

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

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

## NOTES AND STUDIES

THE LEONIAN SACRAMENTARY: AN  
ANALYTICAL STUDY.

FOR reasons which I propose to submit to the judgement of scholars, I believe the greater part of the acephalous collection of *missae* and other items preserved in the chapter library of Verona (cod. lxxxv) and known by the speculative title of *Sacramentarium Leonianum* to have been composed either by or for Pope Leo the Great (A. D. 440-461) and his immediate successor Hilarus (A. D. 461-468), and in the first instance to have been set forth on twenty-five line pages of the average capacity of 28 letters to a line; that under Hilarus a second and somewhat amplified redaction was elaborated with no less care than its predecessor, on twenty-five line pages of the average value of  $30\frac{1}{2}$  letters to a line; and that a third and considerably augmented edition was compiled by or for Simplicius, the next Bishop of Rome (A. D. 468-483), on twenty-five line pages, the lines of which had the average capacity of 32 letters each. The three stichometrical units—28,  $30\frac{1}{2}$ , 32—postulated by my theory are in the following essay denoted by the symbols  $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ .

In setting the period of editorial activity within these three pontificates I find myself at variance with the author of *Origines du culte chrétien*, who does not seem to have entertained the idea of a possible succession of redactions, and attributes the compilation of the work to as late a date, at the earliest, as the year 538. He bases his opinion on two passages in the document.

One of these is the *Secreta* of XVIII xxviii (73: 19),<sup>1</sup> 'Munera nomini tuo . . . deferimus qui nos ab infestis hostibus liberatos paschale sacramentum secura. placida. tribuisti mente suscipere per.'<sup>2</sup> On this

<sup>1</sup> By 73: 19 I mean page 73, line 19 of Dr Feltoe's very useful little edition (Cambridge University Press, 1896). For purposes of reference the Abbé Migne's reprint from the Ballerini is equally serviceable (*Serius Latina* vol. lv). In the 'De Rebus Liturgicis Dissertatio' prefixed to Muratori's *Liturgia Romana Vetus* (col. xvi et seqq.) will be found a carefully written account of the theories and queries that have been hazarded on the subjects of date and authorship.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori makes 'secura', not 'placida', the excepted word. He, with the other editors before Dr Feltoe, reads 'tribuis', not 'tribuisti'; thus misinforming Mgr Duchesne on a detail of some significance. The past tense serves to prove that the Mass was written after, not at, the *paschale sacramentum*.

he says (p. 130) 'Les sièges ou pillages de Rome par Alaric, Genséric, Ricimer, se placent tous dans les mois d'été; il ne peut donc y avoir été fait allusion dans la prière qui nous occupe. Au contraire, le long siège de Vitiges, qui dura une année entière, fut levé au mois de mars. Cette année-là (538) le dimanche de Pâques tombait le 4 avril. La coïncidence est remarquable'; where it is evident that he restricts 'paschale sacramentum' to Easter Day, thus contravening the evidence of the Leonianum itself, which in one of the Pentecostal prayers of Section X (23 : 18) gives a scope of no fewer than fifty days to the phrase.—'O. s. d. qui paschale sacramentum quinquaginta dierum uoluisti mysterio contineri,' &c.—and thus forbids us to exclude from consideration any day between Easter and Whitsunday.

The other passage, into which I restore in italics words overlooked by Mgr Duchesne, is more to the purpose than that just cited. It is part of the Preface of XVIII vi (59 : 11):—'Agnosimus enim . . . agnosimus sicut profetica<sup>1</sup> dudum uoce testatus es ad peccantium merita pertinere ut seruorum tuorum labore quaesita sub conspectu nostro manibus diripiantur alienis et quae desudantibus famulis nasci tribuis ab hostibus patiaris absumi.' On this he says (p. 131) 'En 537 ce furent les Goths qui moissonnèrent dans la campagne de Rome, et, du haut de leurs murailles, les Romains durent assister avec douleur à cette opération qui faisait passer entre les mains des assiégeants le fruit de leurs propres travaux'. This may be true of the summer of 537; but it cannot be correlated with the Preface of XVIII vi, which gives no hint whatever of sorrow-stricken spectators gazing from beleaguered walls. That Preface tells us of two distinct things, a *direptio* and an *absumptio*, a *direptio* carried out under the eyes of the Romans and an *absumptio* permitted by an angry God; and, while it leaves us free to infer that the *absumpta* may have been the cereal crops of the Campagna, its explicit employment of the very words of the prophet Ezekiel (vii 21) obliges us to see in the *direpta*, not the fruits of the earth, but the products of human skill; the handiwork of goldsmith, silversmith, and other like artificers. The reference to the prophet's words is, I repeat, explicit—'Dabo illud (*scilicet* argentum et aurum et ornamentum monilium) *in manum alienorum ad diripiendum*.' Since, then, it is of common knowledge that no such *direptio* followed the siege of Rome by Witiges and his Ostrogoths, for after attempting its walls for a year and nine days they retired and left the city untaken, the positive argument from XVIII vi may be dismissed.

My predecessor has, however, a negative argument which he formulates thus:—'Il est d'ailleurs absolument impossible de rapporter cette prière aux temps d'Alaric et de Genséric . . . Quand ces envahisseurs se pré-

<sup>1</sup> Dr Feltoe omits 'profetica'. See Mur. *Leon.* col. 355.

*sentirent* (the italics are mine) devant Rome la saison était trop avancée pour que les récoltes fussent encore sur pied.' Not at all. The wheat harvest of the Roman Campagna begins in the second half of June,<sup>1</sup> and thus at a moment which in the fifth century, and as computed by the Julian calendar, synchronized as nearly as may be with the middle of the month. What, then, are the facts? The long and terrible siege by Alaric ended on August 13, 408, and thus included both the wheat and the barley harvest. The five months' siege by Ricimer ended on or about July 11, 472, and thus included the earlier, if not the later, ingathering. Between those events, and in the summer of 455, occurred not a siege, but the leisurely, if exceptionally clement, pillage of Rome by the hosts of Gaiseric. It began, according to the computation of one of our most trustworthy authorities, on the last day of May and ended on Tuesday, the fourteenth of June<sup>2</sup>; while another reckoning, which I suspect to be more accurate, sets the happy day on Saturday, the eleventh, the very eve of the day on which the Romans in that year kept Whitsunday. Thus an *abreptio* such as that implied in the Preface of XVIII vi, a Preface which, with remarkable significance, gives no hint of either arson or massacre, was brought to an end at the very moment when the cornfields round Rome were ready for the sickle; while, by a coincidence equally remarkable, the summer of 455 is the only summer in which it is possible to set the *Secreta* of XVIII xxviii in chronological co-ordination with the Preface of XVII vi.

Instead, therefore, of saying that the *Leonianum* cannot have been compiled before the year 538 it will be safer to say that it comprises material which cannot have been in existence before the June of 455.

The theoretical reconstruction which I propose to make of the *Leonianum* at each of the three redactions postulated by my theory will suffice to prove that each of the successive constituents of its several items must have begun at the beginning of a line; and that the scribes employed on the work did not anticipate the very ingenious method by which under Gregory the Great, more than a century later, rubrics,

<sup>1</sup> My authority is Professor John Martyn (sometime Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge), who in his commentary on the *Georgics* (London, 1741) says on iii 132, 'The beginning of the Roman harvest was about the latter end of their June. . . . The barley harvest was reckoned to begin about the latter end of June or the beginning of July.'

<sup>2</sup> I am not aware that historians have made use of the *Secreta* of xviii xxviii in their endeavours to determine that date of Gaiseric's entry into Rome. Dr Hodgkin, who has bestowed much pains on the subject, in the second, not the first, edition of his *Invaders of Italy*, makes the thirty-first of May the day of Gaiseric's entry; but I think that this is three days too late. The data are these:—Maximus was acclaimed emperor on March 16 and was killed on the seventy-second day, May 26. On the third day after the 26th, that is to say on the 28th, Gaiseric entered Rome, which he plundered 'per quattuordecim dies' and thus until June 11.

text and minor rubrics were so distributed and packed together as to avoid the occurrence of residuary blank spaces.<sup>1</sup>

Now, although it is theoretically conceivable that a group of *missae* which in a document executed after the older method had filled an integral number of  $\theta$  pages (i. e. pages each of whose five-and-twenty lines was capable of holding, on the average, 28 letters) would when transferred to  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  pages (i. e. pages each of whose five-and-twenty lines had the average value of  $30\frac{1}{2}$  or 32 letters) require for its accommodation the same or some smaller number of integral pages, we may assume that the coincidence would happen, if ever, yet very rarely indeed. What, then, are the devices by which an editor who was set on bringing about the coincidence could so enhance his material as to gain that object?

1. He might amplify the capitulum so as to make it need one or more lines than heretofore for its accommodation. 2. He might, instead of affixing the customary 'per' to a Preface, write *in extenso* the conclusion proper to it; or make a like addition to a *Communicantes* or a *Hanc igitur*. 3. He might make good one or more lines in this place or in that by appending, before the usual 'per', a new sentence to a prayer or Preface. Caution would in such case be needed, lest the resultant whole should fall asunder on inspection; but should he be careless of detection he would perhaps take no pains to avert it. Careful he certainly would be, if but ordinarily careful, to eschew a repeated 'dñe', a second 'quaesumus' and an awkward repetition of the copulative 'et'. 4. Or, more intimately, he might expand existing work by engrafting here and there a new clause into it. The risk attending such an artifice would be considerable; such as tautology, disbalanced antithesis and crippled rhythm.

I believe the compiler of the second edition postulated by my theory to have used each of these expedients in order to counteract a necessary 'shrinkage': but the last of them was, by reason of its ready adaptability to occurring needs, so serviceable (especially in the case of a long series, when a careful bibliographer would divide his material into parts each of which was to fill an integral number of carefully computed pages) that the compiler of the third of my postulated editions would also be likely to use it.

<sup>1</sup> St Gregory's method, a method employed by his early successors, is more easily illustrated than described, thus :—

tibus pium benignus au-  
M unera dñe sc̄r̄r̄. | ditum. p.  
oblata sc̄ifica nosque a  
peccatorum nr̄orum ma-  
T ua nos p̄cc̄. | culis emunda. p.  
dñe sacramenti libatio  
&c., &c.

5. Or, an editor might introduce here another *Secreta*, there another *Preface*, elsewhere another *Postcommunion*.

6. If his wants were few, or if he was working his way carefully he might here and there introduce a brief elucidatory rubric which, however short, would yet monopolize a line. This would leave intact work which was not his own but another's. 7. Or, he might extend the series to a predetermined limit by adding one or more new *Masses*.

I believe, as the result of a laborious analysis of the document, that the last two expedients were in favour with the editor of the third general recension.

A word or two must here be added about the second of the seven devices just enumerated. There are in the *Leonianum* sixteen *Prefaces*<sup>1</sup> which, while undoubtedly older than the last redaction, do not end with the bare notification 'per',<sup>2</sup> but with a few words suggestive of what was meant to follow and, besides these, 'etc.'; thus, 'unde profusis gaudiis etc.', 'et ideo etc.' The 'etc.' is never absent. Now, when in these sixteen instances we have to compute the stichometrical value of the *Preface* as written at the third of my postulated redactions our course is, I think, clear. We must assume it to have been written as it stands in the *Verona MS*. But if we wish to reconstruct the  $\alpha$  text and, behind that, the  $\theta$  text, we must provide ourselves with a working hypothesis possessing a stronger *a priori* claim to probability than any other.

I infer, then, from the invariable presence of 'etc.' in these sixteen cases, as contrasted with its absence in all others, that in the  $\alpha$  redaction the several conclusions may have been set forth at full length, and that they may have been so set forth because at that time they were not as yet of common knowledge; and, regard had to their comparatively small number and to the striking dissimilarity of the forms employed—such as 'unde profusis' &c., 'et ideo' &c.—to the conventional 'per'—by which was meant 'per xpm dnm n per quem' &c.—that they were more recent than the first edition. This is the working hypothesis which would seem to follow the 'line of least resistance'. I venture to hope that whenever I have to make use of this hypothesis the reader may find that, though it complicates the argument, it strengthens it.

#### SECTIONS VIII, X.

The first two complete Sections of so much of the *Leonianum* as survives at *Verona* are those devoted to the *Ascension* and to *Whitsun*

<sup>1</sup> At VIII ii, iii; x i; XIII ii, iii; XIII iii, vi; XVI ii; XVIII iii; xx vi; xxvi i; xl ii, iii, iiiii, vii, viiii.

<sup>2</sup> The older editors persistently printed 'per etc.' instead of 'per'. Dr Feltoe has happily corrected them.

Eve. Like Sections XIII and XIII, like XXIII, XXV, and XXVI, like XXVIII and XXVIII, like XXX and XXXI, like XXXIII and XXXIII, like XLI, XLII, and XLIII, they represent when taken together, though not singly, an integral number of such pages as I believe to have been used by the compiler of the third edition postulated by my theory. A fact so attested may not be regarded as fortuitous. I therefore deal with Sections VIII and X not separately but together. In terms of letters the values of their several constituents are as follows :—

VIII. PRECES IN ASCENSA DÑI. (no numeral) 179, 128, 152, 105, 100, 143. i : 292. ii : 319. iii : 167, 97. iiiii : 228, 149. v : 113, 336. vi : 88, 216, 92, 150.

X. ORATIONES FRIDIE PENTECOSTEN. (no numeral) 177, 216, 152, 89. ITEM ALIA : 173, 138, 114, 140, 113, 73, 457, 79, 187.

IN PENTECOSTEN ASCENDENTIBUS &c. i : 134, 109, 171, 190, 147, 391. ii : 155. IN IEIUNIO, &c. 117, 98. PRAESUMPTIO &c. 475, 168, 91, 121, 100, 85.

When computing in terms of letters the value of a prayer or other constituent I assume not only the *nomina sacra* to have been written in their immemorial forms, but also 'spiritus' and 'sanctus' when used as common nouns and in their derivatives. I also assume 'christianus' to have been written 'xpianus', and 'noster' when in agreement with 'dñs' or 'dñ' to have been expressed by the single letter 'ñ'. I always neglect the first letter of a constituent, since I assume it to have been set in the margin and thus outside the lineation.

In the foregoing list of values five corrections are needed, corrections which we must not forget when expressing those values in terms of lines. 1. The words 'mysteria . commercia.'—the second enclosed by points—in the sixth constituent of VIII (20 : 26) are rival forms,<sup>1</sup> one of which must be neglected. 2. Instructed by the Ambrosian Missal (Pamelius 374), I insert 'conditor'<sup>2</sup> between 'substantiae' (22 : 2) and 'respice' in the 'humanae substantiae respice dñ' of the first prayer of VIII v, thus raising 113 letters to 121 (4  $\theta$  lines to 5). 3. In the Preface of the same item 'uetustate' must, I feel sure, be introduced between 'pestifera' and 'destructa' (22 : 10)—'nisi qui, pestifera uetustate destructa, subversa tyranni iura calcarit'. For an instructive parallel compare the 'omni ritu pestiferae uetustatis abolito' (79 : 17) in the Preface of XVIII xxxvii. My correction raises 336 letters to 345 (12  $\theta$  lines to 13, 11  $\alpha$  lines to 12). 4. In the Benedictio Fontis

<sup>1</sup> For 'commercia' see the *Secreta* of VIII xxiii (10 : 21) of XVIII xxv (71 : 30) and of XL iiiii (161 : 22). See also my *Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, pp. lvii 9 a 10 b.

