

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

# THE QUEEN OF SWEDEN'S 'GELASIAN SACRAMENTARY'.

## III

*The Second Half of the Telesphoran Observantia.* At the cost of a very slight repetition, the next table of values is so drawn up as to help us to remember that the first station-day of the second moiety of the Telesphoran, or quinquagesimal, observance was the Friday before our 'Mid-Lent' Sunday, and that at both *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>, which were Roman editions, the Mass for that day began on a fresh page; but that, in contrast to them, *S*<sub>2</sub> and *V*, which were, by the hypothesis, cismontane, instituted a fresh paginal collocation on 'Mid-Lent' Sunday itself, the first day of the second half of the quadragesimal observance, an observance which in some, at least, of the Gallican Churches long claimed and finally secured general preference over the quinquagesimal.

	3rd Friday.		Saturday.		§ xxvii. 4th Sunday.				Monday.			
	<i>s</i>	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>s</i>	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>s</i>	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>V</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>V</i>
Capitulum . . .	18	* *	19	I I	25	I	I	*	19	I	I	I
Collecta . . .	97†	3 4	113	4 4					119	4	4	4
Oratio . . .	142	5 5	115†	4 4	103	3	4	4	140	5	5	5
Secreta . . .	117	4 4	200	7 8	121	4	5	5	91 <sup>1</sup> , 100 <sup>2</sup>	3 <sup>1</sup>	3 <sup>1</sup>	4 <sup>2</sup>
Rubric . . .					27	I	I	I				
Postcommunion .	107	4 4	77	3 3	126	4	5	5	82	3	3	3
Ad Populum . .	134	4 5	111	4 4	138	<i>nūl</i>	<i>nūl</i>	5 5	122	4	5	4
Totals (β) for <i>s</i>	20		23		13				20			= 76
" (θ) " <i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	22		24		16				21			= 83
" (θ) " <i>S</i> <sub>2</sub>						21				21		= 42
" (κ) " <i>V</i>						20					21	= 41

All that here requires notice is the Secreta, 'Cunctis nos' &c., of Monday's Mass (Mur. i 526). The Reginensis text contains a 'quæsumus' which is not in St Gallen<sup>1</sup> or Gerbert: nor is it in Ménard (p. 47). Guided by analogous instances, I therefore assign the higher value of 100 letters (4 θ lines) to *V*; the lower value being confined to the two Roman editions and *S*<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>1</sup> The Rheinau book has lost some leaves at this place. See Wilson, p. 329 n. 1, 330 n. 1.

In the record for the next three items I correct the value of Wednesday's *Secreta* from 114 to 119; for a seemingly necessary 'nobis' is wanting in *Reginensis*, though found elsewhere.

	4th Tuesday.				Wednesday.				Friday.			
	s	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	s	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	s	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V
Brought forward .	76	83	42	41								
Capitulum . . .	20	I	I	I	19	I	I	I	19	I	I	I
Collecta . . .	99	3	4	4	184	6	7	7	113	4	4	4
Oratio . . .	142	5	5	5	106	4	4	4	123	4	4	4
Secreta . . .	107	4	4	4	114 (119)	4	4	4	83	3	3	3
Postcommunion .	105	4	4	4	101 <sup>1</sup> , 76 <sup>2</sup>	3 <sup>1</sup>	4 <sup>1</sup>	3 <sup>2</sup>	65	2	3	2
Ad Populum . .	104	4	4	4	138	5	5	5	97	3	4	4
Of the following .										I		
Totals (β) for s	97				23				17			=137
" (θ) " S <sub>1</sub>		105				25				20		=150
" (θ) " S <sub>2</sub>			64				25				19	=108
" (κ) " V				63				24				18 = 105

The Postcommunion<sup>1</sup> of Wednesday's Mass calls for special notice. If derived from Leon. XVIII xxv (Mur. i 369), it has been reduced from 101 letters to 76 by omissions which, though lineally ineffectual at Redaction s, worse than needless at S<sub>1</sub>, and not required at S<sub>2</sub>, would certainly save a line at Redaction V. To the compiler of V, if to any one, they must therefore be attributed.<sup>2</sup> I give the Leonianum text bracketing off the words and the letter not in *Reginensis*.—'Sacramentorum [tuorum] benedictione satiati quaesumus dñe ut per haec semper [e] mundemur a uitiiis [et periculis exuamur]. per.'

Now, then, let us notice the skill which was expended on the equipment of the two Roman editions. On the fourth Friday in *quadragesima* the editor of S<sub>1</sub>, who started on a new course at the medial point of the Telesphoran seven weeks' observance, has included seven Masses in six integral θ pages: but, unless I take a mistaken view of the extant capitulum of the item for the following Sunday, the editor of the first

<sup>1</sup> Mr Wilson has omitted to note that Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert make this the Postcommunion for the Monday before Easter. Nor has he given the references to Ménard (47, 52, 52) for the last three prayers of Monday's item; for the *Secreta* and Postcommunion (53, 53) of Tuesday's, or for the *Secreta* (61) of Friday's. I feel sure that neither he nor those who are happy enough to know his admirable edition will resent this memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> If the reduction had been effected at S<sub>1</sub>, Friday's Mass in that edition would not, with a connecting rubric, have ended simultaneously with a page. It was not needed at S<sub>2</sub>; for in this, as we shall see in the following tables, there was no chance of even an approach to a simultaneous ending of page and item before the Saturday of the fifth week.

Roman issue had on that day succeeded in setting nine Masses in seven integral  $\beta$  pages,<sup>1</sup> the values of the eighth and ninth being :—

	4th Saturday.					§ xxviii. 5th Sunday.				
	<i>s</i>	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>V</i>		<i>s</i>	<i>S</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>S</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>V</i>	
Brought forward . . .	137		108	105						
Capitulum . . . . .	22	1	*	1	1	26 <sup>1</sup> , 37 <sup>2</sup>	1 <sup>1</sup>	1 <sup>1</sup>	2 <sup>2</sup>	2 <sup>2</sup>
Collecta . . . . .	195	6	7	7						
Oratio . . . . .	92	3	4	3	108	4	4	4		
Secreta . . . . .	128	4	5	5	100	3	4	4		
Rubric . . . . .					27	1	1	1		
Postcommunion . . .	102	3	4	4	164(162)	5	6	6		
Ad Populum . . . . .	181	6	7	7	178	nil	nil	7	6	
Of the following . . .										
Totals ( $\beta$ ) for <i>s</i> . .	160					15				=175
„ ( $\theta$ ) „ <i>S</i> <sub>1</sub> . . . .		27				16				(P. 30 ends) =43
„ ( $\theta$ ) „ <i>S</i> <sub>2</sub> . . . .			136				24			=160
„ ( $\kappa$ ) „ <i>V</i> . . . . .				132					23	=155

1. Since the Reginensis phrasing (Mur. i 529) of the first capitulum in § xxviii, '*Quinta dñica quae pro scrutinio celebratur*', is out of analogy with the corresponding rubric in § xxvii (*ib.* 525), it may be of doubtful authority for *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>; and, since it not improbably indicates a divergence from Roman use in respect of the scrutinies preparatory to baptism at Easter, our obvious, and perhaps our safest, course is to restrict it to the cismontane editions, and to assume, at least provisionally, that at *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub> the capitulum had been '*Quinta dñica pro scrutinio iii*'.

2. On the authority of Rheinau I read 'generandis' for 'regenerandis' in the first Postcommunion of § xxviii, thus reducing the number of letters from 164 to 162.

I now proceed with the next five items.

1. Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert bid us assume that at Redaction *S*<sub>2</sub> the Collecta for the fifth Tuesday after Quadragesima Sunday (Mur. i 530) began with the words 'Praesta quaesumus oñp. dñs', and numbered 97 letters (4  $\theta$  lines); not, as in Reginensis, with 'Praesta quaesumus dñe', thus numbering 95 (the precise equivalent of three completely filled  $\kappa$  lines). Hence it is obvious to infer that a change of text was here made by the editor of *V*, and that it was a device of his for

<sup>1</sup> For previous evidences of foresight see above, p. 332, and bear in mind the care taken that in each edition item and page should end simultaneously at the dividing-point of the Telesphoran observance. The present instance raises the question whether the editor of *s* may not have selected his prayers with a view to their future transference from  $\beta$  to  $\theta$  pages; and the further question whether both editions may not have been set forth by one and the same man.

making a given series of items end *pari passu* with the same series in S<sub>2</sub>. We have already found reason for thinking that the editor of V practised the very same economy on the very same prayer on the Friday of the third week (see above, p. 357).

2. The *Secreta* of the same Mass, 'Concede nobis dñe quaesumus ut' &c., numbers 120 letters (4 κ lines) in Reginensis<sup>1</sup>; but in the Roman editions the reading may have been, and probably was, as in Leon. XVIII xl (Mur. i 380), 'Concede nobis dñe dñ n. ut' &c., thus numbering 114 letters (4 θ lines). I therefore construct the first of the two following tables in accordance with this view.

3. The most interesting prayer in the first of the two groups is the Postcommunion for the fifth Tuesday. It illustrates the technique of the second cismontane editor.

I think I may reasonably claim to have proved that it was the editor of V who, with a merely stichometrical object, converted the 'sacratissima mysteria' of the Theophany Preface into 'mysteria', and that it was he who docked the Quinquagesima *Secreta* of its final words 'nobis tribuat facultatem'<sup>2</sup> and banished the clause 'indulgentia ueniae' from the *Ad Populum* of Quadragesima Sunday.<sup>3</sup> Nor do I doubt that, with no merely stichometrical aim, but rather in recognition, together with his predecessor, of St Leo's quarantine of fasting-days, he in the *Oratio* of the Monday of the third quadragesimal week,<sup>4</sup> instead of writing 'ut per abstinentiam . . . tua sc̃a uentura dignis praecurramus officiis' wrote 'ut abstinentiam . . . dignis obseruemus officiis'; or that in the *Collecta* of Tuesday's Mass<sup>5</sup> he replaced 'Prosequere oñp. dñ ieuniorum sacra mysteria' by 'Prosequere nos oñp. dñ', and, as he approached the dividing-point of the quadragesimal *obseruantia*, reduced Friday's *Collecta*<sup>6</sup> to the value of three, instead of four, κ lines.

Instructed by the Leonianum, and by Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert's triple sacramentary, I further venture to declare it beyond question that, after he had passed the dividing-point of the quadragesimal *obseruantia* and as he travelled through the first fortnight of its second half, he made it his constant aim not only to coerce, should coercion be needed, into eleven of his κ pages the twelve items which in Redaction S<sub>2</sub> had filled eleven θ pages, but also to leave himself room on the last three lines of the eleventh page for the title and sub-title of the sixth Sunday *in quadragesima*; that, with this aim in view, he reduced the linear value of the fourth Wednesday's Post-

<sup>1</sup> Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert are of no help to us here, for the Mass to which they give the prayer is a Thursday Mass in Lent prior to Holy Week.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 212, and the table of values on p. 224.

