

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

### I

THE first forty sections of the first Book of the Queen of Sweden's 'Gelasian Sacramentary'—MS Vatican. Regin. 316—contain material proper to a sacramentary, together with excerpts from a *canon poenitentialis*, a pontifical and a *baptisterium*; and would seem to represent a prototype (*V'*) executed on pages of four-and-twenty lines of the average capacity of  $29\frac{1}{2}$  letters to a line, the sacramental portions of this document having been taken from a volume (*V*) the contents of which were similarly distributed.

Now, I hope to be able to prove that this volume, the *V* of my hypothesis, had a real existence, and that it was a studiously devised but by no means veritable transcript of a sacramentary (*S*<sub>2</sub>), the pages of which were such as had been employed by some of the successive editors of the so-called 'Missale Francorum' and, before them, by one of the editors of the Leonianum; that is to say, from a book of twenty-five-line pages of the average capacity of 28 letters to a line. And, if the results of my analysis are as true to fact as I believe them to be, Redactions *S*<sub>2</sub> and *V* were of non-Roman, and presumably cismontane, compilation; as also was *V'*, the complex collection into which *V* was incorporated.

Further: I believe *S*<sub>2</sub> to have been a considerably amplified, though carefully elaborated, transcript of a strictly and exclusively Roman predecessor (*S*<sub>1</sub>), which, in its turn, had been derived from an earlier and somewhat slighter work, also Roman. This, which, by my hypothesis, was the nucleus, or ultimate original, I distinguish as Redaction *s*; and I am convinced that it was written on pages such as went to the making, probably by Pope Simplicius (A. D. 468-483), of the third general edition of the Leonianum<sup>1</sup> and of the first ascertainable edition of the 'Missale Francorum',<sup>2</sup> that is to say, on twenty-five-line pages of 32 letters to a line; but that *S*<sub>1</sub>, its derivative, was written on lines of 28 letters, twenty-five such lines being the complement of a page.

This my hypothesis postulates a sacramentary in four editions, the first and second (*s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>) Roman, the third and fourth (*S*<sub>2</sub> and *V*)

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.* vol. ix pp. 515-556 and vol. x pp. 54-99.

<sup>2</sup> See *J. T. S.* vol. xii pp. 214-250 and pp. 535-572.

non-Roman; and, besides these, an aggregate and complex document ( $V'$ ), one of whose contributories was  $V$ . It also postulates three successive units of paginal capacity, viz. :—

1. For  $s$ , the Roman nucleus of the sacramentarial portion of the extant document, a twenty-five-line page of the average capacity of 32 letters to a line. This paginal unit I style, as in previous essays, ' $\beta$ '.

2. For  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ —one Roman, the other non-Roman—a twenty-five-line page of the average capacity of 28 letters to a line. This, as heretofore, I distinguish as ' $\theta$ '.

3. For  $V$  and  $V'$ —both non-Roman—a twenty-four-line page, the lines of which had  $29\frac{1}{2}$  letters as their average value. This paginal unit I call ' $\kappa$ '.

*The Roman Origins of Sections i-xi.* If the earliest of western sacramentaries, the Leonianum, may be our instructor, we must assume the liturgical year of the Roman Church to have run parallel with the civil year as late, at least, as the second quarter of the fifth century; but we do not know when it was that the scribes of the papal scriptorium first made their liturgical year begin on Christmas Eve. Nor, assuming it to have been some post-Leonian bishop of Rome that authorized the change, am I aware that any serious attempt has been made to learn why and when the change was devised. Assuredly, there must have been well-grounded reason for abandoning a method which, convenient in itself, enjoyed the authority of a pontiff so influential and so recent as Leo the Great; and, if the simplest, the most obvious and the most cogent of answers be the right one, we may venture to assert that, though nothing less may have sufficed as warrant for the change, nothing more was needed than the institution of the Octave of Christmas,<sup>1</sup> an anniversary which in the order of thought must be carefully distinguished from the Feast of the Circumcision, a festival of comparatively recent—and, in the opinion of experts, non-Roman—institution; for, so unreasonable would have been the anomaly of setting the Mass for the last of the eight days at the beginning of a book and those for the first five days at the end of it, that common sense would urge an editor to eschew it.

On the other hand: since our document styles itself *Liber Sacramentorum Romanæ Ecclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli*, and since the primary meaning of '*ordo anni circuli*' would seem to be that of a sequence which has the first day of the year for its beginning and the last day of the year for its completion, we must be on our guard against

<sup>1</sup> The Octave of Christmas is mentioned (Mur. ii 398) in the *Breviarium Ecclesiastici Ordinis*, printed by Tommasi, and, after him, by Muratori, and, although this document, in at least its extant form, cannot be earlier than a late date in the seventh century, it makes no reference whatever to a feast of the Circumcision.

assuming that when the original document—that is to say, Redaction *s* of my theory—was compiled its first item was not a Mass for an early day in January.

Hence the question, Can it be (1) that at Redaction *s* the cycle of commemorative items did not begin with a Christmas Eve Mass, but (2) with a Mass for the Vigil of the Theophany, and (3) that it ended with the Christmas and post-Nativity groups? To each portion of the question an affirmative answer may with probability be given. For,

1. Assuming the author of the Christmas Eve Mass to have designed it in conformity to the custom which made the first item in a volume—or the first item and the rubric of the second—extend to the last line of a page, I find that, if he set it, as by the hypothesis he would have done, on a page of  $\beta$  capacity, he must have compelled himself to devote as many as eleven lines to ornamentation and rubrics; for its constituents represent but fourteen such lines.

2. But, as against so unsightly and improbable a scheme of distribution, I find that if the Mass for the Vigil of the Theophany was thus devised, the reasonable proportion of but eight lines would have been left for ornamentation and rubrics: thus—

VIGIL OF THEOPHANY.

<i>In nomine dñi ihu xpi . . . preces . . .</i>	100 letters	3 $\beta$ lines
<i>In uigiliis de theophania . . .</i>	22 "	$\frac{2}{3}$ " "
Ornamentation . . .		$2\frac{1}{3}$ " "
Corda nra quaesumus dñe &c. . .	134 "	4 " "
Tribue quaesumus dñe &c. . .	112 "	4 " "
UD. quia quum unigenitus &c. . .	121 "	4 " "
Illumina quaesumus dñe &c. . .	161 "	5 " "
Of the following . . .		2 " "
Total . . .		<u>25 <math>\beta</math> lines</u>

3. I find, thirdly, that if we eliminate from §§ i-x the Mass for the Octave of the Nativity (§ ix) and, besides this, the prayers grouped in § v, all other supernumerary prayers, and all Ad Populum prayers, a class not used in Rome on festal occasions—if, that is to say, we reinstate what, by the hypothesis, was the original equipment of the Christmas and post-Nativity groups—and if, that done, we give to the constituents that remain the text which, as will be seen presently,<sup>1</sup> we must assume to have been theirs before the document left Rome and in the first cismontane edition, the resulting value is that of seven integral pages, four of which would contain the four Christmas items, and three the Masses for the subsequent triad of saints' days and for that against peril of idolatry: thus—

<sup>1</sup> See below, pp. 201, 202; and compare the second table of values on p. 202, and those for §§ vi-xi on pp. 203, 204.

	Eve.	Night.	Morn.	Day.	St Stephen.	St John.	Inno- cents.	Against Idols.
Capitulum . . .	34 *	12 1	24 1	20 1	27 1	30 1	19 1	19 1
Collecta . . .	94 3	153 5	225 7	174 6	155 5	172 6	173 6	
Oratio . . .	127 4	107 4	87 3	120 4	118 4	152 5	152 5	165 6
Secreta . . .	133 4	183 6	[206] 180 6	[176] 133 4	108 4	135 4	137 5	156 5
Preface . . .		302 10	212 7	194 6				
<i>Infra actionem</i>				13 1				
Communicantes				118 4				
Postcommunion	100 3	95 3	115 4	103 3	124 4	97 3	90 3	112 4
Rubric . . .								2
Totals ( $\beta$ lines)	14	29	28	29 (=100)	18	19	20	18 (=75)

The verisimilitude of these several results justifies us in believing, first, that Redaction *s* began with the Vigil of the Theophany, and, secondly, that its Christmas and post-Nativity items, supplemented by the Mass against idolatry, stood at the end of Book I, and possibly on the last gathering of the volume. The latter of these convictions is intensified when we note that the four Christmas items would not have filled a quadruple of pages if the Secretae of § iii and § iv had not been by textual economy reduced from their Leonianum values<sup>1</sup> of 7 lines and 6 to 6 and 4 respectively.

*The Contents and Position of the Second and Third Schemes of Christmas and post-Nativity Masses.* If, then, it be true that Redaction *s* was devised prior to the institution of the Octave of Christmas and that its first constituent was the Mass for the Vigil of the Theophany, the question now arises whether the Octave of Christmas can have been instituted while the Pope's own copy of Redaction *s*, a most carefully executed *Prachtexemplar*, was still in use; and, if so, what was the method chosen for introducing the Mass of the new anniversary into the volume.

Unless the item in question was written on a page that happened to be lying blank, it was introduced into the pontifical *Prachtexemplar* in one or other of two ways; one simple, the other complex.

The simpler plan was to write it on a fly-leaf and to insert the leaf into the volume; but this awkward expedient was unworthy of the volume and unworthy of the occasion; for it would neither give the item its proper place in the textual sequence of post-Nativity Masses, nor give the anniversary, which fell on the first day of January, textual precedence of the Vigil of the Theophany, which fell on the fifth.

The other alternative, if complex, was logical, ingenious, and artistic. It was, to unbind the papal copy; to remove the four leaves containing the Christmas and post-Nativity Masses; and, cutting away the first

<sup>1</sup> In terms of letters they are 206 and 176 respectively. See Mur. i 467 and 473.

two leaves, to replace these with a ternion of membranes which would be filled as follows: The first leaf (pp. 1, 2) would carry the title, and on the last page (p. 12) would begin the Mass for the Feast of the Theophany; while the intervening pages (pp. 3-11) would hold the original series of Christmas and post-Nativity items, *plus* the new Mass and *plus* that for the Vigil of the Theophany. I will set forth all this in tabular form presently; for, before proceeding further I must try to learn what precisely was the linear value of the newly composed Mass.

