

accidental dropping of  $\epsilon\eta$  after  $\alpha\gamma\tau\omicron\eta$ , and  $\kappa\epsilon\beta$ - written for  $\iota\epsilon\beta$ -. More probably, however, in view of the doublet in A, the explanation of the mistake is to be found as usual in an attempt to correct a real or supposed error by means of the Hexapla, and that  $\kappa\beta\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\mu$  (the Hebrew corruption of an original  $\text{בִּיבְלֵעִם}$ ) was translated  $\text{Κεβλααμ}$  by Theodotion and  $\text{κατέναντι τοῦ λαοῦ}$  by Aquila. B then gives us the LXX mended by Theodotion, A gives us the LXX mended by Theodotion *plus* Aquila, while 'Lucian' has escaped altogether in this particular instance.

But this is a very different thing from regarding B and Lucian as two texts that have come down from pre-Origenian times, each preserving Hebrew readings independent of the Masoretic, or rather we should say 'later Palestinian', Hebrew text. Our Greek authorities can only attest one variant to the later Palestinian Hebrew text, and they can only do this by preserving the text which lay before the Ptolemaic translators. The reason that this is not always self-evident to those who discuss readings 'attested by the Septuagint' is that very few scholars have realized till lately the terrible extent to which the text of B is disfigured by unskilful sporadic correction from the Hexapla.

F. C. BURKITT.

## LITURGICAL COMMENTS AND MEMORANDA.

CIRCUMSTANCES, which it is unnecessary to explain here, have induced me to think that it may be of use to offer to the readers of the *Journal of Theological Studies* a series of notes embodying passing notions or slight items of enquiry relating to liturgical questions; notes not regular, perhaps, but only intermittent; sometimes in the briefest form, but sometimes a *dissertatiuncula*. It is now more than forty years since the subject of Liturgy attracted my attention; much material, whatever its quality, has accumulated on my hands; the more so inasmuch as, perhaps in some measure by a natural disposition to what the Moralists call 'curiosity', I have been disposed rather to listen and learn than to write and teach. The material in question consists of hasty, if somewhat lengthy, pencillings in the margins or flyleaves of books made in the course of reading them; or a more formal examination, entered in note-books, of points as to which doubts suggested themselves to me that seemed not to have occurred to the authors. All these, with the mind that gave them birth and gives them a certain unity, may still be understood; but in a moment that cannot be distant

these notes, these comments, these memoranda, will become for the most part simply unintelligible. I propose, then, if circumstances be favourable, to utilize a few of them in these pages. It must not be imagined that I have any thought of thrusting on the readers of this JOURNAL a selection from the undigested contents of a now long and varied line of old note-books. By no means. Hitherto, as is elsewhere remarked, everything I have done has been 'accidental'. This will, I trust and think, be the case in the projected series too. Although, doubtless, old stores will be utilized, each item will, I anticipate, be suggested, caused, by something new, a book, an enquiry, a chance remark in some current periodical.

This method, however, has doubtless its drawbacks, and the everlasting 'I' will, it is to be feared, be quite unduly prominent; and the more so that in anything I may write here the main interest, the main object, with me is to make it, if possible, more easy for others, here or there, at one point or another, to look into things for themselves. Whatever be the certainty of assurance I may actually entertain as to the justness of conclusions or the rightness of views that may be indicated, I would wish them ordinarily to take the form of a personal opinion and nothing more, the actual justness, or otherwise, of which only time and the work also of others can shew.

There is another difficulty. If I am to write thus at all, it must be in an informal way, rapidly as the phrase may happen to run off the pen, degenerating possibly sometimes even into the tone of a mere chat or gossip as the mood of the moment may dictate. To exercise over these intermittent trifles the austere control of elaborated revision would simply make them cease to be what they are and were intended to be. I see then how easily it is possible to fail in pleasing. But in such circumstances I will readily, willingly, lay down the pen. For a time, a stage, comes in life when it is not so hard to recognize how silence (with contentment) may be great gain.

## I

In a paper on 'The Litany of Saints in the Stowe Missal' printed in this JOURNAL in October 1905 (vii p. 124) attention was called to the order of suffrages: 'John (the Baptist), (the Blessed Virgin) Mary', in the diptychs of the Stowe Missal and in the Litany of Saints in the MS Reg. 2 A xx; and I had to say: 'The case is, in both diptychs and litanies, so far as I can find, unique.' Already in the spring of 1907, the state of things thus indicated could mean no more than a state of ignorance; and a parallel could be produced which may possibly prove to come from a region familiar to us in England who so greatly

and justly revere Archbishop Theodore; I mean Antioch on the Orontes.

