

MORE READINGS FROM 4 EZRA AND 2 BARUCH IN THE KONAT COLLECTION

FLORIAN NEITMANN

UNIVERSITY OF MÜNSTER, GERMANY

LIV INGEBORG LIED

MF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, RELIGION AND SOCIETY, OSLO, NORWAY

ABSTRACT

This article presents three liturgical manuscripts containing passages from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch which have thus far been overlooked in the scholarship on these two books. The study begins with a summary of the previous history of scholarship on Syriac lectionaries containing readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. This is followed by a description of the three manuscripts, all three of which are preserved in the Konat Collection in Pampakuda, Kerala (India). One of them, Ms. 208, is a lectionary, while the two others, Mss. 91 and 354, are lectionary indices. They were produced in the years 1892–94, which shows that the reception of readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in Syriac liturgical manuscripts continued for much longer than previously thought. This continued reception was enabled by the faithful preservation of—and engagement with—the lectionary Ms. 77 in the Konat

Collection, which, as argued in this article, is the source of the three nineteenth-century manuscripts preserved in the same collection.

Until 2024, five Syriac lectionary manuscripts containing readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra had been identified and published for an English-reading academic audience. This article presents three more. All three manuscripts are held in the Konat Collection in Pampakuda, India, carrying the shelfmarks Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Mss. 91, 208, and 354.¹ The manuscripts in question are also digitized by the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library (HMML) and available through their online reading rooms, but so far, the occurrence of readings from these two books have gone under the radar of scholarship on 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra. The last time a new manuscript containing excerpted passages from these two texts was published in an academic outlet was in 2014.² The occurrence of three more manuscripts is therefore welcome news both to the small scholarly community that specializes in

¹ The three manuscripts were brought to our attention during Florian Neitmann's research visit at the Konat Collection in Pampakuda and at the St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute (SEERI) in Kottayam in June 2024 by the unpublished PhD thesis by Shibu Varughese, *Catalogue of Syriac Liturgical Manuscripts at Pampakuda Library*, PhD Diss., Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, 2017, 17–20. While Varughese notes that Ms. 77 includes readings from apocryphal books, he does not note their inclusion in Mss. 208, 91, and 354 and their relationship to Ms. 77 (on which see below). Unfortunately, this book was accessible to Neitmann only for a short time, during the research stay at SEERI in Kottayam. Thanks are due to Fr. Johns A. Konat for granting access to the collection and referring to the catalogue, and to the staff of SEERI, especially its director Fr. Jacob Thekeparampil, for their support.

² Sebastian P. Brock and Lucas Van Rompay. *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts and Fragments in the Library of Deir al-Surian, Wadi al-Natrun (Egypt)*. OLA 227. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

2 Baruch and 4 Ezra, and to scholars of Syriac liturgical practices and lectionary manuscripts.

This article provides an updated survey of the presence of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra in Syriac lectionary manuscripts, a presentation of the three manuscripts of the Konat Collection, and a table providing a basic overview of the occurrences of readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra across manuscripts and liturgical events.

LECTIONARY MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINING READINGS FROM 2 BARUCH AND 4 EZRA IDENTIFIED IN SCHOLARSHIP BY 2024

The five Syriac lectionary manuscripts that, by 2024, had been published and were known by an academic audience to preserve readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra are: London, British Library, Add. 14,686, Add. 14,687 and Add. 14,736, foll. 13–21; Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms 77, and Deir al-Surian, Ms Syr. 33.

London, British Library, Add. 14,686 and Add. 14,687

Willem Baars was the first to make an academic audience aware of the fact that readings from 2 Baruch occurred in a selection of Syriac lectionary manuscripts. In the 1963 article, “Neue Textzeugen der syrischen Baruchapokalypse,”³ he identified the use of 2 Bar 44:9–15 in London, British Library, Add. 14,686 and the occurrence of 2 Bar 72:1–73:2 in London, British Library, Add. 14,687. According to the colophons, these two manuscripts are companion volumes and both manuscripts were copied in the Monastery of the Syrians (Northern Egypt) by the prolific scribe Bakos, in the years 1255 and 1256 respectively. Baars

³ Willem Baars, “Neue Textzeugen der syrischen Baruchapokalypse,” *VT* 13:4 (1963): 476–78.

focused on the existence of readings from 2 Baruch in these lectionary manuscripts but, in fact, Add. 14,686 and Add. 14,687 contain readings from both 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra.⁴ 4 Ezra 12:31–38 is prescribed to be read on the event of the Revelation of Joseph (Add. 14,686, fol. 16r–v); 4 Ezra 7:26–42 and 2 Bar 44:9–15 occur together as readings for the Sunday of the Departed (Add. 14,686, fol. 75r–77v); and the Festival of Mount Tabor includes a reading from 4 Ezra 6:18–28 (Add. 14,686, fol. 185r–196r). In addition, Add. 14,687 prescribes 2 Bar 72:1–73:1 to be read on the Sunday of the Resurrection (Easter Sunday), on New Sunday and on the Eighth Sunday after Easter (Add. 14,687, fol. 157v–158r and 175r–176r).

London, British Library, Add. 14,736, foll. 13–21

A reading from 4 Ezra occurs also in London, British Library, Add. 14,736, foll. 13–21, dated by the cataloger, William Wright, to the thirteenth century CE.⁵ The reading in question is 4 Ezra 12:31–38, also here prescribed to be read on the event of the Revelation of Joseph.⁶ The lectionary manuscript survives in fragments only. The presence of 4 Ezra in this fragmented

⁴ Cf. R.J. Bidawid, “4 Ezra,” *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version. Sample Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), i–ii and 1–51 at ii; Sven Dederig, “Apocalypse of Baruch,” *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version*, part 4, fasc. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), i–iv and 1–50 at iii n. 2; R.J. Bidawid, “4 Esdras,” *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version*, part 4, fasc. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), iii.

