

time it is to be observed that one valuable and useful instrument of criticism still exists, which, in points of detail, enables us to get behind all the extant MSS of *Greg.* This is the 'eighth-century recension' of *Gelas.*, the important rôle of which in the evolution of Western liturgy has not as yet been duly appreciated. This work, more than anything else, not merely facilitated Charles's measures in regard to the mass-book, but rendered them inevitable.

EDMUND BISHOP.

CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF LATIN MSS. III.

THE LYONS-PETERSBURG MS OF COUNCILS¹.

THE first of the papers published under this heading in the *JOURNAL* (*J. T. S.* i. 435-441), was mainly devoted to the proof of the fact that the manuscript now classified as F II 3 in the library at St. Petersburg was identical with the two MSS 563, 564 of the Jesuit College of Clermont, and further that it originally formed part of the same MS as Clermont 569, now Berlin lat. 83—the combined MS being that described by Sirmond in 1629 as the property of the Chapter of Lyons. The Petersburg MS has, through the singular generosity of the authorities of the Imperial Library, been deposited for some time in the Bodleian, and further notes based on personal inspection may therefore not be out of place in view of the great interest, both historical and palaeographical, which attaches to it.

1. The MS—that is to say, the Petersburg part of the original MS—is unfortunately in a terribly damaged condition; at some period before

express the conclusion to which, as precise information increases, liturgists will come; and it is at any rate important that such a thesis should be brought, if necessary, to the test of a detailed and formal discussion on the basis of the fullest knowledge of the evidence, if, that is to say, the study of Western liturgy of the seventh to the tenth century is to emerge from its present stage of impressionism. And I am the more insistent on this point when I read (to adduce but one instance) what a writer so careful as Friedrich Wiegand, whose vision is so clear, and who sees so much, says of the *Gregorianum* (*Die Stellung des apostolischen Symbols, &c.*, i 291-3, 296-7); in saying this I quite bear in mind what is said pp. 422-4 *supra*, as to the Sunday masses, Nos. vii-xlii, of the Supplement.

¹ I must record my grateful thanks to my colleague, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, for his help in making notes for me on this MS at a time when I was too ill to work at it myself.

the year 1764, when the catalogue of Clermont MSS was drawn up, it suffered from fire, with the result that in the first part of the MS nearly half the writing, and throughout the greater part of it several lines, have disappeared from the top of the page. For the last few leaves the damage reduces itself to the loss of a single line. The early leaves of the Berlin portion of the MS appear to have suffered similarly, so that the damage took place when the MS was still undivided. The breadth of the MS is $9\frac{1}{2}$ inches, of the writing (which is in a single column) about 7 inches: the height of the MS when intact would appear to have been about $13\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and of the writing something over 10 inches. There were originally twenty lines to a page. The ink of the early leaves has faded a good deal, though it hardly ever ceases to be legible: but from about fol. 63 onwards it is in admirable preservation.

The MS consists, with the exceptions to be mentioned, entirely of quaternions, signed with numbers on the last page of the gathering. The first gathering consists now of seven leaves only, the first leaf having been lost: it contained probably on the *recto* the title of the MS, on the *verso* the beginning of the preface of Dionysius Exiguus to the second edition of his collection of Canons, as the present fol. 1 *a* commences with fragments of the word 'digesta,' some ten lines from the beginning in Maassen's text, *Geschichte der Quellen*, &c., pp. 960-962. The gathering must have fallen to pieces before the present binding, since it is now wrongly arranged: the leaf now numbered 3 ought to follow, instead of preceding, leaves 4 and 5. The signature to this gathering has been completely cut away on fol. 7 *b*: of those to the second gathering on fol. 15 *b*, and to the fourth on fol. 31 *b*, just sufficient traces still remain: the rest are legible enough. All the gatherings are quaternions until the twentieth, which consists of two leaves only, foll. 152, 153—the last half of fol. 153 *b* being blank, though no corresponding break occurs in the subject-matter. Further the two signatures 19 and 20 are repeated: fol. 151 *b* is signed q. xviii; fol. 153 *b* q. xx; fol. 161 *b* q. xviii; fol. 169 *b* q. xx; fol. 177 *b* q. xxi; fol. 185 *b* (the last of the Petersburg MS) q. xxii. These various irregularities have a common explanation: the copying of the manuscript was entrusted to two scribes, who are easily distinguished, since one of them wrote in uncial, the other in semi-uncial: the uncial scribe wrote the first two gatherings foll. 1-15 (and also, for some reason or another, fol. 63 *b*), the semi-uncial scribe the succeeding gatherings down to fol. 153. It would seem that his part was calculated to finish at the end of the eighteenth quaternion, fol. 143 *b*; but, on account, as one may suppose, of the unusual space which semi-uncial writing covers (the uncial scribe gets about five more letters in a line), he required nearly ten more pages to copy his share of the presumably uncial exemplar, and so occupied