In *Oriens Christianus* v p. 178 sqq. was printed a Syriac anaphora drawn up by the (Jacobite) patriarch Cyriac of Nisibis (A.D. 793-817). As to the character of this piece a few words will be said later. The following is the passage of the Intercession that is of interest for the immediate purpose :

'As therefore the power of life and of death is Thine, O Lord, do Thou remember also those who from the beginning were of renown before Thee, the fathers, patriarchs, prophets and apostles, martyrs and confessors, preachers, evangelists, John, the voice and forerunner of Thy Word, and Stephen the first (*principis*) of the deacons and martyrs, and the altogether holy and blessed Mother of God Mary, and all saints, and make us sharers,' &c. (p. 191).

Here, then, is an order strictly 'historical' (the determinant of which is the date of death), and yet more fully exhibited than in our two insular documents mentioned above, seeing that St Stephen is in them ranged after the apostles and evangelists and at the head of the list of martyrs, i. e. in order of dignity. What are we to say as to this little problem : a feature that is in any case most striking, and all but unique, found on the one hand in the diptychs of remote Ireland in the West, on the other in the East in remote Nisibis ?

I have not seen or read any remarks on the anaphora-text of the patriarch Cyriac beyond those of its editor, who is disposed to see in it traces of 'Old-Antiochene' influence. In cases of this kind we have to make our way by help of conjectures that are for the most part hardly more substantial than mere shadowy reflexions. Still, the impression the document makes upon me is much the same as that which it seems to have made upon its editor. At any rate this anaphora of Cyriac of Nisibis would appear to be one of those composed (like 'Chrysostom' in regard to 'Basil') by way of reaction against liturgical elaboration and parade, whether in ideas or in forms of expression; betokening at least some effort after simplicity, and perhaps a falling back in some measure on ancient forms. Again, the item in the Intercession, 'Memento Domine presbyterorum et diaconorum et τῶν ὑποδιακόνων, lectorum, psaltarum, ascetarum et laicorum' . . . (p. 192), curiously recalls the Clementine liturgy (Brightman *L. E. W.* 21. 31, 21. 1). Were a Nestorian liturgy in question there might be some opening for the suggestion that the order: John; Stephen, Mary, was due to the Nestorian tenets. But the document is an anaphora of the Monophysite Church. This striking order (unique so far as at present appears in the East) would seem to be most naturally accounted for on

the supposition that it is copied from some more ancient (and, in accordance with what is said above, presumably Old-Antiochene) liturgical form.

If the diptychs order: John, Stephen, Mary, was that anciently existing in the liturgy of the truly Apostolic Church of Antioch on the Orontes, it would not be hard to gather how such Syrian order came to be adopted in Ireland, seeing the peculiar character of Irish learning and Irish devotionism in the seventh century, so readily receptive of new, and especially strange, things.<sup>1</sup> The foregoing considerations go to enforce the need of devoting much more attention than has hitherto been given to the liturgical influence of the 'Syrians' in Western Europe (cf. *J.T.S.* viii p. 293 n. 1); an influence exercised especially in the sixth and seventh centuries, contemporaneously with Byzantine influences. So far as these latter are concerned, their recognition, in general terms, has become almost a commonplace with the liturgists. But what is of importance is to identify in detail the particular features that are of this late introduction into our native western rites. I believe that many features of our earliest extant liturgy books of the West (and very especially the Gallican and Mozarabic), that have been referred to a primitive tradition, and are readily allowed in the Liturgical Schools to pass in this guise, will, when due investigation is made, be found to be really due to these two later currents of influence.

Perhaps it may be as well to add that I do not think our Archbishop, Theodore of Tarsus is either directly, or indirectly, responsible for the particular order: 'John, Mary' found in the Stowe Diptychs, and the litany of MS Reg. 2 A xx.

EDMUND BISHOP.

<sup>1</sup> It may be proper to recall here what was said (*J.T.S.* vii p. 136) as to the identity of the order of names of Apostles in the Liturgy of St James, and the Stowe diptychs. Since that passage was written the Vatican MS referred to (*Gr.* 2282) has been printed. It appears from internal evidence that, whatever be the age of the MS itself, it affords an actual text-recension that dates from some time between the later years of the seventh century and the later years (or, more probably, the middle) of the eighth (see the remarks of Drs A. Baumstark and Schermann *Oriens Christianus* iii, 1903, pp. 215, 218-219). The order of Apostles in this recension is the same as that found in the MSS already in print, among which the oldest text-recension, as fixed by internal evidence, is of the second half of the tenth century (see Brightman *Litt. E. and W.* pp. xlix-li).