

of the Paschal 'sacrament.' I propound it, however, simply as a solution of the notorious difficulties of the Lucan narrative, and on the chance that the consideration of it by more learned critics may suggest some corroboration from the stores of textual and patristic evidence which are now applied so successfully to the elucidation of our documents.

HERBERT E. D. BLAKISTON.

ON THE EARLY TEXTS OF THE ROMAN CANON.

It is proposed in this paper¹ to examine the various readings of the early texts of the Roman Canon as contained in the mass-books from the seventh to the ninth century, with a view to ascertain how they may fall into classes or families; and to indicate briefly some of the questions which the results of the comparison raise.

The texts to be considered are those in the following books: (1) the Bobbio Missal, Paris B. N. lat. 13,246, Delisle *Mémoire*, No. vi (cited as *Bo*). (2) The Stowe Missal, now in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy (*St*)². (3) The Missale Francorum, MS Vat. Regin. 257, Delisle No. iv (*Fr*). (4) The *Gelasianum*, MS Vat. Regin. 316, Delisle No. ii (*GV*). (5) Rheinau MS 30 at Zurich, Wilson's R, Delisle No. ix (*R*). (6) St. Gall MS 348, Wilson's S, Delisle No. x (*S*). (7) The Angoulême Sacramentary, Paris B. N. lat. 816, Delisle No. xv (*Ang*). (8) The Gellone Sacramentary, Paris B. N. lat. 12,048, Delisle No. vii (*Gell*). (9) Paris B. N. lat. 2296, a MS which, though of late date and widely departing from its congeners, must be classed with the MSS of the eighth-century revision of *Gelas*; Delisle No. xlv (2296). (10) Cambrai MS 164, see *supra*, pp. 413-6 (*Ca*). (11) MS Vat. Regin. 337 (*Reg*). (12) MS Vat. Ottobon. 313, Delisle No. xxxv (*Ott*).

Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 have been examined by me. Thanks to the extreme kindness of M. Omont, Conservateur of the Department of MSS at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and of M. de la Roncière, Conservateur adjoint, a friend was able to take for me at once photographs of 1 and 8. The readings of 4, 5, 6 are taken from Wilson's edition of the *Gelasianum*, iii 16 and appended notes. For 2 I follow the edition of Dr. McCarthy (*Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, Literature and Antiquities*, xxvii 208-19, 220), which among other advantages has that of distinguishing by difference of type the original text from that of the interpolator Moelcaich; Dr. McCarthy has also recovered a not

¹ The following addition should be made in the previous article at p. 418 l. 2: In like manner, to the third Sunday of Lent is added (c. 39, note *n*) a 'super populum' which in both MSS is that of the Thursday following. Also: p. 417, l. 22, for '240' read '241.'

² Unfortunately in his account of the Fulda MS (see *Book of Cerne*, pp. 235-6) Witzel gives only those portions of the Canon that were strange to him.

inconsiderable portion of the erased original at a critical point (p. 210, footnote on f. 24^a)¹. For 3 I use Tommasi's own edition (1680), but Dr. Mercati has kindly re-examined the MS for some minutiae as to which I desired further security. Besides this, all the editions of the various missals, Mabillon, Vezzosi, Warren, &c., have been always under my eye. I refrain from entering on questions as to the dates of the various MSS; the object of this paper is to inquire what the texts themselves have to say as to their own history; for dates of MSS Delisle can be referred to. The current spelling is (except on one or two occasions) used in the Table, and variants merely orthographical are as a rule disregarded. But here discrimination is necessary; incorrect forms sometimes supply precisely the most valuable indications of the interrelations of the MSS. But both for clearness and eventual sureness in conclusions division of labour is best observed, and the part of the palaeographer or the philologist best reserved for the expert; in saying this I have particularly in view *Bo*². So far as the MSS of *Greg* are concerned I have thought it better not to complicate a case perhaps already sufficiently involved by adducing readings from any other MSS than *Ca*, *Reg*, *Ott*; the first of these recommends itself by its date whilst *Reg* and *Ott* represent (so far as I have seen, and speaking generally) the extreme of conservatism and the extreme of innovation in their respective renderings of the *Greg* Canon. The Ambrosian Canon is not brought into the comparison, as this would only entail unnecessary and unprofitable elaboration. It affords, however, a small number of particularly interesting readings, and these will be adduced in their place³; but that Canon as a whole can be usefully dealt with, I venture to think, only as part of a formal and systematic analysis of the Ambrosian mass-book.

The only other texts to be mentioned are MS O 83 of the Prague Chapter Library, and MS B 8 of the Vallicellana which seems for the present at least inaccessible (Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, p. 205, n. 1). But as the latter according to Tommasi (ed. Vezz. v, p. xxxv, 2nd pagination) was 'undecimo ut serius, decimo ut citius scriptum,' it is not likely to be of use for the present purpose. The former, according to Ebner (pp. 379-80, 366, 368 note 1) is a MS of the eighth-century recension of *Gelas*. When the evidence of the MSS of this class is reviewed, it

¹ By some mischance the words 'pro spe salutis et incolunitatis suae' have fallen out of the reconstruction in *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie* (1892) p. 481 l. 10 after 'suarum.'

² But I may observe that *Bo* substitutes 'o' for 'u' more commonly than usual; e.g. writing not merely 'incolomitis,' 'inmacolatam,' but 'conctae,' 'in conspecto,' 'sereno vulto,' 'seo' (= seu).

³ For the Biasca MS Ceriani's print is used; for the Bergamo MS that of Solesmes. Both MSS appear to be saec. ix/x.

will I think plainly appear that the absence of the collation of a single MS of the group is not likely to affect in any appreciable degree the results obtained. There remains the Monte Cassino palimpsest, the only hope left, apparently, of a text of the Canon of an earlier type than any which has appeared in print. Of its character I know nothing; but it will in any case be useful to take stock of what can be known on the subject before that MS is edited¹.

On a collation of the twelve texts available (*a*) it is found that a certain number of readings are unique; several of these are mere and obvious blunders of the scribe; a few are of interest in themselves; not one, I think, is likely to prove of any real value for the history of the Canon. (*b*) When these unique readings are removed, and that late work, the saec. viii *Gelas*, is left out of account, the readings of the other MSS on being tabulated fall into two classes or families, the one represented by *Bo*², *St*, *Fr*, the other by *GV*, *Ca*, *Reg*, *Ott*. (*c*) It then appears that the readings of the group of saec. viii *Gelas* MSS (viz. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9) follow on the whole (as might be expected) the second of these two classes, but many readings of the other class are found sometimes in one, sometimes in more than one, MS of the group.

The kernel of the present inquiry manifestly lies in the readings contemplated under (*b*); those under (*a*) and (*c*) being of altogether secondary consideration. I propose therefore to throw into a Table the readings contemplated under (*b*); to relegate to the foot of the page those under (*c*) in so far as they differ from *GV*; and to collect the unique readings in a note at the end of the paper. After a few remarks on the results of the collation as shown by the Table, it will be necessary to consider particularly the small number of variants between *Reg* and *Ott* with a view to determine which gives the purer tradition. One of these variants is of sufficient importance to call for special treatment. From Muratori's print (col. 4) it would appear as if the Memento of the dead were contained in both MSS. This is not the case. After 'replemur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum,' *Reg*, omitting entirely the Memento, passes directly on to 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus.' Moreover *Ca* agrees in this point with *Reg*. As is well known *GV* presents the same feature. All the texts of the Memento of the dead will therefore be excluded from the following Table³, and a consideration of the question will form the closing section of this paper.

¹ In *Leon* the Canon is wanting.

² I place *Bo* first throughout because it is the oldest MS.

³ I have also taken no notice of the names added to the recitals in the 'Communicantes' in the different MSS (Hilary, Martin, &c.) and in the 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus' (*Ang* adds, after 'Anastasia,' 'genouefa, scolastica'; the Canon of 2296 breaks off, imperfect, with the word 'Barnaba'). The crosses are best dealt with independently and after the texts; this question is therefore not touched on.

