NOTES AND STUDIES

THE SO-CALLED MISSALE FRANCORUM.

IN a recent number of the JOURNAL (pp. 214–250 of the present volume) I gave my reasons for believing that the forms of consecration in the first half of the extant 'Missale Francorum' are the result of six several editions, each ampler than its predecessor, of an ultimate Roman original of very modest dimensions. I now propose to analyse the second half of the document in quest of information concerning its internal history; and venture to hope that, with the technical help of carefully constructed tables of linear value, the reader will be able without undue fatigue to bear me company in what must of necessity be a somewhat minute examination of details.

PART II. THE SUCCESSIVE EDITIONS OF THE SECOND INSTALMENT.

If I have thus far been happy in my analysis, the values in terms of pages of the first three editions of the first instalment of our document were as follows:—

		β	θ_1	θ_2
First Instalment	Minor Orders			2 + 3
	Major Orders	2 + 9	2 + 12	18
	Virgins, Widows	3	4	6
	Consecration of Altar	1 + 1	1 + 1	2 + 1
		16	20	32

At the moment of the coadunation of the second instalment with the first the developement might, I believe, have been thus expressed:—

		β	θ_1	θ_2	θ_3
First Instalment	Minor Orders			2 + 3	2 + 3
	Major Orders	2 + 9	2 + 12	18	19
	Virgins, Widows	3	4	6	6
	Consecration of Altar	1 + 1	1 + 1	2 + 1	2
		16	20	32	32
Second Instalment	Political Mass				2
	Sanctorale (2 + 5 + 1)				5 + 1
					40

Read in conjunction with the synopsis of linear values set forth in my previous article,[1] and elucidated by the text of the so-styled

[1] See p. 247 of the present volume.

Orationes et Preces pro Regibus (Mur. ii 680), this second summary of paginal values may be thus interpreted:—

1. That at the period of its second θ redaction the pontifical was enshrined in a small volume of eight membranes, its last constituent being the 'Dñe dš oñp sicut ab initio' &c. (Mur. ii 678), in the *Consecratio Altaris*; that this ended on the antpenultimate line of p. xxxi; that an explicit of two lines closed the series, and that, as matter of course, p. xxxii was left blank.

2. That some bishop of the Gallican Church—presumably the compiler of θ_2—who had in his possession a small Sanctorale executed on the five inner pages of a *libellus* of two membranes, resolved to subjoin this to the pontifical.

3. That, to carry down the pontifical to the end of p. xxxii (which represented the final page left blank at the second θ redaction) he amplified it by means of the *Ad Consummandum Diaconatus Officium.*[1]

4. That, in order to utilize the two pages which now represented the leaf once left blank at the beginning of the *libellus* of saints' Masses, he wrote on these a Mass which he had compiled at a time when his city was besieged by foes of the Catholic faith and of the Roman empire, its theoretical defender; these two pages being, of course, xxxiii and xxxiiii.

5. But that, whether from oversight of his own or of the scribe's, the title of this political Mass was set at the head of p. xxxiii, its normal position, nothing being provided to take the place of the necessarily cancelled explicit which at θ_2 concluded the *Consecratio Altaris*,[2] and

6. That, in correction of this error, he filled up the void with the brief, comprehensive and conclusive paragraph, 'Fiant omnia ista protectione tua tuta atque defensa potens dñe uasa'.[2]

Section V. The Political Mass.

The political Mass now carries the title *Orationes et Preces pro Regibus* (Mur. ii 680). Whatever be the lessons we are to learn from this heading, we must not forget that the representatives of the *nomen Romanum* were in the first instance the subject-matter of the constituents which now mention the *reges Francorum* or the *regnum Francorum.*[3] We must also bear in mind that, although the prayers of the Mass are numerous, those before the first 'Super oblata' being five in number, and therefore not unsuited to the so-called Gallican rite, none of the minor rubrics are characteristically non-Roman.

These two facts seem to afford at least a slight presumption in favour

[1] See p. 232 of the present volume, under 'Scheme θ_3'.

[2] See p. 247, under 'Scheme θ_2' and 'Scheme θ_3'.

[3] See pp. 214–217.

of a nuclear scheme which, whenever and wherever devised, corresponded to the Roman rite, and of one or more amplifications which may, or which may not, be the result of Gallican influence. Can we, therefore, by means of a technical, but consistently conducted, analysis, discriminate, as theoretically possible, one or more editions prior to the last; and will the results yielded by such discrimination bear the application of one or other of our stichometrical tests?

(i) The second constituent, 'Populi tui . . . exultet et ab hostium nos defende formidine ut . . . seruiamus. per', looks like a coadunation of two distinct prayers which in the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary are contiguously placed in one and the same item (III lxi); and (ii) the first 'Super oblata', 'Sacrificium dn̄e' &c., which in the Gelasianum (*ib.* lvii) ends at 'securitate constituat', carries an additional clause, 'ut et a nostris . . . insidiis,' which in its turn forms part of another prayer, 'Huius . . . ut et a nostris . . . insidiis' (*ib.* lviii), in the Gelasianum. Again, the Leonianum (XVIII vi) has a Preface substantially identical with ours, except that this lacks a clause—'et ab omni . . . nos protegas'—which may have been neglected as inapplicable to existing or apprehended circumstances; but, on the other hand (iii), we have two clauses—'et francorum regni (*olim* "ut romani") nominis inimicos . . . maiestatis' and 'ut populus tuus . . . semper exultet'—neither of which is in the surviving Leonian text, but which in the Gelasianum coalesce to form the third constituent of III lviii—'O. d. romani nominis inimicos . . . maiestatis ut populus tuus semper exultet'.[1] Furthermore, (iv) the 'Hanc igitur' contains a parenthetical clause, 'pro quibus . . . mereamur habere' (in 105 letters), which reads like *ex post facto* work, for it burdens the construction with a repeated 'dn̄e', a blemish which cannot reasonably be laid to the charge of the original text.

THE θ REDACTION. In order, therefore, to test as rigorously as I can

[1] Here let me remind the reader that we must not allow these facts to create a prejudice as to the date, or dates, of the present constituent, by assuming any portion of this to be, as of necessity, more recent than III lvii, III lviii, or III lxi of the Gelasianum. The caution is enforced by the fact that the second part of our 'Populi tui', besides being found in the Leonianum (XVIII vi), has the Leonian reading 'formidine', as against the Gelasian 'periculis'. Remarkably enough, too, the prayer 'Protector n̄ aspice' &c., which the second part of our 'Populi tui' resembles, not only occurs in the Leonianum, but occurs there in one and the same Mass (XVIII vi) with 'Agnoscimus enim' &c., a composition substantially identical with the Preface of the present item.

