

in detail? If Berger was misinformed it is well that we should know it, but if he be right in Gen. iii 15, in how many other cases may not important variants have been overlooked?

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON THE PICTURES IN 'THE PENTATEUCH OF TOURS'.

DOM QUENTIN'S *Turonensis*, now Nouv. Acquisitions Lat. 2334 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, formerly belonged to the Cathedral of St Gatiens at Tours: it was stolen by the notorious Libri about 1842, by whom it was sold in 1847 to Lord Ashburnham. It came back to France in 1888. While it was still at Ashburnham Place the nineteen surviving full-page illustrations were reproduced in photograph and edited by Oscar v. Gebhardt (*The Miniatures of the Ashburnham Pentateuch*, London, 1883) with full Prolegomena, which are not out of date even after Dom Quentin's description on pp. 414-432.

In particular I venture to think that v. Gebhardt's account of the descriptive lettering found on the pictures is more satisfactory than that of Dom Quentin. This lettering is painted on the various objects, and is light or dark according to the suitability of the surface on which it is painted, dark on a light ground, light on a dark ground. It was therefore done *after* the pictures had been painted. On *fol.* 56r there is a picture representing the Children of Israel building cities for Pharaoh: in this picture a good deal of the colour has come off, and underneath it is partly legible a similar series of legends, written with a pen, and done *before* the pictures were painted. The two series of inscriptions do not agree verbally: in the main they are based on the Old Latin, but Dom Quentin points out (p. 425 f) that the later, painted, series sometimes deserts the older wording to follow the Vulgate. Thus the under writing makes Moses hide the slain Egyptian *in arena* (Exod. ii 12), while the painting has *sub sabulo*. On the other hand both sets agree in calling the father-in-law of Moses *Iotor* (= Ἰοθόρ), while the Vulgate has *Iethro* (or *Raguel*).

The most obvious deduction to be made is that the pictures are a copy of a set of pictures made for an Old Latin Bible, but that the painter himself was more familiar with the Vulgate. A good many scenes are represented on the same page: before the painting was begun the painter himself, or his master, wrote with a pen the subjects to be represented: these inscriptions were no doubt copied verbatim from the exemplar. After the paintings were done the painter put on the inscriptions but now they were painted there was no further need

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

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

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

F. C. BURKITT.

THE OLD LECTIONARY OF JERUSALEM.

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

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