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SOME RECENTLY DISCOVERED FRAGMENTS OF IRISH SACRAMENTARIES.

Early Irish liturgica are so few and so valuable that the discovery of any fragment, however small, of an Irish sacramentary or other prayer book deserves careful attention and publication. The article by Dr. W. Meyer in Nachrichten der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften (Göttingen)¹, shows how much can be got out of the few pages of one of the Bobbio MSS now at Turin, and it may be hoped that the notice of this and similar recent discoveries may induce librarians to examine the fly-leaves or any stray pages of their MSS with the possibility of coming across early Irish liturgia. We owe the preservation of the fragments here published to such careful collection by two librarians: the first two were discovered by Dr. A. Holder in the binding of one of the Reichenau MSS at Karlsruhe; the Irish words which occur on one of their pages have been published, from a photograph, by Mr. Whitley Stokes², but it had not been hitherto noticed that the Latin text is that of an Irish sacramentary; the third fragment I came across in April last when looking through two packets of stray sheets collected by Monsignore Tononi in the Archivio of S. Antonino at Piacenza.

The Reichenau fragments (now Karlsruhe, App. Aug. clxvii) are two sheets of parchment, here distinguished as A and B, which probably belonged to different MSS, as they do not agree either in size or script. Sheet A, at present from 235 to 240 mm. long and from 277 to 282 mm. broad, formed two pages of a MS, but, as about four lines of text have been cut off the top, and more than half the width of one page is missing, the pages of the original MS must have been about 30 by 20 cm. The right-hand side of A r° (i.e. fol. 1 r°), the left-hand side of A v° (i.e. fol. 1 v°), and the first seventeen lines of the right-hand side of A v° (i.e. fol. 2 r°) are occupied by parts of a sacramentary written by an Irish scribe, who apparently began the first

¹ Cf. Mr. Warren's notice of this in the previous number of this Journal (July, 1903, p. 610).
² Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen, Band xxxi, Neue Folge, Band xi, erstes Heft (Göttersloh, 1889), p. 246, and in the second volume of the Thesaurus palaeohibernicus, p. 256, now being published by the Cambridge Press.
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collect of each office on the top of a fresh page, for both pages \( \text{v} \); and the final page \( \text{v} \) with the "qui prius" of the Canon, whilst \( \text{v} \) has up to this 60 mm. of parchment without any text. Fol. \( \text{r} \) contains \( \text{v} \) is probably a mass for penitents, fol. \( \text{v} \) a mass for the dead; fol. \( \text{r} \) did not follow immediately after fol. \( \text{v} \) as its first words are in the middle of a preface. The lower half of fol. \( \text{r} \) and the whole of fol. \( \text{v} \), left vacant by the first scribe, were subsequently filled up by an Irish-continental writer, who inserted the epistle, gradual, and gospel and the ordo missae pro capitibus, five collects and a preface which extended over another page which has not been discovered.

Sheet B, which formed two pages of another MS\(^1\) is at present 232 mm. long and 278 mm. broad, but was considerably reduced when cut up for insertion into the binding; we have, however, fortunately a small slip of parchment B\(^*\) (220 mm. long and partly 50 mm., partly 22 mm. broad), which formed part of one of the outside edges of B, but the greater part of the connecting portion is lost, so that after the first three lines of the extreme left and extreme right-hand columns of this sheet we have now only four or five letters on B and three or four letters on B\(^*\), separated by a missing interval of about 35 mm. broad. It is therefore not been possible to reconstruct with certainty the whole of this fragment, and a further difficulty has been caused by a large portion (25 x 20 cm.) of one side of it being for some reason blank; possibly it may have been occupied by some painting now erased or left free for one which was never inserted.

The right-hand side of B\(^*\) (i.e. fol. 3 \( \text{r} \)) and the whole of B\(^*\) (i.e. fol. 3 \( \text{v} \), 4 \( \text{r} \)) contain parts of a mass, probably in _sacramentum sanctum_, as far as the _Post sanctorum_ (as in the previous fragment), but with the addition of a bidding prayer which forms part of the Canon in the Stowe Missal; the state of the MS renders it impossible to say whether this prayer was finished on this page, but the left-hand side of B\(^*\) (i.e. fol. 4 \( \text{v} \)) is taken up with (i) the words "sanctae trinitatis et sancti crucis fidelis legendarum" which occupy the whole breadth of the page, and with (ii) an Irish prayer or prayers in two columns printed below.

The fragment B is ascribed by Mr. Whitley Stokes to the ninth century; A has some palaeographical signs which seem to make it somewhat earlier, but the dating of Irish MSS is still a task of such difficulty that one hesitates even to hazard an opinion, though some competent judges, who have seen a photograph of the fragment, assign it to the eighth or ninth century, Dr. L. Trambe preferring the later.

\(^1\) A is written in long lines with a few red initials; B is in two columns and has no red initials. The scribe of B places a single initial letter at the end of a line, whilst in A no words are thus divided.
date. The connexion, however, between these fragments and the MS (Karlsruhe, Aug. MS clxvii), into the binding of which they were inserted, should be taken into account for evidence as to date and place of writing. When two sheets of different sacramentaries are thus found cut up for binding purposes, one of them with the scribblings of an Irishman trying to write a continental hand, and the other with rough specimens of neums, the prima facie conclusion is that when the book was bound, the fragments then used in lieu of boards between the vellum sheets which formed its binding, were so out of date as to be of no practical value. It only remains to be seen when and where the MS was written and whether there are any traces of its having remained unbound for some time. The MS is a well-known one, usually cited as 'The Karlsruhe Bede'; a photographic reproduction of one of its pages will appear in a future number of the new Palaeographical Society's publications. All writers who have referred to it ascribe it to the first half of the ninth century, but the occurrence of the feast of All Saints in the Kalendar on Nov. 1 suggests some date after c. 835, whilst from a mark against one of the Kalendarial tables on fol. 13° I venture to assign it to some date within the nineteen years' cycle, A.D. 836-855, and more definitely from a peculiar b for bissextilis in another table on fol. 15°, as well as from the entry on fol. 18° noting that the year 848 was 6048 after the creation of the world, I think there is little doubt that that was the actual year of its transcription. The MS was the work of two apparently contemporary scribes; the one who wrote the Kalendarial tables, referred to above, also inserted a lunar table on the inner side of the front binding, and as on three visits to Karlsruhe I have failed to discover any evidence that the outer sheet of binding is a later addition, I see no reason for

1 The parchment binding of this MS, with flap, buttons and string, is a well-known Irish fashion.


3 It is a strange coincidence that the same year should be assigned as the date of another copy of Bede's De temporum ratione, also written in France, now B. M. Vespasian, B. vi.

4 It is true that MSS were not always bound immediately after they were written; one of the ninth-century Irish MSS from Reichenau, now at Karlsruhe, is still unbound; but in the case before us, the writing on the inside sheet of the cover has every appearance of being subsequent to the sewing up of the two sheets of parchment which form the cover, and it is also noticeable that, like the Stowe Missal, nearly all the pages of the MS were made square by slips of parchment being attached and fastened with thin thongs of the same material, in exactly the same way as our fragments were stitched into the binding.
doubting that as soon as the Bede was copied in 848, on an erased liturgical MS, other pages of sacramentaries were cut up for its binding.