⁵ William Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838, Part I* (London: British Museum, 1870), 174.

⁶ Cf. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Matthew P. Monger, “Look to the East: New and Forgotten Sources to 4 Ezra,” *The Embroidered Bible: Studies in Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Honour of Michael E. Stone*, ed. William Adler, Matthias Henze and Lorenzo DiTommaso (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 639–52 at 647–51.

manuscript was noted by R.J. Bidawid in his editions of the Syriac text of 4 Ezra in 1966.⁷

Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 77

The presence of readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra in Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 77 was first published in 1973 by Bidawid and Sven Dederling in their editions of the two texts in the dedicated volume of *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version*.⁸ According to the two editors, J. P. M. van der Ploeg had made a microfilm of the manuscript available to them “just in time to include the evidence” in the 1973 edition.⁹ Ms. 77 is a composite manuscript, which according to notes preserved in the manuscript was manufactured over time between 1423 and 1432¹⁰ by the recently appointed Patriarch Basilius (fol. 1v–117v; 128r–147r, see the colophon fol. 147r i)¹¹ and by others, including Joseph Barnisan (fol. 118–127, see the colophon on fol. 118r). This lectionary manuscript contains 4 Ezra 12:31–38, to be read on

⁷ Bidawid, “4 Ezra,” ii.

⁸ Dederling, “Apocalypse of Baruch,” iii; Bidawid, “4 Esdras,” iii.

⁹ Dederling, “Apocalypse of Baruch,” iii n. 4; Bidawid, “4 Esdras,” iii n. 3; cf. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and their Syriac Manuscripts* (Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 1983), 160.

¹⁰ For the date of the first stage of the manuscript, which is the ninth Shevat 1734 AG (i.e., 1423 CE), see the colophon on fol. 147r, right column (henceforth: i, with ii referring to the left column). The second stage (fol. 118–127) was added after six years according to the lower colophon on fol. 118r. The third and fourth stages (fol. 128–140; 141–146) were completed “after ten years” according to the colophon on fol. 146v in the intercolumn. This probably refers to the calendrical year when the first stage was completed, i.e., 1734 AG (=1422–23 CE). Accordingly, the manuscript was probably completed in 1432 or 33 CE.

¹¹ On Basilius, see Mark N. Swanson, *The Coptic Papacy in Islamic Egypt (641–1517)* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2010), 122–23. Also see the brief biographical note in van der Ploeg, *Christians of St. Thomas*, 169.

the Revelation of Joseph (fol. 10v); 4 Ezra 7:26–42 and 2 Bar 44:9–15 prescribed to be read on the Sunday of the Departed (fol. 49v–50r) and 2 Bar 72:1–73:2, copied among the readings for the Sunday of the Resurrection (fol. 102r).

Deir al-Surian, Ms. Syr. 33

Sebastian P. Brock and Lucas Van Rompay noted the occurrence of readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra in Deir al-Surian, Ms. Syr. 33 while cataloguing the Syriac manuscripts that are still kept onsite in the Monastery of the Syrians in the Wadi al-Natrun.¹² 2 Bar 44:9–15 and 4 Ezra 7:26–42 are copied on folios 72v–75r to be read on the Sunday of the Departed. 4 Ezra 6:18–28 is attested on folios 222r–223r among the readings for the Festival of Mount Tabor.¹³ The cataloguers assigned a date to this manuscript in the first decades of the thirteenth century.¹⁴

Overall Structure and Similarities

As this overview suggests, since 1963, readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra have so far been identified in a selection of Syriac lectionary manuscripts dating from the early thirteenth century to the mid-fifteenth century CE. The readings from the two books figure among other readings from the Old Testament.¹⁵ As the overview also shows, it is a certain repertoire of readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra that scribes have copied in these manuscripts, and they are assigned to a selected set of events. 4 Ezra 12:31–38 is prescribed to be read on the Revelation of Joseph in four of them. 4 Ezra 7:26–42 and 2 Bar 44:9–15 occur

¹² Brock and Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 249–52.

¹³ Brock and Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 250–51.

¹⁴ Brock and Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 249.

¹⁵ That is, among the first readings to be read in the worship context, before the readings from Catholic Epistles and Acts, Pauline Epistles and, finally, Gospels.

on the Sunday of the Departed on three occasions. The Festival of Mount Tabor features 4 Ezra 6:18–28 in two of the manuscripts. 2 Bar 72:1–73:1 occurs twice among the readings for the Sunday of the Resurrection, and once on New Sunday, as well as on the Eighth Sunday after Easter.

It is worth noting that, in general, although with some variation, the lectionary manuscripts contain the same set of events and a fairly high degree of overlap in the readings they ascribe to the liturgical events.¹⁶ There are, for example, similarities between Ms. Syr. 33, Add. 14,736 and Add. 14,686.¹⁷ Although it is impossible to pin down any precise historical relationship between the manuscripts that contain readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra, the similarities between the sets of events and choice of readings in these manuscripts suggest that there are links between them. One important link is that they are all somehow connected to the Monastery of the Syrians. As mentioned above, Add. 14,686 and Add. 14,687 were copied there. Ms. Syr. 33 and Add. 14,736 are both of unknown origin, but Add. 14,736 was kept in the monastery before it was brought to the British Library,¹⁸ and Ms. Syr. 33 is still at the premises.

