

# 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:



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



<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. II.

THE nineteenth Section has incurred the censure of the critics. They remark with more zeal than discretion—for the blunder, if blunder there be, may be that of some post-editorial rubricator, and should be carefully discriminated from anomalies inherent to the document—that the St Stephen of the capitulum is not the St Stephen of the several items; and, again with more zeal than discretion, they resent the inconsistency of grouping Masses which they assume to have been originally designed for the twenty-sixth of December in a Section attributed to the second of August.

As to the first of these complaints, I would suggest that the second of August may have been the day on which one or more Masses, the nucleus of the series, were originally said; and that the local attribution, so far from betraying a mistake in identification, is thus the record of a fact; a church of St Stephen the protomartyr—presumably that built by Demetrius and dedicated by Leo the Great—having been consecrated on the Feast of St Stephen the pope. And I would further suggest that, as in like instances, the local attribution is later than the first issue. I assign it to Hilarus, who might have meant it as a warning to any who should be disposed to deem 'IIII NŌN. AŪG.' a clerical error for 'III NŌN. AŪG.', the date of the then recently adopted *Inventio* of the protomartyr.

As to the second complaint, I do not care to insist on the fact that only the last three items of the nine are amenable to it; for I find that the discrepancy which has provoked it—like that in the somewhat analogous anomaly, already explained and justified, in Section X—gives us a clue to the internal history of the document. First, however, let me dispose of the values in terms of letters of the successive constituents of the series:—

XVIII. III. NŌN. AŪG. N̄. S̄CI STEFANI, ETC.    i: 151, 148, 881, 103, 199.    ii: 284, 119, 495.    iii: 115, 495.    iiiii: 230, 157, 121, 320.    v: 115, 488.    vi: 129, 223, 134, 129.    vii: 137, 150, 167, 343.    viiii: 91, 210, 128, 165.    viiiii: 133, 107, 250, 130, 98.

Four modifications of these figures may be proposed. (1) For 'quantum . . . trepidantum . . . confidentes' in the second constituent of i (85 : 13) I should read 'quantum . . . trepidantes tantum . . . confidentes', in preference to Bianchini's 'quantum . . . trepidi tantum . . . confidentes'. (2) In the Preface of iii (87 : 4) for 'tantum gratia' read 'tantam gratiam'; as in that of v (88 : 6). (3) In the last constituent of viii the phrase (89 : 31) 'et sacramentis instructa salutaribus et fulta praesidiis' would seem to need some such word as 'caelestibus' if due balance is to be given to the antithesis. This would raise the numerical value from 165 letters to 176. (4) In the Preface of viiii (90 : 8) for 'qua dicata nomini tuo basilica . . . signauit' I read, as against Bianchini, 'quam dicata' &c. See the 'quam . . . sanguis . . . signauit' of the first Preface in XXII (100 : 8).

The account I propose of these nine Masses is that, with a slightly briefer text than that now extant, some, if not all, of them were originally compiled by or for Leo the Great, who consecrated the earliest recorded Roman basilica in honour of the protomartyr; that Hilarus, his successor, took advantage of the  $\alpha$  lineation employed for the second general redaction to introduce sundry references to the Nativity, his three oratories contiguous to the colonnade enclosing the font of Constantine having been dedicated, one to St John the Baptist as Prophet, another to St John the Divine as Doctor, the third to St Stephen as Martyr, of the Incarnation, the mystery to the Catholic definition of which he had devoted the best energies of his mind and only not sacrificed his life; and that like advantage was taken of the  $\beta$  lineation—perhaps by Simplicius, the successor of Hilarus—to introduce yet other references on the same topic. (1) The first in textual order of these references is in the Super Populum of vi (88 : 27): 'Conserua . . . ut tua redemptione sint digni, tua semper gratia sint repleti. per,' where the phrase I italicize is so early in the series, so short and so incidental, as not likely to have been of itself an *ex post facto* addition; so that the more probable of two alternative hypotheses is that which makes the whole prayer adventitious to the original scheme of the Mass. (2) The second reference, in the opening prayer of vii (89 : 2), is, like the first, reminiscent of the Apostle's 'Misit Deus Filium suum, factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret' (Gal. iv 4, 5), as also of the Evangelist's 'Benedictus . . . qui fecit redemptionem plebis suae' (Luke i 68) and 'omnibus qui expectabant redemptionem Israel' (ibid. ii 38). There need be no doubt that the prayer is new from beginning to end. (3) This cannot, I think, be said of the *Secreta* (89 : 8) of vii. That the original scheme of the Mass should have lacked a *Secreta* is by no means likely, and the laboured diction of the extant prayer would seem to indicate an amalga-

mation of new text with old, the new containing the reference to the Nativity; thus, where I bracket what I conceive to be new:—‘Inter [nostrae redemptionis miranda beneficia et] scōrum martyrum gloriosa sollemnia cum muneribus tuae laudis occurrimus agentes gratias [et de largitate beneficii et] de prouisione suffragiū. per.’ If this be so, we have an original in 106 letters (4  $\theta$  lines) and a more recent form in 167 (6  $\alpha$  lines, 6 of  $\beta$ ). (4) The Preface of the same Mass falls into two parts; the first (89 : 12) in 221 letters (8  $\theta$  lines) being original, the second, ‘et ideo’ &c., being presumably adventitious and yielding an ultimate total of 343 letters (12  $\alpha$  lines, 11 of  $\beta$ ). (5) The fifth reference to the Nativity is embodied in the Postcommunion of viii (89 : 27). The whole of this prayer must be regarded as adventitious, inasmuch as the cardinal word ‘multiplicatis’ not only implies the reference but is intrinsic to the whole structure of the prayer. (6) The last reference to the Nativity (89 : 30), ‘D̄s generis institutor et reparator’ &c., in the Super Populum of viii, is not so conspicuous as the other five; but that it is a reference to the Nativity no liturgical scholar will question.

Of these six references the most explicit are obviously those which have *a priori* the strongest claim to precedence in respect of time, and thus the strongest claim to be classed as part of the second redaction. Remarkably enough, these are the three comprised in vii and the Postcommunion of viii; and, as remarkably, their inclusion effects an ultimate total of 250  $\alpha$  lines. The other two, added *ex hypothesi* at a later date, yield a third total of 249  $\beta$  lines.

Set forth in terms of lines the result is:—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XVIII. III NŌN. AŪG. N̄. SCĪ. STEFANI ETC., ETC.	3	4	4
i: 1, (6) 5, (6) 5, (32) 29 (28), 4 (3), 7 . . .	56	51	49
ii: 1, 10 (9), (5) 4, (18) 17 (16) . . .	34	32	30
iii: 1, 4, (18) 17 (16) . . .	23	22	21
iiii: 1, 8, (6) 5, (5) 4, (12) 11 (10) . . .	32	29	28
v: 1, 4, (18) 16 . . .	23	21	21
vi: 1, 5, 8 (7), 5, 0 (4) . . .	19	19	22
vii: 1, (0) 5, (6) 5, (4) 6, (8) 12 (11) . . .	19	29	28
viii: 1, (4) 3, (8) 7, (0) 4, 0 (6) . . .	13	15	21
viii: 1, 5, 4, 9 (8), 5 (4), 4 (3) . . .	<u>28 = 250</u>	<u>28 = 250</u>	<u>25 = 249</u>

In a word, the discrepancy between the title of Section XVIII and the references to the Nativity contained in some of the Masses is not referable to the original scheme of the series, but is due to *ex post facto* additions, the earliest of which were made in the pontificate of Hilarus. It may be a blemish. If so, it is a *felix culpa*; for, like the

anomalously placed ember Mass in Section X, it serves as a searchlight for elucidating the history of the document.

## SECTION XX.

The first summary of values for the sixth of August is this:—

XX. VIII IDUS AUGUSTI, ETC., ETC. (no rubric) 158, 142, 215. ii: 223, 102, 251. iii: 73, 142, 209, 124, 98, 222. iiiii: 96, 137, 178, 156, 169. v: 94, 102, 211, 111, 91. vi: 95, 119, 139, 78. vii: 149, 86, 212. IN NATALE ETC., 141, 113, 117, 155, 99, 110.

Three textual emendations may be hazarded. (1) In the Postcommunio of iiiii (92 : 13) for 'ut . . . possimus emendare correcti' we should perhaps read 'ut . . . possimus nosmetipsos emendare correcti'. (2) For 'reddes beneficia munera libertatis' (94 : 3) in the last Preface of the series 'reddens benefica munera libertatis' would perhaps be the right reading; and (3) in the last Super Populum (94 : 8), instead of 'actione' I should read 'in actione'.

The first Preface (93 : 18) of the double item headed 'vii' is worded thus:—'cognoscimus . . . tuae pietatis effectus quibus . . . Xysti semper honoranda sollempnia nec inter praeteritas mundi tribulationes omittere uoluisti et nunc reddita praestas libertate uenerari.' Since, then, this Preface was said on the sequel of hostilities which did not interfere with a festivity falling on the sixth of August and celebrated in the Cemetery of Callixtus on the Appian Way, it cannot have been said during the siege of Rome by Witiges, for this included the whole of the latter half of the year 537; nor can it have been said so long as the memory of that siege lingered in the public mind. On the other hand, since the hostilities to which the Preface refers had been preceded by others overruled, like them, in favour of the Feast of St Sixtus on a sixth of August, the words just cited cannot have been penned on occasion of the plunder of Rome and the Campagna by Gaiseric and his Vandals in the summer of 455; for Alaric's terrible siege in 410 was at that time still too recent an event to render possible a retrospective reference such as that implied by the phrase 'nec inter praeteritas mundi tribulationes omittere uoluisti'.

The obvious inference suggested by these considerations is that, of the 'praeteritae tribulationes' and the 'nunc reddita libertas' included in the chronological scope of the first Preface of vii, the 'tribulationes' were those inflicted by Gaiseric in 455, and the 'libertas' that consequent on the victory over Ricimer in the July of 472.

A second characteristic of the first Preface of vii is one which pervades each of the two Masses combined under that heading. Their 'securis mentibus [celebramus]', their '[nunc] reddita libertas',

their '[percepit] de tribulatione auxilium', their '[reddis] munera libertatis', and their 'in actione [*or* actionem] gratiarum propensius intuere' (93 : 14, 21, 31 ; 94 : 3, 8) make it clear that the recent trouble, though very recent, was a finally ended trouble.

Not so the trouble, quite as clearly indicated, which forms the burden of *iiii*. This component, unlike *vii*, was evidently penned during, not after, a crisis of imminent peril. Its 'ab hostium nos defende propitiatus incursu' and 'nobis praebeant inter aduersa constantiam' remind us of the 'ab hostium furore defende' (26 : 16) and 'hostili nullatenus incursione turbetur' (26 : 8) in Section X, which we have identified with the summer of 455 and the interval spent by Gaiseric's barbarians in ravaging the cornfields of the Campagna after their evacuation of Rome in the first half of June ; while its 'continuata censura' (92 : 11) is curiously suggestive of the 'uerbera multiplicata' which I have ventured to identify with Attila's invasion of Italy in the summer of 452. (See *J. T. S.* vol. ix, p. 527.)

Now, as regards so much of the Leonianum as we have examined hitherto we can say with moral certainty that the first of the three redactions postulated by my theory implies a part, at least, of the pontificate of Leo and a part, at least, of the pontificate of Hilarus, the next Bishop of Rome ; while in Section XVII four textual peculiarities and the last Mass of the series are to be attributed to Simplicius, the successor of Hilarus. In this Section, while the penultimate item is very probably referable to Simplicius and the year 472, the fourth is with like probability referable to Leo the Great and 452 or 455. Does the bibliographical inference thus suggested bear the application of a stichometrical test ?

Taken as a whole, the present Section responds accurately to the  $\beta$  criterion ; its title, rubrics, and text being the equivalent of 175  $\beta$  lines. But, taken as a whole, it rebels against the other two criteria. But if, governed by analogy, we assume, first, that the title was originally cast in some such simple form as 'N̄. SC̄ORUM XVSTI FELICISSIMI ET AGAPITI',<sup>1</sup> and, secondly, that the Preface of *vi* (93 : 8) ended originally with 'annua recursione ueneramur. per', we find that the last of 150  $\theta$  lines and the last of 149  $\alpha$  lines must have coincided with the concluding syllables of *vi*.

I conclude, therefore, that the first and second redactions comprised items *i-vi* of the extant series, but that *vii* is proper to the third ; and that, unless the compiler of this last was satisfied for a while with a total of 133 lines—an improbable hypothesis—his work on the Section is not to be dated before the summer of 472. Ricimer's five months' siege of Rome was brought to an end on or about the eleventh

<sup>1</sup> As in Sections XVII and XL. See *J. T. S.* vol. ix. p. 543 ; below, p. 94.

of July; and we may fairly presume that harvest and the ripening vintage postponed the final departure of his hosts until the early days of August. A like delay, if I rightly interpret *iiii*, had taken place in 455.

My summary in terms of lines is as follows:—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XX. VIII IDUS AUGUSTI, ETC., ETC.	4	8	5
6 (5), 5, (8) 7 . . . . .	19	18	17
ii: 1, 8 (7), 4 (3), 9 (8) . . . . .	22	22	19
iii: 1, 3, 5, (8) 7, (5) 4, 4 (3), 8 (7) . . . . .	34	32	30
iiii: 1, 4 (3), 5, (7) 6, 6 (5), 6 . . . . .	29	28	26
v: 1, (4) 3, 4 (3), (8) 7, 4, (4) 3 . . . . .	25	22	21
vi: 1, 4 (3), (5) 4, (4) 5 + 4 (4), 3 . . . . .	<u>17 = 150</u>	<u>21 = 149</u>	<u>15 = 133</u>
vii: 1, 5, 3, 7 . . . . .			16
IN NATALE SCORUM FELICISSIMI ET AGAPITI . . . . .			1
5, 4, 4, 5, 4 (3), 4 . . . . .			<u>25 = 175</u>

But, even so, I cannot persuade myself that we have yet worked back our way to the 'simplest expression' of the series. For, remarkable as is the key-note of apprehension and alarm that governs the first and second, the fourth and last of the five constituents of *iiii*, the latter (92 : 8) of the two sentences into which the Preface falls apart is not only structurally independent of the first, it evinces a gratulation so strangely out of keeping with the other portions of the Mass as to raise the suspicion that it is an *ex post facto* insertion. Again: the 'gloriosum denique . . . uictoria' (91 : 32) at the end of *iii* is not only a distinct sentence structurally independent of the contextual 'Vere digni qui scō . . . contulisti', it restricts itself to one disciple, whether Agapitus or Felicissimus we cannot say, of St Sixtus; and thus either contravenes the preceding context, 'Vere digni qui . . . Xysto . . . ut etiam subiectis sibi ministris ecclesiae proficeret,' or proves itself to be ethically out of focus with it. In either case it is hard to believe that the two halves of the constituent can have been written at one and the same time. And yet again: this seemingly *ex post facto* 'gloriosum denique . . . uictoria' is the only passage in the first four Masses which makes any such categorical reference to any one besides St Sixtus as to oblige us to infer that the proper subject of the celebration was not that martyr to the exclusion of all others. Hence the question whether the original title may not have been merely 'NATALE SCĪ XYSTI'.

