

menon' that the formula 'through Whom to Thee with Him and the Holy Ghost be glory', 'which is somewhat strange to our modern ears', is 'the stereotyped doxology' of the Church of Abyssinia, while he has found only two instances of it in Greek, viz. in the Prayer of St Polycarp and in the Liturgy of St Mark: it may be noted that however rare may be the concise *δι' οὗ σοὶ σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ*, equivalent formulae, some of them even more 'strange', are not uncommon, especially in Egypt. The scheme is a little expanded in the Coptic 'through Whom the glory befiteth Thee with Him and the Holy Ghost' (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 145, 148, 188: Denzinger *Rit. orient.* ii p. 49); but I do not know of an instance of this in Greek. But in Athanasius we have, *de Incarn.* 57 *δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ αὐτῷ τῷ Πατρὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τῷ Υἱῷ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι τιμὴ κατλ.*: *Hist. Arian.* 80 *δι' οὗ σοὶ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τῷ Λόγῳ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα κατλ.*: *Fest. Ep.* ix 11 'through Whom to Him and with Him be glory and dominion in the Holy Ghost': *ib.* xi 15 'through Whom to the Same and to his Father be glory'. A second type, *δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα σὺν τῷ παναγίῳ . . . Πνεύματι*, occurs in the Liturgy of St Mark (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 137, 142), and, if we may judge from the cue, which is all that is given, in the Greek Egyptian St Basil (Renaudot *Lit. orient.* i pp. 57, 60, 63, 76 sq., 79), as well as in St Cyril of Jerusalem *Cat.* xv fin. and St Gregory of Nazianzus *Orat.* vii fin., and the Syriac Liturgy of St James (*Litt. E. and W.* pp. 83 sq., 89, 93, 100, 105). F.E.B.]

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HADRIAN'S SACRAMENTARY.

Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Urrezeptar,
herausgegeben von D. HANS LIETZMANN, Professor in Jena.
(8vo. Münster in Westf., 1921.)

THE third part of the series of *Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen* maintains, both in importance of matter and in quality of workmanship, the high standard which had been set in the first two parts by P. Kunibert Mohlberg's excellent edition of the St Gallen MS 348. The task Professor Lietzmann has taken in hand is not an easy one; it is, indeed, perhaps less simple in its conditions than he has conceived it to be; and it may perhaps be well to suspend judgement about the certainty of his conclusions. But it is right at once, in expressing this opinion, to say that it would be difficult to speak too highly of the skill and care with which, as a rule, he handles the material he has actually used. Assuming that his estimate of that material is correct, his treatment of it is generally convincing, and, apart from a small number of points

where his judgement seems to have failed to hit the mark, it would appear that he has come as near to the fulfilment of his purpose as the conditions of the problem allow.

The aim of his work is the reconstruction of the text of that Gregorian Sacramentary which was sent to Charles the Great, some ten or fifteen years before his coronation at Rome, by Hadrian I, and from which the Gregorian Sacramentaries of later date derive the most important part of their contents. This work has seemed to him to be made more urgently needful by the appearance of a volume issued a few years ago by the Henry Bradshaw Society¹; and no doubt if that volume were taken, as its rather vague title may have suggested, as an attempt at reconstruction, there was need to provide something better. It would have been a misfortune that anything so inadequate, from that point of view, should occupy a position to which it had no claim. And if there is reason to think that it would have been wiser, or at any rate safer, to test the foundations for a scheme of reconstruction by a comparison, or at least by some experimental examination, of the readings of a larger number of the earliest group of manuscripts, it is only fair to remember the difficulties which have, during recent years, stood in the way of all such research.