That it had the extant Collecta, Oratio, Secreta and Postcommunio may be taken for granted; but it cannot have had the whole of the extant Preface. The first sentence, 'Cuius hodie . . . infans et dñs est', enunciates the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation with an epigrammatic completeness and a theological precision such as to challenge speculation concerning anything that might be added to it; but the phrase which follows, 'Merito caeli—or preferably 'Merito ergo caeli'—'locuti sunt, angeli gratulati, pastores laetati', must not be lightly condemned; for, though it reads like an *additamentum*, it is appropriate to the subject and to the occasion. But, that the 'magi mutati, reges turbati, paruuli gloriosa passione coronati' &c., which comes next, should have flowed from the pen of a bishop of Rome in the century that produced a Leo, a Simplicius and a Gelasius, is not to be believed; for its reiterated assonances and overdone alliterations are not the pardonable conceits of a scholar; while its 'magi mutati' must have been excogitated by some provincial to whom the Latin language was neither a vernacular nor a classic. This is curiously like that remarkable passage in the 'Missale Gothicum' (Mur. ii 563; Migne *S. L.* lxxii 251 D) which, commemorating the conversion of St Paul, praises his 'mutatio et fides', 'mutatio' being there a barbarous synonym for 'conuersio', as here 'mutati' does duty for 'conuersi'. And, bad as this is, the 'Lacta mater cibum nostrum, lacta panem de caelo descendentem' &c. is even worse, for it has the further demerits of mixed metaphor and confused historical grouping.

Hence I think it probable (1) that the Preface as originally written ended at 'infans et dñs est', and, with the introductory 'per xpm dñm nrm' and a concluding 'et ideo cum angelis', numbered 142 letters; (2) that a careful Roman editor, whom I should like to identify, amplified it by the 68 letters of 'Merito ergo caeli . . . pastores laetati' and 'et archangelis'; and (3) that 'magi mutati . . . adimplere' is a late addition: the successive totals being thus 142, 210, and 518.

In the subjoined synopses the columns headed 's<sup>1</sup>' shew what, in terms of  $\beta$  lines, would have been the results attained by the sub-redaction of  $s$  which I have just imagined, a sub-redaction which

transferred the Christmas and post-Nativity items to the beginning of the papal *Prachtexemplar* and reinforced the series with the newly devised Mass for the Octave of Christmas. The columns headed 'S<sub>1</sub>' shew what were the results obtained at the second of the two Roman editions postulated by my hypothesis, an edition executed on  $\theta$  pages. It differed from sub-redaction s<sup>1</sup> by making the Christmas group (§§ i-iv), together with a rubric on two lines, conterminous with a page (p. 7): if s<sup>1</sup> had differed from s by enriching the sacramentary with a Mass for the Octave of Christmas, S<sub>1</sub> now differed from s<sup>1</sup> by giving a prayer to each of the six days intervening between feast and octave<sup>1</sup>; and, by help of happily inspired additions to the Preface for the Octave, it enabled the Mass for the Vigil of the Theophany to end, as it had ended at s and again at s<sup>1</sup>, on the antepenultimate line of a page; the last two lines of the page (p. 14) being devoted to the title and sub-title of the Mass for the Feast.

	§ i. Eve.	§ ii. Night.	§ iii. Morn.	§ iv. Day.
	s <sup>1</sup> S <sub>1</sub>			
General title . . .	100 3 3½			
Capitulum . . .	34 1 1½	22 1 *	24 1 1	20 1 1
Ornamentation . . .	2 2			
Collecta . . .	94 3 3½	153 5 6	225 7 8	174 6 7
Oratio . . .	127 4 5	107 4 4	87 3 3	120 4 5
Secreta . . .	133 4 5	183 6 7	180 6 7	134 4 5
Preface . . .		329 11 12	209 7 8	194 6 7
<i>Infra actionem</i> . . .				13 1 1
Communicantes . . .				118 4 4
Postcommunio . . .	100 3 4	95 3 4	115 4 4	103 3 4
Of the following . . .	1			2
Totals (β) for s	20	30 = 50 (P. 4 ends)	28	29 = 57
„ (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	25 (P. 3 ends)	33	31	36 = 100 (P. 7 ends)

§ v. NATIVITY PRAYERS.

	S <sub>1</sub>
<i>Item orationes de natali dñi &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	44 *
<i>Adesto dñe supplicationibus &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	118 4
<i>Largire quaesumus dñe &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	188 7
<i>Dñs qui populo tuo &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	237 9
<i>Dñs qui humanae substantiae &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	195 7
<i>Omp. semp. dñs creator &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	188 7
<i>Dñs qui natiuitatis tuae &amp;c.</i> . . . . .	154 6
Total (θ) for S <sub>1</sub> . . . . .	40

<sup>1</sup> This seems to have been the intention. See in § lxxxii (Mur. i 602) the six prayers *ad uesperos infra octauas pentecosten*.

	§ vi. St Stephen.	§ vii. St John.	§ viii. Innocents.	§ ix. Octave.	§ x. Against Idols.	§ xi. V. of Theophany.
	s <sup>1</sup> S <sub>1</sub>	s <sup>1</sup> S <sub>1</sub>	s <sup>1</sup> S <sub>1</sub>			
Brought forward	57 40					
Capitulum . . .	27 1 I	30 I I	19 I I	16 1 I	19 I I	22 I I
Collecta . . .	155 5 6	172 6 7	173 6 7	130 4 5		
Oratio . . .	118 4 4	152 5 6	152 5 6	184 6 7	165 6 6	134 4 5
Secreta . . .	108 4 4	135 4 5	137 5 5	133 4 5	156 5 6	112 4 4
Preface . . .				142 <sup>1</sup> , 210 <sup>2</sup> 5 8		124 4 5
Postcommunion . . .	124 4 5	97 3 4	90 3 3	111 4 4	112 4 4	166 6 6
Of the following . . .						2 2
Totals (β) for s <sup>1</sup>	75 (P. 7 ends)	19	20	24	16	21 = 100 (P. 11 ends)
„ (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	60	23	22	30	17	23 = 175 (P. 14 ends)

*The First and Second non-Roman Editions of §§ i-xi.* In the next synopses I give over again the values just found for S<sub>1</sub> in order that my readers may the more readily apprehend what it was that I conceive the first of the non-Roman editors to have done.

## CHRISTMAS MASSES.

	§ i. Eve.	§ ii. Night.	§ iii. Morn.	§ iv. Day.
	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> V	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> V	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> V	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> V
General title . . .	100 3½ *			
Capitulum . . .	34 <sup>1</sup> , 20 <sup>2</sup> 1½ 1	22 * I	24 I I	20 I * I
Ornamentation . . .	2			
Collecta . . .	94 3½ 3	153 6 6	225 8 8	174 7 6
Oratio . . .	127 5 5	104 (107) 4 4	87 3 3	120 <sup>1</sup> , 102 <sup>2</sup> 5 <sup>1</sup> 4 <sup>2</sup>
Secreta . . .	133 5 5	183 <sup>1</sup> , 156 <sup>2</sup> 7 <sup>1</sup> 6 <sup>2</sup>	180 7 6	133 <sup>1</sup> , 155 <sup>2</sup> 5 <sup>1</sup> 6 <sup>2</sup>
„ . . .			120 5 4	
Preface . . .		328 (329) 12 11	205 (209) 8 8	194 7 7
<i>Infra actionem</i> . . .				13 I I
<i>Communicantes</i> . . .				118 4 4
Postcommunion . . .	100 <sup>1</sup> , 93 <sup>2</sup> 4 <sup>1</sup> 3 <sup>2</sup>	95 4 3	112 (115) 4 4	103 <sup>1</sup> , 124 <sup>2</sup> 4 <sup>1</sup> 4 <sup>2</sup>
Ad Populum . . .			137 5 5	114 (120) 5 4
Of the following . . .	I I		I	2
Totals (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	25 (P. 3 ends)	33	31	36 = 100 (P. 7 ends)
„ (θ) for S <sub>2</sub>	25 (P. 3 ends)	33	42 = 75 (P. 6 ends)	38 = 38
„ (κ) for V	17	31 = 48 (P. 4 ends)	39	37 = 76

§ v. NATIVITY PRAYERS.

	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V
Brought forward . . . . .		38	76
Capitulum . . . . . 44		* 2	2
Adesto dñe supplicationibus &c. . . 118		4	4
Largire quaesumus &c. . . . . 188		7	7
Ds qui populo tuo &c. . . . . 237		9	9
Ds qui humanae &c. . . . . 195		7	7
Omp. semp. ds creator &c. . . . 188		7	7
Ds qui natiuitatis &c. . . . . 154		6	6
Of the following . . . . .		2	
Totals (θ) for S <sub>1</sub> . . . . .		40	
„ (θ) for S <sub>2</sub> . . . . .		80	
„ (κ) for V . . . . .		120 (P. 9 ends)	

*Memorandum.* I correct within brackets the value of the Preface of § ii from 328 to 329 because the words 'per xpm dnm nrm' are needed as antecedent to 'cuius diuinae natiuitatis' &c., and because there is preponderating authority for a concluding 'et ideo' in preference to 'quem laudant angeli'. The other slight and stichometrically inconsiderable corrections—104 (107), 205 (209), &c.—will be understood on referring to Mr Wilson's notes.