The MS of Bede was for centuries kept at Reichenau, but the Kalendar shows that it was written before it reached that Abbey (the four Swiss or German saints being added by a later hand), and points to some French house, probably in north-east France, whilst the entry in the Kalendar on Oct. 31, as to St. Quentin and his translation, seems to show some connexion with the great foundation of that name. A striking corroboration of this view is afforded by expressions in both the sheets, which point to the sacramentaries having been in use in some religious house which had been attacked by and was in danger from 'heathen foreigners'; if I am right in filling up the lacuna on fol. 2 ν 'sic demu, sanctorum manus co, and in my reading of a word now almost illegible on the last line of that page, the Norsemen are mentioned by name as the oppressors. (As these did not attack Ireland until 795, and as, with the exception of inroads into Frisia from 799–810, their invasion of France was delayed until after the death of Charlemagne in 814, the additions to both fragments cannot be placed before the ninth century.) It is of course possible that both expressions are due, not to the actual pillage of the houses where the MSS were written, but to sympathy with kindred foundations in other lands which had lost some of their brethren by the Viking raids (e.g. Iona, sacked five times between 795 and 832), but the pathetic appeal in the vernacular in fragment B, against 'abundance of foreigners and foes and gentiles' seems to spring more naturally from men liable at any moment to be attacked. Unfortunately these expressions do not occur in the original parts of the MSS, but have been added by later hands, and therefore only point to where the sacramentaries were kept and not to their original scriptoria. The investigation of the twelve Irish saints in the Kalendar leads to no definite result, and the name of 'Engusso,' whose obit is added on fol. 4 ν, is too common to be of any help. There are only two places mentioned by name in the

1 Astronomical Kalendars are not always safe guides as to the provenance of the MSS in which they are found; but, as regards the non-Irish saints, I have noted points of similarity between the one in question and the following eighth- or ninth-century Irish or Gallican Kalendars: Par. B. N. lat. 10837; Rome, Ottob. 67; Vatic. 644; Zurich, Rheims 30.

2 The same entry: '2 Kal. Nov. Sancti Quentinii, cuivis corpus post LV annos ab angelo (anglisis) revelatum est VIII Kal. Iulii' is found in an early ninth-century Bobbio MS (now Ambros. D. 39 inf.); the reference here is to the first invention of this saint in 342, but the entry seems to have been called for by his third translation in 835. At present one cannot venture to assign the Karlruhe Beda to any one Irish house in Picardy, but this special entry about St. Quentin suggests the possibility that Perone s/Somme, Perona Scotorum, near St. Quentin, may have been its scriptorium.
MS which can afford any clue; an added Irish notice on fol. 17 vo as to the death of Muirchuth, son of Muiredun, at Clonmacnois might seem to indicate that great literary centre as a possible mother-house of our MS ¹ (between the years 826 and 846 it was plundered twice by the Danes and thrice by the King of Cashel), but, as Zimmer points out, the notice may be simply due to some friendship between the deceased and the writer of the gloss in the Bede. The words ‘Sancte Trinitatis et sancti cronani filii lugaedon,’ which run across the top of one of the fragments, look very much like an indication of the church or monastery which owned the sacramentary, and seem to point to Clondalkin near Dublin. This Cronan, son of Lugaed, better known as St. Mochua, was specially venerated at that church, and it was there apparently that his relics were translated in 790, but I have not found any trace of a previous or simultaneous dedication to the Holy Trinity, and must be content to point to Clondalkin as the possible home of fragment B.

All that seems fairly proved is that both the sacramentaries were in use on the continent at the beginning of the ninth century, that when the Carlovingian-Roman superseded the Irish use, they were discarded, used for scribblings, and in 848 either erased and rewritten, or cut up for binding purposes ²; the arrival of the MS at the Irish foundation of Reichenau is due to the flight of Irish monks up the Rhine in the middle of the century: the earliest (eighth-century) copy of Adamnan’s life of St. Columba (now at Schaffhausen), was similarly written in France and reached Reichenau at the same time as our MS.

Fragment C, from the Archives of S. Antonino, Piacenza, is a sheet of parchment c. 245 mm. long and c. 355 mm. broad, with from 27 to 30 long lines on a page, which once formed two non-consecutive pages of a MS; the fragment is in a very bad state of preservation, being almost in two halves, and as it has evidently been used for a long time as a fly-sheet, the verso is so completely worn away that it is practically illegible; a few disjointed words here and there show that it was a continuation of the recto. As our knowledge and experience of chemical reagents becomes more advanced, it is to be hoped that the whole of this fragment may be successfully restored.

Piacenza is situated where the mountain road to Bobbio leaves the Via Emilia, and the church of St. Antonino, one of its oldest ecclesiastical foundations, was in close connexion with the Abbey of

¹ It is interesting to note that the Stowe Missal received its eleventh-century metal-work cover at Clonmacnois.

² Apart from the Stowe Missal, the only other known fragments of Irish sacramentaries (St. Gall, 1394, 1395) owe their preservation to having been enclosed in book covers.
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St. Columbanus; hence it would seem not unreasonable to assign to Bobbio an Irish MS found in a city so intimately connected with it, (there was unfortunately no opportunity at Piacenza of seeing whether the library of St. Antonino still possessed the book from which our fragment had been taken, a hurried glance at the few MSS now remaining there did not disclose any Irish ones), and the Bobbio provenance of the fragment seems favoured by the contents of the two pages here published, which contain two prefaces which are only found elsewhere in the seventh-century so-called Gallican sacramentary (now Paris, B. N. lat. 13246) which was discovered by Mabillon at Bobbio, and is now so generally supposed to have been written there that it is cited as Codex Bobiensis. If our fragment does not hail from Bobbio, it is a very strange coincidence that parts of another Irish missal with Bobbian prefaces should have got so near to it.

Bearing in mind the unchangeableness of the insular hand and the remarkably few dated early Irish ecclesiastical documents, it is almost impossible to fix the date of a fragment on purely palaeographical grounds (as one of our leading palaeographists writes to me, 'the dating of these Irish MSS is desperate work'). The script is Irish minuscule with several continental traits. Majuscule letters R and S occur frequently, and some of the large dotted initials are quite in the style of early Irish MSS, though these two marks may be due to the scribe having before him an eighth- or ninth-century MS; several good judges who have seen C ascribe it roughly to the ninth or tenth century; on the other hand Dr. Traube calls it 'twelfth century at earliest,' and Bodley's Librarian 'late thirteenth or early fourteenth'; I do not venture to give a verdict when the authorities thus differ to the extent of three or four centuries.

That the connexion between Bobbio and Piacenza was more than local is clear from the way in which the latter cathedral copied and adapted the tropes and sequences of the abbey; a large proportion of the bishops and abbots of Bobbio, from the eleventh century onwards, were natives of Piacenza.

Cf. Mr. Edmund Bishop's notes on 'The prayer book of Aedelwald' (Cambridge, 1902), p. 239, and Monsignor L. Duchesne Origine de la liturgie gallicane (Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses, 1900, p. 38 sqq.)

There is another slight difficulty in assuming that our fragment was written at Bobbio; palaeographical reprints furnish us with examples of many MSS written (or perhaps only kept) there in uncial, semi-uncial and Lombardic script, but, as far as I have ascertained, they do not give us any MS written in a purely Irish hand.

I hope in some future number to be able to publish the opinions of palaeographical experts on this point. It would have been desirable to have colliotype plates of the fragments in the present volume, that palaeographical students might judge for themselves of their date, but as the Journal was not in a position to do this, photographs have been sent to the Vatican Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, the British Museum, Cambridge University, Trinity College, Dublin, and the Bodleian (the press-mark in the last library is 25778 A, 16).
though it seems to me scarcely possible that such a liturgy as this could have been written for actual use anywhere as late as the twelfth century, and highly improbable that it would have been then copied as a memorial of an extinct rite. We are, at present, strangely ignorant of the early history of Bobbio, and cannot say how long the composite rite shown in the *Boijiens.* was retained there or when Irish ceased to be its vernacular (both questions intimately concern the present fragment, with its most marked Gallican type of service and its Irish rubrics); but if the sacramentary was written there, it would seem that it or its exemplar could not well be dated later than the ninth century. As a matter of fact, for our purpose, the exact date of the actual copy before us is not of primary importance, just as the liturgical value of the Stowe Missal does not depend upon the vexed question of the date of the copy now at Dublin. Our fragment, if not part of an early Bobbio work, may be a late copy of an older Bobbio sacramentary. It is, of course, after all possible that the MS may have been brought there from Ireland or some continental foundation, in which case we can only judge its date on palaeographical grounds. This is an unsatisfactory conclusion, but so it must remain for the present.

