

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE QUEEN OF SWEDEN'S 'GELASIAN
SACRAMENTARY'.

IV

The Roman Masses for the Thursday before Easter. The first and second of the three Masses which Reginensis gives to the Thursday before Easter (Mur. i 548-559) are numbered 'xxxviii' and 'xl' respectively; while the third has no numeral, and the item for the following day is numbered 'xli'. Here, therefore, there is a manifest error. I propose to correct it by transferring 'xl' to the *missa ad vesperum*, and giving 'xxxix' to the *missa chrismatiss*.

By the hypothesis Redactions *s* and *S*₁ contained nothing that was not strictly sacramental, and thus nothing that was proper to a Canon Poenitentialis or a Rituale Pontificale. With a view to their reconstruction I therefore neglect all that in § xxxviii concerns the reconciliation of penitents and the whole of the *missa chrismatiss*: except that the Communicantes and Hanc igitur which now figure in the latter item must be taken thence and reinstated in their original home, the *missa ad vesperum*. This we are, I think, required to do by the rubric '*Infra canonem ut supra*' (*ib.* 559).

I. There are two textual errors in § xxxviii. 1. In the second prayer, 'Concede credentibus' &c., the simplest remedy of an unquestionably perplexing corrupt reading is that indirectly suggested by Gerbert, 'Concede . . . saluum de xp̄i passione remedium ut humana fragilitas a praeteritae culpae laqueis aeterno suffragio absoluatur . per'. 2. In the Secreta, 'Virtutum' &c., the phrase 'in eorum traditione solemniter honorum' must be altered, in accordance with Cardinal Tommasi's suggestion, to 'in eorum traditione solemniter honoranda'.

II. The subject of the evolution of the extant capitulum of § xxxviii must be reserved to a later page. Meanwhile, suffice it to remember (i) that in neither *s* nor *S*₁, each of which was, by the hypothesis, Roman, can there have been any need for the interpretative '*id est non dicit* Dñs uobiscum' after the memorandum '*Eodem die*' &c.; (ii) that, by the hypothesis, the words '*et reconciliatio poenitentiss*' were not part of the title in either *s* or *S*₁, and (iii) that, if § xxxvii may guide us, the original heading was not '*Oïones in quinta feria*', but '*Feria v. hebdom. sexta*' (17 letters).

Whether or not we are to regard as intrinsic to *s* and *S*₁ the clause '*Qui in hac die . . . eleuatis*' which in Reginensis precedes the Post-

communion of § xxxviii (Mur. i 554), we must be circumspect in dealing with the parenthetical ‘*ubi dicimus . . . dicimus*’ there prefixed to it, a phrase the colloquial diction of which would seem to stamp it as a memorandum which had in the first instance been set in a margin.

III. In close connexion with this subject two difficulties now present themselves :—

1. The *Hanc igitur* of § xxxviii is thus phrased : ‘*Hanc igitur oblationem dñe cunctae familiae tuae quam tibi offerunt ob diem ieiunii coenae dñicae in qua dñs n̄. ih̄c xp̄c tradidit discipulis suis . . . offerre diesque n̄fos in tua pace d*’; where the words ‘*ieiunii coenae dñicae*’ raise a prejudice against the claim of the whole of the paragraph as now found in *Reginensis* to be deemed part of the original scheme of the item : because (i) those words are not in the corresponding constituent of the next *Mass* (Mur. i 555); because (ii) they yield a tautological construction, and because, (iii) although at a comparatively late period in the sixth century it was deemed advisable to remind the churches of Spain, and perhaps also those of the south-western littoral of Gaul, that the Thursday before Easter must be observed as a fast, and not, after the manner of the *Priscillianists*, as a feast,¹ no such emergency can be averred of the Roman Church either then or at any other time.

Another prejudice against the claim of the whole of the extant text of this *Hanc igitur* to be deemed part of the original scheme of § xxxviii is raised by its ‘*diesque n̄fos*’ &c.; for this is part of a clause which had no permanent place in the Roman text of the Canon until Gregory the Great put it there.

But when, by elimination of ‘*ieiunii coenae dñicae*’ and ‘*diesque n̄fos*’ &c., this *Hanc igitur* shall have been reduced to what would seem to be an earlier text, we may well doubt whether, even in such earlier text, it can have been a constituent of § xxxviii as originally devised; for none of the ordinary prayers of the *Mass*—*Collecta*, *Oratio*, *Secreta*, *Postcommunion*, *Ad populum*—says anything about the institution of the Eucharist.

2. The same very grave objection must be made in respect of the *Communicantes*. This has for its subject matter the betrayal by Judas. The ordinary prayers of the *Mass* say nothing whatever about it.

IV. The Preface of the *missa ad vesperum* (Mur. i 558) exhibits a peculiarity which must not be overlooked. Apart from its extraordinary conclusion, ‘*Per ipsum*’ &c., a conclusion which seems to have

¹ The sixteenth canon of the First Council of Braga (held according to Baronius in the year 563) ordains, ‘*Si quis quinta feria paschali, quae est coena Domini, hora legitima post nonam ieiunus in ecclesia missas non tenet, sed secundum sectam Priscilliani festiuitatem ipsius diei ab hora tertia, per missas defunctorum, soluto ieiunio colit, anathema sit*’.

replaced (in 59 letters) the customary 'per quem' (in 7 letters), it falls into two clearly distinguishable halves¹: 'UD . . . quem in hac nocte . . . pro saeculi redemptione suppleret (in 542 letters)' and 'Pascit igitur mitis d̄s barbarum . . . relaxauit' (in 354). The style of the first is devoid of startling extravagance; not so that of the second: witness its 'pascit igitur mitis d̄s barbarum iudam' and its 'adhuc cibum eius iudas in ore ferebat et ad lanianda membra eius iudaeos carnifices aduocabat'. The first half contrasts the Redeemer's *innocentia* and His betrayer's guilt; the second contrasts the Redeemer's *patientia* and His betrayer's bloodthirstiness. Divergencies like these would seem to justify us in suspecting that, whoever may have been the author of the first half, the second cannot have been composed within the precincts of the Lateran; for, although the African nationality of Gelasius I, who on an occasion like this comes unbidden into our thoughts, might reasonably be held accountable for the fervour of the 'Quem in hac nocte . . . suppleret', the turgidity and unchastened daring of the 'Pascit igitur . . . relaxauit' seems to betoken a date later than his or a pen not trimmed in Rome. As against the extant value, 955 letters, of the Preface of § xl we therefore seem to have *prima facie* ground for suspecting a first value of (542 + 7 =) 549 for 'UD et iustum est . per xpm̄ dñm nfm̄ . quem in hac nocte . . . suppleret . per quem', a value reducible to 538 if we neglect the unusual 'et iustum est'. But these I propose to raise to 570 and 559, respectively; for whereas in the sentence 'Coenauit igitur' &c. Reginensis reads 'quem nec sub praemia pietas [an evident error for 'quem nec suprema pietas'] a scelere reuocaret' while Pamelius and Ménard find 'quem nec sacрати cibi collatio reuocaret', I am persuaded that both readings are authentic and that the classic text is that of the Canterbury Missal (MS c.c.c.c.

¹ With light but sure touch, a reviser, whom I believe to have been Gregory the Great himself, has, in the Canterbury Missal (fol. 35 v.), reconciled the first and second halves, and reduced the asperities of the second, thus:—

Regin.

1. Quem in hac nocte . . . ut exemplum *innocentiae* mundo relinqueret.

2. Pascit igitur mitis d̄s *barbarum* iudam et sustinet in *mensam* crudelem conuiuiam *donec se suo laqueo perderet qui . . . O d̄m per omnia patientem . . . Adhuc cibum eius iudas in ore ferebat et ad lanianda membra eius iudaeos carnifices aduocabat.*

Cant.

1. Quem in hac nocte . . . ut exemplum *patientiae* mundo relinqueret.

2. Pascit igitur mitis d̄s *immitem* iudam et sustinet *pious* crudelem conuiuiam *qui merito laqueo suo periturus erat quia . . . O d̄m per omnia patientem . . . Cibum eius iudas in ore ferebat et quibus eum traderet persecutores aduocabat.*

Compare St Gregory's 'quatenus suae nobis *patientiae* praebere exemplum' (Hom. 16 § 3) and 'in semetipso nobis Dominus *patientiae* praebuit exemplum' (Hom. 18 § 2). Migne *S.L.* lxxvi 1136 C, 1151 B.