Another peculiarity must here be noted. The fifth item of the series, as we learn (92 : 26) from the 'natalicia praelibantes' of the Preface, is

<sup>1</sup> My argument is not vitiated by the 'Magnificasti dñe scōs tuos' (91 : 7) in *ii*. The same prayer recurs (95 : 11) in *XXI iii*, where there is no question whatever of any saint but St Laurence.

a Mass for the Vigil. Are we to see in this a proof that the document as a whole is what the Ballerini would call a 'magna congeries ualde perturbata', or shall we hope to find in it proof of a new departure in the elaboration of the present Section? A new departure it may have been if time was when the nucleus of the extant Section comprised no more than the first four Masses, *minus* the additions which by my hypothesis were introduced by some later pen. The surmise is justified by the linear values which that hypothesis postulates as the consequence of a capitulum requiring 3 lines, of a Preface to iii in 146 letters (5  $\theta$  lines) and of a Preface to iiiii in 82 letters (3  $\theta$  lines). Thus:—

	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XX. VIII IDUS AUGUSTI, ETC., ETC.	3	4	6	5
6 (5), 5, (8) 7 . . . . .	19	19	18	17
ii: 1, 8 (7), 4 (3), 9 (8) . . . . .	22	22	22	19
iii: 1, 3, 5, (8) 7, (5) 4, 4 (3), (5 replaced by 8) 8 . . . . .	31=75	34	32	30
iii: 1, 4 (3), 5, (3 replaced by 7) 6, 6 (5), 6 . . . . .	<u>25=100</u>	29	28	26
{ v: 1, (4) 3, 4 (3), (8) 7, 4, (4) 3 . . . . .		25	22	21
{ vi: 1, 4 (3), (5) 4, (4) 5 + 4 (4), 3 . . . . .		<u>17=150</u>	<u>21=149</u>	15
vii: 1, 5, 3, 7 . . . . .				16
IN NATALE SCÖRUM FELICISSIMI ET AGAPITI				I
5, 4, 4, 5, 4 (3), 4 . . . . .				<u>25=175</u>

Here, therefore, as with Sections X and XVI, we seem to detect an anticipatory issue on pages of  $\theta$  lineation. Other instances await us

SECTION XXI.

I first set down the values in terms of letters for the present series.—

XXI. III. ID. AUG., ETC., ETC.	i: 121, 146, 121, 100.	ii: 163, 124, 189, 105, 106.	iii: 102, 219, 107.	iiii: 123, 300, 124.	v: 117, 128.	vi: 106, 211.
	vii: 113, 119, 71, 81, 103.	viii: 115, 113, 113.	viiii: 105, 147, 189, 137.		ix: 170, 98, 284.	
	xi: 124, 134, 345, 110, 113.		xii: 117, 125, 136, 92.		xiii: AD OCTABAS, 115, 82, 104, 89.	

The text of xii and xiii invites correction.

i. In the Preface of the former (98 : 26) I bracket off what seems to be redundant, and insert in italics what I suspect to be missing: 'de beati . . . sollempnitate Laurenti . . . Roma laetatur, cuius nascendo cuius *cuius* sacer minister [et] dicatum nomini tuo munus est *prosecutus* proprium, qui . . . emeruit pro praemio [quam] *quo*<sup>1</sup> caelestis exsisteret *quam* consecutus est passionem. per.' Scholars will note that the proposed

<sup>1</sup> If I rightly understand Dr Feltoe, 'quam' may in the Verona text have been altered by erasure into 'qua'.



additions are suggested by the present state of the text as preserved in Verona. 2. In the Preface of xiii (99 : 13), instead of cancelling 'confessione', we should perhaps make it change places with 'hodierna festiuitate', thus:—'Offerimus hostias . . . in sc̄i Laurenti martyris tui confessione hodierna festiuitate gaudentes,' &c.<sup>1</sup>

I cannot but think that v-x must have been written by or for one or more popes who were in some special sense under the patronage of St Laurence. The 'nostrae seruitutis oblatio' (96 : 2) of v, the 'annua uota repetentes' (96 : 14) of vi, the 'nostra ministerii seruitus' (97 : 3) of viii, the 'debitum nostrae seruitutis' (97 : 15) of viii, and in x the phrases 'fidelis ille patronus' (98 : 2), 'qua . . . nos amemus eius [sc̄i. sc̄i Laurenti] meritum passionis' (98 : 1), and 'sc̄m Laurentium . . . diligimus' (98 : 3) would seem to lend countenance to the idea. In this connexion it is opportune to remark, first, that, as we shall see in the sequel, the anniversary of St Laurence, the tenth of August, 440, is a highly probable date for the entombment of Sixtus III and for the election of Leo, his successor, and that the only extant sermon [lxxxv] of Leo's in honour of St Laurence contains the phrase 'cuius [sc̄i. Laurentii] oratione et patrocinio adiuuari nos sine cessatione confidimus';<sup>2</sup> secondly, that Hilarus, the next Bishop of Rome, would seem to have had a special devotion to St Laurence, under whose patronage he erected a monasterium on the Esquiline, as recorded in a sculptured inscription discovered in comparatively modern times, and to whose basilica on the Via Tiburtina he made very considerable additions, besides choosing it as his own last resting-place.

These considerations raise the further question whether the first two Masses, or possibly the first four, of the present Section may not have been composed in the pontificate of Sixtus III. Certainly, they contain no such seemingly personal references as do v, vi, vii, viii, viii, and x; but, as certainly, Sixtus was not unmindful of St Laurence, for it was he who erected the *confessio* over the saint's tomb in the basilica just mentioned, and who, at the instance of Valentinian III, built the intramural church of St Laurence in Lucina.

After Sixtus III, Leo, and Hilarus came Pope Simplicius. He, too, paid honour to St Laurence, but in a different fashion from his predecessors. He made the basilica on the Via Tiburtina the centre of a *regio*, together with those of St Peter on the Vatican Hill and St Paul on the Via Ostiensis. 'Hic constituit,' says the Liber Pontificalis, 'ad sanctum Petrum apostolum et ad sanctum Paulum apostolum et ad sanctum Laurentium martyrem hebdomadam, ut presbyteri manerent

<sup>1</sup> In the last prayer of xii I read (99 : 6) 'suffragio . . . optato' with the older editors, as against Dr Feltoe's 'suffragia . . . optato',

<sup>2</sup> Migne S.L. lv 437 B.

ibi propter poenitentes et baptismum.' It may therefore be that xii, xiii, xiiii—the first of these is for the Vigil—are due to Simplicius, like the last item of XVII and the two *missae* at the end of XX;<sup>1</sup> and this is the more probable as the three Sections are technically analogous. The whole of the present series responds to the  $\beta$  criterion, as does the whole of XVII and of XX; but it refuses to yield a total of integral  $\alpha$  pages unless curtailed of the concluding triad, just as they refuse to yield such total unless curtailed of material which finds its most probable attribution in the episcopate of Simplicius. The subjoined list in terms of  $\beta$  and of  $\alpha$  lines, but not of  $\theta$ , illustrates the fact:—

	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XXI. III. ID. AÜG. N. SCĪ LAURENTI	3	3
i: 1, 4, 5, 4, 4(3)	18	17
ii: 1, 6(5), 4, 7(6), 4, 4	26	24
iii: 1, 4(3), 7, 4	16	15
iiii: 1, 4, 10, 4	19	19
v: 1, 4, 8(7)	13	12
vi: 1, 4, 7	12	12
vii: 1, 4, 4, 3(2), 3, 4	19	18
viii: 1, 4, 4, 4	13	13
viiii: 1(0), 4, 5, 4, 4	18	17 = 150 <sup>2</sup>
x: 1, 5, 5, 6, 5	22	22
xi: 1, 6, 4(3), 10(9)	<u>21 = 200</u>	19
{ xii: 1, 4, 5, 12, 4, 4		27
{ xiii: 1, 4, 5, 4, 3		17
{ xiiii: 1, 4, 3, 4, 3		<u>15 = 250</u>

On examining the text of i–xi I note that the last prayer of vii (96 : 30) is not a true Super Populum, and I infer that it may be a piece of editorial 'padding', like the superfluous prayers in XVI xxv and in XVIII viiii, xii. A like inference is invited by the 'prunis namque . . . in caelis' (98 : 15) in the Preface of xi, which not only carries on the constituent to a much greater length than most of its predecessors but reads like the work of one who laboriously adds phrase to phrase so as gradually but safely to reach a predetermined limit, thus resembling the instances in XVI xvii and xxi. It will be seen presently that by eliminating these two batches of text we reduce i–xi, with the capitulum, to a total of 200  $\theta$  lines.

But even so we do not seem to have reached the core of the problem: for two reasons. First, because if, as will be conceded by those who

<sup>1</sup> See *J.T.S.* vol. ix, p. 543: see also above, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> By omitting 'ITEM ALIA' (97 : 11) the editor of the last redaction enabled viiii to end at the foot of a page. The reason for this will appear presently.

have made a study of the legend of St Laurence, a new departure in that legend is to be noted in the presumably *ex post facto* 'prunis namque . . . in caelis' (98 : 15) just mentioned, a like, though somewhat slighter, suspicion may fairly be entertained of the passage (95 : 28) 'qui pro confessione . . . permansit' in the Preface of iiiii. Secondly, because, if it be fair to regard the last prayer in vii as *ex post facto* because it is not a true Postcommunion, the like assumption is fair of the last constituent of iiiii (95 : 32), for it reads like an Oratio.<sup>1</sup>

For these reasons I think it possible (i) that at a period in the development of the document prior to that indicated by my total of 200  $\theta$  lines, twenty-two of which were devoted to Mass iiiii, Mass iiiii may have required as few as ten for its accommodation, one being devoted to the rubric, five to the Oratio, and, finally, four to the Preface as *ex hypothesi* it stood in the first instance ; and (ii) that the number of items extant at that period was such that their aggregate value was represented by some integral multiple of 25  $\theta$  lines less than eight. That this is no idle fancy will be seen from the table which I now sub-join, and in which by means of brackets I also call attention to the fact that if i is a Mass for the Vigil so also is x, so also xii. (See 97 : 30, 98 : 21).

	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XXI. III. ID. AÜG. N. SCĪ LAURENTI	3	3	3	3
{ i: 1, (5) 4, (6) 5, (5) 4, 4 (3) . . . . .	20	20	18	17
{ ii: 1, 6 (5), (5) 4, 7 (6), 4, 4 . . . . .	27 = 50	27 = 50	26	24
iii: 1, 4 (3), (8) 7, 4 . . . . .	17	17	16	15
iiii: 1, (5) 4, 4 (replaced by II) 10, o (replaced by 5) 4 . . . . .	10	22	19	19
v: 1, 4, 8 (7) . . . . .	13	13	13	12
vi: 1, 4, (8) 7 . . . . .	13	13	12	12
vii: 1, 4, 4, 8 (2), 8, (o) 4 . . . . .	15	15	19	18
viii: 1, 4, 4, 4 . . . . .	13	13	13	13
viiii: 1 (o), 4, (6) 5, 4, 4 . . . . .	<u>19 = 150</u>	19	18	17 = 150
{ x: 1, 5, 5, (7) 6, 5 . . . . .		23	22	22
{ xi: 1, 6, 4 (3), (4) 10 (9) . . . . .		<u>15 = 200</u>	<u>21 = 200</u>	19
{ xii: 1, 4, 5 (4), 12 (II), 4 (3), 4 . . . . .				27
{ xiii: 1, 4, 5, 4, 8 . . . . .				17
{ xiiii: 1, 4, 3, 4, 8 . . . . .				<u>15 = 250</u>

There are, as is well known, two accounts of the passion of St Laurence.

<sup>1</sup> It figures as an Oratio (Mur. *Greg.* 111) in the falsely styled 'Hadrianic Sacramentary', Alcuin's wreck of a post-Gregorian development of St Gregory's earlier scheme of the Missal.

The earlier, or classical, account is thus epitomized by Pope Damasus :—

‘ Verbera, carnifices, flammæ, tormenta, catenas  
Vincere Laurenti sola fides potuit.’

The later account, as made famous by Prudentius, mentions but one form of punishment, and by implication excludes all others. According to this, life was extinguished by studiously regulated torture over a slow fire.

Of these two accounts the earlier would seem to be implied by i–viii, not indeed as they now are, but as I conceive them to have been when originally set forth at the first general redaction, Mass iii at that time comprising, like v and vi, only a *Secreta* and a *Preface*, this latter constituent being short, like those of i, vii, viii, and viii, and counting 99 letters (4  $\theta$  lines)—‘ Vere dign. quoniam . . . ueneramur. per’ (95 : 26, 27); and also by x, xi, as originally set forth in a re-edition of the first general redaction, the *Preface* of xi, ‘ Vere dign. in die . . . suscepisti. per’ (98 : 13–15) in 111 letters (4  $\theta$  lines) not as yet being prolonged to 284 (10  $\alpha$  lines) by the all too graphic ‘ prunis namque superposita’ &c.

Now, i–iii, iii being as yet in the original form which I postulate for it, may with some show of probability be attributed to Sixtus III (A.D. 432–440); but if they are not his they are in all moral certainty Leo’s (A.D. 440–461), as also are the original constituents of v–viii; and to Leo, but at a comparatively late period in his life, I further attribute x, xi, in the original text which I postulate for them.

My theory, then, respecting x and xi—x being for *Vigil* and xi for *Feast*—is that they are a pair of Masses added to the original edition of i–viii at a time when the  $\theta$  lineation was still in use; and that they are referable to the *monasterium* which Hilarus, while as yet Leo’s arch-deacon, erected on the *Esquiline Hill*, as recorded by the extant inscription ‘ + AUXILIANTE DÑO DŌ Ñ XPO ORANTE BEATO LAURENTIO MARTYRE HILARUS ARCHIDIAC FECIT’. But, since they have the value of only eight-and-thirty lines, I think that care was on that occasion taken to write out i–viii afresh, and in the course of transcription to give iii a nett enhancement of twelve lines by adding ‘ qui pro confessione . . . permansit’ to the *Preface*<sup>1</sup> and by introducing the new prayer ‘ Excita dñe’ &c., a prayer which, though not a *Postcommunion*, happened to satisfy the *stichometrical* exigency of the moment. In making or, in any case, sanctioning this development of the fourth *Preface* the reviser superadded to the old classical tradition the newer

<sup>1</sup> With the ‘ solida uictor mente permansit’ (95 : 31) of this passage compare (Migne liv 435 B) the ‘ solidissimam fortitudinem’ of St Leo’s *Sermon* (lxxxv) on St Laurence. On the other hand; whereas the ‘ mutata tormenta’ of the *Preface*, as interpreted by its context, recalls the classical account, the ‘ mutatio’ on which

account which Prudentius had some years before embodied in his famous Hymn.

And I further think that when Hilarus, by this time Bishop of Rome, was engaged on the second general redaction and proposed so to amplify the 200  $\theta$  lines of existing material as to fill 200  $\alpha$  lines, he in his turn seized the opportunity for setting on record a witness to the hold, perhaps the exclusive hold, which the later account had taken of his own imagination by adding to the Preface of xi (98 : 15) a passage which differs conspicuously from Leo's addition to the fourth Preface, inasmuch as it makes no reference whatever to any mode of punishment but the fiery torture of the gridiron.

If in our examination of the Petrine Masses it was interesting to note how categorically in the Prefaces of XVI x, xiiii the theory of the dogmatic *magisterium* of the Roman See was formulated during the interval that separated the second general redaction from the earlier issue of the first; it is not less interesting, though for a very different reason, to watch, during presumably the same period of time, the transition, through  $\theta_2$  and St Leo's Sermon, from the old Laurentian legend as embodied in the  $\theta_1$  text to the new as recorded in  $\alpha$ .

## SECTION XXII.

The values of the two items in Section XXII of the Verona MS are:—

XXII. IDUS AŪG. &c., &c. (no numeral) 105, 100, 170, 115, 114. ii : 100, 113, 189, 89, 115.

We shall perhaps do well if, with the Canterbury Missal, we insert 'tuorum' before 'festiuitate' in the second prayer (100 : 5).

Leo dwells in the Sermon (*ut supra*, 437 C) suggests by its 'conuersorum alterna mutatio membrorum' the horrid incident depicted by Prudentius:—

'Postquam uapor diutius  
Decoxit exustum latus,  
Ultro e catasta iudicem  
Compellat affatu breui.

"Conuerte partem corporis,  
Satis crematur iugiter,  
Et fac periculum quid tuus  
Vulcanus ardens egerit."