Here too let me say that, although my general references are, for the convenience of the reader, made to Muratori, for he gives all three documents in one volume, I invariably prefer the verbal text of Mabillon (Migne *S. L.* lxxii 318–340) when the two editors differ. Some of Muratori's readings—such as 'Populum tuum' for 'Populi tui' in the present item and 'quae' for 'quaesumus' in the next—are simply impossible.

the hypothesis of a nuclear edition, whether on γ, on θ, or on β pages, I assume (i) that in the supposed precursor there were, as is usual in the Gelasianum and by no means infrequent in the Leonian Sacramentary, two, but only two, introductory prayers and those the first two that now present themselves to notice, and (1) that the second of these, 'Populi tui' &c., but with 'romani', as in the Gelasianum, where now we have 'regni francorum', ended at 'exultet', thus comprising, with an added 'per', 138 letters (not 223); (ii) that there was but one 'Super oblata', and this the first of the extant two, 'Sacrificium dñe' &c., and (2) that it ended at 'constituat', thus comprising, with an added 'per', 108 letters (not 167); (iii) that the clauses 'ut romani nominis inimicos . . . maiestatis' and 'ut populus tuus . . . semper exultet' were not in the Preface, the letters of which were thus 452 in number (not 505, as with the first addition; not 577, as with both), and (iv) that the 'Hanc igitur', but (3) with 'potestatum romanarum' where we now find 'vel statu regni francorum', was devoid of the parenthetical 'pro quibus . . . mereantur habere', thus numbering 129 (not 234) letters: and, as will be seen from the subjoined summary of values, I find that a Mass thus equipped is the precise equivalent of two θ pages.[1]

		Schemes θ_3 and θ_3 bis 2 pages	Scheme γ_1 3 pages	Schemes γ_2 and γ_3 4 pages	Scheme γ_3 bis Additional lines
ORATIONES &c. . .		xxxiii 3 *	xli 3	xlvii 3 †	
Dñs qui fideles &c. . .	185	7	7	7	+1
Populi tui &c. . . .	138^1, 223^2	5^1	8^2	8^2	+1
Oñp . . . qui &c. . .	193			7	+1
Oñp et &c. . . .	193			7	+1
Oñp . . . in cuius &c.	140			5	+1
Sacrificium &c. . .	108^1, 167^2	4^1	6^2	6^2	
Suscipe &c. . . .	86		3	3	
VD. Agnoscimus &c. .	452^1, 505^2, 577^3	16^1	18^2	20^3	
Hanc igitur &c. . .	129^1, 234^2	5^1	8^2	8^2	+1
Protege dñe &c. . .	103	4	4	4	+1=7
Fidelem &c. . . .	170	6=50 Page xxxiiii* ends.	6=63 Page xliii ends.	6=84 Page l ends.†	

THE γ REDACTIONS. Whether it was a liturgical motive or a merely bibliographical necessity, or both of them, that can have counselled the insertion of a third, a fourth, and a fifth constituent before the prayer 'Sacrificium dñe' &c., is a question the right answer to which will, I think, be forthcoming in the sequel; nor need we as yet ask why

[1] For the values of β, γ, θ, see p. 217 of the present volume.

* In Redaction θ_3 bis these two pages were numbered, respectively, xxxiiii and xxxv.

† In Redaction γ_3 these were numbered, respectively, xlviiii and lii.

a second prayer of oblation has been subjoined to the 'Sacrificium dn̄e'. What at present challenges remark is the fact that the very constituents in which we have just traced marks of a single textual amplification—the 'Populi tui', the 'Sacrificium dn̄e' and the 'Hanc igitur oblationem'—are, by the hypothesis just formulated, constituents proper to the original scheme; for thus is raised the pertinent question whether their enhancement can have been effected at some period earlier than the last general γ redaction. This question is answered in the affirmative by the second column of linear values in the foregoing list; and the answer is all the more worthy of our regard because none of the prayers which by the hypothesis are extraneous to the first redaction is of composite character. The third and fourth, but beginning with a simple 'Ds̄', will be found at Gel. III lix and lvii (Mur. i 729 and 728), and the fifth at Leon. XXVII iii (*ib.* i 411). The second Secreta is at Gel. III lix.

The evidence in proof of an intermediate redaction is completed by the fact that, as was just now intimated, the Preface has received two amplifications; and, since the second of these, 'ut populus tuus . . . exultet',[1] is not in true structural connexion with the passage that immediately precedes it, 'quia . . . expuleris', it is both obvious and reasonable to regard it as an afterthought, and as an afterthought of later date than the other. By neglecting it we have an intermediate value of [577−72 =] 505 letters, the equivalent of eighteen γ lines. By further neglecting the presumably earlier phrase 'et romani nominis . . . compremas maiestatis', we reach the first value of 452 letters.

Section VI. The Sanctorale.

When dealing with the Sanctorale we must be careful not to assume as certain, or even as likely, that on its incorporation into our document the first of its five Masses had already been, or then was, dedicated specifically to St Hilary, or indeed to any other confessor bishop; for it is by no means improbable that the appropriation was made on some later occasion, and that meanwhile the item was, like each of the other four, a *missa de communi martyrum*; and for the following reasons:—

The first prayer of the Mass is now worded 'Sc̄s dn̄e helarius confessor tuus' &c., but in the Petau[2] Gelasianum (Mur. i 667) it reads 'Sc̄s dn̄e gurgonius' &c.; and Gorgonius was not a mere confessor but a

[1] Its 'fidei integritas' may not improbably throw light on the external history of the document.

[2] The external history of MS. Vatican. Regin. 316—usually known by the name of 'Gelasian Sacramentary'—has not been traced. For the purpose of the present enquiry it seems better to distinguish it from the St Gallen and other books by the name of its first known possessor, the senator Paul Petau.

martyr. The second prayer is as applicable to St Benedict, to the feast of whose translation from Monte Cassino to Fleury, early in the second half of the seventh century, the St Gallen book (Gerbert, p. 149) devotes it, as it is to St Hilary; and St Benedict was not a bishop. Its first 'Super oblata'—*ex hypothesi*, therefore, a component of the original scheme—is in the Petau Gelasianum (Mur. i 637) given to St Marcellus; while St Gallen (Gerbert, p. 170), *mutatis mutandis*, gives the opening sentence, 'Quoniam fiducialiter' &c., of the Preface to St Hermes; and Hermes, whatever we are to say of Marcellus, was not a confessor, but a martyr: nor was he a bishop. These considerations must be borne in mind should we ever attempt to construct the external history of the document. Meanwhile, but within square brackets, I give in my list of values the numerical totals in terms of letters of the several constituents as 'corrected' for a martyr. These, however, I believe to be applicable to none but redactions θ_3, θ_3 *bis*, and γ_1.

We saw just now what were the devices by means of which the political Mass, if set forth originally on two pages of θ capacity, could have been made to occupy first three, then four, γ pages. Instructed by that experience I now propose to make it a working hypothesis that the several Masses of our Sanctorale were in the first instance cast in the Roman norm, thus containing two, but only two, prayers preliminary to the oblation of the gifts, and that these were the two, or the two first, that now offer themselves to our notice; that no Mass had in the first instance more than one 'Super oblata', one 'Post communionem', or one 'Super populum', our choice in cases of plurality being determined by priority of place; and that in all such of the constituents thus selected as are evidently cumulations of intrinsically independent clauses only the first clause is to be regarded as of the original scheme.

I. In accordance with this hypothesis I eliminate from the first Mass (Mur. ii 682) the third and fourth of its extant constituents, the sixth, the seventh and the last; and, besides these, so much of the extant Preface as now follows the words 'quas sc̄i helarii pontificis tui confessione praesenti confidimus adiubandas'; but these, if we are to have the genuine reading, must be corrected to 'quas in sc̄i martyris tui confessione praesenti confidimus adiubandas', thus giving what I conceive to be the first scheme of the Preface the value, with an added 'per quem', of 111 letters (4 θ lines). My reason for regarding as adventitious to the original scheme all that now follows 'adiubandas' is that the tautological 'ut illius patrocinio nos adiubante . . . placeamus' reads like a very awkwardly subjoined ***additamentum***, and that the three sentences which come next—'quia dum . . . deposcimus', 'quia supplicationibus . . . praestari', 'quia licet nobis' &c.—have as little connexion with each other as the first of them

has with what precedes it.[1] On the assumption that the right reading of the first sentence is what I have just suggested, and that it was retained until the last general transcription, the two values next after the first were 340 and 478; but, had the text been worded as for a martyr, which I believe to have been the case with the first sentence so long as it stood alone, these totals would have been slightly less; namely 331 and 465. In my tabular synopsis I distinguish 'martyr' from 'confessor' values by enclosing the former within square brackets.