<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>Fr</i>
1. acceptum habes ¹	accepta ¹ habes	acceptu(m?) ² habes
2. pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica	pro tua sancta ecclesia catholica	= <i>St</i> .
3. una cum devotissimo famulo tuo . . . ⁴ papa nostro sedis apostolicae et antistite nostro et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicæ fidei cultoribus	u. c. beatissimo f. t. N. p. n. episcopo s. a. [e. o. o. a. . . apostolicae f.] ⁵ c. [et abbate nostro N. episcopo] ⁶	u. c. o. o. a. . . . apostolicae f. c.
4. tibi reddunt	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
5. Communicantes [two vari- ables inserted ⁷] sed et memoriam	= <i>Bo</i> ⁷	C. m. s. e.
6. imprimis gloriosae semper . . . virginis	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
7. Petri Pauli	Petri et Pauli	= <i>Bo</i>
8. Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae quam tibi offerimus in honorem nominis tui Deus, quaesumus Domine ut	H. i. o. s. n. s. e. c. f. t. q. t. o. i. honorem Domini nostri J. C. et in com- memorationem bea- torum martyrum tuo- rum in hac ecclesia quam famulus tuus ad honorem nominis gloriae tuae edifi- cavit, q. D. u.	H. i. o. s. n. s. e. c. f. t. q. t. o. i. honore Domini beati martyris tui illi et pro peccatis atque offensionibus nostris ut omnium delictor- um nostrorum rem- issionem consequi mereamur ⁸ , q. D. u.

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*⁹.

On No. 3: (a) 'beatissimo' and 'nostro' interlined by another hand *Ang*;
(b) 'episcopo' omitted *R, S, Gell*; 'et antistite illo' (with 'nostro' interlined
by another hand *Ang*); (c) *R, S, Ang, 2296* omit 'et omnibus . . . cultoribus';
Gell and corrector of *S* as *St* ('et . . . cultoribus').

On No. 6: 'semper' *S, Gell*; 'que' erased in *Ang, 2296*.

On No. 7: 'Petri Pauli' *R, S, Ang, Gell, 2296*.

¹ 'acceptum abeas' *Bo*. Is it certain that the original script of *St* recovered by Dr. M^cCarthy, p. 210 footnote to fol. 24^a, had accepta? Cf. No. 25 where *St* reads twice 'acceptu.'

² "acceptu" clarissime; sed "ha" (ad calcem lineae) videtur scriptum in rasura: porro littera abrasa quantum video "m" est. So Dr. Mercati.

³ i. e. the same reading as in *Bo*, but for clearer apprehension of the Table it has seemed best to refer *Ca, Reg, Ott*, to *GV*, instead of these four texts to *Bo*

<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Off</i>
1. accepta habeas	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
2. pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica ^a	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
3. una cum famulo tuo . . . papa nostro illo	u. c. beatissimo f. t. . . p. n. i.	= <i>Ca</i>	u. c. f. t. p. n. i.
et antistite nostro illo episcopo ^d			e. a. n. i. e. o. o. a. catholicae et apostolicae f. c.
4. tibi reddunt	= <i>GV</i>	tibi que reddunt	= <i>Reg</i>
5. Communicantes et memoriam	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
6. imprimis gloriosae semperque virginis	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
7. Petri et Pauli	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
8. Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
quaesumus Domine ut			

^a A space of three letters in which 'ill' is written by another hand.

^b The words in brackets are restorations taken from the text of the interpolator Moelcaich.

^c 'Et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholici fide cultoribus' interlined in Tironian notes.

^d See McCarthy, p. 211 note b on fol. 24^b; the variable for Christmas is that of *Gelas* I 4 not that of *Greg* col. 8.

^e This text 'pro peccatis . . . mereamur' is utilized for the 'Hanc igitur' of the 'Missa pro peccatis' in the Carolingian Supplement to *Greg*, Muratori II 200. It is evident that the three formulae of the 'Hanc igitur' in *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* are closely related; indeed the text of *Fr* becomes intelligible only when brought into juxtaposition with *St*. The form 'Hanc igitur . . . quam offerimus in honorem,' &c. does not occur in *Leon* or *Greg*; and but once in *Gelas*, viz. III 95, one of the collection of masses for the dead of *Gelas*, as to the late and non-Roman origin of which see *Book of Cerne*, pp. 269-72; and III 95 happens to be one of the masses that incorporate part of a prayer of a mass for the dead in the Toledo missal

<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>Fr</i>
9. ut placatus accipias [‘ac’elided; ‘sus’added in marg. by another hand] ¹¹	¹¹ u. p. suscipias ¹²	= <i>St</i>
10. ab aeterna damnatione nos eripe (?=eripi)	a. a. d. n. eripias	= <i>St</i>
11. Quam oblationem te ¹³ Deus	= <i>Bo</i>	Q. o. tu D.
12. facere digneris quae nobis corpus et sanguis fiat ¹⁴	f. dignareque ¹⁴ (=quae) n. c. e. s. f.	f. dignare quae n. c. e. s. f.
13. dilectissimi Filii tui Domini autem ¹⁵ Dei nostri	d. F. t. Domini . . . nostri	= <i>Bo</i>
14. accepit ¹⁶ panem	accipit ¹⁶ p.	= <i>St</i>
15. elevatis ¹⁷ oculis [‘suis’ interlined by another hand]	e. o. suis	= <i>St</i>
16. in caelos ¹⁸	ad caelum	= <i>St</i>
17. . . . gratias agens benedixit	tibi g. egit b.	= <i>St</i>
18. accepit ¹⁹ et hunc praeclarum calicem	accipit ¹⁹ e. h. p. c.	= <i>St</i>
19. ex eo omnes	e. hoc ²⁰ o.	= <i>St</i>
20. calix sancti sanguinis mei	= <i>Bo</i>	calix . . . sanguinis mei
21. in remissione	in remissionem	= <i>St</i>
22. in mei memoriam ‘faci[ae]tes’ ²¹	i. m. m. faciatis	i. m. m. facietis ²²
23. Christi Filii tui Domini . . . nostri	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*.

On No. 10: ‘eripias’ *R*, *S* (?); ‘eripi’ *Ang* but the second ‘i’ on erasure; ‘eripe’ *Gell* and *Sacr. Godelgaudi* (Ménard, *Notae*, p. 16, Migne, *P. L.* lxxviii. 276).

On No. 12: quae n. c. & c. *R*.

On No. 13: ‘Domini nostri’ *R*, *S*, *Gell*.

On No. 21: ‘in remissionem’ *S*, *Gell*; ‘in remissioñ’ *Ang*.

On No. 22: ‘faciatis’ *R* (‘meae’ *Gell*).

On No. 23: ‘Domini nostri’ *R*; so too *Ang* originally, but ‘Dei’ interlined by same hand.

at the close of the eighth century cited by Elipandus, not now found in *Mos.*, but adapted into a preface in *St* (McCarthy, p. 232, Warren, p. 248). I may be allowed to repeat here with some further extension and precision what I have said elsewhere (*Book of Cerne*, p. 260): the more closely the texts of *Leon* and *Gelas* are examined, the more thoroughly they are investigated, the more imperatively does the question impose itself whether the Irish were not concerned in the manipulations to which these Roman books were subjected in Gaul and in Northern Italy in the seventh century. In this connexion the ‘collectio ad panis fractionem,’ unique in Gallican books, in *M. Goth*, No. xxxvi, is not to be overlooked; see Forbes’s *Book of Cerne*, p. 99, though he has failed to see what this text really ‘resembles.’

<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>
9. ut placatus accipias ¹⁰	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
10. ab aeterna damnatione nos eripi ¹⁰	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
11. Quam oblationem tu Deus	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
12. facere digneris ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
13. dilectissimi Filii tui Domi- ni . . . Dei nostri	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
14. accepit panem	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
15. elevatis oculis ¹⁰	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
16. in caelum	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
17. tibi gratias agens ¹⁰ be- nedixit	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
18. accipiens et hunc prae- clarum calicem	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
19. ex eo omnes ¹⁰	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
20. calix . . . sanguinis mei	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
21. in remissione	in remissionem	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
22. in mei memoriam 'faciaetis'	i. m. m. facietis	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
23. Christi Filii tui Domini Dei nostri	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>

⁹ For the corrector of *S* see Wilson's notes to *Gelas*, III 16.

