

The opinion, therefore, at which I have arrived is that almost certainly Hilary did not write the first seven and the *Ad caeli clara*. But the *Hymnum dicat* he probably did write, or at least may have written.

A. S. WALPOLE.

AN ANCIENT OFFICE FOR HOLY SATURDAY.

IN spite of the great labours of liturgiologists in the past there still remain services and customs in old MSS which have not yet been published or described. The communication of a passage in a Vatican MS at the meeting of the Roman Conferences on Christian Archaeology in January last, and the subsequent discussion at the February meeting, seem too important to be lost without some permanent record of a liturgical point then treated for the first time.

The passage in question is found in Cod. Vatic.-Urb. Lat. 602, a troper usually, though without sufficient authority, assigned to Monte-cassino, with Beneventan script and musical notation of the twelfth century; a thirteenth-century writer has inserted on ff. 99-100^{vo} with neums:

S]i quis catechuminus est, procedat.

Si quis hereticus est, procedat.

Si quis iudeus est, procedat.

Si quis paganus est, procedat.

Si quis arrianus est, procedat.

Cuius cura non est, procedat.

I]sti sunt agni novelli qui annuntiaverunt alleluia, modo venerunt ad fontes.

Repleti sunt claritate, alleluia, alleluia.

In conspectu agni amicti stolis albis et pal[

[For convenience, the words *Isti sunt . . . palmis*, which are separated from the preceding by a slight break, will be referred to as Part II.]

The neums clearly shew that these insertions were not made merely to preserve a dead rite, but for actual use. But what rite is referred to? In the absence of other similar texts, the first and not unnatural interpretation was that the first part represented the ancient *missa infidelium* before the oblation, when the catechumens were dismissed by the formula 'Catecumini recedant. Si quis catechuminus est, recedat' (Mabillon *Mus. Ital.*; Lutet. Paris 1684 vol. ii p. 79), whilst the second referred to the words which the subdeacon pronounced on the Saturday *in albis* as he presented to the Pope the wax *Agnus Dei*.

This explanation of *Si quis* &c., seemed to be so at variance with the

general opinion that heretics, Jews, and infidels were not permitted to be present even at the commencement of the sacred mysteries, and also to be founded on the supposition that *procedat* and *recedat* were synonymous terms, that I endeavoured to find other examples of this formula which would give an explanation more in accordance with the text and the traditional theory¹.

I have fortunately been able to discover the passage in three other MSS, and to find a reference to a fourth.

1. A twelfth-century Beneventan troper (now No. 28 in the Chapter Library of Benevento) has on fol. 27 for the office of Holy Saturday, after the tract 'Sicut cervus desiderat', &c., a short neumed litany which is worth reproducing for its simplicity and archaic character :

Domine, defende nos.

Domine, protege nos.

Hemmanuhel, nobiscum Deus, adiuva nos.

Kyrie leyson. Christe leison. Kyrie leison.

Christe, audi nos.

Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis.

Christe, audi nos.

Omnes sitientes, venite ad aquas, querite dominum dum inveniri potest, dicit dominus.

Here follows the first part of the formula as in the Urbinas MS, except that the clause of the heretic precedes that of the Jew. The second part does not appear, but the MS without any break goes on with the Mass for Holy Saturday.

2. Vatican MS Ottob. Lat. 576, a neumed Missal of about A.D. 1200, which Ebner ascribes to a Benedictine cloister near Montecassino or Benevento, has on fol. 209^v sqq. 'Iste ordo dicendus est sabato post scrutinium. Quando procedunt ad fontem, dicitur ista Antiphona : *Omnes sitientes . . . dominus*. Deinde circa fontem faciant Letaniam' (with many saints, Leucius of Brindisi appearing second in the list of martyrs, between Stephen and Linus). 'Post Letaniam cantet diaconus hos versus. Respondeat diaconus similiter² : *Si quis catholicuminus*' &c., as above, except that the last sentence begins with *huius* instead of *Cuius* (the initial *h* is not rubricated like the *C*). This is followed immediately by the usual blessing of the font.