<sup>3</sup> See above, pp. 219, 330, and the table of values on p. 331.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 353.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* p. 354.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* p. 357.

communion by writing 'Sacramentorum . . . mundemur' in place of 'Sacramentorum tuorum . . . emundemur', eliminating 'et periculis exuamur',<sup>1</sup> and that, after practising, as we have just seen, a slight but effective economy in the Collecta for the fifth Tuesday, he, in the Postcommunion for the same day, had recourse to a procrustean device equal in boldness to those practised on the Quinquagesima Secreta and the Ad Populum of Quadragesima Sunday.

In our search for the classic text of this constituent, 'Vegetet nos' &c., Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert are of no service; for the only item to which they give the prayer is a Thursday Mass in Lent prior to Holy Week, and thus an item both recent as to date and uncertain of pedigree: so that our only sources of trustworthy information are our own document, which makes substantially the same prayer its Oratio for the Saturday in Quadragesima week (Mur. i 511), and the Leonian sacramentary (*ib.* 415). In XXVII vii of that incomplete but priceless repertory there is a prayer identical with ours, save that it comprises words which at this place are not in ours. Those words I italicize:—'Vegetet nos dñe semper et innouet tuae mensae *sacra* libatio quae fragilitatem nřam *et inter mundi tempestates* gubernet et protegat et in portum perpetuae salutis inducat. per.' Now, it is permissible to think that this prayer was in the lost part of the Leonianum as well as at XXVII vii, and that it there lacked the word 'sacra': but we must not assume that it may also have lacked the words 'et inter mundi tempestates'; for these give such life, such vigour, and such fullness of meaning to the composition as to forbid any such assumption. Nay, the very phrase 'quae fragilitatem nřam et inter mundi tempestates protegat et gubernet' occurs, though with a different antecedent, in our Oratio for Quadragesima Saturday (Mur. i 511); while ours for the following Monday (*ib.* 518)—a prayer fraught, like this, with maritime imagery—embodies an 'inter saeculi turbines' in strict analogy with 'inter mundi tempestates'. Hence our only prudent inference is that the editor of V eliminated 'et inter mundi tempestates' from the Postcommunion for the fifth Tuesday *in quadragesima*; but that, since it would not have been necessary to his purpose to eliminate 'sacra',<sup>2</sup> 'sacra' was already absent from the text of S.

4. The competing values, 107 and 115, of Wednesday's Ad Populum in no way concern the internal history of the document, and each represents four lines, whether of  $\beta$ ,  $\theta$ , or  $\kappa$  capacity. What I have to say about them must therefore be deferred to a later page.

5. The number of letters in the Ad Populum for Saturday would

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 540.

<sup>2</sup> For with 'sacra' the prayer would have comprised, with the concluding 'per', 123 letters, and would not have required more than four  $\kappa$  lines.



*Eight Non-Sacramental Sections* (§§ xxix-xxxvi). Between the Masses for the fifth week in *quadragesima* and that for the Sunday before Easter Reginensis has eight sections, all of which are concerned with the preparation of candidates for baptism. Though they would seem to have been set forth primarily on pages of  $\gamma$  lineation and capacity ( $21 \times 29\frac{1}{3}$ ), I do not find that they can ever have been written on pages of  $\theta$  ( $25 \times 28$ ) scheme. But, since, like §§ i-xxviii as extant in Reginensis, §§ xxix-xxxii respond, with a slight exception presently to be noticed, to the  $\kappa$  ( $28 \times 29\frac{1}{2}$ ) criterion, since § xxxiii represents four  $\kappa$  pages, and since § xxxiv represents five such pages, I infer that the second cismontane editor's reason for transferring the sacramental sections from  $\theta$  to  $\kappa$  membranes was that he proposed to combine his sacramental materials and his non-sacramental in one and the same homogeneous volume.

*Sections xxix-xxxii.* The exception to which I refer occurs early in § xxix. On comparing our text of the rubric '*Ut autem uenerint . . . super eas*' (Mur. i 533) with the corresponding forms in Gerbert,<sup>1</sup> Martène,<sup>2</sup> and Mabillon<sup>3</sup> I cannot but think that several details, of the aggregate value of 139 letters, have been omitted by the scribe of Reginensis or a predecessor.<sup>4</sup> The fact that, as we shall see presently, their insertion carries on the section to the end of a  $\kappa$  page justifies the suspicion. I insert them within brackets:—

*Ut autem uenerint ad eliam scribuntur nomina infantum (uel eorum qui ipsos suscepturi sunt) ab acolyto et uocantur (ipsi infantes ab acolyto) in eliam per nomina sicut scripti sunt (ita dicendo Ille puer et sic per singulos eorum) Et statuuntur masculi (seorsum) in dexteram partem (Illa uirgo et sic per singulas statuuntur) feminae (seorsum) in sinistram. Et dationem p̄br super eas.*

In the 'Ōmp. sēmp. d̄s' &c. of § xxx 'et signum' should certainly be corrected to 'ut signo', and 'in elia tua' and 'perceptae medicinae' preferred to 'elia tua' and 'percepta medicina'; while in § xxxi 's̄cae' should perhaps be inserted before 'trinitatis'. On the assumption, therefore, that the rubric '*Ut autem . . . super eas*' has been treated as

<sup>1</sup> *Monumenta* ii 1.

<sup>2</sup> *De Antiquis Ritibus* i 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Musaeum Italicum* ii 77.

<sup>4</sup> Similar instances have already been noticed, instances in which the scribe of Reginensis, or a predecessor, would seem to have inadvertently copied a remote or ultimate text instead of the text which was his proper concern.



I suspect and that the editor of V had given it its ampler value,<sup>1</sup> we have:—

		Bapt.			Bapt.
§ xxix.	<i>Denunciatio</i> &c. . . .	77	3	Brought forward . .	59
	<i>Scrutiniū diem</i> &c. . . .	375	13	§ xxxi. <i>Benedictio salis</i> &c. . .	1
	<i>Ut autem uenerint</i> &c. . .	176 (315)	11	<i>Exorcizo te</i> &c. . . .	511 (515)
§ xxx.	<i>Oīones super electos</i> . .	18	1	<i>Et post hanc oīonem</i> &c. . .	2
	<i>Ad catechumenum</i> &c. . .	23	1	<i>Accipe ille sal</i> &c. . . .	2
	<i>Oīp. sēmp. dñs</i> &c. . . .	411 (415)	15	§ xxxii. <i>Benedictio post datum</i>	
	<i>Preces nřas</i> &c. . . .	212	8	<i>salem</i> . . . . .	24
	<i>Dñs qui humani</i> &c. . . .	198	7 (= 59)	<i>Dñs patrum nřorum</i> &c. .	360
					13 = 96

*Sections xxxiii, xxxiv.* A few faults must be corrected in the former of these.—1. If the Rheinau text may instruct us, the italicized words of the following phrase must be inserted into the first of the prayers to be said *super feminas*,—‘Dñs caeli dñs terrae . . dñs cui omnis lingua confitetur *et omne genu flectitur* caelestium *et terrestrium et infernorum*’; and, instead of continuing with ‘te inuoco dñe ut has famulas tuas perducere et custodire digneris ad *gīam* baptismi tui’, we should read—as, indeed, is suggested by the Pamelian form—‘te inuoco dñe *super has famulas tuas ut eas* custodire digneris et perducere ad *gīam* baptismi tui’, in analogy with a parallel passage in the next following constituent but one: an aggregate enhancement of the value of 29 letters. 2. In this latter prayer, ‘Dñs abraham’ &c., Pamelius finds the words which I now italicize, words which, while they seem to be required by the grammatical construction of the prayer, are more than justified by its evident intention,—‘Dñs . . qui tribus israel *de aegypti seruitute liberasti per moysen famulum tuum et de custodia mandatorum tuorum in deserto monuisti*’. Their value in terms of letters is 83. 3. In the last constituent, ‘Aeternam ac iustissimam’ &c., Rheinau has ‘famulos tuos et famulas tuas’, not ‘famulos et famulas tuas’; and the text found by Pamelius would seem to be right where, in analogy with other instances, it gives ‘ad percipiendam *gīam* baptismi tui’, not ‘ad percipiendam *gīam tuam*’.

The claim to authenticity of the ampler text of these three prayers is attested by the stichometrical result; for, thus reinforced to the amount of five lines, Section xxxiii has the value of four κ pages.

The reason for the only numerical correction—280 letters, instead of 267—which I make when computing the values for Section xxxiv, will be found in the memorandum subjoined to the next table of values.

<sup>1</sup> I think that in this, as in other like instances, the scribe of Reginensis, or a predecessor, perhaps from caprice perhaps from inadvertence on his own part or that of his *contralegens*, wrote the rubric as he found it in some volume of ‘y’ pagination. If there was such a volume, can it have contained the parent of Redaction Bapt.? I hope to give attention to this subject on an early page. See below, pp. 559, 560.

§ xxxiii. <i>Item exorcismi super electos</i> &c. . . . .	68	Bapt.	3	§ xxxiv. <i>Incipit expositio euangeliorum</i> &c. . . . .	54	Bapt.	2
Ds abraham ds isaac &c. . . . .	265		9	<i>Primitus enim procedunt</i> &c. . . . .	187		7
Ergo maledicte diabole &c. . . . .	310	11	11	<i>Aperturi uobis filii</i> &c. . . . .	963	33	33
<i>Item super feminas</i> . . . . .	16		1 = 24	<i>Et annuntiat diaconus dicens</i> . . . . .	25		1
Ds caeli ds terrae &c. . . . .	214 (243)		9	<i>State cum silentio</i> &c. . . . .	31		1
Ergo maledicte <i>ut supra</i> . . . . .	19		1	<i>Et incipiens . . . matthaeum</i> &c. . . . .	100		4 = 48
<i>Item super masculos</i> . . . . .	17		1	<i>Postquam legerit tractat</i> &c. . . . .	34		2
Audi maledicte satanas &c. . . . .	575	20	20	<i>Filii carissimi ne diutius</i> &c. . . . .	437	15	15
<i>Item super feminas</i> . . . . .	16		1	<i>Item annuntiat</i> &c. . . . .	28		1
Ds abraham . . . qui tribus &c. . . . .	169 (252)		9	<i>State cum silentio</i> &c. . . . .	31		1
Ergo maledicte <i>sicut supra</i> . . . . .	19		1	<i>Et legit . . . marcum</i> &c. . . . .	86		3
<i>Item super masculos</i> . . . . .	17		1	<i>Et prosequitur p̄br his uerbis</i> . . . . .	25		1
Exorcizo te immunde sp̄s &c. . . . .	171		6	<i>Marcus euangelista</i> &c. . . . .	267 (280)	10 [9]	10 [9]
Ergo maledicte <i>sicut supra</i> . . . . .	22		1	<i>Item annuntiat . . . Et . . . lucam</i> &c. . . . .	93		3
<i>Item super feminas</i> . . . . .	16		1	<i>Et prosequitur p̄br his uerbis</i> . . . . .	25		1
Exorcizo te . . . per patrem &c. . . . .	178		7	<i>Lucas euangelista</i> &c. . . . .	317		11
Ergo maledicte <i>ut supra</i> . . . . .	19		1	<i>Item annuntiatur . . . iohannem</i> &c. . . . .	93		3
<i>Sequitur oīo quam sacerdos</i> &c. . . . .	34		2	<i>Iterum prosequitur p̄br</i> &c. . . . .	29		1
Aeternam ac iustissimam &c. . . . .	314 (325)	11 = 72	11 = 72	<i>Iohannes habet similitudinem</i> &c. . . . .	504		18
				<i>Of the following</i> . . . . .			2[3] = 72