'Praefectus inuerti iubet.  
Tunc ille, "Coctum est, deuora,  
Et experimentum cape  
Sit crudum an assum suauius".'

A few cautions are here necessary:—

1. Thanks to the shortness of these two *missae* and to the fact that their  $\theta$  values are equal to their values by the  $a$  lineation, we cannot on merely stichometrical grounds assume that either of them is as old as the first general redaction.

2. The latter of them mentions neither Hippolytus nor Pontianus; but Agapitus, a martyr whose feast, if the sequence of the Sections may guide us, cannot have fallen earlier than the thirteenth or later than the thirtieth of August. I believe it to have been, in the intention of its first editor, the sole occupant of a distinct Section which, for whatever reason, has not received its proper capitulum in the Verona MS. The surmise is justified by the totals of linear values:—

	$\theta$	$a$	$\beta$
XXII. IDUS AŪG. N̄. S̄CORUM YPOLITI ET PONTIANI	3	3	3
4, 4, 6, 4, 4 . . . . .	<u>22 = 25</u>	<u>22 = 25</u>	<u>22 = 25</u>
	$\theta$	$a$	$\beta$
[XXII.* FOR ST AGAPITUS]	3	3	3
4 (3), 4, 7 (6), 3, 4 . . . . .	<u>22 = 25</u>	<u>22 = 25</u>	<u>20 = 23</u>

3. The capitulum of the first Mass equates the Feast of SS. Hippolytus and Pontian with the thirteenth of August; but we must not therefore infer that the Hippolytus of the text either was or was assumed to be identical with the Hippolytus of the capitulum. St Pontian is not mentioned in the text; and this is the more remarkable as the *Depositio Martyrum* buries that saint in the cemetery of Callistus and Hippolytus on the Via Tiburtina. It may therefore be that, as in Section XVIII the Stephen of the *missae* is not the Stephen of the capitulum, so here the Hippolytus of the Mass was not assumed by its composer to be identical with the alleged disciple, friend, and fellow martyr of Pope Pontian. In this connexion we shall perhaps do well to note that no burial-places are mentioned in the capitulum.

4. Let us also bear in mind that, whereas the *Depositio Martyrum* associates Hippolytus and Pontian, whoever its Hippolytus may have been, under date of the thirteenth of August, the Hippolytus of Polemius Silvius stands alone under date of the twelfth.

As to the next *missa*, which concerns an Agapitus but has no capitulum, let me submit two considerations to the judgement of scholars:—

1. The *Liber Pontificalis* tells us that Felix III (A.D. 483-492), who succeeded Simplicius, built or rebuilt, either in or before his pontificate, the Church of St Agapitus on the Via Tiburtina; and the compiler of the Salzburg *Notitia*, who made his list of extramural churches early in the seventh century, identifies this Agapitus with the Agapitus of the

sixth of August, who, as he tells us elsewhere in the same document, was buried with SS. Sixtus and Felicissimus on the Appian Way, several miles from the Tiburtine. Inasmuch, therefore, as there is no known Roman Agapitus the anniversary of whose martyrdom fell between the thirteenth and the thirtieth of August, we may fairly infer that the present Mass was meant for use on the anniversary of the dedication of the church just mentioned;<sup>1</sup> and that, being thus later than Simplicius, it accrued to the document subsequently to the  $\beta$  revision.

2. It is by no means certain that in the editorial archetypes of the extant Leonianum dates were inserted into any of the successive capitula. In the Verona book there are none in the capitula of XIII, XV, XXXV, XXXVI, XLI, or XLII; and, what is perhaps yet more significant, in those of XVII and XXV the numeral of the Section, instead of preceding date and attribution, follows them. The simplest explanation of all this vacillation is that, as indeed is antecedently probable, there were no dates in the original documents, and that such as are now extant in the Verona book are due to some scribe who in the course of the fifth, sixth, or seventh century made a copy of the work for the use of non-Roman readers. Such a clerk would turn to calendars and martyrologies for any date he might need; his quest in this instance being bounded as to time by the thirteenth of August, the Feast of St Hippolytus, and the thirtieth, the Feast of St Felix and Adauctus; and, as to place, being limited to Rome. Finding, then, no Roman Agapitus between the days just mentioned, but on the eighteenth Agapitus of Praeneste, a city three-and-thirty miles from Rome, he would leave the Section without capitulum awaiting satisfactory information which might never reach him.

I cannot think of a simpler or more plausible account of the two peculiarities of the Mass in question.

#### SECTION XXIII.

Here the first computation is as follows:—

XXIII. III KĀL. SĒPT. &c. &c. (no numeral) 82, 101, 130, 100.      ii : 121, 120,  
152, 72, 162.      iii : 102, 121, 200, 112.      iiiii : 84, 123, 156, 135.      v : 109, 206.  
vi : 103, 106, 114, 143.      vii : 424.

In the second of these constituents (101 : 4) we should perhaps read 'Scōrum' for 'Scī'; and in the last (103 : 20) 'efficiuntur . . . auctores' for 'exitum . . . auctores'. In the last prayer of iii (102 : 11) I should be disposed to read 'communimur' instead of 'commonemur', and in the Preface of iiiii (103 : 7) 'multas' for 'mutuas'.

<sup>1</sup> The day chosen for this anniversary may have been the eighteenth of the month, the Feast of St Agapitus of Praeneste. The fourteenth of February, the Feast of St Valentinus of Interamna, was the patronal anniversary of the church of the Roman Valentinus, a building near to the Flaminian Gate.

The Prefaces of iii and v exhibit peculiarities for which there has not as yet been any precedent.

1. The former of these (102 : 6) juxtaposes and marks with a '*uel* . . . *uel*' two readings which no sane theologian would set in one and the same sentence in such a way as to suggest that he conceived them to be in one and the same category of ideas. I italicize the disjunctives, and with them the presumably earlier reading; the other reading—presumably the later of the two, by reason of the sentiment expressed and of the antithesis of '*clementia*' to '*potentiam*'—I set within square brackets:—*Vere dign̄. orantes potentiam tuam . . . ut dignanter ostendas quia non plus ad perdendum nos ualeant nostra delicta quam ad saluandum. uel. patrocinia copiosa iustorum. uel. [tuae maiestatis inuicta clementia.] per.*' This assignment gives us first 164 letters, then 169, instead of 200.

In the Preface of v I propose (102 : 29) to read '*festiuitate*' for '*festiuitatem*'; and, treating '*confessione*' and '*nomine*' (102 : 30) as alternatives, discriminate thus:—*Vere dign̄. sacrificium quippe suum hodie frequentat ecclesia et festiuitate dudum muneris immolati [annua festiuitate] concelebrat quo pro eius confessione. uel. [nomine] qui eam . . . redemit . . . obsequium proprii cruoris exhibuit. per.*' The presumably earlier text comprises 180 letters; the presumably later, 175.

Now, '*sacrificium*' in the sense of '*sacred rite*' is new to the nomenclature of the Leonianum; so is '*munus immolatum*' for '*munus oblatum*'; so, again, '*confessio*' in the sense required by the context. Nor is this all; it is new to the theology of the Leonianum to attribute to the protection of the saints the sort of function which, at least constructively, is attributed to it in the presumably superseded phrase in the Preface of iii; to style the blood of a martyr the '*proprius cruor*' of the Church, and, as in the presumably superseded phrase in v, to denote the Death on the Cross by a word the English equivalent of which is merely '*martyrdom*'.<sup>1</sup> For these reasons I should think it extremely improbable that the compiler of either the first or second redaction of the major part of the document can have set forth the presumably earlier text of the present series. And the surmise is justified by the table of linear values which I now subjoin. From this it will be seen that the total—by which I, of course, mean the irreducible total—of the Section in terms of  $\theta$  lines is 135; and, although with an

<sup>1</sup> The theology and diction of this remarkable Preface remind us of the following passage (vv. 17-20) of Prudentius's Hymn on St Laurence:—

'*Armata pugnavit fides  
Proprii cruoris prodiga,  
Nam morte mortem diruit  
Ac semet impendit sibi.*'



undeveloped conclusion to vii it might have filled precisely five *a* pages, we are not therefore to conclude that it first saw the light in the pontificate of Hilarus. Material not as yet in our possession must be forthcoming before a probable theory can be proposed as to the date of its original composition.

	? <i>a</i>	<i>β</i>
XXIII. iii. KĀL SEPT. N̄. SC̄ORUM ADAUTI ET FELICIS	3	3
3, 4 (3), 5 (4), 4 (3) . . . . .	16	13
ii: 1, (5) 4, (5) 4, (6) 5, 3, 6 (5) . . . . .	23	22
iii: 1, (5) 4, (5) 4, 6, 4 . . . . .	19	19
iiii: 1, 3, (5) 4, (6) 5, 5 . . . . .	18	18
v: 1, 4, (7) 6 . . . . .	11	11
vi: 1, 4, (7) 6, 4, 5 . . . . .	20	20
vii: 1, (15) 14 (14 + 3) . . . . .	<u>15 = 125</u>	<u>18 = 124</u>

The argument for a late introduction of the present Section into the series is enforced by the 'S̄c̄i Felicis et Adauti natalicia' of the *Secreta* (101 : 4) of the first Mass; for it is hard to believe that such a solecism could have escaped the notice of any revising editor. On the other hand, the Mass would seem to be older than the story embodied in the legend of the two saints, a legend which makes 'Adactus' or 'Adauctus' the necessary form of the name of the second, but excludes 'Adautus'.

The story is that Adactus or Adauctus is either a pseudonymous or a conjectural appellation of the martyr indicated by it; that, Felix and he recognizing each other as friends and fellow Christians as the former was on his way to execution, the two men were therefore put to death together and buried side by side; but that the real name of the latter was not forthcoming, and that in default of it he was thenceforth styled Adactus or Adauctus.

Now, there may be, and presumably is, a groundwork in fact for all this; a view the more readily acceptable since in the Berne codex of the Hieronymianum Felix stands first in the list for the thirtieth of August and Adactus last, the two being separated by four others.

The substructure of fact would seem to be that many years after the institution of the liturgical cultus of St Felix in the cemetery of Comodilla a forgotten tomb or *loculus* near to that of Felix was revealed to sight, a tomb or *loculus* which bore the symbolical palm-branch and the name Adautus; that in course of time this was in common speech pronounced first 'Adauctus' and then 'Adactus'; and that when the legend for the thirtieth of August was eventually written the legend-writer, to whose ear neither word sounded like a noun proper, found in it material on which to let his fancy play, but instead of making the person indicated an *adactus* to St Felix many

years after death—as by my hypothesis he really was—made him his *adactus* before martyrdom.

Some such theory as this enables us to account for the strange solecism ‘*S̄ci Felicis et Adauti*’ (101: 4) of the Verona book. It is suggested to me not, as might be supposed, by the solecism itself, but by a curiously similar phenomenon in a somewhat later document than the Verona transcript of the Leonianum; I mean the eighth-century Gregorianum of the Roman Church, portions of which have been handed down to us through two distinct channels. In that sacramentary, as represented to us not only in Alcuin’s misguided endeavour to reconstruct St Gregory’s Missal but in adventitious additions made to the *editio classica* which St Gregory’s missionaries had long before brought to Canterbury, we find the strictly analogous peculiarity of ‘*Beati Proti et Iacincti*’ instead of ‘*Beatorum Proti et Iacincti*’; a peculiarity the morally certain explanation of which is supplied by inscriptions that have survived the ravages of time. These give us to understand that ‘*Beati Proti*’ is the original reading and that the words ‘*et Iacincti*’ were added after the discovery in the middle of the seventh century of the *loculus* of St Hyacinth, this having long been hidden from view in consequence of an architectural necessity, and thus, one would suppose, lost to memory. Something of the same kind may have happened here. The *Liber Pontificalis* tells us that Pope John I (A. D. 523–526) ‘*renouavit coemeterium Felicis et Adauti*’; and I suspect that, just as the reconstruction of the cemetery of St Basilla in the seventh century revealed the resting-place of St Hyacinth, so in the pontificate of John I the reconstruction of the cemetery of Domitilla brought to light the resting-place of the martyr Adautus; that ‘*et Adauti*’ is post-editorial, and that the Verona ‘*S̄ci Felicis*’ survives from an original ‘*S̄ci Felicis natalicia*’ &c.

#### SECTIONS XXIII, XXV, XXVI.

There is an irregularity in the disposition of these three Sections which has evoked the censure of the critics; but the second of the facsimiles which Dr Feltoe has added to his edition renders it morally certain that he and his predecessors are mistaken in laying it to the charge of any compiler or editor. The fault is, I think, merely scribal. A *Secreta* and a *Preface* which should have formed a distinct item under XXV have been inadvertently placed (104: 1, 6) after the first prayer of Section XXIII. Hence it is that in my two lists I, under XXIII, substitute asterisks for values, and notify these under XXV as the constituents of an item which I number ‘*iiii*’.

XXIII. XVIII KĀL. OCTOB. N. SCÖRUM CORNELI &c. (no numeral) 114, \*, \*, 128, 142, 143. ITEM ALIA, 129, 111, 225, 96, 157.

XXV. XVI KĀL. OCT. IN NATALE SCĒ EUFYMIÆ (no numeral) 99, 106, 227. ii: 116, 227. iii: 109, 110, 98, 124. iii: 148, 515.

XXVI. PRĪD. KĀL. OCT. N. BASILICÆ ANGELI &c. (no numeral) 298, 149, 400. ii: 110, 377. iii: 121, 269, 113, 154. iii: 148, 515.

In the first prayer of XXVI I propose to read 'praecipuam' for 'praecipua' (106:18) in the phrase 'magis esse praecipua quae . . . superat'.

A few peculiarities of text require notice:—

1, 2, 3. Early in the first Preface of XXIII, as now placed in the Verona book—that is to say, in the item which I class as XXV iii—'mirabilia. tibi hominem' &c. (104:7) should, I think, be replaced by 'mirabilia tua. qui hominem' &c.; and, as suggested by Bianchini, instead of 'hunc . . . aduersarium ut eum' (104:9) I read 'ut hunc . . . aduersarium', cancelling 'eum'. It would, I think, be unsafe to touch 'uenerantes' (104:16), the last word of the Preface as extant at Verona; the more prudent course being to replace 'per' by 'etc.'. Dr Feltoe's facsimile, which gives neither, offers a ready justification of the reading I propose. That a  $\theta$  redaction may have had 'ueneramur' there need be no doubt; but the analogy of other like Prefaces—in XVI ii (37:14) and XX vi (93:8)—counsels us to respect 'uenerantes' as the presumable reading of an  $\alpha$  redaction, a reading which would be followed by the developed conclusion 'hostias tibi . . . sine fine dicentes'. The constituent would thus have 608 letters (20  $\alpha$  lines) in the second edition as against 511 (19  $\theta$  lines, 16 of  $\beta$ ) in the first and third.

4. The 'atque lactificet' (104:29) in the Oratio of the *Item alia* of XXIII would seem to be redundant to the original text. It is not in the so-called Gelasianum [Mur. *Gel.* 668]. I suspect that it was introduced at the second general redaction; the object being to raise 114 letters (4  $\theta$  lines) to 129 (5 of  $\alpha$ ), and thus give the Section its full complement of 50  $\alpha$  lines.

5. The extant text of the Preface in the same item (105:4) is 'Vere dign. tuamque in scörum martyrum Cornelio simul et iam Cypriano' &c. I propose to introduce 'festiuitate' and, by setting the two names in the genitive case, to place them in apposition with 'martyrum'. This would raise the total from 225 letters to 236 (from 8 to 9  $\theta$  lines).