¹ After this notice was in type Prof H. Benigni in the April number of *Misallanea di Storia e Cultura Ecclesiastica* (Rome) vol. iii no. 6 p. 365, has defended the above interpretation, explaining *procedat* as equivalent to *recedat*. But the text of the office of the *scrutinium* makes a very clear distinction between the two verbs; the invitation to the catechumens to come forward is invariably *procedant*, whilst their dismissal is *recedant*.

² The contraction marks leave it doubtful whether the scribe did not intend *cantent diaconi . . . respondeant diaconi*.

3. MS C. 32 of the Vallicellan Library at Rome, an Ordinal of Beneventan script and musical notation, probably written in the twelfth century, has on fol. 30 sq. the Office for Holy Saturday, with part I as above (except *curam* for *cura*) preceded by the Rubric 'Quando procedunt ad fontes. *Ant.* Omnes sitiētes' &c., and a South Italian lityny, and followed by the Order of Baptism.

4. The 'Codice diplomatico Barese' (Bari 1897 vol. i p. 209) gives the text of a Holy Saturday neumed Roll written for Bari in the eleventh century and still preserved in the cathedral. The service for the blessing of the font runs: 'Tunc procedit pontifex ad fontem. canunt clerici antiphonam hanc: *Omnes sitiētes* &c. Venientes (!) ad fontem incipit episcopus letanias [very short]. Deinde legitur lectio: *Hec est hereditas* &c. Tractus: *Sicut ceruus* &c. Tunc presbyter dicit: *Oremus. Omnipotens sempiternus deus respice propitius ad* &c. Deinde dicantur a duobus diaconibus hi versus: *Si quis* &c.' The invitation to the Arian comes second; and the last clause has *Cui* for *Cuius*. Then follows the blessing of the font.

It will at once be seen that all four sources agree in assigning this formula to the procession to the font on the vigil of Easter; and an examination of the Urbinas MS shews that here too the thirteenth-century scribe intended *Si quis* to serve for that day; he had erased the Gradual-tropes at the beginning of the MS in order to insert the processional Antiphons &c. and had written *Sicut ceruus desiderat* &c. for Holy Saturday on fol. 22^{vo}-23, but would not erase the following pages as he desired to retain the Kyrie-tropes which were still in use; so he continued his insertions (*Si quis* &c.) for that day on the next page which he erased, viz. fol. 99^{vo}, although he had already inserted on the margin of fol. 23 the letter S as a sign to the rubricator.

Hence there is no doubt that even as late as the thirteenth century Benevento and its neighbourhood used for the procession that day an office which we have found nowhere else (all five MSS agree in providing the same melody).

The precise meaning of our formula is not so clear: we have apparently six classes of persons to whom the church appeals; the first five need no explanation, though it is strange to find Arians put in a class by themselves apart from other heretics; but the last 'Cuius cura non est' is a strange expression, and in the absence of any parallel passage, one can but offer suggestions as to its meaning. The variants *cui*, *huius*, *curam* make it possible that we may not have the original text and the different order of the preceding sentences adds to the difficulty. Six separate explanations have occurred to me and to liturgical scholars

whom I have consulted. It has been suggested that if the Arian clause is an interpolation due to a marginal note, the scale would descend from catechumens to (i) atheists, *sine cura*, a degree lower than pagans who had some sort of religion; or that the appeal is to (ii) the careless and indolent, the reference being to times when baptism was deferred until late in life¹, but such would scarcely form a definite class by themselves, and the formula should rather have run 'Cuius cura non erat'. In fact the construction *Cui*, not *Cuius*, seems necessary to justify either this or the preceding rendering of the passage. Again, it is possible that the intention may have been to sum up the five classes, (iii) any one who is outside the charge of the church, though it seems hard to bring catechumens under this category. If, as I think, this is the right meaning to give to *cura*, I should venture to make this class (iv) the excommunicate, of whom for the time being the church took no care, i.e. 'cuius curam non habet ecclesia'; it is difficult to say what one word in early ecclesiastical Latin would represent the class later on called the 'excommunicati'. Two other possible explanations have occurred to me; if *sui* could be understood after *cura*, the reference may be to (v) energumens; or, if the expression is a general one, the invitation to join the procession may be addressed to (vi) the body of the faithful, who did not on this occasion need the special care of the church, as the function was primarily intended for the classes already summoned. I must be content to leave the matter thus, though I am inclined to favour the fourth explanation.