MEMORANDUM.—I assume the authentic value of the paragraph on St Mark to be 280, not 267; for 'Parate uiam dñi' seems to be needed after 'Vox clamantis in deserto'. It is in the Gallicanum Vetus and the Bobbio Sacramentary (Mur. ii 715, 829), both of which, like Reginensis, have the puzzling phrase 'siue quia regnat inuictus'. For help concerning this I have consulted some of our best known biblical scholars; but their kind efforts for me have been fruitless. The best I can do is, to cite what follows from a letter (V. 15) written by Sidonius Apollinaris, in or about the year 437, to Siricius, Bishop of Limoges, 'Defert [bibliopola uester] et uolumen prophetarum, licet me absente, decursum, sua tamen cura manue de superuacuis sententiis eruderatum, nec semper illo contralegente qui promiserat operam suam' (Migne S. L. lviii 545 B); and, but with diffidence, to suggest (i) that the bibliopole expunged, as a *superuacua sententia*, the second member of the prophet's parallelism, 'In deserto parate uiam Domini, rectas facite in solitudine semitas Dei nostri' (Is. xl 3), (ii) replacing it with 'quia regnat inuictus'; (iii) that his volume, or a copy of it, fell into the hands of one or other of the successive scribes of *bapt.* or *Bapt.*, who, (iv) deeming the words a true variant, prefixed a 'siue' to them and set them—perhaps as a marginal gloss, perhaps as an interlineation—into his transcript, and (v) that a later scribe substituted the whole 'siue quia regnat inuictus' for St Mark's 'rectas facite semitas eius'. My next best guess would be that 'siue' &c. is a misinterpreted tironian adversarium; my next, that it represents a Gothic mistranslation.

*Section xxxv.* This (Mur. i 539) is one of the most interesting of the forty sections which are the subject of the present essay.

I. 1. The memorandum '*id est antequam dicis symbolum his uerbis prosequeris*' set in Reginensis next after the title of the section gives the meaning of '*Praefatio symboli*'. I assume it to be a late insertion.<sup>1</sup>

2. The words '*animis uestris ueram conuersationem mutatis ad dñm*' in the address '*Dilectissimi nobis*' &c. should perhaps be corrected to '*animis uestris uera conuersione mutatis ad dñm*'. 3, 4. Slight, but necessary, corrections reduce the first directive rubric, '*Post haec accipiens*' &c., from 121 letters to 118; and the last but one, '*Ponens manum acolytus*' &c., from 71 to 69.<sup>2</sup>

II. If we were to assume that the book whence §§ xxix–xxxvi were transferred into our document had been based on a Roman original, and that each of these sections, as now known to us, and, more particularly, the Greek and Latin texts of the Constantinopolitan creed in § xxxv, had been derived, mediately or immediately, from a formulary proper to the Roman Church, we should find ourselves committed to the opinion of more than one scholar of European reputation,<sup>3</sup> that in or before the seventh century the Roman Church must have used that creed in the instruction of candidates for baptism. If the scholars to whom I refer have been well advised in coming to this conclusion, they have enhanced our knowledge of a confessedly obscure subject. If they have been ill advised, their loyalty to historic truth will be the measure of their readiness to take into consideration the suggestion which I am about to make.

The Apostles' Creed is the only *symbolum fidei* which Leo the Great<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I mean an insertion later than V'. But, on the other hand, if the compiler of V', or his scribe, was so careless as to omit from the paragraph '*Marcus euangelista*' &c. in § xxxiv the words '*Parate uiam dñi*', thus reducing it from 280 letters to 267, and from ten lines to nine, he may have compensated the loss by adding '*id est antequam dicis*' &c. (46 letters) to the sub-title, '*Incipit praefatio*' (16 letters), of § xxxv, thereby making this require two lines instead of one. Hence the bracketed alternatives [9] and [3] in the list for § xxxiv and [62] in that for § xxxv (p. 557 *infra*). The compensation, while filling p. 79 of his volume to the last line, would enable him to begin the first constituent, '*Dilectissimi nobis*' &c. of § xxxv at the beginning of a page (p. 80).

<sup>2</sup> For the table of values see below, p. 557.

<sup>3</sup> Dr Burn, the latest writer on the subject, says, after giving the opinions of Harnack and Caspari, 'It is to be hoped that further evidence will soon be found which will throw light on the use of both forms—i. e. the Apostles' Creed and the Constantinopolitan—in Rome in the seventh century' (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 52). I think that I am giving what is really wanted, a true account of the difficulty which scholars have detected in our document.

<sup>4</sup> See the passages which I am about to quote from his twenty-eighth and his thirtieth Epistles.

is known to have used in the instruction of catechumens: it is the only *symbolum fidei* mentioned in this connexion by that minutely informed authority on Roman use, Ioannes Diaconus, author of the *Epistola ad Senarium*, and Leo's junior by about half a century<sup>1</sup>; and, regard had to the well-known declaration of Leo III concerning the Roman church's unfamiliarity with the Constantinopolitan developement of the Nicene confession, irrefragable evidence must be adduced before we can assume that at any intervening period she used either of these in the scrutinies preparatory to baptism.

But, in good truth, whether or not the other portions of that excerpt from a baptisterium which is contained in §§ xxix-xxxvi are of Roman derivation, the 'Dilectissimi nobis' &c. (Mur. i 539) which in § xxxv precedes the 'Pisteuo his ena' &c. and the 'Haec summa' &c. (*ib.* 542) which follows the 'Credo in unum' &c., set it beyond doubt that this 'Pisteuo' &c. and this 'Credo' &c. are intruders which have ousted and superseded the Greek text and the Latin of some early form of the Apostles' Creed: for—

In the first place: The 'Dilectissimi' &c. promises the hearers an 'euangelici symboli sacramentum a Domino inspiratum, ab apostolis institutum'; and tells them that, by special grace of the Holy Spirit 'qui dictauit' it, it is so simple and so short as not to baffle a disciple's apprehension or fatigue his memory.

Secondly: The 'Haec summa' &c.<sup>2</sup> says that the articles of the symbol which had been rehearsed are so phrased as that to comprehend them and keep them in mind 'nemo non idoneus, nemo non aptus', and calls the symbol a '*breuissima plenitudo*'.

Thirdly, and particularly: The recapitulation, 'Hic Dei Patris . . . resurrectio perdocetur', embodied in this 'Haec summa' &c., corresponds to the successive articles of the Apostles' Creed in some of its earliest extant forms, but not to those of the 'Credo in unum . . . et uitam futuri saeculi'.

Fourthly, and conclusively: Whereas the last sentence, 'Hic *postremo* ecclesiae uocatio, peccatorum remissio et carnis resurrectio perdocetur', of that recapitulation tallies precisely with the end of the Apostles' Creed at one well-known stage of its developement, it is irreconcilably at variance with the end of the Constantinopolitan.

Convinced, therefore, that in § xxxv the Constantinopolitan creed is

<sup>1</sup> His words are 'Dehinc . . . ille qui dudum exsufflatus diabolicis laqueis pompisque renunciauerat symboli ab apostolis traditi iam meretur uerba suscipere' and 'Perscrutamur enim eorum corda per fidem utrum . . . se credere fateantur in Deum Patrem omnipotentem', Migne S. L. lix 402 B.

<sup>2</sup> I beg the reader very carefully to consult for himself the whole text of both the 'Dilectissimi nobis' &c. and the 'Haec summa' &c.

an usurper which has ousted and superseded some early form of the *symbolum apostolorum*, I proceed with my examination.

III. Leo the Great begins the argument of his famous epistle to Flavian by saying that, if Eutyches had been too indolent to elaborate from Holy Scripture an intelligible theory of the Incarnation, he should at least have tried to understand the 'ipsius symboli initia quod per totum mundum omnium regenerandorum uoce depromitur', and given careful heed to 'illa communis et indiscreta confessio qua fidelium uniuersitas confitetur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem et in Iesum Christum Filium eius unicum Dominum nostrum qui natus est [ex] Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine; quibus tribus sententiis omnium fere haereticorum machinae destruuntur'.<sup>1</sup> In thus expressing himself he does not, indeed, categorically assert that the *fidelium uniuersitas* of his day regarded the portion of the Apostles' Creed here cited as three articles, each separate and distinct from the other two; but he leaves it to be inferred that he himself took this view of them, and that he believed it to be the view universally taken of them: and, when writing to the Empress Pulcheria, he certainly writes as if both she and he regarded the formula as divisible, and as in actual practice divided, into twelve several propositions,—'Siquidem ipsa catholici symboli breuis et perfecta confessio quae duodecim apostolorum totidem est signata sententiis' &c.<sup>2</sup> But, the writer of the 'Haec summa . . . perdocetur' in § xxxv of our document (Mur. i 542), so far from hinting at any such view as held by himself or the church of which he was a member, makes a sevenfold,<sup>3</sup> not a twelvefold, distribution of the formula; thus leaving us to infer that he may never have heard of a twelvefold distribution, and that, if he had, he may not have thought it obligatory on him. We must therefore hold judgement in suspense as to both the age and the provenance of his Latin text of the superseded formula. Nor may we assume his Greek text of it to have been identical with what Marcellus of Ancyra in the year 341 placed in the hands of Pope Julius; for, whereas Marcellus wrote 'τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου', the expositor inverts the order of the names, writing 'Hic Unigenitus Dei de Maria Virgine et Spiritu Sancto secundum carnem natus ostenditur'; and, whereas the participle employed by Marcellus was *γεννηθέντα*, the expositor's 'natus' seems to imply, not *γεννηθέντα*, but 'τεχθέντα', the word given in the Greek text of Leo's letter to Flavian.