	§ vi. St Stephen.			§ vii. St John.			§ viii. Innocents.		
	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V
Brought forward . . . . .		40	80						
Capitulum . . . . .	27	1	* 1	30	1	2	19	1	1
Calendral date . . . . .	14			14			13		
Collecta . . . . .	155	6	6	172	7	6	173	7	6
Oratio . . . . .	118	4	4	152 <sup>1</sup> , 150 <sup>2</sup>	6 <sup>1</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>	152 <sup>1</sup> , 149 <sup>2</sup>	6 <sup>1</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>
„ . . . . .	147	6 5		134	5 5		126	5 5	
Secreta . . . . .	108	4	4	135	5	5	137	5	5
Postcommunion . . . . .	124	5	4	97	4	3	90	3	3
Ad Populum . . . . .	117	4 4		112	4 4		129	5 5	
Of the following . . . . .								I	
Totals (θ) for S <sub>1</sub> . . . . .	60			23			22		= 105
„ (θ) for S <sub>2</sub> . . . . .	110			32			33		= 175
„ (κ) for V . . . . .	27			30			30		(P. 13 ends) = 87

	§ ix. Octave of Nativity.			§ x. Against Idols.			§ xi. V. of Theophany.		
	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	V
Brought forward . . .		105	87						
Capitulum . . . . .	16	1 * }	1	19	1	1	22	1	1
Calendral date . . .	12								
Collecta . . . . .	130	5	5						
Oratio . . . . .	183	7	7	165	6	6	134 <sup>1</sup> , 136 <sup>2</sup>	5 <sup>1</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>
Secreta . . . . .	133 <sup>1</sup> , 124 <sup>2</sup>	5 <sup>1</sup> }	4 <sup>2</sup>	156 <sup>1</sup> , 149 <sup>2</sup>	6 <sup>1</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>	112	4	4
Preface . . . . .	210 <sup>2</sup> , 518 <sup>3</sup>	8 <sup>2</sup> 8 <sup>2</sup> = 25	18 <sup>3</sup> = 122				121	5	4
Postcommunion . . .	111	4	4	112	4	4	163	6	6
Ad Populum . . . .	165	6	6						
Of the following . . .								2	2
Totals (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	135			17			23	= 175	(P. 14 ends)
„ (θ) for S <sub>2</sub>		35			17		23	= 75	(P. 16 ends)
„ (κ) for V			132			16		20 = 168	(P. 16 ends)

I am convinced that the first of the non-Roman editors, like his immediate Roman predecessor, used  $\theta$  pages, and that his amanuensis wrote a script as equable as that which had been employed in the execution of Redaction S<sub>1</sub>. Can it be that his amanuensis had been trained in the Lateran scriptorium and had brought thence, already ruled, the vellum on which he was to work? <sup>1</sup>

By my hypothesis, the chief characteristic of the first non-Roman editor, as contrasted with his Roman predecessor, was that he introduced supernumerary prayers into some of the items—e.g. a second Secreta into § iii and a second Oratio into § vi, § vii, § viii—and gave Ad Populum prayers to Masses from which, as being meant for festive occasions, they had been by Roman use barred out.

That these enhancements were devised in obedience to a carefully premeditated plan would seem to be unquestionable; and I purposely dwell for a moment on the fact because there awaits us in the sequel a similar phenomenon of no slight argumentative importance. I observe

<sup>1</sup> Let me note an illustrative instance. Plate 7 of Chatelain's *Uncialis Scriptura* is a heliograph duplicate of a page of MS Veronensis 51, a fifth-century transcript—if transcript it be, and not the original—of the *capitula euangeliorum* attributed by some to Maximus of Turin. As regards ruling and textual capacity it is the very sort of page on which I conceive the Roman S<sub>1</sub> and the non-Roman S<sub>2</sub> to have been written. Since, therefore, Maximus was a contemporary, perhaps a kinsman, of Leo the Great, and since he knew Rome, and certainly was there in 465, a few years after the death of Leo, it is fairly conceivable that the vellum of MS Veronensis 51 had been ruled at the Lateran.

then: (1) That, by the admirable device of giving a second *Secreta* to § iii, as well as an *Ad Populum*, the editor of  $S_2$ , herein more felicitous than his predecessor, enabled the culminating *Mass* of Christmas Day to begin on a fresh page (p. 7 of his volume); (2) that, by giving an *Ad Populum* to § iv and a second *Oratio*, as well as an *Ad Populum*, to § vi, to § vii, and to § viii, he secured the same distinction (on p. 14 of his volume) to the *Mass* for the Octave of the Nativity; and (3) that, by means of an *Ad Populum* of six lines added to this item, he carried on the series, with a connecting rubric, to the end of his sixteenth page, not improbably the last page of a quire. Could anything have been more ingenious? Nor was this all. On comparing his totals with his predecessor's, first at the end of § vi and then at the end of § ix, we see how carefully he measured his distances. At the first of these points he, like his predecessor, covered the tenth line of a page; at the second of these points he, like his predecessor, once more covered the tenth line of a page. After completing § ix he put in nothing new, but travelled *pari passu* with the earlier editor to the end of the series.

Let us now give careful attention to the work of the second cismontane editor postulated by my hypothesis; for here, as throughout so much of the sacramental contributory to the extant document as I have examined with a view to the present essay, it is from his text or from that of the final coadunator, the editor of  $V'$ , that I have worked my way back to  $S_2$  and thence to  $S_1$  and  $s$ .

In terms of letters, the full capacity of one  $\theta$  page is ( $25 \times 28 =$ ) 700; that of one  $\kappa$  page is ( $24 \times 29\frac{1}{2} =$ ) 708. Hence it follows that, if it had been the second cismontane editor's task to transfer three long unbroken paragraphs of four, seven and three integral  $\theta$  pages to four, seven and three  $\kappa$  pages, respectively, his task would have been an easy one. Nothing more would have been needed than to add a few words to the first group, and to prolong the second by the value of rather more than a line of text. But, having to deal with eleven *missae* comprising in fourteen  $\theta$  pages a host of short, or very short, prayers and Prefaces each of which had occupied, though it may not have filled, an integral number of  $\theta$  lines, he would scarcely hope to reproduce his predecessor's paginal grouping of those *missae*. For example: in §§ i–iii, which at Redaction  $S_2$  had been lodged in the hundred lines of four integral  $\theta$  pages, there might be precisely four constituents each of which, as a consequence of the change of linear unit from 28 to  $29\frac{1}{2}$ , would sustain an automatic reduction of a line, thus enabling the three sections to cover the ninety-six lines of four integral  $\kappa$  pages. In §§ iv–viii, which had been accommodated in seven integral  $\theta$  pages, there might be precisely seven such cases, thus enabling these items in their turn to cover seven integral  $\kappa$  pages. And similarly for §§ ix–xi. But obliging

coincidences like these were not to be expected to occur; nor did they. What, then, was the editor of V to do? What, in fact, did he do?

I believe him to have begun by doing what the artists of the Reginensis codex itself did after him<sup>1</sup>: I believe, that is to say, that he devoted the *verso* of his first leaf to profuse ornamentation, to the general title of the work, and to the first three words, '*Oïones et preces*', of the capitulum of § i.

Pages 3 and 4 of his volume contained, I feel sure, the remainder of the capitulum—'*in uigiliis natalis dñi*'—the four constituents of § i and the whole of § ii. But—and I crave very special attention to what I am about to say—in order that § ii should not travel beyond the end of a page (i. e. p. 4), he cancelled the word '*natiuitas*' in the Post-communion of § i, thus reducing 100 letters, the equivalent of four lines, to 93, the equivalent of three; and lowered the *Secreta* of § ii from 183 letters to 156, by omitting an entire phrase, '*et pacem nobis semper infundant*'.<sup>2</sup> For my knowledge of these two expedients, as of most of those which will be noted in the sequel, I am indebted to Signor Rappagliosi's collation of Mr Wilson's proof-sheets and to Mr Wilson's record of the variants exhibited by the Rheinau and St Gallen sacramentaries, and by the triple collection on which Gerbert worked. I am convinced that when these three documents agree in giving a clearly acceptable text which differs from that of the Reginensis codex theirs has an unquestionable right to be deemed the Roman *textus classicus*.

Examining his copy of S<sub>2</sub>, the second cismontane editor now saw that five of his pages (pp. 5–9) would amply suffice for §§ iii–v; but he made assurance doubly sure by pruning the *Oratio* of § iv, which numbered 120 letters in his exemplar, to 102. This he did by substituting '*m̄irs d̄s*' for '*quaesumus ōmp. d̄s*' and omitting '*mundi*' and '*nobis*'.<sup>3</sup>

He seems, however, to have had a keen eye to dogmatic accuracy; for in the *Secreta* of § iv, instead of writing, like his predecessors, '*diuini cultus nobis est indita plenitudo. per*'; he wrote, or at least intended the scribe to write, either '*diuini cultus nobis est indita pleni-*

<sup>1</sup> For this see Ebner *Missale Romanum im Mittelalter, Iter Italicum* p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> For this see Gerbert *Monumenta* i 3, and the fourth of Mr Wilson's notes on § ii.

<sup>3</sup> I should be slow to suggest, with Mr Wilson, that '*mundi*' and '*nobis*' are absent from the Reginensis MS by mere clerical error, for I cannot find instances in support of that view. What certainly is very curious in the Reginensis text of § iv is that its '*Praesta m̄irs d̄s*' in the *Oratio* and its '*ipsius*' and '*uegetari*' (not '*respirare*') in the Postcommunion are supported by the Leonianum. Can that document have been known to the editor of V, to his amanuensis, or to a later scribe? Here let me add that, though with a slightly different text, the second and fourth prayers are to be found in the Leonianum (Mur. i 468 and 467).

tudo ihc xp̄c dn̄s n̄. qui tecum uiuit', or, more probably, 'diuinitatis' nobis est indita plenitudo ihu xp̄i dn̄i n̄r̄i qui tecum uiuit', thus raising the total of letters from 133 to either 154 or 155. Similarly, and with like dogmatic intent, instead of phrasing the Postcommunion 'Da nobis dn̄e quaesumus unigeniti filii tui . . . cuius caelesti mysterio et pascimur et potamur. per' (in 103 letters), he preferred to render it 'Da nobis dn̄e quaesumus ipsius . . . cuius caelesti mysterio et pascimur et potamur ihu xp̄i dn̄i n̄r̄i filii tui qui tecum uiuit' (in 124 letters).

Pursuing his course through the post-Nativity items, §§ vi–ix, the editor of V, in order to ensure beyond doubt a now much needed economy of space, wrote 'splendet' for 'resplendet' in the Oratio of § vii, thus reducing 152 letters to 150, the certain equivalent of not more than five κ lines; and not improbably omitted 'nos' from the Oratio of § viii, thus lowering 152 to 149: while in the Secreta of § ix he wrote 'dn̄i' for 'dn̄i n̄r̄i' and 'per' for 'per eundem', by this means substituting for 133, 124 letters, for which four lines would suffice.<sup>2</sup>

My own belief is that he made these textual economies—economies which, though in terms of letters they were slight indeed, could not fail to be efficient in a distribution of text which obeyed the etymological laws of syllabic distribution—in order to give himself room for the long and marvellous 'magi mutati reges turbati . . . Lacta mater cibum n̄m lacta panem de caelo uenientem in praesepio positum' &c., which now adorns the Preface of § ix.