a nineteenth quaternion and nearly, but not quite, two leaves over it. Meanwhile the uncial scribe had been doing his part—the exemplar was therefore either, like many ancient MSS, never bound at all, or had been unbound for the present purpose—and his sheets had been already signed before it was found that his semi-uncial colleague would outstep the number of sheets allotted to him.

For the greater part of their work these two scribes write sharply distinguishable hands: the *a*, *r* and *s* are regularly of majuscule form in the one, of minuscule form in the other. But oddly enough each attempts on one occasion to imitate the characteristics of the other: on fol. 71 *a* the semi-uncial scribe tries to write in uncial, on fol. 162 *b* the uncial scribe tries to write in semi-uncial. A third hand appears to write a few lines at the bottom of fol. 175 *b* and at the top of fol. 176 *a*; and more strangely still his writing is uncial on fol. 175 *b*, semi-uncial on fol. 176 *a*. Possibly a fourth hand writes a few lines at the bottom of fol. 177 *a*. It would be interesting to know which, if any, of these hands continues to write in the Berlin portion of the MS: but I have never seen it, and it is not quite easy to draw a definite conclusion from Rose's description in the Berlin catalogue. Anyhow we seem in the composition of this huge MS—the Petersburg portion contains 185 leaves, the Berlin 119, of thick vellum—to be introduced into a scriptorium where more than one tendency, palaeographically speaking, is at work. In the uncial scribe we have an old uncial hand of the rather degraded and uninteresting but genuine and not yet imitative form in which it was still used at the end of the seventh century. In the semi-uncial scribe we have a contemporary using a totally different and far more life-like hand, the free and bold semi-uncial which was in use already at the beginning of the sixth century, and which anticipates in character and outline the later minuscule hand, while it has hardly yet in the Petersburg MS begun the process of contraction in size, and especially in breadth, which distinguishes the later from the earlier writing. On the other hand, in the fragmentary scribe of fol. 175 *b* we seem to have clear traces of the imitative uncial writing with its fine or rather finikin strokes, such as one associates with the transition from the seventh to the eighth century.

But impressions of date from handwriting alone are apt to be delusive, and only the most highly trained palaeographers have a right to offer a decided opinion on such matters: and even they, in the relative paucity of early MSS, would perhaps prefer to call in the aid of a further test. At any rate one whose knowledge is purely empirical will naturally fall back on the evidence of the abbreviations employed. The sacred names—*deus*, *dominus*, *iesus*, *christus* (*christianus*), *spiritus*—are consistently abbreviated by contraction in the ordinary forms. *Sanctus*

