paraphrase of that book a translation resembling that of Theodotion, but made before his time and known to the writers of the N.T.

The following are some of the questions arising out of the foregoing discussion. When did the division of the Books dealing with the Monarchy originate? Did the translators find a two-fold or a four-fold division already in existence?* What is the explanation of the ordinary four-fold division? What is the relation of βδ to the Greek version of Judges in the Codex Vaticanus?

H. St J. Thackeray.

'SPANISH SYMPTOMS.'

This title is borrowed; but its appropriation may find some excuse in that the details to be given will perhaps fit into the work of the writer from whom it is here adopted. In the *Book of Cerne* (Cambridge, 1902) it was said there appear to be 'real indications that the rising Church of the English was influenced in the very centre of its life by the then flourishing Visigothic Church of Spain' (p. 277); and it was suggested (p. 280) that this influence was felt through the medium of Ireland rather than of Gaul.

In the present paper I propose (I) to bring together the scattered notices on the subject in the 'Liturgical Note' of that volume, and add a few more details; (II) to consider at what period it is most likely Spanish documents can have made their way into England; (III) starting from the three prayers to the Blessed Virgin in the *Book of Cerne* (nos. 56, 57, 58) to illustrate the Marian cult evidenced in some of our earliest Western liturgy books. The subject of 'Spanish Symptoms' is if not new at least somewhat unfamiliar and at present obscure; it must therefore in any case be dealt with tentatively. What I should wish, however, now to do is to raise this question of the influence of the Visigothic Church on our insular Churches, of England and of Ireland, as a matter to be considered in and for itself; but I shall act as if little more than a finger-post, pointing to the lines of enquiry to be pursued and stopping short at the beginning of them.

It will be well, however, to make clear at once what is the ultimate object, what in a word is the 'use', of such enquiries. At the 'Congrès de l'Histoire des Religions', held at Paris in 1900, one or two voices

* I am aware that the Hebrew MSS have a two-fold division only: but the fact that the Book of Saul (the Greek α) and the Book of David (the Greek ββ with βγ) form two volumes of exactly equal length in Codex B suggests that they may have been arranged as separate books before the translators did their work.

were raised on behalf of the study of Christian liturgy; not by professed liturgists indeed, and (if I remember rightly) only by laymen, who dwelt on the need of pursuing this branch of study specifically as a department of the history of religion. But, so far as I have been able to observe, these voices have not evoked any adequate, or perhaps any, response in the quarters most concerned. Yet these speakers precisely touched, I venture to think, on that which has constituted a weakness, has been the cause of a certain sterility, of liturgical work in the last century; namely, that it has been in the main a study in ritual rather than a study in religion, and has, as a consequence, seemed to be in touch rather with professionalism than with life. However it may be with earlier times, in dealing with the insular Churches of the seventh century we stand, comparatively speaking, on firm ground. I cannot, however, but think that with the 'Church History' which has so long held the field and is so familiar to us, there is call for more attention to the religion of the English and Irish of that age than the subject has hitherto received.[1] It is with this idea in mind that I am here concerned with 'Spanish Symptoms', and engage in the minute and miscellaneous details set out below.

I

The following are the Spanish items pointed to in the 'Liturgical Note' to *Cerne* with some corrections, and one or two additions which would not have been there in place.

(*a*) It has been long since observed that the diptychs of the Stowe Missal (an excellent example of the Irish eclectic, or tinkering, method in liturgy) draws, among other 'sources', on the diptychs of the Mozarabic, or old Visigothic (Spanish) mass (F. E. Warren *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* p. 260 n. 61). In the *Book of Cerne* (p. 270) it was also noticed that a prayer for the dead existing in the Toledan missal in the second half of the eighth century (though not now found in its representative, the Mozarabic), cited by Elipandus, bishop of

[1] I am not insensible of the difficulties underlying the question. Some are touched on, rather rudely perhaps, from the Protestant side in the address of the Geheimer Kirchenrath Lemme to the Evangelical Conference at Karlsruhe in the latter part of 1904 (*Religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung oder göttliche Offenbarung?*, Karlsruhe, 1904); on the Catholic, by Professor Schrörs in his rectorial address before the University of Bonn in the following year. The latter is more urbane, or academic, in his tone; but there is a decisiveness of exclusion, not to say a certain snap, in the title that leaves no opening for doubt as to his meaning (*Kirchengeschichte und nicht Religionsgeschichte*, Freiburg, Herder, 1905). And it must be allowed one difficulty attaching to these studies in religion is obvious even to the unconcerned onlooker, but whether inherent or only actual is not so clear,—namely the ease, the seemingly fatal ease, with which those who pursue them so often *ingenii sui adinventiones faciunt* (*scientiae*) *sacramenta*.

Toledo, in his controversy with Alcuin, is used textually as a preface in the mass for the dead in the Stowe Missal.

(*b*) In *Book of Cerne* pp. 253–254 (28) it is pointed out that a prayer (no. 19) of that collection textually embodies the central prayer, entitled 'mysterium crucis', said in the most solemn part of the Good Friday office of the Mozarabic missal. An addition made by another hand to the original script of *Cerne* gave occasion to observe that there must have existed in England a text yet more closely following that in the Mozarabic Missal than the one given by the composer of the *Cerne* prayer.

(*c*) Attention was also called (*ibid.* pp. 252–253 (25)) to a prayer common to the Mozarabic Missal, the Irish fragment in St Gall MS 1395 (eighth or ninth century) and the very curious burial prayers, quite un-Roman in character but marked by Irish and Spanish affinities, that make up the section iii 91 in the Gelasian Sacramentary. But here I must modify what was there said, that the text in *Mos.* 'offers the original text of which that in *Gelas.* is an enrichment'. Since these words were written Dom Férotin has published his Mozarabic *Liber ordinum* (1904). It contains (coll. 110–111) this same prayer in a full text like that of the *Gelasianum*, and shews (what is of more importance here) that the Irish fragment does not derive from the text in *Gelas.* or the *Liber ordinum*, but from one akin to that in the missal.[1]

(*d*) It was stated (*Book of Cerne* p. 240 (1)) that the *first* prayer (*Deus vitae dator*) in the burial service[2] of the Carolingian Supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary is a prayer of a mass for the dead in the Mozarabic Missal (p. 459. 52–62). Not merely the first, but nearly all the prayers of this burial service are found in Spanish (Mozarabic) books. In view of the fact that it is now commonly, and with fair show of reason, considered that Alcuin is the compiler of this Supplement, a review of these prayers in detail is to the purpose of the present paper. The *second* prayer (*Deus qui humanarum*) is in the 'Agenda mortuorum' of the Mozarabic Breviary (p. clii) and in the *Mozarabic Psalter* (Henry Bradshaw Soc. Publ. xxx p. 353). The first half of the *third* prayer (*Obsecramus misericordiam tuam* to 'suscipias') is a prayer in a mass of the dead in the Moz. Missal (p. 459. 64–70, to 'susceptum'). I do not find the second half ('non ei dominentur') in the Mozarabic books[3]; and it contains the expression 'cum sanctis et electis', which (as pointed

[1] Where *Gelas.* reads 'sequi studeat', and *Lib. ord.* 'sequi gaudeat', *Mos.* and the Irish fragment read 'custodiat'.

