

a few still appear in the text of the English editors. One who has followed the work of Berger, both in *ff* and in his painful deciphering of the palimpsest *hæta*, can testify to his general accuracy—far surpassing that of all others who have been in the same field before him.

Description of the Codex.

The early history of the MS is involved in utter obscurity. The copyist left no record of his name or his environment.

The MS belonged formerly to the Benedictine Monastery of Corbey near Amiens—once the home of many precious records of the early Christian ages¹. It has now found a new home in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, where it is numbered Lat. 17,225.

The Codex has lost three out of eight quires in St Matthew. The first three quires have perished down to xi 16 (not xi 6 as Belsheim says). The first leaves of ancient MSS seem most exposed to loss: *ε* has lost its first five quires. Two leaves are missing from St John containing xvii 15–xviii 9 and xx 23–xxi 8 respectively. Three leaves are wanting in St Luke; two of these were consecutive and contained xi 45–xii 6. Happily St Mark is complete except that three leaves—the last two and the third of Quire xxvi—are mutilated. The first two extant leaves of St Matthew are also slightly mutilated².

The Codex originally consisted of twenty-seven gatherings of eight, and a gathering now consisting of five separate leaves, but which may have once been a ternion. The quires of the MS were as follows: i–iii (lost), iv–xiii, xiv (1 and 8 lost), xv–xviii, xix (4, 5, and 7 lost), xx–xxviii.

About two centuries ago (so it appears) the extant leaves were numbered throughout, but carelessly enough, inasmuch as two consecutive leaves are both numbered 55 and two other consecutive leaves are marked 88. The last leaf is numbered 190, and the Codex therefore, in its present form, contains neither 190 nor 191, as has been previously stated, but 192 leaves.

Twenty-three signatures are found at the foot of the inner margin of the verso side of leaves numbered 8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 55 bis, 63, 71, 79, 92, 100, 108, 116, 121, 129, 137, 145, 153, 161, 169, 177, and 185. The leaf that followed 85 and was signed xiiii is lost.

In addition to the mode of numbering by quaternions signed at the foot of the page there survives a trace of another method of counting by binions. On fol. 48 verso under the title is written the letter R by

¹ Some account of this ancient Benedictine House may be found in *Delisle Cœ. des MSS.* ii p. 104.

² The verses lost through this mutilation are St Matt. xi 20; xii 3; St Mark ix 19, 23, 24, 28, and in part 18, 20, 29, 31, 33; xvi 17 (except three letters), and in part 16, 18, 20.

the same hand that wrote the signature uiiii below. Now this R stood originally on the seventy-second leaf of the MS, and $4 \times 18 = 72$.

Berger has found the letter G at the foot of one of the pages of the Fleury Palimpsest. Similarly the S. Germain MS uses letters as well as numerals in its signatures (*Old Latin Biblical Texts* i pp. vii, viii). The peculiarity in our MS is (1) the numbering by binions, (2) the position of the index letter.

State of Preservation.

The vellum is exceedingly fine, so much so that when photographed the letters on the other side appear through the vellum. Looking at a photo of fol. 48 verso one might easily read *adcepit* in St John iii 32 for *adcepit* owing to part of the letter *m* of *homo* being visible through the vellum.

Some pages of the MS—notably fol. 49 verso—are as clear to-day as when they left the hand of the copyist fifteen centuries ago; but others are faded and only fully decipherable by one who has given some years of study to the MS as a whole.

Rulings and Prickings.

There are two columns of twenty-four lines on each page. Every page before being written on has been accurately ruled with twenty-four horizontal lines and four vertical lines. To guide the horizontal ruling a vertical line of twenty-four prickings was first made, extending down the page and about three inches from the right-hand edge of the vellum.

Each vellum leaf measures 28.5 cm. by 24.5 cm., or $11\frac{1}{4}$ in. by $9\frac{5}{8}$ in. (approximately the measurement of *e*); but originally was somewhat larger, having been clipped in the process of binding.

The leaves are now bound in a binding not more than 200 years old, and uniform with that of other MS books in the Library.

The composition and colour of the ink is a valuable clue in determining the age and history of a MS. The ink used by the original scribe had a yellowish infusion in it, and the process of centuries has now given to it a beautiful sheen. The uncial correctors also employed ink of the same yellowish shade. The ink employed by the older of the two Vulgate correctors had a violet tint. There is a close resemblance between the ink of *h^{acta}* and that of the Uncial correctors of *ff*, and both seem to belong to the fifth century.

Orthography of the MS.

The Compendia are only those found in the most ancient MSS, and some are peculiar to *ff*:

\overline{ds} , \overline{dm} , \overline{di} , \overline{do} (the full form *dii* is used in the nom. plur.; *deus* in full is found once).

\overline{dns} , \overline{dms} , \overline{doms} (once), \overline{dom} (*dominus* in full is found twice; \overline{dmn} is not found).

$\overline{ih̄s}$, $\overline{ih̄m}$, $\overline{ih̄um}$, $\overline{ih̄u}$, $\overline{ih̄o}$ (the voc. is $\overline{ih̄s}$ 4/7).

\overline{xps} , \overline{xpm} , \overline{xpi} , \overline{xpo} , \overline{xpe} .

\overline{sps} , \overline{spm} , \overline{spui} , \overline{spo} , \overline{spu} (the full form is found fairly often in the sing., and is usual in the plural)

\overline{scs} , \overline{snc} (once), \overline{scm} , \overline{sci} , \overline{sco} (but as often as not the form is written in full, viz. \overline{spu} *sancto*).

The following ligatures occur, but only at the end (or near the end) of a line :

With *u* : *ua*, *uc*, *ue*, *ul*, *um*, *un* (in *unt* and *unc*), *up*, *ur*, *us*, *ut*, *uu* (*ui* is not found).

With *n* : *nc*, *ne*, *ns*, *nt*.

With *o* : *os* (frequent in *i*).

With *e* (as second letter) : *ae*, *ne*, *ue*, *re*.

The ligatures *unt* and *unc* are also found.

At the end of a line the letters *m* and *n*, and the combination *nt*, are frequently expressed by a little line above the preceding letter. This line when by the original scribe is very thin and straight and is shorter when placed over the letter *e* than elsewhere. In the archetype, as in the MS, *m* and *nt* must have been expressed in the same way ; for we find *verbunt* = *verbum*, and conversely *possum* = *possunt*, *sitium* = *situnt*, *cum* = *cunt*, and many other confusions of the same kind. The combinations *ue* and *us* are represented by a single point in the middle of the preceding letter : thus *quinq.*, *sedentib.*, and even *ann.* This abbreviation, however, is more rarely employed than in later MSS. We find also *ali* without a point for *alius*, which postulates the occurrence of the same abbreviation in the archetype.

The beginning of every column is marked by a rather larger letter, as is the beginning of each paragraph. At the beginning of a paragraph this initial letter projects slightly into the margin.

Punctuation by the scribe himself is exceedingly rare. He sometimes punctuates both after and before certain short words and abbreviations, such as *·va.*, *·os.*, *·o.*, and *·scm.*; and as a rule puts a point after numerals, as *xii.*; even *·x·x·x·* with four points is found. But he does not act consistently in his method of punctuation. In the whole of St Mark's Gospel (if we except the pointing of numerals) there are only five stops. In the other Gospels the stops by the first hand are almost equally rare. For I suspect that not a few of the points marked by me in these Gospels ought to be attributed to an early corrector rather than to the original scribe. Where, however, there has been any doubt I have always punctuated. On p. 130, containing St Luke xvi 4-13, there are quite twenty stops in a very ancient hand—the hand that added *n* to octogi-

in line 18 of col. 1. Six of these stops, which resemble those of the original scribe (and may conceivably have been his), are retained.

Capitula.

As regards the Capitula, found in our MS but wanting in most old Latin MSS, there is good reason to believe that they did not form part of the archetype from which the text of *ff* was copied, but were gathered from another MS which had affinities with the parent of the DPGQ *aur c* group, whose Capitula are given by Wordsworth and White in their edition of the Vulgate Gospels. There occur such variations as the following:

	<i>Capitula in ff.</i>	<i>Text of ff.</i>
St John i 29	ecce agnus di qui tollit	ecce agnus di ecce qui tollit
ii 1	chana	chanaan (<i>and</i> canan)
iv 38	in labores	in labore (= <i>a</i>)
ix 7	siloam	silvae (<i>sic</i>) (<i>and</i> solam)
x 24	pharisei	iudei
xii 25	perdet	perdit
xiv 16	patrem meum	patrem
St Luke ii 28	deum	eum
xvi 20	eleazarus (= <i>e</i>)	lazarus
xix 3	minimissimo	pusillo
St Mark ii 11	ambula	vade
vii 5	edere	manducare
ix 35	infans	puer
xi 30	fuit	est
xii 38	iscribis	scribis
xvi 19	in celis	in celum (= Iren.)

The Capitula of St Matthew are lost.

The forms in the Capitula are nearer to the Vulgate—especially in the matter of Proper Nouns—than those in the Text.

The antiquity of the MS from which these variations were drawn is shewn by the occurrence of such forms in the Capitula as *iscribis* and *minimissimo*; and by the indiscriminate use of the accusative or the ablative after the common prepositions *a* and *de*. This MS, however, must have had affinities with the archetype of *ff*, since both have such ancient spellings as *possessio* and *ams*, while exhibiting the same popular grammatical forms, most patently in the matter of prepositions and their cases.

In the Capitula of St Mark we find in *synagogam hominem sanavit*; *de colonos*; *de septem fratres*; *de xpm*: *de lapides*; *dormiens in naviculam*; *a legionem*; *de septem panes*; *cum ihm*—the classical usage being the exception and the unclassical or popular usage the rule.

Similarly in the text of *ff*, we find *decollavit eum in carcerem; cum discipulos; de montem; de iacobo et iohannem; cum moysen; docere in synagogam; ab orientem; ab orationem; and many others similar to these.* But in the text the ratio of classical usage is somewhat greater.

As regards the paragraphs in *ff*, they exhibit a curious correspondence with those in *e*. It may be roughly stated that five out of every six breaks in the narrative in *e* are also found in *ff*. A minute examination of the punctuation and paragraphs in the MSS *a* and *b* might disclose an early dividing up of the text common to all the earliest Old Latin MSS; but unfortunately the materials for such a study are not yet available.

The Argument to St Luke's Gospel.

Immediately after the Capitula of St Luke's Gospel there occurs in our MS a remarkable Prologue or Argument.

This Argument in an amended state has been printed by Bianchini in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, and reprinted by Migne (*Patrol. Lat.* xii p. 499). A somewhat fuller, and (so it appears) later, form of the Argument is found in the Spanish codices C and T of the Vulgate, and may be seen in Wordsworth and White's *St Luke* p. 271. Had Bianchini been acquainted with either of these codices he would not have been obliged to have had recourse to conjecture in amending the text of *ff*¹.

The style and the matter of the Argument bear a certain resemblance to that of the Muratori Fragment, and both probably came from a Greek original. Hence in the Prologue we find the form *lucas* instead of the form *lucanus* which is found everywhere else.

With the statement: 'itaque perquam necessariam statim in principio sumpsit ab iohannis nativitate,' may be compared that of the Fragment: 'et idem prout assequi potuit ita ut (MS et) ab (MS ad) nativitate iohannis incipe[re]t dicere.'

The reading *boeotia* of our MS is opposed by the reading *bytinia* in C T. But *boeotia* has the weighty support of Jerome (*De vir. illus.* c. 7), who states that St Luke composed his book 'in the countries of Achaia and Boeotia'. Tischendorf also quotes the subscription to St Luke's Gospel in the cursive MS 293 at Paris as *εγραφη εν τη αττικη της βοιωτιας*. And a further confirmation of the testimony of *ff* is afforded by the reading found in the Codex Amiatinus (*Prolog. in Evv.*) *boeti*, which can only point to *boeotiae* or *boeotie*.

The Prologue has every evidence of being composed in very early times. The style is as awkward and involved, and the writing almost as faulty, as that of the Muratori Fragment. That it occurs embedded

¹ For *prophetavimus* Bianchini conjectured *propheta ultimus*; but CT read *propheta unus*, which was no doubt the reading of the archetype of *ff*.

in our MS, of which it is no component part (compare the spelling of *lucas, mattheum, sp̄o*), is an important witness to the antiquity of the strata in which it occurs. No such Argument is found before either St John or St Mark (the beginning of St Matt. is wanting). Belsheim notices the Argument and calls it 'prologus perantiquus', but quotes only five lines from it with one false reading *antiochenus* for *anthiocensis*.