(*sanctitas*), *episcopus*, *presbyter*, *diaconus*, are found both in full and in abbreviation: but whereas the abbreviations used for *sanctus*, *presbyter* and *diaconus* are regular or common, the abbreviations for *episcopus* are sufficiently abnormal to be instructive. Abbreviations by suspension are rare: but I have noticed *eps* for nominative plural (fol. 170 *b*); *epis* for accusative singular; *episo*¹, with name agreeing, for accusative (fol. 169 *a*); *eps*, with name agreeing, for genitive (fol. 174 *a*); *epsi* for ablative: just as \bar{d} = *dixit*, $\bar{l}g$ = *legatus*, $\bar{p}r$ = *prouincia*, occur in the Carthaginian Council. Abbreviations by contraction, on the other hand, are common: *epsci* *epSCO* *epscis* are found occasionally, *episis* rarely; *epsm* *epsi* *epso* *epsis* very frequently, and indeed on the whole more often than the later normal forms *epm* *epi* *epo* *epis*. On fol. 170 *b* occurs the *vox nihili* $\bar{e}p\bar{s}oix$, which would appear to be the nearest the (uncial) scribe could get to a copy of *epso*_z = *eporum*, i.e. *episcoporum*. $\bar{q}n\bar{m}$ I have noticed once for *quoniam* (fol. 161 *a*), \bar{p} occurs twice at least for *per* (fol. 3 *b*, 11 *b*): a superposed sign, something like *s*, is used for *u* not only at the end of a line, e.g. *sacrificauerunt* fol. 21 *a*, *quorundam* fol. 144 *a*, but twice in the middle of a line in cases of *suus*, fol. 163 *b* *suas*, fol. 164 *b* *suam*. The signs *b*; for *bus*, *q*; for *que*, are of course found commonly: the stroke for *m* at the end of a word occurs regularly at the end of a line (rather to the right of, than over, the final letter), not commonly elsewhere; and in the same way ligatures are allowed, and even letters or syllables are superposed, at or close to the end of a line, for economy of space. *Noster* is habitually written in full: but I have noticed both \bar{n} (*dominus noster*, fol. 57 *b*), and $\bar{n}o\bar{i}$ (*domini dei nostri*, fol. 172 *a*); while the third scribe, in his fragment at the top of fol. 176 *a*, is alone in using the later abbreviation *nri* = *nostri*. Practically no other abbreviations are found.

These indications, taken together, point to a date within the limits of the seventh century. The practice of the semi-uncial scribe hardly goes beyond the use of A. D. 600: the uncial scribe betrays indications of an approaching change: the third hand, both in his imitative writing and in his use of *nri* = *nostri*, seems to take us below the middle of the century. Probably the half-century A. D. 650–700 best suits the converging lines of evidence.

The exemplar of our MS would appear to have been one where (1) *s* and *f* might be confused, for on fol. 113 *a*, *praes-* was written *praef*, though corrected by the first hand: (2) *m* and *ni* might be confused, for on fol. 120 *b* *crescentiani* is written *crescentiam*: (3) *c* and *e* might be confused, for on fol. 170 *a* *co* is written for *eo*, and on fol. 170 *b* *causac* for *causae*.

The rubbed condition of some of the outside leaves of the gatherings

¹ Probably copied from *episc* of the exemplar.

suggests that the MS was originally left unbound: but at some time in the eighth or ninth century the leaves were trimmed for binding, care being taken that all ends of lines or *marginalia* likely to be lost in the process should be first copied further into the page. If only one scribe was employed on this task, he used more than one handwriting: for the words lost or likely to be lost from the text of the first pages—after fol. 12 the original scribes had been more careful not to encroach on to the margin—are re-copied in uncial of a late type, while the *marginalia*, which consist almost exclusively of titles of the councils, are copied in by a Merovingian hand¹. Everything was thus saved except on fol. 132 *b*, where a long passage (twenty-seven lines in Migne) in the Carthaginian council of June 401 is omitted in the text—without any break, so that the omission must have been due to the loss or passing over of a leaf or two leaves in the archetype—and supplied in another hand (of about 700 A. D.) in the margin: in this case the precautions taken elsewhere were omitted, and about eight letters have been lost from each line of the marginal supplement.

