

the decisive words *also Helyas dede* in the 'Harmonia Evangeliorum Flamandice' at Stuttgart.

It may be added that the Cambridge fragment (Dd xii 25) is here extant and supports S (*als Elyas dede*).

III.

I have left out of account the Greek and Syriac evidence, because I cannot suppose that Greek or Syriac texts had any influence on Victor of Capua or Dutch mediaeval Harmonies. In Greek the outstanding feature is that many MSS retain **a** ('as Elias did') but omit **b** and **c**, i. e. exactly the opposite of the mass of Latin Vulgate MSS: this seems to me to shew that Greek texts had no influence here in the West.

In Syriac the Arabic Diatessaron has all three clauses in agreement with the Peshitta; syr. *S*, on the other hand, omits them all in agreement with **NB**, while syr. *C* has **b+c** but not **a**. Thus syr. *C* agrees with the mass of Vulgate codices, with the Liège Harmony, and with *e*. It seems easy at first sight to call in the Diatessaron to explain this isolated coincidence between syr. *C* and the Liège Harmony, but it will not explain the addition of **a** in the Stuttgart MS, or the text of *e*, or indeed that of the Clementine Vulgate. The Liège MS, in fact, is the only text which suggests that 'Tatian' accepted **b** and **c** but rejected **a**, and its evidence is discounted by the fact that it agrees textually with the mediaeval Vulgate.

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON THE TEXT OF THE *CANTICUM SOLIS*.

ST FRANCIS of Assisi died on the fourth of October, 1226, so that this Number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* is contemporary with the Septicentenary celebrations at Assisi and elsewhere. It seems, therefore not inappropriate to offer a small tribute here to the memory of the Poverello in the form of a Note on the text of the well-known *Canticle of Brother Sun*, with the special object of evaluating the received text, which in this case is happily that of the most ancient MS, in the light of the newly discovered text from Perugia, and other evidence recently made available.

Most persons, I suppose, read the Canticlè from Sabatier's edition of the *Speculum Perfectionis*, where the whole poem is quoted (§ 120). In this work M. Sabatier, recognizing that the MSS of the *Speculum* gave a very poor text, relegated their testimony to an Appendix and inserted in the text of his book the text of *Assisi* 338 (= A), the oldest and

best MS of the writings of S. Francis. Since the publication of Sabatier's *Speculum* in 1898 various other texts independent of that work have been unearthed, notably the MS from S. Isidoro in Rome from which Fr. Lemmens edited the *Speculum* generally known by his name, and the '*Legenda Antiqua*' from Perugia discovered by Fr. F. M. Delorme.¹ The plan of this Note is to give a complete conspectus of the variants in the five lines where all our authorities are extant, in order to examine the grouping of the documents and especially to see what support they give to the ancient MS from Assisi.

The main authorities for the text of the *Canticum Solis* are

A = Assisi 338 (about 1250).

I = S. Isidoro 1/73 (xiv^o) = Lemmens' *Speculum* (fol. 6r) and Sp. § 10.

P = Perugia 1046, §§ 79 and 6 (1311): see *A FH* xv 71 and 10.

L = cod. A. G. Little, *olim* Phillipps, §§ 156 (± 1400).

N = S. Antonio, § 66 (xiv^o): see *A FH* xii 69.

Sp = *Speculum Perfectionis* (?1318): o Ognissanti, c Cleopatra B 2, m Mazarine 1743.

Bart = Bartholomew of Pisa (1385).

Ricc = Riccardi 1407 (1503).

679 = *Actus in Valle Reatina* (1416).

The *Canticum* has 33 lines, following the division of lines as printed by Sabatier. Of these A N Sp *Bart Ricc* and 679 contain the whole, except that N omits ll. 10-12, apparently by carelessness. I has ll. 1-19, 27-31; P has ll. 23-31; L has ll. 27-31 only. It is therefore only for ll. 27-31 that all our nine authorities are extant.