1 Professor Cipolla, who is now engaged on the history of Bobbio, assures me that by the twelfth century there were no Irish monks there, and that he has found no traces of the Irish tongue or script there as late as that date: the fragment, in his opinion, is 'much older than the twelfth century.'

**REICHENAU FRAGMENT A.**

**FOL. 1, RO.**

[? cinam] tribue vulneribus a-b serui tui N. but percepta rem[is]ione 5 omnium peccatorum in sacramentis tuus sincera deuotion[e] o perueniat et nullum redemptionis aeternae susteneat de[tri] mentum et reliqua

Lines 5-8. This prayer which begins *Deus qui coniunctum tibi corda* is found as a Post-communion collect in the Stowe Missal (St.) [ed. Warren, p. 247], twice in the *ordo ad reconciliandum penitentem* of the Gelasian sacramentary (Gel.) [ed. Wilson, pp. 65, 67], and in an office for the Visitation of the Sick reprinted in Martene, *De ant. eccl. rit.* vol. i, Ordo xxii, p. 335 (Mart.) :- a *vulneratis,* St. Gel. Mart. b-b *deincps deisions*, Gel. Mart., *deincps deitione,* St. d *permanentis,* Gel. Mart., *permanent,* St. e *sustinat,* St. Gel. f Mart. The writer of the Introduction to the *Paleographie Musicale,* vol. v, supposes (p. 141, n. 1) that when the compiler of the Stowe Missal or its prototype had to provide a Post-communion collect for the *Missa pro penitentibus vivis,* as he...
[co]lestie 1 DEUS qui justificas impium 2. et non utis mortem peccatoris 3 maest[a] 3

tem tuam suppliciter 4 depretectur 6 ut famulium tuum 4 N. de tu[a]

misericordia confidente 4. caelesti 4. protegis benigne 6 a[uxi]

lio et tua 5 protectione 4. conserva 6 ut [i]bi ingiter 5 famuli et

nullis temptationibus 6. te separaver super dominum nostrum ...

super oblatas 1 Suscipe clementissime patres hostias 9 placationis [et]

laudis quas ego 1 peccator 4. t 4. indignus 4 N. famulos 6.

tibi offerre presumo ad honorem & ad 9. gloriae nomenis tui pro

incol[um]
tate famuli tu[i 6. ut omnia delectator suorum uernias consequut

atur 6 per dominum nostrum ...
innum paenam deo

super populum 1 2 DEUS qui es instarum gloria & misericordia peccat

torum pieta[tem]

2 tam humili pece deosimis ut 4. famulums tuum 4. N. 6. benigne

respicas et pietatis tuae 4. custodiam 9 impendias 8 ut ex toto co[r]

de et ex tota mente tibi deseruiet et sub tua semper protectio[ne]

consistat 8 ut quando ei extrema 6 uenierit dies 9. societatem sanctorum

per[c]i

1 The three titles of the prayers are by a later hand.
2 First hand 'pium'.
3 6 over i.
4 6 over p. First hand 'ingiter.'
5 Probably to correct the previous R.
6 o over p. First hand av. Second hand altered o into n and added studiwm &c., as far as the end of the line.

could not get one from the Bobbio sacramentary before him, he copied this prayer from the Galisianum. If this is so, the collect here may be the P. C. to some Mass of which we have not got the beginning: but its position here as apparently the first of four prayers before the preface looks more like that of a prefatio missae, and it may hereafter be found that it is by origin Gallican and not Galisian.


1 consueras, Gr. Berg.

Lines 14-18. Suscipe clementissime: This appears (as here) as the Susper oblatas in the votive mass for a living friend in Sacr. Remains. (ed. Chevalier, p. 357) (Rem.), and as the Sanctus in the Zurich MS Rheims 30 (ed. Gerbert, mon. vet. lit. alem. i. p. 282) (Rh.).

k hostias. Rem. 1 1 peccator indigenus, Rem.,

indigenus et peccator, Rh. 6 omit. Rem. Rh.

et 6 pro, Rem., sine pro, Rh. 6 conseque merenti, Rem. Rh.

Line 18, Innum paenam d6 possibly represents Hymnus paenalem d6; or, less probably, In nomine p. d. The expression does not appear to be Irish.

Lines 19-24. Deus qui es instarum. In the Sacr. Remains, as the 'Continentia' after the two preceding prayers, and in the Sacr. Bergomus, as the Praefatio in a missa votiva. 6 6 a omittimus. Rem. 6 6 a custodiae paenales, Rem., super eum custodiam intencam, Berg. 6 6 a dies uenerit. Rem.
piat [et] inenarrabilem gloriam sine fine possideat • per dominum

Vere dignum deus gratias agre in cuius conspectu sanctus raphiel 25
glorio[us]

adsistit presta quessumus ut tibi pro famulo tuo • N • exorar[e]
dignetur ut gratiam tuam • semper mereatur habere presentem ?ex
emplum et in conspectu tuo semper decantare • sanctus et reliqua . . .

DEUS qui culpa • offerens] deris penitentia placaris 
clore ma[la] que secimus ut tuae consolationis gratiam cons[eq]ua 30
mur Qui pridie . .

1 First hand possediat. 28 There remain traces of the first letter. 1R 1S. IP.—

"exemplum" is the only suggestion I can offer, but it is not satisfactory. Mr. Ed.
Bishop notes that "templum" is a word frequently found in Bob., but the scribe of the
fragment never divides a word in this way; Mr. H. A. Wilson suggests 'redemptus'
as giving a possible sense, but the contraction over the final vowel cannot, I feel
sure, represent s. 22 re over a. 31 The rest of the fol. is blank: a later
hand has inserted 'Deus universita[ ]' 'deus in adiutorium meum' 'deus in
adiutorium' 'Riuos meliss Riuus lactis' with peculiar initial R (1 a reference to
Bede's description of Ireland as 'Divus lactis ac melis insulam,' Hist. ecl. lib. i. c. 1)
and the letters M, A or Delta and Delta (1 = Μαθητή Διδάσκαλος).

1 cum quibus, Rem. Berg.

Lines 29 sqq. Deus qui culpa, as far as the word 'placaris' is one of the orationes
pro peccatis in Greg. (ed. Murat. col. 249), whence it was borrowed by the compiler
of the new Mass for the first Thursday in Lent (col. 28), where it figures as the first
collect; the rest of the prayer runs 'preces populi tui suppliantis prorsus respice et
flagella tuae iracundiae quae pro peccatis nostris meremur averta.' Cod. Bobiens (ed.
Murat. col. 776) and Stowe (ed. McCarthy p. 197, n. b) give it in another form
'affictorum geminis respice et mala quae insta irrogas misericorditer averta' as the
col. 658) gives it in this Irish form as the first (and probably only) collect of that
mass. Our collect, which by its position here is clearly intended as a Post-
sanctus, is on different lines, and looks as if it were made up of two prayers, the
second commencing 'Da nobis domine'; yet it is curious that it has the words mala
quae of Bob. St. and Gothic.

FOL. I, vo.

Suscipe domine preces nostras quas pro dispositione famularum tuorum tuorum et famularum tuorum • N • deferimus
orantes ut sacrificii presentis oblatione ad refrigerium animae suae
rum suarum té misereantet perueniente; per dominum filium tuum . . .