¹⁰ See note 3 *supra*.

¹¹ 'ut placatus suscipias' Biasca and Bergamo MSS of *Ambros*.

¹² For the continuation of the text of *St*, see *infra* p. 577, note 1, No. 10.

¹³ 'v' interlined over 'e' by another hand.

¹⁴ 'Facere digneris quae nobis corpus et sanguis fiat' Biasca and Bergamo MSS of *Ambros*; M^cCarthy, p. 213, prints *St* 'facere: dignareque nobis,' treating 'que' as 'and' (see his footnote); in view of the texts this appears clearly a misapprehension.

¹⁵ Both the Biasca and Bergamo MSS of *Ambros* have 'autem.'

¹⁶ Doubtless a mere orthographical variant, but in view of the affinities of *St* and *Fr* it seems to be one worth recording (cf. No. 18).

¹⁷ Mabillon prints '[&] elevatis'; 'et' is not in the MS nor in *St*, *Fr*, &c.

¹⁸ 'Ad caelos' Biasca and Bergamo MS of *Ambros*.

¹⁹ Cf. No. 14.

²⁰ i. e. the Vulgate reading of Matt. xxvi 27; but cf. Sabatier *in loc.* ('hoc' is the reading of the fragment of the Canon in the *de Sacramentis*, as to which see p. 567 *infra*).

²¹ So the MS seems to read at present, but 'ae' from the hand of a corrector; 'facietis' Mabillon.

²² So, clearly, in the MS.

<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>Fr</i>
24. vultu aspicere dignare ²³	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
25. et acceptum ²⁴ habere sicuti acceptum habere dignatus es	e. acceptu h. s. acceptu h. d. e.	= <i>St</i> ²⁵
26. Supplices te rogamus	S. t. r. et petimus	= <i>St</i>
27. per manus sancti angeli tui ²⁶	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
28. in sublimi altario tuo	i. s. altari t.	= <i>St</i>
29. ex hoc altari participacionis	e. h. a. sanctificationis ²⁷	= <i>St</i>
30. partem aliquam societatis donare digneris	p. a. et societatem d. dignare	p. a. et societatem d. digneris ²⁸
31. Perpetua Agne Cecilia Felicitate, Anastasia, Agatha, Lucia, Eogenia	P. Agna C. F. An. Ag. L.	
32. intra quorum nos consortio	i. q. n. consortia	
33. 'non stimatur meritis sed veniam quæsumus largitur admitte'	non aestimatis meritis sed 'venia' quæsumus largitor admitte	
34. ²⁹ Divino magisterio edocti et divina institutione . . . audemus dicere	²⁹ D. m. e. e. d. i. formati a. d.	<i>St. Gall MS 1394</i> ³¹ = <i>St</i>
35. Libera nos Domine ab omni malo praeterito praesenti et futuro	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*.

On No. 24: 'dignare' *R*.

On No. 28: 'in sublime altare tuo' *Ang* (originally; but 'o' altered to 'ū'), *Gell*.

On No. 29: 'ex hoc altaris participacione' *S* (corrected to 'hac'); 'participaciones' ? *Gell*.

On No. 30: 'et societatem' *R*, 2296; *S* doubtful; 'societatis' altered by another hand to 'et societatem' *Ang*.

On No. 32: 'consortio' *R*, *Gell*.

On No. 33: 'non estimatur meritis sed ueniam qs largitor emitt[as]?' *Ang* (corrected by another hand to agree with *Ca*; 'non estimatur meritis sed ueniam quæsumus largitur admitte' *Gell*; *R* and *S* show the same text as *Ca* (but in *S* 'the last syllable of "estimator" is written over an erasure.' Wilson, p. 239, note 70).

On No. 35: *Ang* originally written 'Libera nos quæsumus Domine'; 'quæsumus' erased and interlined by same hand after 'Domine.'

²³ Cf. 'sereno vultu digneris respicere' *Bo*, p. 357; 'ita nos dignare respicere' p. 380.

²⁴ 'acceptu abere,' *cod*. I think; the abbreviation is clear in the next line (cf. No. 1).

²⁵ "'Acceptu . . . acceptu" clarissime, sine compendio, neque in rasura.' So Dr. Mercati.

<i>GV</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>
24. vultu respicere dignare	v. r. digneris	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
25. et accepta habere sicuti accepta habere dignatus es	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
26. Supplices te rogamus ²⁶	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
27. per manus angeli tui	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
28. in sublime altare tuum	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
29. ex hac altaris participa- tione	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
30. partem aliquam societatis donare digneris ²⁷	p. a. et societa- tem d. d.	as <i>Ca</i>	as <i>Ca</i>
31. Felicitate Perpetua Agatha Lucia Agne Cecilia Anastasia	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
32. intra quorum nos con- sorti[um] ²⁸	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
33. 'non stimamur meritis sed veniam quaesumus largitor admitte'	non aestimator meriti s. v. q. l. a.	= <i>Ca</i>	= <i>Ca</i>
34. Praeceptis salutaribus moniti et divina institutione formati audemus dicere	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>
35. Libera nos quaesumus Domine ab omnibus malis praeteritis praesentibus et futuris	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>	= <i>GV</i>

²⁶ 'Ascendat oratio nostra per manus sancti angeli tui ad divinum altare tuum, Domine' *Bo*, p. 351, ed. G. H. Forbes, p. 311.

²⁷ See note 3 *supra*.

²⁸ *Ambros*: 'ex hac altaris sanctificatione' *Biasca MS*; 'ex hoc altari sanctificationis' *Bergamo MS* and 'codd. alii veteres et edd. antiquae Missalis Ambrosiani' (²⁹ *Ceriani*, *Notitia Liturgias Ambrosianae*, p. 70).

²⁹ *Fr* breaks off at this word, imperfect.

³⁰ 'V has now "consortia," but apparently "consortium" was first written' (*Wilson*, p. 239, note 69).

³¹ *Warren*, *Liturgy of Celtic Ch.* p. 177, *M^cCarthy Stowe Missal*, p. 234.

³² From this point *Stowe* offers only a rescript of the interpolator *Moelcaich*. The form in *St* occurs in *Missale Gothicum*, p. 228 (missa in cathedra S. Petri); another variant *ibid.* p. 297 (a Missa Dominicalis: 'D. m. docti et salutaribus monitis instituti a. d.'). This latter being found also in *Mos.* 276. 83-85 (sixth Sunday after Pentecost) and 430. 21-23 (missa plurimorum martyrum). The genuine Visigothic formulae of preface to the Lord's Prayer are of a quite different cast, and there can be no doubt that all the various forms mentioned above are to be referred to the preface in *Gelas* and *Greg* for their original, and all date from the seventh century. The influence of the *Gelas-Greg* preface is also perceptible in *Mos.* 315. 59-65 (in Cathedra St. Petri), 333. 79-80 (in Nativ. S. Joh. Bapt.), 364. 96 (Assumption), 437. 96 (missa unius virg.); and possibly 273. 18, the fourth Sunday after Pentecost.

<i>Bo</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>St. Gall MS 1394</i>
36. et intercedente pro nobis beata et gloriosa semperque virgine Maria . . . beatis apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo da propitius	e. intercedentibus p. n. beatis a. t. . . . P. e. P. Patricio d. p.	= <i>St</i> [except : . . . et Patricio (episcopo)]
37. pacem tuam in diebus nostris	= <i>Bo</i>	= <i>Bo</i>
38. et a peccato simus semper liberi	= <i>Bo</i>	e. a peccatis semper simus l.

Readings of saec. viii *Gelas* in so far as differing from *GV*.