Readers of his *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* will remember that Professor Lietzmann there accepts the position which may be said to have been established by the late Mr Edmund Bishop and his fellow-worker, P. Suitbert Bäumer, with regard to the Sacramentary of Hadrian and its relation to the Gregorian Sacramentaries of later days. He accepts, that is to say, the view that Hadrian's Sacramentary or *Gregorianum* is to be found, either by itself, or distinct or easily distinguishable from the other matter which has been added to it, in a considerable number of manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries, all written, apparently, in the Frankish kingdom: that the supplement which is in most of the earliest group of these manuscripts appended to the *Gregorianum*, and the preface to that supplement which some of them contain (known from its first word as the 'Hucusque'), are the

¹ *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great* (H.B.S. vol. xlix, 8vo, 1915). As I was myself the editor of this volume, I think it may be well to say that there is not, in my own judgement, any question of rivalry or of comparison between Prof. Lietzmann's work and my own. We have been to a certain extent working over the same ground and using the same manuscripts, but in different ways and for different purposes. I had (as I hoped, sufficiently) disclaimed any attempt at producing a final edition: and my aim was merely to supply, for the use of other scholars, a working instrument which might be of service in the process of examining and comparing the manuscripts of the Gregorian Sacramentary. It is a matter of some regret to me that the issue of this book should have been a cause tending to hasten Professor Lietzmann's fulfilment of his scheme; but I am happy to think that it has been of some use to him in his task.

work of Alcuin; and that, as 'Hucusque' tells us, Alcuin had not only provided the supplement to meet practical needs which the *Gregorianum* by itself did not satisfy, but had revised the current text of the *Gregorianum* with a view to correcting, 'artis stilo', the errors introduced by scribes, and had distinguished by 'virgulae' certain parts of its contents which could not be regarded as possessing the authority of St Gregory.

So far, Professor Lietzmann followed the lines of Mr Bishop and his colleague. But he took note of a point which they had (not unwittingly) passed by, and found in it the basis of a classification of the manuscripts of the *Gregorianum* which he proposed to apply for purposes of textual criticism: and in the present work we have its application and its result.

Some of the manuscripts of the earliest group, and some of later—even of much later—date, include in the title prefixed to their text of the *Gregorianum* (or to their text as a whole, where the *Gregorianum* is blended with other matter) the statement that they have been transcribed 'ex authentico libro bibliothecae cubiculi'. This Professor Lietzmann interprets, probably quite rightly, as a claim to be derived from the book sent by Hadrian to Charles, and preserved as a standard text in the palace library at Aix-la-Chapelle.¹ He calls attention to the remark of Dr Ludwig Traube that the words never occur in the title of a manuscript which contains 'Hucusque': and he adopts the view that the presence of these words marks the text of the *Gregorianum* before which they appear as being independent of Alcuin's revision, and derived from Hadrian's Sacramentary, while the appearance of 'Hucusque', on the other hand, marks the text of the *Gregorianum*, which it follows, as being derived from Alcuin's revised text. By this test he divides the early manuscripts into two classes—a 'Hadrian class' and an 'Alcuin class': and he holds that this classification indicates the lines on which reconstruction of the text of the 'authenticum' may safely proceed.

It seems open to some doubt, on the evidence at present available, whether the reference to the 'authenticum' in the title of those manuscripts which would thus be placed in the 'Hadrian class' can be so strictly applied as a test that the classification furnishes a satisfactory basis for reconstructive work. It is clear that, if we include the later manuscripts of the group, the words in question do not and cannot apply

¹ It is not perhaps quite so certain as he appears to think that the words did not occur in the title of Hadrian's Sacramentary, as a reference to a standard copy in the Papal Library. They are so interpreted in the title of at least one late manuscript, which substitutes 'Romanae ecclesiae' for 'cubiculi'; Ebner *Quellen und Forschungen* p. 37. The exact interpretation, however, is unimportant: for practical purposes Hadrian's book, not that from which it was copied, would be the 'authenticum' for Charles's dominions.

in the same sense to all of them. In some of the later manuscripts the reproduction of the words is, as Professor Lietzmann himself says, merely mechanical.¹ And if we consider only those which seem to be of the ninth century, and are thus probably separated from the 'authenticum' by comparatively few descents, we shall find that even here the claim cannot be admitted with equal strictness of interpretation for all of them. They appear to be four:

