

worthy of repentance, to be like the man who built his house upon a rock, following up hearing by doing. This, rather than wrangling and disputing or mere noisy outcry, will be the best answer to the adverse criticism of those who were His enemies and John's. So they will shew the Divine Wisdom to be in the right in sending them such teachers as John and Himself. For 'Wisdom is justified by the works of all her children'.

A. T. BURBRIDGE.

ON THE USE OF THE *QUICUNQUE VULT* IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

[THE following draft of a letter written by the late Henry Bradshaw, apparently intended for publication but never published, has been placed at our disposal by the kindness of Mr F. Jenkinson, Librarian of the University of Cambridge. The letter is undated; but its mention of a statement made by 'the Cambridge Professors' on the subject with which it deals points to the year 1872 as the time when it was written. The reference is no doubt to the last paragraph of a memorandum on the *Quicunque vult* drawn up at the request of Archbishop Tait by Dr Westcott, Dr Swainson, and Dr Lightfoot, which was laid before Convocation early in that year¹. The paragraph in question is as follows:—

'We would also add that we deplore the change ratified at the last revision of the Prayer Book, by which this Exposition of the Faith when used was substituted for the Apostles' Creed; and we hope that the earlier usage of our Church may be restored, by which it was recited on special occasions before that Creed and not in place of it.'

The statement thus put forward appears to have been challenged by Mr J. W. Burgon (afterwards Dean of Chichester), and by another writer who used the signature 'N. P.'² The reply to their criticism prepared by Mr Bradshaw seems worth preserving as a clear statement of the facts with regard to the use of the *Quicunque vult*.—H. A. W.]

'SIR,—I shall be glad if you can find space for a few words concerning the pedigree of the use of the *Quicunque vult*, a point to which your correspondent N. P. justly attaches some importance, though the "palpable blunder" which he and Mr Burgon attribute to the Cam-

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1872, p. 49.

² The initials suggest that this writer may have been Mr. Nicholas Pocock.

bridge Professors lies in the writers' own want of sufficient knowledge rather than in the careful statement with which they find fault.

'Facts are always safer ground than assumptions, as perhaps even Mr Burgon will allow some day. If any one will take the original preface to the Prayer Book "Concerning the Service of the Church" as a guide, and will patiently study the anatomy of the old services of the English Church, and compare them with the Reformed Prayer Book, he will see what a deep knowledge the English Reformers had of the old services, and how closely they followed the old lines, even while they ruthlessly cut off what they (rightly or wrongly) considered excrescences.

'At Mattins the *Venite* was divested of its varying invitatory, the Hymn was abolished, the Psalms for the day were cleared of their anthems, and the Lessons for the day of their responds, while the *Te Deum* was left, to be used daily except during a certain portion of the year. At Lauds immediately following, the fixed Psalms (one of which was the *Benedicite*) with their anthems were abolished, the *Benedicite* alone being retained for use at such times as the *Te Deum* was omitted; the *Capitulum* was deprived of its respond and was expanded into a whole chapter from the New Testament; and the *Benedictus* was retained, only divested of its varying anthem. At this point followed, preceded (on week-days only) by the *Preces feriales*, the Collect for the day and other *memoriae*, among which the Collect in the *memoria pro pace* [Collect for Peace] was one.

'At Prime, which followed at once, the Hymn was abolished, the fixed Psalms (the last of which was the *Quicumque vult*) with their anthems were abolished, the *Quicumque vult* alone being retained for use on certain festivals; the *Capitulum* and its respond were abolished; but the *Preces in prostratione* (including in them the *Credo* and *Paternoster*) were retained in a modified and much abridged form, as well as the Collect for Grace with which (on Sundays, &c.) this service concluded. To this last were prefixed the Collect for the day and the *memoria pro pace* which had formed part of the conclusion of Lauds¹.