<sup>2</sup> For 'nostra', 'humana', 'conditor', 'substantia', see 22 : 18, 23 : 25, 24 : 3, 32 : 31, 55 : 18.

Mellis et Lactis of X i 'patribus' (25 : 9) must be governed by an omitted 'promisisti',<sup>1</sup> and 390 raised to 400 (13 a lines to 14). The value in terms of  $\theta$  lines of this insertion into the Canon will be considered anon. 5. In the fifth prayer from the end of X (26 : 6) a word seems to have fallen out before 'et pacem'. I shall revert to this presently. Whatever it be, it gives the constituent the value of 7  $\theta$  lines.

A textual correction, though not of stichometrical significance, may here be proposed. In the prayer next before the first Preface in X, for 'societ' (24 : 2) I should read 'satiēt'.

Now that I am about to construct my first table of linear values let me explain that in the horizontal rows of Arabic figures on the reader's left such of these as are unbracketed represent ordinarily the values of rubrics or constituents in terms of  $\alpha$  lines; but that when  $\theta$  values differ from these they are set before them between brackets, and that when  $\beta$  values differ from these they are subjoined between brackets. The aggregated values in terms of  $\theta$ , of  $\alpha$  and of  $\beta$  lines are ranged in the perpendicular columns. Here, however, let me add that before dividing the number of letters in a constituent by 28, by 30½ and by 32, in order to ascertain its equivalent in terms of such lines as I conceive to have been used in the three redactions postulated by my theory, I deduct 3 from that number, if, as is generally the case, the word 'per' is appended to the constituent, for, written as a crossed 'p', it could, should necessity so require, be set in the margin; and, further, that when, in the case of a short constituent, the number of letters divided yields a remainder of not more than three or, at the most, four letters, I neglect such remainder, for an ordinarily expert scribe would in a case like that foresee and provide against so small a surplus.

These details borne in mind, I now resolve the values in terms of letters of Sections VIII and X into their equivalents in terms of  $\theta$ , of  $\alpha$  and of  $\beta$  lines; with the following result:—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
VIII. PRECES IN ASCENSA DÑI.	8	8	8
(7) 6, 5(4), (6) 5, 4, 4, 5 . . . . .	31	29	28
i: 1, (11) 10(9) . . . . .	12	11	10
ii: 1, (11) 11 + 4(10) . . . . .	12	16	11
iii: 1, (6) 6 + 4(5), 4(3) . . . . .	11	15	9
iiii: 1, 8(7), (6) 5 . . . . .	15	14	13
v: 1, (5) 4, (13) 12(11) . . . . .	19	17	16
vi: 1, 8, (8) 7, (4) 8, 6(5) . . . . .	<u>22=125</u>	<u>20=125</u>	19

<sup>1</sup> For this see Mur. Greg. 506.



	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
X. ORATIONES PRIDIE PENTECOSTEN, 8(2)	8	8	2
(7) 6 : (8) 7, (6) 5, 8 . . . . .	24	21	21
1, 6, 5, 4, 5 : 4, 8, (17) 15, 8, (7) 6, 0(1)			
[- 21 : (34) 81 (32)] . . . . .	55	52	53
i: 1, 5 (4), 4, (6) 6 + 4(6), 7 (6), (5) 5 + 2(5),			
(11) 14 + 1 (13), 0 (1) . . . . .	39	49 = 125	40 = 225
ii: 1, (6) 5, 0(1), 4, 4(3), 0(1), (17) 16(15), (7) 6	39	36	36
8, (5) 4, 4, 8 . . . . .	<u>15 = 175</u>	<u>14 = 175</u>	<u>14 = 275</u>

As to Section VIII, the estimate for the first of my postulated redactions needs but little explanation. I assume that the Preface under 'ii' (21 : 11) ended with 'participes. per', thus comprising 310 letters, not 319 (11  $\theta$  lines, not 12); and that the Preface of iii ended (21 : 16) with 'conlocavit. per'. The text of the next Preface invites no modification; for it is that usual in the Leonianum, but prolonged for the insertion of a needed 'eundem'. In v, as already explained,<sup>1</sup> necessary corrections raise the two totals to 5 and 13  $\theta$  lines. Thus, the ultimate result, five integral pages of five-and-twenty  $\theta$  lines each, attests not only my main theory of an original thus paginated, but so much of my subsidiary theory on the subject of Prefaces as relates to the first redaction, and, besides these, the textual emendations proposed in the item numbered 'v'. It remains for us to see whether or not the attestation is fortuitous; whether or not, that is to say, like treatment applied to other Sections is destined to yield the analogous result of an integral number of  $\theta$  pages.

As to Section X in such first redaction as is postulated by my theory I assume, in obedience to my hypothesis, that at that redaction it appeared in its 'simplest expression'. I assume, that is to say, that there were as yet no needless prolongations of Preface (24 : 29) of Communicantes (25 : 5) or of Benedictio Fontis Mellis et Lactis (25 : 13). I further assume that the three subordinate rubrics (at 24 : 18, 25 : 19, 25 : 25) were not as yet inserted: the first, 'IN PENTECOSTEN ASCENDENTIBUS A FONTE,' because it is implied in the capitulum of the Section; because it is, though superfluous, yet a general heading and therefore one of the rubrics which, if analogy may guide us, the original editor never set elsewhere than on the first line of a page; and because it is belied by the numerals—'i', 'ii'—which follow it: the second, 'IN IEIUNIO QUARTI MENSIS,' because it is wrongly placed (25 : 19), being set after the first prayer of the Mass; because it is worded unlike those of its class elsewhere<sup>2</sup>; and because it resembles others which,

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> 'In ieiunio quarti mensis.' Analogy gives 'In ieiunio mensis quarti'. See XII (27 : 31), XXVII (108 : 29), XXVII VIII (114 : 24), XLIII (168 : 1).

as the sequel shews,<sup>1</sup> are proper to the third redaction; the last (25 : 25), 'PRAESUMPTIO &c.', because it is one of those supererogatory 'advertisements' which, as again the sequel shews,<sup>1</sup> are peculiar to the last redaction. And, yet again, I assume that the Benedictio Fontis Mellis et Lactis was in its first estate considerably shorter than it now is. I gather from a footnote of Dr Feltoe's that each of the phrases 'et pota . . . ueritatis' (25 : 6-8) and 'terram fluentem melle et lacte' (25 : 10) is enclosed by points. This must be taken to mean that they are extraneous to the original text<sup>2</sup> and that 'enutri eos' must be corrected to 'enutri famulos tuos'—a nett enhancement of 8 letters. The first value of the Benedictio would thus be  $[391 + 8 - (63 + 26) = ]$  310<sup>2</sup> letters, or 11  $\theta$  lines.

Thus reduced to its simplest textual form, X resembles VIII in representing an integral number of pages of 25  $\theta$  lines.

On the assumption, which will be justified in the sequel, that at the second of my postulated redactions unwonted conclusions to Prefaces were written *in extenso*, we have for that redaction of VIII an aggregate of five *a* pages, and for X a provisional total of seven such pages. I call it provisional, because I assume that the Communicantes (25 : 5) and the Benedictio Fontis Mellis et Lactis—the latter now enhanced by the phrases 'et pota . . . ueritatis' and 'terram fluentem melle et lacte'—were then extended, the one as far as 'xpi', with a total of 205 letters (7 *a* lines), the other as far as 'benedicis',<sup>4</sup> with a total of 432 (15 *a* lines). The sequel will shew, for only thus can each several detail of my reconstruction be verified with the rigour which it challenges, whether or not I am well advised in assuming the 'etc.' appended to those constituents to have a significance analogous to the 'etc.' at the end of a Preface.

In the third pair of columns I reckon the capitulum of X as equivalent in textual requirement to two, not three, lines, because its place is not at the head of a page. The like will be done in all such cases.

<sup>1</sup> See xvi; xvi xi, xiii, xvii, xxi; xvii i; xviii xxxi, xxxiii; xxvii vi, vii, viii, &c., &c.

<sup>2</sup> For other instances of words or phrases thus enclosed see 10 : 10, 13 : 18, 17 : 7, 20 : 26, 28 : 16, 38 : 6, 48 : 11, 66 : 22, 79 : 9, 119 : 16, 123 : 31, 126 : 15, 149 : 21.

<sup>3</sup> Or, possibly, 304, by omitting 'fontis' (25 : 6) from the first clause of this most interesting Benedictio. It would almost seem as if, besides the milk and honey heretofore blessed at Pentecost in the Roman as in the African Church, water had been given a place in the Roman rite at some time in the interval which separated the second from the first redaction. See Mur. *Grvg.* 505.

<sup>4</sup> The formulae in the Canon of the Mass are, as the reader may remember, 'Communicantes . . . et memoriam uenerantes in primis gloriosae semper uirginis mariae genitricis di et dñi n̄ ih̄u xpi' and 'Per quem haec omnia dñe semper bona creas sc̄ificas uiuificas benedicis.'

The Ballerini<sup>1</sup> stigmatize the Leonianum as a 'magna congeries . . . ualde perturbata', and visit with special censure several peculiarities which I should prefer to regard, not as inherent faults, but as evidences of its evolution. One of the counts of their indictment is this, 'Missae in ieiunio quarti mensis inseruntur duae missae in dominicum pentecosten quae praemitti debebant.' This is far from accurate. The so-called 'missae insertae' are not two in number, but four (26 : 7, 26 : 18, 27 : 1, 27 : 19); and, of the total six, not only are the second, third, fourth, fifth and last ranged in proper chronological order, they are duly subordinated to the capitula of the Sections in which they severally stand; so that the first (beginning at 25 : 14) is the only anomalous Mass of the six. And even this would, as of course, be classed as Pentecostal, were it not for the notification 'IN IEIUNIO QUARTI MENSIS' which precedes its second prayer. For two reasons: First, because its heading 'ii. ITEM ALIA' sets it in the same category with the Mass next before it (24 : 18), which is certainly of the Vigil; secondly, because two of its prayers, 'Da nobis' &c., and 'Concede nobis' &c. (25 : 15, 20), appear in the Gelasianum (Mur. *Gel.* 600) as members of an *Item aliter in uigilia pentecosten*. In a word, there is nothing in the six Masses that presents any difficulty save the 'IN IEIUNIO QUARTI MENSIS'; and in that notification I see, not chaos, but a problem that challenges solution. A solution I now attempt.

The Whitsuntide of the year 455 is on two accounts memorable in the history of Rome.

It was in that year that Leo the Great reluctantly kept the Feast of Easter on a day which, though by the Alexandrian computation it was the twenty-first day of the first lunar month, was by the Roman computation the twenty-fourth; and thus, as he protested, a week after the proper time.<sup>2</sup> As a consequence of this seven days' postponement, he perforce kept the Feast of Pentecost on the twelfth of June; not, as he would have preferred, on the fifth. Now, it is, I believe, impossible to infer from the letters and sermons of Leo what was the rule by which he computed in any year the incidence of the first of the summer ember-days; whether, that is to say, his first summer ember-day was always the Wednesday in Whitsun week, to the exclusion in any and every year of the second Wednesday in June as a preferable date. But the question need not detain us, for in 455 the Roman Whitsun Wednesday, as distinguished from the Alexandrian, fell on the eighth of June, and was thus the second Wednesday in the month. If, then, we assume that in 455 Leo kept his first summer ember-day on the eighth, we assume him to have obeyed what he believed to be a binding

<sup>1</sup> Migne S.L. iv 14.

<sup>2</sup> See S.L.M. *Epp.* cxxi, cxxii, cxxvii, cxxxvii, cxxxviii.

law in ordinary cases. If on the fifteenth, we assume him to have imposed on the Roman Church more than Proterius, his antagonist at Alexandria, had asked of him, and in doing so to have forgone the most practical protest in his power against what Prosper of Aquitaine, his assessor on subjects of both sacred and secular lore, characterizes as the 'pertainax intentio Alexandrini episcopi'.<sup>1</sup> I prefer the former alternative, and find the preference justified by several characteristics of the two Masses (25 : 14 and 26 : 7) which have suggested the foregoing considerations.

The first constituent (25 : 15) of the former contains in the striking phrase 'Da nobis . . . *nouam* tui paracliti sp̄italis obseruantiae *disciplinam*'—a phrase which is yet more striking if, as is possible, the proper reading be 'Da nobis . . . *noua*' tui paracliti sp̄italis obseruantiae *disciplina*'—what looks like an allusive reference by way of *aequiocatio* to the novel computation which Leo so reluctantly adopted in the year 455. Again: the second constituent of this penultimate Mass of Section X embodies three phrases (25 : 20), 'militiae xp̄ianae,' 'sc̄is inchoare ieiuniis' and 'contra sp̄itales nequitas pugnaturi', identical with three of Leo's on the summer fast,—'Hi itaque doctores . . . tirocinium militiae christianae sanctis inchoauere ieiuniis ut contra spiritalis nequitas pugnaturi abstinentiae arma caperent.'<sup>2</sup> Yet again: the Preface of the Mass is circumspectly worded; for, unlike the corresponding constituent in XII (28 : 7-11), it neither says nor implies that the Pentecostal feast is over. Nevertheless, by its oblique citation (25 : 27) of the passage, 'Numquid potestis filios sponsi, dum cum illis est sponsus, facere ieiunare?' (St Luke v 34), it invites the inference that it was composed for use between Ascension Day and Whitsunday. Nor is this all. The next constituent embodies a prayer for *peace* (26 : 6), and the Preface of the following Mass (26 : 30) declares *unity* to be the perfecting of true religion. Can it be by mere accident that Leo himself in his letter of instruction to the Gallican and Spanish bishops (Ep. cxxxviii) says '*studio unitatis et pacis* malui orientalium definitioni acquiescere quam in tantae festiuitatis obseruantia dissidere', and that Prosper,<sup>3</sup> who, since he was the reputed writer of many of Leo's most important letters,<sup>4</sup> may have given Leo's written prayers the benefit of his censorship, has left a like statement upon record,—'Exstant eiusdem papae epistolae ad . . . Marcianum datae . . . quibus ecclesia catholica instrui potest quod haec persuasio studio *unitatis et pacis*

<sup>1</sup> *Chronicon*, s.l. (Migne S.L. li 606 A).

<sup>2</sup> The MS has '*noua . . . disciplinam*'.

