “unsere Genossen, die
Orientalen, führen fort sich wie in alter Zeit mit der ganzen Hand zu
bekreuzen, was mit den Erfordernissen des Christentums, welches von keiner
Veränderung getroffen und unter keinen Widerspruch gelitten, übereinstimmt.”

Cf. on the different manners of signing E. Fehrenbach, D.A.C.L., s.v. Bénir
(manière de), t. ii, col. 746-758. Three fingers is always an expression of the
Trinity. (The reversion of V. p. 159, n. 5 is clearly mistaken, cf. L.E.W., p. 291.)
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Q. 6. The answer is the same as the contents of T., p. 144–146, respect.
p. 144, l. 25 sqq. (cf. l. 22 sqq.); p. 145, l. 6 sqq. (though it is said here and in
the next case that he should sign with three fingers); northern wall, l. 12
sqq.; southern wall, l. 15 sqq.; the door-post (only in V.) l. 18 sqq.; small altar,
l. 22 sqq. (It is also mentioned in: Gismondi i, p. 89; “fidelibus ex ara minori
eucharistarim sumentibus”; but it is not clear what was its place in the sketch
of Dom. Connolly, Expov. i, p. 196). Only the signing of the temple is not
mentioned separately but in the concluding formula, p. 146, l. 22. T. sup-
poses signing of the Western side, inside the altarplace. It is not said in the
rubric that the consecrator goes under the candle, but he stands “on the
platform” (see Q. 121) p. 146, l. 20, quite in accordance with the description
here. This question can only be explained, I think, by assuming that there
existed some differences about it though they are not specified. The addi-
tions in V. are merely fuller quotations.

Q. 7. The prayer discussed here is T., p. 143, ascribed to Bar Sauma of
Nisibis; see: A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 108–109, and add: Wigram, Introduction,
p. 142–171. In T. it begins with the opening words that are discussed here. Here
again we find the parallelism in the formularies (p. 190). About ‘Abdisho’ see
p. 86. We do not know anything about this addition (which was, it is readily
admitted, of no great importance from the liturgical point of view) from other
sources. It seems, however, that ‘A. attached some great weight to it since
disobedience is punished by excommunication (cf. D.C.A., s.v.; for the Nesto-
rian Church, see J. Labourt, Christianisme, p. 344; it “is still a very serious
punishment... It can, however, always be revoked in as much as it is a com-
mand to the offender to repent””, Browne–Maclean, p. 191–192. ‘A. was very
ready in distributing this punishment’, Gismondi i, p. 90: “Excommunicationis
poenam saepissime infilgebatur”; what is done often, loosens its force.

Q. 8–9. The Λοιπὸς translated always by “sacristian” is somebody who
has to do with the Λοιπός, a word borrowed from the Greek, meaning: shell;
it is typically Nest. to denote the Apse or Sanctuary (cf. Expos. i, p. 90–93;
for the archaeological material see: D.A.C.L., s.v. Abside, t. i, col. 183–197),
though it is sometimes found in Greek (Bingham, viii 6, 9, who refers to
Dufrenne) because it has the form of a shell. (T., p. 7, l. 21 = L.W.E. p. 270 it
is explained by “altar”: Λοιπὸς αὐτηῆς Λοιπός; this quotation shows once
for all that “altar” has a wider meaning than of table alone; cf. Ἀφαντοτρόπος,
Ignatius, Eph. 5, 2, Trull. 7, 2; hence we often translated it by: “altarplace”).
His task is the same as that of the Skeuophulan of the Greeks (D.C.A., s.v.).
He had to take care of all matters required for the right preformance of the
service and had to order the vessels at the end. The office could only be held by
priests and deacons since only they were allowed to come everywhere in the church
(E.S.D.O., p. 298 adds: “according to the books” without a further reference).
It is not always certain what functionary is meant. But from Q. 81 it seems
to be sure that he was generally a priest; a variant of ii 12 might be compared
where M. has Ἰερέα and V. Λοιπὸς of whom is spoken before in the same Q.
and who distributes the communion which was only allowed to a priest.
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“Sacristy”, lit., “Deacon’s house”, see Q. 34, 44 and p. 226; L.E.W., p. 387 (to distinguish between Nest. and Chald. as is done by Brightman is wrong): “the chamber attached to the church in which the sacred vessels etc. are kept under the charge of the deacon”; in the Sketch of Dom. Connolly, *Expos.* i, p. 196: E.

At the end of the service the veils are drawn, cf. L.E.W., p. 302 (T. uses slightly different words). When there is no service the altarplace may not be entered. A young priest was once rebuked “quo altare inicet . . . quo tempore minime id fert consuetudo”, viz. at night (Gismondi i, p. 107). The places of the laymen in the church were separated from the Sanctuary by an elevation (ἐνίσχυσι) with openings that were closed by veils “utque ab oculis mortaliun abscendantur ea quae ibi observantur” says *Expos. ii*, p. 114 cf. i, p. 90–93 (D.C.A., s.v. *Cancelli* and *Veils*; L.E.W., p. 590; D.A.C.L., s.v. *Cancel*, t. ii, col. 1821–1831 about its aim and shape; it is the usual scheme found in the Eastern church since the 4th century. Pictures of such veils in C. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch*, S. 369–371). At certain moments of the liturgy they were opened and closed (see e.g. T., p. 7; there are slight variations between rubrics and practice). This was specially done during the communion. Then the firmament is put aside and the unity of Heaven = Sanctuary and earth = church that is aimed at in the liturgy is realised (*Expos. ii*, p. 37, a usual symbolism, see e.g. Chrysostomus, in Eph. iii 5 in: L.E.W., p. 480). When the liturgy is finished this connection is broken and the altar protected against defilement. This seems to be the obvious explanation. (See also: E. Bishop, in: Connolly, *Narsai*, p. 90–91). Yet it is highly probable that we are here on the wrong track. I believe that the writer has in mind altarveils proper viz. those close around the altar, L.E.W., p. 590–591. For in ii 39 sqq. (quoted ad Q. 39) a sacristan is spoken of who stands on a ladder in the altarplace to fasten the veil and the evidence of Q. 29–30 is conclusive by its climax. In our Q. the sacristan may not enter the Sanctuary, yet to put it right again he has to reach over a long distance, therefore using a cane which would not be necessary if the veils of the Cancelli were meant; and he risks to touch the altar.

At the end of the service follow the ablutions, cf. Q. 18. By doing this the priest breaks his fast after which he was not permitted to enter the altar (Can. xxvi and ad Q. 27). It is a clear case of collision of two precepts and of course that of the guarding of the altar prevailed. About touching the altar see ad Q. 10.

Q. 10. The chalice is in all christian liturgies composed of wine and water (see ad Q. 46 and 72–75). It is mixed before the service (L.E.W., p. 251). One of the two chalices which are mixed here (in view of the 2nd one: fill, would be a better translation) was reserved for the Eucharist. It is not clear for what purpose the other one was made; possibly for the ablutions (see ad Q. 18). The deacon was permitted to bring the elements on the altar, at any rate the chalice and if there was no priest present also the bread (*John Bar Abgare*, *Quastio Eccl. x.*, cf. Isha’ Barnun, Q. 23 and ii 23–24 ad Q. 11). V. omits “deacon”; it may imply that sacristan and deacon were thought to be equivalents. It is not certain if it must be inferred from M. that the sacristan and deacon were separate persons. Ἰσραήλ ἡμᾶς ἐπήνωσεν ἀπόστολος = to bring on high. In itself this does not express the thought of offering, though it is also found in that meaning (*Thesaurus Syriacus* s.v.) and that a certain shade of it was found
in the word is proved by ii 17 quoted ad Q. 15 (the same is the case with the Latin "offrere", see: Lietzmann, Mess., S. 182). We may compare John Tell., Canon 12 (Lamy p. 72): Is something that was put on the altar by mistake, holy or can it serve a common end (Δώδεκα)? Answer: Yes, if the mysteries are performed over it; otherwise it may be taken away. A reference to Exod. xxix 37 may be useful: "it shall be an altar most holy: whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy"; the same in: Exod. xxx 29. Cf. ii 1: a chalice with insects must be thrown away (cf. ad Q. 78) "because it has been placed on the sacred altar". Yet it seems to be better to take the neutral sense, cf. ad Q. 15. The mixing was done after the example of Christ; bringing an unmixed chalice causes a great injury. Therefore the altar should be consecrated with oil; that differs from the rubric of T., p. 119, where it is mentioned among the cases that need consecration without oil. Of course the Paghira is also affected and cannot be used any more for consecration and communion. It is distributed as a Δώδεκα = blessing. For since it was separated and set upon the altar it had got something of consecration that should have been completed in the liturgy. That is the reason of the often occurring "distribution", a word used without addition as a terminus technicus, not to be confused with communion. Δώδεκα = eulogia. The latter word has many shades in the ecclesiastical language, (D.C.A. s.v. and: D.A.C.L., s.v. Eulogia, t. v, col. 733-734; L.E.W., p. 579). At the end of the early christian times it means preferably: a particle of the bread from which the host is taken; but which was not consecrated, and which was given to some people instead of the communion. The Nestorians do not use this name, but Purshana, cf. p. 114, n. 2; ad Q. 81. Brightman gives the word μεσαιρά and says that our word is specially Jacobite. It may be that it has not such a specialized meaning; it was given together with the host (Q. 32) as an extra-gift. (We should notice that there does not exist a transliteration of the Greek Eulogia as in Coptic; does this show that the technical meaning of this word is from a date after the separation?)

We may compare with this question a piece that is only preserved in V. (fol. 83b-84b); it may be that it was omitted in M. because the writer (or copyist) thought that it was sufficiently dealt with in this Q., cf. p. 69. It reads as follows: "Question: A priest of the church throws water into the chalice and by mistake he forgets to mix wine with it, and he brings the pater and the chalice upon the altar and completes the Qudasha. At the end of the Qudasha the deacon draws near and receives the Qudasha. Having tasted it (communion, L.E.W., p. 290), he says to the priest: 'this is water without wine', and (then) the wretched priest remembers that he did not mix wine with it. After that the sacristan comes and throws pure (lit.: living = not mixed with water) wine into the chalice, takes a Q'asaja from the paten, signs the chalice and offers it on the altar. Solution: The altar has been profaned since they brought profane water upon it. Question: What must be done with the Q'tsaja that has been consecrated together with the profane water, and with that chalice in which new wine was thrown in the end? Solution: It must be distributed among the people, and the altar must be consecrated with oil. Thus that stupid sacristan should have acted, instead of throwing pure wine into the chalice by which act profanation was added to profanation. His behaviour was stupid in all respects.
But he must mix equal parts of wine and water and throw the mixture into
the chalice and give it to the people; and on the morning of the next day the
bishop must efface the profanation of the altar\(^\text{3}\). This seems practically the
same question; and the solution is similar. There is only one difference viz.
that in this case consecration has taken place while in our Q. it had not yet
been consecrated. Yet it does not remove the profanation: if the elements are not
made according to the law, they do not become consecrated. The sacristan
thought he could put it right by pouring wine into it at random, instead of
the usual half and the ordinary signing by which the consecration was always
brought about. But everything is wrong from the very beginning. Only the
consecration of the altar can bring relief. That makes the lawful state in which
the consecration of the Eucharist may become effective. This case is mentioned
in the rubric of T.\(\text{4}\) p. 119 (cf. p. 156).

These questions are important to supplement Q. 10, since nothing was
said there about the chalice. We may conclude from the parallel that the matter
could not be put right by simply substituting the right elements. The whole affair
should be built up from the beginning. In M. it is said that new Euch. Br.
must be provided and the Leaven renewed (see Q. 58 and 84), but not how
it should be done. According to V. it must be brought from another place,
(see the same Q Q.). The treatment of the water which is prescribed here differs
from that of Q. 75 where the same matter of bringing a chalice with water
alone is discussed and where the connection of the sentence suggests that the
chalice with water must be distributed together with the Eulogia. Here it must
be preserved, though it is not said for what purpose (ablution?).

Among the Copts. the deacon was ordered to smell whether the mixture
was all right (Villecourt, Observances, p. 249); probably this was prescribed
for the deacon to notice whether the mixture was not yet corrupted; but it
had also the effect that he could see whether it was water alone or mixture.

Q. 11, 12, 14. They must be treated together since they deal with the
same matter, viz. the dropping of one of the Eucharistic elements, the wine.
The bread is spoken of in Q. 13, 41, 56 and 61. Both during the preparation
and the communion something might easily be dropped and admonitions
to make the administration careful are very old. See p. 234 Generally the point
is there that the elements are injured in some way while here the effect upon
the altar is considered. Therefore no difference is made between “consecrated”
and “unconsecrated”. First the unconsecrated wine is dealt with. In various
places this spilling of the wine is treated. In Canon 100 of Basilius (Riedel,
S. 278) the priest is advised not to fill the chalice “bis zum Rande . . .
damit nichts auf den Boden verschütet wird”. Gabriel Ibn Tarikh, Can. ii (ed. O. H. E.
Burmester, in: Le Museon, 1933, p. 52) says: “he who has not reached his majority
shall not carry the chalice, lest some of it be spilled, and this is a great sin; but
he shall carry it who has the ability to take care of it”. The point in question
is not: what must be done with the wine, as in John Tell., Can. vi (Lamy, p. 66)
and James Edess., Can. 32 (Kayser, S. 21–22; text, S. 1), but with the altar.
Isho’Barnum, ad Maccabium speaks about spilling in every place in general
terms: Q. 29: What must be done if it occurs to a deacon carrying the chalice
that something of the blood is shed on the earth? Solution: The place must be
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washed with water. This water must be used to cover the wall of the altar or to be a Ḥiṣnāna for the true believers who must necessarily receive the communion together with it in the church.” (It must be concluded that it was wine from the chalice which the deacon carried to communicate; otherwise it was forbidden that water should touch the altar; for covering the walls see ii 1 ad Q. 78; Ḥiṣnāna see p. 132, n. 2). Here the matter is pursued with the unconsecrated wine. Q. 11 is referred to in ii 19 (ad Q. 59). The meaning is perfectly clear. It is spilled in the prothesis. According to Q. 15 the consecration takes place at the Epiclesis. The altar was covered with a number of vestments and various vessels used during the service, especially the paten was placed upon it (cf. L.O.C., p. 51–62 and T., p. 146). These objects prevented the altar itself of becoming touched and thereby desecrated. If the stones of the altar are reached, consecration with oil is necessary, see also the rubrics T., p. 119.

In ii 23–24 the same question is put in a different form. There the author does not seem to be so sure. He gives an other solution and finishes by expressing his doubt. The text reads as follows: “Question: A deacon of very good reputation in our country who was in a town in the neighbourhood said to me: I saw a priest and a deacon bringing the paten and the chalice on the altar at the time of the mass and the contents of the chalice were spilled over the altar and the altar with all its vessels and vestments was drowned by the mixture of the chalice. They went to tell the bishop about it. He answered them that the altar was not injured by it. What is your opinion about this fact? Answer: The priest must judge as his eyes saw it. By the word of his mouth the altar becomes consecrated and by his words it loses its consecration. Question: The bishop has authority over his diocese, cathedral and residence. But if to us happens something like this, what ought we to do? Answer: I do not know it from a bishop, but I only tell what I have seen. It was in the days of Mar George, Metropolitan of Mosul, while I was a deacon, on the Wednesday of the Fast of the Ninevites and at the moment of the Offertory I took the chalice and the priest took the paten. After I had taken it, the contents of the chalice were poured from my hands over the altar. The altar with all its vessels and vestments was drowned by that mixture. The priest-priest went out to tell it to His Holiness (the bishop) and he ordered to carry out the altar and its vessels. They brought in other vessels and vestments and endued that altar and they brought a consecrated wooden altar and placed it on the large altar. The bishop celebrated the Eucharist according to the liturgy of the Holy Mar Nestorius and distributed the Euch. bread to the believers. In the morning of the next day the bishop came back and consecrated the altar. So we have seen it with our eyes. But if somebody says something else, we shall not quarrel with him.” We find here a supplement of what is discussed in Q. 11. From

(1) See ad Q. 88. (2) L.E.W., p. 267; cf. ad Q. 10. (3) It seems as if it did not occur very often. (4) The answer of the bishop suggests that nothing had happened to the altar. Yet the point is uncertain, as it is written that everything was drowned. It would be quite probable that the altar was actually profaned. It can only be decided by the priest who assisted. (5) Cf. ad Q. 2. (6) Lit.: “Country, church, town” (V. reads instead of the last word: “Altar”). (7) Does this clause imply that the questioner was a monk who did not live under the jurisdiction of a bishop? (8) See p. 74–75. (9) The date of this Fast was not fixed since it was held 20 days before Easter, E.E.D.O., p. 268 and note, and A. Baunmarch, Fastiense, S. 191–194; it seems to be a Mesopotamian specificity, but it is also found in the Ethiopian church. (10) Cf. Cassani and Istib-Yarmun, ed Insn Q. 19 (quoted ad Q. 29–30). (11) See p. 29, n. 9 for the dates on which it should be said. (12) The consecration takes always place at this time; probably because it was a new day and a fresh situation (cf. Q. 74).
this quotation we can induce that our author starts from the method in which
George of Arabela had solved this difficulty though he did not consider it oblig-
gatory.

Q. 12 does not state clearly at what moment the chalice was shed and there-
fore it is not known whether it was consecrated or unconsecrated wine. No
similar questions besides that of Isho’Barnum are known to me from the
Nestorian church. Among the Jacobites Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon, vi 4 brings
several Canons prescribing the treatment if consecrated wine was spilled
(at any rate this interpretation is suggested by its connection and by the similar
decision, of John Tell., Can. 6 (Lamy, p. 66) who orders that coals of fire should
be laid in that place). Very interesting in this respect is the response of James
Edess, who tells us that there was a double practice about this point: some
people throw water in that place while others lay glowing coals on it; the
former do it to cover the place, the latter to purify it; “jedoch weder diese
noch jene können jenen heiligen Tropfen von dem Orte entfernen. Denn
ihre Absicht ist die, dass er nicht mit Füssen getreten wird.” Therefore James
advises to scrape off that place with a knife and to throw away or to burn
these scrapings. If that cannot be done, the practices mentioned before are
allowed. He does not think it to be of great importance since the power of the
consecrated elements is not attached to the earth but to the hearts of the faithful
(Can. 32, Kayser, text S. 1, tr., S. 21–22; it is not found in Lamy’s text as it falls
in the Paris Ms.). Rabula ordered what was rejected by James whose directions
are taken over by Bar Hebraeus. It is not superfluous to notice that burning
holy things was an atrocity to our author ii 15, ad Q. 78). The Nestorians seem
to have followed the first practice. They run the risk that the altar will be
affected, e.g. by the flowing away of water. This can be prevented by using
a sponge. This article is found in all Eastern rites and is used to wash the chalice
and the paten (D.C.A. s.v. sponge, D.A.C.L., s.v. Ephange, t. v, col. 344 and L.O.O.,
p. 56. Of course it was also holy. John Tell., Can. 15 (Lamy, p. 74) ordered that
if a sponge could not be used any more it should be burnt lest it may be despised.)
Even in this case one should be careful not to transgress the Canon. For it
was prescribed that the altar should never be washed when it had once been estab-
lished (Canon ii).

Q. 14. Belongs to Q. 11 dealing with the other possibility. Its principle is
a logical one, but is never expressed so plainly. Some people however thought
that in such a case the altar did need signing. The author did not want to
quarrel with them but he did not think it necessary, if only care was displayed
(ii V. 25, quoted ad Q. 16).

Q. 13. For the Eucharistic bread the same measures are applied as for the
wine in Q. 12. Basilus, Can. 99 (Riedel, S. 277) impresses on the priest to take
care that nothing should fall upon the earth during the fraction (Comput.). Cf.
below Q. 40-41, 61.

Q. 15. This is analogous to Q. 10. Olive-oil was necessary for preparing
the dough (cf ad Q. 53) and for the lamps (Can. xii). It is not easy to see why
the sacristan could make this mistake since the smell and the nature of these
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two liquids were so different. At any rate there was a mistake. The literal translation was: "and the Descent was called" and in Q., 19 it is styled: "the calling of the Spirit", a common name for the Epiclesis among Jac. and Nest. In Expos. ii, p. 60 (text) דס קדש is also used absolutely. Another name was מַעַל from the first words of the prayer: "and may there come, 0 my Lord" (L.E.W., p. 282) in which the Descent of the Spirit is prayed for. "The moment of signing" is that part of the liturgy in which the priest breaks the host and signs the chalice with it reciting several prayers, and then he signs the bread with the chalice in saying a special formula (L.E.W., p. 289-293; L.O.C., ii, p. 587-588, is much shorter). The "administration" seems to be another name for the communion. Some attention must be paid to the variant in V, though it seems to me that this text does not fit in with the following sentences. The answer does not agree quite with the Q., so far as the former part is concerned. It is a habit of the teacher to give an answer which contains more than a simple answer of the question.

It is here the place to enter into a discussion: what is the moment of consecration? In our Q., the Epiclesis forms a clear division between one state of the Elements (viz. unconsecrated) and another (viz. consecrated). This prayer is one of the most central points of liturgical investigation. It turns about the points: at what date this prayer was introduced (historical); why it does not take such a prominent place in the Western formulary (when it is found there) as in the Eastern liturgies (liturgical) and what was its effect (dogmatic). The debate has been very sharp since it was one of the points of difference between Eastern and Western Christianity; see: F. Cabrol, D.A.C.L., s.v. Epiclesis, t. v, col. 142-184 (very important); F. Heller, Urkirche und Ostkirche, S. 256-262; Hansens ii, p. 454-463. What consecrates the elements: the words of the Institution or the Epiclesis? It is well-known that the former answer was given by the Western church while the Eastern church ascribed the effect to both while stressing the latter (cf. the fact that in most liturgies they are found both together; it is clearly expressed by 'Abdisho', Pearl iv 5: "The form He conveys through His life-giving word, and by the descent of the Holy Ghost"). But from the expositions of the liturgy it is obvious that they ascribed this power to the Epiclesis since they pass over the words of the Institution while they have much to say about the E. The questions referred to above are very complicated, but need not be answered here (cf. E. Bishop, The Moment of Consecration, in: Connolly, Narsai, p. 126-165; and: Lietzmann, Messa, p. 69-81). The Nest. church shared the general conception of the completion of the consecration by the Epiclesis, cf. M. Jugie, Thol. dogm., v. p. 308-316 (who tries to weaken this statement as far as possible, and to bring it into agreement with that of the Roman Catholic Church.) They even omitted the words of Institution in the Mss. of 'Addai' (p. 56) though it is said there in practice; at any rate they are found in the 2 others). All the Mystagogies pass over these words while it is emphasized that the Spirit brings about the change (Theodore Mops., W.S., vi, p. 111, 113, cf. p. 103-104; Narsai, tr. Connolly, p. 20-21; Expos. ii, p. 56; Timotheus ii, Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 129a).

Yet there existed at the time of our treatise another point of difference with regard to the consecration. ii 17 discussed the question whether it is right to bring back the wine into the chalice, if the contents of the chalice had been
shed over the Paten with the Bukhra, as some very learned teachers permitted. The answer is as follows: "some people think that when the Paten and Chalice are brought upon the altar, they are immediately consecrated from the mere fact that they have been placed on the altar and become Paghra and Dëma. But others say that only at the moment when the power of the Spirit comes down on the elements, and the Dëma has been signed with the Paghra and the Paghra with the Dëma they are signed and completed and have become Paghra and Dëma." Parallel points are mentioned ad Q. 10. The latter view is the only right one according to our author who sticks to the traditional opinion. Yet it is interesting to find this former view. Already at the Prothesis and L.E.W., p. 267 the elements are styled: Body and Blood. It is not particularly Nest., but is also found elsewhere (see: Lietze, Messa, S. 190 ff; and: L.O.C., i, p. 171). It shows once more that the words of Institution were not thought of in this connection, and that the exact dogmatical definition of this point was not yet given. We may insert here also a piece that has been preserved only by V. (fol. 81). It mentions once more the case that bread and wine are mixed by accident, and it is asked whether anything is injured if it happens before the signing of the elements. The answer is sufficiently clear: "no consecration is completed before the Epiclesis, but through the Epiclesis it is consecrated. If the chalice is shed after the Epiclesis the altar is not injured and the signing after the Epiclesis is only a supplement of the consecration" (cf. B.O., iii 1, p. 246 and Q. 19, Q. 89). Here another possibility is offered viz. that only at the signing (L.E.W., p. 291) the effect which is required is brought about. But our writer considers it only as an addition; his view of the moment of consecration is very definite. It is also shown here. If it is noticed before the Epiclesis the same must be done as in Q. 10; what is said there about the renewal of the bread is undoubtedly supposed here though it is not expressed; after that the service can go on. About the ingredients of the bread see ad Q. 53. The treatment is different if the Epiclesis has been said, for then something has happened. A single formula is said over the renewed chalice, which is not the same as the ordinary one: "the precious Blood is signed with the lifegiving Body of our Lord Jesus Christ etc." (L.E.W., p. 291). Of course, the normal form cannot be used. But to this word of consecration applies what is said Q. ii 23: "by the word of the priest it is consecrated", cf. Q. 2. After that the mysteries are ended by communion. The wrong chalice that came in touch with the Holy must be reserved for the holy use. It seems as though it was a valid Eucharist. Yet the altar is injured and needs consecration.

Q. 16. The word "Treasury" is rarely met with; in our treatise cf. Q. 49 and ii 4: dealing with the signing of chalices where it is allowed by lack of a consecrated chalice to sign "the chalice with the particle of the Paghra, the Treasury" (the last words are omitted in V.). It seems as though this name is only found among the Nestorians (it is not found in the index of L.E.W., nor anywhere else; the example given by Payne Smith, Dictionary, s.v. is a Nestorian quotation that will be cited afterwards. The first place where it occurs as far as I know, is in the letter of Isho’yabbi to James of Darai, Canon 3, in: O. Braun, Synodos, S. 243; he describes the way in which a priest should receive the communion, if only a deacon is present. He must act in the same
way, if no deacon is present, but “wenn der Schatz der Eucharistie vorhanden ist”. This word is used without any further explanation; this fact shows that it was not an invention of I., but already existing (it may be that the hymns of Ephraem contain some help to detect the origin of this word). In Isho‘Barnum,

*ad Isaac Q.* 1 it is asked whether the treasury may remain on the altar overnight. The answer is to the negative for various reasons (parallel with the Paschal Lamb Ex. xii, and the Manna Ex. xvi); only one exception is made, viz. if there is left more than may be taken at the Ablutions (cf. *ad Q.* 18); this is on account of the weakness of our nature. If neglectful people leave it for many days they must be punished. A similar, though shorter *Q.* is found in the same author’s *ad Macarius.* But there the word “Treasury” is not found; he uses “Holy Paghra of Christ”. The same regulation about the Treasury is given in *Cen. xiv* in slightly different words. It is said there that it was prohibited in the law of Moses (Ex. xii 10, Lev. vii 15; the parallel with the Paschal Lamb is a very favourite one among the Eastern Christians, cf. for the Copts, Riedel, S. 276, Villecourt, *Observations,* p. 208). It is not difficult to decide what Treasury means here. Isho‘Barnum uses as a synonym: Qudasha and Mysteries, and he and *Cen.:* Paghra. It should be observed that it is always used of the Paghra that was left. This may also account for its special name (we should also compare the addressing of the Lord as “Celestial Treasury”, in the hymns *Q.* 7). These regulations repeated on various occasions, cf. very severely *Q.* 37, are directed against the old Christian use of the reservation of the Sacrament (*D.C.A.,* s.v. *Reservation;* W. H. Freestone, *The Sacrament reserved*, Alcuin Club Publications xxi, 1917, (which I did not consult). Originally the laymen had taken the communion home and preserved it for private communion (see *ad Q.* 51, which was strictly forbidden, because it gave rise to various abuses, e.g. as a charm). Edess., *Can. 9* and Kayser, S. 94–95. At an early date it was already condemned by Origenes, in *Lev.* vi in: *M.S.G.,* xii, col. 459 saying that Christ did not allow the Euch. Bread to be left till the next day. Later on this preservation was definitely forbidden, but practised still by the clerks and monks. In the churches it was preserved for the communion of the Missa Praeambientorum (cf. *D.C.A.,* s.v. *Preanuntiatus*, and: Hansens, ii, p. 86–110, xix and iii, p. 540–556), consecration of altars, communion of the sick. But those practices do not seem to have occurred in the Nestorian church; for the communion of the sick see *ad Q.* 51; *Expos. i.* p. 52: “Mysteria plena, id est cum consecratione non conficiuntur”, cf. also, p. 67, do not deal with a “missa Praesenticatorum”; “mysteria” means here: “liturgy” and not: “the sacrament”; for the consecration of the altar see before. The Nestorian Canonlaw prescribed to “order” the elements directly after the service (*Q.* 18). If this were impossible, the Bread might be left upon the altar under the light of a candle and should be carefully guarded; the guarding priest was not allowed to eat, to drink or to sleep (*Syrodon Arab.*, fol 8ob). In plain words it was interdicted by Timothy i (E. Sachau, *Syrische Rechtshäcker,* ii, S. 70–71): “*Q.* xvii: Is it right to leave the Qudasha on the altar till the next day? *Solution:* It is in no wise right to leave it. It must be taken on the day itself. For it was not allowed to leave anything from the Manna or from the Paschal Lamb which were types of the Body of our Lord. The fact that the Manna was reserved for the Sabbath, is a Mystery in a type like this; that we cannot draw near to God, neither in this world the type of which is the Sabbath eve, nor in the
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world to come, the type of which is the Sabbath, except by the manhood of Christ who is the Mediator between God and men." I do not know whether this was formulated by him for the first time. At any rate it is sure that it was repeated at several occasions by his successor Isho'Barnun (see before; in the letter ad Macarum he states that many teachers do not allow it at all, but that some permit it in emergencies up till three days; he himself adhered to the former point of view, cf. Ming. Syr. 586, fol. 439b, Q. 55: "Is it allowed to leave the Qadasha on the altar for three days? Solution: That is absolutely not permitted"). The arguments given by Timothy ii are very curious. He says that it was ordered by the Fathers that the priest must do his service standing before the altar as long as Eucharist was upon it (cf. the Arabic Synodicon before and Can. xxii afterwards); but they understood that the priest could not do so night and day and therefore they ordered that nothing should remain (this is exactly the opposite view of that given in Can. xxii and ii 29). His other explanation is that it is a type of Christ depicted in the O.T., referring again to Paschal Lamb and Manna that became spoilt if they were left. Therefore he repeats the commandment that is only broken by some daring people (Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 139a–139b). Besides these Nestorian canons we draw attention to Pseudo-Nicaca, Canon xix, in: Mansi, Conciliorum nova collectio, ii, col. 1029–1030: "Quoties fiunt commemorationes in ecclesiis, monasteriis et martyriis, et aliquid eucharistiae residuum fuerit, co honorentur sacerdotes in sequentis diei mane, antequam communient: si autem residuum multum fuerit, partintur illud inter se, et unusquisque suam sumat portionem unica tantum vice per modum unius boli, sive parva sit illa sive magna, nec iterum aut tertio id fiat."—The origin of this rule is unknown; it is not quite the same as those we have met before; but it offers a parallel since it does not allow that Euch. Bread remains during another service. Cf. Athanasius, Canon 78, ed. Riedel-Grun, p. 48–49: "And concerning the holy Mysteries, the body of Christ and His blood, they shall not let aught thereof remain over from evening to the morning, but shall do with it whatsoever they will. The holy altar having been prepared and so long as the holy Mysteries are thereon, ere he hath raised it up (dunpiaxou), the readers shall not be silent before it . . . And because it is His body and blood, so shall they not leave praising Him until the time when the place is cleansed", and Timotheus Alex., Q. 16 (2nd series), in: Pitra, Monumenta, i, p. 641.

It will be seen from these examples that the later Nestorian Canonists emphasized this point and did not permit anything of a permission to reserve the bread. We must reconstruct the history in the following way. It was not allowed to end the service if anything of the Eucharist was left; this was hard in practice. Then the priests were allowed to take at the Ablutions more than usual. This commandment should not be contravened although it was rather difficult, see Q. 49. The case provided for in Can. xxii: "... if by urgent circumstances or without the will of the priest the urgent case arises in which the Holy Sacrament is kept overnight on the altar, because there is nobody to order it, let him do one of the two following things with the sacrament: if a believer, male or female, is found let them order among themselves the chalice, and this must be reckoned as the two elements of the sacrament, when the priest knows that this remained from the communion of the sacrament. He should order the chalice only; for he should never order all the Eucharistic bread. Because
of its abundance the Eucharistic bread may stay over night on the altar, if sufficient care is displayed towards it through the burning of the lamps and the service of the night. But if it happens that there are no persons who can order the two elements of the sacrament, the man who is in charge of them shall stand on his feet, till the moment they order it, be it night or day; and he should never leave this service without a substitute.” This canon explaining what is meant by the information that he “guards it with great care” is also reproduced in II 29. In II 33 we have a case of a priest who forgot his duty for he placed the Paghra in the House of the Treasury (see below). Those priests who broke these rules were heavily punished (see ad Q. 69) and this shows that great weight was attached to it. The reason of it was that one was anxious that the elements should become corrupted; as is apparent from the parallel with the Lamb and the Manna. It can also be seen from the rebuke of Elias Nisib. to the other Christian churches (Bewris, S. 99): “Sie bewahren es (die Eucharistie) eine lange Zeit auf, und setzten es den Motten, den Würrmen, der Fäulnis, den Mäusen und anderer Verderbnis aus; also strahlen sie das Wort der Schrift Lüge, wenn sie sagt: keine Änderung und kein Verwesung soll sein Leib treffen (Act. ii 27, 31).” He is right in saying that it was not practised by the others. The Jacobites did not know it, cf. John Tell., in: Bar Hebraeus, Nomeamoun, iv 11: “si superest ex margaritâ, custodiantur caute, et alia diebus dentur” (this being the practice allowed by the Nestorians in urgent cases!), and James Edess. (Ibidem) went even further in saying: “xatam, quae superest, postsum sacerdotes vendere, verum sacerdotibus sociis suis.” We surmise that in this case too the Nestorian practice had become stricter in course of time and that the allowance made for urgent cases was really the more ancient practice. We suppose that this stricter rule was made sometime in the middle of the 8th century. For there we find for the first time this Canon directed against reservation. It is not improbable that one might challenge our statement that the Nestorians did not know the reservation by pointing to a sentence of P. Bedjan (Isaac Ninevita De Perfectione Religiosa, Leipzig, 1907, p. xvii): “Ce qui prouve l’usage de la Ste. Réserve.” The emphasis with which this point is underlined by drawing attention to it in the preface, proves sufficiently that this place was also a peculiarity for this connoisseur of the Nest. Literature. The place he referred to was found in what seems to him a letter of Isaac that he published in an incomplete form, but was reprinted completely by Dr. Mingana as a word of Dadiáho’ (end of the 7th cent., cf. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 226-227). There we read (W.S. vii, p. 90) that a recluse was advised not to go to communion until the end of his solitude of the 7 weeks. “If, however, you converse with others, and thus not do live in complete solitude, go out of your cell on the night of Saturday, a little before the bell of the Night Service, and receive the Communion from the Sacrament that has been consecrated on Friday.” It proves that in monks’ circles the sacraments were reserved from Friday on which mass was said, to Saturday. But this is not so amazing since the Nestorians did not consecrate on Saturday, as is stated by Elias Nisib., Bewris, S. 110-111; he objects to the Greeks that they do so and

(1) Cf. Elias Nisib., Bewris, S. 99: “Zur Fastenzeit heiligen sie die Elemente aus Sonntag für die ganze Woche, und achten dass jeden Tag davon, was sie brauchen, die heiligen Canones verbretzen soliehen; das Abendmahl soll kein einziges Mal übernacht aufbewahrt werden.”
continues: "Es ist aber bekannt, was das Abendmahl an diesem Tag besonders unerwähnt macht; zunächst das wir die jüdische Sitte verwerfen und die Juden nur am Sabbat in ihre Kirchen gehen ...; ferner noch das Abendmahl ist der Leib des Herrn und es ist bekannt, dass er am Samstag im Grab und bei den Toten war. Daher muss man für die Feier des Abendmahls dem ersten besten Tag in der Woche den Vorzug vor dem Samstag geben, es sei denn dass ein Festtag darauf falle, an dem das Ausbleiben des Abendmahls unstatthaft wäre"; and cf. the special case quoted ad Q. 50. It might be explained to the Nestorian mind by referring to the fact that it was expressly stated in Scripture that Manna should be taken on Friday for 2 days. And Dadisho lived before the time of the rules against the reservation.

