

DIDACHE AND DIATESSARON

FOR about forty years it has been known that something very like the combination of Mt. v 39-41 with Lk. vi 29-30, which is offered by *Didache* i 4 was also to be found in Tatian's *Diatessaron*.¹ The agreement is not exact, and in particular there is the awkward little difference that, while every version of the *Didache* containing this verse has been supposed to read *ἐάν τις σοι δῶ ῥάπισμα εἰς τὴν δεξιάν σιαγόνα* (with the T.R. of Mt. v 39), it is more than probable that Tatian's text omitted *δεξιάν*.² Despite these differences, eminent editors have been found who doubted if the agreements could be accidental.³ There being no reason to suppose the *Didache* to have escaped the usual risks of scribal assimilation, it was always possible to suspect *δεξιάν* of being an interpolation in *Did.* i 4. But in default of MS evidence the suspicion remained a suspicion.

A collection of 'Moral Maxims' ascribed to Isaac of Nineveh, which was published by M. Besson so long ago as 1901,⁴ contains a reworking of the *Didache's* 'Two Ways' deserving of more attention than it seems to have received. Among other interesting variants (supporting *Ap. Const.* vii in many cases) this reads *ἐάν τις σοι [ἢ.λ. σε] δῶ ῥάπισμα εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα*, without *δεξιάν*—the Tatianic reading. This is the only known version of the *Didache* to omit the word, but this is the reading of both Besson's MSS of the 'Maxims'⁵ which elsewhere exhibit variations too considerable to allow of a close relation between themselves. The omission can therefore be taken with some confidence as the true reading of this particular recension and also, I suggest, as the original form of the passage in the *Didache*.

It is true that this witness to the omission of *δεξιάν* is not only isolated but relatively late. Though Besson rejected the MS attribution of the 'Maxims' to Isaac of Nineveh, the collection shews no obvious sign of being older than Isaac's day (7th century) and might quite conceivably be later still. Against the omission, *δεξιάν* is in the text of the 4th century *Ap. Const.* vii,⁶ and was apparently read by the 5th-century Edessan Greek text from which the Georgian version of

¹ Cf. Ciasca's Arabic-Peshitta *Diatessaron* ix 6 sqq.

² An omission found in Ephrem, Syr. Cur. and Syr. Sin. Cf. F. C. Burkitt *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* ii p. 117.

³ So e.g. Harnack, Lietzmann, R. Harris. But not Armitage Robinson *Barnabas, Hermas and the Did.* p. 52.

⁴ *Oriens Christianus* i pp. 49 sqq. and 288 sqq. Matter from the *Didache* i in the first half.

⁵ *Vat. gr.* 375, s. xiv and *Palat. gr.* 146, s. xv.

the *Didache* was made,¹ as well as by the Bryennios MS which is dated A.D. 1056.

Though the methods of the 'Constitutor' make it precarious to infer that he found δεξιάν in his copy of the *Didache*, the insertion of the word, whether deliberately or unconsciously, to make the quasi-citation in the *Didache* accord better with the canonical text of Matthew, would be a scribal correction of the normal type which might well take place very early in the MS tradition. On the other hand, assimilation to the text of the *Diatessaron* seems improbable either in the 7th century or later, particularly in a Greek document. The inference is strong that the compiler of the 'Maxims' had before him a text of the *Didache* which omitted δεξιάν. This compiler was (from the contents) certainly a monk, and in the 7th century an out-of-the-way Syrian monastery might well possess a copy of the *Didache* older than most of those represented in our present sources and in some respects purer in tradition than any of them. That some of the readings of the *Didache* used for these 'Maxims' did go back at least to the later 3rd century is shewn by their appearance not only in *Ap. Const.* vii but in other sources also.²

In any case what should be decisive in favour of the omission of δεξιάν in *Did.* i 4 is the context of the verse. A peculiar Tatianic reading which has MS support has strong claims to preference over a canonical reading when it is found in a conflation of gospel texts which has been supposed Tatianic on other grounds.

If the foregoing be accepted, we have a reasonably clear use of the *Diatessaron* in the *Didache*, which should give us a *terminus a quo* for the latter about A.D. 175. But the question is unfortunately complicated by the fact that this is found in a verse forming part of the so-called 'interpolation' (*Did.* i 3 b-ii 1), a passage which it is now almost traditional to treat as forming no part of the original *Didache*.

Though there is textual evidence for the omission of these verses, it

¹ Cf. the collation of the Georgian published for the first time by the discoverer, the Archimandrite G. Péradzé, *ZNTW* July 1932, pp. 111 sqq.