270, fol. 35 v), 'quem nec sacrati cibi collatio nec suprema pietas a scelere reuocaret'.

The following table of values for S_1 is drawn up in accordance with the considerations suggested by the difficulties to which I have called attention. It assumes, that is to say, that at the second general Roman redaction § xxxviii had neither Communicantes nor Hanc igitur, and that the Preface of § xl ended at 'suppleret', comprising 570 letters. It also assumes that the Hanc igitur of § xl, now in § xxxix, ended at 'offerre'.

		S_1
	Brought forward	45
§ xxxviii.	<i>Feria v. hebdom. sexta</i> 17	1
	<i>Eodem die non psallitur nec saluta</i> 30	1
	<i>Oñp. señp. dñs da quaesumus &c.</i> 195	7
	<i>Concede credentibus mire dñs &c.</i> 131 (126)	5
	<i>Oñp. señp. dñs qui uitam &c.</i> 130	5
	<i>Virtutum caelestium dñs de cuius &c.</i> 168 (170)	6
	<i>Concede quaesumus dñe ut &c.</i> 79	3
	<i>Gregem tuum pastor bone &c.</i> 107	4
§ xl.	<i>Item in feria v. missa ad uesperum.</i> 27	1
	<i>Suscipe quaesumus dñs munus &c.</i> 105	4
	<i>UD . . . quem in hac . . . suppleret. et ideo</i> 549 (570)	21
	<i>Infra canonem.</i> 12	1
	<i>Communicantes et diem &c.</i> 79	3
	<i>Item infra.</i> 9	1
	<i>Hanc igitur oblationem famulorum &c.</i> 278 (267)	10
	<i>Concede quaesumus dñe ut &c.</i> 79	3
	<i>Praesta quaesumus dñe ut &c.</i> 103	4 = 125 (P. 55 ends)

The Roman Evolution of §§ xxxviii, xl. I. In a study of the Leonian Sacramentary contributed to the JOURNAL a few years ago (vol. ix p. 524) I invited attention to the following facts: That in the year 455 the Wednesday and Saturday of the summer ember-fast fell on the eighth and eleventh of June, and that those days were the Wednesday and Saturday of what by Roman computation was Whitsun-week; but that in that year Leo the Great—albeit with extreme reluctance, and as a concession to the Patriarch of Alexandria—kept the Christian Pentecost not on the fifth, but on the twelfth, of June: the consequence being that he committed the inconsistency of observing the summer ember-season before he kept the Feast of Whitsunday. In view of these facts I suggested that the very curious phrase 'noua disciplina' in the first prayer of the penultimate Mass of Leonianum X (Mur. i 319) 'Da nobis . . . nouam . . . obseruantiae disciplinam' &c. is an allusive reference *per aequivocationem* to the exceptional innovation thus brought to pass in the year 455; and I justified the suggestion by the fact that the probably right reading of the last prayer in the same item, 'Oñp. señp. dñs . . . da quaesumus ut *unitatem mereantur et pacem*', calls

to mind the phrase '*unitas et pax*' which Prosper of Aquitaine, the literary assessor of Leo the Great, employed on this very occasion, 'Exstant eiusdem papae epistolae ad . . . Marcianum datae quibus ecclesia catholica instrui potest quod haec persuasio studio *unitatis et pacis* tolerata sit potius quam probata'.¹

Now, I suspect that in the obscure 'de praeteritis ad noua transimus in the Ad Populum, 'Praesta quaesumus' &c., of the *missa ad uesperum* in § xl (Mur. i 559) there is a similarly devised allusion *per aequivocationem* to another innovation, that of an evening Mass on the Thursday before Easter. That such Mass was at one time customary in the Roman Church cannot reasonably be denied, for the Breuiarium Ecclesiastici Ordinis (*ib.* ii 401) which I have more than once quoted says, 'In ipsa nocte in uigilia Parasceuen non canuntur *Gloria in excelsis* nec *Kyrie eleison*'; so that, until or unless the contrary can be proved, we must surmise as best we can when the use began and when it was discontinued. As found at XIII iii of the Leonianum (*ib.* i 325) the 'Praesta quaesumus' &c. presents no difficulty, for it is there worded, 'Praesta . . . ut sicut de praeteritis ad noua sacramenta transimus ita' &c.; but in § xl of our document there is no 'sacramenta'; and I cannot help thinking that the word has been purposely omitted, so as, while not precluding a sacramental interpretation, to make permissible the sense of 'we are passing from an old liturgical use to a new'; i.e. 'we are now doing a new thing in the history of this the Roman Church by commemorating at night—'in hac nocte', as the Preface has it—the institution of the Holy Eucharist'. This assumed as a legitimate account of the 'de praeteritis ad noua transimus' in the Ad Populum of § xl, the question now arises, At what period in the history of our document was the *missa ad uesperum* instituted?

II. Again: The Breuiarium says 'Quinta uero feria ante Pascha ad missas antiphonae ad introitum non canuntur, apostolum [*lege* 'apostolus'] et euangelium non legitur, nec responsorium canitur'.² This information suffices to account for the absence from § xl of an Oratio and, since the item is not a Mass of station, of a Collecta, but raises a difficulty as to two of the prayers (Mur. i 548, 549) which in § xxxviii precede the Secreta. It bids us expect to find but one, and yet here are three. The first indeed is a Collecta such as might be used to introduce a Mass of station; and its explicit mention of baptism accords with the ancient theory that the Thursday before Easter was the last day of the praepaschal *obseruantia* preparatory to the Church's solemn administration of that sacrament at Easter: but not so the second and third. Not only have they another subject-matter, the Passion and Death of the Redeemer; their very presence is out of accord with what the

¹ *Chronicon* s.f. (Migne S.L. li 606 A).

² Mur. ii 401.

Breuiarium says. Are they, then, *ex post facto* to the original scheme of the item, and, if so, when, severally, were they introduced?

III. Yet again: The Breuiarium continues 'Nec salutat presbyter, id est non dicit *Dominus uobiscum*', and a memorandum at the beginning of § xxxviii says the like, '*Eodem die non psallitur nec salutat* [?' *salutas*']. But why such memorandum? Rubrics like this are not usual in such items of our document as, by the hypothesis, are Roman; so that, assuming this to be a Roman rubric, the only satisfactory explanation I can offer of it is that it enjoins an innovation on old use. If this be the true account of it, the question arises, At what period in the history of our document was the innovation made?

IV. Another question now suggests itself. Since the three ferial Masses of § xxxvii are rubricated '*Feria ii. hebdom. sexta*' &c., we may fairly infer that the original capitulum of the Sunday item had been a normal '*Dñica sexta*', and that the extant '*De passione dñi*' was subjoined to it at a date subsequent to the issue of Redaction *s*, the ceremonial conduct of the Mass having meanwhile been so developed as—by means, it may be, of a new Introit, Gradual, Tract and Communion; or, it may be, by the solemn singing of St Matthew's Passio—to set in prominent relief the subject of the Redeemer's sufferings. If so, when was the innovation made?

These questions concerning the sub-title of the first item in § xxxvii, concerning the rubric '*Eodem die*' &c., concerning the supernumerary prayers in § xxxviii, and concerning the whole of § xl, call to mind the question which at the beginning of our enquiry¹ suggested itself as to the motive for amplifying the original scheme of Christmas items. For if, as would seem to be implied by the dogmatic colouring of the Collecta and Oratio of § ix and of its Secreta, Preface and Postcommunion, the Octave of the Nativity was instituted at a time when, in view of danger from eutychianism, it was deemed advisable to insist upon the fact that our Lord's birth of the Virgin was a true human birth,² the reason for so developing the ritual accessories of the first Mass in § xxxvii as to make it pre-eminently a Mass *de passione Domini*, for inserting into § xxxviii supernumerary prayers having reference, not to the baptism of neophytes, but to the '*de Christi passione remedium*' and the '*Filius tuus moriens*', and for giving § xl a long Preface con-

¹ See *J.T.S.* vol. xv p. 210. My analysis gives two amplifications. At the first of these the Mass for the Octave was introduced with a short Preface, '*Cuius hodie . . . infans et dñs est*'; at the second the phrase '*Merito ergo caeli . . . pastores laetati*' was added to this and the whole of § v introduced into the work (*ib.* pp. 200-202).