¹⁶ Nils H. Korsvoll, Liv Ingeborg Lied and Jerome A. Lund, “British Library Additional 14,686: Introduction, List of Readings, and Translation of Colophon and Notes,” *Hugoye* 19:2 (2016): 385–402. A certain degree of variation is highly common in Syriac lectionary manuscripts.

¹⁷ Ms. Syr. 33 contains a similar (but not entirely identical) collection of events and readings as Add. 14,686. Add. 14,736 is a fragmentary manuscript and therefore there is much we do not know. However, the readings prescribed for the Revelation of Joseph that survive are the same as the readings scripted to be read at this event in Add. 14,686. It remains possible that if more of this manuscript had survived, some of the other readings from 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra that are found in Add. 14,686 may also have been copied there. Due to the state of the manuscript, however, this remains hypothetical. Cf., Brock and Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, 252; Liv Ingeborg Lied, *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*, STAC 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 232.

¹⁸ Brock and Van Rompay, *Catalogue*, xv.

The only manuscript that does not betray any direct connection to the Monastery of the Syrians is Ms. 77. In none of the colophons is the monastery in the Scetis desert mentioned as the place where the manuscript was copied or kept.¹⁹ However, the fact that all other manuscripts containing readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are attested in that monastery suggests that the lectionary order prescribed by them was a local tradition transmitted there. The circumstances around the production of Ms. 77 lend strength to this argument. As mentioned above, the first stage of the manuscript was produced in 1422 or 1423 by the newly appointed Patriarch Basilius. He had been consecrated as Patriarch by the Coptic Pope Gabriel V, two other Coptic bishops and one Syrian bishop in Cairo one year before.²⁰ Consequently, Basilius completed the manuscript soon after his return from Egypt to Syria.²¹ It is conceivable that he drew upon a lectionary manuscript that he encountered in Egypt, which represented the same or a similar reading order as the manuscripts mentioned above, which were produced or kept at the Monastery of the Syrians.

Through Ms. 77, the reading order that is otherwise attested only in Egypt was brought to other regions of Syriac-speaking Christianity. According to notes in the manuscript, it was first brought to Homs, later to Jerusalem,²² and eventually to the

¹⁹ The Scetis desert is mentioned in the earlier colophon by Gabriel from Bayt Sbirina (also known as Basbirina, see fol. 147r). Gabriel records that he bound and sewed the codex again for the second time after his return from the Scetis desert to Jerusalem in 1804 AG (=1492/93 CE). For Gabriel and his brother Abraham, see also fol. 1r.

²⁰ Mark N. Swanson, *Coptic Papacy*, 122.

²¹ Accordingly, he states in his earliest colophon that the first stage of the book was completed in 1422/23 “when we came into that city,” referring to Homs (see fol. 147r i).

²² According to the earliest colophon, it was produced in Homs (fol. 147r i), which is also the place where it was “improved” and rebound by Joseph

Konat Collection in Pampakuda, a village in Kerala, India, where it is preserved today.

The collection is owned by the Konat family, which has a lineage of twenty-four generations of Malankara-Orthodox priests. The current owner of the collection is Fr. Dr. Johns Abraham Konat, the 23rd-generation priest from the family, who succeeded his father Abraham Malpan II (1908–1987).²³ The latter's predecessor, in turn, was his father Mathen Konat (1860–1927), who was elevated as Malpan in 1890 and later in 1926 appointed as Cor Episcopa.²⁴ As Shibu Varughese notes, Mathen Malpan Konat “was known to collect Syriac texts copied at Syrian monasteries, especially Mosul[,] and in preserving them.”²⁵ Importantly, Mathen Malpan's effort to collect manuscripts was yoked to his particular interest in the study and practice of West Syrian liturgy. Thus, as Varughese records, he “had a significant role in the propagation of west Syrian rites in Malankara.”²⁶ Moreover, he founded the *Malabar Threesai Samootham*, a society directed to foster “spiritual growth,” “general education,” “church constructions and renovations,” and—what is most interesting for the present study—the purpose of “consolidating and unifying the rubrics of liturgy.”²⁷ This society was founded in 1888, only a few years before the manuscripts presented in the following were copied.

Barnisan six years later (fol. 118r). Between 1488/89 and 1520/21 at least, it was kept in Jerusalem (see the colophons on fol. 1r and 147r–v).

²³ For further details on Abraham Malpan II, see Varughese, *Catalogue*, 20–21.

²⁴ Varughese, *Catalogue*, 17–18, citing several handwritten biographical notes by Mathen Malpan Konat from Konat Collection, Mss. 192 and 284.

²⁵ Varughese, *Catalogue*, 19. For further details about Mathen Malpan's acquisition of Syriac manuscripts from Mosul, see Varughese, *Catalogue*, 45–46.

²⁶ Varughese, *Catalogue*, 19.

²⁷ Varughese, *Catalogue*, 19.

However, not all manuscripts from the Syrian region that are preserved in the Konat Collection today were necessarily acquired by Mathen Malpan in these years. Some manuscripts may well have been brought to Kerala, or even to Pampakuda specifically, at an earlier date. This may also count for the lectionary Ms. 77, whose date of arrival in India is not recorded. What is clear, however, is that the manuscript did not lie idle in its new location but was meticulously studied and copied in the 1890s, when Mathen Malpan Konat strove to consolidate the local liturgical practices according to West Syrian practices.