1 as over a. 2 First hand 'depositione.' 3 Above this word is written the alternative text & N. 4 The second n is θ; I read oblatio ... proveniant.
Sacrata deo pro sé suisque defferentibus in domo sanctissimae sanctitatis
innocentibus suffrat

gesatis uirtutis inmensa ingiisique clementia. per dominam iessum chri
tum filium suum qui secum
10 Suscipe dominum hoc sacrificium ab offerantibus. qui tē ipsum sacrifici
i obtulisti
Vece digne igitur et iustum aquam et iustum est nōs tibi hic et ubique
semer gratias
[agere] domine sancte pater omnipotens eternus deus cuini
[prœmis]:iones a plenæ aeternærum bonorum in ipso expectans
manifestas
[quod scimus b] absconditas dominus nostrum iessum christo filio tuo
qui uera est
15 vitæ credentium et resurrectione mortuorum per quem tibi pro ani-
mabus d simulculo
torum et famulan tumurum H. sacrificialis studium offerim
obscuram
tes ut regenerationis fonte purgatos et temptationibus exemptos be
atorum
[rum]numero digeritis inserere et quos h fecisti ad oblationem et participes
inbas
[r]editatis tue esse cesse et seorsus et tē enim omnipotens deus creaturarum
celestialium
20 [c]udo & innumerales angelorum chori sine cessatione proclamant
dicentes

2 r over the second 8; over the rest of the word et au; i.e. defferentibus.
9 and over iu. 7 doubtful reading in bi omnis.
8 cuinas.
9 So Stow: the letter before the first 8 looks like a. t pro omisiones.
10 versus.
11 alternative men.
12 alternative finus, tenui.
13 N.
14 alternative finus, tenui.
15 alternative men.
16 s over u. 17 s over u.
18 alternative men.

Lines 11 sq. Vea dignissima. Mr. E. Bishop: Book of Cerne, p. 270) quoted a
Toledan prayer in massa defunctorum cited by Elipandus (Migne, P. L. xxvii., 875
Dominus Iesus Christus qui vera est vita credentium, tibi pro defunctis fidelibus sacrificium
imadamente offerimus, observantes ut regenerationis fonte purgatis et temptationibus exemptis
sacerdotes manus dignemis inserere, et quos fecisti adoptiones participe æquationem
his cuius convertas, and shewed how it has been in its entirety worked up into the preface of the Mass pro mortuis pluribus in Stow (Ed. Warne, p. 248) with the following variants:—
a promissione.  b as before absconditas.
 omitted.  c omitted.  d omitted.  e omitted.  1-1 hoc sacrificium.  1-1 a tem-
plationibus exemptos.  b ad adoptionis.  1 here the preface ends in St. which
after seorsus has Per, the ending of a collect and not of a preface. In every case,
especially in the insertion of the words mortuorum and tibi and in the readings
sacrificium and exemptos, the fragment provides readings which are more correct and closer
to the Toledan prayer than St. Mr. Bishop calls attention to the light it throws
on the comparative value (or on the relations) of the fragment and St., and also on
the recklessness of Irish adapters in the seventh and eighth centuries.
sanctus sanctus sanctus dominus deus\textsuperscript{19} saaboth &c.;

Adsistat huic\textsuperscript{20} sanctificationi illa benedictio quâ dominus noster iesus christus sacrificium tale instituit atque benedixit

[O]sanna\textsuperscript{21} in altissimis té pro refregrio spiritus defunctorum omni-
potens eternê deus

[hum]iliter exoramus. precipe pro animabus famulorum tuorum\textsuperscript{22} et

famularum tuarum. N. inlessa

[ ]memoratione. ut ab infernali\textsuperscript{23} manu liberatas\textsuperscript{24} in sinu patris requi-
escant

[patri]archae per dominum nostrum iesum christum qui tecum uiuit
dominatur ac regnat simul cum
spiritu sancto in secula saeculorum qui pridie quam\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{19} after deus l. \quad \textsuperscript{20} huic above the line, originally after sanctificationi but erased.
\textsuperscript{21} n over n. \quad \textsuperscript{22} alternative ma famuli tui. \quad \textsuperscript{23} First hand infernali. \quad \textsuperscript{24} First hand liberatus. \quad \textsuperscript{25} at foot of page 1 a cæ—original manuscript.
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tus deus quem benedecimus in apostulis et in omnibus sanctis suis qui pl[a]
cuerunt ab initio saeculi
Vere elogius bassilius []
20 tor apostolorum om[nia]
sanctis suis salvificat

lectiones ad misam o[aptivorum]?

f Paulus apostolus iesu christi . . pro vobis scie[n]tes

* The rest of this page and the whole of the next page are by a later hand.

The Stowe Missal inserts si after placuerunt.

The text of the lections is not printed in full, but any variations from the Vulgate are noticed.

2 Cor. i 1-11: the lacuna on the ninth line of the MS is too small for consolamur pro vestrâ consolâtiones, sine exhortamur pro vestrâ exhortâtiones et salutâ quae operâtur, the clause sine exhortamur pro vestrâ exhortâtiones, was probably omitted. The MS has intollerantia (verse 6) \( = \) ur tolerantium, and in verse 7 omits sit.

FOL. 2, VO.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{n} & \text{os et eruit. inquam speramus quoniam} \\
\text{... adiuvantibus} & \text{et vobis in oratione pro nobis.} \\
\text{[t]...} & \text{Dominius de celo in terram aspexit ut audi} \\
\text{ret gemitus compeditorum} & \text{ut adnuntiat} \\
\text{...} & \text{in sion nomen domini & laudem eius in ierusalem:—} \\
\end{align*} \]

a terroga[vis] discipulos suos dicens

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{15 . . . . } & \text{et in celis.} \\
\text{...}\text{ans corde contrito flebili uoce lacrimabile} \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{...}\text{tregurat bat\ } & \text{sic de no[rm]annorun} \\
\text{manibus} & \\
\end{align*} \]

1 read come[gregat]. 2 A crease in the parchment may have led to the rubbing away of some of the letters; all that is visible now is de[n] annorum, with room for about two letters in the gap. Possibly the name was intentionally not written here in full.

* 1 Cor. i 10. The MS places original before nos.  b The Grail is Ps. i 20-22.
* The MS probably did not contain here the words 'ut solet fuisse interregnaverunt,' which occur in a collector a few lines down. 4 Vulgate = adhuc diam.
* The Gospel is St. Matth. xvi 13-19, but the MS. in company with the oldest versions, has no Jesus in v. 15 nor et before in celis in v. 19. 6 Dan. vi 20.
ducat specialiter autem frater nostrum. H. festina
ciat per dominum nostrum [filium] suum qui secum regnantem

• e redempta ad celos conscendisti de celis
• filios interemptorum cunctosque in captivitate
generibus dignare perducere qui cum patre post nominem recitata

• domi ni deprecemur uti universos baptizatos
• domino eripiat suum unigenitum
• qui tecum

per istam tui corporis
alligatos et fratem nostrum
reduce]re digneris qui regnas:

omnipotens mise[ri]cordiam
captivatibus elongatis carceribus detentis
con]ulator ads[i]stat neque deesse sibi
domi]num nostrum suum

V.D. gra[jtias agere domine sancte omnipotens eterno deus.
qui po]pulum tuis preceptis contradicentem duro seruitio

? subiectum a[d] pristinam libertatem reducebas . respice

?ne dicant] gentes ubi est deus eorum qui quamvis tibi non bene seruiant

rup[tis] vinculis carcere reserato terre motu

um reddidisti sic domine cunctos christianos

normanicis ferreis funibus atque

REICHENAU FRAGMENTS B & B*.
The dotted line represents fragment B*

FOL. I ro, Col. 1.

magnus facis mirabilia
deus ueri\textsuperscript{1} latittia sanctorum . quam tu

promissisti omnipotenti in fide cre

\textsuperscript{1} vera.