[2] 'Orationes post lavationem corporis', no. civ of the Supplement (Muratori *Lit. Rom. Vet.* ii 215–218). It is unnecessary to say how much of what follows has been rendered possible or easy by Dom Férotin's Index to the Mozarabic formulae at the end of his book.

[3] Cf. however *Book of Cerne* p. 266 (68), and *Lib. ord.* 134. 5–6.

out *Book of Cerne* pp. 243–245) is characteristically Irish.[1] The *fourth* prayer (*Deus apud quem*) is in the office of the dead in the Mozarabic Breviary pp. cxlix–cl (*Moz. Psalter* p. 351). The *fifth* (the address *Oremus fratres carissimi pro spiritu cari nostri*) does not appear to be in the Mozarabic books; but the Gallican expression 'cari nostri' as applied to the dead[2], and the Irish 'inter sanctos et electos' would lead us to expect that it is not drawn from a Spanish source. I cannot find the *sixth* prayer (*Deus qui iustis supplicationibus*) in the Mozarabic books; but it contains the characteristic 'cum sanctis et electis', and this prayer also occurs in the burial service of the *Gelasianum* (iii 91; Muratori i 749, ed. Wilson p. 297), and among the prayers for the dead in the Bobbio Missal (Muratori ii 952, ed. Mabillon p. 386). The *seventh* prayer (*Debitum humani corporis*) is also in *Gelas.* (iii 91), but not in the Mozarabic books (it has the expression 'sanctis ac fidelibus'). The *eighth* (*Temeritatis quidem*) is in the Mozarabic *Liber ordinum* (125. 25–42). The *ninth* and last (*Tibi commendamus*) is in the Mozarabic Breviary (p. cli).

It may be objected that Alcuin perhaps adopted a burial service current in France in his day, but this would be a mere conjecture so far destitute of proof. On the other hand, we have in print two burial services of an earlier date than Alcuin's that were in use in France: one of the beginning of the eighth century in the *Gelasianum* (iii 91), and one of the end of that century from the now lost Rheims MS of Godelgaudus, preserved to us by Ménard in his Notes to his Gregorian Sacramentary.[3] It is to be observed that this French burial service, contemporary with Alcuin, contains his fifth and seventh prayers not

[1] This expression occurs twice in *Lib. ord.*, 'cum sanctis omnibus et electis', col. 126. 3–4, col. 423. 34. But the texts of the *Lib. ord.* seem to me, speaking generally, as if they had undergone late revision and to be so far of a value inferior to those of the Missal and Breviary of Cardinals Ximenes and Lorenzana. It also occurs in the letter of Idalius, bishop of Barcelona (Migne *P. L.* 96. 459) to Julian of Toledo acknowledging the latter's *Prognosticon lib. iii* (see p. 283 n. 3 below), but nowhere in Julian's own work.

[2] As to the use of 'carus' for the living, not as in Gaul for the dead, see *Book of Cerne* p. 263 note 4; see also Julian of Toledo's *Prognost.* lib. ii capp. 26, 27, 'charorum viventium', 'charorum superstitum' (Migne *P. L.* 96. 487 D, 488 A, B); in lib. i cap. 19 of the dead 'ubi sepultum sit charissimi corpus' and then immediately after 'a fidelibus charissimis' of the deceased person's living relatives (*ibid.* 474 B); 'cari' for the living in the Bobbio Missal (ed. Mabillon, p. 325); for the dead only once so far as I see in *Lib. ord.* 399. 34; and once in *Moz. Psalter*, 'et omnes patrum fratrum carorumque animas', p. 347. But, as may sufficiently appear from this last quoted book alone, 'cari' is not a characteristic word for the dead in the Spanish as it is in the Gallican documents.

[3] In the original edition, pp. 260–261; in Migne *P. L.* 78. 467, 468; another copy of this service from a Rheinau MS of the same date (Mr H. A. Wilson's R) is in print in Gerbert *Mon. vet. lit. Aleman.* i pp. 314, 315.

identified above, and none of those that occur in the Mozarabic books. But the services in *Gelas.* and in the Carolingian Supplement shew use of Spanish materials, and these prayers bear marks of Irish manipulation at some time in their history. In all the circumstances it is a not unreasonable supposition, as Spanish materials are found otherwise freely current in England and Ireland, that the Spanish prayers in the burial service of the Supplement formed part of the devotional material originally derived from Spain that had by the end of the eighth century become in some measure naturalized in the insular Churches in Alcuin's day, and so came to be utilized by him, with some sparing use of Gallican material, in the compilation of that service.[1]

(*e*) In the 'Liturgical Note' to the *Book of Cerne* attention was called (p. 278) to Harl. MS 3060 ('saec. ix seemingly', or x?) which appears to be a copy of an earlier Visigothic MS of a date (so far as its contents indicate) of the end of the seventh century or beginning of the eighth. This MS contains a prayer which (it was said, p. 279) 'stands behind' a series of prayers in *Cerne* that falls into two groups: nos. 21, 24, 49, and nos. 20, 23, 29, 36. But it is now possible to bring one of these groups into relation with a Spanish liturgical manuscript. The Mozarabic *Liber ordinum* recently printed contains a long series of priest's masses 'for himself'.[2] In one of these the introductory prayer, and the 'alia' prayer following it (col. 266. 22 *Deus iustitiae* to col. 267. 12 *alienum sensum*), are, with a line added at the beginning and the end, the first part of the *Cerne* prayer no. 49 *Oratio penitentis* (p. 145. 14 to p. 146. 17). This raises the further question whether some at least of the *Cerne* prayers enumerated above as having affinity with that in Harl. MS 3060 may not almost as they stand in *Cerne* have come into England from Spain.[3]

[1] It is to be remembered that in this early period Rome had, so far as appears from the documents, no burial service; or rather that its burial service or 'Agenda mortuorum' was a mass (*praesente corpore* doubtless) and nothing else. Hence the peculiar character of the burial services in *Gelas.* and the Carolingian Supplement to *Greg.*

[2] This rich collection counts no less than eleven masses (nos. 5 to 13, 17, 18, of the list at p. xliv). I suspect that the collection, as well as the composition of the individual masses, represents (like so much else in the *Lib. ord.*) a late phase of Mozarabic liturgy. The origination of the priest's 'mass for himself' seems to be due, on the one hand, to the anniversary mass of a bishop's or priest's ordination (*Leon., Gelas.*); and on the other, to the spirit which created and developed the special 'Praeparatio Sacerdotis' found in liturgy books as early as the seventh century (see *J.T.S.* vii 122, 123). No mass 'pro seipso' is found in the Gallican missals, designated *Gothicum*, *Gallicanum*, *Francorum*. The Bobbio Missal of a slightly earlier date has one mass of this kind, 'Missa quomodo sacerdos pro se orare debet' (ed. Mab. p. 357). I have not been able to trace its prayers earlier than this MS.; in the prayer 'ad pacem' occurs the expression 'inter sanctos et electos', and it also shews familiarity with the Roman Canon.