<sup>3</sup> S.L.M. *Sermo lxxviii* (Migne S.L. liv 416 B).

<sup>4</sup> 'Epistolae . . . Leonis . . . aduersus Eutychem . . . ab isto [Prospero] dictatae dicuntur,' Gennadius *De Scriptoribus* § 84 (Migne S.L. viii 1108 A).

tolerata sit potius quam probata, nunquam deinceps imitanda' ? For these reasons I propose 'unitatem' as the word awaiting reinstatement in the last prayer (26 : 5) of the penultimate Mass. Nor must we overlook the parallelism between the 'noua obseruantiae disciplina' in the first prayer (25 : 15, 16) of these two *missae* and Leo's phrase in the letter just cited, 'tantae festiuitatis obseruantia.'

The other event which made memorable the Whitsuntide of 455 was the fourteen days' plunder of Rome by the hosts of Gaiseric. It began on one of the last three days of May and ended on or about the Whitsunday of Leo's reluctant adoption. Bearing this in mind, let us revert (26 : 7) to the Mass, the Preface of which I mentioned just now ; the Mass immediately following the ember *missa* we have been discussing.

The sequence is in literal truth immediate ; for no heading, however brief, separates the one item from the other. In this I see no oversight, but a confirmation of my view. The former of the two, a Mass *in ieiunio*, would be said at sunset ; but before it was over the evening star must already have appeared, and a Mass for the Vigil would therefore follow without delay and without the preliminary of a Collecta. Hence, as I venture to think, the absence of a distinctive heading to the latter of the two *missae* ; hence also the absence of a prayer antecedent to the Oratio, 'Da quaesumus' &c. (26 : 7). On such a night, then, as that of the eleventh of June, 455, when the Vandal still lurked near, if not in, the city, could any Oratio have been more appropriate than this prayer to the 'all-merciful God' that the assembled congregation might not be thrown into confusion by 'hostilis incurisio', or any Post-communion better fitted to the occasion than the brief and hurried cry (26 : 15), 'Adesto dñe quaesumus populo tuo et quem mysteriis caelestibus imbuisti ab hostium furore defende. per' ?

If this be so, we may reasonably see in Section X an aggregation of six groups of liturgical compositions :—1. A series of four preliminary prayers (23 : 2-16), penitential in character, and, since they contain (23 : 7) a reference to 'uerbera multiplicata', compiled in a year of many troubles. 2. A series of four prayers (23 : 18-30) separate, it may be, from these in respect of time. 3. To be said consecutively with one or other of these (23 : 31-24 : 17) the constituents of a Mass proper to Whitsun Eve. 4. As an alternative to this Mass, and for use on a Whitsun Eve when there had been a solemn baptism of catechumens, a second, beginning with the Oratio 'Praesta nobis' &c. (24 : 20), and ending with the Benedictio Fontis Mellis et Lactis. 5. A Mass (25 : 15-26 : 6) compiled for the concurrence in 455 of ember-fast and vigil. 6. The sequel of this, and used instead of 3 or 4, a Mass (26 : 7-16) proper to Whitsun Eve.

Of these groups 5 and 6 are certainly synchronous ; so in all proba-

bility are 3 and 4, which, with the capitulum and group 1, represent an aggregate of  $[3 + 24 + 34 + 39 = ] 100 \theta$  lines. It is, therefore, theoretically possible that the Section as now known to us is the result of a revision which, made in or after the year 455, raised its stichometrical value from four  $\theta$  pages to seven by the introduction of groups 2, 5 and 6, groups of the value of  $[21 + 39 + 15 = ] 75$  lines. If so, the original scheme of the Section may be referable to a yet earlier year in the summer of which there happened events of such a sort as to provoke not only the cry for propitiation and succour which rings through the four prayers of group 1, but the specific mention (23 : 3, 7) of 'merita supplicia' and 'uerbera multiplicata'; and thus to 452, the year of Attila's invasion of northern Italy. This would give us:—

	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$
X. ORATIONES PRIDIE PENTECOSTEN	3	3
[1] 7, 8, 6, 8 . . . . .	24	24
[2] 1, 6, 5, 4, 5 . . . . .		21
[8 and 4] 4, 8, 17, 8, 7 and 1, 5, 4, 6, 7, 5, 11 . . . . .	<u>73 = 100</u>	73
[5 and 6] 1, 6, 4, 4, 17, 7 and 8, 5, 4, 8 . . . . .		<u>54 = 175</u>

SECTIONS XI, XII.

Here we have in terms of letters:—

- XI. IN DOMINICUM PENTECOSTEN. 120, 109, 372.
ii: CONTRA INIMICOS &c.
- 132. CONTRA IMPETITORES, 172, 95, 277.
iii: 86, PRÆCE. EF. 95, 151, 94.
- XII. IN IEIUNIO MENSIS QUARTI, 123, 149, 136, 239, 90, 185.

As in analogous instances, I assume the needless rubrics (27 : 2, 6) in XI ii to be 'padding' peculiar to the third redaction postulated by my theory; and to that redaction I attribute the 'XII' prefixed to the heading of the ember Mass, for only then do I find that, throughout the remainder of the document, a capitulum was ever made to stand elsewhere than at the head of a page. I also assume that, as in all analogous instances, the editor of the second general redaction, differing thus from the other two, prolonged the text of the Communicantes in iii by adding where 'etc.' now stands (27 : 28) 'inprimis gloriosae . . . xpi', thus giving the constituent 212 letters (7  $\alpha$  lines) instead of 151.

We shall find on an early page that the last constituent of XVI xvii (44 : 29) would seem to have been amplified by a process of cumulation from 2  $\theta$  lines, first to 5 of  $\alpha$  value and then to 6 of  $\beta$ ; and that the last prayer of XVI xxi (47 : 7) falls asunder into two parts, the first of which is found elsewhere standing alone as a prayer complete in itself. We shall also see that an obvious stichometrical reason is to be given for each of these peculiarities. Like phenomena, and a like explanation, will be found in the final constituents of XVIII xv and XVIII xxxiii. These evidences of editorial economy in compensation

of the 'shrinkage' consequent on the use of ampler units of linear capacity are anticipated in the last constituent (28 : 14) of the series with which we are now concerned. It falls asunder into two distinct prayers, the first of which, 'Adesto . . . conserua,' Muratori (*Mur. Greg.* 255) in one of his MSS finds standing alone as a composition complete in itself. The needless 'dñe' (28 : 16) in the second of these looks like a survival, and justifies us in inferring that, with a now cancelled subject, perhaps 'populi tui', it is the original Super Populum of the Mass, in [87-9=] 78 letters (3  $\theta$  lines), and that 'Adesto dñe . . . conserua' is adventitious.

But, curiously enough, a point (.) has been set between the two halves.<sup>1</sup> In this I see a corrective memorandum by a reviser of the third general redaction; in all probability the last editor himself. We shall find traces of his pen in later parts of the document. The intention seems to have been to resolve the double whole into two distinct prayers, thus replacing one constituent of 185 letters (6  $\alpha$  lines and 6 of  $\beta$ ) by two, of 110 and 87 letters (4 and 3  $\beta$  lines) respectively; and by that means to make the series fill 99 lines.

These qualifications borne in mind, we obtain the following list of equivalents in terms of lines:—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XI. IN DOMINICUM PENTECOSTEN	3	3	3
(5) 4, 4, (14) 18 (12) . . . . .	23	21	20
ii: 1, 0(2), 5, 0(1), 6, (4) 8, 10(9) . . . . .	26	25-49	27-50
iii: 1, 8, (4) 8, (5) 5+2(5), (4) 8 . . . . .	17	17	15
XII. IN IEIUNIO MENSIS QUARTI, 1(2)	1	1	2
(5) 4, 5, 5, (7) 8, 8, (3) 7(4, 3), . . . . .	<u>30=100</u>	<u>32=99</u>	<u>32=99</u>

The second item—the record, it may be, of a Whitsun-Monday Mass celebrated by Leo—invites notice. 1. Although the first, second and last of its four constituents made mention of the Holy Spirit, the mention is subordinated to the governing theme, the *evacuatio* and *expugnatio* (27 : 4, 5) of assailants who were not only enemies of Rome but foes to the Catholic faith. In these assailants I see, as do the Ballerini,<sup>2</sup> the Arian Vandals who held possession of Rome in the early June of 455. 2. The choice of 'captiuitas' in antithesis to 'uictoria' (27 : 8) in the second prayer, a choice the more remarkable as the words are there employed in a spiritual sense, is such as might have

<sup>1</sup> The thanks of scholars are due to Dr Feltoe for his care in noting this and other like instances.

<sup>2</sup> Migne S.L. lv 42 D. They are mistaken, however, in their chronology. Gaiseric did not enter Rome on Whitsun-Tuesday. His fourteen days' plunder of the city had by that time come to an end. He was then outside the walls ravaging the Campagna,

been suggested by that occupation: in other words, its 'de captiuitate uictoriam' reads like an allusive reference, by means of *aequiuocatio*, to that event, as does the 'noua disciplina' (25: 15) in XI ii to the new-fangled yoke of a Paschal computation which St Leo so keenly resented. That 'captiuitas' was his word for such an occupation as Gaiseric's is proved by the oft cited sermon in which he passionately demanded of his hearers 'Quis hanc urbem a captiuitate eruit? Quis a caede defendit?'<sup>1</sup> 3. A like allusive reference would seem to be discernible in the 'securitas' and 'tranquillitas' of the Preface (27: 14, 15). Viewed in its seeming relation to the last two items of X (25: 19, &c. and 26: 7, &c.), this is a very interesting Mass. It serves to prove that the series in its present completeness cannot have been put into bibliographical form before the summer of 455, although there may have been an earlier scheme in which the second of the extant items had no place. 4. Regard had to the circumstances in which the Preface would seem to have been composed, the Ballerini are therefore probably right in suggesting 'et terror illatus' as preferable to 'et error illatus' in the last clause of the Preface.

The 'PRÆCE · SF' which occurs in the third item is probably a corrupt reading of two corrective memoranda which we should be able to understand if we had them in their proper guise. My predecessors have failed to remark that the first prayer (27: 20) of the item as now arranged is not an Oratio, but a Secreta; that the second reads like a Postcommunion converted into a second Secreta by the substitution of 'praeparet' (27: 23) for 'reparet', and that the proper place for the last is at the beginning of the group. The oversight is the more remarkable because the order I suggest is that observed by St Gregory on the Tuesday in Whitsun Week.<sup>2</sup> St Gregory, however, instead of 'Purificet . . . perficiat' (27: 21) wrote 'Purificet . . . efficiat', and instead of 'Mentes . . . praeparet' (27: 23) 'Mentes . . . reparet'. I venture, therefore, to suggest that in 'PRÆCE · SF' we have the mutilated residuum of memoranda directing one or both of two necessary changes; the distribution of the three prayers in their right order—'Adsit', &c., 'Purificet', &c., 'Communicantes', &c., 'Mentes', &c.—and the substitution of 'reparet' for 'praeparet'. But why this disorderly sequence? The question is the more pertinent because this is the only instance of the kind that occurs in the document. It is also

<sup>1</sup> *Sermo lxxxiv* (Migne S.L. liv 433 B).

<sup>2</sup> For this I have the authority of the Missal of St Augustine's, Canterbury (p. 53 a). The academical exploit of Alcuin for some time current in the Frankish kingdom (Mur. Greg. 7-182) has 'praeparet', although it makes the prayer a Postcommunion. On this curious *collectio orationum Gregorianarum* see my communications to *The Athenaeum* of August 5, 19, September 2, 1905, on *The Last Eighth-Century Gregorianum of the Roman Church*.



the more interesting because the only case which in any way resembles it is that of a complementary prayer added to XXI *iiii* in a second  $\theta$  scheme of the series for St Laurence. Now, we have seen it to be possible that there had been a prior scheme of Section X, a scheme of 100 lines; a scheme the value of which was raised to 175 in or after the summer of 455. We have also seen that in the present series item *ii* is referable to the summer of 455.<sup>1</sup> If, then, as I suggested just now, item *ii*, in 26 lines, was *ex post facto* to a prior scheme of presumably 75 lines, an abatement of the value of a line must have been made in some one of the other items when *ii* was introduced. I would suggest, therefore, that *iii* was the Mass marked for retrenchment, the reviser's intention being to replace one of its constituents by a shorter prayer; and that by a blunder of the scribe's the right order of the item as thus re-cast was disturbed in the course of transcription.

## SECTIONS XIII, XIII.

The first list of values for XIII and XIII is as follows:—

XIII. VIII. KAL. IUL. &c., &c. (no numeral) 193, 109, 610, 97, 209.    *ii*: 104, 127, 863, 106, 141.    *iii*: 197, 92, 287, 112, 104.    *iiii*: AD FONTEM, 175, 149, 260, 123.    *v*: 157, 220, 215, 439, 110, 142.

XIII. IN N̄ SCÖRUM IOHANNIS ET PAULI.    *i*: 144, 68, 304.    *ii*: 128, 109, 252, 109, 212.    *iiii*: 127, 221, 117, 212.    *v*: 154, 131, 403.    *vi*: 94, 402, 99, 222.    *viii*: 81, 212, 105, 115.

A few textual modifications would seem to be necessary:—

I 1. The 'et' (28:25) in the first *Secreta* of XIII, unless it be redundant, a possible echo of the preceding 'ut', should not stand before 'uenerando', but before 'gratiam'. 2, 3. The 'sedula uoce benedictione susciperet' (29:4) in the Preface must, I think, be due to vocal or visual misdirection, the true form being 'sedula uoce benedictionis susciperet'; and for 'seraque' (29:6) I propose 'seroque'. 4. For 'inueniant' (29:16) in the first *Super Populum* I read 'perueniant'. 5. For 'consecrari' (30:26) in the Preface of XIII *iii* we should perhaps read, with Dr Feltoe, 'consecrare dignatus es'. 6. The 'et ut' (31:29) in the second prayer of *v* (31:29) resembles the 'ut et' in that of *i*; and the copulative, unless it be due to clerical oscitancy or other error, should be set before 'praesentia'.

II 1. In the second prayer of XIII *ii* (33:7) we should perhaps insert 'munera' after 'Dicata nomini tuo'. See the same prayer in VIII *xl* (18:23). 2. In the Preface of the same Mass (33:10) insert 'generis' after 'humani', 3, 4, 5. In the last prayer of *iiii* (34:7)

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 527, 529.

cancel the second 'dñē'; substitute, with Dr Feltoe, 'adsequantur' for the first 'percipiant', and for 'humili' read 'humiliter et'. See a similar phrase in XVI xvii (44:31). 6. In the first prayer of v (34:13) for 'beatorum . . . glorificatione' read 'de beatorum glorificatione'. 7. In the Preface of viii (35:25) 'sčas' would seem to be an error for 'suas'.

