

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

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

THE SO-CALLED MISSALE FRANCORUM.

IF the happily named *Sacramentarium Leonianum* is the oldest of the known liturgical monuments of the Western Church, the so-called *Missale Francorum* ranks next to it in order of antiquity. But this has a claim on our regard which is wanting to the other. The *Leonianum* is a record, sometimes complete and sometimes incomplete, of Masses said on various occasions by Leo the Great and his two immediate successors; but it is not, in the technical sense of the phrase, a sacred book. The *Missale Francorum*—part pontifical, part missal—may from its very inception have been designed for use *in sacris*, and would therefore seem to deserve more careful scrutiny than I apprehend that it has hitherto received.

Experts of unquestioned authority assure us that the acephalous manuscript (*Codex Vatican. Regin. 257*) to which we owe our knowledge of the document dates from about the end of the seventh century; and thus that the learned Oratorian Jean Morin was mistaken in assigning it to the fifty years which followed the death of Clovis in 511. But, although the manuscript is of less antiquity than Morin suspected, I believe its first and rather larger half to represent a document which, so far from coming into existence between the years 511 and 560, was even then not new. The possibility of such ulterior derivation cannot, I should imagine, have occurred to Morin; for he says '*Codicem illum Gallicum fuisse dubitari non potest, cum in Missa pro Regibus Francorum*¹ *et in uariis orationibus imperium Romanum*² *nunquam commemoretur, sed perpetuo Deus in eo pro Regni Francorum prosperitate exoretur. Itaque mihi uidetur codex ille post annum 511 sed ante annum 560 in Gallia scriptus, Gallisque nondum in unum populum cum Francis coalescentibus*'. And, indeed, he must have completely overlooked the evidence in favour of such derivation; for, had he so much as suspected the seeming significance of that evidence, he would scarcely have contented himself with saying, of the very passages in which it lurks but half concealed, '*Ter enim pro Regno Francorum nominis*

¹ This is not a technically accurate designation. The extant title is '*Orationes et Preces pro Regibus*'.

² Morin evidently means the empire of the western line which began with Charles the Great in 800. The possibility of an ultimate origin during the continuance of the western line of emperors which ended with Romulus Augustulus in 476 does not seem even to have occurred to him.

preces fiunt; alias pro Francorum Principatu; alias pro Principibus Francorum, et semel pro salute et incolumitate Regni Francorum'.¹

Morin, as we shall see presently, was not in possession of all the facts of the case. But his clever, though perhaps inadequately developed, argument from the plural 'regibus' in the title of the Mass and the plural 'principibus' in one of its prayers was summarily dismissed by Mabillon who saw, what seems to have escaped his predecessor's notice, that the Canon Actionis contains Gregory the Great's 'diesque nostros in tua pace disponas' &c., and who thence concluded that the document must be as late as the seventh century.

Had Morin been better informed than he was, or had he more carefully studied his citations than he seems to have done, he might, and perhaps would, have suggested that the item now rubricated '*pro Regibus*' was an editorial adaptation of a Mass compiled at a time when the *imperium Romanum*, in the old historical sense of the term, was a political reality unquestioned and unrivalled; and, had Mabillon been careful to discriminate between a written codex and the document enshrined in it, it might, and perhaps would, have occurred to him that, though the manuscript now at the Vatican was not older than the seventh century, the underlying document—its unseen but mentally conceivable *substantia*—might be the resultant of two, if not more, redactions; and that, though the *terminus a quo* of one of these was as comparatively recent as the year 590, when Gregory was made Bishop of Rome, the other might reasonably be given a *terminus ad quem* as remote as the year 560.

Thus much said by way of preliminary statement of the case as left by Morin and Mabillon, let us now examine the passages cited by the former. For reasons which will soon be sufficiently evident, our consideration of the 'diesque nostros' clause in the Canon, Mabillon's weapon of retort, may be postponed to its proper stage in our analysis of the document.

The passages in question—see Muratori ii 680, 681—are: (1) 'ut regni Francorum nominis secreta libertas . . . exultet', where Morin attempts no explanation of the seemingly needless 'nominis'; (2) 'Francorum regni adesto principibus'; (3) 'Francorum regnum . . . protege principatum', where 'regnum' escapes diagnosis; (4) 'protege regnum Francorum nominis ubique rectores', where the strange 'regnum' and the suspicious 'nominis' pass unchallenged; (5) 'ut . . . Francorum regni nominis inimicos . . . compremas', where 'nominis' is yet again overlooked, and (6) 'pro salute et incolumitate uel statu regni Francorum', where 'uel statu' receives no notice.

¹ *De sacris Ecclesiae Ordinationibus*, opera J. Assemani (Romae 1756), vol. i p. 4.

We know that Morin had some slight knowledge of the Gelasianum when he wrote the appendix (p. 52) to his *De disciplina in administratione sacramenti poenitentiae*; but, as the Gelasianum was as yet an unpublished document¹, he may not have had occasion or opportunity for observing that, at III lxi and lviii, it contains the first and fifth of the passages cited by him (see Mur. i 731, 728), but with the significant difference that in each instance it has 'Romani nominis' where the Missale Francorum has 'regni Francorum nominis' or 'Francorum regni nominis'. And to this evidence we can now add² that of the Leonianum (XXVII iii) on the fourth of the six passages. I set the two texts side by side, italicizing the cardinal phrase in each:—

SACRAMENTARIUM LEONIANUM

(Mur. i 411).

O.s.d. in cuius arbitrio regnorum
omnium iura consistunt protege *romani*
nominis ubique rectores ut eorum uotiu
prosperitas &c.

MISSALE FRANCORUM

(Mur. ii 680).

O.s.d. in cuius arbitrio regnorum
omnium iura consistunt protege *regnum*
francorum nominis ubique rectores ut
eorum uotiu prosperitas &c.

The obvious and simplest explanation of the several differences is probably the right one: that the original text, written in large uncials, was that now extant in the Leonian and Gelasian sacramentaries; that over 'ROMANI' the two words 'regni francorum' or 'francorum regni' were written *manu posteriori* in small characters; that, for whatever reason, neither 'ROMANI' nor 'NOMINIS' was marked with expunctory dots, and that, as a consequence of that omission, a subsequent transcriber, though he conceived, whether rightly or wrongly, that he must discard the adjective because of the words written over it, was not sufficiently logical or sufficiently officious to discard the substantive. This account elucidates each of the six passages noted by Morin; thus—where I italicize the text, which by my hypothesis was to have been superseded, and bracket what I suspect to be the new reading; and whence it will be seen that in each instance all that my 'subsequent transcriber' omitted was the word 'romani', 'romanis', 'romanorum' or 'romanarum', though in three of them he should have omitted 'nominis' as well. In the last passage I propose 'potestatum' as a fairly certain correction of 'uel statu':—

1. ut *romani* (regni francorum) *nominis* segura libertas . . . exultet.
2. *romanis* (francorum regni) adesto principibus.

¹ When Morin published in 1651 the *De disciplina* the Gelasianum was no longer in the possession of Petau, who had allowed him to inspect it. It was by that time the property of the Queen of Sweden, and was published in 1680.

² The Leonianum, edited by Giuseppe Bianchini, was published by his uncle, Francesco Bianchini, in 1735, in the edition by the latter of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. It was an unknown document in Morin's day.

3. *romanorum* (francorum regnum) . . . protege *principatum*.
4. protege *romani* (regnum—?regni—francorum) *nominis* ubique rectores.
5. ut . . . *romani* (francorum regni) *nominis* inimicos . . . comprehemas.
6. pro salute et incolunitate potestatum *romanarum* (regni francorum).

Rarely, if ever, has there been a *felix culpa* of greater felicity than that which in the first, fourth, and fifth of these places left 'nominis' uncanceled; and, in the third, 'principatum'. But for that blunder we might have been disposed to assume, and for the historical reason by which Morin was swayed, that we were dealing with the constituents of a Mass compiled not earlier than the second decade of the sixth century at the very earliest. As elucidated by the Leonianum and the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary the surviving 'nominis' reveals, in respect of this particular Mass, an ulterior original the compiler of which deemed the *Romani nominis rectores* to have an imperative claim on the prayers of the Church, and renders irrelevant all contention based on the phrase *regnum Francorum*. This is a mere patch of surface colour. The original canvas was innocent of it. I say 'in respect of this particular Mass'; for it is theoretically conceivable that the ulterior original thus revealed was in its turn adventitious to an ultimate nucleus of greater antiquity than itself.

PART I. THE SUCCESSIVE EDITIONS OF THE FIRST INSTALMENT.

If we except the incomplete Canon Actionis—for its incompleteness excludes it from the satisfactory application of a stichometrical text—we find that our document resolves itself into seven sections, the Canon being a possible eighth, each of which is equivalent to an integral number of pages of one-and-twenty lines having the average value of $29\frac{1}{3}$ letters. I propose to notify this unit of paginal measurement by the symbol ' γ '; reserving ' β ', as in my study of the Leonianum, for a twenty-five line page of 32 letters to a line, and ' θ ' for a twenty-five line page of 28 letters to a line.

The first four sections constitute a pontifical; and this I designate as the first of several instalments because I believe, and hope to prove, that the fifth and sixth sections are an accession of appreciably later date, and that the seventh and eighth are accessories still more recent.

SECTION I. THE MINOR ORDERS.

I further believe and hope to prove that the editorial evolution of the first instalment, though not of each section in it, covered three successive periods of stichometrical use; β pages being employed in the first

of these, which I unhesitatingly style 'Roman'; θ pages in the second, which, for geographical and historical reasons, it will be safe as well as convenient to regard as Gallo-Roman; and γ pages in the third. The γ pagination was not at its inception much more recent than the last stage of the θ period; but the gradually growing document had meanwhile passed into another diocese, and, as this was a diocese whose history was, from more than one cause, soon to be interwoven with the fortunes of Clovis and his house, the γ redactions may justly be denominated Frankish.

THE γ REDACTIONS OF SECTION I. Whatever may have been the precise contents of the nuclear scheme of the first of the four general instalments of the document, that instalment now begins with a series of directive rubrics sufficient, with accessory headings, to fill two γ pages. Then follow forms of admission to the orders of doorkeeper, acolyte, reader, exorcist and subdeacon. These have the value of five such pages.

The directive rubrics so closely resemble the *statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, which, though at one time attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage, recent scholarship unhesitatingly refers to the year 529 and the Second Council of Vaison in the province of Arles, that, unless the two codes have a common parent, one must certainly have been derived from the other. Nevertheless, they differ so remarkably in the distribution of their several parts and in minute details of ritual as to set it beyond reasonable doubt that if the *statuta* be Arlesian, our rubrics represent the use of some other province. For example: our rubrics make no provision for the ordering of either reader or subdeacon; they admit an acolyte to his duties with formalities slightly but significantly different from those enjoined by the *statuta*, and they either omit or fail to anticipate in their *Diaconus cum ordinatur* the clause 'quia non ad sacerdotium sed ad ministerium consecratur'.

In the forms themselves of admission to the minor orders I observe that, whereas three of the five comprise a Praefatio (that is to say a 'bidding-prayer') and a Benedictio, (i) that which relates to acolytes has no Praefatio, while (ii) that for readers has, instead of Praefatio, an address to the candidate which differs *toto coelo* from the address embodied in the corresponding Vaison statutum. I also note that (iii) prefixed, as though *ex post facto*, to our form for the ordering of a subdeacon there is an Allocutio addressed to the candidate, and, constructively one with this, two short rubrics which partially, but only partially, resemble analogous directions in the Vaison code. Of the first of these peculiarities I shall speak presently. The second serves to shew why it is that the Vaison 'Lector cum ordinatur', or an equivalent to it, is not among our directive rubrics, for the 'Eligunt te' in our

form of ordination excludes, as both inconsistent with it and needless, the 'Accipe et esto lector' &c., embodied in the *statutum*. The third, and for a like reason, enables us to see why neither the Vaison counterpart to the two short rubrics which coalesce with the 'Vide cuius ministerium' nor a practical equivalent to it is to be found in our series of preliminary rubrics.

