

Page 1.	Page 2.	Page 3.	Page 4.
εαν, στησων	μου και απε	αυτοις εγω και ο	γειλαμην σοι 5
τα 'με εκ της	λευσομαι ε,	πῆρ μου ο: εν	εν χειροιν του
κολασεωσ και	γω και οι εκλε,	τοις ουνουσ.7	υῦτου εν αι
δωσω αυτοις	κτοι μου αγαλ	Jιδου εδηλωσα	δου εινα αρ
καλον βαπτι	λιωντες με,	σοι πετρε	χην λαβη αυ
σμα εν σωτη	τα των πατρι	και εξεθε	του η αφα 10
ρια αχερουσια(σ)	αρχων εισ τη(ν)	μην παντα.	νια και συ7
λιμνησ ην κ(α)	(α)ιωνιαν μου	και πορευου	δεκτος της
λουσιν εν τω	(β)ασιλειαν7	εισ πολιν αρ:	επαγγελει

Wessely writes the iota subscript, but this, with accents and breathings, I omit.

M. R. JAMES.

## ST FELICITY IN THE ROMAN MASS

It seems to me convenient to start this article by a discussion of a various reading, a mere question of the order of a list of names, but I hope to shew that it leads to the consideration of wider issues and to a reorientation of some current ideas about the history of the Christian Liturgy in the Dark Ages.

First, as to the various reading. Towards the end of the Roman Canon of the Mass 'we sinners' (*nobis quoque peccatoribus*) ask to be in some way conjoined with the holy Martyrs of old, a list being given, first of men then of women. The women are (1) Felicitas, (2) Perpetua, (3) Agatha, (4) Lucia, (5) Agnes, (6) Caecilia, (7) Anastasia. This is the present order, and it is confirmed by the MSS of the so-called 'Gelasian' and 'Gregorian' Sacramentaries. The *Missale Francorum* (Vat. Reg. 257) is here missing, but the *Bobiense* (*Bo*) and the Stowe Missal (*St*) have Perpetua<sup>2</sup>, Agnes<sup>5</sup>, Cecily<sup>6</sup>, Felicity<sup>1</sup>, Anastasia<sup>7</sup>, Agatha<sup>3</sup>, Lucy<sup>4</sup>, *Bobiense* also adding Eugenia at the end.

This division of the MSS is quite normal. It represents the Irish or 'insular' tradition opposed to what—at least in the times of Charlemagne and his Pope Hadrian—was regarded as specifically Roman. The division corresponds very much in general character to what we find in the MSS of the New Testament: the 'Irish' type corresponds to the Western text, the 'Roman' to the Alexandrian or Hesychian. The latter is, as a rule, more correct, but the former, like the Western text of the New Testament, represents a very old branch of transmission and amidst many errors seems to preserve a certain number of original readings lost elsewhere.

Direct consideration of MS authority, therefore, is not decisive: it is like a N.T. variant where the mass of MSS are on one side, D and the Latins on the other.

But there is one other witness for the text of *Bo* and *St* which deserves particular attention, about which I am going to venture to differ from the late Mr Edmund Bishop. I will quote the relevant parts of his Note on this very question (*Liturgica Historica* 104 f.): 'Aldhelm in his (prose) *Tractatus de laudibus uirginitatis* c. 42 writes: "Mihi quoque operae pretium uidetur, ut sanctae Agathae rumores castissimae uirginis Luciae praeconia subsequantur, quas praeceptor et paedagogus noster Gregorius in canone cotidiano, quando missarum sollempnia celebrantur, pariter copulasse cognoscitur hoc modo in catalogo martyrum ponens: *Felicitate, Anastasia, Agathe, Lucia*, quatenus nequaquam litterarum serie sequestrentur quae contribuli populo apud Siciliam genitae simul caelesti gloria gratulantur." Mr Bishop points out that the Sicilian origin is only true of Agatha (from Catania) and Lucy (from Syracuse), but that nevertheless the series Felicity, Anastasia, Agatha, Lucy, is definitely that of *Bo* and *St*, while all others have the order in which Felicity is put immediately before Perpetua. Bishop decides against *St Aldhelm*: 'It seems to me not open to doubt that, whilst the actual Canon text familiar to Aldhelm . . . was of the type *Bo-St*, this order of the four women saints was merely a local Irish corruption, and that Aldhelm does not here preserve the reading of the genuine, Roman, Gregorian text of *St Gregory*.' He further draws attention to the separation in *Bo-St* (and Aldhelm) of the names Felicitas and Perpetua, and has no difficulty in shewing that as early as 354 we find the famous pair of Carthaginian martyrs conjoined in a Roman document,<sup>1</sup> and so he regards the conjunction of the two names as a Roman feature.