\textsuperscript{2} read at ut. \textsuperscript{3} read Paulum or apostolum. \textsuperscript{4} The first three letters are almost illegible in the MS, but the photographic negative reveals not or nor before manicis.
* Deus qui sanctam [huius diei sollem]\textsuperscript{8} pnitatem in o\textsuperscript{8} [N.] cons[crasti] adesto famili

\[e\ tue\] precibus et dona [ranti]
\[?u]t? ho\die festa celeb\[xilio]\n[corum]

\[?bus comme\] mun [iamur per]\n[istum]\n[christum]

\[S\]anctorum \[intercessi\]
onibus

\[nme\]
deuo
\[i num\]
sensi
\[i sancti\]
contin:
tu la
\[ie in\]
pill\textsuperscript{8}

\[?ati\] h
\[?atu:\]
qui in
t me
diosa
colim
talis
\[ob? s? o\]

\textsuperscript{8} Lacunae supplied from the Missale Gothicum.  \textsuperscript{8} There is no sign of any contraction, hence the word is probably not omni, the second letter is possibly the first half of n.

\textsuperscript{6} \(\text{\&}\) a\textsuperscript{7} y, reading very uncertain.
\textsuperscript{8} \(\text{\&}\) s ill.  \textsuperscript{8} The letter before tion is either a or u.

\textsuperscript{6} This collect might be reconstructed: \(D.\) q. s. h. d. s. in [h]onore beatorum .N. consacrati a f. t. p. et dona nobis hodie festa celebrantibus ut auxilio eorum muniamur, \&c. Cf. the first collect for the Mass of many martyrs in the Gothicum 'Deus qui sanctam huius diei sollemnitudinem pro commemorationem beallissimorum martyrum tuorum ill. et ill. passionem fecisti, Adesto famili tua precibus et da ut quorum hodie festa celebramus eorum meritis et intercessionibus adiuvermur, \&c. [Text as collated from the MS of the Gothicum.] The Sacramentarium triplex at Zurich, fol. 228\textsuperscript{80} gives it for the Mass of one martyr, evidently taken from some Ambrosian Sacramentary. Ff. 227\textsuperscript{70}-233\textsuperscript{70} in that MS contain the Ambrosian Commune sanctorum, and agree exactly with the Bergamo sacramentary (ed. 1900, pp. 135-142). Gerbert printed this in his smallest type on pp. 213-220 col. 1 and 222-225, but he did not realize that what he printed on his p. 316 (including the present collect) was one Ambrosian Mass.
Fol. 1 vo., Col. 1.

ritatem obte
suis set mota

litum suum:

Deus ad cuius c:
rescit glori

am quicquid sanctorum sal:
utus contu

lis [ti . . ]
exemplum tuae

tu 1 uoluiste e

nim 1 ulls per dominum

nostrum

D: [ignum et iust]
[stum est n] um equum et in
[emper gratias a] os hic et ubi
[nit] [ati . . ] gerie tr
[tor em omni] ut te auc
[ra] in laudem

sanctor [um . . ] s creatu
atur [um . . ] atum diei
hui [us . . ] ? in tuam loc

orem N consecr
ast [i . . ] gratias
it ? c te tr:
ist ma est:

Fol. 1 vo., Col. 2.

hostia innocens uita suscipisti

enim domine hodierna die animam
sacerdotis tui . N . carnis intig
re conversationis inlesse crucis

uixillum calcato seculo preferenti
s. quem ad eternam uitam 9 et ad glo
riam regni celestis quam pretioso
exitu tam felici petere iubes
ingressu qui et celestium secre

10 torum interpres et diuinorum consi
lorum capax iam in hoc mundo esse
promeruit angelorum comes consor	rs apostolice dignitatis qui

1 1 fi, 1 tis.

2 Before ‘uitam’ sa but deleted. 1 = sabellem.
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... durem carnis aculeos contruit
nuitorum ascendiua prosternit dia
buli uirus exstinguit ante moritu
rus in secula quae natura ista est
mors pretiosa sanctorum qui gloriatur in re
que sua die beate resurrec
tionis expectans in quo erit et ius
titiae mercis et corona uirtutis
et palma victoriae per dominum nostrum

Fol. 2 ro, Col. 1.

Angeli ymnus debitum sine
cessatione proclamant dicen
tes sanctus sanctus sanctus dominus deus sabao
th pleni sunt . . . . . . .

Domine deus noster nos quoque hodi
eram diem in honorem tui sancti no
minis et in commemoratione b
eatissimorum martirum con cete
ris sanctis annua festuitate

percolimus alteribus tua pieta
tes adsistimus tibi enim domine
laudes et gratias referamus
in homine et honore sanctissimi
filli tui dei ac domini nostri iers christi ip

se enim qui pridie quam pro nostra o
mnium salute patietur cefit panem

+ Oremus domini missercordiam

* pro animbus omnium episcoporum nos
torum et presbiterorum b nostrorum et di

aconorum nostrorum et carorum nostrorum
et cararum nostrarum et puerorum nostrorum
et paellarum nostrarum et penentium nostr

\[\text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{1} in over C.} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{2} in above the line.} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{3} E.} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{4} for nomine.} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{5} MS has c pa only.} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{6} r over a.} \quad \text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{7} w over a.} \]

\footnotesize \textsuperscript{1} Cf. Stowe Missal (ed. Warren, p. 233), the variants of which are given as St.
\footnotesize \textsuperscript{2} sacerdotium St.
orunum e et o in communi d stratu e seniorum f & e minis
torum omnium e . . . Pro intigitate uriginum .
et continentia - uiduarum . Pro h aegis - temp
[erie et fructum f (ecunditate terrarum k pro
pacis redetu et i fine discriminum 11]

10 First hand status. 11 Lacuna supplied from the Stowe Missal.

Pro incolmitate f [regum et pace a popu]
lorum ac red[itu b captiourum pro no]
tis adstan[tium e pro memoria mar]
tirum d . . . Pro o re[misione pecatorum]
5 nostrorum . e[t actuum emendatione [r]eorum] e
f et pro f requie d[efunctorum et e prosperitate]
iteneris nostri b & [pro domino papa episcopo et h omnibus 7]
episcopis i e[t prespeteris et omni ecclesi]
astro ordi[ne pro imperio romano k]
et omnibus regib[us l christianis m pro fratribus in uia]
directis . & pro [fratribus quos de cali]
genisis n huius [mundi m tenebris dominus ar]
cessire dig[natus est ut eos in o eterna lu]
ce et quiete 59 di[uiuna pietas p suspiciat]

15 Pro fratribus qui u[nris dolorum]
gemittub q ut [i eos z diuina pietas e cur]
are dignet[ur t petri]

1 Lacunae supplied from Stowe Missal. 2 The MS may have room for all
these words.
The Irish texts are in two columns on vellum, the left containing small portions of twenty-nine lines, the second three complete lines; they have been published by Whitley Stokes, etc., from a photograph, but a careful collation of the MS has afforded a more accurate text in one or two words. The fragments of twenty-nine lines are as follows—

\begin{verbatim}
: aspiientur sc ilia Vincenti esse cognoscant: est de in et : scilicet: tamen: massa arm et et dicit: sacra et mai am nor mai: ...:
\end{verbatim}

The three lines in column two are as follows—

\begin{verbatim}
Dum illa et intacta et gens: et patriae. dum illa et intacta et miser: et quantum et quae ad nasum: that is, according to Whitley Stokes, etc.; from abundance of foreigners and foes and families and tribulations: from plagues of fire and sickness: and hunger and many diverse diseases.
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{Fragment C Placentia \# Bocc.}

Fol. 10v.

\begin{verbatim}
Compl. inaurium etc cum maxima exaudita janus peccatum: "et cetera ad id oculus omni suum:" pacem magistro et continuo:
\end{verbatim}

\textit{See a preceded by an omission of one letter and followed by an omission of presumably three letters.}
mus habeamus adominum: ländianach, immola deo.

Ymmola deo sacrificium laudis et redde altissimo uota tua.

