

## LITURGICAL COMMENTS AND MEMORANDA.

## III

THE review in the September number of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (pp. 624-625) of Mr W. E. Crum's 'Greek [= Egyptian] Diptych of the seventh century' printed in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, December 1908, pp. 255-265, has just come under my notice. As this ivory is the oldest known specimen of an eastern ecclesiastical diptych, and its liturgical features have not to my knowledge been up to now discussed, I feel impelled to say something on the subject, especially as its interest on this side does not lie on the surface of the document but has to be sought for a little particularly, and what has to be said happens to be in some measure a continuation or appendix of No. II of these Comments.

The following is the text of the portion of the diptych to be commented on:—

. . . . [τοῦ] μακαριωτάτου ἡμῶν πατριάρχου τὸ εὐχαριστήριον: καὶ ἀπα [= Abba] Περσυνθίου τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπου τὸ εὐχαριστήριον: καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ εὐσταθείας παντὸς τοῦ περισσώτους εὐαγεστάτου κλήρου καὶ παντὸς τοῦ φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ: καὶ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ ὑγείας τῶν προσηνεγκάντων τοῦδε καὶ τῆσδε καὶ προσηνεγκόντων τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν προσφερόντων.

This text can be approximately dated, viz. between A. D. 623 and 662 (*Proceedings* p. 258).

The following were the observations that suggested themselves to me on examination of this little ivory.

1. The first item that occurs for consideration is a slight matter—the word *εὐχαριστήριον* which, as a Christian or ecclesiastical term does not appear to have entered into the glossaries, &c., general and particular. It seems peculiar to the Liturgy of 'St Mark' where it occurs twice in the passage of the Intercession relating to 'offerers' (Br. 129. 20, 30). This passage is enough to suggest that *εὐχαριστήριον* was the early technical term in use at Alexandria to designate the bread and wine at one time offered by the people for the sacrifice. And the use of the word in the diptych is proper to confirm this notion. In the seventh century, however, we are in presence, as the wording of the diptych shews, of a different state of things. In the Markan

Intercession it is still used for the actual offerings of the 'offerers', the people; whilst in the diptych it is reserved for the patriarch of Alexandria and the local bishop. At what time the offering of the bread and wine by the people to be used in the mass ceased at Alexandria, there is no specific and indubitable evidence to shew. There is, I think, some indication that the practice may have been discarded there already as early as about the middle of the fourth century, and at Antioch by the time of St Chrysostom.

The idea underlying the use of *εὐχαριστήριον* in this diptych of the seventh century seems to indicate the existence of a practice at that date of conventionally assigning a particular offering or host as that of the patriarch and another as that of the local bishop, the living heads of the Christian community, such appropriation being expressive of ecclesiastical communion with these absent hierarchs and spiritual pastors, who are thus honoured with something more than mere mention by name. This would be quite in accordance with the usual style of development in such things, from plain matter-of-fact practice to fictive or ideal refinements.

2. The part of the diptych-text (from *καὶ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας* to the end) which concerns 'offerers' is more interesting as raising questions the answers to which may carry with them all sorts of consequences. If we are to understand this passage of the diptych it is necessary to go back first to the corresponding passage of the Intercession in the Liturgy of 'St Mark' (Br. 129. 20-32) and endeavour to understand what is the real character of this latter, to which (to the exclusion of the passage of the diptych) our attention for the moment is to be directed. In the July number of *J. T. S.* (pp. 597-598) I pointed out how the text of the Marcan Intercession as to 'offerers' had at some time undergone modification under the influence of the Hierosolymitan Liturgy of 'St James'. The case as to this prayer for 'offerers' in 'St Mark' is really more complex than was there formally stated.

To make clear, if possible, the matter to be dealt with, we must first have a table with the texts concerned set out in parallel columns.