On No. 36: 'pro nobis' omitted *R, Ang*, erased *S*; 'semper' *R*; 'que' erased *S, Ang*; 'beatis' on an erasure, and 'apostolis tuis' omitted *S*; 'atque Andrea' omitted *S, Ang, Gell* (but 'atque Andrea cum omnibus

On a review of the foregoing Table, it will be seen that whilst as a whole the Canon of *Bo* must be classed with *St* and *Fr*¹, yet in a certain number of its readings (see Nos. 2, 9, 10?, 15, 17 'agens,' 19, 27, 29 in part, 30, 36 in part)² it deserts these two MSS and agrees with the other class as represented by *GV*. A question therefore arises: has *Bo* adopted certain readings of the *GV* class, its original having in these items agreed with *St* and *Fr*; or did its original belong to the *GV* class and has *Bo* modified that original by the adoption of *St* readings? Not to dwell on the general tendency to approximate to the current practice of Rome which is a dominant feature in the history of Western Liturgy viewed as a whole, and manifests itself too in the hands of the correctors of *Bo*³, there is the broad fact obvious on the face of the Table that the agreements with *GV* are the exceptions,

¹ In comparing the readings of *Bo, St, Fr* the list of *unica* p. 577, note 1 *infra* should not be forgotten.

² Nos. 3 and 21 have no bearing here.

³ The following is a list of corrections of the text of *Bo* by other hands designed to bring the MS as first written into conformity with the *GV* text (the references are to the numbers in the Table): No. 3 'devotissimo' elided; No. 12 'quae' changed to 'ut'; No. 13 'autem' elided; No. 20 'sancti' elided; No. 24 'aspicere dignare' changed to 'respicere digneris'; No. 29 'hoc' to 'hac' (but 'altari participationis' is not corrected); No. 31, see Wilson, p. 239 note 68; No. 34 *ibid.* note 72; No. 35 'malo,' &c. changed to the plural; No. 36 'dei genitricis' inserted before 'Maria,' and 'et' before 'beatis.' But it will be seen from Nos. 9 and 15 that the corrections were not all in one direction (15 cannot come from the Ambrosian text, and hence therefore neither, it may be assumed, does 9). It may be worth while to note that the 's' of 'celos' (No. 16) has been elided (cf. Ceriani, *Notitia*, p. 65).

<p>36. et intercedente pro nobis beata et gloriosa semperque virgine Dei genitrice Maria et sanctis apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo atque Andrea da propitius</p> <p>37. pacem . . . in diebus nostris</p> <p>38. et a peccatis simus liberi semper</p>	<p><i>GV</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p><i>Ca</i></p> <p>i.</p> <p>b. e. g. semper v. D. g. M. e. beatis a. t. P. e. P. d. p.</p> <p>= <i>GV</i></p> <p>e. a peccato s. l. semper</p>	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>Reg</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>Ott</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= <i>Ca</i> [adding :</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">atque Andrea³³]</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= <i>GV</i> = <i>GV</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">= <i>Bo</i> = <i>Bo</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>	= <i>Ca</i> [adding :		atque Andrea ³³]		= <i>GV</i> = <i>GV</i>		= <i>Bo</i> = <i>Bo</i>	
<i>Reg</i>	<i>Ott</i>											
= <i>Ca</i> [adding :												
atque Andrea ³³]												
= <i>GV</i> = <i>GV</i>												
= <i>Bo</i> = <i>Bo</i>												

sanctis' has been added in margin of *S*); *R* after 'Andrea' adds 'et beatis confessoribus tuis illis.'

On No. 38: *Ang* as *Ca*; in *S*, 'o' of 'peccato' over erasure (*R* and *Gell* as *GV*, except that *Gell* reads 'ad' for 'a').

³³ For the addition in *Ott* between 'Andrea' and 'da propitius' see p. 570 below.

dissent from it is the rule. To take, on the other hand, an item of detail: that a scribe, with the correct form 'accepta' familiar to him from practice and lying under his eye, should, in the exercise of his choice of readings to adopt from the *St-Fr* text, change it to 'acceptum' (see Nos. 1 and 25), is surely an assumption much less reasonable than that of descent from a common vitiated ancestor. The natural conclusion, in face of the facts, and the only safe working hypothesis, is that the original of *Bo* belonged to the *St* class, but that in this particular MS certain readings of the *GV* class have been adopted. Indeed (unless there be some feature of the case that escapes me) to assume the contrary would be perversity. I therefore take *Bo* as in its origin a member of the *St*, not of the *GV*, class.

Next, within the group *Bo, St, Fr*, certain minutiae deserve attention. Although on the whole *St* and *Fr* agree as against *Bo*, yet No. 13 (perhaps also 7 and 11, cf. also 1, 20, 22, 30) shows that *Fr* is not the mere reproduction of a *St* text, that no one of these MSS directly descends from one of the others—as indeed might be expected from the fact that one of them is found in Ireland, one in France, one in Northern Italy—and that all three descend from an ultimate original that lies some distance behind them. For although *Fr* agrees very closely with *St*, yet its original must have embodied at least one feature (No. 13) characteristic of the original of *Bo* (i. e. in which this original differed from the original of *St*). On the other hand, the close affinity as well as the ultimate common origin of *Bo* and *St* is evidenced by a feature proper to these two MSS, viz. the existence of the word 'sancti' before

'sanguinis' in the recital of institution; and (what may by some persons be considered even more significant if the two items are taken into account together) the crying blunder (see No. 11) 'quam oblationem te Deus in omnibus benedictam . . . facere digneris,' instead of 'tu.' The ultimate common origin (from a single ancestor) of the text of the Canon as found in *Bo*, *St*, *Fr*, may therefore, I think, be taken as sufficiently established.

Of the two recensions of the Canon evidenced by the Table, which is the earlier? Taking first the indications afforded by the MSS, I still believe the view put forward in the article on the Stowe Missal in the *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie* in 1892 (pp. 489-90) to be just, viz. that, when we find in the seventh century at Bobbio, a monastery founded by the Irish, a 'Missal Romensis' which is identical with a mass found in Ireland containing a *commemoratio defunctorum* (or diptychs) specially designed for Ireland and dating from about the year 630¹, the conclusion seems inevitable that these two texts derive from a common progenitor current either in Ireland or among the Irish in quite the early years of the seventh century. On the other hand, when the question of the earlier recension of the *Gelasianum* (*GV*) comes to be dealt with, it will, I believe, appear that the MS from which the single extant copy of *Gelas* (*GV*) derives, left Rome not after, but before, the masses of the B. V. and Holy Cross were embodied in it, i. e. at the latest in the very first years of the seventh century. But even if this be so, it does not necessarily follow that the text of the Canon found in this single extant MS of *Gelas* (*GV*) was the text contained in the Roman original from which it derives. In *GV* (written at the close of the seventh century or early in the eighth) the text of the *Gelasianum* has evidently been manipulated, and much foreign matter has been inserted. Among the changes it is quite possible that a text of the Canon of the type found in *Greg* MSS of the ninth century may have been substituted for the text which existed in the Roman manuscript brought into France a century earlier². So far, then, as the general evidence afforded by the MSS is concerned, it points to an attestation of the *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* text earlier than that which can be adduced with any confidence on behalf of the text now found in *GV*, for in the one case we can through the combined evidence of three MSS trace back the original of their Canon to a MS at the latest of the first years of the seventh

¹ This is not in the least affected by the question of 'Macl ruen,' important only for the date of the MS.

² I need only mention the (parallel) case of the 'baptismal' creed. It is impossible to touch on any problem presented by these early books without involving the case of other problems. But each is best dealt with, first of all, separately, on its own merits. By-and-by will come the summing up of the whole matter.

century, whilst in the other we have no security that the text of the Canon in the one existing MS may not have been (as so much else certainly was) introduced later, and in France.