It will be noticed that Bishop uses the adjective 'Gregorian'. What does it mean, now and in ancient times? The answer seems to me that in ancient times the meaning of Gregorian differed somewhat in different countries. There is little doubt as to what it meant to Pope Hadrian and to Charlemagne. During Merovingian times the mass-books of Gaul had become sadly corrupted; Charlemagne determined to put an end to anarchy and diversity. All his whole realm should have but one use, and he got from Pope Hadrian a copy of 'the Sacramentary set forth by Pope Gregory taken from the authentic book of the Library of the Cubicle'. Whatever in particular is meant by this description, found in the best MSS of what we now call the Gregorian Sacramentary, it is evident that to Charlemagne and his

<sup>1</sup> *Non. Martias: Perpetuae et Felicitatis, Africae*. Note that nothing is said of a commemoration in Rome, as is the case with Cyprian.

circle 'Gregorian' meant 'correct', 'approved', 'free from corruption', in a word R.V. not A.V.

Things were different in England, anyhow in the days of Aldhelm. To Aldhelm, as to Egbert of York, Gregory the Great was 'our Gregory', from whom they had originally received the Gospel. By 'Gregorian' they mean, so to speak 'A.V.' as distinct from modern innovation, something which they have inherited from the earliest foundation of Christianity among Englishmen. It may be that in certain cases they were right, and that a reading known to Aldhelm as 'Gregorian' may have been the Roman reading of 596 or earlier, though it was not the reading familiar to Pope Hadrian in 790 and attested by the *Gregorianum*.

In modern times the word 'Gregorian' is generally contrasted with 'Gelasian'. What was meant in ancient times by *Gelasianum*? The term, so far as I know, is almost exclusively French. It was used from the ninth century onward to designate Service-books that had no title to be called correct or 'Gregorian'.<sup>1</sup> What is now commonly called the Gelasian Sacramentary does not call itself so; the name 'Gelasian' was first given to this St Denis MS (now *Reginensis* 316 and known as *GV*) by Morinus and Bona. We may note also that Moelcaich, the corrector and interpolator of the Stowe Missal, calls the Canon in that MS *Canon dominicus Pape Gilasi*. The deduction I draw is that the word has no strict scientific technical meaning, but that it was used for 'old-fashioned Roman', i. e. Roman—but not quite up to date.

What is the reason for the term? Why should unrevised Prayer-books be called Gelasian in Northern France? The regular biographies do not tell us. Pope Gelasius died in 496, he published a list of canonical and uncanonical writings, but the only authority for the fact, if it be a fact, that he authorized a Service-book is the word *Gelasianum* itself. Here, I venture to suggest, we may take a hint from St Aldhelm. His reference to St Felicity's place in the Canon of the Mass as due to 'our Gregory' may be safely taken to mean "'Felicity, Anastasia, Agatha, Lucy", has been the order ever since we English became Christians'. Now when did the country south of the Channel become Christian? No doubt there had been Christians in Gaul for centuries. But the country of Irenaeus and of Martin had been overrun by heathens and Arians, and had lapsed into anarchy. But when Clovis was baptized by Remigius, and for the first time a barbarian King became a Catholic Christian, Gelasius was Pope. It was, so to speak, under Pope Gelasius, that Gaul became Christian France. The converted Franks when they went to Church heard neither heathen

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, p. 47 f.

incantations nor heretical Arian prayers, but the forms that Roman Gelasius approved.

This was the ideal: the concrete facts, of course, were more complicated. Even supposing that St Rémi himself used a pure Roman Service-book it would speedily have become interpolated and corrupted in Merovingian conditions. We do not hear of any Pope himself sending reformed or accurate prayer-books to France till the days of Hadrian (784-791). But doubtless from time to time Frenchmen visited the *limina apostolorum* and brought back Roman forms of prayer or Roman corrections of their current usages. This took place notably after Gregory's own day: the oldest and best MS of what is called now the *Gelasianum* contains many Gregorian elements, and it is almost certain that its text of the Canon itself is post-Gregorian.

The earliest, pre-Clovisian, Mass (or should we say 'type of Eucharistic forms'?) current in Gaul in Imperial days is lost. Similarly the oldest Irish Masses, the forms used by Patrick or Columba, are unknown. Very likely a great part of the service was then supposed to be extempore, or semi-extempore, but in the Dark Ages the poorly educated priest must have been glad to have a 'Roman' form to fall back on. At any rate the only surviving Irish service-book, the Stowe Missal (eighth century), and also the *Bobiense*, which certainly contains a large Irish element, both have their text of the Canon labelled '*Roman Mass*'.