[3] On a comparison of the extracts from *Cerne*, nos. 21, 24, 49, given pp. 278, 279

(*f*) The venerable psalter, Cotton MS Vespasian A I, said by competent judges to have been written in England about the year 700, presents a feature worthy of more attention than it has hitherto received. At f. 156 is the 'Oratio' *Rex Deus inmense*, which is the first item, after the preface, of the collection of 'Carmina' of Eugenius, bishop of Toledo (646–657). This copy is at least a century earlier than any other known; the MSS next in order all date from the ninth century (*Mon. Germ. auctt. antiquiss.* xiv p. 232). How comes it that this piece is found in an English MS written at the turn of the seventh and eighth centuries and within some forty years of the author's death?

(*g*) Many years ago M. Manitius[1] called attention to the use which Aldhelm, in his grammatical work entitled 'Epistola ad Acircium', first printed by Mai (*Class. auctt.* v 501–599), made of the 'Ars grammatica' of Julian, bishop of Toledo (681–690). But here it seems necessary to proceed with caution, for H. Hagen has shewn[2] that Julian made use of a pre-existent anonymous treatise found in Cod. Bern. 203. It would remain then to enquire whether Aldhelm used this treatise directly as found in the Berne MS, or only indirectly through Julian's work.[3] But Manitius also pointed out (p. 611) that Aldhelm had in his metrical riddles made use of those of Eugenius of Toledo[4], and states (p. 535)

of that volume, with the Spanish text in *Lib. ord.* (which runs as follows: 'Parce anime mee, parce malis meis, parce peccatis meis, parce factis meis atque criminibus') it will be seen that the text in *Lib. ord.* covers all the varying forms of the corresponding passage in those *Cerne* prayers, except one, viz. 'parce hereticis meis' (no. 24, p. 122. 20); the absence of which from the Spanish supports the suggestion already made (*ibid.* p. 278 n. 4) that this curious expression is an Irish addition.

[1] 'Zu Aldhelm und Beda' in *Sitzungsber. der phil.-hist. Classe* of the Vienna Academy, Bd. cxii, 1886, pp. 597–599.

[2] *Anecdota Helvetica* (1870), see pp. xxi, xxiii, cciv, ccvi–ccviii, ccxi, ccxviii–ccxix.

[3] I do not know whether this has been already done; Manitius at any rate says nothing on the subject. Julian's grammatical work is not reprinted by Migne and seems to be accessible in its entirety only in the Appendix to Vol. ii of Cardinal Lorenzana's Toledan Fathers. It is curious to observe how, on the one hand, Lorenzana could find no MS of Julian's *Prognosticon futuri saeculi libri iii* in Spain and could refer to the existence of one only, that seen by Ambr. Morales in the sixteenth century, but in the interval burnt; and how, on the other hand, this work (the subject of which is the intermediate state of souls) occurs commonly in the earliest library catalogues but always and only in repositories with 'Celtic' attachments; and when by and by in the tenth century it occurs in other libraries also this is first at Cremona close to Bobbio, and at Lorsch not far from Fulda. See G. Becker's *Catalogi Bibliothecarum antiqui*, cited by number of library and (of item): 8 (32); 10 (5); 11 (142); 15 (242); 22 (235); 32 (543, 568); 36 (76); 37 (368); Fulda MSS in F. Falk (see p. 287 n. 1) vi 4 15 p. 100 and viii 4 15 p. 102 (at viii 1 18 p. 103 is a copy of Julian of Toledo's 'Ars grammatica'). The matter has a bearing on what is said under (*e*) as to early forms of burial service.

[4] Aldhelm *Aen. tetrast.* xi 1–3, cf. Eugenius, carm. lxii, ed. Vollmer *Mon. Germ.*

that L. Müller had already called attention to the fact that in his 'Epistola ad Acircium' Aldhelm cites a verse of the Visigothic king Sisebut (died 621).[1]

Each of the cases above enumerated may, taken by itself, seem a slight matter; but their cumulative force seems considerable. Although the liturgical and devotional documents noticed under (*a*)–(*e*) afford no evidence as to date, the facts set out under (*f*) and (*g*) shew that some sort of communications, or relations, or influence, or call the phenomenon what we will, direct or indirect, existed as between England and Spain in the second half of the seventh century.

II

Extrinsic considerations tend also to shew that such communication would be more likely in that period, or quite in the beginning of the eighth century, than at the end, or early in the ninth. By this date Hispanism and Irishry, in religion and devotion as well as in other respects, had fallen into disrepute. Moreover, in the seventh century whilst the Church of Gaul was the most debased in Western Europe, and promise or hope of better things lay not in native but in foreign and imported elements, Irish, Roman, and by and by English, the Visigothic Church of Spain, a convert Church, was in the full course of its short-lived glory. Strong and self-centred, it was animated by an intense, indeed an intolerant, spirit of nationalism. The English Church was still weak, but it was receptive. There remains the Irish, the most interesting, the most pervasive, of them all. So things stood at the beginning of the eighth century. By its close the situation had completely changed. The foreign elements at work in Gaul had been reinforced and their action had issued in the reformed Church of Charlemagne, with a strongly marked individuality of its own; and this Church, whilst actually antipathetic in regard to other elements which had once enjoyed consideration, was, in spite of the little but noisy trouble as to Images, Roman through and through. It was not the mere repulsion of self-conscious orthodoxy to obstinate and decadent misbelief that

auctt. antiquiss. xiv p. 261 and V.'s note; xvi 3–4, Eugen. xlviii, *ibid.* p. 259 and note; *Aen. pentast.* viii 1–3, Eugen. lx, *ibid.* p. 261 and note. I do not understand Vollmer's note 8, p. xliii of his Preface, as in any way affecting these three cases.

[1] The case stands thus. The verse in question is cited by Aldhelm as Isidore's (ed. Giles p. 232 ll. 4–5), and is drawn from the metrical piece 'de eclipsibus solis et lunae' commonly in the ancient MSS appended to Isidore's treatise 'de astronomia', although it certainly is not Isidore's and comes from the pen of a man not of peace but of war, of a layman not a priest. The Leyden MS Voss 4° 33, embodying much early grammatical material of 'English or Irish' origin, contains a tract 'which (says L. Müller) comes from a compatriot of Aldhelm' and attributes the 'de eclips.' to Sisebut by name: 'et in hoc Sisebuti regis.' See *Rhein. Museum* xxii pp. 86–87.

in the Adoptianist controversy inspired the letter of the bishops of France (794) in answer to Elipandus, bishop of Toledo, speaking in the name of the Spanish Church. Elipandus had written, with some touch of ancient pride, 'our confession is in accord with the teaching of the holy venerable fathers Hilary, &c., &c., Fulgentius, Isidore, Eugenius, Hildefonsus, Julian, and the rest of the orthodox and catholic'. The reply, in which Alcuin had the main hand, breathes the scorn of a master of the newest learning for the great representatives and glories of a fallen Church and a learning now no longer the mode; in the words '*our* Gregory' the actual writer betrays himself. He thus writes as to the liturgical evidence which Elipandus had brought forward from the Toledan Missal. 'It is better to give credit (he says) to the testimony of God the Father as to His own Son than to the testimony of those who composed such prayers for you in your mass as the holy and universal Church of God knows not. Nor do we think God listens to you when you say them. And if your Hildefonsus in the prayers he wrote called Christ "adoptive", our Gregory, Pope of the Roman see and Doctor renowned throughout all the world, in his prayers never hesitated always to call Him the Sole-begotten One'.[1] Who better could know, or better express, the temper of the English Church of his age than Alcuin?

