

writings of the other great Alexandrian, Clement.¹ With regard to the matter grouped under E—details of a topographical or historical character—it is noteworthy that Rufinus often records an additional fact connected with some place or country where at one time or another he had lived, as for example, Rome,² Jerusalem,³ Caesarea Philippi.⁴ And as regards group F, it is significant that Rufinus amplifies Eusebius's account of martyrdoms which took place in Caesarea,⁵ Tyre,⁶ Antioch,⁷ Egypt,⁸ and Mesopotamia⁹—places of which Rufinus from his travels might be supposed to have some local knowledge. In any case, we know that in one instance¹⁰ at least he had documentary evidence before him in the shape of the *Acts* of the martyrdom: and doubtless he had similar evidence to go on, in other passages where we are unable to trace the source from which he drew his details. His *verbatim* accounts¹¹ of what the martyrs said points in this direction.

Thus it will be seen that Rufinus's translation of the *Church History* is tinged by the circumstances of his career. And if this fact, on the one hand, made him an unfaithful exponent of Eusebian theology, on the other, he was led to incorporate in his version material which as a student and a traveller he had gleaned during a busy and varied life. Such material deserves a consideration which it has not hitherto received.

J. E. L. OULTON.

ST WULSTAN'S PRAYER BOOK.

In the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is preserved a book (MS 391), the history of which is almost a romance. This is the eleventh-century volume known until recently as the *Portiforium* (or *Breviarium*) *Oswaldi*. The ascription was derived from a title written in large red letters of the thirteenth or fourteenth century on the first page of the MS *Liber S. Marie Wygorniens. ecclesie per S. Oswaldum*. That the book was written for Worcester is proved by internal evidence; that it was never in the hands of St Oswald, bishop of Worcester from 960 to 992, is equally proved by the fact that the Saint's festival occurs in the Calendar in the original hand. The date of the volume is unmistakably fixed by the Calendrical tables prefixed, which extend from

¹ pp. 159 f. ² pp. 165, 167. ³ pp. 164, 166. ⁴ pp. 167 f. ⁵ p. 169.

⁶ p. 170. ⁷ pp. 172 f. ⁸ pp. 170 f., 173. ⁹ pp. 171 f.

¹⁰ Martyrdom of Phileas and Philoromus: see pp. 170 f.

¹¹ pp. 169-173.

1064 to 1093. It was the Rev. H. M. Bannister who, in 1916, restored the book to its rightful owner. In a note printed on p. lx of *Early Worcester Manuscripts*¹ he writes: 'The traditional title, *Portiforium Oswaldi*, is clearly wrong . . . it [the book] might justly be called the *Portiforium S. Wulstani*, for it was written in the episcopate of the last Saxon bishop of Worcester and for his use.' St Wulstan ruled from 1062 to 1095, almost exactly the span of the Calendrical tables. Dr Frere, if a little less positive, also declares for St Wulstan's claims: 'The date of its [the book's] origin lies within the years of the Calendrical table, 1064-1093. They are all part of the episcopate of the great St Wulstan. . . . The priors under him were first his brother Ælfstan, and then Thomas, with possibly Ægelwin and Ægelred between. These are the persons for whom conceivably the book may have been written. The bishop has the first claim to be considered the owner, and there is much to substantiate the claim. . . . In any case, the book has many links with this great Englishman, sufficient to justify calling it "The Collectar of St Wulstan".'²

Before advancing new evidence on the point of ownership, the book and its contents may be described. It is a stout vellum volume, measuring $8\frac{4}{5}'' \times 5\frac{2}{5}''$ and paged 1-724, written almost entirely, as Dr M. R. James says in his detailed description,³ 'in two hands of the eleventh century, one a fine round delicate upright hand, the other blacker, more pointed, with a slight slope'. It contains (besides a Calendar, a complete Psalter, and a Hymnal) the Antiphons with music, Chapters and Collects for the Day Hours (i. e. a Collectar), and some portions of the Night Office (also noted), a series of private prayers, and other miscellaneous matter. It is in fact almost a Breviary, or *Portiforium*, and it is recognized as one of the most important witnesses to the liturgy and its chant in pre-Norman England. The Collectar has been published in extenso by the Henry Bradshaw Society (see above) and the Calendar appears there also, printed in parallel columns with three others also from Worcester. It is expected that the musical portions will be reproduced by the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society.

The portion that has not yet been dealt with contains a collection of private prayers, and my present business is with this section, for it seems to my mind to confirm previous evidence and decide, once for all, the ownership of the MS. This conclusion is based on a text recently published which brings the book into closer and more intimate relation than had hitherto been suspected with the last of the Anglo-Saxon Saints.

¹ C. H. Turner, Clarendon Press, 1916.