We now encounter a difficulty. Like the 'Hanc igitur' of the fourth Mass of the series, the corresponding constituent of the first Mass may, when introduced, have been nothing more than hint of a clause in the Canon; or it may have been a modification of that clause, the words 'in honore sc̄i helarii confessoris tui atque pontificis' being intended to take the place of the lengthy 'in honore domni beati martyris tui *illius* et pro peccatis' &c., &c.'.[2] By the former hypothesis we should, when constructing our table of values, be at a loss when first to notify the value of the formula and should have to await the first stichometrical opportunity for doing so. If we adopt the latter hypothesis we must remember that the extant clause could not have been made a constituent of the Mass before the Mass itself, which may originally have been a *missa de communi martyrum*, had been appropriated to St Hilary. Not knowing which of the two to adopt, or at what stage in the developement of the work to make use of it when adopted, I propose to neglect the formula until, meanwhile constructing the table of values, we shall have ascertained when its inclusion first became possible or necessary if the Mass was to occupy an integral number of pages.

II. 1. In the second prayer, 'Beati martyris' &c., of the second item (Mur. ii 683) the phrase 'ut eius sacra natalicia . . . conspiciamus aeterna' reads like a carelessly worded addition to an original complete in itself, and we have the authority of the 'Gelasian' *missa* for the twenty-seventh of December (*ib.* i 499) for so regarding it. Its omission reduces 158 letters (6 γ lines) to 91 (3 θ lines). 2. Warned by similar experiences in the Leonianum, as at XVII i, XVIII xviii, XL ii, I suspect the second half, 'Unde benedicimus' &c.,[3] of the Preface to be proper to a later

[1] The first of them, but with 'per eos qui tibi placuere' for 'per eum qui tibi placet', is the St Gallen Preface, *In basilicis martyrum* (Gerbert, p. 220); the second, but with 'quoniam' for 'quia' and 'quam beati Rufi' for 'quam beati Helarii confessoris tui', is the St Gallen Preface (*ib.* p. 169) for St Rufus; while the same collection (*ib.* p. 153) assigns the third to St James the Apostle, but without the 'et illorum' which disfigures our text.

[2] The clause is too long for citation in full. But see below, p. 563, in my collation of the text of the Canon.

[3] The St Gallen sacramentary (Gerbert, p. 115) has this second sentence, as well as the first, in its Preface for SS. Nereus, Achilleus and Pancratius.

redaction than the first. By omitting it, and also the needless 'maiestatem' of the conclusion, we reduce 234 letters (8 γ lines) to 153 (6 of θ value). Omitting the needless 'quem' we have 149 letters (5 γ lines).

III. In the third item (Mur. ii 684) I assume (1) that the prayer 'Sĉi martyris tui' &c., ended originally at 'augmentum', as in the Leonianum (*ib.* i 401), thus counting 80 letters (3 θ lines), not 149 (5 of γ value); and (2) that, as in the Leonianum *missa* for St Agapitus (*ib.* i 400), but that of the Codex Sangallensis for St Hippolytus (Gerbert, p. 163), the Preface ended at 'iustorum'[1] with a total of 188 letters (7 θ lines). (3) Besides this first logical pause there is, at 'uictorem', yet another before we reach the extant conclusion,[2] and thus 395 letters (14 γ lines) as a second total.

IV. 1. The fourth member of the series (Mur. ii 685) has a Preface the first part of which, as far as 'protegis', occurs twice in the Leonianum (*ib.* i 334, 340); while the hopelessly ungrammatical construction given to the extant whole by the words which immediately follow 'protegis' makes it morally certain that these are a comparatively late addition. By neglecting them and assuming 'protegis' to have been followed by the usual conclusion, 'Per quem', we have a prior total of 87 letters as against the 234 letters of the present text. But, ancient as was this 'Qui ecclesiam tuam . . . protegis', I cannot feel sure that it is identical with the Preface as originally set forth in our document, for, on the Feast of St Bartholomew, the St Gallen sacramentary, with which our document has much in common, subjoins to 'Qui ecclesiam tuam . . . protegis' the words 'et sine fine custodis' (Gerbert, p. 169); and I think that, as at present informed, our most prudent course is to identify the original text of the earlier portion of the present Preface with this St Gallen Preface as we just now identified the original text of the earliest portion of the first Preface, 'Quoniam fiducialiter' &c., with the St Gallen Preface for St Hermes, and to give the constituent the three successive values of 105, 87, and 234 letters.

2. In dealing with the next constituent we are beset by a difficulty similar to that which we encountered in the only other 'Hanc igitur' of

[1] But with the difference that, whereas our text has 'supplicaret' and the Leonianum 'supplet' (? 'suppleret'), St Gallen has 'obtineret'.

[2] As observed in the text, the St Gallen Preface for St Hippolytus ends with the words 'tibi grata iustorum'; but on the nineteenth of August we find our next phrase, 'Qui humanum genus . . . eripiens . . . soluisti; per quem ita . . . ut . . . beatum martyrem suum magnum faceret esse uictorem'. In this latter agreement there would be nothing extraordinary, were it not for the startling fact that, whereas the character, the title, and the entourage of our Preface require us to see in 'magnum' a noun adjective qualifying 'martyrem', St Gallen makes a proper name of it, identifying it with the real or imaginary St Magnus whom it celebrates on that day.

the section. A normal 'Hanc igitur' is no necessary constituent of a Mass constructed, as by the hypothesis each of these may in the first instance have been, in accordance with the Roman type of *missa*; and, as the 'Hanc igitur' of this Mass is normal, it must be regarded as mere 'padding' which may have been inserted at any one of several redactions, and which we must therefore first compute when first we shall find it necessary to do so. But, even so, we must be on our guard. We must remember that, simple as it is, the formula during the period covered by the earlier history of our document may certainly have had a lower textual value than it now has; for, frequently as it occurs in the Leonianum, it never in that collection contains the theologically significant words 'seruitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae', and in our own document the 'Hanc igitur' of the political Mass was devoid of 'sed et cunctae familiae tuae' not only during the period of θ pagination, but also—a fact to be carefully noted by any who would attempt to trace the external history of the compilation—when, at the first γ redaction, it underwent a very considerable augmentation.[1] By neglecting the words last cited we have a possible antecedent value of 79 letters as against 103.

V. The second 'Super oblata' of the fifth Mass (Mur. ii 686) sets it in analogy with the first, third, and fourth, each of which has more than one prayer for the offering of the gifts. Its opening clause, 'Suscipe . . . laudis', seems to have been borrowed from the fourth item, and, by means of a connecting 'ut', conjoined to a prayer, 'Benedictio tua' &c., which in the Petau Gelasianum (II xv) serves as second Secreta for the Feast of St Euphemia. When we compute the linear values of the series we shall find that but for this prefix to a sufficiently equipped prayer the series would have fallen inconveniently short of an integral number of pages at the last general redaction.

Like each of its four predecessors, the Preface would seem to have attained its extant value by a process of gradual coacervation. It resolves itself into four parts. The second of these, 'Quoniam gloria . . . uincentibus contulisti'—which, however, and for reasons to be stated on a later page, I believe to be first in the order of time—is, as a literary achievement, superior to any of the Leonianum Prefaces (VIII viii, xv, xviii, xviiii) on the model of one or more of which it would seem to have been composed; and we may reasonably believe it to be the work of one who knew the older document. The third in textual order—'Qui . . . fuderunt'—is a relative clause added, it may be, by the compiler of an amplified issue of the work, who, as he neared his goal, found himself in want of four lines of text; and, if I am right in believing it to be second in the order of time, it was most probably added at the

[1] See the list of values, p. 538 *supra*.