This enterprise is reflected in the three manuscripts containing readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch that have so far escaped the notice of scholars. One of them, Ms 208, is a lectionary manuscript copied from Ms 77. The other two, Mss. 91 and 354, are indices which list the readings without reproducing the entire text.

NEWLY IDENTIFIED LECTIONARY MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINING 2 BARUCH AND 4 EZRA

Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 208

Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 208,²⁸ which was written in 1893 by an unnamed scribe,²⁹ is a lectionary manuscript containing readings for the whole year from the Old Testament, Acts and Catholic Epistles, and Pauline Epistles.³⁰ The codex is written in a clear Serto script in black ink. The rubrics, that is, the general heading (fol. 5r) and the headings indicating the beginning of a liturgical event or a reading are written in

²⁸ The manuscript is accessible in the HMML at <https://w3id.org/vhmmml/readingRoom/view/539736>.

²⁹ See the colophon (fol. 352r).

³⁰ See the general heading, fol. 5r.

another color, mostly in purple, more rarely in red (see, e.g., fol. 26v–29v; fol. 94v–109v).³¹ Occasionally, the writing is embellished with calligraphy.³² At many passages, the location of the reading is noted in the margin in red ink in a markedly thinner hand, which strikingly resembles that of the lectionary index Ms. 91, which was written by Mathen Malpan Konat (see below). Consequently, the same scribe probably noted the chapter-and-verse numbers in Ms. 208. The manuscript does not show strong marks of wear, which may indicate that it has never, or only scarcely, been used in liturgy. However, the careful handwriting and the calligraphic embellishments³³ suggest that it was destined for that purpose.


The readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are identical to the readings in Ms. 77 both in respect to their content and their liturgical location: on the Sunday of the Revelation of Joseph: 4 Ezra 12:31–38 (fol. 27r–28r); on the Sunday of the Departed: 4 Ezra 7:26–42 (fol. 122r–123v) and 2 Bar 44:9–15 (fol. 123v–124r); on the Sunday of the Resurrection: 2 Bar 72:1–73:2 (fol. 244v–245r).³⁴ The reading from 4 Ezra on the Sunday of the Revelation of Joseph is identified as “From the Book of Ezra” (ܠܟܬܒܬܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ). The heading is in red ink, inscribed in the characteristic thinner hand. The two readings for the Sunday of the Departed do not have headings. The scribe left open spaces for them when inscribing the text of the readings but did not subsequently enter the headings. This is not unique for these two readings, but rather a recurring feature of the codex. The entry from 2 Baruch on the Sunday of the Resurrection is identified as ܠܟܬܒܬܐ ܕܒܪܚܝܐ, “From Baruch the Scribe.” The heading is in purple, inscribed by the same hand who copied the main text of the reading.

³¹ See, e.g., fol. 128r; 130r; 132r.

³² See, e.g., fol. 11r; 26v; 27r; 119r.

³³ See, e.g., fol. 11r; 26v; 27r; 119r.

³⁴ See the chart below in the appendix to this article.

In all likelihood, Ms. 208 is a copy of Ms. 77. Of the numerous details suggesting this we shall adduce four examples. First, the general heading (fol. 5r) is identical with the one in Ms. 77 (fol. 1v i). Second, the heading indicating the first liturgical occasion, which is lacking in Ms. 77 fol. 1v, is omitted in the main text of Ms. 208 as well (fol. 5r). However, the scribe noted in the margin that the lectionary begins with the Feasts of the Consecration of the Church and the Renewal of the Church. Third, there are two cases in which a reading from Proverbs is wrongly rubricated as a passage from Wisdom of Solomon (Ms. 77 fol. 70v ii, at Prov 16:12–32; fol. 80v ii–81r i, at Prov 16:13–25). This mistake appears in Ms. 208 as well, albeit only once (fol. 170r).³⁵ Fourth, in Ms. 77, the Sundays after Pentecost have originally been titled as Sundays “after the New” (ሰንበት ነጋሥ, i.e., New Sunday) by the scribe(s) who produced the second stage of the lectionary manuscript (fol. 118–127). In most instances of this designation, “New (Sunday)” is corrected by a later scribe into  “Pentecost.” At those instances in which the headings “after New Sunday” are corrected in Ms. 77 by effacing, Ms. 208 has “Pentecost” as well. By contrast, the heading of the fifth Sunday after “New Sunday” is not effaced in Ms. 77 (fol. 118v) but corrected into “Pentecost” only in the margin. In Ms. 208, it is retained at this instance as well (fol. 280r). Apparently, the scribe of Ms. 208 copied the main text of Ms. 77 and did not always pay attention to the marginal notes.

Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 91, fol. 21r–37v

This codex consists of two parts, the first of which (fol. 3r–19r) is a Gospel lectionary. The second part, which concerns us here, is an index of liturgical lections, as noted in the general heading:

³⁵ At the second mistaken ascription of a passage from Proverbs to Wisdom of Solomon, the rubric is lacking in Ms. 208 (fol. 195r), presumably to be supplied later because the rubrics are written in red or purple ink.