² E.g. *Did.* ii 2. Bryenn. reads simply οὐκ ἐπιπορήσεις. *Is. Ninev.* has μὴ ὀμόσεις ὄλωσ ποτέ εἰς οἰονόηποτε πρᾶγμα μήτε ὀρκίσεις ποτέ τινα. *Ap. Const.* vii 3 4: οὐκ ἐπιπορήσεις, ἐρρέθη γὰρ μὴ ὀμόσαι ὄλωσ. *Ap. Ch. O. Cod. Mosq.*: οὐκ ἐπιπορήσεις, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὀμόσεις ὄλωσ. *Syntagma Doctrinae*: μὴ σαπρὸν λόγον ἐκ χειλέων προφέροντα, μήτε ὀρκον ὄλωσ τὸ παράπαν. The agreement of the oldest Egyptian tradition (*Synt. Doctr.*; see below) with a fourth century Syrian witness in reading ὄλωσ and probably ὕμνου also (? = σαπρὸν λόγον of *Synt. Doctr.*) is interesting but does not necessarily point to a clause having dropped out of Bryenn. Though not always very reliable on points of detail, Bryenn.'s text is the more probable in the context. But the gloss is obviously an ancient one, and no discredit to *Is. Ninev.*'s ancestry. There are other similar agreements between these four documents.

is hard to crush down a suspicion that the obvious use of *Hermas* M ii 4-6 which is found in *Did.* i 4-5 has something to do with the firmness with which the 'interpolation' theory is held. Those who are willing to see in the *Didache* a monument of the earliest post-apostolic age naturally look askance at a passage clearly dependent on a document which may well be as late as A.D. 150. Traces of the use of a gospel harmony which cannot have been in general circulation in Syria more than a year or so before 175 A.D. are not likely further to commend the authenticity of the passage in such quarters. Yet I venture to say that if the question of its genuineness be approached from the neutral ground of purely textual criticism, the evidence in its favour will be found exceptionally strong; and it is increasing in strength as documents come to light. When the late Dr Armitage Robinson—never more scholarly nor more acute than in his neglected *Donnellan Lectures*—first argued in favour of retaining these verses,¹ he could find only *Ap. Const.* vii with which to support Bryennios's MS. Since then Dom Connolly, in a discussion to which what follows is partly indebted,² has shewn that the 3rd-century *Didascalía* was acquainted with these verses, and also that the evidence against them is by no means so strong as had been supposed. But it is now possible to bring at least seven, and perhaps eight, witnesses in their favour, against three documents only which omit them.

Besides 1. The Bryennios MS which contains the whole passage, 2. The *Didascalía*, both Syriac and Latin, quotes quite casually and in separate books from *Did.* i 3 b and 5 a. There is no reason to doubt that its author read at least the intervening verse i 4, if not the whole 'interpolation'. 3. *Ap. Const.* vii 2 2 certainly read *Did.* i 3 b, 4 and 5 a, less certainly 5 b, 6 and ii 1, which have left no trace at all in the 'Constitutions'. 4. The Georgian *Didache* (Edessa c. A.D. 430-440) contains *Did.* i 3 b, 4, and ii 1, but not i 5 and 6. The discoverer is inclined to attribute this to carelessness³ but in a version in general a mere translation of a MS very close to the tradition of the Bryennios MS the lack of these two verses is noticeable. The omission of 5 a as well as 5 b rather complicates the Syrian evidence. The point will be taken later. 5. The Egyptian papyrus fragment B. M. Pap. Ox. 1782, i⁴ (c. A.D. 400-450) consists of the end of *Did.* i 3 and the beginning of i 4. There is no reason to doubt that it originally contained all of these two verses at the least. 6. *Isaac*, or Pseudo-Isaac, of *Nineveh* makes use of *Did.* i 3 b, 4 and 5 a, but has nothing corresponding to

¹ *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache. Donnellan Lectures* 1920, p. 72.

² *J. T. S.* xxiv pp. 147 sqq.

³ *ZNTW art. cit.* p. 114.