Thus the history of the Canon of the Mass in Gaul is that of a fifth-century form, progressively corrupted, but also emended from time to time to what was understood to be the Roman model. Meanwhile it is important to remember that even conservative Rome did not stand quite still. In particular, the greatest of the Popes between the days of Leo and those of Charlemagne had entirely reformed the singing and had made at least some innovations—it is not certainly known how much, or how little,—in the wording of the services.<sup>1</sup> If, therefore, we are looking for 'earlier readings', for the 'original form of the Roman Mass' in such and such a particular, it may be preserved in an early French MS (such as *GV* is) or even in the English tradition, for it is just possible that Augustine's books were not all of the most up-to-date Roman fashion: I think it is not known at what date precisely Gregory introduced his innovations, or how far they were at first adopted outside Rome.

All this is by way of shewing two things. On the one hand, there is

<sup>1</sup> See especially F. E. Brightman's Note on Greg. *Ep.* ix 26 (*J. T. S.* xxix 161), in which he disposes once for all of the idea that 'this notorious passage' implies any major alteration by St Gregory in the *orationem oblationis*.

no sign of liturgical revolution between the times of Patrick and Remigius and the times of Charlemagne; on the other, minor corruptions and minor reforms were taking place both in Rome and in the outlying regions of the West from time to time, perhaps all the time. And to come back to St Felicity and her place in the Canon, it seems to me that the general considerations I have brought forward shew that the MS evidence can still be interpreted either way genealogically. The case remains like the N.T. 'Western' readings. The separation of Perpetua and Felicitas may not unfairly be interpreted *either* as an Insular corruption which has infected even the predominantly Gregorian English use, *or* as a Continental correction from which Insular and English texts remained for a long time free.

In other words we are thrown back on internal evidence. And here I think that Dom A. Manser and Mr W. Lockton of Winchester are right against Edmund Bishop. Mr Lockton has noted that a separation of Felicitas from Perpetua is odd, it is not a natural emendation, whereas the contrary would be natural, not only at Rome but everywhere else, wherever the famous tale of St Perpetua was known at all. And he goes on to suggest that our Felicity is not the companion of Perpetua at Carthage but a local Roman saint, a worthy matron said to have been martyred under Antoninus Pius and commemorated on Nov. 23. This Felicity was therefore another local Roman martyr. There was a basilica erected in her honour which was repaired by Pope Symmachus (about 500), and the Saint and her feast are referred to by Gregory himself. Her martyred 'sons' are still commemorated at Rome on July 10.

An additional reason for regarding our Felicity as the comparatively obscure Roman lady, not the famous Carthaginian, is found in the strongly local Roman character of the names selected for mention in the Roman Canon. There are forty names in all, including the Twelve Apostles, the Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, Stephen, Matthias, and Barnabas: only two of these, Peter and Paul, are Roman. But of the other twenty-three only four, if we do not include Felicity, are non-Roman. One of these is Cyprian, mentioned along with Pope Cornelius; another is Perpetua; Agatha and Lucy, as Aldhelm points out, are Sicilian. 'John and Paul', mentioned after the Roman Chrysogonus are Roman, martyred under Julian. I venture to treat Cosmas and Damian as 'Roman' because of the well-known Basilica in the Forum. St Anastasia goes with Chrysogonus, who was of great Rome and had a *titulus* named after him: he is said to have instructed Anastasia in the faith. Quite clearly, therefore, the names are a local, rather than an oecumenical, list and the presumption in cases of doubt will be that a Roman identification is more likely than an alternative.

Elsewhere than at Rome the lists were regarded as defective: it is not surprising that 'Gelasian' (i. e. French) Sacramentaries insert such names as Hilary and Martin, not to speak of Ambrose and Augustine and indeed St Gregory himself. I have included Ignatius as Roman because he was martyred at Rome: we may note that his name is followed by Alexander, who is reckoned to have been Bishop of Rome when Ignatius was there, just as Cornelius is mentioned along with Cyprian. Marcellinus is the Pope who is said to have offered incense in the Diocletian Persecution, and then to have condemned himself as an apostate.

