

# 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]

## DOCUMENTS

THE *VETUS ITALA* TEXT OF THE *EXULTET*.

MONSEIGNEUR DUCHESNE has shewn<sup>1</sup> how the liturgical blessing of the Easter Candle was foreign to the original Roman use, and was only allowed in the suburbicarian churches in the middle of the sixth century, though it was apparently customary everywhere else in the West. The differences, however, between the usual Roman text, as found in the *Gregorianum*, the 'Gelasian' formula, and the *Exultet* of the Mozarabic and Ambrosian, are so fundamental that the several formulae must be of quite independent origin. Yet this is only what might be expected if it is borne in mind that this 'preconium paschale' or, more accurately, that larger part of it which follows the introduction<sup>2</sup> and the liturgical preface,<sup>3</sup> was not only recited by the deacon or archdeacon, but was apparently occasionally composed by him. The existence of two such formulae written by Ennodius of Pavia (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica Auct. Antiquis.* vii pp. 18, 109); the quotation by St Augustine (*De civitate Dei* xv 22) of part of a metrical form which he had composed 'in laude quadam cerei' (possibly, as Duchesne suggests, for some deacon at Milan or a neighbouring church); the caustic remarks as to their composition made by St Jerome or pseudo-Jerome in the letter to Praesidius of Piacenza in 384 (Migne *P.L.* xxx c. 1881); and the rhythmical Mozarabic formula, written in the first person singular, quoted in Ewald and Loew, *Exempla scripture Visigothice*, Tab. II and III and republished in *Studi e Testi* xiii pp. 40 sqq., are sufficient proof of this; and further witness to it is borne by the ascription of the usual *Exultet* in the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* and the *Missale Gothicum* to St Augustine, 'cum adhuc diaconus esset'; while in a Poitiers Pontifical quoted by Martène (*De ant. eccl. rit.* iv 24) it is stated to be the work of St Augustine as corrected by St Jerome; Durandus mentions as other composers St Ambrose and even Peter the deacon of the twelfth century; and as late as the fourteenth century a Munich MS (Clm. 831) calls it 'Benedictio Gelasii pape'.

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Worship*, English tr., ed. 2, 1904, p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> In this introduction the deacon invokes a blessing on what he is about to recite.

<sup>3</sup> The two compositions of Ennodius (see below) and the Mozarabic commence with *Aequum et dignum*; the Ambrosian only begins to differ from the Roman after the Preface.

It seems clear then that each extant *Exultet* is an individual composition on a fixed theme; the main subject never varies, but its treatment does. For the present the temptation is resisted to compare the different ways in which the theme is developed or to touch the thorny question as to whether the earlier *laudes cerei* were for daily or for paschal use.

With the benedictions in the Gelasian, Ambrosian, and Mozarabic books we are not now concerned, nor with the Roman; our view must be confined to a formula which was restricted to South Italy, and has not yet received the attention it deserves.<sup>1</sup> The present notice is called for by an article in a recent number of the *Rassegna Gregoriana* (vol. vii col. 125-134) entitled *Un 'Exultet' inedito*. Liturgists, who are much indebted to Dom Latil for the Monte Cassino series of reproductions of *Exultet* rolls, will welcome his account of the Salerno MS Missal of 1431 with its text of the *praeconium paschale*. This, however, can scarcely be called 'inedito'. Some ten years ago in answer to a request by Fr Ehrle to reconstruct as originally written the oldest *Exultet* roll in the Vatican Library (MS Vat. Lat. 9820), I had to reply that the greater part of its original text (which had been so erased that only the initial letters of some sentences were legible) must have been quite different from that of the only version of the Roman *Exultet* then known; but as soon as G. B. Nitto de Rossi and Francesco Nitti di Vito had published in their *Codice diplomatico Barese*, 1897 (vol. i pp. 208-215), the text of the Bari roll<sup>2</sup> I saw that its initial letters agreed exactly with those of the first hand of the Vatican roll.

This Bari text has since been published by M. Émile Bertaux in *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale* (Paris, 1904, pp. 218 sqq., Plate ix), and in the accompanying *Iconographie comparée des rouleaux de l'Exultet*; M. Bertaux calls attention to its difference from the usual form, the *Vulgata*; the text has also been reproduced in the latest English (1904) edition of Mgr Duchesne's *Origines du culte chrétien*. Dom Beyssac has also published in *Rassegna Gregoriana*, v. 107, a fragment belonging to Dom Palmieri and has shewn how it agrees almost exactly with that of Bari except as to its conclusion (see below).