² In a journal meant primarily for theologians it would ill become me to labour this assertion. On examining the first three items of § ix and the '*Cuius hodie . . . infans et dñs est*' of its Preface, the reader will see at a glance what I mean.

cerning our Lord's betrayal by Judas may have been that the time was opportune for insisting on it that His sufferings were truly human sufferings, and His death a true human death; and to establish as *lex supplicandi* what Leo the Great had in sermon after sermon delivered on successive Sundays before Easter set forth as *lex credendi*.¹

Before testing the hypothesis suggested by these considerations let me note a peculiarity in the Secreta of § xxxviii (Mur. i 553). I attach some importance to it, because, as we shall see presently, that prayer was said immediately before what we shall find reason to believe to have been an important moment in the solemnities of the day. The prayer has already occurred on the Wednesday of the third week *in quadragesima* (*ib.* 524); but with the difference that it there runs 'D^s de cuius' &c. thus numbering 151 letters (5 β lines), whereas here it numbers 169 letters (6 β lines), for it is amplified at the beginning by the words 'Virtutum caelestium'. I believe the shorter form to give us the *textus classicus*.

Thus much premised, I give again the values for *s* and *S*₁ for the first four days of the week before Easter; but with provision made for Sub-redaction *s*¹, that stage in the development of our document which was just now suggested as the stage at which the subject of the Passion received new prominence. (See *J. T. S.* vol. xv pp. 567, 568.)

	§ xxxvii. 6th Sunday.			Monday.			Tuesday.			Wednesday.			
	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ¹	<i>S</i> ₁	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ¹	<i>S</i> ₁	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ¹	<i>S</i> ₁	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ¹	<i>S</i> ₁	
Brought forward			156										
Capitulum	10	*	*	1	18	1	1	19	1	1	18	1	1
Sub-title (<i>De passione dñi</i>)	13		I	I									
Collecta	194	6	7	139	5	5	79	3	3	122	4	5	
Oratio	162	5	6	111	4	4	70	2	3	138	5	5	
Secreta	90	3	3	130	4	5	114	4	4	106	4	4	
Postcommunion	118	4	4	65	2	3	117	4	4	108	4	4	
Ad Populum		<i>nil</i>	<i>nil</i>	<i>nil</i>	115	4	4	171	6	6	138	5	5
(At <i>s</i> P. 35 begins)		18			20		20		23				= 81
(At <i>s</i> ¹ P. 43 begins)		19			20		20		23				= 82
			178			22 = 200		21				24 = 45	

¹ These most noble efforts of Leo's genius are not, like many modern sermons preached at Passiontide, devotional exercises on the sufferings of Christ *qua* sufferings, but carefully wrought discourses elucidatory of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. See *inter alia* the exordium of the first *sermo de passione Domini* (Migne *S.L.* liv 314 A-C), that of the third (*ib.* 319 B) and that of the fifth (*ib.* 326 B). See also the passage 'Hac fidei regula' &c. in the eleventh (*ib.* 350 B), the 'Gloria dilectissimi' &c. in the twelfth (*ib.* 353 A), and the 'Sermonem dilectissimi' &c. in the fourteenth (*ib.* 361 C).

I now proceed synthetically.

Let us assume that, at the sub-redaction (s^1) at which I conceive the papal copy of the sacramentary to have been taken to pieces and the sequence of items made to begin not, as previously, with the Vigil of the Theophany but with Christmas Eve,¹ the volume also underwent a mechanical rehandling at the part which contained §§ xxxvii and xxxviii, § xxxvii being then written out anew, but with '*De passione dñi*', subjoined on a line by itself next under the capitulum '*Dñica sexta*'. On this hypothesis the four items of § xxxvii would now occupy 82 lines, not, as at s , 81.

Let us further assume (i) that at Redaction s , as is indicated in the next table of values, § xxxviii had lacked the memorandum '*Eodem die*' &c.; (ii) that it had then contained but one prayer preliminary to the Secreta, the Collecta '*Oñp. señp. dñ da quaesumus*' &c., and (iii) that the Secreta had then kept its classic value of 151 letters. This threefold assumption gives us the result notified in column ' s ' of the next table. The fifth of a series of items the first of which began on a fresh β page on the Sunday before Easter (see *J. T. S.* vol. xv p. 567) ends on the hundredth line of four such pages; and this it does on the last of the *quadraginta ieiunia* of the quinquagesimal observance, the last of the *quadraginta dies* of the quadragesimal.

Hence the inference that, since the *missa ad uesperum* is greatly in defect of an integral number of pages of β value (for it is the equivalent of 43 β lines), the custom of evening celebration on the Thursday before Easter had not as yet been established in Rome at the time of Redaction s .

But let us next assume that, while § xxxvii received a rubric indicative of honour to the Passion at the manipulation which I conceive to have been practised at sub-redaction s^1 , § xxxviii was amplified (i) by the very suggestive memorandum '*Eodem die*' &c., (ii) by the supernumerary '*Concede credentibus*' &c., this too in honour of the Passion, (iii) by the longer text of the Secreta, about which I have something to say presently; and, further, (iv) that the *missa ad uesperum* was now introduced into the series, this in its turn giving special honour to the Passion by the '*passionis mysterium*' of its Secreta and by every word of its plaintive Preface, '*Quem in hac nocte . . . passionem suam pro saeculi redemptione suppleret*'. On this hypothesis ended item would once again, with a connecting rubric, coincide with ended page; pp. 43-48 of the new numeration now replacing, on three leaves, pp. 35-38 of the old, on two leaves.

Thus are we enabled to account for one of the two prayers which

¹ See *J. T. S.* vol. xv pp. 198-200.

Thursday before Easter.

		<i>s</i> (β lines)	<i>s</i> ¹ (β lines)	<i>S</i> ₁ (θ lines)
Brought forward		81	82	45
§ xxxviii. <i>Feria v. hebdom. sexta</i>	17	1	1	1
<i>Eodem die non psallitur nec salutas</i>	30	<i>nil</i>	1	1
O \bar{m} p. se \bar{m} p. d \bar{s} da quaesumus &c.	195	6	6	7
Concede credentibus m \bar{i} re d \bar{s} &c.	131 (126)	<i>nil</i>	4	5
O \bar{m} p. se \bar{m} p. d \bar{s} qui uitam &c.	130	<i>nil</i>	<i>nil</i>	5
D \bar{s} de cuius g \bar{i} ae rore &c.	151	5		
Virtutum caelestium d \bar{s} de cuius &c.	169		6 = 100 (P. 46 ends)	6
Concede quaesumus d \bar{n} e ut &c.	79	3	3	3
Gregem tuum pastor bone &c.	107 ¹ , 115 ²	4 ¹ = 100 (P. 38 ends)	4 ¹ (=7)	4 ¹ (=77)
§ xl. <i>Item vi. feria v. missa ad uesperum</i>	27		1	1
Suscipe quaesumus d \bar{n} e &c.	105		4	4
UD . . . quem in hac nocte &c.	559 ¹ , 570 ²		18 ¹	21 ²
<i>Infra canonem</i>	12		1	1
Communicantes et diem &c.	79		3	3
<i>Item infra</i>	9		1	1
Hanc igitur oblationem famulorum &c.	267		9	10
Concede quaesumus d \bar{n} e &c.	79		3	3
Praesta quaesumus d \bar{n} e ut &c.	103		3 = 50 (P. 48 ends)	4 = 125 (P. 55 ends)

the Breuiarium had bidden us not expect to find: thus are we justified in inferring that at sub-redaction *s*¹ the Roman custom of evening celebration recorded in the Breuiarium was already in existence.

Now, then, let us turn our attention to the *Secreta* of § xxxviii, a prayer which I believe to have been augmented by the value of a line at Sub-redaction *s*¹.