6. In the first prayer of XXV (105:17) 'nos' would seem to be needed between 'tuorum' and 'natalicia'; and perhaps we should read 'suffragiis' for 'suffragia'. These, the 'Gelasian' readings [Mur. *Gel.* 677], raise 99 letters to 103 (3 full  $\beta$  lines). But, regard had to the jubilant character of ii, with its 'hostias laetantis ecclesiae' (105:28), and of iii, with its 'hodiernae festiuitatis laetitiam' (106:8), and to the

fact that the 'Eufymiae ueneranda confessio' [see 106:9] was the scene of the Council of Chalcedon in which Leo won his great dogmatic victory, I should almost be inclined to think that 'ecclesiam tuam' is more likely to be right than 'nos', and 114 letters (4  $\beta$  lines) than 103.

7. In the Preface of XXVI, ii 'humano generi' (107:6) is perhaps a *datiuus incommodi*, and 'corpore' an italicized 'corpori' for 'corporis';<sup>1</sup> but 'conspectu subtrahitur' and 'negatur adspectu' cannot stand together, so that the total must be reckoned as 357 or 362, not 377 (13  $\theta$  lines, not 14; 12  $\alpha$  lines, not 13).

8. The last Preface lacks 'ueneratione' after 'Michael' (108:20).

Subject to a modification which I explain presently, we have—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XXIII. XVIII KĀL. OCTOB. N. SCÖRUM CORNELI ETC.	3	3	3
4, *, *, 5(4), 5, 5 . . . . .	19	19	18
1, (4) 5(4), 4, (9) 8, 4(3), 6(5) . . . . .	<u>28=50</u>	<u>28=50</u>	25
	$\theta$	$\alpha$	
XXV. XVI KĀL. OCT. IN NATALE SCAE EUFYMIAE.	3	3	2
4, 4, 8(7) . . . . .	16	16	15
ii: 1, 4, 8(7) . . . . .	13	13	12=75
iii: 1, 4, 4, 4(3), (5) 4 . . . . .	18=50	17=49	16
iiii: 1, 5, (19) 17+3(16) . . . . .	<u>25=75</u>	<u>26=75</u>	22
	$\theta$	$\alpha$	
XXVI. PRĪD. KĀL. OCT. N. BASILICAE ANGELI ETC.	3	3	2
(11) 10, (6) 5, (14) 13+4(13) . . . . .	31	32	28
ii: 1, 4, (13) 12 . . . . .	18	17	17
iii: 1, (5) 4, (7) 9, 4, (5) 5 . . . . .	<u>23=75</u>	<u>23=75</u>	23
iiii: 1, (6) 5, (6) 5, (8) 7 . . . . .			18
v: 1, (6) 5, (9) 8, 4, 5 . . . . .			<u>23=224</u>

To the textual peculiarities already noted one more must now be added:—

8. In XXVI iii (107:17) the construction of the passage 'Vere dign. multoque magis in archangelis . . . tua praeconia non tacere, quia ad excellentiam tuam recurrit . . . cum angelica creatura . . . honoratur' is as irreprehensible as the sentiment enunciated; but the next clause, 'et cum illa sit digna uenerari tu quam sis immensus et super omnia praefendus ostenderis', is on two accounts open to objection: first, because, so far from elucidating or strengthening what goes before, it

<sup>1</sup> St Leo in his Sermons has 'corporali intuitu inquirere' (xxxiv), 'corporeo discernere conspectu' (xlvi), and 'corporeo uidere intuitu' (lxxiv) [Migne S.L. liv 247 A, 293 B, 397 C]; but in the present passage 'corporis' gives a clearer construction than 'corporeo'.

obscures and weakens it; secondly, because in one and the same construction it subjoins a verb in the subjunctive mood, and governed by 'cum' = 'quamuis', to the verb in the indicative governed by 'cum' = 'quando'. I therefore regard it as a somewhat hastily composed piece of 'padding'; and infer that it was added to 'Vere dign̄. multoque magis . . . honoratur' in order that, in concert with the 'et ideo' &c. affixed to XXVI i, it might carry on XXVI iii to the last line of a third a page by raising 195 letters (7  $\theta$  lines) to 269 (9 of  $\alpha$ ).

## SECTION XXVII.

The first list is as follows:—

XXVII. ADMONITIO IEIUNII &c., &c., 349. i: 189, 133, 72, 538, 104, 129.  
 ii: 145, 107, 136, 158, 145. iii: 140, 87, 157, 241, 269. iiiii: 126, 120, 96,  
 216, 71, 107. v: 133, 127, 188, 93, 125. vi: 104, IN IEIUNIO, 107, 289, 79,  
 179. vii: 88, IN IEIUNIO, 87, 118, 548, 149, 108. viii: IN IEIUNIO, 136, 152,  
 201, 495, 114, 171. INUITATIO PLEBIS . . . MENSIS DECIMI, 294. viiii: 171,  
 100, 161, 390, 81, 150. x: 282, 235, 142, 202. xi: 170, 145, 110, 127, 99,  
 172, 165, 486, 114, 216. xii: 104, 105, 104, 407, 109, 115. xiii: 100, 62, 94,  
 272, 84, 137. xiiii: 106, 136, 125, 132.

For 'satiasti' in the Postcommunion of vi (112: 26) I propose, with the earlier editors, 'satiati'. This is the reading of the Gelasianum (Mur. *Gel.* 507 and 670); which, however, in one place gives 'munere' for 'tuo', and in another has both words.

The series exhibits rubrical anomalies which may perhaps supply us with a presumable theory of its evolution:—

1. The ninth item, which is duly numbered, is preceded (115: 1) by the remarkable heading 'ITEM PRECES'.<sup>1</sup> This latter would seem to have been meant to govern the Masses which follow it, and thus to denote a division of the Section at one or other of the redactions into two parts, i–viii and viiii–xiiii. Hence we seem to be in touch, as in Sections XI, XVI, and XVIII, with two schemes of rubrication, and thus with two schemes of grouping, and to be following the work of a transcriber who intermingled them with some little carelessness.

2. The numeral and rubric just mentioned are now preceded by an Inuitatio Plebis for the month of December. Whatever be the cause of this anachronism, we may fairly suspect the Inuitatio to be in some sort analogous to the Christmas references in Section XVIII, and therefore to be of later date than the original edition. Hence then the question whether the seemingly cognate Admonitio which now stands before the first Mass may not also be later than the first compilation.

<sup>1</sup> It occurs nowhere else in the Leonianum, but must not therefore be dismissed as a mere slip of the pen.

3. The theory of a comparatively recent date for the first as well as the second of these addresses is justified by the fact that its heading, 'Admonitio Ieiunii Mensis Septimi et Orationes et Preces', is not a heading *simplex duntaxat et unum* such as we expect to find in a true capitulum, and may fairly be thought to have ousted the original title, which, if analogy may guide us, must have been 'IN IEIUNIO MENSIS SEPTIMI'.

Turning from rubrics to text, I find as follows:—

1. The last constituent of the third item (111 : 3) resolves itself into three parts: (1) 'O. s. d. . . exoramus ut (2) hoc tuum dñe sacramentum . . . sit contra mundi pericula firmamentum (3) haec nos communio purget' &c.; where 1 and 3 would seem to have been a single prayer in 112 letters, but to have been split asunder by 2, a distinct composition complete in itself and containing 158 letters. The account of this which analogous instances suggest is that the shorter but now spissate prayer was the original Postcommunion in 4  $\theta$  lines, and that the amplification was inserted at the last redaction.

2. In the last constituent of vii (113 : 24) the puzzling 'purificetetsusetterudiat' looks like the wreck of an editorially proposed 'purificatus uel eruditus', one or other of which words would supply a serious but otherwise neglected hiatus in the construction, thus:—'Tueatur dñe dextera tua populum deprecantem ut consolatione praesenti purificatus [uel eruditus] ad bona futura proficiat. per,' in 94 or 91 letters. This numerical value and the present condition of the text lead me to suspect an effort so to abbreviate the prayer as to coerce vii into the last of 225 *a* lines. The suspicion is justified by the fact that in the Gelasianum [Mur. *Gel.* 527] the prayer has the value of 121 letters (5  $\theta$  lines, 4 of *a*), —'Tueatur quaesumus dñe . . . deprecantem, et purificatum dignanter erudiat ut consolatione' &c.

3. The last constituent of xi (117 : 20) ends thus: 'ut . . . (1) tua consolatione subsistat (2) tua gratia promissae redemptionis perficiatur haereditas. per'; where some of the editors put an 'ac' between 1 and 2, but where I suspect the latter phrase to be a substitute for the former. Not only is this view justified by parallel instances, it is recommended by the manifest reference to the Nativity implied in the '[ut] tua gratia promissae redemptionis perficiatur haereditas'. Regard had to the cognate phrases which we have examined in Section XVIII, we may with some confidence assume that this reference to the Nativity was not introduced into the eleventh item before that partition of the present Section into two moieties by which items viiii–xiii were formally and specifically appropriated to the month of December. This account would give us 'Absolue . . . subsistat. per', in 154 letters (6  $\theta$  lines, 5 of *a*), for certainly the first, and possibly the

second, redaction; and 'Absolue . . . declinans tua gratia . . . perficiatur. per', in 192 letters (7  $\alpha$  lines, 6 of  $\beta$ ), for possibly the second, but certainly the third, redaction. The attribution which makes it the sole property of the third redaction is the more probable of the two.

I observe, moreover, that (4) the 'et ideo' clause (109 : 23) in the Preface of i reads like the *ex post facto* addition of what might originally have been a collect to an otherwise complete composition in 387 letters (14  $\theta$  lines).

If, then, these four considerations being admitted, we assume that the original capitula were 'IN IEIUNIO MENSIS SEPTIMI' and 'ITEM PRECES' or, more probably, 'ITEM PRECES IN IEIUNIO MENSIS DECIMI,' and that there were as yet no 'Admonitiones', we find that at the first redaction i-vii occupied nine  $\theta$  pages, as also did viiii-xiii.<sup>1</sup>

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XXVII. IN IEIUNIO ETC. (3) 0 : ADMONITIO ETC.			
(o) 3, (o) 12 (11)	3	15	14
i: 1, 7 (6), 5 (4), 3 (2), (14) 18 (17), 4 (3), 5 (4)	39	43	37
ii: 1, 5, 4, 5, 6 (5), 5 . . . . .	26	26	25
iii: 1, 5, 3, (6) 5, (9) 8, 4 (9) . . . . .	28	26	31
iiii: 1, (5) 4, (5) 4, (4) 3, (8) 7, 3 (2), 4 . . . . .	30	26	25
v: 1, 5 (4), (5) 4, 7 (6), (4) 3, (5) 4 . . . . .	27	24	22
vi: 1, 4 (3), 0 (1), 4, (11) 10 (9), 3, (7) 6 . . . . .	30	28	27
vii: 1, 3, 0 (1), 3, 4, (20) 18 (17), (6) 5, (5) 3 . . . . .	<u>42 = 225</u>	<u>37 = 225</u>	37
viii: 1, 0 (1), 5, (6) 5, 7, (18) 17 (16), 4, 6 . . . . .			45
	$\theta$	$\alpha$	
ITEM PRECES (2) 0 : INUITATIO ETC. (o) 3 (1),			
(o) 10 (9)	2	13	10
viii: 1, 6, 4 (3), 6 (5), (14) 18 (12), 3, (6) 5 . . . . .	40	38	35
x: 1, 10 (9), (9) 8, 5, (8) 7 . . . . .	33	31	30
xi: 1, 6, 5, 4, (5) 4, 4 (3), 6, 6 (5), (18) 16 (15),			
4, (6) 5 (6) . . . . .	65	61	59
xii: 1, 4, 4, 4, (15) 14 (13), 4, 4 . . . . .	36	35	34
xiii: 1, 4 (3), 2, (4) 3, (10) 9, 3, 5 . . . . .	29	27	26
xiiii: 1, 4, 5, (5) 4, 5 (4) . . . . .	<u>20 = 225</u>	<u>19 = 224</u>	<u>18 = 475</u>

Secondly. If for 'IN IEIUNIO MENSIS SEPTIMI' we substitute 'ADMONITIO IEIUNII MENSIS SEPTIMI ET ORATIONES ET P.' (108 : 29) inserting

<sup>1</sup> The 'tempus frumenti vini et olei' in the Preface of xi (117 : 12) and the 'collecti terrae fructus' (118 : 1) in that of xii must not mislead us into thinking that they belie the rubric and Inuitatio prefixed to viiii. St Leo's ember sermons preached in the month of December contain the following passages: 'Sancti patres nostri . . . decimi mensis sanxere ieiunium ut *omnium fructuum collectione conclusa . . . abstinentia dicaretur*' (Sermo xvi) and 'decimi mensis solemne ieiunium . . . annua est consuetudine celebrandum, quia plenum iustitiae est . . . gratias . . . agere . . . *pro fructibus quos . . . terra produxit*' (Sermo xvii) [Migne S.L. liv 177 A, 180 B]. See also the opening sentence of the thirteenth Sermon [ib. 172 B].

the address 'Annua nobis' &c. ; and if for 'ITEM PRECES' we substitute 'INUITATIO PLEBIS IN IEIUNIO MENSIS DECIMI' (114 : 24), inserting the address 'Hac hebdomada' &c., we find that at the second redaction i-vii must have occupied nine  $\alpha$  lines ; provided only that we assign to that redaction the abbreviation which postulate in vii.

Thirdly. If we assume that the compiler of the third general redaction, resorting in this Section to the simple device adopted in XVIII and elsewhere, devoted in three places (112 : 16, 113 : 4, 113 : 28) a line to the rubric 'IN IEIUNIO', and made in xi the textual enhancement already notified, we find that the whole was finally lodged in nineteen  $\beta$  pages, each of its two groups occupying a mixed, not an integral, number of pages, as was the case with Sections VIII and X, XIII and XIII, XXIII, XXV, and XXVI ; and that the 'ITEM PRECES' which now separates the ninth Mass from its proper numeral is a survival from the first issue, brought back into the document by a scribe who, as we have already in several instances found reason for thinking, must have had before him copies of the first and second redactions.

#### SECTIONS XXVIII, XXVIII.

These two Sections are the equivalent of thirty-nine  $\beta$  pages ; though each, taken by itself, represents a mixed number of such pages. One represents eight, the other thirty pages of the  $\alpha$  lineation. They thus resemble VIII and X ; XIII and XIII ; XXIII, XXV, and XXVI, and the complex group just examined.

The first, unlike the second, is not amenable to the  $\theta$  criterion. Nor need we wonder at this. Its Masses are not commemorative ; it comprises nothing in honour of any saint having a claim on the devotion of St Leo or his successor ; and, though the manuscript germ of the Sanctore of the Missal of the Roman Church be as early as the period of  $\theta$  lineation, there is no reason why we should assume  $\theta$  pages for the manuscript germ of the Pontifical.

The values in terms of letters of XXVIII are as follows :—

XXVIII. CONSECRATIO EPISCOPORUM. 88, 74, 185, 81, 127, 706, 782. BENE-  
DICTIO SUPER DIACONOS. 198, 184, 266, 1483. CONSECRATIO PRESBYTERI. 169, 187,  
715, 572.

The 'peragatur. firmatur' at the end of the first prayer are alternative readings, one or other of which must be neglected in our computation of linear values.

The numbers for XXVIII are :—

XXVIII. IN NATALE EPISCOPORUM. (no numeral) 180, 192, 403, 284, 55, 168,  
178. ii : 171, 237, 270, 84, 150, 103, 453, 109, 174. iii : 188, 178, 206, 163,  
407, 178, 179, 117, 283, 131, 151. iiiii : 113, IN IEIUNIO, 146, 85, 412, 93, 144.



v: 323, 178, 192, 239, 341, 190, 168, 137, 195. vi: 210, 179, 414, 118, 120.  
 vii: 170, 228, 445, 106, 185. viii: 189, 79, 138, 151, PRO EPISC. OFFERENDUM,  
 151, 112, 151. viiii: 117, 106, 126, 202, 91, 185. x: 124, 124, 55, 177, 74,  
 130. xi: 106, 61, 94, 271, 84, 137. xii: 130, 97, 112, 197, 70, 163. xiii:  
 79, 91, 108, 195, 83, 142. xiiii: 108, 109, 147, 254, 87, 126. xv: 114, 125,  
 100, 196, 109, 107. xvi: 146, 113, 127, POST INFIRMITATEM, 172, 96, 111.  
 xvii: 131, 145, 72, 139, 62, 149. xviii: 77, 71, 112 + 75, 123. xviii: 89, 85,  
 205, 65, 130. xx: 128, 106, 100, 209, 146. xxi: 105, 92, 147, 109, 155-  
 xxii: 93, 162, 86, 287, 89, 153. xxiii: 86, 105, 286, 131, 173, IN IEIUNIO, 83.

