

POPE INNOCENT I 'DE NOMINIBUS RECITANDIS'.

THE letter (xxv) of Pope Innocent I to Decentius, bishop of Gubbio, contains a passage which has long been a *crux interpretum*. This is the section in which he defines the place in the Mass at which the names of 'offerers' should be read out to the people. Strangely enough the question which remains under debate is, at what precise point in the service the recital of names should, according to Innocent, take place. The answer to be given to this question is a matter of extreme importance for the history and criticism of the Roman Canon of the Mass. One group of liturgical writers deduce from the Pope's words that in the year 416, when the letter was written, the Roman Canon of the Mass had somewhere after the recital of the Institution a prayer of general intercession with Diptychs of the living and dead, corresponding to the Great Intercession and Diptychs of the Eastern liturgies.¹

It is the purpose of this Note to examine the passage afresh, and with special reference to the above interpretation of it. We must begin by having the text before us; and since the preceding section of the letter (that concerned with the position of the kiss of peace) helps to illustrate the terminology of our passage, it also may be quoted.²

Ep. xxv § 4. Pacem igitur asseris ante confecta mysteria quosdam populis imperare, vel sibi inter se sacerdotes tradere, cum post omnia, quae aperire non debeo, pax sit necessario indicenda, per quam constet populum ad omnia, quae in mysteriis aguntur atque in ecclesia celebrantur, praebuisse consensum, ac finita esse pacis concludentis signaculo demonstrantur.

¹ So the late Dr Paul Drews *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe* (Tübingen and Leipzig 1902) pp. 34-35; Dr Anton Baumstark *Liturgia Romana e Liturgia dell' Esarcato* (Rome 1904) pp. 70-74; Dr Adrian Fortescue *The Mass* (Longmans, 2nd ed. 1914) pp. 132-133, 170-171. At an earlier date Theodor Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen* vol. iii (Schwerin 1859) pp. 6-7, argued from the passage that at the beginning of the fifth century the Roman Canon contained a general intercession in two parts, the first before, the second after the 'consecration'; each part being accompanied by a recital of names and special prayers for the individuals mentioned. Evidently in his view the first part of this intercession concerned the living, the second the dead. Kliefoth's view does not exactly correspond with that of the writers just mentioned; but the ground on which he places a part and they the whole of a general intercession after the consecration is the same, viz. the wording of the last clause in § 5 of Innocent's letter.

² I employ the edition of Coustant-Schoenemann, Göttingen 1796.

§ 5. De nominibus vero recitandis, antequam precem sacerdos faciat atque eorum oblationes, quorum nomina recitanda sunt, sua oratione commendet, quam superfluum sit et ipse pro tua prudentia recognoscis, ut cuius hostiam necdum Deo offeras, eius ante nomen insinues, quamvis illi incognitum sit nihil. Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandae, ac tunc eorum nomina, quorum sunt, edicenda; ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur, non inter alia, quae ante praemittimus, ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris precibus aperiamus.

The last clause of § 5 ('ut inter sacra mysteria', &c.) is usually (in fact always, so far as I know) translated so as to give the sense: 'so that they may be named in the course of the sacred mysteries, not in the course of those other things which we place before: so that by the mysteries themselves we may open the way for the prayers that are to come' ('futuris precibus').

According to the writers referred to above, the 'prayers' ('preces') here mentioned, for which the 'mysteries' prepare the way (and which accordingly must come *after* the 'mysteries') are those of an Intercession which stood at the end of the Canon.

But here a difficulty presents itself. Innocent, in this section of his letter, has set out to speak of the mere reading of a list of names ('De nominibus vero recitandis')—the names of those who have made offerings¹ at an early point in the service; and so far he has given no hint that anything else is in his mind but just this only. How then does he come here at the end, in summing up and pointing his argument, to refer in this matter-of-course fashion to certain 'prayers' of which he has previously said nothing?

To this it is answered in effect, that the reading out of a list of names constitutes the liturgical item known as 'the Diptychs'; that in the Eastern rites the Diptychs commonly occur in connexion with the Intercession in the anaphora; that Innocent consequently uses the word 'preces' (at the end of the section) to denote the whole complex of Intercession *plus* Diptychs of living and dead; and that 'preces' in the last clause is therefore equivalent to what has hitherto been called simply 'nomina recitanda', 'nomina edicenda'. This identification is to be carefully borne in mind in the sequel.