I have thus early dwelt, and dwelt with some insistence, on these three considerations, (i) that the Constantinopolitan creed now found in Reginensis has taken the place of that brief formula which, usually

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 28 (Migne S. L. liv 757 A, B).

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 32 (ib. 794 B).

<sup>3</sup> I shall return to this subject presently.

known as the Apostles' Creed, it may be safer to denote as the 'Credo in Deum', and (ii) that we must not assume either the Greek or the Latin text of that brief formula to have been of Roman derivation, or (iii) take it for granted that its Greek text was identical with that of the profession made by Marcellus; because I feel sure that careful account must be taken of them if scholars are ever to devise a tenable theory of the external history of our document.

*The Evolution of § xxxv.* A first review of the section suggests the following remarks:—

I. The initial rubric, '*Incipit praefatio*' &c., is not a true capitulum having for its scope the whole of the section, such as '*In traditione symboli*' would have been; but a mere heading to the prefatory address, '*Dilectissimi nobis*' &c.

II. This '*Dilectissimi nobis*' &c. looks like inserted work, for the '*id est antequam dicis symbolum his uerbis prosequeris*' prefixed to it seems to imply that it is to be read by the bishop; a dignitary whose presence is neither mentioned nor implied in any part of the section but that which relates to the Latin text, and who indeed is assumed to have delegated to a presbyter the *traditio symboli* in the Greek. I believe it to have been introduced *ex post facto* to the original scheme of the item, and introduced at the instance of a bishop who desired to grace the ceremony with his presence. I also observe with interest that its 698 letters are equivalent to one  $\kappa$  page, but defer for a moment what I wish to say about the stage of evolution at which the Latin text was set forth.

III. On comparing with each other M. Léopold Delisle's heliographs in illustration of MS Vatican. Regin. 316, I find that the 'Greek' text of the Constantinopolitan symbol is written on successive lines of the ruling, but in characters much smaller than those used in the document generally, and that due space is thus allowed for the superscribed Latin transverbation. The reduced scale of the script in which the 'Greek' symbol is set forth gives every five lines of it the content of about six lines of normal text; so that when I draw up my table of values for the exemplar of V' I shall correct 870 to 725. Whether or not the writer of that exemplar in thus resorting to a smaller scale of script did what his predecessor, or predecessors, had already done is a question which we must remember to bear in mind. I shall assume that he did.

IV. Granted that at that stage<sup>1</sup> in the developement of the baptisterium whence § xxxv was excerpted both Greek and Latin were vernacular languages in the province or diocese where the baptisterium was then used, we yet may fairly ask whether or no both languages had been

<sup>1</sup> That stage I notify as 'Bapt.', identifying it with the 'Bapt.' of previous pages.

vernaculars in the province or diocese for which the original scheme<sup>1</sup> of the baptisterium was drawn up: and, on either the one hypothesis or the other, the question arises whether in the original scheme the apostolic symbol was set forth in both a Greek text and a Latin, or only in one; whether, if only in a Greek text, this was employed as being deemed the original text, or because Greek was revered as a hieratic language, or because it was by local accident better understood or more usually spoken than Latin; and, if in both, why precedence was given to the Greek. Here, again, are considerations which must be carefully borne in mind.

V. The long admonitory address (Mur. i 542) appointed to be read after the *traditio* reads like a cumulate composition. First comes the paraphrase, 'Haec summa . . . resurrectio perdocetur', (in 612 letters) of the apostolic symbolum, 'Credo in Deum' &c.: then follows (in 601 letters) a passage, 'Vos itaque dilectissimi . . . scī sps uirtute generati', on the grace of baptism: we next have (in 462 letters) a passage, 'Et ideo hanc breuissimam . . . gloriam resurrectionis habeatis', which evidently has the apostolic symbol for its subject-matter, and which calls to mind the teaching, and indeed the very words, of St Paul, and the 'good confession' of the *milites Christi* in the first days of the Church; and after it (in 226 letters) a sentence, 'Ergo dilectissimi praefatum symbolum fidei catholicae . . . ad regna caelestia faciat peruenire', which almost as evidently has no specific reference to the Constantinopolitan formula; a subject to which I shall revert in the sequel. The concluding 'per eundum . . . saeculorum. Amen', I may here add, gives, by its 60 letters, 1961 as the total value of the extant constituent.

Here, too, let me note that the passage 'Vos itaque . . . generati' is but indirectly relevant to the proper subject of the address; that it is not in Gerbert; and that, unless or until we be otherwise informed, we may therefore assume it to be a late insertion.

VI. The extant rubrication of the section is by no means perfect, for—(1) The '*Incipit praefatio symboli ad electos*' (Mur. i 539) which now does duty as a capitulum would seem to be the fusion of an '*Incipit traditio symboli ad electos*' and a subjoined '*Praefatio*', or the fusion of a '*Traditio symboli ad electos*' and a subjoined '*Incipit praefatio*'; while (2) the explanatory '*Id est antequam dicis symbolum his uerbis prosequeris*' looks like a gloss which clerical mischance has assumed into the section itself from the lower margin of the page in V' or a copy of it.<sup>2</sup> (3) I explain the faulty '*Et interrogat ei pbr*' in the directions that follow the address 'Dilectissimi nobis . . . inchoatur

<sup>1</sup> The original scheme will be notified as '*bapt.*<sub>1</sub>'.

<sup>2</sup> For an alternative view see above, p. 548 n. 1.

exordio' (*ib.* 540) by supposing that here, as in several other instances, the scribe of Reginensis, or a predecessor, had two sources of information, and that in one of these, the older book of the two, the words '*super caput eius*' were immediately followed by '*Et dicit ei p̄br*' and '*Annuntia fidem ipsorum*' &c., whereas the other and more recent book of the two interposed after '*super caput eius*' a rubric '*Et interrogat p̄br*' and the question '*Qua lingua confitentur*' &c. I mean, that is to say, that the extant '*Et interrogat ei*' is a conflation of an earlier '*Et dicit ei*' and a later '*Et interrogat*'. (4) Immediately after the 'Greek' creed (*ib.* i 541) some such rubric as '*Hoc expleto sequeris*' would seem to have been overlooked from visual misdirection or confusion of thought due to the '*Hoc expleto sequitur*' &c. at the corresponding place after the Latin creed (*ib.* 542), as also (5) '*Dicis*' between 'Latine' and the questioner's '*Annuntia fidem*' &c.<sup>1</sup>

*The Earlier Phases of § xxxv (bapt., and bapt.).*

Let us therefore assume that, as originally devised, the present section set forth, not the Constantinopolitan creed, but some early form of the *symbolum apostolorum*: and let us so far give play to the speculative faculty as further to assume that this was appointed to be said in Greek, either because Greek was deemed a hieratic language, or because Greek was the language in which the formula was believed to have been originally written or in which it had been brought westward; but that, for whatever reason, the formula was not appointed to be said in Latin. By this hypothesis we should have—

1. *Traditio symboli ad electos.*
2. *Accipiens acolytus unum . . . super caput eius. Et dicit ei p̄br* (in 105 letters).
3. *Annuntia fidem ipsorum* &c. (in 34 letters).
4. *Et dicit acolytus symbolum graece decantando* &c. (in 79 letters), where I should be disposed to retain the word '*graece*', connecting it with '*decantando*', as designed to direct the successive clauses of the formula to be sung to an oriental melody known by the name 'Greek'.
5. Next would come the formula, distributed into seven clauses, as is intimated by the sevenfold structure of the paraphrase contained in our '*Haec summa est . . . resurrectio perdocetur*' (*Mur.* i 542), and written on twelve lines of the average capacity of 29 letters, or thereabout, thus—

Πιστεύω εἰς ἑὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα καὶ  
εἰς υἱὸν ἁγῶν τὸν μονογενῆ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ

<sup>1</sup> Nothing would be more likely to happen if the scribe of Bapt., or his *contralens*, had before him a copy of *bapt.*<sub>1</sub> with only the '*Πιστεύω εἰς ἑὸν*', and also a copy of *bapt.*<sub>2</sub> with both the '*Πιστεύω εἰς ἑὸν*' and the '*Crede in dñm*'.



Τὸν τεχθέντα ἐκ μαρίας τῆς παρθένου  
καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου  
Τὸν σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ τῇ  
τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα  
Τὸν ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ  
καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς  
Ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς  
Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα  
Ἀγίαν ἐκκλησίαν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σαρ-  
κὸς ἀνάστασιν.

6. Then would follow the rubric '*Hoc expleto sequitur p̄br his uerbis*' (in 30 letters).

7. If I have made a right diagnosis of the exposition introduced by this rubric, the series would end with '*Haec summa est . . . resurrectio perdocetur. Et ideo hanc breuissimam plenitudinem . . . resurrectionis habeatis. Per eundem*' &c. (in 1134 letters).

This equipment—consistent as it is in itself and, if not morally certain, yet unimpeachably probable in theory—does not respond to the κ criterion of measurement; but—and I confess that I think it a significant coincidence—I find that, with two lines, allowed for connecting rubric, it yields to that γ criterion which, in my opinion, governed some editions of the '*Missale Francorum*',<sup>1</sup> and which, as we have found reason to believe, would seem to have governed early editions of the *canon poenitentialis* and the pontifical excerpts from which are extant in §§ xv, xvi and in §§ xx–xxiv<sup>2</sup> and § xcix. Indeed, it not only has the total value of three γ pages, it divides into two parts logically distinct,<sup>3</sup> the first of which fills one page and the second a couple of pages, thus—

Scheme of bapt. <sub>1</sub>	γ lines.
<i>Traditio symboli ad electos</i> . . . . .	24 *
<i>Accipiens acolytus unum . . . super caput eius. Et</i> <i>dicit ei p̄br</i> . . . . .	105 4
<i>Annuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt</i> . . .	34 2
<i>Et dicit acolytus symbolum graece decantando</i> &c.	79 3
Πιστεύω εἰς θν πατέρα κτλ. (On 12 lines) . . .	12 = 21
<i>Hoc expleto sequitur p̄br his uerbis</i> . . . . .	30 1
<i>Haec summa . . . perdocetur. Et ideo . . .</i> <i>habeatis. per eundem</i> &c. . . . .	1134' 39
Of the following . . . . .	2 = 42 (Total, three γ pages)

<sup>1</sup> See vol. xii pp. 232, 242, 247, 538, 544, 545, 554, 555 of the JOURNAL.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 328, 329 and 334–336, 338–340.

<sup>3</sup> For a like logical distribution see columns '*pen.<sub>1</sub>*' and '*pen.<sub>2</sub>*' in the table of values on p. 329 *supra*.