3. The first observation that occurs on the following table is this: that the 'altar' in the first two columns (liturgy of Jerusalem) is a different thing, a different conception, from the 'altar' in columns 3 and 4 (liturgy of Alexandria). In the former case it is just a matter-of-fact object, the wooden table or stone erection that the people have before their eyes in the church building; in the latter it is the same (presumably) as that mysterious 'sublime altare tuum in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae' that we know so well, and find so hard to define, in the Roman mass-canon; in the one case, at Jerusalem, the idea of the 'altar' is earthly, material; in the other, at Alexandria,

Greek 'St James' (Br. 56. 16-19)	Syriac 'James' (Br. 91. 26-34)	Greek 'St Mark' (Br. 129. 20-30)	Coptic 'St Cyril'. (Br. 170. 37-171. 8).
Ἐτι μνησθῆναι καταξί- ωσον Κύριε καὶ τῶν τὰς προσφορὰς προσενεγκάντων	Remember also, O Lord, those who have offered the offerings	τῶν προσφερόντων τὰς θυσίας, τὰς προσ- φορὰς, τὰ εὐχαριστήρια	The sacrifices, the oblations, the thank- offerings of them that offer honour and glory to Thy holy name,
ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ ἅγιόν σου	at Thine holy	πρόσδεξαι ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἐπουράνιον καὶ νοερόν σου θυσιαστήριον εἰς τὰ μεγέθη τῶν οὐρανῶν διὰ τῆς ἀρχαγγελικῆς λειτουργίας,	receive upon Thy reasonable heavenly altar for a sweet smelling savour, into Thy vastnesses in heaven, through the ministry of Thine holy angels and arch- angels: like as Thou didst accept [here mention of sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and two mites of widow], so also accept the thankofferings of Thy servants, those of the great and the small, the hidden and the open, <i>of them that will to offer and have not wherewithal,</i>
θυσιαστήριον καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἕκαστος προσῆνεγκεν	altar and those for whom each has offered	τῶν τὸ πολὺ καὶ ὀλίγον, κρύφα καὶ παρρησία, βουλομένων καὶ οὐκ ἔχόντων	and of them that have offered Thee gifts <i>this day.</i>
ἢ κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ τῶν ἀρτίως σοὶ ἀνεγνωσμένων	<i>and those who have wished to offer and could not</i> and those who are in any one's mind and those who are now mentioned by name	καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ τὰς προσφορὰς προσενεγκάντων, ὡς προσεδέξω τὰ δῶρα [&c. of Abel, Abraham, Zaehary, Cornelius, widow with two mites] πρόσδεξαι καὶ αὐτῶν τὰ εὐχαριστήρια, καὶ ἀντίδος αὐτοῖς κτλ.	Give them things, &c.

mystic, spiritual, heavenly. Whatever, then, be the superficial resemblances of wording or idea in these corresponding passages of 'James' and 'Mark', in this central idea that gives the tone, character, and meaning to the whole they are fundamentally different and further than the poles asunder. This (in part, at least) is what I had in mind to indicate in saying (*J. T. S.* for July, p. 599 n. 1) that the prayer for 'offerers' in the Markan Intercession shews late and unskilled compilation, what is really proper for the consecrated gifts being made to apply to the offerings of the people (of whatever nature these may have been). An imported text different in conception, that of Jerusalem, has been superimposed on, mixed up with, the ancient and genuine Alexandrian elements; but still not in such a way, I think, as to make it impossible to disentangle these latter well enough for practical purposes.

4. Two expressions in the Markan Intercession for 'offerers', that (as I think) belong to the borrowed material, now call for attention. These are (see table) *ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρα* in relation to actual 'offerers'; and *βουλομένων καὶ οὐκ ἔχόντων* in relation to those who fain would offer but have not wherewithal. Of these two expressions the former is found in this connexion in the Greek 'James' (Br. 56. 17), but not in the Syriac; whilst the latter is found in the Syriac 'James' (Br. 90. 30-31), but not in the Greek. Moreover, these expressions occur in such connexion, so far as I see, in no other liturgy.<sup>1</sup>

Seeing that 'Mark' has both clauses, and Greek and Syriac 'James' each but one, it would seem at the first blush that here 'Mark' should be the 'source' for the other two. And yet I doubt if this be so; indeed decidedly consider it is not so, if it were only on the ground that I find the text of 'Mark' penetrated with elements clearly original in and proper to 'James', but have failed to detect in the same way 'Mark' in 'James'. If pressed to say how the exercise of such influence of 'James' on 'Mark' could have come about, I should suggest how the hurrying to and fro and agitations between and in Syria and Egypt on behalf of the great and passioning Monophysite cause in the later part of the fifth century and in the sixth would be proper enough to open the way for liturgical changes and assimilations in Egypt; whilst it is precisely the Liturgy of St James that, historically considered, is the Liturgy *par excellence* of the Monophysites.