ഓരോ വർഷവും എഴുതുന്നതിന്നായിട്ടുണ്ടാകുന്നതിന്നു
 ഓരോ വർഷവും എഴുതുന്നതിന്നായിട്ടുണ്ടാകുന്നതിന്നു “Through God,
 the Lord of all, we are writing an index of readings of the entire
 year from the Old [Testament], the *Praxis* (i.e., Acts and
 Catholic Epistles), and the letters of the divine Paul” (fol. 21r).
 According to the colophon (fol. 37r), the index was written by
 “the el[dest] (i.e., priest) Mathen Konat, the Malpan (i.e.,
 teacher), from Malabar (മലബാർ) on
 4 Nisan 1892 AD (൧൯൦൨).”³⁶ The main text is written in black
 ink, and the headings are written in purple ink.³⁷ Both in the
 main text and in the margins, there are numerous corrections
 and supplementations written in blueish ink. When entire
 liturgical events are written in the margin, their main body is
 usually written in the same blueish ink and the heading in red
 ink.³⁸ Additionally, there are some corrections in the main text
 and marginal notes in black ink³⁹ and a heading in Malayalam

³⁶ The index shows several traces of editing. First, some passages have
 been crossed out and replaced. Often, this is done in a blueish ink (see, e.g.,
 fol. 21v; 29v). Second, some readings or entire liturgical events not contained
 in Ms. 77 have been supplemented, which is often written in the same
 blueish ink (see, e.g., fol. 21v), with rubrics in red (see, e.g., fol. 22r). However,
 the edits do not show typographical differences from the passages written in
 black (see especially the characteristic “looped” shape of the final *ʾālaf*). This
 indicates that the edits were made by Mathen Konat himself.

³⁷ There are some typographic differences between the rubrics and the
 main texts. For example, in the main text, the final *ʾālaf* is usually written
 with a looped ligature, which does not occur in the rubrics. Here, by contrast,
 the final *ʾālaf* is sometimes written in Estrangelo, see, e.g., the general
 heading, fol. 21r, second line.

³⁸ See, e.g., fol. 23v–24r. For an exception, see fol. 25v.

³⁹ See, e.g., fol. 21r, at the first reading in the third section superscribed
 ൧൯൦൨ “Of the Annunciation of the God-Bearer,” where
 ൧൯൦൨ “Genesis” is crossed out and corrected into ൧൯൦൨
 “Deuteronomy.” In all likelihood, the initial error is based on Ms. 77, fol. 4v i,
 where the rubric gives the erratic reference ൧൯൦൨ “From Genesis, the fifth Book of the Torah.” For an example of a
 marginal note written in black ink, see fol. 21v, on which see below.

next to the general heading, written in pale purple ink (fol. 21r). The typographic variety and the multitude of edits show that the manuscript has been amended according to several liturgical sources.

In its original form, the present index is probably a faithful excerpt of the lectionary Ms. 77, as will be demonstrated below. Consequently, the liturgical location of the passages from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch remains the same. This probably counts for the range of the passages as well. The reason why this does not emerge with absolute certainty from the manuscript itself is the way in which the passages are referenced.

The readings from 4 Ezra are introduced with the rubric “Ezra,” and those from 2 Baruch with the rubric “From Baruch the scribe” (fol. 24v) or “Baruch the scribe” (Syr. ܠܒܪܟܬܐ ܬܝܥܝܢܐ, fol. 28v). Unlike most readings in the index of Ms. 91, they are not referenced by chapter-and-verse numbers⁴⁰ but instead by incipits, which read as follows:



- (1) On the Sunday of the Revelation of Joseph (fol. 21v):

ܠܥܠܡ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ “And the angel said: ‘And that you saw a lion rising up from the forest.’” (4 Ezra 12:31a)

- (2) On the Sunday of the Departed (fol. 24v): ܠܥܠܡ ܕܥܝܢܐ

ܠܥܠܡ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ “For lo, days are coming, and it will be when they are coming.” (4 Ezra 7:26a)

⁴⁰ Remarkably, the practice of referencing passages by incipit is not limited to books that appear only in a few Syriac Bible manuscripts but also in some that are commonly considered “biblical.” This is the case with some readings whose source is designated as “Twelve Prophets,” e.g., the reading from Micah 7:11ff. on Easter Sunday (fol. 28v).

- (3) On the Sunday of the Departed (fol. 24v):  “For all that is corruptible will pass, and [all that is mortal] will go away.” (2 Bar 44:9a)
- (4) On Easter Sunday (fol. 28v):  “But hear also about the bright waters.” (2 Bar 72:1a)

The most noteworthy entry is the first one (fol. 21v),⁴¹ prescribing the reading from 4 Ezra 12:31–38. The entry begins like all the other ones with the name of the book and the number of the chapter: **ܡܕܪܬܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ** “Ezra, ch.” However, in the blank space where the chapter number would usually be noted in this manuscript, there is an x-shaped note sign, referring to a note at the outer margin: **ܕܡܕܪܬܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ ܕܠܥܝܢܐ ܕܡܕܪܬܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ ܕܠܥܝܢܐ ܕܡܕܪܬܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ ܕܠܥܝܢܐ** “This reading, which is from Ezra, is not found in the printed book of the Old Testament.”⁴² This sentence can be understood in several different ways. The designation “Ezra” may be understood as referring either (a) to the book that is commonly found in Syriac bibles and in the Masoretic canon, (b) to another book of Ezra, or (c) to a corpus comprised of several books of Ezra. Moreover, the reference to the “reading, which is from Ezra,” may refer to the pericope only or, by implication, to the book as a whole. In other words, the note does not necessarily state that the entire book of Ezra from which the reading is extracted is *not* found in the printed Old Testament, but it may also make that claim only about the

⁴¹ See the marginal note: “This reading from Ezra is not found in the printed (Syr. ܡܬܬܬܐ) book of the Old Testament.” There are no such notes at the other readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.