A few modifications are necessary. In the penultimate prayer of the first Mass (123:31) either 'optata' or 'profutura' must be dropped, thus lowering 168 to 162 or 159 (6  $\beta$  lines to 5). 2. In the last prayer of ii (125:9) either 'praecepta' or 'quae praecipis' must be neglected. This gives 165 or 161 (6  $\theta$  lines, 5 of  $\beta$ ) instead of 174 (7  $\theta$  lines, 6 of  $\beta$ ). 3. So with 'pia' and 'sacra' (126:15) in the Secreta of iii; the total thus being 114 or 112. 4. The first prayer of v is defective (127:22), the words 'intueris quanto sublimius', or the like, having dropped out. The total must therefore be reckoned as 346 (13  $\theta$  lines, 12 of  $\alpha$ , 11 of  $\beta$ ). See the fifth prayer (128:14).

The text presents no great difficulties; but I think the editors might have done better than read 'O. et m. d. qui benigne semper *operaris* ut possimus implere', &c. in the sixth prayer of v (128:19). The MS has '*operis*'. Surely this is a depraved '*opperiris*'. In the Postcommunion of xii (133:10) I propose 'operationis suae . . . capaces' in place of 'operationes suae . . . pacatos'.

Dr Feltoe's emendation of the first Preface (123:18) must not be overlooked. I bracket one of the words he proposes to insert; but hold myself responsible for 'uirtute', which I prefer to his 'salute', and for 'quoniam'. These I italicize:—'si per rationabilem regulam praesidendi populus tuus et numero [creuerit] *et uirtute quoniam* incrementum' &c. He is mistaken, however, in suspecting a defect in the clause which follows the 'Hanc igitur'.<sup>1</sup> Its only fault is that 'Qua oblatione' (123:27) should be 'Quam oblationem'; but it is not defective as a whole, and it is not a separate prayer. It is merely the developement of a well-known clause in the Canon.

Nor in xviii (136:13) can the words 'quanto te . . . laetitiam' have been meant for a separate prayer. They are surely an amplificatory clause designed for insertion into the Preface, and thus resemble the words subjoined to the Preface of XVIII xiii (63:32). I should attribute them to the third redaction. [112 + 75 = 187, six  $\beta$  lines.]

<sup>1</sup> The 'diesque meos clementissima gubernatione disponas' in the 'Hanc igitur' (123:25) is most interesting. It may have suggested the 'diesque nostros in tua pace disponas' which Gregory the Great is reputed to have inserted into the Canon. For what I conceive to be the authentic text of the Gregorian Canon see my *Canterbury Missal*, p. 42.

Subject to these modifications and to one or two which will be made presently, the linear details and totals of XXVIII, XXVIII are as follows:—

		<i>a</i>	<i>β</i>
<b>XXVIII. CONSECRACTIO EPISCOPORUM</b>		3	3
3, 3, (7) 6, 3, (5) 4, (26) 24 (23), (28) 26 (25).		69	67
<b>BENEDICTIO SUPER DIACONOS</b>		1	1
7(6), (7) 6, (10) 9, (53) 49 (47)		71	68
<b>CONSECRACTIO PRESBYTERI</b>		1	1
(7) 6, (7) 6, (26) 24 (22), (21) 19 (18)		<u>55=200</u>	52
	<i>θ</i>	<i>a</i>	
<b>XXVIII. IN NATALE EPISCOPORUM</b>	3	3	2
(7) 6, 7(6), (15) 14 (13), 10(9), 2, 6, (7) 6(5)	54	51	47
ii: 1, 6, (9) 8, (10) 9, 3, (6) 5, 4, (16) 15 (14), 4, 6(5)	65	61	59=300
iii: 1, 7(6), (7) 6, (8) 7, 6(5), (15) 14 (13), (7) 8, (6) 5, (7) 6, 4, 10(9), 5(4), (6) 5	89	82	77
iiii: 1, 4, 0(1), (6) 5, 3, (15) 14 (13), (4) 3, 5	38	35	35
v: 1, (13) 12 (11), (7) 6, 7(6), (9) 8, 12(11), 7(6), 6, 5, 7(6)	74	71	66
vi: 1, (8) 7, (7) 6, (15) 14 (13), 4, (5) 4	40	36	35
vii: 1, 6, (7) 6(7), (16) 15 (14), 4, (7) 6	41=404	38	38=551
viii: 1, 7(6), 3, 5, (6) 5, 0(1), (6) 5, 4, (6) 5	38	35	35
ix: 1, 4, 4, (5) 4, 2, (7) 6	31	29	29
x: 1, (5) 4, (5) 4, 2, (7) 6, 3, 5(4)	28	25	24
xi: 1, 4, 2, (4) 3, (10) 9, 3, 5	29	27	27
xii: 1, 5(4), 4(3), 4, 7(6), 3, 6(5)	30	30	26
xiii: 1, 3, 3, 4, 7(6), 3, 5	26	26	25
xiiii: 1, 4, 4, (6) 5, 9(8), 3, (5) 4	32	30	29
xv: 1, 4, (5) 4, 4(3), 7, 4, 4	29	28	27
xvi: 1, 5, 4, (5) 4, 0(1), 6, (4) 3, 4	29	27	28
xvii: 1, 5(4), 5, 3, 5, 2, (6) 5	27	26	25
xviii: 1, 3, 3, 4(6), (5) 4	16	15	17
xviiii: 1, 3, 3, 3, (8) 7, (3) 2, 5(4)	26	24	23
xx: 1, 5(4), 4, 4(3), (8) 7, (4) 3, 5	31	29	27
xxi: 1, 4, (4) 3, 5, 4, (6) 5	<u>24=800</u>	<u>22=750</u>	22
xxii: 1, 3, 6(5), 3, 10(9), 3, 5			29
xxiii: 1, 3, 4, 10(9), 5(4), 6, 0(1), 3			<u>31=975</u>

At the end of xxi Section XXVIII ceases to respond to the *θ* and the *a* criteria, thus leaving the third editor sole proprietor of xxii and xxiii. The like occurs, as we have seen, in XVII, for the Septem Fratres, where the third editor adds one Mass; in XX, for SS. Sixtus,

Felicissimus and Agapitus, where a dual group is added ; in XXI, for St Laurence, who receives a triad ; and in XXVI, where two are added for St Michael.

On further examination of XXVIII we note that only the first seven of its many items are in explicit terms Masses for an episcopal anniversary ; for, though the eighth relates to a cognate but different subject, the remainder do not correspond to the title. This is the first case of its kind : I therefore examine it further. I find, then, that in v the prayer 'Dñe dñ pater gloriae', &c., occurs twice (127 : 20 and 128 : 12), and that, but for this accident, the first seven Masses would scarcely have filled a  $\theta$  quire ; but that in consequence of it the last four lines of vii would probably have been left without a leaf on which to copy them. I suspect, therefore, that after the consequent addition of a new quire to the libellus of anniversary Masses no more of like character can have been composed ; Leo allowing himself some latitude of subject in his last fourteen years. Certainly, the twenty-one  $\theta$  *missae* correspond to his twenty-one anniversaries.

The critics have noticed a peculiarity of XXVIII which is to me the more interesting because, analogous to those of an ember Mass on Whitsun Eve and of Christmastide celebrations of St Stephen in the components of an August Section, it bids fair to elucidate, as do they, the history of the document. The peculiarity is that the extant text of iiiii and vii is in three places so worded as to restrict the use of those Masses to the season of Lent.

Bianchini, it is true, finds no fault with this anomaly ; indeed, he makes a plausible apology for it. But he fails to observe that in the remaining Masses of the Section there is nothing proper to September or to any other period of the year ; and that we therefore are confronted with the question, Why have not the only chronological references in the series been allowed to determine its place in the volume ?

I suspect, then, that, as originally compiled, i-vii were Masses commemorating St Leo's consecration in the September of 440 ; but that on some occasion after his death the chronological references to that event contained in iiiii and vii were so modified as to fit them for the use of a pope who had been raised to the episcopate in the season of Lent. By this hypothesis, if we are to effect a conjectural reconstruction of the original text, we must so 'correct' the extant references to the prae-Paschal fast as to make them applicable to the ember fast of autumn ; unless, indeed, they be susceptible of elision. In other words, we must deal with these Lenten references as we have already dealt with the references to the Nativity in Section XVIII, and, whether stichometrically or otherwise, test the result as best we may.

1. As now known to us, the second prayer in *iiii* (126 : 34) is 'Tribue . . . fidelibus tuis ut *ieiuniis pascalibus* conuenienter aptentur' &c. For this I make bold to substitute 'Tribue . . . fidelibus tuis ut *ieiunio mensis septimi* conuenienter aptentur' &c.; and the venture is most happily justified, for I find that the reading is that of the Gelasianum [Mur. *Gel.* 670] in one of its ember Masses for the autumn quarter.

2. The extant Postcommunion of the same Mass (127 : 13) is this, where I italicize a word which I propose to cancel, and bracket a suggested precursor:—'Praesta . . . ut et de nostrae gaudeamus prouectionis augmento et de congruo sacramenti *pascalis* [pontificalis] obsequio. per.' For this I find an admirably relevant attestation in a sermon by St Leo himself on no other subject than that of his own elevation to the episcopate, and in a passage which even echoes the phrase 'ut de nostrae gaudeamus prouectionis augmento';—'Religiosum tamen uobis atque laudabile est de die prouectionis nostrae quasi de proprio honore gaudere, ut unum celebretur in toto ecclesiae corpore *pontificii sacramentum*.'<sup>1</sup> I am the more pleased with this justification of my proposed 'pontificalis' for 'pascalis', because I have never been able to persuade myself that St Leo can have employed the term 'pascale sacramentum' as the equivalent of 'pascalis obseruantia' or 'ieiunium quadragesimale'. Its primary and proper attribution is to Easter and the season culminating in Pentecost.

3. The only other 'correction' needed is in the *Secreta* of *vii* (129 : 29), and is effected by eliding the words which I now bracket:—'Suscipe . . . oblationes et preces quas [et pro reuerentia pascali supplices adhibemus et] pro sollemnitate primordii sacerdotalis<sup>2</sup> offerimus,' &c.

These three corrections give us instead of 146 letters 149; instead of 93, 97; and instead of 228, 185.

Assuming the implied alterations to have been made, we must now face the question, On whose account can they have been made?

The Preface of *iiii* (127 : 6) has these words, 'aptius siquidem atque decentius his diebus (1) episcopalis officii suscepta principia celebramus quibus et (2) ecclesiae totius obseruantia deuota concurrat et (3) ipsius cui sacerdotalis ministerium deputatum est natalis colitur sacramenti.' Successfully to collate these three references we must remember that the ember fasts were designed as a consecration of the four seasons of the year, but that only the last day of each—that is to say, the Saturday—was the day devoted to the ordination of presbyters. Re-

<sup>1</sup> Sermo *iv* (Migne S.L. liv 149 A).

<sup>2</sup> The 'sacerdotium' implied in this 'sacerdotalis' is, as the Preface of the same Mass proves, the episcopal office. It is the equivalent of the 'summum sacerdotium' of the 'Hanc igitur' in *viii* (130 : 32).

membering this, and keeping in mind (4) the 'ieiunia pascalia' (126 : 34) of the second prayer, we are to infer that the textual changes postulated by my present hypothesis must have been made in order to qualify the Mass for the use of a pope in some year in which the anniversary of his episcopal consecration happened to fall on the Saturday of the spring ember days.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, the original text postulated by my present hypothesis—'ieiunio mensis septimi' and 'sacramenti pontificalis' in the second prayer and the Postcommunion of *iiii*—was that of a Mass compiled for the use of a pope in some year in which the anniversary of his consecration fell on the Saturday of the autumnal ember week.

Now, working back from the consecration of Gregory the Great in the September of 590 to that of Anastasius in the November of 496, I find that there was not a Bishop of Rome in the interval whose anniversary can ever have fallen on an ember Saturday in Lent ; that is to say, between the fourteenth of February and the nineteenth of March, both included ; for not one of them was consecrated in either March or February. Nor can that of Gelasius, the predecessor of Anastasius ; for, although he was consecrated on Sunday the first of March in the year 492, his four years' pontificate was too brief for such concurrence. Felix III, the predecessor of Gelasius, was consecrated, it is true, on Sunday, March 6, 483 ; but, as is evident from the incidence of the leap-years, none of his anniversaries fell on a Saturday. With Simplicius, however, who preceded Felix, we at last find the desired concurrence. He was consecrated on the twenty-fifth day of February in the year 468 ; but, as that was a leap-year, the twenty-fifth, like the twenty-fourth in all years, was reckoned as what it thus was, the sixth day before the Kalends of March. Five years later—that is to say, in 473—Quadragesima Sunday fell on the eighteenth of February, thus throwing the next Saturday, the last of the ember days, on the twenty-fourth, the normal sixth day before the Kalends of the following month.

Inasmuch, then, as from the days of Constantine the Great—to go back further would be needless—there had never been a pope in respect of whom such coincidence would have been physically possible,<sup>2</sup> I conclude that we must attribute to the year 473 the textual changes in XXVIII *iiii* which are postulated by my present hypothesis ; namely 'ieiuniis pascalibus' (126 : 34) for 'ieiunio mensis septimi' and 'sacramenti pascalis' (127 : 14) for 'sacramenti pontificalis'.

As to the original text thus reconstructed, as I venture to think,

<sup>1</sup> Muratori (col. 28) overlooks the ember Saturday as a factor in the problem.

<sup>2</sup> In the century and a half before Simplicius, Zosimus (A. D. 417) was the only pope consecrated—and, as of course, on a Sunday—between Feb. 14 and March 19, but he died in the second year of his episcopate.

I trust that it may be of service to scholars in determining the date of the episcopal consecration of St Leo. On obviously insufficient grounds some have set this as early in the September of 440 as Sunday the eighth; others, for reasons equally untrustworthy, have thrown it forward to the twenty-ninth. On the assumption that the 'ipsius natale sacramenti cui sacerdotale ministerium deputatum est' (127: 8) of the Preface of *iiii* was an ember Saturday—I see not what other meaning to give it—the twenty-second is the only eligible date; for by no known computation could the last of the ember days have fallen as early as the fifteenth or as late as the twenty-ninth. It fell on the twenty-second in the years 445, 451 and 456.

I now turn to another subject.

Simplicius is the Bishop of Rome to whom, on data independent of the foregoing, I have already assigned, in addition to some seeming changes of text in XVII *i*, *iiii* and *vi*, the authorship of the paired Masses annexed to XX at its third redaction and of the triad introduced at the corresponding stage of the evolution of XXI. I therefore note with interest that, while the last two items of XXVIII are, for a technical reason, peculiar to the third redaction, one of them, *xxiii*, contains in the words 'populus tuus . . . a tribulatione respirans' (139: 12) that sort of reference to recent deliverance from public ills which we found in the last two Masses of XX; and, further, that, whereas the last two Masses of XX would seem to be the work of Simplicius in the summer of 472, the textual anomalies in the fourth and seventh items of the present Section, anomalies which I attribute to its third redaction, are in all moral certainty the work of the same pontiff in or shortly before the spring of 473.

SECTIONS XXX, XXXI.