At a later time, if not in another place, this perhaps first expression of the item may have been amplified under new conditions; these being (1) that after the creed had been sung in Greek the bishop intervened,<sup>1</sup> saying, 'Filii carissimi audistis symbolum graece audite et latine'; (2) that, addressing himself to the acolyte, he asked him—inferentially, if not categorically—what was the vernacular of the *electi*, or one of two vernaculars; and that, (3) on receiving 'Latine' as the reply (4) he—not the priest—said 'Annuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt'.<sup>2</sup>

Here again I do not presume to dogmatize; but I do venture to assert that the theory I propose<sup>3</sup> is clearly suggested by the actual condition of the Reginensis rubrication, and that it is probable not only on its own merits but because it bears the application of the  $\gamma$  criterion.

What precisely was the Latin text of the Apostles' Creed which the Constantinopolitan has replaced it is by no means easy to surmise; for as early as the first half of the fourth century there were, at least in the south of Gaul, two theories as to the conditions to be satisfied in a good translation, theories which 'blend in fantastic strife' in the Reginensis rendering of the longer formula: but, whether the wording of the second clause was 'Qui natus est de maria uirgine et spū sōo' or 'Natum de maria uirgine et spū sōo', one line would suffice for it, and eleven lines would contain the whole. We thus have, as summary of the item at the second of its not improbable earlier phases—

Scheme of bapt. <sub>2</sub>	$\gamma$ lines
<i>Traditio symboli ad electos</i> . . . . . 24	*
<i>Accipiens acolytus unum . . . super caput eius. Et</i> <i>dicat ei pbr.</i> . . . . . 105	4
<i>Annuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt.</i> . . . 34	2
<i>Et dicat acolytus symbolum graece decantando &amp;c.</i> 79	3
<i>Πιστεύω εἰς θν̄ πατέρα κτλ.</i> (On 12 lines) . . .	12 = 2 I
<i>Hoc expleto dicis</i> . . . . . 15	I
<i>Filii carissimi audistis . . . audite et latine. Et dicis</i> 56	2
<i>Qua lingua confitentur &amp;c. Resp. Latine. Dicis</i> 46	2
<i>Annuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt.</i> . . . 34	2
<i>Ponens manum acolytus . . . dicat symbolum decan-</i> <i>tando &amp;c.</i> . . . . . 71 (69)	3
<i>Credo in dñm patrem &amp;c.</i> (On 11 lines) . . .	11 = 2 I
<i>Hoc expleto sequitur pbr his uerbis</i> . . . . . 30	I
<i>Haec summa . . . perdocetur. Et ideo . . . habea-</i> <i>tis, per eundem &amp;c.</i> . . . . . 1134	39
Of the following . . . . .	2 = 42 (Total, four $\gamma$ pages)

<sup>1</sup> Let us not forget the strikingly and suggestively similar intervention of the bishop in *pen.*<sub>2</sub> as contrasted with *pen.*<sub>1</sub>. See above, p. 329.

<sup>2</sup> That the acolyte sang the Latin creed to the same melody as the Greek—presumably a melody imported from the East—we are not told. He probably did.

<sup>3</sup> What I also suggest about episcopal intervention is based on the second person

Here, yet again, I do not dogmatize; but I do assert that this my reconstruction of a theoretically possible second phase of the item is suggested by the actual condition of the rubrics in *Reginensis*; that it is approved by the fact that, as concerns the Latin creed now by the hypothesis introduced into the ceremony of the *traditio*, it transfers the conduct of the function from the priest to the bishop, and that its tolerance of the  $\gamma$  test gives it a compelling claim on our acceptance.

*The Later Phases of § xxxv.* I. Let us assume that this, like other sections containing non-sacramental material, was transferred from  $\gamma$  ( $21 \times 29\frac{1}{2}$ ) pages to pages of  $\kappa$  ( $24 \times 29\frac{1}{2}$ ) value. To fill four of these, as previously it had filled four of the less ample pages, it must of course receive an aggregate enhancement amounting to not less than ( $4 \times 3 =$ ) 12 lines. The accompanying table of values shews what, in my opinion, was really done.

1. Section xxxiv (see above, p. 547) ending on the antepenultimate line of a page, the last two lines of this were devoted to the capitulum of § xxxv and a new rubric '*Incipit praefatio*'. Then followed, as the reader will see on consulting the table, the address '*Dilectissimi nobis accepturi*' &c. It fills a  $\kappa$  page.

2. So much of the item as relates to the '*Πιστεύω εἰς θν̄ πατέρα*' κτλ. had in *bapt.*<sub>1</sub> and *bapt.*<sub>2</sub> filled a  $\gamma$  page: the editor of *Bapt.* raised it to  $\kappa$  value by inserting a question which would have been unmeaning in *bapt.*<sub>1</sub>, which would have been unnecessary in *bapt.*<sub>2</sub>, and for which there now was no need. This, however, and the answer to it enabled him to end the '*Πιστεύω*' on the last line of his second page.

3. But he could not resort to a like device as he worked his way to the '*Credo in dñm patrem*' &c., for the editor of *bapt.*<sub>2</sub> had anticipated him. He therefore transcribed what lay before him in his copy of *bapt.*<sub>2</sub>

of the direction '*prosequeris*' in the rubric before the opening address, '*Dilectissimi nobis accepturi*' &c. (Mur. i 539), and of the directive '*Et dicis*' in the rubric (*ib.* 541) before the '*Qua lingua . . . ihm xp̄m?*' which relates to the Latin creed, as contrasted with the '*dicat p̄br*' in the corresponding rubric before the '*Qua lingua . . . ihm xp̄m?*' which related to the Greek. In all the other rubrics of § xxxv the verb employed is in the third person, and has for its subject either the acolyte or the presbyter, but never the bishop.

Whether I am right or wrong in making '*prosequeris*' and '*dicis*' imply the bishop's participation in the function in no way affects the validity of my argument in proof of a second  $\gamma$  redaction (*bapt.*<sub>2</sub>) in place of a first (*bapt.*<sub>1</sub>). But, if I am right—and I think I am—some very interesting questions at once suggest themselves. Where was it, when was it, why was it, that, on the substitution of *bapt.*<sub>2</sub> for *bapt.*<sub>1</sub> in honour of the Latin version of the creed, the bishop himself made that version his own special concern? These questions will, I think, have to be taken into account in any attempt that may be made to determine the external history of the section.

## The Traditio Symboli (§ xxxv at Redaction V).

		γ schemes.		κ schemes.	
		bapt. <sub>1</sub> (3 pages)	bapt. <sub>2</sub> (4 pages)	Bapt. (5 pages)	V' (7 pages)
<i>Traditio symboli ad electos</i> . . . . .	24	*		*	
<i>Incipit praefatio [id est antequam &amp;c.]</i> . . . . .	16 [62]			*	
<i>Dilectissimi nobis accepturi &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	699 (697)			24 = 24	
<i>Accipiens acolytus unum . . . super caput eius. Et dicit ei p̄br</i> . . . . .	105	4			
<i>Post haec accipiens . . . super caput eius. Et interrogat p̄br</i> . . . . .	121 (118)			4	
<i>Qua lingua confitentur dñm nrm ihm xpm? Resp. Graece</i> . . . . .	41			2	
<i>Iterum dicit p̄br</i> . . . . .	14			1	
<i>Annuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt</i> . . . . .	34	2		2	
<i>Et dicit acolytus symbolum graece decantando &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	79	3		3	
<i>Πιστεύω εἰς θν πατέρα κτλ. (On 12 lines)</i> . . . . .		12 = 21		12 = 24	
<i>Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θν πατέρα κτλ.</i> . . . . .	(810) 725			26	
<i>Hoc expleto dicit</i> . . . . .	15	1		1	
<i>Fillii carissimi audistis symbolum graece audite et latine. Et dicit</i> . . . . .	56	2		2	
<i>Qua lingua confitentur dñm nrm ihm xpm? Resp. Latine. Dicit</i> . . . . .	46	2		2	
<i>Annuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt</i> . . . . .	34	2		2	
<i>Ponens manum acolytus . . . dicit symbolum decantando his uerbis</i> . . . . .	71 (69)	3		3	3 = 48
<i>Credo in dñm patrem &amp;c. (On 11 lines)</i> . . . . .		11 = 21		11	
<i>Credo in unum dñm patrem &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	790			27	
<i>Hoc expleto sequitur p̄br his uerbis</i> . . . . .	30	1		1	
<i>Haec summa . . . perdocetur. Et ideo . . . habeatis. per eundem &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	1134	39			
<i>Haec summa . . . perdocetur. Et ideo . . . habeatis. Ergo dilectissimi</i> . . . . .					
<i>. . . peruenire. per eundem &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	1360			48	
<i>Haec summa &amp;c. Vos itaque dilectissimi . . . generati. Et</i> . . . . .					
<i>ideo &amp;c. Ergo dilectissimi &amp;c. per eundem &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	1961				68 = 96 <sup>1</sup>
<i>Of the following</i> . . . . .		2 = 42	2 = 42	2 = 72	

MEMORANDUM.—Scheme 'Bapt.' when incorporated into the document at Redaction V would end on p. 82.

<sup>1</sup> P. 86 of V' ends here.

until he reached the words '... gloriam resurrectionis habeatis' in the last constituent, when, between these and the concluding 'per eundem' &c., he interposed the sentence 'Ergo dilectissimi . . . faciat peruenire'. This addition, an addition, be it well observed, which by its 'praefatum symbolum' assures us that the Apostles' creed was not yet superseded by the Constantinopolitan, carried him to the antepenultimate line of a fifth page on which to write rubric or rubrics proper to the next section.

II. 1. When it was that this scheme—incorporated, I assume, with the document at Redaction V—was replaced by that in which the 'Πιστεύω εἰς θν̄ πατέρα' κτλ. gave way to the 'Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θν̄ πατέρα' κτλ. we must enquire in the sequel; but the substitution itself was effected very cleverly indeed. The longer symbol began, as its predecessor had begun, on the first line of a page; but it was written in so ingeniously reduced a script that, instead of occupying 31 lines, it occupied only 26, with the consequence that the distinction of a fresh page was accorded to its Latin equivalent as well as to itself.

2. But nothing short of new material having the value of 20, or, at the least, 18 lines must now be found if the item was to end concurrently with a page. Hence the barely relevant *farcimentum*, 'Vos itaque dilectissimi . . . uirtute generati', which now divorces the 'Et ideo hanc breuissimam plenitudinem' &c. from its proper context, the 'Haec summa est . . . resurrectio perdocetur'.

POSTSCRIPT. Two questions may here be opportune :—

1. If there was such a redaction as the *bapt.*<sub>1</sub> of my analysis, why was the Greek text of the Apostles' Creed the only text officially recognized? Perhaps in obedience to long tradition: perhaps because, though Latin was understood by some, by many, or by all, Greek was the dominant speech of the laity.