But there was at this time a like recoil from Irishry. On the Continent in ecclesiastical circles inconvenience from the presence of the Irish was felt rather in the sphere of discipline and order. In the last year of Charles's reign, after long intermission, councils were held by superior command in various parts of his dominions. The canons against wandering clerics had Irish priests doubtless in view among the rest.[2] But one only of these councils, that of Châlon, mentions the 'Scotti' by name, and then only to declare that orders received from Scottic bishops, as wanderers and unattached, are to be treated as null and void. Under the rule of the great Offa and the Mercian hegemony England was in thorough sympathy with the policy and sentiment of Charlemagne, in whose administration, even of educational affairs, the Irish no more

[1] See *Mon. Germ. Concil.* ii pp. 111, 145; Migne *P. L.* 101. 1333–1334. Alcuin goes over this liturgical ground a few years later in his 'Adv. Elipandum' (lib. ii capp. 7–9, Migne *P. L.* 101. 264–267), written for Leidradus and his companions on the occasion of their journey to Spain to try and patch up matters. Alcuin makes an effort to be civil and is even flattering as regards Isidore; but his aversion to the 'Toledan Fathers' he cannot suppress; one work, however, among their productions he specially mentions as at least not unorthodox, the *Prognostica* of Julian.

[2] See as to 'clerici vagi' Conc. Mogunt. A.D. 813, can. 22, Conc. Turon. c. 13, Conc. Cabillon. c. 42 (this is the canon as to the 'Scotti'), 41, 44, 45 (*Mon. Germ. Concil.* ii pp. 267, 288, 282). Cf. the 'Annotatio capitulorum synodalium', nos. 42, 58, 104, 105 (*ibid.* pp. 304, 306).

than the Goths could find a place; and they, or the former at least, were left to obscurity in peace. But the contemporary English synod deals with the Scottic question in a different spirit and quite another temper from that of the councils held on the Continent. The synod of Celchyth of July 27, 816, was composed of bishops from all southern England, and Kenulf, king of the Mercians, was 'in person present, with his princes and dukes and nobles'. This synod simply excluded the Scotti summarily, in a body and individually, without benefit of clergy. The canon runs not as if coming from those whose preoccupation it is to correct irregularities and set them right; it is passion that speaks in this decree which is a sentence of ostracism and an expression of racial antipathy.[1]

The Irishman and the Goth, their piety and their learning, are in this period at a discount in England as well as on the Continent. A day of revived influence for the Goth is at hand, and somewhat later, at least on the Continent, for the Irishman too. But if we find in England at the end of the eighth century or in the early decades of the ninth, religious or devotional pieces bearing marked evidence of a piety Spanish or Irish in character, the actual composition of these may, on general grounds, be attributed with greater probability to the turn of the seventh and eighth centuries rather than to that of the eighth and ninth.

But this Hispano-Hibernian character is notably evident in the MS known as the *Book of Cerne*; we must turn aside for a moment to consider so curious a phenomenon; for the actual MS is of the first half of the ninth century, it has come down to us with entries apparently in the Mercian dialect, it contains an acrostic with the name of a bishop Ethel-

[1] This canon is so important in its bearings that I give it here, dividing and italicizing it for easier apprehension. The text as it came from the synod was probably in much the same state as now, since the difficulties are inherent in its drafting and construction. 'Ut Scotti non admittendi sacra ministrare. Kap. quinta interdictum est: Ut nullus permittatur de genere Scottorum (*a*) in alicuius diocesi sacram sibi ministeria usurpare, (*b*) neque ei *consentire* liceat ex sacro ordine aliquot attingere, (*c*) vel ab eis *accipere* in baptismo, aut in celebratione missarum, vel etiam (*d*) Eucharistiam populo praebere: (*e*) quia incertum est nobis unde *en* [= *an*] *ab aliquo* ordinentur. Scimus quomodo in canonis praecipitur ut nullus episcoporum, presbiterorum invadere temptaverit alius parrochiam nisi cum consensu proprii episcopi. Tanto magis (*f*) *respuendum est* ab alienis nationibus sacra ministeria *percipere*, cum quibus nullo ordo metropolitanus, nec honor aliquis habeatur' (Haddan and Stubbs iii p. 581). From the title and from (*a*) and (*e*) it appears that a general exclusion of Scotti from performing acts of the sacred ministry among the people is intended. From (*b*) it appears that licence by the bishop for private acts is forbidden; whilst the prohibitions (*c*), (*d*), and (*f*) are aimed at the reception of baptism or holy communion at their hands, and are a warning against even hearing their masses. I do not see how, when the terms of the canon are fully considered and weighed, it is possible to avoid the conclusion that the whole ground is meant to be covered, and that this is indeed a sentence of ecclesiastical ostracism.

wold, and an Ethelwold occupies the great Mercian see of Lichfield (818–830). It is tempting to settle, without more ado, on Ethelwold, bishop of Lichfield, as the only begetter of this book and so finish with the matter. But I cannot manage to think that in doing so we are really getting to the bottom of it. In the catalogue of the then sadly dilapidated Fulda library drawn up in the second half of the sixteenth century, several books dating from St Boniface's day can still be recognized. There is one MS, of what date we know not, described as 'Ymnarius Edilwaldi'.[1] Dr Traube has remarked on this entry: 'I do not think I can go far wrong if I take this manuscript of Edilwald to be a copy of the Book of Cerne.'[2] The writer of these words is one of the very last scholars from whose opinion I should care to dissent in matters concerning these early times. But in face of the entry in the Fulda catalogue I ask myself whether, whilst unduly emphasizing line 10 of the acrostic:—

'En omnipotenti deo *libellum hanc* ad laudem *scribere fecit*',

he may not have allowed lines 12, 13 to pass without due attention:—

'In domum gredi domini cum fiducia huic uolumini oracul texti
Solum Deum castis *carminibus* indesinenter diligenter pulsate.'

It is true the *Book of Cerne* contains more matter in verse than appears from the print or the titles; but the question arises whether the acrostic was written to apply to the contents of the MS now in the Cambridge University Library, or for a hymnar now lost; some items of which, however, may be still preserved in that MS. Moreover, may not this MS itself, an evidence of reviving or active Irishry, perhaps throw some light on the causes of canon 5 of the Council of 816?

III

Among the prayers of the *Book of Cerne* those addressed to the Blessed Virgin, nos. 56–58, have appeared to some persons among the most notable. Nos. 57, 58 read to me as if somewhat commonplace but genuine.[3] No. 56 was one of the small number of prayers printed from this MS by the late Mr F. A. Paley in his article on 'Liturgical Manuscripts at Cambridge' in the *Home and Foreign Review* in 1862.