As to the assumptions underlying this equation a word will be said later. Here it will be enough to remark that even if it were a fact that

¹ *Oblationes*. He appears to speak primarily of the people's offering of the bread and wine for the Sacrifice. But we must probably not restrict the *oblationes* to this; for St Jerome *Com. in Ezech.* lib. vi cap. 18 (Migne *P. L.* xxv 175 B, C) speaks of the public recital of the names of those who have made or promised money offerings—'tantum offert illa, tantum ille pollicitus est'. As practically all St Jerome's works were written for Latin readers, it seems unreasonable to doubt that he here describes a Roman, or at least a Western practice.

the Roman Canon in Innocent's day contained an Intercession after the recital of Institution, his supposed reference to it in the present context would still be most abrupt, foreshadowed as it is by nothing that has gone before, and the reference itself highly questionable. But there is a whole crop of further difficulties in the way of identifying the 'prayers' at the end of the section with the previous 'nomina recitanda'.

1. It is sufficiently clear that both in § 4 and § 5 of his letter Innocent employs the word 'mysteria' as virtually equivalent to what we call the Canon of the Mass. When therefore in § 5 he insists that the names of offerers are to be read out 'in the course of ('inter') the sacred mysteries', he means in the course of the Canon: not before it, but also not after it. On the other hand (according to the interpretation of his words which we are considering), Innocent states that the mysteries, that is the Canon, prepare the way for the 'preces' to come *after*. I do not see how 'futuris precibus' can possibly imply less than this, or how that expression is consistent with the idea that the 'preces' came anywhere *within* the Canon—even towards the end of it. Innocent has a very clear notion as to where the Canon ends: it ends just where the kiss of peace is given, which serves as its 'seal' and shews that it is closed (see § 4). Hence we do not expect to find him saying loosely, now that something occurs in the course of the Canon ('inter sacra mysteria') which really follows it; now that something follows the Canon which really takes place in the course of it. But this contradiction is involved in the equation of 'nomina recitanda' with 'preces' of the last clause.

2. The only mention of 'prayer' in § 5 previous to the 'preces' of the last clause occurs in the passage in which Innocent declares that the names are not to be proclaimed 'antequam *precem* sacerdos faciat atque eorum oblationes, quorum nomina recitanda sunt, sua *oratione commendat*'; after which he adds: 'prius ergo oblationes sunt *commendandae*, ac tunc . . . nomina . . . edicenda'. Here 'prex' and 'oratio' are one and the same thing, the prayer by which the priest 'commends' to God the people's gifts.

Is this 'prex-oratio', then, also equivalent to the Canon, within which (or is it after which?) the Intercession and Diptychs find their place? and is it accordingly distinct from the 'preces' (i. e., *ex hypothesi*, the Intercession) mentioned at the end of the section? On the hypothesis we are considering, it must at least be different from the 'preces'; and it is in fact taken to mean the Canon, or a part of the Canon. But then, (a) it is unnatural that 'preces' at the end should refer to other prayers than those previously mentioned; and (b) 'commendare' is not an apt word by which to express the purpose of the Canon. In an earlier passage (§ 3) of his letter Innocent has

spoken of the Roman *mos* 'in consecrandis mysteriis': why should he not use 'consecrare' here, if that is what he means?

But on the view that 'prex-oratio' denotes the Canon, there is another difficulty to be faced. The 'commendation' of the gifts effected by this prayer is presently alluded to in the following manner: Your own good sense tells you how superfluous it is 'ut cuius hostiam *necdum* (i. e. not before the 'prex-oratio') Deo *offerat*, eius ante nomen insinues'. Are we to understand Innocent as saying that before the Canon is reached no 'offering' or 'commendation' of the gifts has taken place? But the collects called *secreta* or *super oblata* in the Roman Sacramentaries are framed and designed precisely as offertory prayers; and the 'secret', which is certainly as old as the time of Innocent's letter, precedes the Canon. I cannot think it possible therefore that the above is his meaning.

3. The translation given above of the final clause of § 5—'so that by the mysteries themselves we may open the way for the prayers that are to come'—attributes to Innocent the preposterous argument, that the 'sacred mysteries' (that is the Canon), the solemn prayer of consecration, the terms of which he may not quote ('*quae aperire non debeo*' § 4), will, if his directions be followed, serve as a sort of prelude to some other prayers of which he has hitherto said nothing. It has to be added that of the intercessory prayers after the prayer of consecration, to which Innocent is thus made to allude, there is absolutely no trace in Western tradition.