I conclude therefore that the *Felicitas* mentioned in the Roman Canon originally was meant for the *magnifica mater et martyr*, who was not only *fecunditatis prosperitate gloriosa* with her seven sons, but also with them suffered for the faith, when nevertheless, as the ancient Roman preface said, *mansit et inter aduersa Felicitas quam eidem nec mors auferre potuit*.<sup>1</sup>

I am not defending the historicity of the 'Legend' of St Felicity, not even to the extent of asserting that the 'Seven Brothers' of July 10 were really her sons. But her cult was old in Rome: that is all that the theory demands.

When was the change made, and the memorial of the Roman matron confounded with that of Perpetua's companion? It is indeed difficult to say. In the last resort it depends on how we are to interpret Aldhelm's evidence. If we accept Edmund Bishop's view that the Canon with which he was familiar had been contaminated with Irish readings, then we may place the change before Gregory. If on the other hand we think it more probable that it really does faithfully represent the text which Augustine brought to Kent in 596, then the change is later than Gregory and we must believe that the text of the Canon found both in the book sent by Hadrian to Charlemagne, and also in that of the Merovingian books which it was intended to supersede, represents a modification made or approved at Rome during the seventh century—not later, for the Monte Cassino palimpsest, which has a Gregorian Canon, was transcribed not much later than the year 700, and *GV* is certainly not later than 750.

However that may be, the extant liturgical books actually shew prayers once used to commemorate St Felicity on her proper day (Nov. 23) being adapted to commemorate the Carthaginian Felicity on March 7. In the Leonine Sacramentary there are three sets of prayers for the commemoration of Felicity the Roman matron in addition to those for St Clement, to whom Nov. 23 also belongs. Most of these prayers are not found elsewhere, but the three special prayers for

<sup>1</sup> See the *Leonianum*, ed. Feltoe, p. 154.

Perpetua and Felicitas, which are given in the MSS of the Gelasianum and are still used in the Roman Missal on March 7, are clearly adapted from those once used for the Roman Felicity. I will end by quoting them with the variants of the later services.

*L.* (Missa II, p. 155.)

Da nobis Dñe Ds noster sanctorum martyrum palmas incessabili deuotione uenerari, ut quos digna mente non possumus celebrare humilibus saltem frequentemus obsequiis, per.

nobis] + quaesumus *hodie* sanctorum m. tuarum Perp. et Fel. *hodie* deuot.] ueneratione *GV* (*sic*)

*L.* (Missa I, p. 154.)

Intende munera Dñe quaesumus altaribus tuis pro sanctae Felicitatis martyris tuae commemoratione proposita, ut sicut per haec beata mysteria illis gloriam contulisti nobis indulgentiam largiaris, per.

Dñe munera *Gelas* 9. D. munera *hodie* sanctae . . . tuae] sanctorum tuarum Felicitatis Perpetuae *GV S\**, s. t. Fel. et Perp. *S\**, sanct. martyrum Perp. et Fel. *hodie* comm.] festiuitate *hodie* illis *L* (*sic*) nobis] *pr.* ita *hodie*

*L.* (Missa II, p. 155.)

Praesta nobis Dñe quaesumus intercedentibus sanctis tuis ut quae ore contingimus pura mente capiamus, per.

quaes. Dñe *hodie* tuis] *om. Gelas*, martyribus tuis Perp. et Fel. *hodie* quae] quod *hodie* contegimus *L*

I imagine that *illis* for *illi* in the second prayer is a mere slip of the scribe of *L*, not a sign that the form has been adapted from one commemorating two or more martyrs. On the other hand the unusual order Felicity-Perpetua (corrected in the modern Missal), and still more the tell-tale omission of the copula in *S\** as well as *GV*, do suggest to me that the prayer originally belonged to Felicity alone and to Nov. 23, and that its use for March 7 to commemorate the Carthaginians is an adaptation.

\* \* \*

After explaining my ideas on these liturgical subjects to a most competent friend I was told that it all seemed very complicated. Perhaps therefore a paragraph or two may be not out of place here, giving not conclusions—that is too hasty a word—but the directions along which my study seems to point.

In the first place I want to make it quite clear that in the main liturgical controversy, the controversy that may be nicknamed Bishop *v.* Buchwald, I am unhesitatingly on the side of Edmund Bishop. Dr Buchwald was one of a number of scholars who believe that at some

time between Constantine and St Gregory the Great a fundamental change was made in the Roman Liturgy, whereby an Invocation or Epiclesis for the Holy Spirit to consecrate the bread and wine (like or analogous to the Epiclesis in Eastern Rites) was dropped out. Edmund Bishop, on the other hand, contended that no such fundamental change ever occurred, that the only direct prayer for the consecration of the elements is that contained in *Quam oblationem*, an Invocation so untechnical that it might be claimed as 'protestant'. In this most important matter nothing that I have said here in any way tends to invalidate Bishop's view.