That § xi might end on the last line of a page (p. 16), all that the editor of V now needed was a textual economy having the value of one κ line; and those of my readers who may take the trouble to examine

<sup>1</sup> Compare St Paul's 'diuinitatis plenitudo' at Col. ii 9. If I am right in making this suggestion the question arises whether the editor of V may not, consciously or unconsciously, have deserted what on that hypothesis would be the reading of S<sub>2</sub> in favour of 'diuini cultus', which again is the reading in our only known copy of the Leonianum.

<sup>2</sup> Here let me repeat what I have said elsewhere: That when resolving terms of letters into terms of lines I always neglect the concluding 'per' of a prayer, though not, of course, the concluding 'per eundem'; for 'per', should need be, could be written as a crossed 'p' or set *in extenso* in the margin; but that when dealing with θ pages I compute (3 × 28 + 4 + 3 =) 91 letters as the maximum content of a three-line prayer and (4 × 28 + 4 + 3 =) 119 as the maximum content of a four-line prayer, for in writing so short constituents as these an expert scribe would be careful to make economical equipment of his lines. When dealing with κ pages I allow 5 + 3 as the extreme concession. In short, for three-line prayers on β, θ, κ pages respectively, the highest permissible values are 103, 91, 96; and for four-line prayers 135, 119, 126. For five-line prayers, on the contrary, which end with a mere 'per', I allow no more than 163, 143, 151. Similarly, should occasion arise, we are at liberty to neglect the conventional 'et ideo' subjoined to Prefaces.

the last two constituents of § ix and the whole of §§ x, xi, will see that such economy could not have been better effected than by the simple device of changing the Leonianum words 'ueritatis tuae praemia' (see Leon. XVIII. xviii; Mur. i 364) in the *Secreta* of § x into 'diuina praemia'. A substitution such as this would have the merit of retaining that duplication of the consonantal 'u' which is characteristic of both the classical and the post-classical stylists; and I believe that it was in fact made, and made by the editor of V, because the 'diu' in 'diuina' gives us a ready explanation of the very curious Reginensis reading 'diuersitatis tuae praemia', a reading so strange that Mr Wilson has relegated it to his notes rather than exhibit it in his text.

*Two Post-editorial Blemishes in §§ x, xi.* This 'diuersitatis tuae praemia' in the *Secreta* of § x and the cruelly abbreviated Preface of § xi demand special attention, if but for a moment.

1. The Leonianum text (Mur. i 364) of the first of these constituents is 'Ut tibi grata sint dñe munera populi tui ab omni quaesumus eum contagione peruersitatis emunda nec falsis gaudiis inhaerere patiaris quos ad ueritatis tuae praemia uenire promittis. per' (156 letters); and this I believe to have been the text of *s*, of *S*<sub>1</sub>, and of *S*<sub>2</sub>. The account, then, which I propose of the Reginensis 'quos ad diuersitatis tuae praemia' is as follows: That the editor of V, in order to effect the needed economy of a line, substituted 'ad diuina praemia' for 'ad ueritatis tuae praemia', thus reducing the text to 149 letters, the value of precisely five of his κ lines—

UT TIBI GRATA SINT DÑE MUNERA POPULI  
TUI AB OMNI QUAESUMUS EUM CONTAGI-  
ONE PERUERSITATIS EMUNDA NEC FALSIS  
GAUDIIS INHAERERE PATIARIS QUOS AD DI-  
UINA PRAEMIA UENIRE PROMITTIS. PER :

but that some post-editorial copyist at the very moment of writing the 'di' which he found at the end of the fourth line, was disturbed by a subconscious echo of the 'peruersitatis' which he had himself just written, and, besides this, by a reminiscence of the original 'ueritatis tuae'; and that, as a result of the double distraction, he unthinkingly excogitated a conflation of 'DI uina' 'per UERSIT atis' and 'uerit ATIS TUAE'.

2. A line thus wasted on his fifteenth page, a line was saved on his sixteenth, perhaps intentionally, perhaps inadvertently, in the Preface of § xi. I incline to the latter alternative, attributing this disfigurement, like the other, to ill health or physical weakness; and I think my readers will agree with me when they observe what has happened. Not only are the words 'apparuit in nouam nos immortalitatis suae' omitted

between 'mortalitatis' and 'luce[m]'; 'per quem maiestatem tuam' has been superseded by an intolerable 'per quem laudant angeli'.

But, whichever view we take, the values he gave to the Secreta of § x and to the Preface of § xi were such that, if his pages were ruled and his script written in accordance with those of V and V', he ended the series on the last line of a page. The next table shews what I mean.

	§ x. Against Idols.				§ xi. V. of Theophany.			
		S <sub>2</sub>	VV'	α		S <sub>2</sub>	V <sub>1</sub> V'	α
Brought forward . . . . .		35	13 <sup>2</sup>	13 <sup>2</sup>				
Capitulum . . . . .	19	1	1	1	22	1	1	1
Oratio . . . . .	165	6	6	6	134 <sup>1</sup> , 136 <sup>2</sup>	5 <sup>1</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>
Secreta . . . . .	156 <sup>1</sup> , 149 <sup>2</sup> , 159 <sup>3</sup>	6 <sup>1</sup>	5 <sup>2</sup>	6 <sup>3</sup>	112	4	4	4
Preface . . . . .					121 <sup>1</sup> , 84 <sup>2</sup>	5 <sup>1</sup>	4 <sup>2</sup>	3 <sup>3</sup>
Postcommunion . . . . .	112	4	4	4	163	6	6	6
Of the following . . . . .						2		
Totals (θ) for S <sub>2</sub>		5 <sup>2</sup>				23		= 75
„ (κ) for V and V'			148			20		= 168
„ (κ) for α				149				19 = 168

*Data for the External History of §§ i-xi.* Thus we have, as data for a working hypothesis of the development of this part of the sacramental contingent of our document after its original issue in Redaction s, first, a stage of enhancement, s<sup>1</sup>, at which (a) the Mass for the Octave of Christmas was introduced; secondly, a later stage, S<sub>1</sub>, at which (b) the six post-Nativity Prayers were inserted, and the phrase 'Merito ergo . . . pastores laetati' subjoined to the Preface of the Octave; and thirdly, a cismontane stage, S<sub>2</sub>, at which (c) a second Secreta was given to the Christmas Morning Mass, while three super-numerary Orations and six Ad Populum prayers were distributed through the series. Hence it follows that—assuming my analysis to be free from prejudicial error—if it should ever be possible to aver with certainty that either a or b or c is the work of such and such a pope, a *point d'appui* will have been secured for dealing with the external history of the document. Let me illustrate my meaning:—

1. On the seemingly unquestionable assumption that the original issue, written on β pages and beginning with the In Vigiliis de Theophania, was so arranged as to have the seven Christmas and post-Nativity items on the concluding pages of a book, the stichometry of the document (see the table of values on p. 199) bids us infer that these were followed by the short Prohibendum ab Idolis (now § x). Was there, then, ever a period—and, if so, when was it—at which the Roman Church was in such peril from *profanae uanitates* (see the Oratio of the present § x), from *gaudia falsa* (see the Secreta), and from *diabolicae insidiae* (see the Postcommunion), as to justify the compiler of a papal

sacramentary in making a votive Mass on the subject integral to the scheme of the document<sup>1</sup>; a votive Mass, be it borne in mind, which is not so worded as to oblige us to say that it was to be used exclusively, or even preferably, at Christmastide? If so, that would be the period to which, until better informed, we should have to refer Redaction s.

2. If my analysis has conducted me to a right chronological distribution, we shall have to say that the Mass for the Octave of the Nativity—although, as having the value of one  $\beta$  page, it may have in the first instance been set on a fly-leaf—was co-opted into the document at the sub-redaction which I notify as s<sup>1</sup>, its Preface then ending with the words 'infans et d̄s est'; but that this constituent was at Redaction S<sup>1</sup> augmented by the phrase 'Merito ergo . . . laetati', and that the six Nativity Prayers were inserted on the same occasion. Now, the Leonian text (Leon. xl i) of the second of these, 'Largire quae-sumus' &c., is so worded as to suggest the possibility—it does no more than this, but still it does it—that the primary and proper subject of our Christmas joy is the Eternal Generation of the consubstantial Word; but our text, with its 'īhu xp̄i' in place of 'tui filii' carries on our thoughts to His human birth; and, whereas the Leonian text (Leon. xl i, as before) of the fourth prayer, 'D̄s qui humanae substantiae' &c., ends at 'particeps', ours, by adding 'xp̄c filius tuus. per eundem d̄nm n̄rm', emphasizes the dogmatic distinction of the two natures of the one Person. So, too, does the very remarkable 'unigeniti tui natiuitas corporea' of the third prayer, 'D̄s qui populo tuo' &c., whoever may have been its author. These characteristics of our text, while suggesting an Eutychian or sub-Eutychian date for S<sub>1</sub>, call to mind the *elimatio* by means of a *cautus sermo* which is the peculiar praise of the first Gelasius, and thus give that pontiff a primary claim to the editorship of that redaction. And, if I am well advised in attributing to that redaction the structurally needless 'Merito ergo . . . laetati' in the extant Preface for the Octave, it certainly is a striking coincidence that those words read like an *additamentum*<sup>2</sup> such as might have been inserted by so conspicuously anti-Eutychian a theologian as

<sup>1</sup> I say 'integral to the scheme of the document' because without it the document would have been bibliographically imperfect; for it is a necessary part of one and the same group with the saints' Masses which precede it, each member of the quatrain having been so devised as to co-operate with the others in filling three successive  $\beta$  pages. It cannot be regarded as an insertion introduced *ex post facto* to Redaction s.

<sup>2</sup> The very bold 'caeli locuti sunt' of this passage occurs also in that commentary on Psalms i-lxxv which modern scholarship assigns to the 'Vincentius . . . natione Gallus' commemorated by Gennadius *De uiris illustribus* § 81. Expounding Ps. xlv 3, the commentator says, 'Pulcher natus infans Verbum quia cum esset infans . . . coeli loquuti sunt'. (Migne *S. L.* xxi 821 B.) For a similar, if not precisely analogous, coincidence, recently detected by Dom G. Morin, see the *Revue Bénédictine* for April 1913.

was he. They tell us that the Hypostatic Union was the inspiring motive of the wonders attendant on the birth in Bethlehem.