If it be true that at both *s* and *s*¹ three integral pages were given to Quinquagesima week (see *J. T. S.* vol. xv p. 222), five to Quadragesima week (*ib.* p. 223), and five to the week thence ensuing (*ib.* p. 351); then three to the items which bring us to the dividing-point of the Leonian quarantine of fasts (*ib.* p. 355), and one to that which brings us to the dividing-point of the seven-weeks' *observantia* of Telephorus (*ib.* p. 358); then, again, seven pages to the next nine Masses (*ib.* pp. 539-541), and four to the five that followed (*ib.* p. 544), I cannot believe it to have been without design that at Sub-redaction *s*¹ the next quatrain of pages instead of ending, as at Redaction *s*, with the last prayer of § xxxviii, ended with the *Secreta*. Assuredly the object of this change of method was to emphasize the fact that at that specific point in the Mass said on the morning of the day now known as Maundy Thursday the continuity of the function was interrupted and its intention restricted: the continuity interrupted by a pause¹ during which all such might retire as, having offered their gifts with the intention of returning in the evening then to communicate, were now at liberty to leave the sacred building and break their fast; the intention restricted to those who remained behind. I venture to say that this coincidence of ended *Secreta* with ended page, suggestive as it is of evening communion on the anniversary of the institution of the Eucharist, sheds a ray of light as clear as it is unexpected on Roman practice in that respect during the pontificate in which *s*¹ was issued.

The External History of §§ xxxvii, xxxviii, and xl. (Roman Period.)
Such then is the result of an analysis as free from prejudice as it has been rigorous of §§ xxxvii, xxxviii, and xl. I therefore venture to assert that when the first general redaction of the sacramentary was compiled only one Mass was as yet by Roman custom appointed to be said on the Thursday before Easter, and that the time for saying it was the time customary on station-days, the *hora nona* of the Roman reckoning; but that at Sub-redaction *s*¹ the time for saying it was shifted from afternoon to morning, the new *missa ad vesperum* being appointed to be said at or soon after nightfall. Assuming these changes to have been made

¹ The reader may perhaps remember the analogous instances which I claim to have discovered in the 'Missale Francorum', and in what would seem to have been the second γ scheme of the forms of ordination in § xx, § xxii, and § xcix of the present document. See *J. T. S.* vol. xii pp. 230, 232; and vol. xv pp. 335, 338-340.

simultaneously, or nearly so, with the composition of § ix, it will, I think, follow that, should scholars ever learn when, or under what pope, the Roman Church first observed the Octave of the Nativity, or first used the *missa ad vesperum* of § xl, a clue will have been obtained to the external history of our document. Meanwhile let us remember that theological acumen and terminological accuracy were oriental characteristics, and that these are conspicuously discernible in the first three prayers and the nucleus of the Preface of § ix; that the African Church as far back as the time of St Augustine had celebrated an evening Mass on the anniversary of the institution of the Eucharist; that Gelasius I was probably of oriental lineage and certainly of African nationality, and that he was the first man of African nationality who was raised to the government of the Roman Church. As at present informed, therefore, we can but say that Gelasius I is the most probable claimant, perhaps the only probable claimant, of the editorship of s^1 .

Reverting for a moment to my synopsis for s , s^1 , and S_1 , I would observe that the third column of linear values shews us why and when it was that the second of the prayers which the Breuiarium had not led us to expect to find was introduced. But for it § xl would not at S_1 have reached the end of a θ page.

Sections xxxviii, xl at Redaction S_2 . Conceded that I have thus far truly appraised the work done at Redactions S_1 and S_2 , it is evident that, if the deviser of the latter edition had been so disposed, he might, like his Roman predecessor, have made the Mass for the Wednesday before Easter end at the distance of five lines from the foot of a page; for this he could have done by leaving Sunday's Collecta and Secreta as he found them (see *J. T. S.* vol. xv pp. 567, 568). He must have done what he did in order to make the first Mass for 'Maundy' Thursday begin on a fresh page. That anniversary had not received so appropriate a distinction at either of the Roman issues.

But this innovation imposed on him the task of amplifying either § xxxviii or § xl, or both of them, with material having the value of twenty θ lines if, as was fitting, they were to occupy a multiple of five-and-twenty such lines and thus bring the series to an end at the foot of a θ page.

It may be that scholars, after carefully examining the constituents which—whether composed or merely adopted by him—he inserted into §§ iii, iv, vi, vii, viii, xii, xiv, and the Ad Populum prayers which he gave to the Sundays in Lent, will be able to make a shrewd guess as to who he was: it may be that they will some day have that happiness when they shall have studied the 'Communicantes et diem' &c. of § xxxviii and more especially the latter half, 'Pascit igitur . . . relaxauit',

of the Preface of § xl; for to him I attribute them. These two passages are not, it is true, the only additions to the scheme which he found in his copy of S₁: but I think that they must be his, because they are homogeneous the one with the other; and I hope presently to find that their aggregate value is the nett equivalent of twenty lines. But I do not think that the other three *complementa* can be his: I take them in their order. (i) The rubric '*Post haec offert plebs*' &c. must not be given to him, because there was no need for it before the form for reconciling penitents was inserted into § xxxviii; and by the hypothesis this was not done until Redaction V. (ii) I do not assign to him the '*Hanc igitur oblationem*' &c., because its subject matter is not the same as the subject matter of the '*Communicantes*' &c., because by reason of its phrasing—'*ob diem ieiunii coenae dñicae*'—it seems to have been designed as a protest against the priscillianism¹ condemned by the fathers of the First Council of Braga (A. D. 563), and therefore to be of comparatively late date, and because I cannot find that he anywhere inserted new material, as Gelasius I might have done, of polemical character. (iii) Nor do I think that the '*Item infra canonem ubi dicimus . . . dicimus*' &c. is his, because since, by the hypothesis, he was not a bishop, though probably an abbot, I cannot believe he would have presumed to innovate on the text of the Canon. But, even if I could, the colloquial '*dicimus*' '*dicimus*' makes me think that the memorandum, by whomsoever composed, was a marginal note, and therefore that it cannot have been part of the augmentary material having the value of twenty lines of text for which I am in search. These surmises are justified by the next three tables.

		S ₁ S ₂
Brought forward		45
§ xxxviii. Capitulum	17	I
<i>Eodem die non psallitur</i> &c.	30	I
Oñp. señp. dñs da quaesumus &c.	195	7
Concede credentibus mire dñs &c.	126	5
Oñp. señp. dñs qui uitam &c.	130	5
<i>Post haec offert plebs et</i> &c.	43	
Virtutum caelestium dñs de cuius &c.	170	6
<i>Infra actionem</i>	13	I
<i>Communicantes et diem . . . quo traditus</i> &c.	79	3
<i>Item infra</i>	9	
Hanc igitur . . . familiae tuae &c.	165, 279	
<i>Item infra canonem ubi dicimus</i> &c.	77	
Qui hac die antequam traderetur &c.	63	
Concede quaesumus dñe &c.	79	3
Gregem tuum pastor aeterne &c.	107	4 = 77 4 = 11

¹ See above, p. 29, n. 1.

		S ₁	S ₂
Brought forward		77	11
Capitulum	27	1	
Suscipe quaesumus dñe &c.	105	4	
UD et iustum. Quem in hac nocte &c.	570 ¹ , 976 ²	21 ¹	36 ²
<i>Infra canonem</i>	12	1	
Communicantes et diem quo traditus &c.	79	3	
<i>Item infra</i>	9	1	
Hanc igitur famulorum famularumque &c.	267 ¹ , 278	10 ¹	
Concede quaesumus dñe &c.	79	3	
Praesta quaesumus dñe &c.	103	4 = 125 4	
Of the following		1 = 75 (P. 63 ends)	

This serves to shew that the editor of S₂, like Gelasius I, or whoever it may have been that introduced into the Roman Church the custom of evening communion on the Thursday before Easter, made the *Secreta* for the first Mass of that day end on the last line of a page; and, although it by no means proves that he too observed that custom, it suffices to suggest that he may have observed it. It serves to shew us why it was that the Preface of the *missa ad vesperum* was so strangely lengthened, and thus to prove that the editor of S₂, like the editor of S, the editor of S¹, the editor of S₁, regarded the Thursday before Easter as the last day of a sacred series.

Section xxxviii at Redaction V. And what of the second cismontane editor? I have not yet traced his work as far as the end of § xl, but I feel sure that he in his turn made the *missa ad vesperum* end on the last line of a page.

Meanwhile let us see how he dealt with § xxxviii.

By my hypothesis the disciplinary prayers now found in this section (Mur. i. 542-553) had not formed part of the document at Redaction S₂, because S₂ was compiled for a dignitary, probably an abbot, who though of high rank, was not a bishop; and because, if the rubric in § xvi may instruct us, the bishop in whose diocese his domain lay had reserved to himself the public reconciliation of penitents.¹ But, since it is hard to see why, at the cost of minute and infinite pains, the editor of V should have adapted sacramental material previously written on θ pages to pages of κ lineation and capacity if not to make them bibliographically homogeneous with several pontifical libelli already executed on κ pages—the 'Pont.', the 'Ord.', the 'Bapt.' of my analysis—we must believe it to have been he that engrafted into the first Mass for the Thursday before Easter the disciplinary material now found in it. The next table shews how true he was to his own artistic self, how scrupulously careful that his work should be done 'decently and in order'.