4. Lastly, the expression 'futuris precibus', if the two words be construed together, is suspicious from the point of view of mere latinity. As 'futuris' has the position of a mere epithet, the natural rendering would be 'future prayers'; which, however, can hardly mean anything. But if the meaning intended be 'for the prayers that are to take place', the Latin is odd; for then we should expect 'futuris' to have some position of emphasis—such as '*viam precibus aperiamus futuris*', or at least '*precibus futuris*'.

I have not seen that the advocates of the interpretation from which we started have shewn any due realization of these difficulties. They may, however, retort that the two last of them equally attend any view of the general meaning of the passage. That is in part true. If the last clause be translated as it has (so far as I know) always been translated, I do not see how Pope Innocent is to be found consistent with himself, or how his closing words can have any other effect than that of contradicting and undoing what he has, up to this point, been striving to insist upon—viz. the necessity of preparing the way for the recital in the Canon of the names of the offerers by first commending with prayer their offerings to God.

But I believe that the current translation of the last clause is a mistaken one. It arose not unnaturally out of the collocation of the two words 'futuris precibus', which has given the impression that they belong together and are a pair of datives. The truth is, I am persuaded, that though 'futuris' is a dative, it agrees not with 'precibus' but with 'ipsis mysteriis'; while 'precibus' and not 'ipsis mysteriis' is the instrumental ablative; and what Innocent says is, not that by the mysteries we may open the way for prayers that follow; but something much less unexpected, namely, that by our prayers we may open the way for the mysteries themselves that are to follow. This is the sense that the whole tenor of the passage prepares us for, and the sense that must be adopted if the Latin will bear it. Let us have the second part of the section under our eyes: in order to beg no questions I keep the punctuation of Coustant-Schoenemann.

Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandae, ac tunc eorum nomina, quorum sunt, edicenda; ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur, non inter alia, quae ante praemittimus, ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris precibus aperiamus.

There are two possible ways of taking the second 'ut' clause ('ut ipsis', &c.).

i. It may be regarded as 'consecutive', or at any rate as depending upon 'Prius ergo . . . edicenda'. In this view it repeats the first 'ut' clause ('ut inter', &c.), stating a further consequence of commending the offerings before proclaiming the names of the offerers. Now the commendation of the offerings is made by a prayer ('prex', 'oratio') said by the priest for that specific purpose; and before that prayer no offering of the gifts has taken place ('cuius hostiam necdum Deo offeras'). This could not be said of the Canon or any part of it, as we have already seen; nor is 'commendare' the sort of word to express the purpose of the Canon. The prayer, therefore, by which the offerings are commended is one that precedes the Canon. That is sufficiently clear in any case from the argument: '*Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandae, ac tunc . . . nomina . . . indicenda; ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur*'. The first 'ut' clause, then, completes the following sequence: the presenting of the gifts by the people; their commendation to God by the priest's prayer; recital of the names of offerers *within* the Canon, not after or at the end of it.

If the second 'ut' clause merely resumes the first, it must represent the same sequence of events. But if 'futuris precibus' denotes prayers said at the end of the Canon, in such wise that the Canon prepares the way for them, then a new and unlooked-for element is introduced. In addition, the argument now ends with a *non sequitur*; for, that the Canon prepares the way for additional prayers is no conceivable

consequence of commending the offerings before the offerers' names have been read out in the Canon. But the consequence is valid if the 'preces' at the end are identical with the earlier 'prex-oratio', by which the gifts are commended, and if 'precibus' in the last clause is the instrumental ablative; for an earlier prayer of commendation will prepare the way for the Canon, with the recital of names in it: and that there should be this preparation is in fact the kernel of Innocent's whole contention.

ii. But there is another way of taking the clause, and one which, while it leads to the same result, appeals to me as superior in the context. This consists in taking the second 'ut' as dependent not, like the first, on 'Prius . . . indicenda' but on the immediately preceding 'quae ante praemittimus', and as introducing a purely final clause: that is, a clause stating the purpose for which those 'other things' are 'placed before'. The Latin will now be construed as it necessarily would be if there were an 'ideo' or an 'eo consilio' before 'ante praemittimus', thus: 'not in the course of those other things which (for this very reason) we place before in order that we may open the way', &c.