3. Again. By my hypothesis, it was not at *s* or at *S*<sub>1</sub>, but at *S*<sub>2</sub>, a cismontane issue, that a second *Secreta* was given to § iii and an *Ad Populum* added to the Mass for the Octave of the Nativity. Was there, then, ever a time—and, if so, when was it—at which in some cismontane region it can have been deemed expedient to use in a Christmas-day Mass a *Secreta* against the *diabolica figmenta* of some heresy on the subject of the Incarnation, and on New Year's Day to implore Heaven, again in an adventitious prayer, to save the children of the Church from the *diabolicum conuiuuium* of food dedicated to false gods? If so, the correctness of my diagnosis assumed, we should have two clues to the when and the where of Redaction *S*<sub>1</sub>.

4. If Rheinau and St Gallen may be our guides, it was not until the second of the cismontane revisions which I conceive the sacramental component of our document to have undergone, that the words 'ihc xpc dñs n̄. qui tecum uiuit' were added to the very remarkable 'nobis est indita plenitudo' of the *Secreta* for Christmas Day. The words are a censure, not of Eutychianism, but of the heresy of Arius; and, especially if employed in concert with other clues, might serve as aid towards determining the when and the where of Redaction V.

5. Let me add another example. Assuming that the whole of the passage 'magi mutati . . . dignatus es adimplere' in the extant Preface of § ix was added at a second cismontane issue, Redaction V of my analysis, it is worthy of note that it reads like the composition of one who, though his literary language was Latin, thought in some other. I have already observed that the 'Missale Gothicum' has an analogue to 'magi mutati' in 'mutatio' as used for the 'conuersio' of St Paul. I would further observe that, the Virgin-mother having suckled her Child, none but a *barbarus*, who, while thinking in one language and writing in another, was insensible to the niceties and requirements of idiom, would have perpetrated such a solecism as '*lacta* cibum nostrum, *lacta* panem' &c.—'*milk* our food, *milk* the bread' &c. Again, the truth which, as the last clause, 'Quod etiam . . . adimplere', tells us, ox and ass had prefiguratively hinted the prophet Simeon proclaimed by word of mouth in his 'Nunc dimittis'; the truth that both Jew and Gentile were to be saved by Christ. This the ancient did; but he *adimpleuit* nothing. Here, too, we see that the author of the last half of the constituent must have thought in a language whose vocabulary had a word the literal Latin rendering of which was '*adimplere*', but that the sense intended was either to *epitomize* or to *formulate*. Should linguists know of such a language, they may help us to determine the when and the where of Redaction V.

*The Roman Equipment and Text of §§ xii-xiv.* Sections xii-xiv of the Reginensis codex contain Masses for the Theophany, and for Septuagesima and Sexagesima.

I. For a probable reinstatement of their original equipment we must eliminate the second Oratio of § xii, 'D $\bar{s}$  illuminator' &c., as inconsistent with the simplicity of an *editio classica*; and also the Ad Populum prayers of §§ xii, xiv, as inconsistent with Roman use.

II. Textual accommodations must be made. 1. The Reginensis text of the Theophany Preface does not seem to be true to the original text. As compared with that of the Rheinau sacramentary it has 'regni tui mysteria', not 'sacratissima regni tui mysteria', and the very strange 'index puerpera uirginalis stella', not 'index puerperii uirginalis stella'; thus comprising 301 letters (the precise equivalent of 10 completely filled  $\kappa$  lines, as against 314<sup>1</sup>) (10  $\beta$  lines, 11 of  $\theta$ ). Why it should have been thus reduced I hope to enquire when the moment comes for dealing with the methods of the second of the cismontane editors. Meanwhile I assume that in the Roman editions the value of the constituent had been 314. 2. There can be little doubt that in the Secreta of § xiv 'quam sacris muneribus facis esse participes tribuas ad eam plenitudinem uenire' should be corrected to 'quam sacri muneris facis esse participem tribuas ad eius plenitudinem uenire' and the value computed as 108, not 110.

These corrections made, we have as follows for Redactions  $s$  and  $S_1$ ; where, since, by the hypothesis,  $s$  began with the Vigil of the Theophany (see above, p. 198), and on page 3 of the pope's book, I assume that the Mass of the Feast began on page 4; but where, since, by the hypothesis,  $S_1$  began with the Vigil of the Nativity (see above, pp. 199, 200), I assume that § xii began on page 15 of the papal copy of this latter edition.

	§ xii. Theophany.		§ xiii. lxxma.		§ xiv. lxxma.	
	$s$	$S_1$	$s$	$S_1$	$s$	$S_1$
Capitulum . . . . .	16	* *	14	1 1	12	1 1
Sub-title . . . . .	5	* *				
Collecta . . . . .	223	7 8	164	6 6	153	5 6
Oratio . . . . .	124	4 5	140	5 5	96	3 4
Secreta . . . . .	143	5 5	88	3 3	110 (108)	4 4
Preface . . . . .	314†	10 11				
<i>Infra actionem</i> . . . . .	13	1 1				
Communicantes . . . . .	179	6 7				
Postcommunion . . . . .	140	5 5	110	4 4	93	3 4
Of the following . . . . .					2	
Totals ( $\beta$ ) for $s$	38		19		18 = 75 (P. 6 ends)	
„ ( $\theta$ ) for $S_1$	42		19		19 = 80	

<sup>1</sup> For reasons which will in due course be submitted to the notice of my readers,

*The Obseruantia Paschalis of § xvii.* Sections xv and xvi were, by the hypothesis, incorporated into the extant document during the cismontane period. They consist of material proper to a *canon poenitentialis*. Since, therefore, our obvious course is to proceed with the subject on which we have just entered, the equipment and text of the sacramentary during the Roman period of its evolution, I pass on to § xvii in which the series of Masses is resumed.

It so happens that the first day after Quinquagesima Sunday to which our document (Mur. i 506) gives a Mass is the first day of the comparatively modern Lent. We must for that reason be careful to note, in the first place, that in neither rubrics nor text of that or of any other item in § xvii is anything said of a fast either prolonged or restricted to forty days; in the second, that no such words as 'quadregesima' and 'quadregesimalis' occur in any of them; and, in the third, that 'quadregesima' is a term of the same category with 'septuagesima', 'sexagesima' and 'quinquagesima', and must not be regarded as originally or necessarily of equivalent meaning or identical scope with the term 'quadraginta dies'.

On the other hand, and in the fourth place, we must carefully note that, although 'quadregesima' and 'quadregesimalis' do not occur in any of the items of § xvii, distinctive formulae do abound in them, and that these are not only distinctive but suggestive, viz. 'obseruantia paschalis' in the Secreta of the first item; 'inchoata ieiunia' and 'obseruantia' in the Collecta of the second; 'ieiunia paschalia' in the Collecta of the third; 'obseruatio haec' and 'paschales actiones' in the Collecta of the fourth and last.<sup>1</sup>

To these cautions I would add another. The Mass for Quinquagesima Sunday is member of one and the same liturgical scheme with the other items of § xvii. The 'obseruantia sc̄a' of its Oratio and the 'obseruantia paschalis' of its Secreta are identical with the 'obseruantia' of the Wednesday Collecta and with the 'ieiunia paschalia' and 'paschales actiones' of those for Friday and Saturday. This considera-

I reserve to a later page (see below, p. 224) my syllabus of values for S<sub>2</sub> and V. Meanwhile I set a printer's dagger (†) against the '314' of the present list.

<sup>1</sup> Pamelius finds, in his MS of a Carolingian sacramentary of quasi-Gregorian type, a Mass for the Saturday in Quinquagesima week; herein differing from Muratori, who, in a similar sacramentary (see Mur. ii 30) finds none. In it he inserts, whether with or without authority, the prayer, 'Obseruantias' &c., which in our document serves as that day's Collecta; but with the remarkable difference that, instead of 'paschalibus actionibus', he reads 'actibus quadregesimalibus'. Thus the Pamelian reading assumes a Lent which, beginning in Quinquagesima week, and comprising forty fasting days, anticipates Quadregesima Sunday. The Reginensis reading, as I am about to shew, assumes an *obseruantia*, the inspiring motive of which is not a commemorative imitation of the Redeemer's forty days' fast, but a preparation for the baptismal solemnities of Easter.

tion suffices to refute the late Dr Probst's theory that the ferial *missae* of § xvii were ember Masses.

Yet another caution must be added. Our document gives no *missae* to any of the Thursdays before Holy Week; for, although these were fasts, they were not station-days. If, then, it be true that though the Thursday in Quinquagesima week has not a *missa* it yet was a fast, we are not at liberty to exclude the Monday and Tuesday for no better reason than that *missae* have not been assigned them. Nor must the opening words, 'Inchoata ieiunia', of the Wednesday Collecta mislead us into thinking that that was the day on which the *obseruantia paschalis* began. Rheinau and St Gallen use this very prayer in their Friday Mass, the third day and the third station of their comparatively modern Lent; and our own document uses the words on the Friday, not the Wednesday, of the autumn ember-week (II lx).

What account, then, are we to give of the 'obseruantia paschalis', the 'paschales actiones', and other like peculiarities of § xvii?

The Liber Pontificalis,<sup>1</sup> in its account of Telesphorus, bishop of Rome between the years 142 and 152, says 'Hic constituit ut septem hebdomadas ante Pascha ieiunium celebraretur', but does not tell us whether the fast was enjoined as an esoteric observance or was obligatory on laity equally with clergy, or on seculars equally with ascetics. On the other hand, it was at the close of the sixth century the general custom of the Roman Church to keep a fast which began not, like the Telesphoran, on the morrow of Quinquagesima Sunday, but a week later. Are we, then, to infer that the Telesphoran fast was intended to be of general obligation, but that in course of time its duration was lowered from seven weeks to six; or is it more reasonable to believe that the six weeks' fast customary at the time of Gregory the Great, so far from being a modification of the *constitutio* of Telesphorus, represented another tradition and was historically distinct from it? The latter would seem to be the more probable opinion of the two; but, as an aid to the better understanding of the document with which we are now more especially concerned, I must be content with inviting attention to what I believe to be the unquestionable fact that, although in Rome, as probably in other cities of Italy, the Telesphoran, or seven weeks', use survived until the second half of the fifth century, the later, or six weeks', use was already bidding fair to supersede it.