2. If there was such a redaction as the *bapt.*<sub>2</sub> of my analysis, why was a Latin text of the creed now recited, and recited at the instance of the bishop himself? Perhaps because now, as had not been the case formerly, or because here, as had not been the case elsewhere, Latin as well as Greek was a vernacular tongue: perhaps because now and here Latin was rivalling and tending to supersede Greek as the language of the people: perhaps because there were reasons of ecclesiastical or secular polity for encouraging children to make devotional use of it: perhaps because, as at Arles in the closing years of the fifth century, the laity were desired to use one language equally with the other when engaged in public worship.

All these considerations must, I think, be borne in mind if the problem of the external history of our document is ever to be solved.

*Sections xxix-xxxiv (resumed).* Since we have good reason to believe that the non-sacramentarial sections xv, xvi; xx-xxiv; xxxv;

and, besides these, xcix have been developed from an original written on  $\gamma$  ( $21 \times 29\frac{1}{3}$ ) pages (see above, pp. 327-330 and 333-343), let us enquire if this may with probability be said of §§ xxix-xxxiv. The question is the more important inasmuch as these sections—at least, in their present estate—are part of one and the same baptismal series with § xxxv which we have just been examining.

*The First Scrutiny.* Sections xxix-xxxiii (Mur. i 533-537) are concerned with the first scrutiny of the *electi*; and the fact that, if we assume the ampler form of the rubric '*Ut autem*' &c. in § xxix to have been set forth in the  $\kappa$  libellus in which, by the hypothesis, Bapt. was written, they have the aggregate value (see above, pp. 545, 546) of ( $96 + 24 + 72 =$ ) 192  $\kappa$  lines, i.e. of eight  $\kappa$  pages, justifies us in believing that it had indeed been thus set forth in that libellus.

My reason for thinking that at Bapt. the rubric appeared in the longer of its two forms was not, that it is the wont of rubrics to grow, rather than to lessen, with lapse of time; but because the structure of the longer form is such as very forcibly to suggest that it is due to the insertion of phrases and single words<sup>1</sup> into the shorter form; and because, as will be seen on inspection, the converse theory is so very improbable as to be barely tenable.

Let us then assume (1) that—as in the *bapt.* already ascertained for § xxxv, and as in the *pen.* and the *ord.* already ascertained for §§ xv, xvi, and for §§ xcix, xx-xxiv—§§ xxix-xxxiii had once been set forth on pages of  $\gamma$  ( $21 \times 29\frac{1}{3}$ ) capacity; (2) that the libellus in which they were written had not a pictorial frontispiece, but (3) that  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lines of the first page of text were devoted to the general title and some slight ornamentation; and (4) that the rubric '*Ut autem uenerint*' &c. had as yet its lower value of 176 letters. The result in terms of letters and of lines would be—

§ xxix.	77, 375, 176	
	$1\frac{1}{2}, 2\frac{1}{2}, 13, 6 =$	23 $\gamma$ lines
§ xxx.	18, 23, 411, 212, 198	
	$1, 1, 14, 8, 7 =$	31 " "
§ xxxi.	32, 515, 44, 47	
	$1, 18, 2, 2 =$	23 " "
§ xxxii.	24, 360	
	$1, 13 =$	14 " "
§ xxxiii.	68, 265, 310, 16, 243, 19, 17, 575, 16, 252	
	$3, 9, 11, 1, 9, 1, 1, 20, 1, 9 =$	65 " "
	19, 17, 171, 22, 16, 178, 19, 34, 325	
	$1, 1, 6, 1, 1, 7, 1, 2, 11, 2 =$	33 " "
		Total, 189 $\gamma$ lines (9 pages).

<sup>1</sup> The phrases and words 'uel eorum qui ipsos suscepturi sunt', 'ipsi infantes ab acolyto' . . . 'seorsum', 'seorsum'.

Hence we see that at Bapt. it would in any case be necessary to introduce some few lines of augmentation if the series were to fill an integral number of pages; and, evidently, the necessity would be heightened if the general title now formed part of a pictorial frontispiece: 192  $\kappa$  lines would have to be filled, as against the prior series of 188  $\gamma$  lines. For the values at Bapt. see above, pp. 546, 547.

*The Second Scrutiny.* Section xxxiv is concerned with the *apertio aurium* of candidates for baptism. We have seen (p. 547 *supra*) that with the two-line capitulum of § xxxv (which followed its last constituent) it covered the 120 lines of five  $\kappa$  pages at that second edition which I denominate 'Bapt.'. But, it is evident that if at the *bapt.* of my hypothesis it had filled but 124 of the 126 lines of six  $\gamma$  pages, it must then have been ampler in respect of rubric, of text, or of both than at the later issue. How, then, can it at that stage have been equipped?

Here again Gerbert helps us. The reader will see from Mr Wilson's notes<sup>1</sup> that, between the opening address 'Aperturi uobis . . . lucas iohannes' and the exposition of St Matthew's function as an evangelist, Gerbert's Zürich MS differs from Reginensis. The Zürich equipment I assign to the  $\gamma$  libellus on which *bapt.* was written; that of Reginensis I assign to the  $\kappa$  libellus of Bapt. I set the two schemes side by side together with their values in terms of letters:—

<i>bapt.</i>		Bapt.	
<i>Et annuntiat diaconus dicens</i> . . . 25		<i>Et annuntiat diaconus dicens</i> . . . 25	
State cum silentio audite intente . . 28		State cum silentio audientes intente 31	
<i>Et dicit</i> . . . . . 7			
Dñs uobiscum . . . . . 10			
<i>Et incipiens legit</i> . . . a peccatis eorum 100		<i>Et incipiens legit</i> . . . a peccatis eorum 100	
<i>Iterum annuntiat diaconus ut supra</i> 30			
State cum silentio . . . . . 15			
<i>Et post haec tractat p̄r his uerbis</i> . 29		<i>Postquam legerit tractat p̄r his uerbis</i> . . . . . 34	

Thus we have for *bapt.* as distinguished from the record for Bapt. (see p. 547 *supra*) the following summary,<sup>2</sup>—

§ xxxiv. 54, 187, 963, 25, 28, 7, 10, 100, 30, 15, 29, 437  
 2, 7, 34, 1, 1, 1, 1, 4, 1, 1, 1, 15 = 69  $\gamma$  lines  
 28, 31, 86, 25, 280, 93, 25, 317, 93, 29, 504  
 1, 1, 3, 1, 10, 4, 1, 11, 4, 1, 18, 2 = 57 " "  
 Total, 126  $\gamma$  lines (6 pages).

Reassured, therefore, as to the existence of a prior edition on  $\gamma$  pages of §§ xxix–xxxv, I now turn to § xxxvi, the last of the present group of non-sacramental items.

<sup>1</sup> Or from Gerbert himself, *Monumenta* ii 2.

<sup>2</sup> The *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Mur. ii 714–716) has an item which, while sub-

*Section xxxvi.* The thirty-sixth section teaches the *electi* the text of the Lord's Prayer, and explains its eight several clauses. These are set forth a clause at a time; each clause in its turn being followed by a brief exposition.

I. 1. I learn from M. Léopold Delisle's '*Mémoires sur d'anciens Sacramentaires*' (p. 68), what Mr Wilson fails to tell us, that 'heureusement nous avons au folio 2 v<sup>o</sup> [du ms. 316 de la reine de Suède au Vatican] un texte bilingue de l'oraison dominicale de la même main' as the sacramentary itself; a fact which leads me to suspect that here, as in many other instances, the scribe of Reginensis had before him not only a copy of the V<sup>o</sup> redaction of the item, but also a copy of some earlier edition: and, on consulting vol. xxxvii of the '*Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*' (p. 16), I infer from M. Delisle's transcript of the page as well as from his verbal description of it that both texts are written on lines of the ruling, and in characters of normal size; here again getting a hint in aid of the reconstruction I should like to make.

stantially identical with § xxxiv of Reginensis and with the Zürich article, represents not six, but only five  $\gamma$  pages. The contents and distribution is as follows:—

	$\gamma$ lines	
<i>Incipit expositio euangeliorum &amp;c.</i> . . . .	54	2
<i>Aperturi uobis filii karissimi &amp;c.</i> . . . .	971	33
<i>Post haec legit diaconus . . . matthaeum</i> . . . .	53	2
<i>Et postquam legerit tractat pbr &amp;c.</i> . . . .	36	2
<i>Filii karissimi ne diutius &amp;c.</i> . . . .	435	15
<i>Explicit secundum matth.</i> . . . .	21	1
<i>Incipit secundum marcum.</i> . . . .	19	1
<i>Legit diaconus . . . marcum</i> . . . .	42	2
<i>Exponit pbr.</i> . . . .	10	1
<i>Marcus euangelista leonis gerens &amp;c.</i> . . . .	279	10
<i>Incipit secundum lucam</i> . . . .	18	1
<i>Legit diaconus . . . lucam.</i> . . . .	42	2
<i>Tractat pbr.</i> . . . .	10	1
<i>Lucas euangelista speciem uituli &amp;c.</i> . . . .	321	11
<i>Item legit diaconus . . . iohannem</i> . . . .	49	2
<i>Tractat pbr his uerbis</i> . . . .	19	1
<i>Iohannes habet similitudinem aquilae &amp;c.</i> . . . .	488	17
Of the following . . . . .		I = 105 (five $\gamma$ pages).

I have not as yet had occasion or time for analysing *M. G. V.* as a whole: but this result justifies us in suspecting that in different dioceses different expedients were employed for so interspersing essential work with rubrics or other material as to effect a result equivalent to an integral number of pages; and, further, that the  $\gamma$  unit of pagination was not confined to one diocese, or group of dioceses, but that it was or was not observed as the scribe, probably an itinerant bibliopole, happened or did not happen to be in the habit of using it.

An alternative theory—whether preferable or not preferable I cannot at present divine—would be that, as with the canon poenitentialis and the pontifical used by the editor of V, so also with the baptisterium used by him: the theory that this, like those, had passed through two editions, a *bapt.*<sub>1</sub> (represented by *M. G. V.*) and a *bapt.*<sub>2</sub> (represented by Gerbert's Zürich MS.), prior to its redaction on  $\kappa$  pages in Bapt.