[1] See F. Falk *Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion der alten Bibliotheca fuldensis* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1902) p. 102.

[2] *Anzeiger für deutsches Alterthum* (supplement to the *Zeitschrift*) xxix, October, 1903, p. 1.

[3] The word 'saluatrix' in no. 58, p. 155. 16 must not be looked at through modern developments any more than Hildefonsus's 'administratrix Dei' (Migne *P. L.* 96. 65 C). It is characteristic of a certain class of devout minds in all ages to incline to expressions of ambiguous import or interpretation (cf. p. 291 n. 1 below).

As a prayer to the Blessed Virgin it certainly has some noteworthy features: the accumulation on the one appellative 'Dei genetrix uirgo Maria' of twelve adjectives, besides two adjectival clauses; the triple 'exaudi'; the very confident expression 'we trust and know for certain you can obtain from your Son everything that you wish'. These three items make up, it may be said, the whole prayer, which may read to some as betraying a mind overstrung, to others only as if evidencing a desire to do better than a forerunner. It has been remarked that the 'advanced' character of this prayer is a sign of its late origin, an origin as late, say, as the actual manuscript. But this seems subject to a good deal of doubt, and I will close the substantive part of this paper by an attempt to view the particular case in the light that may be thrown upon it by a consideration of some of our early documents relating to Marian cultus in the West.

In the *Book of Cerne* (p. 280 n. 1) those of the seventh century were briefly indicated. The most important are the mass of the Assumption in the great Gallican missal known as the *Missale Gothicum* and the treatise *De virginitate perpetua sanctae Mariae* of Hildefonsus, bishop of Toledo (659–669). This latter, short as it is, is one of the most characteristic productions of the Visigothic Church of Spain in the days of its splendour. On the death in 636 of that great inheritor and representative of the older learning, Isidore of Seville, predominance and influence, the literary no less than the ecclesiastical, passed to the city of Toledo, long the seat of the civil power. Braulio of Saragossa (who died in 646), the friend and literary correspondent of Isidore, was still left to speak for the old school. But his successor in that see, Taius (who once calls himself 'cognomento Samuel'[1]), begins the new, which is continued in the series of great bishops of Toledo, Eugenius, a native of that city and sister's son of Braulio, Hildefonsus, nephew of Eugenius, and by and by Julian, also a Toledan, and a devoted scholar of Eugenius and admirer of Hildefonsus. It would almost seem as if Braulio anticipated but did not appreciate the advent of the new school of learning. When Taius sent Braulio his *Libri quinque Sententiarum*, largely a compilation from Gregory, whose works wanting in Spain Taius had gone to Rome to copy with his own hand, Braulio frankly told him that 'except for what was stolen, or rather corrupted, from Gregory, his book was only good to be thrown aside and trodden under foot'.[2] Taius's letter dedicating this book to Eugenius is a speci-

[1] Migne *P. L.* 80. 727.

[2] He writes: 'Paradigma tuum illud in armatura compositum, quam mihi erat pervium et pede, ut aiunt, conterere, excepto illud, pace Gregorii, quod peculatum, immo corruptum, vidi' (Migne *P. L.* 80. 657). The following illustrates another kind of difference between the old school and the new. Taius writes to Braulio

men of the style carried to such perfection in Hildefonsus's treatise *De virginitate perpetua*, which certainly confirms his successor Julian's recollection of its author as 'disserendi ingenio clarus, eloquendi facultate praecipuus, linguae flumine copiosus', &c. Though perhaps more cultured and certainly of a freer and less artificial vocabulary, it is the same sort of florid elocution, in which triads and quaternions are the soberest forms, that meets us so often in early Irish Latinity.[1] In chapters i and xii Hildefonsus pours himself out in prayers to and appreciations of the Blessed Virgin. Indeed it is difficult to see how a sermon, for instance, addressed in the seventeenth century to the highly patronized confraternity of the Slavery of Mary, then flourishing in various parts of the Spanish dominions, could well be conceived in terms more precise or words more fervent than those used in his twelfth chapter by this seventh-century bishop of Toledo. But Hildefonsus spoke of the Blessed Virgin as yet by way of piety and devotion, not of doctrine, which was to follow later.

The treatise *De virginitate perpetua* does not stand alone. In the year 1577 the Franciscan, F. Feuardent, printed at Paris along with that treatise, and the tract *De partu*, now recognized as a work of Paschase Radbert, eleven sermons. The manuscript from which he drew all these pieces is described by him as 'an ancient codex that had been brought out of Spain by Gotiscalc, a bishop of Aquitaine'.[2] Feuardent's ascription of the sermons to Hildefonsus was accepted until some theologians began to find traces of unsoundness in them, in representing the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven as a pious

about a relic of our Lord's blood, and thus comments: 'Pia quidem talis est religio sed mihi fateor dubia.' Braulio replies: Why trouble about things of doubtful quality like this when we have our Lord's *sanguinem verum* every day on the altar? (*ibid.* coll. 686, 690).

[1] The book itself must be read to get any adequate idea of the author's facility in words and economy in thought. The following which has relation to the present subject may give some notion: 'O domina mea, dominatrix mea, dominans mihi, mater Domini mei, ancilla Filii tui, genetrix Factoris mundi, te rogo, te oro, te quaeso, habeam spiritum Domini tui, habeam spiritum Filii tui, habeam spiritum Redemptoris mei, ut de te vera et digna sapiam, de te vera et digna loquar, de te vera et digna quaecumque dicenda sunt dicam. Tu es enim electa a Deo, assumpta a Deo,' &c., &c. (there follow twelve other clauses of the same kind) (*De virg. perpet.* cap. 1).

[2] Cardinal Lorenzana for his edition of Hildefonsus's *De virg. perp.* used three MSS, all then at Toledo, one of the year 1067, one of 12–13 cent., and a third which was a copy of that of the Aquitanian bishop Gotiscalc, made in the 14th cent. by order of Cardinal Amelil and brought back by him from France. Lorenzana found this last the most correct of the three; which raises the presumption that the MS of Hildefonsus and the sermons from which Gotiscalc's MS was copied was a good and early Visigothic codex (Migne *P. L.* 96. 54 and 235–240).

opinion but not to be certainly affirmed, &c. The sermons then fell into discredit, and so into neglect. Cardinal Lorenzana in reprinting them as an appendix to the works of Hildefonsus, thinks he sees in them traces of differing authorship, and he sorts them accordingly. Of sermon ix, however, he says nothing but this in a footnote: 'almost wholly from sermon viii.' It is of sermon ix precisely that there must be question here, for it contains passages that are to be found textually in the Contestatio (or, as we now say, Preface) of the very noteworthy Assumption mass already mentioned of the *Missale Gothicum*. On examination, too, it appears that these passages do not occur in any other of the sermons; and besides sermon viii, sermon vii also shews affinity with sermon ix.