It is unnecessary to quote the Canticle at length, but for the convenience of readers, especially with regard to the variant *da* for *per*, discussed at the end of this Note, I give the opening words and the last couplet, following cod. A.

- Altissimu onnipotente bon Signore
 tue so le laude la gloria e lhonore et onne benedictione.
 Ad te solo Altissimo se konfano
 et nullu homo ene dignu te mentovare.
 5 Laudato sie, Misignore, cum tucte le tue creature
 Spetialmente messor lo frate Sole
 lo qual e iorno et allumini noi per loi
 et ellu e bellu e radiante cum grande splendore
 de te, Altissimo, porta significatione.

¹ See *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* vol. xv pp. 23-70, 278-332 (1922). *La Legenda Antiqua S. Francisci*, texte . . . de Pérouse, par le P. Ferdinand-M. Delorme, Paris, 1926, only gives the text of the latter part of P, so I here keep to the numeration in *A FH* xv.

10 Laudato si, Misignore, per sora luna e le stelle
in celu lai formate clarite et pretiose et belle.

32 Laudate et benedicete Misignore et rengratiate
et serviateli cum grande humilitate.

The verses omitted are all of the same general structure as ll. 10-11: 'Be praised, my Lord, *per* Brother Wind', or 'Sister Water', &c. Line 7 is given here exactly as in A, except that I have printed *qual* and *e* as two words, as explained below. The general sense of the stanza will then be (ll. 5-9): 'Be praised, my Lord, with all Thy creatures, specially our noble Brother Sun, *who indeed is Day*, and Thou dost illuminate us by him, and he is radiant and a type of Thee'.

In ll. 27-31, where all our authorities are extant, the variations are here given in full:—

27 *Laudato si, Misignore, per sora nostra morte corporale*
laudatu Sp.c, lauda Sp.m si] A L 679, sia I N *Bart Ricc*, sie P,
sii Sp.o c m misignore] A I, mio signore P N, mio signore L Sp.m
Bart, meo signore Sp.o c, mio signiore *Ricc*, monsignore 679 per]
omnes, da 679 sora nostra] A P N Sp.c 679, nostra sorore I, sorore
nostra L, soror nostra Sp.o m, suor nostra *Bart*, suora nostra *Ricc*.

28 *da la quale nullu homo vivente po skappare.*

da la quale] A I Sp.c m *Bart*, dalla quale P N *Ricc* 679, de la cale L,
de la quale Sp.o nullu homo] A Sp.c m, nullo homo I N Sp.o
Bart, nullomo P, nul homo L, niuno huomo *Ricc*, niuno homo 679
vivente] morto 679, om. *Ricc* po] A I P L Sp.o c m 679, puo N
Bart Ricc skappare A, scapare I, scampare P L N Sp.o c m *Bart*,
ne campare *Ricc*, scampar et 679.

29 *guai acquelli ke morrano ne le peccata mortali.*

guai] A P N Sp.c *Bart* 679 (guay Sp.o *Ricc*), vay I, gay L, gaiai Sp.m
acquelli A, a quegli I, *Ricc*, ad quilli P, a quello L, a quelli N (*Bart*),
a quilli Sp.o c m, ad quelli 679 ke] A I P Sp.c m, che L N *Bart*
679, qui Sp.o, li quali *Ricc* morrano A, morono I, morano N *Ricc*;
morira P, morro L, moro 679, more Sp.o *Bart*; om. mor. . . ke (2°)
Sp.c m ne A P L, nel I, in N Sp.o *Bart Ricc* 679 le peccata
mortali A, li peccati mortali I P: peccato mortale L N Sp.o *Bart Ricc*
679 (pechato L).