		Scheme θ_3 and θ_3 bis		Scheme γ_1	Scheme γ_1 bis	Scheme γ_2	Scheme γ_3	Scheme γ_3 bis
		6 pages	5 pages	6 pages	8 pages	9 pages	12 pages	Additional lines
Already computed								+7
I ORATIONES ET PRECES IN NATALI &c.		xxxv	3 xxxvi	xliiii 3	xliiii 3	li 3	liii 3	
Sc̄s dn̄e helarius &c.	[76[1]], 87[2]		3[1]	3[1]	3[2]	3[2]	3[2]	
Intercessio nos quaesumus &c.	[111[1]], 107[2]		4[1]	4[1]	4[2]	4[2]	4[2]	
Indulgentiam nobis &c.	[113], 123[1], [212], 222[2]				5[1]	5[1]	8[2]	
Exaudi dn̄e preces &c.	[145], 172[1], [305], 332[2]					6[1]	12[2]	
Sc̄i confessoris tui &c.	[164[1]], 181[2]		6[1]	6[1]	7[2]	7[2]	7[2]	+1
Sacrificium dn̄e quod &c.	[151], 157*					6[*]	6*	
Ut nobis dn̄e tua sacrificia &c.	[76], 79*						3*	
VD. Quoniam fiducialiter &c.	[111[1]], [331], [465], [598]		4[1]	4[1]				
	119, 340[2], 478[3], 611[4]				12[2]	17[3]	21[4]	+1 †
Hanc igitur oblationem &c.	[114], 139*					5*	5*	
Beati helarii confessoris &c.	[145[1]], 155[2]		5[1] = 25	5[1]	6[2]	6[2]	6[2]	+1
Protegat nos dn̄e &c.	[131], 144*						5*	
II ORATIONES ET PRECES UNIUS &c.		xxxvi	1 xxxvii	1	1 = 41	1 = 63	1 = 84	
Ds̄ qui nos annua &c.	108		4	4	xlvi	4 liiii	lvii 4	
Beati martyris tui &c.	91[1], 158[2]		3[1]	3[1]		6[2]	6[2]	
Praesta dn̄e mentibus &c.	125						5	+1
Hostiam nostram quaesumus &c.	90		3	3		3	3	+1
VD. Quoniam a te &c.	153[1], [149], 234[2]		6[1]	5[1]		8[2] = 21	8[2]	
Quaesumus dn̄e salutaribus &c.	91		3	3	xlvii	3 lv	3[= 29]	+1 [= 13]
Adesto dn̄e familiae tuae &c.	138		5 = 25	5		5	5	+1
III ITEM DE UNO MARTYRE		xxxvii	1 xxxviii	1		1	1	
Adsit nobis quaesumus	134		5	5		5	5	
Sc̄i martyris tui dn̄e &c.	80[1], 149[2]		3[1]	3[1]		3[1]	5[2]	

Muneribus nostris dñe &c. . . .	126		5		5 = 63		5		5	+ 1
Adesto dñe supplicationibus . . .	170								6	
VD. Qui non solum malis &c. . .	188[1], 395[2], 465[3]		7	xlvii	7		14^2		16^3	
Sumptis dñe sacramentis &c. . .	102		4 = 25		4		4		4	+ 1
Sumentes gaudia &c.	170								6	
IV ITEM DE UNO MARTYRE		xxxviii	1 xxxviiii		1		1 = 41		1 = 83	
Oñp semp dš fortitudo &c. . . .	191		7		7	xlviiii	7 lvii	lxi	7	
Praesta quaesumus dñe &c. . . .	130		5		5		5		5	
Grata tibi sint munera &c. . . .	107		4		4		4		4	
Suscipe dñe sacrificium &c. . . .	135								5 = 21	
VD. Qui ecclesiam tuam &c. . . .	105[1], 87[2], 234[3]		4^1		3^2		8^3	lxii	8^3	+ 1
Hanc igitur oblationem &c. . . .	79[1], 103[2]				3^1		4^2		4^2	
Caelesti munere satiati &c. . . .	83		3 = 24		3		3		3	+ 1
Libantes dñe mensae tuae &c. . .	112								4	
V IN NATALE SCORUM		xxxviiii	2 xl		1		1		1	
Dš qui nos scorum tuorum &c. . .	109		4		4 = 42		4		4	
Prosint nobis dñe quaesumus &c. .	138		5	xlviiii	5		5		5	
Offerimus dñe preces &c.	135		5		5		5		5	+ 1
Suscipe dñe sacrificium &c. . . .	165								6	
VD. Confiteantur tibi dñe &c. . .	115[1], 235[2], 406[3], 458[4]		4^1		8^2		14^3		14^3	+ 2[4] †
Purificet nos quaesumus &c. . .	81		3		3 = 21		3 = 63		3	+ 1 = 22
Praesta quaesumus oñp dš &c. . .	130								5 = 62	
Explicit.			25 = 2							
Last page			xl							
			BOOK ENDS							
From the following			2 = 25							
			Page xl ends.		Page xlviiii ends.		Page li ends.		Page lviiii ends.	Page lxiiii ends.	Page lxv ends.

† For these two values, which are not those of minor rubrics, see below, pp. 557–559.

first γ redaction. The fourth in textual order—'Clementiam tuam . . . affectu'—would be a duly constructed and completely equipped Preface if it stood alone[1]; but, standing where it does, and thus substituting a subject in the first person for that of the preceding context, which is in the third, it bids us assign its introduction to some by no means careful rehandler of the document—perhaps a scribe rather than an editor—who under compulsion of a stichometrical exigency followed the example and rivalled the carelessness of the contributor of the 'Qui . . . fuderunt'. I appropriate it with some confidence to the first amplification which the series seems to have undergone after it had been transferred to γ pages and at a subredaction which may be conveniently denominated γ_1 *bis*.

The first in textual order of these mutually independent sentences—'Confiteantur tibi dn̄e omnia opera tua et sc̄i tui benedicant te'—is the strangest of the four; for it violates all precedent, and has neither ethic relation to the 'Vere dignum' formula nor grammatical nexus with it. I was at one time inclined to think it a marginal memorandum that had found its way into the text through scribal inadvertence; and the guess, though wide of the mark, was not far from the truth, as we shall see on an early page. Meanwhile we must be careful not to think of it as part of any one of the redactions of which we have as yet had cognizance, but to set down the values as 115, 235, and 406.

Thus much said by way of a preliminary survey of our Sanctorale, its characteristics and its peculiarities, let us try to ascertain whether or not it be possible to justify the opinion that it was subjoined to the first main instalment of our document, the pontifical, concurrently with the insertion into this of the *Ad Consummandum Diaconatus Officium* in the form for the ordering of deacons, and of the 'Fiant omnia' &c. in the *Consecratio Altaris*, and with the adjunction to it of the political Mass.[2]

THE θ REDACTIONS. On consulting so much of the foregoing synopsis of values as relates to the second and three following items, the reader will perceive that if, neglecting for a while the intractable 'Confiteantur tibi . . . benedicant te' just noticed, we give the four Prefaces the respective first values, just found for them, of 153, 188, 105, and 115 lines; and that, if we give the 'Beati martyris tui' and the 'Sc̄i martyris tui' the first values, just found for them, of 91 and 80

[1] In the St Gallen sacramentary (Gerbert, p. 183) the 'Clementiam tuam' appears as Preface for the Feast of SS Cosmas and Damian, but with the evidently right readings 'cum exultantibus sc̄is' and 'debitae uenerationis contingamus affectu', as against our 'cum exultatione sc̄is' and 'de uitae ueneratione coniungamus affectu'.