Sections, Chapters, Subscriptions.

There is no notation in the margin of the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons. In this the MS resembles *e*. Another curious point of resemblance with *e* is that although *e* has no general numbering of chapters, one number (lxxviii) is actually found embedded in that part of the text of St Luke xxiv to which the same number is affixed in *ff*. Tischendorf who edited *e* exclaims in surprise: 'In quem locum quo casu iste numerus irreperit difficile dixeris. Neque enim capitulorum aut canonorum numeri de quibus cogitare possis, ullo modo conveniunt.' The mystery is solved if we admit that the archetype of *e* had a numbering of its chapters agreeing with that of *ff*, and the D P G Q *aur c* group to which reference has already been made. The same numeration is found in the Irish MS *r*.

The headings of the pages are of the simplest description. On the left-hand page is written *euangelium sec* or *euangelium*. On the right-hand page is written *matteum, iohannem* (or *ioadhem* (once) or *ioadnem* (twice)), *lucanum, marcum* (or *sec marcum*). Of the first four leaves of the Gospel of St John, three lack the name of the Evangelist.

The subscriptions at the end of each Gospel are thus worded:

(1) EUANGEL | SECUNDŪ | MATHEŪ | EXP INC | EUANGELIŪ | SECUNDŪ | IOHANNEM.

(2) EUANGELIŪ | SEC IOHANNĒ | EXPL INC | EUANGELIUM | SECUNDUM | LUCANUM | AMEN.

(3) EXPL EUĀ | GELIUM SEC | LUCANUM | INCP CAPITULA | EUANGELII | SECUNDUM | MARCUM.

(4) EXPLICIT | EUANGELIUM | SECUNDUM | MARCUM.

The occurrence of the form *matheum* in the subscription instead of the form *matteum*, which occurs at the head of each leaf in the Gospel, is not perhaps without its significance. It may be that these subscriptions were not found in our scribe's archetype, but were added by him from some other MS, possibly the MS from which he obtained the Capitula.

Correctors of the MS.

The MS was examined by two if not more uncial correctors who were little more than a century removed in point of time from the scribe. The first of these correctors (probably the *diorthota*) made a few

corrections in a beautiful uncial hand very like that of the scribe himself. An example of the work of this corrector appears in St Luke xviii 31. The first hand wrote *de* before *prophetas*. The corrector drew a fine line across the *d* from right to left, wrote *p* above and added *r*, thus changing *de* into *per*. The ink he used was of a slightly darker shade of yellow than that of the scribe himself. Again, in St Luke ix 3, the first hand wrote *petram*, but discovering his mistake drew a line through the *t*. The corrector, however, with more zeal than discretion restored *petram*¹. Examples of the work of the second uncial corrector may be seen in St Luke vii 13 and xiv 14, where the letter *m* is added, but somewhat above the line of writing, to *miseriordia* and *resurrectione*, thus, *miseriordia^m*, *resurrectione^m*. His corrections are confined to St Luke. This second uncial corrector I suspect to be the inserter of the twenty stops on p. 140. The ink he used resembles that of the first hand, but its tint of yellow is slightly paler and exactly the tint of *h^{acts}*.

In addition to these two correctors, who did little to deface the beauty of the MS, at least three other hands have left their impress on the Codex. The two earliest of these both used Vulgate MSS, to the standard of which they sought to bring the Old Latin text of our MS; and therein they had a difficult task. They both write in minuscules, but they differ from each other both in handwriting and in the shade of the ink employed. The earlier of the two belongs to the eighth or ninth century, and the more recent to the twelfth century. Examples to the writing of the earlier of the two may be seen in the marginal note of St Matt. xiii 50: *In lib. ii sup apocalyp̄. odituri (sic) ubi iesubel meretricē dīc. ponendā in lectū cū eis q̄ cū ea fornicantur.* [Cf. Rev. ii. 22.] Again, on the opposite side of the same leaf, against the Parable of the Pearl, the same hand added: *In lib. secū apocalyp̄s. odituri ubi ait q̄ vicerit dabo illi calculū candidum.* His third and last devotional note is in the margin against St Matt. xxv 15: *In lib. apoc audituri ubi ait dabo unicuiq; vestrum secūm opera vestra.* The same hand inserted in the Capitula of St Luke (at the end of xliii): *et de ficu quae fructum non rettulit et de cophinum stercoris.* This corrector, so it seems, in St Matt. xxv 43 corrected *venimus ad te*, the mistake of the original scribe, by writing above it: *non venistis ad me*, and two verses later corrected *minis* into *mini^ms*. He also added *quem quæris* (sic) after *quid ploras* in St John xx 13. The ink of this scribe had a violet infusion.

But the most active by far of all the correctors was the second Vulgate hand. He has left scarcely a column of the MS in the first three Gospels untouched. He deftly changed many an *e* into *ae*, by adding a tail to the *e*, and in every way did what he could to make the MS

¹ It is not without significance that *e* has here the same blunder and reads *petram* uncorrected.

resemble the Vulgate text of the twelfth century. A sample of his writing is seen on the margin of St John iii 32, where he substitutes *hoc testatur* for *testimonium perhibet*. It is easily distinguished by the colour of its ink as well as by the shape of its letters. The same scribe busied himself in inserting semicolons, and in making efforts to shew (where the continuous writing seemed to require it) the proper division of the text into separate words. He treated the original writing with but scant respect, and in some cases he wellnigh extinguished it by writing over it his corrections. All his many and laborious corrections have been ignored. The only corrections admitted have been those of the two uncial correctors, except that in a very few cases—one of which has been just referred to (St Matt. xxv 43)—a needed correction inserted by the first Vulgate corrector has been retained with a note stating to whom the correction is due. It is remarkable that neither of the two Vulgate correctors touched St Mark.

The last corrector of the MS uses a black modern ink, and corrects in imitative uncials. Some of his corrections are inept in the extreme. He defaces with black ink the letters he wishes away. To him, we must admit, falls the honour of correcting in St Luke xi 18 the egregious blunder of the first hand which escaped all the other correctors, viz. *si et sanatas sanatum eicit*. He is not so happy, however, when in St Luke ix 24 he suspects something wrong in the words *auferte ab illo mna*, and so inserts the word *decem* before *mna*! Other examples of this good man's officiousness are seen in St Mark viii 7, where he corrects *paucus* into *paocus* (instead of *paucos*); and in St John xi 11 where he inks over the letters *iv* in true modern schoolboy fashion and makes *dormit* out of *dormivit*.

The work of the earlier correctors of the MS shews no acquaintance with the Latin idiom or even with the rudiments of the Latin language. The insertion of punctuation in the middle of a word, the blundering attempts to correct obvious errors, the failure even to detect the most palpable mistakes of the first hand—all bear witness to the MS having lain for centuries in the keeping of men who knew little or nothing of the Latin tongue. Not until we come to the twelfth-century corrector do we find any intelligence brought to bear on the MS—and even then not of a high order.

Internal Evidence as to date.

Whilst *ff* has features common to all old MSS of the Latin Gospels, it has also some noteworthy peculiarities. One of these (shared by *d*) is the occurrence of the forms *dms*, *dmi*, *dmo*, *dme* alongside of the usual forms *dns*, *dni*, *dno*, *dne*. The form *dms* instead of *dns* has been noted as occurring in the St Gall MS *n* of the fifth century, and has

been spoken of by von Arx, the librarian of St Gall, as 'a characteristic sign of MSS of the third or fourth century'. It would have been more correct to have said 'up to and including the fifth century'.

The following table will shew the relative occurrence of both forms in the text of *ff*.

St Matthew		St John		St Luke		St Mark		Totals.	
$\overline{d}n\overline{i}$	1	2		16		2		21	
$\overline{d}m\overline{i}$	5	1		8		0		14	
$\overline{d}n\overline{o}$	2	2		5		1		10	
$\overline{d}m\overline{o}$	0	1		5		2		8	
$\overline{d}n\overline{s}$	2	2		3		0		7	
$\overline{d}m\overline{s}$	18	2		24		8		52	
$\overline{d}n\overline{e}$	17	27		18		1		63	
$\overline{d}m\overline{e}$	7	6		7		0		20	
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	22 30		33 10		42 44		4 10		101 94

Hence it appears that $\overline{d}m\overline{s}$ is the general form and not $\overline{d}n\overline{s}$, whilst $\overline{d}n\overline{e}$, on the contrary, is found three times out of four. In the Capitula of St Luke $\overline{d}m\overline{s}$ occurs 9/10. The accusative is always $\overline{d}m$. In *d* I have noticed the interesting fact that $\overline{d}om$ is the form used in St Luke and St John; $\overline{d}mn$ (*dnm*) that used in St Mark and St Matthew.

A second peculiarity in the orthography of the MS is the representation of *-nt* by a line over the preceding letter, viz., $\overline{er}\overline{a}$ = *erant*; $\overline{indig}\overline{e}$ = *indigent*; $\overline{er}\overline{u}$ = *erunt*; $\overline{vener}\overline{i}$ = *venerint*. This abbreviation occurs forty-nine times in St Luke, twenty-seven times in St Mark, nine times in St John, and only twice in St Matthew (the first ten chapters of which are lost). It is not found in the Capitula of St John, but occurs once in the Capitula of St Luke, and four times in the Capitula of St Mark. Thus the abbreviation occurs in the Codex ninety-two times in all.

A third and interesting feature in the orthography of our MS is the use of the form *-isset, issent* for *-isset, -issent*. The occurrence of this ancient form of inflection has escaped the notice of all who have in times past commented on the Codex. Yet it appears no fewer than twelve times; once in what remains of St Matthew, four times in St John, three times in St Luke, and four times in St Mark, as the following list will indicate:

St Matt. xiv 19 et cum iussisset.

St John vii 9 haec cum dixisset.

xiii 1 cum dilexisset.

xiii 2 cum diabolus iam misisset.

xiii 26 et cum intinxisset.

St Luke vii 24 et cum discessissent.

ix 42 et cum accessisset.

xx 20 et cum recessissent.

St Mark vi 14 quod iohannis baptista surrexisset.

vi 25 cumque introisset.

xiv 45 et cum accessisset.

xv 39 quod sic clamans emisisset.

I have noted the same form once in Codex *b* in St Mark v 4.
et compedes confregisset.

Bianchini punctuates confregit: set. It is not found in any other Latin MS, nor am I aware that any one has up till now called attention to its existence.

Belsheim notices this peculiarity of our MS only once, viz. in St Luke xx 20, where the reading is

Et cum recessissē
summiserunt qui.

This with more daring than ingenuity he resolves as follows:

Et cum recessit sensum miserunt qui.

But *summiserunt* is plainly the reading of *ff* with *acilq*.

The occurrence of such an ancient form so many times in the text of *ff* is a strong argument for the antiquity of the text that contains it.

Affinities with Old French.

There is ample evidence that the original Old Latin Version was of popular rather than classical origin. It is the *lingua rustica* spoken in the Roman colonies and by the common people in Rome itself that has given birth both to the Romance languages and to the Old Latin Version. The classical idiom of Cicero was no more the language of the Roman legionaries than was the language of Dr Johnson that of the generality of the citizens of London. This being the case we should expect to find the same phonetic corruptions and the same levelling of grammatical distinctions both in Old French and in the earliest copies of the Old Latin Version. For it is well known that the Latin text of the N. T. underwent during the first four or five centuries a gradual process of refinement and of adaptation to classical usage.

Berger has already called attention to the form *iscindamus* in *ff* in St John xix 24. The form *iscribis* occurs in the Capitula of St Mark; and *pispicas* in the Capitula of St Luke. With these forms we may compare *ispiciens* in *b* (St Mark vi 41) and *ispumans* (St Mark ix 19).