⁴ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri in the Brit. Mus.* vol. xv, Grenfell and Hunt, p. 14.

i 5 b, 6 or ii 1. This strengthens the doubt as to whether these latter verses were read by the author of *Ap. Const.* vii, for *Isaac* seems to me, for what the opinion is worth, to be using that edition of the *Didache* which underlies the *Constitutions*.¹ 7. I hope to shew that the Pseudo-Athanasian *Syntagma Doctrinae*, hitherto reckoned a witness against the disputed passage of the *Didache* or, by Dom Connolly, a neutral, is as a matter of fact a rather important witness in favour of the form read by A. C. vii and *Is. Ninev.* 8. St John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, gr. xxvi:² εὐσεβῶν μὲν τῷ αἰτοῦντι διδόναι, εὐσεβεστέρων δὲ καὶ τῷ μὴ αἰτοῦντι τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ αἰροντος μὴ ἀπαιτεῖν, δυναμένουσ μάλιστα κ.τ.λ. has been reasonably supposed by some (Bryennios, R. Harris, V. Bartlet) to shew a knowledge of *Did.* i 5 a: παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτειν οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνασαι.³

The documents certainly omitting *Did.* i 3 b–ii 1 are three. 1. The *Apostolic Church Order* in all its forms and versions.⁴ 2. The Latin Homily based on the *Didache* first published by Schlecht.⁵ 3. An Arabic version of a lost Coptic *Life of Abba Schnudi* first published by Amélineau and treated by Iselin.⁶ There is no need to enlarge on the weaknesses of these adaptations as negative witnesses. They have been

¹ The author of the 'Maxims' may well have known A. C. vii itself, but he clearly had independent knowledge of its *Didache* also. He could scarcely have picked out from the 'Constitutor's' verbiage just those words and phrases which come from the *Didache* by the light of nature alone. He shares with A. C. vii a number of distinctive variants, yet many of them with curious differences. My own impression is that most of these differences are due to the 'Constitutor's' habits with his sources, and that *Isaac* generally gives a more faithful text of the edition they both used. This is not to suggest that their edition was nearer to the original than the tradition represented by the Georgian-Bryenn., but that it was an ancient—(? 3rd-Cent.)—revision. The subject is scarcely germane to the present discussion and I cannot develop it in a note. But, as will be seen, I find traces of this same edition in *Synt. Doctr.*, and, I may add, also in *Cod. Mosq.* of the *Apostolic Church Order*, and the Coptic fragment (B.M. Ms. Or. 9271) printed by Dr Horner, *J.T.S.* xxv pp. 225 sqq.

² *Ap. Migne P. G.* 88 col. 1029.

³ I confess I see little in the passage which *could* not have been developed from Lk. vi 30. The alleged fragment of Clem. Al. from the *Catena* of Nicetas which has been claimed as echoing the same phrase of the *Didache* rests apparently on *Ap. Const.* and is not Clement's at all. Cf. Connolly *J.T.S.* xxiv p. 149.

⁴ The fragment of a Latin version of this recovered by Hauler from the Verona Palimpsest begins after this passage of A. C. O. There is no ground for supposing that this version contained any indication of the 'interpolated' verses.

⁵ This has elsewhere inserted a phrase found both in *Did.* i 5a and in *Hermas* M ii 4, but in a form rather closer to the old Latin version of *Hermas* than to the *Did.*, cf. Armitage Robinson *op. cit.* p. 75. This does suggest that the homilist knew the sentiment as part of the *Didache*, even if his knowledge of the Latin *Hermas* has affected the phrasing of his translation.

⁶ T. U. xiii 2.

admirably exposed by Dom Connolly.¹ My concern is with another witness cited as omitting *Did.* i 3 b-ii 1,—that group of Egyptian documents comprising the Pseudo-Athanasian *Syntagma Doctrinae* and the closely related *Fides Nicaena* which reappears as the *Didascalía cccviii Patrum* or *Canons of Basil*.²

The somewhat complicated history of these texts has been elucidated by the late Mgr Batiffol with all his wonted elegance, but with just a touch of that extreme lucidity and precision which sometimes stirs a doubt on the work of French scholars. *Fides Nicaena* is no more than a literary recasting of a document closely related to *Synt. Doctr.* (not *Synt. Doctr.* itself³) and Batiffol puts forward strong reasons for placing its compilation in its present form between A.D. 375 and 381.⁴ It appears to exhibit an acquaintance with the *Didache* independent of the citations found embedded in *Synt.*, since in two places it supplements or corrects the rather loose quotations in that document. But the inference may be misleading. The bulk of the matter from the *Didache* has been considerably disguised by *Fides Nicaena* in the process of rewriting, in a way which suggests that it was *not* recognized as quotation from a more venerable source. It is possible that the apparent independent reference to the *Didache* may be the result of descent, not from *Syntagma* itself, but from a closely related document. At all events, *Fides Nicaena* may be entirely neglected on the present issue. The passage of *Synt.* which is here concerned is clearly present in *Fides Nicaena*, but in a rather rewritten form.