In favour of the first of these two constructions is the fact that it makes the argument end on a positive note, with a reassertion of the writer's main contention; while the second method makes it end with a mere negation. Nevertheless the second method seems to me to be preferable, and to be recommended especially by the choice of words 'ante praemittimus . . . ut . . . viam . . . aperiamus'. These expressions involve the metaphor (which I cannot but think must have been intended by the writer) of 'sending' on ahead to prepare the way. But unless 'ut . . . viam . . . aperiamus' depends on 'ante praemittimus' the metaphor is destroyed, and the wording which involves it will have to be explained as merely accidental. That does not appear to me probable. It is also to be noted that the first person plural, which appears for the first time in 'praemittimus', is carried on in 'aperiamus'.

If this second construction of the clause be adopted, there can be no further question as to what that is for which the way is opened: the 'things we place before' the mysteries can prepare the way only 'for the mysteries themselves that are to follow' ('ipsis mysteriis viam futuris'). But whichever way the clause is taken the result is the same: it is the mysteries (the Canon) for which the way is prepared, and not they that prepare the way for something else.

Were it not for the fact that the words 'futuris' and 'precibus' stand side by side, I imagine that no controversy could ever have arisen as to the liturgical import of the passage. It is the taking of these two words together in the same case that throws the whole meaning into confusion and doubt. Let us suppose that 'oratione' stood in the place of

'precibus': could any objection be taken to the latinity of 'ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris oratione aperiamus', or could there be any doubt as to the meaning? But 'precibus' may as well be an ablative as 'oratione'.

I quite realize that this juxtaposing of a dative and an ablative plural is awkward, and liable to mislead. But it is to be remembered that to Innocent's correspondent it could not have brought any misunderstanding, since Decentius was thoroughly acquainted with the Roman practice referred to: 'Saepe dilectionem tuam ad urbem venisse, ac nobiscum in ecclesia convenisse, non dubium est, et quem morem vel in consecrandis mysteriis vel in ceteris agendis arcanis teneat cognovisse' (§ 3). And in fact we have to set one defect of composition over-against another; for the awkwardness of the like-ending dative and ablative is balanced on the other side by the weakness of 'futuris, precibus' (as a pair of datives) to express the required sense 'for the prayers *that are to follow*'. It has already been said that if 'futuris' was intended to have this force it should properly have received some position of emphasis, whereas the place it holds is that of a simple epithet. The stylistic difficulty therefore is not all on one side; and it is preferable to admit a merely clumsy construction rather than one which, besides being grammatically weak, lands us in the perplexities and contradictions already explained.

I must now state in brief how I understand both the general drift of Pope Innocent's passage on the recital of the names, and the individual terms employed in it.

(1) The second half of § 5 I would translate thus:—

'The oblations, therefore, are to be commended first, and (only) then are the names of those whose they are to be proclaimed: so that they may be named in the course of the sacred mysteries—not in the course of those other things which we place before in order to open the way by (our) prayers for the mysteries themselves that are to follow'.

(2) Innocent is concerned neither with Intercession nor Diptychs (in the ordinary sense of a formal and fixed list of living and dead persons to be either prayed for or honoured), but merely and only with a list of the names of persons who happen to have made offerings at the Mass in course of being celebrated: a list, therefore, which would vary from day to day.

(3) What had been done at Gubbio was to read out the names of the offerers at a point in the service corresponding to that at which the recital of names of offerers¹ and of the dead is indicated in the

¹ The public recital of names of offerers in the West can be traced back to the beginning of the fourth century: cf. the Council of Elvira can. 29. St Jerome also