Now, it is obvious that the preliminary rubrics cannot have had a place in our document at an earlier date than the five forms of ordination; and it is by no means likely that they and the five forms were introduced simultaneously, for in the order of thought the former group—with which we may reasonably associate the whole of the *Allocutio ad Subdiaconum Ordinandum*—is the more recent of the two, being evidently the Vaison *statuta*, or some such document, so altered as to be reduced to conformity with the latter group. Hence, then, the question, Can it in the order of time, as well as in the order of thought, be later than the five forms of ordination?

To answer this question I must so far anticipate what yet has to be said as to assure the reader that our document as a whole would seem to have undergone not fewer than two redactions on pages of γ lineation, the first considerably less ample than the second. This assumed, there can be no doubt that our answer to the question must be in the affirmative; for I find that, although the preliminary rubrical series represents thirty-nine γ lines, the *Allocutio ad Subdiaconum Ordinandum*, which, with its dependent rubrics, is homogeneous with it, represents, as its nett value, twenty-four such lines; the two values being thus the equivalent [since $39 + 24 = 63 = 3 \times 21$] of three γ pages. In other words: The section resolves itself into two intermingled categories, which, for the sake of brevity, may be called the 'rubrical' and the 'textual'; the 'textual' sufficient of itself, and not dependent on the other; the 'rubrical' ancillary to and dependent on the 'textual'; and, since the 'textual' represents four γ pages, as will be seen from the table of values on an early page, and the 'rubrical' three, there is no reason why the 'rubrical' should not have been introduced into our document at the later of two γ redactions, the 'textual' having had a place in it at the earlier.

THE θ REDACTION. If, then, we can prove that, although in its extant form the 'textual' category is equivalent to four γ pages, it may have been compiled while our document was as yet in the θ period of its evolution, but that the like cannot be said of the 'rubrical' category, we shall have to infer that the 'textual' is the more ancient of the two.

While our document was in course of evolution a Roman churchman, of the same name and designation as the Ioannes Diaconus who lived three centuries later, replied to a correspondent, Senarius by name, who

had asked him what at Rome was the difference between an acolyte and an exorcist, that at Rome an exorcist might become an acolyte, but that no acolyte would think of degrading to the rank of exorcist, and that the next upward step was to the subdiaconate.¹ Senarius has by some been identified with a man of high rank and extensive travel who held office under King Theodoric, and whose home was not improbably in either northern Italy or Gaul. Whoever he may have been, we can rest assured that he would not have asked the question he did, had there nowhere been any uncertainty among well-informed people as to the number or gradation of the Roman *ordines minores*, and had there nowhere been a doubt as to whether local usage was in these respects identical with the Roman. Can it be that he knew of an ecclesiastical province in which there were as yet no acolytes?

Now, our form for the ordination of an acolyte is in two respects remarkable. Each of the other forms consists of a Praefatio and a Benedictio, ours has only a Benedictio; and this differs from its compeers by an allusive reference to the ritual of the Old Law such as certainly bespeaks a different $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ from theirs, and not improbably a much later date. These peculiarities suggest the inference that there may have been a period in the evolution of our document in which the order of acolytes was not as yet locally recognized, and that, if such period synchronized with that stage of the bibliographical history of the document at which the θ pagination was employed, the hypothesis of its existence, if true, should be able to bear the application of the stichometrical criterion of the θ unit of pagination.² That criterion I now apply, and perceive with more pleasure than astonishment that if, neglecting the form for the ordering of acolytes, we express in terms of θ lines the values of the remaining components of the 'textual' category we have material equivalent to three θ pages, the last of them devoted exclusively to subdeacons; but that, as was intimated just now, if, admitting that form, we express the values of the whole category in terms of γ lines, we have material equal to four γ pages. Nor is this

¹ For the date of this letter see Muratori *Liturgia* i 32. For the relevant portions see Duchesne *Origines* pp. 332 n. 2; 340 n. 1. For the whole see Migne *S. L.* lix 404 D.

² That at or about the close of the fifth century there should have been a province of Western Christendom—presumably a province in Gaul—which had no order of acolytes is a theory which, if it surprise some, will remind others that there was no such order in Eastern Christendom, and that Eastern Christendom had done much for the south of Gaul.

On the subject of acolytes see the very instructive remarks of Mgr Duchesne, *Origines* pp. 332, 333, 352, and the footnotes on those pages. I think myself happy in shewing it to be probable that it was not till a comparatively late period in its history that our document took cognizance of that order.

all. If we compute in terms of θ lines the values of the preliminary series of directive rubrics they do not yield a multiple of five-and-twenty such lines; whereas, with the governing capitulum and a connecting rubric, they are the precise equivalent of two γ pages: and if we combine the value of the 'rubrical' *Allocutio ad Subdiaconum Ordinandum* with the 'textual' series into which it has been inserted we have an ultimate total of five such pages. Hence, assuredly, the reason why the second γ compiler disjoined the *Allocutio* from the series to which it properly belongs. Had it formed part of that series the first form, that for the ordination of doorkeeper, would not have begun on a fresh page—page v of the volume.

The question whether at some earlier period than that of the θ redaction which we seem to have determined provision had been made for any, and if so for which, of the minor orders is one which must of necessity be deferred to a later stage of our argument, although the answer to it is of necessity anticipated in the subjoined summary of values.

The foregoing conclusions may be numerically systematized thus:—

	Scheme θ_2 Five pages	Scheme γ_1 Six pages	Scheme $\gamma_2(s)$ Nine pages
First leaf	i, ii	i, ii	i, ii
INCIPIT DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS 24	iii 3	iii 3	iii 3 [= 3]
<i>Ustarius cum ordinatur</i> &c. 231			8
<i>Acolythus cum ordinatur</i> &c. 237			8
<i>Exorcista cum ordinatur</i> &c. 188			7
<i>Diaconus cum ordinatur</i> &c. 76			3
<i>Presbyter cum ordinatur</i> &c. 156			6
<i>Episcopus cum ordinatur</i> &c. 203			7 [= 39] = 42
<i>Praefatio ustiarii</i> 17	I	I	v I
<i>Deum patrem</i> &c. 197	7	7	7
<i>Benedictio ustearii</i> 18	I	I	I
<i>Domine sancte pater</i> &c. 144	5	5	5
<i>Benedictio acolyti</i> 17		2	2
<i>Domine sancte . . . qui moysi</i> &c. 167		6	6
<i>Praefatio lectoris</i> 17	2	2	2
<i>Eligunt te fratres tui</i> , &c. 113	4	4	4
<i>Benedictio lectoris</i> 18	I	I	I
<i>Domine sancte . . . benedicere</i> &c. 175	7	6	6
<i>Praefatio exorcistae</i> 19	2	2	2
<i>Deum patrem</i> &c. 183	7	7	7
<i>Benedictio exorcistae</i> 20	I	I	I
<i>Domine sancte . . . benedicere</i> &c. 346	9 = 50	9	9 [= 54]
<i>Allocutio ad subdiaconum ordinandum</i> 33			2
<i>Exhibeatur in conspectu</i> &c. 65			3
<i>Vide cuius ministerium</i> &c. 558			19 [= 24]
<i>Et trades ei calicem et patenam</i> 26			I
<i>Praefatio ordinationis subdiaconi</i> 31	v 2	2	I
<i>Oremus deum et dominum</i> &c. 182	7	7	7
<i>Benedictio subdiaconi</i> 20	I	I	I
<i>Domine sancte . . . benedicere</i> &c. 408	15 = 25	14	14
From the following		3 = 84	3 [= 27] = 105
	Page v ends	Page vi ends	Page viiii ends

SECTION II. THE MAJOR ORDERS.

In an article on the Leonian Sacramentary recently contributed to *The Journal of Theological Studies* (vol. x pp. 76-78) I observed that the items in Section XXVIII of that collection which are concerned with the ordering of bishops, deacons and priests do not seem to have formed part of the first general edition. Nor can they have formed part of the third; for their aggregate total value is not a multiple of twenty-five β lines.¹ And yet it is hard to believe that they can have been included in the original scheme of the second, an enterprise referable to Hilarus, successor of Leo the Great and predecessor of Simplicius; for their several successive values conflict with the method observed by Hilarus, a method which made each item in its turn occupy a multiple of five-and-twenty α lines.

But since, on the other hand, the aggregate sum of their values is the equivalent of two hundred α lines; since, as we saw in my essay, it was the wont, though not of Hilarus, yet of Simplicius, to collect into an integral number of pages two or more contiguous items, each of which was the equivalent of a mixed number, and since, as we also saw, Simplicius used the α pagination² for a brief but undetermined period at the beginning of his editorial career, we may with probability infer that, as made known to us in the Verona book, the *Consecratio Episcoporum*, the *Benedictio super Diaconos* and the *Consecratio Presbyteri* are to be classed among the earlier efforts of that pontiff. He was elected in 468.

Now, the *Consecratio Episcoporum* of the Verona book is wrongly placed in respect to the two other forms; nor, indeed, do its constituents stand in due order, for the 'Hanc igitur' and Postcommunion (Mur. i 421) are placed between the 'Super oblata' and the prayer of consecration. If, then, the three forms are indeed the work of Simplicius, how is it that while employed in revising the Leonianum he did not correct these inaccuracies and, causing the whole group, if not each member of it, to fill an integral number of β pages, make the triad, thus rectified, a part of his final redaction? Why did he not do this instead of leaving us the unfinished attempt which we now possess? My conviction is that he purposely excepted the group from his last revision of the Leonianum for the sufficient reason that he had in fact

¹ As left in the form transmitted to us, through the Verona MS, they would have filled only 192 β lines. See *J.T.S.* vol. x p. 78.

² The only finally completed work on α lines that can with probability be attributed to Simplicius as its author is the group of four *missae* in honour of St Andrew (Section XXXVIII). These may reasonably be referred to the years 468-471. His later contributions were on β pages. See as before, p. 92.

thus rectified it, and that he had in fact not only thus rectified it, but further improved it to such good purpose as to deem it worthy of being set forth in a distinct and separate libellus.

THE FIRST, OR β , REDACTION. For, assuming that, in or about the year 469, he had resolved so to deal with the material which, in the ill-assorted form proper to an inchoate effort, has been transmitted to us through the Verona channel as that it should be worthy of transcription into a small separate fasciculus, what does our knowledge of his bibliographical methods enable us to surmise that he would be likely to do?

If, as is fairly presumable, (1) he had, when drafting the scheme of such libellus, already resolved on using the β pagination; if (2) he now took care that the forms for the ordering of deacons and priests should stand first and second in the series; if (3) now, as ever, it was his governing intention to make use of already existing materials; and if (4), as in his final recension of the Leonianum, he now allowed himself three lines for a first capitulum and two for a second, should this not occur at the head of a page, I find that, to make the first and second items fill five β pages, he would have to effect no other changes than to transpose the 'Dñe dñ preces' and the 'Oremus dilectissimi' in the form for the ordering of deacons (Mur. i 423), thus making this analogous to that for the ordering of priests; to weld them into one, thus completing the analogy, and to set the 'Dñ conlator' after, instead of before, the prayer of consecration. The result of so simple and obvious an arrangement may be formulated thus:—

	β Scheme	
<i>(For Ordering of Deacons)</i>		
Capitulum	184	3
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	198	} 12 ¹
Domine deus preces &c.	1483	
Adesto quaesumus &c.	266	47
Deus conlator &c.		9 = 71 β lines
<i>(For Ordering of Priests)</i>		
Capitulum	162	2
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	187	5
Exaudi nos deus &c.	1287	6
Domine deus pater &c.		41 = 54 β lines
		Total : 125 β lines (5 pages)

Now, on referring to the so-called *Missale Francorum*² we observe

¹ The due fusion of these two paragraphs into one would necessarily involve a slight economy of text, with the numerical result of 366, not 382, letters.