30 *Beati quelli ke trovaro ne le tue sanctissime voluntati*

biati P, beato L; pr. e N quelli] A N (*Bart*) 679, quegli I *Ricc*,
quilli P Sp.o; quello L ke] A I P, che L N *Bart Ricc* 679, q̄ Sp.o
trov.] A I P L; pr. si N *Ricc*, pr. se Sp.o c m *Bart* 679 trováro]
scripsi: trovara A P L, trovarone I; truovano N, trovano *Bart* 679,
trovam *Ricc*, trova Sp.o m; corona Sp.c (cf. Sp. 123) ne le] A I

Bart, ne li P, nelle N 679, in le Sp.c m; ne la L, en la Sp.o, nella *Ricc* tue] A I, toi P 679, toe Sp.c m *Bart*; tua Sp.o *Ricc*; cor(!) L* sanctissima L *Ricc*, sancte 679 uoluntati] A Sp.c 679, voluntadi I, voluntadi N, voluntade P *Ricc*, voluntate L Sp.m, voluntade Sp.o *Bart*.

31 *ka la morte secunda nol farra male.*

ka la] A I L, kella P, ke la Sp.o c m, che la N *Bart Ricc* 679 secunda] A I L N *Bart*, second P, seconda Sp.o, secunde Sp.c, secondo Sp.m, seconda *Ricc* 679 nol A, nogle I, noli P L Sp.c m, nolli N 679, non li Sp.o *Bart*, non gli *Ricc* farra] A L, fara I P; porra fare N Sp.(c) m, porra far Sp.o *Ricc*, pora far *Bart*, potra fare 679.

A large number of these variants are no doubt insignificant in the strict sense of the word, in that their significance is small, but it seemed to me worth while for these five lines to put down every difference that I have noted, in order to see how the authorities divide themselves. The general result is to confirm A in its position: the other chief witnesses, such as I and P, differ more from one another than they do from A. Thus A is not often alone; it generally has I or P or L with it. For instance in l. 29 f. it not only preserves the old-fashioned *ke* (= Latin *qui*, mod. *chi*) and *ka* (= Latin *quia*, mod. *che*). N, on the other hand, tends to head the list of the later texts.

Of the readings which are strictly textual and not grammatical the most interesting is the insertion or omission of *si* before *trovaro*. There is great diversity in the spelling of the latter word, but the texts fall into two groups in the matter of *si*, which is found in N, all MSS of Sabatier's *Speculum*, Bartholomew of Pisa and the two late texts, but is omitted in A I P and L. This omission was long supposed to be peculiar to A, and was actually cited by Böhmer in 1871 as a reason for not following A everywhere. But the distribution of the evidence shews pretty clearly that if *si* be right it must be a correction and that the oldest tradition did not have the reflexive. I venture to think A correct, and that ll. 30-31 form one sentence, not two, meaning 'Blessed are those who (when they died) found in Thy most holy wishes that the Second Death would do them no ill': for the phrase, see Rom. i 10 *in uoluntate Dei*.

In l. 31 the same grouping occurs. The older MSS A I P L have 'will not do', the later texts, headed by N, have 'will not be able to do'. It may very well have been that the hand which inserted *si* also turned *farra* into *porra fare*.

The actual form of the verb in l. 30 is a more difficult question. The later group all have what is meant for the present indicative: N *Bart* and 679 have a plural, the *Speculum* a singular. The four

older texts all begin with *trovar* . . ., which suggests *trováro* (or *trovárono*). It is in fact the only form of the verb which so begins. A P L all have *trovara*, which is meaningless, I actually has *trovaro*, but followed by *ne*, reduplicated from *ne* following. The agreement of A P and L is an agreement in error, but the other readings seem to be corrections of this: here again, therefore, A preserves the oldest extant tradition.

It is the same with l. 7, which begins in I, as well as in A, with

Lo quale iorno,

said of Brother Sun. Most texts have *iorna* or *giorna*, and 679 has *orna*, a correction which at least shews that *giorna* was felt to be not quite satisfactory. The agreement of I with A shews us that *iorno* did not originate with the scribe of A: is it translateable? I venture to suggest that *quale* stands for *qual'è*, so that it means 'Brother Sun, who indeed *is* Day'. And I would further compare the line with what is said in P § 78 (= Sp. S 119) about the *Canticum Solis*: 'In mane (said Francis) cum oritur sol, omnis homo deberet laudare Deum qui creavit ipsum, quia per ipsum oculi *de die* illuminantur.'