1. The Cambrai MS 164 (C) written for Hildoard, Bishop of Cambrai, in 811 or 812.

2. The Vatican MS *Reginae* 337 (r), written probably c. 850, certainly before 868.

3. The Paris MS B. N. lat. 2292, written probably c. 870.

4. The Vienna MS Theol. 149, from Reichenau.²

Of these, Professor Lietzmann regards C as an actual transcript from the 'authenticum': and he has observed that C and r exhibit agreement in certain points which clearly indicate descent from a common archetype. But their texts of the *Gregorianum*, taken as a whole, differ in their general character. That of C is in a high degree ungrammatical. That of r is not wholly free from grammatical errors: but these are comparatively few, and the faults of the first scribe seem to have been mainly the result of a tendency to omit letters, syllables, or words. It is clear that if C be regarded as an accurate copy of the 'authenticum' the text of r must be the product of a revision. Professor Lietzmann, in the introduction to his reconstructed text, remarks of r that it has occasionally been subject to the influences of Church usage and of Alcuin's edition, and describes it as 'mannigfach entstellt'.³ He thus

¹ *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, p. 34.

² Of these, Prof. Lietzmann has employed the first two, using for C a photographic copy, for r the text printed in H.B.S. vol. xlix. In that volume this manuscript is distinguished by the symbol R: but it is probably most convenient here to follow Prof. Lietzmann's notation.

³ Pp. xxxviii, xxv. In this description I am uncertain whether he has had in view the frequent indications, given in the printed text, of corrections in the manuscript, without at the same time taking account of what has been said in the preceding introduction about the date and the peculiar method of the corrector. See H.B.S. vol. xlix, p. xxvi. It may be worth while here to take notice of some points in which he has fallen short of complete accuracy in regard to this manuscript. (1) He places its date (p. xxv) in the time of Hadrian II, on the strength of a note by Mr Bishop, which, while it points out that the Hadrian whose name appears (as an addition) in the *Exultet* cannot, as had been supposed, be Hadrian I, gives as a reason that the name has replaced that (also an addition) of Nicolas, and assigns to the manuscript a date about 850. (2) He states (p. xxv) that it contains not only Alcuin's appendix, but 'Hucusque', apparently forgetting that this preface never occurs in a manuscript of the class to which he assigns it. These slips are the more unaccountable since in *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* he had stated the facts correctly. (3) On p. xxvi he gives, as the present press-mark of the 'Codex

appears to admit that his classification of it as a member of the 'Hadrian' group is subject to certain reservations.

Of the third manuscript it is clear that its *Gregorianum*, if independent of Alcuin's revision of the text, is probably not altogether independent of Alcuin's work: for it includes, as Mr Bishop has pointed out, a good deal of matter which is found in Alcuin's supplement to the *Gregorianum*, and has probably been derived from that source. Of the fourth I do not know any account sufficiently detailed to indicate clearly its relation to the other three. It appears to contain Alcuin's Supplement with some modifications and additions: and as it is practically certain to have been among the manuscripts examined by Professor Traube, it may be safely regarded as not containing 'Hucusque', and therefore as falling into the 'Hadrian class'. Some readings cited from it agree with C and r, where these differ from those of the manuscript selected by Professor Lietzmann as the representative of the 'Alcuin class': but this fact, while it suggests that the text of its *Gregorianum* might repay examination with a view to classification, does not carry us far: the citations are not sufficient in quantity or in character to shew that it belongs to a group independent, for their text of the *Gregorianum*, of Alcuin's revision. For the confirmation, or for the testing, of the theory that such a group of manuscripts really exists, some further examination of the unexplored texts of the Paris and the Vienna manuscripts would seem desirable: and in the absence of such evidence as this may be found to give, it seems best to suspend judgement about the security of this part of Professor Lietzmann's foundation.

If we turn to the earliest manuscripts of the 'Alcuin class' there seems to be also here some reason for hesitation, and for holding that further comparison is desirable before deciding that the 'Hucusque' manuscripts as a class, or any one of them, can be securely accepted as furnishing a text reproducing the results of Alcuin's revision of the *Gregorianum*. It is most likely that Alcuin's work was done before 800; it cannot be placed later than 804: and the earliest manuscripts of the class are probably not much earlier than 850. The intervening years were a time of rather varied liturgical activity; and the manuscripts covered by Mr Bishop's survey suggest that even in the *Gregorianum* Alcuin's work was not left untouched by influences which worked more freely after the death of Charles than under his control.