'It is difficult to give a broad view of these changes in few words, so as to be understood. But let any one read carefully the old service of Prime, which the Reformers had been in the habit of using for years past. He must allow that in abolishing the Hymn, in cutting down the daily use of the long series of fixed Psalms to the occasional use of one of them, the *Quicumque vult*; in reducing the long *Preces in prostratione* (which consisted of the *Kyrie eleison*, Lord's Prayer, Creed,

¹ Here follows a paragraph which has been cancelled, and written afresh in another form.—H. A. W.

Confession and Absolution, with from twenty to thirty verses and responds interspersed) to the simple Prayers to be said all devoutly kneeling, *Kyrie*, Creed¹, Lord's Prayer and seven verses and responds; the Reformers may well have felt that curtailment could hardly go further.

'It will be seen from what I have said, and it must always be borne in mind, that in the old service, and in the Prayer Book of 1549, the *Quicumque vult* is sung as an ordinary Psalm, while the *Credo* forms part of the *Preces in prostratione* or Prayers to be said all devoutly kneeling. In 1552 the Revisers seem to have come to the conclusion that it was better to repeat the *Credo* standing; at any rate, from whatever cause, we find the Creed now removed from the *Preces in prostratione* and prefixed to them with a rubric ordering that it shall be said standing. If they had meant to say that the Creed was not to be used at all when the *Quicumque vult* was sung, surely they would have said so. Having been accustomed all their lives to use the two in the same service, they might at least have added a direction to omit one of them if they had really meant us to do so. It is perhaps difficult for us, at the present day, to appreciate the enormous reduction which the Reformers made in the length of the services. The tendency, as we all know, has been gradually to shorten even these abridged services more and more. From this point of view, Mr Burgon's note about Cartwright is very interesting, as shewing that even in 1572 the practice of mutilating the service had begun. But even Cartwright's words hardly authorize us to speak of the practice as universal, much less of its affording the only rational meaning of the rubric in question. Otherwise we might almost be told that the modern abuse of closing the common² Sunday service with the sermon was sufficient warrant for believing that the offertory rubrics naturally supported that interpretation. When we know for certain what the Reformers had been accustomed to themselves, it is only fair to interpret their words by this rather than by the custom which grew up even in the very next generation.

'The Quignon Breviary³ afforded our Reformers many valuable hints; but it is a fancy service, which deserts the old lines of the Catholic service-books, and it is a very unsafe guide to those who would study the genuine history of the English services.'

¹ In the draft the words '*Kyrie*, Creed' precede the words 'Prayers, all devoutly kneeling'; but in the Prayer Book of 1549 the *Kyrie* and Creed are part of these prayers, not something prefixed to them: the later changes are discussed in the next paragraph.—H. A. W.

² This word is doubtful.—H. A. W.

³ The Breviary of Quignon, in both its forms, contemplates the omission of the Apostles' Creed on Sundays, when the *Quicumque vult* was to be said.—H. A. W.

CLARENDON PRESS GREEK TESTAMENTS.

1. In a note added to my unpretending article¹ Professor Sanday expresses a little surprise that I ruled out the one book which has some real connexion with the Oxford of the present day, and demurs to the title I have given to my study. The reason of the first fact is very simple: I wished to treat of those editions alone which confine themselves to the *Text* of the Greek Testament. If any one wishes to buy a Greek Testament *without apparatus* published by the Clarendon Press he can get no other than 'Lloyd' for 3s. and 'Mill' for 2s. 6d. 'Palmer' has an apparatus, a special purpose, and costs in its cheapest form 4s. 6d. I further confined my words strictly to the 'Press', and I did not speak at all of the New Testament at Oxford at the present day.

2. But as Professor Sanday insists on Palmer's Greek Testament, as prescribed for use in the Examinations of the University, a word on 'Palmer' will be allowed. The principle was to introduce into the text of Stephanus 1550 (= Mill=Lloyd) the readings adopted by the Revisers, and it contains on its margins, if I counted correctly, 5,257 variants, as proof how far the text of the Revisers deviated from that of 1550. But there are grave doubts, whether this principle really does justice to the Revisers and whether it satisfies the wants of modern students.