² *The Leofric Collectar*, H.B.S. 1918, p. xix.

³ *Catalogue of the MSS of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, vol. ii p. 241.

The main authority for the life of St Wulstan is William of Malmesbury's *Vita*, founded on an earlier Life by a contemporary of the Saint. The only known copy of Malmesbury's work is a British Museum MS (Cotton, Claud. A.V.), and from this one leaf is missing. The contents of this leaf have just been revealed from an abridged version of the *Vita*, now published for the first time by Mr R. R. Darlington (*Vita Wulfstani*, R.H.S. 1928). There we read that the Saint was in the habit of saying psalms and prayers, and that both these items were in one volume which he carried about with him: 'Sepe psalterium, sepe orationum librum, in quo non minus quam in psalterio erat, quemque semper sinu gestabat, et horas de Sancta Maria dicebat.'¹

Now, the *Portiforium*, as has been seen, contains a complete Psalter and a collection of some sixty private prayers in Latin (some with translations in Anglo-Saxon), written, as internal evidence proves, for a Benedictine monk connected with Worcester, for there are prayers to St Benedict and to local saints. This section is in the same two hands as the rest of the MS, and it can scarcely be rash to recognize the MS as the precious volume which was St Wulstan's daily companion and the witness of his devotion. Thus on one more count the book claims him as its owner. Dr Frere suggests that it was intended for use in choir, and so it may have been; but it is equally suitable for a traveller. In the course of his episcopal duties St Wulstan was constantly in the saddle and his biographer describes his custom of saying psalms and other prayers at such times with his attendants. The *Portiforium* would supply him with all that he needed in this way, as well as with the text of the Day Hours of the Divine Office.

It may be asked: How could a book so closely connected with Wulstan be misnamed at Worcester and attributed to Oswald? This is scarcely a serious difficulty. The inscription connecting it with the latter saint is of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, and in the course of two or three centuries traditions are frequently obscured. Dr James, while approving the attribution of the volume to Wulstan, writes: 'Maybe they remembered only that it had belonged to a great worthy of the Church and thought it must be Oswald.'

This is not the place to deal with the prayers themselves. There is no reason to suppose that any of them are original, or peculiar to St. Wulstan. Many, in fact, are found in other collections of the same nature. Unfortunately the opening leaf (or leaves) of this section is missing. This is the more to be regretted as each item of the collection is carefully headed, and it may be presumed that the whole set would

¹ The reading in another version of the abridged *Vita* is still plainer: 'in quo non minus psalterium continebatur'.

have had a title. However, it is ungracious to express regrets when the prayers have done us the service of restoring to our veneration the prayer book of one of the most attractive of English saints.

DAME LAURENTIA McLACHLAN, O.S.B.

TERAPHIM.

'IMAGES, with at least a head resembling that of a man (1 Sam. xix 13, 16), which were venerated by the less spiritual Hebrews, apparently as a kind of household god, or *Penates* (cf. 1 Sam. i. c., and the concern of Laban here [i. e. Gen. xxxi 19] at their loss), and were likewise consulted for the purpose of obtaining oracles (Zech. x 2, and especially Ezek. xxi 21 [= 26, Heb.]): the regard in which they were popularly held is apparent also from the narrative of Judges xvii 5, xviii 14-20, and from Hos. iii 4.'—S. R. Driver, *Genesis*, p. 283 (Westminster Commentaries).

Dr Driver's note on the Hebrew word in his commentary (Oxford 1913) on Samuel (1 Sam. xv 23) gives a complete list of the occurrences of the word, but does not otherwise help us to gather its meaning.

The note on Gen. xxxi 19 quoted above seems to me, excellent as it is in its compression of matter and its reserve of tone, to be open to one criticism. Does not the reference to 1 Sam. xix 13, 16 suggest that the word *teraphim* is used of a single image, and further that this image had a head large enough to be mistaken at a short distance for the head of a man? Is the narrative in 1 Samuel to be so understood?

The two Biblical passages which show the *teraphim* actually 'at work' or 'in use' are those just referred to (in Genesis and 1 Samuel). What do we learn from these?

(1) Gen. xxxi 34 'Now Rachel had taken the *teraphim* ["the images" A. V.], and put them [a plural suffix in the Hebrew] in the camel's furniture ["in the saddle of the camel", Jewish Version, 1917], and sat upon them. And Laban felt all about the tent, and found them not.'

May we not conclude from this (*a*) that *teraphim* is not only plural in form, but also in meaning: (*b*) that these *teraphim* were small enough to be easily concealed?

(2) 1 Sam. xix 13, 16. This passage needs to be carefully translated from the Hebrew, for A. V. has shewn here its not infrequent infelicity in the renderings of prepositions, and its mistranslation has remained uncorrected in R. V.