⁴² For the meaning “to print,” see Thoma Audo, *Dictionnaire de la langue chaldéenne* (ܡܕܢܗܐ ܕܠܗܘܐ ܕܡܕܢܗܐ), vol. 1 (Holland: Monastery of Mor Ephrem the Syrian, 1985), s.v. ܡܕܢܗܐ, 390. Thanks are due to Gabriel Rabo for referring us to the entry in Audo’s dictionary.

reading prescribed in the order referred to here. Thus, it is possible that the scribe thought that the passage to be read here is an addition to the book of Ezra as commonly found in printed Bibles.⁴³

The limited accessibility is not noted at the other readings from “Ezra” and “from Baruch the Scribe” (fol. 24v; 28v).⁴⁴ It is very likely that at the time when the manuscript was produced, the source through which the readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch were accessible to the scribe was the lectionary Ms. 77. There are two reasons for this assumption, first, the scarce dissemination of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in Syriac Bibles prior to the Leiden Peshitta, and second, the large agreement of the present manuscript with Ms. 77. If this hypothesis holds true, the scribe reproduced a liturgical order including books that were not commonly included in Bible editions in late-nineteenth-century Kerala. Moreover, that liturgical order was probably difficult to put into practice outside Pampakuda,

⁴³ A similar case is the reading from the story of Bel and the Dragon on the fourth day of Holy Week (fol. 27r). The reference shows several traces of editing. In the main text line, the source is simply called “Daniel.” Above the line, the attribute ܐܘܠܡܐ “small” or “young” is added. The main line continues with an incipit: ܠܐܢܐ ܕܒܒܠܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܐܢܬܐ ܕܐܢܬܐ ܕܐܢܬܐ “Lo, the Babylonians have seen the fear of you” (note the punctuation marks!). In the margin, a reference by the number of the chapter and the verse is added, written towards the upper part of the page: ܡܩ ܕܢܐ: ܚ ܠܥܐ-ܕܥܐ ܦܠܥܐ “ch. 14:26b–41.” In the line below, another reference to the location is added: (ܒܥܝܪ ܕܥܠܥܝܒܐ ܕܕܥܝܒܐ) “(see in the story of the dragon.)” [brackets in the original]. This indicates that the passage was accessible to Mathen Konat, and that he assumed that those who would use the index would have access to it, too. Cf. the two marginal notes to the same reading in Ms. 77, fol. 88v: ܠܥܐ ܕܒܒܠܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܐܢܬܐ “The rest of the book of Daniel the Prophet,” and ܡܩ ܕܢܐ ܦܠܥܐ ܕܥܐ-ܕܥܐ “ch. 14:26b–41.”

⁴⁴ On the Sunday of the Departed, the reading 4 Ezra 7:26–42 is referenced as ܠܥܐ “Ezra” and 2 Bar 44:9–15 as ܠܥܐ ܕܒܪܚܝܐ “from Baruch the scribe” (fol. 24v). On Easter Sunday, the reading 2 Bar 72:1–73:1 is referenced as ܠܥܐ ܕܒܪܚܝܐ “Baruch the scribe” (fol. 28v).

The second observation is that the mistaken ascription of a passage from the Book of Proverbs to Wisdom of Solomon, which, as mentioned above occurs twice in Ms. 77, appears in Ms. 91 as well.⁴⁵ The same is true for Ms. 354 (fol. 8r), which will be described in the following paragraph. However, it must be noted that in the second case in which a passage from Proverbs is wrongly ascribed to Wisdom of Solomon in Ms. 77 (fol. 80v ii), the reading of Proverbs 16:13–25 on the Holy Sunday of Hosanna (i.e., Palm Sunday), it has not been copied in Ms. 91 (fol. 26v) and Ms. 354 (fol. 11v), where the passage is referenced correctly. Apparently, the scribes who produced Mss. 91 and 354 noticed the error at the second instance and corrected it in their excerpts.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ As noted above, this matches the evidence from Ms. 208, fol. 195r, where the corresponding passage lacks a heading. This allows for the possibility that the heading was deliberately left out in order to correct the mistaken ascription later. However, this is open to further speculation.

Pampakuda, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 354

Ms. 354, written in 1894 by an anonymous scribe,⁵⁰ is another index (ꠕꠞꠦꠦ) of liturgical readings for the entire year. This already emerges from the heading, which is identical to the one in Ms. 91. The manuscript is written in a clearly readable Serto. The main text is written in black ink, and the headings indicating the liturgical events in red ink. In a few instances, corrections or additions have been written in pencil.⁵¹ In contrast to Ms. 91, however, the number of later edits is scarce in Ms. 354.

In a note after the colophon (fol. 18v), written in red ink, it is stated that the manuscript was “compared with a manuscript (or: copy)” (**נִקְרָא בַּחֲפֻצָּה אֶחָדָה**), that is, verified by comparison with another manuscript. The same word **נִקְרָא** occurs in the section of the Sunday before Christmas, in a note that is nigh-to identical with the one that was originally written in Ms. 91 at the corresponding place, which has been quoted above.) **וְכָךְ הָיָה לֵב חֲתֹבֵט**. “Read from the readings of Christmas. (It is not written in the manuscript)” (opening parenthesis in the original).⁵² A corresponding note is given on the Sunday after Christmas (fol. 2v), this time in red ink, so that it is typographically styled like a heading: **מִן הַלְלוֹת שָׁבוּעַ אַחֲרֵי חֲגֻגֵינוּ**: **חֲתֹבֵט מִן הַלְלוֹת שָׁבוּעַ אַחֲרֵי חֲגֻגֵינוּ** “The readings of (the Sundays) after Christmas

⁵⁰ See the colophon (fol. 18v): **כִּסְוֵי הַסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה נֶאֱמַר בְּיָמֵינוּ**
בְּחֹדֶשׁ נִסָּן ה'תקפ"ד “The writing of this index was
completed on 3 of Nisan, 1894 AD.”