At this place we should also mention a formulary published by Mr. H. W. Codrington in 1904 which seems to be inconsistent with our conclusion, as it is called an East Syrian Liturgy of the Presanctified (H. W. Codrington, The Syrian Liturgies of the Presanctified iii, East Syrian or Persian, in: J.T.H., 1904, p. 535-545). It will be useful to give a summary of this article. Mr. C. found this rite which is now obsolete, in two MSS, viz. Cambridge Add. 1968 (A.D. 1559) in which Israel, bishop of Kashkar († A.D. 877) is called the author, and British Museum Add. 7181 (A.D. 1570) under the name of "Abdisho" of Elam (13th cent). The former MS. is more detailed. "The rite is constructed in the same manner as the Jacobite Presanctified, from which the idea may have been borrowed by the Nestorians of the plains, and is adapted to the normal Persian liturgy." Its use is obscure, because the Nestorians rejected the reservation (Mr. C. quotes: Elias Nisib; our Q. 49; Cap. xix). But Isho’Barnun allowed it to remain for three days (but see before). "The present rite would therefore seem to provide for the contingency of the Body alone remaining." He finds a difficulty in the rubric: "when the Treasure remains in the night in which the Holy Thing is baked," as it could be consumed at the celebration of the Mass which follows the baking. The text and its translation will be found on p. 536-545. Prof. Hansens ii, p. 91 accepted the conclusion of Mr. C. though with some hesitation (cf. iii, p. 556 and p. 627). The article summarized before seems to have escaped the attention of Prof. Baumstark. He mentions only the Cambr. MS. and dates (L.G., S. 394) this Israel "spätestens in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jhhr." and credits him with other liturgical activities. This formulary is called: "ein Formular zur Konsekration des Kelches ausserhalb der Messe" and Ak. 6 adds: "So und nicht der Präsanctifikaten-Liturgie" wird zu sagen sein, da eine solche im technischen Wortsinne dem nestorianischen Ritus fremd ist."

Whose opinion is the right one? Baumstark's dating is based upon the year of the MS he knows, but is rather vague. On p. 81 a liturgical authority, called Israel was mentioned (n.b. "the learned"), in n. 4. I do not see any reason why we should not assign the making of the formulary under discussion, to the later half of the 10th cent. as the rubric supposes the canons given before and this time showed a great liturgical activity. It is even more important to answer the question whether it is a "Missa Praesanctificatorum"; it will be good to copy the rubrics at the beginning. "The order of the signing of the Chalice or of the Treasure, that is, when the Treasure remains in the night, in which the Qudasha is baked; ordered by Mar Israel the sharp of wit, bishop of
Kashkar. First it is not right that the Treasure should stay the night, except from necessity; and when it happens to stay the night, let there not be therein anything that is kneaded at all, except the true bukhre, or perisatha; (but let not the chalice stay the night in any way) a light not departing from before it." It appears that the Qudaah remained in a special vessel. Next follow the prayers etc.—Everything in the rubric fits in very well with the evidence we have collected as Q. 16 and 18. This formulary was not performed as an ordinary ritual such as the Greek Praesanctified, *L.E.W.*, p. 345-352, but only in case of emergency, viz. when there were not a sufficient number of people to "order" and the quantity of Bread too large. The difficulty which Codrington found here is quite easy to solve as "it is not right that two Kings should sit on one throne". It is not a "missa praesanctificatorum" as Baumstark already observed, but the sequence of the "ordering" in the morning of the next day (why 'Abdisho' is mentioned in the other MS., I do not see. A. Baumstark, *L.G.* does not mention him).

The teaching of the Nest, about this point is clear though it is not always the same from the beginning; among the Jacobites there was none such prohibition. They order that the priests must take care that the bread grow mouldy and that the chalice must be cleaned to prevent the wine becoming sour while it is supposed that the bread is always left (James Edess., *Can.* 16 and ap. Bar Hebraeus, *Nomocanon*, iv 2-8, quoted by Kayser, S. 41, cf. Lampl, p. 210-218 "De asseverantio euch."). I have not found any changes mentioned. But that does not imply that they did not exist. At any rate this was the teaching of the leading Nomocanists. And it differs from the Copts who strangely enough seem to have points of contact with the Nest. They also refer to the Paschal Lamb: "Et parélement, nous, nous mangeons le vrai agneau Pascal, le corps et le sang de notre Signeur Jésus Christ qui a été immolé à cause de nous, et nous n’en réservons rien jusqu’au second jour." One pointed also to the example of the Lord (Villecourt, *Obseraunus*, p. 208; an exception in the week of the Passion; what had been consecrated on Palm-Sunday might be distributed on Tuesday, see: L. Villecourt, *La Lettre de Masacre*, in: *Le Musée*, 1923, p. 41). In the same way it was strongly impressed upon the clerks not to leave anything till the next day cf. *L.O.C.*, i, p. 273, and: "Statutes of the Apostles" (tr. G. Horner, London, 1904, p. 201, 277, 344-345): the Arabic text reads as follows: "And the little (pieces) which remain over let the deacons take care of, lest any should be left of the Oblation, and let the priests take great care that there should not be much left".

The Greeks do not know this reservation; they have a large host consecrated on Maundy Thursday from which pieces are taken during the year (Salaville, *Les liturgies Orientales*, p. 138-139; *D.C.A.*, s.v. *Doxa*). Special measures are not found. We have reproduced the evidence because the Nest have a development of their own about this point and because it shows that the statement of Mgr. Rahmani (*L.O.O.*, p. 61-62), "tous les anciens documents attestent que les syriens, les grecs, et les coptes conservaient le saint sacrement", based totally upon Jacobite evidence needs some rectification.

It has already been indicated how this Treasury should be guarded (cf. also ii 34). It was laid in the Beth-Gazza. According to Payne Smith (*Dictionary*, s.v.) it means: "a recess in the north wall of the Sanctuary", an explanation
given by Dean Maclean (E.S.D.O., p. 294 and: L.E.W., p. 590, referring to p. 262 where it is said that the priest places the Paten in the Treasury until the cárůζὴθα is finished). It is not said on what evidence this explanation is based. The term is not found anywhere else. Certainly, the name Gazophylacium is found (cf. D.C.A., s.v.), being a "storehouse attached to a church, for the reception of the offerings of the faithful, made either in bread and wine, or in money for the service of the altar." It is clear that in this connection it is used in a different sense. Nevertheless it may be that after the time in which the offerings of the people fell into disuse, the name was retained and attached to another place. On the other hand it may be a simple derivation from the word Treasury in its special use as has been discussed before. For the moment we must leave this matter open. I suppose that the translation given before goes back to the practice as seen by Dean Maclean among the Nest. at the end of last century. The word is also used in the rubrics of the "Consecration of the altar with oil" of I. iii: "And if there is a small altar, that is to say a Beth-Gazza etc." (T., p. 153). Unfortunately it is not clear what is the precise relation between the "big" and "small" altar. (Cf. ad Q. 6. Several altars in the church are also mentioned in Can. xii and Q. 17.) This gives a meaning somewhat different from that of Maclean. I do not know what must be chosen here.

The Eucharist was held "on festivals and memorials and Sundays and Fridays, except Good Friday", T., p. 150. (Cf. also Expos. i, p. 107). The practice in the ancient church varied in different countries; many people held daily communion which is also implied in: Babai, De Unione (ed. Vaschale, p. 284), see: D.C.A., s.v. Communion, and: D.A.C.L., s.v. Communion quotidienne, t. iii, col. 2437-2452. On the memorials some prayers were different from those that were usually said, see notes in L.E.W. Λουσία is the yearly memorial service for the saints ("Abdisio, Nomocanon, v 12). For the service of "consolation", cf. Browne–Maclean, p. 287: "For the second and third day (after the funeral) services of "consolation" for the mourners are appointed; and on other days also 'memorials' are very commonly made of the dead. The Holy Communion is celebrated, alms are offered by the relatives"; formerly it was held on other days. As "memorial" and "consolation" are distinguished here, I have adopted this interpretation. But in Expos. ii, p. 137 (text: p. 138) Λουσία is used of the "consolation" too (cf. the question: "Quare tertia die, non secunda, commemo- rationem faciunt? et quare iterum die septima, nec non quinta decima, et in fine mensis?").

"King" cf. the quotation from Can. ix ad Q. 52; it proves that it was specially used in connection with the Holy Leaven. The simile of Abraham b. Lipheh, Expos. ii, p. 162 shows that it laid at hand to use it in connection with the host. Later on it got a pregnant meaning (cf. ad Q. 52–but not here). "Throne" as a name for the altar is also found in the Byzantine writings (L.E.W., p. 569 and cf. ad Q. 100) but Suicerus, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, and: Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Cambridge (Mass), 1914, s.v. do not mention it. The Syriac Jacobites and Nestorians have it both (see also: L.O.C., ii, p. 52. It is a common Nestorian name–Dietrich, Taufit, S. 31, 77). In our treatise it is found Q. 104: Λουσία; T. uses the word "Σωμάτων. Brightman thought the name had been derived from Isa. vi which had a considerable influence upon
Mystagogies; Renaudot pointed out that it was called so because Body and Blood were placed upon it. It is not clear at what time the name arose nor from what place it was borrowed. The agreement between the great Christian communities points to a time before the separation and from Antioch(?). In: *Exop.* ii, p. 62 the altar is called the mystery of the “throne” of Christ; and altar is here clearly distinguished from the Apse (not: = “altarplace”). This makes Dean Maclean’s explanation of the word: Beth-Gazza less probable for our Q. As far as I know it was not specially commented upon in the Mystagogies though one would expect it. Is it lawful to infer from this fact that the name came into existence outside the sphere of the explanation of Eucharist (in contrast with “grave”, Q. 100)? In that case Brightman’s derivation was wrong. I should like to point to the possibility that the identification of altar and throne is a very old one, though it is only found at a late date in Christian Literature; see the word in Apoc. ii 19, the throne of Satan in Pergamus = the altar of Zeus (E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung Johannes*, Tübingen, 1926, z. St.; and others).

“Forign” = hostile to God; cf. Lev. x 1, where it is said that the sons of Aaron “offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not”. The place is of a somewhat doubtful interpretation as to what kind of fire is meant; but the meaning of “strange” is clear; see also Exod. xxx 33; *Ode of Solomon* vi 3 (ed. Harris-Mingana, Manchester, 1920, ii, p. 232): “for he destroys what is foreign, And everything is of the Lord”; so-called *Churchherd of Hippolytus* c. 60 (ed. Hauler, p. 117); “nolito effundere (calicem quasi antitypum sanguinis Christi), ut non spiritus alienus velut te contemnente illud delinguat.” Canon xx speaks of a priest who is insolent in regard to the Eucharistic element that “he is a stranger to the holy Sacrament” and must be deprived of his office. All these places point to the same meaning.

Q. 17. This Q. does not treat of the same matter as Q. 11. The latter deals with “falling” upon the altar; the former with remaining upon it. The present Q. is a counterpart to Q. 16. In the previous Q. the consecrated element remained there without it being known; here something unconsecrated is lying there.

Books upon the altar: either liturgical books summed up in: *E.S.D.O.*, p. xxv–xxx, or simply the Gospel. For the form of the answer see p. 113.

The answer distinguishes between 3 possibilities: a) before the consecration after one day = after one consecration1; it is set apart upon another altar (Q. 16) during the next mass to prevent a second consecration. Though the matter is not quite right it is given as a communion with the chalice while another host is added. The last clause is omitted in V, thereby considering it as an ordinary host. b) Discovered after several days = after several consecrations; given as an Eulogia (see ad Q. 10). c) If it is not possible to distribute this blessing from lack of people present, the altar must be shaken (see ad Q. 76); the particles must be put in the chalice as the crumbs and be drunk, as in the Ordering Q. 18. V. adds that it was not allowed to take twice the Eucharist, of course because one was not fasting any longer after the first time. “Not leave anything” see Q. 16.

(1) It was forbidden to consecrate twice a day upon the same altar, cf. Isai/Barth, ed. Isae, Q. 4.
Q. 18. The climate of the country round Mosul (Iraq, Kurdistan, Persia) is well known. Water is scarce. In summer and time of drought it is difficult to get. Dr. Budge has collected (B.G. ii, p. 336, n. 1) many instances of droughts which are recorded in history. Several prayers for rain and against drought are found in: E.S.D.O., p. 231, 249.

The “Ordering” of the Mysteries takes place at the end of the service. After the communion and thanksgiving the deacon draws the curtains of the Sanctuary (see Q. 8) L.E.W., p. 302. Next follows the dismissal and the distribution of the Purshana’s. (Q. 8o). L.E.W., p. 304-305 gives some prayers to be said “when they order the mysteries”. But it is not indicated what should be done. Yet from other sources we find the following data.

Αρχόντης = to order, is used Epos. ii, p. 36 in an other sense: to prepare. But in our treatises it is always used of this special Ordering at the end of the service, the Ablutions. In Q. 16 we saw that the Nest. did not allow that anything of the Eucharistic elements was left. Yet it was not always possible to make the number of particles exactly correspond to the number of the communicants (see Q. 49). Then something remained. The first of whom we read something about this point, was Isbho’yahb (cf. p. 122): “If something of the Eucharist remains, the lamp may not be taken away from it. If many G‘murtha’s are left, after the communion of the people, the priests who are on the altar and have not communicated, take from them, so that every one takes a mouthful only once. For it is not allowed to communicate twice a day. If the priest who distributes the Eucharist is alone, and nobody is present to receive a portion, he is not allowed to take it himself. He can only give it to somebody who receives it from him. As to the chalice (cf. ad Q. 26), if there is no priest, one of the monks must order it, and if no monk is present, one of the faithful, a man of goodness, piety and virtue, shall order it and empty it at one draught” (Synod. Arab., fol. 79b-80a). Isbho’Barnum directed in: ad Macarium Q. 35 in answer to the question: “Are one or two priests allowed to order it when much Qudasha is left, and how much may they eat after the Qudasha, more than one Purshana?”

Solution: If much Qudasha is left, it is not right that one or two order it. But every one may take in the Ordering three or four G‘murtha’s. If it is an urgent case he may go up to five. But if he eats more than five, it is audacious and careless. After the Qudasha he is allowed to eat one Purshana, and if the Priabha is large, a fourth.” In his letter ad Isaac the same Patriarch said (Q. 1) that every one who trespassed against this commandment, did so to his own condemnation (cf. 1 Cor. xi 29). Like several others of his prescripts this one was taken over by John Bar Abgare in his Canon xx though with a somewhat different phrasing (cf. ad Q. 49). The same canonist decided that the chalice should not be filled too full. With emphasis it is said that one should not trespass against these regulations: “that act should not express greed and insolence as regards the Ordering of the sacraments which by grace had been given to the congregation.” In Canon xxi it is strictly forbidden that a priest or deacon should order alone under pain of deposition. If it is impossible to do so, the Paghra must remain on the altar while it must be duly preserved (see ad Q. 16); after that it must be ordered in the usual way. First the bread must be taken and then the chalice. In our treatises the writer solved various difficulties connected with the execution of these Canons (cf. also ii 7, 11, 33-39). We
find the following acts mentioned: the curtains must be drawn "lest any injury might affect the altar" (Q. 23); then the altar must be cleared, the crumbs of the paten must be swept into the chalice; the bread must be consumed by two persons in the altar, but not more than is ordered in the Canons (during this act people who wanted to communicate could come and take it (Q. 43); after that the chalice should be taken to the sacristy (deacon's house) or any other place outside the Sanctuary and be consumed there. This drinking of the chalice was done to desecrate it, therefore it could not be done in the holiest place of the church (during these ablutions the "injured" bread was also eaten). We see that these measures are quite in accordance with those of John; but the cases that made it necessary to lay down these rules, show sufficiently that the canons were not always observed in spite of their severe penalties.

Having thus summarized the Nestorian ways of treating the remains of the Eucharist we must look at the similar material in the other churches. Unfortunately I was not able to consult the monograph of W. Lockton, *Treatment of the Remains at the Eucharist after Holy Communion and the Time of the Ablutions*, Cambridge, 1920. Not much is known about it (Hanssens iii p. 527-533), and it seems as if the Nestorians were the only people who had strict rules for it, though Prof. Hanssens (loc.) has little to mention about their present rite, and nothing about its history. The Byzantine church used to give the rests of the consecrated loaves to young children after some days, a practice which still existed in the 14th century (Eugrius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv 36; Nicephorus Callistus xvii 25, quoted by Bingham xv 7, 4). In the present Greek rite the priest and deacon consume the remains in the prothesis (A. Baumstark, *Messe im Morgenland*, S. 169; S. Pétrides, *D.A.C.L.*, s.v. *Ablutions*, t. i, col. 110) and purify the vessels, of course while saying certain prayers. The same is done in the Jacobite rite (L.E.W., p. 106-109) where it seems to be done however in the sanctuary itself, together with the chalice. According to John Tell., in: *L.O.O.*, p. 707 and notes, this was the function of the deacon. James Edess., quoted by Kaysor, S. 38-39: "Die, welche des heiligen Kelches warten, sollen wenn sie auch Wasser um ihn auszuspielen hinein thaten (und das Wasser tranken), nicht verhindert werden, wenn sie an dem Tage noch communiciren wollen, weil sie nicht gewöhnlichen Trank genossen" (cf. Kaysor's comment., S. 176; interesting parallel to the quotation from Isho'yahl i). Concerning the church in Jerusalem the well-known place in Hesychius (quoted ad Q. 76) tells us that there the remains were generally burnt. The Copts, just like the Nestorians, did not allow it to be left on the altar; therefore they ordered the priests should take it whether it was much or little (Villecourt, *Observatures*, p. 237, cf. ad Q. 16, 49). However these usages may vary in the different churches, all of them were used to purify and desecrate the chalice by pouring water into it (the Byzantines used hot water, a practice severely impugned by the Nestorians, Elias Nisib., *Beteis*, S. 99). In the present time it is usual among the Nestorians that the priests take their communion at this moment (*E. S. D. O.*, p. 297; already in the 10th. cent., cf. ad Q. 43).

The foregoing excursus explains sufficiently why one priest has several Gemurtha's in his hand and what is the meaning of: "his fellow". "Levites" is a common name for the deacons since the very beginning of the Christian
church (1 Clement 40, 5; it is not necessary to give examples of this use since the name is found in all the departments of the church; see: D.C.A., s.v., and: D.A.C.L., s.v. Lenta, t. viii, col. 2992–2996 give exclusively western texts.) The clergyman has not sufficient saliva to masticate the bread because of the dryness of the atmosphere; he almost chokes in swallowing it. The Answer of our author is not immediately clear as is often the case in oriental books owing to change of subject. The fellow must throw a particle of the bread into a chalice that is not consecrated, but becomes so through this particle and is therefore similar to the chalice of the ablutions.

Q. 19. The places of the liturgy in which the priest makes the sign of the cross are specified in Q. 90 sqq. The one meant here is: L.E.W., p. 291. The influence of this signing has already been spoken of on page 192, n. 1. Since this last sign has not been made, the bread is not “made perfect”. The moment when the sacristan comes, is not exactly indicated. Therefore the answer is twofold and the division is again made at the Epiclesis (see ad Q. 15). In this state the sacristan is not in the least able to administer the Eucharist; of course he will be inclined to make mistakes. For one should not add to (cf. Q. 1) nor take something from the bread of the consecration during the most holy moment of the Eucharist. ἱεράς lit. = table = paten, cf. Budge, B.G. ii, p. 436, n. 3; in our Q.Q. it is the only word used for this article while T., p. 12, l. 22, Can. xxiii uses also ἱερός; both words together T., p. 6, l. 10–11. It is never used to mean “altar” as among the Jacobites (cf. John Tell., Can. 46, Lamy, p. 94; Lamy, p. 241, quotes Dionysius B. Salibi who clearly states this identification; James Edess., Lamy p. 100). Several other words for this plate are mentioned by Rahmani, L.O.O., p. 54 (cf. Kayser, S. 83–85) who however does not mention our word. Pictures of it in: D.C.A., s.v., and: Kaufmann, Handbuch, S. 571–573. There were always several patens at the altarplace for the usual distribution. The course of events is clear if one remembers the meaning of Qmtsa and Bkhr (p. 194) and the effect of the consecration. It is clear too that in the latter case there is a slight mistake as the sacristan brought it on the paten in his hand before the time appointed in the formulary.

Q. 20. A Zuza is a coin, according to Payne Smith = a quarter of a Jewish shekel = a Greek drachma worth 10 pence (Dictionary, s.v.; Budge, B.G. ii, p. 403 n., gives a somewhat different account: “the ἱεράς is explained by Dirham. The gold ἰδίαιτα which weighs from sixty-five to seventytwo grains was equal in value to twenty ἰδίαιτα, or about 10½ English shillings”). In this case it had probably been given for the sustenance of the priests. This is the reason of the priest’s joy! It is uncertain what was their income among the Nestorians. In the ancient church it was taken from the church-property of land and slaves, gifts from the state and occasional gifts (D.C.A., s.v. Property of the church; D.A.C.L., s.v. Libéralité des Fidèles, t. ix, col. 489–497, deals with the various sources of income, but admits that little is known about it). The Persian church has always been under non-christian rulers, therefore it was dependent on the gifts of the faithful and even if it had some property of its own there was always the danger that it might be seized by the Government.
The piety of the people expressed itself in the building of churches and monasteries, as is said by Isho'yahb i; he quotes this as an example to his contemporaries who neglect their churches because they do not want to give any money, or they spend it on other holy places than those of their own parish, because they are so unbelieving as to think that God will hear them better there (Canon x–xii, in: O. Braun, Synhados, S. 214–216, referring to John iv 23–24). But we shall not be wrong in assuming that the income of the priests was not very high. Isho'Barnun prohibited to give the Qudasha for money (E. Sachau, Syrische Rechtbücher, ii, S. 122–123) cf. the same order of Rabbula in: F. C. Burkitt, Early Eastern Christianity, p. 149. Therefore we must think here of a voluntary gift. The answer covers more than is asked. A Zuza may be thrown from a distance, but the touching of paten and bread is forbidden. The distribution means the communion. The paten is unclean and may not be cleaned at the altar, cf. Q. 18 and Q. 78. Touching of the Pathora is also strictly prohibited by James Edess, Can. ii and xxiv, though in these regulations the upper part of the altar seems to be intended. Cf. p. 190 about touching. We might compare a part inserted in V. after ii 3 (M. fol. 68a–b) which is possibly omitted in M. because it agreed with what has been said here. “Question: If the sacristan receives the paten to order it and he has taken one or two parts, and a believer enters to receive the Qudasha (cf. Q. 43), and the sacristan gives the Paghra and the believer throws a Zuza on the paten and his hand touches the paten or the Paghra on it, is the Paghra of the paten injured or not? Answer: Yes. Question: What must be done with the paten and the Paghra on it that is injured; can he return the paten to the altar or take the Paghra standing (in the same place). What must he do with the chalice and how must he take the chalice after that defiled Paghra? Is the chalice injured together with the altar? It is a grave mistake. Tell me: how must the sacristan extricate himself and the altar that it may not be injured? Answer: Your question is difficult and needs a careful investigation. Question: Explain it carefully. Answer: Our Fathers appointed in their “Admonitions” that when a sacristan orders and has taken only one Gnamurtha, he is not allowed to give something of it to anybody. If he does something trespassing against this Canon he must expiate (where is this written? It is not found in the Canons of John B. Abgare). The fact that a believer touched the Paghra while throwing a Zuza upon it, is an injury to the Paghra and also to the paten. If he takes it standing near the altar it is not certain that the altar and the chalice thereon are not injured. As it seems to me he must place the paten on the Gospel, receive the chalice to order the altar while the curtains are drawn, next take the paten (standing) at the door of the deacon’s house near the altar, clean the chalice, desecrate it with water and use the crumbs left on the paten for the ablutions” (for the answer see ad Q. 18).

Q. 21. Quoted by Assemani, B.O., iii 1, p. 248, to demonstrate the care of the Nest. towards the Eucharist (Mr. H. W. Codrington, in: J.Thr.St., 1904, p. 237 has quoted the essence of this Q. from Denzinger, Ritus Orientalium, i, p. 85, whose source was Assemani, who is not mentioned by Mr. C.) It was not definitely prescribed for Christian women to wear a veil, but at any rate it was decent. It is a well-known fact, that wearing of veils was common in
the East and it may be that the Christians specially based it upon the words of Paul 1 Cor. xi 3ff (cf. H. Lietzmann, *Die Korintherbriefe*, Tübingen, 1931, z. St.). It was specially worn by the "Virgins", cf. Tertullian, *De Virginibus Votandis* (Bingham, vii 4, 6; G. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch*, S. 564–565). That the women should come to the communion dressed with veils, is also ordered in the *Apost. Const.* ii, 57 (ed. F. X. Funk, i, p. 167): "Let the women approach with their heads covered, as is becoming the order of women", and the reason is: "lest they may be seen", and is perhaps depicted in the well-known "Tractio Panis" (so Kaufmann). *D.A.C.L.,* s.v. *Femine*, t. v, col. 1950–1953 does not say anything about the dressing of women in the church nor about their relation to holy things. Afterwards it was called "Dominicale" in the Western church (Concil. Auxere A.D. 587, Can. 42; it is not right to take this Dominicale to mean the veil over the hand, cf. *D.C.A.,* s.v.; J. Braun, *Lit. Handlex.*, s.v.; *D.A.C.L.,* s.v. *Dominicale*, t. iv, col. 1385 quotes a letter of Leo the Great in which it is said: "mulieres possunt sub nigro velamine sacrificium accipere ut Basilius indicat." Rahmani who generally reproduces very faithfully the Syrian (Jac.) usages, does not speak about it. From our Q. it is clear that it was generally used. A modern description is given by Browne-Maclean, p. 93: "A cap is worn on the head, covered by a muslin veil, one end of which is carried from the back of the neck to cover the mouth in the case of married women, but the rest of the face is exposed. It is considered improper to let the hair be seen. The women generally move this veil aside when they kiss the hand ... the girls ... do not wear veils." Something among the orders of Gabriel Ihn Tarik in the Coptic Church may be compared with it (L.O.C., i, p. 964–965): "Communio autem mulierum summam diligentiam et curam exigit: nam cum mulier velata sit, nemo quacunam illa sit agnoscere potest ... curam adhibere vos oportet, omnes adeo adhuc prae clausurae, ne desit corpus Christi et sanguinem indignae" (see the Can. in Riedel, S. 209, that women should be veiled if they were of age). Its usage is defended by pointing to the decency and is not connected with special physical qualities of women that would cause special rules for the behaviour of women in the cultus (as e.g. the Canons about communion after menstruation found in all churches). The chalice was generally given by the deacon, but it is not said that it should not be taken at hand by the communicants as was for some time done with the bread (see ad Q. 32). Again the answer generalizes. Reconciliation see Q. 15 with practically the same formula. As to the rule about the deacon we must connect grammatically with *illud* but it implies also that he was only allowed to make the sign and not to say the formula. Cf. the Canon in Suda in: *Synodicon Arab.*, fol. 81a: "If a deacon wants to sign the chalice, if something of the Eucharist is left, he must sweep the altar called the Holy of Holies and light the candle, prepare the perfume, put the vestments on the altar, bring forth the napkin or vessel in which it is and place it on the altar, adore and kiss the altar and a Gemurtha, sign with it the chalice without saying a word. For he is not allowed to say the *Canon of the priest*. As to the priest he is allowed to say: *Loqua ventris ad altare progressi, sed pro eis foribus consistens, communiones percipiat* (and see the note of Assemani, R.O., iii 1, p. 290).
Q. 22. The kissing of the paten is no liturgical action properly speaking and is not mentioned anywhere else. It is as the kissing of the feet of the priest (Q. 24), of the Eucharist (Q. 80) and of the Cross (Q. 93) a sign of deep devotion. It should well be distinguished from the "kiss of peace". Several instances of this practice such as kissing of the altar etc. are found, see: Bingham, viii 10, 9; D.C.A., s.v. Kiss (F. Cabrol, D.A.C.L., s.v. Baiser, t. ii, col. 117-130 deals with the "Kiss of Peace" and the liturgical discussion of it). In the same way as the altar itself must be protected by vestments (T., p. 146, l. 18), the substitute of the altar must be covered. "Veil" = ἱματιῶν; this word is used elsewhere for "humeral veil"... worn by the deacon who holds the paten at the communion of the priest" (L.E.W., p. 591); this use in T. p. 29, l. 29; ii 11 (in Ordering the M. touches the paten and takes away a particle of the bread), and: Budge, B.G. ii, p. 485 and n. 3; Timotheus ii, Mingana Syr. 13, fol. 119b mentions it as a "humeral veil" worn by the priest who carries the Gospel, (L.E.W., p. 250). But this is impossible here or it must be that this stole was used to cover the paten, a kind of corporal of the paten. The ἱματιῶν was laid over the bread; this veil was under it (see also ii 25: by mistake the chalice is poured out over the paten; "the priest took the mixture of the paten and returned it into the chalice, and placed it on the altar. He took the Bukhdar's on the paten on one side, and covered the paten carefully with the M.; after that he placed other Bukhr's on the paten"). (For the words used before, see: J. Braun, Lit. Handlex., s.v. Humeral and Kuponale).

The end of the answer proves once more that the Eucharist is not a magical ceremony. For in that case he who made the transgression should be punished. But here the guilty person is the priest who did not take care to prevent a mistake (cf. "his sin felleth upon the bishop", in: Athanasius, Can. 23 and 24, ed. Riedel-Crum, p. 29 and 39).

Q. 29. ἱματιῶν = cingulum; mentioned in several rites as an indispensable part of the priest's vestments, especially necessary for the Euch.; it was also necessary during the preparation. James of Edessa, Canon 14 (Lamy, p. 116).
and Kayser, S. 100-101) calls it: “Altar-girdle” (cf. about this vestment: L.O.C., i, p. 161-162; D.C.A., s.v. girdle; L.E.W., p. 599; L.O.O., p. 78). It is not said how it was made in former times; Mgr. Rahmani, who gives only the name [Στοτό μακ] (cf. Q. 28, 86), says that it consists at the present time of “una pièce d’etoffe de petite largeur, ayant à ces deux bouts deux agraffes en argent ou en métal pour la boucler par devant”. An interesting statement about it is found in: Giamondi ii, p. 32, about Mareme, living before Isho’yabh iii: “ipse primus fuit qui mandavit sacerdotes vestem gerere cingulo palam obstrictam ut a ceteris distinguenterut” (what is meant by: “ceteris” the laics or the priests of other churches. For the latter interpretation, cf. the fact that the Nestorian monks had another tonsure than those of the Monophysites, Budge, B.G. ii, p. 40-41; the former is based on the Canon of John v). If anybody leaves the service he looses his girdle, see: Giamondi i, p. 102: Marcus of Tagrit apostasized to Mohammedanism and “progressus in aedes chalilae proprium cingulum scidit et Christo renuntiavit”; and i, p. 81: A certain Theodore is accused of being married; he went to the palace of the caliph “ut fidem suam euraret. Hæc retulit Abu-l-Farag filius Dinhar: ‘aderam ipse eumque vidii, antequam ingredieretur ad vestes decoras ac cingulum scindendum’.” According to John Bar Abgare (‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon vi, Mai, p. 277) there was a difference between the priests and laymen in the vestments and cloaks and the Tonsure and “especially in the girding of the loins”; they should not gird themselves as the soldiers, though it is uncertain what was exactly meant thereby. It is not superfluous to draw attention to the opposite view of Canon of pseudo-Nicola ivxi (Mansi, ii, col. 1002) prohibiting “ne lumbos suos præcingant zonis tempore orationum clericis, quia ingenui, ac liberi sunt, et nemo eis dominatur nisi Dominus Christus Deus eorum”. In Q. 25 and 28 something similar to this Q. is dealt with; if the girdle failed, it was a sign that there was no service, cf. Can. xvii: “no one who administers the altar, is allowed to leave the sacrament and sit down or loosen his loins and sandals”; for the sandals see Q. 39; and also the Arabic Can. v of John B. Abgare quoted ad Q. 52: We may also compare Severus of Ashmonin, De Agno Pauchati (L.O.C., i, p. 162): “Sacerdotes fideles calceos in pedibus habent, dum consecrantes corpus Christi, sigillum externum rei internae: sicut etiam quod Zonis praecinguntur sigillum est praecinctio interitoris” (is this really Copité as far as the sandals are concerned? Cf. Q. 39). In the Pearl of ‘Abdisho’ the girdle is one of the signs that prefigure the world to come (v 6; Badger ii, p. 418-419); he points out that it is a sign of “preparedness for service, and a ready appearance before the Lord, after the manner of those who stand in the presence of Kings of the earth”, but specially as a divine commandment (Ex. xxi 4, Luc. xii 35-36); it teaches that its bearer is a worshipper and minister of the Kingdom; possesses “a wakeful mind, pure intentión, and being in wait for Him”; it is a sign of death (John xxi); travellers are girded and it shows that we are pilgrims to heaven and must make a viaticum for it viz. “orthodox faith and practice of good works”. It is remarkable that nothing is said here about the Eucharist. He speaks only about “girding of christians (in general) at the time of prayer”. Yet it is curious to read this exposition; for this is the only vestment to which such a meaning and importance is attributed. Unfortunately it is unknown in how far ‘A. reproduces here tradition (the Greeks
give quite another explanation, cf. Salaville, *Les Liturgies Orientales*, p. 162; among the Copts, it is not specified but only a sign of an inner state as it is in the Canon of Pseudo-Nicene, see the quotation given before). At any rate it shows that great importance was attached to it. Without it the priest was not in the right condition; and unable to do his service. Therefore he was not allowed to enter the altar and the Paghara was not treated in the right way. One of the charges of Elias of Nisibis against the validity of the Patriarchate of Isha'yabb ib was: “(Denket an) den Gürtel, der dem neugewählten Patriarchen loging zur Zeit, da er in der Mitte des Altares die Gewänder anlegte” (Leiter, ed. B. Vandenbroeck, in: O.C., 1913, S. 260); it had been a “malum omen” (as to the rules of the ancient church it is worthwhile to quote Timotheus Alex., Q. 13, 2nd series, in: Pitra, *Monumenta*, i, p. 641: ἕτερον ἑδραία ἐν ἔκπληκτος θαλάμοις δίδων διώκθεσιν καὶ εὐτυχιὸν προσφέρειν, ἦ τε; λοιπόν Ἀλεξανδρείας εἰς ἵππον). The altar did not need consecration with oil, cf. p. 196. It is not surprising that this girdle is spoken of in several places in particular since it naturally slipped down very easily.