There are, speaking generally, no post-Caroline corrections in the MS. It is one great advantage possessed by ancient manuscripts of councils, that, as they passed out of date by the introduction of later systematic collections, they were safe for the most part from the disastrous industry of mediaeval scholars.

2. The contents of the Petersburg MS are as follows:—

fol.	1 <i>a</i>			Preface of Dionysius Exiguus to his second edition
	2 <i>a</i>			Capitula of the Canons of the Apostles
	5 <i>b</i>		”	” Nicaea (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	3 <i>a</i>	III	”	” Ancyra
	6 <i>b</i>	”	”	” Neocaesarea (whole title lost)
	”	V	”	” Gangra
	7 <i>b</i>	VI	”	” Antioch
	9 <i>a</i>	”	”	” Laodicea (whole title lost)
	11 <i>a</i>	VIII	”	” Constantinople
	11 <i>b</i>	VIII	”	” Chalcedon
	13 <i>a</i>	”	”	” Sardica (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	14 <i>a</i>	”	”	” Carthage (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	16 <i>a</i>	XII	”	” diuersorum conciliorum Africanae prouinciae

¹ If the MS was, as is probable, in Lyons, it is perhaps hardly likely that Caroline minuscule and not Merovingian writing would have been employed after 800 A. D.

fol.	20 <i>b</i>	[XIII] ¹	Capitula of the Canons of Ancyra ²
	22 <i>a</i>	XIII	" " Arles
	22 <i>b</i>	xv	Sinodus Valentina (no capitula, name only)
	"	xvi	Sinodus Foroiulensis " "
	"	xvii	Sinodus Regensis " "
	"	xviii	Capitula of the Canons of Orange
	23 <i>b</i>	xviii	" " Vaison
	24 <i>a</i>	xx	" " Arles ³
	25 <i>b</i>	xxi	" " Agde
	28 <i>a</i>	"	" " Orleans (number at the head of the Capitula lost)
	29 <i>b</i>	xxiii	" " Epaon
	32 <i>a</i>	xxiii	" " Arles 'secunda' ⁴
	33 <i>b</i>	"	" " Vaison II (whole title lost)
	"	i	Text of the Canons of the Apostles
	43 <i>a</i>	"	" " Nicaea (number at the head of the Canons lost)
	50 <i>a</i>	iii	" " Ancyra
	56 <i>a</i>	iiii	" " Neocaesarea
	58 <i>b</i>	"	" " Gangra (number at the head of the Canons lost)
	61 <i>a</i>	vi	" " Antioch
	69 <i>b</i>	vii	" " Laodicea
	77 <i>b</i>	viii	" " Constantinople
	80 <i>a</i>	viii	" " Chalcedon
	92 <i>b</i>	x	" " Sardica
	102 <i>a</i>	xi	" " Carthage
	119 <i>b</i>	"	" " 'diuersa concilia uniuersae prouinciae Africae'
	178 <i>b</i>	xiii	" " Ancyra
	185 <i>a</i>	xiii	" " Arles

With regard to the first fourteen of these items the correspondence

¹ The MS has at the end of the titles of the 'diuersa concilia Africanæ prouinciae' **EXPLICIUNT CAPITULA XIII.** The number XIII obviously belongs to the heading of the next series of capitula: but the fact that it is thus misunderstood and misplaced suggests that our MS was copied from an exemplar which contained so far exactly the same contents, including, that is, the second version of the canons of Ancyra.

² The title is 'Ancyram et Caesaream,' but the capitula here, and the text on fol. 178 *b*, give only Ancyra. 'Ancyra and Caesarea' is a form drawn from the title prefixed to the canons in the Isidorian version.

³ The capitula of this council are only a selection: they are numbered i-viii, xiii-xxv, vi-x, i(?)-vi (= xlv-lvi of the editions).