⁵¹ See, e.g., fol. 1r, at the first reading in the third section superscribed **ጥቅለ ሐይለ ሰብሐእ** “Of the Annunciation of the God-Bearer,” where **ጥቅለ** “Genesis” is crossed out and corrected into **ጥቅለ** **ጥቅለ** “Deuteronomy” (cf. Ms. 91, fol. 21v, see above). Also see the additions on Ms. 354, fol. 11v. The additionally referenced passages appear neither in Ms. 77 nor in Ms. 91.

⁵² The opening parenthesis is the only difference from the note in Ms. 91.

are not written in the manuscript.⁵³ As in the abovementioned case, this very likely refers to Ms. 77. Thus, both liturgical indices are most likely based on the fifteenth-century lectionary manuscript. However, some elements indicate that Ms. 354 drew upon an additional source. For example, the reading order of the commemoration of Saint Ephrem, which is not mentioned in Ms. 77, is added after the first Saturday of the (pre-paschal) Fast, as it falls on the same day (fol. 6r).⁵⁴

Another common feature of the two manuscripts is the form of referencing the pericopes from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. Like in Ms. 91, the readings are introduced by the rubric “Ezra” (fol. 1v; 4v), “From Baruch the scribe” (fol. 4v) and “Baruch the scribe” (fol. 13v). Like in Ms. 91, the passages are referenced by incipits, which are identical in both manuscripts. Again, at the first instance (fol. 1v), the index names “Ezra” and the abbreviation [qp]. “chapter,” but the space designed for the chapter number is left blank and an incipit follows it. At the later instances, “chapter” does not appear again but only an incipit, as in Ms. 91. These commonalities, especially the fact that they share the oddity of the blank space at the first entry of a reading from Ezra, allow for two possibilities: either that Ms. 91 is the *Vorlage* of the present manuscript, or that both derive from a common

⁵³ This note does not appear in Ms. 91. Instead, the readings of two Sundays after Christmas are noted in the margins (fol. 22r–v). This supports the hypothesis that the source of Ms. 354 is Ms. 77, not Ms. 91.

⁵⁴ In Ms. 91, the event was added in the margin (fol. 25v), but later crossed out. Instead, the commemorative aspect is noted by expanding the heading of the liturgical event. Originally, the heading, written in purple, reads ܐܰܠܰܗܰܝܰܐ ܰܡܰܪ ܰܝܰܫܰܝܰܐ ܰܡܰܪ ܰܝܰܫܰܝܰܐ “Of the first Saturday of the Fast.” The new heading, written above in red, reads ܰܡܰܪ ܰܝܰܫܰܝܰܐ ܰܡܰܪ ܰܝܰܫܰܝܰܐ ܰܡܰܪ ܰܝܰܫܰܝܰܐ “Of the Commemoration of Mar Ephrem and Mar Theodoros.” The two headings have been joined by replacing the proposition ܰܐܰܠܰܗܰܝܰܐ in the original one, “Of (the Saturday),” by the preposition ܰܐܰܠܰܗܰܝܰܐ, “On the Saturday.” The divergence between Mss. 91 and 354 reflects the variation and change in the understanding of how to celebrate those two coinciding liturgical events.

Vorlage which contained that oddity. Unlike in Ms. 91, there is no note indicating the scope of dissemination of the book, or reading, associated with Ezra.⁵⁵

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the three, nineteenth-century lectionary manuscripts presented here, the reception history of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in Syriac liturgy is expanded by another episode and by almost five hundred years. Passages from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch were copied or referenced in Syriac lectionary manuscripts from the early thirteenth to the late nineteenth century.

However, the present case also calls for nuancing the category of “reception history.” As the set of pericopes and liturgical events remains largely constant in all lectionaries and lectionary indices, the passages that in modern scholarship are commonly perceived as parts of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch lived a life of their own in Syriac liturgical manuscripts, independently of their “base texts.” This is underlined by the hitherto unnoticed evidence from the late-nineteenth-century manuscripts from the Konat Collection. For these manuscripts, the source of the readings from Ezra and Baruch was, in all likelihood, the lectionary Ms. 77, one of the oldest manuscripts of the

⁵⁵ Above the entry for the reading “from Baruch the scribe” on Easter Sunday (fol. 13v), there is an x-shaped cross written with a pencil. However, this is probably not connected to the reading from Baruch but to the previous one from Joel, which is marked by the same x-shaped cross and which is written in the same line with the previous reading. Usually, every entry is written in a separate line. The same occurs on the subsequent page (fol. 14r), where the same sign precedes a reading from Isaiah and is written again above the following line. In this case, the subsequent reading is from 1 John, which is commonly found in Syriac Bibles. All this indicates that the sign preceding the reading “from Baruch the scribe” is not related to that reading and to its limited accessibility. Instead, it is more likely that its purpose is to prevent readers from overlooking the readings that are written in the same line with the preceding ones.

collection. At least to one of the scribes who produced these manuscripts, and probably to all of them, the texts from “Ezra” and “Baruch the scribe” were not extant as passages within biblical books but as pericopes within liturgical reading orders. Thus, the reproduction of the lectionary order containing passages from what in contemporary scholarship is called 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch is but an indirect act of reception of these two books.