The text now published by Dom Latil also agrees almost *verbatim* with the Bari roll; and, far from being 'veramente nuova' and a fifteenth-century composition,<sup>3</sup> is a faithful reproduction of the rarer

<sup>1</sup> Duchesne's note (*l. c.* p. 256 n. 2) in which he speaks of it as 'a formula which varies somewhat from the usual text' does not do justice to the immense difference between it and the well-known text.

<sup>2</sup> Another photograph appears in *Comptes rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres xxxv* (1897) pl. 1.

<sup>3</sup> On the subject of its melody I express no opinion.

text, which in comparison with the *Vulgata* may very well, for reasons given below, be called the *Vetus Itala*.

Before, however, any suggestion is made as to its origin and use, it should be recalled that the same text appears in the original part of the Roll of Mirabella Eclano which I have been privileged to see (cf. Raimondo Guarini *Ricerche sull' antica città di Eclano*, Napoli, 1814); and that the fragment of a Roll of unknown origin but in a script very similar to that of MS Vatican. Lat. 9820, published in Disp. vii of the Monte Cassino reproductions, contains the sentence 'Apes siquidem . . . virgini[tatem]' which belongs to the *Vetus Itala* and not to the Vulgate text, so that this roll should probably be added to the list of *Vetus Itala* texts.

But there is still another example of this text, one hitherto unsuspected, viz. the Roll, once the property of Lord Crawford and now in the Rylands Library at Manchester.<sup>1</sup> Of this there only remain the first three sheets, containing the text as far as 'viros non norunt'. The roll is now 181 × 31 cm., and has four pictures: (i) at the *Vere dignum*, Christ seated between two angels; (ii) a large one in three compartments, (a) the Crucifixion, (b) the Entrance into Limbus, and (c) the Deliverance of Adam and Eve, representing 'Solutis quippe nexibus et calcato mortis aculeo resurrexit a mortuis qui fuerat inter mortuos liber'; (iii) the Nativity as representing 'dum per virginea viscera mundo illaberis', and (iv) the usual picture of the bees before 'apes siquidem'; the pictures, as in the oldest rolls, not being upside down, but corresponding to the direction of the text. The script bears some resemblance to that of MS Vatican. Lat. 10673, the S. E. Italian as distinguished from the Cassino type, and may fairly be dated about 1000 A. D.

The Vatican roll, no. 9820, referred to above, has the first sentence 'Exultet . . . salutaris'; after which only a few letters and words are legible until the conclusion with an additional sentence: *Necnon et famulam, &c.* The *Vetus Itala* sentence: 'Ut superne benedictionis tue munus accomodes' is quoted on the deacon's roll represented in one of the pictures. The first impression conveyed by this MS and the usual explanation of its condition was that the text has been erased and then rewritten in an inverse order to that of the pictures, that so the people might be able to see the pictures the right way up as the roll was unwound and allowed to fall over the front of the ambo. But on examination it became clear that the original text was in fact quite different, and that the pictures, after having been roughly cut out, have been readjusted to fit in with the new text which

<sup>1</sup> In 1877 this roll was in private possession at Nürnberg. See W. Wattenbach in *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit*, 1877, No. 8, col. 296.

has been written over the erasure of the original text. The roll has now been restored as originally written, no regard being paid to its later maltreatment; but it will be noticed that the order differs considerably from that given in the *Iconographie comparée* of Bertaux, *l. c.* p. 223, n. 2.<sup>1</sup> It bears witness to the deliberate rejection of one text in favour of another. Up to the *Vere dignum*, however, the two texts are identical; and this has led to a curious result. When the new text had to be adapted, the beginning of an old roll still served its purpose. Hence the original text of Mirabella is retained as far as 'creature commendas' and the representation of the bees, while the rest of the roll beginning 'Vere quia dignum' has the Vulgate text in a thirteenth-century hand; the oldest Gaeta roll has everything after the Preface erased and rewritten in the fourteenth century; the MS Vatic. Lat. 3784 extends as far as the Preface only and was probably completed by a part now lost; the Palmieri fragment has first the *Vulgata* and then, without any break or new title, the *Vetus Itala* beginning with 'Vere quia dignum'. The second Bari roll [Ba\*] kept in the same glass case as the earlier one [Ba] has as far as the Preface the *Vetus Itala* text in a hand of the middle of the twelfth century; the rest of the roll is *Vulgata* added at the end of the thirteenth; but by the end of the twelfth century the *Vulgata* was in use at Bari, for the third and smallest roll [Ba\*\*] has that text, although for its conclusion it retains that of the *Vetus Itala*.