Of the character of Alcuin's textual work on the *Gregorianum* we may gather from 'Hucusque' that it was limited to the correction of manifest *Reginae Sueciae* cited by the Benedictine editors of St Gregory, 'Vat. Reg. 337', having apparently forgotten for the moment that this is the press-mark of r, and failed to observe that the 'Cod. Reg. Sueciae' in question is really (as appears quite clearly from the Benedictines' account of it) identical with another of his own principal authorities, the Vatican MS Ottob. lat. 313.

errors in the current copies, and did not include the importation or substitution of matter not included in the text of the 'authenticum'.¹ For such alternative or additional forms he had a place in the Supplement; there was no need, and it was probably not in accordance with his instructions, to interpolate them in the *Gregorianum*. But in all the manuscripts covered by Mr Bishop's examination we find more or less of such interpolation. The influence of the Sacramentaries of the 'later Gelasian' type has evidently affected the contents of their *Gregorianum* in varying degrees: and it is most likely that in a greater or less degree the same influence would affect its text. It is hardly to be doubted that this influence had been one source of the errors which Alcuin's revision was intended to remove. Both in early transcripts from the 'authenticum' and in the multiplication of copies derived from them, the accuracy of the scribes would inevitably be affected by their long use of the Gelasian texts—the readings of the 'eighth-century Gelasian' Mass-books would tend to appear in the 'Gregorian' text, just as those of the Old Latin version tend to appear in manuscripts of the Vulgate. And in its turn Alcuin's revised text would naturally be affected in the same way, perhaps even more strongly, since the tendency to a conscious return to the earlier liturgical tradition would lead to the intentional adoption of the older readings.

The Vatican manuscript Ottob. lat. 313 (O), which Professor Lietzmann has taken as the representative of the 'Hucusque' group, and therefore of Alcuin's text, is apparently the earliest of the group; and its *Gregorianum* shews less interpolation than that of the others discussed by Mr. Bishop. But it was from this point of view—as exhibiting the contents and arrangement of Alcuin's Sacramentary, not as reproducing the textual results of Alcuin's revision of the *Gregorianum*—that Mr Bishop placed it among the best examples of the combination *Gregorianum* + 'Hucusque' + Supplement. And before deciding on its value for purposes of textual criticism, it would have been desirable, had it been possible, to make at least an experimental comparison of its text with some other of the earliest manuscripts which contain the like combination.² For the choice actually made of another 'Hucusque' text for purposes of comparison it is difficult to account, except on the

¹ The 'authenticum' itself was probably not free from grammatical errors, such as Alcuin strove to remedy: and the guarded language of 'Hucusque' may suggest that his aim was not so much to secure exact agreement with the 'authenticum' as to secure a text of respectable latinity.

² Perhaps such a comparison with MS 19 *bis* of the Autun Seminary (mentioned, but not discussed in detail, by Mr Bishop) might be of special interest from the textual point of view. This manuscript is one of the earliest of the 'Hucusque' group: and as it was written, apparently, at Tours, where Alcuin's reputation might have secured special respect for his work, it seems possible that it may have preserved the text of his edition of the *Gregorianum* in a form less altered than other Sacramentaries of the same period.

ground that it was necessary to use the most accessible witness, without much regard to the certainty of its evidence. The printed text of Pamelius, which has been thus employed, is no doubt a careful piece of work according to the standard of its times: but it is not quite clear what manuscripts were employed by its editor, or how he handled them; while it is most probable that, like other editors of his time, he did not hesitate to correct the readings of his authorities, where they seemed to need correction.