The form *ab scandalis* (St Matt. xviii 7) in *ff* A F and the best Vulgate MSS, and *ab scribis* (St Mark xii 38) in *ff* *b a i K G M V X * Z*, are

survivals of the *lingua rustica* in which were found *iscandalum* and *iscribere*, the parents of the Old French *esclandre* and *escrire*. In the text of G (Paris Bib. Nat. 11553) I noticed in i St John *escribo* (ii 1) and *escimus* (iii 4). In the Fleury Palimpsest are found *iscribo*, *iscimus*, *esecuti*, *eseducere* and *istare*, and in F I have seen *istamus*, *ispirans* and *iscientia*¹.

Another feature of our MS that here calls for notice is the use of *respondes*² for *respondens* chiefly in the phrase *respondens dixit*. In St Matthew *respondes* is found 15/37. In St Luke it occurs 7/23, whilst in St Mark *respondens* is found twenty-four times and *respondes* only once³. In St John the phrase *respondens dixit* is replaced by *respondit et dixit* (*e* replaces *respondit et dixit* by *respondens dixit* in St Matt. 15/22, and in St Luke 11/22).

That *respondes* was misread by the scribe for *respondens* is unlikely when we notice that *dicens* although occurring more frequently than *respondens* is in every case spelt correctly. Moreover there is found *langues*, *ascendes*, *inclinans*, *convocas*, *significas*, *magnificas*, *manducas*, *seminatis* (= *seminantis*); and with these may be compared *expectas* and *praegnas* in *e* and *praegnatibus* in F *vg*^{alt.}. There is good reason to believe that these are all correct ancient forms which were replaced by the regular endings in later MSS.

Another peculiarity of *ff* which belonged to the vulgar speech is the phonetic insertion of *d* between two vowels in the phrase *quo audito*.

Quo audito is found only once (St Luke vii 9), whilst *quo-d-audito* occurs six times: St Matt. xiv 13, St Luke xviii 22, xx 16, St Mark vi 16, vi 29, xi 18. In St Luke xviii 22 *b* agrees with *ff* and reads *quo-d-audito*, but in this instance only. In *b* this old form has virtually disappeared; but it is preserved 5/6 in *ff*.

Phonetic Changes from Classic Forms.

The following phonetic changes are found both in *ff* and the Old French:

(a) Dropping of medial *h*: *adpreendere*, *geenna*, *ioannes*, O. Fr. *prendre*, *jean*.

(b) Of initial *h*: *abere*, *abitent*, *oram*, etc. O. Fr. *avere* = *avoir*.

(c) Change of *r* to *l*: *pelegre*, *pelegrinans*. O. Fr. *pelerin*.

¹ *Escimus* occurs for *scimus* in the *Fragment of Exegesis of the Third Century*—*JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, January, 1904.

² The Latin suffix *-ensis* was pronounced *-esis* in O. Fr. Hence *pays* is from Low Latin *pagensis*, *marquis* from *marchensis*, *bourgeois* from *burgensis*, &c. *demonstrat* in *ff* no doubt represented the vulgar pronunciation.

³ It is worthy of note that in St Mark xiv 62 *respondes* 2nd pers. sing. is altered to *respondens*, and that the only surviving *respondes* is an addition peculiar to the text of *ff*.

(d) *t* becomes *d* in O. Fr., *imperatorem* gives *emperador*. Hence *densaurus* as well as *tensaurus*.

(e) *f* interchanges with *t*: *sitim* gives *soif*. Hence *blastemia* and *blastemabant*.

(f) *s* becomes *x*: *duos* gives *deux*. Hence *vos, extimo* (= F)¹, *superunsit*.

(g) medial *s* becomes *j*. In *ff* are found *euangeliio* and *gaiophylacio* (= *b*). *Zelusos* gives *jaloux*.

(h) Hard *c* changes to *ch*: *chana, chapharnaum*.

(i) *oo* becomes *o*: *cooperire* becomes *coperire*, whence *coworir*. *ff* has *coperire*.

(j) Medial *n* becomes *t* or *d* and vice versa. *ff* has *dissitio, comstritgat, mercetnarius, vedundari, quondam* (= *quoddam*), *pitna, antendo, ioadnes*. In the *Chanson de Roland* there occurs *anpres* (= *après*) from *ad* and *pressum*.

(k) Dropping of initial *a*: *postolis*. Cf. *donec* from O. Fr. *adonc*.

(l) *oe* is softened into *e*. In *ff* *ceperunt* = *coeperunt*.

(m) Dropping of final *m*: *septe* (= *d*), *dece*. Cf. *sept* and *dix*.

(n) *-dc-* for *-cc-*: *sudcendo, sudcido*. *-cc-* in this way becomes soft *c*.

(o) *t* final falls out after *s, n,* and *l*: *posquam, es* (= *est*), *erun, vul*. Hence Lat. *post* becomes in O. Fr. *puis*. Also *e* is found for *et*.

(p) Dropping of medial *i*: *divitis, calcum*. *ff* has the old form *tirabe*.

(q) Insertion of parasitic *r*: *lithrostrorvus, adpropiat. propiam* which occurs twice in *ff* and also in *h^{acta}* is I believe the true spelling of *proprius*, which is derived from *prope* by the insertion of a parasitic second *r*. The presence of one *r* incites to the insertion of another.

The place of the aspirate in such words as *scarioht, eprhem, sepulcrhum, iosehp, osehc*, may perhaps be due to the aspirate being in early times expressed by a mark placed above the letter to be aspirated as in Greek. This misplacement of the aspirate is a striking peculiarity of *ff*.

Grammatical Variations from Classic Usage.

Cases of Nouns. There is an utter disregard of the distinction between the ablative and accusative cases after prepositions. Such forms as *intrare in regno* (thrice), *cum moysen* (= *i*), *docere in synagoga*, *de potestatem* (= *i*), *post resurrectione* (= *G*) are frequent.

We find also *in die festum, in ficulneam hac* (= *i*), *serviens nocte ac diem, propter tua loquellam, ex hoc panem, implebatur sapientiam et gratia*. Such forms as these point to the levelling of oblique cases in Low Latin, whereby the ablative was confused with the accusative².

¹ Ranke calls it an error for *existimo*.

² Compare *videt duos angelis*, St John xx 12; *ubi apostolus dicit*, St Luke Capitula; *dimittes populum unum vincium*, St Matt. xxvii 15.

The Genders of Nouns. Neuter plurals in O. Fr. were treated as fem. singular. Hence *foliam* gave (*la*) *feuille*. In *ff* we find *foliam*, *retiam*, *civarias*, *horream*, *zizaniae*, *tributam*, *aromatam*, *mannam*. There also occur *parascævem* and *marem*. *Lapis* is fem.; *faenum*, *linum*, *sal*, *altare*, and *olus* are masculine. *Corpus* is masc. in St John

xx 12.

Declension of Nouns. There is a confusion that tends to reduce all declensions to the first and second. Hence also we find *vaso*, *fructo*, *moto*, *spirito*, *iho*, *fici*, *cornum*, *ossum*. *Noctu* (= *i*) and *patruum* are also found (*fratruum* is found in *a b* St Matt. xxv 40).

The acc. plur. of masc. nouns and adjectives of the second declension ends in *-us* more frequently than in *-os*: *oculus*, *porcus*, *paucus*, *pisciculus*, *meus*, *medicus*, *discipulus*, *servus*, *illus*, *multus*, *filius*.

The nom. plur. of masc. and fem. nouns of the third declension ends as a rule in *-is*. Hence we have *principis* (*principes* is found only thrice), *militis*, *daemonis*, *famis*, *valetudinis*, *calicis*, *possessionis*, *docibilis*, *divitis*, *hominis*, *virginis*, *salutationis* (= *i*) 1/4, *voluntatis* (but always *sorores* and *gentes*).

Some participles form their nom. plur. in *-is* for *-es*: *videntis*, *habentis*, *cantis*, *ascendentis*.

The nom. sing. of substantives (or adjectives) of the third declension frequently ends in *-is* for *-es* and vice versa: *famis*, *panes vivus*, *heris*, *herodis*, *iohannis*, *austeres*. The gen. sing. often forms *-es* for *-is*: *principes*, *sermones*, *purgationes*.

The gen. plur. of *panis* is both *panum* and *panium*. The nom. plur. of *angelus* is *angelus* in St Luke ii 15. The neuter sing. of *ille* is *illum* and *illut*.

Forms of Adjectives. *Austeris* = *austerus*; *infirmis* (St Matt.) = *infirmus* [F has *sinceres* = *sinceri*]. *Minimissimo* is found as a double superlative.

Prepositions used unclassically. A mark of *ff* that calls for special notice is the instrumental use of *de*. The Codex has

de digito scribebat, St John viii 8.

extergere de linteo (= *b d f*), St John xiii 5.

tange eam de manibus tuis (= *d i*), St Mark v 23.

percutiebant eum de arundine (= *c*), St Mark xv 19.

que scripta sunt de prophetas, St Luke xviii 31.

This use of *de* = *avec* is common enough in the *Chanson de Roland*. Roland says to his sword: 'Mult larges teres *de* vus avrai cunquises,' l. 2352. Its occurrence in *c d i ff* seems to connect these MSS at least with Western Europe if not with Gaul.

Use of habere as an auxiliary. The auxiliary use of *habere*—the precursor of the forms found to-day in the Romance languages—is

another peculiarity of *ff* and *d*. In St Mark xiv 27 for the Vulgate *scandalizabimini ff d* read *scandalizari habetis*, which is in strict conformity with that O. Fr. usage, whence the Modern Fr. verb endings are derived (e. g. *parlerai* is from *parlare* and (*h*)*abeo*).

Use of qui for quis. This use noted by Tischendorf as occurring in *e* is also found in *ff*; but the classic usage is the more common.

Quicum is sometimes used in *ff* for *quicumque*.

The curious *ad alis alium* (for *ad alterutrum*) found in *a b n* is not found in *ff*.

Confusion of Active Verbs and Deponents. *ff* uses *acusarentur* for *accusarent*, *vocarentur* for *vocarent*, and *consensus erat* (St Luke xxiii 51) for *consenserat*.

Syntax of Verbs. *Misereor* governs both the gen. and the dat. : *miserere mihi* and *miserere mei* are both found in St Luke; *perhibeo* has a double acc. in St John v 37 and viii 18; *noceo* governs an acc. (St Mark xvi 16); *egeo* takes an acc.

The second and third persons sing. pres. indic. of the verb *sum* are confused; but *es* for *est* is more frequent than *est* for *es*. *Offers*, *adferet*¹, *auferet* are found for *offer*, *adfert*, *aufert*. [F has *offeret* for *offert*.] *Erint* = *erunt*.

Some verbs of the 3rd conj. in *-io* make infinitive in *-ire*: *interficire*, *diripire* (*recevoir* and *concevoir* are from *recipire* and *concipire*, not from *recipere* and *concipere*); *fugierunt* = *fugerunt*; *processierant* (= *b G*).

Verbs in *-eo* form their imperf. indic. in *-iebam*: *abiebam*. Their future is in *-iam* or *-ibo*: *transiet* or *transibit*.

Reduplicated perfects of the 3rd conj. formed with *e* for *i* are *crededi*, *tradedi* (= F), *tetegi*, *perdedi*. *Prando* has for its perf. *prandidi*. So *prendidi* for *prendi* in St John xxi 10 is found in *b* and *v^g^{Alq}*.

2nd pers. sing., imp. and plup. subj., ends in some cases in *-is* for *-es*: *scris*, *petissis*. So also *perspiciis* (= *perspicies*).

Respondite, *dicabant*, *manate*, *vexebantur* are also noteworthy.

In verbs compounded with the preposition *ad* the preposition more often than not remains unresolved: *adcipio*, *adpareo*, *adcesso*, *adcuso*.

The preposition after compound verbs is not repeated: *incidit latrones*.

Non is used for *ne* in imperatives, and also for *nonne* in interrogatives.

Spelling.

The spelling found in *ff*—or rather the absence of all uniformity of spelling—is an important witness in determining the age and history of the text. In no other ancient MS is there found such an unfixeness in the spelling. The process of levelling all variant spellings began

¹ Scrivener needlessly suspects *adferent* in *d* of being a clerical error (*Besae Codex Cantab.* p. xlii). Similarly Ranke classes *offeret* in F as a blunder.

before Augustine, and was part of that 'emending' of ancient MSS to which he refers. Thus old spellings such as *nequa*, *cottidie*, *triticum*, *eclesia*, and *nubs* found in *ff* and old Latin MSS were silently changed into *nequam*, *cotidie*, *triticum*, *ecclesia*, and *nubes*, whilst words like *chana* and *chapharnaum* and *phascha* were reduced from their vulgar form to the form they assume in the original Greek.¹

The scribe of *ff* writes *delubium* in one verse and *diluvium* in the next; *cesar* in one line and *caesar* in the next; *preses* in one verse and *praeses* in the following verse; *austeris* and in the next verse *austeres*; *grabatum* in one verse, *gravatum*¹ in the next. These variants make the task of editing the MS one that requires constant watchfulness.