[2] As suggested above, p. 536.

letters, there remain to the constituents proper for selection as those necessary to a 'Roman', as distinguished from a 'Gallican', equipment values such that the second, third, and fourth items, would each of them occupy a θ page, and that the fifth would occupy twenty-three θ lines, thus leaving two lines for an explicit or a connecting rubric. And if, turning back to the first item, now dedicated to St Hilary, he here again fixes his attention on the constituents proper to a 'Roman' as distinguished from a 'Gallican' *missa*, that is to say, on the first, second, fifth, eighth, and tenth, he will find that, reducing the lowest textual totals of these to terms of θ lines, and allowing, as usual, three lines for the *capitulum*, we obtain twenty-seven such lines, or two lines in excess of a page. But if, remembering it to be not only probable but presumable that in the first instance this item was, like each of the others, a *missa de communi martyrum*, he gives the five several constituents the values demanded by that hypothesis—reducing, more especially, the 'Super oblata' from 181 letters to 164 by substituting 'martyris' for 'confessoris atque pontificis', and the 'Post communionem' from 155 to 145 by substituting 'martyris' for 'helarii confessoris'—if, I say, he makes the corrections required by the hypothesis, he will find that the resulting total is the precise equivalent of one θ page.

THE FIRST γ REDACTION. A scribe whose business it might be to transfer the present section from five θ pages to six of γ capacity would find on reaching the end of the third Mass that he had given as many as seventy-four lines to material which in his exemplar filled but seventy-five; and that if the fourth *missa* was to end on the hundredth line—the limit given to it in the older copy—he must make it longer by two lines than it actually was. This amplification I conceive him to have effected by removing the words 'et sine fine custodis' from the Preface and inserting a 'Hanc igitur' of the value of three lines.[1] He must now deal with the last item. He saw by inspection that two-and-twenty lines would suffice for this as it then was; but twenty-six lines were to be filled. He therefore added the sentence 'Qui summum . . . morte fuderunt' to the original scheme of the Preface, 'Quoniam gloria . . . contulisti'. Its 120 letters constituted a nett accession of four lines of text.

THE SECOND GENERAL γ REDACTION. At the last of the three general γ recensions of the document the component items of the present section were admirably distributed. The first of them—by this time definitively appropriated to St Hilary, the spiritual patron of the see of Poitiers—filled four pages; four pages contained the second and third, the latter of these being for the vigil of a martyr; four more contained the other two. But, inasmuch as some of the constituents were by this time at a third, and even at a fourth, stage of textual coacervation,

[1] As to this value, in 79 letters, see above, pp. 542, 543.

we may reasonably imagine that the section as a whole, like the form for the blessing of virgins and widows, like the *Consecratio Altaris*, like the political Mass, had undergone one, if not two, editorial developements since it was first copied out on γ pages. Let us therefore once again consult the tabular synopsis.

Neglecting the first Mass for a moment, but assuming the second to have begun on a fresh page at the recensions which I notify as γ_1 *bis* and γ_2, the reader will perceive that by giving the later of its two values to the 'Roman' prayer, 'Beati martyris tui' &c., and by doing the like by the 'Roman' Preface, 'Quoniam a te' &c., an editor would carry down this latter constituent to the foot of a page; and that, if he wished the fourth Mass to begin on a fresh page, he might, still confining his ingenuity to 'Roman' materials, attain that object by prolonging the Preface of the third Mass, 'Qui non solum malis' &c., as far as to the words 'faceret esse uictorem'. Again: by giving its third and extant value to another 'Roman' constituent, the Preface of the penultimate *missa*, and its third value to that of the last—the second value had been assigned at redaction γ_1, the fourth was to be used at a later stage—he would make these two items, as he had just made the two before them, fill three pages. These five values are 158, 234, 395, 234, 406.

REDACTION γ_1 *bis*. The first Mass of the series is yet more interesting. The composite prayers and Prefaces to which I have thus far invited notice are all of them 'Roman'; that is to say, their position in the several items bids us assume that each of them when as yet in its first form was the constituent of a Mass constructed after the Roman ideal, and therefore containing not more than two prayers preliminary to the oblation of the elements. But in the first Mass of the series as now known to us there are two more such preliminary constituents, each of which has an earlier and a later value; namely, the 'Indulgentiam nobis' and the 'Exaudi dñe preces'. The first part of the former, 'Indulgentiam . . . ualeamus', comprising, with an added 'per', 123 letters (5 γ lines), figures in the St Gallen sacramentary (Gerbert, p. 220) in the Mass 'In basilicis martyrum'; and the first part of the latter, 'Exaudi . . . nos absolue peccatis,' comprising, with an added 'per', 172 letters (6 γ lines) appears in the Petau Gelasianum (II iii) as a prayer for the Feast of St Marcellus (Mur. i 636). Hence, therefore, the inference that it was before the last general redaction that a third and a fourth preliminary prayer were subjoined to the first and second. Nor is this all. The further inference that there may have been two amplificatory redactions of the item after γ_1 but before γ_3 is suggested by the fact recorded on a previous page that the Preface has no fewer than four successive values, the second of which would seem to be later than γ_1. How then does the case stand? On referring to the column

marked 'Scheme γ_1 *bis*' in the table of values the reader will see that to make the item coincide with two γ pages, as compared with the twenty-four γ lines which it had previously filled, nothing more was needed than the first 'confessor' value of the accessory prayer, 'Indulgentiam nobis' &c.; the 'confessor', as distinguished from the 'martyr', text of the first 'Super oblata', now worded 'Sc̄i confessoris tui' &c.; and the second of the four 'confessor' values of the Preface.

THE SECOND GENERAL γ REDACTION (*resumed*). And, under 'Scheme γ_2', he will further perceive that to make the item coincide with three γ pages, the needed modifications were the first 'confessor' value of the accessory prayer, 'Exaudi dn̄e' &c.; the second 'Super oblata'[1]; the third of the four 'confessor' values of the Preface, and the 'Hanc igitur'.

THE THIRD GENERAL γ REDACTION. The Mass for St Hilary was at the last general redaction made to occupy the extraordinary space of four γ pages by adding three lines of text to the first accessory prayer, and six to the second; by introducing, on three lines, a third, but seemingly needless 'Super oblata'[1]; by, yet again, adding four lines of text to the already twice lengthened Preface, and by adding on five lines a second and seemingly needless 'Post communionem'. The proper value of this was four lines, but the simple device of adding 'dn̄m n̄ ih̄m xp̄m filium tuum qui tecum' to the usual and sufficient 'per' made it five.

The devices by means of which the second and third *missae*, and, after them, the fourth and fifth, were made, each pair in its turn, to fill four γ pages instead of three need not be described in detail. They speak for themselves.

PART III. THE SUCCESSIVE EDITIONS OF THE THIRD INSTALMENT.

At some comparatively early period, not improbably the eighth decade of the fifth century, we have a dual document, the successive paginal values of which were:—

		β	θ_1	θ_2	θ_3
First Instalment	Minor Orders . .			2 + 3	2 + 3
	Major Orders . .	2 + 9	2 + 12	18	19
	Virgins, Widows .	3	4	6	6
	Consecratio Altaris	1 + 1	1 + 1	2 + 1	2
		16	20	32	
Second Instalment	Political Mass . .				2
	Sanctorale . . .				5 + 1
					40

[1] Muratori prints these as if they were one prayer. Mabillon separates them.