¹ See *J. T. S.* vol. xv pp. 327-330.

		V	V'	
§ xxxviii. <i>Oñones et preces in quinta feria</i> *	27	I	*	
<i>Eodem die non psallitur nec salutas</i>	30	I	*	
<i>Id est non dicis Dñs uobiscum</i>	24		*	
<i>Et reconciliatio poenitentis</i>	26	I		
Three prayers : 7, 5, 5 † =		17		
<i>Ordo agentibus publicam poenitentiam</i>	35	I		
<i>Egreditur poenitens . . . corpore in terra</i>	100	4 = 24	4	(P. 91 ends at V)
<i>Et postulat in his uerbis diaconus</i>	29	I	I = 24	(P. 96 ends at V')
Postulation and rubric : 56, 5 =		61		
Three prayers : 8, 5, 28 =		41		
<i>Item ad reconciliationem</i> : 1, 5, 6, 9, 16 =		37		
<i>Reconciliatio . . . ad mortem</i> : 1, 18, 7, 12, 24 =		62		
<i>Oïo post reconciliationem &c.</i> : 2, 10 =		12		
<i>Post haec offert plebs &c.</i>	43	2 = 216	2	(P. 100 ends at V)
<i>Virtutum caelestium &c.</i>	169	6		
<i>Infra actionem</i>	12	1		
<i>Communicantes et diem &c.</i>	79	3		
<i>Item infra</i>	9	1		
<i>Hanc igitur oblationem &c.</i>	165 ¹ , 279 ²	6 ¹	10 ²	
<i>Item infra . . . dicimus . . . dicimus</i>	77	3		
<i>Qui hac die antequam &c.</i>	63	2		
<i>Concede quaesumus dñe &c.</i>	79	3		
<i>Gregem tuum pastor bone &c.</i>	107 ¹ , 115 ²	4 ¹ = 24	4 ² = 248	(P. 101 ends at V)

* The values for § xxxvii at V and V' will be found in *J. T. S.* vol. xv pp. 567, 568.
 † In terms of letters (see p. 39 *supra*) the values of these three prayers are 195, 126, 130.
 || I assume the last prayer of the *Reconciliatio . . . ad mortem* to have ended 'esse saluum. per.' See Faustus of Riez *De Gratia &c.* I, § 12, 'Quotiescunque in sacris paginis legeris "In quacunque die conuersus ingemueris tunc saluus eris"'. (Migne S. L. lviii 803 A.)

He alters nothing that lies before him in the Canon Poenitentialis, but (i) by means of a new directive rubric, '*Egreditur poenitens . . . prostrato toto corpore in terra*', he makes the ceremony begin on the first line of a fresh page. Again he alters nothing, but (ii) by means of another directive rubric, '*Post haec offert plebs et conficiuntur sacramenta*', he gives the resumed Mass the same distinction.¹ Yet again he alters nothing, but (iii) by means of an inserted *Hanc igitur* he gives what remains of the Mass the value of one integral page.

Now then we are able to conjure the difficulties of that very puzzling constituent, the *Hanc igitur* (Mur. i 553), to which I have more than once referred.² As written by the editor of V it ran simply thus—'*Hanc igitur oblationem dñe cunctae familiae tuae quam tibi offerunt ob diem in qua dñs n̄. ih̄c xp̄c tradidit discipulis suis corporis et sanguinis sui mysteria celebranda quaesumus dñe placatus intende*', in the 165 letters of six κ lines. It was another editor than he who, as a lance at the Priscillianists who feasted on a fast-day, introduced the tautological '*ieiunii coenae dñicae*'; another editor than he who, after '*placatus intende*', inserted words not proper to the Canon, '*ut per multa . . . mereatur offerre*', where '*mereantur offerre*' would have been preferable; another editor than he who began to add St Gregory's '*diesque n̄os . . . iubeas grege numerari*', but stopped short on reaching the first necessary verb of the clause on finding that, whereas St Gregory had written '*disponas*', his own manipulation required '*dispone*'.³ These lapses in style may have a just claim on our consideration if I am well advised in believing V' to have been edited at the beginning of the seventh century, a hundred years after V, and in a place remote from centres of learning.

The Missa Chrismatis. We have seen reason to believe that the forms of ordination in §§ xx–xxiv of Reginensis were derived into V' from V (see *J. T. S.* vol. xv p. 348); that the editor of V had found them in a book of κ pagination which I style '*Ord.*' (*ib.* pp. 334–338); that one of the sources of *Ord.* was a libellus of γ pagination, *ord.*₂; and that this was a highly developed representative of an ultimate, but very small, book, *ord.*₁. Let us now assume that the *Missa Chrismatis* in § xxxi—wrongly numbered 'xl' in Reginensis—had a like history: let us, that is to say, assume an ultimate nucleus, *pont.*₁, and a developement of this, *pont.*₂, both of them γ libelli; and, after them, a κ developement, *Pont.* And let us further assume that, just as *ord.*₂ differed from *ord.*₁ by the presence of long passages dealing with the ritual of the Old Law as adumbrative

¹ On the last line of p. 100 of his volume; perhaps the last of a gathering.

² It is the only thing in the whole course of my enquiry that has given me any serious trouble.

³ Because the preceding verb was '*intende*', not '*intendas*' or '*accipias*'.

of the ritual of the New, so the long passage in the formula for the blessing of chrism—'Qui in principio . . . propheta cecinisset'—was introduced by the editor of *pont.*₂ but had not been in *pont.*₁.

Again, we have seen reason to believe the essential differences of Ord. from *ord.*₂ to have been that it contained forms of ordination—the *Consummatio presbyteri* and the *Ad consummandum diaconatus officium*—not recognized by the earlier book; and, further, that it had all the necessary equipment of a proper Mass, i.e. the Oratio 'Exaudi nos dñ salutaris n.' &c. (Mur. i 513) and the six constituents now found in § xxiv (*ib.* 517). In § xxxix, indeed, the forms for the blessing of the *oleum infirmorum*, the *oleum catechumenorum* and the chrism are not 'shadowed' by another triad; but there certainly are all the constituents of a proper Mass, as also directive rubrics which imply and refer to the Canon Missae. These I therefore assume to have been inserted by the editor of Pont.

But before I act on these assumptions let me note a peculiarity in the formula for blessing the *oleum catechumenorum*, 'Dñ incrementorum' &c. (Mur. i 555). This constituent, like the formula for the *oleum infirmorum*, 'Emitte' &c. (*ib. ib.*), and like that for chrism (*ib.* 556), is a prayer; but in Reginensis it is made to conclude as if it were an exorcism, 'per . . . uenturus est' &c. (in 635 letters). I neither say nor think that this can be due to clerical error; but I do believe that it represents a theory which was not held at the time and in the place in which either *pont.*₁, *pont.*₂, or Pont. was set forth, and that the author of it wrote 'Dñ incrementorum . . . adepturi per . in unitate eiusdem' (in 585 letters). The subject will recur on an early page. Meanwhile we have the theoretical reconstruction notified in our next table.