In St Luke xx he writes *phascha* (v. 1), *pascha* (vv. 7, 8, 13, 15), *pasca* (v. 9), *phasca* (v. 11).

In St Matt. xxi occur *ossanna*, *ossana*, and *osanna*. The form in St John xii 13 is *osanna*; in St Mark xi 10 *ossanna*.

Iohannes occurs together with *iohannis*, *ioannes*, *ioadnis*, *ioadnes*.

Herodes is written *herodes*, *herodis*, and *erodes*.

Iscariotes is *scarioth* or *scarioht* (8/11).

Praesepium is *presipium* (3/4) and *presepium*.

Propheta is *profeta*, *propheta*, *prophetha*, and *prophaeta*.

Denarius is *dinarius* (12/14) and *denarius*.

Mattheus is *matteus*, *mhatteus* [cf. *mhattata*], *mattheus*, *matheus*.

Pharisaeus is *pharisaeus*, *phariseus*, *parisaeus*, and *pariseus*.

Gazophylacium is *gazophilacium*, *gaiophilacium*, *gaiofilacium*, *gazophylacium*, and *zaiophylacium*.

Philippus is *philippus*, *pilippus*, and *filippus*.

Grabattum is *grabatum* (2/10), *gravatum* (5/10), *grabattum* (3/10).

Elisabet is *elisabet*, *elisabeth*, and *elisabeht*.

Esaias is *esias* and *eseias*.

Barabbas is *barabas* (8/11) and *barabbas*.

Hypocrita is *hyprocita* (ten times), *hyprocyta* (once), *hyprocrita* (twice), and once *hyprocritys* for *hypocritis*. *Hypocrisis* is spelled *hyprocrisis* in G R in St Luke xii 1 (*ff* defic.), which is probably an imperfect correction of *hyprocrisis* just as *grabriel* in *e* is a correction of *grabiel* in *ff*.

There are some exceptions to this variety:

Levi is always *levvi*. So also *levvita*.

Magdalene is always *magdalenae* (except St Matt. xxvii 61 *magdelenae*).

Ilicism. The following are the commonest examples:

(1) *b* and *p*: *plaspheemia*, *piscipus*.

(2) *v* and *b*: *vivit* = *bibit*, *benit*, *vonum*, *cioum*, *serbe*, *bidimus*.

(3) *o* and *u*: *bus* = *e*, *spungia*, *hoc* = *huc*.

¹ In *b e* and *d* the spelling *grabattum* (= *vg*) is fixed, and in *a* it is only once varied (*grabbatum*).

(4) *ae, e¹, i: itenere, terri motus, cecus, ve, adcepit (= adcipit), dimittae, hec.*

(5) *y and i: praebiterium = e, hyprocritys, iherosolomys.*

(6) *x and s: vos = vox, extimo = aestimo.*

(7) *d and t: reliquid, densaurus.*

(8) *m and n: finbriam, recunbo.*

Palaeographical miscopyings. The most striking and frequent of the scribe's errors is the confusion of *m* and *nt*. *Sunt* occurs at least half a dozen times for *sum*; and even *verbunt* for *verbum*. On the contrary, *eum* is found for *eunt*, *sitium* for *sitiunt*, and *faciam* for *faciant*. The confusion no doubt arose from faulty resolution of the *lincola* that in the archetype signified both *m* and *nt*. It is an important fact that not one in twenty of our scribe's errors are corrected, and he himself erased nothing that he had once written.

(a) A syllable is lost: *constitum, tristia, phasma, exclaverunt, bedicens, diffatus, existibunt*—none of which is corrected.

or a syllable is reduplicated: *mamanus, superaveraverunt, quemquem, uniuniversum.*

or (β) a terminal letter does duty twice (*Haplography*): *quintingit, dextramanum, domuilli, multin, quaerant, nuncpistis, quiadpropiavit.*

or (γ) letters and syllables are changed round (*Metathesis*): *servientes (= esurientes), arbitetrur, xestus, lazamaphthani, eas (= aes), sanatas (= satanas), eridacare.*

The letters *m* and *n* are omitted: *ude, capharnau.*

m is confused with *s*: *sponsusm, locusm, tespestas.*

t is confused with *s, m* and *nt*: *dicit = dicis, tunicat, ceperut.*

Omission of *i*, and insertion of *i*: *qua = quia*, and *quia = qua* (*e* has the same confusion).

Omission of *s*, and insertion of *s*: *eis = ei, vestris = vestri.*

Omission of *r*, insertion of *r*: *fetum, paate, lithrostrorutrus, tronitruui.*

There is one instance of the use of *r* for *n*, *resciunt = nesciunt*; and one of *m* for *ns*, *quadram*.

Blunders of mere carelessness such as the following are distinct from those given above:

(a) *Qui non honorificat patrem non honorificat filium qui misit illum* (St John v 23).

(b) *per os sanctorum prophetaverunt.*

(c) *rabbi barabam (d has rabbi thabita).*

(d) *aepulabatur cottidie splendebat.*

So poterant is found for *propter*, *nin* for *non*, *nemo* for *me non*, *quoniam* for *vobis*, *intellege* for *in lege*, *bropterea* for *prope*.

¹ Forms in *e* constantly replace those in *ae*: *quero* is more frequent than *quaero*, and *praecipio* than *praecipio*. *Caeus* and *cecus* are about equally distributed.

The number of mere blunders, however, in *ff* is remarkably small. Their character vouches for the fact that *ff* has undergone but little emendation. The faithfulness of its text is due not a little to the total ignorance of Latin on the part of its scribe.

Homoeoteleuton. The small number of errors of Homoeoteleuton in *ff* raises a presumption that *ff* is not far removed from the archetype. In an area remote from learning there should be a rough proportion between the number of copyings and the number of errors of this kind.

The following list¹ of these errors shews how accurate was the work of the scribe of *ff* (especially in St Mark), even if all of them be attributed to him :

(1) St Matt. xi 21, quia si in tyro et Sidonae factae [essent virtutes quae factae] sunt.

(2) xii 37, unusquisque enim ex verbis suis [iustificabitur aut ex verbis suis] condemnabitur.

(3) xviii 17, quod si non audierit [eos dic ecclesiae si autem ecclesiam non audierit] tibi sicut ethnicus.

(4) xxii 11, et vidit ibi hominem non vest[itum vest]em nuptialem.

(5) xxv 21, et fidelis [quia super pauca fuisti fidelis] super multa.

(6) St John iv 5, cognovit ergo pater quia [illa hora erat in qua] dixit ei
ihs.

(7) vi 19, vigin[ta quin]q.

(8) viii 55, ego autem cognovi eum [et si dixero quia non novi eum] ero similis.

(9) xi 2, 3, frater lazarus infirmabatur [miserunt ergo . . . infirmatur] audivit.

(10) xii 24, mortuum fuerit [ipsum solum manet si autem mortuum fuerit].

(11) xiv 21, ille est qui diligit me [qui autem diligit me] diligetur (*ff* = *e*).

(12) St Luke i 41, ut audivit salutationem mariae elisabeht [exultavit infans . . . elisabeht] et exclamavit.

(13) vii 26, quid existis videre prophetam [utique dico . . . prophetam] hic est.

(14) xii 47, 48, vapulabit [multas qui autem non cognovit . . . vapulabit] paucas.

(15) St Mark xiii 30, non transiet generatio haec [donec] omnia ista fiant.

It is probable that a few of the above occurred in the exemplar from which *ff* was copied.

It is also quite possible that Nos. 2, 3, and 11 may not be errors at all, but may represent the ancient Old Latin Text. In the case of No. 3

¹ The list is not quite complete. Other errors occur St Matt. xx 28; xxiv 23; St Luke xviii 27.

it is hard to see how words so important should have been omitted not only by *ff*, but by the diorthota and uncial correctors of the MS. They were not inserted in the MS until the twelfth century.

The Archetype.

Errors of the Archetype. A small number of the errors in *ff* are of a character to warrant the belief that they were taken from the archetype, and are not due to the scribe himself. Such errors are quite distinct from the errors made by an ignorant scribe, who could write *nin*, *verbunt*, and *ponec*. The following appear to belong to the same class

- (1) *in ieiuniis* for *in ianuis*.
- (2) *nos tenuerunt* for *nocte venerunt*.
- (3) *in viam erat* for *invaserat*.
- (4) *pelegrinantibus* for *praegnantibus*.
- (5) *innocente* for *in occidente*.
- (6) *iunior* (St Luke xv) for *senior*.
- (7) *silvae* for *siloam*.
- (8) *mala* (St Luke xii) for *bona*.

These readings were, in the main, the outcome of a brain familiar (but non-conversant) with the Latin tongue, and were beyond the power of invention possessed by the scribe of *ff*.

It is probable also that in his archetype the scribe found *hyprocrita* and *hyprocisis*, and possibly *servientes* for *esurientes* and *sicut* for *secus*.

Length of line. The lines in the archetype of *ff* were a little shorter than in their surviving copy.

In St John vi 17 *ff* reads Et cum ascendisse in | navem venieba.

The archetype was

Et cum ascendissē
in navem veniebā.

In St Mark xi 1 Et cum adpropinqua
was miscopied from Et cum adpropinquā.

In St Mark xiii 6 the words dropped out formed a line, viz.

multi enim venient.

Capitals. The fact that the scribe of *ff* sometimes begins a column without a capital letter, raises the presumption that the columns were not begun (or not always begun) with a capital in the archetype.

Punctuation. The punctuation by the scribe is often misplaced. In many instances his division of the text shews no knowledge of the Latin. Once he wrongly indents five lines in St John as though they formed a quotation from the Old Testament.

If the inept punctuation be subtracted from the whole, the fewness of the remaining marks of punctuation leads to the belief that the archetype had little, if any, punctuation in the proper sense of the term.

The marks were employed to mark off short words and numerals rather than to note the end of a phrase or sentence; whilst sometimes they appear to have been purely ornamental.

Palaeographical Evidence as to the Date of the MS.

In *ff* the beautiful rounded uncials of the scribe must strike even a casual observer. On first seeing the MS in 1899 I was much impressed by the apparent antiquity of the writing as compared with such MSS as I had hitherto examined, including Codex Bezae (*d*) and the Brescian Gospels (*f*). The writing of *ff* has, in fact, more resemblance to that of *a* than to any other Old Latin MS. Both are written on untinted vellum in natural ink. Compared with the MSS *k* and *h*¹ and *n*, which are all attributed to the fifth century, *a* and *ff* have a good claim to be ranked at least a century earlier; whilst *a*, *ff*, *k*, *h*, and *n* appear to be all earlier than the silver MSS *b*, *f*, *e*, and *i*.

On examining the letter D we notice that in *a* and *ff* the finishing line is bent rather more to the left from the vertical than in *k* and *h*. It is true that this is not a *proof* of great antiquity, as the same shape of D continues till the eighth or ninth century; but, on the other hand, straight-backed D's are a later departure, and in Codex Bezae the back of the D is quite vertical, as it is in most later MSS which approach the cursive formation².

In the case of the letter E the letter is *crossed high* and with an extremely thin line in *a* and *ff*, and with an almost equally fine line and nearly as high in *n*. In *a* and *ff* the horizontal stroke sometimes passes through the back of the letter. In *h* and *k*, on the contrary, the letter is crossed in the middle, and with a much thicker and more pronounced stroke. In other respects the E of *k* is unique in its oval rather than circular formation and the thinness of its back stroke.

With respect to the letter T the greatest possible affinity exists between *a* and *ff*, in both of which codices I and T are much alike. Hence in *ff* Belsheim edited *intra* for *in ira*, and Bianchini *scariothi* for *scarioht*. Tischendorf has remarked that the same similarity exists in *e*. But in *h* and *k*, as well as in *b*, the letters are clearly differentiated and the cross of the T is quite pronounced as in later MSS.