² A doubly misleading title: '*Francorum*', because, as we have seen, the Frankish touches—'*regni Francorum*' and the like—are superficial and post-editorial; '*Missale*,' because, if we except the *Canon Actionis*, the larger, older and more important half of the document is not a missal, but a pontifical. We want

that it sets the forms for the ordering of deacons and priests first and second in the series (Mur. ii 664, 666), and that its mode of dealing with their constituents tallies with that just suggested, and therefore that it justifies *pro tanto* the theory of some such separate edition as that which I have sketched. And when we examine its form for the ordering of bishops we find good reason for believing that this may be a development, mediate or immediate, of some such separate edition of the Leonianum Consecratio Episcoporum as is required by the hypothesis of an integral number of β pages.

The six constituents of the Leonianum Consecratio Episcoporum are, with its capitulum, the equivalent of sixty-nine β lines¹; so that, in order to make the item fill three β pages, Simplicius would have had to make a nett addition of half a dozen lines; and, to make them fill four such pages, a nett addition of thirty-one lines. The constituents in the so-called Missale Francorum, as known to us in its present development, are more than six in number; but, confining my attention to the six which it has in common with the Leonianum, I find that these, together with a capitulum representing three lines, would have the value of a hundred β lines; and that this strikingly suggestive total is due to the noteworthy fact that the prayer of consecration has been amplified by a passage—‘Sint speciosi . . . de profectu omnium consequantur’—which, while it is worthy of Simplicius, for, written in his style, it has all his wealth of scriptural citation, comprises no fewer than 1,009 letters, thus making the constituent occupy seventy-eight, not forty-seven, lines. The values are:—

(For Ordering of Bishops)

Capitulum	3	
Exaudi <i>domine</i> supplicium &c.	32	3
Propitiare <i>domine</i> supplicationibus &c.	127	4
<i>Deus</i> honorum omnium &c.	1488	} 78
Sint speciosi pedes eorum &c.	1009	
Suscipe <i>domine</i> munera &c.	74	3
Hanc igitur oblationem &c.	185	6
Adesto misericors <i>deus</i> &c.	81	3 = 100 β lines (4 pages)

On the whole, therefore, there would seem to be abundantly good reason for saying that the three forms of ordination in the extant Leonianum are an ill-arranged group of inchoate drafts, but that, prior to the last general revision of that document, they had been so perfected by Simplicius as to be worthy of forming a separate libellus; and that

a phrase that shall neither confuse our ideas nor beg the question at issue. I propose to employ the words ‘our document’, or the like.

¹ In my article on the Leonian sacramentary I too faithfully followed Dr Feltoe, who divides the ‘*Deus honorum omnium*’ into two separate halves, thus giving it the value of 48, instead of 47, lines, and making the item fill 70 instead of 69.

the text of that libellus—the text, in other words, of the first ascertainable pontifical of the Roman Church—has been handed down to us in the so-called *Missale Francorum*.

Nor is this the only claim that I make in respect of our document. I believe that not only has it preserved to us in the nucleus of the present section, what is not elsewhere to be found, the *purus purus textus* of the earliest ascertainable pontifical of the Roman Church, but that, over and above the component members of that nucleus, it comprises amplifications added, not on one, but on three several occasions and, besides these, some slight additions made at two subsequent dates.

The external history of the whole document is a subject the more careful discussion of which does not lie within the scope of the present essay. But before we analyse the collection in hope of tracing its internal history, it may suffice to say that it resolves itself into four main parts, a Pontifical, a Sanctorale, a group of *Missae Cotidianae*, and a copy of the Canon *Missae*; and that the career of the pontifical would seem to be susceptible of some such summary as this:—

1. On β pages, i. e. pages of 25 lines capable of holding 32 letters each, the *editio princeps*, by Pope Simplicius, of the forms for the ordering of deacons, priests, and bishops, and, besides this, two others, one for the dedication of virgins to the religious life, the other for the consecration of an altar.

2, 3, 4. On θ pages, i. e. pages of 25 lines having the average value of 28 letters, three successive amplifications of the foregoing, at the second of which were imported forms of admission to minor orders.¹

5. On γ pages, i. e. pages of 21 lines of the average capacity of 29½ letters, a re-issue of 4; this (6) once repeated; and (7) a final amplification executed by Merovingian scribes, if not under the direction of Merovingian editors, and in respect of time separated from 1 by considerably more than a century.

I said just now that the long amplification which distinguishes our text of the prayer for the consecration of bishops, the ‘*Ds honorum*’, from that of the Leonianum has characteristics which justify us in believing it to have been composed by Pope Simplicius. The like cannot be said of much else that is proper to our document as compared with the Leonianum; nor, indeed, of anything in it which the evidence in our possession bids us regard as of non-Roman provenance. The truth is that, apart from distinctive methods employed in the treatment of subject-matter, the extant whole exhibits as many as four several literary styles; two of them worthy of the name, two unworthy. The first in order of time and of thought is that with which we are familiar through the writings of Leo the Great and of Simplicius, and may be

¹ As notified above, p. 221, in the table of linear values relating to the minor orders.

described as normal. Its phraseology is virile, simple, stately; and its diction such as we may suppose to have been that of well-educated churchmen prone to think in terms not far removed from those which they used when writing, and to write pretty nearly as they spoke. The second, which I distinguish as academical, though characterized by a somewhat operose research of phrase and by a diction which is of the pen rather than of the tongue, is yet vital with the charm that we expect of those to whom a literary language is a classic. The third, or transitional, style has a but barely tolerable construction and a diction which is almost ostentatiously unidiomatic. The last has the attributes of a hopeless decadence.

Again. I said just now that of the seven redactions through which I conceive the present section of the work to have passed the first was, in my opinion, executed on β pages and the next three on pages of θ capacity. If this was the case, the second may have been little more than a transcription of the original effected with no more economies, whether of text or rubric, than were necessary to adapt the section to its new environment; and the like may be said of the first γ redaction as compared with the third of the θ series.

THE FIRST θ REDACTION. (*The Ordering of Deacons.*) Let us, then, suppose some late fifth-century bibliographer, master of an even script, to have undertaken to transfer the form for the ordering of deacons from the seventy-one β lines¹ postulated by my hypothesis to such integral number of θ pages as was nearest to them in textual capacity. What would he be likely to do?

Inspection would inform him that, though the task might demand some little economy of material, there would be no need to curtail, even were curtailment permitted him, the long and carefully composed 'Adesto quaesumus o[mn]p. d[omi]n[us]'; but that, after he had transcribed this constituent, he would have to substitute a somewhat shorter prayer in place of the 'D[omi]n[us] conlator' which had descended to him from the deviser of the rough draft preserved to us in the Leonianum (Mur. i 423). Remarkably enough, there is no 'D[omi]n[us] conlator' in our document; but, instead of it, the somewhat shorter prayer 'Exaudi d[omi]n[us] supplicum preces', &c., a prayer of the very length required by my hypothesis. In this fact I see a first proof of a comparatively early transference from β to θ pages. The two sets of values are

	β		θ
Capitulum	3		3
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	366	12	366 13
Adesto quaesumus &c.	1483	47	1483 53
Deus conlator sacrarum &c.	266	9 = 71 β lines	
Exaudi domine supplicum &c.			157 6 = 75 θ lines

¹ See above, p. 223.

As set forth in our document, the item comprises, besides these constituents, the preliminary *Allocutio ad Populum*, 'Dilectissimi fratres' &c. (Mur. ii 664) and the inseparable components of the supplementary *Ad consummandum Diaconatus Officium* (*ib.* 666). None of all this is in the Leonianum; and the stichometrical value of the *Allocutio ad Populum* excludes it from the sort of redaction postulated by my hypothesis, for it would yield a total representing a mixed number of pages. Nor do I think that the *Ad consummandum*, though stichometrically permissible, for it is equivalent to a θ page, can have formed part of it; for an editor who wished to introduce any such supplementary material could easily have done so without discarding the 'D \bar{s} conlator' and substituting a shorter prayer in place of it. He could have retained the 'D \bar{s} conlator' and given his *Ad consummandum* the value of twenty-two lines, not, as now, of twenty-five.

(*The Ordering of Priests.*) In dealing with the next item, the editor of a θ redaction but slightly in paginal excess of the *editio princeps* on β pages would see at a glance that it would be impossible without mutilation to coerce it into two θ pages, for the prayer of consecration itself 'D \bar{n} e s \bar{c} e pater o \bar{m} p. aeterne d \bar{s} &c. (Mur. ii 667) has the value of forty-six θ pages. He must therefore amplify; and, amplification once resorted to, he must not be too sparing of it if the new libellus he was constructing was to fill, like its β prototype, an integral number of pages; but, by subjoining the *Consummatio Presbyterii* (Mur. ii 668) he would not only make the item itself equivalent to four θ pages; he would outstrip the editor of the β scheme by two pages, the value of half a membrane, thus:—

	β		θ_1
Already computed (deacons)	71		75
Capitulum (priests)	2		3
Oremus dilectissimi &c. ¹	153	5	153
Exaudi nos domine salutaris &c.	188	6	188
Domine sancte pater omnipotens &c. ²	1287	41 = 125 β lines	1287
<i>Consummatio presbyterii</i>			2
Sit nobis fratres &c. ³			227 (232)9
<i>Sanctificationum omnium</i> &c.			711
			26 = 174 θ lines

¹ Our document in its text of the 'Oremus dilectissimi' has the plural inflexions 'suscipiunt' and 'assequantur', although the subject of this, as of the other constituents, is singular, not plural. On this see below, p. 231.

² As to this also see below, p. 233, where a slight modification will be proposed.

³ Without counting the 'dominum' of the concluding 'per dominum', the value of the 'Sit nobis fratres' is 227; and this, if we neglect the 'per', is the precise equivalent of 8 θ lines. But as there is something wrong in the text, and as the mischief cannot be more simply remedied than by reading 'sacerdotalia' for 'sacerdotali', and 'in perpetuum' for 'per suum', we must raise 227 to 232, at the least, and allow 9 lines to the constituent.

The second of these two totals, which falls short of seven θ pages by merely a line, is attained by simply neglecting, as proper to some later edition, the preliminary *Allocutio ad Populum in Ordinatione Presbyteri*; just as when dealing with the previous item we neglected, and for a like reason, the preliminary *Allocutio ad Populum in Ordinatione Diaconi*. Hence, therefore, a second attestation of the hypothesis of a pontifical on θ pages and ampler than the *editio princeps* on β pages which I claim to have ascertained, but considerably less ample than the final development represented by MS Vatican. Regin. 257.

The two *Allocutiones ad Populum* which I have thus far omitted prove that at some period in the history of its development our document was that of a diocese in which both deacons and priests were elected by popular acclamation. Let us, therefore, note that the earlier redaction which we seem to be reconstructing implies, in the bidding prayer of the *Consummatio Presbyterii*, the election of candidates for the presbyterate, if not by acclamation, yet by some sort of popular suffrage; and therefore that, wherever and by whomsoever compiled, it differed from the draft forms in the Leonianum, and possibly from the *editio princeps* as well, in being meant for use in some other diocese than that of Rome.