Here then we have for *pont.*₁ as in our examination of § xx and § xxii we had for *ord.*₁, a title, a form of blessing (with such adornment of its initial letter as became a bishop's altar-book) and a connecting rubric, on one γ page; and, again as in *ord.*₁, on another γ page, a second form of blessing. For Pont., again, as in Ord., we have, in addition to forms of blessing, constituents and rubrics proper to them when incorporated into a Mass: but here in Pont. as these in Ord. all have been arranged with careful foresight; for, if there the consecratory 'De quaesumus oñp. pater in hos' &c., for priests and the consecratory 'Emitte in eos quaesumus dñe' &c., for deacons began, each of them, on a fresh κ page, so here does the consecratory 'Emitte quaesumus dñe spñ scñ' &c., for the *oleum infirmorum*, while its junction with the 'per quem haec omnia' &c., of the Canon is so abbreviated by means of an 'et caetera' as that when the bishop, having left the altar and taken his place at the throne (Mur. i 555), is ready to begin the second function, the blessing of the oil of catechumens, yet another κ page

		γ schemes		κ scheme
		<i>pont.</i> ₁	<i>pont.</i> ₂	Pont. (V)
<i>Benedictio olei infirmorum</i>	24	I		
Ornamentation		1½		1½
<i>Missa xpismatis</i>	14			½
Dñe dñ qui in regenerandis &c.	180			6
Da nobis oñp. dñ remedia &c.	91			3
Huius sacrificii potentia dñe &c.	112			4
UD clementiam tuam suppliciter &c.	382			13
<i>Infra actionem</i>	13			I
Communicantes et diem . . . quo traditus est &c.	79			3
<i>Item infra</i>	9			I
Hanc igitur oblationem famulorum . . . offerre.	267			9
<i>Benedictio olei ad populum in his uerbis</i>	34			2
<i>Ad populum in his uerbis</i>	20			
Istud oleum ad ugendos infirmos	26			
<i>Ut autem ueneris</i> . . . per xpm dñm nrm . et intras	82	I		I
Emitte quaesumus . . . creas scificas . . . nobis per ipsum	485		16	3 = 48
Emitte quaesumus . . . creas et caetera.	445			15
<i>Expleto enim canone dicis.</i>	22			I
Oremus. Praeceptis salutaribus moniti	32			I
<i>Sequitur oio dnica</i>	16			I
<i>Et iterum subsequitur alia oio</i>	26			I
Libera nos quaesumus dñe	20			I
<i>Ipsa expleta confrangis</i> <i>dicis</i>	115 (113)			4 = 24
Dñs uobiscum. <i>Resp.</i> Et cum spũ tuo. <i>Dicis</i>	30			I
Oremus. <i>Et intras</i>	13			I
<i>Benedictio olei catechumenorum</i>	28			I
Dñs incrementorum et profectuum . . . adepturi. per . . . in unitate eiusdem	625 (601)			I
			I = 21	
			21 = 21	21 = 24

MEMORANDUM.—These items occupied pp. 102-105 at V; and at V the *Benedictio chrisimatis* and *Olei exorcizati confectio* (see below, p. 48) occupied pp. 106-109.

awaits him. The twenty-four lines of this page contain nothing that is not proper to the subject.

Let us now continue our examination of § xxxix.

The formula for the blessing of chrim falls into three parts: the illative 'UD et iustum . . . aeterne d̄s' (in 83 letters); the long expository 'Qui in principio . . . cecinisset' (in 989 letters), where the Old Law is explained as adumbrative of the New; and the strictly consecratory 'Te igitur . . . consortes' (in 368 letters). This last should, however, have for conclusion either 'per eundem . in unitate eiusdem' or 'per eundem d̄nm n̄m ihm x̄pm filium tuum qui tecum uiuī et regnat in unitate eiusdem sp̄s sc̄i d̄s'; and should therefore be computed as containing either 393 or 444 letters. The lower value is of course probable for at least *pont.*₁ and *pont.*₂.

Guided by *ord.*₁ and *ord.*₂ I give all of these factors to *pont.*₂; but only the first and third to *pont.*₁. At this redaction, however, we must assume that the words 'd̄ne sc̄e pater ōmp. aeterne d̄s' (23 letters) were not in the 'Te igitur' &c., for they had just occurred in what was then the contextual 'UD et iustum est' &c. For *pont.*₁, therefore, the value of the formula must be lowered from (83 + 393 =) 476 letters to (83 + 370 =) 453.

Instructed by § xx and § xxii in *ord.*₂ I cannot but believe that in *pont.*₂ the expository 'Qui in principio . . . cecinisset' ended on one page, that the consecratory 'Te igitur' &c. began on another, that between them stood the rubric '*Sequitur benedictio*', and that so much of the item as preceded either the '*Sequitur benedictio*' or the 'Te igitur' &c. filled two γ pages. The subjoined table justifies this my belief.

		γ schemes	
		<i>pont.</i> ₁	<i>pont.</i> ₂
<i>Benedictio xpismatis</i>	19		1
D̄ns uobiscum. <i>Resp.</i> Et cum sp̄u tuo	25		1
Sursum corda. <i>Resp.</i> Habemus ad d̄m	26		1
Gias agamus d̄no d̄o n̄o. <i>Resp.</i> Dignum et iustum est	38		2
UD et iustum &c. (83). Te igitur deprecamur per ihm &c. (370)	453	16 = 21	
UD et iustum &c. (83). Qui in principio &c. (989)	1072		37 = 42
<i>Sequitur benedictio</i>	18		1
Te igitur deprecamur d̄ne sc̄e &c.	399 (392)		13
<i>Item olei exorcizati confectio</i>	27	1	1
Exorcizo te creatura olei &c.	575 (539)	19	19
UD ōmp. aeterne d̄s qui mysteriorum &c.	237 (193)		7
Explicit, or other rubric		1 = 21	1 = 42

Passing on to the *Olei exorcizati confectio*, (1) I neglect the rubric '*Hoc loco*' &c. (Mur. i 557), not because it is of doubtful authority, but because, by the hypothesis, *pont.*₂, like *ord.*₂, eschewed directive rubrics; (2) that the formula of exorcism, 'Exorcizo te' &c., did not necessarily

extend beyond the word 'iudicare', thus comprising 539, or perhaps rather more, letters; and (3) that the last constituent of all had the conclusion proper to it, 'per . in unitate eiusdem', not, as now in *Reginensis*, the conclusion proper to an exorcism, and that its value was therefore 193, not 237.

These results are of exceedingly great interest and value, for:—

In the first place: If it was at *ord.*₂ that a long passage, 'Dñe sc̄e . . . indigemus' (Mur. i. 513), on the Mosaic ritual was introduced into the *Ad ordinandos presbyteros* (see *J.T.S.* vol. xv pp. 335–339), that a similar though shorter passage, 'Adesto quaesumus . . . possiderent' (*ib.* 515), was introduced into the *Ad ordinandos diaconos*, and that a long and analogous passage, 'Dñs qui moysen . . . clarescat' (*ib.* 625), was inserted into the *De episcopis ordinandis* (see *J.T.S.* vol. xv p. 340); it was at *pont.*₂ that the precisely analogous 'Qui in principio . . . cecinisset' here in § xxxix found its way into the formula for the blessing of chrism. Hence we may fairly infer not only that *ord.*₂ and *pont.*₂ had one and the same editor, but that both of them may have stood in one and the same libellus, that one and the same libellus may previously have held *ord.*₁ and *pont.*₁, and that at a later date one and the same book may have held both *Ord.* and *Pont.*

Secondly: Although the foregoing list of values gives us no technical certitude on the subject, it shews it to be possible that *pont.*₁ contained the formula for the exorcism of the *oleum simplex*¹ when as yet the constituent 'UD om̄p aeterne dñs qui mysteriorum tuorum' &c. had not been subjoined to it. It certainly does shew that this last constituent, whatever be the truth as to the exorcism itself, cannot have appeared before redaction *pont.*₂.

If, therefore, scholars should ever learn where, when or by whom the four exegetical passages on the Old Law as adumbrative of the New were written; where, when or by whom the *oleum exorcizatum* first received liturgical recognition in Western Christendom; where, when or by whom the idiomatically curious 'UD . . . qui mysteriorum tuorum' &c. was written, very useful clues will have been obtained to the external history of our document.

Let us now resume our examination of *Pont.* for so much of the present section as relates to chrism and the *oleum exorcizatum*.

Between the rubric '*Iterum dicitis*' and the dividing-point of the

¹ I may have to recur to this subject on a later page. Meanwhile, let me say that at one time the *oleum simplex*, as ritualists call it, bore to the oils known as sacramental some such relation as mere holy water bears to the water of the baptismal font. I think I am right in saying that the blessing of this oil is not nowadays practised in dioceses where the observance of the Roman rite is rigorously enforced.

formula for the blessing of chrism Reginensis has not material sufficient to fill an integral number of κ pages. It is on occasions like this that we realize the value of an ascertained unit of paginal measurement. But for such a criterion, I could not have felt sure, as I now do, that, by whosoever fault, Reginensis is here defective. What then are the facts in our cognizance?