The differences in the Bari text as edited by Nitti di Vitto<sup>2</sup> and Bertaux, the palpable errors in Guarini's collation of the Mirabella roll, and some evident mistakes, possibly typographical, in Dom Latil's version of the Salerno Missal, seemed to demand a personal inspection of all the known sources before a critical edition of the text could be published. This I have been able to make,<sup>3</sup> and two South Italian journeys for that purpose have revealed more than had been expected;

<sup>1</sup> The description of this Roll by Bertaux (*l. c.*) seems to call for comment. Reserving for my *Paleografia Musicale Vaticana* a notice of his omission of a sentence at the back of the roll which is of prime importance for the determination of its date, and of his neglect to distinguish the various hands which can still be made out, I should here point out that he has failed to see that the text has been rewritten and that the pictures were not originally upside down, while he acknowledges that the fifteen representations could without difficulty have been incorporated in the Bari roll and expresses surprise that the most characteristic passages of the text, viz. those referring to 'Adae peccatum' and the 'primum pascha', are not illustrated. As a matter of fact these two incidents are not mentioned at all in the *Vetus Itala* and the paintings fit in perfectly with that text.

<sup>2</sup> I am greatly indebted to the Solesmes monks for a photographic copy of the fragment belonging to Dom Palmieri. A page of it is reproduced in *Paleographie Musicale* ii pl. 20.

<sup>3</sup> The text in Duchesne (*l. c.*) is the faulty one of the *Codice diplomatico Barese*; its footnotes do not accurately represent the original.

for not only did Bari and Salerno yield additional material, but the rich Chapter Library of Benevento disclosed sources hitherto unnoticed; MS vi 33, of the end of the tenth century, in addition to many evidences of the survival of an older *ordo* on certain feasts, has for the *praeconium paschale* the *Vetus Itala* text; whilst MS vi 39, written about 1100 A.D. and (like MS Vatic. 9820) for the abbey of S. Peter, Benevento, has the *Vulgata*.

The list then of the known examples of the *Vetus Itala* text are:—

*Ba* Bari roll, complete.

*Ba\** Second Bari roll, as far as the preface.

*Ba\*\** Third Bari roll, from 'Una cum'.

*Ben* Benevento Chapter MS vi 33, complete.

*Ga* Gaeta roll A, as far as the preface.

*Mi* Mirabella Eclano roll, as far as 'commendas'.

*Pal* Fragment Palmieri B; from 'Vere quia dignum'; the text is at times indecipherable.

*Pi* Pisa, Museo Civico roll A, two sentences only [see below].

*Ry* Rylands Library roll, defective after 'non norunt'.

*Sal* Salerno MS Missal 1431, complete.

Salerno MS Missal, saec. xv, complete.

*Tro.* Troia roll (so far as can be ascertained from the Monte Cassino reproduction) where the older hand is apparently erased.

*Va* Vatican roll 9820 (vide supra).

*Va\** Vatican roll 3784, as far as the preface.

*Va\*\** Vatican MS Lat. 10673; only the first sentence remains on the last fol. of the MS, but (vide *Miscellanea A. Ceriani*, Milano, V. Hoepli, 1910) the MS was written for some place where the two uses 'Ambrosian' and 'Roman' existed side by side for *ad libitum* use, and the *Exultet* is placed in the so-called 'Ambrosian' *ordo*.

It is also worth recording that two sentences, saved from the wreck of the older text, have been retained in two rolls and in one MS which have the Vulgate text:—

(a) The oldest roll in the Museo Civico of Pisa,<sup>1</sup> written in South Italian script of the end of the eleventh century, inserts after 'nectar includunt' of the Vulgate the sentence 'Flore utuntur . . . substantia'; after 'destruunt castitatem' it inserts 'Cuius hodor . . . hilaris', a sentence which it repeats after 'luminaribus misceatur' with the addition of 'non tetro odore arvina desudat sed iocundissime suavitate inficitur'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Martini: *Theatrum Basilicae Pisanae*, App. fol. 20, Roma, 1724-1728.

<sup>2</sup> The Pisa roll also contains after 'cruribus suspensis insidunt' the following sentence: 'Legunt pedibus flores et nullum damnum in floribus invenitur,' which also occurs in the 'Gelasian' formula.