Leo the Great (A.D. 440-461) in some of his sermons speaks in terms so explicit of *quadraginta dies* devoted to fasting as to raise a very strong presumption that he had in mind a true quarantine of fasts, and thus a quarantine which, by arithmetical necessity, began before Quadragesima week. I refer to the phrases 'quadraginta

<sup>1</sup> Migne S. L. cxxxvii 1175. It is worthy of special note that Telesphorus is described as 'natione Graecus'.

dierum continentia' in the third sermon (Migne *S. L.* liv 273 D); 'quadraginta dierum exercitatio' in the fourth (*ib.* 275 B); 'quadraginta dierum ieiunium' in the fifth, seventh and tenth (*ib.* 283 B, 288 B, 298 B), and more especially to the 'quadraginta dierum ieiunia' of the sixth and eighth (*ib.* 286 B, 294 B).

But, if so, are we to understand by these phrases a quarantine of *feriae* which began on the Wednesday after Quinquagesima Sunday? I think not. I believe it to have begun, as Telesphorus would seem to have designed, on the Monday of Quinquagesima week, and, as a consequence, to have ended on the evening of the Thursday before Easter, being followed by what was perhaps already known to some of the churches of Gaul as the *ieiunium biduanum*, the Paschal fast *κατ' ἐξοχήν* of the two days before Easter<sup>1</sup>: because Leo, in his fifth Lenten sermon (Migne *S. L.* liv 283 B), speaks of a forty days' fast which was a preparation, not specifically and exclusively for the anniversary of our Lord's resurrection, but for the 'sacramenta redemptionis nostrae', a phrase which the context seems to explain of the death as well as the resurrection of our Lord<sup>2</sup>: because when, in the seventh (*ib.* 288 B-290 A), he speaks of a 'quadraginta dierum ieiunium quod festi paschalis est praeuium' he identifies<sup>3</sup> the 'festum paschale' with the reconciliation of penitents and the baptism of catechumens: because, in the twelfth (*ib.* 305 C), he is careful to expound 'solemnitas paschalis' of the death equally with the rising again of the Redeemer<sup>4</sup>: because, in the ninth<sup>5</sup> and tenth<sup>6</sup> (*ib.* 295 A, 298 A), he associates the Crucifixion with the

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 217 n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> His words are 'Quae (*scil.* redemptionis nostrae sacramenta) ut dignius celebremus quadraginta dierum ieiunio praeparemus. Non enim ii tantum qui per mortis Christi resurrectionisque mysterium in nouam uitam baptismo sunt regenerante uenturi sed etiam omnes populi renatorum utiliter sibi et necessarie praesidium huius sanctificationis assumunt, illi ut . . . isti ut' &c.

<sup>3</sup> 'Sive enim illam partem populi cogitemus quae . . . tendit ad palmam, sive illam quae lethalium conscia peccatorum per reconciliationis auxilium festinat ad ueniam, sive illam quae, Sancti Spiritus regeneranda baptisate, uetustate Adam exui et Christi cupit nouitate uestiri, apte et utiliter omnibus dicitur "Parate uiam Domini" . . . Unde ut sacramentorum paschalium diuina mysteria digno suscipiantur officio' &c.

<sup>4</sup> 'Appropinquante, dilectissimi, solemnitate paschali adest praecurrentis consuetudo ieiunii quod nos quadraginta dierum numero . . . exerceat. Suscepturi enim festorum omnium maximum festum ea nos debemus obseruantia praeparare ut in cuius sumus resurrectione conresuscitati in ipsius inueniamur passione commortui.'

<sup>5</sup> Here, speaking of the 'dies quos illi sublimissimo diuinae misericordiae sacramento scimus esse contiguos', he says 'in quibus . . . maiora sunt ordinata ieiunia ut per commune consortium crucis Christi etiam nos aliquid in eo quod propter nos gessit ageremus, sicut apostolus ait "Si compatimur et conglorificabimur"'

<sup>6</sup> Here, speaking of the 'festiuitas paschalis', he says 'Siquidem etiam ipsa Domini ex matre generatio huic est impensa sacramento; nec alia fuit Dei Filio

'paschale sacramentum', the 'festiuitas paschalis', and the 'celebrandus paschae dies' to which a 'quadraginta dierum ieiunium' had led the way: because, in the fourth (*ib.* 275 A, B), he equates the 'sacratissimum maximumque ieiunium' which is its subject-matter with a 'quadraginta dierum exercitatio', and declares the object of this to be 'ut excellens super omnia *passionis dominicae* sacramentum purificatis et corporibus et animis celebremus'; and because, in his seventh sermon on the Passion (*ib.* 332 B, C; 333 A, B), so far from calling Easter Day a passover, he gives the appellation of '*nouum pascha*'—and that in no doubtful terms—to the eucharistic feast instituted on the night of the first Maundy Thursday, and instituted as antitype to the *solemnitas paschalis* and *festiuitas paschalis* of the Old Law—'Antiqua obseruantia nouo tollitur sacramento, hostia in Hostiam transit, Sanguine sanguis aufertur, et legalis festiuitas dum mutatur impletur', 'Incipiente enim festiuitate paschali . . . nouum pascha condebat', 'Discumbentibus enim secum discipulis ad edendam mysticam coenam . . . ille corporis et sanguinis sui ordinans sacramentum' &c.

Such, then, is the evidence yielded by the majority of St Leo's pre-Paschal sermons. But when we turn to the first and second of those discourses we find a conspicuously different terminology; a fact the more noteworthy from the circumstance that each of them was preached on a Quadragesima Sunday. When, in the first sermon, the pontiff refers to our Lord's victory over the tempter, he says 'Vicit enim aduersarium, *ut audistis*, testimonio legis'; for the Quadragesima Gospel had just been sung as part of the Mass then in progress: and when, in the second, he quotes the Epistle for the same day, he says 'Unde opportune auribus nostris lectio apostolicae praedicationis *insonuit* dicens "Ecce nunc tempus acceptum, ecce nunc dies salutis"': for the passage was still lingering in the ears of his audience (*ib.* 265 A; 268 B).

Now, in these two sermons he neither mentions a 'ieiunium quadraginta dierum' nor employs any phrase that can be deemed equivalent to it. But he does say in one of them (*ib.* 264 B) that he and his hearers are keeping<sup>1</sup> the 'sacratissimi *quadragessimae* dies', days therefore, which, as beginning with Quadragesima Sunday, cannot have comprised as many as forty *feriae* on which to fast: while in the other (*ib.* 268 A) he describes the devotional exercise on which they are about to enter as a 'ieiunium *quadragessimale*': in each case using *causa nascendi* quam ut cruci posset affigi . . . ut esset nobis sacrificium redemptionis abolitio peccati et ad aeternam uitam initium resurgendi'.

<sup>1</sup> The Ballerini, following Quesnel, here print 'Scientes enim *adesse* sacratissimos *quadragessimae* dies' in place of 'Scientes enim *agere nos* sacratissimos *quadragessimae* dies'. The substitution is due to a mistake which ought not to have been made. The quadragesimal *fast* had not begun, but the quadragesimal *season* had, and Sundays are part of it.

'*quadragesima*' as a noun substantive, but in each case making it evident that in the public vocabulary of the Roman Church the term 'ieiunium quadragesimale' was not, and cannot have been, regarded as equivalent to 'ieiunium quadraginta dierum'. On this last consideration it is impossible to insist too strongly.

Thus we find in St Leo's sermons two co-existent, but not necessarily antagonistic, theories. By one of these a *quadraginta dierum ieiunium* kept on forty ferial days in seven successive weeks; the first feria being Quinquagesima Monday, and the last the Thursday before Easter. If to these we add the *mysterium paschale* of the Friday and Saturday, we complete the seven weeks' fast which the *Liber Pontificalis* asserts that Telesphorus instituted; the forty-two days' fast on which an author identified by some with St Ambrose, by some with Maximus of Turin, dilates when he calls them the antitype of the forty-two *stationes* of the children of Israel on their journey to the Red Sea.<sup>1</sup> By the other theory, a thirty-four days' fast kept in as many feriae as are included in forty<sup>2</sup> out of the forty-two consecutive days of six weeks, the first of which days is Quadragesima Sunday—whence the name *ieiunium quadragesimale*—and the last the Thursday before Easter. If to these we add the next two days we have, as total, the thirty-six days' fast on which Gregory the Great descants in his sixteenth homily on the Gospels.<sup>3</sup>

*The Roman Equipment, Text and Rubrics of §§ xvii, xviii.* In the document on which we are engaged two theories of prae-Paschal fast are discernible; and I beg my readers to note that they correspond to those found in the sermons of Leo. In § xvii, which is devoted to Quinquagesima week, we find, as in St Leo's sermons concerning

<sup>1</sup> See Migne *S. L.* lvii 311 A-312 A. Be it carefully observed, however, that the preacher, whoever he may have been, employs 'quadragesima' in the secondary sense of the Italian 'quaresima', the Spanish 'quaresma', the French 'carême', the English 'lent', all of which begin on the Wednesday in Quinquagesima week. On the other hand, a homily preached on the Wednesday in Quinquagesima week, and as to which there is no doubt that Maximus of Turin is its author (Hom. 36, Migne *S. L.* lvii 301 C), gives the word its proper and primary sense of a season beginning in Quadragesima week—'Quia nonnullorum est consuetudo, carissimi, aduenientes quadragesimae dies deuotiore ieiunio praeuenire' &c.

<sup>2</sup> These forty consecutive days—some of them Sundays—make up what Amalarius (*De eccl. off.* I iv) calls the 'quadragenarius numerus', a number upon the completion of which, on the 'quinta dies ante Pascha', 'duo dies supersunt usque ad baptismum' (Migne *S. L.* cv 1001 D).

<sup>3</sup> The whole of what he says is too long for citation. Let the following suffice: 'A praesenti etenim die usque ad paschalis solemnitatis gaudia sex hebdomadae ueniunt, quarum uidelicet dies quadraginta duo fiunt: ex quibus dum sex dies dominici ab abstinentia subtrahuntur non plus in abstinentia quam triginta et sex remanent' (Migne *S. L.* lxxvi 1137 B).

the *ieiunium quadraginta dierum* and the *quadraginta dierum ieiunia*, the phrases 'obseruantia paschalis', 'ieiunia paschalia', 'paschales actiones'; phrases correlative with, and equivalent to, the 'obseruantia' which the pontiff describes as preparatory to the *solemnitas paschalis*. On the other hand, in § xviii, and in its first item, the Mass for Quadragesima Sunday, we find, as in St Leo's sermons for that day, no mention whatever of 'paschalia ieiunia' and the like; but terms of another category, namely, 'quadragessimale sacramentum' and 'sacrificium quadragesimalis initii'; terms identical in scope and meaning with the 'sacratissimi quadragesima dies' and 'quadragesima initium' in the two sermons just mentioned.