Further, Bishop has shewn that what Pope Hadrian sent to Charlemagne was the First Part only of what was generally called the *Gregorianum*, i. e. as far as the Note *Hucusque*: this, and this only, is preserved in the Cambrai MS and has been now edited by Lietzmann.

Yet further, Bishop has emphasized the stationary and ultra-conservative tendency of 'Roman', i. e. local Roman, habits; in contradistinction to the innovating enthusiasm of the Gothic races. Here I do not feel quite so sure that he has not sometimes a little exaggerated a good case.

As concerning the relations of our four chief documents, *viz.* the Pseudo-Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*, the Leonine Sacramentary, the *Gregorianum*, and the so-called 'Gelasian' documents, the view I have taken has been this.

(1) The *De Sacramentis* is a kind of fence in the background, marking the extreme limit of variation which we may allow in forms of the Canon during the period from A.D. 400 onwards.

(2) The MS at Verona, called the Leonine Sacramentary, is not a true Sacramentary, but a collection of Eucharistic forms. It marks the transition between the original system of unspecified prayers (which might be either extempore, or prepared like a modern written sermon for one occasion only), and the later system of directly specified prayers, with or without definite alternatives. In this connexion I take the opportunity of referring to Dom Connolly's Paper on the *Notae* in the *Leonianum* (*Revue Bénédictine* for 1926, pp. 196-204), which seems to me to put the connexion between the origin of that collection and St Leo on its true basis. No doubt the collection was added to from time to time, like the contents of a portfolio: Prof. Lietzmann has given good reason for believing that some of the prayers in the Verona MS are as late as the episcopate of Vigilius (538-555).<sup>1</sup>

(3) The *Gregorianum* is the book sent by Hadrian to Charlemagne in 790, or thereabouts: it professes to be the Mass-book as arranged by St Gregory. In a general way this may be correct. It prescribes,

<sup>1</sup> Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, 2nd ed., p. 34.



for instance, the use of the Lord's Prayer immediately after the Canon. No doubt it is Roman from cover to cover. But I venture to submit that minor changes may have come in at Rome during the period of almost two centuries which elapsed between Gregory the Great and Hadrian. I am inclined to believe that the transformation of Felicity the Roman matron into Felicity the Carthaginian was one.

(4) The documents classed as 'Gelasian' should be simply called Merovingian Mass-books. The oldest of these, a MS written about 750 for St Denis, calls itself *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*. But that does not necessarily mean that it is Roman in the sense that the Cambrai MS of the *Gregorianum* is Roman. Ever since the conversion of Clovis all the Church in Gaul had been Roman in theory, pilgrims went from time to time to Rome, and brought back word of customs and observances, and many of these were incorporated, more or less, with current practices. There were churches or monasteries who prided themselves on being quite 'Roman': St Denis must have been one. Others, equally within the Roman obedience, held more to their local rites. When Charlemagne put an end to liturgical anarchy in the Empire the Gallic service-books that had called themselves 'Roman' got the name 'Gelasian', not because Pope Gelasius had authorized a service-book, but because Clovis was converted when Gelasius was Pope.

F. C. BURKITT.

FELICITY.—*Additional Note on the Names in the Ambrosian Rite.*

It has been pointed out to me by my friend Mr O. H. E. Burmester that the names of the Women Martyrs in the Ambrosian Canon are <sup>5</sup> Agnes, <sup>6</sup> Cecily, <sup>1</sup> Felicity, <sup>2</sup> Perpetua, <sup>7</sup> Anastasia, <sup>3</sup> Agatha, *Euphemia*, <sup>4</sup> Lucy, *Justina*, *Sabina*, *Thecla*, *Pelagia*, *Catharine*. The numbers give the ordinary Roman order, and italics mark non-Roman names. If we represent the non-Roman names by dots, and put initials for the names (with *p* for Perpetua) we get:—

<i>Roman</i>	F	<i>p</i>	Aga	L	Agn	- C	Ana
<i>Bo-St</i>	<i>p</i>	Agn	C	F	Ana	Aga	L (.)
<i>Milan</i>	Agn	C	F	<i>p</i>	Ana	Aga	. L . . . . .

Arranged this way we see that the Ambrosian-Milanese order only differs from that of *Bobiense* and *Stowe* by the position of Perpetua and by the insertion of some extra names. It is unlikely that the order of *Bo-St* has been influenced from Milan: it is therefore more likely that the aberrant Roman order is the result of a later revision.

F. C. B.