On turning to seek for any indications of anteriority that may exist in the texts themselves, I call attention to a note by Dr. McCarthy on the 'Supplices te rogamus *et* petimus' of *St* (see No. 26 of the Table), and the omission from *Bo* of the last two words. He writes: 'The insertion arose perhaps from the scribe remembering "rogamus et petimus" in the opening of the Canon' (p. 215, note *b* on fol. 27^a). This may possibly be the case; at the same time Dr. McCarthy had not observed that *Fr* has the same reading, and (as it is no mere copy of the original of *St*) affords independent testimony. And another explanation is possible. It will be observed (No. 9) that *St* and *Fr* read 'Hanc igitur oblationem . . . quaesumus . . . ut placatus *suscipias*'; and that the original 'accipias' of *Bo* is corrected to '*suscipias*,' thus showing that the *St* reading of the Canon at this point was known and indeed preferred, if not that the type of text afforded by *St* was as a whole current, in the circle in which the corrector lived. Moreover, not merely do *St*, *Fr* agree in reading 'supplices te rogamus et petimus,' but they continue (and herein are supported by *Bo*) . . . 'iube haec perferri in sublimi altari (altario *Bo*) tuo' (No. 28). Now the fragment of the Canon quoted in the (?) pseudo-Ambrosian treatise *de Sacramentis* lib. iv cap. 6 reads: '*et petimus* et precamur ut hanc oblationem *suscipias in sublimi altari tuo* . . . sicut *suscipere* dignatus es,' &c. (cf. too note 20 to the Table). In view of the persistency of the tradition of verbal minutiae evident in the various early MSS of the Canon, in spite of all their variants, I think it will be allowed that these resemblances if slight are not to be lightly dismissed as just accidental, but are rather to be viewed as indications possessing a positive and substantive value¹. This is not all. The 'Hanc igitur' is one of the few variable clauses of the Roman Canon, thus affording means of verification; and I think there are distinct indications that '*suscipias*' was the word used in the 'Hanc igitur' of the original of *GV*. The detail is thrown into a footnote².

¹ It is significant, too, that while *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* do in fact preserve, as shown above, readings of the close of the fourth century, there should immediately follow in the prayer for the communicants in *St*, *Fr*, the remarkable variant (No. 29) 'ex hoc altari sanctificationis,' a reading which was evidently that of the original of *Bo*, and which long survived at Milan. The quotation of the Canon in the *de Sacramentis* unfortunately breaks off at the point where it might be expected to turn to the prayer for the communicants, and we are thus deprived of what might have been decisive testimony on the subject now under inquiry.

² In *Greg* all the 'Hanc igitur' formulae read 'ut placatus accipias.' In *Glas*, I 24, 26, III 24, 49, 50, 52 (second form), 53, 54, 73, 106 read '*suscipias*.'

The indications therefore uniformly point to the conclusion that the group *Bo, St, Fr* preserve an earlier recension of the Roman Canon, whilst the group *GV* and the ninth-century MSS of the Gregorianum present a later one. On this several interesting questions suggest themselves; but the time, I think, is not yet come to deal with them, or to enter formally on the subject of what I may call the Antiquities of the Roman Canon; certainly this is not the place to do so, the object of this paper being merely to disengage the elementary facts that, on an analysis of the early texts, emerge from apparent confusion. I propose to distinguish the two recensions as recension A (that of the group *Bo, St, Fr*) and recension B; and at any rate it seems undesirable in future to designate the text of the Canon in *GV* as 'Gelasian'; if a descriptive I 40, 45, 89, 94, 98, 100, probably 101, 102, 106, III 52 (first form), 93, 98, 99, 103 read 'accipias.' It is unnecessary to mention other variant forms here. As regards I 89, &c., the closing numbers of the first book of *Gelas* are, as a whole, Gallican interpolations; whilst III 93, 98, 99, 103 belong to that series of masses of the dead which I have elsewhere pointed out as being also of late date and not part of the original Roman copy. There remain I 40, 45 and III 52 (first form).

(a) The 'Hanc igitur' of I 39 and I 40 (for Holy Thursday) are with slight variants the same. The corresponding 'H. ig.' of *Greg* (col. 55) is either an abridgement of these or the original on which they are built up. If the purport of the additional clause 'ut per multa curricula,' &c. and the nature of the feast be taken into consideration together, it will not be doubted, I think, that the second alternative is the true explanation and the improvements of I 39 and 40 are a barbarous conception.

(b) If the 'H. ig.' of I 45 (ad missam in nocte, Holy Saturday) be compared with *Leon* 24. 30-25. 2 and *Greg* col. 66, it will, I think, again appear that the text of *Greg* is that on which the other two (with their 'ascription in the book of the living') are built up.

(c) Once more, if III 52 first form (nuptial mass) be compared with *Leon* 141. 3-8, and *Greg* col. 245, it is once more clear that *Greg* is either an abridgement or the original of the other two. It will be observed that the additional element in *Leon* and *Gelas* 'sic (cam) consortio maritali tuo munere copulatam desiderata sobole gaudere perficias atque ad optatam seriem cum suo coniuge provehas benignus annorum' is pieced up out of the nuptial blessing of *Greg* ('quae maritali coniungenda est consortio,' 'ad optatam perveniat senectutem').

In every case therefore the formulae of 'Hanc igitur' which read 'placatus accipias' betray marks of derivation, of later date. The masses of book III which have 'suscipias' in the 'H. ig.' need not be particularly examined; some of these are without doubt Gallican interpolations. It is otherwise with I 24, 26. These, one the mass for Saturday of Lent Ember days with a 'Hanc igitur' for the newly ordained, the other for the third Sunday of Lent and first Sunday of the Scrutinies with a 'Hanc igitur' for the 'electi,' are both most authentic and ancient portions of *Gelas*, and both read 'suscipias.'

Such treatment as it were by scraps in a note is eminently unsatisfactory but may at least serve to illustrate the need of minute and close examination and comparison of the texts of *Leon*, *Gelas*, *Greg*, and not the least of *Leon* which contains, I believe, certainly some texts (in the form there found) of a date very little if at all earlier than the single extant MS itself.

name must be given to it, this, it would seem, should rather be 'Gregorian.' I should like also to be beforehand with any suggestion that the Ambrosian Canon is the source for recension A of the peculiar readings common to the two: a comparison of recension A as a whole and the Ambrosian Canon as a whole, as known in the early MSS, shows that this is not the case, but only that the latter exhibits a few readings that are characteristic of A as compared with B.

The variants between *Reg* and *Ott* have now to be considered in order to determine, if possible, which is the more authentic text of recension B of the Roman Canon.

(a) It is evident that the words 'et antistite nostro illo' (see No. 3 of the Table) are an addition, and that *Ca* and *Reg* with the mere mention of 'papa nostro illo,' preserve at this point the original Roman text¹.

(b) The clause 'et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicæ et apostolicæ fidei cultoribus' (No. 3) is wanting in *Ca* and *Reg*. The observation of the Micrologus on this clause in his chapter 13, *Quid sit superfluum in canone*, are just: 'after the names of the Pope and their own Bishop (he says) some are wont to add the clause "et omnibus . . . cultoribus"; but this is superfluous. The very next words, "Memento Domine famulorum famularumque tuarum," allow us to commemorate all the living as many as we will.' It may be added that all these 'orthodox adherents of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith' and no others had already been prayed for as 'Thy Holy Catholic Church.' When, moreover, it is seen that *Reg* is supported in the entire omission of these words, not only by *Ca* but also by *GV* as representing the seventh century, and by *R, S, Ang, 2296* as representing the eighth, that the MSS in which the clause is represented vary in their readings, and that in *Ott* alone of the texts reviewed is it found in full, the natural conclusion seems to be that it formed no part of the text of the Roman Canon, but was an interpolation made in A.

(c) *Ott* stands alone in prefixing to the clause '. . . qui tibi offerunt' the words 'qui tibi offerimus vel,' which in the MS are written by the original hand and as if an integral part of the text². There is no need to say they are an interpolation.

(d) *Ott* reads (No. 13 of Table and the readings of saec. viii *Gelas*) 'dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri,' *Reg*. 'd. F. t. Dn. Dei n.'

(e) *Ott* reads 'Unde et memores Domine'; all the other MSS read, as originally written, 'U. et m. sumus D.' (The word 'sumus' has been erased in *S, Ang, 2296*, and *Ca*.)

¹ It is not improbable also that 'beatissimo' is the genuine Roman reading and its omission in *Ott* is only due to a French tradition represented in *GV*; whilst the absence of both Roman pope and diocesan bishop in *Fr* is probably due to accident.

² The addition is made in a later hand in *Ang* but in the same order and terms as *Ott*.

(f) *Ott* reads (perhaps only by a slip of the scribe) 'in conspectum divinae maiestatis tuae'; the other MSS 'in conspectu d. m. t.'