The letters G and C in *a* and *ff* are but slightly differentiated; and an intent gaze is needed to discriminate the two in some places, so fine is the distinguishing downward stroke. In *b*³, *n*, *k*, and *h* the finishing

¹ I use *h* throughout to signify *Le Palimpseste de Fleury*—not *Codex Claromontanus* of the Gospels.

² The formation of the D in S Hilary *de Trinitate* (Pal. Soc. 2nd series, Plate 10), attributed to the sixth century, is quite peculiar, the finishing stroke being a thin tail nearly at right angles to the vertical.

³ The publication of a facsimile leaf of *b* in *Monumenta Palaeog. Sacra* (Torino :

stroke is shorter and thicker and more pronounced. G in *h* and *d* might have been penned by the same scribe.

Again the bow of the P in *a* and *ff* is remarkably small, and is formed by a stroke more vertical than horizontal. In *b* and *h* the stroke takes a more horizontal direction.

The letter B has a small upper loop in *a* and *ff*, and is almost a replica of the B in the Bobbio Cicero Palimpsest at Turin, which is assigned to the third or fourth century.

In F the horizontal strokes are extremely short and unobtrusive in *a* and *ff*; and in this letter too there is a striking resemblance between *ff* and the Bobbio Palimpsest. In *b*, on the other hand, the horizontal strokes are pronounced, and the back of the F is even curled at its extremity.

The old scribes wrote the letter O with two crescent-shaped strokes, which met, or more often *nearly* met, in a thin, scarcely visible line at the two points of contact; and the letter has thus in *a* and *ff* an oval rather than a circular appearance. In *b* and in *q* the O is almost an exact circle with a uniform thickness of its circumference; and in *n*, *k*, and *h* the circumference is also continuous, though of varying thickness.

The letter S in *a* and *ff* is more graceful and less rotund than in *b* or *n*, and approaches nearer to the S in the Bobbio Palimpsest. S in *h* and *d* sometimes dominates the other letters as does F in *e*.

Finally, in *a* and *ff* the letter A has a quite plain line as its back stroke, while the loop is short. In *b*, *k*, *n*, and *h* the back stroke of the A is slightly hooked and undulatory, and the loop of the letter is longer than in *a* and *ff*. Ancient scribes wrote the loop of the A first. I noticed this in an A begun in *i* and then cancelled.

Mr Warner of the British Museum has pointed out to me that there is a resemblance between *ff* and the Paris Livy (*Pal. Soc.*, First Series, Plate 32). If, as is probable, they must be assigned to the same century palaeographical considerations would place *ff* at the beginning of that century, and the Latin text of Livy towards the end.

The result of the comparison of the penmanship of *ff* with that of other ancient Latin MSS has convinced the present writer that *ff* must rank with *a* in point of antiquity. It is earlier than *h* or *n*, and decidedly earlier than *b*. In *h* and *n*, and more pronouncedly in *b*, the oval formation found in the Bobbio Cicero Palimpsest at Turin, and preserved in *ff*, has given way to the bold rounded letters of the sixth and seventh centuries. In *b* the letters are almost circular. It is true that in *k* the oval form survives, but the heavily-crossed T and E and the frequent punctuation of *k*, together with other considerations, such as Fratelli Bocca, 1899) reveals the fact that the work of Bianchini leaves much to be desired.

the confusion of S and F, and R and N, make it probable that *k* should be assigned at the earliest to the second half of the fifth century.

Since writing the above the writer has seen in Vienna the two MSS *e* and *i*. The initials in *e* are, as a rule, much larger than in Tischendorf's facsimile. They overshadow three lines of writing, and they have ornamental knobs.

T and E are more pronouncedly crossed than in *a* and *ff*, and E is not crossed as high.

The tail of Q is not quite straight, but slightly bent to the left.

The abbreviation mark over *dne* and *xps* is short as in *h^{acta}*, and covers only one letter, whilst in *a* and *ff* a thin longer line is drawn over the whole word. The stroke at the end of a line that stands for *m* is hooked at both ends (*autē*), and placed rather *after* the letter, as in *i*, than above it, as in *a* and *ff*.

The second loop of M and the loop of H curve inwards and depart from the openness of *a* and *ff*.

The letter F dominates the other letters, which is a feature of the later uncial writing, viz. the writing superposed in *h^{acta}*.

The loop of A is exceptionally long in *e*; in *a* and *ff* it is short. L is pronouncedly angled at the foot, and is hooked at the top.

Punctuation is exceedingly frequent. There are at least twenty points in *e* for every point in *ff*; and these are all by the first hand, for in *e*, as in *i*, no second hand has touched the text.

A careful comparative study of the palaeography of *b*, *i*, *f*, and *e* points to the conclusion that *e* should be assigned to the latter part of the sixth century¹. Tischendorf thought *e* might belong to the fourth or fifth or sixth century. The practice of writing in gold and silver on purple vellum appears to have begun in the sixth century and to have died out in the eighth. Silver ink had not the durability of other ink.

One cannot tabulate all the impressions that are received from a MS and that lead to the belief that it is earlier or later than another. The great simplicity of the letters in *ff*, the absence of all knobs or ornamental points, the *smallness* and plainness of the capitals, the straightness and thinness of lines marking abbreviations, the extreme rarity of punctuation—all these contribute to the conviction that *ff* belongs to a more remote antiquity than does *e*, and that it surpasses in age all other Old Latin MSS with the exception of *a*.

E. S. BUCHANAN.

¹ Other considerations support this later date for *e*. One is the frequent use in *e* of *apud* side by side with *aput*. Both *aput* and *apud* are found in Codex Fuldensis. *Apud*, however, never appears to the best of my belief in either *a* or *ff*. *e* also reads the later form *gennesaret* (= *vg*) in S Luke; *ff* invariably *gennesar*.

(To be continued.)

THE LITANY OF SAINTS IN THE STOWE MISSAL.

IDEAS in regard to the first attestations and early history of what is designated in the official books of the Roman Church 'the Litanies', but commonly called 'The Litany of the Saints', seem vague and indefinite. The use of such a series of invocations of saints by name was, for instance, in an article I read not long ago, assumed to exist in Gaul in the sixth century; and this assumption was used as an instrument in the criticism of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. In the last number (iv 1) of the *Oriens christianus* Dr Baumstark has printed (text and translation, pp. 116-119) a 'Syrian-Melchite Litany of All the Saints', with a lengthy preliminary dissertation (pp. 98-116, 120). The subject is now therefore on the order of the day. Moreover, what must be the definitive edition of the *Stowe Missal* is in preparation; and doubtless discussion of some points of detail had better precede, than follow on, that publication. But the starting-point of an enquiry such as I have indicated is, so far as I can see, precisely the litany which stands at the beginning of the normal mass in that missal. It has then seemed to me opportune, without waiting for further informations, or more light, to lay before those interested in the subject what I have been able to gather in regard to the early history of the 'Litany of the Saints' in the West, with which Dr Baumstark and his former colleague, Dr Schermann, have not concerned themselves. Such a paper will serve to bring the discussion of this rather obscure matter into some definite form; and I propose to restrict my remarks, as much as I can, to what is textual, documentary, and, so far, positive.

Before examining the features of the litany of *Stowe*, it will be proper to remark on its position and surroundings. This litany appears as an item of what is now called the 'Praeparatio Sacerdotis', viz. the series of non-liturgical prayers which form the priest's personal preparation for saying mass. In the earliest Western books this 'Praeparatio' is rudimentary, being represented by a single prayer entitled 'Apologia Sacerdotis'. In his edition of the *Book of Cerne* (pp. xxv-xxvi), Dom Kuypers has pointed out that the most ancient examples of the 'Apologia' represent more than one type of religious mind and feeling. The form given in the *Bobbio Missal*¹ shews yet a different type of such mind, though textually it is related to the two 'Apologiae' adduced by Dom Kuypers. This is the stage of developement at the close of the seventh century. The 'praeparatio' which the *Stowe Missal* offers

¹ Mabillon *Mus. Ital.* i 375; Muratori *Liturg. Rom.* ii 934.

(before the interpolations were made by Moelcaich), is something quite different both in form and substance. It is thus composed: (1) a short prayer embodying penitential supplications evidently inspired by the litany; (2) the litany of saints; (3) a prayer 'ut pro peccatis meis possim intercedere, et adstantis populi peccatorum veniam promereri, ac pacificas singulorum hostias immolare; me quoque tibi audaciter accedentem ne sinas perire' &c.; (4) a brief ejaculatory prayer. Item (3) strikes, in the words quoted, a note that is absent from the 'Apologiae' mentioned above. In these the idea of specifically priestly supplication does not transpire. But it is quite in the spirit of those prayers of Eastern liturgies which, beautiful and devout in themselves, repeat with a wearisome iteration the same idea—the unworthiness of the priest himself, the 'tremendous' nature of the sacrifice. The newly-found manuscript of 'St James', of the close of the seventh century or the earlier years of the eighth, shews that a developed 'Praeparatio Sacerdotis' already existed by that date in Syria¹. The precise position of the *Stowe* 'Praeparatio' in the Western development must be matter for consideration; but to me it appears to represent the next stage immediately after the simple 'Apologia' of the seventh century².

The exact text of the litany of saints, item 2, will be given later. But it will be convenient, for the understanding of what follows, to give a summary of it at once; thus:

Christe audi nos (three times)—Kyrie eleison—thirteen invocations of saints—Omnes sancti orate pro nobis—Propitius esto parce nobis Domine—P. e. libera nos D.—Ab omni malo I. n. D.—Per crucem tuam I. n. D.—Peccatores te rogamus audi

¹ *Oriens christianus* iii 216.

² I do not know how the case stands in the Sacramentary of Gellone. The Sacramentary of Angoulême, Paris B. N. Lat. 816, f. 70^b has a single 'Apologia' (printed by Martene, *de ant. ecd. rit.* lib. iv cap. 27 § 10) there called 'Accusatio Sacerdotis ante altare'; it emphasizes the ideas already found in the *Stowe* 'Praeparatio' item (3). In Gerbert (*Mon. vet. liturg. Alemann.* i 297) this 'Accusatio' appears as if a collect of a 'missa sacerdotis propria'. Abbot Cabrol has recently printed an article in the *Revue Bénédictine* (April 1905) to shew that the so-called *Missae Fl. Illyricae* is a production of Alcuin. But these difficulties occur to me: (1) the special 'proof' on examination breaks down; (2) fashions and tendencies in liturgy have a history of their own; and in the time of Charlemagne the tendency in ruling circles was to simplify and clarify liturgy, liturgy books, and prayers; the *Missae Fl. Ill.* is an extreme example of the opposite tendency; (3) Alcuin's character shews many deficiencies, but the want of common good sense was not one of them and from any point of view the *Missae Fl. Ill.* is a liturgical monstrosity. For reasons such as these I believe the judgement of the older liturgists (like Bona) who assigned this document to the tenth or eleventh century to be sound. It has some fifteen or twenty apologies, besides a fully-developed scheme of prayers for putting on vestments, &c.

nos—[? Fili Dei t. r. a. n.]—Ut pacem dones t. r. a. n.—Agne Dei qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis¹.

Here it is necessary to distinguish two elements: the general 'framework', and the names of the saints invoked. Each element must be considered separately. I take the names first. The invocations of this *Stowe* litany of saints are: Mary, Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James, Thaddaeus, Matthias, Mark, Luke. Inspection of the four lists of Apostles in the New Testament shews that this list, imperfect as it is, agrees in order with that of Matthew (x 2-4) only². The order in the diptychs of the *Stowe Missal* is: John Baptist and Virgin Mary, Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James, Simon, Thaddaeus, Matthias, Mark, Luke. This is the order of Matthew except that in the diptychs Simon (the Canaanite) comes before, not after, Thaddaeus. After Matthias, Mark, Luke come Stephen and other martyrs. The litany then so far as it goes agrees with the diptychs; and it is not too much to suppose that when drawing it up the compiler had before him the diptychs and adopted their order.