Gallican books, i. e. just before the Gallican *post nomina* prayer. Now the *post nomina* are essentially offertory prayers, and apart from their allusion to the names recited they answer closely to the Roman *super oblata* or 'secret', the prayer which immediately precedes the Canon.¹ The prayer, therefore, before which the offerers' names were read at Gubbio, and by which their offerings were commended, was one which corresponded to the Roman 'secret'. Was Innocent aware of this? There can be no sufficient reason to suppose that he was not. But then it is just this prayer that forms for him the fixed point in both uses, the point with reference to which he defines the proper place for the recital of the names: 'De nominibus vero recitandis, *antequam precem*² sacerdos faciat atque . . . oblationes . . . sua oratione commendet', &c. The 'prex-oratio' is for him the same prayer at Gubbio and at Rome; and if at Gubbio it was that which came to be called the *post*

alludes to it (*Com. in Ieremiam* lib. ii cap. 11, *P. L.* xxiv 784 D; and *Com. in Ezech.* lib. vi cap. 18, *P. L.* xxv 175 B, C). It may be doubted whether the Gallic recital of names of the dead at the same time is so ancient: Innocent makes no mention of it as part of the practice he condemns at Gubbio. Even in the Gallican books some of the *post nomina* prayers, whilst they refer to the recital of names of the offerers, make no mention of the dead: cf. in the *Missale Gothicum* the *post. nom.* forms for Epiphany ('Auditis nominibus ac desideris offerentium'), and for the Mass 'in initium quadragesimae' ('Offerentium nominibus recensitis'). A number of others make mention of the names of the offerers only, but go on to pray for the dead as well.

The origin of the reading out of the names of offerers in the West (as a practice quite separate in its implications from the Eastern Diptychs) may not unreasonably be traced to the importance attached in these regions, from early down to comparatively late times, to the offering by the people, the laity, of the matter for the Sacrifice, and the prominence thereby given to the idea that the people as well as the priest 'offer' the Sacrifice. The following passages may be consulted: Hippolytus *Apostolic Tradition* (Coptic version: in Horner *Statutes of the Apostles* p. 316); St Cyprian *de opere et elemos.* c. 15; Council of Elvira (c. 300) can. 28, 29; Ambrosiaster (s. iv *fin.*) *Quaest. vet. et nov. test.*, Quaest. 46; St Leo *Ep.* ix 2 (ad Diosc. Alex.); Felix II [III] *Ep.* xiii (A. D. 487-488); the Gregorian Canon ('et omnium circumadstantium . . . devotio, qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis'). The idea is represented in many of the Roman 'secrets'. On the characteristic difference between East and West in the matter of 'Diptychs' see Edm. Bishop's section on 'The Diptychs' in his Appendix to *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*.

¹ Noteworthy is the following 'secret' in the *Leonianum* 'Offerentium tibi munera, quaesumus, Domine, ne delicta respicias sed intercessorum merita propitius intueri' (Feltoe, p. 14 l. 6).

² There is no evidence that in the fifth century 'prex' had become a technical term to denote exclusively the Canon, or indeed that it ever became so. Much improper use has been made of this supposed technical force of the word. If Innocent had been familiar with it he could hardly have failed to employ the word in § 4 of his letter, where he says that the kiss of peace is to be given at the end of the Canon: he uses instead 'mysteria', and the circumlocution 'omnia quae aperire non debeo'.

nomina, at Rome it was the *super oblata* or 'secret'. The names, he says, are not to be recited before but only after this prayer, and indeed some little way after it, within the Canon itself ('inter sacra mysteria').

This conclusion is confirmed by what is said by Innocent in regard to the 'prex-oratio': it is a prayer previous to which no offering of the gifts has been made by the celebrant, and is therefore not the Canon; and by it the gifts are 'commended' to God in their special aspect of offerings of the people.¹

(4) 'Mysteria' is in effect equivalent to the Canon as a whole: the 'arcana' of the Mass, the 'omnia quae aperire non debeo' (§ 4).

(5) The place in the Canon at which the names were recited at Rome may be assumed to have been in the neighbourhood of the *Memento vivorum*. There is nothing in Innocent's words that positively indicates this; but his insistence that the recital should come after the 'secret' suggests a point in the early part of the Canon, and no more probable place can be found: particularly if in Innocent's day the text went on (as it did already long before the year 700): 'et omnium circumadstantium . . . devotio, qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis'.