To effect a probable reconstruction of the first and second redactions postulated by my theory we must bear in mind the following considerations:—

1. That the rubric 'AD FONTEM' in XIII iiiii (31:5) is not necessarily to be assigned to the first of these, or even to the second. Analogy suggests the third. The reference would seem to be to the chapel which Hilarus, the successor of St Leo, built and sumptuously embellished (A. D. 461-468) as part of an architectural scheme enclosing the Baptistry of Constantine at the Lateran. The Liber Pontificalis mentions it as 'ad sanctum Ioannem iuxta sanctum fontem'.

2. That XIII ii has two Secretae (33:4 and 7), a redundancy to which, if analogy may guide us, the third redaction has the presumptive claim.

3. That of the juxtaposed alternatives in the Preface of XIII ii (33:13, 14) the less elegant form, 'atque in membris . . . sequeretur,' may be presumed to be the earlier; while, if analogy may guide us, the briefer and better, 'et eadem . . . in membris,' may with some confidence be attributed to the *a* reviser. We should thus have, as against the 252 letters of the Verona book, a first total of 225 (8 *θ* lines) and a second of 217 (7 *a* lines).

4. That the textual blemishes crowded into the Super Populum (34:6) of XIII iiiii suggest the inference that there has been some none too careful cumulation of phrase by way of compensation for the 'shrinkage' consequent on transference to pages of ampler capacity.<sup>1</sup> The prayer as originally written would seem to have comprised the first and last of the three parts which now compose it,—'Beatis . . . intende, sed ut . . . percipiant.' They yield a total of 120 letters (5 *θ* lines, 4 of *a*). The present form of the prayer, regard had to the slovenly condition of the text, is more likely to be referable to the third redaction than to the second.

5. In accordance with my theory concerning such forms as 'propterea' &c. and 'unde cum angelis' &c., I compute thus the *a* values of the Prefaces to which those forms are added:—

Preface of XIII:	ii	863-17+128 = 974	(33 <i>a</i> lines);
"	"	iii 287-17+128 = 398	(13 " );
"	"	v 438-17+128 = 549	(18 " );
"	XIII:	iii 212-19+128 = 321	(11 " );
"	"	vi 402-12+143 = 533	(18 " ).

<sup>1</sup> See the curiously parallel instance in XVI xvii (44:29-32).

These considerations kept in view, we obtain the following values in terms of lines :—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
<b>XIII. VIII KĀL. IŪL N̄ SCĪ IOHANNIS BAPTISTAE</b>	8	8	8
7 (6), 4, (22) 20 (19), (4) 8, (8) 7 . . . . .	45	41	39
ii: 1, 4, (5) 4, (31) 29 + 4 (27), 4, 5 . . . . .	50	51	45
iii: 1, 7 (6), (4) 8, (10) 10 + 8 (9), 4, 4 . . . . .	30	32	27
iiii: AD FONTEM 1, 0 (1), 6, 5, 9 (8), 4 . . . . .	25	25	25
v: 1, (6) 5, 8 (7), (8) 7, (15) 15 + 8 (14), 4, 5 . . . . .	<u>47 = 200</u>	<u>48 = 200</u>	43
	$\theta$	$\alpha$	
<b>XIII. IN N̄. SCŌRUM IOHANNIS ET PAULI</b>	8	8	8
i: 1, 5, 8 (2), (11) 10 . . . . .	20	19	18
ii: 1, 0 (4), 4, (8) 7 . . . . .	13	12	16
iii: 1, 4, (7) 7 + 4 (7) . . . . .	12	16 = 50	12
iiii: 1, (5) 4, 8, 4, (5) 4 (7) . . . . .	23	21	24
v: 1, (6) 5, 5 (4), (15) 14 (13) . . . . .	27	25	23
vi: 1, (4) 8, (14) 18 + 5 (13) . . . . .	19	22	17
vii: 1, 4 (3), 8 (7) . . . . .	13	13	11
viii: 1, 8, (8) 7, 4, 4 . . . . .	<u>20 = 150</u>	<u>19 = 150</u>	<u>19 = 524</u>

Henceforth the occasions are infrequent on which in the second general redaction a Preface or Communicantes is supplemented by a fully developed conclusion in order to make good the 'shrinkage' consequent on transference of text from the  $\theta$  to the  $\alpha$  lineation; but where it was freely used there was little, if any, likelihood of need for other expedients. For example: in Section VIII the eight lines thus lost—two in the first item, one each in i and iii, and two each in v and vi—were made good by four lines of developed conclusion in ii and the like in iii; no other means being employed (see above, p. 521). Similarly, in XIII the ten lines lost by 'shrinkage'—four, three, one, two lines, respectively, in the first, second, third and fifth items—were compensated by a fully evolved 'unde cum angelis' in the second, third and fifth; and by no other means. Again; in XIII nine lines similarly lost were made good by nothing more than fully evolved conclusions in iii and vi. So far as our examination has hitherto gone, the compiler of the second redaction postulated by my theory has only once resorted to any other mode of textual enhancement; I refer to the addition made in the last prayer of XII (28: 16).<sup>1</sup> (See pp. 527, 528.)

<sup>1</sup> The amplifications in the Benedictio Fontis Mellis et Lactis cannot have been made for a merely stichometrical purpose.

But the compiler of the third redaction employed different methods. When he transferred VIII, X from the  $\alpha$  to the  $\beta$  lineation, the two Sections underwent a contraction of the value of eight-and-twenty  $\beta$  lines. Twenty-five of these were equivalent to a page and might therefore be neglected; but the remaining three were made good by the needless rubrics, 'IN PENTECOSTEN ASCENDENTIBUS A FONTE' (24 : 18), 'IN IEIUNIO QUARTI MENSIS' (25 : 19) and 'PRAESUMPTIO ET REPARATIO PRIMI HOMINIS' (25 : 25). Again; the four lines lost by the transference of XI, XII from  $\alpha$  to  $\beta$  pages were made good by the 'CONTRA INIMICOS' &c. (27 : 2) in XI ii, which required two lines for its accommodation, by the 'CONTRA IMPETITORES' in the same Mass and by the anomalous 'XII' prefixed to the ember Mass.<sup>1</sup> Similarly; the like transference of XIII, XIIIII caused a 'shrinkage' of the value of thirty-four lines. Twenty-five of these might be neglected, for they were equivalent to a page; but the scribe adequately rectified the remaining deficit by the needless 'AD FONTEM' (31 : 5) in XIII iii, the supernumerary *Secreta* (33 : 4) in XIIIII ii, and the 'tui sunt . . . exspectant' somewhat clumsily thrust into the Super Populum of XIIIII iii (34 : 7).

## SECTIONS XV, XVI.

Sections XV and XVI, though nominally two, would seem to have been in the first instance a single and undivided series; for their collective items are comprised in a single numeration, they have a common subject-matter, and the rubric to which the dividing numeral 'XVI' is prefixed (36 : 21) governs no more than one short paragraph, and that a paragraph of separate attribution and merely occasional applicability.

The manifestly cumulate construction of some of their many prayers and Prefaces attests my theory of three successive redactions on pages of  $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  lineation; as also do the six *notae*—'FĒ.' in one place, 'F. Ē. SP.' in three, 'P. SP. F. Ē.' in one, and 'P. F. Ē. SP.' in one—which have long baffled the curiosity of the learned.

The first list of values is :—

XV. IN Æ. APOSTOLORUM PETRI ET PAULI (no numeral) 152, 141, 332.			
XVI. CONIUNCTIO OBLATIONIS &c., 226.	ii : 126, 756.	iii : 149, 185.	iiii :
137, 140, 141, 169.	v : 225, 143, 927.	vi : 109, 144.	vii : 74, 98.
127, 129, 149, 118.	viii : 173, 140, 251.	x : 110, 370.	xi : POST INFIRM-
TATEM, 390.	xiii : 128, 143, 161, 158.	xiii : 103, POST INFIRMITATEM, 337, 105,	

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 522, 527, and 528.

142. xiii: 190, 116, 479, 138, 126. xv: 162, 97, 465, 97, 119. xvi: 182, 112, 273, 104, 134. xvii: 152, 110, POST INFIRMITATEM, 400, 135, 171. xviii: 92, 140, 98, 103, 83. xix: 202, 289, 161, 144. xx: 172, 125, 171, 132, 124. xxi: 127, 158, IN IUNIUNO, 127, 458, 104, 257. xxii: 174, 180. xxiii: 127, 118, 433, 144, 117. xxiiii: 175, 138, 336. xxv: 117, 83, 177, 101, 135. xxvi: 135, 147, 582. xxvii: 105, 191. xxviii: 144, 114, 106.

As by 'corrections' to be explained presently, the next list is:—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XV. IN N. APOSTOLORUM PETRI ET PAULI	3	3	3
(6) 5, 5, (12) 11 . . . . .	23	21	21
XVI. CONIUNCTIO OBLATIONIS ETC. I (3), 8 (7) .			10
ii: 1, (5) 4, (20) 28 + 5 (24) . . . . .	26	33	29
iii: 1, (6) 5, (7) 6 . . . . .	14	12	12 = 75
iiii: 1, 5, 5, 5, (6) 5 . . . . .	22	21	21
v: 1, 8 (7), 5, (25) 31 (29) . . . . .	39	45	42
vi: 1, 4, 5 . . . . .	10	10	10
vii: 1, 3, 4 (3) . . . . .	8	8	7
viii: 1, 5 (4), 5, (6) 5, 4 . . . . .	21	20	19
viiii: 1, FĒ. 6, 5, 9 (8) . . . . .	21	21	{ 1 = 175* 19
x: 1, 4, (8) 18 (12) . . . . .	13 = 200	18	17
xi: 1, 0 (1), (14) 18 (12), F. Ē. SP. . . . .	15	14	14 = 225*
xii: 1, 5 (4), 5, 6 (5), 6 (5) . . . . .	23	23	20
xiii: 1, 4, 0 (1), 12 (11), 4, 5 . . . . .	26	26 = 275	26
xiiii: 1, (7) 6, 4, (12) 16 (15), 5, (5) 4 . . . . .	34	36	35
xv: 1, 6 (5), 4 (3), (17) 16 (15), 4 (3), (5) 4 . . . . .	37	35	31
xvi: 1, (7) 6, 4, (10) 9, 4, 5 (4), F. Ē. SP. . . . .	31	29 = 375*	28
xvii: 1, (6) 5, 4, 0 (1), (15) 18, 5, (2) 5 (6), F. Ē. SP. . . . .	33	33	35 = 400*
xviii: 1, (4) 8, 5, 4 (3), 4 (3), 8 . . . . .	21	20	18
xviiii: 1, 7, (11) 10 (9), 6 (5), 5 . . . . .	30 = 450	29	27
xx: 1, 6, (5) 4, 6, 5 (4), (5) 4 . . . . .	28	26	25
xxi: 1, (5) 4, (6) 5, 0 (1), (5) 4, (17) 15, 4, (4) 9 (8) . . . . .	42	42 = 525	42
xxii: 1, (7) 6, (7) 6, P. SP. F. Ē. . . . .	15	13	13 = 535*
xxiii: 1, 5 (4), (5) 4, (15) 14 (12), 5, 4 . . . . .	35	33	30
xxiiii: 1, (7) 6, 4 (3), (12) 11 . . . . .	24	22	21
xxv: 1, (5) 4, P. F. Ē. SP. (0) 8, (7) 6, 4 (3), 5 (4) . . . . .	{ 6 = 600* 16	23	21
xxvi: (1) 2 (1), 5 (4), (6) 5, (21) 20 (18) . . . . .	33	32	28 = 635
xxvii: 1, 4, 7 (6) . . . . .	12	12	11
xxviii: 1, 5, 4, 4 . . . . .	14 = 675	14 = 674	14 = 650

*Memorandum.* We shall see in due course that xx-xxviii, though set forth in the first instance on  $\theta$  pages, are in all probability of later date and other origin than the nineteen preceding items.

For the manifestly corrupt 'quamque uniuersa praecipua uiderentur in saeculo' in the Preface of v (38 : 21) I propose, with Dr. Feltoe, 'quaeque uniuerso praecipua uiderentur in saeculo'; and for 'si . . . Romana cognosceres' (47 : 31) in that of xxiii 'si . . . Romana cognosceres ecclesia'. The difficulty in the first prayer of xxi (46 : 17) will perhaps be surmounted if for 'exhorta' we read 'exorata'.

I had long suspected the 'Hanc etiam' &c. between the first and second *missae* (36 : 22) to be later than the  $\theta$  and  $\alpha$  redactions, when, on drawing up my synopsis of linear values I found that opinion justified by two out of the six *notae* already mentioned, one at the end of xvi, the other in xxv.

A few textual peculiarities must now be examined :—

1. As in all similar cases, I believe the suggested conclusion of the Preface of ii (37 : 15) to have stood at the third redaction as it now stands in the Verona MS. ; but I believe it to have been developed to the full at the second, when it thus attained a total of 843 letters (28  $\alpha$  lines), as against an original total presently to be determined.

2, 3. The passage relating to St Paul—'huic quoque . . . nomen' (37 : 10)—to which 'huius igitur' &c. (37 : 13) is now subjoined, is structurally independent of what precedes it, and of which the prerogative of St Peter is the inspiring idea. The like is true (39 : 3) of the 'beatum quoque . . . poenam' in the extant Preface of v. I therefore think it more likely than not that the former of these Prefaces ended originally at 'pateret introitus' (37 : 10), and, with an added 'per', comprised 542 letters (20  $\theta$  lines) ; and that the second, ending with 'post mortem. per' (39 : 3), comprised originally 679 letters (25  $\theta$  lines).

4. The Preface of x as far as the word 'uniuersitas' (40 : 26) is, *mutatis mutandis*, identical with the Oratio of v (38 : 9) ; and my suspicion that what now follows it—'salubrique compendio' &c.—was added *ex post facto* receives an unexpected confirmation from the fact that, if we assume x to have ended at 'uniuersitas', thus numbering 220 letters, the first ten *missae* of my hypothesis filled precisely eight such pages as I believe to have been used at the first redaction.

The memoranda, 'POST INFIRMITATEM', in xi, xiii, xvii, and 'IN IEIUNIO', in xxi, may be tentatively attributed to the compiler of the third redaction ; because, being merely rubrical, they are more likely to have been inserted by him, and for a technical purpose, than by the  $\alpha$  reviser, whose pen dealt, primarily at least, with the text. This attribution will be justified in the sequel.

5. The Preface of xiii, as far as 'dissonant' (42 : 25), where, with an added 'per', it would have reached a total of 337 letters (12  $\theta$  lines), is only not a verbal repetition of the first Preface in the series (36 : 15). After 'dissonant' it is prolonged by a dogmatic statement which we may

fairly doubt whether St Leo and his theologians would have made before the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). However this may be, the analogy of this Preface, as compared with the first in the series, to that of x, as compared with the Oratio of v, advises me to note 'ipsaque sit', &c., as a probable enhancement of the first text.