But the two *Stowe* documents do not stand alone. The order of names of Apostles and Evangelists in the litany of MS Reg. 2 A xx³, a manuscript of the eighth century, is the same as that in the diptychs, except that Barnabas is inserted before Mark and Luke. Not merely so; but this litany adopts the order 'John, Mary', of the diptychs, and the case is both in diptychs and litanies, so far as I can find, unique. Moreover, after thus taking its order of invocations up to this point from the *Stowe* diptychs, the litany of 2 A xx proceeds to subjoin after Stephen the whole twelve names of martyrs appended to the quite different list of Apostles in the canon of the Roman mass⁴.

The question arises which is the borrower? Did the English document borrow the order of Apostles and Evangelists from Ireland, or Ireland from England. Several prayers and other documents, English and Irish, of a date presumably earlier than the ninth century, shew enumerations of the apostles. A list of such enumerations with some few others is given in the appended note A at the end of this paper (p. 135). From this list it appears that the order in the Roman canon occurs only

¹ See McCarthy 'On the Stowe Missal', *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxvii pp. 192-195 and 267 (on fol. 13^a).

² The order of Luke vi 14-16 is as Matthew's, except that it has 'Matthew, Thomas' instead of 'Thomas, Matthew', and 'Simon, Iudas Iacobi' instead of 'Thaddaeus, Simon'.

³ fol. 26^a (*Book of Cerne* pp. 211-212).

⁴ This use of the Roman canon probably explains the insertion in 2 A xx of Barnabas. For Barnabas see Duchesne, in *Mélanges G. B. de Rossi* (Rome, 1892) pp. 40-71.

in prayers in *Cerne*, not in 2 A xx or Irish books; whilst of the New Testament lists, that of Matthew only is followed except in the case of the diptychs of the Mozarabic mass and those of the Church of Arles which both adopt the list of Acts i 13. But it is in Irish or English-Irish documents that the Matthew list is found. Unless, therefore, further evidence can be adduced to throw a new light on the case, the conclusion seems inevitable that the presence of the Matthew list is to be taken as a probable indication of Irish influence¹.

If there be relationship (doubtless but indirect) between the invocations in the litanies of the *Stowe* 'Praeparatio' and 2 A xx, much closer is the relationship in the 'framework'. In fact the 'framework' of the two is identical. But we must not stop here. A Greek litany appearing on the last leaf (f. 200) of the so-called 'Athelstan Psalter', Cotton MS Galba A xviii², has to be taken into account. This manuscript contains on the same leaf the Greek text of the Old Roman Creed, whereof the Latin is found in the Laudian MS of the Acts and (with slight changes) in MS Reg. 2 A xx also. In what I have now to say it will be well to ignore the discussions on the Creed, but proper to observe in passing that through the documents common to Galba A xviii in Greek and 2 A xx in Latin, viz. the Old Roman Creed and the litany, we come into touch with the earliest age of the English Church. Sir E. M. Thompson, who has described the Galba manuscript³, considers that the psalter was written abroad in the ninth

¹ I should feel disposed to add here as follows: 'with the *Stowe* diptychs as a primary model. It would therefore follow that our litanies are of a later date than (say) about the year 650.' But this would hardly be justified except at the expense of a special dissertation for which this is not the place. Mr F. E. Warren and Dr M^cCarthy have, of course, only dealt with these diptychs as if in passing; but neither, it seems to me, has really envisaged the particular 'difficulties' which make them an interesting little problem from the modern point of view. I hope to deal with this in a separate paper by and by.

² In what follows I take no notice of the discussions on the Apostles' Creed; of set purpose. But it may be for persons engaged in that line of enquiry to consider whether, or how far, anything said in this paper may have a bearing on the questions that engage their attention; e. g. the origin or 'sources' of the Enumerations of Apostles found in connexion with the Creed, the suggested date of the Galba litany in relation to the use (or disuse) of the Old Roman Creed in Rome itself, &c.

³ *Ancient Manuscripts at the British Museum, Part II Latin* pp. 12-13. Kattenbuech *Apost. Symbol.* i 66, following Heurtley, states that the attribution to Athelstan 'has no sort of authority', but is a mere conjecture of the possessor of the MS in the sixteenth century. But is there not good ground for giving credence to the 'Athelstan' tradition? Dackombe was a Winchester man, and from entries of his name in MSS at the B. M. (*Anc. Manusc.* p. 62) it appears that at the dissolution he acquired several MSS belonging to Winchester Cathedral; he chose (it may be said in passing) valuable ones. A leaf of Galba A xviii, that has disappeared since the seventeenth century, had five lines in verse commemo-

century and that the additions (ff. 1-21, 120, 178-200) were made in England in the tenth. At the bottom of f. 199^b is the title 'Hic incipiunt Grecorum laetanie', the litany occupies f. 200^a; on 200^b is first the Our Father with the title 'Hic incipit Pater noster in lingua Grecorum'; then the Apostles' Creed with the heading 'Credo Gr.'; lastly, with the heading 'Scs scs scs' the 'Sanctus', also in Greek but breaking off imperfect with the word 'doxis'. The next leaf which gave the continuation is now missing. The Greek litany at f. 200^a shews a 'framework' identical with that of the two Latin litanies that have been under consideration. The Galba manuscript, however, does not stand alone. The Cotton MS Titus D. xviii f. 12^b after giving the conclusion of a piece begun on f. 12^a, has on the eighth line a title: 'Ymnus Grecorum ante canonem' and thereon follows the 'Sanctus' in Greek and complete. Then: 'Incipit letania Grecorum' and the first eleven suffrages of the Galba litany occupying the rest of the page; f. 13 is blank. From the orthography it may be gathered that this is not a copy made from the Galba leaf¹. I do not give a print of the manuscripts here; it would serve no useful purpose; and doubtless a convenient opportunity may soon occur (may I say in the forthcoming edition of the *Stowe Missal*, for instance). But it is necessary in this place to give in parallel columns the full texts, Greek and Latin, of the 'framework' of the litanies, with so many of the invocations as they have in common. The Greek is obtained from the Galba and Titus MSS just mentioned. The Latin from 2 A xx, the Litany in *Stowe*, and a third copy from a Fulda MS printed by G. Wicel in 1555. The words in brackets complete from *Stowe* and Wicel the cues which are found in 2 A xx.

rating a gift by Stigand to some church of a rich cross (*ibid.* p. 12); from the Winchester annals (A. D. 1072) it appears that Stigand gave such a cross to Winchester Cathedral. From several extant MSS it also appears that Athelstan, in giving books to churches, liked to have record entered in them of such gift; for instance: Cotton MS B v, gift to Bath; Otho B ix, gift to Durham; MS Reg. 1 A xviii, and the MacDurnain gospels at Lambeth, gifts to Christ Church, Canterbury. Is it not probable, in all these circumstances, that Dackombe's note 'Psalterium Regis Ethelstani' is simply based on an inscription of this kind recording a gift of the Psalter in question by Athelstan to Winchester Cathedral? This may throw some light on the source or origin of the Greek pieces in Galba A xviii f. 200.

¹ Dom N. Birt has kindly copied the Greek pieces for me and supplied requisite details. The MS seems of about the twelfth century. As regards orthography, Galba reads, for instance: 'Aie Gabriel euxe yperimon', 'Pantas yaies euxe yperimon', 'fise ymas cyrie'; Titus reads: 'Agie Gabriel euche yper imon', 'Panta agies euchaste yper ymon', 'phise ymas Kyrric'.

GREGORUM LAETANIE.

Galba A xviii f. 20^a
Titus A xviii f. 12^b †

Χριστέ, ἐπάκουσον ἡμῖν
Ἅγιε Μιχαήλ, εὐξαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
Ἅγιε Γαβριήλ, εὐξαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
Ἅγιε Ῥαφαήλ, εὐξαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν

Ἅγία Μαρία, εὐξαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
Ἅγιε Πέτρε, εὐξαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
Ἅγιε Παύλε, εὐξαι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
Πᾶντες οἱ ἄγιοι, εὐξασθε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν

Ἐλεος γίνου καὶ φέισαι ἡμᾶς κύριε

Ἐλεος γίνου καὶ λύτρωσαι ἡμᾶς κύριε

Ἄπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ λύτρωσαι ἡμᾶς κύριε

Διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ σου λύτρωσαι ἡμᾶς κύριε

Ἄμαρτωλοὶ σε παρακαλοῦμεν, ἐπάκουσον ἡμῖν
Ἴνα εἰρήνην δώσης, σε παρακαλοῦμεν, ἐπάκουσον ἡμῖν
Ἰέ τοῦ θεοῦ, σε παρακαλοῦμεν, ἐπάκουσον ἡμῖν
Ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν⁷ τοῦ κόσμου, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς

LAETANIA.

MS Reg. 2 A xx f. 26 (*Bk. of Cerne*
pp. 211–212); *Stowe* litany, pp. 192,
267; Fulda litany in *Wicel Exercit.*
sig. P.

† Christe, audi nos [thrice in S. W.]¹
* Scē Michahel, ora²
* Sce Gabrihel, ora²
* Sce Raphael, ora²
* Sce Iohannes, ora³
† Scā Maria, ora [pro nobis W.]
† Sce Petre, ora [pro nobis W.]
† Sce Paule, ora [pro nobis W.]⁴
† Omnes sancti orate [pro nobis S. W.]
† Propitius esto par[ce nobis Domine S. W.]
† Propitius esto liber[a nos Domine S. W.]
† Ab omni malo liber[a nos Domine S. W.]
† Per crucem tuam liber[a nos Domine S. W.]
† Peccatores te rog[amus audi nos S. W.]
† Ut pacem dones te rog[amus audi nos S. W.]
† * Filius Dei te rog[amus audi nos. Moelcaich]⁵
† Agnus⁶ Dei qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis⁸.

After consideration I have been unable to find any real grounds or valid arguments to support a conjecture that the Latin is the original

* = invocations not in the Litany of the *Stowe* 'Praeparatio' (= S.).

† = invocations of which the text is given by *Wicel* (*Exercitamenta syncerae pietatis* . . . per Georgium Vuicelium seniore edita, 1555, sig. P) (= W.).

‡ The invocations found in Titus D xviii end with Ἄπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. In this MS the invocation Ἅγία Μαρία comes *before* that of Michael.

¹ Followed in *Stowe* by 'Kyrie eleison'; this is not in *Wicel* or in any of the other texts and is doubtless an addition by the writer of the *Stowe* litany.

² These three suffrages are not in *Stowe* or *Wicel*.

³ This invocation in 2 A xx only; doubtless derived from the *Stowe* diptychs, see *skprta*, p. 124.

⁴ Here follow in *Stowe*, *Wicel*, and 2 A xx, further and differing invocations of saints for which see p. 130 *infra*.

⁵ This suffrage, according to M^cCarthy (p. 267), does not occur in the litany of *Stowe* as written by the original hand; it is on Moelcaich's rescript (p. 194) which inserts it before 'Ut pacem' &c. As it is found in the Greek, 2 A xx and *Wicel*, its absence from *Stowe* would be doubtless a mere omission. In W. and Moelcaich 'Fili'.

⁶ 'Agne', *Stowe* (p. 267) and *Wicel*.

⁷ 'tin amartias' Galba A xviii.

⁸ 2 A xx adds 'Christe audi nos'; Moelcaich, the same three times; it is not noticed by *Wicel*.

and the Greek a translation, so far as England or Ireland is concerned. Such indications as I have been able to discern point in the opposite direction. I therefore assume that the Greek is the original. And, on this assumption, to the question: 'Whence came this document into England?' the reply can be made with fair certainty: 'From Rome'. This conclusion is arrived at as follows. The first portion of the 'Sanctus' of the mass is derived from Isaiah vi 3, which in the Old Latin and Vulgate reads 'Lord God of hosts'; in the Hebrew and Septuagint, 'Lord of hosts'. This latter form is adopted in all the Greek liturgies known to us, Sarapion, the Clementine, James, Basil, Chrysostom, Mark, Alexandrine Basil, Alexandrine Gregory; whilst the reading 'Lord God of Hosts' is found only in Syriac James, and in the Nestorian, Armenian, Roman, and Mozarabic liturgies¹. But the Greek 'Sanctus' in both the Galba and Titus manuscripts reads κύριος ὁ θεὸς Σαβαώθ. As there is no ground for supposing that the four Greek pieces found in the Galba (or the two in the Titus) manuscript came into England one by one from different quarters, or otherwise than together, it seems but reasonable to conclude that as the 'Sanctus' and the Creed came from Rome so did the litany also².