To put on the ground see ad Q. 13. The places of “ordering” ad Q. 18 and 34. “Chalice” as read in both codices is rather awkward since it is not spoken of before and I do not know that it was taken together with the paten under the name “paten”. It may be a mistake and perhaps simply ἡ βασιλεία should be read. It does not become clear from this Answer how it should be done if nobody is near by. It must be concluded from this sentence that a deacon too was allowed to carry the paten for the distribution. This is not found anywhere else and the Q. does not speak of an urgent case. So I suppose that this distribution is not the communion, for from: Expos. ii, p. 72 it is clear that it was not done. To “distribute” is also used of the Eulogia’s (see Q. 80). Perhaps it should be taken in this sense.

Q. 24. Omitted in V. which goes on immediately with Q. 25 that offers the same contents of Q. 23. That the communicants were obliged or used to kiss the feet of the priest as a token of honour, see ad Q. 22, is found, as far as I know, no where else. Kissing of the hand of the priest was very common, D.A.C.L., s.v. *Communion*, t. iii, col. 2437 (where Dom. Leclercq explicitly corrects the statements of Prof. Drews, *Eucharistie*, in: P.R.E. 3, v. S. 567, who only mentions the picture in Cod. Ross. Tab. vii and goes on: “wie weit dieser Brauch kirchlich war, ist nicht sicher”). Gabriel Ibn Tarikh of the Coptic Church commanded that “celebri qui communicem accipit, metanoeam sive prostrationem faciet versus altare dei”, in: L.O.C., i, p. 264. But no where if found this adoration of the priest. “To ask forgiveness of their sins” hints at private confession. About the connection between Eucharist and forgiveness see also the commentary of Theodore Mops. (W.S., vi, p. 118 sqq.). We cannot enter here upon an investigation of the Eastern doctrine of confessions and its development, cf. M. Juge, *Theol. Dogmatica*, passim; the Nestorian doctrine in: v. p. 318-321, though it is worthwhile to investigate it. It is well known that confession should precede the communion (Isha'Barnun, ad *Macarius*, Q. 31, 57 and 59; ‘Abdisho’, *Pearl iv 7. Loss and gain*: see p. 193.

Q. 25. A parallel case to Q. 23. Two possibilities are distinguished: a)
Somebody helps and thereby the injured chalice is restored by signing; the
formula see ad Q. 21. b) Nobody is able to help; the sacristan is allowed to put
the chalice on the ground (that is not allowed for the patent), but only inside
the threshold of the altar as this ground has shared in the consecration of the
altar.

Q. 26. It is very properly observed that the two elements are not treated
in the same way. It remains obscure why the chalice can be re-consecrated
by signing with the bread, but the paten not. At any rate it appears that greater
holiness was ascribed to the Pughra than to the Deima. The same can be con-
cluded from other places. Expos. ii., p. 72, says that they are one. Yet some
difference was felt, since the question is asked why the chalice, too, should
not be carried by a priest. However this may be, it is true that the chalice
could be carried by the deacon (the lower officer) and the paten not, in bringing
the Elements to the altar (cf. ad Q. 10). In the same line lies the remark of Timothy
that the Blood cannot augment the Bread in the same way as the Bread
does the Chalice (he explains it by pointing out that blood is soon corrupted
while flesh can be preserved and that flesh is the cause of the blood, because
without flesh there would not be any blood. Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 133a–b). I
have not found this remark anywhere else, but one should not be surprised
at that on account of the poor tradition and it is possible that nobody else has
ever thought of it. It does not seem to be particularly Nest. But we must also
remind the readers that they had a special doctrine about the Holy Leaven
which is said to be descended from the Last Supper; and this doctrine though
it is of very young tradition shows that the Pughra was estimated very highly
(cf. ad Q. 52). This feeling about the bread may be a heritage of the Ancient
church, cf. the remark of Prof. Drews, P.R.E., i, v. S. 567: “(Kelch) der weniger
als das Brot galt”. Prof. Lietzmann (Messe, S. 248, cf. S. 238–249) pointed out
that it seemed as though there existed a religious meal of the Christians alongside
with the ordinary Eucharist in which bread was the sole element. This type was
perhaps the base of the Serapion-Lit. and was afterwards influenced by and
transformed into an ordinary Eucharist. He speaks of “relative Gleichgültigkeit
gegen das zweite Element der Eucharistie”. This dictum remains true, it seems
to me, although the rest of his construction is still disputable. The question
of the connection between the views of this early time and those of the 10th
century, cannot be solved with the present material and will remain unsolved
unless the links between them are found. In any case it is a remarkable coinci-
dence that has to be explained somehow. For though our treatise feels here
a difference, it states it merely and fails to give any clue for the explanation.
Timothy's words do not give an answer which is historically sound.

Q. 27. Lamps in the service are mentioned in the christian church from
the beginning of the 4th century, even in cases where they were not so strictly
necessary, as in the Catacombs. Some opposition against them had to be over-
come because of their pagan precursors. They are preserved in various forms
(D.A.C.E., s.v. Lamps, t. viii, col. 1086–1221; D.C.A., s.v. Lamps, Lights;
Kaufmann, Handbuch, S 581–592). It is not specially stated that they were used
for the altar, and this is the point in question. Can. Apost. iii (ed. F. X. Funk,
i, p. 564) speaks for the first time of "a holy lamp" for which oil should be given. It is uncertain how this must be understood, but the connection seems to point to an altar-lamp. According to Paulinus of Nola there were several. The places given by Brightman (L.E.W., p. 580, v. 8. Chrysostomus, in Math. xxx 6 and Joh. Damascus, de Imaginibus iii 33), which mention λαμπάς (resp. plur.) are not very clear about this point. Though the context shows that lamps in the sanctuary, standing or hanging, are intended. In the Caons of the Arabic Synodic (fol. 79a and 80a) it is ordered that the candle may not be removed from the altar as long as the Eucharistic bread is upon it. The interpretation is doubtful: is a lamp meant hanging over and in front of the altar or one upon the altar as the present Eastern rites show (2 among the Nest.); L.E.W., p. 530 calls this however "at earliest medieval use"; cf. N. Müller, Alter, in: P.R.E., i, S. 3965. The former possibility must be chosen I think. At least John Bar Abgare summarizing the tradition (?) says something similar in: Canon xxii: The Eucharistic bread may be preserved if only care is displayed in the "keeping of the lamps". These lamps or lights must be those hanging over and in front of the altar; see: Can. xii: "... there must be a lamp before the altar, filled with pure olive-oil, burning always night and day. It should not go out under any circumstance, there may be or may not be consecrated bread. Where ever there are two fixed altars, there are also two lamps needed etc." (cf. also E.S.D.O., p. 2297 s.v., who adds: "this is not done in practice". -- It is recorded from the time of Machicha i, 1091–1108 that one of the great outrages of a monk was that he extinguished the lamps in the sanctuary, Giamondi i, p. 120. -- When Narsai, Hom. xvii, tr. Connolly, p. 12 says that lamps shine in the church, his statement is of no use for the present investigation since he does not describe their place). It is not easy to decide whether this Canon is of ancient date. Yet we may refer to possible influence of the O.T. Ex. xxvii 20; Lev. xxiv 2 though the author himself did not suggest it. There are also lamps mentioned in: Can. xxvi: "... no priests or deacons may touch the altar after the breaking of his fast; and when the Holy Sacraments have been ordered, he is not allowed to draw near, under no circumstance, not even to the door-post of the Sanctuary (beth maqdesha). But if there are no Sacraments on the altar, and it is an urgent case, as far as the outer-candle. But when he enters and passes the lamp, if he is drunk, even if the enters when there are no Sacraments prepared or ordered, and does not enter the Sanctuary nor a part of it, because of the greatness of the evil and the sin, there is no absolution for him". Whether the same lamp is spoken of is not clear. For our question it is important that we find mentioned here a candle in the sanctuary that served as a limit. Nothing of this kind is found in other churches; at least D.A.C.L., s.v. Chóeur, t. iii, col. 1409–1413 does not say a word about it. The Esges. contains several places about various kinds of lights in the service (ii, p. g, 11, 92), but they are very well distinguished from the lamps that are spoken of in: i, p. 108–90, ii, p. 36, and that should be cleaned before the time of the services according to the rule of hsho'yabî iii. It is the row of lamps indicated in the sketch (i, p. 196) by C. Among other things it is said that the deacons are allowed to go to the throne = altar in the apse, but that the sub-deacons should not go further than "usque

(1) It is done in the somewhat confused Cana 13 of Athanasius, ed. Riedel-Crum, p. 24.
ad medium absidem, sive ad lampadum locum” (i, p. 109, cf. p. 120; in agreement with this information is the statement in: Badger ii, p. 325: “sub-deacons to be admitted as far as the lamp, hung in the middle of the bema”, “bema” being here the alter-place; cf. ad Q. 97). Our treatises mention candle-sticks on the altar at the time of the Sacraments (ii 10, text somewhat obscure); but along with it, as in our Q. “a candle in the middle of the altar or Sanctuary” (Q. 6, 28, 29 and 80). In Q. 28 and 80 distinction is made between the part before and beyond the lamp. Only if this limit is passed the injury proper takes place. This is the entrance of the Sanctuary in the strict sense of the word. Another parallel of this use is Can. 26 of an anonymous Synod in: ‘Abdis’horo, Nomocanon, vi 4. It ordered that beer for the priests should not be brought “inter cancellos” during the funeral service but should be placed on the steps in the middle of the temple. Only the beer for the Patriarch may be brought “in cancellos” till the lamp if one wants to do so, in order that it is placed in his grave (in the chronicles it is often found that Patriarchs were buried in the oratorium, is this the same place?) One should be inclined to call the place beyond the lamp “holy of holies”. According to: E.S.D.O., s.v. (the same in: L.E.W., p. 578) this is a general name for the sanctuaries (the same remark is found in: L.O.O., p. 39-40, but Mgr. Rahmani has generally only Jacobite matters under consideration) and specially for “the space under the baldakyn of the altar”. The latter explanation fits in very well with our Q., while the former may suit to Can. xxvii where it is said that a priest or deacon who has not taken part in all the services of the day, is not allowed to enter the holy of holies; although this can also apply to the place around the altar (at least if this Canon must be interpreted in accordance with this Question of Isho’Barnun, ad Macar. iv, 6: “Are a priest or deacon who have not served in the Night-service, allowed to go to the Apsae to serve the Order [Takhsa] and to consecrate the Qudasha, or not? Solution: He is not allowed to serve the Takhsa, to go to the Apsae and to consecrate the Qudasha. He is allowed to receive the Qudasha.”). We should also observe that the name is used in the Formulary of Consecration of the Altar with oil for the most oriental wall of the sanctuary (T., p. 145; before Q. 6; also D.C.A., s.v.). It is not certain what is the date of this statement; the formulary is ascribed to Isho’yabbi iii. Must we also assume some influence of the division of the Temple in the O.T.? Incense is mentioned in several places of the Nestorian Liturgy (L.E.W., p. 262, 263, 269; the various formularies do not always mention it in the same places; so Timn. it adds it to L.E.W., p. 292). It is not clear what point of the liturgy the author has in mind. His mistake is not that he brings the incense, for it is always an offering to make men pleasant for God. But it is a parallel to the case quoted in: Can. xxvi since he is not fasting; John b. Abgare, Canon iii, ap. ‘Abdis’horo, Nomocanon, vi 6, Mai p. 278, forbade any priest, deacon or monk to do their service after a meal, if he was not kept by the holy fast (cf. Can. xxvi quoted before; for the meaning of t.t. see: Payne Smith, Thesaurus, s.v. and also Q. 8, 9, ii 9 quoted on Q. 82) and in such a state it is not allowed to come near to the altar not even if covered by the Holy incense. This case is not provided for in the rubric T. p. 119.

Q. 28. Belongs to Q. 23-25 for the essentials. Here however he is
inside the sanctuary with the polluted elements. He must try to restore the
fact as soon as possible even if the altar is injured. The ḫādūa is not mentioned
by Brightman's index nor by Rahmani. It is according to the context a napkin
hanging loosely over the shoulder. Another use of it is found in: John Tell,
Can. xv, ḫādūa, translated by Lamy: "mantille quae corpus sanctum attigit" (p. 66–67; cf. note 4, where he compares it with the
latīn mantilla "linenum... abstergendis manibus inserviens". Among the
Syrians however "ad oblataeem teggandam vel sustentandam, ad instar mappa-
lae, ex quaeque praeestis conjecerim"). According to Dean Maclean it
is either a white Baptismal robe or a napkin, without further comment (E.S.D.O.,
p. 295). Prof. J. Braun styles it a medieval word for: altarveil, manipel, covering
of the chalice, "Schultervelum des Patenarius" (Lit. Handlexicon, s.v.). The
Syriac places given before are covered by this explanation. Only the view that
it was medieval though may apply to the western church, should be revised.
For it appears already in the 6th century in Syria. In our Q. the last meaning
given by Braun is the right one. About ḫādūa Dean Maclean says (E.S.D.O.,
p. 293): "an ecclesiastical vestment now obsolete (shape unknown); an altar-
cloth". The definition given by Browne–Maclean, p. 263 is rather obscure. In
the Dictionary of Payne Smith, s.v. it is added that the latter meaning is specially
East Syrian and another explanation is offered viz. "a woollen cloak worn
by monks or shepherds". For our Q., only the first meaning remains. A rubric
of the Pontifical prescribes at the ordination of new priests: "the consecrating
Bishop takes the Guita that lies upon his shoulder, and covers him with it".
Mgr. Rahmani (L.O.O., p. 81 and n. 1) who describes this vestment as belonging
only to the Nest., translates: "shape"; but that cannot be applied in our case.
The etymology of ḫādūa = to twine round, does not bring us far. Is it perhaps
a Nest. name for: orarium = stole that was worn both by priests and deacons?
If one passes by the lamp (see ad Q. 27), the altar is injured and must
be signed with oil. The rubric T., p. 119, does not provide for this occurrence.
It orders consecration with oil if the girdle is loosened in the altar. The
punishment of the priest is simple rebuke cf. ad Q. 69. "Head of the church",
must be taken as Bishop, as appears from Q. 119 and Can. xviii.

Q. 29–30. Another case of the degrees of Holiness in the sanctuary
marked by the threshold (31) and veils (cf. ad Q. 8). Several places in this treatise
speak about pagans (cf. ad Q. 42, 52). Can. xi specifies: pagans, Magians,
priests of another religion. A useful comparison is offered by the letter of Isho'
Barnun, ad Isaac, second question: "If it happens that one of the faithful or a
foreigner enters (the church) and lays his hand on the altar, how should
one put this right? Answer: If a foreigner enters forcibly or without the knowl-
edge of the servants of the altar, since the affair is not blameworthy, its memory
will be blotted out with prayers; 1 because it was not Nicodemus who drew
right unto the grave? nor was it Joseph the Councillor, the honest anointers

1 Cf. ad Q. 17. (a) It will be seen that the injury is determined by the guilt of a christian who knew
what to do or had no respect, in short that something is blameworthy; if it is forced upon somebody
he is not guilty. The most remarkable thing is the memory of the misdeed. Cf. p. cf. 193. (b) Name of
the altar, see Q. 104.
of the Holy Body," let the priest recite in a special Hulala the ode which
David sang prophetically in the person of the Maccabees and it is 'O God,
the gentiles have entered in Thy inheritance,' and with the 'Onitha: 'Thy
altar, omnipotent God!', and the hymn: 'High and Holy'. There will be no
need of oil or of anything else. In case that he who entered and touched the altar
was a believer if the cause of his entry was the abundance of his faith or his
ignorance, none of the above things are to be done because he did not do it
disrespect. This is not comparable with the case of a son who touches
the honourable things of his Father or a servant those of his master, because
the son would then be in need of admonition and the servant of rebuke."

It is not remarkable that pagans are spoken of in this country. Christianity
was surrounded on all sides by Mohammedans, adherents to the old Persian
religion and people that were not Christians because they did not belong
to any other of the great religions (Jews are not mentioned.) It does not imply
that the rule was not applied to them; but simply that they did not seem to form
part of the population that counted). See: Budge, B.G. ii, Index s.v. Arabs,
Magians, Pagans (and the division of Bar Hebræus, quoted by C. Kayser, p. 112).
The three groups are sharply distinguished there: at any rate, the Arabs worship
one God while the pagans adore mute idols (p. 508); the Magians are those
who venerate the celestial bodies (p. 307). But this makes no difference in
fact. It is a matter of course that pagans were not allowed to enter into the
sanctuary where even those who had the "sign of life" were prevented from
doing so (Bingham, vii 6, 7; Kayser, S. 80–81). Only the higher clergy from the
deacon upwards were allowed to enter. The deaconesses should be consecrated
"in the deacon's house (cf. p. 200), before the door that leads to the ase", because
they are women, Synod ... (?), Can. i, in: 'Abdisho', Nomocanon, vi 4, Mai,
p. 275). It should be observed that James Edess., Canon i, calls this a particularity of "these Eastern countries" (cf. D.C.A., s.v. Laos). Yet it was often impossible to prevent pagans from entering into it; attacks on the churches
during programs are often recorded in history (cf. the above quotation:
"Forcibly"; cf. James Edess., quoted in: L.O.O., p. 169 and n. 4: it is necessary
to close the doors of the churches "pour défendre l'entrée aux Hageréens
 [= Mohammedans], qui de nos jours dominent, d'entrer audacieusement
les églises, troubler le peuple de Dieu et profaner les saints Mystères). About
pagans at the Christian Service, cf. ad Q. 42. The measures that should be
taken in that case were mentioned by John Bar Abgare, Quaestio Ecol. xx:
"Accedet Altare consecratum in loco hostilibus (these "hostes" may be
heretics as well, but that does not make any difference) incursionibus
obnoxio repariri. Quaeritur, an illud tollere et condere liceat, postea loco suo
refigere, atque in eo Sacrum facere? Respondetur, id minime facere. Nam si
Altare in loco, cui fixum fuit, convelli contingat, ne dicam alio transferatur,
nova consecracione indiget. Quodsi accidat fidei nostrae hostes Sanctuarium
intrare, nec Altaris arcam convellere, communes Ecclesiae preces inibi celebrabri

should be observed.
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hoc minime obstante licebit, modo sanctuarii pars orientalis cruce signetur muno, non autem christiante, citra Arcam ... Si vero Arca e loco, in quo fixa est moveatur, aut alio asportetur, iterum cam consecrari oportet." We may compare James Edess., Can. xxv-xxvi (Lamy, p. 126–128. Or is in xxv special stress laid upon the eating = contact with the demons?), who ordered that the Tableth = the altar–table that was not fixed must be washed carefully and be counted as profane or that it must be broken, as would be the case with the altar, and buried carefully (for the difference between the two cf. Isho‘Barnum, ad Isaæ Q. 9 who says: that this Tabula is "not equal in honour to the altar is known by the fact that if the altar is shaken it becomes desecrated, as to the portable altar although it is carried to many places, the grace is kept in it." He says also that the Tabula was an invention of the time of tribulation. Cf. also John b. Abgare, Canon 1; ii 24, ad Q. 11; L.O.O., p. 49; on "autels portatifs" see: D.A.C.L., s.v. Autel, t. i, col. 3187.—It is the Greek "antimension", not used before the Iconoclastic War, S. Pétrides, D.A.C.L., s.v. Antimension, t. i, col. 2319–2326. The remark of Kayser was very much to the point saying that not all the canonists were so strict, referring to "Prières du rite de réconciliation d’un autel d’une église qui avaient été profanés par des hérétiques ou des païens" in Dr. Zotenberg's Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale (Kayser, S. 113; cf. his comments, S. 112–113. As to the Coptic church he might have referred to: L.O.C., i, p. 55–56 and 312: washing with water, reciting of prayers, incense, crossing of the altar, after the ritual of Gabriel of Alexandria). The burying that is also found elsewhere (cf. ad Q. 78) was a usual manner to dispose of sacred objects. Yet I have not found that it was practised by the Nestorians in cases of injury of the altar by pagans. Isho‘Barnum gave restoration without oil. John Bar Abgare distinguished between being shaken or not: if it was simply touched, signing and prayers = consecration without oil, as ordered by Isho‘Barnum was sufficient. If it was shaken it should be consecrated with oil for then it had lost its "grace". It is exactly in the line of our Q.Q. that have only introduced the limit of the veil. The rubric T., p. 119 does not mention these cases. The quotation Q. 29 = T., p. 126. A view that the altar would not be profaned by the entering of pagans is not found anywhere. It seems to me to run counter to the whole Eastern tradition and only proves lax views. Or did they think that it was only profaned by actual touching?

Q. 31. Children of the Christians (naturally baptised) see Q. 52, 81. Can. vii and xi. The question is: what is the age of discretion? According to Payne Smith, Dictionary, s.v., jas means a child under the age of 5 years. It will be instructive to quote an answer of Timotheus Alex. Q. 18 (1st series), in: Pitara, Monumenta, i, p. 634: "From what age onwards are the sins judged by God? Answer: (It is done) according to knowledge and intelligence of everyone, some from being 10 years of age and some even older" (Pitara, I., p. 644, remarks that something similar is asked by Nicephorus about the ordination of the clergy, and thinks that it might be here the same case. Yet this seems to be wholly improbable). "Threshold" see Q. 9 and 25. It is always a holy limit. It is not indicated in the sketch of Dom. Connolly (Expos. i, p. 196), and I did not find it referred to elsewhere. It seems to be the place indicated in this sketch by d.d., the small wall between apse and katastroma (Cancelli).
Once more this whole question is a clear proof against considering the Eastern idea of holiness simply as magical. It is absolutely clear that the age of the trespasser was taken into account! According to V. the boy may go further into the sanctuary than in M., but the state of affairs is the same.

Q. 32. The point is the “carelessness in communion”. Care was necessary for one who received “the precious Paghra that may not be despised” (II 3). The formulary does not indicate how the communion should take place, nor is it stated in our Q.Q. (for Q. 12 deals with another matter). In what did this care consist? Of course one should not drop anything (Q. 11 sqq.), to kiss the hand of the priest (Q. 24). But this was not the only care; for if the angry communicant throws back the Gemurtha, this carelessness must refer to something before the communion proper. In Narsai, Hom. xvii (Connolly, p. 28-29) we read: “He who approaches to receive the Body stretches forth his hands, lifting up his right hand and placing it over his fellow. In the form of a cross the receiver joins his hands; and thus he receives the Body of the Lord upon a Cross... (Narsai gives a further explanation of this symbol in which the following words occur “on the same cross He flew and was exalted to the height above”, a remark not commented upon by Dom. Connolly. Yet I do not understand what the writer had in mind)... He receives in his hands the adorable Body of the Lord of all; and he embraces it and kisses it with love and affection. He makes to enter, he hides the Leaven in the temple of his body etc.” thus: receiving upon the crossed hands, kissing and eating of the Euch. This East Syrian practice agrees with the way of communicating elsewhere in the Ancient church. It is needless to give references here since no other practice is found, cf. D.C.A., s.v. Communion, and: Bingham, xv 5, 3 and 6. Generally one communicated standing. This way of communion is also supposed in the communion-prayer: “strengthen, o our Lord etc.” (L.E.W., p. 300; it is ascribed to a certain Isaac, A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 133, Ak. 12-134). The present practice is that it is given by the priest into the mouth of the communicant, cf. Badger ii, p. 242. But cf. E. Tisserant, D.Th.G., s.v. Nestorienne, t. xi, col. 315: “les adultes reçoivent la parcella dans la main droite et se communient eux-mêmes” (the learned author has confused the former with the present practice). This practice existed already, so it seems, at the time of our treatise; at least this may be inferred from the fact that a Bishop is rebuked in II 10, who “despising the particle in the cup took it in his hand, placed it in his mouth and communicated as if it were from the hands of the priest.” It can also be deduced from: Canon xxiii which ordains that any who orders must do so with care; the precious Paghra must be received “on a piece of leather or on the covering of the chalice or at all events on the palms of his hands; he shall not bring any particle of the Paghra with his hand to his mouth, but take it (directly) with his mouth, because it is heavenly pasture”. We should realize that from the information of this Q. the conclusion may be drawn that the Gemurtha was given into the hand and thrown back, yet in fact he received it in his mouth, took it from there and threw it back. The reverse of a blessing is always the curse, cf. i Cor. xi 29. Naturally he acts “foolishly” for he despises the gift of God and causes it to become the opposite. It is not said what should be his punishment; was the fact that he did not receive the Eucharist or better
that he cut himself off, a sufficient punishment? The way in which the polluted paten should be treated is the usual one. "Clean" viz. the crumbs, cf. ad Q. 18 about the Ordering.

Q. 33. I have not found any parallel of this Q. (but cf. Dionysius b. Salibi ad Q. 46-47) It is not clear why this cooked food should be placed on the paten together with the Pagira. It is a matter of course that the paten is defiled since the cooked food was not consecrated nor fit for consecration (since it did not belong to the Euch. Elements), and only something answering this condition may be brought on it. It is a case that "holy" and "profane" are brought together, which is not allowed under any circumstance (cf. Rabbula, Canon 31, in: Burkitt, Early Eastern Christianity, p. 147: "Let not any of the Priests or Deacons or any of the Sons of the Church dare to place common vessels side by side with the Sacramental vessels in any box or chest.")

Q. 34. "Ablutions" see ad Q. 18. That this must be drunk in the places mentioned in the text, is also stated in Q. 23 to which may be referred.

Q. 35. This Q. teaches that Cross and Gospel on the altar are indispensable for a valid Eucharist (cf. T., p. 146). This agrees with, looks like a quotation from the Expositio of Abraham Bar Lipheh: "Crux vero et evangelium quae ponuntur super altare, et imago Domini nostri super ca, ipsum Dominum nostrum reprezentant. Quare omnino non licet consecrari mysteria saneta sine praesentia crucis et evangelii et imaginis Domini nostri" (Expos. ii, p. 161). This means that those two objects should be standing upon the altar during the Mass. Cf. ad Q. 118 sqq. cf. Expos. ii, p. 33 text: [ latino text ] . This Cross and Gospel were always on the altar, see the story in: Gismondì i, p. 106-107. This is confirmed also by Narsai, Hom. xvii (Connolly, p. 12): "The altar stands crowned with beauty and splendour, and upon it is the Gospel of life and the adorable wood (ac. the Cross)". It does not matter that the authorship of this Homily is not quite sure since the Cross upon the altar is found in other places of Narsai also (cf. Connolly, p. 330). From this oldest Nestorian statement it is not clear whether it was a simple Cross or a Crucifix as in the example quoted by Prof. Baumstark from the Biography of Bar’Itta (cf. A. Baumstark, Altarkreuze in nestorianischen Klöstern des vi. Jahrhunderts, in: Römische Quartalschrift, 1900, S. 70-71; also in C. M. Kaufmann, Handbuch, S. 575, who gives some more examples, but that of Narsai that could not be known to Baumstark seems to have escaped Prof. K.’s attention). An example of a Crucifix was known to Baumstark only from 872 A.D., but he does not say, what (on the use of the crucifix by the Nestorians, see: L. E. Browne, Eclipse of Christianity, p. 78, 79). Cf. also Q. 104: The Crosses the author has in view are not those on the sides of the altar nor crowning the ciborium, since they are put on the same line with the Gospel. For the western materials see the short statement by N. Müller, Altar, in: P.R.E. 1, i, S. 396, and: D.A.C.L., s.v. Croix et Crucifix, i. iii, col. 3079; Dom. Leclercq says on account of the article of Baumstark: "le fait de la présence du symbole sur l'autel est certain, et l'Orient, sur ce point, est en avance de six siècles sur l'Occident". An image of the Lord is not mentioned here. The context of Abraham shows
that it was not a Crucifix, but probably a picture. Mgr. Rahmani gives an instance from the Jacobite church of the 6th cent. viz. in the *Admonitions* of John Tell. to a deacon which he quotes in translation (*L.O.O.*, p. 59: “Si le prêtre t'ordonne de préparer l'autel pour la messe, ... aie soin lorsque tu t'en approches ... que la croix ne soit pas inclinée par négligence; si tu la trouves ainsi, tu dois la remettre en place d'une manière digne de la liturgie sacrée.”) Otherwise I did not find a statement proving that Cross and Gospel on the altar were indispensable requisites for the Jacobites (*Syr. or Copt.*), though it was certainly the case, as in the Byzantine rite (*Salaville, Liturgies orientales*, p. 142, 185).

Q. 96. Morning service see ad Q. 105. It seems to be supposed here that it was a High Mass in a big church where several priests were wanted for the distribution of the Eucharistic bread. The matter of discussion is that they wait until all the bread is given to somebody (cf. ii 14, a sacristan distributes from the early morning till noon) and do not return to the altar. The officiant goes on with his service, and finishes it while he “orders” alone. In: *Canon xx* and especially *xxi* it was strictly prohibited under pain of expulsion from the office. At least two ministers were necessary to give Bread and Chalice to each other or a priest and a deacon (*Isho’yabh* i, *Can. iii*, in: O. Braun, *Synedros*, S. 243–244). According to our author there is one exception, namely the villages since the necessary priests anddeacons are not found there on account of the small number of the inhabitants and of the priests caused by persecutions. Nearly one thousand years later Badger’s description from 1840 gives a good impression of such a state: “Very many of the Nestorian villages in these two districts are consequently left without resident clergy, and are dependent for the ordinances of religion upon the ministrations of a single priest who travels among them from place to place” (i, p. 195). For the State of Christianity in the country see also ad Q. 96. In any case it was strictly forbidden to consecrate alone, (Riedel, S. 192; cf. p. 121–122). It is supposed that a priest is travelling while a deacon is found in several of the villages that have no priests. It was forbidden by an anonymous Synod, quoted in: ‘Abdisho’, *Nomocanon*, vi 4, *Can. 3–4* (Mai, p. 276; 2nd Synod of Carthago, *Can. ix*); but it might be allowed by the Chorèpiscopos; cf. George i († 680), *Canon x*, in: O. Braun, *Synedros*, S. 342: “und sie (the priests) dürfen sich nirgends hin von der Kirche und Stadt entfernen, ... ohne Erlaubnis des B.”; the priests could not decide this themselves except in urgent cases. If therefore a priest wished to consecrate on one day in several villages he was allowed to do so, and this seems to be the intention of the writer. – Ἑλπίζω = “priest” is especially the priest as officiant; otherwise it is practically identical with Ἱερέας = “presbyter”; cf. *Expos. ii.*, p. 46: “nunc autem (*L.E.W.*, p. 282) ablatum est nomen ‘presbyter’ et ‘episcopus’, et ‘sacerdos’ vocatur. Cum iam sacerdos, Christus, officium hoc persolvat, sublatum est nomen ‘presbyter’ et ‘episcopus’,” referring to some verses of Ephraem. What allowance of the Fathers is meant, is not clear. We may suggest that it was an unwritten tradition of the men of the High Monastery (p. 140) or it may be that it refers to the 318 Fathers who allowed that solitaries who could not go to a church might consecrate alone (Riedel, S. 192). In that case our answer gives an expansion of that Canon. The urgent cases.
are twofold: a) a travelling priest (allowed by the Greeks, see p. 129, n. 1,) comes into a church without any clergy; b) he comes into a church where a deacon is found. In a) he must do all the service alone, the ordering included; in b) he must leave the rest of the service to a deacon who may take over the priest's duties in emergencies (cf. Canon iii of Isho'yabh to James of Darai, in: O. Braun, Synhodos, S. 243). ἢδος may be either: finish his mysteries, or: consecrate. The former opinion seems to be intended; but cf. Expos. ii, p. 145 (text): ἢδος translated by Connolly with: "iam consecrata mysteria" (ii, p. 132).

Q. 37. Since the end of the 2nd cent. Wednesday and Friday (feria quarta and sexta) had already been not only days of fasting, but also of celebration of the Eucharist (Bingham, xiii 9, 2; xv 9; Drews, P.R.E.1, v, S. 569-570; for the practice of the Nestorians of the last century see: Badger ii, p. 242-243: often there is no Eucharist at all, and Maclean, E.R.E., s.v. Syrian Christians, t. xii, p. 177). "Hedebomada" = week; we have introduced this term because otherwise some confusion might arise. For the week mentioned here is a typically Nestorian liturgical division that is, as far as I know, not found anywhere else. The year is divided into 7 periods each of which had about 7 weeks, named respectively: Moses; Annunciation and Birth; Baptism; Fast; Resurrection and Ascension; Apostles; Summer; Elia (and the Revelation of the Cross). This is the summary given by the Expos. i, p. 27-28. Maclean gives a somewhat different one (E.S.D.O. p. 265, n. 4; where p. 264-281 show the Nestorian calendar). He added to "Moses" the "Hallowing of the Church" (this is a subdivision of Moses in the Expos. and definitely settled, i, p. 28-29); he began with Advent. This latter fact is in agreement with the ordinary liturgical year. Therefore it is possible that the order of the Expositio which is of course ascribed to Isho'yabh must be preferred, since it stresses the point that one should begin with "Moses". From Giambond i and ii it will be seen that these names occur in the histories of the Patriarchs after the reign of I. iii. It is not known what reasons led this Patriarch to this division nor if there were older examples. To answer these questions the data are failing. A treatise of Berikhisho' about the division of the year by Isho'yabh iii (cf. ch. vi, ii) as an introduction to the Hudhra in: Camb. Addl. 1981 and published by: W. Wright-St. A. Cook, A catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts preserved in the library of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 1901, p. 164-168.