(6) The 'preces' mentioned at the end of the passage are to be identified with the previous 'prex-oratio' (i. e. the 'secret'), at least in the sense that they cover it. There is no reason to press the plural as denoting several distinct prayers; it is satisfied by the general sense 'prayers', or even 'prayer'.²

As regards the assumption that the reading out of a list of 'offerers' at Rome connotes a Great Intercession and Diptychs of the living and the dead: it will be time to consider such an idea when some one has produced evidence that the Roman *Canon* ever contained a set of prayers for 'all sorts and conditions' such as we find in the Eastern

¹ The actual word 'commendare' comes fairly frequently in the 'secrets' of the Roman Sacramentaries. It usually occurs in a petition that the oblation may be commended by the prayers or merits of the Saints; but from the point of view of the people, the offerers of the oblation, it would be equally apt to describe the purpose of the priest's prayer in recommending their gift, as especially theirs, to God's favourable regard. Examples of the use of the verb may be found in Dr Feltoe's edition of the *Leonianum* at pp. 2 l. 16, 8 l. 29, 9 l. 21, 18 l. 11, 35 l. 14, 39 l. 18, 42 l. 17, 91 l. 29, 99 l. 25, 165 l. 29.

² The 'preces' represent the prayer element in the 'alia quae ante praemittimus'. It is worth noting that several Roman 'secrets' ask not only that the oblations but also the prayers ('preces') of the people may be accepted or commended: e. g. *Gelas*, ed. Wilson, p. 88 'Suscipe . . . preces . . . cum oblationibus'; p. 167 'Preces nostras . . . admitte, et . . . sacrificium beata Soteris commendet'; p. 181 'preces et hostias b. Petri ap. commendet oratio'.

rites, to which alone the liturgical term 'Intercession' is applicable; and when it has been shewn that the names of dead persons were ever at Rome recited in the ordinary public Mass. In regard to the particular interpretation of Pope Innocent's letter which makes him witness to the presence of an Intercession after the words of Institution, I will merely point to one historical consideration.

The pseudo-Ambrosian treatise *de Sacramentis* is nowadays very commonly regarded as being, if not actually contemporary with St Ambrose, at least as early as the beginning of the fifth century. I should not myself be prepared to place it so early, though I think it is certainly of the fifth century, and probably not later than the middle of the century. But Dr Drews and Dr Fortescue are both prepared, and apparently inclined, to accept the earlier date.¹ Next, it matters little for our purpose that the treatise was not written in Rome; for the author speaks of the Roman Church as that 'cuius typum in omnibus sequimur et formam' (iii 1. § 5). Nor does it matter very much if this statement be taken not quite literally in regard to the actual wording of the Canon quoted in the document; for in reality the long piece of text there given agrees so closely with the traditional Roman prayer that it must have been own brother to the Roman text of the fifth century; and where the two agree now they must have agreed then. The only alternative to this obvious conclusion would be that Rome at a later date (let us say in the fifth or sixth century) abandoned her old prayer of consecration and adopted, with some merely verbal changes, that of Milan (?): a supposition which has neither evidence nor probability to recommend it, and cannot be seriously entertained.

What the author of the *de Sacramentis* has to say that bears on the question of a Roman 'Intercession' is the following: 'Consecratio autem quibus verbis est et cuius sermonibus? Domini Iesu. Nam reliqua omnia, quae dicuntur in superioribus, a sacerdote dicuntur: laudes Deo deferuntur (*or laus Deo defertur*), oratio petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro ceteris; ubi venitur ut conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, iam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi' (iv 4 § 14).

'The liturgical sequence', says Dr Drews (p. 35), 'is here unmistakable: after the Preface and Sanctus (*laus Deo defertur*) follows the Intercession, and later still the Consecration.'² 'We conclude', says Dr Fortescue (p. 133), 'that, whereas *de Sacramentis* places the

¹ Drews *op. cit.* pp. 35-36; Fortescue *op. cit.* pp. 128-129.

² To guard against misunderstanding I would here add that I am not satisfied that this prayer 'for the people, kings, and the rest' is to be placed within the Canon at all. But it is anyhow the only prayer of intercession of which the writer has anything to say, and it certainly took place earlier than the recital of Institution.

Intercession before the Consecration, Innocent places it afterwards.' Dr Fortescue leaves the matter there. Dr Drews goes on to remove the obstacle which the passage sets in the way of his own interpretation of Innocent and of his general thesis as to the dislocation of the Roman Canon. His way of doing this is simply to assert that the *de Sacramentis* represents a Milanese and not a Roman use, and that, to explain the agreement of the present Roman Canon with the *de Sacramentis*, 'we must suppose that finally Rome yielded to the widespread rite of Milan' (p. 39). This supposition will not appear so necessary to those who are not committed to the thesis of Dr Drews.