But then a further question would arise. The texts shew that it must have been the Greek 'James' from which the revisers of 'Mark' drew their novelties. How comes it that only one of the expressions we are concerned with is found in our present Greek text of 'James' whilst the other is found only in the Syriac? Is this a trace of a textual

<sup>1</sup> Of course the numerous liturgies in Renaudot ii come under the 'James' category as later derivatives more or less directly from 'James'.

change at some time? Does the *βουλομένων καὶ οὐκ ἐχόντων* refer to the offering not of bread and wine but to money offerings? and is it only a late addition in 'James', or Syriac 'James', consequent on change in practice? As we go through the collection of liturgies of the Monophysites in the second volume of Renaudot's Collection we can see how the early Christian idea of the 'offertory', the people with eye fixed on what is about to take place, and concerned with offering the matter, bread and wine, for the sacrifice, becomes a substantial question of this world's goods, tithes and the like.

It will be said that this is merely asking questions; but it must be also said that there are so many questions we may usefully raise the answer to which we do not know.

5. I now come to the minutiae of the diptych itself; and the following are the suggestions they call forth.

(a) If I be right (as I believe to be the case) in regard to changes made on the text of 'Mark' by use of 'James', then, seeing that this Egyptian diptych has already one of the two foreign importations mentioned above in § 4, viz. *ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ* (cf. *J. T. S.* July, p. 597), and seeing that the diptych dates from 623-662, this would be documentary confirmation of what might be considered antecedently probable as to the date of these textual changes; namely, that they took place in the sixth century or late in the fifth.

(b) The particular combinations in the diptych, *ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ εὐσταθείας* and *ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ ὑγείας*, do not occur in any Greek mass formulae so far as I can find, though each of the elements is found in other and recurring combinations. And, so far, it looks as if the person responsible for the phrasing of the diptych had, out of the stock of commonplace terms, made his own combinations here.

(c) Such idea of personal eclecticism is countenanced by other parts of the diptych-text: its *καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν προσφερόντων*, and its *φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ*. I do not find *καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν* in any other liturgical text that can with reasonable certainty be fixed as earlier than our diptych than a deacon's address to the people towards the close of the canon of 'St James'<sup>1</sup>; the address concludes thus: *καὶ ὑπὲρ*

<sup>1</sup> In Dr Swainson's four texts (pp. 302-303; cf. p. 298 l. 24, the Messina Roll); not in the eighth-century text edited by Cozza-Luzi; but seeing that in this latter text the diptychs in full appear as an integral part of the anaphora and are assigned to be said by the priest, I do not think that this absence of the deacon's address would be any valid argument against the antiquity of the address itself; especially as the deacon's 'Catholica' at the same place, peculiar to Syriac 'St James', reads as if a large amplification in detail of the brief deacon's address of the Greek. At a later period the words *καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν* are said by the deacon as a usual termination of diptychs. See the Jerusalem diptychs of c. 1166, Br. 503. 12, and the Byzantine diptych of 1427-1439, Br. 552. 24-25, by which date borrowing and

τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν, and the people repeat καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν (Br. 57. 28-32); and it is thus probable that the writer of the diptych had this passage of 'St James' before him. In the liturgy, it may be remarked in passing, the words have simply the general meaning they express; in the diptych-text their meaning is completely changed (with the introduction, I fancy, of a touch of absurdity) by the addition of the word προσφερόντων; whilst the περιεστῶτος λαοῦ is varied by substituting the adjective φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ.<sup>1</sup>

(d) What commends itself to me as the most interesting feature of this diptych is the τοῦδε καὶ τῆσδε. Hitherto there has been no positive evidence in the East of what I have elsewhere called the parochial use of diptychs for mere commonplace persons which is so well attested in the West. With this diptych in hand we have now documentary evidence of such use, at all events for Egypt. It is true that the diptych now in the Mayer Collection at Liverpool is of this 'parochial' character; but then it is Sicilian, and the mention of Pope Adrian shews that it has Latin affinities, so that it is hard to be sure in this case that Greek ways and usages remain pure and uncontaminated by western ecclesiasticism.