On referring to my synopsis of linear values the reader will note that this *ex hypothesi* addition occurs in a short group of three *missae*, xiiii-xvi, which but for it would not have had their present value of four *a* pages. He will also note, and note with I think curious interest, that the fifteen pages of my *a* scheme which they thus complete are marked at the point of completion with the letters 'F. E. SP.'

6, 1\*. The Super Populum of xvii (44 : 29) is noteworthy. Like several others (as at XIII iii, XVIII xxiii, XXXII iiiii) which would seem to have been elaborated with a stichometrical object, it falls apart into three; and it has the further characteristic of a repeated 'dñe'. It therefore seems reasonable to assign the first part 'Tuere . . . subsidiis' to a first edition; the first and third, 'Tuere . . . subsidiis' and 'benedictiones . . . exspectant', to a second; and the extant whole, with its needlessly repeated 'dñe', to a third. The several totals are 57 (2  $\theta$  lines), 130 (5 *a* lines, 4 of  $\beta$ ), 171 (6  $\beta$  lines).

On referring to my list of linear values the reader will see the meaning of this cumulation of phrases in the last constituent of xvii. (i) But for the 'CONIUNCTIO OBLATIONIS' &c. and its 'Hanc igitur' &c. (36 : 21), immediately before ii, precisely seven  $\beta$  pages would not have been completed at the point signaled by the *nota* 'FĒ' (40 : 5) between the major rubric and the first prayer of viiii. (ii) But for the 'POST INFIRMITATEM' in xi, nine  $\beta$  pages would not have been completed at the end of that Mass and at the point marked by the *nota* 'F. E. SP.' (41 : 7). (iii) But for the 'POST INFIRMITATEM' in xiii, the like rubric in xvii, and, again in xvii, the seemingly interpolated 'tui famuli . . . subiecti', sixteen  $\beta$  pages, presumably the sixteen pages of a quire, would not have been completed at the end of that Mass and at the point marked by another 'F. E. SP.' (44 : 33).

7. The Super Populum of xxi (47 : 7) falls into two parts, the first of which figures elsewhere [see Mur. *Greg.* 247 and Pam. *Amb.* 322] as a complete composition. This, in 101 letters (4  $\theta$  lines), I assume to be the original prayer. The extant whole, in 257 letters (9 *a* lines), I attribute to an enhancement at the second redaction postulated by my theory; partly because the additions characteristic of that redaction were textual rather than rubrical, partly because, but for it, the Mass would not have ended on the last line of twenty-one *a* pages. The case is thus in two respects analogous to that of the Super Populum of XII (28 : 14).

Meanwhile, the 'IN IEIUNIO' between the second and third prayers of *xxi*, a seemingly needless rubric which analogy invites us to attribute, like the thrice occurring 'POST INFIRMITATEM' (40 : 30, 41 : 26, 44 : 17), to the third redaction, has raised the  $\beta$  total of *xviii-xxii* to 125 lines, thus making a twenty-first completed  $\beta$  page coincide with the end of *xxii* and at the point marked by the *nota* 'P. SP. F. E.'

2\*. There can be no doubt that the extant text of the Preface of *xxiii* is conflate. I italicize what I conceive to be the earlier reading, and bracket its rival (48 : 1) :—'nulli te hostes impeterent . . . si . . . ueraciter atque [veraci fidelique proposito] fideliter eos proposito xpianae sinceritatis ambires,' &c. If this be so, we have two totals ; an earlier of 417 letters (14  $\alpha$  lines, 15 of  $\theta$ ), and a later of 382 letters (12  $\beta$  lines).

3\*. The cumulation of conjunctions in the *Secreta* of *xxiii* (48 : 19) arrests attention. Here again I see a conflate text which I discriminate thus :—'precamur ut pariter ad laudem tui nominis [et apostolicae reuerentiam dignitatis] et ad nostrum proueniat scificata praesidium,' assigning posteriority of date to the shorter reading because of its Petrine reference. The two totals are 105 and 101. Slight as is the difference in terms of letters, tested by the  $\beta$  criterion it is the difference between four lines and three. If, then, it was by deliberate design that each of the four consecutive groups of  $\beta$  lines to which *notae* have been appended was a multiple of five-and-twenty, we must infer that the remainder of the Section, *xxiii-xxviii*, represented another such multiple ; and this is possible if in *xxiii* and *xxiii* we assign to the third redaction the shorter alternatives just noted. But if, on the other hand, we suppose the briefer readings to be those of the second redaction we make this fall short of 675 lines, or 27 pages, by the unparalleled deficit of three lines.

4\*. Even so, however, the last redaction would not have been confined to  $26 \times 25$   $\beta$  lines if it had spared a second line for the heading of *xxvi*. That it did not do so may fairly be inferred from the evidence of the Verona MS. In its anomalous 'xxvi ITEM AD SCUM PAULUM' I see fairly certain evidence of 'xxvi' and 'AD SCUM PAULUM' on two lines at the second redaction, of an original 'xxvi ITEM ALIA' at the first redaction, and of a fusion due to clerical error at the third.

I briefly recapitulate as follows :—

As they stood at the second redaction postulated by my theory the twenty-eight Masses in honour of SS. Peter and Paul were an unbroken series. This the third editor broke into two by the numeral and capitulum 'XVI CONIUNCTIO OBLATIONIS' &c. As a consequence of these rubrical additions and the 'Hunc etiam oblationem' &c. (36 : 22) then introduced, he caused the heading of *viii* to stand at the foot of the seventh  $\beta$  page, a stage now marked by the *nota* FE. (40 : 5). By



inserting the rubric 'POST INFIRMITATEM' into xi he carried on that Mass to the foot of the ninth  $\beta$  page, a stage now marked by the *nota* 'F. E. SP.' (41 : 7). By inserting like rubrics in xiii and xvii and by thrusting the clause 'tui famuli . . . subiecti' (44 : 30) into the last prayer of the latter Mass, he carried on this into the last of 400  $\beta$  lines, presumably the last line of a quire, a stage now marked by another 'F. E. SP.' By inserting 'IN REIUNIO' into xxi (46 : 22) he made xxii end on the last line of the twenty-first  $\beta$  page, a limit now marked by the *nota* 'P. SP. F. E.' (47 : 21). Finally, by economies of text in xxiii (48 : 3) and xxiiii (48 : 19) and of rubric in the heading of xxvi he compressed the remainder into the last five of six-and-twenty such pages.

When, then, we have eliminated these *ex hypothesi* amplifications, we find ourselves in presence of material sufficient to make *missa* xvi end on the last line of a fifteenth  $\alpha$  page at the very point marked 'F. E. SP.', and to carry on the series into the penultimate line of twenty-seven such pages.

And when, still working back, we have reduced to its simplest expression the text of the second *ex hypothesi* redaction thus obtained, by eliminating what look like *ex post facto* additions in the Prefaces of ii, v, x, xiii, and in the last prayers of xvii and xxi, we obtain the successive totals of eight  $\theta$  pages ending with x, of ten more such pages ending with xviii, and of nine more such pages ending with the last item of the series. Nor is this all. The twenty-fourth of these  $\theta$  pages, presumably the last page of a second *ternio*, ends at the very point (48 : 32) in xxv where we now find the *nota* 'P. F. E. SP.'

Now emerges a question of some interest and of more than slight importance.

The difference in stichometrical value between the text of ii, v, x and xiii as I conceive it to have stood in the first redaction postulated by my theory and the text of the same Masses as I conceive it to have been left at the second redaction represents 28  $\alpha$  lines<sup>1</sup>; so that we are not at liberty to attribute the amplifications which are the cause of that difference to a mere desire of the second editor's that xvi should end on the last line of a page; for, obviously, it would have so ended if his amplifications had been confined to the value of 3  $\alpha$  lines. The subject demands consideration, for it raises the historically important question whether (a) the passage (37 : 10-13) about St Paul in the second

<sup>1</sup> The values would have been :—

For ii : 1, 4, 18 not 28 =	23 not 33	} 104 not 132.
„ v : 1, 8, 5, 23 not 31 =	37 not 45	
„ x : 1, 4, 8 not 13 =	13 not 18	
„ xiii : 1, 6, 4, 11 not 16, 5, 4 = 31 not 36		

Preface, (*β*) the further passage in the same Preface about the ‘huius triumphi dies’, (*γ*) that about St Paul in v, and (*δ*, *ε*) those in x and xiii about the Petrine prerogative of the Roman see, are textually such that they cannot have been added but on pages of *α* lineation, a lineation presumably more recent than the pontificate of Leo; or whether they are textually such that they may have been added while the *θ* lineation was still in use, and in the pontificate of Leo, though presumably after the Council of Chalcedon and its famous ‘*Petrus locutus est per Leonem*’.

By my hypothesis the fully expanded conclusion of the Preface of ii (37 : 14), ‘*hostias tibi . . . sine fine dicentes*,’ is proper to the second redaction; but there is no reason why its preceding context, with ‘*celebramus per*’, where we now have ‘*celebrantes*’, should not have been introduced at an earlier date. This would give us a total of 727 letters, or 26 *θ* lines; the totals for the other three Prefaces being 927, 370, 479, or 33, 14 and 17 *θ* lines respectively; i.e. a second aggregate of [26 + 33 + 14 + 17 =] 90 as against a first of [20 + 25 + 8 + 12 =] 65. We should then have two *θ* schemes for the first nineteen Masses of the Section; namely, the original in eighteen pages as already divined, and after it a second, executed like the first at the instance of Leo himself, and so contrived as to fill nineteen pages. Thus:—

	<i>θ</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>θ</i> <sub>2</sub>
XVI. IN N. APOSTOLORUM PETRI ET PAULI	8	8
6, 5, 12 . . . . .	23	23
ii: 1, 5, 20 (raised to 26) . . . . .	26	32
iii: 1, 6, 7 . . . . .	14	14
iii: 1. 5. 5, 5, 6 . . . . .	22	22
v: 1, 8, 5, 25 (raised to 83) . . . . .	39	47
vi: 1, 4, 5 . . . . .	10	10
vii: 1, 8, 4 . . . . .	8	8
viii: 1, 5, 5, 6, 4 . . . . .	21	21
viii: 1, 6, 5, 9 . . . . .	21	21
x: 1, 4, 8 (raised to 14) . . . . .	13 = 200	19
xi: 1, 14 . . . . .	15	15
xii: 1, 5, 5, 6, 6 . . . . .	23	23
xiii: 1, 4, 12, 4, 5 . . . . .	26	26
xiii: 1, 7, 4, 12 (raised to 17), 5, 5 . . . . .	34	39
xv: 1, 6, 4, 17, 4, 5 . . . . .	37	37
xvi: 1, 7, 4, 10, 4, 5 . . . . .	31	31
xvii: 1, 6, 4, 15, 5, 2 . . . . .	33	33
xviii: 1, 4, 5, 4, 4, 8 . . . . .	21	21
xviii: 1, 7, 11, 6, 5 . . . . .	<u>30 = 450</u>	<u>30 = 475</u>

It surely is remarkable that a series possibly edited on eighteen  $\theta$  pages and with significant additions re-edited on nineteen, as though on each occasion they were deemed to be a distinct and homogeneous group, comprised it may be in a separate libellus, should almost equal in number the one-and-twenty anniversaries of SS. Peter and Paul that fell in the pontificate of Leo the Great. I venture to look on them as exclusively his, carefully edited, and as carefully re-edited by him in the last two years of his life.

A few more words on the chronology of the Section may here be opportune.

East and west of the baptismal font of Constantine<sup>1</sup> and within a few paces of the octagonal peristyle which enclosed, and still encloses, it, Pope Hilarus, the successor of Leo the Great, constructed two small but sumptuously adorned chapels, dedicating one to the beloved disciple and the other to the Baptist. The ground plan of each was a rectangular parallelogram; but so accurately placed were they in respect of the baptistery that their major axes were in line with one and the same diameter of the font. A radius at right angles to that diameter was, in its turn, in line with the major axis of a third chapel equidistant with the others from their common centre; this was dedicated to St Stephen. The three structures were not contiguous at any point, and yet they were not so much three as a triad; for Hilarus made their several fronts serve as three of the eight sides of the outer perimeter of a vaulted ambulatory encompassing the baptisterium, its inner perimeter being the small octangular peristyle already mentioned.

Had Hilarus in proximity to his own palace and patriarchal church built no more than this interconnected triad of chapels, I might have hesitated to call attention to it. But close to it was another architectural scheme of his devising; a single chapel, the ground plan of which was a Greek cross. That is to say, it comprised four limbs of like plan and equal dimension converging to a central square; so that the whole area was enclosed by twelve rectilinear foundations set at right angles each to its neighbour, and bonded together by twelve corner stones.

Thus, the three chapels disposed about the baptistery of Constantine were on twelve foundations, four to a chapel: the chapel of the Holy Cross was on twelve foundations, three to each of its four limbs.

Now let us turn to the Preface (46 : 26) of XVI xxi :—' Vere digni. qui in omnibus<sup>2</sup> sc̄is caelestis Hierusalem fundamenta posuisti quae duodecim solidata lapidibus apostolorum chorus ecclesiae tuae sp̄ali

<sup>1</sup> Ciampini *Vetera Monumenta* i 239; De Rossi *Bullettino*, 1866, p. 75.

<sup>2</sup> The MS at Verona has 'omnis', which Bianchini corrects to 'montibus'; but I think 'omnibus' is safer. On the other hand, 'montibus' is supported by the first prayer of xvi (43 : 24).

constructione declarat ostendens nobis et in trinitate quadriformis euangelii constare mysterium et in unoquoque euangeliorum trinitatis plenitudinem contineri.' Could anything be more felicitous than the correspondence of the two architectural *chori*, or schemes, of Hilarus to this twofold description of the *chorus ecclesiae*; or any inference more justifiable than that XVI xxi is one of a group of *missae* composed by or for that pope?

Another chronological clue is yielded by the Preface of xv, which strikes the lyre of triumph over some persecutor of the orthodox who had borne the 'regiae potestatis insignia' (43 : 14). This, one would suppose, must have been the usurper Maximus, who, himself the slayer of the Emperor Valentinian III, was assassinated in the early summer of 455, a few weeks before the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul. If, then, *missa* xv be referable to the summer of 455, the fifteenth in the pontificate (A.D. 440-461) of Leo, the coincidence justifies the suggestion which I made just now, that i-xviii are the tale of Masses composed by or for Leo in nineteen of the twenty-one years of his episcopate.

Of the remaining nine (xx-xxviii), xx, xxvi, xxviii, and perhaps xxvii, would seem to have been designed for a second celebration in the basilica of St Paul *foris muros*, and xxi is for the Vigil; so that we may fairly regard it as likely that xxii-xxv should be assigned to the first four years (A.D. 462-465) of the pontificate of Hilarus, and as possible that the second general redaction, the redaction executed on pages of a lineation, was carried out at some period between the summer of 465 and the close of that pontificate in the spring of 468.