(b) The roll written about 1100 A.D. for Sorrento, now at Monte Cassino, has after 'rutilans ignis accendit', 'cuius odor . . . sancto' and 'Flore . . . conficiunt' before 'apis ceteris'.

(c) MS Bodleian Canonici Bibl. Lat. 61, written about the same time probably for Zara in Dalmatia, has 'Flore utuntur . . . conficiunt' after 'nectar includunt'.

The concluding sentence, which precedes the intercession for the authorities, 'In huius . . . hoste fidelibus' is taken from the first benediction of Ennodius, with 'omnipotens' for 'domine' and 'tua iussa faciens' after 'procellarum', and a few variants noticed below.

In the following edition of the text no notice has been taken of the accompanying rubrics or of the preceding *Lumen Christi*, &c. ; of the additions by later hands of the Vulgate text in *Ba, Ga, Mi, Va* ; of subsequent insertions of names of dignities which have no connexion with the original text ; or of manifest errors due to the original scribe or later copyists, e. g. in the beginning of the text, l. 2 *tantis regis, Va, tantis regi Tro*, l. 3 *tellus* omitted *Tro*.

No care has been taken to mark the use of *e* cedilla or to reproduce such orthography as *inobs, abemus, set* for *sed, adque* for *atque*, or the use of *b* or *v* in such words as *illaveris, vivit* for *bibit, flavra, flabea*.

Limitations of space have prevented the printing of the clauses in a way which would have shewn their rhythm, &c., but commas have been freely introduced for this purpose and the sentences are divided from each other as in the rolls.

Such words and letters as are legible in *Va* are represented in *italic* type.

*Exultet iam angelica turba celorum, exultent divina mysteria, et pro tanti regis victoria, tuba intonet salutaris.*

Gaudeat se<sup>1</sup> *tantis tellus irradiata fulgoribus et eterni<sup>2</sup> regis splendore lustrata, totius orbis se sentiat amisisse caliginem.*

*Letetur et mater ecclesia, tanti luminis<sup>3</sup> adornata fulgore et magnis populorum vocibus hec aula resultet.*

*Quapropter, astantibus vobis, fratres Karissimi, ad tam miram huius luminis claritatem, una mecum queso dei omnipotentis<sup>3</sup> misericordiam invocate,*

*Ut qui me non meis meritis infra<sup>4</sup> levitarum numerum<sup>5</sup> dignatus est aggregare, luminis sui gratiam<sup>6</sup> infundens, cerei huius laudem implere praecipiat,*

*Per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum filium suum,<sup>7</sup> viventem<sup>8</sup> secum atque regnantem<sup>9</sup> in unitate spiritus sancti deum<sup>10</sup> per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.*

*Dominus vobiscum.*

*Et cum spiritu tuo.*

*Sursum corda.*

<sup>1</sup> et *Mi.*    <sup>2</sup> *tanti Mi.*    <sup>3</sup> *patris Ry.*    <sup>4</sup> in *Ba, Ba\*, Ben. Mi.*    <sup>5</sup> *numero Ben, Ba\* (first hand numerum), Mi.*    <sup>6</sup> *claritatem Ga.*    <sup>7</sup> *tuum Sal.*    <sup>8-9</sup> *atque regnantem secum Ba.\**    <sup>10</sup> *omit Mi; deus Ba, Ba\*, Sal.*

Habemus ad dominum.

Gratias agamus domino deo nostro.

<sup>11</sup> Dignum et iustum est.<sup>12</sup>

Vere quia dignum et iustum est, per Christum dominum nostrum,  
Qui nos ad noctem istam, non tenebrarum sed luminis matrem,  
perducere dignatus est, in qua exorta est ab inferis in <sup>13</sup> eterna die <sup>14</sup>  
resurrectio mortuorum ;

*Solutis* quippe nexibus et calcato mortis eculeo<sup>15</sup> resurrexit a mortuis  
qui fuerat <sup>16</sup> inter mortuos liber.

*Unde* et<sup>17</sup> nox ipsa<sup>18</sup> sydereo pro ecclesiarum ornatu cereorum splen-  
dore tamquam dies illuminata collucet, quia in eius matutino,  
resurgente Christo, mors occidit redemptorum<sup>19</sup> et emersit vita  
credentium.