Here the first list is—

XXX. AD VIRGINES SACRAS. 116, 2185.

XXXI. INC. UELATIO NUPTIALIS. 123, 124, 319, 109, 114, 1248.

When combined they represent an integral number of *a* pages, but not separately; and they refuse, whether separately or in conjunction, to submit to either of the other two systems of pagination. On the other hand, they are not material proper to a Missal. The only Section that they resemble is XXVIII; but, unlike XXVIII, they have not been subordinated to the third editorial scheme. The linear values are—

	<i>a</i>	<i>β</i>
XXX. AD VIRGINES SACRAS	3	3
4, 72 (69) . . . . .	76	73
XXXI. INC. UELATIO NUPTIALIS	3	2
4, 4, 11 (10), 4, 4, 41 (39) . . . . .	<u>68 = 150</u>	<u>65 = 143</u>

SECTION XXXII.

Here the first list is as follows :—

XXXII. DE SICCATATE TEMPORIS. 129, 137, 140, 112, 168, 76, 160. ii : 109, 67, 158, 117, 142. iii : PROPE PASCA, 86, 88, 154, 82, 121. iiiii : 151, 133, 210, 188. v : 140, 127, 98. vi : 155, 110, 99.

The stichometrical devices employed by the scribes of the second and third editions are I think manifest.—

I. I. The Super Populum of the first item (142 : 26) falls into two parts, 'Familiar . . . prosequatur' and 'bonam . . . perducat'. Muratori finds the former in two places [Mur. *Greg.* 78, 256] as a prayer complete in itself. The cumulation is such as we have seen in XVIII xxiii, XXVII iii, and elsewhere ; and raises 103 letters (4  $\theta$  lines) to 160 (6 of  $\alpha$ ).

2. The Postcommunion of iiiii (144 : 13) is of the same kind. The latter half, 'haec nos' &c., of the present amalgam, a liturgical commonplace of the value of 68 letters (3  $\theta$  lines), was, in my opinion, superseded at the second redaction by the extant whole in 188 letters (6  $\alpha$  lines).

II. I. The 'DE SICCATATE TEMPORIS' which follows the numeral of the Section merely notifies the intention of the first prayer. It neither gives nor implies a date ; and would seem to be analogous to the 'AD FONTEM' in XIII, and to the 'IN IEIUNIO' and 'POST INFIRMITATEM' of frequent occurrence. I therefore attribute it to the last editor or his experts ; and, since no date or other instruction accompanies the 'XXXII', allow one line, not three, for the heading of the Section at the first and second redactions.

2. If analogy may guide us, the 'PROPE PASCA' in iii was inserted at the last issue. It carried on the Mass to the foot of the page.

These 'corrections' made, we find that we have four Masses in as many pages, first of  $\theta$  lineation and then of  $\alpha$  ; and two more, added at the last redaction. The Section thus resembles XVII, XX, XXI, XXVI, XXVIII.

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XXXII. DE SICCATATE TEMPORIS	1	1	3
5 (4), 5, 5, 4, 6 (5), 3, (4) 6 (5) . . . . .	32	34	31
ii: 1, 4, (3) 2, (6) 5, 4, 5 . . . . .	23	21	21
iii: 1, 0 (1), 3, 3, (6) 5, 3, (5) 4 . . . . .	21	19	20 = 75
iiii: 1, (6) 5, 5, (8) 7, (3) 6 . . . . .	<u>23 = 100</u>	<u>24 = 99</u>	24
v: 1, 5, 4, 4 (3) . . . . .			13
vi: 1 5, 4, 3 . . . . .			<u>13 = 125</u>

## SECTIONS XXXIII, XXXIII.

I begin with the values in terms of letters of the constituents comprised under the numerals XXXIII, XXXIII.

XXXIII. SUPER DEFUNCTOS. (no numeral) 178, 120, 252. ii: 195, 117 + 82.  
iii: 165, 170, 130, 137, 156, 119, 126. iiiii: 119, 169, 69, 60. v: 131, 152,  
103, 137, 135, 120.

XXXIII. SĪ SILVESTRI. 158, 164, 133.

The value for the penultimate prayer of iii must be lowered from 119 to 108 or 111, for 'sempiternam' and 'immensam' (146: 21) are alternatives.

The item headed 'SĪ SILVESTRI' is a mortuary Mass, but not therefore of precisely the same category as those in XXXIII. They were used *super defunctos*; that is to say, at the tomb of this or that servant of God. This was used, not necessarily at his tomb, but, as the first prayer intimates (148: 3), 'in famuli tui Silvestri episcopi depositione'.

On reviewing the course which we have thus far traversed I note that whenever, after reducing the items of a Section to their 'simplest expression', we have found the point at which they respond, whether or not for the first time, yet finally, to the  $\theta$  criterion, the point thus determined is that at which they finally yield an integral number of  $\alpha$  pages. There are, however, noteworthy peculiarities in XXXIII which seem to make it an interesting exception to this general rule:—

1. In *missa* ii (145: 25) there is a passage, 'Et quod officio' &c., which, though grammatically insufficient in itself, yields an admirable sense if, cancelling a needless 'per', we incorporate it into the *Secreta* which precedes it; if, that is to say, we deal with it as with a similar passage in XXVIII xviii. As there so here, I believe the appended work to be an amplification of the last editor's, whose design it would thus have been to raise the value of the *Secreta* from 117 letters (4  $\alpha$  lines) to [117 + 79 =] 196 letters (6  $\beta$  lines).

2. The extant text of the last constituent of iiiii (147: 3) is 'Hanc igitur etc. et in . . . sacerdotum. per,' in sixty-five letters (2  $\beta$  lines); but, warned by the 'etc.', and instructed by the 'etc.' appended to many of the Prefaces, I suspect that in the earlier redactions the constituent may have been written *in extenso* and with the same text as the 'Hanc igitur' of the first Mass (145: 12), except that 'in numerum . . . facias sacerdotum'—words proper to a bishop's anniversary—took the place of 'et miserationum . . . concedas'. The passage, in 263 letters, would thus have the value of 9  $\alpha$  lines (10 of  $\theta$ ) as against the present value of 2  $\beta$  lines.

3. And I assume that, whereas the extant text of the 'Hanc igitur' of v (147: 16) now counts but 133 letters (4  $\beta$  lines), there had previously been a fully developed 'Hanc igitur oblationem . . . concedas ut qui Petri apostoli . . . portionem. per' in 260 letters (9  $\alpha$  lines).



The linear totals thus computed are :—

	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
<b>XXXIII. SUPER DEFUNCTOS</b>	3	3	3	3
(7) 6, (5) 4, 9 (8) . . . . .	21	21	19	18
ii: 1, 7 (6), 4 (6) . . . . .	12	12	12	13
iii: 1, 6 (5), 6, 5 (4), 5, (6) 5, 4, (5) 4	<u>38=74</u>	38	36	34
iiii: 1, (5) 4, 6, (3) 2, (10) 9 (2) . . . . .		<u>25=99</u>	22	15
v: 1, 5 (4), (6) 5, 4 (3), (5) 5 + 4 (4), 5 (4), (5) 4			<u>33=125</u>	25
<b>XXXIII. S<small>AN</small>CT<small>US</small> SILVEST<small>RI</small></b>				2
6 (5), 6 (5), 5 (4) . . . . .				<u>14=125</u>

From this it would seem to follow that the sole occupant of XXXIII was added at the last redaction. The like has already happened. The two Masses for SS. Felicissimus and Agapitus at the end of XX (93 : 23) are referable to its last editor ; similarly the last three for St Laurence in XXI (98 : 19), the last two for St Michael in XXVI (108 : 1), the last two for episcopal anniversaries in XXVIII (138 : 8), and the last two in the promiscuous group 'De siccitate temporis' (144 : 17) which precedes the present Section.

There is nothing in the first three items of XXXIII to forbid the hypothesis that they were composed by St Leo during the pontificate of his predecessor.<sup>1</sup> Not so iiiii (146 : 26), the first and second prayers of which were certainly designed for use in the basilica of St Laurence on the Via Tiburtina, and the Preface—'Vere dign. qui nos scorum tuorum . . . commemoratione refoues' &c. (147 : 1)—perhaps as certainly for use on the feast of that saint. I suspect that, Sixtus III dying on the twenty-ninth of July, 440, the *depositio* of his embalmed body 'uia Tiburtina in crypta iuxta corpus beati Laurentii' took place on the tenth of August, the Feast of St Laurence ; and that this was the Mass said by Leo the Great, or a delegate of Leo's, on some or all of the anniversaries of that *depositio* between the years 441 and 461. The fifth Mass may with like probability, because of the local attribution (147 : 6) in its first prayer, be attributed to Hilarus, the successor of Leo ; and I venture to think that it was composed by him in anticipation of his own burial 'ad sanctum Laurentium iuxta corpus beati episcopi Sixti'.

We now come to the sole occupant of Section XXXIII of the Verona book (148 : 1). I believe it to have been composed by or for

<sup>1</sup> As, so I venture to think, the first two items of XVII ; and as XX i-iii in the  $\theta_1$  scheme, XXI i, ii in the  $\theta_1$  scheme, and XL i-iii in the  $\theta_1$  scheme. See *J. T. S.* vol. ix, p. 543 ; and above, pp. 60 and 63. See also below, p. 94. The episcopal anniversary of Sixtus III fell, in all probability, on the Feast of the Septem Fratres, the subject of XVII.

Pope Simplicius; not, indeed, because his name occurs in it (148: 11), but for a reason already intimated. We have seen that the last two Masses of Section XX are in moral certainty his;<sup>1</sup> that the concluding triad of Masses for St Laurence<sup>2</sup> are probably his; and that to him are referable those chronological peculiarities in the anniversary Masses for bishops which it is impossible to co-ordinate with any pontificate but his.<sup>3</sup> He thus becomes the first claimant, and, unless some other can reasonably be proposed, the sole claimant to the authorship of XXXIII.

Nor does this theory compel us either to impugn the authenticity of the 'Siluestri' in the capitulum and the first two prayers of the Mass (148: 1, 3, 7), or to reject the 'Simplici' in the third prayer (148: 11). On the contrary, it enables us to accept 'Siluestri' as indubitably right, but does not oblige us to condemn 'Simplici' as necessarily wrong, for it grants admission to some such account as the following:—(1) That Simplicius composed the Mass primarily, indeed, for Silvester, the first pope who, though a confessor, was not a martyr, but derivatively for any other pastor of the Roman Church who in that Church's judgement had merited the titles of 'confessor' and 'sanctus', his 's̄c̄i Siluestri confessoris et episcopi tui' being thus a typical formula; (2) that he himself received the benefit of this pious provision; and (3) that, wittingly or unwittingly, an early copyist recorded the fact by substituting 'Simplici' for 'Siluestri' in the last prayer. I cannot think of a more probable conciliation of the discrepancy. It certainly has the merit of *proclivitas*

#### SECTIONS XXXV, XXXVI.

The values in terms of letters for these two Sections are the following:—

XXXV. IN NATALE SC̄ORUM QUATTUOR &c. (no numeral) 141, 132, 121. ii: 112, 217, 94, 145.

XXXVI. IN NATALE SC̄AE CAECILIAE (no numeral) 165, 401, 167, 177. ii: 193, 234, 133, 382. iii: 109, 540. ii: 99, 142, 511. v: 164, 421, 98, 261.

A few modifications are needed in the items for St Caecilia's Day:—

1. The penultimate prayer in the first of them must be lowered from 167 to 158 or 160 (5 β lines), for 'cessura' and 'profutura' (149: 21) cannot stand together. 2. In the second prayer of ii (150: 4) for 'metuant . . . concupiscant' let us read 'metuat . . . concupiscat'. 3. In the Preface of ii 'nutabili' and 'carnalis' (150: 11, 12) may safely be replaced by 'nubili' and 'carnis'. 4. In that of iii 'destrueres' must make way for 'destruis'; and either 'testificans' (150: 28) or 'perficiens' replaced by the third person singular of the perfect tense

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 57-59.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 61, 62.

<sup>3</sup> See above, pp. 80-82.

active; whilst (150:29) either 'quem coniugem fuerat habitura' or 'quem fuerat susceptura coniugio' must be cancelled. The total is thus reduced from 540 to 508, 514, or some intermediate number. Let us say 512. This last modification must be carefully borne in mind; so too must the following:—

On the assumption that the Section had its beginning in the pontificate of Leo the Great or of his successor, Hilarus, I cannot persuade myself that either of those popes is to be held responsible for so much of the following passage in the Preface of iii as I now italicize:—' Vere dign. qui *ut de hoste generis humani maior pompa duceretur non solum per xpm dñm ñ diabolicam destruis tyrannidem nec tantum pro subuersione protoplasti per uirilem sexum . . . reciprocas ultionem sed etiam . . . per femineam*' &c. As the sentence now stands, nothing could be more reprehensible than the suggestion thus made; but the simplest account of the difficulty it creates is also the most probable, namely this:—That some such balancing phrase as 'sed nos efficis participes triumphi tui' has by clerical oversight been dropped between 'tyrannidem' and 'nec tantum'. Such phrase would give the passage which I have italicized the value of [113 + 34 =] 147 letters.

The extant legend of St Caecilia contains two strikingly dramatic details: first, that on the day of her espousals with Valerian she persuaded him to seek instruction in the Christian faith, with the result that the marriage was not consummated, her betrothed being put to death for refusing to offer sacrifice to the gods; secondly, that her own death was the result of partial suffocation in a caldarium followed by the slow exhaustion consequent on an incomplete decapitation. Neither the prayers, however, nor the Prefaces of the present Section make any reference to the extraordinary means by which the death of St Caecilia is said to have been compassed, nor to the miraculous intervention by which it is said to have been delayed; thus raising the question whether during the period of time covered by their textual evolution the extant legend can as yet have been current in the Roman Church. That question, though not germane to the present subject, is the more interesting because the references which the Prefaces of the presumable nucleus of the series—there are none in the prayers—make to the conversion and martyrdom of Valerian would seem to be mere post-scripts to the original text. Thus:—

1. The Preface of the first item falls into two after the word 'originem'<sup>1</sup> (149:15); when follows its first and only mention of Valerian—'in cuius gloriam . . . accedit' &c., a structurally needless clause of the value of 140 letters. [N.B. 401 - 140 = 261.]

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps we should read 'progeniem'. See under XXXVII (155:32) the term 'magnifica mater . . . praeclara progenies', used of St Felicitas and her sons.

2. The Preface of ii (150 : 14) rises to the masterly climax 'multiplicem uictoriam uirgo, casta, martyr, expleuit'; where 'uirgo' is correlated to the contextual 'inter puellares annos', 'casta' to 'inter saeculi blandimenta', 'martyr' to 'inter supplicia persequentum'; but where the first and only mention of Valerian is made in the short 'et ad potiozem' &c., a clause, of 64 letters, which detracts from the literary perfection of the composition. [N.B. 382 - 4 - 64 = 314.]

3. The first part of the Preface of iii ends with 'calcaretur' (150 : 27), and has no connexion, whether in idea or structure, with the clause about Valerian which follows it. Without that clause, the uncorrected value of this is 376, and the corrected value [376 + 34 =] 410.

4. The like is true of the Preface of iiiii. There is neither inspiring idea nor structural nexus to give it unity; for it falls apart at 'consortium' (151 : 17), thus giving to 'ipsumque temporalem uirum' &c. the appearance of a postscript in 90 letters. [N.B. 511 - 90 = 421.]

Only when we come to the fifth and last Mass do we find a Preface which from beginning to end is ethically and structurally one; and this is the Mass before which a precise multiple of five-and-twenty  $\alpha$  lines is completed, provided that we exclude from computation the four presumably *ex post facto* additions just notified and also the remarkable passage, 'ut de hoste . . . duceretur per xpm . . . protoplasti', in the Preface of iii. With these five batches of text the corrected values of the four Prefaces are 401, 378, 512, and 511; without them, they are 261, 314, 263, and 421; or 9, 11, 9, and 14  $\alpha$  lines (10, 11, 10, 15, of  $\theta$ ).