This conclusion seems to find confirmation in the text of the litany itself. To say nothing of the names Peter and Paul, two suffrages deserve particular attention: Δὲ τοῦ στυραποῦ σου and Ὁ ἀμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. These are cults both of which are associated in Rome with the name of Pope Sergius (687-701). Sergius was a Syrian of the region of Antioch (and therefore Greek-speaking) though born at Palermo; he came to Rome at a mature age and, as a skilled musician, was placed under the chief cantor; five years later he was ordained priest, and seven years after that made pope. The account of him in the *Liber Pontificalis* shews that he had a natural bent towards all that concerns the church

¹ Also in Africa in the latter part of the fifth century. Victor Vitensis writes: 'sicut in mysteriis ore nostro dicimus . . . sanctus sanctus sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth' (*de persec. Vandal.* iii 23; in Petschenig's edition ii 100).

² It has been not infrequently stated that the church Office was said in Greek as well as in Latin in England towards the close of the seventh century. I do not know how the statement can be evidenced. Certainly there is nothing to warrant it in the elaborate exposition or argument printed in 1875 by Caspari (*Ungedruckt Quellen* iii 188-199) who really seems to rely at bottom on the Greek pieces in Galba A xviii as evidence for the fact, as subsequent writers seem, for their part, to have relied on Caspari. The statement is also repeatedly made (e. g. among the last by Kattenbusch *Apost. Symbol.* ii 858, in 1900) that the Greek creed of Galba was said in the hours, and 'especially at Prime'. But it is to be observed that the Apostles' Creed was not said in the Office in the seventh and eighth centuries; and that the Greek pieces in Galba have nothing to do with the hours. It would appear therefore that the statement as to the recital of the Office in Greek in England is not warranted by evidence, and seems to be based ultimately on a misunderstanding.

services ritual and song. As is well known he ordered that at the time of the confection in the mass (i. e. just before the communion) 'Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis' should be sung by the clergy and people. Some persons have thought that the 'Agnus' was already before this date in use in the Roman mass and that Sergius only made some change in the mode or place of singing it; others, that he first introduced it. These contradictories can each be plausibly maintained, and neither can be shewn to be wrong. All that is of importance here, however, is certain, viz. that the first record of the use of the 'Agnus Dei' in Rome occurs in the time of Sergius; and that if it had been indeed in use before, he gave to it an additional importance inasmuch as by his new arrangement he introduced into the Roman mass a (possible) element of what is called 'eucharistic adoration' in a way that should be popular and universal, public and unmistakeable. The originality of the action of Sergius in regard to the cult of the Cross in Rome is yet less open to doubt. Sergius, we are told¹, found a case hitherto 'in angulo obscurissimo jacentem' in the sacristy of St Peter's, which, though of silver, was dirty and black from neglect and age. After prayer he broke the seal, and opening it found within a precious gemmed cross containing a relic of the True Cross. 'Which from that day forward (says his contemporary biographer) is kissed and adored by all the Christian people in the Lateran basilica on the day of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross.' This is the earliest notice of the public liturgical cult of the True Cross and the feast of the Exaltation in Rome, and there can, I think, be no doubt that Sergius was the real originator of such cult in Rome.

We have at any rate these elements: on the one hand a litany in Greek coming to England from Rome with evidence in its invocations of the cults of the Cross and of our Lord as the Lamb of God; on the other, a pope Greek by race, whose speciality was church services and devotions, under whom the first mention is found of these cults in Rome. If we go a step further, sufficient traces are found of the relations of this pope with England; for instance: he consecrated St Willibrord (Nov. 21, 695); he was concerned in the accession of Berctwald to the See of Canterbury in some way special enough to call for record in the jejune contemporary biography; he was in correspondence with Jarow and Wearmouth. Any one of these occasions might have served to bring to England a litany, the text of which suggests Sergius; there were doubtless many others of which we know nothing, and speculation as to the real one is useless. I am therefore content to have endeavoured to follow up the origins of the litany of invocations of

¹ *Liber pontif.*, ed. Duchesne, i 374.

saints so far as, keeping under the guidance of the documents, is possible to me.

But a few words must be given to the question of the probable age of our first English and Irish imitations of the Greek litany. (1) The writer of the saints' litany in the *Stowe* 'Præparatio' restricts himself to the Blessed Virgin, and some of the Apostles, with Matthias, Mark, Luke. (2) The invocations of the litany of 2 A xx begin with three arch-angels (as in the Greek); then come invocations of John the Baptist, the Blessed Virgin, Apostles and Evangelists in the order of the *Stowe* diptychs with the insertion of Barnabas, followed (after Stephen) by the first order of martyrs (in the 'Communicantes') of the Roman canon; then come twenty-eight invocations of martyrs, hermits, doctors, and confessors (ending with Benedict), lastly virgins; all of these well known in the earliest Western mass-books or calendars; but to the exclusion of all Irish names. (3) In Moelcaich's revision of the original litany of *Stowe*, after Stephen, Martin, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, Hilary, Patrick, come invocations of nineteen Irish men, and five Irish women, saints. (4) The litany in Wicel's Fulda manuscript after Luke has Barnabas, Stephen; then twenty invocations of well-known martyrs, doctors, confessors (ending with Benedict); then Patrick, Secundinus, and twenty-three more names *nostris temporibus ignotissima* of men and women, doubtless all Irish. This description suffices to shew the close relationship of the four documents, and the influences determining the differing selection of names in each case. The constant element is that derived from the *Stowe* diptychs, the Apostles and Evangelists. It is clear from the Council of Cloveshoe that litanies with a series of invocations of saints must have been widespread, or even in general use, in Southern England by the year 747. If we may accept (as after consideration I certainly do) Paul Ewald's assignment of the *Vita S. Gregorii antiquissima* to the first quarter of the eighth century, it would appear that such litanies were in use in the North of England twenty or thirty years before the Cloveshoe decrees¹. A developement must have taken place very soon after the arrival of

¹ 'Iste enim sanctus utique per omnem terram tam sanctus habetur ut semper ab omnibus ubique sanctus Gregorius nominatur. Unde letaniis quibus Dominum pro nostris imploramus excessibus atque innumeris peccatis quibus eum offendimus sanctum Gregorium nobis in ammiculum vocamus, cum sanctis scilicet apostolis et martyribus' (ed. Gasquet, Westminster, 1904, p. 45). This strikes me as if written in the quite early days of St Gregory's (liturgical) cult. To the writer of this *Life* Augustine is counted in the same category as Mellitus and Justus; 'venerandae memoriae viros' is his term for all three of them (*ibid.* p. 15). St Boniface is, it is true, mentioned as 'venerandae memoriae' in the letter of archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury to Lullus of Mentz (Haddan and Stubbs *Councils* iii 392), but the letter itself sufficiently qualifies the term in this case.

the Greek document in England. There could be nothing to appear surprising in this if we consider the prevailing tone and temper of the English or Irish religious mind at this period.

The ejaculatory, litanic, asyndetic, type of prayer is peculiarly suited to the Irish genius. We have only to observe the prayers common among that people from the *Lorica* of St Patrick downwards. The publication of the *Book of Cerne* and of MS 2 A xx affords abundant, and genuine, material for study. But there is more. The Irish masters in the early days of England's conversion were by nature attracted to solitude; they strove, were even able, to combine this inclination of theirs with the active duties of the apostolate; and many of their English disciples imbibed much of their spirit. We must not look to the ordinary life of Jarrow and Wearmouth in this matter; but the *Life of St Guthlac* by Felix gives a lively presentment of a type of spiritual life that was common in England so long as the influence of the Irish teachers lasted. But if men such as these lived in solitude, they still were not alone; their world was peopled by spirits, angels, good and bad, all either friends or foes, with whom they were in continual communion or conflict. Given too the particular stage of religious development in Western Europe we are bound to believe that in the world thus peopled with spirits, the ancient martyrs and the hermits, who had suffered and had conquered in the fight were present too. In such a spiritual atmosphere as this nothing is more easy than to understand, once the impulse given, the development and rapid spread of such a devotion as that which we call the litany of the saints. On the supposition that the Greek litany reached England in (say) the last decade of the seventh century, I think it is not unreasonable to expect that even a dozen years may have sufficed for the propagation of the new devotion at least among those that still gave the tone to the common religious public of the time.

And here many questions suggest themselves—questions in which centres the real interest of the present enquiry: is the (Roman) Galba litany, so far as the invocations of saints are concerned, an abridgement of a litany already in use in Rome? is it Roman at all? is it a record of the introduction into Rome of an already existing Byzantine devotional practice¹ which then found there further development?

¹ Dr Schermann (*Römische Quartalschrift* 1903 p. 335) is disposed to assign one at least of the Greek litanies of saints printed by him with that from the 'Athelstan Psalter', to the sixth or seventh century. His grounds for this opinion are the invocation of categories of saints only in addition to the angels; and the special predicates used of the B. V. These grounds do not seem strong. Such a set of invocations of categories of saints is found, e.g., at the beginning of the litany of saints in the 'Pontifical of St Dunstan' (*Martene de ant. eccl. rit. lib. ii cap. 13*

did Gaul borrow the litany of the saints from Rome, or was the litany of the saints propagated in Gaul and Germany under English and Irish influences? The answers to such questions will be largely determined by individual appreciations of the respective 'factors' in the evolution of Western religion in its critical period, that is the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries. Besides this, no suggestion can, I think, be safely made until something has been done to clear up the obscurities of the earliest history in the Western Church of that form of prayer which we call a 'litany'. Starting with the *Stowe* litany called by Moelcaich 'Deprecatio Sancti Martini pro populo', I propose to make such an attempt in two or three papers to which the present one may be considered a prelude. And such an enquiry seems the more necessary inasmuch as the litany of the Galba manuscript gives the actual 'framework' of the Litany of Saints that is found in the Roman liturgical books of the present day and bears there the name 'Litaniae', 'The Litanies', simply. There would therefore seem to be no room for doubt that these latter trace their descent, in some way, from the former. How this was, is a question that does not admit of a ready, or perhaps quite easy, answer. The task of necessary investigation is beyond my scope; but at least a few remarks on the subject of Carolingian developments seem called for here.

Angilbert, friend, confidant, son-in-law, of Charlemagne, afterwards abbat and creator of the glories of St Riquier, drew up a ritual order for his monks, seemingly in the first two or three years of the ninth century. Some fragments survive¹; and in them are found the following directions for the processions of the Rogation days. So soon as the brethren pass out of the monastery gates 'let them begin to sing their psalms in alternate verses. Let the schola of the boys, and others who can, begin at once to sing the Apostles' Creed; then, after a short interval, the creed of Constantinople; then, the faith of St Athanasius; and lastly the Lord's Prayer. After this, the general litany (*laetaniam generalem*) which stands first in our book (*quae prima in nostro continetur scripto*). Then let the schola of boys sing the *laudes*, for the welfare of the whole of Christendom. When

Ordo 4) and at the end of the special invocations of saints in a litany seemingly of the time of Lewis the Pious described by Wicel *Exercitamenta*, sig. O iij. I should have been disposed, as a matter of opinion, rather to connect the litanies which Dr Schermann prints with the Greek monastic revival in Lower Italy in the tenth century.

¹ This was printed in the *Downside Review*, March 1895 (vol. xiv pp. 91-98) in ignorance of the fact that it was to be included in the appendix to M. Lot's edition of Hariulfus which appeared at the same time. The copy in the *Review* was by an accident printed off without revision of proofs and contains several errors. The passage cited above is at p. 94.

all this is finished let the brethren cease their psalmody¹ and sing the litanies (*faciant laetantias*) along with the boys; first the Gallic, secondly the Italian, and lastly the Roman (*primo Gallicam, secundo Italianam, novissime vero Romanam*). Here are four (or, if we include the *laudes*, five) kinds of litanies mentioned. Rome, Italy, Gaul, and their ways, Angilbert knew perfectly well; no one better. I have no intention of even enquiring what all these litanies may have been, or what features may have distinguished one from the other. This must be done, if at all, by some one who undertakes to examine the history of the litany from the ninth to the thirteenth century and is in full possession of the manuscript evidence. But the 'general litany' would seem to have been one of Angilbert's own composing, though doubtless following generally some model. Gerbert has printed from a Vienna manuscript of the tenth century a litany of saints with the title *Letania Gallica*²; Muratori and Delisle, two with the title *Letania Romana*³. What, if any, value attaches to these titles is doubtful.