In conspectu omnis populi eius in medio tui hierusalem immola deo. Immolamus tibi domine hostiam gratulationis nostræ. exaudi nōs et presta unicumque nostrum proprium petitionem. affectumque tribue.

miserere nobis domine qui regnas.

Terrenis cogitationibus seperatis sola celestia ac spiritalia cogitemus.

Deus et deus & dominus nostor.

Fratres carissimi sicut simul oruimus ita simul et oferamus sacrificium deo nostro susceptum eorda habeamus adominum

Offeramus domino deo nostro sacramenta munera spiritalia. Dignum

Dilecto & deus & dominus nostor dominus nostor.

Dignum et iustum eumum et iustum est nōs. tibi hic et ubique semper gratias agere: domine sancte pater omnipotens eternus deus. qui fecisti cæolum et terram mare et omnia que in eis sunt. in tuum domine nemo

nōbit et magnitudinis tuæ non est finis. una diuinitas et una maiestas. nature insepabilis. persona dividua deus unus et non solus.

In the margin here 1. cons. Deus et deus, &c. as below, but erased. 

1. yr. with one mark of contraction over the two letters. 

2. A second hand inserts or over er; this scribe’s final long s is always very like f (cf. gratulationis. fratres). here it is a distinct f.

3. The first two and the last two words of this sentence are in red.

4. Above the line. 

5. A later hand has inserted in red a short s over the long s.

6. In the margin. 

7. I. e. novit.

8. A full washing.

9. Here are sung the Dignum on an augmentum before the Dignum of the Trinity.

10. Part of Ps cxv 18. 

11. Part of Ps cxv 19. 

12. This preface is found in Cod. Bobien. (Par. B.N. lat. 13246) here quoted as Bob., and in the Mozarabic Missal (ed. 1755, p. 84), here quoted as Mos. It occurs in one of the Sunday Masses in Bob. and for the eighth Sunday after the Epiphany in Mos. 


14. Mr. Edmund Bishop points out (Book of Cerne, ed. 1903, p. 148) that this adaptation of Acts iv 24 in liturgical prayers is almost entirely confined to books that can be connected with Ireland.

15. Part of Ps. cv 14. 

Cf. the Leabar Breac; McCarthy on Stowe Missal, p. 262.

16. ^ cf. also Book of Cerne. (ed. 1903, p. 203) Deus omni- potens, qui es unus nec solus, terque unus et in tribus unus. 

Cf. also Book of Cerne (ed. 1902, p. 124, II. 9 and 10) Deus unus et non solus, unitas triplices. 

Bob. omits non either because liable to misconception or from a recollection of Ps. xxxv 10

Tu es deus solus.
unitas triplex \( k \) et trinitas semplex sapientia multiplex \( k \), incomplectus \( m \) distinctio. quæm \( n \) unum substantialiter \( o \) coniectus \( m \) trinum personaliter nominamus \( q \), quia \( r \) tu es \( s \) deus solus \( t \) et non \( u \) est alius præter te. nec \( x \) est \( 12 \) x secundum \( 13 \) opera tua qui fecisti cælos \( 24 \) intellectu \( y \) et \( z \) fundasti terram super aquas \( a \). \( a \) pater et filii et spiritus sanctus \( b \). qui in uno \( y \) trinus \( z \) a pater \( a \) procedens patri et filio coeternus una \( a \) in tribus et voluntas \( a \)

\( 12 \) The MS has the usual contraction for \( est \), \( e \) is found written in full (rendered \( est \) by Muratori) in the corresponding passage of Cod. Bobier.; the phrase is probably taken from Ps. lxxxv 8 Non est simulis tu æ in diva domine, et non est secundum opera tua. \( 13 \) The MS has a long \( s \) with a transverse line under it, a rare but not unique contraction for \( secundum \). \( 14 \) Above the line. \( 15 \) over \( i \). \( 16 \) The MS has a single \( s \) with the contraction line over it, a capital \( S \) has been erased before it. \( 17 \) Above the line. \( 18 \) The reading here is very uncertain; I believe the original words to have been ante secula infinitæ, but the final letter of ante appears to have been erased for the sign for \( quam \) and the \( a \) of secula has been changed into \( io \).

\( 1 \) Moz. omits et \( b-k \) omitted in Bob. \( 1 \) incomprehens. (i.e. incomprehens.\( 1 \) in comprens.), Bob. \( m \) incomprehens. Bob., et incomprehens. Moz. \( n \) qui, Bob. \( o \) incomprehens., \( n \) Moz. \( q \) omitted, \( p \) Moz., Moz., incomprehens. \( r \) confiteretur, Bob. \( s \) omitted in Moz. \( t \) omitted, Bob. \( e \) enim deus, Bob.; Moz. (ed. 1755, p. 304) has an 'aem deus' with expressions like this and a phrase which occurs a few lines further on in the fragment, Tu es deus et in te est deus et non est alius præter te; ab ore egressum verbum, non regredies, quia utique natus filius, non ipse qui pater est creditur, dum tamem ipsum esse quod pater est facturus. \( 4 \) omitted, Bob. \( s \) omitted, Bob. \( 5 \) ex, Bob. \( 6 \) omitted, Bob. \( 7 \) Tu, Bob. \( 8 \) aquam, Bob. \( 9 \) om. \( 10 \) Bob. \( 11 \) quæm, Moz., Moz., legem creatoris omnibus possist, Bob. \( 12 \) om. \( 13 \) Moz. \( 14 \) Here Moz. concludes with Quem concludant angeli, etc. \( 15 \) omitted, Bob. \( 16 \) omitted, Bob. \( 17 \) unus est generatur, Bob. \( 18 \) unus est ex patre, Bob. \( 19 \) autem in tribus unitas et dignitas potestas, etc., Bob.
Cuius b propitiatorem [sacerdotum prepar]atio declaravit

Cuius [lon]gan[imitatem e iudicum eq]uitas protulit. Cuius b sapien-
tiam d

regnum e uita desseruit Cuius spiritum p[rophet]arum uestitas adpro-
bauit

Cuius b aduentum zacharias castigatus ostendit. Cuius introitum

Iohannis precurso r admonuit. Cuius b natuitatem urgo protulit

stella proecessit angelorum f sacra uox f cicinit pastorum peruigel sol
licitudo pruedit s magorum tripertiti b oblatio muneris honorauit

Cuius possionem e mundus non sustenuit a tremuit terra 61. sol fug[it] k

Cuius resurrectionem adsistentes ostentauerunt 1 angeli m Cuius 5... 
gentes n glorificauert sancti i explorantes apostoli predictuert 7

Cuius ascensum discipuli porrectis in celum introitum Johannis pncussor s admonuit. Cuius b

natiuitatem uirgo protulit s estrella uogis angelorum f sancti p

pastorum penuig sollicitudo prament I magorum tripertiti h oblatio muneris bonerauit

UtiIlS bosionem mundus non sustenuit t tremuit terra 11. sol fugit 11:

Cuius 7 resurrectionem adsistentes ostentauerunt. Cuius ascensum discipuli porrectis in

ce;rum oculis prosecuti sunt. Cuius 9 regnum

cum uniuerso o celestium et terrestrium p et infernorum preconio p animalium et 9 seniorum signatorum cententus r incessabili

uoce proclamant dicentes sanctus sanctus dominus deus

sabaoth 8

Haec tibi laudes in excelsis omnes consona uoce resonant ac ...

nós uero ex humili 8 sede supplices maiestati tuæ fundimus preces
obseccrantes ut ad hæc pura libamina respicere digneris . . .

primogeniti filli tui ac domini nostri isu christi Qui pridie quam ...

amen dicitur 9 ordo missae sancte marie 10

Concede quessumus omnipotens deus ad beatæ sanctæ marie

urginis gaudia eterna pertinguere de cuius nós ueneranda as

sumptione tribuas annua sollemnitate gaudere per

9 Intercessio domine marie beatæ munera nostra commendat no 11 ...

1 The first three lines are much rubbed and could not have been deciphered
without the help of the corresponding passage in Bob., from which the words
within brackets have been supplied. 2 The sense demands regum. 3 The
contraction for us is the one which usually signifies us at the end of a word.
4 i.e. passionem. 5 o over the first r. 6 Reading doubtful. 7 Deus, 1 Omnes.