The fasts of Apostles (middle of July, it lasted 7 weeks from Whitsun tide till the last Sunday of the Hedebomada of the Apostles; often mentioned as date, e.g. Gismondi i, p. 71, 74 etc.) and of Elia are treated in connection with the origin of the four fast terms in the Greek church by Prof. K. Holl, Die Entstehung der vier Fastenzeiten in der griechischen Kirche, in: Ges. Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, ii, Tübingen, 1928, S. 177-180. It lasted 40 days (Expos. i, p. 52). The times of these fasts may be previous to the order of Isho'yabh. The sacrifician trespasses against: Canon xx, for he takes so much as seems good to him [in stead of following the Canon (this is his mistake!)] and leaves the rest for the next day, probably without precautions, a practice that was strictly forbidden. He seems to be administering a kind of "missa praesanctificatorum". See about this point the discussion ad Q. 16. The chalice was as ever cleansed the previous evening, and is simply
reconsecrated by signing (cf. also ii 4: "this that they sign the chalice with the particle of the Paghra the Gazza, may be done, if they are forced by lack of a consecrated chalice; but where a consecrated chalice is found they are not allowed to sign with a particle"); cf. about the end ad Q. 72).

The end of the answer looks like a separate Q. and A.; it deals with reservation by the communicants (the beginning mentioned the priests).

Q. 38. Cf. ad Q. 36. He trespasses against: Gen. xxi. We may also compare ii 34: "A priest consecrates in the Morning service a Qudasha, and preserves it till noon or evening. When he does not find a deacon to order with him, what must he do?" In our Q. the priest himself solves this question as is also said in the answer: "This is a blameworthy tradition; priests of our time maintain it and make a steady use of it, giving as a pretext that they cannot find anybody to order with them owing to lack of deacons. But at the end of the Qudasha the priest should deliver it up to a deacon and say: 'the precious Paghra is delivered up from the altar, pardoning the modest priest of God, that he may distribute it to the people of the Lord, and order it to life eternal.' Likewise the chalice in the same way." Here the formula that should be said is given; naturally it is not the same as that of the communion. It is a matter of course that the altar is defiled though this case is not found in the well-known rubric on p. 119 of T.--About the answer of the Priest and his punishment see Q. 69.

Q. 39. Assemani cited this Q. (B.O., iii 1, p. 251) in commenting Quaestio Eccl. xii of John B. Abgar. When asked if a priest may serve with ordinary sandals John answered that this was allowed in urgent cases though the use of special vestments and shoes for the service of the church was advisable. In Q. xxv he forbids expressly to serve without sandals. During the Preparation (cf. ad Q. 52), too, the Priest should wear sandals. An adult man, being baptized, must come to the altar to communicate "atque calceamenta ferre et suis incidere pedibus permittatur" (John b. Abgar, Quaest. Eccl. iv). Our Q. is an answer to the question what should be done if somebody trespassed against it (cf. also Q. 62). This point seems rather important for the Nestorians. In the Arabic Synodicon fol. 80a = Riedel, S. 192, cf. p. 192, n. 1) objections were made to the Greeks that they entered the altar naked and barefoot, and the first accusation of Elias Nisib. against the Jacobites (Bedeis, S. 98–99) was: "Ihre Priester, zu der Schändlichkeit ihres der Wahrheit wiedersprechenden Glaubens, halten es für erlaubt, barfuß und ohne Beinkleider den Altar zu betreten." I have not found any regulations about this point among the groups that are accused here. On the other hand it is remarkable that Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon iv 2, quotes the decision of John Bar Abgar with the entry "Persians". At the end of the last century the Nestorians were liable to the same error of which they accused their neighbours (cf. Browne-Maclean, p. 214 who point out the difference); the people of the mountain districts (see ad Q. 96) exchanged their shoes for special slippers. Several rules about the footwear are found among the Copts and it is possible that Elias hinted at them in his book. The priests had to wear special liturgical vestments that might not be
taken outside the church"; and: "keiner soll innerhalb des Chores Schuhe anzehen", referring to Ex. iii 5. (Basilius, Can. 96, Riedel, S. 273; L.O.C., i, p. 160–163). Coptic fragment of uncertain origin, published by Dr. Crum, in: W. Riedel-W. E. Crum, The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria, p. 144: "No priests shall put sandals upon their feet, when they go into the church", referring to Ex. iii 5, Josh. v 16. The first Canon of Christodoulos of Alexandria (11th cent.) ordered the same: "... no one shall enter the church unless bare-headed and bare-footed" (O. H. E. Burmester, The Canons of Christodoulos, Patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 1047–1077, in: Le Més, 1932, p. 79; Assemani, I. I., referred also to it). Here the rule seems to be extended over all the faithful (about the uncovering of the head cf. L.O.C., i, p. 264–265). Yet it is not quite fixed, for Renaudot quotes a book of Severus of Aschmonia, de Agno Paschal, of which no date is given, and that expressed the opposite: "Sacerdotes fideles calceos in pedibus habent, dum consecravit corpus Christi..." (ll., p. 162). It is difficult to decide which is original and which derivative. It may be that the O.T. had some influence as is also suggested by some Egyptian canons (the same was found among the Jews, as appears from the Talmud Jerus., Pessachim 7, 11 [35b]): "our scholars put off their shoes when they entered the outer door of the mountain of the Temple", quoted by J. Klausner, Jesus von Nazareth?, Berlin, 1934, S. 433). John Bar Abgare refers in other places also to the O.T.; he draws a parallel between a prince of this world before whom nobody will come unshod, and the Lord of Heaven, but he did not cite a special place (ap. 'Abisho', Nomocanon, vi 6, 2, Mai, p. 277–278). It may be that in the Nestorian precepts a certain awe inspired the Canonists viz. not to touch the holy ground, or the fact that a person was not well dressed without sandals (cf. John Bar Abgare) as we found also in regard to the girdle (Q. 23). We must also refer in this connection to the Q.Q. in li 39–42, that suggest that the former opinion is the better. The author discusses what should be done if a sacristan standing on a ladder to fasten the veils of the altar loses his sandal that falls in the middle of the altar-place. The Solution is that "as long as he is on the ladder, he does not do anything blameworthy", he must try to pick up his sandal without touching the ground with his bare foot; if he cannot reach it he must walk on his hands and one foot "as cattle, holding his bare foot in the air" and reach it in this way. If both his sandals fall he must try to reach the nearer and so on, but if that is impossible: "he must call for the Bishop that he may consecrate the altar". One sees what capers the poor man must cut to prevent his touching the earth and thereby desecrating the altar.

The difference in practice may be old and the losing of the sandals something that was typically Egyptian (among the Nestorian it was the sign of rest and that the priest was not serving, cf. the quotation ad Q. 23). Its origin was probably to be found in monks' circles. Only a single place was quoted by Bingham (viii 10, 6) from Cassianus, Institutiones, i 10, which refers to it as a peculiarity of the Egyptian monks: "Nequaquam tamen caligias pedibus inhaerere permittunt, cum accedunt ad celebrae vel perciplianda sacrosancta mysteria, illud acstimantes etiam secundum literam custodiiri debere quot dictur ad

(1) Cf. Athanasius, Can. 20, ed. Riedel-Crum, p. 31: "The garments of the priests, wherein they celebrate, shall be white and washed. They shall be laid in the storechambers of the sanctuary.... even as the prophet Ezekiel hath said..." (xii 19, cf. ibid., p. 77).
Moysen vel ad Jesum filium Nave’ (see before). But for the rest Bingham observed: “We do not find it mentioned as a general custom prevailing among the primitive Christians.” This statement is true. That it is found among the Abessynians, as Bingham already remarked, is of course owing to Coptic influence.

Q. 40. Mixture of the chalice etc. cf. ad Q. 72 sqq. One should be careful not to place it on the ground. The chalice was, as will be remembered, already before the consecration itself holy to a certain extent, as it contained the holy mixture and might not be polluted. Special Canons about it as among the Jacobites (Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon, iv 2) are not found among the Nestorians so far as I know nor special consecration-prayers as among the Copts (L.O.C., i, p. 307). It is possible that the fact that the chalice was “separated” or “set apart”, or put on the altar, was already thought sufficient as seems to be supposed by John Tell, Can. xii (Lamy, p. 72). 15: not in the Thesaurus of Payne Smith and the other Dictionaries. For the meaning “shelf”, see: Thomas Audo, Dictionnaire de la langue chaldéenne, Mosul, 1897, vol. ii, s.v.

The point is: not to place it on the ground of the Temple (ad Q. 44); for in Q. 25 it is ordered to place it beyond the threshold of the sanctuary, if it is impossible to give it into the hands of a priest, as this ground shared in the consecration of the altar. Cf. also Q. 23 where a prohibition concerning the pater is given. The “ground” always plays a desecrating part, see also Q. 56 and 61. The same regulation was made concerning the water of Baptism (in two MSS J’ and J’): “und es sei Vorsicht, dass man nicht Taufwasser auf die Erde fallen lasse” (G. Dietrich, Tauflit., S. 79-80. Prof. Drews (quoted by F. Loofs, in: P.R.E. 1, xxiii, S. 3) supposed with reference to Tertullian, De Corona 9, in: M.S.L. 2, col. 98-99: “we feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground”, that this anxiety arose from fear of the demons who were thought to have their home especially in the earth. This opinion is right, I think. We know of the great importance of the “chthonic” gods in the ancient religions, and it is a matter of course that these gods had become demons for the Christians. We may refer to Hippolytus, Canon 29: “Der welcher die Mysterien aussteilt, und die welche sie empfangen, sollen scharf aufpassen, dass nichts auf die Erde falle, damit sich nicht ein böser Geist dessen bemächtige” (Riedel, S. 219), cf. the Latin text of the Churchorder of Hipp. (quoted ad Q. 16) and: Horner, Statutes of the Apostles, p. 181. The demons were specially connected with the earth; and they could not enter the altar-place because it was consecrated and exorcised.

Q. 41. This fact does not happen in the communion as in the cases that are generally quoted to show the care taken with regard to the Eucharist (Bingham, xv 5, 6), but it is a matter of the priest as in Q. 13 which says what should be done with the place and Q. 15 about the wine. Here the same rule holds good: the holy altar is not desecrated by the holy bread. But since the mistake of dropping has been made, the G. cannot be given in the ordinary way. About the “pater which is on the altar”, see ad Q. 19 and: L.E.W., p. 267-268 rubrics. This Q. is the one that is quoted in ii 5 when it is said “I asked you
before about the Gomurtha which falls from the pater of the sacraments on
the ground: is it allowed that it returns to the pater?, and you answered: No’
(a wording somewhat different from our Q., but with the same meaning);
and it becomes certain when it follows, though the connection is somewhat
loose: “Now I want to ask you again: If the sacristan offers the pater on the
altar and the Bukhra falls on the altar-vestments, is he allowed to return it to
the pater or not? Answer: If he returns it to the pater, he does it rightfully,
as in the case when we return a Gomurtha when it has fallen from the pater
on the altar.” Since the subsequent Q Q. offer a good parallel to others of
our treatise we may give them here in translation: Question: And if the Bukhra
falls on the ground? Answer: He may in no wise return it to the altar. Question:
What must be done if it comes on the altar? Answer: They (the priests) must
set it apart, and take it outside the altarplace after the Ordering. Question:
What if the priest lifts up the veil (over chalice and pater) to consecrate (L.E.W.,
p. 282) and a Bukhra falls to the ground? Answer: He must deal with it in the
same way. Question: If it happens after the first, second and third signing that
a Bukhra falls, how must he deal with it? Answer: The priest must return it
and take it into his left hand and make it partake of all the signings which he
makes, and distribute it to the believers joining with it another portion’
(cf. ii 1).

Q. 42. Canon xi impresses on the priests to take care that no host mixed with the
holy leaven of the Eucharistic bread (cf. ad Q. 52) should be given to a pagan,
magian or priest of any other religion (Muslim may be used for Jews and Moham-
medans; while it is also a usual word for the members of Christian sects; all this
is comprised in it. That the magians or priests of the Persian religion are specially
mentioned must be explained from the Persian origin of the Canons; in many
places in the Book of the Governors and the Acts of the Persian Martyrs it may be
seen that it still exercised a considerable influence) cf. ad Q. 29 and Copt.: Hip-
pylaurus, Com. 28 (Riedel S. 918): “Die Cleriker sollen achtgeben und keinen
an den heiligen Mysterien kommunizieren lassen als alleine die Gläubigen”;
and; Basilius, Com. 98 (Riedel, S. 276).

It is well known that the Mass was divided into the “Missa Catechumenorum”
and the “Missa Fidelium” and that after the reading of the Scriptures and
Prayers the deacon shouted that those who had not been baptised, those who
had not received the Sign of Life, those who would not communicate should
depart (L.E.W., p. 267; we take the Nestorian form; but in a slightly different
wording it is found in all the liturgies; cf. also L.O.O., p. 164-169; Hassen’s
iii, p. 265-272). We confine ourselves to the Nestorian material. In the time of
Narsai this usage seemed to be still in practice (Hom. xvii, tr. Connolly,
p. 2–3). Abraham Bar Lipheh gives a very queer explanation; according to
him it meant the entering of the souls into Paradise. It is impossible however
to decide whether this meant a real expulsion or not (Expos. ii, p. 160-161).
In the time of the Expos. it had already become obsolete; the older meaning
was known; but had been replaced by another (ii, p. 30–33). Timothy ii connects
it with the congregation itself (Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 121a). It seems as though
this institute had lost its meaning as it happened in the other Eastern churches
(cf. e.g. Moses bar Cepha, in: R. H. Connolly-H. W. Codrington, The Com-
mentaries, p. 31: “at one time”, the whole explanation is in the past tense. Practically it was out of use. Pagans assisted at the whole service. This appears e.g. from the History told by Bar Hebraeus (Chron. Ecl. iii, col. 239–241) that a Mohammedan Vizier asked the Catholicos Abraham (p. 85) how the communion was distributed, and the answer was that the Mohammedans knew it very well as they had often seen it. John Bar Abgare strictly forbade Christian people to send their children under the guidance of a pagan to receive the communion as the holy Mysteries would be an object of mockery and derision for those infidels. This evidence shows sufficiently that pagans assisted at the service. Naturally the priests could not always distinguish a pagan from a christian (unless they had different dresses, p. 88).—The similar case of a heretic coming to communion is not found in our QQ., but was dealt with by Timotheus Alex., Q. 20 (2nd series), in: Pitra, Monuments, i, p. 642: The answer is: εἰς ἐρεύς καὶ ἐν ἁρμόνια τῆς τοῦ ἐν παλαιολογία εὐχαριστία λαβοντος προσευχής, τὸν γὰρ σπουδίας ἐστών δόσῃ τὸν χρόνον καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν ἐπεξεργάζεσθαι. At one time it was usual that a foreigner before being admitted to the communion had to show a commendatory letter of his Bishop (D.C.A., s.v.; D.A.C.L., s.v. Litterae Commendationis et Formatae, t. ix, col. 1571–1576); but there was a great distance between Canonlaw and practice!—The fact that the pagan had communicated, had, of course, polluted the whole Gμμυρθα (since a pagan stood under the influence of demons). The care for the holiness of the Sacrament went so far as to avoid speaking to a pagan after the Communion, although this intercourse could not really affect the Sacrament, and therefore if it was necessary one could talk with a pagan (Isho'Barnun, ad Macarum, Q. 26).

Q. 43. “Ordering” cf. ad Q. 18. It can be gathered from several other Q.Q. too that no communicants were present during the service; see ii 13 in which is told how the priest had to act in such a case when he had another occupation 1 (the Solution is: “From sheer necessity he must throw the particle of the Euch. Bread into one of the unconsecrated chalices and pour water on it and keep it till the Ordering and mix it with the rest of the chalice and take it to the deacon’s house after the Ordering”; and ii 11: “after a Gμμυρθα had fallen that had to be given to one of the people (Q. 41) it lasted some time before there appeared somebody (V. adds: to receive the Qudasha) to give it together with another Gμμυρθα which had been joined to the former, and nobody was present, and the sacristan wants to order etc.”) It shows that the priests waited some time to see whether a communicant should appear. Cf. John Bar Abgare, Questio Ecl. xiii: “Accidit duas sacerdotes nullo alio praesente solos ad altarc adesse: quare alter alteri porrigit communionem. Contiguit post adventire fidelium quempiam, et communionem expetere. Quacritur, liceat necne sacerdodi communionem potenti porrigere ex ea, quam manu tenet hostia? Respondetur, hoc minime licere: nam quod pro Sacerdote offeretur, ejus oblatio est, nec ei fast est quidpiam ex eo alteri cedere, nec duorum Sacerdotum praedictorum cuivis licet communionem ex disco et calice alteri porrigere, deinde abire et reliquere, ut ex eodem percipiati communionem quisquam pro suo

1) I do not know what is meant by “occupation”. I did not find that the priests in this time had all sorts of business as in the days of the Canon of Athanasius, 49–50, ed. Riedel–Grun, p. 36 and passim. — Most of the priests were monks.
arbitratu”, etc.). The Priests communicated at the Ablutions (cf. ad Q. 18). Our Q. makes it, nevertheless, possible. “Crumba” and their treatment cf. ad Q. 17. This applied to the bread. Communion with the chalice only is never found. The opposite, however, occurs sometimes in urgent cases (cf. ad Q. 51 and: Lamy, p. 181) for the sick.

Q. 44–45. In Mesopotamia the chance of floods in the rainy season must be considered or the rising of Tigris and Zab in the months from February to April when the snow on the Armenian mountains is melting. This causes a rising of the water-mark of several feet. “Floods on the Tigris are often accompanied by violent south-east winds which literally blow craft up the river or into the banks” says Mr. Badge (B.G. ii, p. 353 n. 1–554). Several times large floods are recorded in history. In connection with our Q. it is worth while to give the following quotation of the time of ‘Abdisha’ (Gismondi i, p. 91–92): “Anno autem 967, Tigris fluvius adeo enormiter excrevrit ut obturi baglidensem periclitati sint, ni agger stetisset quem tempore alluvionis plagae orientali Mus‘azz ad-Daula excitaerat”. These floods occur so often that we cannot identify this one with that mentioned in our Q., apart from the fact that this speaks of Bagdad and not of the place where our author was probably teaching p. 83. It is clear that “altar” means here the whole place round about the altar-table, the Sanctuary. For the water enters into it several feet. The difference turns here again about consecrated and unconsecrated places cf. ad Q. 27, 40. Several steps always lead from the Temple (= nave, L.E.W., p. 583) to the altar. It appears that the “deacon’s house” was not on the same level as the altar, a detail that is not seen in the sketch of Dom. Connelly, Expos. i, p. 196. The rubric T. p. 119 does not mention this case. “Signing” seems to imply that a formulary without oil had to be used.

Q. 46–47. About mixing the chalice cf. ad Q. 72 sqq. There and in Q. 10 it is clearly stated that the chalice should never be given with water only, as was the practice of some sectarians, probably from ascetical reasons (cf. Hanssens ii, p. 223–224). But it might happen that wine was scarce (Q. 48) or failed altogether. Mesopotamia and the mountain districts did not produce much wine (especially since the Government was Mohammedan). From Q. 47 it appears that it was important that the mixture had the ⲙⲁⲧⲁⲧⲧ = strength and colour of wine. As to the latter point Hanssens ii, p. 230–231 gives some information, but that is of little interest. The point of the colour: red or white, was left undecided. Probably it was red, the blood (drma) of Christ. (Cyprian, Epist. 63, 7, ed. Hartel, ii, p. 705–706, and: Chrysostom, Hom. 82 in Matt. xxvi, in: M.S.G., 58, col. 738). The former quality might be defined by “taste”. This word is used by James Edessa, Can. 32 (Kayser, S. 22) and Isho‘Barnun, ad Marciunum Q. 25 in connection with the sacrament but with a different meaning, viz. “das in den Sakramenten Wirksame”. There it points to the consecrated elements and must be identified with the effect of the Descent of the Spirit on them. This possibility is out of the question here and with regard to what will be said ad Q. 48 we must offer an other translation as: “essence, nature”. Though in that case Ⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧ would be expected.

This scarcity or lack of wine is not rebuked, as it was no fault of the sacristan.
Why not? We should certainly expect a remark about it. The reason lies, I think, in: Can. xxxv: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit to order that no one who is in charge of the service of the altar may offer without necessity marred wine in which is a defect, on the holy altar when good wine is left; nor mix marred wine for the 'Chalice of the Blood of our Lord';" the trespasser profanes the divine sacraments. Wine soon gets spoilt in the eastern climate; once spoilt it is forbidden to offer it. But it is rather difficult to notice it beforehand. Therefore the sacristan is not rebuked. For that reason, too, it was impossible to soak the raisins for one or two days, as would be necessary to get the result which was required (47). These raisins were pure at any rate. "Purify" means of course: pare off the skin and remove the stones.

The same view is found in the Maronitic Nomocanon, quoted by Mgr. Rahmani (L.O.O., p. 71; following a MS. in the Vatican Lib.; it is said to be "traduit l'an 1069 de notre ère du syriaque en arabe par le métropolite David", p. 722): "Le vin doit être l'extrait du raisin, fruit de la vigne selon la parole de notre Seigneur dans le s. évangile. Il sera de la meilleure qualité possible, ni aigre ni d'un goût désagréable. Les autres extraits de dattes, de miel, de bananes etc. . . . sont sévèrement interdits. Cependant l'usage du vin tiré du raisin sec est autorisé par quelques pères là où le jus de raisins frais fait défaut." The prohibition could not be traced among the Nest.; the view of our Q. is mentioned here as allowed by some fathers (ch. vi. iii). The whole Canon fits in very well with the spirit of our Q. Q. It is possible that its origin was the same as that of our treatise, this is the more probable as the Maronites have more points of the liturgy in common with the Nest. (p. 54) and the date suits very well. Yet origin and connections of the Maronites are so uncertain that it is better to leave this question to someone who will in future investigate the whole problem of this sect (cf. E. Roediger—K. Kessler, Maroniten, in: P.R.E. i, xii, S. 355-364, and: P. Dib, D.Th.C., s.v. Maronite (Église), t. x, col. i-142).

As to the Coptic Church it was told by Renaudot how an Egyptian prefect wanted to tease the Christians and prevented them from getting any wine, and how they used palm-wine from sheer necessity. He also cites from the Questiones Ecclesiasticae of Michael of Melicha the following decision: "Licetne Eucharistiam offerre ex picato aut resinate vino, vel eo quod maceratione exprimitur? R.: Picatum quidem adhiberi potest, quia medicamento quodam e genere picis praeparatur, in coequo non est aqua, verum odor tantum et fumosum alicuius; sed quod maceratione exprimitur, cum in eo aqua sit, illud omnino usurpare non licet ad Liturgiam celebrandum." The same Bishop decided quite in agreement with the Nestorian Canon that it was strictly forbidden to offer sour wine because that had lost the taste, name and use of wine and had changed its nature. The other Coptic Canons (also found in: Hansens ii, p. 219-221; who tells exactly the same as Renaudot) agree closely with it. From the Jacobites he reproduced a decision of Dionysius Bar Salibi (not found in the Syriac Nomocanon) which differs a little from the foregoing because it allows to use "uvaram succus" in urgent cases, if it had not been in touch with fire or cooked food. The Ethiopians, too, employed raisins (L.O.C., i, p. 176-177; ii, p. 67). This is the same as found in Nest. We see that the Maronitic view is practically the same as that of the Nest, while the Jacob. and Copt. though similar in many respects, vary as to the decisions in emergencies.
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Q. 48. About the proportion of wine and water in normal and abnormal cases viz. scarcity of wine (the opposite case is not spoken of). The Canon quoted is: xxiv (but Assemani did not illustrate this Can. by our Q.): “... the mixture of the chalice should be made of equal parts of wine and water. For it is said that blood and water came from the side of our Saviour (Joh. xix 35, this text is always referred to in this connection from the time of the commentaries of Augustin and Chrysostom.); and in the same way must the mixture of the chalice consist of equal parts of wine and water; if it is necessary owing to lack of wine, it is allowed to use one part of wine and two of water; and if there is not even enough for that, one part of wine and three of water. But less than three is not allowed under any circumstance...” In spite of this last clause our Q. allows even more water and less wine.

Nothing is found about it in the ancient church. As far as I know, the Jacobite John Tell. was the first to give a regulation similar to the first part of the Nestorian one: “et in calice dimidium vini, et dimidium aqua miscetur” (this place known from Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon, iv 1 appears to be borrowed from John’s Admonitions to the deacon, quoted in: L.O.O., p. 71; Mgr. Rahmani, Lc., informs us that the Jacob. rubrics have the same rule). The Coptic Church prescribed (Can. 59 of Basilis) not to pour in too much water, no more than a third part; “sind viele Geräte (?) am Orte der Zubereitung, so genügt ein Zehntel.” Never should the wine be taken unmixed (1 John v 6; John xix 34-35); neglect is punished by lifelong deposing off the office (Riedel, S. 277). This is the opposite of the foregoing rules; small quantity of water and diminishing of it in relation to the number of the chalices. Practically the same is found in other places. For the rest of the material cf. Hanssen ii, p. 242-250.

It is clear that there did not exist any agreement except in the fact that the chalice should be mixed. The proportion depended on local circumstances. As to the Syrians we may be sure that they kept in view this rule that not: “vini proprius sapor mutetur in saporem aquae” (rubric of the Russian Missal, quoted by Hanssen ii, p. 243, tr. appendix, p. 78). This (probably late) Canon expresses very well the thoughts of the Syriac Christians too (what has been said before about the “nature” of the wine and what has been quoted ad Q. 70 offers a very instructive parallel).

Q. 49. “Admonitions” = Canon xx where our Q. is quoted by Assemani. This Canon to which we have referred already ad Q. 18 (compare the commentary of that Q. to understand the present Q.) is derived from Isho’Barnun, ed Macariam Q. 35 and reads as follows: “… he who orders may not take more than four Gmurtas or parts which form a complete Bukhra. If a very urgent case arises, they may take five parts which is however illegal and abnormal. But if much is left, it is by no means possible to order it. Whosoever dares to trespass, the justice of the Lord shall punish him...” (In the Coptic Church the following rule is given by the Statutes of the Apostles, ed. Horner, p. 205, 280-281, 349: “Concerning that which is left of the Oblations. The Eulogia which is left of the Mystery besides that which they offered, the deacons shall distribute among the priests, with the knowledge of the bishop or presbyter. Four parts shall be given to the bishop, and three shall be given to the pres-
byter, and to the deacon two parts, and to the others, to the subdeacon and to the reader and to the singers and to the deaconesses, one part," according to the Ethiopic text; the others have slight variations in wording, but not in facts). Here arose a collision of the law to leave nothing (ad Q. 16) and the real situation. The communicants had already gone home, and there was the danger of the perishing of the Body of the Lord. This was the decisive point. "Gazza" ad Q. 16. The condition of our sources does not allow us to say anything about the church-going among the Nestorians. Of course it has always been a rule that all the members of the church should communicate every time. But that was an ideal. Here it appears that the number was rather fluctuating and could not be ascertained beforehand (an other variation allowed by the differences in the number of communicants viz. in cases the Euch. Bread is short, is found in the direction of Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon, iv 5.) This variety seems therefore to be a case of emergency.

Q. 50. This is the well-known prohibition of reserving Paghra till the next day (see ad Q. 16), Λαεδ = Passover is according to: E.S.D.O., p. 297, s.v. Piška; cf. Diction. s.v., a specially Nestorian name for Maundy Thursday. As a matter of fact I have not found it elsewhere. It is uncertain when this name arose. The Expos. states that on this day the Mysteries were held in the evening (instead of at the 3rd hour) because this was the time of the true Mysteries (i, p. 6); it formed the end of the Fast (i, p. 51-52). The Quaestiones of George of Arbelae use also this expression (cf. ad Q. 51). The Formulary of the Renewal of the Holy Leaven that took place on this day (cf. Ex. xii 13; 1 Cor. v 7), called this day Λαεδ = Feria quinta of the Passover. It is probable that the name was an abbreviation by omitting the first word (cf. "Hosanna" = Sunday of Hos. = Palmsunday). The expression is used in its technical sense by Thomas Mabg. in the mouth of somebody who lived some generations before (B.G. ii, p. 547-548): a monk asked a certain Nares how the Quaestions in the Paradise of Palladius had been preserved. N. answered: "Now on the holy days of the Passover, and the Passion, and the Resurrection when they (the monks) were going forth from the restraint of fasting between one service and the other," the answers were given by the Fathers to novices and written down by secretaries. This story may be true or not for the time of Palladius, at any rate it shows that the practice of the name existed already long before Thomas; the three days are the same as those mentioned by George, and for the end of the Fast see the Expos. i, p. 52. This reference is a "terminus ante quern". It had probably been instituted by Isḥo'yabb. iii. It was strictly forbidden to consecrate on Good Friday according to the rubric at the end of the formulary of the Consecration of the altar with oil ascribed to I. iiii (T., p. 150). Nor was it practised in other churches, but there existed the "Missa praesanctificatorum" (cf. D.C.A., s.v. Good Friday), but this was not done by the Nestorians. Reasons for it are not found anywhere, but on the analogy of the fact that Isḥo'Barnun prohibited the Eucharist on the Sabbath, a.o. because the liturgy supposes that Christ lived while the Sabbath was the day of his death and the liturgy represents His resurrection (ad Isae., Q. 7; ad Macer. Q. 21; cf. Expos. ii, passim), we may say that this day of the
“Passion” (the Nest. terminus technicus together with ἡμέρας Δυσσόμενος) did not permit the Euch., since all attention was concentrated upon the sufferings and not upon the Victory of the Lord. (The name Pascha is also found in ì 35, but there it must have had another meaning following from the context and probably means there the week before Good Friday).

Q. 51. A very famous question in the Oriental Church. We begin with the Nest. material. The first is the famous question of Isho‘yabbi, that is always quoted since Assemani published it from V. fol. 92a to illustrate Can. xviii; together with it he cited our Q. It reads as follows: “If somebody is ill, or in an urgent case (agony?) (the priest) must take a particle, dip it into a chalice, place it in the cloth of the chalice and go to the sick man in the early morning while it is still dark, reciting in his heart psalms as long as he carries the Grumpta, and give it; not sitting down in the meantime. Then he must return to the church, going on with his service”. The text of the Arab. Nomascaneti (cf. p. 122) is slightly different; we remind readers that Assemani’s quotation of Moses Cascar to the same effect is a mistake. Riedel’s text gives the following translation: “Man darf das Opfer (Qurbana) nicht aus dem Chore (Temppel) ab schöpfen, ausser zu einem Kranken oder wo es sonst nötig ist bei einem, der aus irgend einem Gründe nicht zur Kirche kommen kann. Zu einem solchen soll er es in einem Gefässe bringen und es in seinem Gewande geben, mit Lichten und Weihrauch und Lesern vor sich, damit der Kranke oder in Not Geratene davon kommuniziere. Keiner aber von denen, welche es tragen und vor ihm dienen, soll sich auf die Erde setzen bis sie es zum Altare zurückbringt haben.” We see that the Arab. text has an expansion about the carrying of the lights etc. Isho‘yabbi (ad Mat., Q. 42) brings in a new element: “Is it allowed to take the Qudasha to a sick man or a prisoner? Sfd.: If it is necessary and the sick man or the prisoner is a true believer (italics are mine), it may be done; as is prescribed in many places in the Law. But if that is not the case, it is forbidden.” Some further restrictions are made in: Canon xviii though it moves on the same lines: it is not allowed “except to a prisoner or a sick man, dangerously ill, on the day of the Feast of the Resurrection of our Saviour (by command of the Head and Leader; this clause is missing in Ming. Syr. 121 and means: allowance of the Bishop), and at night”. If it is done on other occasions, one despises the divine sacraments to please the people. This “dangerously ill” is not superfluous; Budge, B.C. ii, p. 492; 268 tells us that a very old monk who could only come once a week to communion did so, although it was the only thing he could do; another was carried by a fellow pick-a-back. Several parts from the foregoing quotations were put together by George of Arbelo when he answered the question: “If a man is so ill that it is impossible to carry him to the church on Maundy Thursday, and he asks for a Qudasha, what must be done for him?” by saying: “There is no necessity on Maundy Thursday; but on Easterday the Canon orders that the Grumpta should be carried immersed in the chalice, secretly at night, and they must not stop their prayers, and leave off from incense and lights, and they must take the

1 This is a clear proof of Syrian origin; Temple = nave, not: “Choe” or Sanctuary, as in Egypt, cf. Riedel-Comn., Canon. of Athanasius, p. 41, n. 9 and L.E.W., p. 359, 357.
Gemurta to the sick man”. He is clearly linking up Can. xviii with that of I. i. In contravention of these rules our Q. prefers to take the certain for the uncertain and forbids it. He does not want to take the risk that the sacrament should be defiled being put in unclean places; it is not quite clear, but it is highly probable that this unclean is meant in the ritual sense (cf. Kayser, S. 104). All the precautions apply to the church! The use of incense and lights, mentioned on several occasions in the Expos., are necessary requirements at the celebration of the Euch., see: Rubric in T., p. 150 (they are also used in the other churches, D.C.A., s.v. light, incense). The author was very much afraid of desecration by taking it outside the church (cf. ii 22: “A Bukhra that was defiled because wine had been poured out, may under no circumstance be taken outside the church”). This makes the Communion of the Sick (D.C.A., s.v.; D.A.C.L., s.v. Communion, t. iii, col. 2437-2440, where the later development is neglected) absolutely impossible. What is meant by “to take it to the houses of the faithful”, becomes clear from the parallels in the ancient and Jacobite church. I do not know what is the practice of the present time.