Vere tu pretiosus es opifex, formator es omnium, cui qualitas<sup>20</sup> in  
agendi non fuit officio sed in sermonis imperio.

Qui ornatum<sup>21</sup> atque habitum<sup>22</sup> mundi<sup>23</sup> nec adampliandum<sup>24</sup> quasi  
inops potentie, nec additandum quasi egenus glorie condidisti.

Totus ac plenus in te<sup>25</sup> es,<sup>26</sup> qui dum per virginea viscera mundo  
illaberis, virginitatem etiam creature<sup>27</sup> commendas.<sup>28</sup>

Apes siquidem dum ore concipiunt, ore parturiunt, casto corpore, non<sup>29</sup>  
fedo desiderio copulantur.

Denique virginitatem servantes, posteritatem generant,<sup>30</sup> sobole gaudent,  
matres dicuntur, intacte perdurant, filios generant et viros non  
norunt.<sup>31</sup>

Flore<sup>32</sup> utuntur coniuge, flore<sup>32</sup> funguntur genere, flore<sup>32</sup> domos  
instruunt, flore<sup>32</sup> divitias conveunt,<sup>33</sup> flore<sup>32</sup> ceram<sup>34</sup> conficiunt.

O ammirandus<sup>35</sup> apium<sup>36</sup> fervor ! ad commune opus pacifica turba  
concurrunt<sup>37</sup> et operantibus plurimis una augetur<sup>38</sup> substantia.

O invisibile<sup>39</sup> artificium ! primo<sup>40</sup> culmina pro fundamentis edificant  
et tam ponderosam<sup>41</sup> mellis<sup>42</sup> sarcinam pendentibus domiciliis  
imponere non verentur.

O virginitatis insignia ! que non possessori damna sed sibi luca  
convectant ; auferunt<sup>43</sup> quidem predam et cum preda<sup>44</sup> minime  
tollunt peccatum.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>11-12</sup> omit *Ba, Ba.\**    <sup>13-14</sup> eternam diem *Ry.*    <sup>15</sup> aculeo *Sal.*    <sup>16</sup> fuit *Ba.*  
<sup>17</sup> omit *Ba, Ba\*, Sal.*    <sup>18</sup> ipse *Ba.\**    <sup>19</sup> redemptorem *Sal.*    <sup>20</sup> equalitas *Pal.*  
<sup>21</sup> natum corrected into ornatum *Mi* ; ornatu *Sal.*    <sup>22</sup> habitu *Sal.*    <sup>23</sup> mundo *Ben.*  
<sup>24</sup> adampliandum *Pal.*    <sup>25</sup> se corrected into te *Pal.*    <sup>26</sup> es *Ben.*    <sup>27</sup> creatura  
*Ben, Pal, Mi.*    <sup>28</sup> commendans *Pal (second hand), Ry.*    <sup>29</sup> non de *Pal.*  
<sup>30</sup> generans *Ben.*    <sup>31</sup> Here *Ry* breaks off.    <sup>32</sup> flores *Pal.*    <sup>33</sup> condunt *Pisa.*  
<sup>34</sup> cera *Pisa.*    <sup>35</sup> ammirandum *Ben,* admirabile *Pisa.*    <sup>36</sup> apum *Pisa, Sal.*  
<sup>37</sup> concurrunt *Pisa.*    <sup>38</sup> augeatur *Ben.*    <sup>39</sup> invisibilis *Pal.*    <sup>40</sup> primo (diluculo  
*second hand) Ben.*    <sup>41</sup> ponderosa *Ben,* ponderosas *Pal.*    <sup>42</sup> melli *Pal.*  
<sup>43</sup> auferetur *Pal.*    <sup>44</sup> predam *Pal.*    <sup>45</sup> peccata *Pal.*



Spoliant quidem florum cutem et morsuum non annotant cicatricem.

Sed inter hec que dinumeravimus,<sup>46</sup> huius cerei gratiam predicemus.

Cuius odor suavis est et flamma ylaris; non tetro odore arvina<sup>47</sup> desudat<sup>48</sup> sed iocundissima<sup>49</sup> suavitate.

Qui peregrinis non inficitur<sup>50</sup> pigmentis sed illuminatur spiritu sancto;

<sup>51</sup> Qui ut<sup>52</sup> accensus proprias<sup>53</sup> corporis compages depascit, ita coagulatas lacrimas in rivulos fundit<sup>54</sup> gutturarum.

Quique semiusta membra ambroseo sanguine flavea vena distollit, abitum bibit ignis humorem.