5 Scarcely legible, doubtful reading. 8 u over m. 9 These words are
added by a later scribe who uses a final r not found elsewhere in the fragment.
10 This title is by the original hand, and enclosed in a single red line.
11 Apparently regum...

1 This preface occurs in Cod. Bobiensis, in one of the Missae dominicales. It begins
Cuius vocem Adam audivit (cf. Muratori, Lit. Rom. Vet. vol. ii, col. 934), and has
the following variants : b Ipsius. c longaminatite (sic). d sapiencia. e regum.
1-4 war sacra. 5 peruidit. h tripertita. l omitted. k fugit.

1 sastentauert. m cum resurgendum. o omitted. o uniuersum.
1-7 infernorumque cententus. 9 omitted. 10 r omitted. 11 Here the
preface ends in Bob. 11-14 This collect and secret appear in the Assumption
mass of the Triplex as G(elasian) and A(mbrasian), with nobis after concede and
ueneratione tuæ maiestati reddet per dominum nostrum... The letters co\l\ can be made out at the end of this line perhaps referring to the following prayer. 

Recensitis nominibus offerentum in beate maris sollemnitate
clementiam dei diperecurur ut per istius merita peccatorum
nostrorum ueniam defunctis refrigerium concedere dignetur.

Pf. 1 vo. and 2 vo. are illegible.

tribis for tribus in the former, whilst the latter runs: Interessio quaesumus
d. beate M. semper virginitatis nostra commendem nosque in eis ueneratione tuae
maiestati redde acceptos. Their occurrence in the Biasca MS (Solesmes Sacr. Bergom., p. 136) as respectively the Super simonem and Super oblatione of that feast will justify the Ambrosian title, but as usual the use of the word Gelasian in the Triplex refers only to the eighth century Gelasian (Wilson, p. 353) as the Vatican Gelasian has neither prayer for this day; as a matter of fact, the secret is only that of the Gelas. II 5 and II 50 with the substitution of the B. V. for St. Fabian and St. Rufus. A study of the Triplex at Zurich leads me to endorse Mr. Bishop's warning (Book of Cerne, p. 263 n. 2) as to the uselessness of this MS as an index to the real pre-Gregorian Sacramentary.

The object of the present notice being the publication of the text of the fragments and not a disquisition on the knotty questions which concern the ancient Gallican rite, it will suffice to call attention to the new evidence which these fragments reveal, and to show their points of similarity and contrast with the Stowe and Bobbio missals: these two really fall under one category; a glance at the Paléographie musicale, vol. v, pp. 128 and 129, will show their intimate connexion with each other.

The general similarity between our fragments and these two missals is evident at first sight: the vernacular rubrics and prayers which are a special feature of Irish liturgica occur not only in fragment B, which is moulded after the type of the Stowe missal, but in the (presumably) Bobbio sheet, though the Cod. Bobiens. is entirely in Latin.

I am indebted to Mr. Whitley Stokes and Professor Rhys for help in translating the rubrics, which at once recall somewhat similar ones in the Stowe missal, though it is difficult to see how one Dignum could be sung before another, and the liturgical meaning of landiunach ("a full washing," "a complete washing out"), apparently at the offertory and

1 Our fragments will bear out Mr. E. Bishop's belief, expressed in the last number of the Journal (July, 1903, p. 560, n), that the Irish were concerned in the manipulation to which the Roman books were subjected in Gaul and in Northern Italy in the seventh century.
Certainly before the preface, is at present unknown: it cannot be the same ceremony as the Stowe lethdirech and lándirech (the half and the full uncovering of the chalice); one hesitates to suggest a hitherto unrecorded ceremonial cleansing of the chalice at this part of the mass; but if O'Reilly's Irish-English Dictionary (1864) is correct (diunach= 'bathing,' 'washing'), the ceremony will be the customary washing of the celebrant's hands.

Putting on one side the phraseology of the prayers, which, as regards fragments A and B, is distinctly Roman, it will be at once noticed that their whole system is a Gallican one, for whilst Gregor. and Gelas. for each mass only supply as a rule one or two collects, a secret and a post-communion prayer, Bob., Gothic., Francor., and Gallican. vetus agree in providing four separate prayers before the preface, which in its turn is followed by the post-sanctus and the canon 'Qui pridie'; after which Bob. provides nothing else, as the Missa Romensis cotidiana at the beginning of that missal, with its fixed post-communion, had apparently to serve for all masses. Now this arrangement is precisely the one witnessed to by fragments A and B, whilst C. fol. 1ro provides somewhat elaborate initials for four only of the items which precede the preface. It is far from being suggested that we have here a pure Gallican rite; the fragments are a product of a time when Roman influence had substituted short pithy collects in the place of the lengthy Gallican ones, and the Roman canon, or part of it, had been introduced, but the distinctive prefaces are left untouched and the old framework remains; the diptychs are still read and the pax is given before the consecration; though the actual title 'post nomina recitata' only occurs once, the word recita... appears in one of the prayers, whilst another begins with 'Recensitis nominibus.' It must be borne in mind that the titles on the first sheet of A are a later addition by a Romanizing corrector, who seeing three nameless collects prefixed to them the three titles common in Roman sacramentaries, without stopping to think whether they were applicable to the prayers, and without seeing the impossibility of the Roman 'Super populum' coming before the preface. The very position of the Epistle and Gospel, so rarely found in early sacramentaries, but here placed by themselves as 'lectiones ad missam' and followed by the 'Ordo missae,' is exactly the arrangement of the Bobbio Missal.

But it is not only in the arrangement of the office that our fragments agree with the Stowe and Bobbio MSS; it may be only a strange coincidence, but just as the Stowe Missal has three masses only, viz. for the common of saints, for penitents, and for the dead, fragments A and B

1 This procedure is the reverse of what we find in Cod. Bobiens., where the Roman prayers of the Missa Romensis cotidiana appear under utterly unsuitable Gallican titles.
reveal three masses which, though they bear no title, correspond exactly with these three. In the few pages before us we meet with typical Hiberno-Gallican expressions which rarely if ever occur in the Greg. or Gelas.; e.g. the elders of the church are termed 'seniores' whilst the faithful laity departed are the 'cari nostri'; 'stratus,' in the sense of body or congregation, which occurs only in the Stowe Missal, is found here with the epithet 'communis'; the solemn Amen at the giving of thanks (1 Cor. xiv 16) is ordered by the special rubric 'Amen dicitur'; but perhaps the most striking similarity with the Stowe Missal is the omission of the filioque; though it was added to that MS by Moelcaith, the text of the Piacenza fragment remains unchanged, 'Spiritus sanctus a patre procedens;' a fact which seems to go some way in justifying the early date assigned to this sheet or its exemplar; the fact that the words occur in a preface here instead of in the creed does not weaken the argument.