2. But from M. Delisle's transcript of this *texte bilingue* I glean the very interesting fact that it phrases the fourth petition of the Prayer 'Panem nrm supersubstantialem da nobis hodie', not, as in Reginensis, 'Panem nrm quotidianum da nobis hodie'. From this remarkable difference it is obvious to infer that at some early period in the evolution of the item the text of the petition may have been set forth in its older version, and that the new version found in Reginensis has replaced the other; an inference which is lifted from the level of mere possibility to the much higher level of moral certainty by the extant exposition. This falls asunder into two parts: the first being (on 3 lines)—

Hic spalem cibum intelligere debemus  
xpc enim panis est n. qui dixit Ego sum  
panis uiuus qui de caelo descendi,

where there can be no doubt that 'supersubstantialem' is the reading held in view by the writer; the second being (on 4 lines) a sentence which, while it expressly cites the word 'quotidianum', reads like an awkward and carelessly phrased apology for the use of it,

quem quotidianum dicimus quod [*not* 'quia'] ita  
nos semper immunitatem petere debe-  
mus peccati ut digni simus caelesti-  
bus alimentis.<sup>1</sup>

We thus have contributory material towards an attempted reconstruction of two successive schemes; a first, in which 'Panem nrm supersubstantialem' &c. (37 letters) shall occupy two lines, and 'Hic spalem . . . descendi' three; a second, in which 'Panem nrm quotidianum' &c. (30 letters) shall occupy one line, and 'Hic spalem . . . alimentis' seven.

3. The most striking feature of the Reginensis copy of § xxxvi is the very large scale on which, if all the editors are to be trusted, the eight clauses of the Prayer are written. In explanation of this peculiarity I would suggest some such theory as the following:—That the compiler of V' had before him copies of two editions of the section, one of which set forth the clauses in both a Latin text and a Greek, while the other set them forth only in Latin: that in his transcript he left spaces for the bilingual exhibition of the clauses,<sup>2</sup> but that before or when the time came for carrying out the intention he changed his mind; and

<sup>1</sup> *The Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Mur. ii 717) words this differently—'Quem cotidianum *dicens* ita nos semper immunes praecepit esse peccati' &c. This reading seems to indicate a higher estimate of the authority of the Hieronymian 'quotidianum' than is conceded to it by our 'Quem quotidianum *dicimus*' &c. It would seem to be the earlier of the two, ours being a deliberately made modification of it.

<sup>2</sup> This he would have in the earlier of the two editions, copies of which I suspect to have lain before him.

that, the spaces he had left being therefore very greatly in excess of his present requirements, he resorted to an exaggerated scale of penmanship rather than let his manuscript be disfigured by unsightly blanks.

II. Two textual corrections would seem to be needed before we attempt a probable reconstruction of the successive phases of the section. 1. The conclusion to the exegesis, 'Hic ideo ait' &c., of the seventh petition of the Prayer limps, for it omits the absolutely necessary words 'cum dō patre'. So grave a blunder cannot have been made under editorial authority; and, since it would have in any case sufficed to let the constituent end at the words 'regnat dō', our safest course is to deem the 'in unitate . . . saeculorum' the post-editorial addition of some indolent scribe. 2. The extant conclusion of the final address, 'Audistis dilectissimi' &c., is equally reprehensible, for it is in dogmatic conflict with the preceding context, and indeed with the constituent as a whole. We must assume the editor to have stopped at the word 'regnat'.

These corrections reduce 245 letters to 206, and 367 to 319.

*The Penultimate Scheme* (Bapt.) of § xxxvi. Thus much premised, let us further examine the item as it stands in Reginensis.

III. 1. By my reconstruction of § xxxv (see above, p. 557) the rubrics '*Expositio oionis dñicae*' and '*Incipit praefatio*', which in Bapt. had stood on the last two lines of a page, were at Redaction V' set on the first and second lines of p. 87 of the editor's volume: then came the rubric '*Et admonetur*' &c., and, next after this, the opening address 'Dñs et saluator n̄.', &c.

2. But if in this, as in other analogous instances, Gerbert may be our instructor, the Reginensis text is not the original text of this 'Dñs et saluator n̄.' &c. The first sentence of the Reginensis text contains in 154 letters what in Gerbert's MS is otherwise expressed in only 119. The end of the second sentence and the beginning of the third—'illi soli patere commemorat. Et clauso ostio dñm adorare debere' (52 letters)—are not in Gerbert's MS; nor does Gerbert, nearer the end of the paragraph, know anything of the sentence 'Claudatur ergo . . . precibus n̄i' (153 letters). The result of these differences—a few variants taken into account, which Mr Wilson has noted—is, that, as against the Reginensis total of 761 letters, we have a lower total of 530. This lower sum, then, I give as the value of the constituent 'Dñs et saluator n̄.' &c. in the baptisterium (Bapt.) which was incorporated into our document at Redaction V.

3. In that baptisterium I assume the eight clauses of the Lord's Prayer to have been set forth either in characters of normal size, and only in one language; or, like the Constantinopolitan symbol in § xxxv, in two languages, one of these being written in somewhat reduced characters on the lines of the ruling, and the other superscribed interlineally.

		γ scheme.		κ schemes.	
		bapt.		Bapt.	V <sup>1</sup>
xxxvi. <i>Expositio orionis dñicæ</i> . . . . .	18	*		*	I
<i>Incipit præfatio</i> . . . . .	16	*		*	I
<i>Et admonentur &amp;c.</i> . . . .	27	I		I	I
Dñs et saluator ñ. &c. (1). . . . .	530 (1)	19		19	
Dñs et saluator ñ. &c. (2). . . . .	761 (2)				27
<i>Post hoc intras et dicis</i> . . . . .	20	I = 21		I	I
Pater ñ. qui es in caelis . . . . .	18	I		I [? 0]	2
Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὃ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς . . . . .	23	I		0 [? I]	
Haec libertatis uox est &c. . . . .	289	10		10	10
Scificetur nomen tuum . . . . .	18	I		I [? 0]	2
Ἀγασθήτω τὸ θρονά σου . . . . .	18	I		0 [? I]	
Id est non quod dñ nñs &c. . . . .	151	6		5	5
Adueniat regnum tuum . . . . .	17	I = 21		I [? 0]	2
Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου . . . . .	17	I		0 [? I]	
Dñ namque ñ. quando &c. . . . .	151	6		5	5
Fiat uoluntas tua sicut &c. . . . .	36	2		I [? 0]	4
Γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς κτλ. . . . .	37	2		0 [? I]	
Id est in eo fiat uoluntas tua &c. . . . .	87	3		3 = 48	3
Panem nñm supersubstantialem &c. . . . .	37	2			
Panem nñm quotidianum &c. . . . .	30			I [? 0]	2
τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον κτλ. . . . .	37	2		0 [? I]	
Hic spalem cibum &c. . . . .	83	3 = 21			
Hic spalem cibum &c. quem &c. . . . .	188			7	7
Et dimitte nobis debita nñra &c. . . . .	56	2		2 [? 0]	4
Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν κτλ. . . . .	62	2		0 [? 2]	
Hoc praecepto significans &c. . . . .	204	7		7	7
Et ne nos inducas &c. . . . .	26	I		I [? 0]	2
Καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς κτλ. . . . .	30	I		0 [? I]	
Id est ne nos patiaris &c. . . . .	177	6		6 = 24	6
Sed libera nos a malo . . . . .	16	I		I [? 0]	2
Ἀλλὰ βῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ . . . . .	25	I = 21		0 [? I]	
Hoc ideo ait quia &c. . . . .	245 (206)	7		7	7
Item annuntiat diaconus ut supra . . . . .	28	I		I	I
State cum disciplina et &c. . . . .	46	2		2	2
Audistis dilectissimi &c. . . . .	367 (319)	11 = 21		11	11 = 115
Of the following . . . . .				2 = 24	

MEMORANDUM.—Scheme 'Bapt.' when incorporated into the document at Redaction V would end on p. 86.<sup>1</sup>

These three corrections, all of them recommended by their probability, give the item the value of four κ pages in the baptisterium which the compiler of V introduced into the document.

<sup>1</sup> A moment's meditation suffices to shew why at Bapt. only one text of the clauses should have been written on the lines of the ruling, the other being superscribed interlineally. Material which at *bapt.* had filled 105 lines, a multiple of 21, was now to be set in a multiple of 24, either 96 or 120. The former was the more simple alternative, because—

The new exposition 'Hic spalem cibum &c. quem' &c. would require 7 lines, as against 3, a nett increment of 4 lines; while automatic reduction, in the 'Id est non quod' &c. and the 'Dñ ñ. namque' &c., would make a saving of 2: but,

The scribe would save 12 lines whether he interlineated the Greek or the Latin text of the eight clauses and whether he wrote 'quotidianum' or 'supersubstantialem' in the Latin of the fifth.

*The Original Scheme of § xxxvi.* But I cannot believe the book which I call 'Bapt.' to have exhibited the first and classic text of the item: because, although my reconstruction—if this be as true to fact as I think it may justly claim to be—resolves itself into three logical groups of either one or two pages each, it allows no room for both Greek and Latin clauses written on the lines of the ruling; and because it requires us to accept the longer and *ex hypothesi* later exposition of the fifth clause, and, with it, St Jerome's 'quotidianum' in the clause itself.<sup>1</sup> But if, on the other hand, while keeping Gerbert's shorter and presumably older text of the 'Dñs et saluator n̄.' &c., we insist on having on the lines of the ruling both Greek and Latin clauses, as bidden by the bilingual Pater noster on fol. 2 v of Reginensis; and if, as again bidden by this, we adopt 'supersubstantialem', and, with it, the short exposition 'Hic sp̄alem cibum . . . de caelo descendi'; if, I say, we make these few but obvious corrections then 'all is light'. The 105 lines of five γ pages are our total; and of these five pages the first holds the opening address and its attendant rubrics; the second holds the first two clauses of the Prayer and the expositions proper to them; the third holds the next three clauses and their expositions; the fourth holds the sixth and seventh clauses and their expositions; while the fifth completes the Prayer and includes the final exhortation.

The Zürich MS would thus appear to reveal to us the original equipment of the item (*bapt.*); unless, indeed, there had been a yet earlier scheme. But, since in quest of such a scheme I should have to consult the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*, a sacramentary not strictly akin to ours, I set in a foot-note what I have to say on the subject.<sup>2</sup>

There would thus be a nett economy of 10 lines, and a nett total of 96.

All this is as clear as noonday: but I insist upon it as I do because we might fatally cripple our efforts to learn the external history of the document if we were to begin by assuming that at the time and in the place represented by Bapt. only Greek, to the exclusion of Latin, or only Latin, to the exclusion of Greek, was the language which children were expected to use in their private devotions.

<sup>1</sup> I observed just now that the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* differs from Reginensis in its rendering of the exegesis 'Hic sp̄alem cibum' &c., and that I suspect that rendering to be the earlier of the two. It may be well to note, further, that *Gallicanum Vetus* in its exegesis, 'Dñs namque' &c., of the second petition, reads 'Sed cum dicimus Veniat [*not* Adueniat] regnum tuum', as indeed does Reginensis; and that in its explanation of the fifth petition, when citing another passage from the N.T., 'Nisi dimiseritis' &c., it reads 'nec uobis pater uester dimittit peccata', not 'nec . . . peccata uestra'.