But even so we have not yet reduced the series to its first or simplest expression; for, if analogy may guide us, the structurally needless relative clause, 'cuius gloriae . . . consortium' (151 : 14-17), which just now helped to give us 421 letters (14  $\alpha$  lines) as an earlier value of the Preface of iiiii, would seem to have been no part of the original, which, ending at 'superatur', would thus comprise [421 - 139 =] 282 letters (10  $\theta$  lines). Here, too, let me observe that there is an implied contradiction between the 'cuius gloriae' &c. and the subjoined 'ipsumque' &c.

As hitherto traced, therefore, the evolution of the Caecilia series is to be summarized thus: where it will be seen that the four  $\alpha$  lines required by the 'cuius gloriae . . . consortium' just noted counteract the 'shrinkage' of two lines in the first item and of one each in ii and iii :—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$
XXXV. IN NATALE SCÆ CAECILIAE	3	3
6 (5), (10) 9, 6 (5), (7) 6 . . . . .	29	27
ii: 1, 7 (6), (9) 8, 5 (4), 11 (10) . . . . .	33	32
iii: 1, 4, (10) 9 . . . . .	15	14
iiii: 1, 4 (3), 5, (10) 14 . . . . .	<u>20=100</u>	<u>24=100</u>

If I rightly trace the bibliographical evolution of the present series, it passed, like most of the others, through three editorial stages, but, in addition to these, through a penultimate stage which I denote by the term 'deutero-Hilarian'.

1, 2. At the first, then, of the four editorial stages the Preface of i ended at 'originem' (149: 15), which however should perhaps be 'progeniem'; that of ii at 'expleuit' (150: 15); that of iii at 'calcatur' (150: 27); that of iiii at 'superatur' (151: 14). And at the second stage this last was lengthened by the relative clause 'cuius gloriae . . . consortium'. As yet there were only four Masses.

(1) Simultaneous, or nearly simultaneous, with these was the first ascertainable stage of the Caecilia legend. This represents Caecilia (*a*) not as espoused, though 'humanis deuota nuptiis' (149: 12) and 'nuptiis deputata terrenis' (151: 15), but as holding the married state in contempt—'dum talamos temporales contemneret' (149: 13), 'despecto mundi coniugio' (150: 10).

3 (2). At the deutero-Hilarian stage, the second in the ascertainable development<sup>1</sup> of the legend, *missa v* was added to the series. Caecilia has now (*a*<sub>2</sub>) contracted a matrimonial alliance, but (*b*) with a suitor whose name is not given, and (*c*) whom she predeceases—'confessio puellaris uirum *praecedens* ducit ad praemium' (152: 1)—and (*d*) of whom no hint is given that when he dies he dies a martyr.

The Masses for the Quattuor Coronati were introduced into the document at this stage of the development of the legend, the number of the Caecilia Section being now no longer XXXV but XXXVI; and, that the two groups might, when combined, have the value of seven *a* pages, the Preface of the third Caecilian *missa* was amplified (150: 20) from nine to fourteen lines by the insertion of 'ut de hoste' &c. in [113 + 34 =] 147 letters. [N.B. 263 + 147 = 410.]

4 (3). We next come to the fourth and last stage. By this time the legend has grown and, in growing, shifted; for now (*a*<sub>3</sub>) the marriage is all but consummated—'cui fuerat matrimonii iure copulanda' (149: 16), 'quem fuerat susceptura coniugio' (151: 1). Now, moreover, but not till now, (*b*<sub>2</sub>) the husband's name—'Valerianum' (149: 16)—is given; and (*c*<sub>2</sub>, *d*<sub>2</sub>) the two suffer martyrdom together—'*secum* ad regna caelestia cui fuerat nupta perduxit' (150: 15), 'ipsumque temporalem uirum cui mortali fuerat more nectenda martyrii foedere *secum* uirgo casta fecit aeternum' (151: 17), 'fecit *comitem* passionis' (151: 1).

At this final stage the first Preface was raised from 261 letters to 401

<sup>1</sup> I say 'development' for want of a better word. Tradition, the topography of the catacombs, the contemporaneous conditions of the Roman Church—one or more, perhaps all, of these—may have conduced to the introduction of one or both of the new factors in the story.

(from 9  $\beta$  lines to 13); the second from 314 to 378 (from 10  $\beta$  lines to 12); the third from 410 to 512 (from 13  $\beta$  lines to 16), and the fourth from 421 to 511 (from 14  $\beta$  lines to 16). These four enhancements contributed to an ultimate total of seven  $\beta$  pages, thus:—

	$a_2$	$\beta$		
XXXV. IN NATALE SCÖRUM QUATTUOR CORONATORUM.	3	3		
5, 5 (4), 4 . . . . .	14	13		
ii: 1, 4, 7, 8, 5 . . . . .	20	20		
	$\theta$	$a$		
XXXVI. IN NATALE SCÆ CAECILIAE.	3	3	2	2
6 (5), (10) 9 (13), 6 (5), (7) 6 . . . . .	29	27	27	29
ii: 1, 7 (6), (9) 8, 5 (4), 11 (12) . . . . .	33	32	32	31
iii: 1, 4, (10) 9 [raised to 14] (16) . . . . .	15	14	19	21
iii: 1, 4 (3), 5, (10) 14 (16) . . . . .	<u>20=100</u>	<u>24=100</u>	24	25
v: 1, 6, 14 (13), 4 (3), 9 (8) . . . . .			<u>34=175</u>	<u>31=175</u>

We now see, I venture to think, why it is that in the Verona book the Caecilia series (149 : 6) is numbered 'XXXV' not 'XXXVI'. The peculiarity has been styled a mistake. Whatever it be called, I cannot resent it; for, like the anomaly of an ember Mass on Whitsun Eve, and like the anachronism of Christmas references under 'Mense augusto' and of Lenten references under 'Mense septembri', it elucidates the history of the document. It corroborates the inference already deduced from other data, that the rubrication, as well as the text, of our document is the resultant of at least two redactions.

#### SECTIONS XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXVIII.

In terms of letters the values of these are as follows:—

XXXVII. VIII. KĀL. DĒC. N̄. SCÖRUM CLEMENTIS &c. (no numeral) 201, 167, 735.  
 ii: 159, 311. iii: 135, 147, 315. iii: 143, 319, 98. IN NATALE SCÆ FELICITĀLIS (no numeral), 163, 168, 384, 133, 120. ii: 135, 129, 310, 85, 115.  
 iii: 160, 175, 156, 92, 170.

XXXVIII. VIII. KĀL. DĒC. N̄. SCÖRUM CHRYSOGONI &c. 130, 108, 201, 130, 178.

XXXVIII. PRĪB. KĀL. DĒC. N̄. SCĪ ANDREAE &c. (no numeral) 161, 146, 142, 139, 147. ii: 208, 108, 306, 154, 191. iii: 136, 143, 329, 123, 155. iii: 134, 109, 259, 118, 197.

A few modifications are needed in XXXVII and XXXVIII:—

1. In the 'in martyrii inclyti finis gloria' (153 : 11) of the second Preface for St Clement 'martyrii' and 'finis' would seem to be alternatives one or other of which must be neglected, thus reducing the total from 311 letters (11  $a$  lines) to 302 or 306 (10  $a$  lines). 2, 3, 4. In the Preface of iii 'inter parentum uel inquisitione uel receptione' is

evidently wrong (153 : 23). Here I propose, with Dr Feltoe, to turn the ablatives into accusatives; but if, as is most probable, *uel . . . uel* be a formula denoting alternatives, its value must be neglected as well as that of one or other substantive; the total for the constituent thus falling from 317 (11 a lines) to 299 or 300 (10 a lines). For 'fidelissimus et alumnus acceptus' (153 : 24) I propose 'fidelis seruus et alumnus acceptus'. 5. In the first prayer of iiii (153 : 28) for 'et te creante' read 'ex te creante'. 6. In the first prayer for the Feast of St Felicitas (154 : 13) instead of 'debita ueneratione seruitute currentes tuorum facis gaudere scōrum' I propose 'debita ueneratione currentes festiuitate tuorum facis gaudere scōrum'; and, 7, for 'illis' (154 : 18) 'illi'. 8. In the Postcommunion of the same Mass (154 : 29) 'temporalem' and 'praesentem' are presumably alternatives. A reference to the table of linear values will shew the reader that the first and third of these corrections are justified by the resultant total of 100, not 102, a lines.

II 1, 2. In the Preface of XXXVIII iii (158 : 11) the halting 'hoc ipso namque ieiunio quo . . . offerimus' requires some such word as 'sacrificium', 'hostias', or 'munera'. There is an obvious theological objection to the 'quod' which all the editors substitute for 'quo'. In the same constituent (158 : 12, 13) 'et . . . proficimus' should be 'ut . . . proficiamus'. With 'sacrificium' the value rises to 340.

Of the four groups of *missae* in these three Sections none yield to the  $\theta$  criterion, and only the first and last represent a multiple of 25 a lines; while the second, for St Felicitas, whose feast concurs with that of St Clement, was added at the last redaction in the same way as in Section XX the Mass for SS. Felicissimus and Agapitus was at that redaction subjoined to those for St Sixtus.

Section XXXVIII illustrates the chronology of the document.

The Romans had not a church in honour of St Andrew until Simplicius dedicated to his memory the basilica known as *catabarbara* or *inbarbara*,<sup>1</sup> an event celebrated in the following verses:—

Haec tibi mens ualide decreuit praedia, Christe,  
 Cui testator opes detulit ille suas  
 Simplicius quae papa, sacris caelestibus aptans,  
 Effecit uere muneris esse tui.  
 Et quod apostolici deessent limina nobis  
 Martyris Andreae nomine composuit.  
 Utitur haec haeres titulis ecclesia iustis,  
 Succedensque domo mystica iura locat.  
 Plebs deuota ueni perque haec commercia disce  
 Terreno censu regna superna peti.

<sup>1</sup> For particulars concerning this basilica see Ciampini *Vetere monumenta* P.I, p. 243, with which compare Platina *De uitis et gestis* (s.v. Simplicius I).

If then, we have rightly assigned to the years 472 and 473 the retranscription on  $\beta$  pages of Sections XVII, XX, XXI, and XXVIII,<sup>1</sup> we may reasonably infer that the first of the three years represented by the first, second, and last Masses of XXXVIII—the third is of the Vigil—cannot be dated earlier than 468, the year in which Simplicius was elected, nor the last of them earlier than 470 or later than 472; and therefore that XXXVIII is one of the last Sections set forth while the  $\alpha$  lineation was in use.

It would also seem to follow that Felicitas was one of the few saints whom Simplicius added to the menology of the document; the others being Felicissimus and Agapitus in XX, Chrysogonus and Gregory of XXXVIII, and possibly the Agapitus of the acephalous Mass between XXII and XXIII.

I subjoin the synopsis of linear values:—

	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XXXVII. VIII. KĀL. DĒC. N̄. SĀORUM CLEMENTIS ETC.	3	3
7, 6, 25 (23) . . . . .	38	36
ii: 1, 6 (5), 10 . . . . .	17	16
iii: 1, 5, 5, 10 . . . . .	21	21
iiii: 1, 5, 11 (10), 4 (3) . . . . .	<u>21 = 100</u>	19
IN NATALE SĀE FELICITATIS		2
6 (5), 6, 13 (12), 4, 4 . . . . .		31
ii: 1, 5, 5 (4), 11 (10), 3, 4 . . . . .		27
iii: 1, 6 (5), 6, 5, 3, 6 . . . . .		26
XXXVIII. VIII. KĀL. N̄. SĀORUM CHRYSOGONI ETC.		2
5 (4), 4, 7, 5 (4), 6 . . . . .		25
	$\alpha$	
XXXVIII. PRID. KAL. DĒC. N̄. SĀI ANDREAE APOSTOLI	3	2
6, 5, 5, 5, 5 . . . . .	26	25
ii: 1, 7, 4, 10, 5, 7 (6) . . . . .	34	33
{ iii: 1, 5 (4), 5, 12 (11), 4, 5 . . . . .	32	30
{ iii: 1, 5 (4), 4, 9 (8), 4, 7 (6) . . . . .	<u>30 = 125</u>	<u>27 = 825</u>

SECTION XL.

The singularly heterogeneous capitulum of the present Section is presumably later than the first general redaction; and, as none of the saints whom it records receive either mention or allusion in the Masses, we may fairly suspect it to have superseded, at either the penultimate or

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.* vol. ix, p. 543, and above, pp. 58, 62, 82.



last redaction, some such briefer and more appropriate title as 'VIII KĀL. IĀN. IN NATIUITATE DÑI'.

In terms of letters the values of the constituents, as extant in the Verona MS, are:—

VIII. KĀL. IĀN. N̄. DÑĪ &c., &c., &c. (no numeral) 184, 207, 645, 127, 190.  
 ii : 213, 585.    iii : 185, 453, 175.    iiiii : 141, 209, 146, 212.    v : 97, 127, 272,  
 131, 126.    vi : 204, 87, 362.    vii : 125, 451, 119.    viii : 169, 179, 198, 93.  
 viiii : 109, 131, 222, 118, 175.

A few memoranda are here necessary:—

1. In the first prayer of the first Mass (159:10) the two forms 'iñu xpi filii tui' and 'eius' have been regarded as textual alternatives, notwithstanding their stichometrical disparity; but I propose to insert 'per natalicia' before the former, treating the clause thus made as an amplification of the second general editor's. We should then have a first total of 170 letters, and a second of 196. 2, 3. In the final words of the Preface of iii (161:14) either 'perpetuae' or 'aeternae' should, I suppose, be cancelled. Perhaps, too, it would be tolerable to insert 'in' before 'regnum', reading 'educeret' for 'efficeret'. 4. In the 'cum de homine ueteri homo nous exsisteret curatus mortalitate mortalitas' (162:32) of the sixth Preface we cannot, I venture to think, do better than read 'exsistit et' for 'exsisteret' and 'curatur' for 'curatus'. 5. In the Preface of viiii (164:15) 'congruentibus' seems to call for some such lost word as 'modis' or 'mysteriis', thus raising 222 letters to 227 or 231 (7  $\beta$  lines to 8). 6. In the last prayer of the series (164:23) either 'miserationis' or 'pietatis' must be neglected and 175 lowered to 163 or 167. 7-11. No fewer than five of the Prefaces are followed by 'unde profusis' &c. Cancelling in that of iii either 'aeternae' or 'perpetuae', and in viiii inserting 'mysteriis' we have, in accordance with the hypothesis invariably assumed in the present essay, successive values as follows:—

In	ii :	568	(21 $\theta$ lines,	19 of $\alpha$ ) :	704	(23 $\alpha$ lines) :	585	(19 $\beta$ lines).							
„	iii :	433	(16	„	15	„	) :	571	(19	„	) :	445	(14	„	) .
„	iiii :	197	( 7	„	7	„	) :	335	(11	„	) :	209	( 7	„	) .
„	vii :	439	(16	„	15	„	) :	577	(19	„	) :	451	(15	„	) .
„	viii :	222	( 8	„	8	„	) :	351	(12	„	) :	231	( 7	„	) .

By the first device, and by that of developed conclusions to these five Prefaces, the 21 lines of 'shrinkage' caused by transferring the Section from  $\theta$  to  $\alpha$  lines are thus made good. The like happened, as the reader may remember, in Sections VIIII and XIII.

We have seen that the first four items of XX when reduced to their simplest expression represent, with the capitulum, an integral number of  $\theta$  pages, and that the fifth is for the Vigil; we have also seen that in XXI the first nine items when thus reduced are, with the capitulum,

the equivalent of 6  $\theta$  pages, and that the tenth is for the Vigil.<sup>1</sup> In the present Section the fifth Mass is for the Vigil. What then do we find on further examination of i-iiii?