(g) In the *Libera* after the Lord's Prayer, *Ott* reads 'atque Andrea [then occurs an erasure of the space of about fifteen letters] necnon et beato Dionysio martyre tuo atque pontifice cum sociis suis Rustico et Eleutherio et beato Chlodoaldo confessoribus et omnibus sanctis da propitius pacem'; *Reg* reads 'atque Andrea da propitius pacem.' That the text of *Ott* is not pure is obvious¹.

The conclusion to be drawn cannot be doubtful; viz. that of the two MSS *Reg* preserves the genuine *Greg* text of the Canon, and *Ott* offers a corrupt text. But it is interesting to observe that (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and the 'et omnibus sanctis' of (g) are found in the present Roman Canon, which must therefore descend from a MS of the type of *Ott*, and consequently may be (since *Ott* was written for the Church of Paris) the Parisian recension in the ninth century of the text of *Greg*.

Finally, the question of the Memento of the dead remains to be considered. It is wanting in *Ca* and *Reg*, the best witnesses to the text of *Greg*; in *GV*, the earliest extant copy of recension B of the Canon; also in *S* and 2296, MSS of saec. viii *Gelas*. *Gell* has the single word 'Memento'.² *Ang* gives a quite different text³. This is not all. Amalar's lengthy comment on the Canon (*De offic.* iii capp. 25, 26 written about 827-32) passes directly from the clause 'Supplices . . . replemur' (ed. Hittorp 1610, col. 425 D) to 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus' (col. 426 E), and says nothing of the Memento. It is also absent from two expositions of the mass, which embody the text of the Canon, printed by Gerbert from a MS of the tenth

¹ The considerable variation in the texts of the MSS. at this point (see No. 36) seems to evidence successive interpolations. It looks as if *St* most nearly preserved the original text; cf. the omission of 'et' before 'beatis' in *Eo* (Mabillon has 'et' in error).

² This is mentioned by Martene, *De ant. eccl. rit. lib.* I cap. 4 art. VIII § 24.

³ As follows: 'Memento mei Domine hanc tibi sancte pater licet meis manibus offerantur quia nec inuocationem tui nominis dignus sum et quia per sanctum atque sanctificationem filii tui nominis oblationes offerantur. sicut incensum in conspectu tuo cum odore suauitatis accendatur et eorum nomina qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei per xpm dnm nostrum (fol. 119). This, altered and reduced to the rules of grammar, is entered by a later hand in *Ott* in margin opposite the Memento of the dead (Muratori II, col. 4, note y) but for the words 'et eorum nomina . . . fidei' is substituted 'meque emundatum a delictis omnibus tibi Deo soli immaculatum concede famulari.' With slight revisions the prayer in this form found its way into this place of the Canon of many later Sacramentaries, see Ebner, p. 419, *Bona Rer. liturg.* II 14 (1). 'Sed et haec inconsulto hic posita est' says Bona; *Ang* (where it really embodies a Memento of the dead) explains how the anomaly arose. (In Muratori read 'et licet haec'; the first two letters of 'licet' are still legible in the MS.)

century¹. One of these, he says, commonly has this note in MSS of south-western Germany and Switzerland: 'expositio haec a coenobio S. Dionysii venit'. From the time of abbot Fulrad (died 784) S. Denis had cells in Alsace through which such a document could easily pass to monasteries of that region. The tract is thus of interest as showing at Paris a text with a different tradition from *Ott*. On the other hand *Ott* is supported by *Bo*, *St*, *Fr* as testimony for the seventh century and by *R* for the eighth².

Were a literary production in question, the clause, in face of such MS evidence, would doubtless be pronounced spurious, an interpolation which (like the clause 'omnibus orthodoxis . . . cultoribus') arose in A and passed thence to *Ott*. The case is not so easily settled where liturgical texts are concerned. Circumspection is needed to avoid conclusions that may be as false as they are facile. External circumstances, too, have to be taken into account. These texts were for practical use in very varying circumstances; they were widely spread, from Ireland to Calabria; they made a very direct and intimate appeal to persons and races of very different minds, temperaments, traditions.

I have elsewhere pointed out⁴ that the terminology of the Memento of the dead under discussion is not native Spanish, French, Irish, but Roman, or Romano-African, if that be preferred. Nor, until the body

¹ *Mon. liturg. Aleman.* II 280, 288.

² *Ibid.* p. 282, n. 1.

³ The Memento is also incorporated (but in such a way as to make nonsense) in a 'post nomina' prayer of the *Missale Gallicanum*, Tommasi, p. 438, Mabillon, p. 333. The following is the text of the Memento in these books: 'Memento etiam Domine et eorum [rubric:] nomina [for the last three words, 'famulorum famularumque tuarum ill. et ill.' *Ott*] qui nos praecesserunt cum signo ['signum' *Bo*] fidei et dormiunt in somno ['somnom' *R*] pacis. Ipsi ['Domine' *Fr*] et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus locum refrigerii lucis et pacis ut indulgeas deprecamur.' *Fr* is the only one of these texts which still shows the word 'nomina' obviously as a rubric; in *Bo* the commemoration of the names of the dead is transferred and comes after 'pacis,' and 'nomina' is allowed to remain as if part of the text, though making nonsense, as it does also in *Gall*. This is duly perpetuated in later texts, the solecism from habit passing unnoticed by skilled and unskilled alike. See, however, the correction of an expositor, Gerbert, *Mon. Lit. Al.* II 165 'et eorum nominum qui.' Though the Micrologus (end of a xi) in cap. 13 uses the Gregorian form, he still has at cap. 23 'M. et. D. et eorum nomina qui.' As is well known, besides having the Memento of the dead in the usual place, *R* inserts one also after the Memento of the living (see p. 577, note 1, No. 26), but in this case uses the form 'famulorum famularumque tuarum . . . illorum et illarum,' thus betraying the influence of the later Gregorian tradition. Ebner (p. 422) has already pointed out the explanation of this anomaly in *R*, 'in Reminiscenz an altere Uebung' in Gallic lands, according to which the names of living and dead were commemorated together.

⁴ *Book of Cerne*, pp. 267 seqq.

of evidence there brought together is challenged¹ and the case generally put on some other footing, do I see how the Roman origin of the clause can well be doubted although (whilst it figures in the earliest attestations of the Roman Canon) it be absent from many MSS of the period (750—850) in which the Gregorian mass-book was generally propagated in France; that is, absent from the Canon, for it appears in all these MSS (with some slight variants) in the mass for the dead. Still, its absence from the Canon is a difficulty which calls for an explanation. This I will endeavour to give in some measure at least, though necessarily by way only of briefest indication.

The Lyons deacon Florus (died c. 860) writes categorically thus: 'After the words "qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis" it was the ancient custom, *which is also still observed by the Roman Church (sicut etiam Romana agit ecclesia)*², immediately to recite the names of the dead from the diptychs, that is the *tabulae*, and then after they have been read, the clause "Ipsis et omnibus" is said.' Unfortunately Gallic and other expositors or partisans have had a trick of squaring the facts to their fancies in these matters. This is shown in

¹ As the occasion offers I may be allowed to advert to a question put in these pages, vol. IV, p. 148. In writing p. 275 *Book of Cerne* I meant to say no more than this, that *as a fact* the all-familiar 'Requiem aeternam,' &c., does embody the characteristic expressions of what I venture to think are two very different religious types, the Gothic and the Roman, though I dare say I expressed myself awkwardly. But then I believe that the present Roman Office of the dead and the discipline connected therewith and the antiphonal parts of the mass of the dead are not of Roman origin at all, but Frankish and Carolingian. I may add that the earliest example known to me of the 'Requiem aeternam,' &c., occurs in the 'capitella' (see *Downside Review*, xix, p. 46) of the 'Orationes in agenda mortuorum' of the Carolingian Supplement (no. civ), and it does not occur in the contemporary forms of Burial Service (cf. *Sacr. Godegandi in Ménard, Notae*, p. 260, *Migne P. L.* lxxviii 467. I understand the text of the Supplement to give only the versicles; for full texts of *℟* and *℣* see, for instance, Tommasi ed. Vezzosi II 562). In other words the first known use of the formula dates from the end of the eighth century and proceeds from English circles. Does an Irish 'source' lie behind? See in Canon 27 of the Council of Cloveshoe the earlier form on which Alcuin, giving it a liturgical stamp, improved in the Supplement; this must have been already in 747 a popular prayer ('lingua . . . sua Saxonica dicunt') derived by the people at large from their teachers. Which? The antiphonal parts of the mass for the dead (apart from their phraseology) bear crying witness to Frankish origin in the 'dimidiation' of the Offertory and Communion, a unique case, if I remember rightly, in the Roman Missal. The value of isolated facts like these, however, can only appear when put in their proper setting. But merely to say so much, and mention the name of S. Riquier, is to open up a vista of inquiries.