Syntagma Doctrinae is a rather earlier Egyptian document (A.D. c. 350–375) but here again there is strong ground for suspecting that the *Didache* is being used largely, if not entirely, at second-hand. Batiffol very deftly and convincingly disentangled from its mid-4th century regulations for *μονάλογους* an older document of more general import, which he christened *Fidei Praecepta* and assigned to Alexandria at the close of the 3rd or opening of the 4th century. If I do not misunderstand him, he would make this *Ur-Syntagma* responsible for the whole

¹ *J.T.S.* xxiv art. cit.

² *Synt. Doctr.* is to be found in vol. iii of Montfaucon's *Athanasius*, and in Migne *P. G.* 28 (Athanas. iv) coll. 836 sqq. I cite it from Batiffol's ed., issued as *Studia Patristica* ii (Paris, Leroux, 1890) for the convenience of the division into verses which he introduced. *Fides Nicaena* is to be found, printed from a single Venetian MS, *P. G.* 28 coll. 1637 sqq. (It is not included in the Table of Contents.) A better text, from three other Greek MSS collated with a Turin Coptic version, was issued by Batiffol in a little paper-covered edition of 100 copies (Paris, Leroux, 1887) under the title of *Did. cccviii Patrum*. No attention should be paid to the improbable suggestions as to the origin of this document which Batiffol appended to this edition, which he subsequently withdrew in *Studia Patristica*.

³ *Stud. Patr.* ii pp. 130 sqq.

⁴ *Id.* pp. 137 sqq.

of the matter from the *Didache* now found embedded in our text of the *Syntagma*.¹

On the main point, the existence and character of the *Praecepta*—it is convenient to use this name for the earlier under-document and to keep *Syntagma* for the 4th century rewritten rule for *μονάζοντες* as we now have it—Batiffol amply proved his case. Opinions may differ as to the details. It is conceivable that *Syntagma* should have used the *Didache* independently of what it found in its parent, the *Praecepta*, but in the absence of an unrevised copy of the *Praecepta* we cannot detect the fact. It is sufficient that the bulk of the matter from the *Didache* is found in passages which must be assigned to the earlier and more general document.² The point has this much importance—it carries back the text of the *Didache* underlying the *Syntagma* to the later 3rd century. These quotations are thus the oldest certain Egyptian source for the text of the *Didache*, and almost comparable in age with the (less extensive) quotations in the oldest Syrian source, the *Didascalía*.

Two points stand out clearly from a consideration of these fragments.

1. Though they are produced in no sort of order they are drawn from both parts of the *Didache*—‘Church Order’ as well as ‘Two Ways’.
2. Many of them, though clearly based on the *Didache*, are fusions of two or more passages, and have been otherwise much adapted. They are more in the nature of ‘reminiscences’ than ‘quotations’. Dom Connolly has further pleaded³ that they are in themselves too small and scrappy for any argument to be possible as to what was *not* contained in the compiler’s *Didache*. Though it seems possible to recognize more than the ‘scarcely half-a-dozen lines in all’ which he allowed, the argument is obviously just, but also, I suggest, irrelevant on the question of the ‘interpolation’. *Syntagma* offers good evidence for these verses in the form read by *A. C.* vii and *Is. Ninev.* The simplest thing is to let the texts speak for themselves.

Did. i 5 a. Bryennios MS παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει.

Ap. Const. VII ii 6 τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θέλοντος δανείσασθαι παρὰ σοῦ μὴ ἀποκλείσῃς τὴν χεῖρα.

Is. Ninev. τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείζασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.

Synt. Doctr. iii 8 sq. ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ τις παρὰ σοῦ, εἰς χρῆσιν δίδου, καὶ λάμβανε παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ κεφάλαιον, ὅταν ἔχη, ἀνευ τόκου. Μὴ δολιεύου ἐνώπιον κυρίου. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἔχης γεννήματα ἢ ἀργύριον καὶ ζητῇ τις δανείσασθαι

¹ *St. Patr.* ii pp. 156 sqq.

² E.g. some of it has reference to family life, &c., which could hardly be interpolated for the benefit of *μονάζοντες*.

³ *J.T.S.* xxiv p. 157.