Professor Lietzmann bases his reconstruction on three manuscripts: C, regarded as transcribed directly from the 'authenticum', is the primary authority; O, regarded as exhibiting Alcuin's recension of the text, and r, regarded as derived from the 'authenticum' by less direct and less immediate descent than C, stand next. Where C and O agree as against r, they suffice, as a rule, to determine the reading of the archetype. Where C and r agree as against O, the reading of O is to be regarded as derived from Alcuin's recension, especially if it lacks the support of Pamelius's text (p). The combination of O r p against C may suggest a doubt whether C has preserved the reading of the archetype. But there is sometimes reason to think that an early reading, supported by the Leonine Sacramentary, has been retained in the 'authenticum' and preserved by C, though it has been discarded by the other texts. The *Gelasianum*, as found in the Vatican MS Reg. 316, has also weight in indicating the survival of early readings: but it has perhaps still greater importance for the text of O, as being the source from which Alcuin drew his corrections of the apparent errors of the current Gregorian texts. The Sacramentaries of the 'eighth-century Gelasian' group are occasionally cited: but comparatively little use has been made of them.¹

Against the soundness of this method there is not much to be said, if it be granted that the estimate of the three manuscripts, C, O, and r, is correct. But an 'advocatus diaboli' might say that the claims of C to be on the whole a faithful and accurate transcript of the 'authenticum' stand in need of support. Its scribe, as we may see from his colophon, was not fettered by ordinary rules of grammar, and probably, even apart from the influence of the books he had been accustomed to use, would add in his copy to the number of such grammatical blunders as may have existed in the text of the 'authenticum'. As a matter of fact a considerable number of the readings which appear in C alone of the three manuscripts are to be found also in one or more of the available texts of the 'later Gelasian' books. These books depend to a large

¹ It is to be noted that in the citations from Ménard's notes of the readings of the ancient manuscript of Rheims, that book appears to be regarded as an early example of the Gregorian Sacramentary. It was, as is clear from Joseph Voisin's transcript, the text of which was published some years ago in the *Bibliothèque Liturgique* of Canon Ulysse Chevalier, a book of the 'later Gelasian' type.

extent on the earlier *Gelasianum*, and probably to a considerable extent upon a source closely related to the Leonine Sacramentary: and early readings may sometimes be due to them, rather than to the 'authenticum'. With regard to O he might say that while the number of places in which its readings differ from those of C and r indicates an amount of alteration, often of a trivial sort, greater than is suggested by the language of 'Hucusque', it is clear that it has been affected by interpolations derived from the 'later Gelasian' books, and that its peculiar readings also shew signs of their influence. He might argue that it is possible to regard C rather as a specimen of the books which called for Alcuin's work of revision than as a close and exact copy of the 'authenticum', and to hold that O, while it is probably derived from Alcuin's revision, cannot safely be regarded as a faithful representative of Alcuin's text. About the merits of r, there might be less need for him to suggest doubts, as its relative value in the scheme of reconstruction is not high. It stands closer to the archetype than O: but its text, as compared with that of C, shews the results of a revision, in which the emendations sometimes agree with those of O, and where they differ, are sometimes better, sometimes worse: even where they may be regarded as certainly right, it does not follow that they were the readings of the 'authenticum'. And if Alcuin was responsible for the revision which is represented by O, the authority of the revision represented by r is quite uncertain.

The part of such an advocate is odious, and I am not desirous of undertaking it. Nor am I inclined, without further evidence, to uphold such a counter-estimate of the value of the three manuscripts as I have sketched. But it could not, on present evidence, be put aside as altogether groundless; and it is clear that its acceptance would seriously affect the validity of Professor Lietzmann's method and the security of his text. It is at least quite possible, and I believe not unlikely, that further exploration of the early texts of the *Gregorianum*, while it may give us further light upon the character and extent of Alcuin's revision, may establish the general correctness of his classification and of that estimate of the three manuscripts on which he has relied. And it therefore seems the more a matter of regret that he has been hindered by the conditions of the time, and by a desire for the early completion of a task which he believed to be urgent, from making the foundations of his work more sure. For such exploration as seems to be desirable, and for the publication of its results, we may have long to wait. But in the meantime, admirable as his work undoubtedly is in many respects, it seems wisest to delay a full acceptance of his judgement, and to look upon the reconstructed text as an authority requiring perhaps more than ordinary caution in its use.