#### SECTION XVII.

The values of the constituents of XVII are, in terms of letters, as follows:—

VI IDUUM IULIARUM, &c., &c., &c. (no numeral) 78, 97. (no numeral) 133, 106, 102. (no numeral) 145. i : IM IUNIUS, 130, 261, 148, 119. ii : 79, 138, 143, 367, 111, 132. iii : 139, 107, 240, 86. iiiii : 122, 125, 177, 123. v : 166, 143, 150. vi : 185, 137, 90, 202. vii : 111, 278.

The only correction needed is, that in the Preface of iii (52 : 30) we read 'esset ueneranda', not 'esset et ueneranda'.

The siege of Rome by Ricimer in the year 472, and thus in the pontificate of Simplicius (A.D. 458-483), the successor of Hilarus, was ended early in July; but on precisely what day is not known. Historians say 'on or about the eleventh'; but, regard had to the frequent danger of reckoning chronological intervals *exclusive*, instead of *inclusive*, which in doubtful cases is the safer method, the true date is more

likely than not to have been a day or two earlier, and thus on or before the tenth of the month, the Feast of the Septem Fratres, to which the present Section is devoted.

The text of the Section is in four places remarkable :—

1, 2. The Postcommunion of i (51 : 24) has two pairs of conflicting readings ; one member of each of which I now italicize, bracketing the other :—‘ Repleti dñe *munificentia gratiae tuae* [benedictione copiosa] *et pro nostrae seruitutis obsequiis* [et pro celebritate scōrum] caelestia dona sumentes gratias tibi referimus. per.’ The value of the whole is thus reduced from 148 to 107, if we neglect the bracketed text ; to 93, if we neglect the italicized.

3. Similarly, in the Preface of iii we have (53 : 8) ‘ Vere dign. qui sic tribuis ecclesiam tuam scōrum martyrum commemoratione proficere ut eam [semper illorum et festiuitate laetifices] *et exemplo piae confessionis exerceas* et grata tibi supplicatione tuearis. per’, where I bracket ‘ semper . . . laetifices ’ because of its manifest correlation to the ‘ pro celebritate scōrum ’ in the Postcommunion of i just noticed.

Now there can be no doubt that by ‘ scōrum martyrum festiuitas ’ we are to understand the Feast of the Septem Fratres, and that ‘ semper ’ = ‘ year by year without intermission ’ ; or that the more likely of the juxtaposed readings to be second in point of time is that which has in ‘ semper ’ a retrospective reference. For these reasons I infer that in the Postcommunion of i the lower total of 93 letters (3 β lines) is more recent than the higher total of 107 (4 α lines, and 4 of θ), and that the earlier of the two numerical values of the Preface of iii is 141 and the later 144 ; and I think it highly probable that, in gratitude for the deliverance of himself and his flock in the July of 472, Simplicius, in the first of these constituents, replaced ‘ pro nostrae seruitutis obsequiis ’ by ‘ pro celebritate scōrum ’, and in the second ‘ et exemplo piae confessionis exerceas ’ by ‘ semper illorum et festiuitate laetifices ’.

4. The third of the constituents characterized by conflate text is the Preface of vi (54 : 3) :—‘ Vere dign. quoniam martyrum beatorum . . . sanguis effusus simul et tua mirabilia manifestat *quo perficis in infirmitate uirtutem et nostris studiis dat profectum.* [et infirmis apud te praestat auxilium.] per.’ The longer of these rival phrases would seem to be correlative to those which I have already italicized ; for, inspired by a well-known passage in St Paul’s Epistles (2 Cor. xii 9), it reads like the composition of one in whom the cares of office had been superadded to more intimate trials. The shorter phrase has no such personal attribution and is of public applicability. The longer, and presumably older, form gives the constituent a total of 170 letters (6 θ lines, 6 of α) ; the briefer form yields a total of 142 letters (5 β lines).

I therefore draw up the subjoined table of linear values in accordance with these inferences. And, further, I assume that, as in analogous cases, the capitulum was briefly expressed in the first redaction postulated by my theory, 'VI. ID. IUL. <sup>1</sup> Ñ. SCÖRUM SEPTEM FRATRUM'<sup>2</sup>; and that, again as in analogous cases, the extant 'etc.' (51 : 13) appended to the prayer immediately before i represents a conclusion written *in extenso* at the second redaction in place of the usual 'per' at the first :—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
VI IDUUM IULIARUM, ETC., ETC. XVII. (3)9(7)	8	9	7
8, 4(3)	7	7	6
1, 5(4), 5(4), 4(3)	15=25	15	12=25
1, (5) 5+8(5)	6	9	6
i: 1, 9(1), 5(4), (10)9(8), 4(3), (5)4	25	23	21
ii: 1, 8, 5, 5, (13)12, 4, 5(4)	36	35	34
iii: 1, 5, 4, (9)8, 8	22	21	21
iiii: 1, (5)4, (5)4, 5, (5)4	21	18	18=125
v: 1, 6(5), 5, (6)5	18	17	16
vi: 1, (7)6, 5, 8, 6(5)	<u>22=175</u>	<u>21=175</u>	20
vii: 1, 4, (10)9			<u>14=175</u>

This means that the extant Section finally responds to the  $\theta$  criterion at the end of *missa vi*<sup>3</sup>, and at the same point to the  $\alpha$  criterion; but that not until its last line is reached does it for the last time respond to the  $\beta$  criterion. I therefore infer that at the first and second redactions it ended at vi, and that vii was added at the third redaction; the compiler—perhaps Pope Simplicius, to whom, engaged on that redaction, I have just attributed alternatives in i, iiiii and vi—wishing the Section to fill precisely seven of his ampler pages, as heretofore it had filled first seven pages of the  $\theta$  and then seven of the  $\alpha$  lineation. Analogous cases are in store for us over and over again; that is to say, in XX, in XXI, in XXVI, in XXVIII, in XXXII, in XXXIII and XXXVIII, in XXXVI and in XLIII. Hence the inference has the logical value of a conclusion.

<sup>1</sup> 'IUL.' not IULIARUM. See 28 : 19, 85 : 7, 103 : 26, 105 : 15, 152 : 10, 159 : 6.

<sup>2</sup> See the capitula of XX, XL (90 : 19, 159 : 6).

<sup>3</sup> The transference to  $\alpha$  pages involved a 'shrinkage' of nine lines, two in i, three in iiiii, and one each in ii, iii, v, vi. To counteract this the compiler or scribe of the second redaction added six neat lines of major rubric and, immediately before i, three of text.

## SECTION XVIII.

In Section XVIII the values in terms of letters are as follows :—

XVIII. ORATIONES ET PRECES DIURNÆ. (no numeral) 121, 129, 105, 854, 105, 168. ii: 172, 189, 151, 437, 119, 156. iii: 98, 80, 94, 895, 85, 140. iii: 85, 85, 153, 335, 90, 144. v: 149, 182, 95, 544, 114, 165. vi: 118, 108, 118, 451, 182, 170. vii: 83, 185, 95, 155, 93, 127. viii: 86, 77, 135, 319, 119, 152. viii: 139, 150, 80, 79, 102, 98, 184. x: 92, 106, 109, 86, 103, 164. xi: 125, 123, 222, 113, 149. xii: 119, 125, 152, 194, 95, 105, 99. xiii: 120, 143, 98, 261 + 102, 205. xiii: 143, 192, 130, 242, 117, 157. xv: 107, 104, 93, 402, 146, 201. xvi: 98, 121, 291, 130, 147. xvii: 82, 92, 150, 199, 84, 179. xviii: 163, 124, 152, 278, 109, 110. xviii: 73, 124, 112, 176, 121, 119. xx: 57, 82, 80, 1555, 90, 124. xxi: 125, 113, 85, 134, 63, 89. xxii: 115, 143, 97, 145, 92, 98. xxiii: 87, 97, 110, 73, 111. xxiii: 183, 201, 227. xxv: 100, 91, 94, 94, 94. xxvi: 96, 96, 136, 227, 114, 105. xxvii: 106, 133, 218, 105, 96. xxviii: 182, 137, 290, 93, 116. xxviii: 133, 150. xxx: 95, 73, 123, 85, 96, 98. xxxi: 166, 108, 75, 104, 128. ORATIONES MATUTINÆ &c., 120, 77, 124, 165. ITEM AD VESPERUM, 124, 103, 116. xxxii: 145, 111, 136, 175. xxxiii: 103, 164, 120, 143, 157, 102. xxxiii: INC PRECES DIURNÆ &c., 109, 94, 107, 288, 88, 191. xxxv: 145, 105. IN IUNIUNIO, 187, 157, 212. xxxvi: 78, 91, 201, 105, 176. xxxvii: 129, 102, 107, 562, 149, 197. xxxviii: 93, 151, 132, 235, 127, 247. xxxviii: 116, 101, 86, 299, 85, 139. xl: 127, 109, 182, 75, 206. xli: 86, 77, 175, 96, 135. xlii: 104, 107, 93, 271, 79, 123. xliii: 78, 117, 107, 238, 104, 138. xliiii: 93, 113, 164, 92, 195. xlv: 87, 82, 105, 226, 110, 151.

The order of the numbered items of the Section is broken between xxxi and xxxii by a double group of prayers (75 : 9-31) which serve as a copula for connecting the two parts into which the forty-five items are thus divided. Besides this cross-division there is another ; for xxxiii-xlv are preceded by a heading, 'INCIPIUNT PRECES DIURNÆ CUM SENSIBUS NECESSARIIS,' which, in seeming contradiction to their numerical continuity with i-xxxiii, gives them the semblance of a separate series. These two cross-divisions promise to be of service in elucidating the bibliography of the Section.

By reason of its five *notae*—'P. F. E. SP.' in two places, 'P. S. F. E.' in one, and 'P. F. E.' in two—and of the numerous phrases which would seem to have been engrafted into it *secundis curis*, it strikingly resembles the series, recently examined, in honour of SS. Peter and Paul. To these five *notae* we must, I think, add the strange 'MEMORES' (81 : 8) which, since it interrupts the construction of the Preface of xxxviii, has always seemed to me to be a marginal memorandum incorporated into the text by clerical error.

A few textual emendations are necessary :—

1. In the first *Secreta* (54 : 24), for 'ut sit' we must read, with Dr Feltoe, 'ut tuo sit.' 2. In the 'ita mites ad omnes nos esse inbuis' of the first Preface (55 : 5) 'inbuis' should, as Bianchini sug-

gests, be corrected to 'iubes'. 3. In the 'non subripiat facilitas caritati' (58 : 17) of the Preface of v, the verb should be 'subrepat'. Frequent instances of this confusion might be cited from other documents. 4. In the first prayer of viii (61 : 7) 'retribuuntur' has by a commonplace blunder been written instead of 'retribuimur'. 5. In the Oratio of xi (62 : 11), for the 'crescamus . . . aumentum' of the Verona MS, I propose 'capiamus . . . augmentum'. 6. In the Postcommunion of the same Mass (62 : 22) 'diuinis' and 'perpetuis' cannot stand together. The latter is the preferable word, for it balances 'temporalibus'. 7. In the last prayer of xii (63 : 15) for 'Inclinantes . . . propitiatus' read 'Inclinantes . . . propitiatus intende', thus raising 99 letters to 106 (3  $\beta$  lines to 4). For this see Mur. *Greg.* 28.<sup>1</sup> 8. In the last prayer of xv (65 : 17) for 'boni operis instruat' we should perhaps read 'boni operis studio instruat'. 9. In the last of xx (69 : 18) for 'et potius postulata concede' we should perhaps read 'et percipere postulata propitius concede', thus raising the total from 124 to 136 letters (4  $\alpha$  lines to 5). 10. In the last prayer of xxxiii (77 : 22), where we find 'Fidelem populum . . . inuicta defensio sc̄um . . . percipiat', the verb should surely be 'perficiat'. 11. In the Preface of xxxv (78 : 4) the Verona MS has 'ieiuniis et orationibus expiemur consequi nos posse', where Bianchini proposes 'speramus' in place of 'expiemur'. I think that 'expiati speramus' would be better. 12. Instructed by parallel passages elsewhere [see Mur. *Gel.* 587, Mur. *Greg.* 164], I see an insertion of the second editor's in the 'et salutaria . . . capiamus' (78 : 25) of the Postcommunion of xxxvi, and thus discern the cause of the dislocation of the extant text. Set 'praesta quaesumus ut' next after 'muneribus' where it was at first, and 'et' next before 'a tua nunquam laude cessemus'. The lower total of 76 letters represents 3  $\theta$  lines, the higher total, 106, represents 4  $\alpha$  lines. 13. In the first prayer of xxxvii (79 : 2) either 'morbiferis' or 'sacrilegis' must be eliminated and 129 letters reduced to 119 (5  $\alpha$  lines to 4). 14. For 'celebraturi sc̄orum' (81 : 20) in the Secreta of xl I propose to read 'celebraturi sc̄a tua'. See the 'sc̄a tua nobis . . . proficiant' (91 : 17) in the Secreta of XX iii. The like correction may here be suggested for the Postcommunion of VIII xviii (7 : 18).

Let us now endeavour to trace the modifications which the Section would seem to have undergone in its passage through the three redactions postulated by my theory.

1. The Preface of ii would have been adequately developed and crowned with the rhythmical and sonorous termination proper to that class

<sup>1</sup> See also p. 21a of my *Canterbury Missal*. Bianchini and Muratori give 'intende'. Its absence from Dr Feltoe's text may therefore be due to editorial oversight.



of compositions, if it had ended with 'quos amamus optemus' (56 : 7). The relative clause, 'quibus praeceptis' &c., which now prolongs it has all the appearance of *ex post facto* work added by the compiler of the second edition. The two totals are 349 (13  $\theta$  lines, 12 of  $\alpha$ ) and 437 (15  $\alpha$  lines).

2. The Preface of iii runs 'inoffensive' as far as its penultimate sentence, when, after 'conueniunt', we encounter the awkwardly placed 'iam de poena diuini uenire iudicii' (57 : 6). One would suppose that if this had been part of the original text it would have preceded 'quod traduntur . . . conueniunt'. Then comes 'Quapropter huiusmodi . . . miserantes quo debemus affectu et ideo' etc., where 'et ideo' would seem to be a suggested substitute for 'quapropter'. This medley gives the extant text 895 letters, a total which falls to 889 if we deduct 'et ideo', but which, if we now supply 'cum angelis et archangelis . . . canimus sine fine dicentes', rises to 1015 letters (34  $\alpha$  lines) for the second redaction postulated by my theory. If, on the other hand, we make the text end, with an added 'per', at 'conueniunt', we have for a first redaction 793 letters (29  $\theta$  lines).

*Memorandum.* It will be seen from the table of linear values which I now subjoin that this hypothetical restitution of the first and second texts postulated by my theory makes the capitulum and first three Masses fill six  $\theta$  pages at the first redaction, and six  $\alpha$  pages at the second.