1. The Preface of the first Mass is complete, self-contained, and sonorously ended if we suppose it to stop at 'continetur' (159 : 20). The case is not so clear as many that we have detected; but we must not therefore conclude that the homiletical and structurally independent 'hoc in ipsis' &c. which follows 'continetur' cannot be adventitious; and indeed since, if it be adventitious it is presumably early work added by or for Leo the Great himself, we may reasonably infer that some pains would be taken to give the resultant whole a semblance of homogeneity.

2. The same may be said of all that follows 'nobiscum dñs est' (160 : 18) in the Preface of ii. It is an admirable exposition, deduced from Holy Writ, of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation as defined at Chalcedon; but the preceding context is complete without it.

3. The Preface of iii, though harmonious and consistent from beginning to end, falls asunder (161 : 11) after the words 'oriens ex alto'; on the other hand, that of iiii is indivisible, an admirable example of the 'simplex duntaxat et unum'.

The table of linear values, which I now subjoin, shews that if, in accordance with these data, we reduce the Prefaces of i, ii, iii from 645, 568, 433 letters, respectively, to 129, 126, 298, the first four Masses of the Section represent, with the capitulum, four pages of the  $\theta$  lination:—

	$\theta_1$	$\theta_2$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
XL VIII KAL. IĀN. N̄. DÑI., ETC.	3	3	3	6
(6) 7 (6), (8) 7, (5 raised to 23)				
22 (21), (5) 4, 7 (6) . . .	31	49	47 = 50	44 = 50
ii : 1, (8) 7, (5 raised to 21) 19 + 4 (19)	14	30	31	27
iii : 1, (7) 6, (11 raised to 16) 15 + 4				
(14), (7) 6 . . . . .	26	31	32	27
iiii : 1, 5, (7) 7 + 4 (7), 5, (8) 7 . . .	<u>26 = 100</u>	26	29	25
v : 1, 4 (3), (5) 4, (10) 9, 5 (4), (5) 4	30	30	27	25
vi : 1, (8) 7, 3, (13) 12 . . . . .	25	25	23	23
vii : 1, (5) 4, (5 raised to 16) 15 + 4 (15),				
(5) 4 . . . . .	16	27	28	24
viii : 1, 6, (7) 6, 7 (6), (4) 3 . . . . .	25	25	23	22
viii : 1, 4, 5 (4), (8) 8 + 4 (7), 4, (7) 6	<u>29 = 225</u>	<u>29 = 275</u>	<u>32 = 275</u>	<u>27 = 250</u>

Pursuing my examination I note that, while there is nothing in v, vi, viii, or viiii that invites theoretical elimination, the structurally independent passage (163 : 10) 'atque ideo' &c. in the Preface of vii

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 60 and 63.

may reasonably be regarded as late work ; for the first two words would seem to introduce an afterthought, as in the Preface of XVIII xxxviii (80 : 15),<sup>1</sup> XVIII vii (89 : 16),<sup>2</sup> and XXVII i (109 : 23).<sup>2</sup> In the first of these the original writer, as he nears a stichometrical halting-place at the distance of eight pages from the final limit, adds an 'atque ideo' clause so as to make Mass and page conterminous ; in the other two the compiler of the second redaction adds new work, introducing it with an 'et ideo'. The elimination here invited gives us 125 lines as the original value of what, since the first of the five Masses is for the Vigil, would seem to be a second group of Christmas Masses.

Thus, by a nett addition of 18, 16, 5, 11 [= 50] lines to the Prefaces of i, ii, iii, and vii, items which had once filled nine  $\theta$  pages were so amplified as upon transcription to fill eleven. Of these additions that in vii is of interest for a historical reason. Its triumphant reference to the universal acceptance of the Catholic doctrines of the Incarnation, as contrasted with an earlier 'difficulty' (163 : 13), assures us by its 'toto etiam mundo testificante' and its 'cernitur ubique conspicuum' (163 : 12, 15) that it must have been penned after the definition of that doctrine by the Council of Chalcedon in the year 451. That year may therefore be accepted as a *terminus a quo* for the re-edition of the original  $\theta$  redaction of the present series.

But this development of the pristine text obscured what had in the first instance been made manifest by the bibliographical collocation of the nine items ; I mean the independence, each of the other, of the two groups i-iiii and v-viii. Bearing in mind that in the first instance i-iiii filled precisely four pages, i being a Mass for the Vigil, and that v, which also was for the Vigil, began at the head of a page ; we naturally infer that i-iiii may have been an interrelated group, and that v-viii may in their turn have been interrelated. This would, indeed, appear to have been the case. Theologians will, I think, agree with me that i, iii, iiiii exhibit a progression from ( $\alpha$ ) prophecies under the old law to ( $\beta$ ) that of Zacharias, as the old was giving way to the new ; and thence to ( $\gamma$ ) the fulfilment of all that had gone before in the Person of the 'uerus agnus et aeternus pontifex hodie natus' (161 : 27). They will also, I think, agree with me that the Prefaces of v, vi, vii, framed on an entirely different ideal from the earlier three, are in their turn a progressive series, passing as they do from ( $\alpha$ ) man's first disobedience to ( $\beta$ ) the revelation of the mystery of godliness, and thence to ( $\gamma$ ) the illumination finally perfected in the vision of the infinite Majesty of God.

Nor is this all. If in i-iiii we have *missae*, one for Vigil and three for Feast, the immemorial custom of three eucharistic celebrations on

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.* vol. ix, p. 547.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 56 and 75.

Christmas Day would seem to have been already established early in the pontificate of Leo the Great. And I think that in v-viii we are to recognize, not only that, but another very curious usage recorded in Mabillon's *Ordines Romani*. According to the eleventh Ordo (§ 17), not only did the Bishop of Rome say mass at three different altars on Christmas Day, he would also, if time and weather permitted, hold the station preparatory to the last of these at St Peter's in Vaticano, going thence in procession to Sc̄a Maria Maior, but after first hearing mass in the former of those basilicae. Hence, as I infer, the evidently supplementary Mass set at the end of the present Section; hence, too, its first prayer (164:6), a prayer as irrelevant to the engrossing subject of the day as it would have been unsuitable to the churches in which the Pope's own masses were said, a prayer meant for use in a church dedicated to an Apostle and presumably St Peter, — 'apostolicis tribue nos dñe quaesumus precibus adiuuari.'

#### SECTIONS XLI, XLII, XLIII.

Here the first list is as follows:—

XLI. IN NATALE SC̄I IOHANNIS EUANGELISTAE. (no numeral) 170, 177, 142, 692, 149, 139. ii: 148, 136, 626, 153, 144.

XLII. IN NATALE INNOCENTUM. (no numeral) 151, 123, 480, 132, 162. ii: 170, 137, 369, 147, 202.

XLIII. IN IEIUNIO MENSIS DECIMI. (no numeral) 174, 89, 124, 336, 80, 163. ii: 164, 113, 153, 197, 112, 243. iii: 98, 123, 114, 82, 114, 109, 79, 263, 114, 148. iiiii: 119, 97, 93, 148, 80, 94, 463, 115, 138. v: 86, 90, 114, 170, 109, 16, 184, 19, 175.

Two modifications are needed. 1. In the first Postcommunion in XLI either 'saluationis' or 'redemptionis' (165:20) must be neglected. 2. In XLII the final clause of the first Preface (166:33) needs some such word as 'nomine' in agreement with 'suo'. In the first prayer of XLIII iiiii (170:19) for 'prospera cunctaque procedant' I propose 'prospera sanctaque procedant', thus balancing the 'religionis et pacis' which precede.

None of the three Sections responds to the  $\theta$  criterion; and the extant text of XLI yields a total of only 95  $\alpha$  lines. But I venture to suggest that by clerical oversight 'per' may have been appended to its first Preface (165:17) in place of 'unde profusis gaudiis' etc. That so venial an error should have happened in one of the transcriptions that separated the Verona MS from the second general redaction of the original document is very much more likely than that a pope so ardently devoted to St John the Evangelist as was Hilarus should not have compiled a short Section in his honour. It was to the protection of

that apostle that Hilarus attributed his escape from assassination when on his way to Chalcedon as legate of Leo ; and in commemoration of that mercy he adorned the epistyle of the sumptuous chapel which he built in honour of his celestial patron with the inscription 'LIBERATORI SUO BEATO IOANNI EVANGELISTAE HILARUS EPISCOPUS FAMULUS XPI'.<sup>1</sup>

But, on the other hand, we must be careful to remember that, if the Leonianum be, what we have good reason to believe it to be, a collection of liturgical forms actually used, the second of the considerations just suggested, so far from turning the scale in favour of an Hilarian authorship of Section XLI, would seem to turn it in the contrary direction. Hilarus, in his short pontificate of six years and a few weeks, may indeed have witnessed the final completion of the adornment as well as of the erection of the chapel of St John the Evangelist ; but it by no means follows that he lived long enough to celebrate in it the next ensuing festival of its patron ; still less, that he lived long enough to celebrate two such festivals. The truth with regard to his architectural scheme around the baptistery of Constantine would seem to be that the chapel of St Stephen was finished in time for him to use in it his adaptation of two previously composed *missae*, XVIII vii and viii ;<sup>2</sup> and that, though the chapel of St John the Baptist either was or may have been completed in time for him to use in it one previously composed *missa*, XIII iiiii, for the twenty-fourth of June<sup>3</sup>, the pursuer who overtakes all men overtook Hilarus before the twenty-seventh of December next after the completion of the chapel of St John the Evangelist.

Hence it is that, after as careful consideration as I have been able to give to the subject, I think that Simplicius, not Hilarus, must have composed Section XLI.

We have seen<sup>4</sup> that St Leo's *missae* for the December fast form the second of two groups in XXVII. It need not, therefore, surprise us to find that those in XLIII are not amenable to the  $\theta$  criterion ; and we may thence infer that they are from the pen of Hilarus, of whom the Liber Pontificalis tells us that he ordained presbyters, deacons and bishops at that season, mentioning none of the other three.

I find on examining XLIII v that only its first, second and third components are correlated to each other as portions of one and the same Mass ; and observe with interest that the third is conterminous with an  $\alpha$  page. Equally noteworthy is the fact that the miscellanea which follow are precisely what was needed to carry on the document to the end of a  $\beta$  page.

<sup>1</sup> For an inscription recalling the archidiaconate of Hilarus, see above, p. 64. My authority is Ciampini *Vetera Monumenta* vol. i, pp. 239, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 55, 56.

<sup>3</sup> See *J. T. S.* vol. ix, p. 531.

<sup>4</sup> On p. 75.

The linear summary is therefore as follows:—

	? $\alpha$	$\beta$
<b>XLI. IN NATALE S<math>\bar{C}</math>I IOHANNIS EUANGELISTAE</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
6, (7) 6, 5, (25) 23 + 5 (22), 5, 5 . . . . .	55	49
ii: 1, (6) 5, 5, (23) 21 (20), (6) 5, 5 . . . . .	<u>42 = 100</u> ? 41	
	$\alpha$	
<b>XLII. IN NATALE INNOCENTUM</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
5, 4, (18) 16, 5 (4), 6 (5) . . . . .	36	34
ii: 1, 6, 5, 12, 5, 7 . . . . .	<u>36 = 75</u>	36
	$\alpha$	
<b>XLIII. IN IEIUNIO MENSIS DECIMI</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
6, 3, (5) 4, (12) 11, 3, 6 (5) . . . . .	33	32
ii: 1, 6 (5), 4, 5, 7 (6), 4, 8 . . . . .	35	33
iii: 1, 4 (3), (5) 4, 4, 3, 4, 4, 3, (10) 9, 4, (6) 5 . . . . .	45	44
iiii: 1, 4, 4 (3), (4) 3, (6) 5, 3, 3, (17) 16 (15), 4, 5 . . . . .	48	46
v: 1, 3, (4) 3, 4 . . . . .	<u>11 = 175</u>	11
5, 1, 4, 1, 6, . . . . .		17 = 250

ADDENDUM. It only remains for me to note three analogous coincidences.—

In Section XVII i for the Vigil of the Septem Fratres, the ninth of July; in XXI v, viii, viiii, x for the Feast of St Laurence, the tenth of August; and in XXXV i, undated at Verona, but for the Quattuor Coronati on the eighth or, as the *Depositio Martyrum* has it, the ninth of November, we find expressed the correlated ideas of *patrocinium* and *seruitus*: the *patromus* or *patroni* being the saint or saints of the day, the *seruus* being the celebrant. The coincidences are that Sixtus III, predecessor of Leo, was consecrated on the tenth of July, and may therefore have been elected on the ninth; that Leo himself was elected on the tenth of August; and that, supposing him to have been consecrated on the twenty-second of September, 440, and to have died<sup>1</sup> on the third or fourth of November, 461—data which I assume with some little confidence [see above, p. 82]—Hilarus, his successor, was elected on the eighth or ninth of November.

In the first of these I see corroborative proof of the suggestion several times made in the foregoing pages, that some few groups of Masses are referable to the pontificate, if not to the pen, of Sixtus; in the second, that in their first form XXI v—viii were Leo's<sup>2</sup>; in the third, that XXXV was inserted into the collection by Hilarus; and, inferentially, that to Hilarus are due those amplifications of XXXVI i—iii which represent Caecilia as already espoused at the time of her martyrdom, but to an unnamed suitor whom she predeceased.

<sup>1</sup> After a pontificate of 21 years, 1 month and 13 days, the period assigned in some copies of the *Liber Pontificalis*.      <sup>2</sup> His, no doubt, were also x and xi,

The reticence of the  $\theta$  and  $\alpha$  redactions with regard to this portion of the legend may perhaps be explained thus : That Leo of set purpose so modelled his panegyrics of Caecilia as to suggest a tribute of admiring respect to his friend Demetrias, the generous benefactress of the Roman Church who from motives of piety had made choice of the single life ; a tribute which mention of a matrimonial alliance contracted for Caecilia would have rendered irrelevant.

I do not think that investigators of the chronology of the Roman See have ever as yet made use of Sections XVII, XXI, XXVIII, XXXIII and XXXV of the Leonianum.

MARTIN RULE.

POSTSCRIPT. It has several times occurred to me that there may have been a  $\theta$  redaction of the Masses in honour of St Clement. Assuredly, they contain no needless rubrics, no superfluous and no awkwardly amalgamated prayers, no clauses devoid of regimen but susceptible of incorporation into prayers contiguous to them but already complete ; nor do they, like the Sections in honour of St Stephen, St Laurence, or St Caecilia, contain constituents the component parts of which, from historical and other points of view, are so manifestly out of focus with each other as to challenge dissection. Nevertheless, the last sentence, 'postremo' &c. (153 : 1) of the first Preface reads like a repetition of what goes before ; while in the third and fourth Prefaces the hopeless 'apostolicae praedicationis fidelissimus et alumnus acceptus' (153 : 24) and 'in tuis praedicatoribus sequendo' (154 : 3) are not only suggestive of blundering efforts to decipher indistinctly written memoranda, but are such that the disbalanced antithesis of the context is in each instance restored by their removal. Although, therefore, I have not the same kind of certitude as in other instances, I cannot fail to note that, if the passages just mentioned are indeed *ex post facto* to the original text, the first values of the Prefaces in which they severally occur were [735 - 78 =] 657 letters (24  $\theta$  lines), [299 - 54 =] 245 letters (9  $\theta$  lines) and [319 - 29 =] 290 letters (11  $\theta$  lines), and that my list on p. 92 may, though with becoming diffidence, be supplemented thus :—

	$\theta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
FOR TITLE	3	3	3
7, 6, (24) 25 (23) . . . . .	37	38	36
ii: 1, 6 (5), (11) 10 . . . . .	18	17	16
iii: 1, 5, (6) 5, (9) 10 . . . . .	21	21	21
iii: 1, 5, 11 (10), 4 (3) . . . . .	21 = 100	21 = 100	19
For St Felicitas . . . . .			86
For SS. Chrysogonus &c. . . . .			27
For St Andrew . . . . .			125 117 = 325

M. R.