σθαι παρὰ σοῦ . . . (and you try deceitfully to make a profit, God will punish it). This seems to be a case where the general preoccupation with the readings of the Bryennios MS has obscured the bearing of the early evidence. I believe that any one who examines this passage in the light of the sort of use which *Synt.* elsewhere makes of the *Didache* will accept its relation to *Did.* i 5a in the variant form read by *A. C.* vii and *Is. Ninev.*¹

It should perhaps be added that Batiffol, following out a somewhat rigid theory of the differences of style between the work of the 'Preceptor' and of the 'Syntagmatist', would assign *Synt.* iii 8 sqq. to the later document. But 1. a regulation forbidding the loan of money at interest has no particular application to the *μονάζοντες* for whose special benefit the 'Syntagmatist' introduced all the rest of his interpolations. 2. On the contrary, it fits in excellently with the 'Preceptor's' scheme of advice to Christians living in the busy trading world of Alexandria. The *Præcepta* (in a clause which Batiffol justly assigns to the earlier work) have just made clear the author's dislike of usury—τόκον μὴ λάμβανε (iii 4). If the somewhat reckless generosity of *Did.* i. 5 seemed an impracticable ideal to set before commercially-minded Alexandrians, it is quite in the 'Preceptor's' style to recast his source in such a way as to exclude at least the practice he especially disliked—the taking of interest. This particular prohibition of interest would recall *Did.* i 5a to his mind quite naturally because the text of that verse which he knew contained an exhortation to 'lending' as well as to 'giving'. But the three prohibitions—1. Take no usury. 2. Take no usury on loans. 3. Do not cheat borrowers and take usury that way—hang together and seem to belong by nature to the 3rd century advice to Christians living in the world rather than the 4th century rule for *μονάζοντες*. It follows that the 'interpolation' in

¹ Cf. e.g. the next sentence of *Synt.* (iv 1) γίνου ταπεινὸς καὶ ἡσύχιος, τρέμων διὰ παντός τὰ λόγια κυρίου. Μὴ γίνου μάχιμος, μὴ τύπτε ἄνθρωπον ἢ μόνον παιδίον σου μικρὸν πρὸς παιδείαν, καὶ αὐτὸ παρατηρημένως κ.τ.λ., where *Did.* iii 8, iii 2, ii 7 and iv 9 are all apparently at the back of the 'Preceptor's' mind, but where phrases taken bodily from the *Didache* like τρέμων διὰ παντός κ.τ.λ. are fused with others more completely reconstructed, and the rather drastic educational theory of the *Didache* has been radically contradicted. Or compare what *Synt.* (ii 4) makes of the *Didache's* enactments against sorcery: μὴ μαγεύειν, μὴ φαρμακεύειν, μήτε ἄλλον σοι ταῦτα πράττειν ἐπὶ νόσῳ ἢ πάθους ἀλγήματι· μὴ ἀπέρχεσθαι πρὸς ἐπαιδὸν, μήτε φυλακτῆριον ἑαυτῷ περιτιθέναι, μήτε περικαθαίρειν, μήτε μὴν ταῦτά σοι ποιεῖν, μήτε ὑπὸ ἄλλου σοι γένηται. This is a fusion of *Did.* ii 2 with iii 4, both being clearly traceable, but three-quarters of the passage is the 'Preceptor's' own invention. It may be that, though the matter of *Synt.* iii 8 sqq. above is from *Did.* i 5a, the form has been affected by *Did.* iv 6 ἐὰν ἔχῃς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου, δώσεις. . . . The γεννήματα and ἀργύριον are found in *Did.* xiii.

the *Didache*, upon which the second and third of these prohibitions are based, was in the Egyptian text of the *Didache* in the 3rd century.

To sum up: we have a solid group of the only five certainly Syrian authorities for the text of the *Didache* (*Didascalia, Ap. Const.* vii, Georgian, *Is. Ninev.* and *Bryenn.*) all of which receive at least the first part of the 'interpolation', verses sufficient by themselves to demonstrate a relatively late date for the document. The *Didache* is a Syrian manual for whose text the unanimity of the Syrian witnesses should carry a special weight. These are further supported by two Egyptian documents, the papyrus fragment and the *Didache* underlying *Synt. Doctr.*, and perhaps by Climacus also. This positive evidence includes both the oldest Syrian and the oldest Egyptian authorities, the only 3rd century evidence we have.