(*The Ordering of Bishops.*) It was not to be expected that an item which had filled four β pages should without reinforcement fill five of θ value; and the compiler of the comparatively short redaction postulated by my hypothesis must have foreseen that, even though four lines, instead of three, should be devoted to a new and longer capitulum, and two lines allowed for a rubric connecting the next section with the present, some few lines of compensating text would yet be required of him.

His simplest course was that which seems to have been in fact taken at some period in the evolution of our document; to set a short 'Oremus dilectissimi' (Mur. ii 670) before the opening prayer, to transcribe successively the already existing constituents, beginning with the first and ending with the last, and, when all were copied, to fill with some short *alia* such few lines as might be standing idle. The introduction of an 'Oremus dilectissimi' before the first prayer would allow him to alter the capitulum from 'DE EPISCOPIS ORDINANDIS', requiring three lines, to 'ORATIO ET PRECES DE EPISCOPIS ORDINANDIS', requiring four; and if, as by my hypothesis would be the case, the item was now to be used in some diocese the bishop of which would be consecrated in his own cathedral, the assembled laity would have a concern in the ceremony sufficiently intimate to justify an address asking them for their prayers, but such as could not have been taken for granted in Rome, where bishops-elect brought from neighbouring dioceses for consecra-

tion by the Pope were to Roman spectators merely strangers and not their prospective fathers in God. I subjoin the respective values of the *editio princeps* and of the early derivative postulated by my hypothesis:—

	β	θ
Capitulum	3	4
Oremus dilectissimi &c.		113 4
Exaudi domine supplicum &c.	82 3	82 3
Propitiare domine supplicationibus &c. 129 . 4		129 5
Deus honorum omnium &c.	2497 78	2497 90
Suscipe domine munera &c.	74 3	74 3
Hanc igitur oblationem &c.	185 6	185 7
Adesto misericors deus &c.	81 3 = 100 β lines	81 3
Ecclesiam tuam domine &c.		115 4
Connecting rubric		2 = 125 θ lines

Here, therefore, we have a third attestation of the hypothesis of a pontifical on θ pages; a book ampler than the *editio princeps* on β pages which I claim to have ascertained, but considerably less in bulk than the final development represented by MS Vatican. Regin. 257.

THE SECOND θ REDACTION. The words 'per dñm' are appended to two out of the three preliminary addresses *Ad Populum* (Mur. ii 664, 667) which, by reason of their nett textual value, must unquestionably be attributed to one and the same edition and, on grounds of style, to one and the same pen. The formula does not, however, indicate a conclusion such as would be proper to a prayer, but some such phrase as 'per dñm ñ ihm xpm filium dī qui cum patre et spū sōo uiuit et regnat in saecula saeculorum'. One would, therefore, suppose that on its first occurrence it must have been written *in extenso*; and the surmise is confirmed by two facts: first, that the constituent, if thus equipped, would, with the rubrics contiguous to it, fill five-and-twenty θ lines and enable the office proper to begin at the head of a page; secondly, that thus equipped it would, with the rubric next after it, fill one γ page, the governing capitulum, as we have already found reason to believe was the case, being set on the page next before.¹

We must at the proper moment endeavour to learn who it was that composed these three addresses, the last of which bears a resemblance to the instructions given by Leo the Great on the choice of candidates for the episcopate which is too close to be accidental.² We cannot but admire him; for unqualified praise is due to the 'scientia, pompa, proprietat'³ of a style that, without detriment to those characteristics,

¹ See summary of linear values on p. 232.

² The places in St Leo's letters thus turned to account are too numerous for transcription; but the reader will easily identify them on consulting Epp. 4, 5, 10, 14, 41 and 167 (Migne S. L. 610 B, 611 A, 612 A, 615 A, 622 B, 634 A, 672 A, 673 B, 815 A, 815 B, 1201 B).

³ I borrow this insuperably happy phrase from Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* iii 14 (Migne S. L. lviii 508 A).

could yet accommodate the balance and rhythm of perilously laboured periods to the number of lines which these must be made to fill if the ultimate whole were to satisfy the exigencies of a scrupulously artistic bibliography. Evidently that was his design; as evidently the design was realized: for the synopsis of values which I am about to exhibit enables me to see that the first of the newly-inserted addresses was so economized in respect of length as that the text of the second, 'Quoniam dilectissimi' &c., should begin at the head of a θ page (page x), and that this was so computed as to give a like distinction to the *Consummatio Presbyterii* (page xiii) and, after it (p. xvii), to what was no mere climax, no mere peroration preceded by a significant rhetorical pause, though certainly it was both of these, but a direct appeal and solemn challenge from speaker to listeners, calling on them to ratify by common acclamation a choice which otherwise had not been final. A distribution of text such as this cannot have been accidental; for nothing could be more felicitous than the appropriation of a new page to the opening scene of a fresh act in the drama. The transition from the sixteenth page to the seventeenth coincided with the brief but eventful interval in which the bishop-elect was conducted to the metropolitan, who, taking him by the hand and presenting him to the electors, resumed, 'Hunc ergo, dilectissimi fratres, testimonio boni operis electum dignissimum sacerdotio consonantes laudibus clamate et dicite "*Dignus est*".'

In this I see the technical master-touch of the second θ redaction of our pontifical; but we shall, I think, in due time find that even this was improved at the third θ redaction, the document being then in such wise re-arranged as that the assistant deacon should turn a leaf of the volume during the moment or two that must elapse before the officiating prelate pronounced the critical 'Hunc ergo dilectissimi fratres'.

There are in the extant document three rubrical details the origin of which would seem to be referable to this, the second θ redaction. When the editor introduced the three preliminary allocutions he seems to have retained what had previously been the governing capitula of the respective items, but to have adapted them to their new function of merely subordinate headings by prefixing a necessary qualification to each; thus turning 'AD DIACONUM ORDINANDUM' into '*Oratio ad diaconum ordinandum*', 'AD PRESBYTEROS ORDINANDOS' into '*Oratio ad presbyteros ordinandos*' and DE EPISCOPIS ORDINANDIS' into '*Oratio et preces de episcopis ordinandis*'.

There are also textual peculiarities which this is the proper place for noticing.

The Leonianum draft (Mur. i 421) assumes more than one candidate for the episcopate in its text of the 'D \bar{s} honorum omnium'; although,

probably for a ritual reason,¹ singular inflexions characterize its *Secreta* and *Hanc igitur*, not the plural inflexions which would imply a plurality of candidates: and MS Vatican. Regin. 257 in its text of the third item of the present section resembles it *pro hoc*, but with the exception that in one or two places the singular as well as the plural inflexion is given. But surely it would be cause for wonder that the very reviser who himself introduced the two long addresses 'Seruanda est dilectissimi' &c., and 'Dm̄, totius sc̄ificationis' &c., neither of which presupposes more than one candidate, should have been so inconsistent as to retain in the text of the 'D̄s honorum omnium' plural inflexions indicative of several candidates, even if he had found them there. I cannot believe that so minutely careful a scholar as the author of the three preliminary allocutions would forgive himself such an inconsistency, and therefore venture to suggest (i) that at the first θ redaction, primarily and in the main a transcription of a strictly Roman book, the 'D̄s honorum' retained its plural inflexions, (ii) that at the second θ redaction these were replaced by their singular counterparts, which (iii) were retained at the next θ redaction; but (iv) that the first of the γ scribes, or the editor for whom he worked—if indeed there was a responsible editor—reinstated the plural forms for no better reason than that they served to distribute the prayer over as many as eighty-six lines, a value which exactly sufficed to make the section end on the last line of a page, at the same time (v) so far respecting his predecessor's careful consistency and his own common sense as to superscribe the singular forms; and (vi) that most of these have disappeared in the course of successive transcriptions. Hence it is that in the table of linear values I compute the number of letters in the 'D̄s honorum' as 2450 (eighty-eight θ lines) at θ_2 and θ_3 , but at 2497 (seventy-eight β lines, ninety of θ , eighty-six of γ) on the five other occasions.

Again, in the Leonianum draft (Mur. i 424) the three constituents of the *Consecratio Presbyteri*—'Oremus dilectissimi' &c., 'Exaudi nos dñe' &c., 'Dñe sc̄e pater ōmp.' &c.—assume, in contrast to their title, a plurality of candidates for the presbyterate: but in our document,

¹ Then, as now, each of the newly consecrated bishops would seem, by the Roman rite, to have made his own offering of bread and wine.

In this connexion let me call attention to the only ritually important difference between the Leonianum forms and ours in respect of such constituents as are common to the two documents. The Leonianum text of the *Secreta* is 'Suscipe dñe quæsumus munera famuli tui *illius* et propitius' &c. (Mur. i 421); ours is 'Suscipe dñe munera quæ tibi offerimus pro famulo tuo *illo* et propitius' &c.

There is also a slight verbal difference between the two texts of the 'Hanc igitur'; the Leonianum being 'Hanc igitur . . . ut quod diuino munere consecutus est diuinis effectibus exsequatur. per', whilst ours is 'Hanc igitur . . . ut quod diuino munere consecutus est tua in eo protectione firmetur. per'. Ours is, by my hypothesis, the later of the two.

		Scheme β 11 pages	Scheme θ_1 14 pages	Scheme θ_2 18 pages	Scheme θ_3 19 pages	Scheme γ_1 (a) 22 pages	Scheme γ_3 23 pages
First leaf		i, ii	i, ii	vi 4	vi 4	*	*
ALLOCUTIO AD POPULUM &c.	38						
Dilectissimi fratres quamlibet &c.	558 (489)			20	20	vii (x) 20	x 20
<i>Oratio ad diaconum ordinandum</i>	20, 26	iii 3	iii 3	I = 25	I = 25	I = 21	I = 21
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	366	12	13	vii 13	vii 13	viii (xi) 13	xi 13
<i>Consecratio</i>	11					1	1
Adesto quaesumus &c.	1483	47	53	53	53	51	51
Deus conlator sacrarum &c.	266	9					
Exaudi domine supplicium &c.	157		6 = 75	6	6	6	6
<i>Ad consummandum diaconatus officium</i>	32				1	1	1
Commune uotum communis &c.	177				7	6	6
<i>Benedictio sequitur</i>	20					1	1
Domine sancte spei fidei &c.	455				17	16	16
ALLOCUTIO AD POPULUM &c.	41			3 = 75	3 = 100	3	3
Quoniam dilectissimi &c.	1066			x 38	xi 38	37	37
<i>Oratio ad presbyteros ordinandos</i>	(23), 29	2	vi 3	2	2	2	2
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	155, 153	5	6	6	6	6	6
<i>Item alia</i>	8						1
Exaudi nos deus salutaris &c.	187, 188	6	7	7	7	7	7
<i>Consecratio</i>	11					1	1
Domine sancte pater &c.	1296 ¹ , 1287 ²	41 ¹ = 125	47 ¹	46 ²	46 ²	44 ²	44 ²
<i>Consummatio presbyterii</i>	22		2	I = 100	I = 100	1	1
Sit nobis fratres communis &c.	227 (232)		9	xiii 9	xv 9	8	8
<i>Item benedictio</i>	14						1
Sanctificationum omnium &c.	711		26 = 100	26	26	25	25 = 231
<i>Consecratio manus</i>	16						xxii 2
Consecrentur manus istae &c.	15 ¹						5
<i>Item alia</i>	8						1
Unguantur manus istae &c.	307						11
EXHORTATIO AD POPULUM &c.	40					2 = 231	2 = 21
Seruanda est dilectissimi &c.	1059			38 = 75	38 = 75		
Hunc ergo dilectissimi &c.	115			xvii 4	xviii 4	xviii (xxii) 40	xxiii 40
<i>Oratio et preces de episcopis</i> &c.	(21), 35	viii 3	x 4	3	3	2 = 42	2 = 42
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	113		4	4	4	xxi (xxiii) 4	xxv 4
Exaudi domine supplicium &c.	82	3	3	3	3	3	3
Propitiare domine &c.	129, 130	4	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Collectio sequitur</i>	17					1	1
Deum totius sanctificationis &c.	1418 (1427)			51	51	49	49
<i>Consecratio</i>	11					I = 63	I = 63
Deus honorum omnium &c.	2497 ¹ , 2450 ²	78 ¹	90 ¹	88 ²	88 ²	xxiii (xxvii) 86 ¹	xxviii 86 ¹
<i>Super oblata</i>	11					1	1
Suscipe domine munera &c.	(74), 83	3	3	3	3	3	3
Hanc igitur oblationem &c.	185	6	7	7	7	7	7
Adesto misericors deus &c.	81	3 = 100	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Item alia</i>	8					1	1
Ecclesiam tuam domine &c.	115		4	4 = 175	4 = 175	4 = 105	4 = 105
From the following				2 = 125			