(e) To sum up in a few words the result of my examination of the precious, though certainly not elegant, little ivory published by Mr Crum,

fusion of texts of various liturgies had long been the order of the day in the East no less than in the West, so that nothing can be concluded from this as to early Byzantine practice; cf. the modern texts of 'Basil' and 'Chrysostom', Br. 409. 7-8, 389. 24.

<sup>1</sup> This epithet, it would seem, was originally proper to 'St James'. The case is as follows. It is the word used in the Intercession of 'St James' in reference to the sovereigns, and is, therefore, indubitably early; the corresponding Byzantine term in 'Basil' is εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ πιστοτάτου (Br. 333. 5); in the (later) 'Chrysostom' πιστότατος is used for the emperor and φιλόχριστος for the empress (Br. 333. 1-2); φιλόχριστος is not a word used in the Byzantine litanies. For reasons stated elsewhere, I think that the litanies in 'St James' (in which φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ occurs more than once) cannot be safely referred to in illustration of a document of so early a date as our diptych; the same remark would apply to the litanies on 'St Mark' (for φιλόχρ., see Br. 120. 8-9, and cf. the Coptic 159. 17-18; 128. 33-34, not in the Coptic; also a priest's prayer, Br. 120. 7, which, however, runs differently in the Coptic); although it is thus shewn as an epithet favoured in 'James' and 'Mark' circles as distinguished from Byzantine. The prayer for the emperor in the Intercession of St Mark runs: τοῦ δούλου σου τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου καὶ φιλοχρίστου ἡμῶν βασιλείως (Br. 128. 9-10); but it has been pointed out (*J. T. S.* for July p. 597) how this prayer for the emperor is a piece of patch-work, with materials drawn from 'St James' among others; a little further on (ll. 17-19) in a piece derived from 'St Basil', this Markan redactor, in his familiar way of embroidering, makes of 'Basil's' παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, π. τ. φιλοχρίστου λ. When all the cases of use of the word are examined, it seems to me that it was an originally characteristic word of 'James'.

I should say (1) that (unlike the Sicilian diptych which for its prefatory matter simply copies the text of 'St James') the text of this Egyptian diptych, with its threefold commemoration of offerers in the space of as many lines, was not taken from an actual liturgy, but was an independent and personal composition; and (2) that it shews evidence of the influence—may we not say the Monophysite, Jacobite, influence?—of the Liturgy of 'St James'.

EDMUND BISHOP.

### THE FESTIVALS OF ST JAMES AND ST JOHN IN THE MOZARABIC KALENDAR.

A WORD may be added to Dr Feltoe's note on the festivals of St James and St John the Apostles.<sup>1</sup>

The Kalendar contained in the current Mozarabic Missal is not Mozarabic at all, but that of the Toledan Roman Missal. The Kalendar in the Breviary is Mozarabic, but has been somewhat modified to fit in to some extent with the Missal.

A true Mozarabic Kalendar of the eleventh century was printed by Dom G. Morin in *Liber Comicus* (Maredsous, 1893); and this was reprinted by Dom Férotin, along with five other Kalendars, all of the eleventh century, and with notes from a very peculiar tenth-century Kalendar of Cordoba, at the end of his *Liber Ordinum* (Paris, 1904). The last is partially Romanized; but all the Kalendars agree in the following list of saints' days for Christmas week.

- Dec. 26 St Stephen
- „ 27 St Eugenia and her companions
- „ 28 St James the Lord's brother
- „ 29 St John the Evangelist
- „ 30 St James the brother of John
- „ 31 St Columba Virgin.

But in the *Orationale Gothicum* (in *Liturgia hispanica gothica* Rome 1746), the oldest extant Mozarabic service-book, an earlier stage in the development of the ecclesiastical year is represented. The book contains no Kalendar, but the services of the successive days are arranged in order. And here there is no service for either St James the Lord's brother or St James the brother of St John; that is to say, Dec. 28 and 30 have no commemorations. Consequently these festivals appear to have been added to the Mozarabic Kalendar at some date between the seventh or eighth century and the eleventh. Where did they come from?

W. C. BISHOP.

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. x, July 1909, p. 589.