In huius autem cerei luminis corpore, te omnipotens postulamus, *ut superne benedictionis munus accommodes,*

*Ut*<sup>55</sup> si quis hinc<sup>56</sup> sumpserit adversus flabra ventorum, adversus spiritus procellarum, sit ei,<sup>57</sup> domine, *singulare per fugium*, sit murus ab hoste fidelibus.

<sup>58</sup> Salvum fac populum tuum domine et benedic<sup>59</sup> hereditatem tuam,<sup>60</sup> ut redeuntes ad festivitatem pasche, per hec visibilia<sup>61</sup> invisibilibus tuis inhiantes,<sup>62</sup> dum presentium usufruuntur, futurorum<sup>63</sup> desiderio<sup>64</sup> accendantur.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Una cum beatissimo papa nostro ill.<sup>67</sup> et antistite<sup>68</sup> nostro ill.<sup>67</sup> sed et omnibus presbiteris, diaconibus, subdiaconibus cunctoque clero vel plebe.

<sup>69</sup> Memorare<sup>70</sup> domine<sup>71</sup> famulorum tuorum<sup>72</sup> <sup>73</sup> imperatorum nostrorum ill. et ill.<sup>74</sup> et<sup>75</sup> cunctum exercitum eorum.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>46</sup> credimus *Ben.* <sup>47</sup> ar vna *Ba.* et ruina *Pisa.* <sup>48</sup> resudet *Sal.*

<sup>49</sup> iocundissime *Pisa.* <sup>50</sup> infigitur *Pisa.* <sup>51-52</sup> Qua *Ben.* <sup>53</sup> propria *Pal.*

<sup>54</sup> infundit *Ben.* <sup>55</sup> Et *Ben, Sal, Ennodius.* <sup>56</sup> hunc *Pal.* <sup>57</sup> eis *Pal.*

illi *Ennodius.* <sup>58-60</sup> occur in *Ba\*\** before the conclusion *Per dominum &c.*

<sup>59-60</sup> hereditati tue *Ba\*\*.* <sup>61</sup> visibilibus et *Ba, Ba\*\*, Ben, Pal.*

<sup>62</sup> inhians *Ba\*\*, Ben, Pal.* <sup>63</sup> futurarum *Pal.* <sup>64</sup> desideria *Ba, Ben, Pal.*

<sup>65</sup> Here *Pal* inserts: Precamur ergo te domine ut nos famulos tuos omnem clerum et devotissimum populum una cum beatissimo viro papa nostro ill. et antistite nostro ill. et his qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis. Memento etiam domine famulorum tuorum principum nostrorum il. et il. et omni exercitum...

<sup>66-68</sup> Lacuna in *Pal.* <sup>67</sup> *N. Sal.* dompno illo *Bari\*\*.* <sup>68</sup> archiepiscopo *Sal,*

famulo tuo pontifice *Ben,* dompno illo *Bari\*\*.* <sup>69-76</sup> Respice quesumus domine

super devotissimum famulum tuum *N.* Cuius tu deus desiderii vota prenoscens,

ineffabilis pietatis et misericordie tue munere iocundum perpetue pacis accomoda,

Et in his pascalibus gaudiis regere, gubernare et custodire digneris. <sup>70</sup> Memora

*Pal.* <sup>71-72</sup> omit *Pal,* famulum tuum *Ben,* famuli tui *Ba\*\*.* <sup>73-74</sup> imperatore

nostro il. *Ben,* regis nostri ill. *Ba.* <sup>74</sup> ill. et principum nostrorum il. et il. *Pal,* ill.

et principe nostrum il. *Ben.* <sup>75-76</sup> eorum exercitum universum *Ben, Pal,* cunctum

eius exercitum et omnium circumadstantium. Salvum fac... accendantur *Ba\*\*.*

<sup>76</sup> eorum et omnium circumadstantium *Ba.* eorum. *Necnon et famulam tuam*

*abbatissam nostram il. cum universa congregatione* [first hand *beatissimi petri apostoli,* second hand *beatissimi petri apostoli sibi commissa ac*] *temporum vite quiete concessa, gaudiis eam facias perfrui sempiternis. Vat.*

<sup>77</sup> *Qui vivis* <sup>78</sup> *cum patre* <sup>79</sup> *et spiritu sancto et regnas* <sup>80</sup> *unus* <sup>81</sup> *deus, in* <sup>82</sup> *secula seculorum. Amen.* <sup>83</sup>