As early, it may be, as the first decade of the sixth century we have a threefold document of which I believe this to be the summary compendium in terms of pages:—

		β	θ_1	θ_2	θ_3	$\theta_3$bis
First Instalment	Minor Orders . .			2+3	2+3	
	Major Orders . .	2+9	2+12	18	19	
	Virgins, Widows .	3	4	6	6	=30
	Consecratio Altaris	1+1	1+1	2+1	2	3
		16	20	32		
Second Instalment	Political Mass . .				2	2
	Sanctorale . .				5+1	5
					40	
Third Instalment *Missae Cotidianae*						7+1
						48

To determine the textual value of the source, and trace the developement, of this third instalment must be our next endeavour.

SECTION VII. THE *MISSAE COTIDIANAE*.

The minor rubrics of our *missae cotidianae* (Mur. ii 687–692) are of the type usually denominated Gallican[1]; and, although in the present condition of the series each Mass in its turn is not the equivalent of an integral number of γ pages, there is reason to believe that such equivalence was a characteristic of the penultimate stage of editorial revision. To learn whether or not it be likely that the earliest ascertainable γ redaction had been preceded by an edition executed on θ lines, but in accordance to the Roman norm, I propose, as when dealing with the Sanctorale, to make it a working hypothesis that in such edition there were only two prayers previous to the oblation of the gifts, and only one 'Super oblata' and one 'Post communionem'; that our selection of these is in every instance to be determined by priority of textual order; and that, when a constituent has more than one value, the lowest is to be selected.

But the group presents a difficulty the solution of which must precede all our other efforts.

THE LOST LEAVES OF THE VATICAN MS. M. Léopold Delisle, in his description of the Vatican codex, informed us that the gathering registered 'XVII' is incomplete[2]; and, with a diffidence worthy of so conscientious a scholar, estimated our loss at 'probably' three leaves—'le cahier XVII est incomplet, probablement de trois feuillets'. The lacuna occurs at the end of the first Mass; and, since the item next

[1] The '*Collectio*' before the second prayer is probably meant for '*Collectio post precem*'.

[2] *Mémoire sur d'anciens sacramentaires* p. 71.

after it is not defective at the beginning, either an integral number of *missae* must have disappeared, or none. Unless nothing has been lost, I fear that more has gone than M. Delisle suspected, and that, not only have three leaves disappeared, but, besides them, an entire quaternion, or its equivalent. My reason for so thinking shall be given without needless delay; but, for the convenience of the reader, and to make my reason more readily intelligible, I at once estimate, as accurately as may be, the value in terms of γ lines of eleven leaves of the Vatican Codex :—

1. We learn from M. Delisle[1] that a piece has been removed from the upper part of fol. 117, and that fol. 122 *verso* ends with the last extant words, 'sustentet et foueat', of the first Mass. On referring to Muratori (ii 687), I find that fol. 117 *recto* began with the opening words, 'Dŝ qui diligentibus', of the first constituent. Hence it follows that, as will be found on careful examination of my list of linear values,[2] six leaves of the Vatican codex represent, with exceedingly close approximation, 63 γ lines of text and minor rubrics[3]; or, to state the case more accurately, that the constituents and minor rubrics which at the last editorial period in the history of the *missae cotidianae* occupied 63 γ lines occupied six leaves when transferred to the Vatican book. From this we may infer that the eleven Vatican leaves which I assume to have disappeared would hold constituents and major and minor rubrics which if re-transferred to γ lines would have been found to have the value of 115 or 116 of these; but that if only three Vatican leaves have disappeared our loss is, in terms of γ lines, 31 or 32.

2. Each of the three complete Masses of the extant group has either five or six minor rubrics; and on the assumption that two *missae* have disappeared we must suppose that these together contained, say, eleven such rubrics on as many lines.

3. On referring to the last column but one of linear values the reader will observe that, if we disburden I of its minor rubrics, we have major rubric and text of the value of 63 γ lines, three integral γ pages; that IV, if thus treated, is equivalent to two integral γ pages; that V, if thus treated, represents three integral γ pages, and that VI in all moral certainty had the same value.

4. If, then, the lost material filled, like each of the Masses handed down to us, a multiple of 21 lines at the last stage but one of editorial activity, and if at the last they filled about 115, the number of lines to be allowed it on the earlier occasion is 105, or five γ pages. But were we to employ M. Delisle's cautious 'probablement' as warrant for the very assumption which that word precludes, we should have on the last occasion but one a Mass whose *capitulum* and nine con-

[1] *Op. cit. ut supra.* [2] See below, p. 554. [3] For $63+5-(4+1)=63$.

stituents were lodged in 21 lines, and on the last occasion the same Mass *plus* the 10 or 11 lines required to make a total of 31 or 32; that is to say, 10 or 11 lines of minor rubric—an incredible hypothesis.

5. Let us now examine the case more closely, and by a different method.

Before they were amplified by minor rubrics three out of the four extant *missae* filled three pages each, and one of them filled two. How many *missae*, then, of one or other of these values shall we assume to have disappeared? A definite number, or an indefinite? If an indefinite number, there is an end to argument—*cadit quaestio*. If a definite number, we must assume it to have been two; for six is the total of *quotidianae* both in the Petau Gelasianum (Mur. i 700–703) and in the St Gallen sacramentary (Gerbert, pp. 230–238); a number not improbably determined by the ferial days of the week. I therefore make it a working hypothesis that the lost material consisted of two Masses, and that these at the penultimate editorial stage of our document filled either four, five, or six γ pages. Which of these alternatives to adopt we must hope to be able to determine when we have explored the earlier history of the four surviving items. As a first step to this end let us at once examine their text.

THE EXTANT TEXT. 1. The latter part, 'precantes ut . . . placere possimus', of the first Preface (Mur. ii 688) does not cohere with the 'Oⁿiptiam . . . sempiterna succedant' which precedes it; but, on referring to the series of Prefaces in the appendix to Alcuin's theoretical Gregorianum to which is prefixed the admonition 'Heic studiose praescriptas' &c. (*ib.* 291), we find that early in the ninth century a composition (*ib.* 323) closely resembling the first part ended, like it, at 'sempiterna succedant'. And, in the St Gallen sacramentary (Gerbert, pp. 139, 184) and in that edited by Ménard (pp. 171, 181) there are two separate Prefaces, one of which, for the Fifth Sunday after Pentecost, agrees in the main with ours as far as 'succedant', where it ends; while the other, for the Twentieth Sunday, agrees in the main with ours at and after 'precantes', where it begins. We may therefore infer that ours is a dual composition, and that at some period in the evolution of our *missae cotidianae* it ended at 'succedant' and followed by 'per' (or 'per. per quem maiestatem') comprised 256 (or, preferably, 273) letters, not as yet 399 (or, preferably, 416).

2. The opening prayer, 'Perpetua quaesumus dⁿe pace' &c. (Mur. ii 688), of the second of the surviving items, numbered 'IV' in my list of values, exhibits a like phenomenon. Its first part, 'Perpetua . . . concede', which, with 'Adesto nobis misericors dⁿs' before the words 'et tuae pietatis' &c., appears as two distinct but contiguous prayers in the St Gallen book (Gerbert, p. 230), in the *missae quotidianae* of

Petau (III xviii) and in the ungrouped *orationes quotidianae* of Ménard (p. 197), presents no difficulty; but its second part, 'et ut tuis' &c., is not in structural nexus with the first. We may therefore infer that in such nuclear predecessor of the present series as I am endeavouring to discriminate the constituent ended at 'concede' and, with a subjoined 'per', comprised 95, not 167, letters.