How long after the age of St Leo these two theories may have subsisted, and subsisted each distinct from the other, in the public apprehension<sup>1</sup> of the Roman Church, we do not know; nor do we know when it was that the second of them can be said to have finally asserted itself in Rome to the general exclusion, or the general oblivion, of the first: but there can be no doubt that after the lapse of some four human generations from the death of Leo the first of them was not in general recognition. Even then, however, Roman custom does not seem to have employed the term 'quadragesima tempus' in any such loose and extended sense as that which is now given to 'carême', 'quaresma', 'quaresima', and our own 'lent'; still less, the single

<sup>1</sup> I say designedly 'public apprehension', 'general exclusion', 'general oblivion', 'general recognition'; for it stands to reason that in conservative circles tradition may have not only kept alive the memory, but perpetuated the observance, of that seven weeks' fast of which I see unquestionable proof alike in the sermons of St Leo and the book we are studying. The Vatican MS, to which I have already referred, the *Breviarium* edited by Tommasi, and after him by Muratori (ii 391, &c.), admirably illustrates and enforces my surmise, not only in the passage I am about to cite, but in certain words, which I italicize, of its title: 'Incipit breuiarium ecclesiastici ordinis qualiter in coenobiis Domino seruientes . . . debeant celebrare sicut in sancta ac Romana ecclesia a sapientibus ac venerabilibus patribus traditum fuit.' The passage germane to the subject of the two theories of fast is (*ib.* 400) as follows: 'Monachi uero et Romani deuoti, uel boni Christiani, a Quinquagesima; rustici autem et reliquis uulgus a Quadragesima [*heic aliquid desideratur*].' Then follows 'Primum autem ieiunium quarta et sexta feria post Quinquagesimam, id est una hebdomada ante Quadragessimam apud eos publice agitur', where an implied distinction is drawn between the *publicae actiones*—that is to say the *publicae stationes*—of Wednesday and Friday and the fast common to all the feriae of which the previous sentence has informed us.

See also, in Gerbert *Monumenta* ii 171, the following, from a composite document which has much in common with the foregoing: 'Monachi uero et Romani deuoti a Quinquagesima [*de carne*] leuant ieiunium': and, from yet another (*ib.* 189), 'Clerici nostri, auctore Telesphoro papa, sequentem [hebdomadam] id est Quinquagesimam sanctificant; qui constituit septem hebdomadaram ieiunium ante Pascha'.

word 'quadagesima': for Gregory the Great, in passages of the homily just mentioned, says that the 'quadagesimae tempus' was a season which had its *inchoatio*, not on a feria, but on Quadragesima Sunday, and that the days over which the *abstinentia* of the season was distributed were forty in number; but that even when that number was raised to forty-two, by the added abstinence of the two days next before Easter 'non plus in abstinentia quam triginta et sex dies remanent' (Migne *S. L.* lxxvi 1137 A, B).

Hence two inferences concerning the Wednesday, Friday and Saturday for which in § xvii (Mur. i 505-508) Masses have been provided; one negative, the other positive: One, that in the order of thought they are not identical with three out of the four days which at a comparatively late date in Rome, and at a still later date elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> were co-opted to the quadagesimal *observantia*, thus raising St Gregory's thirty-six days to forty: the other, that in the order of thought they are contributory units to St Leo's *ieiunium quadraginta dierum* and *quadraginta dierum ieiunia*, contributory units to a quarantine of fasts which, beginning on Quinquagesima Monday and taken in conjunction with the *paschale mysterium* of Good Friday and Holy Saturday, coincided with the seven weeks' observance of which Telesphorus is said to have been the institutor.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the contrasted terminologies of § xvii and § xviii correspond, and correspond precisely, with the two distinct theories of prae-Paschal abstinence which, though clearly discernible in the teaching of Leo the Great, had ceased to be publicly recognized in the Roman Church a century and a half later, it is reasonable to infer that the inception of our document may be referable to a date which fell, at the latest, during that interval. What, then, must on this hypothesis be done if we would reconstruct their original equipment, rubrics and text with probable claim to verisimilitude?

I. 1. As a preliminary step to reconstruction of equipment, we must restore the *Secreta* of the first item in § xvii to the text in which there can be no reasonable doubt that it appeared at Redaction S<sub>2</sub>.

Signor Rappagliosi, the Roman expert who collated Mr Wilson's proofs with the Reginensis MS, assures us that the Sunday *Secreta* in § xvii runs thus: 'Sacrificium dñe observantiae paschalis exerimus: praesta quaesumus ut tibi et mentes n̄as reddat acceptas et continentiae promptiores. per.' The Oxford editor, substituting 'promptio-

<sup>1</sup> This was not done at Monte Cassino until the abbacy of Desiderius, subsequently known as Pope Victor III (A. D. 1086). Such, at least, is the inference I draw from the *Chronicon Casinense* of Leo Marsicanus: 'Porro autem dominus Petrus Damiani ad hoc monasterium ueniens . . . a cuncta congregatione . . . obtinuit ut triduanum ieiunium in capite quadagesimae per annos singulos agerent' (Migne *S. L.* clxxiii 112 C: or, see *ib.* cxlix 933 A).

ris' for 'promptiores', subjoins—though, with scholarly caution, within brackets—'nobis tribuat facultatem'; words which have the commanding authority of Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert's triple sacramentary; and I think that in so doing he has given us the original extent of the prayer. But I think that he is mistaken in believing that, if we would have the text of the prototype of Reginensis, we must substitute the longer form for the shorter; because, but for reasons which cannot be duly set forth till the moment comes for discussing the literary methods of the cismontane editors, I am convinced that the words 'nobis tribuat facultatem' were deliberately excised by the second of these. The longer text comprises 141 letters<sup>1</sup> (5 β lines, 5 of θ); the shorter comprises 119 (4 κ lines). I assign the higher value to the Roman editions which I hope to be able to reconstruct.

2. We must also remember that Roman use eschewed Ad Populum prayers on Sundays. Such prayers must therefore be eliminated from the Sunday items of §§ xvii, xviii—and indeed of all other Sections—if we are to succeed in reconstructing the equipment of *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>.

II. Let me next invite attention to a detail which is of very great interest as elucidatory of the non-Roman career of the document.

Prefixed to the title of § xix (Mur. i 511) Reginensis has the rubric '*Istae orationes quae sequuntur primo sabbato in mense primo sunt dicendae*'; and, consistently with this direction, the last item of § xviii, the Mass for the Saturday in Quadragesima week, is equipped like that for any ordinary feria in Lent: whereas in a duly provided Roman item for that day we should expect to find the numerous constituents proper to an ember Saturday. Hence it follows that, if, as my hypothesis postulates, Redaction V', the prototype of Reginensis, was elaborated from an ultimate original purely Roman, this part of the document must in all probability have been recast at some period of its history. I am happy to be able to say that a very strong presumption in favour of this view is yielded by the Reginensis text of the Collecta of the Wednesday Mass in § xviii: 'Precamur om̄p. d̄s ut de transitoriis operibus abstinentes ea potius operemur quibus ad aeterna gaudia consequenda et spes nobis suppetat et facultas. per' (in 127 letters).

Now, this 'de transitoriis operibus abstinentes' is bad Latin, for the preposition required by the construction is *a*, not *de*: and, even if *de* were right, since all our works in this life are transitory, abstention from them would be self-annihilation. Why, then, so strange a phrase?

If the reader will consult the ember prayers in XLIII iii of the

<sup>1</sup> For, on the authority of Rheinau, St Gallen and Gerbert, I assume that at Redactions *s*, *S*<sub>1</sub>, and *S*<sub>2</sub> the verb of the first clause was 'offerimus', not 'exerimus', as in Reginensis.

Leonianum (Mur. i 480) he will find as follows: 'Precamur o[mn]p. d[omi]n[us] ut *de transitoriis opibus ea potius operemur* quibus ad aeterna gaudia consequenda et spes nobis suppetat et facultas. per' (in 114 letters): and, remembering that the primary aim of the ember seasons was to obtain by prayer and fasting grace so to use temporal things—the fruits of the earth more especially—as not to lose eternal, he will, I think, deem it probable (i) that in the earlier history of our document this 'Precamur' &c. was set forth as in the Leonianum; (ii) that some subsequent editor, repudiating the original intention of the prayer, designed to replace its 'de transitoriis opibus ea potius operemur' by 'a transitoriis operibus abstinentes ea potius operemur'; but (iii) that *de* was inadvertently allowed to remain instead of giving place to *a*. In this unidiomatic 'de transitoriis operibus abstinentes', therefore, I see a clue to the original intention of the Wednesday Mass of Quadragesima week, and thus to the intention of the Saturday Mass set forth in Redactions *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>.

But, if so, what was the equipment of the Saturday Mass in Redactions *s* and *S*<sub>1</sub>? How, that is to say, shall we with reasonable claim to probability reconstruct that Mass for the Saturday of the Roman ember week in spring which, if the account I have just proposed be true, was superseded by the extant group of prayers?

The simplest course would seem to be the right one. It is (i) to cancel the Reginensis Collecta and Oratio for the day in question, in favour of (ii) the first five prayers now found in § xix, and, (iii) retaining the Secreta and Postcommunion, (iv) to eliminate the Ad Populum, because, as is well known, such prayer would not be admitted into a Mass which, having begun *aduesperascente sabbato in diem dominicum*, ended on a Sunday.

By my reconstruction, therefore, the value of the Sunday Secreta in § xvii was at the two Roman editions 141, not 119<sup>1</sup>; and that of the Wednesday Collecta in § xviii was 114, not 127. But these divergencies are slight indeed as compared with the differences yielded by the complex reconstitution of the Saturday Mass in § xviii which I have just proposed. Begging the reader, while he bears in mind the *prima facie* reasonableness of this reconstitution, to remember that, the greater its complexity the greater is the unlikelihood that, if ill-conceived, it should respond to a stichometrical test which we have good reason to regard as trustworthy, I now apply that test.

The result for Quinquagesima week, the capitulum of the first item having been set at Redaction *s* on the last two lines of the previous page (see above, p. 212) is as follows:—

<sup>1</sup> See p. 220, *supra*.