Lamy, p. 180-182 has collected and discussed several points; he did it in his way to show that the practice of these churches was practically the same as the practice of the R.C. church: “Communio infirorum sub una” (but it should not be overlooked that the Bread had been dipped into the Chalice first, as it was hard to walk with a chalice of wine to the house of the sick) 1. The oldest Canon is that of John Tell., Can. 8. James Edess., Can. 9, 10, 17 specified some points. It was summarized by Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanum, iv 4. It suffices to note the essential points. John Tell. is asked whether the holy Margaritha may be sent to a sick person in a λάρ νάος as the authorities did not agree about this point. Lamy translated this with: “in canistro” and explained it by “vas ecclesiasticum in quo distribuantur eulogiae seu panes beneficiti”. But it means “take” (Diction., cf. Kayser, S. 97). Therefore the answer is that in such a case either the Margaritha or the cake can be broken. It is preferable to send it in a piece of linen or paper that can be burned afterwards (probably because it was sanctified by its contents and could not be used in another way). In emergencies it may be sent by a layman and even by a woman. Can. 11 refers to this matter according to Kayser (“Noch im 6. Jahrhundert gestattet Johann von Tell a Entsch. 11 bei Lamy] dem Priester den Kelch und die Hostie mit bloßer Hand, wenn Eile nötig, zu dem Kranken zu tragen, S. 93). This question was quite rightly not noted by Lamy among those about the communion of the sick; for that it refers to the sick, is an addition of Kayser himself. The text has: outside the λάρ νάος = Sanctuary. It is simply a case about the ordinary communion. James Edess. joins John, adding that he has no objection to take a leaf of a cabbage. It would be proper that if it was taken home the priest should inquiere beforehand what use would be made of it; this is however impossible in most cases. Therefore they must go themselves (they may go on horseback, Canon 17) or entrust it to faithful laymen or women. For its does not matter that the sick should take a part of the Eucharist for cure of body and soul. But it is strictly forbidden to preserve it in beds, walls

(1) The interpretation of Lamy is absolutely impossible, cf. Arab. Synodicon, fol. Robi: “It is not allowed to take the Euch. Br. without chalice, as the Bread is the Body (Paghra) and the chalice the Blood (D'rosa) and these two may not be separated".
or as charms for magical practices (Can. 9 and 12, cf. Kayser's Commentary). Besides that we observe that according to James, Can. 11 the Eucharist may be administered in various places outside the church. Renaudot, L.O.C., i, p. 270 borrowed from Bar Hebræus as these regulations have the same authority among the Copta. The differences that occur are of no importance; "nam etiam in ipso qualiscumque sit, dissimilitudine, cadem animadvertitur religio circa Eucharistiam, ut quam decentissime tractetur, nullusque sit profanationi, neglegentiae, imo nec superstitioni locus". Before following this track we must see the Coptic texts. For this remark of Renaudot's may be conclusive from his point of view, the historian of the rite is interested in the differences. Basiliius, Can. 98 (Riedel, S. 276) bases itself upon the precept in Exod. xii 46: the Paschal Lamb must be eaten at home and no bone may be taken outside. "Wir aber bringen das Mysterium überhaupt nicht aus der Kirche heraus um es jemand zu geben; nur bei Todesgefahr geben wir jemand von den Mysterien". The same argument is used in the book of Abul Barakat (Villecourt, Observances, p. 208); he does not say anything, however, about the danger of death. Athanasius, Can. 36, ed. Riedel-Crump, p. 32: "No priest shall carry forth the mysteries and go with them about the streets, except for a sick man, when the end and death's hour of need draws nigh. And when they carry the mysteries (without), they shall suffer none but the sick to partake. And they shall not do according to favour and give unto one beside the sick, but unto the sick alone." We see that they held a position between the Nestorians and the Jacobites.

Concerning the practice of the Ancient church it is well known that in the first extra-canonical account of the Eucharist the deacons take the Sacrament to the absent faithful (Justinus Martyr, Apol. 63, 5, ed. Goodspeed, p. 74). Many other examples from the following centuries are known that tell us that the Eucharist was not eaten in the church, but taken home by the faithful and preserved there to be used later. This "taking home by the faithful" (cf. our Q.) was the origin of several practices inconsistent with the meaning of the Sacrament as was shown already by James Edess. (it is not necessary to repeat here these instances, cf. D.C.A., s.v. Reservation and: Bingham, xv 4). This custom was abolished afterwards and instead of that we find the Reservation of the Sacrament in the church from which the sick and the dying men got their communion. We have observed already that this practice is not found in the Nestorian and Coptic church, see ad Q. 16. It could not be treated in the same way as it was done by the Jacobite, in agreement with the Ancient church. It was only possible to take a particle by means of a priest who had to do a service, to sick people and prisoners. This limitation of the older practices was even forbidden later and confined to the highest service of the whole year at Easter. It is interesting to see the development among the Nestorians to a stricter observance. Our Q. is the strictest of all.

Q. 52ff. The following category deals with questions concerning the Preparation of the elements. The data as far as they are known at present were printed together by Hansens ii, p. 206–211 Usus praesens; p. 211–217 Historia; iii, p. 283. The former part consists mainly of Canons of the Eastern Uniates which display a great care for the preparation. But most of them are of a recent date and nothing is said about their origin. The Nestorians and Aethiopians
are the only bodies of non-Uniates mentioned. As to the history this consists mainly of Nest. and Coptic Canons. Those of the churches outside Persia prescribe mostly that the bread must be baked on the same day on which it is offered and the material is merely traditional. In reviewing this collection of Hansens we see that it was especially the Nestorian Church that had at an early date (10th century) a Canon-law of fairly detailed regulations. They have also a special: *Formulary of kneading and preparing of the mixture;* (T. p. 101–110; translated together with 'Addai' in: *L.E.W.* p. 247–252). It does not seem to occur in the ordinary copies of the liturgy. Renaudot and Badger did not mention it and in T. it seems to have been published from one MS. (cf. p. 112, it should be noticed that the Prothesis of Baptism is also found apart, see: Dietrich, *Taufrit.,* S. 55 [in J. 1, p. 110]). At what time did it come into being? An important though negative indication concerning this question is given by the *Expos.* ii, p. 36. It asks why Isho'yahb ii prescribed (*L.E.W.*, p. 268) the priests to order the Mysteries on the altar, but did not prescribe how it should be done nor how the bread should be baked and the wine mixed while he has given regulations on so many points of minor interest. The writer gives for it a mystical reason that does not furnish any point of liturgical importance. At any rate he sticks to what was dictated by Isho'yahb, and it does not become clear whether the rite of T. or something of that kind existed already. Anyhow it is sure that it was not ordered by Isho'yahb, but was of later date. The only regulation that is known before the Canones is *Canon 26 of the Apostle Addai* (Bar Hebraeus, *Nomocanon* iv 1) that is nothing but a form of *Canon 37 of the Apostles* (Syr. rec. in: Mai, *Sr. Vat. Nov. Coll.* x, 2, p. 5) to the effect that the bread of the oblation must be brought upon the altar on the same day and not afterwards. The *Canons* of John Bar Abgare are full of this matter and we do not know whether this had been fixed before, they exhibit the first rules. As Prof. Hansens did not translate them in full we will give them here all together, (following the text of T.): iii "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit through the Fathers (to order) that the mixers of the Holy dough should be priests and deacons. It is not allowed that anybody else than a priest or a deacon should draw near it. If a layman or an unordained monk does so, it is under pain of the Word of our Lord" (cf. Armen. Sion i, *Can. 12, 8th cent.* in: Hansens ii, p. 211). iv... (we omit the introductory and final formulas) "nothing else should be used to prepare the dough, but pure, fine wheat flour and clear water and pressed olive-oil" (cf. also the rubric in: *L.E.W.*, p. 247, and that for the renewal of the Holy Leaven T., p. 105. It is remarkable that nothing is said about salt though it was used, cf. *Q.* 81. This mixture was the same as that of the Jacobite Syrians who had at some day a controversy with their Coptic co-religionists as the latter did not mix in it salt nor oil, cf. Hansens ii, p. 167–169 and his reference to Renaudot. Does this agreement point to the time before the separation? v (Arabic addition of Assemani). "Presbyter aut diaconus, qui oblationis panem praeparat sui instrumenti munditiem curet, habeatque, ne a laico contingatur. Habeat praeterea umbos succinctos et calceamenta in pedibus suis, (cf. ad *Q.* 93, 39; this shows that the Elements had already a "proleptic" holiness), faciem ad orientem et amicu velatam. Ministret autem cum psalmis." viii "There may not be in the Qēṣəṣṭa two forms through two kinds of wheat flour, one white and one black. But there must
be one dough each day consisting of one kind of wheat flour; for in Christ's Body (Paghra) there is not black and white' (lit.: "Cush and Ionian', a play of words on Paul's Gal. iii 28, Col. iii 11). ix 'No priests nor deacons serving the altar shall make pursbana's of wheat flour when the 'Malkha' is of black flour. Because it is not fit that they should make 'Malkha' a black man who is a slave and not a free man, while the Roman is white' (the pun of Can. viii must be kept in mind; Malkha = King is used her in a twofold sense, viz. for the priest's loaf and the Emperor of Byzance whose ordinary Syriac title it is, cf. E.S.D.O. p. 205, and p. 246-247. At any rate it is a highly remarkable quibble that one should not expect among the Nestorians since they were not adherents of the Byzantine church or subjected to that sovereign, on the contrary that might be considered to be high-treason). Canon xi tells us that the bread must be mixed with holy leaven and xiv for baking to bake bread for two days (cf. the texts in: Hansens ii, p. 212-215; iii, p. 283; Athanasius, Canon 64 ad Q. 70; add to the Canon of John Tell., p. 212 a reference to: L.O.O., p. 69). In his Quaestio Ecol. 28 the answer of John to the question whether a priest who is afraid of staying the night in the church may bake the Euch. bread at home and take it to the church, is that it is not necessary to take it into the church at night, but to bake it in the church. It may be done at home in emergencies, but in a special oven and only by priests and deacons (cf. Cyril. iii Ibn Laklak, in: Hansens ii, p. 214 and: Villecourt, Observances, p. 247: "ne coqurat pancrea extra ecclesiam. Et si non est furnus in ecclesia neque ibi confici potest (panis), sacerdos vel aedilicium eum coquat in domo sua. Neve sinat feminam aut aliam quemlibet prater secreatum ipsum illum tangere"). Reviewing this evidence we see that they give regulations about officiants and their habits, place, time and materials that are necessary for a right baking. The questions that follow are also concerned with these matters; they suppose that the Canons were not used or were not known as they ought to be known. They show that as much weight was attached to them as to the liturgy itself. But it is not possible to state whether the formularies mentioned above was already existant. Nor can it be fixed whether these regulations were traditional (cf. p. 150-151). At any rate it seems to be a tradition that is peculiar to the Nestorian church. We do not hear anything of it in the Ancient church (D.C.A., s.v. Elements: "The more minute directions for the preparation of the Eucharistic bread belong to a later age"—cf. R. M. Woolley, The bread of the Eucharist, Alcuin Club Tracts, 1913, a book which I was not able to consult). Originally it was taken from the obdella of the faithful (cf. the rule of Chrestodoulus of Alexandria, in: Hansens ii, p. 217 that mentions still the ancient practice). But afterwards it was mainly done by ordained people. The evidence collected by Prof. Hansens is mainly concerned with this (the Ethiopians baked it in a special house near a church, the Bethlehem; cf. Hansens ii, p. 210-211, and this seems also to be found elsewhere; at least Mgr. Rahmani states: L.O.O., p. 69: "On en voit encore de nos jours dans quelque églises syriennes [probably Jacobite] des villages et dans les églises du vieux Caire'"). One of the points of reproach to the Jacobites who do not seem to have followed this strict practice was: "Ihre Abendmahls-
elemente werden auf den Markt gekauft, von Weibern geknetet, von Ungläubigen gebacken" (Elias Nisib., Beussis, S. 99; the elements must be distinguished from the ingredients, for from Q. 55 it appears that also the Nestorians bought them in the market place; the prohibition that women should knead it is also found among the Copts, Hanssens, ii, p. 214, on the other hand it seems to have been a peculiarity of the Nestorians, cf. the invective of a Greek author against the Armenians, Hanssens, ii, p. 216, for the Greeks themselves allowed it as well). To praise the Eucharist of the Nestorians themselves the same author says (s.a.O., S. 102): "Niemand handhabe bei uns irgend etwas beim Abendmahl, als der Priester und der Diacon, dem das Lesen des Gebets, das Kneten des Brots und dessen Verfertigung zukommt." No directions about it besides those of Addai 28 and John Tell. are found in Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon; so the way to make the Elements was free and therefore such events could happen.

We have reviewed the material because it explains why it is practically out of the question that we can find parallels to the subsequent questions. They seem to be impossible in any other church but the Nestorian, at least as far as we can see from the present state of our knowledge. What is mentioned by Prof. Hanssens under the "Usus praesens" is of too late a date to give any historical explanation and insight. It is well known, and does not need further comment that the Nestorians as well as the other Eastern Churches except the Armenians used the Euch. bread with leaven (cf. Hanssens ii, p. 123-141).

Q. 52. About the "Horae" mentioned here see ad Q. 105. It is not clear from the Canonii etc. when the bread must be baked. It seemed that it was allowed to do so in the morning (Quaest. Eccl. 28, see p. 245). As to the leaven it is distinguished in: "Ordinary" and "Holy". These words are not used as in most cases where the former means something unconsecrated and the latter something consecrated (see e.g. for the altar Timothy ii, in: Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 49b; and at the end of this answer about the dough). In Q. 58 we also see that two kinds of leaven are distinguished: one to sign with and an other that must be kneaded into the dough (is this an invention of the time after the Canonii as it is not mentioned there in iv [that seems to be the opinion of Hanssens ii, p. 171] or does this Canon only sum up the ingredients?). The "Holy Leaven", also called Malkha, is a terminus technicus, cf. T., p. 106: [אַשְׁרָא לַחְמָnea] and see p. 105, 114, 118. The Supplement to the Thesaurus Syr., s.n., says: "holy leaven", made "with the leaven (אַשְׁרָא לַחְמָnea) kept from the last baking and with this holy leaven handed down from age to age and renewed yearly" (its second meaning is: priests Euch. loaf, p. 245). The Nestorians have a piece of leaven that is renewed once a year with ceremonies of the formulary (mentioned ad Q. 50) on Maundy Thursday. It is said in a prayer and told in the legend that it descended by succession from the Eucharistic bread that was given by the Lord to His disciples of the East and bequeathed to the Persians (prayer: L.E.W., p. 248; the legend: B.O., iii 2, p. ccxxv-ccc; Hanssens ii, p. 171-174; M. Jugie, Thes. Dogmat., v, p. 305-308). The writers who mention this story

(1) Malkha = King, is a typical Nestorian term.
are all of later date, after the 12th century and Badger pleaded (ii, p. 161) for a late date as he had not found this special leaven in any other ritual than in that Formulary that he assigns to the 12th or 13th century, without giving however any reasons for this dating. At any rate we see that this special leaven existed already in the 10th century (though it is possible that the legend did not yet exist). At the same time Elias Nisib. boasted that only the Nestorians had Holy leaven (Beseis, S. 102). On the other hand the Holy leaven of the Qṣatha of Canon xii (see p. 245) does not refer to it; this appears from the apposition; it is the leaven called in our Q. "ordinary" viz. that of the Eucharistic bread of the foregoing mass that was left and mixed with the dough (to indicate the continuity of the several Eucharists), cf. L.E.W., p. 247, n. a.

This Holy leaven blesses the dough in the Preparation by signing (L.E.W., p. 248). It is impossible to conclude with any certainty from the data what was its origin and at what time it was first used. It must remain undecided if there is really a connection as Prof. Baumstark (L.G., S. 310 Ak. 9) and after him Prof. Harsens (ii, p. 170) supposed, between this leaven and the old-roman rite of the preservation of the sancta from one papal mass to the other. We think it possible to point to another parallel viz. that the Greeks have a holy Reserve of a piece of bread that is consecrated on Maundy Thursday (cf. ad Q. 15). It was known already in the time of James Edes. who rejected it (Canon 7 and cf. commentary of Kayser).

According to the Formulary the priest mixes while reciting Ps. 93–90 and he kneads it with the (ordinary) leaven; next he makes a mark in the middle and on the four sides and covers it carefully "until the time of preparing" (Mixing and baking are two separate acts). If this has been done he takes a piece of dough Mcaphrana, then a piece for the leaven (of the next day); and from the middle the "royal Purshana". After that the priest recites Ps. 145: 1–7a and takes a piece Malkha = Holy Leaven and blesses the dough by signing it with the Malkha. After that he signs the Qṣatha; the Malkha is returned to its place on the altar and the priest goes on with kneading and baking.

Those who are spoken of in the Q. did this accurately, but with one dough. It was forbidden in Can. xi "to give a Purshana of what has been mixed with the Holy Leaven of the Qṣatha to a pagan or to a Magian (priest of the Persian religion) or a priest of any other religious body, not even to a christian boy". They trespassed against this rule by giving bread that had something holy in it, because it had been in contact with something that was destined for the Eucharist, while they themselves admitted that there was a danger of defiling (about fasting before Communion, cf. ad Q. 82; crumbs were always dealt with carefully, cf. ad Q. 78; that children could be somewhat negligent is also said in Can. vii; "pagana" see ad Q. 42). The "stamp" ḫaḏ is not a terminus technicus as among the Jacobites for: Euch. Bread (L.E.W., p. 71 l. 8, cf. p. 571).

Our teacher specifies some points for it was not clear from the formulary, at what time of the day the dough should be made; it was, as has been shown here, at night. "Crying of the cock" is also found among the indications of the

---

(1) The opinion of M. Jusis, Theol. Dogm., v, p. 305, n. 3 is: "ad hanc traditionem jam alludit Ioannes v bar Abgar" - but this rests upon a wrong interpretation of Can. xi (quoted in the text); and John does not say a word about nor alludes to the apocryphal story.
“Horae” in ‘Abelsho’, Nomoamon, v3 (Mai, p. 248), see also: Can. Hipp. 29 (Riedel, S. 219). From the Gospels it is well known as the Roman name for the third vigil, 12-3, see: D.A.C.L., s.v., Gallicium, t. vi, col. 593-596. Instead of this they did it in the evening, went to sleep instead of serving the whole night (this was prescribed by Isha‘barnun, ad Macarium, Q. 67: “Is it lawful that a priest or deacon who did not serve in the night-service, should go to the apse to serve his order and to consecrate the Qudasha, or not? Solution: It is not lawful that he should do so. But he is allowed to receive the Qudasha”; and Can. xxvii repeats it and says that the priests must serve in the evening, night and early morning. Or is it a counterpart of the service of Can. xxii ad Q. 16, because this bread was already “holy”, cf. p. 190.) Sufficient proof of their laziness! If they want to give something to children or pagans they may do so if they make dough in the evening and mark it; but at the aforesaid time they must prepare the real Euch. dough with the leaven; and bake them together.

Q. 53-55. Among the ingredients is mentioned olive-oil, p. 244. Canon xii ordered that pure olive-oil should be burnt in the lamps of the altar, and if “there is no olive-oil available, they must take pure oil for the lamp in its stead (in passing I note that Dionysius B. Salibi objects to the Armenians, that they use Sesam-oil for the chrism instead of the Biblical olive-oil, W.S. iv, p. 37-38, 57); olive-oil for the lamps: Ex. xxviii. 20. But the Quattuor may not be prepared with other oil under any circumstance” (the oil of Anointing at Baptism should also be olive-oil, cf. Dietrich, Taufrit. S. 31, A. 1). The liberty granted here seems to have allowed the practice of distinguishing the oil of the lamps and the olive-oil. The latter was not only biblical, but also more refined and pure, while the former might be of somewhat inferior quality. Only at the second act when the leaven (of the previous day) had already been mixed, the mistake was observed. Everything had to be done again otherwise it would be wrong from the very beginning. About Purshana and double leaven cf. ad Q. 52. In Q. 54 a similar case with a similar solution; he notices it from the smell. Q. 55: the “purity” of the oil does not depend on the fact that there is dust in it, but that it is unmixed and is not what it is called. Of course this case stands upon the same line with bringing bad wine upon the altar, cf. ad Q. 46 (in this connection cf. Villecourt, Observances, p. 249, where it is prescribed that the sacristan must smell to see if the wine has not undergone an “alteration”). This Q. is very important for the meaning of injury.

Q. 56. The dough must be broken to pieces, see p. 247; about the falling on the ground see ad Q. 40. The signing mentioned here is the one that is made with the holy leaven. It was baked in any case. The writer does not say that it must be given as a Purshana, but this was probably the case. From this and the preceding questions it is clear that according to our author the priests should take care during the baking etc. that everything was done according to the precepts. It seems that this was of the same importance as the later parts of the liturgy though they are generally neglected. A mistake here spoils everything.

Q. 57. It is not said what use was made of the water. Possibly it was used
lest the bread should stick to the hands of the priests and so get a wrong shape. At any rate this was not ordained in one of the Canons and therefore it was wrong to use it, since it had nothing to do with the holy act. The olive-oil is not the oil used in the mixture, but that used for the special loaf of the priest (T., p. 105, l. 12; L.E.W., p. 247, l. 20). That it must be made in or with the form of a cross is not definitely stated in the formulary (ἐκ = to paint, to model, to adorn). The form of the bread is not given officially in the Canons. Prof. Brightman says that it is “a round leavened cake, 2 × ½ in., stamped with a cross-crosset and four small crosses” (L.E.W., p. 571–572; the forms in the other churches, cf. also: L.O.O., p. 68 and figure at the end of that book). The oven should be somewhere in or near the church, see the Q. Ecl. 28 of John B. Abgare, p. 245, as in the other churches, (it is not mentioned in the Expar, therefore not indicated in Dom. Conolly’s sketch i, p. 196). It is not indicated in any regulation where it should be. In any case, it stood in a place where every one could enter (see Q. 86). The formulary of baking provides a little consecration for every time the oven is used (L.E.W., p. 248), so it should not be used for anything else (John b. Abgare: “nihil alium in illum immisum fuerit”; after the baking it was desecrated. Brightman came to the conclusion from the use of Ps. xlv 2, that it had the usual form of an eastern oven: “a clay-lined cavety in the floor” (L.E.W., p. 584; cf. the various forms of ovens in the East in: P. Vole, Biblische Altertümer i, Stuttgart, 1925, S. 317–318. See ad Q. 85).

Q. 58. Originally (up till the 6th cent.) the laymen were allowed to bring personally the offerings to the altar; after having done this they should retire to the nave (cf. D.C.A., s.v. Leiti). We observe a growing tendency of excluding laymen from the service. Among the Nestorians the preparation was, as we saw, exclusively the work of priests and deacons and no laymen should touch it, and certainly not after that it had been signed by the holy leaven and addressed as “King of Kings” (L.E.W., p. 248). If only one piece was touched all the dough was desecrated. In such a case one should begin anew from the very beginning, with a part of leaven from another church (see Q. 84).

Q. 59–60. Water has the same desecrating effect as a layman (cf. also Q. 57). This Q. is referred to in ii 19: the author gives a “proof” that his answer in ii 17 (see ad Q. 15) is the right one, and says: “When they offer a chalice on the altar and its contents are shed over the altar do you not know that the altar is injured from that mixture? (= Q. 11) Again if a drop of water falls on one of the Prishta’s in the basket before some particle of it has been consecrated, the whole of the Euch. Br. is desecrated,” etc. The Nestorians are stricter in this respect than the Jacobites, cf. James Edeas, ap. Bar Hebraeus, Nomocanon, iv 1: the Body of the Lord is not injured if touched upon with water. Among the Copts on the other hand it was ordered that after the sacristan had brought the bread on the altar, “il essuie (lave) chaque (pain d’) offrande de face et de dos” (Villecourt, Observances, p. 245). It is strange that suddenly a biblical text is used as an argument (but only in M.!). It is: 1 Cor. xii 26a; the quotation is not quite according to the Pshita (The N.T. in Syriac, ed. British & Foreign Bible Society, London, 1905–1920), but the variations are practically of no importance.
Q. 61. "Falling", see ad Q. 41. It happens during the transfer of the bread to the altar. After the preceding Q. Q. it is clear that it should not be used. It is not said what should be done with it; probably used for distribution.

Q. 62–63. About the girdle see ad Q. 23 and the sandals ad Q. 39. Ad Q. 52 we quoted already the Canon of John b. Abgar (Arabic, Assemani v) to the effect that nobody could prepare the bread unless he had them on. In Q. 23 and 39 we saw that no priest could do the service of the altar without them. It appears here once more that this preparation was considered as a close parallel to the Eucharist proper. The same is true as regards of the theft of a particle. For the rubric (T., p. 119) ordered to consecrate the altar with oil: "if an altar-cloth is stolen, or a Bukhra or vessels". In that case the bread was not complete any longer as it ought to be; no more was the Qrtatha (Q. 60), and unconsecrated things defile that what has been consecrated, viz. the altar.

Q. 64. The same point in a somewhat different wording is treated in Q. 81. I cannot guess why it is dealt with twice, because there is no reference in the latter Q. (there is no indication whatever that this book should have been compiled from two sources). About the services of Morning and Mysteries it will be dealt ad Q. 105 (mysteries do not mean here "Eucharist" or "Sacrament", but the service at the third hour on Sunday-morning). It is quite clear from both questions what should be done. It is in accordance with: Canon xiii: "... any one who is in charge of the service of the altar, after having brought the Qrtatha to the altar, must before one Purshan of the Bukhra's or Prisha's is distributed single out from what remains and carefully preserve it. If he is forced to consecrate at the end of the day, he must consecrate from what he has singled out, a token to supply his need." The bread was only baked once a day (the time see ad Q. 52). If it was distributed without these precautions it was possible that nothing of it should be left (the lowest limit was two, Q. 67). The different words for the bread see p. 194. Purshan's for children ad Q. 52.

Q. 65–67. These three Q. Q. were quoted by Assemani (B.O., iii 1, p. 243, and after him by Hansens ii, p. 199–200) ad Canon xvi. It says that: "there should not be consecrated on the altar less than three Bukhra's; if there are very few people only two: one with which the priest must make the sign of the cross and an other to be signed. But it is not allowed to consecrate one Bukhra". The rubric (T., p. 5, l. 13 = L.E.W., p. 262) only said that the priest must place them "according to his discretion". Probably to give a more definite number in stead of this vague indication, the Canon was given by the Patriarch John. Yet our questions do not quite agree with it, though the difference is only very slight, since Q. 67 admits two only in cases when there are hardly any communicants. In other cases they keep the number three. Undoubtedly this number was suggested by the thought of the Trinity. This is shown by the parallels that are found in the other Eastern churches, printed together by Hansens ii, p. 182–200. Very interesting and instructive for a comparative study of the liturgy is the similar practice adduced from the Russian church by Hansens ii, p. 193, which also denotes that it is unlawful to celebrate the
Eucharist with one loaf only. For it is rather unconceivable that here the influence of the Nestorians was felt. Neither do they both go back to a regulation of the ancient church. For in reviewing the various Canons given by Hanssens, we see that there existed a difference as to the number of the loaves. Generally it was an odd number (among the Greeks 5 or 7; the Jacobites generally 3, cf. L.O.D., p. 277, n. 1 [Basilius, Can. 99: "in case there are few communicants only one!"])). It is not out of place here to draw attention to the remark of the traditional canonist Bar Hebraeus, Nonoecanon, iv 1, to the effect that there was no apostolic Canon about this matter. In mentioning the number 3 the Trinity is generally referred to. Why was this asked as the answer could be found in the Canons? Again we must answer by pointing to the lax disciple of the time. In the rubric: L.E.W., p. 291 is mentioned the signing with half a Bukhra.

In reference to what has been quoted before, this sounds somewhat strange, as it seems to suppose that there was only one Bukhra on the altar. I do not know how this contradiction should be solved unless by assuming once more that this rubric is of a later date.

Q. 68-69. Deal with the question that was left unanswered by Can. xvi. "Insult" see p. 192-193. The question must be seen in connection with the previous ones: Two is the minimum because of the signing. This cannot take place with one Bukhra; if it should be done with one it would be a deviation from the formula. Then it speaks about the punishment of the priest (see also Q. 38). The way in which the priest should be corrected etc. is not often mentioned, nor is the kind of his punishment. The nature of his penance is dependent on the degree of the mistake, viz. whether it is of great importance or not, and whether it was done on purpose, and whether it is a recidivism. Isho'Barnun (ad Isaa, Q. 1) says that one should not leave the bread during the night upon the altar; those neglectful people who do so, must be punished by the ecclesiastical dignitary, but he must "make use of the usual long-animitiy of Christ, His prototype, and order that those who dare leave it, should stand in sackcloth and ashes while fasting and reciting prayers of penitence during as many days as the number of the days in which they have left it." The canons say in several places that one who trespasses against the Canon given "according to the word of the Lord" should be deprived of his office (xx, xx, adding: he is a stranger to the Holy Sacrament and is anathematised by the Holy Spirit; xxi, xxv which adds "and becomes a layman, because he has profaned the divine Sacrament"). Here we find some very grave penalties (lay-communion is one of the most severe punishments; "they [the priests] were reduced to the condition of laymen, deprived of office, and forbidden to exercise their clerical functions"; it is not specially connected with the Eucharist, cf. D.C.A., s.v.; about "anathema" cf. ad Q. 7; the same climax, first an admonition and after repeating the mistake a penalty by the bishop is found in: Resolutio xxvi of the Letter to the Eastern Jacobites, in: I. E. Rahmani, Vetusta Documenta Liturgica, p. 11-12 [text]). Very instructive is the case in ii 30-32 as it exhibits the various degrees. They speak about ordering by the priest alone without anybody else being present. The answer is given according to Canon xxii and the questioner Q. 30 goes on saying: "But if a priest by mistake thinks that it is entrusted to him as is the custom of the rulers, and received it for himself and
takes the cup, in what respect is the altar injured? Solution: The altar must be signed, and the priest must be rebuked for his insolence, if it has happened without his knowledge. Question: But if he has done this wilfully without any outward reason, what must be done with the altar and in what respect must the priest be corrected? Answer: The altar must be consecrated with oil and the priest must be suspended for two weeks. If mercy is shown to him, he must stand in sackcloth and ashes and confess his stupidity before (the eye of) everybody, lest he should do again something like this. Question: But if there is evidence against him that he has done it once or twice, what must be his punishment? Answer: He must be dismissed from his rank for one year, and after that he must stand in sackcloth and ashes. Next he must do the service of his rank, but the service of the altar shall never more be entrusted to him, because of his insolence against the Sacraments” (italics are mine). All these measures correspond exactly with the rules of the ancient church about the punishment of the church. The best summary of it will be found in: Bingham, xvi to which we may refer; for the Persian Church cf. J. Labourt, Christianisme, p. 340, 343–346. It seems as though the Eastern church did not go beyond the development of these rules of the 4th and 5th century (sackcloth and ashes are the ancient symbols of deep mourning known already in the O.T., cf. P. Volz, Altertümer, S. 325; for the Christian use see D.C.A. s.v. Sackcloth, and: F. Cabrol, D.A.C.L., s.v. Ceniter, t. ii, col. 3037–3040). The teaching of the different oriental churches about these points seems to have been the same, see e.g. J. Pargot, L’Eglise Byzantine, Paris, 1923, p. 394–395; “les clercs faits, à qui leur repentir vaut d’être réintegrés dans leurs emplois, n’en méritent pas toujours pour cela d’être réadmis à l’autel”; John Tell, Can. 6 (Lamy, p. 66): if the mistake in mixing the wine (ad Q. 13) is made from negligence, “he must receive the canonical punishment” which is not defined; and Basilius, Can. 99 (Riedel, S. 277: “Wenn einer die Bestimmung betrügt und, was unerlaubt ist, so soll er seiner Würde für immer entkleidet und ihm niemals etwas überlassen werden, worin er seinen Scherz treibt.”) This is not surprising since all these churches maintained the tradition of the ancient church.

Q. 70–71. The decision reproduces the precept of Can. vi: “... there may not be any defect in what is singled out from the Qrsatha for the sacrament. It was not allowed under the old Convenant to offer anything which was crippled, blind, weak or in which a defect was found; how much more caution must be taken with regard to the divine sacraments.” This is a reference to Deut. xv 21, cf. Lev. xxii 20, Deut. xvii 1. The same is found in: Athanasius, Can. 64, ed. Riedel-Crum, p. 42: “An offering that remaineth over from yesterday they shall not offer, neither that which hath been divided in pieces in any church, but bread warm, fresh and whole.” Basilius, Can. 98 (Riedel, S. 275): The deacon must take care that the bread should not be burned or that a “Fehler daran ist, damit sie keine Sünde begehen”. A somewhat different answer was given by the Coptic Bishop Michael in his; Response Ecclesiasticae 31 (quoted in: L.O.C., i, p. 177); Q.: “Panis Eucharisticus fissus est aut ruptus: potestne offeri ex eo? R.: Eligendus est melior et integer: tamen ob earum rerum defectum quae ad melius conducent, non est alatimundum ab Eucharistia celebranda.” This is in contra-distinction with the wine; for he says
that if anything of this liquid is failing, it is not wine any more, while the nature of bread remains the same. In the Scriptures bread and wine have been prescribed, but nothing was said about their condition. The same judgment is given by other Coptic canons, and among the Syriac Jacobites by Dionysius B. Salibi who allows a defect Euch. bread in urgent cases, as is stated in L.O.C., I, p. 177. The decisive point is thus the nature of the element. It is remarkable that we notice that the O.T. has influenced the Nestorian Canon. On the other hand the result was practically the same, for it becomes clear in Q. 71 that it was not a mistake such as would make the liturgy impossible. It is exclusively a matter that concerns the sacristan.

Q. 72–75. Something must be said here on the mixing of the chalice. Among the foregoing Q.Q. 10 and 46 sqq. gave an opportunity to say something about it. It goes without saying that Hansens ii, p. 217–271 has collected most of the material that would be necessary for a comparative study. Apart from some obscure sects that are always mentioned in this connection (the Aquarians, cf. D.C.A., S.V. Elements, i, p. 604–605; P. Battifol, D.A.C.L., S.V. Aquarians, t. I, col. 2648–2654.) Dionysius B. Salibi says, W.S. iv, p. 30: "when he [John Chrysost.] noticed that the Manicheans, the dirty Messalians, and Severus the heretic were offering the Eucharistic sacrifice with water only etc."; in: M.S.G. 58, col. 740, Chrysostomus speaks of Marcion, Valentinus and Mani; about Severus cf. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv, 29, 4–5, ed. Schwarz, i, S. 390, and: Epiphanius, Haer. 45, ed. Holl, ii, p. 199–202) the whole church always used in the chalice a mixture of wine and water. The only important exception are the Armenians who poured in wine only. They were severely attacked for this practice by the Greeks at the Council of Trullo (692) and otherwise in controversial writings and by the Jacobites who had close relations with them (particulars in: Hansens ii, p. 265–271; at p. 268–269, the "adversus Armenos" of Dionysius, W.S. iv, must be added). At the mixing (L.E.W., p. 251–252) the priest took wine and water and poured it crosswise into the chalice reciting texts that had some connection with it, ending with John xix 34–35 which always forms the keystone. In II 26–27 some more questions are put on this point: "When the sacristan mixes the chalice, what must he pour in first, water or wine? Answer: First they must pour in the wine and next the water, for about the water it is said: From His side came wine and water (John xix 35). Question: When they have consecrated the Euch. bread and wine and there is not enough mixture in the chalice, what must they do? Solution: They must mix another chalice, sign it with the consecrated one, place it on the altar and distribute it to the believers" (H. W. Codrington, in: J.Th.St., 1904, p. 544–545, published a formulary of "the Signing upon the Chalice on a day of want, before it goes up to the altar" from 2 MSS., see ad Q. 16. It is a clear proof that the communion was not given sub una; only in the communion it became apparent that the wine became deficient.

This series of questions is to a certain extent a complement to Q. 10. The situation is the same though the motive is different. There it was already stated that the altar becomes desecrated by it, as is the case here. There it was asked

(1) Athanasian, Cav. 9, ed. Riedel-Craum, p. 21 referred to Prov. ii 5.
what was the effect on the Paghra. Here it is discussed how this matter can
be solved. That the chalice is desecrated is obvious for it has been treated in
the wrong way and is not fit for ordinary use. Signing is necessary. “As we
have shown above” refers probably to Q. 15 (see in loco).

In Q. 71 it has got something of the consecration, consequently it must be
distributed as an Eulogia. Consecration on the next day see p. 203, n. 12.

The elements are treated in the same way Q. 75; none ranks prior to the
other.