3. The Preface of the same Mass, 'Ut quia tui est operis' &c., though grammatically faultless, falls ethically into two unconnected halves at 'facultatem'; but finding, as I do, that not only in the supplement, just mentioned, to the Alcuinian Gregorianum (Mur. ii 317) but in the *missae quotidianae* of the St Gallen book (Gerbert, p. 231) there is a Preface substantially identical with the first half and, like it, ending at 'facultatem', I cannot doubt that here again we have a composite constituent, the first half of which has, with an added 'per', the value of 130, not 279, letters. The second half, 'Ut non in nobis' &c., but with 'proueniat' for 'praeueniat', figures in St Gallen (Gerbert, *ut supra*) as Preface of the *missa quotidiana* next after that which has the first for its Preface.

4. The Postcommunion of the next item is a mere coadunation of two distinct prayers. For 'Sumpti sacrificii' &c., see Leon. XXVIIII xiii, Gel. II xxiv, xlviii, III xxviii, and Gerbert, pp. 63, 137. For 'Sc̄a tua nos dn̄e' &c., see Leon. XXVIIII xviiii and Gel. I xxvii, xxxvii.

5. For 'Verbum tuum', the first words of the last Preface, we should perhaps read 'Per uerbum tuum', thus giving the whole a total of 618 letters. I cannot identify this constituent. In a shorter text it may have had a place in the lost portion of the Leonianum; for, like others of its class in the preceding section and in this, it seems to have had two values, ending in the first instance at 'ipse sustinuit', and thus comprising 478, not 618, letters.

THE θ REDACTIONS. In none of these cases have we, as we had when dealing with other sections, more than two values; nor does it seem possible to work our way back, as we could when dealing with the Sanctorale, to a source on β pages. But we cannot doubt that, constructed in accordance with the Roman norm, the section had at one time been set forth on pages of θ capacity. For, if we assume items I and IV to have had, each of them, but two preliminary prayers, one 'Super oblata', one Preface, and one 'Post communionem', but no 'Ad plebem'—a class of prayers eschewed by Roman usage on any but fasting days—and if in cases of dual value we select the lower alternative, we have a result equivalent to $[31+20=]51$ lines; but, on the assumption that two *missae*, II, III, have disappeared, and that their respective values were nineteen and thirty, we have for I and II $[31+19=]50$ lines, or two pages; for III and IV $[30+20=]50$, or

Petau (III xviii) and in the ungrouped *orationes quotidianae* of Ménard (p. 197), presents no difficulty; but its second part, 'et ut tuis' &c., is not in structural nexus with the first. We may therefore infer that in such nuclear predecessor of the present series as I am endeavouring to discriminate the constituent ended at 'concede' and, with a subjoined 'per', comprised 95, not 167, letters.

3. The Preface of the same Mass, 'Ut quia tui est operis' &c., though grammatically faultless, falls ethically into two unconnected halves at 'facultatem'; but finding, as I do, that not only in the supplement, just mentioned, to the Alcuinian Gregorianum (Mur. ii 317) but in the *missae quotidianae* of the St Gallen book (Gerbert, p. 231) there is a Preface substantially identical with the first half and, like it, ending at 'facultatem', I cannot doubt that here again we have a composite constituent, the first half of which has, with an added 'per', the value of 130, not 279, letters. The second half, 'Ut non in nobis' &c., but with 'proueniat' for 'praeueniat', figures in St Gallen (Gerbert, *ut supra*) as Preface of the *missa quotidiana* next after that which has the first for its Preface.

4. The Postcommunion of the next item is a mere coadunation of two distinct prayers. For 'Sumpti sacrificii' &c., see Leon. XXVIIII xiii, Gel. II xxiv, xlviii, III xxviii, and Gerbert, pp. 63, 137. For 'Sc̄a tua nos dn̄e' &c., see Leon. XXVIIII xviiii and Gel. I xxvii, xxxvii.

5. For 'Verbum tuum', the first words of the last Preface, we should perhaps read 'Per uerbum tuum', thus giving the whole a total of 618 letters. I cannot identify this constituent. In a shorter text it may have had a place in the lost portion of the Leonianum; for, like others of its class in the preceding section and in this, it seems to have had two values, ending in the first instance at 'ipse sustinuit', and thus comprising 478, not 618, letters.

THE θ REDACTIONS. In none of these cases have we, as we had when dealing with other sections, more than two values; nor does it seem possible to work our way back, as we could when dealing with the Sanctorale, to a source on β pages. But we cannot doubt that, constructed in accordance with the Roman norm, the section had at one time been set forth on pages of θ capacity. For, if we assume items I and IV to have had, each of them, but two preliminary prayers, one 'Super oblata', one Preface, and one 'Post communionem', but no 'Ad plebem'—a class of prayers eschewed by Roman usage on any but fasting days—and if in cases of dual value we select the lower alternative, we have a result equivalent to $[31+20=]51$ lines; but, on the assumption that two *missae*, II, III, have disappeared, and that their respective values were nineteen and thirty, we have for I and II $[31+19=]50$ lines, or two pages; for III and IV $[30+20=]50$, or

		Scheme θ_3 bis 8 pages	Scheme γ_1 11 pages	Scheme γ_1 bis (2) and γ_3 17 pages	16 pages	Scheme γ_2 bis 18 pages
ORATIONES ET PRECES COMMUNES &c.		*	l 4	lii (lx)	4 lxv	lxvi 4
I. *Post prophetiam*						1
Dŝ qui diligentibus te &c.	170	xli 6	6		6	6
Collectio						1
Dŝ qui in sc̄is habitas &c.	150	6	5		5	5
Ante nomina						1
Protector in te sperantium &c.	160				6	6
Dŝ uirtutum cuius est &c.	175				6	6
Super oblata						1
Propitiare dn̄e supplicationibus &c.	160	6	6 = 21		6	6
Adesto dn̄e supplicationibus &c.	181				6	6
VD. Om̄ptiam tuam &c.	273^1, 416^2	9^1	li 10^1		14^2	14^2
Post communionem						1
Caelestis doni benedictione &c.	99	4 [= 31]	4		4	4
Ad plebem						1 = 63
Veniat dn̄e quaesumus &c.	151		5		5	lxviii 5
	+x		1		1 = 63	1
II.		1	1 = 21	lv (lxiii)	2 (lxviii)	1
Computed losses		18 [= 19] = 50	lii 21 = 21		40 = 42	
III.		xliii 30 [= 30]	liii 41	lvii (lxv)	62 (lxx)	113
IV. ITEM ALIA MISSA		1	1 = 42^2		1 = 63	1
Perpetua quaesumus dn̄e &c.	95^1, 167^2	4^1	lv 4^1	lx (lxviii)	6^2 (lxxiii)	6^2
Exaudi nos miserator &c.	47	2	2		2	2
Dŝ cui nulla potest &c.	144				5	5
Praesta nobis misericors &c.	123				4	4
Super oblata						1
Suscipe dn̄e quaesumus &c.	121	5	4		4 = 21	4
Alia				lxi (lxviiii)	(lxxiiii)	1
Munera dn̄e tibi dicata &c.	152				5	5
Contestatio						1
VD. Ut quia tui est operis &c.	130^1, 279^2	5^1	5^1		10^2	10^2
Post communionem						1
Mysteria sc̄a nos dn̄e &c.	79	3 [= 20] = 50	3		3	3
Item alia						1
Da ueniam dn̄e peccatis, &c.	84		3 = 21		3 = 21	3 = 168
V. ITEM ALIA MISSA		xlv 2	lvi 2	lxii (lxx)	2 lxxv	lxxvii 2
Post prophetiam						1