while the 'Exaudi nos' and the 'Dñe sc̄e' assume only one candidate, the 'Oremus dilectissimi' is so inconsistently worded—'ut super hunc famulum tuum . . . ut quae suscipiunt . . . exsequantur'—as very strongly to suggest the inference that at some early stage in the editorial development of the item that constituent and, in accordance with it, the other two as well must have assumed a plurality of candidates. Bearing in mind therefore, the peculiarities of inflexion in our third item which were just now examined, I think the most probable account of these in the second item to be (i) that the Roman precedent was followed in θ_1 in respect of all three constituents, but (ii) that the compiler of θ_2 replaced inflexions implying plurality by their counterparts in the singular number, and (iii) that the contradiction which disfigures our text of the 'Oremus dilectissimi' is the result of some later carelessness. Hence in my list the two sets of values 155, 187, and 1296 (forty-one β lines, forty-seven of θ) for β and θ_1 , but 153, 188, and 1287 (forty-six of θ_1 , forty-four of γ) for θ_2 .

It certainly is a remarkable coincidence that, just as plural inflexions would have given the 'Dñs honorum omnium' too extended a text for the linear capability of our document at the second and third of the θ redactions postulated by my hypothesis, though not at the first, so at the second and third would a like difficulty have arisen had plural inflexions been retained in the 'Dñe sc̄e pater ōmp.' of the form for the ordering of presbyters. To me the coincidence is reassuring: because it serves to corroborate my theory of a first θ redaction and of the constituents proper to it; because it serves to prove that the reviser who first assumed as normal the presence of only one candidate for priesthood and for episcopate was the editor to whom we are indebted for the three preliminary allocutions, for these assume but one candidate; because it justifies my estimate of the scrupulously minute stichometrical skill for which I just now gave credit to the author of those addresses, for his 'Quoniam dilectissimi', preliminary to the second item, comprises 1066 [= $38 \times 28 + 2$] letters, his 'Seruanda est' before the third item 1059 [= $38 \times 28 - 5$] letters, and his 'Hunc ergo dilectissimi' 115 [= $4 \times 28 + 3$]; because, regard had to these values, it justifies the opinion that the conclusion to his 'Dilectissimi fratres', preliminary to the first, was properly worded and set forth in full, its value thus being 558 [= $20 \times 28 - 2$] letters, and because it seems to shed a gleam of light on one period in the external history of the document.

The long constituent, 'Dñm totius sc̄ificationis' &c., which precedes the prayer of consecration in the last of the three items, except that in one place it has suffered at the hands of the copyists,¹ is, as an example

¹ In no instance would scribal corruption of the text be likely to make any great difference in its value as computed in terms of letters. In terms of lines there

of the academical style, entirely worthy to rank with the three preliminary allocutions. Like the 'Seruanda est dilectissimi fratres', it is replete with instructions to be found in the letters of Leo the Great,¹ and thus has a *prima facie* claim to be attributed to the same redaction with that address. When we compute the values of the several successive issues of the whole pontifical in terms of sheets or membranes—that is to say, in terms of quadruples of pages—we shall find the attribution justified.

THE THIRD θ REDACTION. I hope when discussing the fourth and fifth of the eight sections into which the extant document resolves itself to justify my attribution of the *Ad Consummandum Diaconatus Officium* (Mur. ii 666) to a redaction somewhat later than θ_2 , but by the same pen. Meanwhile, one or other of two corrections must be made in its first constituent. Either we must turn the ablatives in 'qui in diaconatus ministerio praeparatur leuitico' into accusatives, thus correcting a Merovingian depravation; or we must elide 'in', making 'ministerio . . . leuitico' a dative governed by 'praeparatur'. Compare the 'ut . . . successor praeparatur ecclesiae' in the third of the preliminary addresses.

THE γ REDACTIONS. If the deviser of the first γ scheme set the rubric *Oratio ad diaconos ordinandos* at the foot of his sixth page the task that lay before him was to transcribe on [$22 \times 21 =$]462, or perhaps 460, lines of the average capacity of $29\frac{1}{3}$ letters, material which had hitherto filled 471 lines of twenty-eight letters; and, the space at

might be none. In the present instance Mgr Duchesne's very clever emendation makes a difference of only three letters, lowering 148 to 145. For 'pastorali erga creditas sibi oues domini diligentiae eius semper se flagrantissimum adprobans. Te delictorum adigitur praefuturus ex omnibus electus ex omnibus uniuersis' &c., he reads, 'pastorali erga creditas sibi oues domini diligentia eius semper se flagrantissimum adprobans mandatorum. Ut igitur praefuturus omnibus electus ex omnibus uniuersis' &c. (*Origines* p. 360). I think, however, that 'semper se flagrantissimum adprobans dilectorem' would be much better than 'semper se flagrantissimum adprobans mandatorum'; for not only is 'dilectorem' an exceedingly simple substitute for 'delictorum', it yields an excellent sense and makes a pretty antithesis to the preceding 'diligentia eius'. But, even so, the adjective 'pastorali' stands unsupported. I propose to insert 'cura'—'pastorali cura erga creditas sibi oues domini, diligentia eius'—where 'diligentia eius' is synonymous with 'amore eius'—'semper se flagrantissimum adprobans dilectorem' &c. The similarity of an uncial CURA to an uncial ERGA would account for the omission of the former.

I just now saw in the numerical values of the preliminary addresses what looked like proof of minute care taken by the compiler of θ_2 to make each of them fill, as nearly as might be, an integral, not a mixed, number of lines. An inserted 'cura' would give us, the final 'per' included, a total of [1419 = $51 \times 28 - 9$] letters; where again we have an integral number of lines if, with the Vatican codex, we add to 'per' the unusual 'dominum nostrum ihcum'.

¹ See Epp. 5, 14, 41 (*Migne S. L.* liv 615 B, 673 A, 815 B).

his disposal thus being more than he needed, he seems to have resorted to the simple, if inartistic, expedient of minor rubrics, an expedient employed in years long passed away by successive editors of the Leonian Sacramentary. He could make the first and second items fill eleven pages, if only in two places he devoted a line to '*consecratio*', and in another place a line to '*Benedictio sequitur*'. By inserting '*Collectio sequitur*' and '*Consecratio*' each of them on a line of its own, he could make the first half of the third item fill five pages; and, starting with the '*Dñs honorum*' on a fresh page, he could by means of a '*Super oblata*' and an '*Item alia*' fill five more.

It was, I suspect, the last of the long series of scribes that introduced the two rubrics '*Item alia*' and '*Item benedictio*' into the second of the three forms, then making it conterminous with page xxi of the volume in order to devote a fresh page to the new rite of the *Consecratio Manuum* (Mur. ii 669). In the governing rubric of this insertion we have, though perhaps by clerical oscitancy, a singular inflexion in place of a plural—*Consecratio Manus* for *Consecratio Manuum*—a subjective consequence, it may be, of a silent 's' in the plurals of the scribe's vernacular; and, in its first formula '*Consecrentur manus istae et sc̄ificentur per istam unctionem*', an idiom of commonplace occurrence in mediaeval Latin; while the second formula is thus conceived: '*Unguantur manus istae sicut unxit samuel dauid ita unguantur et consecrentur . . . in nomine . . . facientes imaginem sc̄ae crucis*' &c. Other pieces of presumably inserted work as exceptional as this in idiom, in construction, or in both, are in store for us in the next two sections; and, inasmuch as each of them represents a single page of γ lineation, I attribute them, like this, certainly to a barbarous age, and presumably to either the penultimate or the last general redaction.

SECTION III. THE DEDICATION OF VIRGINS AND OF WIDOWS.

In my article on the Leonian Sacramentary (*J. T. S.* vol. x p. 82) I found that, by a singular anomaly, its *Ad Virgines Sacras* is one line in excess of three β pages; but, collating its text (Mur. i 444) of the prayer of dedication, '*Dñs castorum corporum benignus habitator*' &c., with that exhibited by our document (*ib.* ii 674), I now perceive that the latter reads, in the first sentence, '*ad experientiam bonorum*', not '*ad experientiam quorundam bonorum*'; and, about the middle of the latter half, '*protectionis tuae munimen*', not '*protectionis tuae munimen*'

¹ See list of linear values, page 232.

² With this contrast the following conjunction of two idioms from the *Consecratio Altaris*, '*Consecrare et sc̄ificare digneris dñe patenam hanc per istam unctionem*' &c.

et regimen'.¹ Thus, 2185 letters are reduced to 2167 (sixty-nine to sixty-eight β lines), with a result as follows:—

Capitulum		3
Respice domine propitius &c.	116	4
Deus castorum corporum &c.	2167	68 = 75 β lines

Now, whether or not, as is probable, 'quorundam' and 'bonorum' be tentative alternatives, one of which would have been out of place in a finally corrected text; whether or not 'munimen' and 'regimen' be tentative alternatives; whether or not, as again is probable, 'honor' and 'gaudium' in the last sentence² be tentative alternatives, the mere fact that the Leonianum text would not have been longer by a line than its due stichometrical value had it been identical with ours in having neither 'quorundam' nor 'et regimen' raises a prejudice in favour of ours; for it suggests the inference that ours is an editorially corrected and approved text, as against an uncorrected or discarded text in the other document.

Again: the Leonianum, not far from the beginning,³ reads 'Quando enim animus . . . legem naturae . . . euinceret nisi tu hanc flammam clementer accenderes, tu hanc cupiditatem benignus aleres?'; and, about the middle,⁴ 'ut cum . . . super \bar{s} cum coniugium initialis benedictio permaneret existerent tamen sublimiores animae quae in uiri ac mulieris copula fastidirent conubium concupiscerent sacramentum nec imitarentur [*? nec hoc implicarentur*] quod nuptiis agitur sed diligenter quod nuptiis praenotatur'; where 'fastidirent conubium' may be a suggested substitute for 'concupiscerent sacramentum'. Be this as it may, ours is a very different text: 'Quando enim animus . . . legem naturae . . . euinceret nisi tu per liberum arbitrium hunc amorem uirginitatis clementer accenderes hanc cupiditatem in earum corde benignus aleres?', and 'ut cum . . . super copulam tua benedictio permaneret existerent tamen sublimiores animae quae non hoc concupiscerent quod habet mortale coniugium sed hoc eligerent quod praemittit xpi ecclesiaeque sacramentum'. The two forms are stichometrically equivalent,⁵ but there is a material and unquestionable difference between them. That of the extant Leonianum is applicable to women who, after living in the state of wedlock, have been inspired with *dilectio* for a life of continence; ours cannot be understood of any but of those who of their own free choice have made it their *electio* to realize in their own person the 'perpetua uirginitas' which in the Leonianum as well as in our document is the burden of the immediate context and the inspiring idea of

¹ At pp. 139:27, 140:18 in Dr Feltoe's edition.

² *Ib.* 140:27.

³ *Ib.* 139:32.

⁴ *Ib.* 140:8.