⁴ The capitula which follow this title are, however, those of the second council of Orange, A. D. 529.

between capitula and text in the Petersburg MS is complete. But this part of the MS breaks off after fol. 185 *b* in the canon there numbered viii, but in Bruns xvi, of the first council of Arles: and from this point onwards the Berlin MS takes its place. From Rose's catalogue it will be seen that that MS begins with the final words of the same canon, '... nionem consequantur | ut nullus epis alium epism inculcet,' and after Arles has the following councils:—

fol. 1 *a*; xv Statuta synodi apud ecclesiam Valen(ti)nam [Valence, A. D. 374].

fol. 2 *a*; xvi Clero et plebi ecclesiae Foroiuliensi [Letter of Valence to Fréjus].

fol. 3 *b*; xvii Sinodus habita in ciuitate Regensi [Riez, A. D. 439].

fol. 6 *a*; xviii Constitutiones sanctae synodi habitae in territorio Arausico [Orange I, A. D. 441].

fol. 11 *a*; Constitutiones sanctae synodus habitae in ciuitate Vasensi [Vaison I, A. D. 442].

fol. 12 *b*; xx Synodus habita in ciuitate Arelat. [Arles II, A. D. 452].

fol. 16 *a*; XXI Synodus habita in ciuitate Agatensi [Agde, A. D. 506].

fol. 25 *b*; Cum auctore deo in Aurilianensi urbe . . . [Orleans I, A. D. 511].

fol. 30 *b*; xxiii Synodus Epaunensis [Epaon, A. D. 517].

fol. 37 *b*; xxiiii Constitutio sanctorum episcoporum quae in ciuitate Arelatensi . . . [Arles IV, A. D. 524].

fol. 39 *b*; xxv Constitutio habita Carpentoratae [Carpentras, A. D. 527].

fol. 40 *b*; Capitula sancti Augustini.

fol. 44 *a*; xxvi Constitutio episcoporum in ciuitate Arausica [Orange II, A. D. 529].

The correspondence, it will be seen, between the list of capitula of these Gallic councils in the Petersburg MS and their text in the Berlin MS is complete down to no. xxiii. But the capitula give Orange II under the heading xxiv Arles II and substitute Vaison for Carpentras as no. xxv: the text in the Berlin MS goes on without break to De synodo Arverna [Auvergne, A. D. 535], Synodus Aurelianensis secunda [Orleans III, A. D. 538], Canones Aurilianenses tertii [Orleans V, A. D. 549]. At this point (fol. 80 *a*) the words EXPLICIT FELICETER AMEN may indicate the end of one stage in the collection: but the original hand still continues with other councils, no longer however in strict chronological order—Arles III, A. D. 455; Vaison II, A. D. 529; Arles V, A. D. 554, ending on fol. 87 *b* with the ejaculation DS ADIVVA ME. The remaining leaves are by another hand and contain more miscellaneous matter, including only one council, that of Macon in A. D. 581¹.

¹ Dr. Gillert's list of the councils whose capitula are contained in the Petersburg

The original MS, that is, the Petersburg MS with the first eighty-seven leaves of the Berlin MS, consisted therefore of the following elements :

(i) The complete collection of Greek and African councils according to the second edition of Dionysius Exiguus, with the preface properly belonging to it. About this Dionysiana the following points are to be remarked. It is a century earlier than any other complete MS of Dionysius known to us: its history is definitely connected with the papal chancery by the subscription (whether originally belonging to our MS or to its ancestor) appended to the last of the Dionysian documents, the letter *Optaremus* of the African council to Celestine, EXPLICIVNT CANONES ECCLESIASTICI EX SCRINIO ECCLESIAE ROMANE TRANSLATI AMEN, fol. 178 b: it was written a century before Pope Hadrian sent his enlarged Dionysiana to Charles the Great, and yet it already contains several (though not all) of the marks which distinguish the Hadriana from the original Dionysius, such as the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, the Chalcedonian definition, and some at least of the names of the bishops present at the different councils.

(ii) The council of Ancyra, this time in the original form of the Isidorian version, printed from the two MSS of Freising and Würzburg by Maassen, pp. 929-933.