Q. 76. The counterpart of what was quoted from ii 27 ad Q. 72. The case
occurs while the number of the people present changed (Q. 49). “Anthem of
the Mysteries” after the Offertory (L.E.W., p. 268–269). The elements when
lying upon the altar are covered with a veil. It was lifted up at the beginning
of the Anaphora proper (L.E.W., p. 282); almost immediately it was followed
by the first blessing (L.E.W., p. 283). For the signing see p. 192, n. 1. Compare
with this Q. the remark of Dionysius b. Salibi, Expositio Liturigica, c. 6 (Labourt,
C.S.C.O., ii 92, p. 24–25: “Si vero adhuc expanditur anaphora (= veil),
et necessarium est additamentum, [illos panes] offerre licet, modo sint ordine
imparis, ut diximus, et numero impari, non vero pari seu equali, nisi tamen
sint duo... Quamdiu expanditur [super vara] anaphora... hostiae convenieant
adduntur; at postquam anaphora amota est, [panes] signatos addere
non decet.”

Q. 77. This is the analogy for the bread of Q. 15, 2, where a mistake con-
cerning the chalice was dealt with. “Time of the Offertory,” (L.E.W., p. 267f;
“time of the Breaking” L.E.W., p. 289. That chalice of Q. 15 could not be
distributed; but this bread could. Otherwise the situation is the same.

Q. 78. Assemani referred to this and the next Q. without quoting them literally
in his Comments upon: Can. x. This Canon reads as follows: “... the minister
of the altar must clean and sweep the sacristy every day on which he has said
the Qudasha. Before giving the Holy Mysteries he is obliged to sweep the whole
sacristy and its walls once a week.” So we find here two ways of cleaning.
In our Q. the first one is spoken of, as in Q. 176 (the Jacobites allowed this
to be done by a deaconess, James Edess., Can. xxiv. The second manner of
sweeping e.g. in the Arabic Nonomos, fol. 81a (cf. ad Q. 21). But this Canon
does not say what must be done with the dust that was swept together. There-
fore this question. For as appears from the text it was not the dust itself that
caused the Q., but the crumbs in it. The same rule applied to these remnants
of the Euch. bread as well as to the more voluminous quantities (cf. ad Q.
16). In breaking the bread some crumbs would naturally fall on the paten
and on the altar itself. These should be carefully collected into the chalice
(Q. 17 and 43) and in this way be taken by the sacristan during the ablutions,
(cf. ii 14 about crumbs that are found together as debris of a Bukhra in the
altarplace). The same is found in ii 15 and 16: “I have seen a sacristan of a
church who while he was cleaning the altar, found many crumbs underneath the
altarvestments. He went to the priest of that church and asked him: What must
I do with them? The priest answered: Gather them and throw them into the oven
to be burnt. This act is altogether wrong I think. What is your opinion about it? 

Answer: Oh, this is a great insolence: to burn the ‘Body’ of our Lord with fire. This is not right.” We observe that in any case it was allowed by some people who probably did not consider it to be the body of the Lord. We can illustrate it by an historical witness, though from another part of the church, viz. the well-known place from Hesychius of Jerusalem, in Lev. ii, in: M.S.G., 93, col. 886d, also in: L.E.W., p. 487 and elsewhere, although he dealt with everything that remained: “sed hoc quod reliquum est de carnisibus et panibus in igne incendi praecipet (Lev. xiii 32, cf. also Ex. xii, 10 about the remains of the Paschal Lamb). Quod nunc videmus etiam sensibiliter in ecclesia fieri ignique tradi quaecumque remanere contigerit inconsuema, non omnino ea quae una die vel duabus aut multis servata sunt; sicut enim apparat non hoc legislator praecipet sed quod reliquum est incendi jubet.” This shows that such a practice based upon the O.T., existed, but it was severely condemned by our writer. He prescribes what should be done in 16: “He must gather them in one of the consecrated chalices and pour water on them and desecrate them. After receiving the sacraments, the sancti must after the ablation of the chalice take them in the sacristy.” This agrees perfectly with the precept of John Tell, to the deacon, commanding him to be on his guard that any crumb should remain on the altar or on the vessels after the service and to drink them together with the chalice (text in: L.O.O., p. 507, n. 2-3).

In contrast with this our question is concerned with the crumbs that have fallen round the altar in the dust and can not be distinguished any more. Since it seems as though the Canonist was somewhat afraid of applying the same rules to this case which might have some bad influence upon the health of those who take them he indicates two ways of removing them viz. either throw them into running water or buy them in the uncultivated soil. Both these forms are also found together in ii 11 to remove mixture that has been defiled by insects (besides those mentioned before it offers the possibilities of throwing it into a fountain or sprinkling it on the walls of the church); and in iii 34 about the reservation of Pughrax: it may be done according to Can. xxi 11 “or they must bury it in uncultivated and untroubled ground and conceal it there, or it must be thrown into the Tigris viz. that it may lose its consecration and may be defiled by the water and the fishes may eat it.” The last sentence reveals unmistakably what was the meaning of this act. The same rules were applied to the water of Baptism, cf. G. Dietrich, Tanitliturgie, 5. 103: T., p. 75 orders that the water should be shed in a pure, untroubled place; MS., l. 11 adds: “or he the priest must give it to the faithful as a blessing or it must be thrown into a river”.

Both manners are also found among the Jacobites: John Tell, dictates that the water in which the holy vessels had been washed should be thrown into

a deep hole in an honourable place, and the same must be done with the fragments of the holy vessels (Lamy, p. 64, Can. 3, cf. 2). This is slightly different, but James Edess. forbids to throw the dust of the sanctuary into a fountain, because one risks that animals shall drink from it; if no risk is run it is allowed to do so; but it should be buried in a pure place in a field (Can. xv). To explain this word "pure" Kayser, S. 101 refers to places such as Lev. xviii 28, Num. xxix 9, Deut. xxii 23, Ez. xliii 7-9, viz. a place that is not polluted by idol-worship, cadavers etc. Among the Copts it was prescribed to throw it into a swollen river (Hippolytus, Can. 29, Riedel, S. 219, and; Basilius, Can. 96, Riedel, S. 272). This change probably depended on the geographical conditions. The Tigris is mentioned specially (in V. even alone) because it was the most important river in the Nestorian country, flowing along the place where our author was teaching (p. 83).

We are unable to enter into the interesting "religionsgeschichtliche" parallels that show that these points are not specially Christian. It suffices to state that the uncultivated soil was "virgin" and if it was trodden upon it was defiled cf. Kayser, S. 91, and: Deut. xxii 4. Running water is generally a purifying element; but here it serves to take away the "holiness" before it is touched by the unholy, p. 190 (cf. G. v. d. Leew, *Phaenomenologie der Religion*, Tübingen, 1933, S. 320ff.-D.A.C.L., s.v. Eau and Fleuve does not contain anything of importance for our Q.).

Q. 79. "Prayer of the Incense": *L.E.W.*, p. 282. "Ark of the Lord" is not a usual name for the altar in the Nestorian church. Neither is it a common expression in other churches except the Aethiopian, though here they do not speak of Aron, but of Tabot. For the rest of the question cf. ad Q. 78. In the Coptic church the following was ordered: "Il y en avait (viz. of the incense) de reste, qu'il soit brûlé entièrement et sa cendre conservée et jetée dans le fleuve" (Villecourt, *Observances*, p. 260). This "fleuve" is undoubtedly the Nile, as is conclusively shown by the parallels of the foregoing question, and not "la piscine, la ṣāḥiṣṣ ṣaṣṣ" as it was explained by M. Villecourt (*L.L., n. 1*), an equalization that is not clear without any further comment.

Q. 80. The Teshbihā or Hymn: "Oh our Lord Jesus," : *L.E.W.*, p. 299 n. a (is only said on Sundays) during the communion, instead of: "strengthen oh our Lord." It seems as though *Expos.* ii, p. 80 knows a practice that uses them together. It was followed by Thanksgivings and Dismissal. After that the Purshana's were distributed; therefore in this case this distribution was made in the wrong place, too soon. The deacons were allowed to distribute (of course not the Euch. bread!) as is also stated in the rubric: *L.E.W.*, p. 304. The "last Lord's Prayer" (cf. ad Q. 105 sqq.) is found: *L.E.W.*, p. 303. The sequence of events is not quite clear in the short rubrics of T.; a somewhat clearer picture is shown by the *Expos.* ii, p. 70-80, which gives an extensive explanation of all the facts that took place at communion. For our purpose it is sufficient to know that the deacons communicated at the altar (p. 71). About ᵐᵉˡᵉ another verb, denoting a modification, see: Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, S. 264. The fact of "kissing the altar and the priests" is not found elsewhere. *L.E.W.*, p. 302, states that "the priests are giving the kiss of peace to each other"; but *Expos.*
ii, p. 82 has a somewhat different remark, viz.: “Dioecus pacem secreto instituit; et qui in abside sunt pacem invicem secreto dant.” Yet it is known that kissing is a common form of adoration which is not always laid down in the formulaires (cf. Q., 24). In the answer several points should be distinguished. 1) The lamp in the middle of the altar is again the limit, cf. ad Q., 27. That the Purshana’s may not pass this mark is clear since they are not consecrated nor destined to be so. Therefore the mistake was not only that they were given at the wrong moment, but also, and this is the main point, that they were taken to the wrong place. The inaccuracy of the reading of M. is shown e.g. by L.E.W., p. 290 l. 2 where a Buchra on the altar is mentioned. “After” opp. to “during”; it does not include that it took place before the Dismissal. The rubric L.E.W., p. 304 says that: “The people kiss the cross in the priest’s hands and the Eulogia which was baked along with the buchri, is distributed by one of the priests or deacons standing at the nave entrance of the baptistry” (this seems also to be meant in our answer. This is the ordinary course). 2) If this is not followed exactly, as in our Q., because the P. is given too soon, he must act as is said in the clause: “In case... go out”; consequently not making them pass the limit. (3) About the “singling out” of the Qëñatha, this belongs to the preparation. It is possible that it was added because of the “Stichtwort” ḫ-m. It may account for the origin of the word Purshana: the part that was separated for distribution. Cano xiii, quoted ad Q., 64, is followed in our Q. The Canons know the “lamp” (xxvii); therefore it is clear that ḫ-m is not: “to offer on the altar” but “to take into the altarplace.” See also ad Q., 10.

Q. 81. This Q. agrees perfectly with Q. 64 (see in loco).

Q. 82–84. For the ingredients of the dough cf. ad Q., 53. Salt is prescribed in either of the Syriac churches as well as among the Greeks and Armenians (D.C.A., s.v. Salt); but not by the Copts (L.O.C., i, p. 174). What takes place does not need any comment. “Jewish” must be taken here metaphorically, as: “scandalous, impious.” We can compare an exclamation of Chrysostomus that those who take the treasury of the souls of men and (at the same time) gave alms from their murders to the church, gave Jewish, indeed diabolical alms (Hom. 85 in Mt., in: M.S.G., 58, col. 761). For I cannot guess what the author is hinting at if it should be taken literally. Leave, see ad Q., 52; this was left from the previous day and was holy, because it had been consecrated then. The Eucharist must be received fasting; this is a Canon definitely adopted in the church since the 4th cent. and strongly maintained since that date (D.C.A., s.v. Communion, p. 417–418; D.A.C.L., s.v. Jeïnes, t. vii, col. 2436; for the Syriac church see: P. de Lagarde, Reliquiae juris ecclesiastici antiquissimae, syriaci, Lipsiae, 1856, p. 18). L.O.C., i, p. 266–267 collected the material from the Jacobites, (cf. John Tell, Can, 17, Lamy p. 74; Bar Hebraeus, Namecanon, iv 2 and: Lamy, p. 182–184). Nevertheless it was one of the objections of Elias Nisib, against them that they communicated without fasting (Beweis, S. 99; he probably generalizes from one or two instances. The same objection could be made against the Nest. according to our Q.Q. Elias is a polemist!) Cf. ad Q., 27. In Q., 52 we saw that the children were allowed to receive the Eulogia only
a. o. because they use it sometimes after other food. In the main the Jac. and Nest. laws agreed on this point, though they varied in particulars. E.g. John Tell, Can. 9 (Lamy, p. 70) answered a question: "whether anybody who had drunk anything before sunrise was allowed to communicate on that day?" with: that he might do so, if he only fasted the rest of the day without having any doubt. The Nestorians did not allow it to a priest: cf. ii 2: "If a deacon or a monk or a priest drinks water, while it is still dark and makes a mistake and tastes something and by mistake has taken a draught and comes to receive the oblation; and while the oblation is still in his hands, he remembers that he is not fasting, what must he do with the Gemurta?" The answer does not matter here, but we must notice that theGemurta is called "an injured Paghria" (ii 3). Has saliva a specially polluting quality that it is mentioned here? cf. spitting as an expression of strong aversion. It is not remarkable after what we found at the beginning of our treatise that the altar is defiled. Since the heaven is desecrated, another must be fetched from another church as in Q. 56.b. It is well known that the moral qualities of the priests have no influence on the efficacy of the sacrament (for the Nestorians it is clearly expressed in: Narsai, Hist. xvi, p. 21–22: "The Mysteries of the Church are not celebrated without a priest, for the Holy Spirit has not permitted (any other) to celebrate them... These things the Holy Spirit celebrates by the hands of the priest, even though he be altogether in sins and offences"; cf. Badger ii, p. 163–164 with an interesting quotation which is, unfortunately, of uncertain date). But on the other hand it was inculcated upon the priests that their high office implied great obligations to preserve themselves pure, and priests who failed to do so were suspended (some instances from a great array: Isho’yabî, Can. vi, in: O. Braun, Synkento, S. 206–208; John B. Algare, Canon iv, ap. 'Abdîsho', Nomokanon, vi 6, Mai, p. 278; Kayser, S. 120 and N.). But this is not intended here. Our writer only wants to be sure that the Leaven that is brought, is absolutely pure, that no mistakes have been made in preparing it, that the priest has acted as he should do. Ψαλτεσσ triumphally in itself is no moral faculty; it denotes the qualities of its possessor in one field or another. All the qualifications, as in ii 23: "A deacon of the best reputation of our country" are exclusively concerned with the knowledge of liturgical usages (opposite to those priests mentioned in the Introduction). The first sacrificant was unreliable and had to be deposed (for the penalty cf. ad Q. 69). 

Q. 83. Something about the oven is said ad Q. 57. The bread was baked by heating the surrounding stones. The sacrificant raises the heat by adding

(1) There is one exception allowed, viz. immediately after their baptism, according to Johannes bar Algare, Quaest. Ecd. xix (communion was attached to baptism, C. Dietrich, Tegehi, S. 91, and: Kayser, ii, p. 101). Priests serving the altar had to fast till nine o'clock, Joh. B. Algare, Can. sin, ap. 'Abdîsho', Nomokanon, vi 6, Mai, p. 278 (notes of the "Naphturian").

(2) Timotheus Alex., Q. 16 (18th series), in: Pitra, Monumenta, i, p. 634: 'Εκαν να σειστησε τις πτώσεις της πύλης τα αγαθά και τα σπάνια καταγράφει ένα από στοιχείο της ευθυγράμμην ιστορίαν της θρησκείας στην κατοχή της πρώτης περιόδου της Περσίδος της Μινδούλινη από τους παραπάνω συγγερδούς υπάρχει οικείων. — Drinking at the Ablutions was allowed, cf. ad Q. 18.

(3) This fact was used by some priests as a pretext to get free from service, cf. Giuntini i, p. 38: "(presbyteros) vις τεριστήσει, ρηοδάκατοι, ρηον τον εκκλησίαν άκεφολην, ιτό αυτό τίμανα παντοτινών θεουργίαν".
new fuel to prevent the Qsatha of becoming unbaked or defect (Q. 70). It is worse while to quote here some words of the description given by Browne-Maclean, p. 40-41 about the baking of ordinary bread. They are highly in-structive. "On the floor enclosed by this truncated hollow cone of solid clay a fire is made... The fire is swept away, and a broom dipped in water is used to clean the interior of the oven of all dust and smoke. Then the dough cakes are forcibly slapped against the side of the oven to which they adhere until they are baked. Sometimes it is necessary to put the embers back into the oven to bake the bread thoroughly." The questioner thinks probably that there is a possibility of injury, because it was not provided for in the formulary, or that it was not allowed to add something afterwards, (parallel to Q. 76). Dry vineshoots are very common fuel in the East, Ez. xv 4.

Q. 86. The oven is reconsecrated every time when it has been used (L.E.W., p. 246, cf. ad Q. 57); the consecration is removed after the baking, but not as is said here by means of some wheatstraw, but by incense, while these words are recited: "This earthen vessel is hoosed and let it return to its former nature; in the name etc." (L.E.W., p. 251). It is not said what is the purpose of the throwing and kindling of the wood. A statement to explain it has not been found anywhere. Must there always be some glowing coals near, without the priest being obliged to make fire by burning wood?

Q. 87-89. Something has already been said about the meaning of these Q.Q. on p. 111-112, 150-151. Though we observed that the formularies in: L.O.C., T. = L.E.W., and Berol. Syr. 38 vary, especially in the rubrics (p. 60), yet they have all these 3 signings in the same places; respectively: 1) L.E.W., p. 285 = L.O.C., ii, p. 583 = Berol., fol. 88a; 2) L.E.W., p. 285 = L.O.C., ii, p. 584 = Berol., fol. 90a; 3) L.E.W., p. 288 = L.O.C., ii, p. 586 = Berol., fol. 91b. It is difficult to draw conclusions from the formularies underlying the Expositions since they do not comment on every act. "Canon" always means here the end of a prayer said in an audible voice (contrast: Gehanta), see the word in Q. 89, and cf. ad Q. 4. This order of signings applies only to 'Addai', for in the other two occur also 3 signings, but in different places ('Theod.'): 1) T., p. 33; 2) T., p. 36; 3) T., p. 39. 'Nest.': 1) T., p. 41; 2) T., p. 46; 3) T., p. 52). We have here a similar question as in Q. 5. From Q. 89 it becomes clear what is its bearing. One insisted on the making of 3 signings in the whole liturgy. The point of controversy is clearly stated here. The first group is that of our writer and the liturgical practice of the present day. The second one omits the first blessing and counts as the third one that signing that is made during the Consignation (L.E.W., p. 291), while the former considered it as of a different order. This opinion seems in fact to have been the most usual one. For in perusing the explanations of the liturgy we see that none of them mentions the signings, though they quote the prayers at which they are made. Of course it might seem to be possible that these signings were not made in the time of those expositors; but this observation misses the point as we see that it also applies to Timothy ii and we know that they were performed in his time (see below). But the signing of Paghra and Dma in the Consignation is known to all. And they agree in their explanation of it, following Theodore Mops. who explained
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it by the “Union” though their exposition is different (Theodore Mops., W.S. vi, p. 105; Abraham B. Lipheh, Expos. ii, p. 164; Narseti, Connolly p. 23; Expos. ii, p. 61; Timothy ii, Mingana Syr. 13, fol. 189b–190a. This thought of the Union is also found among the Jacobites, cf. Moses B. Cephe (tr. Codrington–Connolly, Two Commentaries, p. 67). From these facts it appears that the one mentioned last was thought to be higher, at any rate different from the other, and deserving a special treatment. “After the Descent of the Spirit that is thought to be completed by this, the priest makes no sign any more over the Mysteries for they have been brought to an end” says Bar Lipheh, an explanation adopted afterwards by Timothy ii. We may also refer to ii 17, quoted ad Q. 15 and to V. ad ii 25 which also makes a difference between signing before and after the Epiclesis. The argument of the Ordination: in the formulary “The Ordering of the Clergy,” translated by Badger ii, p. 322–329, is only found the signing that is also mentioned here viz. that at the Consecration proper; nothing is said about the other three. That arguments were drawn from other formularies appears also in: M. fol. 48b–49a (cf. p. 190). There some people make an analogy between the Ordination and the Consecration of the Church; pointing out that all signings must be executed in the same way. This shows that the Consecration and the manner in which it was performed, was conceived as a unit; and that every consecration of whatever formulary was thought to have the same effect. It was considered unlawful that one should differ from another, cf. Q. 3.

We return to the point under discussion. The Exposition of Timothy ii contains an echo. His information comprised some historical particulars, which are the more interesting since they are so scarce in this book (we translate this part in full, in spite of the fact that the sequence of this question does not belong to the present Q., but to Q. 92). He writes iv 16 (Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 137a f.): “Concerning the signings: For it is right to know that the (number of the) signings that are performed in the Mysteries of Body and Blood, is three. In this way every Mystery is completed (!), because they are performed in the name (MS.: “In the heaven”, sic!) of the Holy Trinity, even though those over the Mystery of Baptism are called nine: the question is that besides those over the Mysteries three others are given to the people and three to the priest (himself); in the same way it happens in Baptism: three over the oil, three over the Baptizand and three over the Font. They are specified on fol. 199a). They are distinguished in this way: first of all the signing of the Mysteries: at the first ‘the Grace of...’, and at: ‘and for all...’, and the last at: ‘...lifting up’. There exists an uncertainty about this signing on the part of some people. For they say that it is not right to sign after the Epiclesis (lit.: descent of the Spirit, see ad Q. 15), as the Mysteries have got a sufficient completion by the Epiclesis. But we practice according to the ruling Law, and a given commandment. This is according to the opinion of the Catholici and Patriarch Mar Abraham and Mar Emanuel (cf. p. 85) But according to the opinion of the Catholici and Patriarch Isho'yab, Sliba Zakha and Isho'Barnun (Isho'yab i 581–596; S.Z. 714–728; I.B. 820–824) the first signing takes place at: ‘and for all...’, the second at: ‘...lifting up...’, the last at: ‘... have been set apart and consecrated...’ (L.E.W., p. 292).—But the signings which are used to-day by the ministers of the church are those of Abraham and Emanuel the Catholici. For they say: ‘The signing of the
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Blood by the Body and of the Body by the Blood is the Mystery of the Unity and the return of the Soul to the Body we depict in the Fraction and the Unity (compare Abraham Bar Lipheh, Expas. ii, p. 164 who has the same explanation); they are performed in the signing with the adorable names of the Trinity. They do not necessarily need signing. The signing over the priest: according to the opinion of the holy doctors (lit.: men) the first takes place at: ‘... and that we may raise...’. They give as an argument for this that every one who draws nigh unto a matter he wishes to complete, first of all beseeches help from God that this matter may be completed by means of him. In the same way the priest who consecrates must first pray for himself and show his wretchedness and weakness, and that he is not worthy. He signs over himself that he may be accounted worthy by the strength of the Cross to complete it. The second signing at the second ‘the grace of...’; the third at: ‘Yea, o our Lord and our God...’ (L.E.W., p. 296). But according to the opinion of others the first at: ‘... and that we may raise...’; the second at: ‘... it is set apart...’, that the priest agrees with it and shows herewith that up till now he has blessed and consecrated the Mysteries, so that they are completed; but that now he needs to be signed himself with the Mysteries; the third at: ‘Yea, o our Lord and our God...’—Those over the people are in the same way three: the first at the first: ‘Peace be with you’; the second at the last: ‘The Grace of...’; the third at the last: ‘Peace be with you’—According to the opinion of others: the first one at the last: ‘The Grace of...’; the second one at: ‘The Gift of his Grace...’; for the third one is at the end of the Mystery: ‘He who has blessed us with all blessings...’ of the Hutaia’s (see ad Q. 109).” After this follow the signings at Baptism that are of no importance for the present moment.

The end of this quotation will be verified with our Q Q., in its proper place. Here it is worth while to observe that our question deals with a point that was of actuality and importance in the time of the writer, since the men who replaced the older practice by a new one, lived some decades before his time and the signings were a part that could not be neglected in the liturgy. That older practice was covered by the name of Isho’yabbi, it is most probable that Timothy refers to the answer of I. i to James of Daraei, Cassan i (in: O. Braun, Synthidas, S. 240–244). It informs us that the manner that was prescribed by our writer and inserted in the liturgy is a later one. For the two points of view of Timothy agree closely with that of our Q.; for the apparent difference of the last signs is not one in the mind of the Nestorians, as it happens during the same act.

Q. 90–91. “Nine signings”: the Nestorian expositors do not say anything about it, but their Jacobite colleagues often speak about it though there are differences as the Jacobites signed every time 3× and separately over chalice and bread etc. while of course the frame work of the liturgy was also different. But at any rate we find that the exposition of James Edess. (in: L.E.W., p. 493), Moses B. Cepha (tr. Connolly p. 70–71) and their plagiarist Dionysius B. Salibi (tr. Labourt, p. 89–90) speak extensively of the number of signings and they always have the string 3·9–18, as characteristic. Cf. ad Q. 3 on “three”.

Q. 92. The quotations are again following ‘Addai’, since ‘Nest.’ and ‘Theod.’
have them in other places. They are found: \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 274 = Berol. fol. 86b (has a very extensive rubric on the making of the sign); \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 293 = Berol. fol. 94b; \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 296 = Berol. fol. 95b. As to the last one we observe that this signing does not occur in T. at this place, but somewhat earlier viz. at: ‘Yea, o our Lord and our God’ on the same page. This agrees with Timothy ii (see ad Q. 87–89). In the meantime this last sign seems to have changed its place. The difference of the second opinion in Timothy ii consists in the second signing; this one is also found in: \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 292.

Q. 93. The reference is to Q. 87–89. The first \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 293, where the rubric has the same remark: ‘And he signs himself lifting his hands a little upwards on either side, because this signing is received on behalf of the people although he makes it on his own person’ (the same in: \textit{L.O.C.}, ii, p. 589), but not in: Berol. fol. 94b that says simply: ‘And he signs himself’). It is not stated in the formularies that the faithful must kneel down at this moment nor that they must kiss the Cross. The latter usage is not found anywhere as a prescript. It is not necessary that it had become a fixed liturgical practice, but it might have been a sign of deep veneration as all other kisses (cf. ad Q. 22). The thought that the mysteries are completed at this moment is found everywhere in the Expositions. 2nd signing \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 298 = Berol. fol. 97b (adding: the priest stands at the door of the apse)–3rd \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 303 = Berol. fol. 97b (the prayer that is also occurring fol. 99a–100b is ascribed to Elias of Nisibis, cf. A. Baumstark, \textit{L.G.}, S. 588 and Ak. 11). In comparing this with the statements of Timothy ii, cited before, we see that this is the second opinion mentioned by him that is also incorporated in the usual formulary. In the manner indicated by Timothy it takes place: \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 296 (or does “the first” mean: in the Missa Fidelium, p. 272–p. 293 = the first one in the other manner)–p. 296. It will be seen that this offers considerable variety. Yet I fail to see what might have been the reason of it, and the sources are silent about this preference of one way to the other.

Q. 94–95. “Bless oh my Lord,” in: \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 298 = \textit{L.O.C.}, ii, p. 590 = Berol. fol. 96a (l. 21; we mention this line because this MS. has the same exclamation on that page l. 11, before: “Let us pray,” \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 298 l.3; see below). Dr. Brightman pointed out concerning the Greek equivalent, that it was addressed to the celebrant by the deacon “often only as a signal for a prayer or blessing”; but that the Nest. thought that it had to be said to God, hence this translation \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 597; the same opinion has been quoted from the English translation of T., London, 1893, by Dietrich, \textit{Taufliturgie}, S. 25, A. 6). As a matter of fact it is found to have been used in this way, cf. e.g. \textit{L.E.W.}, p. 272, 274, 284, 286, 289, \textit{L.O.C.}, and Berol. do not always offer the same text; this shows that it was not an indispensable element, but a free interjection; the Jacobitic opinion is expressed by Moses b. Cepha, tr. Codrington-Connolly, p. 96: “the deacon, by saying \textit{Bless}, my Lord, really asks the priest to bless and pray”). But this case does not occur here and the person addressed to is certainly the priest as is shown by the sequence of the sentence. So it was understood by Timothy ii who appends to it: “And the priest blesses the gift with his blessing etc.” (in: Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 133b). It is also
clear from the statement in Berol. (fol. 96a-b): “at the end of the antiphon the deacon exclaims and says: ‘Bless oh Lord!’ and being asked to bless the people in the Temple the priest leaves the deacon who carries the paten at the word: ‘The gift of...’ in the middle of the altar, goes to the door of the apos and blesses the people.” יַעֲדַת is the small veil that covers the elements;
the same word is found in V. fol. 93a. The word generally found in the liturgy is: יָעֵדָת T. p. 12, 24, Estot., p. ii 38. The fact in itself is not quite clear;
the last time but one that something about the chalice was said, was exactly
the opposite, as found in the rubric: L.E.W., p. 292: “Let him unwrap the
veil which is folded round about the paten and the chalice” (this is missing in:
L.O.C.); a special veil over the chalice is not mentioned, except Canon xxiii,
ad Q. 92: “covering” (of: יָעֵדָת). None of the actions stated here are found anywhere. It seems to be a peculiarity of some deacons. Nothing about it is found in the expositions, although they deal with everything that expresses a “symbol” or “type” (this word can mean, as in the Greek, several things; here, cf. Q. 100 and
Estot. passim, is the prototype that is expressed by the image; “mystery” is taken here in a very broad sense, as often, viz. a liturgical act. This mystagogical explanation seems to be wanted. But in Q. 95 the questioner is not satisfied and repeats his question. The answer however is no explanation of something that is hidden, but states exclusively the reasons of the deacon’s acts. Some difficulties remain. For it is clear that the deacons follow a certain tradition.
But what means: יָעֵדָת and: יָעֵדָת קדְמָה? Should we take the translation adopted in our text or must the latter number of words be taken in the second part of the sentence and mean: when they do not know (one another); that it formed a kind of sign of recognition. Or does the former part mean which they see from one another: and learn by seeing though in that case יָעֵדָת should be expected. The text is found in both MSS. But where does that “one another” come from; nothing has been said about another group. One would expect that Q. 95 would give an explanation for the lifting of the veil. Instead of that it is said that the deacon bows his head to share in the signing over the people (L.E.W., p. 293 and cf. ad Q. 93.) This bowing does not occur in the rubrics and is at all mentioned in the foregoing Q. which has not been answered. The 2 MSS. agree. It seems as though there is no other solution than assuming that the matter was already confused at an early date and that the words Q. and S. have disappeared in Q. 95.

Q. 96. Again something exclusively Nest. About the last signing is spoken in Q. 89; it is the one of the elements (א) L.E.W., p. 290–291 etc. There is also found the prayer “we draw nigh etc.” T. has here the following rubric:
“While naming the Trinity he breaks the Būchra that is in his hands attentively into two halves. And some here sign the P'rista with their thumb at the time of breaking; but do thou beware of such an audacity, for it is not necessary here to sign, but only to break in the name of the Trinity, holding them in both hands” (see about this place
p. 153). This is exactly the mistake that is blamed in our Q. The italicized words fail in: L.O.C. and in: Berol. fol. 95a. The latter has before this rubric the following remarkable addition: “You must know that those signs according to the mind of Mar Elias of Nisibis save us from introducing a quaternity in
the breaking (E. of N., 975–1050, writer of a good many books on various topics in Syriac and Arabic; his liturgical interest is shown by his composition of prayers and hymns; cf. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 287–288, and: G. Graf, *Die christlich-arabischen Literatur*, Strassburg, 1908, S. 59–67. We can infer from this note that he had decided this point; therefore it shows once more that our author dealt with Q.Q. that were being debated then). We can assume that the shorter text is the original one and that the interpolation is made perhaps not under the influence of the present Q., but at any rate on account of the same combated practice, the more so because the audacity in both is the point attacked. Yet it is nowhere told what were their contents; anyhow it is not found in the making of the sign of the cross with the thumb, but in the fact that it should only be broken and not signed. This last act had to follow later. Probably the trespassers did so here because it is mentioned in the prayer. It is once more seen here that deviation from the sequence laid down in the formulary is severely forbidden. Q. 36 revealed already that the state of affairs of the village churches was not as it was desired by the High Church. The *Book of the Governors* of Thomas of Marga, so important from the point of view of the history of Culture, informs its readers over and over again that in rural districts even of Christian countries paganism was still prevalent and this had of course an influence upon Christianity. The people living on the mountains were always rough, uncultivated and retained practices which had been condemned by the leading churchmen; so it is told that at the time of Mari 12th century they still held Agapae which had elsewhere fallen into disuse (Gismondi i, p. 4). This backwardness of these far-off places is not particularly Nestorian, but is also found at other times, even in the great ages of Antiquity, cf. K. Holl, *das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien im nachchristlicher Zeit*, in: *Gez. Aufsätze*, ii, S. 246–248 and: John of Ephesus, *Lifes of Eastern Saints*, ed. Brooks, P.O. xviii, p. 231–233. It should not be overlooked that a rigorous jealousy between the people of the plains and of the mountains existed through all ages (Browne-Maclean, p. 168). We must also remember that the instruction of the clergy was often very bad; a priest that was not well instructed could naturally not give good instruction himself (ch. vi).

Q. 97. Cf. ad Q. 118 sqq.

Q. 98. The ordinary liturgical books do not say where the censer had to stand though both the liturgy and the *Expos.* (index, s.v. Thuribulum) mention the censing in several places (cf. D.A.C., s.v. Censer and Incense; E. Fehrenbach, D.A.C.L., s.v. Encense and Encensoir, t. v, col. 2–21, 21–33.) Neither do other rites give any information. Mgr. Rahmani says only (L.O.O., p. 66) that "l'auteur anonyme de l'Explication de la messe (with the vague reference: "dans le manuscrit de notre bibliothèque") n. 2 about which the notice bibliographique does give any explanation) dit que l'encensoir se place sur l'autel; mais cet usage a disparu depuis longtemps." Yet he does not say where nor how it is done at present. In spite of difference in space and time we must quote
here Can. 106 of Athanasius, ed. Riedel-Grum, p. 68, because it contains an indication: "At all incense-offering) that is offered up in the holy place, morning and evening, especially at the divine anaphora, before the Gospel (lesson), the archdeacon shall take in his hand a censer and fill it with coals and shall stand before the altar over against the Gospel (book) and into it shall be put for him the incense and he shall cause it to rise up until the Gospel is read. Then he shall go with the censer before the Gospel into the inner part of the holy place. It is not that the Lord hath need at all of incense. Nay, but man shall remember the incense of the ages of light where is no hateful smell before the Lord, the God of the living, where (are) hymns of praise." The big question here is what means: left and right? Is it said looking from the church or from the east (cf. ad Q. 121)? In combining the data of the Q Q 97-99, 103 and 118 sqq. we come to the following sketch of the situation.¹ In the prayers of the incense

(Q. 99. The rubric: L.E.W., p. 267 = Berol. fol. 81a, prescribes in the Offertory that the priest and the deacon must bring the paten and chalice on the altar and then: "The priest takes the paten in his left hand and the chalice in his right putting his hands in the form of a cross!" (L.O.C., ii, p. 350 mentions this crosswise, but does not say how; cf. Gismondi i, p. 16: "narratum est sacrum fecisse Simmonem [bar Saba], martyred in the great persecution of Sapor, Laburt, Christianisme, index, s.v.; Martyrium and Narratio, ed. M. Kinosko, in: R. Graffin, Patrologia Syriaca, i, 2, Parisius, 1907, which do not contain this story] feria quinta paschatis in carcere, constituisseque loco altaris unum e suis pres-

¹ When Isho'yahb i writing to James of Darai, Canes i, in: O. Braun, Synodoxe, S. 243, says: "und steht zur Rechten gegen Süden", his point of view is that of the congregation. On this confusion of right and left, cf. B.A.C.L., s.v. Orientation, t. xii, col. 2666.
byteris stantem deposito in eius dextera patena et in leava calicis; exactly the same words in *Chronique de Sève*, ed. A. Scher, P.O., iv, p. 303. But this piece of evidence is from a time before the exact rules.) The expositors do not comment on it. Only Timothy ii (Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 121b) says that the paten must be on left and the chalice on the right, comparing in a very queer way the chalice with the liver which changes all food into blood and feeds the body. This remark is the same as that suggested in our Q. The difference between the rubric and this decision is merely the way of approaching the altar viz. in the former case from the west, in the latter from the east (see sketch). The Syriac St. James (L.E.W., p. 70–74) has something of the same kind. The text has merely: “Hand”, but the whole connection shows that it must be the right one. Nevertheless nothing is found about that in the formulary.