It is notable how bad the tradition of the text is in the MSS of Sabatier's *Speculum*, and how much better (and nearer to A) it is in P. As Sabatier remarked, the Cantic was written down by someone unfamiliar with Italian. In 1898 M. Sabatier put this down to 'some Northern scribe', but the text is almost as bad in the Ognissanti MS as in the Mazarine. I would rather say that the editor of Sp. S was more skilled in Latin than in the Umbrian vernacular. Possibly indeed this editing may have taken place at Avignon, or have been the work of some Franciscan attached to the Papal Court established at Perugia. Certainly the text of Sp. S shews no sign of independence or special excellence.

I, on the other hand, is the best text next to A itself. It has plenty of errors of its own, but they are different from those of other texts, and when A and I agree they seem to be always right. I is not directly copied from A, but its great value is to shew again and again that what might have seemed to be scribal peculiarities of A are not errors, but the correct maintenance of an old, if not indeed the original tradition.

The variant *da* for *per* in l. 27, and in all the other seven places where *per* similarly occurs (e. g. l. 10), raises a question of a different order. It is only in 679, i. e. the 'Acts of Francis in the Valley of Rieti', that *da* is found, and naturally there can be no question but that *per* is the true reading. But what did St Francis mean by it? When he says 'Be praised, O Lord, *per* Brother Wind or Sister Water' what is the meaning of *per*? It may be answered that Francis was composing in

Italian and that *per* has all the meaning, and either of the meanings, that it has in Italian. But the English translator must choose, and the variant *da* at least tells him that one Italian early in the 15th century did find a difficulty in *per*.

The preposition, in fact, holds the key to the meaning of the whole Canticle. According to 679 Francis wishes God to be praised *by* Sun, Moon, Fire, and the other creatures: e.g. 'God be praised by (*da*) Fire, through (*per*) which God illuminates the night' (li. 18, 19). Even *cum* in l. 5 is turned into *da*. On the other hand it seems a little inartistic to exhort those who pardon their enemies for the love of God to praise Him (ll. 23, 24); it makes better sense to take the lines as meaning that God is praised through the fact of these forgiving men and women. The same may be said about 'our Sister, bodily Death'. At the end of the Canticle comes *rengratiate* (l. 32): this corresponds to the phrases about the beauty and usefulness of the various Creatures, suggesting therefore that God is to be praised *for* them. So we get back to *cum* in l. 5: this does not naturally mean *da* (so 679), but *con*, i. e. God is to be praised *together with* His Creatures, so that when Francis praises Sun, Moon, and Fire he wishes us to think of it as praise of God who made each one so. All this tends to make the English translator choose 'through', if not 'for', to render *per*.

The variant *da* is proof positive that the interpretation of *per* was somewhat doubtful. It is, therefore, worth remark that in this, as in other matters, Conventuals and Spirituales—or perhaps it is more accurate to say, Thomas of Celano and the Leonine tradition—seem to be divided. I venture to call 2 Cel. ii 161 (*ad fin*) as a supporter of 'by': 'Laudes de creaturis tunc quasdam composuit et *eam* utcumque ad Creatorem laudandum *accendit*'. On the other hand we have *Perugia* 78 (= *Speculum* 100), which makes Francis say: 'Volo . . . facere nouam Laudem Domini de suis creaturis quibus cotidie utimur . . . in quibus humanum genus multum offendit Creatorem . . . quia inde nostrum Creatorem et datorem omnium bonorum sicut deberemus non laudamus'. Here clearly the new Laud is to be a praise of God *by* men *for* the creatures.

F. C. BURKITT.

CODEX BEZAE AND THE 'SORTES SANGALLENSES'.

To translate Lk. xxi 34 *μερίμναισ βιωτικαῖσ* the Vulgate has *curis huius uitae*, while the Old Latin texts vary, for the first word, between *sollicitudinibus* (*a e* Iren) and *cogitationibus* (*b c f f i l q r*). The Latin of Codex Bezae has *soniis*.