From Amalar⁴ it appears that the use of litanies with invocations of saints was common in Gaul (say about 830) on Holy Saturday before the blessing of the font. The so-called Sacramentary of Gellone, written in 'the second half of the eighth century', in a baptismal office towards the end of the volume, gives such a litany⁵. It is short, containing but thirteen invocations of saints by name; but it otherwise recalls the 'framework' of the Galba litany and its congeners, consisting as it does of suffrages, 1, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 of that litany (+ a final *Audí nos* as in 2 A xx; cf. Moelcaich)—with the insertion of three petitions for fine weather between 14 and 15. This is the earliest text of a litany of saints in a Gallic manuscript that I know of. In the

¹ In regard to psalmody as the substance of the (popular) devotion of the Rogation processions see *Downside Review*, March 1900 (vol. xix pp. 47-49); cf. *Missale Gothicum* N° xlvi, Contestatio: 'invictum hoc signum cum plebium cuneis praeferentes atque maiestatem tuam psallencii modulatione lautantes.' From Angilbert it appears that the psalmody still survived, but now as if a liturgical element, being confined to the monks; it was, from obvious causes, no longer popular; and as a 'popular devotion' litanies (in our common modern sense) took its place. With their short responses often repeated, they were sure in the long run to displace the more irregular and 'difficult' psalmody and come by and by to be so far regarded as proper to the Rogations as to have obliterated, as it were, the memory of the old practice; of which, however, a trace still survives in the singing of psalm 69 (= 70) immediately after the 'Litany of the Saints' on Rogation days.

² Gerbert *Mon. vet. Liturg. Alemann.* ii 90.

³ Delisle *Mém. sur d'anc. Sacramentaires* p. 363 (from a Senlis MS of about 886); Muratori *Liturg. Rom.* i 74 (from Ottobon. 313, a Paris MS 'of the second half of the ninth cent.'). This litany, at ff. 109-110, is in another hand.

⁴ *De ecl. offic. lib.* i cap. 28.

⁵ Martene *de ant. ecl. rit.* lib. i cap. i art. 18 ordo vi.

course of the ninth century and tenth, litanies come into common liturgical use, and are now found too in the order for the visitation of the sick, and among the prayers said for those at the point of death. It is, however, but slowly and gradually that in the manuscripts they obtain admission into the strictly liturgical offices of the body of the Sacramentary itself.

The order of Apostles in the ninth and tenth centuries is commonly that of the Roman Canon ; or, very frequently, the order is not reducible either to it or to any of the lists in the New Testament. The influence of the order of Matthew (= of the *Stowe* diptychs) may still be traced, it would seem, in some cases¹. This order is found, however, exactly in the Rogation litanies of the *Manuale Ambrosianum*, a manuscript of the eleventh century ; this seems to be the earliest Milanese attestation².

In concluding, in order to avoid misconception, so easy in dealing with things so vague and shadowy, I think it is well to add a few words by way of summing up the enquiry so far as it has yet gone. Subject to the production of further evidence or correction of oversights, I conceive of the case as follows. The Galba litany actually came to England from Rome about the last years of the seventh century, and was actually the starting-point for the English and Irish developments which have been reviewed. The Irish received this form of litany (that is the 'framework') from the English. At first it was a private devotion of individuals, and by and by probably of communities. If it in any way came to form part of the 'services' of secular priests or monks, this was as yet but in an informal manner, and it was far from having acquired a strictly 'liturgical' character even (I conceive) at the date of the Council of Cloveshoe. I think that the English and Irish were the propagators of such litany of the saints in the eighth century in Gaul and Germany. The subject of the Roman liturgy in Rome and outside Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries is still involved in obscurities ; with patience and increasing knowledge a good deal may be done to

¹ See the litany in the 'Pontifical of St Dunstan' cited above p. 131 note 1 (but hardly that in the 'Pontifical of Egbert' p. 27) ; in a Fleury MS in Martene, lib. iii cap. 15 ordo 1 ; in an important Poitiers Pontifical *ibid.* lib. iv cap. 24 ; in an Antiphonar described by Abbé Eugène Muller in an article entitled 'Antiphonaire du Mont-Renaud' in the *Bulletin du Comité archéol. de Noyon* (and separately Noyon, D. Andrieux, 1875, p. 21). All these are MSS of late ninth, or of the tenth, century. The order of the Roman Canon seems generally followed at this time in the litanies of the region Paris-Rheims.

² *Manuale Ambrosianum ex cod. saec. xi* ed. M. Magistretti (Milan, Hoepli, 1894), ii 247, 258 (and from a manuscript saec. xiii pp. 47, 129, 164). Some persons may perhaps be disposed to see here a trace of Milanese influence in Ireland ; I should rather think of the influence of the Irish in Milan. But possibly the resemblance has another cause altogether.

clear these away. Meantime an attitude of reserve is the only one that is reasonable, in regard to the question whether the litany of saints was also developed by Rome herself, or whether it was received into her liturgy already developed from the Franks. My own present propension is sufficiently indicated; but doubtless it is in great measure due to general appreciations of the liturgy of Rome in its permanent characteristics as compared with the liturgies of other peoples or churches.

Lastly it may be well to revert to the fact already noticed that the litany of the Galba MS gives the actual framework of the Litany of the Saints found in the Roman liturgical books of the present day. This latter is an actual translation of the former so far as it extends, and the same order is preserved. Moreover, the Latin found in our Irish-English books, *Stowe* and 2 A xx, is verbally identical with the Latin of the present Roman books. It seems incredible that in rendering the Greek litany two independent translations should be so absolutely the same. This identity of the *Stowe* 2 A xx litany and the present Roman litany will appear further emphasized when the earliest history of the 'Litany' in the West is considered. Here, however, I will so far anticipate what has to be said by being beforehand with an idea that may occur to some reader of this paper: is the Greek of Galba A xviii an abridgement of some already existing Latin litany? So far as I can see at present there is no ground or evidence whatever in support of such a notion; rather the evidence runs quite counter to it.

Note A (see p. 124 *ante*).

The list in St Matthew is: 1 Peter, 2 Andrew, 3 James (Zebedaei), 4 John, 5 Philip, 6 Bartholomew, 7 Thomas, 8 Matthew, 9 James (Alphaei), 10 Thaddaeus, 11 Simon the Canaanite (St Luke's see in note 2 p. 124 *supra*).

The following enumerations seem derived from the Matthew order:

I *Stowe diptychs*: 1, Paul, 2 to 9, 11, 10, Matthias Mark Luke (+Stephen). II *Stowe litany*: 1, Paul, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, Matthias Mark Luke. III 2 A xx *litany*: as I but Matthias Barnabas Mar. Lu. (+Stephen). IV *Cerne prayer* 1 (p. 81), and 2 A xx f. 18^b (p. 208): as I but Matthias Barnabas. V *S. Gall MS* 1395 (Warren *Lit. and Rit.* p. 180): 1, Paul, 2 to 8, 11, 9, 10, Matthias Mar. Lu. (+Stephen). VI *Cerne pr.* 71 (pp. 170-171): 1 to 9, 11, Matthias, 10 ('Iudas'). VII 2 A xx f. 47^a (p. 222): 1, Paul, 2 to 8, 10 ('Iudas Iacobi'), 11, Matthias Mar. Lu. (+Steph.) (9 is omitted). VIII *Hymn attributed to Cummain the Tall* (*Ir. Lib. hymn.*, H. B. Soc., i 18-20, cf. ii 108): 1, Paul, 2 to 11, Matthias Mar. Lu. (+Patrick Steph.). IX 2 A xx ff. 40^b-41^a (p. 218): 1 Paul, 2 to 11, Matthias.

The following cannot be reduced to any New Testament list:

X *Cerne pr.* 15 (pp. 104-105; and in De Gray Birch *Ancient Manuscr.* p. 59): 1, Paul, 4, 2, 'tres Iacobi', 5, 6, 7, 8, Barn. Matthias. XI *Cerne pr.* 68 (pp. 162-163), 1, 'Iacobus iustus', 2, 4, 3 ('altus clarus Iacobus'), 8, 7, 5, 6, 10 (Iudas), 11 (S. Zelot.), Paul. XII *Nomina apostolor.* (*Lib. hymn.* i 159, ii 52, 222): 11, Matthias, 8, 6, 7, 10, 1, 2, 5, Paul, 4, 3, 9 ('two Jameses'). XIII *Harl. MS* 7653

(*Ant. of Bangor*, H. B. Soc., ii 83: 1, Paul, 2, 3, 7, 4, 5, 6, 9, 8, 11, 10, John BAPT. MAR. LU.

The order of the Roman Canon (= 1, Paul, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 5, 6, 8, 11, 10) is found in XIV *Cerne pr.* 30, repeated 69 (pp. 128-129, 164-165). XV *Cerne pr.* 48 (p. 145); XVI *Cerne pr.* 29 (p. 127), also found substantially in *Harl. MS 7653 f. 4^a* (*Ant. of Bang.* ii 85) but with order of apostles changed to 1, Paul, 2, 3, 4, 7, 6, 8, 5, 9, 11, 10. None of these has the additions Matthias, &c.

The diptychs of (XVII) the Mozarabic mass give the order in Acts i 13 (viz. 1, Paul, 4, 3, 2, 5, 7, 6, 8, 9, 11, 10 ('Iudas') with Matthias Mark Luke (ed. Lesley 225. 108-226. 4). XVIII The diptychs of the Church of Arles (*Mabilion de Liturg. Gall.* p. 44) give the same order with Matthias only added. At the beginning of the 'Acta Thomae' is a list of the apostles 1 to 9+11, 10 (but Simon is called 'the Canaanite', as in St Matthew, and Thaddaeus 'Iudas Iacobi' as in St Luke and Acts. Two other lists which might have been known in England and Ireland in the seventh century, that in the so-called *Codex Fuldensis* (Victor of Capua's MS) ed. Ranke, p. 332, and that in Gerbert *Mon.* i 453-454, shew quite other orders.

We have accordingly in authentic 'diptychs' three orders of apostles in use in the West: Irish, based on St Matthew; Mozarabic and Arles, based on Acts; Roman, not derived from Scripture. There is a gap: the Gallican is wanting; for it would be a gratuitous assumption, and unsafe, to treat the Arles diptychs as evidence for Gaul; they must rather be taken with the Mozarabic, and viewed as representing Hispano-Gothic practice. There is still a chance of recovering a 'Gallican' order. M. Omont has found (see G. Schlumberger, *L'ivoire Barberini, Mém. et Doc. publiés par l'Acad. des Inscr.* Fondation Eugène Piot vii 1900, p. 88 seqq.), at the back of that wonderful ivory now at the Louvre, church 'diptychs' containing as many as 350 names coming down to the middle of the seventh century. Of course lists such as this must not be confused with those formal ecclesiastical documents of which the diptychs of *Stowe* and Arles are specimens; it is rather an anticipation of the *Liber vitae*, the volume, of later times, and is akin to the lists in the Sacramentary MS Ottobon 313 printed by M. Delisle (*Mém.* p. 374 seqq.). But as it seems to embody episcopal lists from the fourth century, it is just possible that the long list of names may be headed by patriarchs, prophets, apostles and such like categories of 'the well-pleasing' that have gone before, and that these may be among the names still legible. The list as a whole is seemingly *Austrasian*, and so affords the possibility of recovering an enumeration of apostles in formal ecclesiastical use in one of the 'Gallican' churches.

Finally, the order of apostles in the diptychs of St James, in all the MSS now in print, is identical with that of the *Stowe* diptychs + Matthias, Mark, Luke. I do not know how the case may stand in the recently discovered seventh- to eighth-century MS; but those in 'print' seem to cover ground from Thessalonica to Sinai and Lower Italy to Jerusalem. At the last moment a friend tells me (what is well to be added here *pro memoria*) that Mr F. C. Burkitt has a note on the order of the apostles' names in various documents, chiefly Syriac and Old Latin, in his *Evangelion Da-Mepharroshe* ii 270.

EDMUND BISHOP.