But another question arises as to the rite for which these various classes were bidden to come forward. It is apparently for baptism, and we could quote as a similar rite not only the present Roman Missal which refers to baptizing catechumens² on Holy Saturday, but also the custom of baptizing 'Jews' at the Lateran on that day. But baptism is out of the question for the last class if we are right in supposing them to be the excommunicate, and also for the Arians, if we are certain that the rite here referred to is Western in its origin, for the rebaptism of Arians was never allowed by the Roman Church, whatever may have been the belief and custom of the Easterns³.

Another solution of the question is suggested by the order in which the classes are called up: the first four appear according to their nearness to the church—(1) pious catechumens, (2) Jews by descent, (3) heretics, quasi-Christians, and (4) pagans, all of whom require baptism;

¹ Cf. the Holy Saturday prayer in the *Missale Gallicanum vetus*: 'Pro negligentibus tardisque domini nostri cultoribus, id est neophytis.'

² The formula *Caticumini procedant* is found in all the Offices of the Scrutinium: cf. *inter alia* MS Vatican. Palat. 485, fol. 37^{vo} (a Lorsch MS of the ninth century).

³ Cf. the sixth-century Timotheus *De iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt*, Migne P. G. lxxxvi col. 1059 sqq.

then come Arians, separated from the class of heretics in general as already validly baptized, and for such Confirmation was the public reception into the body of the Catholic Church; and lastly the excommunicate who needed reconciliation with their mother. As a matter of fact Confirmation was always administered after the Holy Saturday baptism, and penitents expelled at the beginning of Lent were received back on one of the last days of Holy Week, though I cannot for the moment recall an instance of their reconciliation being appointed in the West for the day preceding Easter¹.

Further research may settle the question definitely; but the above is offered as a possible explanation of the formula. As in the Good Friday prayers the Western Church prayed, and still prays, 'pro catechuminis nostris, pro haereticis et schismaticis, pro perfidis Iudaeis, pro paganis', so on Holy Saturday she invited them to approach the sacrament, whether of baptism, confirmation, or absolution, which they respectively needed before they could be admitted to the paschal feast.

This explanation suggests a corresponding one for the second part of our formula which is not found in the three MSS quoted above. It is true that the blessing of the wax *Agnus Dei* goes back as far as the eighth or ninth century, but, unless commentators are mistaken, the function was restricted to Rome and *suburbanis civitatibus*. Moreover, whilst the blessing of the *Agnus* was on Holy Saturday, the distribution and the use of these three sentences by the subdeacon took place on the following Saturday; as in the Urbinas MS the words follow the *Si quis* and apparently belong to the same office, and as all the additions by the second scribe have reference to processions, it seems very unlikely that *Isti sunt* can refer to the subdeacon's appeal to the Pope in a stationary rite. Hence I prefer connecting these three sentences with the procession back to the church after the baptism on Holy Saturday. It will at once be seen how appropriate is the description of the newly baptized as 'agni novelli, qui modo venerunt ad fontes', whilst 'repleti claritudine' and 'amicti stolis albis' well fit in with the lights they carried and the clothing by the bishop², and the 'qui annuntia-

¹ The oldest pontificals may perhaps be cited as witnessing to some similar arrangement: e. g. the ninth-century Poitiers pontifical (MS Paris, Arsen. 227) and the so-called Gellone Sacramentary of the eighth (MS Paris, B.N. 12048) after the usual ceremonies for Holy Saturday provide the following offices: *Si quis nondum catechuminus ad baptizandum venerit; ad catechuminum faciendum ex pagano; reconciliatio ab hereticis rebaptisati: benedictio super eos qui de variis heresibus veniunt; reconciliatio redeuntium a paganis; impositio manuum super emergumenum*. It is true that the precise day for the use of these collects is not mentioned, but their position after the Easter-even offices suggests that they may have been intended for that day.

² Cf. the rubric in the South Italian MS Barberini Lat. 561 (xii 4) = *dat singulis stola, casulla et chrismale et decem siliquis et vestiuntus*.

verunt alleluia' recalls the words of the eleventh *Ordo Romanus* which speaks of the newly-baptized children as those 'qui annuntiant alleluia, id est gloriam caelestis patriae'.