² 'Pseudo-Alcuin' (saec. 10 or 11) betters him thus 'sicut etiam usque hodie Romana agit ecclesia.' As to the use of Florus in 'Pseudo-Alcuin' and the groundlessness of the ascription of the Treves 'Liber Officiorum' to any 'Amalar,' see Ad. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg, Herder, 1902), pp. 368 seqq.

³ *Opusculum de expositione missae*, cap. 70 (*Migne P. L.* cxix 62).

all ages from the general introduction of Gregorianism in the ninth century to the 're-establishment of the Roman rite' in France in the nineteenth. It is necessary therefore to scan the statements of this class of writers somewhat closely. A difficulty at once suggests itself. If the statement of Florus be correct, how comes it that the *Ordo Romanus I* (a document which, so far as I have been able to test it, proves itself eminently and singularly trustworthy) not only says nothing of the reading of the diptychs but describes the recital of the Canon in a way which excludes such observance? The ninth century produced on this side of the Alps very many ritual tracts explanatory of the Roman rite, called forth by the liturgical changes of the time. Some embody personal reminiscences of what the writer had seen in Rome or had heard from those who had been there, and notice matters elsewhere taken for granted, or deliberately ignored or even misrepresented¹. Two of these tracts supply an explanation which at least fits the facts. One says: 'on week-days from Monday to Saturday masses for the dead may be said, and the names of the dead are commemorated in the mass; but such masses are not to be said on Sundays, nor are the names of the dead recited on that day, but only the names of the living.'² The second, an exposition of the mass by question and answer, says: 'after the "Supplices te rogamus" come two prayers, one "super dipticios" (viz. "Memento . . . pacis") and one ("Ipsis . . . deprecamur") after the recitation of the names, and this on week-days, that is on working-days. only'—'et hoc cottidianis, id est in agendis tantummodo diebus'³. If this be so, and the Memento of the dead was not made in the Canon on Sundays in the then rite of Rome (and I see no reason for discrediting the statement, except the novelty of the idea to the modern mind), it helps to explain how it is that this Memento is absent from some at least of our Sacramentaries (e. g. *Ca*⁴), whilst it is found in the meaner, everyday, codices like *Bo*, *St*.

¹ For instance, as regards the *Gloria in excelsis*.

² Gerbert, *Mon. liturg. Aleman.* II 173.

³ *Ibid.* p. 165 (a fragment is printed by Mabillon as his fourth *Ordo*, *Mus. Ital.* II 61-2; see what he says p. 560 and p. 52. The whole question of the MSS seems very obscure even after the lengthy explanations of Ad. Franz, *Die Messe*, pp. 377 seqq. and especially 388-9). The passage quoted in the text is cited in Du Cange under *Agenda*; I have ventured on a risky rendering of the word which at any rate makes sense. I do not think the text can mean 'on week-days, and then only in masses for the dead,' a rendering which (apart from other objections) runs counter to the *Ordo* cited just above.

⁴ I have said *Ca* is a 'Prachtexemplar.' The supplementary matter added by later hands sufficiently shows, I think, that it was specially designed for the use of the bishop. It comprises, roughly, the following items: ff. 2-24^a benedictions; ff. 24^a-25 prefaces 'in unius confessoris,' and of St. Vedast, 'of post confirmationem,' and 'Deus qui apostolis' (*Mur.* II 91), a 'Bened.,' and an 'Absolutio' (long and

Another consideration suggests itself. The Memento of the dead was just the point where difficulty would be most probably found in popularizing the Roman rite in Gaul in the seventh and eighth centuries. In the end, indeed, the old native custom asserted itself in those regions, though in extra-liturgical fashion. I proceed to explain. The 'diptychs,' which accident has left embodied in some texts of the Liturgies, Eastern and Western, 'St. James,' 'Stowe,' make a considerable figure in the pages of the Ritualists (to use Maskell's favourite term). But in fact (apart from their interest for that article of the creed, the Communion of Saints) they belong to the department of ecclesiastical etiquette rather than popular religion. Even to the Irish of the ninth century¹ the 'Stowe' diptychs, native though be the names, must have been as wearisome as to Witzel centuries later,—'nostris temporibus obscurissima, ignotissima,'—or as Matt. i 11-16 on the feast of the Immaculate Conception in the Roman rite or on January 2 in the old Anglican Lectionary.

The recital of the names of the dead in Gaul in the seventh century had quite a different character; one living, intimate, personal. Throughout the land it was, too, a prominent feature of the service on those days precisely when the Churches were full, Sundays, feast days. They were read aloud so that all present might hear, distinct and apart from the text of any prayer. The names of the saints and holy men that form the substance of the extant 'diptychs' are not once mentioned in the large collection of 'nomina' prayers in the Gallican missals², but these prayers

Gallican': ff. 26-33^b ordinations (ostiar to priest); ff. 34-35^a miscellanies; f. 204^a, (mass of All Saints, also found at f. 240^a); ff. 204^b-205^a 'Or ad infantes consignandos'; ff. 206-221^b prefaces and benedictions; ff. 222-239^b 'ordo ad inungendum infirmum' with prayers for agony, funeral, masses of dead; ff. 239^b-241^a masses for 'Dom. post ascensionem' and vigil and feast of All Saints; ff. 241^b-245 more benedictions. If (as I think appears from this review) the additions have generally the special requirements of the bishop in view, this MS was intended for use precisely on days (be they Sundays or feasts) when the Memento of the dead in the Canon was omitted.

Whether the commemoration of the dead was in fact thus passed over at Cambrai, even by Bishop Hildaard, by whose order the volume was written, is another matter. In the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* (Mon. Germ. SS. vii 415) one fact, and one fact only, is recorded of Hildaard, viz. that 'he caused two handsomely carved ivory tabulae to be made in the twelfth year of his episcopate (801-2) as appears on the same tabulae.' Was he providing thus for the continuance in his church of its traditional practice of reciting publicly the names of the dead on Sundays and feasts, no less than on other days? The idea seems not unreasonable. If so, here would be another explanation of the omission of the Memento in *Ca*.

¹ This I presume to be the date of the MS (original hand) of *St* at the latest.

² But see in *Mos.* mention of the saints 15. 12-23, 27. 83, 345. 9 ('confessorum' 435. 44 has quite another meaning). The saints are mentioned once in (the print

continually dwell on the names of the dead, friends or relatives known to all, 'our dear ones' as the Gallican formulae are never weary of calling them with that strong affection and deep sense of family relationship that, inherited from a remote past, characterizes the French people still. It is no accident that All Souls day originated in France. This public recital of the names of the dead and recommendation to the prayers of all in the seventh century touched the nature and piety of those Gallic people in their tenderest point.

The Roman method was a complete contrast. When read without preconceived notions, or *parti pris* derived from present practice (of which later), the very text of the Memento shows that a simple mention of the names as an integral part of the celebrant's prayer is all that is contemplated: 'Remember Thy servants, so and so, who have gone before us with the sign of faith.' There is no room here for 'the diptychs.' Nor does there seem anything to bar the conclusion naturally suggested by the documents that, at least from the date when our present text of recension A was settled, the names of the dead were in the rite of Rome commemorated in the Canon silently by the celebrant as at present.