⁵ Ours is only three letters in excess of the other.

all the other portions of the constituent. In other words: the Leonianum phrasing of the two passages puts them out of focus with their immediate setting; ours does not. It is therefore unlikely that the extant Leonianum text should have been the earlier of the two, and impossible that it should be the finally authentic one of the two. Ours may be. Hence once more, as in the case of the 'D \bar{s} honorum omnium', the value of the so-called *Missale Francorum* as a repertory of literary evidence.

But for these differences, the two texts are identical until, as we approach the end of the prayer, the Leonianum reads (in 456 letters) 'Sit in eis d \bar{n} e per donum sp \bar{s} tui prudens modestia sapiens benignitas' &c., &c., &c.¹; while ours has 'Sit in eis d \bar{n} e per donum sp \bar{s} tui prudens modestia et quod sunt professae custodiant scrutatori pectorum non corpore placiturae sed mente' (115 letters). 'Transeant in numerum sapientium puellarum' &c., &c., &c. (336 letters). Now, I believe that our prayer ended originally at 'sed mente', and hope presently to justify that opinion in so far as concerns the *editio princeps* of our document. But, inasmuch as by the hypothesis the *editio princeps* of our document was the work of some Bishop of Rome, that hypothesis obliges me to infer that there may have been a moment in the history of the Leonianum at which there, as well as here, the last words of the prayer were 'sed mente', its last clause being identical with our 'Sit in eis . . . sed mente'. If so, and if we are right in excluding 'quorundam' and 'et regimen' as intrusive alternatives, we have a final Leonianum value of 2167 and before it a lower value of (2167 - 456 + 115 =) 1826 letters. Will this inference bear the test of the θ criterion? Again, the last paragraph of the Leonianum text has a change, 'tu eis honor sis . . . in ieiunio cibus in infirmitate medicina', which, by reason of the sudden change of subject from a third person plural to a second person singular—'famulae tuae' to 'tu'—and the consequent dislocation of the construction, reads like an awkwardly inserted piece of 'padding'. It comprises 174 letters, so that its omission would reduce 2167 to 1993. Will this value bear the test of the α criterion? Each of these questions must be answered in the affirmative; witness the following syllabus of values:—

	θ	α	β
AD VIRGINES SACRAS . . .	3	3	3
Respice domine propitius &c.	116 4	116 4	116 4
Deus castorum corporum &c.	1826 66	1993 66	2167 68 = 75 β lines
Connecting rubric or explicit	2 = 75 θ lines	2 = 75 α lines	

Thanks, therefore, to the information given us by the so-called *Missale Francorum* as to the inadmissibility of the readings 'quorun-

¹ Feltoe 140: 22.

dam' and 'et regimen' in the Verona text of the 'D \bar{s} castorum corporum', we have it in our power to reconstruct, what otherwise were impossible, a stichometrically perfect last, or β , redaction of the *Ad Virgines Sacras* of the Leonian Sacramentary as well as for the other sections of that document. Thanks, too, to the inferences it suggests as to the earlier history of the 'D \bar{s} castorum corporum', we have it in our power, as for the other sections of the Leonian Sacramentary, so also for the *Ad Virgines Sacras*, to reconstruct first a θ , then an α , redaction.

I. As to our own text of the 'D \bar{s} castorum corporum benignus habitator', I believe it to be the resultant of no fewer than three successive enhancements of the primary text, 'D \bar{s} castorum . . . sed mente'; that is to say, that it is derived thence by three descents, not by two; that each of these descents was, as already has been intimated and as indeed must be evident, in a line different from that discernible in the Leonianum, a difference which may be of service in throwing light on the external history of the document; and, further, that these extended over a much longer space of time than the Leonian pedigree.

As it now stands, it is worded thus:—'D \bar{s} castorum corporum . . . non corpore placiturae sed mente. (1) Transeant in numerum sapientium puellarum ut caelestem sponsum accensis lampadibus cum oleo praeparationis expectent nec [(3) turbatae improuisi regis aduentu secuturae cum lumine ut praecedentium choro iungantur occurrant nec] excludantur cum stultis. (2) Regalem ianuam cum sapientibus uirginibus licenter introeant et in agni tui perpetuo comitatu probabiles mansura castitate permaneat. per.'

(1) The passage 'Transeant in numerum . . . cum stultis', if we except the words which I include within square brackets, is written in the normal style and contains nothing to invite remark on critical grounds. But it certainly is noteworthy as introducing an entirely new subject; for throughout the whole of the preceding context—that is to say, from the first words, 'D \bar{s} castorum corporum benignus habitator', to the last, 'non corpore placiturae sed mente'—there is no reference whatever to the parable of the wise and foolish virgins. Theologians will observe this fact with interest; and bibliographers will, I think, share with me the opinion that the addition I detect was made by some editor who wished by means of it, whether with or without other new material, to fill an integral number of pages of one or other of the three systems β , θ , γ , but with preference for the second of these; for there does not seem to have been a second β redaction, and the normal Latin in which the passage is written seems, so far at least as our document is concerned, to have fallen into desuetude before the period of the γ transcriptions.

(2) To this 'Transeant in numerum sapientium puellarum . . . nec excludantur cum stultis', the next succeeding passage, 'Regalem ianuam . . . permanenteant', exhibits striking contrasts. Now (i) the *sapientes* are not, as before, *puellae* but *uirgines*, a difference which might be allowed to pass without remark, were it not that, while the *puellae* of the 'Transeant in numerum' are the mere equivalent of our *damsels*, *uirgines* is susceptible of equation with our *nuns*, a smaller and irrevocably dedicated class. Now (ii) the entrance is no ordinary doorway, but a *regalis ianua*, the *porte royale* of some great abbey or the *regia*¹ of ceremonial admission to the strict enclosure of a monastery of women. Now (iii) the personage expected is not, as in the parable, a personage to be escorted to his house and left there, but one in whose company the *sapientes* hope to dwell perpetually, while (iv) he in his turn is now no longer a bridegroom but the Lamb of the apocalyptic vision. This kaleidoscopic phantasmagoria obliges us to regard the passage 'Regalem . . . permanenteant' as adventitious—and adventitious, it may be, by no slight chronological interval—to the sentence immediately before it. But though it is textually the last-placed passage of the prayer, I do not think that in respect of time it is its latest enhancement; for, like the *Ad consummandum Diaconatus Officium* in the preceding section, it has the contrasted characteristics of a good grammatical construction and a scarcely idiomatic phraseology, and may therefore claim chronological precedence of the 'turbatae improuisi . . . occurrant nec' which so curiously disbalances the construction of the 'Transeant in numerum'. If style may be our guide, its first appearance must be attributed either to the third θ redaction or to the first of the γ triad. The stichometry of the section would seem to demand the latter of the two alternatives.

(3) The chaotic 'turbatae improuisi . . . occurrant nec' differs from the context in which it is set by changing the coming personage from a bridegroom into a king who arrives *à l'improviste* and by picturing two companies of *sapientes*, a choir who go before and a light-bearing group who follow after, and whom it identifies with the postulants for admission. If style may be our guide, it cannot be earlier than the last general redaction.

The four successive values thus obtained are 1831, 1958, 2076 and

¹ St Caesarius of Arles in his Rule, § 13, enjoins thus: 'Ianua monasterii nunquam extra basilicam cum uestra uoluntate uel cum uestro permissu fiat.' Migne *S. L.* lxxvii 1118 B. For *regia* in the sense of state gateway see *Becket Memorials*, Rolls edition, vii 17, 265, 'Cum ego pauper et dolens tantae maiestatis regiam pulsaverim' and 'regiam illam clementiae tuae pulsantes', and delete the editorial footnote to the former passage. See also the 'ad regias aedis sacrae' of Gregory of Tours, *H. F.* iv § xiii (Migne *S. L.* lxxi 279 A).

2164; but the first of these must, I think, be made to undergo a very slight reduction.

For reasons presently to be explained, the prayer 'Respice dñe propitius' &c., which survives as the first constituent of the Leonian *Ad Virgines Sacras*, and which, by my hypothesis, was the first constituent of the *editio princeps* of our own *Benedictio super Virgines*, was, by the same hypothesis, superseded at a comparatively early date by the prayer 'Omp. seomp. dñ adiuua' &c., and we must conjecture as best we can as to whether it was so worded as to imply one or more than one postulant. The present text of our 'Dñ castorum corporum' implies more than one, and thus resembles our present text of the 'Dñ honorum omnium' in the preceding section; but we are not therefore to infer that its text in the *editio princeps* did not imply only one. On the contrary, since the bidding-prayer, 'Castum dñ veri cultum' &c., which is its proper companion, which must have been introduced by the compiler of the *editio princeps*, and for altering the text of which there were no such motives as evidently would be operative in the 'Dñ castorum corporum' itself from the moment that this was freighted with allusive references to the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, our safer alternative is to assume that at the time of the *editio princeps* it contemplated the presence of but one postulant, and therefore that the number of its letters then was not, as with the existing plural inflexions it would have been, 1831, but 1817.¹ Hence it is that in my synopsis of values I reduce 1831 to 1817 for the first computation of the prayer, but make no such deduction for the others. Similarly, I give the 'Respice' 115 letters, not 116.

II. The constituent 'Dñ qui annam' &c. (Mur. ii 676) dedicates to the ascetical life a matron, member of a class by no means infrequent in Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries, women who, while still in the estate of legitimate or merely nominal widowhood, chose to practise the austerities of a sanctified widowhood. The opening sentence as far, inclusively, as the words 'noctibus ac diebus orationes ieiuniaeque miscentibus'—provided only that for *miscentibus* we read *misceret*—is irreprehensible; so too is the clause 'et tribue ut haec famula tua' &c., of the antepenultimate sentence, and all that thenceforward follows. Nay, more; if we strike out the *et* before *tribue*, the latter passage not only coalesces with the former, but with it constitutes a prayer which for purity of idiom and grace of style deserves to take rank with the 'Omp. seomp. dñ adiuua' of the *Benedictio super Virgines* and with the 'Consolare dñe' of the present item. But the text intervening between the two passages is in striking contrast to them. Make what

¹ In the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary (Mur. i 629) only one postulant is assumed. See also Mur. ii 184, 452.

allowance we may for scribal depravation, nothing can convert it into the work of one to whom the Latin language was a classic. We thus have two values for the 'Ds qui annam': one referable for literary reasons, and also, as we shall, I hope, see in due course, for historical reasons, to the second θ redaction; the other referable to the second general γ redaction rather than the first, because we have not as yet found reason to believe that this comprised editorial work in a style later than the academical. The two values are 623 (twenty-three θ lines) and 1373 (forty-seven γ lines).

The foregoing inferences assumed as reasonable and probable, we find ourselves in possession of material which almost automatically resolves itself into six successive systems of bibliographical collocation: the first on three β pages; the second and third on four and six θ pages, respectively; the fourth, fifth, and sixth on seven, nine, and ten γ pages.

The table of values on the next page will, I trust, be of service in elucidating my theory of the development of the present section.

THE β REDACTION. As to the *editio princeps*, the β redaction, there remains nothing to say; unless it be to observe—while reminding the reader that there is neither Leonian authority nor Leonian precedent for our introductory constituent, 'Omp. señp. dñ' &c.—that material having the stichometrical value of our bidding-prayer, 'Castum ueri dñ cultum' &c., would be needed in order to make good the 'shrinkage' consequent on the transference of the long 'Dñ castorum corporum benignus habitator . . . non corpore placiturae [altered to "placitura"] sed mente' from its first Leonian home on θ pages¹ to pages of β capacity.