Against these we have to set three adaptations none of which goes back beyond the 4th century in its present form, all of which omit a deal of other matter of which there is no question but that it is integral to the text of the *Didache*, and one of which (Schlecht's Latin) offers some indication that it knew of the 'interpolated' verses. I submit that on scientific grounds it is hard to deny the claim of these verses (or at the least of *Did.* i 3b, 4 and 5a)¹ to form part of the original text. That they may carry with them a use of Tatian's *Diatessaron* is a matter to be considered *after* the text has been established so far as possible by the principles of textual criticism alone.

Doubtless the 'interpolation' theory will die hard; after all, rather

¹ By this I do not imply any doubt of *Did.* i 5 and 6 and ii 1. The last is read by the Georgian, and is in any case negligible, little more than a rubric. The variations in the attestation of i 5 and 6 may well be due to their contents. To say 'Give to every one that asketh of you and ask not again' is scriptural. To continue 'Blessed is the giver, for he is free from punishment' is something of a bathos. To go on 'Woe to the receiver, for if a man have need and receive he is free from punishment' is scarcely sense and confuses the passage as a whole, which is not mended by denunciations of future Divine investigations and fearful punishments for all who lightly receive the alms which must be so freely bestowed. But verse 6 *can* only mean 'Give with discretion and only after investigation of the merits of the case', which blankly contradicts what we started with. Anyone not a mere copyist in the strict sense might feel moved to take liberties with such a passage, especially if he realized that the alleged scriptural authority in verse 6 was not to be found in scripture. The simplest thing was to omit the whole of the contradictory statements (cf. the Georgian). But 5a makes sense by itself, and is scriptural (Lk. vi 30). It was possible to retain that alone and fuse it with the sense of Mt. v 42 (cf. the *Didache* used by A. C. vii, *Is. Ninev.* and the *Synt.*). If this common-sense emendation, which had already been made in the late third century, was the text read by *Ap. Ch. O.* and the other negative witnesses, their own omissions only amounted to a verse and a half, or two halves,—which in such collections of extracts scarcely calls for explanation.

more than textual points are at issue over the *Didache*. But if the foregoing be correct, it is only one more indication that the theory of the *Didache's* origin associated with the names of the late Dr. Armitage Robinson and Dom Connolly is the truth of the matter. What may be permanently more doubtful is the point between A.D. 175 and—say, 220–230—at which we may best place the compilation of this strangely misunderstood *apocryphon*.

GREGORY DIX.

NOTES ON THE *TE DEUM*

A. *The Final Verses.*

I

THE final verses of the *Te Deum* raise problems for which it is not easy to find satisfactory solutions. The following are the manuscripts from which I have drawn the materials for this note :

London, B. M. Harl. 7653, ff. 5^v–6^v, viii–ix cent. Described by W. de Gray Birch in *An Ancient Manuscript* (Hampshire Record Society, 1889).

Milan, Bibl. Ambr. C. 5. inf., ff. 10^r, 10^v, 680–691. Edited in *H. B. S.* vols. iv and x, by F. E. Warren.

Paris, B. N. lat. 9488, f. 76^v, xi cent. Described by H. M. Bannister, *J. T. S.* vol. ix p. 426.

Rome, Vat. Reg. 11. ff. 250^v–251^r, c. 750 (Ehrensberger *Libri liturgici Bibl. apost. Vaticanae manu scripti* p. 3).

Munich, S. B. Clm. 343, ff. 211^v–212^r, x cent.

Madrid, Bibl. Nac. 10001 ; Hh 69 (formerly Toledo 35, 1), pp. cxxv, cxxvi. x cent. Printed by F. A. Lorenzana in 1775 as part of his edition of the *Breviarium Gothicum* (Migne, *P. L.* vol. lxxxvi). Unfortunately he only gives the opening words of the *Te Deum*.

Silos, Monastery of S. Domingo :

(a) *Rituale Moz.*, ff. 48^v–50^r, xi. cent.

(b) *Ritus et Missae*, ff. 48^v–49^v, xi cent.

I am indebted to the Rev. German Prado, O.S.B., for photographs of the *Te Deum* from these manuscripts.

Rome, Vat. Reg. 12, ff. 155^r–156^r, xi cent. (Ehrensberger *op. cit.* p. 34).

For the *Gloria in excelsis* we need the evidence of the Bangor Antiphonary (Milan, c. 5. inf.), the two manuscripts of the Irish *Liber Hymnorum* (Dublin, (a) Trin. Coll. E. 4. 2, xi cent. ; (b) Franciscan Library MS, xi cent.) ; and London, B. M. Add. 34209, xii cent. (*Paléographie musicale*, t. v and t. vi).