On the whole formula it is noticeable that its use was apparently restricted to the south of Italy, and that it points back to some date before the final disappearance of pagans, whom St Benedict found at Montecassino in the sixth century, and before the Arianism of the Goths had died out; the Beneventan liturgy has several references to this period, e.g. the cathedral is termed the *ecclesia catholica*; in the farced Kyrie trope *Devote canentes* which I am now publishing (*Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* vol. xlvii p. 173) we meet with: *Iudaea lugeat, garrat Arius, sileat, centies victus est*. The baptism office of the South Italian manuscript missals has many allusions to the time when adult baptism was common; to take only one example—Ottobon. 576 speaks of the catechumen on fol. 192 'quem de errore seculi ad agnitionem nominis tui vocare dignatus es', on fol. 196 'quem liberasti de errore gentilium', and as one 'qui in seculi huius nocte vagatur incertus et dubius', whilst on fol. 193 it adjures the pagan 'horresce idola, respue simulacra', and the heretic or Arian 'cole Deum patrem omnipotentem et Iesum Christum filium eius cum Spiritu sancto'; these expressions occur, it is true, in an office for the baptism of infants¹, but are a clear indication of the surroundings of the time when it was originally drawn up.

If it appear strange that such a formula as ours was preserved and was in use as late as the thirteenth century, whilst no traces of it are found in the corresponding Roman office, it is, I venture to think, due to the fact which, as far as I know, has not yet been noticed, that the local ritual and offices of South Italy seem to have escaped the Gallican influence of the ninth century which so changed the Roman rite, and that, even after the arrival of the Normans with the usual Gallican-Roman books, they were allowed to be retained for some time; in some MSS, e.g. Barberini Lat. 560 (xii 3) of the tenth century, the office for the processions to and from the font, which may have contained the two formulas we have been describing, was not cancelled until a thirteenth-century scribe inserted other rubrics in their stead, one evidently of the local rite, the other 'secundum morem Romanae ecclesiae'; whilst in MSS still at Benevento the two rites seem to have been allowed to go on side by side in the twelfth century.

It must be reserved for some future notice to consider how far we may be able to find in the Beneventan MSS traces of the original Roman liturgy, such as are probably still to be seen in the Ambrosian;

¹ These expressions occur in the present Roman office for adult baptism.

for the present it may not have been without interest to call attention to one small but not unimportant part of it in the Office for Holy Saturday.

HENRY MARRIOTT BANNISTER.

PS.—*July 7, 1905.* I have now found that the formula occurs in the Ambrosian Antiphoner of the twelfth century (B.M. add. MS 34209), for *Sabbato in traditione symboli*. This fact may on investigation lead to a modification of my theory. If so, I hope to publish a further Note upon the subject in the next number of the JOURNAL.—H. M. B.

THE IDEA OF SLEEP IN THE 'HYMN OF THE SOUL'.

MR A. S. DUNCAN JONES in his review of Dr E. Preuschen's *Zwei gnostische Hymnen* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* No. 23 p. 450 writes as follows :

'The idea that Christ fell asleep and forgot his heavenly origin seems difficult to understand. Preuschen represents it as the result of partaking of the food of the world.'

The verses of the Bardesanic hymn in question are thus translated by Prof A. A. Bevan :

'I forgot that I was a son of kings,
And I served their king ;
And I forgot the pearl,
For which my parents had sent me,
And by reason of the burden of their . . .
I lay in a deep sleep . . .
To thee our son, who art in Egypt, greeting !
Up and arise from thy sleep.'

In a *Summa contra Patarenos* contained in an early thirteenth-century Codex of the San Lorenzo library in Florence, Bibl. Aedilium 37, fol. 75^{vo} foll. is a passage which throws some light on the reference to sleep in the hymn. The *Summa* is in the form of a dialogue between a Catholic and a Patarene, and on fol. 77^{ro} the latter speaks as follows :

'Villicus iniquitatis de quo euangelium (Lk. xv 25) dicit, fuit diabolus, cuius omnis <cohors> angelorum cum fuerit deputata, ut laudum