THE FIRST θ REDACTION. But since, when the item thus amplified was in course of time re-transferred to θ pages, it necessarily required more than three of these, but fell considerably short of four, opportunity was then taken to provide for the dedication of widows to the ascetical life, by introducing in their behoof, under the title of *Benedictio Viduae quae fuerit Castitatem professa*—or perhaps merely *Benedictio Viduae*—the prayer 'Dñe dñ uirtutum' &c. This addition and the capitulum of the next section completed the equipment of a fourth page.

THE SECOND θ REDACTION. The next advance in the evolution of the section was cleverly made.² The 'Dñe dñ uirtutum' of the *Benedictio Viduae* was lowered to the grade of an *alia*, and before it was set a new prayer, 'Consolare dñe' &c., so contrived as that the two should fill the whole of a page. But, since this 'Consolare dñe' declared the estate of widowhood to be, if faithfully kept, a guarantee of the sixty-fold³ reward promised in the Gospel, congruity required in the *Bene-*

¹ See above, p. 237.

² The reader will here oblige me by consulting the table of linear values.

³ 'Qui possit . . . sexagesimum gradum percipere.'

		Scheme β Three pages	Scheme θ_1 Four pages	Scheme $\theta_2(s)$ Six pages	Scheme γ_1 Seven pages	Scheme γ_2 Nine pages	Scheme γ_3 Ten pages
BENEDICTIO SUPER VIRGINES . . .	13	xii 3	*	xxiii (xxv) 3	xxviii 3	xxxii 3	xxxiii 3
<i>Omnipotens . . . adiuua &c. . .</i>	302			11	11	11	11
<i>Consecratio uirginum</i>	19				1	1	1
Respice domine &c.	114	4	xv 4				
Castum ueri dei cultum &c. . . .	34 ²	11	13	13	12	12	12
<i>Deus</i> castorum corporum &c. . . .	1817 ¹ , 1958 ² , 2076 ³ , 2164 ⁴	57 ¹ = 75	65 ¹	71 ²	71 ³	71 ³	74 ⁴
Accipe puella pallium &c.	471 [= 115 + 356]					16	4 = 105 xxxviii 12
Benedicat te deus &c.	146						5
<i>Benedictio uestimentorum uiduae</i>	29						2
Visibilem et inuisibilem &c. . . .	149						5
<i>Consecratio uestium</i>	18						1
Inlumina quaesumus &c.	171						6
BENEDICTIO VIDUAE QUAE &c. . . .	16, 44		2	2 = 100	2	2	2
Consolare domine &c.	307			xxviii (xxviii) 11	11	11	11
<i>Item alia</i>	8				1	1	1
Domine deus uirtutum &c.	380		14	14 = 25	13	13	13
<i>Deus</i> qui annam &c.	623, 1373 [1385]			xxviii (xxx) 23	22 = 147	48 = 189	47 = 105
From the following			2 = 100	2 = 25			
		Page xliii ends	Page xviii ends	Page xxviii (xxx) ends	Page xxxv ends	Page xl ends	Page xlii ends

MEMORANDA. 1. Muratori and Mabillon may be assumed to have had the authority of the Vatican MS for printing the 'Accipe puella pallium . . . in finem per' in one paragraph. But its first and shorter half (115 letters) is a formula of investiture, and its second half a benediction; so that they are ritually two compositions, not one. It is therefore worthy of note that at Redaction γ_3 the one ended with p. xxxvii, while the other began with p. xxxviii; the leaf being turned for the bishop as the novice assumed the pallium. For a like dramatic coincidence see above, p. 230.

2. I assume that at Redaction γ_2 a few words were added to the conventional conclusion 'per', so as to carry on the constituent to the last line of the page; a not unusual device at the end of an item. N.B. $47 \times 29\frac{2}{3} = 1378\frac{2}{3}$.

dictio super Virgines an analogous composition the burden of which should be the hundredfold recompense¹ appropriated, from the days at least of St Jerome, by common consent of western theologians to final perseverance in holy virginity. Hence the 'Oñp. sēmp. dš adiuua', a prayer of loftier scope and higher ideal than the 'Respice dñe', which it therefore ousted. Inasmuch, however, as this nett addition of [11-4 =] seven pages was insufficient to carry on the 'Dš castorum corporum', even with plural inflexions instead of singular, to the penultimate line of a page, the latter prayer was, by means of the added 'Transeant in numerum . . . expectent nec excludantur cum stultis', so amplified as to attain that object. To complete the triad of evangelical references, twenty-three lines of page xxviii—page xxx at the third θ redaction—were devoted to the 'Dš qui annam' with its first value of 623 letters. This had for its burden the thirtyfold² fruit which widows in the secondary sense of the term were to expect as their reward. Proof of the correctness of this attribution is, I venture to think, afforded by the fact that the section was now technically perfect as well as dogmatically homogeneous and complete. To each of the three classes of women an integral number of pages was now allotted.

THE FIRST γ REDACTION. There is no need to say that this very careful distribution was disastrously confounded on the transference of the section to pages of γ capacity; but, as the material in hand did not suffice to fill seven of these, the 'Dš castorum corporum' received a second augmentation in the picturesque and theologically significant sentence 'Regalem ianuam . . . introeant et in agni perpetuo comitatu . . . permaneat'.

THE SECOND AND THIRD γ REDACTIONS. The *pallium* which is the subject-matter of the formula of investiture, 'Accipe puella' &c. (Mur. ii 675), was a token of irrevocable dedication to a life of religious virginity; and its employment with that specific symbolism would seem to date, in at least the Frankish kingdom, from the latter half of the sixth century.³ Subjoined to that formula is a blessing which is in equally remarkable contrast to the preceding 'Dš castorum corporum' on the one hand and to the subsequent 'Benedicat te dš' on the other. The 'Dš castorum corporum' discerns in religious virginity a shadow of the mystical union of the Church with her Divine Lord, and makes none but an oblique and suggestive reference to her whose Son He was—'qui sic perpetuae uirginitatis est sponsus quemadmodum perpetuae uirginitatis est filius'. The benediction embodied in the 'Accipe

¹ 'Ut . . . centenarium munus . . . accipiat.'

² 'Ut . . . fructum tricesimum sortiatur.'

³ I believe that the earliest extant mention of the nun's *pallium* is by experts held to be that contained in Canon 20 of the Second Council of Tours in A.D. 567.

puella'¹ mentions by name 'St Mary the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ' and exhibits her as the exemplar of a 'whole and spotless virginity'. But in the 'Benedicat te d̄s' she is depicted as patroness of the nun's cowl, if not as actually clothed in it—'ut maneat . . . sub uestimento sc̄ae mariae'. The three constituents—'D̄s castorum corporum', 'Accipe puella pallium', 'Benedicat te d̄s'—would therefore seem to be separated from each other as distinctly, if not as widely, in the order of time as the third is severed from the second in respect of theological accuracy and artistic propriety; so that I have no hesitation in assigning the third to the last of the γ redactions and the second to the previous recension, γ_2 .

To the last redaction I assign, besides the 'Benedicat te', the formulae of investiture for widows in the proper and in the secondary sense of the word—'Visibilium et inuisibilium' &c., and 'Inlumina quaesumus' &c., not only because in the order of thought they are later than the 'Accipe puella pallium' of γ_2 , but because the first of them contains, in the words 'desuper gratia tua inrigante', what is perhaps the earliest of surviving documentary evidences to the comparatively late usage of the sprinkling with hallowed water of apparel devoted to a sacred use,² and also because its 'ut benedicere et sc̄ificare facias' must have been written by a Frankish pen, or by a pen influenced by Frankish modes of expression, for its idiom is not Latin but French—'que tu faisses bénir et sanctifier'.³

I have already assigned to γ_3 the 'nec turbatae . . . occurrant' clause⁴ in three lines of characteristically Merovingian Latin thrust into the 'D̄s castorum corporum'; and it is by no means unlikely that its length was so devised as to make the phrase 'Accipe . . . infernorum' coincide with the end of a page. But, however this may be, that clause together with the three consecutive paragraphs which, with their rubrics, form a connecting bond between the two items of the present section, conspire to yield a total of ten pages, as against the nine pages of my second γ redaction.

¹ It begins with the words 'Benedicat te conditor caeli et terrae'.

² Let us remember that it is our document which, in the preceding section (Mur. ii 669), contains the oldest explicit mention as yet extant of the use of chrism at ordinations. See scheme γ_3 in list of values on p. 232 *supra*.

³ A still more interesting example of transitional Latin occurs in the so-called *Missale Gothicum*, where, on the Feast of the Decollation of the Baptist (Mur. ii 625), we have not only a Spanish idiom but a Spanish word as well—'sub trina invocatione *estan* dicentes', *están diciendo*. I accept *estan* as authentic, *pace* Mabillon, who turns it into *cantant*.

⁴ See above, p. 239.

SECTION IV. THE CONSECRATIO ALTARIS.

1. There can be no doubt that at some period in the history of our document the *Consecratio Altaris* ended with the long prayer rubricated *Ad omnia* (Mur. ii 679); for this is of the nature of a final and comprehensive summary, and by implication excludes, as later than itself, the two constituents—with their rubric '*Praefatio chrismalis*'—which now follow it. But on careful scrutiny we note that the prayer has, in its latter half, a marvellous and intolerable 'ut diximus' (nine letters), inserted parenthetically; and, at its close, the words 'quibus inter nos et aeternam unitatem in superno meatu sine fine constare credimus' (70 letters), words which, while they have no nexus with the preceding context, are both unintelligible and devoid of construction. These two batches of text must therefore be distinguished from the remainder of the constituent; for this, though verbose and loosely composed, has a clearly discernible grammatical framework and allows us to know what it means. I believe them to have been introduced between the first and last of the γ redactions in order that, together with the evidently supplementary *Praefatio Chrismalis* and other material, presently to be determined, they might give the section its present value of six γ pages.

2. That material I believe to be the directive rubric '*Ponis super cornua altaris*' &c.; partly because it severs the bidding-prayer, 'Di patris' &c., from its proper heading; partly because the only other directive rubrics in the document would seem to be of late insertion; partly because the materialism¹ of its '*offeret incensum super altare odorem suavissimum dño*'—like that of the last two constituents, one of which describes the ciborium as a bier, while the other calls it a sepulchre—betokens, for ethical reasons, a comparatively recent date; and, more especially, because its value, if added to that of the presumable *addimenta* just notified, yields a total which has the value of one γ page: thus—

¹ For a similar, if exaggerated, instance compare the following passage from the *Immolatio missae*—i. e. the Preface—of the Mass for St Laurence in the '*Missale Gothicum seu Gothicogallicanum*', as Mabillon styles it (Mur. ii 628): '*Strident membra uiuentia super craticulam imposita; et prunis saeuientibus anhelantes* [?' *anhelantis*'] *incensum suum in modum thymiamatis diuinis naribus exhibent odorem.*'

This reminds me that, when preparing my article on the Leonianum (*J. T. S.* vol. x p. 65) for the press, I overlooked a memorandum of my own calling attention to the resemblance of the foregoing passage to the addition which I conceive Pope Hilarus to have made to the first text of the Preface of Leon. XXI xi. The compiler of the 'Gothic' Mass for St Laurence may have got his facts, or supposed facts, from the Leonianum; but men like Leo the Great and Hilarus would have shuddered at his '*diuinis naribus exhibent odorem*'.