Q. 100. ἐν ἀυτῷ, “symbol” see ad Q. 94. M. has here ἐν ἀυτῷ, V. ἐν ἀυτῷ. the first word is missing in Payne Smith, *Theaurus Syriacus*. In their present form both words are derived from ἀυτό “to collect, to wipe together” (the ending ἐν, cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, S. 104) one who gathers together. This is impossible here. It must be an object in the hand of the deacons. Therefore I suppose that it should be read ἐν ἀυτῷ of ἐν = “to drive, flap away”; the word is not found in the *Theaurus* in this form; it gives the forms ἐν ἀυτῷ and ἐν ἀυτῷ (this in: Narsai, *Hom.* xvii, ed. Mingana, i, p. 281, cf. tr. Connolly, p. 4, n. 1). But in the Expos ii, p. 78 (text) this form occurs and was rightly translated by Dom. Connolly into “flabellum”. All Eastern rites know these fans in the hands of the deacons; see: D.C.A., s.v. Flabellum; D.A.C.L., s.v. Flabellum, t. v., col. 1610–1625 (Dom. Leclercq gives reasons for its falling into disuse in the West); both articles with pictures, and: L.O.O., p. 52–53 and fig. 1. The first time it is mentioned is in: Const. Apost. vii 12, 3, Funk i, p. 496; here it is said that they were used to drive away the flies from the elements. This forms a sufficient explanation of its origin since so many little insects were found in these countries (ii deals, e.g. with the question of the desecration in case some of these insects should be found in the chalice). This view was expressly combated in the explanation of Bar Cepha (Connolly–Codrington, p. 36 tr.) where he says that they were used lest anything unlawful might come near.

He compares these deacons with the angels viz. the Cherubim and Seraphim. This is a very common explanation of the Eastern Fathers. It is met with already in Theodore Mops. He combines both views. He compares these deacons with the angels spreading linen over the grave of the Lord. After that: “They stand up on both sides and agitate all the air above the holy body with fans, thus keeping it from any defiling object.” This thought is then expanded further (ad Baptizandos, W.S. vi, p. 86–87). The first part is borrowed by Narsai; he omits the object of the “fanning”, but his symbolism is the same (tr. Connolly, p. 4 and 12). Neither Abraham B. Lipheh nor Timothy ii (the latter speaks of deacons on both sides of the altar, but not about the fans) mention it neither does the Formulary. The Expos. mentions them only in passing. The symbolism of the angels near the grave has been abandoned: “neque illi diaconi, qui ad alatrum stant, ad negotium flabellorum accedere audent, donec sacerdotes permiserit eis.” They are well distinguished from Gabriel who
is also represented by a deacon, in this connection (ii, p. 71). The fans are mentioned once more at Baptism; those who carry them are compared directly with the Cherubim in reference to the vision of Isaiah vi (Expos. ii, p. 92). Regarding this evidence we observe 1) that the doubt uttered by Renauldot, whether the Syrians knew fans in their liturgy (L.O.C., ii, p. 80) as the Greeks did, is gratuitous; 2) the judgement of Dr. Brightman concerning the fan: “Not used apparently by Nest. and Abyssin.”, L.E.W., p. 577 must be modified as far as the former group is concerned (about the latter I must abstain from judgement, though I think it highly improbable that it would not be found there). At any rate the word used by the Jacobites is different from that of the Nestorians. It becomes clear too why this question was put. For in the older explanations (as far as they are preserved) it held a real place, while we see that it is almost wholly neglected in the later ones. This gap had to be filled and it was the aim of the questioner to do so.

Gabriel and Michael are prominent figures in the Nest. mystagogy as far as we know it from the Expos. They are not specially mentioned by Theodore and other older expositors. Neither do they play a predominant part in Jacobite liturgical literature (the highly traditional Dionysius B. Salibi mentions twice Gabriel but only in connection with the Annunciation and he does not mention Michael at all; Labourt, p. 34 and 81). Narsai is the only one among the Nestorians who mentions them separately among the choirs of the angels (Connolly, p. 48); the others do not refer to them, except the Expos. There they officiate as watchers; their “picture” in the liturgy are two deacons who address the people, read the Scriptures, recite the litanies etc.: Gabriel is the functionary of the New Testament and Michael of the Old (ii, p. 9, 14 etc.). This division of functions will be explained by the fact that Gabriel announced the birth of Christ (Luke i 26) and Michael who was highly venerated in the East, (cf. W. Lucken, Der Erzengel Michael, Göttingen, 1890) was thought to be the guardian angel of Israel (cf. Dan. x 13, 21; xii 1). They are, as Dom Connolly aptly remarks the “Diaconiæ officiales” (Expos. ii, p. 9, n. 2). They play here the same part as at the end of our Q. V adds to the last clause: “In the same way there are many deacons.” It is difficult to decide whether this is the original text. At any rate it is the right “tertium comparationis.” Their service at the grave implies the identification of them with the two men “in shining garments” of Luke xxiv 4, an identification that is not far out of the way, but that I do not remember having found somewhere else. Though the names are not found, the explanation seems to be traditional; Narsai sings in one of his hymns (Hym. xxi, Connolly p. 56): “Two angels the disciples saw in the tomb of our Lord who were attending the place of His body as though it were the body (itself). In that apparel of the two watchers the two deacons are standing to hover over the Mysteries.” The equalization: altar = grave of Christ is a term of the Mystagogy that seems derived from Antiochene theology. Theodore Mops. expresses himself clearly in connection with what has been quoted before: “when we see the oblation on the communion-table—something which denotes that it is being placed in a kind of sepulchre after its death . . .” (W.S. vi, p. 86-88). This agrees with his fellow countryman and contemporary John Chrysostomus; for in the Explanation of Bar Cepha (p. 34) a word of his (not traced in his works by Dom. Connolly) is quoted with approval, while other opinions, a.o.
that of Dionysius Areopagita (!), De Ecclesi. Hier. iv, in: M.S.G. 3, col. 484 D are rejected. This was copied out by Bar Salibi (p. 50). The same thought is found among the Byzantines; but in view of the present state of research it cannot be decided if it is a traditional feature there. At any rate the altar is styled by Symeon of Thessalonica † 1429 (?), De Sacra Liturgia, cap. 98, in: M.S.G., 155: “Throne” and “grave”. The former name, see Q. 16 and 104; the second here. They are also found both in Narsai, Hom. xvii: “The altar is a symbol of our Lord’s tomb, without doubt (Connolly, p. 4, cf. 7, 11 and 36) and it is followed by: “In another order . . . the adorable altar . . . is a symbol of that throne of the Great and Glorious, upon which He will be seen of watchers and men in the day of His revelation” (p. 4-5). We see, the name “grave”, meaning “altar” is very current in Narsai. The same holds good for the other exegetes (Bar Liph. Expos. ii, p. 161; Timothy ii, Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 122v) and in the letter of Isho’l Barann, ad Isaac Q. 2, and in Canon ii, the parallel between the altar and grave of the Lord is used as a conclusive argument, in the case of people drawing near to it; they can only do so if they come as respectively Nicodemus and Joseph or the women. These facts form a sufficient refutation of the remark of Prof. F. Kattenbusch, Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde, Freiburg i. Br., 1892, i, S. 496, Anm. 1: “Diese Spezialitäten (viz. the symbolical burial of the Lord) haben sich . . . erst zwischen dem elften und sechszehnten Jahrhundert ausgebildet.” In reading the expositions it becomes clear that this name fits in originally with the whole course of thoughts. Their view of the liturgy is, whatever may be the differences in regard to particulars, that it represents the incarnation, life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This principal train of thought is crossed by another; therefore Narsai can say: “In another order.” But the motive out of which the name “grave” arose is the principal one. It accounts wholly for its use. And its meaning does not go further. It is simply a mystagogical name and it is rightly missing in the collection of names, made by Dr. Brightman, (L.E.W., p. 596). We point this out because it is a well-known religious idea that the altar is a grave, as Prof. G. v. d. Leeuw remarked (Phänomenologie, S. 372, Anm. 1); this latter designation seems to originate from the fact that the dead members of the family were originally buried near the altar of the house. It is obvious that here exists only a similarity of name and that the thought is not the same. That relics were preserved on the altar of the Christian Church, that even the name “Sepulchrum” occurs in the Roman Catholic Church, may lie in the same line as Prof. G. v. d. Leeuw observes. But this was never the cause of special speculations in the liturgy.

Q. 101. 0] as comparative instead of the usual $\frac{1}{2}$ as in the answer of Noldeke, Syr. Gramm., S. 187, Ak. 1; it is generally found in translations of the Bible under Greek influence and only very few times in original Syriac works. A discussion as is mentioned here and meant in Q. 123 has not left any traces in literature as far as I know. Unless one would like to refer to a story in Budge, B.G. ii, p. 506, 516, that a saint were on his breast a complete evangelium instead of a simple cross. But this is not liturgical as in our Q. The use of “other people say” is rather peculiar as another opinion would be expected. The same division as is found here is given by Timothy ii, cf. ad Q. 35;
it is possible that he had borrowed it from our Q. The Expos. does not mention this debate; it declares merely that the Cross is the "sign" of this conquering King and the Gospel the series of His commandments (Expos. ii. p. 10; i. p. 133: Cross instead of Christ). Abraham Bar Lippeh says that they are one, viz. the corporal being of Jesus (Expos. ii. p. 159). That the Gospel was thought to be representing Christ is shown by the fact that at the Council of Ephesus (431) a Gospel was laid in the middle of the "Church of the Virgin" on a throne to show that Christ Himself was present (J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, t. iv, col. 1237).

Q. 102. The quotations from the liturgy are found in T., p. 5 = L.E.W., p. 290; p. 11 = p. 275; p. 26 = p. 296 (the first and the last are the same in Thed.); the second T., p. 23 and p. 49 respectively stand in another connection as that given in this Q.; this confirms the result of p. 239). In Berol. Syr. 98 and: L.O.C., ii the first fails (the two others are found: Berol. 87a = L.O.C., ii, 52b; and: Berol. 96a = L.O.C., ii, 59b); this fact is probably the cause of putting the Q. The witness of the Expositions is not very certain in this respect: the first one is not found in Narsai who does not deal with the beginning of the Mass, Abraham B. Lippeh and Timothy ii (this omission is very remarkable); but in Isho'yabbi, i. O. Braun, Synchrotes, p. 240, and: Expos., ii. p. 21–22; the second in all: Narsai, Hom. xvii, p. 8 Conn.; Abraham, Expos. ii, p. 162–163; Expos. ii, p. 42; V. has the variant "before", but this does not correspond with any textform; Timothy, fol. 125b, has it in a somewhat different place; the third in all: Narsai, Hom. xvii, p. 26 Conn.; Abraham, Expos. ii, p. 69; Timothy ii, fol. 131b. (Hanssen iii, p. 206 finds three salutations in: Narsai, Hom. xvii, viz. on p. 8, 23 and 26 Conn. This second greeting is missing in my list, since on p. 23 the Priest gives a "blessing" = L.E.W., p. 293, and there is no reason whatever to suppose with Dom. Connolly, p. 23 n. 4 that "it would seem, 'Peace be with you'" or to replace the present formula with Prof. Hanssen.) "New Sunday"—name of the first Sunday after Easter, typical Nestorian name, about the origin of which nothing is known. The Bible-texts alluded to are: John xx 19, 26 and xxii 7, though it may be observed with respect to the last text that it is not said that Jesus gave peace, as is suggested here; it may be an expansion of some Homilist. The explanation of these texts is quite different from that given by other expositors. Their explanations show a great variety; the single point of agreement is that the last blessing is always connected with the events after the Resurrection. Probably the explanation given here is quite incidental; for it does not fit in with any other one. For whatever may be their differences all exegesis correspond in finding the Resurrection after the Consecration. This cannot possibly be connected with the remark made in this answer. The number of greetings varies very much in the different rites; see the complete materials in: Hanssen iii, p. 194–198 (usus praesens), p. 198–209 (historia). The quotation from John xxii 7 is in accordance with the Peshitta—text that reads: our Lord, and not: the Lord, as the Greek text (but cf. codex D.).

Q. 103. will be treated together with Q. 118 seq. since it treats of the same subjects.
Q. 104. What is meant here by the "Throne"? The first thing that will be thought of is the Bishop's seat that was not only found in the aephe, but also on the Bema (cf. Expos., i, p. 91 and the plan of the church drawn up by Conn. p. 196-197 indicated by P.). But when one tries this exegesis it appears that the explanation of the rest is impossible; for in reading what is said about the Cathedra in the handbooks (cf. G. M. Kaufmann, Handbuch, S. 164-165 and 523ff) we find there all kind of information, but nothing that shows any connection with the answer. The page of the Expos. mentioned before shows the right way. In his Mystagogical explanation of the whole church he also deals with the Bema, the platform in the middle of the nave. It represents for him as for others as Bar Liphe and Timothy ii, Jerusalem. "Altare autem, quod in medio Bemate est, locum Golgotae implet." This is the same view as that of our question, for we have found already in Q. 16 that the altar was styled "Throne", though in that case it was not quite sure whether it was a metaphorical phrase or not. There are two other places in which the present writer found the name "Golgotha" in connection with the Liturgy. Mgr. Rahmani, L.O.O., p. 42 and n. 4 states in summing up the parts of the church that: "à l'entrée du choeur on dresse un pupitre, où est exposé le livre des ss. évangiles," and indicates that this was called Golgotha. Unfortunately he does not say whether this name is generally found among all the Syrians or only among the Jacobites or Nestorians. He does not add any reference so that his information is for the greater part useless since we do not know at what time it was found first. At any rate it cannot be the same as that of our Q. as is clear from the place in which it was erected. It is possible that the Eastern Scholar had in mind the same practice as found in the information of Mr. Badger ii, p. 20 and n. He informs us that in this time (1840-1850) the Apostolos was read near the altar, but formerly on the Gagolta, "the name given to an ambon at the western end of the church, consisting of two raised stone platforms, placed opposite to each other, and reached by several steps or stairs". A picture of it is given, facing p. 21. He adds that the only one he has met with was that in Tahara, a church dedicated to the blessed Virgin in Mosul; for this object has fallen into disuse, and B. supposes that it has never existed in many small village-churches. He does not give the data on which this opinion is based. Comparing these facts with our question it is clear that they do not agree. It stood in the Temple = nave and in the "House of Prayer". The latter name is not found in the list of: E.S.D.O., p. 294 nor in the Dictionary, and is failing in the description of the Expos. Without any doubt it is the same as the Greek ὁ διώκων, or, an oratorium, cf. D.C.A., s.v. Oratorium-D.A.C.L., s.v. Oratoire, t. xii, col. 2346-2372 does not contain any help for the explanation. A word with various meanings, among others: a part of the church, distinguished from Bema and Narthex, but not the choir. It is mentioned in several places of Amr and Mari as a place where Bishops were buried (Gismondi i, p. 126; ii, p. 60, 64, 68). In another place (Gismondi i, p. 91) it is said: "Oratorium etiam condidit ('Abdisho') in atrio majori, cuius altaris faciem Moyses . velamine auro textu obtestit"; here we have together the place of the House of Prayer and the altar in it. Yet it is not clear where it should be placed in the sketch of Dom. Connolly.

Two crosses are spoken of, a big one that is supposed to have stood on the
Bema on the east side (head) and next cross and gospel that are explained as in Q. 101. I did not find purple-coloured coverings over the Cross mentioned elsewhere. The writer is not very exact as regards the biblical data. For the priests and not the soldiers are mentioned here as mocking Jesus, against the testimony of the Gospels, cf. Mat. xxvii 28 par., who also say (Mat. xxvii 31 par.) that Jesus was put on the Cross in his own clothes. Two fans see Q. 100. Here we have a different connection as this is in the Missa Catechumenorum. The Expos. also says that it is an indication of the Cross. In: L.E.W., p. 249, the robbers are mentioned for the Buchra's viz. Titus and Dumachus (cf. C. Tischendorf, Evangelia Apocrypha, Lipsiae, 1853, p. 184); some other names are found elsewhere, cf. A. Meyer, in: E. Hennecke, Neuestamentliche Apokryphen 1, Tübingen, 1924, S. 79.

The questions 105-116 deal with the Lord's Prayer in the various services (Q. 117 is an addendum suggested by the preceding question). For while it was said in most rituals at the beginning and end, it was not done in the ritual of Marriage and Funeral service, as is observed by Q. 105.

It is known from various other sources that it was discussed on different occasions. The subject of debate is the number of times the Lord's Prayer had to be recited in the Eucharist (we may take this one for example, since it is used most of all): T., p. 1 and 90 = L.E.W., p. 252 and 203 (ibid: L.O.C., ii, p. 589 only the latter is found; it is missing at the beginning, the text of which varies largely from that of T.-Berol. Syr. 38 has it in neither place!). The Lord's Prayer of T., p. 25-26 = L.E.W., p. 205-206 is out of discussion. It is old and was fixed by Ischos; cf. Expos. i, p. 191. This latter finds its counterpart in nearly all the other liturgies between Consecration and Communion (it is not found in: Test. Dom.; Const. Apost., East Syrian fragment, cf. L.O.O., p. 240-241, and D.A.C., s.v. Lord's Prayer. It is mentioned already by Cyril of Jerusalem. That it is not quoted by Theodore Mops., is hardly of any weight. The wording of James of Edessa quoted in: L.O.O., p. 240, N. 2 seems to suggest that it did not belong to the ancient form of 'James'. But our topic is not found in any of them. It is a typical Nestorian controversy; D.A.C.L., s.v. Oration Dominicales, c. xii, col. 2244-2255 has nothing about it. The point must be cleared from information of the Nestorians only. The oldest witness about a question of the use of this prayer is from the time of Ischos (820-824). In his letter ad Macarius he answers the question (Q. 62): "Should the Lord's Prayer be said at the beginning and at the end of the service? Solution: Officially it must be said. In this way one sticks to that Chrysostomus or Mouth of Gold, the blessed John and the blessed Nestorius. For they wrote as follows: "Every service of the church which does not begin or end with the Lord's Prayer that the Saviour delivered to the church, is sinful and mutilated, and not perfect." I do not know what places the author has in mind; it is not surprising since the tradition of the writings of Nestorius is so incomplete; but the quotation of Chrysostomus is somewhat suspect, the more so since we find that this point was debated, but never do we find this quotation of the famous Father cited.

(1) Cf. Expos. i, p. 153; those who followed the ancient practice, as against the innovation of Timothy i, say it once: "tempore mysteriorum cum consecratione".
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This question was raised by Timothy i (780–820; see about his life and times the sources mentioned by A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 217–218). This Patriarch ordered at a Synod "ut Canonicae precise oratione Dominica et incoharent et terminarentur" (Auctor, Collectionis Canonum Ecclesiae Syro-Nestorianae, Cod. Arab. 96, t. 2, p. 507, quoted in: B.O., iii 1, p. 100–101). Here we find only the Daily Offices mentioned but not the other liturgies. The Expos. has more particulars. The case is discussed there three times. In: Expos. i, p. 121–123 two questions are put on account of the Evening service, viz. a) why some people pray the Lord's prayer at the beginning, while others do not? and b) why in some places the priest prays before the Lord's Prayer and elsewhere after it? The Mystagogical reasons of the author need not to detain us. Within the whole of his work the reasons are clearly those of the author himself (i, p. 125 end) and are not historical. Concerning the matter itself he says that Isha'yahh iii did not order anything about it. It was introduced by Timothy i to be said at the beginning. Some people stuck to the older tradition while others obeyed the Patriarch. The author judges that this is right and that first the Lord's Prayer and then the Office should be prayed. These statements are completed by i, p. 153: why some people do not recite it at the end. The answer is practically of the same tenor. He leaves it undecided whether it must be said with or without Canon (cf. ad Q. 4). In explaining the Eucharist ii, p. 81–83 he states once more that this Prayer (L.E.W., p. 303; the former is not mentioned; the beginning of T. does not quite agree with the Expos.) is an addition of Timothy i, and is said by those within and outside (the altar). (‘Abdisho’ i has changed this; up to his time it was said by two choirs in the altar and in the nave; since his time it had to be said by all together, cf. Bar Hebraeus, Chr. Eccl. iii, col. 253. This is at any rate a "tempus ad quem" for dating the Expos.—The other question about the Lord's Prayer at the end of the 11th century of ‘Abdisho’ ii and Machicha i (cf. Gisonndl i, p. 121–122) is a totally different matter).

Nothing about this question is found in the letters of Timothy i, published by O. Braun, Timothei Patriarchi in Epistulae, in: C.S.C.O., ii 67, Parisiis, 1915 nor in the short biography by H. Laborit, De Timoteo i Patriarcha, Parisiis, 1903. But there is no reason whatever to doubt the information given before. It also explains the question of his successor. They fit in very well with our Q. Q. which deal with points that are not cleared up in other places. The anonymous Patriarch or Catholicos of the East is Timothy i who is mentioned expressly in Q. 107 (in passing it may be remarked that Q. 105 and 107 do not treat the same subject. First Timothy ordered the recitation with "farcings" ("farcings", see ad Q. 107) after his ordination, after that at the beginning and end of every service). It is corroborated by the fact that we hear that it was ordered after a dispute with a Jacobite in "books" and we know that Timothy i debated with a Jacobite, Bar Hebraeus, Chr. Eccl. iii, col. 181 sq. tells us that Timothy had a dispute with the Jacobite Patriarch George of Be'eltean (it is nowhere said by ‘Abdisho’, Catalogus, § 86 that the (answers of) Questions, contained confessional polemics as was supposed by A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 217. That a Nestorian speaks in a way as is done in our Q. of a Patriarch of the Jacobites is not so remarkable; on the contrary its tone is rather gentle).

It is important to hear what was the exact reason of this new practice. For
though it is in itself of minor interest, yet it is an example how one rite influenced the other; it should be observed that it is stated here that the Nestorians did so to overtrump the Jacobites! Very often such influences are suggested by the similarity between two liturgies, but hardly any direct testimony can be found about it. Though it is very sad, yet it is true that liturgical changes have been brought about silently (cf. p. 14); so it can seldom be historically fixed and even if that is possible we do not know the circumstances which led to it. Another remarkable thing is that here it is not only similarity which is the result in the formularies, but a disagreement which nobody however would suppose to be dependency. This point is useful to show how difficult it is to prove this borrowing. In view of this question Mgr. Rahmani said simply that Timothy "a fait cet emprunt au rite byzantin", L.O.O., p. 350 (this fact makes the other references to the Byzantine Liturgy on the same page rather questionable. It is an important point for the question of the genuineness of Homily xvii of Narsai, cf. p. 48–49) referring to the places in ‘Chrysostom’ L.E.W., p. 353 and 393. But these prayers do not stand in the same place as in the Nestorian Liturgy; hence there is no parallel between the two rites in this respect. Here we are informed that is was not derived from a Byzantine source, but sprang up among the Nestorians themselves in contradistinction to the Jacobites. The last Lord's Prayer is also commented upon by Narsai, Hom. xvii (Connolly, p. 30), but the translator rejected it (p. 82) as an interpolation.

We will examine now the details of the Q.Q.

Q. 105. Puts the question; the answer is an historical reminiscence stating the original form. The Jacobite James has a Lord's Prayer in the prothesis L.E.W., p. 72 and at the ablutions p. 109, but this does not exactly agree with the Nestorian facts, it looks like a parallel with the Byzantine Lit. On the liturgy and its place in the intercourse between the various Eastern Churches something was said already on p. 194. Though the matter is worth while a closer examination it cannot be studied here. Many works of polemics are mentioned (about the polemics between Jacobites and Nestorians cf. the Register in: A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 363, s.v. Antikathetische und konfessionell polemische Literatur) and in other places too we hear that there were relations between the two bodies and their nature was not simply that of ‘Todfeindschaft’ (A. Baumstark, Messe im Morgenland, S. 48). The Answer was not a response to the question. But first of all the questioner goes into what was answered.

Q. 106. What was the state before Timothy? V. misses: "And in the morning". It may be that it was done on purpose because this service is not dealt with in the answer! The three services mentioned here are the principal ones of the Daily Office. It is known that fixed hours of Prayer go back to the oldest times of Christian worship though there were differences in the times at which they should be said, cf. D.C.A., s.v. Hours of Prayer, and: F. Cabrol, D.A.C.L., s.v. Office Divin, t. xii, col. 1962–2017 (mainly Western). It is not known in how far this was taken over by the Nestorians. In any case Isho'yabh iii has regulated it. He had a book composed by 'Ananisho' indicating the prayers for a whole year. (Budge, B.G. ii, p. 177, cf. p. 189.—This book was the Hudra, cf. p. 125. On the way in which it was done Thomas says: "He alone possessed in a sufficient measure
a clear mind, and a natural talent for the art of music, and a knowledge how to arrange words." It is uncertain whether he has also fixed the hours of the day. The Expos. i. p. 106–108 has the answer to the question why the Fathers fixed three Daily Offices, viz. Evening, Night and Morning; why they ordered that on Sundays and Festivals the service of the Mysteries should be held and in Lent the Complete after the Evening-service and the Tertia, Sexta and Nona. The answer informs us that Evening and Morning-service were obligatory for everybody, but the Night only for priests and ascetics. This wording suggests that this does not go back to a regulation of Isho'yahb. In Expos. ii. p. 1 it is asked why Isho'yahb ordered to hold the service of the Mysteries at the third hour and it seems as though he had some connection with it. At any rate the present state of tradition is not very clear. The Expos. cannot exactly be dated, but gives the reflex of the situation probably in the 10th century. George i († 680 or 681) decided that the laymen should assist the services in the congregation in the evening and morning, Canon xv. in: O. Braun, Synodus, S. 344–345. According to Elias of Nisibis the following services are obligatory for all the faithful: Morning, Evening and "Sacramentsgebet zur 3ten Stunde"; the priests, deacons and monks have beside them: Sexta, Nona, Complete and Night, Brauns, S. 91f, quoted also in: B.O., iii 1, p. 304–305. (We pass over the witness of the Exposition of Abraham Bar Lipheh who mentioned only Night and Morning as it is not quite sure if this part is complete and not mutilated as are some others). Ascemani did not trust this information; I think, wrongly for as to the former part it agrees completely with the Canon of George taking into account that the prayer of the Sacrament is only on Sundays. His objection is that "ex ipsis Nestorialisorum Officiis constet, eos praeter Vesperas, Nocturnum, et Matutinum, nulias alias horas celebrius." But this is merely based on the Expos. and, though we cannot investigate it here, it is probable that it gives us the practice of the High Monastery (p. 148–149), while in other places the old practice was maintained. According to the Nomocanon of 'Abdisho' v 1 and 2, Mai p. 245–246, one gets the following state of affairs (from this place is derived the information of: B.O., iii 2, p. ccxxxvii–ccxvi, and: E/S.D.O., p. xii, cf. Badger ii, p. 16–17): seven times of prayer are instituted by Jesus Christ; the Oecumenical Fathers have prescribed these seven hours to the monks, pure priests and steadfast laymen. The Fathers of later times ordered that, because it was impossible to do so for many people, that four would be sufficient, viz. Evening, Complete, Night and Morning. The first and the last are the principal and "can neither be added to nor abridged" (cf. the note ad Q., 1); the other two are facultative for laymen. Badger and Maclean observe that the Complete have practically fallen into disuse (except for some days); this was already the case in the time of the Expos. and of our treatise. 'Abdisho' says about the Complete and Night that they must be performed according to the rules of the (High) Monastery (the word "High" is not found in the edition of Mai, nor in: E/S.D.O., but in the text used by Badger, and probably right, because otherwise the statement is somewhat obscure). It may be that the Fathers mentioned by him in the last place are the same and it fits in very well with what we found above. In v 3 he gives the names of the various services It is not known how old these rules laid down in this book are. Timothy ii repeats a Canon that agrees closely with the description of Elijah, Canon 3, in: 'Abdisho',
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Nomocanon, before Tomus ii, Mai, p. 269. We have summarized once more these places though they are also given in other books (cf. O. Braun, Synhados, S. 344. N. 2–345) because it seems to the present writer that they have not always been looked at in the exact historical sequence. It was asked how the Nestorian church divided its Horae without taking into account the historical connections and in this way the statements were somewhat contradictory. From these statements we can make the following reconstruction: the Nestorians took over at their separation the seven Horae as they had been developed in the cloisters and after that in the church; Isho'yabhi tried the 3rd hour for the Eucharist and laid down a rule for the Lessons and Prayers that had to be used. It is easy to understand that it proved to be impossible for laymen to share in all services; the result was that they had only to assist at the Evening, Morning and Eucharist-service. Clerics and Monks had also the Night-service (and Completas), a rule probably going back to the High Monastery, of which it is known that it revised the Offices (p. 148–149); the others were not used any more. In this way a good explanation is found for the sequence given by 'Abdisho'.

An excellent survey of the three services may be found in the East Syrian Daily Offices of Bishop Maclean (p. xiii–xvi), whose introduction and translations must be used to get an insight into these services of the Nestorian Breviary (it is well known that the edition of P. Bedjan in his: Breviarium Chaldaicum, Parisiis, 1886, 3 vols. is for the use of Uniates and is not a true presentation of the original Nestorian text (for the Jacobites, see: A. Baumstark, Festbrevier und Kirchenjahre der syrischen Jakobiten, Paderborn, 1910; of course the rules were not the same there as among the Nestorians; they seem to have maintained seven hours).

The quotations of the evening service that open the answer, see: E.S.D.O., p. 9; the beginning of the present formulary was omitted.—Marmitha is a part of an Hulala. The Psalter of the Nestorians or Dawida is divided into 21 Hulala's and subdivided into 60 Marmitha's, containing from one to four Psalms. A very clear "Table of the Divisions of the Psalter" may be found in: E.S.D.O., index i, p. 259. (the division is not the same as among the Greeks and Jacobites, cf. Budge, B.G. ii, p. 292, n. 6–293. The name is not found in: B.G. ii, p. 292, which uses the word "stations"; the first instance of it known to me is Abraham Bar Liphehi), with a survey of their use and the Daily Offices (index ii, p. 266); the Expos, i, p. 93–106 has the same. The first name (root: Ἐσοφ) does not seem to be found outside its technical use; its meaning is not quite clear; Hulala = Hallelujah. The origin of these names is obscure just as is their division. It is remarkable that the Expos. does not seem to connect it with Isho'yabhi iii, cf. Expos. i, p. 160: "unaquaque schola in re hulilarem adhíbendorum suum exequitur consilium... si (Isho'yabhi) regulam imposuit de hulilis, non potuisser homines regulam eius transgredi." It is not necessary to enter further into these questions; there is still a wide field here awaiting the scholar.

For the Night-service see: E.S.D.O., p. 85 (beginning omitted); the answers and prayers "strengthen, Our Lord etc." p. 85, and "May the secret strength etc." p. 86 are omitted as is done also according to the notes in the Roman Catholic edition; one proceeds immediately to the Hulala's.

We have observed already that nothing is said about the Morning-Service. There the Lord's Prayer comes in: E.S.D.O., p. 106, in its present form after
a very long introduction, followed by the prayer: “O Compassionate one whose name is holy etc.” This entry is the same for Festival as for Ferial services. It should be noted that our writer indicates the sequence of prayers that was rejected as inferior by the author of the Expos., p. 123; he thinks it better to say first Lord’s Prayer and after that the prayers of the priests.

Q. 107. The Lord’s Prayer that was introduced by Timothy was not the ordinary one but farced, that is: the addition of our question, viz. the Trisagion (2 x) and the Doxologia Minor (cf. P. Drews, Liturgische Formeln, and: Trisagion, in: P.R.E.t., xi, S. 547–548; and: xx, S. 126–128), both occurring very often in all Eastern liturgies, were inserted into it. So we get the form given in: L.E.W., p. 252, where it is placed within brackets as an addition not found in the MSS. but in practice = T., p. 1 begins with an ordinary L.P. = E.S.D.O., p. 1–2. On the other hand the Lord’s Prayer in: L.E.W., p. 203 seems to be said without farcings. This addition is not mentioned iprimis verbis in the Expos.; but it was well-known, though some people recited it without Canon; the author leaves it undecided, Expos. i, p. 153.

“Canon” is here the antiphonal singing (cf. ad Q. 4). According to the asterisk in Maclean’s text, the changes are after: “Come”; before the full text of the Lord’s Prayer and after it; after the Gloria; after the following Amen, and before the last Trisagion. This happened also at the Marmitha’s “after the first clause of the first Psalm of each Marmitha say, Hallelujah (2 x), yea Hallelujah, and repeat the first clause. After each Marmitha Doxologia Minor. Then there are two choirs in the church who sing it in turns, though this does not take place on weekdays (E.S.D.O., p. 2 and n. 3). Therefore we find here this comparison. It is not quite sure what is meant by the second “Canon”; whether it is the same as before or “Eclesiastical rule”; the former is more probable though the latter is not impossible. “Of the Nestorians”—applied to themselves; this shows it was not considered as an inventive of a heretical name as is said sometimes; so e.g. J. H. Petermann—K. Kessler, Nestorianen, in: P.R.E.t., xiii, S. 727. It is not a particularity of our Q.Q., but it is also found, Expos. i, p. 96, 133 and cf. Isho’Barnun, ad Macarianum 47, where the question is put: “If a Nestorian is sojourning in a country where they have no churches . . .”