<sup>2</sup> We have seen that the Expositio Euangeliorum in *M. G. V.* (p. 560, n. 2 *supra*) is equivalent to five γ pages; and, assuming its Expositio Orationis Dominicae, like my reconstruction of the *bapt.* edition of § xxxvi and like p. 2 v of the Reginensis MS, to have set forth the eight clauses of the Prayer in both a Greek text and

*Section xxxvii.* The sequence of sacramental items<sup>1</sup> is resumed at the thirty-seventh section (Mur. i 546). The salient peculiarities of this are the (1) title and (2) subtitle of the item for the day now known as Palm Sunday, and the very long conclusions given to its (3) Collecta and (4) Secreta.

1. The ceremony of carrying branches of palm in solemn procession on the Sunday before Easter is usually, and perhaps rightly, believed to be of oriental derivation, but it was not observed in Rome, at the comparatively remote dates of *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>; nor, indeed, is there reason to

a Latin, these being written on the lines of the ruling—but making no other alterations whatever—I find that this in its turn responds to the  $\gamma$  criterion. Thus—

	$\gamma$ lines			$\gamma$ lines	
<i>Incipit praefatio</i> &c. . . . .	28	*	Brought forward . . . . .	50	
<i>Dñs et saluator</i> &c. . . . .	497	17	5. <i>Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν κτλ.</i> . . . .	37	2
1. <i>Πάτερ ἡμῶν κτλ.</i> . . . .	23	1	<i>Panem nr̃m</i> &c. . . . .	30	1
<i>Pater ñ.</i> &c. . . . .	18	1	<i>Hic sp̃alem cibum</i> &c. . . . .	181	7
<i>Haec libertatis</i> &c. . . . .	277	10	6. <i>Καὶ ἀφες ἡμῖν κτλ.</i> . . . .	62	2
2. <i>Ἀγiasθήτω κτλ.</i> . . . .	18	1	<i>Et dimitte nobis</i> &c. . . . .	56	2
<i>Sc̃ificetur</i> &c. . . . .	18	1	<i>Hoc pactum est</i> &c. . . . .	201	7
<i>Non quod dñs</i> &c. . . . .	146	5	7. <i>Καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς κτλ.</i> . . . .	30	1
3. <i>Ἐλθέτω κτλ.</i> . . . .	17	1	<i>Et ne nos inducas</i> &c. . . . .	26	1
<i>Adueniat</i> &c. . . . .	17	1	<i>Id est ne nos</i> &c. . . . .	180	7
<i>Dñs namque ñ.</i> &c. . . . .	150	5	8. <i>Ἀλλὰ ρύσαι ἡμᾶς κτλ.</i> . . . .	25	1
4. <i>Γενηθήτω κτλ.</i> . . . .	37	2	<i>Sed libera nos</i> &c. . . . .	16	1
<i>Fiat uoluntas</i> &c. . . . .	36	2	<i>Hoc ideo ait quia</i> &c. . . . .	255	9
<i>Id est in eo</i> &c. . . . .	87	3 = 50	<i>Patefactum nobis</i> &c. . . . .	413	14 = 105 (five $\gamma$ pages)

I believe this to be no predecessor of the *bapt.* of my reconstruction, but an offshoot from it; an offshoot, be it well observed, that took root in some other diocese, possibly some other province, than that in which lay the ancestral home of that baptisterium excerpts from which were used by the second of the cismontane editors. Those of its characteristics which now concern us are—1. That its opening address (497 letters) is slightly shorter than that in the Zürich MS and the *bapt.* of my reconstruction (530 letters), a difference attributable to intentional abbreviation. 2. That the latter part of its exposition of the fifth clause '*Quem cotidianum dicens*' &c.—a part peculiar to itself—contains the startling assertion that the Author of the Prayer would have us interpret '*ἐπιούσιον*' as '*cotidianum*', not, as anciently, '*supersubstantialem*'. 3. That, as if to make this view obligatory, the concluding admonition bids the candidates learn the text of the Prayer just recited to them *nullo mutato sermone*. 4. That it mentions by name two *magistri*, whose duty it is to take care that the injunction be carried out.

The discussion of the second, third, and last of these peculiarities must be reserved to a proper occasion. Meanwhile I make bold to say that the *M. G. V.* exposition of the Lord's Prayer is not in the same line of descent with the exposition in Reginensis; and therefore that we cannot say of § xxxv, as we could of § xxxv, that there may have been two  $\gamma$  redactions of it (see above, p. 557).

Meanwhile, too, let us bear in mind that neither in *M. G. V.* nor in *bapt.* would the *Expositio Orationis Dominicae* have occupied an integral number of  $\gamma$  pages if both the Greek and the Latin texts of the eight successive divisions of the prayer had not been set forth, and set forth, as on fol. 2 *vo* of the Reginensis MS, on the lines of the ruling.

<sup>1</sup> Suspended at § xxviii (see above, p. 544), when the pages at that point traversed in *s* and *S*<sub>2</sub> were 34 and 55 respectively.

assume that it was observed in any part of Gaul early enough to justify us in assigning the title '*Dñica in Palmis*' to either  $S_2$  or  $V$ . Our safest course is to restrict it to  $V'$ , and to assume that, in analogy with the capitula of the next three items—'*Feria ii hebdom. sexta*', &c.—the heading of the Sunday Mass was '*Dñica sexta*' in  $s$ ,  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ , and  $V$ .

2. It is by no means easy to say when the subtitle '*De passione dñi*' was introduced. I incline to think that it cannot have been in  $s$ , but that we must not refuse it to  $S_1$ ; and draw up the next table accordingly, in hope of soon finding more to say on the subject.

3, 4. As to the Collecta of the Sunday item, Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert bid us assume that the text of the two Roman editions was differently worded from that of  $V$ , and that, in 194 letters, it ran thus,—  
'Oñp. señp. dñ qui humano generi ad imitandum humilitatis exemplum saluatorem nñm et carnem sumere et crucem subire fecisti concede nobis propitius ut et patientiae ipsius habere documentum et resurrectionis consortia mereamur. per'.

That the Reginensis text of this prayer is that of the second cismontane edition is not to be doubted: and, since the compiler of this has always collocated integral numbers of items in integral numbers of pages after the same system of grouping as that observed by his predecessor, it will be seen from the second of the subjoined tables that he must have but followed that predecessor's lead, not only when he gave the Collecta its present value of 230 letters, but also when he gave the Secreta its extant complement of 162, as against the lower total of 90 which St Gallen and Gerbert assure us<sup>1</sup> had been its value at  $s$  and  $S_1$ ; those two editions subjoining no more than the customary 'per' to its last word, 'inimicos'.

We thus have—

§ xxxvii. Sunday before Easter.

		$s$	$S_1$	$S_2$	$V$	$V'$
Brought forward . . . . .			15 <sup>6</sup>			11 <sup>5</sup>
<i>Dñica sexta</i> . . . . .	10		I	I	*	nil
<i>Dñica in palmis</i> . . . . .	13					1
<i>De passione dñi</i> . . . . .	13	nil		I		I
Oñp. señp. dñ qui humano &c. . . . .	194 <sup>1</sup> , 230 <sup>2</sup>	6 <sup>1</sup>	7 <sup>1</sup>	9 <sup>2</sup>		8 <sup>2</sup>
Dñ quem diligere et amare &c. . . . .	162	5		6		6
Ipsa maiestati tuae . . . . .	90 <sup>1</sup> , 162 <sup>2</sup>	3 <sup>1</sup>	3 <sup>1</sup>	6 <sup>2</sup>		6 <sup>2</sup>
Sacro munere satiati . . . . .	118	4		4		4
Purifica quaesumus &c. . . . .	153	nil	nil	6	6	6
Total ( $\beta$ ) for $s$ . . . . .		18				
" ( $\theta$ ) " $S_1$ . . . . .			178			
" ( $\theta$ ) " $S_2$ . . . . .				33		
" ( $\kappa$ ) " $V$ . . . . .					31	
" ( $\kappa$ ) " $V'$ . . . . .						147

<sup>1</sup> Rheinau would probably tell the same tale, were it not that an intolerable 'inimicus', in place of 'inimicos', has tempted a scribe to insert 'iñs xps dñs ñ'.

5. In the Postcommunion of Monday's item Reginensis reads 'Sca tua . . . semper renouent', as against the Leonianum (XXVIII xxviii), Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert, all of which have 'Sca tua . . . renouent'. Assuming, therefore, that, as in all similar instances, the augmentation was made at either V or V',<sup>1</sup> but with preference for V', we have—

	Monday in 6th week.					Tuesday.					Wednesday.				
	s	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	V'	s	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	V'	s	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	V'
Brought forward .	18	178	33	31	147										
Capitulum . . .	18	1	1		1	19	1	1	1		18	1	1	1	
Collecta . . .	139	5	5		5	79	3	3	3		122	4	5	4	
Oratio . . .	111	4	4		4	70	2	3	3		138	5	5	5	
Secreta . . .	130	4	5		5	114	4	4	4		106	4	4	4	
Postcommunion .	65 <sup>1</sup> , 71 <sup>2</sup>	2 <sup>1</sup>	3 <sup>1</sup>	2 <sup>1</sup>	3 <sup>2</sup>	114	4	4	4		108	4	4	4	
Ad Populum . .	115	4	4		4	171	6	6	6		138	5	5	5	
Of the following .															3
Totals (β) for s	38					20					23				= 81
" (θ) " S <sub>1</sub>		200 (P. 50 ends)				21					24				= 45
" (θ) " S <sub>2</sub>			55					21					24		= 100
" (κ) " V				52					21					23	= 96
" (κ) " V'					169					21					(P. 59 ends)
															(P. 90 ends)
															26 = 216
															(P. 95 ends)

If, then, I have rightly traced the evolution of our document, we must say that on the Wednesday before Easter the first of the cismon-tane editors—mainly by means of carefully chosen Ad Populum prayers, but also by means of prolonged conclusions to the Collecta and Secreta of the first item of § xxxvii—made ended Mass coincide with ended page; that the κ pagination assured that result to the editor of V, and that the final coadunator attained a like end by means of one line devoted to textual economy, and three lines of connecting rubric: but that the two Roman editions had not been devised with view to that object.

Let us, then, hope to learn whether or not—and, if so, by what means—s and S<sub>1</sub> can have been so devised as that completed item should coincide with completed page on the Thursday before Easter; the last of the *quadraginta ieiunia* of the quinquagesimal *obseruantia*, the last of the *quadraginta dies* of the quadragesimal.

MARTIN RULE.

<sup>1</sup> For at S<sub>1</sub>, which was written on θ pages, it would have made no difference, in terms of lines, to the value of the prayer.

(To be continued.)