To make the case clear I give below a print which shews the relation of sermon ix to sermon viii and the passages in sermon vii, together with so much of the Contestatio of the Assumption mass of the *Missale Gothicum* (a MS written about A.D. 700), as is found in sermon ix. But this Contestatio also appears, though in a somewhat shorter form, in one of the two masses of the Assumption of the Bobbio Missal, a manuscript assigned to the seventh century. The omissions and more important variants of the Bobbio Missal are shewn by square brackets.[1] The parts common to sermon ix and the Contestatio are printed in italics.

SERMON IX (Migne *P. L.* 96. 271).	SERMON VIII (Migne *P. L.* 96. 270).
Merito itaque sancta et venerabilis Dei genitrix virgo Maria, caelorum regina, mundi domina, singulari	Merito beata Maria singulari
a nobis praeconio extollitur, quae	a n. pr. attollitur, q.
singulare commercium mundo praebuit.	s. c. m. p.
	Merito inter feminas . . . credidit (21 lines, col. 270 A–B).
Denique tantum se ad caeli fastigium sublevavit ut Verbum in principio apud Deum	D. t. s. a. c. f. s. u. V. i. p.
de summa arce susciperet.	a. Deum id est Dei Filium d. s. a. s. (Then 17 lines, col. 270 B–C).
O felix Maria et omni laude dignissima O genitrix gloriosa. O sublimis puerpera cuius visceribus	O f. M. O g. gl. O puerpera sublimis c. v.
auctor caeli terraeque committitur.	a. c. t. c. (Sermon vii, col. 268 A:

[1] There seems no doubt that the text given in the *M. Goth.* is the original form of the Contestatio; and that in the Bobbio Missal is an abridgement only; note, however, the word 'decorus'.

SERMON IX

Haec est *immaculata coitu, fecunda partu, virgo* lactans Dominum caeli,

angelorum cibum et hominum nutriens

O felicia oscula lactantis labiis impressa !

O felix puerperium, laetabile angelis, optabile sanctis, necessarium perditis, congruum profligatis. Quas ergo laudes o Domina, totius mundi salvatio[1], fragilitas generis humani tibi persolvet quae solo tuo commercio recuperandi aditum invenit.

O quam *venerandum* et *trae caeteris honorandum* hunc *diem* in *quo Dei genitrix Virgo Maria de mundo migravit ad Christum, quae*

SERMON VIII

H. e. i. c. f.
p. v. castitate, haec concepit virgo, non ex viro sed de Spiritu Sancto; haec peperit non dolore sed gaudio; haec nutrivit angelorum et hominum cibum.—Serm. vii, col. 268B: Lacta Maria Creatorum tuum, lacta panem coeli, lacta praemium mundi, &c.; cf. Serm. viii, col. 271B: Lacta ergo mater cibum nostrum, lacta panem caelestem, lacta cibum angelorum, &c.).

O f. o. labiis impressa lactantis, cum inter crepundia reptantis infantiae utpote verus ex te Filius tibi matri alluderet cum ex Patre Dominus imperaret. Nam auctorem tuum ipsa concipiens edidisti in tempore puberem quem habueras ante tempora conditorem.

O f. p. delectabile
a. exspectabile s. n.
p. c. p. qui post multas assumptae carnis iniurias ad ultimum verberatus flagris, potatus felle, patibulo affixus, ut te veram matrem ostenderet, verum se hominem patiendo tormenta monstravit, &c., &c.

MISSALE GOTHICUM
(ed. Mabillon, p. 212).

Dignum et iustum, &c. . . .
[tempore *celeberrimo*
die prae caeteris honorando]. *Quo* fidelis Israel egressus est de Aegypto, q. *Virgo Dei genitrix* [+*Maria Bo*] *d. m. m. a. C.* [*Quae* nec de corruptione suscepit contagium nec resolutionem pertulit in sepulcro; pollutione libera] germine gloriosa, assumptione secura, paradisi dote

[1] See p. 287 n. 3 above.

dolori non subiacuit post *partum*, *non labori* post *transitum*.	praelata, [1] nesciens damna de coitu, sumens vota de fructu, *non subdita dolori* per *p. n. l.* per *t.*
O admirabilem *thalamum de quo speciosus forma prodiit sponsus*. O *lux gentium*, *spes fidelium*,	[nec vita voluntate ne funus solvitur vi naturae.] *Speciosus thalamus de quo* dignus [*decorus Bo*] *prodit* [procedit *Bo*] *sp*, *l. g. s. f.*
tabernaculum gloriae, *templum caeleste*, [2] cui apostoli sacrum reddunt obsequium, ad cuius canunt angeli triumphum, quam Christus amplexatur.	praedo daemonum, confusio Iudaeorum, vasculum [vitae, *t.*] *g. t. c.* (*M. Goth.* then goes off, the Bobbio Missal following, into a long contrast between Eve and Mary to which nothing corresponds in the sermons).

The sermon then goes its own way also; what follows is of no interest here, except this passage the words of which are now commonly familiar, although their source or origin has not (I believe) been hitherto identified :—

'Succurre ergo genitrix Christi piissima miseris ad te confugientibus, adiuva et refove omnes qui in te confidunt. Ora pro totius mundi piaculis, interveni pro clero, intercede pro monachorum choro, ora pro devoto femineo sexu; sentiant omnes tuam clementiam quicumque invocant tuum nomen gloriosum' (col. 272).

It is clear that either the composer of the Assumption mass in *M. Goth.* had before him the text of Sermon ix, or the writer of Sermon ix knew the mass found in *M. Goth.* I cannot but think the first alternative is the true one; and find difficulty in even conceiving in a natural or rational manner how Sermon ix could have been made out of the other pieces indicated, which betoken decadence and corruption, whilst that sermon in its unity, sequence of ideas, freshness, and style, betokens generally an original effort. I do not see how it is possible on the face of things to take any other view than that we have in sermon ix the primitive document [3]. But if this be so, our two missals throw it back

[1] Also *M. Goth.* 'Praefatio' of same mass, p. 211 : 'quae *fecunda virgo*, beata de *partu*' and 'ferens unico beata de *partu*'; cf. the words of serm. ix italicized above: 'et immaculata *coitu*, *fecunda partu*, *virgo*,' &c.

[2] Cf. *M. Goth.* 'Praefatio' of same mass, p. 211 : 'quo beatam matrem Mariam famulantibus apostolis transtulit ad honorem.'