In Reginensis the form for the blessing of chrism begins with the rubric '*Iterum dicitis*': then follow the salutation 'Dñs uobiscum' and the response proper to it. But what does '*Iterum*' imply? I do not think that it refers to the 'Dñs uobiscum' (Mur. i. 555) which precedes the form for the blessing of the *oleum catechumenorum*: because that was a function distinct from the present; because the '*Iterum iterum dicit*' in § xx (*ib.* 512) excludes the idea of separation in point of time between one announcement of the 'Auxiliante dño' &c. and another, and because the directive '*Et iterum subsequitur alia oïo Libera nos dñe*' in the present section (*ib.* 555) gives '*iterum*' the meaning, not of 'again', but of 'immediately' or 'without interruptive interval'. Turning therefore for help to the Roman pontifical now in use, I there find that the salutation 'Dominus uobiscum' precedes, not only the consecration itself of the chrism, but also the preliminary ceremony of infusing balsam into the urn which contains the waiting oil; and, thus informed, proceed as follows:—

If I have rightly reconstructed Pont., that edition was characterized by directive rubrics: witness, in the preceding forms, the '*Ut autem ueneris* &c., the '*et reliqua usque ad*' &c., the '*Expleto enim canone*' &c., and several others, all of which are in Reginensis. We therefore should assuredly expect to find in Reginensis, what it does not give us, a rubric about the balsam, the admixture of which with oil constitutes the material difference between chrism and the other *olea sancta*. Mr. Wilson's note 25 (P. 74 of his *Gelasian Sacramentary*) gives us what we want. He tells us that the St Gallen book here has '*Post hoc misces balsamum cum alio oleo et benedicis crisma in his uerbis*'.

From these data I infer that, whether from carelessness or from other cause, and at whatsoever stage in the history of Reginensis, the following details have been omitted:—

Dicitis

Dñs uobiscum. *Resp.* Et cum spū tuo.

*Post hoc misces balsamum cum alio oleo
ad benedicendum xpisma.*

and that then came

Iterum dicitis

Dñs uobiscum. *Resp.* Et cum spū tuo

&c., &c.

We thus have for the three editions :—

		<i>pont.</i> ₁	<i>pont.</i> ₂	Pont. (V)
<i>Benedictio xpismatis</i>	19		I	I
<i>Dicis</i>	5			I
<i>Dñs uobiscum. Resp. Et cum spũ tuo</i>	25			I
<i>Post hoc misces balsamum &c.</i>	48			2
<i>Iterum dicis</i>	11			I
<i>Dñs uobiscum. Resp. Et cum spũ tuo</i>	25		I	I
<i>Sursum corda. Resp. Habemus ad dãm</i>	26		I	I
<i>Gias agamus dñõ do nřo. Resp. Dignum et iustum est</i>	38		2	2
UD et iustum &c. Te igitur deprecamur per xp̃m &c.	453			
UD et iustum &c. Qui in principio &c.	1072	16 = 21		
<i>Sequitur benedictio</i>	18		37 = 42	37
Te igitur deprecamur dñe sc̃e &c.	392		11	I = 48
<i>Item olei exorcizati confectio</i>	27		3	13
<i>Sequitur exorcismus*</i>	18	I	I	I
Exorcizo te creatura olei &c.	539	I9	I9	I9
UD omp. aeterne d̃s qui mysteriorum &c.	193		7	7
<i>Hoc autem expleto uiens ante altare &c.</i>	157			6
Explicit or other rubric		I = 21	I = 42	I = 48

* MEMORANDUM.—The '*Hoc loco misces balsamum*' &c., which here stands in Reginensis, looks like a conflation of words in the '*Post hoc misces balsamum* (or *Hoc loco misces balsamum*) *cum alio oleo*' in the rubric on the fourth line and the '*Sequitur exorcismus*' which would be permissible at this place.

If I have rightly traced the evolution of Ord. and Pont. from *ord.*₂ and *pont.*₂, and of this from *ord.*₁ and *pont.*₁, the collation of the three successive editions would be as follows :—

For *ord.*₁ and *pont.*₁ we should have, on two membranes

Page 1	Blank.
„ 2	Consecration of Bishop (see <i>J. T. S.</i> vol. xv p. 340).
„ 3	Ordering of Presbyters („ „ „ 338).
„ 4	Ordering of Deacons („ „ „ 338).
„ 5	Blessing of <i>oleum infirmorum</i> .
„ 6	„ „ <i>oleum catechumenorum</i> .
„ 7	„ „ Chrism.
„ 8	Blank, or filled <i>ex post facto</i> with exorcism of <i>oleum simplex</i> .

This collation tells against, rather than for, the inclusion of the *Olei exorcizati confectio*—an item, not improbably, of oriental origin, and for this reason worthy of most careful notice—in the nuclear scheme; for its inclusion would not have left a blank page at the end of the libellus.¹ On the other hand, the scheme which I just now gave for *pont.*₁ (see above,

¹ I suspect that the libellus was not bound, but that when in use its two membranes were enfolded within the wings of a diptych. The editor of such a libellus would naturally leave the last page blank as well as the first.

p. 45) does not leave room for an explicit after the *Benedictio chrismatis*. This objection might, however, be met by assuming that the original formula was not only devoid of the words 'dñe sc̄e pater ōmp. aeterne d̄s', which by the hypothesis (see above, p. 45) would have been tautological, but that it also lacked the succeeding 'per ih̄m xp̄m filium tuum dñm n̄m' (25 letters). I am inclined to think that it did; for, as the reader will perceive on consulting the extant text (Mur. i. 557), these words are by no means necessary, since they are almost immediately, and in the very same sentence, followed by 'per potentiam xp̄i tui'. Their exclusion would give the original formula (453 - 25 =) 428 letters, the equivalent of 15, not 16, lines, and would thus leave room for an explicit on the last line of the penultimate page. On the whole, the most probable opinion must, I think, be (1) that the *Olei exorcizati confectio* was not in the original libellus, but (2) that, which as yet consisting of nothing but title and exorcism, it had a first and temporary lodging on the last page of that little document, and (3) that when it eventually received an assured home in the second libellus the constituent 'UD ōmp. aeterne d̄s qui mysteriorum tuorum' &c., whoever may have been the author of this, was subjoined to the exorcism, so as, with an explicit, to fill the whole of the penultimate page of a fasciculus of four membranes: the collation of this being:—

Page 1	Blank.
Pages 2-4	Consecration of Bishops.
„ 5-9	Ordering of Presbyters, <i>Consummatio</i> , Ordering of Deacons, <i>Ad consummandum</i> &c.
Page 10	Blessing of <i>oleum infirmorum</i> .
„ 11	„ „ <i>oleum catechumenorum</i> .
Pages 12-15	„ „ Chrism and exorcism of <i>oleum simplex</i> .
Page 16	Blank.

Thus was a fasciculus of two membranes superseded by a fasciculus of four. This in its turn was replaced by a fasciculus of six, the collation being:—

Page 1	Blank.
„ 2	Frontispiece.
Pages 3-6	Consecration of Bishops.
„ 7-10	Ordering of Presbyters and <i>Consummatio</i> .
„ 11-15	„ „ Deacons, <i>Ad consummandum</i> and § xxiv.
„ 16-18	Mass and Blessing of <i>oleum infirmorum</i> .
Page 19	Blessing of <i>oleum catechumenorum</i> .
Pages 20-23	„ „ Chrism and <i>Olei exorcizati confectio</i> .
Page 24	Blank.

Hence the prominent facts in the external history of this contributory pontifical would seem to be, that the first and the second issues of it

were written in a scriptorium, or in scriptoria, whose sacred books were books of γ pagination; that the second, if not the first, issue was designed for use in a diocese which employed not only the three sacramental oils but also the *oleum simplex*; but that the third was written in a scriptorium whose sacred books were books of κ pagination, in a scriptorium which boasted artists as well as scribes, a scriptorium therefore of some pretension; that, as many of its directive rubrics intimate, it was written in or after the pontificate of Gregory the Great, and that, as its final rubric, '*Hoc autem expleto*' &c., intimates, it was written in a diocese obedient to the decree of the First Council of Braga (A.D. 563) which forbade after-supper communion on the Thursday before Easter.