A word as to the conclusion of the *Exultet*. As Dom Beysac justly remarks (*Rassegna Gregoriana* v 109), the Palmieri fragment 'contient manifestement un doublet', and I venture to suggest a possible explanation. The Bari roll and the Salerno missal are identical as to the sentence 'Salvum fac . . . vel plebe', a sentence which is complete and good in construction if we take 'Ut redeuntes . . . accendantur' as a parenthesis (possibly a marginal addition and not in the original text) and if we connect 'una cum' with the *¶ Salvum* and its *R. Et benedic*, which form a separate paragraph in *Ba\*\**. This prayer with its archaic ring, quite foreign to the later text, is for the *populus-hereditas* of the Psalmist and includes pope, bishop, clergy, and 'plebs', the temporal powers being remembered in the succeeding sentence beginning 'Memento'.

But the Palmieri copyist, though retaining intact all that is in the Bari roll and the Salerno missal, interjects three sentences: (i) between 'accendantur' and 'una cum' he places 'Precamur . . . populum' (words which in the *Vulg.* precede 'una cum'), but he does not complete the sense of the sentence by some such necessary conclusion as the *Vulg.*: 'gaudiis facias perfrui sempiternis'; (ii) instead of this he inserts the *Vulg.* 'Et his . . . laudis' but connects it with 'una cum' instead of concluding it with 'premia eterna largiaris [largire, largiri digneris]'; (iii) he adds, again from the *Vulg.* 'Memento . . . omni exercitu'.<sup>1</sup> If we might suppose that the lacuna of one line in the MS contained the words: 'una cum beatissimo papa nostro il. et antistite' there would be less difficulty. In either case two or three partly imperfect clauses from the *Vulgata* are inserted in the *Vetus Itala* text. Either the scribe mixed the two together or, more probably, by the time the Palmieri MS was copied, the *Vulgata* had become so well known that its fuller conclusion made its way into the older and dying formula.

We are, then, in the presence of two very distinct texts of the *Exultet* in concurrent use in Italy; the *Vulgata* and the *Vetus Itala*.

The *Vulgata* (1) goes back as far as 800 A.D., being found both in the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* and in the *Missale Gothicum*, and

<sup>77-80</sup> Per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum filium tuum qui tecum et cum spiritu sancto vivit et regnat *Ba\*\**. <sup>78</sup> vivit et regnas *Pal.* <sup>79-80</sup> in unitate spiritus sancti *Pal, Sal.* <sup>80</sup> illegible *Vat*, regnans *Ba.* <sup>81</sup> omit *Ben, Ba\*\*, Pal, Sal.* <sup>82</sup> per omnia *Ba\*\*, Pal, Sal.* <sup>83</sup> omit *Ba\*\**.

<sup>1</sup> Dom Beysac suggests *Amelfitano* as the word in the lacuna, but *Salernitano*, as a word of five syllables, the second one liquescent, and with a spondaic termination, would be equally applicable.

it occurs in the oldest copy of the *Gregorianum*, viz. MS Vatican. Regin. Lat. 332 made between 855 and 867 or possibly before 855;

(2) is found in all Sacramentaries and missals of North and Central Italy (e.g. Arezzo, Bobbio, Como, Lucca, Monte Amiata, Monza, Nonantola, Novalesa, Padova, Perugia, Piacenza, Vercelli, Verona);

and (3) is frequent in South Italian *liturgica* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, e.g. the Rolls of Amalfi (?) (Pisa A), Benevento (Casanat. MS 724), Capua, Fondi (Paris B. N. Lat. n. a. 710), Gaeta (B and C), the Barberini roll (592) and the one in the British Museum (add. MS 30337), and the MSS Barberini Lat. 560, 603, 699, Vatican Lat. 4770, 6082, Ottobon. 570, Vallicell. c. 32.