(iii) A series of Gallic councils in strict chronological order, beginning with the first council of Arles in A. D. 314, and going down either to the second council of Vaison—the last of which the capitula are given at the head of the MS—or to the second council of Orange—the last which is numbered in the text of the MS—but in either case to the year 529 A. D.

The facts that the list of capitula at the beginning of the MS ends here, and that the continuous numeration of pieces (i-xxvi) comes to a close at about the same place in the text, tend to suggest that the nucleus of our MS is a collection of Greek, African, and Gallic councils, of which the two former elements represented Roman, while the other represented local, church law, made after the year 529 (the date of the councils of Orange II and Vaison II), but perhaps not long after, since other councils followed quickly which might naturally have been included in any posterior collection. If this is so, the development of the Dionysiana must have begun at a very early period after its publication, since that does not precede by more than ten or twenty years the hypothetical date I have suggested for the nucleus of our MS.

MS (*Neues Archiv* v 616) is correct, except that he omits Epaon and Vaison II—in the latter instance the title is lost in the MS, and the mistake was excusable. The list in the Benedictine catalogue of the Clermont MSS, A. D. 1764, omits Valence, Fréjus, Riez, Orange—exactly the councils where there is no rubricated title, and which therefore a careless cataloguer would naturally overlook.

To this original nucleus the first addition would be that of a series of mainly Frankish councils, following the councils already incorporated in strict chronological order from 535 to 549 A. D., and brought to a close by the EXPLICIT FELICETER of Berlin fol. 80 a : the second addition consists of councils from Provence, which this time form not simply a continuation but a correction to the series, since the first of them goes back again to the year 455. But as the last belongs to A. D. 554, there is no reason for doubting that the whole of our Petersburg and Berlin MS down to this point represents a collection made, or rather completed, soon after the middle of the sixth century, a century before the MS itself was written.

That our Petersburg-Berlin MS was written at Lyons there seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt. It was from Lyons that Sirmond first drew it to light : and the indications of a collection whose later additions are councils of Auvergne and Orleans on the one side, of Arles and Vaison on the other, combine excellently for the great city which lies midway between the Loire and the Mediterranean. That it was not our present MS, but only the ultimate exemplar of a portion of it, which was written at Rome, is clear—apart from palaeographical reasons—from the stages which we have seen reason to postulate in the accumulation of Gallic material, before the original Roman-Gallic collection swelled to the dimensions of our present MS.

C. H. TURNER.

TWO NOTES ON ISAIAH xli 5-7¹.

I.

I AM much attracted towards Dr. Barnes's view ; and certainly think that he has shewn that the meaning *solder* for *כֶּסֶף* rests upon a slight foundation ; one would gladly have the same meaning for it in all its occurrences. There are, however, difficulties (which I will state briefly) which make me hesitate about accepting the view as a whole. (1) Is it clear that *כֶּסֶף* is a *metal-founder* in general? The whole root (including *כֶּסֶף* Prov. xvii 3 = xxvii 21 'the fining-pot for *silver*') is so used of the *noble metals*² (and the figurative senses of *smelt*, *smelt away*, or *refine*³, and *test*⁴, seem also to presuppose this), that, though our data are of course limited, it seems to me doubtful whether it would have been used of other metals. This is my chief ground for hesitation. Less serious ones are : (2) In a description of general war-

¹ See *J. T. S.* vol. iv p. 266.

² See Jer. vi 29, Zech. xiii 9, Ps xii 7 [A.V. 6], lxvi 10; and the ptcip. (R.V. usually *goldsmith*), Jud. xvii 4 ('founder,' but the metal worked with is silver), Neh. iii 8, 32, Isa. xl 19^a, xli 7, xlvi 6, Jer. x 9, 14 = li 17, Prov. xxv 4 ('finer').

³ As Isa. i 25, xlviii 10, Jer. ix 7 (A.V. 6), Zech. xiii 9, Mal. iii 2, 3.

⁴ As Jud. vii 4, Ps. xvii 3, xxvi 2.