	§ xvii. lma S.	<i>In ieiunio</i> &c.	F. in lma.	Sat. in lma.
	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>
Brought forward . . . . .				
Capitulum . . . . .	80			
Sub-title . . . . .	48 * 2	22 I *	2I I I	22 I I
Collecta . . . . .	82 3 3	7 I *		
Oratio . . . . .	104 3 4	122 4 5	138 5 5	120 4 5
Secreta . . . . .	141† 5 5	112 4 4	90 3 3	126 4 5
Postcommunio . . . . .	111 4 4	114 4 4	100 3 4	147 5 6
Ad Populum . . . . .		90 3 3	81 3 3	104 3 4
Of the following . . . . .	2	88 3 3	137 5 5	86 3 3
Totals (β) for s	15	20	20	20 = 75 (P. 9 ends)
„ (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	100 (P. 18 ends)	19	21	24 = 64 <sup>1</sup>

III. Before proceeding to tabulate the values yielded by my reconstruction of § xviii at Redactions *s* and S<sub>1</sub> I must give my reason for thinking that the Roman capitulum of its Sunday Mass so far differed from the extant heading as to consist of 19 letters, not 50.

The titles of our ferial Masses in § xviii are worded '*Feria ii in quadragesima*', '*Feria iii in quadragesima*', &c.; and thus resemble the '*Feria vi in quinquagesima*', '*Feria vii in quinquagesima*' of the last two items of § xvii (Mur. i 507): but, had they been phrased in analogy with those of the ferial *missae* of the following weeks (see Mur. i 518-532), we should have had '*Feria ii in hebdomada prima*', '*Feria iii in hebdomada prima*', &c. Hence the inference that in these the ferial rubrics of § xviii '*quadragesima*' has not the secondary and improper sense perpetuated in the modern '*quaresima*', '*quaresma*', '*carême*', but its original and proper sense, a sense analogous to that of '*septuagesima*', '*sexagesima*', '*quinquagesima*', '*tricesima*' (a word not infrequently found), a sense the scope of which is confined to a single week. This consideration leads me to believe it morally certain that the Roman heading of the first Mass in § xviii was '*Dñica in quadragesima*' (19 letters), and that the extant '*Ōiones et preces dñica in quadragesimae inchoantis initium*' (not '*initio*') is a Merovingian substitute.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> From their common starting-point on the Feast of the Theophany the scribe of *s* has now covered (75 + 75 =) 150 β lines, the scribe of S<sub>1</sub> has covered 164 θ lines. The proportion 150 : 164 = 11 × 6 $\frac{2}{3}$  : 12 × 6 $\frac{2}{3}$ .

<sup>2</sup> Why the substitution should have been made we must enquire when we endeavour to trace the external history of the document.

We therefore have as follows:—

	§ xviii. xl <sup>ma</sup> S.	M. in xl <sup>ma</sup> .	T. in xl <sup>ma</sup> .	W. in xl <sup>ma</sup> .	F. in xl <sup>ma</sup> .
	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>	s S <sub>1</sub>
Brought forward . . . . .	64				
Capitulum . . . . .	19† 1 1	21 1 1	8 1 1	7 1 1	7 1 1
Collecta . . . . .	141 5 5	83 3 3	108 4 4	114† 4 4	114 4 4
Oratio . . . . .	143 5 5	176 6 7	120 4 5	128 4 5	111 4 4
Secreta . . . . .	142 5 5	120 4 5	142 5 5	75 3 3	122 4 5
Postcommunion . . . . .	82 3 3	76 3 3	114 4 4	77 3 3	78 3 3
Ad Populum . . . . .		86 3 3	97 3 4	91 3 3	97 3 4
Totals (β) for s	19	20	21	18	19 =97
„ (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	83	22	23	19	21 =168

Saturday in Quadragesima.

	s S <sub>1</sub>
Brought forward . . . . .	97 168
Capitulum . . . . .	24 1 1
Dñ qui delinquentes &c. . . . .	194 6 7
Omnium n̄m dñe &c. . . . .	102 3 4
Ieiunia quaesumus &c. . . . .	122 4 5
Adesto quaesumus &c. . . . .	80 3 3
Da nobis obseruantiam &c. . . . .	113 4 4
Secreta (Haec quae nos &c.) . . . . .	70 2 3
Postcommunion (Perpetuo dñe &c.) . . . . .	116 4 4
Of the following . . . . .	1 1
Total (β) for s	125 (P. 14 ends)
„ (θ) for S <sub>1</sub>	200 (P. 26 ends)

Thus do two systems, each of which (see above, p. 212) on the Feast of the Epiphany began on a fresh page, end; each of them on the penultimate line of a page.<sup>1</sup> If that of *s* is original and of earlier date than the other, it is of course the more interesting of the two: it certainly has the characteristics that we should expect to find in a studiously premeditated scheme. An integral page (p. 3) is devoted to the first Mass in the volume<sup>2</sup>; then three (pp. 4–6) to those for the Theophany, Septuagesima, and Sexagesima<sup>3</sup>: Quinquagesima week,<sup>4</sup> as might be expected of a skilled editor familiar with St Leo's two theories, falls into three integral pages (pp. 7–9); while Quadragesima week, as might be expected of such an editor, holds possession of an integral number (pp. 10–14). At what point will he next make a

<sup>1</sup> From their common starting-point on the Feast of the Epiphany the scribe of *s* has now covered (75 + 75 + 125 =) 275 β lines, the scribe of S<sub>1</sub> has covered (100 + 200 =) 300 θ lines. The proportion is 275 : 300 = 11 : 12.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 212.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 222.

logically determined series of items and simultaneously with a group of pages?

The same question may be asked as regards Redaction  $S_1$ , because the twelve  $\theta$  pages over which it distributes §§ xii–xiv, xvii, xviii resolve themselves into two groups of four and eight, respectively, the second group beginning at what was certainly a starting-point in the liturgical year, the first station of St Leo's *observantia paschalis* (see above, p. 222). I cannot help suspecting that the original compiler, the editor of  $s$ , so selected and distributed his prayers and Prefaces as that, in the event of a transcription on  $\theta$  pages, this result should ensue. If this was indeed his design while elaborating §§ xii–xiv, xvii, we may well be curious to learn when next, not only in  $s$  but in  $S_1$  as well, ended item will be found to coincide with ended page.

*The Cismontane Editions of Sections xii–xiv.* In the next table I transcribe from a previous page (see above, p. 212) the values for  $S_1$ , in order the more clearly to shew what were the foresight and care with which I conceive the first of the cismontane editors to have worked.

	§ xii. Theophany.			§ xiii. lxx <sup>ma</sup> .			§ xiv. lxx <sup>ma</sup> .		
	$S_1$	$S_2$	V	$S_1$	$S_2$	V	$S_1$	$S_2$	V
Capitulum . . .	16	*	I	14	I	I	72	I	* I
Sub-title . . .	5	*	I						
Collecta . . .	223	8	8	164	6	6	153	6	6
Oratio . . .	124	5	5	140	5	5	96	4	4
„ . . .	138	5	5						
Secreta . . .	143	5	5	88	3	3	110 (108)	4	4
Preface . . .	314, <sup>1</sup> 301 <sup>2</sup>	11 <sup>1</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>						
<i>Infra actionem</i> . . .	13	I	I						
Communicantes . . .	179	7	6						
Postcommunion . . .	140	5	5	110	4	4	93	4	4
Ad Populum . . .	208, <sup>1</sup> 179 <sup>2</sup>	8 <sup>1</sup>	6 <sup>2</sup>		I		145	6	5
Of the following . . .								I	
Totals ( $\theta$ ) for $S_1$		42		19			19		= 80
„ ( $\theta$ ) for $S_2$			55			20 = 75 (P. 19 ends)		25	(P. 20 ends)
„ ( $\kappa$ ) for V			53			19 = 72 (P. 19 ends)		24	(P. 20 ends)

*Redaction  $S_2$ .* Whether or not the first of the cismontanes had on his desk a copy of the original Roman edition ( $s$ ) in which this group of items filled three  $\beta$  pages, I believe that he, working on  $\theta$  pages, was resolved that it should fill an integral number of these, not, as at  $S_1$ , a mixed number, and that he therefore observed the method which he had adopted when re-editing §§ vi, vii, viii (see above, p. 203); that he gave § xii a second Oratio of 5 lines and an Ad Populum of 8, thus

making this and § xiii fill three pages; and that, as when dealing with § ix (see above, p. 204) he gave § xiv an Ad Populum of 6 lines, thus making it fill, with a connecting rubric, a fourth. Can it be, I would again ask, that ingenious craftsman as he was, he not only worked on membranes which had been ruled at the Lateran,<sup>1</sup> but that he had himself received his professional training there?

*Redaction V.* By the hypothesis, the Ad Populum for the Feast of the Theophany is one of that numerous category of prayers which the first cismontane editor inserted into the document. Now, the Reginensis text of the apodosis of this prayer is 'da plebi tuae . . . ut ad perpetuam claritatem per eius incrementa perueniat'; where, though the grammatical construction is not at fault, we are left in some suspense as to the precise meaning of 'eius'. On the other hand, Rheinau and the uncorrected St Gallen continue the phrase in words which the corrected St Gallen improves into what would certainly seem to be the *textus classicus*, 'da plebi tuae . . . ut ad perpetuam claritatem per eius incrementa perueniat per quem eiusdem sumpsit exordium'. Hence I seem to detect in the Reginensis reading a curtailment made in obedience to the stichometrical necessity to which the editor of V from time to time found himself subject, the necessity of restricting to a multiple of 24 κ lines material which had occupied the same multiple of 25 θ lines.

Of this necessity I see evidence in the absence already noted (see above, p. 212) from Reginensis of the word 'sacratissima', which is found in all the other texts; if not also in its 'puerpera' for 'puerperii'.

Instances justifying the view I take of these two textual peculiarities of Reginensis await us in the sequel. For the moment, therefore, I content myself with observing that if the editor of V had given the Preface and Ad Populum of § xii the ampler of their respective texts, the former of these would have required 11 of his κ lines, not 10, as by my hypothesis it did; and that the latter would have required 7, not 6, such lines: the consequence being that, unlike his predecessor, he would not have kept §§ xii, xiii within the compass of an integral number of pages.

MARTIN RULE.

<sup>1</sup> An alternative to this would be the attractive, and by no means improbable, theory that membranes of θ lineation had half a century earlier been transported to Rome from his own scriptorium; a scriptorium, let us say, in Southern Gaul.

(To be continued.)