This and no more is what was offered in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries to those in Gaul adopting the Roman rite in place of the touching solemnities hitherto observed. The result of the shock of the new system and the old, the foreign custom and the native, was a compromise, the precise steps of which it may, or may not, be possible one day to trace in detail; but its nature is seen in those mediaeval bidding prayers and the *prône* that continues till to-day, in which this section of the Gallican mass is perpetuated much in its ancient form and almost in its old position. It can be no cause for surprise if the Sacramentaries of the period of transition, the eighth and ninth centuries, bear traces of the conflict of two incompatible practices, and if the Memento of the dead be absent from the Canon of not a few of them.

Having proceeded so far, I may before concluding glance at another point. Whilst the prayers of the Gallican books, *Richenov*, *Goth*, *Gall*, are rich in detail for the 'recitation of the names,' the Bobbio missal is as markedly sparing in them. But such as the material is (three or four items only), it offers a singular medley. At p. 332 is a scrap on the subject, drawn from the *Missale Gothicum*, thus a Gallican source; p. 359 from *Moz.*, and therefore Visigothic; thirdly in the 'missa pro principe,' p. 379, which (as stated above) is no part of the original

of *Bo*, and this text arrested the attention of G. H. Forbes for the reasons he explains, p. 348, note j. But the whole mass in which this mention occurs ('missa pro principe') is not a part of the original MS; it is written by another hand on an inserted leaf.

book, is a mention of 'sanctorum nomina' only. Finally, in a mass *pro vivis et defunctis*, is a text proper to the *Bobiense*, found nowhere else. This is, if I mistake not, a genuine piece of Irish work betraying the style and method of a race whose influence is of such incalculable religious importance in the seventh century as the medium through which the transition from one rite, practice, observance, to another was most easily brought about, and the age of fusion of very disparate religious elements most efficaciously prepared. This is the text: '. . . tam pro vivis quam et solutis debito mortis . . . quorum animas *ad memorandum conscripsimus* vel quorum nomina *super¹ sanctum altarium scripta adest evidenter*' (p. 363). Here is a middle term that does not belong to either use, Roman or Gallican, but shows a compromise between the two. The same spirit and method is to be observed in the Memento of the dead in the Canon of the Bobbio missal. The rubric 'nomina' in spite of grammar is made part of the text, and the recitation of the names is deferred and intercalated between the two clauses of which the Memento consists, i. e. between the words '. . . somno pacis' and 'Ipsis Domine et omnibus . . .'; this again is a compromise which will allow either of the silent recital of the names by the celebrant, or of the insertion of 'the diptychs.' This latter operation has been actually effected, in an awkward manner, in the Stowe missal; whilst the other alternative (*viz.* the recitation of the names between the two clauses of the Memento) has, in derogation of its ancient practice still evidenced by the words of the Memento themselves, been by-and-by adopted by the Roman Church, is now prescribed by the *Ritus celebrandi* § ix 2, and is inculcated by common consent of the authoritative rubricists (Le Vavasseur, De Herdt, Martinucci³, &c.).

To sum up. The early texts of the Roman Canon fall into two classes or recensions ('A' and 'B'). A, which seems the earlier, can be traced back (among the Irish) to the early years of the seventh century. B is first found at length in the only extant MS of the older recension of

¹ In the Gallican books the expression is: '*ante altare tuum nomina recitantur*' (*M. Richenou*, missa iv, cf. *M. Goth*, No. lxx); '*hos quos recitatio commemoravit ante sanctum altare*' (*Goth*, No. xxvii). In *Mos.* '*ante altare*' 257.99; '*coram altario*' 317.100, 441, 101 (this is the text copied in *Bo*). The formula '*oblationis sacratarum virginum*' in *Leon* with its mention of the recitation of their names 'before' the altar, '*quarum ante sanctum altare tuum oblata nomina recitantur*' (36. 22-23) has no bearing on the questions relating to the seventh and eighth centuries under discussion here.

³ This arrangement, first found in the Bobbio missal, is also that of the mass of the dead in *Greg* (Muratori II 270), to the anomalies of which attention is called *Book of Cerne*, pp. 266-7. The question will by-and-by have to be considered whether in all existing MSS. of *Greg* certain changes of detail have not been made of the Roman text sent by Hadrian; for a case see p. 419 *supra* note 1; the mass of the dead may be another.

Gelas and offers the same type of text as the MSS of *Greg* of the ninth century. Both A and B existed in France in the seventh century. Of the two copies (from *Reg* and from *Ott*) of the Canon of *Greg*, printed by Muratori, *Reg* is the purer; but the Canon in the present Roman missal descends from a text like that in *Ott* (a MS of the church of Paris). The Memento of the dead, found in *Ott* but not in *Reg*, is a genuine portion of the Roman Canon in both recension A and recension B.

The unique readings of the various MSS are appended in a footnote¹.

EDMUND BISHOP.

¹ The following are the unique readings of the MSS additional to any already given in the Table; although some are mere blunders, I have thought it best to record them.

I. Of *Bo*, *St*, *Fr*: 1. supplices te rogamus *St*. 2. et unare *St*. 3. totum orbem terrarum *Bo*. 4. after 'episcopo' (see No. 3 of Table): *Hic recitantur nomina vivorum*, *St* (M^cCarthy p. 210 note on f. 24^a). 5. Memento etiam Domine famulorum tuorum N. famularumque tuarum (i.e. the living) *St*. 6. beatissimorum apostolorum *Bo*. 7. Thomae et Jacobi *St*; Thomae Item Jacobi *Gell*. 8. et omnium sanctorum tuorum qui per universo mundo passi sunt propter nomen tuum Domine seu confessoribus tuis quorum meritis *Bo*. 9. muniamur auxilium *Bo*. 10. placatus suscipias eumque (cf. No. 8 of Table) atque omnem populum ab idolorum cultura eripias et ad te Deum verum Patrem omnipotentem convertas dies quoque nostros *St*. 11. *Fr* omits 'ex hoc omnes' after 'manducate.' 12. et ad te *St*. 13. postquam *Fr*. 14. caenatum (no 'est') *St*. 15. (chalice) in sanctas et venerabiles *Fr*. 16. Inde et memores *Fr*. 17. nos servi tui *St*. 18. In *Bo* 'caelos' of 'in caelos gloriosae ascensionis' has been changed to 'caelis' by another hand; *Ca* also reads 'caelis.' [The same reading appears in the printed text of *GV*, but this is an error. H.A.W.] 19. jube perferri (omits 'haec') *St*. 20. omni benedictione (omits 'caelesti') et gratia *St*. 21. Between 'somno pacis' and 'Ipsis' of Memento of dead, rubric: *Commemoratio defunctorum*, *Bo*. 22. donare dignari (in 'Nob. quoque pecc.') *St*. 23. Before 'Libera nos' rubric: *Post Pater noster*, *Bo*.

II. Of saec. viii *Gelas*: 24. *Gell* omits 'et benedicas.' 25. *Ang* inserts: *Memento Domine famulo tuo rege nostro illo* before the usual Memento of the living; cf. an interlineation in Tironian notes at this place in *GV*: *Memento Deus rege nostro cum omni populo* (Wilson p. 238 note 11). 26. *R* inserts between 'incolumitatis suae' and 'tibi reddunt': *Memento etiam Domine et animabus famulorum famularumque tuarum fidelium catholicorum in Christo quiescentium, qui nos praecesserunt, illorum et illarum, qui per elemosynam et confessionem*. 27. *Ang* appends to the 'Hanc igitur' of *GV* the following, with the rubric 'Item infra actionem': *Hanc igitur oblationem quam tibi hac si indignus pro emendatione utiorum et remissione peccatorum meorum offero et pro gloria martyrum et confessorum et pro salute uiuorum uel requiem defunctorum, propitius aspiciendo sanctificas sanctificando benedicas. Per quem te suppliciter deprecamur diesque nostros in tua pace disponas per xpm dnm nrm*. This is the original of the marginal entry by later hand in *Ott* (see Muratori II, col. 3, note k). 28. *gregem numerari Gell*. 29. *Hic est enim calix sanguis mei noui Gell*. 30. *ad inferis*; sed et in celo *Gell*. 31. *panem sanctae vitae aeternae R*. 32. *jube et perferri Gell*.