It will be observed from the notes that whilst the first mass in the Reichenau sheet is more or less the common property of Roman and Gallican missals, our fragments, with the exception of three Ambrosian collects, give us texts which are only found elsewhere, if at all, in Stowe, Bobbio, Rheims and the Mozarabic, and that the variants are instructive, as providing what in some cases looks like a purer and more primitive reading. If the number of known liturgical forms is not greatly increased by the present publication, it brings out a few new points as to text and arrangement, as well as some apparent difficulties which await solution. The phrases 'refrigerio spiritus defunctorum' 'Deus ... da nobis domine' may be due to errors in copying, but the frequent reiteration of enim in the middle of prayers is peculiar, nor do I remember having seen elsewhere sursum corda habeamus in a collect, or cepit panem for accepi panem at the commencement of the Canon; the sequence Petri et Pauli Iohannis, to the exclusion of Andrew, in what appears to be an extract from the Canon, is a distinguishing mark of the Mozarabic Missal, though the three names do occur in this order in one of the Stowe collects; the 'Vere eulogius basiliius' (unfortunately defective) on A. fol. 2r is presumably a half Greek version (eulogius = Εὐδοξον) similar to 'Vere benedictus' which precedes it, but it seems to break off into the Latin of another prayer; at any rate, it is interesting to note

1 Witzel's print of the Falda MS has 'stata.' Of course it is impossible to rely on his text as rendering the reading of the MS here, but still it now appears his statu is countenance the first hand of the new fragment. The correction to stratu however, as in St., seems highly interesting [Ed. B.].

2 I do not know of any other suitable expansion of the c pa which follows after patirimv in the MS; it might be a scribe's error for c r(ellique), but the reading of the text is clear.
this survival of the ancient ecclesiastical tongue where it was scarcely expected.

In the almost total absence of headings to the collects it is impossible to arrange with certainty the masses in the Piacenza fragment; some of its sentences were sung by the choir and not said by the priest; e.g. 'Immola Deo sacrificium laudis'1 was ordered, according to the Leabar Breac, to be chanted after the full uncovering of the chalice and paten after the gospel, and there is little doubt that the Deus et deus et dominus dominus noster, which occurs three times in one mass on fragment C, must have been one of those antiphons which we learn from Stowe were interspersed in the service, though these or similar words have not been met with before. But it is very doubtful whether this explanation can account for the two prayers, which look like benedictions, which are found on A. fol. i vo between the preface and the post-sanctus, 'ad-sistat ... benedixit' and on C. fol. i vo immediately before the preface 'Benedictio ... spiritus et reliqua'; the former of these is apparently unfinished and perhaps has been copied into a wrong place, but the absence of any similar examples of any liturgical interpolation immediately before the preface makes it necessary to call special attention to these anomalies.

The first question naturally asked as to any newly discovered Gallican sacramentary is as to the existence of a non-Roman canon, for up to the present no such has been found. Our fragments merely give the first words of a formula which either, as in Bob., agree with the so-called Gelasian canon: (i) 'Qui pridiie,' (ii) 'Qui pridie quam,' or (iii) with the Ambrosian 'Qui pridie quam pro nostra omnium salute patetur,' and in all three cases this apparently invariable formula follows immediately on the post-sanctus, whether the latter is addressed to the first or to the second person of the Holy Trinity; there is no trace of any reference to the night of the betrayal instead of the eve of the passion, or to our Lord's standing in the midst of the apostles, such as might have been expected in a purely Gallican liturgy. But there is a certain confusion and irregularity in B. fol. 2, col. i which deserve notice; after cepit panem (?) there is a short space, and on another line the same scribe proceeds to write + Oremus domini, &c., which begins much like a bidding prayer post nomina (defunctorum) recitata; but suddenly, in its eighth line (after the punctuation mark .: instead of .), it becomes a prayer for the living, 'pro intigritate, &c.' Of this text Stowe has as far as 'penitentium nostrorum' as the end of an added Super oblata (ed. Warren, p. 233), whilst it provides the rest of it in

1 These are probably the words erased on fol. 19 of the Stowe Missal: see Dr. M'Carty's article, Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy (Polite Literature and Antiquities), vol. xxvii, pt. I, p. 205, n. b.
a slightly altered form, *pro stratu seniorum suorum et ministrorum omnium puritate, pro integritate, &c.*, as part of the *canon dominicus papae Gilasi* after the recitation of the diptychs of the living, the seniores and ministri being among the faithful departed in our fragment but with the living in Stowe. The whole of this long prayer *'pro stratu ... curare dignetur'* is wanting in *Bob.* and *Gelas.*, and is clearly an interpolation arbitrarily inserted by the copyist of Stowe in the middle of the commemoration of the living in his *'Gelasian'* canon, between *'pro redemptione animarum suarum'* and *'pro spe salutis, &c.'* As it stands in our fragment, it is even more out of place than in *Stowe:* its position, immediately after the *Qui pridie* and preceded by a + seems to indicate that it was intended to be said somewhere in the *Canons* or at least to be in some way connected with it. But this is not the only difficulty: after the words *'pietas curare dignetur,'* without any break, and after a lacuna of two or three words only, we meet with *et pauli to* (evidently *petri et pauli iohannis*), the normal position of which is after *memoriam venerantes before* the words of Institution, and in the next lines (unfortunately half cut off) the names of the patriarchs from Abel, which in the usual Canon form the conclusion of the clause *Unde et memorares after* the consecration. Even this is not the end of the confusion: for the patriarchs in the genitive case are followed by the ablative case (? *cum or pro* in the lacuna) of bishops and others, whether living or dead cannot unfortunately be ascertained. It is scarcely possible to believe that all this is a mere medley, a meaningless amalgam of three or four separate parts of the liturgy, necessitated by the need to conciliate the opposite Roman and non-Roman practices as to the commemoration of the dead; the length and the phraseology of the prayer seem to preclude the supposition that it was intended as an alternative post-sanctus for the preceding *'Domine Deus noster.'* But if we bear in mind that this portion of the Stowe MS. is by the later hand,

---

1 Mr. H. A. Wilson has kindly sent me the following note: "I think the + before *Oremus* may very likely be intended simply as a means of readily finding the form, which would be wanted constantly, when the celebrant turned from another page to that on which it was written. It may have corresponded to an abbreviation + *omnes* or even to a + on other pages. This is, I am inclined to think, more likely than the view that the appearance of the + marks the prayer as something connected with the *canon Actus.* I do not suggest a doubt that it was so connected—its position suggests that it may have been recited after the Institution. The fragment shows, I think, a somewhat earlier stage in the process which has embedded the similar form in the Roman canon found in *Stowe.*" [H. A. W.]

2 The name of Abel may, I think, be accounted for if we suppose that it was one of a list parallel to that which appears on fol. 51 a of *Stowe.* But in this case the list (unless it is here abbreviated) must have been a shorter one than that of *Stowe,* from which it must also have differed in order, if the words *'Patri et Pauli Johannis'* are also part of it. [H. A. W.]
and that Bob. here is pure Gelasian, the suspicion crops up that possibly we may have here the relics of a part of the Gallican canon; this is a mere surmise with but little to uphold it, but at least it may be thrown out, if only to be destroyed by the criticism of more experienced judges.

Considering how few are the extant documents of the Irish rite,\(^1\) and how little we know at present of its origin and development, the present fragments, though apparently insignificant, may be of real value to future liturgical students, and if their assumed date and provenance, as here tentatively set forth, are accepted, they may prove to be portions of sacramentaries which are older than the Stowe\(^2\) and which preserve a more perfect text than the Bobbio Missal; at any rate they will show that neither one nor the other of these can retain its claim to be a unicum or a mere personal production, and their publication may lead to the search for and the discovery of other fragments and to the elucidation of an important question.\(^3\)

HENRY MARRIOTT BANNISTER.

---

\(^1\) Mr. Warren's reliquiae of Irish liturgies are taken from about a dozen sources, of which only three are really sacramentaries.

\(^2\) The consensus of opinion seems to place the transcription of this MS to the ninth century, but see The Academy, Oct. 20, 1894, and Palæogr. Musæ. v, p. 142. A photographic reproduction of the whole MS is a great desideratum which the Henry Bradshaw Society would do well to consider.

\(^3\) I must acknowledge with much gratitude the very valuable suggestions sent me by Mr. H. A. Wilson and Mr. Edmund Bishop.