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XVIII. INC. ORATIONES ET PRECES DIURNAE	3	3	3
(5) 4, 5 (4), 4, (31) 29 (27), 4, 6 .	55	52	49
ii: 1, 6, (7) 6, (6) 5, (13) 15 (14), 4, (6) 5	43	42	41
iii: 1, 4 (3), 8, (4) 8, (29) 28 + 6 (28), 8, 5	49 = 150	53 = 150	46
iiii: 1, 8, 8, (6) 5, 11, 8, 5 . . . . .	32	31	31
v: 1, (6) 5, (7) 6, (4) 8, (20) 18 (17), 4, 6 (5) . . . . .	48	43	41
vi: 1, 4, 4, 4, (16) 15, (7) 6, 6 . . . . .	42	40	40
vii: 1, 8, (5) 4, (4) 8, (6) 5, (4) 8, (5) 4	28 = 800	23	23
viii: 1, 8, 8, 5, (12) 11 (10), (5) 4, 5 . . . . .	34	32	31
viii: 1, 5, (6) 5, 8, (0) 8, 4, (4) 8, (7) 6 . . . . .	30	30	30
x: 1, (4) 8, 4, 4, 8, 4, (5) 6 (5) . . . . .	25	25	24
xi: 1, (5) 4, (5) 4, 8 (7), 4, (6) 5 . . . . .	29	26 = 400	25
xii: 1, (5) 4, (5) 4, (6) 5, 7 (6), (0) 8, 4, 4	32 = 450	32	31
xiii: 1, (5) 4, 5, 4 (3), 10 (9), (8) 7 . . . . .	33	31	29
xiii: 1, 5, 7 (6), 5 (4), (9) 8, 4, (6) 5 . . . . .	37	35	33
xv: 1, 4 (3), 4, (4) 8, (12) 14 (13), (6) 5, (3) 7 . . . . .	34	38	36
xvi: 1, 4, (5) 4, (10) 9, 5 (4), 5 . . . . .	30	28	27
xvii: 1, 8, (4) 8, (6) 5, 7, 8, (6) 5 (6) . . . . .	30	27	28
xviii: 1, 6 (5), 5 (4), (6) 5, (8) 9, 4, 4 . . . . .	34	34 = 625	32 = 600

xviii:	1, 8, (5) 4, 4, (7) 6, (5) 4, (5) 4	30	26	26
xx:	1, 2, 8, 8, (55) 52(49), 8, 5(4)	72=750	69	65
xxi:	1, (5) 4, 4, 8, 5, 2, 8	23	22	22
xxii:	1, 4, 5, 4(3), 5, (4) 8, 4(3)	27=800	26	24
xxiii:	1, 8, (4) 8, 4, 8, 4	19	18	18
xxiiii:	1, (7) 6, (8) 7, P̄. S̄. F̄. Ē. (3) 8(7)	19	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 14=800^* \\ 8 \end{array} \right.$	21
xxv:	1, 4(3), 8, (4) 8, P̄. F̄. Ē. SP̄. (4) 8, (4) 8	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 12=850^* \\ 8 \end{array} \right.$		17
xxvi:	1, 4(3), 4(3), 5, (5) 8(7), 4, 4		27	30
xxvii:	1, 4, 5(4), 8(7), 4, 4(3)	26	26	23
xxviii:	1, (5) 6, 5(4), (8) 10(9), (4) 8, 4	27	29	27
xxix:	1, 5(4), (6) 5, P̄. F̄. Ē. SP̄.	12=950*	11	10
xxx:	1, (4) 8, 8, (5) 4, 8, (4) 8, 4(3)		21	20
xxxi:	1, 6, 4, 8, 4, 5		23	23
[ORATIONES MATUTINAE UEL AD UESPERUM				3=925
	[4, 8, 4, 4			15
	[Item ad usperum			1
	[4, 4, 4			12
xxxii:	1, 5, 4, P̄. F̄. Ē. [5, 4		10=975*	19
[xxxiii:	1, 4, 6(5), 4, 5, 6(5), 4, P̄. F̄. Ē.			28=1000*
	IŃC. PRECES DIURNÆ ETC. (3)			3
xxxiiii:	1, 4, (4) 8, 4, 10(9), 8, 7(6)	33	32	30
xxxv:	1, 5, 4, 0(1), (7) 6, 6(5), (8) 7	31	29	29
xxxvi:	1, 8, (4) 8, 7, 8(4), (7) 6	25	23	24
xxxvii:	1, (5) 4, 4(3), 4(3), (20) 19, (6) 5, 7(6)	47	44	41
xxxviii:	1, (4) 8, (6) 5, 5(4), (9) 8, (5) 4, (9) 8	39=1125	34	33
xxxviiii:	1, 4, 4(3), 8, (11) 10(5 MEMORES 5), 8, 5	31	30	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 16=1175^* \\ 13 \end{array} \right.$
	xl: 1, (5) 4, 4, 6, 8, (8) 7	27	25	
	xli: 1, 8, 8, (7) 6, (4) 8, 5	23	21	21
	xlvi: 1, 4, 4, (4) 8, (10) 9, 8, (5) 4	31	28	28
	xlvi: 1, 8, 4, 4, (9) 8(8+3), 4, 5	30	29	29+3
	xlvi: 1, (4) 8, 4, 6(5+1), 8(3+1), 7	25	24	23+2
	xlvi: 1, 8, 8, 4, (12) 11, 4, (6) 5	33=1825	31=1825	31=1850

3. The Preface of *iiii* bears in its final clause (57 : 26) evident marks of aftertouch:—'quatenus dum per alterutram pietatem se reperit communes [in singulis fieret semetipsam diligens] *esset*<sup>1</sup> mens una cunctorum'. My discrimination gives us 301 letters (11  $\theta$  lines) for the first redaction and 333 (11  $\alpha$  lines) for the second.

4. I account as follows for the 'et . . . et . . . et' (61 : 2, 3) of the

<sup>1</sup> Here, as in other cases, I italicize what seems to be the first reading and bracket its competitor. The *Ballerini* banish 'fietet' from their text, but in a footnote seem to imply that in the MS it stands before 'diligens'. *Muratori* omits it.

last constituent of viii :—‘Porrige . . . misericordiam . . . per quam [et terrores declinet humanos] et solacia uitae mortalis accipiat et sempiterna gaudia comprehendat,’ thus assigning 127 letters (5  $\theta$  lines) to the first edition and 152 (5  $\alpha$  lines) to the second.

5. In viii (61 : 13) there is a second *Secreta*, ‘Sit nomini’ &c., of 79 letters (3  $\alpha$  pages). It is inconsistent with the simplicity of a first redaction, and the analogy of similar cases invites us to assign it to the second edition postulated by my theory.

6. The ‘sustenta circumtege’ which in x follow ‘prosequere’, the governing verb of the *Super Populum* (62 : 6), look like an insertion made casually and on the spur of the moment. This may be important. To me it seems to shew that the compiler of the second edition is cautiously enhancing his text as he finds himself in view of a not distant goal. These two needless words raise 146 letters to 164 (5  $\alpha$  lines to 6). But for them, the last of the first 400 lines of the second edition—presumably the last line of an integral quire—would not have coincided with the final words of the first eleven *Masses* of the series.

7. The twelfth item of the series comprises seven, instead of six or five, constituents; and of these the ‘*Libera nos*’ &c. (63 : 10) is, I suspect, *ex abundantia*. Its 95 letters represent three  $\alpha$  lines.

*Memorandum.* The textual discriminations thus far made would seem to be verified by the stichometrical values yielded in consequence of them. For the original scheme we have the capitulum and three items in six integral pages of  $\theta$  capacity, and after these two groups of items (iii–vii and viii–xii) each in its turn filling six integral pages of the same value. For the second redaction we have the capitulum and three items in six integral pages of  $\alpha$  capacity, and after these eight items (iii–xi) in ten such pages; the whole being the equivalent of a quire.

8. In xiii there survive (63 : 28), under the form of juxtaposed alternatives, editorial instructions of great interest and value. ‘Vere dign. quoniam . . . nos conuenit laudes tuas quia non possumus competenter explorare saltem *sine cessatione* [obseruationis annuae celebritate gratulantes] depromere *ut quas nunquam sufficienter exsoluimus nunquam reddere desinamus. per.* [ut eorum quorum actionibus inhaeremus plenis effectibus gaudeamus. per.]’<sup>1</sup> My suggested discrimination of earlier and later work gives us a first total of 261 letters (10  $\theta$  lines), and a second of 288 (10  $\alpha$  lines).

<sup>1</sup> Dr Feltoe thinks that the presumably later text, which I therefore bracket, may be ‘a form of *Communicantes*’. This theory is untenable, for the passage has none of the characteristics of a *Communicantes*. Misled by the ‘per.’ after ‘*desinamus.*’, some copyist must have disjoined it from the phrase it was meant to supersede, instead of leaving the two alternatives side by side. For a similar instance, see the Preface of XXVIII xviii (136 : 11–14).

9. The commonplace and structurally needless maxim, 'ita sicut a nemine' &c. (65 : 11), which now terminates the Preface of xv, is, I venture to think, the next modification made by the editor of the second redaction in order to accommodate the Section to its new home in a pages. The value of the constituent is thus raised from 315 letters (12  $\theta$  lines) to 402 (14  $\alpha$  lines).

10. The last constituent of xv (65 : 16) is one of the many benedictory prayers<sup>1</sup> as to which we can safely say that they are patchwork compositions studiously, if unskilfully, accumulated with a stichometrical purpose. Its nucleus, 'Consequatur . . . ecclesia,' which, with an added 'per', comprises 79 letters (3  $\theta$  lines), is all that we need attribute to the original editor. If analogy may guide us, it was worked up to its present complement<sup>2</sup> of 207 letters (7  $\alpha$  lines) at the second redaction.

11. By appending 'unde benedicimus' &c. (67 : 8) to the Preface of xviii the compiler of the second redaction raised 230 letters to 278 (9  $\alpha$  lines) and thus carried on the item to the last line of a twenty-fifth  $\alpha$  page.

In the next five Masses (xviii-xxiii) we find no traces of editorial aftertouch, and for a good reason. By a half-dozen devices<sup>3</sup> more or less skilful, devices some of which must, one would think, have been adopted in the very course of transcription, the compiler of the second redaction had so economized his material as to make the eleventh Mass of the series end on the last line of sixteen pages, presumably an integral quire, of a lineation; by five more such devices<sup>4</sup> he had fitted xii-xviii into precisely nine pages, the first nine, it may be, of a second quire; and now he hoped—so, at least, I surmise—that xviii-xxiii, which in his exemplar filled [30 + 72 + 23 + 27 + 19 + 19 = ] 190  $\theta$  lines, would fill only 175 of his  $\alpha$  lines. But this was physically impossible, for their value was 178; and, if I am right in thinking that, though he might add to existing work, he made a conscience of cancelling nothing, it was morally out of the question to attempt the consummation. He was therefore fain to copy xviii-xxiii as they were, subtracting nothing and adding nothing, and to complete his second quire before the end of the last prayer of xxiii. And of this I see a convincing record in the *nota* 'P. S. F. E.' at the very point where, by my hypothesis, the last of 800 lines had been pressed into his service. It is the only *nota* of its kind; and I venture, but with all proper diffidence, to interpret it as meaning

<sup>1</sup> They are to be found at XII, XVI xvii and xxi, XVIII xxiii, XXVII iii, vii, and xi, XXXII i and iii, XLIII ii and iii.

<sup>2</sup> The insertion of 'studio' after 'operis' raising 201 to 207, as already intimated.

<sup>3</sup> As explained in 1-6 of my numbered paragraphs.

<sup>4</sup> See 7-11 of my numbered paragraphs.

*Pugillaris secundi finis est.* Be this as it may; like the *notae* in Section XVI, and like those which we are yet to meet in the present Section, it marks the end of one of the pages postulated by my hypothesis.

I must now notice two passages which differ conspicuously from those which we have thus far examined. I attribute their peculiarities to the editor of the third redaction, and regard them as memoranda for the guidance of the scribe, should occasion require the latter to make use of one or other of them.

We have seen that, when the editor of the third redaction found himself within easily measurable distance from the end of Section XVI, he escaped the impending difficulty of a surplusage of one or two lines over and above a multiple of 25 by means of a corresponding reduction of text in items xxiii and xxiiii.<sup>1</sup> In xvi of the present Section he seems to have made provision for a possibly needed reduction of text, and in xvii for a possibly needed augmentation.

1\*. As it stands in the Verona MS, the Preface of xvi (65 : 26) is curiously worded: 'Vere dign̄ . . . cum tuorum sensibus . . . infundis . . . tua uirtute confidere, et indeficientem gratiam comprobamus cum nos *uel* in hac deuotione tribuis permanere *uel* de perceptis beneficiis non in nobis sed in tuo nomine gloriari. per'; where the disjunctives, which I italicize, would seem to be out of place if regarded as part of the text, as indeed does one or other of the phrases they denote; for, taken as it stands, the passage yields neither good sense nor good theology. I therefore see in 'in hac deuotione permanere' and 'de perceptis beneficiis non in nobis sed in tuo nomine gloriari' two juxtaposed alternatives. The longer of these, which I believe to be of the original text, would, if retained to the exclusion of the shorter, give the scribe a total of 262 letters, the equivalent of 9  $\beta$  lines; while the shorter would, if preferred in place of it, give him a total of 232 letters, the equivalent of 8  $\beta$  lines, or even—the 'per', written as a crossed 'p' and set in the margin—of 7  $\beta$  lines.

2\*. In the last prayer of xvii (66 : 20) we have a yet clearer case of editorial economy in 'te protegente seruentur *aliter* te largiente copiosius augeantur'; where *aliter* is unquestionably an editorial memorandum. I see in it a memorandum instructing the scribe, should he find it necessary, to raise the total value from 150 to 179 letters, or from 5 to 6  $\beta$  lines. It was the second of these provisions which I conceive to have met the requirements of the case; for, as will be seen from the table of linear values, by enabling the scribe to give xvii twenty-eight,

<sup>1</sup> In the Preface of XVI xxiii and in the *Secreta* of XVI xxiiii. See above, p. 537. I have often thought that the *pariter* (48 : 18) in the latter of these may be a corruption of *aliter*.

instead of twenty-seven, lines, it enabled him to write the final words of xviii on the last of 600 lines.