The Revisers continue in their Preface, after the words quoted by Palmer in his Preface (that it did not fall within their province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text)—'In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly *either of two competing readings in the Greek*, and then the question of text was usually not raised'. Now I ask, is it justifiable in the hundreds and thousands of these cases where *S* deviates from a modern text, say that of Westcott-Hort, to exhibit (just and only) *S* as the text represented by the Revisers, with the exclusion of the competing reading, which has, perhaps, much better foundation?

To quote the examples from the first two chapters of Matthew. Palmer changed *S* in ch. i seven times, in ch. ii three times; Scrivener gives in his *editio maior* in the same chapters 19 + 7 and 15 + 3 deviations of Westcott-Hort from *S*; to mention but the spellings Δαυειδ, Ἀχάς, Σολομῶνα, Ἡρῳδης; the transpositions ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῳδης, ἐξετάσατε ἀκριβῶς, κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται, ἀντὶ Ἡρῳδοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, the replacing of παραδειγματίσαι by the simple verb, ἔστη by ἐστάθη, the omission of ἐπί in ii 22. Surely these readings are all much better attested than those of *S*, may just as well claim to correspond to the Revised Version,

¹ See *Journal of Theological Studies*, January 1904, p. 274.

and have better claims to be placed in the hands of modern students than those of 1550. But this is a question by itself; what I wished to insist upon was, that the Clarendon Press in its *text*-editions ought no longer to circulate the *Textus Receptus*.

3. Finally, Professor Sanday made a little mistake in writing: 'Cambridge prints the Stephanus text of 1550 with the Revisers' readings as variants'. It is not the Stephanus text of 1550, but Beza's fifth and last text of 1598 (as being more likely than any other to be in the hands of King James's revisers). Whether the Cambridge Press, in like manner as the Clarendon does with Lloyd and Mill, 'still issues the text of Stephanus' is unknown to me¹. Scrivener's reprints of Stephanus are, as far as I am aware, private undertakings, and his edition of Beza with the reading, of the Revisers, published for the University Press, ranks with Palmer, not with 'Lloyd' or 'Mill'.

EB. NESTLE.

NOTES ON THE BISHOPS OF ST ANDREWS.

Addenda et Corrigenda.

DURING the great schism, while Scotland up to 1417 adhered to the Anti-Popes, the Popes continued to make appointments to Scottish sees, which appointments in Scotland were wholly unrecognized and ineffective. The following may be recorded. (1) As already noticed (see p. 122 note) Alexander de Neville, archbishop of York (deposed 1388), was translated by Urban VI to the bishopric of St Andrews in Scotland (*Walsingham*, Rolls Series, ii 179). The date of the bull is given as April 30, 1388. He is the 'Alexander bishop of St Andrews' of subsequent letters of Urban VI and Boniface IX (*C. P. R.* iv 271, 326, 343). He died in poverty at Louvain in May, 1392. (2) Thomas de Arundel (successor of Neville at York, translated to Canterbury in 1396), while in banishment after his attainder, was translated to St Andrews by Boniface IX, Jan. 21, 1398. He was restored to Canterbury in Oct. 1399 (see Hardy's *Le Neve's Fasti*). (3) John Trevor,

¹ The Cambridge University Press publishes Beza's text of 1598, with the variants adopted by the Revisers at the foot of the page, as stated by Dr. Nestle. For this edition there is a good demand. It also still prints and publishes the Stephanus text of 1550, with the English of the Authorized Version in parallel columns (first edited by Scholefield in 1836—some small changes, e. g. of orthography, in later editions), as there is still some demand for this edition. Scrivener's reprint of the Stephanus text of 1550, with the variants of later editors and the Revisers at the foot of the page, is published by Messrs Deighton & Bell, though printed at the Cambridge Press.—[EDD.]