[3] It is undoubtedly imperfect at the beginning as appears from the first words 'Merito *itaque*'. But then the 'itaque' seems fatal also to Lorenzana's notion that ix copies viii; quite independently of the fact that viii seems obviously to spoil

to a date that cannot be much later than the middle of the seventh century; we must remember too that the earliest manuscript we know of came from Spain, and is a copy of a Spanish codex. As the sermon is anonymous so it may well remain. But it seems not too much to say that its origin in all probability lies in the circle who were gathered around the author of the *De virginitate perpetua* at Toledo. And if so, we must recognize in the Assumption mass of the *Missale Gothicum* and the Bobbio Missal another 'Spanish Symptom'. Whether the *Cerne* prayer no. 56 be a 'Spanish Symptom' also must remain, I think, matter of mere subjective appreciation as to the character of the devotion it displays, especially when compared with nos. 57, 58.[1]

IV

In what goes before, the Bobbio Missal has not been specially dealt with. But I am not able to understand the readiness at the present day to view that book as 'Gallican', or Milanese; or the difficulty in regarding it as (what the place of its origin seems naturally to suggest) an 'Irish' production—that is, proceeding from circles, from a community, still Scottic in religious spirit, and in some measure also doubtless in *personnel*. Its strongly marked 'Spanish' character points in the same direction. It is to be remembered too that the Bobbio Missal is but one item to be considered in this connexion. It is surely not by accident that the inestimable 'Orationale Hispano-Gothicum' (one of the two MSS at least) is found in the Verona Library. But I readily leave such questions for another hand altogether better qualified to deal with these continental matters than I who speak only as insular. But it must be added that our insular material too is not exhausted; a systematic examination of *Cerne* in the light of the *Liber ordinum* would doubtless yield interesting results; the investigation of its congener, MS Reg. 2 A xx, is almost untouched; and probably more English and Irish devotional material of as early a date has yet to be printed.

what in ix reads well, e. g. 'Lacta ergo mater' &c., 'cum inter crepundia reptantis infantiae' &c.

[1] It is more than twenty years since the late Professor Scheffer-Boichorst printed in the (Austrian) *Mittheilungen des Instituts* vi (1885) pp. 521–550 his article on the Syrians in western Europe. It attracted (so far as I have observed) little attention, certainly none from the liturgists. M. Bréhier's recent article in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* on the same subject, which I have not had the advantage of seeing, has been more fortunate. I still think (cf. *Book of Cerne* p. 278) that one of the first matters to be investigated, if we would understand the outburst of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin in the West in the seventh century, at least in Spain, is the early translation of pieces by St Ephrem into Latin. As to a Syrian bishop wandering in the south of Spain, see canon 12 of the council of Seville in 618.

The three centuries that elapsed between Caesarius of Arles and Alcuin are the darkest of West European history. Evil though it was beyond compare for the particular see and city of Rome, the case of the 'leaden' tenth century was in no way so desperate. Yet it is precisely in those three centuries that took place the evolution definitely fixing the religion of mediaeval and a large part of modern Europe. The stage then passed through was that one so particularly decisive when popular piety that has listened to the word of the preachers makes the ideas they express, even if but rhetorically at times, its own; and that piety in its slow and silent workings generates by and by a common and accepted belief. Thereafter, by steps natural and easy enough, come the reflexion or reasoning of the more educated on what is so believed, its formulation, consequent disputes, heresy, dogma. It is this consideration which gives value, indeed importance, trivial looking as they may seem or sometimes almost grotesque, to the records coming from this darkest period of the history of the Church. It is too late to begin our knowledge of the post-patristic age with the ninth century, with the Carolingian renaissance, or with Bede who is a figure apart. It is not only in the fixation of the biblical text and the palaeographical declension of 'noster'[1], but in all the great range of items that lie between such extremes, that the ninth century presents us already with a completed work. If we wish to know how the result came about we must look to the years 500–800. The liturgist is better off perhaps than most other kinds of enquirers for this period; but I venture to think that if he wishes his study to be fruitful it must not be divorced from the history of popular religion and current beliefs.

EDMUND BISHOP.

NOT A GLOSS (2 KINGS XV 30 *b*).

THERE is a striking discrepancy between (*a*) 2 Kings xv 30 and (*b*) *ibid.* xvii 1.

According to (*a*) Hoshea slew Pekah, king of Israel, and succeeded him on the throne

בשנת עשרים ליותם בן עזיה

'in the twentieth year of Jotham, son of Uzziah'.

[1] See Traube *Perrona Scottorum* p. 527.

According to (*b*) Hoshea began to reign

בשנת שתים עשרה לאחז מלך יהודה

'in the twelfth year of Ahaz, king of Judah'.

The first statement of date seems to be impossible; sixteen years only are assigned to the reign of Jotham in 2 Kings (xv 33). There is a proposal to shorten his reign by attributing part of it to his regency for his father (2 Kings xv 5*b*; cf. E. L. Curtis, CHRONOLOGY, in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* i 402 *b*), but none for lengthening it to twenty years. Accordingly Stade, in the *Polychrome Bible*, pronounces xv 30*b* to be 'a very late addition'; Benzinger (*in loco*) would strike it out of the text.

But the knife (blind instrument!) should be applied sparingly in criticism. Before 30*b* is finally condemned as a gloss, the text should be more carefully examined. The text is no doubt corrupt, but a corrupt text sometimes conceals a fact worthy of attention.

In the present case we have, I believe, three helps towards the emendation of the passage: *first*, the parallel half-verse, 2 Kings xvii 1; *secondly*, the LXX version of xv 30*b* itself; and *thirdly*, an Assyrian inscription.

In the first place in 2 Kings xvii 1 the statement of date stands outside the construction of the verse; it is an addition to the text, as the writer first wrote it. The hypothesis put forward in this note undertakes to explain the origin of this addition; it suggests that xvii 1*a* is borrowed from xv 30*b*, and preserves a less corrupt text of that passage.[1]

(1) The corruption of בשנת שתים עשרה into בשנת עשרים is an entirely reasonable hypothesis. The possibility of such a misreading *springt ins Auge*, as the Germans say.

(2) The change of the name *Ahaz* into *Jotham* requires more consideration. The point is crucial. Threefold evidence may be brought forward to support the hypothesis of this change.

(*a*) The LXX (cod. B) exhibits the name of *Ahaz* in this verse. No doubt the Greek text is itself corrupt. But I do not think that we can say with Stade, 'Αχας is without doubt an attempt to correct the text'. If so, it was a hopeless attempt. LXX B runs thus:—

ἐν ἔτει εἰκοστῷ Ἰωαθὰμ υἱῷ Ἀχάς

'in the twentieth year of Joatham the son of Ahaz'.

(Ahaz was, on the contrary, the son of Jotham.) The corrupt reading 'twentieth' is retained, and this fact militates against the theory that the LXX took Ἀχάς by way of correction from xvii 1. The more

[1] A memorable date such as that of the tragic death of Pekah the enemy of Judah (2 Kings xv 30*b*) is likely to belong to an earlier stratum of Kings than a merely formal synchronism like that of xvii 1.

reasonable supposition is that the LXX found the name *Ahaz* in some form in xv 30.

(*b*) Transcriptional probability suggests an explanation of the supposed falling out of the name *Ahaz* from Hebrew MSS, and its disappearance from the MT. We have only to suppose (see below) that *Ahaz* is a shortened form of *Jehoahaz* (2 Kings xiii 1), or *Joahaz* (2 Chron. xxxvi 2), and the probability of the loss of the name in the course of transcription becomes apparent. I suggest that the original reading was

ליואחזבניותם

'of Joahaz the son of Jotham'.

The transcriber's eye slipped from the first name to the second, and the transcriber wrote 'of Jotham'. A later scribe added 'son of Uzziah', an obvious gloss. In xvii 1 the compiler added a different description, namely, 'king of Judah'.

In the LXX also transcriptional probability favours the reading *Joahaz*. The original reading was, I believe,

Ἰωαχὰς υἱῷ Ἰωαθάμ.