Q. 108. After this deviation in the foregoing Q.Q. they come back to the original point.—The importance of prayer for the faithful is explained in various treatises dealing with this part of the Christian life, in some way or another (cf. Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, on Prayer; Theodore Mops., ad Baptistædo ii; Isaac of Niniveh, Index in Wensnick’s Translation, s.v. Prayer). But this does not offer an explanation of the “advantage” mentioned here, since it deals with the meaning of the Lord’s Prayer. Nor can it be explained by pointing to a treasury which is augmented by the prayers even if it were possible to show that this thought is found among the Syrians, or to thoughtless praying because saying prayers has a worth in itself. The Expos. i, p. 125 says: “in his quae docuit eos verbis, Dominus totum evangelii canonem comprehendit” that it is: ἐν δόξαις (this phrase is of doubtful interpretation; it means either: “which fills the true beatitude”, or: “which is full of the true beatitude”,
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At any rate it is not quite clear what are the contents of this beatitude. In connection with the rest of the Expos, it means probably the eternal state of blessedness of which this prayer gives a glimpse and for which it asks. The ritual of Baptism was published in: T., 55-75. It was translated and examined by G. Dietrich, *Taumaturgie*; (cf. also the Review of this book by A. Baumstark, in: O.C., 1903, S. 219-226). He pointed out that this liturgy was moulded upon that of Eucharist (p. xx-xcii), though Baumstark showed that this was not particularly Nest. It may be that the latter author is right in his criticism. But the fact should not be overlooked that all Nestorian rituals seem to have the same effect (cf. ad Q. 3 and 92), and accordingly the same structure. We have found before and it is corroborated in this place that there should be a close parallel between the rituals. About the mysteries see Q. 89 seqq. The place of the Questions on Baptism in which he deals with this matter was already been referred to in p. 77-78. From this quotation it must be concluded that the first time it was omitted (because they did not want to follow the rule of Timothy i ?; cf. G. Dietrich, a.a.O., S. 50).

Q. 109. As the remark in that place was somewhat vague they asked to give the precise places. They are found T., p. 55, 56, 73 (Badger ii, p. 195, 206, 210; G. Dietrich, a.a.O., S. 4, 39 and 50) where also the Antiphons are found. “Holy oil” to sign with, see rubric T., p. 69 = Dietrich, a.a.O., S. 57-58. The “power” of the Lord’s Prayer means here “its meaning”. About the beginning of Baptism, cf. Dietrich, S. 59 (his suggestion sub 4 is right). According T. the loosening of the water took place after the sealing (also Expos. ii, p. 103). The two alternative or accompanying prayers are not found in T. It gives on p. 74 two different forms of prayer plus an “alternative prayer” but not in the form supposed here. G. Dietrich, a.a.O., S. 93 offers a survey of the different “sealings” in the MSS. he has examined; one of them, viz. that from Malabar, exhibits a text which is supposed in our Q.; the alternative prayer is “through Thine blessing, o our Lord and our God.” Mr. Dietrich thought S. 91 that J. Mal. had preserved the original text in other places too. The text of “O Compassionate One etc.” e.g. E.S.D.O., p. 106. The Expos. is of no use here. “Alternative” not meaning: “taking the place of”, but: “linked up with”; see e.g. Timothy ii, Mmg. Syr. 13, fol. 134b, speaking about the prayer: “It is fitting, o my Lord etc.” and its alternative prayer (L.E.W., p. 302) styles it the two blessings of the Lord to His disciples. Nothing is known to me about further use of this word as a *terminus technicus* in Oriental Churches. “Sealing” and “seal”: E.S.D.O., p. 209, s.v. Conclusions, translates it simply by “Blessing”. As a matter of fact this happens here, but what is the origin of this name? (cf. Apoc. viii: Sealing of the Tribes of Israel?) In Q., 116 occurs the phrase: “to seal the prayer”, which cannot possibly be a blessing. The word is found at the end of almost every formulary to denote the end of the service. It seems as though these prayers and hymns had not yet been definitely selected when the Formularies were drawn up. Those in Eucharistic Formulary of Berol. 38 show a text which is different from that of T. and besides that it has more forms; T., p. 151-164 has a great number of Ἁρμονίας Ἐλληνας, most of them are from a later date than our treaties (viz. ‘Abdisho’ b. Berikha, 14th cent.); in L.O.C. they are not found. The same observation can be made in the various MSS.
of the Baptismal Rite, cf. G. Diettrich, Tauflit., S. 93. About this late Nestorian kind of poetry see: A. Baumstark, L.G., Index s.v. Ḥūṭāmā. The technical use of this word is not found in the other churches; cf. Diettrich, a.a.O., S. 99, Ann. 3: “Die hier folgenden Ḥūṭāmā finden sich in keiner der verglichenen Taufliturgien” (Hansens iii, p. 521 informs us that the same word is also found in the Missale Sfanae, p. 91-93; but this book cannot be considered as a witness of ancient liturgical practices. Besides this worthless remark Hansens contains nothing of interest). Yet I think that it may go back to an ancient Christian use. Timothy ii, Ming. Syr. 13, fol. 135a speaks of the last Lord’s Prayer as “a seal of our prayers” i.e. a short summary and confirmation of them. Undoubtedly the same is meant here. Tertullian, De Oratione 18, in: M.S.L. 1, col. 1281, says that the kiss of peace is “the seal of prayer”. It is the corroborating conclusion. We might also compare: Testamentum Domini, ed. Rahmani, Moguntiae, 1899, p. 44: “seal of thanksgiving”, and: Euphemia and the Goth, ed. F. G. Burkitt, London, 1913, p. 210: “... and sealing their prayer with tears”. These places show conclusively that the word was often used to denote the solemn ending of prayers. I do not know whether ἁγιασμός is found in this sense. The Expos. mentions it in connection with baptism (see Index, s.v.) but that is not sufficient to make our point clear since “Seal” is there a common name for baptism from the earliest times of Christianity (cf. W. Bauer, Handwörterbuch zum N.T., Giesen, 1928, Sp. 1276, s.v. ἁγιασμός). At any rate it is worth while to notice that the Expos. does not mention it at the end of the Eucharist; and this poses the question, if this kind of ending a service was a speciality of a later age. Since the Expos. wants to explain the rules of I. iii it may be passing over the additions of a later age, but already existing in its time, without comment. In this connection we may observe that one of the most important Ḥūṭāmā’s is ascribed in Berol. 38 to Elias of Nisibis (975± 1050, cf. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 287-288; “anscheinend” on S. 288, Abt. 11 can be struck out; and if this statement is accepted, it is highly probable that this kind of ending was introduced by the reform of the liturgy in the High Monastery. It will not be out of place to quote a sentence of Prof. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 393 on this kind of ending; in dealing with the revival of religious poetry in the 11th and 12th cent. he says: “Freier ist in der Wahl des metrischen Aufbaues bei wenigstens vorherrschendem Gebrauche von alphabetischer Akrostichis und Endreim der als dichterische Weiterspinnung des priesterlichen Schlusssegres der eucharistischen Liturgie gedachte Ḥūṭāmā.” This date is the same as that of our treatises! The H. is not only the end of the Euch. Lit.; the same question was discussed with regard to the Baptismal Ritual by G. Diettrich, Tauflit., S. 93 who ascribed the introduction to Elias iii Abū Halim (1176–1190), A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 288-289, because this Elias is the only one who is known as a poet. As a matter of fact, he had been metropolitan of Nisibis, but the reason of Mr. Diettrich can also be applied to the former E. who is always called: of Nisibis and who is thought to be the author by Prof. Baumstark.

Q. 110-112. The question in regard to the formulary of marriage is once more repeated; for the answer see p. 113. For a right understanding of the following

(1) While ἁγιασμός uses the verb ἁγιάζω several times in the sense of “solemn ending” e.g. ii, p. 60.
Q.Q. it is necessary to give a brief summary of this rite (the laws concerning Marriage, see in: ‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon, ii. A translation of the formulare [ed. by the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury’s Assyrian Mission, Urmiia, which I know only by name] was given by Badger, ii, p. 244-276, cf. the chapter on “Marriage-Customs” in Browne-Maclean, p. 142-159 [for the ancient rites, see: D.C.A., s.v. Marriage, and: D.A.C.L., s.v. Mariage, t. x, col. 1888-1890; but the data are not very old]). This blessing consists of the following parts: betrothal; marriage; blessing of the bridal attire; benediction of the colours and of the Crowns; coronation; setting up of the bridal chamber. The text of Badger contains a Lord’s Prayer at the beginning of ii (p. 253); it seems that this was an addition of a later date, since otherwise Q. 114 would be without meaning. Here the question seems to have suggested the addition. Q. 111 shows clearly that these Eastern Christians were very well conscious of the contents of the Lord’s Prayer. They did not conceive it, as is often thought, as a dead or as a living but magically operative formula,¹ which has power by being repeated. It is accentuated by the fact that the phrases used here, especially the verbs, do not agree with those found in the Peshita text, but replace them by synonyms. It is not obvious what suggested to the writer that this prayer is only to be said “by the mouth of the whole congregation”. It is possible that it was said because it had been taught by the Lord to His disciples (Mt. vi, cf. v 12; Lc. xi) and has the first person plural.

The writer hints at what is going on during this service. The betrothal consists of asking the man and woman if they are inclined to be married; if they want they are joined together and blessed by the priest. In the marriage-service prayers for help follow next, e.g. “Build up, O Lord, through Thy Word, and adorn with Thy hope, and establish in Thy mercy, this work which Thy servants have entered upon etc.”, an anthem and new prayers of the same kind. Next the priest takes the chalice in his hand, prays for the espoused and prays over the ring. He makes a sign of the cross over the chalice and throws it into the cup, in glorifying the great power of the cross. A small cross and līnānā (p. 120, n. 2) is also thrown into it and then the cup is perfect (a similar formula as that of the sacramental elements, p. 253). Bridegroom and bride drink from the cup (we observe that in our treatise this blessing of the chalice seems to belong to the betrothal). The bridal attire is blessed during which the following prayer a.o. is said: “Let the right hand of Thy mercy, O Jesus our Lord, rest upon this bridegroom and bride in Thy grace and in Thy pity make them a blessed pair, and enrich their dwellings with wealth and all manner of possessions etc.” followed by many biblical examples (p. 255-256).

At the “crowning” (for this sign of victory, see: D.C.A., s.v. Crow; D.A.C.L., s.v. Mariage, t. x, col. 1889-1890; and the discussion of J. Rendel Harris- A. Mingana, Odes and Psalms of Solomon, ii, p. 207-214) The hope is expressed upon a temporal and eternal crowning, it is accompanied by all sorts of glorifying of God’s greatness and strength. After that the couple is blessed and God is asked to enrich them. The last part “setting up of the bridal chamber” is generally recited, as we are informed by Mr. Badger “in the evening, before the bridegroom and bride retire to rest for the night” (p. 271 n.). It consists

(¹) The same observation can be made in reading the words of Timothy ii, quoted ad Q. 87 seq., as in many other Eastern explanations of the meaning of the Liturgy.
once more of prayers for deliverance from the devil and of prayers for good
faith: "Bless, O Lord, the bridal chamber of Thy servants, and keep the bride-
groom and bride who dwell there in from the evil one," again followed by
examples from the O.T. It will be seen that our writer brings to the fore the
leading thoughts of this ritual. Again he paraphrases them in his own way as
is seen in glancing through the pages. The second reason is less spiritual and
has been spoken of before. The argument of our author himself is based upon
history, curious enough, since it is only once or twice that he speaks in this
way. Unfortunately he does not say what is exactly meant by "formerly".
D.C.A., ii, p. 1107 it is said that marriages were generally celebrated in
the church in early times, but sometimes at home, especially in the East, referring
to: Chrysostomus, Hom. xlvi in Gen. xxiv, in: M.S.G., 54, col. 443. The latter
practice was that of the writer's age in opposition to the general practice of
the Nestorians. It is ordered in: 'Abdisho', Nomocanon, ii 2, that "Betrothal
must be performed in the church." Our text agrees with the rubric of the
present formulary (Badger ii, p. 244: "all shall assemble in the house of the
damsel's father etc.")) As far as I know the Nestorians are the only Christians
who have this festival at home. This is the more striking, since they have a
high idea of common worship (cf. E.S.D.O., p. xviii). About the Lord's Prayer
after the morning psalms see: E.S.D.O., p. 167, referring to p. 106.

Q. 113 is the ordinary case. The present formulary does not provide the
Lord's Prayer at the beginning, nor did it do so at the time of our writer. It
was simply put before it. "To share," is possible. Yet the following \& is
difficult to connect with it. I think it is the object-prefix and V, has preserved
the better reading. In case the one of M. should be followed it must be remembered
that an advantage (Q. 108) was contained in this prayer, of which one should
avail oneself.

Q. 114. The unity of the two parts is also supposed in the formulary. The
betrothal was the beginning of the married state (cf. D.C.A., s.v. Betrothal, where
some references to earlier times of the same effect are found). But I do not
know whether there were special Canons about this point in the Eastern church-
books; the Synodicon Orientale and other Nest. books which I consulted do not
contain them. Again it appears (see: Q. 3 and 92) that all formularies were
thought to be parallel and made up according to the same type. Mautebha =
Seslio: "an anthem at the nightservice, sung sitting" (E.S.D.O., p. 296, where
it is added that they vary and the books in which they are contained are men-
tioned. It is somewhat misleading to draw a parallel with the Greek Cathe-
ismas, because both words mean: sitting. For the Greek means a division of the Psalter,
as Hulala among the Nestorians, and is different with regard to its contents
from the Mautebha. The part which is said will be found: E.S.D.O., p. 151-152
(since one M. is spoken of; this is better than referring to: i.e., p. 85-96). The
Hulala is mentioned p. 153. I did not find anywhere that this intermission
of the service was allowed and practised.

Q. 115. The third point. Answer parallel to that of Q. 111: the contents
of the service do not agree with those of the Lord's Prayer; therefore it
is useless to say it here. "Return to the earth etc." cf. Gen. iii 19. To a right understanding of the first part we must remember that the Nestorians generally adhered to the doctrine of the "status intermedius" with regard to the dead i.e. that the dead after passing away are not judged immediately, but wait in a sleeping state till the day of the resurrection and the last judgment. Cf. Badger, B.G. ii, p. 307: "he departed this life of troubles and trials for the rest of those who sleep in Christ"; p. 265: "We shall both be buried until the day of the revelation of the Raiser of the dead"; p. 485: "Thus the blessed man departed from this laborious life... to the greatly desired chambers of Paradise"; very explicit is this word of Expos. ii, p. 124: "mortem enim somnium et dormitionem ostendimus esse". Often it was thought that after the death there was already a partial judgment, that the soul of the just goes to a better place viz. Paradise than that of the wicked. This Paradise is a place "desen Wonne ihnen das letzte Pfand für ihre endgültige Belohnung, die Anschauung Gottes, bittet" (A. Baumstark, O.C., 1901, S. 341 und N. 3; cf. Salomon of Basra, Book of the Bee, ed. Budge, Oxford, 1886, p. 132). Some other places in Syrian writers who speak of this doctrine are mentioned by M. Jugie, Theologia Dogmatics, v. p. 336–340. This teaching is not confined to the Nestorian Church, but was found in many places and at an early date, see: J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, Gegenwoerig betreffende graf en eeuwig leven in de oud christelijke Epigraphie, in: Nederlandsch archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, 1924–1925, blz. 81–94, and: F. Heiler, Urkirche und Ostkirche, S. 232–234. A fuller discussion than is given there is a desideratum. We may point out that this view tries to give an explanation of all the biblical data (see e.g. Ps. cxv 17); it reaches back to Jewish conceptions, see: H. L. Strack–P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch, München, 1928, iv 2, S. 1016–1165.

The burial-service of the priests was translated, though not completely, by Badger ii, p. 282–321 (cf. p. 282 n. cf. Browne-Maclean, p. 279–289; I have not consulted the edition of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Mission (mentioned by A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 111 and 355). In this case too the writer reproduces in his own words the tenor of the prayers though we observe that most of them as given by Mr. Badger speak in the first person plural and are not direct intercessions; about prayers for the dead see: M. Jugie, Theol. Dogm., v. p. 341–344. Such a prayer is given e.g. p. 301–302. Those quoted by the author are verses of Ps. lixxviii and xxxviii. Those mentioned first and last in: Badger ii, p. 283–284 where also the proper Antiphon is printed. Hymn = Madrasah, see: A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 99, who gives some explanation of this doctrinal chant and those chants of the dead: Register s.v. (most of them are made after the time of our treatise) V. has extended the number of examples; for "Antiphons of the way" see Q. 117.

Q. 116. Ma’atebra is used in a twofold sense: the first one is the seso of the night-service (as in Q. 114), that is to say that the first part of the night-service was said together with the Lord’s Prayer at the house of the dead man (E.S.D.O., p. 151). The second is a hymn sung during the burial of which Mr. Badger gives some instances.

Nowhere else I found a remark expressing the command to the priest of saying such prayers; but on the other hand prayers should be said over the
dead body as soon as possible (D.C.A., s.v. Obsèques). The end however shows that fixed rules did not exist. In the morning the prayers of E.S.D.B.O., p. 103–105, were said and the beginning of the burial-service (Badger ii, p. 203 seqq.) was added to it.

It is possible that the following part formed originally a separate Q. and A. (p. 71), the response beginning at: “We are not able.” The village Niniveh is well known in history; it was situated opposite to Mosul. For long it had become an insignificant spot, which was quite superseded by Mosul. Bar Hebraeus mentioned it fairly often (also in the time of our treatise: Chr. Eccl. iii, col. 319, 325, 331, 333, 337, 339). It may be that this was done by Jacobite aversion against Mosul, which was a stronghold of Nestorianism. About its History cf. B.O., iii 2, p. decclvi–declxvii, and: E. Sachau, Zur Ausbreitung des Christentums in der Per ßes, 1916, S. 48. Why it is called “House of the Ignorant” is not clear. Isho’yabha (Epistulae, ed. Duval, p. 57) said that it was a poor church. But this can hardly explain the expression in question. Possibly it was called so because the Jacobites who were ignorant by the mere fact of being heretics, had here a bishop’s see.–Hazza, cf. Payne Smith, Thesaurus syr., Col. 1238, and: Supplement, p. 123 with various references (cf. also: B.O., iii 2, p. dexx and dxxxi). It was situated in the neighbourhood of Arbela, famous through its important Chronicle. For some time it was the Capitol of Adiabene. Interesting is the interpolation in: Gismondi ii, p. 32; a bishop “ex regimine Hazzae (nunc notae nomine Arbela).” It was at a distance from Mosul and far from the place where our writer probably lived (ch. iv). Therefore he says “I have heard etc.” (cf. the Map in: J. Labourt, Christianisme).

The burial-service consists of washing the dead man at home (this was obligatory, cf. ‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon, vi 6, Mai, p. 280) while prayers and hymns are said (D.A.C.L., s.v. Funérailles, t. v, col. 2705–2715 does not contain anything of interest for our Q.). After that the dead body (at least that of the clergies) is taken to the church, the “Antiphons of the way” (Q. 115 V., 117) being recited (the Greek use, cf. L. Petit, D.A.C.L., s.v. Antiphone, t. i, col. 2484–2485). In the church there is reading of the Scriptures besides prayers and hymns and usually there is communion-service, if a priest is buried. This being done one goes to the grave and the body is interred, and earth is thrown in it in the form of a cross. Each of these acts is accompanied by proper prayers and hymns. In the churchyard the service is ended by “securing”. The next day follows a “consolation” or memorial service, see ad Q. 16. It will be seen that this formulary is of a very loose structure (cf. the remark in Q. 117). The writer did not know the tradition which furnished a solemn beginning and end. In Niniveh it was done in the church and there the question which formed the starting point of the discussion would be superfluous. Nevertheless this was apparently left to discretion of the priests. The expression “They ate” means the dinners after the burial at the house of the deceased which were usual in all places, cf. Browne–Maclean, p. 284. John Bar Abgare (in: ‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon, vi 6, Mai, p. 280) had ordered the priests not to take too much food or drink. We hear of various complaints about this institution, which seems to have often become more or less an orgy. Our author only states the fact. Some more about this as well as about the burial-services among the Jacobites may be found in: Kayser, S. 155, ad Q. 60. It is not out of place.
to observe that these meals are different from the "Agapes Funèbres", mentioned in: L.O.O., p. 257–258, since they are simply a Eucharist at the grave.

Q. 117. The formulary does not give any rubric about the point that is under discussion here. It seems to be the intention there that the dead man will be buried on the same day on which he died. We must remember that the sequence of services was in the evening, at night and in the morning. The former group considered the Mautziha's of the evening as the beginning of a service that was interrupted for some time (cf. Q. 52) and carried on the next morning. The latter thought it to be a special service; hence it was ended in the usual way; the next day they began afresh. The end of the ordinary Evening-service which the author has in mind is found: E.S.D.O., p. 20 seq.: "The priest takes the cross in his hand, and turning to the people says: Bless O my Lord. By Your Command (κ. I will give the blessing). They answer, By the Command of Christ and glory to his holy Name and they bow their heads." The conclusion (= Sealing) follows during which the priest makes the sign of the cross over the people. This conclusion is in the form of an invocation for help (the form given by Dean Maclean ends with giving the kiss of peace and reciting the Nicene Creed. The editor remarks that "this appears to be the universal custom," but that the former is not to be found in the Roman Catholic edition and in that of Urmia, while the latter is not found in the R.C., p. 22, n. 2. In fact our author does not refer to it and therefore it is probably a later addition). That he is "a partaker of the signing" is the same thought that leads to putting the Host into the mouth of the dead as though they were living (D.A.C.L., s.v. Communion des morts, t. iii, col. 2445-2446).

Q. 118–123. Together with these Q.Q. we must deal with Q. 97 and 103 since they are concerned with similar questions, viz. the place of Cross and Gospel at the beginning of the service. They were indispensable for a valid Eucharist (cf. ad Q. 35). The Cross and the Gospel are constantly mentioned together, not only in the Eucharist, but also in every solemn procession (though no mention is made of special processional crosses, cf. D.A.C.L., s.v. Croix et Crucifix, t. iii, col. 3102–3103, and: Kaufmann, Handbuch, S. 375–376).

In Q. 101 we saw what meaning these two objects had for the devote Nestorian. It is not out of place to summarize what is said in T. concerning this matter (L.E.W. is quoted); it is not said where the priest stands at the beginning, nor during the "anthem of the Sanctuary" (p. 253–254) nor during one of the following prayers and hymns until the lections (p. 255–256). It seems, though, it is not expressed anywhere that it was the Bema (cf. ad Q. 97). For on p. 257 after the prayer before the apostle we read: "When the priest goes down from the Bema and reaches the door of the altar he and the deacon both incline..." "They all go down to the nave (temple)..."; p. 258 brings the rubric: "When the priest goes to make ready the Gospel..."; "when he takes up (the Gospel) to go out (of the altar)", followed by the other readings. On page 262 the censer is taken and the paten with the hosts prepared during the carazutha. The following rubric bringing something about it is on p. 267 "the deacons enter the altar", while the priest places the mysteries upon the altar, "and going outside the Sanctuary the priest lades the deacons with the Cross and
Gospels (p. 268); is this still practised? Hansens iii, p. 107 says: “Hodie utraque processio, evangelii scilicet et crucis, plane obsolevisse videtur.” The deacons are distinguished from those who remain inside the altar. It is described how the priest worships on the Bema (p. 269) after which he goes back to the altar giving peace (p. 269–271). During the rest of the liturgy he remains there.

The rubrics in: L.O.C., and Beryl. 98 are somewhat different. But at any rate it is clear that these precepts, unless supplemented by indications from other sources, are not quite clear, though it must be admitted that this will be specially the case for those who are obliged to rely upon these rubrics and are not able to assist at a real Nestorian service. In passing it will be noticed that these entrances have nothing to do with the so-called Little Entrance of the Greek liturgy (cf. Hansens iii, p. 100).

It will be useful to consult here the various expositions (a short summary in: Hansens iii, p. 107, cf. p. 104–106). Narssi, Hom. xvii does not yield much evidence for he deals only with the Missa Fidelium. The only reference is the following: “the priests now come in procession into the midst of the Sanctuary” (Connolly, p. 4). The sequence in the exposition of Abraham Bar Laphel (Expos. ii, p. 158–161) is clear: after the Anthem of the Sanctuary follows the “Egressus Crucis et Ascensus super Bema” (not found in: L.E.W.), accompanied by lights etc.; the Gospel is not mentioned. This comes after the reading of the Apostolos and a psalm: “egressio evangelii, crucisque cum eo,” escorted by deacons. The Cross is held upon a long pole. After the reading of the Gospel that follows next comes the “sublatio crucis et evangelii de thromo Bematis” (cf. Q. 103) by a deacon and priest without escort. The Cross is put in “super-liminari porta sanctuarii” and the Gospel at the other side. This description is one of an ordinary service. Here in Q. 118 it is specially emphasized that the bishop or Metropolitan is present. Such a high service, which was not provided for in the ordinary service-books, is underlying the Expos. Its evidence is the following: The Anthem of the Sanctuary is sung, sub-deacons stand near the door of the altar carrying lamps and deacons carry tapers. They are preceded by two deacons without anything, while an arch-deacon is on the left hand of the bishop. Then the deacons go out, first the two without anything, the sub-deacons join in, next the rest of the deacons followed by him who carries the Cross “signum Regis victoriosi, et seriem mandatorum eius.” They go from the Sanctuary to the Bema. The sub-deacons remain standing in a corridor. The two deacons stand on the Bema near the altar in honour of the altar and the bishop having the Cross and Gospel. Those who stand in the corridor go back to the sacristy, the others carrying censers descend from the Bema. Only those two remain there. The reading of Law and Prophets follows next. The reader comes from the sacristy, bows before the altar and comes to the Bema. After that the Apostolos is carried into the Bema (two practices regarding the door). After three verses the deacon of the order and some people with him go to the sacristy worshipping and a priest goes with him (“surgit sacerdos et adorat, et crucem osculatur et episcopum”). There they prepare the procession to bring out the Gospel while the Apostle is being read. A hymn is sung and every one prepares himself for the reception of the Gospel. It enters the Bema a priest going on the right-hand-side; the Gospel is kissed by the bishop. While it is brought in it is received with all the splendor of Eastern
ritual. The Gospel being read, the various members of the clergy are blessed by the Bishop, and the deacons draw near to the altar and the Cross and the Gospel. Then they go back to the altar, two deacons carrying the Cross and the Gospel and they go in to the throne and the veils that have been opened since the beginning are closed; “qui crucem et evangelium portant, non ponunt ea super altare donec vela ligentur” (cf. various places between p. 9–33). Timothy ii in his Exposition, Mingana Syr. 13, fol. 115b–116b, mentions the Anthem of the Sanctuary; the bringing out of the Cross and its being placed on the Bema; the veils are opened; the readings of the Scripture; the priest who reads the Gospel descends from the Bema, goes to the door of the altar and prays there; the priest puts a pure stole over his shoulder and takes the Gospel preceded by deacons with lights and incense, after which the Gospel is read; this reading is ended with an adoration; the priest gives Cross and Gospel to the deacons who carry them from the Bema without procession; at the altar-door the Cross is placed on the left hand side and the Gospel on the righthand side.

It will be seen that there is some difference between these sketches; the Expos. has the fullest details which shows and is explained by the fact that it is a pontificale. It is interesting to notice that Timothy who is the latest expositor says exactly where Cross and Gospel must be placed in the end, while the others have no indication whatever. It may be that this point and others were decided under the influence of such questions as are discussed here.

We should remember in order to understand these questions well that the righthand-side has always been the side of most honour (cf. Mt. xxv 35, Marc x 37, and: Klostermann’s comment, Das Markusevangeliu m, Tübingen, 1926, and: Das Matthäusevangeliu m, Tübingen, 1927, on these places.—Jewish materials in: Strack–Billerbeck, Kommentar zum NT., München, 1922, i, S. 895–896, 980–981.—D.A.C.L., s.v. Droit, t. iv, col. 1547–1549: “la droite est le côté sacré, le côté de la vie et de la force; la gauche, le côté profane, de la mort, de la faiblesses,” in almost every religion, cf. the use of “dexter” and “sinister”). For the exact places of right and left see ad Q. 98.

Q. 97: Deacons carrying it, cf. what was quoted from Abraham and Expos. This comparison shows a difference in which Timothy stands on the side of our Q. The moments of coming out and entering see before. “They” are the priests and deacons of the Sanctuary (Expos.). ΔΩδοί Pa. lit. = to receive—to go to meet, a meaning also of the Af. What is meant by the Bema? E.S.D.O., p. 292 gives two explanations: 1) raised space between the Sanctuary-doors and the dwarf wall in the nave parallel to them; 2) rarely the Sanctuary. The same in: L.E.W., p. 571 where the readers are referred to the word: Ambon (p. 569). The former use can be illustrated by a reference to: Budge, B.G. ii, p. 413 sketch; the latter is found in the quotation from: Badger ii, p. 325 (ad Q. 27). The use of the word in our Q. Q. supposes that there is a kind of procession going through the church. This agrees with the description given in the Expos. where the Bema is a place in the middle of the Church (besides the references given before, cf. i, p. 31 and the Sketch of Dom. Connolly i, p. 196 M.) on which the Gospel etc. is read and which correspond with the Ambo (in the Greek
church formerly but now obsolete). Compare: *D.A.C.L.*, s.v. *Ambro*, i, col. 1330–1347; in the East its place was in the middle of the church.

Q. 103. A high mass as in *Expos*. It is illustrated by our quotations from the explanations. The kissing, a sign of devotion (Q. 22), is not found elsewhere. That “they” means here the congregation is apparent from the version of our Q. in

Q. 118–119. Probably the answer of Q. 103 was not sufficiently detailed. For there are no traces whatever that our treatise is composed from different parts of separate origin. At any rate the latter two are a more expanded form. None of the sources mentioned before shows that the priests go out during the said antiphon, or we must suppose synchronism instead of sequence of events.

That the priest = Jesus, that he in spite of his humanity acts “vice Christi” is a supposition which is continually found in all the mystagogies. It is superfluous to give here texts to prove this since it is met everywhere (Nest.: Narss., *Hom. xvi*, p. 4 Connolly; Isho’yabth i, *Canon 1*, in: O. Braun, *Syndados*, S. 240; *Expos*. ii, p. 7, 12, 18, 24 etc.). The quotations are to be found in: *Breviarium Chaldaicum*, ed. P. Bedjan, iii, the former, p. 504, cf. *Expos*. i, p. 122; the latter p. 502 quoted from Prayers in the Hebdomada of the Holy Cross. Nevertheless the reasons are dark why this way of arrangement is chosen as one would expect that “Jesus” would be right as in Q. 119. “Ancient” ch. vi. Palm-sunday, lit. Hosanna’s, clearly borrowed from Mt. xxi 9 (cf. about it also *Expos*. i, p. 72–78 which does not say anything about the festival itself). A. Baumstark, *Festbereit*, S. 230, mentions a Homily of Severus of Antioch with the same name in its title. Nevertheless it does not seem as if the name: “Hosanna’s” was generally accepted. Among the Nestorians it is most common. To celebrate this day with a procession is already found in the first description of this festival in the Peregrinatio Silviac (see: P. Drews, *Weche, geese*, in: *P.R.E.*, xxx, S. 416–419). It seems as though it was introduced among the Persians in the time of Babai + 560 (Labourt, *Christianisme*, p. 154–160), cf. Gismondi i, p. 41: “Eius diebus celebratum est Nisibi et Madainae festum palmarum et Transfigurationis. Porro solemnitas palmarum apud graecos ex festis est celebrioribus” (*Expos*. i, p. 52–58; ii, p. 90 does not afford any help).

For the reasons in Q. 119 and 120 cf. the Comments of the Preface ch. vi. Their thoughts were clearly a presumption when we see how the Cross and Gospel are estimated by our author (Q. 101 and 123).

Q. 121. “Platform” is not a terminus technicus, cf. T., p. 10, l. 7; p. 143, l. 11. It is the same place called “Katastroma” elsewhere (cf. Connolly’s Sketch, *Expos*. i, p. 196, G.G.; = now the Bema?); cf. *L.E.W.*., p. 586: “the footpace before the altar.” The Cross facing the altar was thus probably expressing adoration of the altar and its Sacraments. East and West mentioned here are explained by the orientation of the whole cult (the same in the Baptismal Ritual, see: Diettrich, *Tauflit*, S. 78). It is found everywhere in the Christian church from the oldest times (a good summary in: *D.A.C.L.*, s.v. *Orientation*, t. xii, col. 2665–2668 and add to the literature mentioned there: G. Graf, *Zur Gebetstonsung*, in: *Jahrbuch f. Liturgiegeschichte*, 1927, S. 153–159, specially from Christian Arabic sources). But this use is not specially Christian, but is
very wide spread in various religions, cf. G. van der Leeuw, *Phänomenologie*, S. 372–377. The later Christian authors offer all sorts of mystagogical reasons. *Expos. i*, p. 87–90 are devoted to the question why the people must pray turned to the East and not to Jerusalem as the prophets did, a point of special interest for the Nestorians of course, since they were east of Jerusalem. The answer is: because in the East lies Paradise, the place of immortality and sanctity (these reasons mentioned in: Browne–Maclean, p. 235 are not only those of the modern Nestorians, as is thought by G. Dietrich, *Tudrīt*, S. 78, Anm. 1). ‘Abdisho’, *Nimrudu*, v. 6 says that it is done because of the apostolic commandments and an (apocryphal) tradition, that Jesus blessed His disciples at the Ascension (Luke xxiv, 50) looking west, while the disciples looked east. These reasons seem to point back to a common Christian tradition since they occur in all the Eastern churches.

The answer is not extremely clear. The beginning seems to express that the Cross must stand as far East as possible. But the ambiguity of expression appears where the opinion of those who are mentioned in the Question, is summarized. Particularly doubtful is where the apodosis begins in the sentence *איהויה יִזְכָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*. Or in other terms must *איהויה יִזְכָּר* be explained as a modification of the following verb (Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, §327) or is it verbum finitum; in the former case “they need not etc.” is the apodosis, while in the latter it is a special sentence of its own. In both cases there seems to be a difference with what is said at the end of the question. It seems as though the teacher corrects the statement of the questioner. We have adopted the latter possibility taking “to come” to mean: the coming back of the Cross to the altar. Nevertheless I do not see the solution quite well.

Q. 122. *איהויה יִזְכָּר* cf. Q. 104. I have never heard that a gospel is mentioned connected with the Cross. It may mean that the Cross stands with one arm over the Gospel. Those people that are spoken of in the question placed it in the West of the Bema, for undoubtedly the altar here means: the altar in the Bema. The faithful are the officiating priests. The adoration is by bowing and metanoia’s which are met several times in the rubrics where the priests worship before the altar and kiss it, cf. e.g. *E.W.*, p. 205, p. 272. For the setting see ch. vi, 1–. About the end of the Q., see ad Q. 1.

Q. 123. Refers to Q. 119. It is a reflex of the dispute mentioned in Q. 101 (see there about the meaning of the Cross). It is worth while to draw here the attention to the sentence of the author, that without the Cross the Gospel would not have been known. Such a word shows sufficiently that for people like our author the ritual had not obscured the comprehension of the vital truths of Christianity; but that the ritual really conveyed them and made them tangible before the eyes of those who knew their interpretation; that the truth was living and was not superseded by magic and paganism.