<i>Ponis super cornua altaris</i> &c.	149 letters =	5 γ lines
<i>Dignare domine deus</i> &c.	795-716 letters = [27-25 =]	2 " "
<i>Praefatio chrismalis</i>	19 " =	1 " "
<i>Oremus fratres carissimi</i> &c.	162 " =	6 " "
<i>Omnipotens deus trinitas</i>	186 " =	7 " "
		<u>Total 21 γ lines</u>

In the subjoined table the fourth and fifth columns of linear values shew that if we assume the directive '*Ponis super cornua*' &c., to be proper to one or other of the γ schemes, the brief, pithy, and comprehensive paragraph, 'Fiant omnia ista protectione tua tuta atque defensa potens dñe uasa', may have occupied the last two lines of a θ page; while the sixth column shews that if we assume the directive *Ponis super cornua* &c., the material imported into the '*Dignare dñe dñ*', and the whole of the *Praefatio Chrismalis* to be still absent from the document, there not only remains material of the value of precisely five γ pages, but that this resolves itself at a logical division of the subject into two parts, one equivalent to three such pages and the other to two. In proportion, therefore, to the unlikelihood that results like these should be fortuitous is the likelihood that those details were inserted after the first γ redaction, but, regard had to their merely unacademical, but not decadent, Latin, before the third.

3. The paragraph, 'Fiant omnia ista protectione tua tuta atque defensa potens dñe uasa',¹ which my reconstruction places at the foot of a θ page, is not only isolated, comprehensive, and so singularly brief and pithy as for that reason, if for none other, to attract the attention of any careful student of the document; it, curiously enough, consists of fifty-nine letters, and then looks as if it had of set purpose been so composed as to turn to the best possible account two lines which once had carried an *explicit* now no longer needed. I mention this peculiarity at once, because I believe it to indicate a cardinal fact in the history of our document, and shall revert to it on the first relevant occasion; for our more immediate concern is, if possible, to ascertain and determine the nuclear scheme of the item.

4. The Ioannes Diaconus whose letter to Senarius has already been noticed says in that document that in his day it was a traditional custom of the Roman Church to consecrate seven altars on Holy Saturday: 'Quod de septem altaribus quae in urbe Roma sabbato paschae moris est consecrari, hoc dico quia maiores nostri . . . Illud tamen firma mente custodio quod non a maioribus tradita custodiret ecclesia nisi certa sui

¹ It may be worthy of special remark that in the Gothicogallicanum (Mabillon, 222 and 249) there are two parallels to this conjunction of *tuta* and *defensa*; 'tuti atque defensi' on St Andrew's Day, 'tutam defensamque' on Easter Eve (Muratori, ii 559 and 592; Migne, lxxii 253 B and 276 A).

		Scheme β Two pages	Scheme θ_1 Two pages	Scheme θ_2 Three pages	Scheme θ_3 Two pages	Scheme θ_{3bis} Three pages	Scheme γ_1 Five pages	Scheme $\gamma_{2(s)}$ Six pages
CONSECRATIO ALTARIS		xv 3	*	*	*	*	xxxvi 3	xli 3†
Creator et conservator &c.	189 ¹ 201 ²			xxx 7	xxxi 7	xxxi 7	7	7
<i>Praefatio consecrationis altaris</i>							1	1
<i>Ponis super cornua altaris &c.</i>	149							5
Dei patris &c.	303 ¹ , 323 ²	10 ¹	xviii 11 ¹	12 ²	12 ²	12 ²	11 ²	11 ²
<i>Benedictio altaris</i>							1	1
Deus omnipotens &c.	316 ¹ , 344 ² , 364 ³	10 ¹	12 ¹	13 ²	13 ²	13 ²	13 ³	13 ³
<i>Praefatio linteaminum</i>				1	1	1	1	1 = 4 ²
Domine . . . sicut ab initio &c.	401			15	15	15	14	xliii 14†
Explicit		2 = 25	2 = 25	2 = 50				
Last page		xvi	xx	xxxii				
		BOOK ENDS	BOOK ENDS	BOOK ENDS				
Fiant omnia ista &c.	59				2 = 50	2 = 50	2	2
<i>Ad consecrandam patenam</i>					Page xxxii			
Consecramus &c.	119				ends	xxxiii 2	1	1
<i>Item alia</i>						4	4	4 = 21
Consecrare &c.	107						1	xliiii 1†
<i>Ad calicem consecrandum</i>						4	4 = 63	4
Oremus dilectissimi &c.	166					1	xxxviii 1	1
<i>Item collectio</i>						6	6	6
Dignare domine calicem &c.	226						1	1
						8 = 25	8	8 = 21
<i>Ad omnia</i>						Page xxxiii		
Dignare domine deus &c.	716 ¹ , 795 ²					ends	1	xlv 1†
							25 ¹ = 42	27 ²
<i>Praefatio chrismalis</i>							Page xl	
Oremus fratres carissimi &c.	162						ends	1
Omnipotens deus &c.	186							6
								7 = 42
								Page xlv
								(xlviii) ends

† In Redaction γ_2 these four pages are numbered, respectively, xliii, xlv, xlvi, xlvii.

ratio poposcisset.' After dwelling at some length and with no slight emphasis on the antiquity of the custom, and thus giving us to understand that it must have existed long before the age of Leo the Great, he turns to another subject: 'Quod autem quaesisti cur in sacratissimum calicem lac mittatur ac mel, et paschae sabbato cum sacrificiis offeratur, illud in causa est quia scriptum est in ueteri testamento . . . "Introducā uos in terram repromissionis, terram fluentem lac et mel".'¹

Now, since the surviving fragment of the Leonianum provides (Mur. i 318) for the blessing of milk and honey on Whitsun Eve, we may reasonably infer that if its missing portion ever comes to light this will be found to provide for the paschal blessing as well, and also to have at least one form for the blessing of the seven altars, which form will be seen to correspond to one or other of the three standards of pagination, θ , α , β .

Instructed, therefore, as we now are concerning the relation which the *editio princeps* of the forms of ordination in our second section bore to the corresponding forms extant in the surviving portion of the Leonianum, we thus have an exceedingly strong presumption that the *editio princeps* of our *Consecratio Altaris* was substantially identical with some one item of those provided for Holy Saturday in the unhappily lost portion of that document: but, inasmuch as the ceremonial use of incense was not practised in the Roman Church as early as the fifth century, and since it is morally certain that holy water was as little used then in the dedication of altars² as it was at a much later date in the dedication of churches, we must not assume that any such item made even a suggestive reference to either incensation or aspersion.

¹ Migne S. L. lix 405 A.

² The well-known letter of Pope Vigilius to Profuturus of Braga (A.D. 538) is explicit as to this: 'De fabrica uero cuiuslibet ecclesiae, si diruta fuerit, et si in eo loco consecrationis solemnitas debeat iterari in quo sanctuaria [i. e. *relics*] non fuerint, nihil iudicamus officere si per eam minime aqua exorcizata iactetur; quia consecrationem cuiuslibet ecclesiae in qua sanctuaria non ponuntur celebritatem tantum scimus esse Missarum. Et ideo si qua sanctorum basilica a fundamentis etiam fuerit innouata, sine ulla dubitatione cum in ea missarum fuerit celebrata solemnitas totius sanctificationis consecrationis impletur.'

The words 'ecclesiae uel' in our first constituent look like an intrusive addition. Neither their presence nor their absence affects the older theory here laid down by Pope Vigilius that a church receives its dedication *ipso facto* from the first celebration of the holy mysteries at its altar, but I suspect them to have been added at a period, perhaps that of γ_3 , when the newer theory was in course of evolution. That the older theory prevailed in, at least, some parts of Gaul late in the sixth century is evident from what St Gregory of Tours (*Gloria Confessorum* § 116) says of the cellula in which St Radegund was buried, and of a church at Tours (*Vitae Patrum* viii 8), both of them consecrated by himself; as also of an oratory erected by Abbot Senoch in memory of St Martin (*ib.* xv 1). The references in Migne S. L. are lxxi 906 B, 1047 C, and 1071 B, C.

Hence it follows that, if we are to subject our 'Dī patris oīptis' and our 'Dē oīp. in cuius honorem' to a stichometrical test—for, manifestly, these two constituents, if any, are of the Roman nucleus postulated by the hypothesis—we shall in all probability be well advised if we assume the phrase 'spāli placatus incenso' (twenty letters) to have had no place in the former and 'et sp̄s sc̄i tui semper rore perfusa' (twenty-eight letters) to have had no place in the latter.

This borne in mind, I observe, what the reader will see on consulting the syllabus of values, that, to fill to their utmost capacity in the first instance, the penultimate page of a β quire—for, by the hypothesis the nucleus of the present section was the last item of a carefully composed pontifical enshrined in a libellus executed with the minute skill which befitted an altar-book intended for the use of an officiating prelate—and, in the second, the penultimate page of a quinion of θ pagination, we want in the one case text equivalent to twenty β lines, two more being reserved for an explicit, and, in the other, besides two lines similarly reserved, text equivalent to twenty-three θ lines; and I note with more pleasure than surprise that, if only we exclude from computation the two phrases 'spāli placatus incenso' and 'et sp̄s sc̄i tui semper rore perfusa' from the 'Dī patris oīptis' and the 'Dē in cuius honorem', thus lowering 323 letters to 303 and 344 to 316, we have precisely the values needed.

4. But, on the other hand, if, when we reach the second θ redaction, we are careful to remember that by the hypothesis this, like the second θ redaction of the forms for ordering deacons, priests and bishops, was executed in Gaul, where incensation¹ and aspersion were widely, if not universally, practised in the latter half of the fifth century; and if, thus remembering, we assume that the constituents 'Creator et conseruator' &c., and 'Dñe dē oīp sicut ab initio' &c., were now introduced into the item and, further, that the phrases 'spāli placatus incenso' and 'et sp̄s sc̄i tui semper rore perfusa' were now incorporated into the 'Dī patris oīptis' and the 'Dē in cuius honorem', we have, together with an explicit on two lines, precisely what is needed to make the first instalment of our document fill a libellus of two θ quires to the very last line of its penultimate page, just as it had similarly filled a single β quire in the first instance and a libellus of five membranes at the first θ redaction.

¹ Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epp.* viii 14) writes, in or about the year 473, to Principius, Bishop of Soissons, 'Uos uero tacturi paginam altaris, nihil, ut audio, offertis ignis alieni; sed, comitantibus uictimis caritatis castitatisque, fragrantissimum incensum turibulis cordis adoletis'. Whether read by itself or read in the light of its context, this passage seems to prove that though Principius did not burn incense at Soissons, his correspondent at Clermont did. (Migne *S. L.* lviii 612 B.)

5. (1) Between the formula 'Fiant omnia ista' &c., final and conclusive at redaction θ_3 , and the *Ad omnia* 'Dignare dñe dñs oñp.' &c., final and conclusive at γ_1 , there are four constituents which invite notice. Of these the address 'Consecramus et sc̄ificamus' is irregular, for, though it serves as a bidding-prayer, it does not begin with the customary 'Oremus dilectissimi'; while the 'Consecrare' &c. is suggestive of a new literary era, for it contains the low-Latin form 'per istam unctionem' in the sense of 'per hanc unctionem'. We must therefore be careful not to assume that the group is part of the third θ text.

(2) No doubt, they play their part spontaneously enough in γ_1 , where they help to give the section its value of five pages; but they would not do this were it not for the two minor rubrics *Item alia* and *Item collectio*, both of which are intrusive and both of which, even if they were not intrusive, are ridiculously inaccurate. We must therefore be careful to abstain from assuming that they had not been brought into the document before the first γ redaction.

But, if we eliminate the offending rubrics, there remains enough to fill precisely one θ page. Although, therefore, I cannot at the present moment divine its bibliographical *raison d'être*, I attribute the group to a review intermediate between θ_3 and γ_1 , to which I assign the symbol ' θ_3 bis'; for the two facts just noted give us reason to suspect that in the course of the θ_3 period the volume must have been unbound and taken to pieces in order that, the first and second quires (pp. i-xxxii) remaining untouched, the next following fasciculi might be retranscribed and new work incorporated into them. Our analysis must be continued with this possibility borne carefully in mind as, at least, a working hypothesis.

MARTIN RULE.