The *Vetus Itala* seems to have been restricted to Southern Italy and, with one or two exceptions, was not copied after the end of the eleventh century. About that time that part of its text which follows the 'Vere dignum', in fact the actual *praeconium*, was for some reason abolished and its place was taken by the other text. (The present is not the occasion to enter into the question as to which was really the older or as to the relation between the two.) In the eleventh century, as MS Vat. 10673, the Palmieri fragment, and other MSS shew, the two texts and the two uses to which they belonged are found side by side in South Italy; Dom Beysac's explanation that the choice of the *Exultet* was left to the personal preference of the deacon does not seem to fit the case. There are two concurrent uses, the older local use and the more recently introduced, and apparently, for a time at least, it was permissible to use either of them; the *ordo* of Vat. MS 10673 (vide *Miscellanea A. Ceriani*, cit. sup.) leaves no doubt on this point. We cannot here discuss what authority this *ordo* has to call the former 'Ambrosian'<sup>1</sup> and the latter 'Roman'; if we might substitute 'old Italian' and 'ninth-century Roman' I think we should arrive at a better comprehension of the facts of the case. It is with extreme diffidence that I venture to touch a difficult but most interesting and important subject, and I merely do so by way of suggestion. The one seems to be the original Italian liturgy, a liturgy of which we possess practically no monumenta, the other the Roman, commonly called Gregorian, as it emerged from the Carolingian reformation.<sup>2</sup> The South of Italy naturally retained its old customs longer than the North and the Centre, but the 'Roman' use made its way in gradually

<sup>1</sup> Its text has no connexion whatever with the Ambrosian as found in the earliest Milan MSS, none of which, however, go further back than the eleventh century.

<sup>2</sup> There are no real Roman *liturgica* extant older than the ninth century. Were they then destroyed?

and effectively; for a time the two existed side by side, but the arrival of the Normans with their 'Roman' books gave the *coup de grâce* to the local liturgy.<sup>1</sup> Only those who have studied the liturgical MSS of South Italy (of which MS Barberini Lat. 560 is a most conspicuous example) and specially those of Benevento<sup>2</sup> can realize how full they are of erasures and corrections, and, wherever the older text has been allowed to remain uncanceled, how frequent are the references to an alternative use, 'vel secundum quosdam,' 'vel secundum Romanum,' &c.<sup>3</sup> To one who is willing to put up with the many discomforts and disappointments involved in an *iter liturgicum* in South Italy, I would warmly commend the search for more material in this direction, and I should not be surprised if he discovered more evidence for the earlier Italian liturgy.

The startling fact remains that the old text of the *Exultet* was used at Salerno as late as 1431; for it was not then copied as an archaeological memento but inserted in its proper place in the missal written in that year and in the other similar but undated missal. It is known that in other respects that city was extremely conservative; the names and history of its bishops shew how slightly Norman influence prevailed there; and as late as the eighteenth century it retained the dramatic witness of the prophets in the Mattins of Christmas Day. The local opposition may have been so strong that the new text was refused admission to Salerno whilst it made its way into Bari, Benevento, Gaeta, &c. If the opinion of Pieralisi (*Il preconio pasquale*, Roma, 1883), that the Barberini roll was written for Salerno at the end of the twelfth century, could be proved, it would be fatal to this theory; but there is really nothing in that roll to connect it with Salerno; and the same is true of the twelfth or thirteenth century roll now in the cathedral of Salerno (No. 15); it is a textless series of pictures arranged in a wrong order but, as the Red Sea is included, its text must have been the *Vulgata*. It is quite possible that just as Benevento destroyed the *Vetus Itala* text in order to use its pictures, so Salerno may have cut

<sup>1</sup> It was during his visit to Montecassino (A. D. 1057-1058) that Pope Stephen IX put a stop to the Ambrosian chant there, but a century later a breviary of that abbey (the lost MS No. 199) contained a notice which touches the *Exultet*: 'feria v et vj et Sabbato in nocte fiant omnia secundum Romanam consuetudinem' (*M. G. H. Script.* vii 693; *Bibliotheca Casinensis* iv [1880] 126).

<sup>2</sup> I regret that my article on MS Vat. Lat. 10673 in the *Miscellanea A. Ceriani* was in type before my last visit to Benevento when I found startling evidence of the double use there in the tenth and eleventh centuries; the oldest missal in the Chapter Library fits in exactly with the 'Ambrosian' of the Vatican MS.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. MS Vatic. Ottob. 145, copied in the eleventh century from a Cassino exemplar, f. 124: 'Quando non canimus ipse (!) Antiphonas secundum Romano, quomodo suprascripte sunt, canimus secundum Ambro[sianum] hoc modo,' &c.

up a Vulgata roll, retaining its pictures but destroying its text as of no use there. Hence that city enjoys the distinction of having retained its old *liturgica* longer than any other South Italian city; and in the missal of 1431 we may see the last remnant of the old Italian use for Easter Even.

H. M. BANNISTER.