Furthermore, this study has consequences for the understanding of textual authority. The dependency of the lectionary Ms. 208 and of the lectionary indices Ms. 91 and Ms. 354 upon Ms. 77 reveals that the latter was studied thoroughly in the years 1892–94 by Fr. Mathen Konat and other scholar-scribes who had access to his collection, and that the fifteenth-century lectionary manuscript was held in high esteem. If the new manuscripts were produced not only for study but also for liturgical use, this reveals that the old lectionary manuscript was ascribed authority as a norm of liturgical orders. This illustrates that authority can be ascribed not only to texts as abstract entities but also to manuscripts. By reproducing a lectionary order containing readings from 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, the scribes at Pampakuda did not ascribe authority to these two books but to that lectionary order itself.

Finally, the present case study reflects not only the material dimension of liturgical orders in concrete, tangible manuscripts but also, more broadly, the local anchoring of liturgical traditions as well as their mobility. On the one hand, as the manuscripts transmitting liturgical traditions are written, kept, and read at a certain place, traditions are bound to that place. On the other hand, if manuscripts are brought to other places where they are kept, read and rewritten, the traditions manifested by them move along across space and time.

Shelfmark	Date	Event	Excerpted passage	Folios
London, British Library, Add. 14,686	1255 ce	Revelation of Joseph	4 Ezra 12:31–38	16r–v
		Sunday of the Departed	4 Ezra 7:26–42 2 Bar 44:9–15	75v– 77r 77r–v
		Festival of Mount Tabor	4 Ezra 6:18–28	195r– 196r
London, British Library, Add. 14,687	1256 ce	Sunday of the Resurrection (Easter Sunday) and New Sunday	2 Bar 72:1–73:2	157v– 158r
		Eighth Sunday After Easter	2 Bar 72:1–73:2	175r– 176r
London, British Library, Add. 14,736 (Fragment ed)	13 th century	Revelation of Joseph	4 Ezra 12:31–38	18v
Deir al-Surian, Ms. Syr. 33	13 th century	Sunday of the Departed	4 Ezra 7:26–42 2 Bar 44:9–15	72v– 74v 74v– 75r
		Festival of Mount Tabor	4 Ezra 6:18–28	223r

Pampakud a, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 77 (Composit e)	Manufac tured in several stages: 1422/23; 1427/28; 1431-33	Revelation of Joseph	4 Ezra 12:31-38	10v
		Sunday of the Departed	4 Ezra 7:26-42 2 Bar 44:9- 15	49v- 50r 50r
		Sunday of the Resurrection (Easter Sunday)	2 Bar 72:1- 73:2	102r
Pampakud a, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 91	1892	Revelation of Joseph	4 Ezra 12:31-38	21v
		Sunday of the Departed	4 Ezra 7:26-42 2 Bar 44:9- 15	24v 24v
		Sunday of the Resurrection (Easter Sunday)	2 Bar 72:1- 73:2	28v
Pampakud a, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 208	1893	Revelation of Joseph	4 Ezra 12:31-38	27r- 28r
		Sunday of the Departed	4 Ezra 7:26-42 2 Bar 44:9- 15	122r- 123v 123v- 124r
		Sunday of the Resurrection	2 Bar 72:1- 73:2	244v- 245r

		(Easter Sunday)		
Pampakud a, A. Konat Collection, Ms. 354	1894	Revelation of Joseph	4 Ezra 12:31–38	1v
		Sunday of the Departed	4 Ezra 7:26–42 2 Bar 44:9–15	4v 4v
		Sunday of the Resurrection (Easter Sunday)	2 Bar 72:1–73:2	13v

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Audio, Thoma. *Dictionnaire de la langue chaldéenne* (ܐܬܬܝܬܐ ܕܠܗܘܐ ܕܬܝܠܕܐ), 2 vols. (Holland: Monastery of Mor Ephrem the Syrian, 1985).

Baars, Willem. “Neue Textzeugen der syrischen Baruchapokalypse,” *VT* 13:4 (1963): 476–78.

Bidawid, Raphael I. “4 Ezra,” *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version. Sample Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), i–ii and 1–51.

—. “4 Esdras,” *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, part 4, fasc. 3 (Leiden: Brill), 1973.

Brock, Sebastian P. and Lucas Van Rompay. *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts and Fragments in the Library of Deir al-Surian, Wadi al-Natrun (Egypt)*. OLA 227. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

- Dedering, Sven. "Apocalypse of Baruch," *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, part 4, fasc. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), i–iv and 1–50.
- Korsvoll, Nils H., Lied, Liv Ingeborg and Jerome A. Lund. "British Library Additional 14,686: Introduction, List of Readings, and Translation of Colophon and Notes," *Hugoye* 19:2 (2016): 385–402.
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg. *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*, STAC 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021).
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg and Matthew P. Monger. "Look to the East: New and Forgotten Sources to 4 Ezra," *The Embroidered Bible: Studies in Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Honour of Michael E. Stone*, ed. William Adler, Matthias Henze and Lorenzo DiTommaso (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 639–52.
- Swanson, Mark N. *The Coptic Papacy in Islamic Egypt (641–1517)* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2010).
- van der Ploeg, J. P. M. *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and their Syriac Manuscripts* (Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 1983).
- Varughese, Shibu. *Catalogue of Syriac Liturgical Manuscripts at Pampakuda Library*, PhD Diss., Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam, Kerala, 2017.
- Wright, William. *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838, Part I* (London: British Museum, 1870).