I venture to claim that the explanation of Innocent's passage offered in this Note is simple and coherent. Innocent supposes that the prayer over the oblations has been recited before the Canon; and the terms he uses in regard to it are readily applicable to the Roman 'secret', and to that only. In the second place, he refers the recital of the names to the Canon itself; and for this our present text (and still more the true Gregorian text) of the Canon provides a natural and obvious place in connexion with its Memento of the living and the prayer that follows. And thus the explanation offered may also claim to be 'traditional'.¹ There is but one objection that can be urged against it: the order of the words in the last clause. The special point which this paper is intended to emphasize is, that the mere order has caused an illusion as to the grammatical construction, and that the

¹ Not merely does it fall in with the traditional structure of the Roman Mass, it embodies also the traditional meaning of the Pope's words. 'The canons 50 and 51 of the great Council of Frankfort of 794 dealt with the practice of this period of transition. They read: (50) "Ut confecta sacra mysteria in missarum solemnibus omnes generaliter pacem ad invicem praebeant"; (51) "De non recitandis nominibus, antequam oblatio offeratur" (*M. G. Concil.* ii 171). These prescriptions go back on Nos. 53 and 54 of Charles's "Admonitio generalis" of 23 March 789, which however make their purport quite clear: (53) "In decretalibus Innocenti papae, ut pax detur ab omnibus, confectis Christi sacramentis"; (54) "Item eiusdem, ut nomina publice non recitentur ante precem sacerdotalem" (*M. G. Capit.* i 57). With the adoption of the Roman rite, some priests, and perhaps bishops also, continued to recite the "names" and to give the "pax" at their accustomed place in the Gallican mass, i. e. before the Canon. The object of the two canons of the Council of Frankfort was to secure that in quarters in which the Roman rite was adopted the "names" should be said and the "pax" given in their (Roman) places, namely the "names" (of offerers) at an early point of the Canon, the "pax" immediately before the communion' (Edmund Bishop *Liturgica Historica* p. 101 note 1). This note was not written to illustrate Innocent's passage; but it does so in a very striking way. The Roman Mass at the end of the eighth century was, as we know, what it is now; and at the same date Innocent's injunctions were understood as prescribing conformity with it.

clause can, and indeed must, be construed in such a way that it fits naturally into the writer's argument, instead of throwing the whole passage into confusion.¹

R. H. CONNOLLY.

¹ I feel the less diffidence in propounding this solution inasmuch as I have submitted it to two friends whose opinion on a question of Latin translation must command a respect not due to my own. The Dean of Wells, Dr Armitage Robinson, allows me to say that he too takes 'futuris' with 'ipsis mysteriis', and the last 'ut' clause as depending on 'alia quae ante praemittimus', translating thus: 'not among those things which we put before (the sacred mysteries) to open up by prayer the way for the mysteries themselves which are to follow'. Dom André Wilmart, who has kindly read the paper in a first draft and offered some valuable suggestions on it, also agrees with me on the essential point that 'futuris' is to be taken with 'mysteriis' and not with 'precibus'. He agrees also with the liturgical interpretation that I have given of the passage; but he inclines to give the last 'ut' clause a retrospective force, as stating the general result of commending the gifts before the Canon (by the 'secret') and reciting the names in the Canon (in connexion with the Memento of the living). He points out that Innocent observes the rhythmical *cursus* throughout, and that 'precibus aper(i)amus' is a regular *cursus tardus* if the 'i' be regarded as having a semi-consonantal value: an observation which suggests to me this further remark, that the rhythm of the last clause seems to be improved if we attach 'precibus' closely to the verb 'aperiamus' by making a mental pause before the final *cursus*, thus: 'ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris | precibus aperiamus'.

The latest writer to deal with the passage is Mgr Batiffol (*Leçons sur la Messe*: Paris, Lecoffre, 1919—the book was in circulation already in Nov. 1918), who devotes several pages to it (218 ff). Mgr Batiffol appreciates the difficulty of the last clause in relation to the rest: he thinks it resides in the word 'mysteriis', for which he suggests that we should read 'oblationibus'. To this word he gives the sense 'oblationum commendatione', meaning the *prayer* by which the oblations are commended. The rest of his interpretation implies the emendation. It is enough, therefore, to point out that earlier in the passage 'oblationes' twice denotes the material gifts, and could hardly have been employed again in the context with a new and unusual sense. The emendation is not likely, I think, to win acceptance.