Ahaz was not recognized under the unusual form of his name, and a careless transposition was made,

Ἰωαθὰμ υἱῷ Ἰωαχάς.

In the course of further transcription the initial letters Ἰω of the second name were lost in the preceding υἱῷ, so cod. B reads

Ἰωαθὰμ υἱῷ Ἀχάς.

(*c*) The supposition that Ahaz is a shortened form of Jeho-ahaz (Jo-ahaz) is confirmed by an inscription of Tiglath-pileser III (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ii 20).

The Assyrian king, after mentioning the kings of Ammon, Moab, and Ashkelon as his tributaries, adds the name of Ya-u-ḫa-zi (mâtu) Ya-u-da-ai. This can only be Jeho-ahaz (Joahaz), i. e. Ahaz of Judah; cp. 2 Kings xvi 7, 8.

I conclude that 2 Kings xv 30*b* is not a late, but an early passage, and that it yields Hebrew evidence that the true name of Hezekiah's father was not *Ahaz*, but *Jehoahaz* (*Joahaz*).

W. Emery Barnes.

A TENTH-CENTURY FRAGMENT OF TERTULLIAN'S *APOLOGY*.

In view of the slender ancient testimony to the text of Tertullian's *Apology*, it seems worth while to report the readings of a tenth-century MS of chapters 38, 39, and part of 40, especially as its text is closely related to that of the important Fulda MS which is now lost. The excellent manuscript catalogue of the Rheinau collection, now in the Kantons-Bibliothek in Zürich, has never been printed, and it is probably on this account that the fragment has hitherto escaped notice. MS xcv (saec. x) is a collection of passages from various authors which interested the compiler, something after the fashion of the 'Collectaneum' of Sedulius Scottus at Cues on the Mosel.[1] Among these are to be found the *De XII Abusiuis Saeculi*, which is sometimes attributed to Cyprian, and on pp. 175–184 Tertullian's *Apology*, chaps. 38–40 (down to *tantos ad unum* = Oehler I (Lips. 1853) p. 267, 4). I here give a collation of the extract with Oehler's text.

Oehler.	*Rheinaug. etc.* (λ = Fulda MS).
nec	ne (= F λ *Vindob.*)
licitas	inlicitas (= λ)
timeri solet	praecauetur (= λ)
constat	costat
quae res	qua (= λ)
concilia curias	curias concilia
contiones	conditiones
inquietaret	inquietarent (= λ)
quaestu	questum
coepissent	coepisse
homines	*om.* (= λ)
nobis	uobis
gloriae	gloria (= λ)
unam	una
aeque	atque adeo (= λ)
renuntiamus	renuntiauimus
eorum	illorum
est	enim (= λ)
dictu	dictum

[1] For which see S. Hellmann's *Sedulius Scottus* (München, 1906).

Oehler.	*Rheinaug. etc.*
post uanitate *nihil*	*post* uanitate *habet* licuit epicureis aliam decernere uoluptatis ueritatem, id est anima (animae λ) equitatem. In (= λ)
nouisse	nouissime (= λ)
reprobamus	probamus
Sed licuit Epicureis aliquam decernere uoluptatis ueritatem id est animi aequitatem et ampla negotia Christianae	*om.* (= λ)
ut qui	quo minus (= λ)
ostendam	ostendam si etiam reuelauerim ueritatem (cf. λ uer. reuel.)
coetum	coetu (= λ)
congregationem	congregationem facimus (= λ)
orantes	*om.* (= λ)
ministris	ministeriis (= λ)
pascimus	poscimus
praeceptorum nihilominus	nihilominus praeceptorum
inculcationibus	in conpulsationibus (= λ)
futuri iudicii	iudicii futuri
honoraria	oneraria (= (λ))
conpellitur	conpellitus
confert	confret[1]
nam inde	quippe (= λ)
ingratiis	ingratis (= G λ)
ac puellis re	*om.* (= λ)
destitutis	destitus
senibus	senibus iam otiosis (= λ)
sectae	sectae conflictantur (cf. λ conflictatur)
nobis inurit	uobis inurit
et ut (= A B G λ)	et (= D E)
enim	enim sunt

[1] This spelling I have also seen in Clm. 6312 (saec. ix) of Ps.-Aug. *Quaest.*

Oehler.	*Rheinaug. etc.*
alterutrum	alterutro
erunt	*om.* (= λ)
fratres nos vo-	fratrum appel-
camus	latione censemur (λ, *sed hic* censemus)
opinor	opinior
quam quod	quam cum
At (= λ etc.)	*om.*
quanto	quanto nunc (cf. λ quando nunc)
patrem deum	deum patrem
spiritum biberint sanctitatis	sanctitatis spiritum biberunt (*quoad* biberunt λ etc.)
exclamat	exclamant
ex	*om.* (?)
loco	solo (= λ)
maiorum et sapi-	malorum et suorum
entissimorum	sapientiorum (cf. λ sapientiorum suorum)
quam	quas
donauerant	donauerunt
lenones	leno est (= λ etc.)
philosophus	philosopus
conviolatur	conuiuatur (= λ)
coenulus	caenula
morituri (*alt.*)	moriantur (= λ)
Saliis	si aliis (= λ etc.)
Herculanarum	herculanorum
polluctorum	polincto lucitorum (= λ)
Apaturiis	apparaturis
Dionysiis	aconisi
delectus	dilectus
indicitur	inducitur
Sarapiacae	se arapia ae (cf. λ serapiae)
sparteoli	spartioli
de solo	doloso (λ *habet* de loco)
vocatur quod	uocatum quō (λ uocatum quo)
refrigerio	refrigiorio
parasiti	parasti
saginandi	sagenandi
qua	quia
est convivii	conuiuii est
ut qui (*pr.*)	ut (= λ)
deum sibi	sibi deum
dominum	deum (= F λ)

Oehler.	*Rheinaug. etc.*
sanctis	diuinis
provocatur in medium deo canere	de deo canere prouocatur in medio (cf. λ de deo)
in eruptiones	ad inreptiones (λ in inceptiones)
ut	et
damnanda	sane damnanda
om.	si non dissimilis damnandis (= λ)
de ea queritur	deaquaeritur
quo	quō
cuius	ciuius
neminem laedentes	*om.*
accommodandum	adcommodandum
qui adversum	quid aduersus
sane	plane
omnis publicae cladis omnis popularis incommodi	omnis popularis omnis publicae cladis incommodi in primordio temporum (λ *habet* in primordio temporum)
arva	rura (= λ)
stetit	non stetit
adclamatur	*om.* (= *aliquot edd.* : λ *habet* inclamant).

The close relationship between the Zürich extract and the Fulda MS is at once evident.[1] The accuracy with which the old scholars collated the latter is incidentally illustrated. Some readings given above are manifestly wrong, but they may help in tracing the date and character of this special form of text. Other readings are mere variations of order. The remainder seem worthy of consideration.

ALEX. SOUTER.

[1] Compare the case of the Fulda (formerly Weingarten) and Rheinau MSS of Sedulius Scottus. Hellmann (*op. cit.* p. 190 ff) has shewn that they are both copies of the same lost MS.