Section xxxix at Redactions V and V'. I cannot find that when the editor of V was dealing with sacramental items he was ever untrue to his exemplar, a copy of S₂, except when stichometrical necessity prompted him to resort to expedients of retrenchment or enhancement: but since no such necessity beset him when dealing with § xxxix, for the pages of his exemplar, a copy of Pont., were, like his own, pages of κ value, I assume that he followed that exemplar line by line except at the beginning of the item. There his predecessor had sacrificed a line to ornamentation; and, as he himself eschewed ornament, the disparity thus presented would be most easily met by concluding the first constituent, not with the conventional 'per', but with 'per dñm nrm ihm xpm'. Thenceforward his course was clear until he reached the end of his own eighth page (p. 109 of his volume). I need not tabulate his values. Save for the slight exceptions just mentioned, they will be found in columns 'Pont.' of the preceding tables (see above, pp. 44, 48).

The editor of V' worked otherwise. He had carried § xxxviii into the first eight lines of a page (p. 107 of his volume): and it may have been to rectify this disadvantage that he gave one line instead of four to the Communicantes (Mur. i 555), that he deprived the Hanc igitur of its rubric, and that he suppressed the rubric '*Diis*', the salutation '*Dñs uobiscum*' and its response, the headings proper to the successive forms of blessing, and the '*Sequitur benedictio*' at the dividing-point of the formula for chrism. But, on the other hand, and for whatever reason, he made the '*Ds incrementorum*' &c. occupy twenty-two lines, instead of twenty-one, by giving it a conclusion proper to exorcisms (*ib.* 556); he made the formula for chrism occupy fifty-one lines instead of fifty (*ib.* 557); he inserted an unintelligible rubric before his exorcism of the *oleum simplex*; that exorcism he so prolonged as to make it require twenty-one lines instead of nineteen; and, by giving the last constituent the conclusion proper to exorcisms he made this require

eight lines instead of seven. In the subjoined table I make careful note of these peculiarities. It shews that on reaching the limit of the item he reached the end of a page.

		V'
	Brought forward. (See p. 41 <i>supra</i>)	248
§ xxxix.	<i>Item in quinta feria missa xpismatis</i>	31 1
	Four details as in Pont. (See p. 44 <i>supra</i>) 6, 3, 4, 13 =	26
	<i>Infra canonem Communicantes ut supra</i>	33 1
	Hanc igitur oblationem famulorum . . . offerre*	267 9
	<i>Benedictio olei ad populum in his uerbis</i>	34 2
	Istud oleum ad ungendos infirmos	26 1 = 288 (P. 108 ends)
	<i>Ut autem ueneris Nobis . . . dñm nřm et intras</i>	82 3
	Six details as in Pont. (See p. 44 <i>supra</i>) 15, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1 =	20
	<i>Ipsa expleta confrangis . . . dicis</i>	113 4
	Dñs uobiscum. <i>Resp.</i> Et cum spũ tuo. <i>Dicis</i>	30 1
	Oremus. <i>Et intras</i>	13 1
	Dñ incrementorum . . . iudicare saeculum per ignem	625 22
	<i>Iterum dicis</i>	11 1
	Three details as in Pont. (See p. 46 <i>supra</i>) 1, 1, 2 =	4
	UD et iustum . . . per eundem . . . xp̄m filium tuum	1471 51
	<i>Item olei exorcizati confectio</i>	27 1
	<i>Hoc loco misces . . . et sequitur hic exorcismus</i>	51 2
	Exorcizo te . . . per eundem . . . per ignem per dñm	575 20
	UD om̄p. aeterne dñs qui . . . per dñm . . . saeculum per ignem	237 8
	<i>Hoc autem expleto ueniens ante altare &c.</i>	157 6 = 144 (P. 114 ends)

*MEMORANDUM.—I doubt whether even the editor of V' can have added the words 'diesque nřos' which in Reginensis follow 'offerre'. To assume that he did might gravely prejudge the question of his date: to assume that he did not would involve no such risk. This, therefore, is our safer alternative. St Gallen not only knows nothing of them but subjoins 'per xp̄m' to 'offerre'.

Section xl. *The Missa ad uesperum*. On a previous page (see above, p. 30) I give my reasons for thinking that the latter half, 'Pascit igitur' &c. (Mur. i 558), of the extant preface of the *Missa ad uesperum* is not the work of a Roman pen; and I shewed at some length how admirably the result implied by this hypothesis consorts with the paginal distribution which the ceremonial observances proper to a first 'Maundy Thursday' Mass would require of a careful Roman editor. I also gave my reasons for thinking that the original text of the first part, 'Per xp̄m dñm nřm quam in hac nocte . . . suppleret', contained words not in Reginensis, the words 'nec sacrati cibi collatio' and that it thus comprised, with a concluding 'per quem', 570 letters (or, possibly, 559), the equivalent of eighteen β lines and of twenty-one θ lines.

There is no reason to believe that the first of the cismontane editors

made any addition to what he transcribed from his copy of Redaction S₁ further than the Communicantes of § xxxviii and the latter part, 'Pascit igitur . . . relaxauit', of the Preface of § xl.¹ On the other hand: so soon as the second cismontane editor had adopted into his volume the *Missa chrismatis* the Communicantes, and the Hanc igitur of which had in S₁ formed part of the *Missa ad uesperum*, there was no need that he should rewrite these at length in his transcript of the latter item. We may therefore assume that it was he who, instead of doing this, wrote the '*Infra canonem ut supra*' (Mur. i. 559) which now separates the Postcommunion from the Preface.

On this hypothesis the author of the very curious and suggestive 'magi mutati, reges turbati . . . dignatus est adimplere' in the extant Preface for the Octave of the Nativity² (Mur. i 500) and the author of this 'Pascit igitur . . . relaxauit' can scarcely have been one and the same man³: and I therefore venture to hope that the salient characteristics of the two passages may yet help scholars to form a probable theory as to when, where and by whom, Redaction S₂ and Redaction V, respectively, were compiled.

And, if I was just now well advised in believing that the editor of V took the rubric '*Hoc autem expleto*' &c. from a pontifical (Pont.) which lay ready to his hand, it would seem to follow that the bishop for whom he worked was bishop of a diocese in which after-supper communion on the Thursday before Easter was not customary.

¹ We have seen that, like the edition of the Roman sub-redaction S₁, and presumably for the same important reason as had inspired that of his predecessor, the editor of the cismontane S₂ so economized his material as to make the Secreta of § xxxviii end simultaneously with a page (see above, pp. 39, 40). The consequence was that enhancement having the value of twenty ̸ lines would be needed if the *missa ad uesperum*, the last Mass of the *quadraginta ieiunia* of the quinquagesimal observance, was to end in like manner. Such enhancement was supplied by the '*Infra actionem*' and 'Communicantes' &c. of § xxxviii; by the 'Pascit igitur' &c. of the Preface of § xl, and by the capitulum of § xli.

² See *J. T. S.* vol. xv p. 200.

³ Because, whereas the editor of S₂ may have subjoined his 'Pascit igitur . . . relaxauit' to the original Preface of § xl as early as the year 495, or thereabout, the editor of Redaction V, at which, by the hypothesis, the marvellous 'magi mutati, reges turbati . . . dignatus est adimplere' (see *J. T. S.* vol. xv p. 200) was added to the original Preface of § ix, may not have worked before the year 563, when the First Council of Braga forbade after-supper communion on the Thursday before Easter (see above, p. 50); and also because the two passages differ conspicuously from each other in respect of style.

The successive totals for § xl are—

		s^1	S_1	S_2	V_1	V'
Brought forward. (See above, p. 36, p. 39, and pp. 48, 51)		7	77	111		
§ xl. <i>Item in feria quinta missa ad uesperum</i>	27	1	1			1
Suscipe quaesumus dñe &c.	105	4	4			4
UD et iustum est per xpm	570	18	21			
UD et iustum est per xpm relaxauit per ipsum &c.	976			36		34
<i>Infra actionem</i>	13	1	1			
Communicantes et diem &c.	79	3	3			
<i>Item infra</i>	9	1	1			
Hanc igitur oblationem famulorum &c.	267	9	10			
<i>Infra canonem ut supra</i>	19					1
Concede quaesumus dñe &c.	79	3	3			3
Praesta quaesumus dñe ut &c.	103	3	4			4
Of the following					1	1
Total (β) for s^1						50 P. 48 ends)
„ (θ) „ S_1						125 (P. 55 ends)
„ (θ) „ S_2						75
„ (κ) „ V						(P. 63 ends)
„ (κ) „ V'						48
						(P. 111 ends)
						48
						(P. 116 ends)

MARTIN RULE.