On the whole, then, it may, I think, be fairly claimed for the explanation which I have offered of the thirteen exceptional passages thus far encountered that it enables us to trace the evolution of the Section through three several editions down to the point in each thus far attained. That is to say: For the first edition we have, first, the capitulum and three Masses carefully lodged in 6 pages of  $\theta$  lineation, then four Masses in 6 such pages, then five Masses in yet another 6, then eight Masses in 12 such pages, and finally the twenty-first and twenty-second Masses on two, presumably the *recto* and *verso* of the last leaf of a second  $\theta$  quire. For the next edition we have the same material on pages of  $\alpha$  lineation; but the same material so economized by means of six textual modifications as that the first eleven Masses fill precisely an  $\alpha$  quire, and so economized by means of five more textual modifications as that, with the addition of xxiii and the greater part of xxiiii, the point in xxiii thus reached is at once the very point at which we encounter the *nota* 'P. S. F. E.' and the very point at which by my hypothesis a second  $\alpha$  quire came to an end. For the third redaction all that was needed to lodge the capitulum and items i-xviii in two ternions of  $\beta$  lineation was that, taking the second redaction as he found it, the scribe should, as in all like cases, dispense with the *in extenso* conclusion of the Preface of iii and prolong the Super Populum of xvii in accordance with the instructions given him by the editor.

I now resume my examination of the Section, beginning with xxiii for the first redaction and with xviii for the third, and for the second at the *nota* 'P. S. F. E.' in xxiiii.

12. The extant Postcommunion of xxiiii (71:19) comprises two complete and independent prayers which it links together by the words 'misericordiam . . . exorantes ut'. The now needless 'dñe' of the 'hoc tuum' &c. would seem to shew that this was the original constituent. We thus have 84 letters (3  $\theta$  lines) for the first redaction and 227 (8  $\alpha$  lines) for the second.

13. The Preface of xxvi (72:16) falls asunder at 'salutem'; and here the original would seem to have ended, for the axiomatic statement which follows is not in logical connexion with 'quia . . . salutem'. Hence the inference that we have an original of 128 letters (5  $\theta$  lines) augmented by 'quoniam' &c. to 227 (8  $\alpha$  lines).

14. In the first prayer of xxviii not only should the copulative 'et' (73:18) precede, instead of following, 'ut . . . concedas,' the extant whole has the added demerit of questionable theology. I therefore regard all that now follows 'absoluas' as an addition meant to raise

123 letters (5  $\theta$  lines) to 182 (6  $\alpha$  lines). A case in both respects analogous to this awaits us in xxxvi.

15. The extant text of the Preface (73 : 22) of the same Mass would seem to fuse together a superseded and a superseding phrase:—‘*Vere dign. maiestatem tuam deprecantes ut sic vitia nostra depellas sicut [quorum] ferales exstinguis inimicos . . . sed ut . . . largiaris*’; and, by also adding the ill-assorted ‘*semper nos*’ &c., to raise an original total of 220 letters (8  $\theta$  lines) to 290 (10  $\alpha$  lines).

16. The ‘*eruis a peccatis*’ (75 : 1) in the Preface of xxxi must, one would suppose, be an enhancement of text inserted in the course of transcription. Its adoption would raise the total from 61 letters to 75, or from 2 to 3  $\alpha$  lines. See the Super Populum of VIII xiii (5 : 12), where, unless ‘*ab hoste securus*’ be a mere alternative to ‘*a peccatis liber*’, the two phrases should be connected by a copulative conjunction, as in Mur. *Greg.* 255.

17. And in the ‘*praesentibus*’ and ‘*futuris*’ (75 : 7, 8) in the last constituent of the same Mass—the Super Populum next before the Morning and Evening prayers which now break the series—I see no mere alternatives, but material for some such added clause, should stichometrical need arise, as ‘*praesentibus remunerare praemiis et futuris*’. This would raise the total from 109 letters to 148, from 4  $\alpha$  lines to 5. Its purpose resembles that of the seemingly suggested enhancements of text which we have noted in xv, xvi, xvii. In it, as in them, I see the cautious work of one who is approaching a point which he must neither miss nor overstep.

3\*. In xxxii and xxxiii there is nothing that at the present moment invites attention; nor yet in the text of the remaining items, xxxiii–xl, of the Section; except that the ill-placed ‘*et salutaria semper dona capiamus*’ (78 : 24) in the Postcommunion of xxxvi may fairly be attributed to the third redaction, and the total lowered from 105 to 76 letters (3  $\theta$  lines, 3 of  $\alpha$ ) for the first and second.

We shall see presently that the extant numbering of the Section is referable to the second redaction. I therefore regard the rubric (77 : 5) now appended to the numeral of the thirty-fourth item as a cross-division introduced at the third; and to that stage of the evolution of the document do I, as in analogous instances, attribute the rubric, ‘*IN IEIUNIO*,’ now prefixed to the Preface of xxxv (78 : 1).

The account which I have proposed of the seven textual anomalies just examined (one each in xxiii and xxvi, two each in xxviii and xxxi, and one in xxxvi) is an account suggested by their context, by the literary character of the document as a whole, and by their resemblance to like anomalies which we have found to be susceptible of an analogous explanation. So, too, is my attribution of the rubrics in xxxiii and

xxxv. And since we have reached a stage in our examination of the Leonianum at which the result may with some confidence be submitted to a stichometrical test, that test I now apply. Assuming, then, that I have rightly appraised these peculiarities of text and rubric, what do we find?

We find, in the first place, that all that in the first redaction of Section XVIII postulated by my theory intervened between the termination of its thirty-second page, where xxii ends, and the point in xxv now marked by the *nota* 'P. F. E. SP.' had the value of  $50 \theta$  lines; and that from this point to the end of xxviii where now stands the next 'P. F. E. SP.' there were a hundred such lines. And, since between the point just named and the subsidiary series, xxxiii-xlv, with which the Section closes, there is no place where the end of a Mass can have coincided with the end of a  $\theta$  page, I infer that the second 'P. F. E. SP.' marks the end of the main series in the first redaction.<sup>1</sup>

We find, in the second place, that, taking care to eliminate the two groups of prayers which, interpolated between xxxi and xxxii, break the continuity of the numeration, there intervened at the second redaction  $175 \alpha$  lines between the end of the thirty-second page, at the point marked by the *nota* 'P. S. F. E.' in xxxiii and the end of xxxii, at the point there marked by 'P. F. E.' And, since xxxiii is not amenable to the  $\alpha$  criterion, I infer that at the second redaction the main series terminated at this latter point. We further find that the subsidiary series, xxxiii-xlv, has the value of  $350 \alpha$  lines, thus giving the second redaction of the Section a total of  $1325 \alpha$  lines, or  $53 \alpha$  pages.

We find, in the third place, that at the last of the three redactions all that intervened between the termination of its twenty-fourth page, where xviii ends, and the point, at the end of xxxiii, where stands the second 'P. F. E.', had the value of  $400 \beta$  lines, presumably those of an integral quire of  $\beta$  lineation. And we further find that when the subsidiary series, beginning presumably on the first page of a gathering, and headed, as though it were a new section, with the rubric 'INC. PRECES DIURNAE CUM SENSIBUS NECESSARIIS', had run through the  $175$  lines of  $7 \beta$  pages, the very point<sup>2</sup> in xxxviii (81 : 8) must have been reached where now stands the 'MEMORES'—or as, I think, we should read it, the 'MEMOR ES'—which from the days of Bianchini to our own has puzzled all careful students of the Leonianum who have

<sup>1</sup> On revising these pages for the press I observe that both here and in XVI 'P. F. E. SP.' is peculiar to the first redaction, and that this in its turn has no other form of *nota*. Can 'P. F. E.' mean '*paginae finis est*'? The 'SP.' baffles me.

<sup>2</sup> I say 'the very point' advisedly. The value in terms of letters of 'Vere digni ... impugnatione' is 161, the equivalent of  $5 \beta$  lines. Then comes 'MEMORES'. The Preface began on the fifth line from the foot of the page.



been so fortunate as to know of its existence, for Muratori and the Ballerini have not printed it. What account shall we give of it?

Its position, immediately after the last word written on the seventh page of the fourteen devoted to the subsidiary series suggests a plausible account of its nature, meaning, and purpose.

I believe it to be an editorial memorandum which, set in the margin of the archetype of the third redaction, has by clerical error been incorporated into the text. I see in it the two words 'MEMOR ES', and these I interpret as a warning to the scribe, 'Bear in mind the instructions I gave you.' What those instructions may have been will best be surmised when we shall have examined the textual peculiarities of the remaining pages of the Section.

The reader has not forgotten the anomalous '*uel . . . uel*' alternatives (65 : 29, 30) in xvi or the equally anomalous '*aliter*' (66 : 22) in xvii; precautions taken, as I conceive, by the last editor, whose design it was that the last words of xviii should be written on precisely the last of 600 lines, presumably the last of a gathering; nor has he forgotten that the former of these precautions was taken early on the third page from the limit just mentioned.<sup>1</sup> By a curious coincidence the first of the passages I am about to cite stood early on the third page from the end of the Section.<sup>2</sup>

4\*. It occurs (83 : 18) in the Preface of xliii, 'dum simul et experientiam fidei declinarat ad afflictio et per te superata uitae praesentis efficit gloriosam.' Now, it so happens that Muratori [Mur. *Greg.* 282, 331] in two of his MSS finds a Preface identical with this as far as 'ad afflictio', except that for 'declinarat' they read 'declarat'. After 'ad afflictio', however, it diverges thus, 'et uictoriosissima semper perseuerat te adiuuante deuotio. per.' The account, therefore, which I would hazard is that 'uictoriosissima' &c. was the original reading; that some phrase, the mutilated remains of which survive in our impossible 'et per te superata' &c., was proposed by the last editor as an addition to it; but that the scribe, instead of adding, substituted, and substituted carelessly.

If so, what can the last editor's marginated *aliter* have been?

The passage as a whole is reminiscent of St Paul's teaching to the Romans (Rom. v 3) at a place rendered thus by the Vulgate, 'scientes

<sup>1</sup> The third  $\beta$  page from the end of xviii began at or about the second syllable of 'totis' (65 : 27) in the Preface of xvi. The '*uel . . . uel*' alternatives are a line or two lower down and in the same constituent.

<sup>2</sup> The third  $\beta$  page from the end of the fourteen pages which the third editor devoted to the subsidiary series began at the middle of 'perficiens' (83 : 16), one line of the Preface of xliii having been written on the preceding page. The passage cited above occurs in this constituent.

quod tribulatio patientiam operatur, patientia autem probationem, probatio uero spes.' Equating *tribulatio* = *ad afflictio* and *patientia* = *experientia*, we get 'scientes quod ad afflictio operatur experientiam, experientia autem probationem, probatio uero spes'. I suspect, therefore, that it was the editor's design to amplify the passage by the words which I now italicize, 'dum simul et experientiam fidei declarat ad afflictio et ad afflictio declarat experientiam et experientia probationem et probatio spes uitae praesentis efficit gloriosam, et uictoriosissima semper perseuerat te adiuuante deuotio. per.'; but that the scribe, forgetful of the warning 'MEMOR ES', cancelled 'et uictoriosissima . . . deuotio', which he should have allowed to stand, and, instead of writing 'et ad afflictio declarat experientiam . . . et probatio spes', so far mistook the editor's note as to interpret it as meaning either 'et per te superata' or something which might easily take that form in future transcriptions. In offering this suggestion I assume that the editor did not write the proposed insertion *in extenso*, but satisfied himself with notifying the repeated words of the strictly biblical portion of it in shorthand or by other compendious intimation.' If it be worthy of consideration, I would further remark that the 'et per te' of the Verona text may be referable to 'experientia' and the 'perata' of 'superata' to 'probatio'. If it be worthy of acceptance, it gives us a total of 347 letters (11  $\beta$  lines) for the value of the Preface of xliii at the third redaction as against 243 (8  $\alpha$  lines and 8 of  $\beta$ ) at the second.

5\*. The extant text of the Preface of xliiii (84 : 4) cannot be right, 'qui ideo . . . prospera . . . impendis cum haec in tui nominis cultu transferimus promptiorem'; where for 'cultu' and 'promptiorem' the editors read 'cultum' and 'promptiores'; two bold but simple changes which give us good syntax but nothing else, for 'tui nominis cultus' is too unlikely a phrase to be hazarded with safety. I suspect that the original reading was 'cum haec in tui nominis transferimus laudem'; and that it was the last editor's intention, intimated in a marginal memorandum, to raise the total of the Preface, should need be found for doing so, but not otherwise, from 154 letters (6  $\alpha$  lines, 5 of  $\beta$ ) to 169 (6  $\beta$  lines), by developing the phrase into 'cum haec in tui nominis laudem cultu transferimus promptiore'. Here, again, if this be so, we see the reason of the warning 'MEMOR ES'; as though the writer of it meant to say 'I have left the text as it was; but should amplification be needed, as doubtless it will, you will find all you want in my shorthand adversaria. But, *memor es*, be careful in adopting any or all of them to develop them in scholarly fashion'.

6\*. The last of these exceptional cases—exceptional because, unlike

<sup>1</sup> For a perhaps similar case see my *Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, p. clii.

the juxtaposed alternations with which the document abounds, they violate the laws of grammar—is in the Postcommunion (84 : 9) of the same Mass:—‘qui nos et temporalibus subsidiis refoues et pacis aeternis,’ with a superscribed ‘aeternae’. This I resolve into an original ‘qui nos et temporalibus subsidiis refoues et aeternis’ in 86 letters (3 lines of  $\theta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ), and, should occasion be found to require it, a suggestion in the margin of some such phrase as ‘qui nos et temporalibus subsidiis refoues et pacis aeternae promissione sustentas’ or the like, in 111 letters (4  $\beta$  lines).

Thus the aduersaria, to which I believe the editor of the third redaction meant to call the attention of his amanuensis by the memorandum ‘MEMOR ES’, would, if duly developed, have raised the contents of the last seven pages of the Section from 170 to 175 lines.

MARTIN RULE.

(To be continued.)

## SOME LITURGICAL AND ASCETIC TRADITIONS OF THE CELTIC CHURCH.

### I. GENUFLEXION.

WALAHFRID STRABO († 849) in his *De Ecclesiasticarum rerum exordiis et incrementis* writes:—

‘Quamvis autem geniculationis morem tota seruet Ecclesia, tamen praecipue huic operi Scotorum insistit natio: quorum multi pluribus, multi paucioribus, sed tamen certis vicibus et dinumeratis per diem vel noctem genu flectentes, non solum pro peccatis deplorandis, sed etiam pro quotidianae devotionis expletione studium istud frequentare videntur.’<sup>1</sup>

A manuscript in Irish character, belonging to the Berne Library, *Codex Bongarsianus*, n. 363 (ninth century), contains, among other things, the commentary of the grammarian Servius Maurus on Virgil. Naturalists, it is said there, maintain that each part of the body is dedicated to a special virtue: ‘. . . frontem genio, unde venerantes deum tangimus frontem; dexteram fidei; genua misericordiae, unde haec tangunt rogantes.’ And the Irish scribe adds in the margin, by way of gloss: ‘de flexu genuum ut Scotti faciunt.’<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Walaf. Strabo *De eccles. rer.* 25 (Migne *P. L.* cxiv 952–953).

<sup>2</sup> L. C. Stern *Bemerkungen zu den Berner Glossen in Zeitsch. f. celtische Philologie* iv p. 180.