Dn̄s qui nobis om̄ptiam &c.	150	6	5	5	5
Post precem					1
Om̄p sem̄p dn̄s qui abundantia &c.	162	6	6	6	6
Ante nomina					1
Om̄p sem̄p dn̄s adesto &c.	180			6	6
Creaturarum omnium &c.	199			7	7
Super oblata					1
Dn̄s qui legalium differentias &c.	216	8	8 = 21	8	8
Suscipe munera quaesumus &c.	176			6	6
VD. Ut filius tuus ih̄c xp̄c &c.	354	13	lvii 12	12	12
Post communionem					1
Sumpti sacrificii &c.	80^1, 143^2	3^1[=38]	3	5^2	5^2
Ad plebem					1 = 63
Benedictio dn̄e quaesumus &c.	171		6 = 21	6 = 63	lxxx 6
VI. ITEM ALIA MISSA		1	lviii 2	lxv (lxxiii) 2 lxxviii	1
Post prophetiam					1
Concede quaesumus om̄p dn̄s &c.	90	3	3	3	3
Post precem					1
Ecclesiam tuam dn̄e &c.	104	4	4	4	4
Ante nomina					1
Praesta quaesumus om̄p dn̄s &c	206			7	7
Pateant aures misericordiae &c.	122			4	4
Super oblata					1
Dn̄s cui omnium sacrificiorum &c.	162	6	6	6	6
Remotis obumbrationibus &c.	211			7	7 = 4^2
Quaesumus om̄p dn̄s n̄ &c.	99			4	lxxxii 4
VD. Per uerbum tuum tibi &c.	478^1, 618^2	17^1	17^1	17^1	21^2 †
Postcommunion (conjectural)		4	4	4	
Ad plebem (conjectural)			3	3	
Explicit		2[=37] = 75	2 = 41	63 = 2	
Last page		xlviii	lx	lxviii (lxxvi)	
		BOOK ENDS.	BOOK ENDS.	BOOK (BOOK) ENDS.	2 = 63 Page lxxx ends.
From the following					
INCIPIT CANON ACTIONIS					2
Sursum corda. Resp. Habemus ad dn̄m	20				1
Gratias agamus dn̄o d̄o n̄	18				1
Dignum et iustum est	16				1
Vere dignum &c.	338				12 = 4^2 Page lxxxiii ends.

† Of the 21 lines occupied by this Preface at the final redaction the last 4 were on p. lxxxiii. See below, p. 559.

two pages; and—with the reasonable allowance of four lines for the transferred, but now lost, Postcommunion of VI—[38+37 =]75, or three pages, for the last pair.

THE LOST LEAVES OF THE VATICAN MS (*resumed*). Unless, then, the process of elimination which served us so well when we were dealing with the Sanctorale is to be thought illusory in its results when applied to I, IV, V, VI of the present series, we may rest assured that of the lost *missae*—by the hypothesis two in number—the first was at one time contained in 19 θ lines and the second in 30.

THE γ REDACTIONS. The reader will discover on referring to the table of values that if in imagination we now transcribe I, IV, V, VI, not on θ, but on γ pages,[1] and allow to each of the first three its final prayer—whether rubricated *Ad plebem* or *Item alia*—and allow three lines for a final prayer, now lost, of VI, their successive values are 42 lines (two integral pages), 21 lines (one integral page), 42 lines (two integral pages), and 41 lines (the practical equivalent of two integral pages). And since it is incredible that these should be haphazard coincidences, I assign one γ page to item II, which was the analogue of IV when as yet on θ lines; and a couple of γ pages to III, which was the analogue of I when as yet at the θ stage.

In like manner: if, with the exception of the interspersed minor rubrics—the object of which has yet to be divined—and of the presumably expletory 'Unde' &c. at the end of the last extant item of VI,[2] we compute the present values of all the constituents, un-Roman though they be in numerosity, we find that I, V, VI are each of them equivalent to three γ pages, and IV to a couple of such pages. And since no sane scepticism could pronounce fresh results like these fortuitous, I infer that II, once more like its analogue IV, now had a new value of forty-two γ lines, and III, like I and V, a new value of sixty-three.

At the last redaction of all (γ_3 *bis*) the items of the present section were amplified, like the political and the Saints' Masses, by minor rubrics; and, since eleven of them have been allotted to I and IV, eleven is no unfair allowance for II and III.

One result of this seemingly capricious interspersion of minor rubrics is to me unexpectedly encouraging. It carries down IV at the last redaction of all to the end of a page, and bids me hope that there was after all method in the seeming madness. What, if any, may have been the object held in view we must enquire presently.

[1] See column headed 'Scheme γ_1'.

[2] See column headed 'Scheme γ_1 bis (2) and γ_3'.

PART IV. THE LAST EDITION OF THE SECOND AND THIRD INSTALMENTS.

1. At a comparatively early period in our investigation we found that three successive editions of the pontifical had been so devised that, allowance always made for a first leaf left textless and for a last page left blank, each had the value of a quadruple number of leaves, and thus of an integral number of membranes; the first edition representing a quire of β capacity; the second, five θ membranes; and the third, eight (see above, p. 535). (2) The document was next made dual, in great part by the adjunction of a Sanctorale to the pontifical, when it occupied ten θ membranes (see above, pp. 535, 545). (3) After four times traversing the third stage of the journey we found that the document—by this time threefold and comprising pontifical, Sanctorale, and *missae cotidianae*—had attained the successive values of twelve θ membranes, and of fifteen, seventeen, nineteen membranes of γ capacity (see above, p. 555). (4) But when, at the third general γ redaction, though neglecting as yet the minor rubrics interspersed through the political Mass, the Sanctorale, and the *missae cotidianae*, we at last gave to each successive item in each of those three main instalments of the document its full textual value, we perceived that they represented eighty pages, or twenty membranes, but without room allowed for a final page left blank (see again p. 555).

The inference which I deduce from this peculiarity of no room left for a blank page is that the redaction which gave their final textual equipment to pontifical, to Sanctorale, and to *missae cotidianae* was the redaction at which the *Canon Actionis* was conjoined to those three instalments. The text, therefore, of the Canon must engage our attention so soon as we shall have disposed of three subjects which we have not as yet had suitable opportunity for discussing. These are the 'Pax fidi s̄ca' next before the Preface of the first item of the Sanctorale, the 'Confiteantur tibi . . . benedicant te' which obstructs the Preface of the last, and the minor rubrics interspersed through the Sanctorale and the *missae cotidianae* (Mur. ii 682, 686, and 682–691).

I. True though it be that the first Mass of the Sanctorale, now devoted to St Hilary, was originally framed in accordance with the Roman norm, it by no means follows that the more ample equipment which it received at the third general redaction was a mere exploit of bibliographical ingenuity. The rubrics *Post prophetiam*, *Post precem*, *Ante nomina*, which are so striking a feature of the *cotidianae*, forbid any such inference; and, until we know what specifically was the ritual of the diocese of Poitiers in the later decades of the sixth century, we must allow it to be possible that four out of the six prayers which now

precede the 'Ut nobis dn̄e' &c. of the Mass in question did, in fact, serve the purpose of a *Post prophetiam*, a *Post precem*, an *Ante nomina* and a *Post nomina*, and the 'Ut nobis dn̄e' &c. itself that of an *Ad pacem*. This granted to be a tenable hypothesis, what shall we say of the 'Pax fidi sancta', as the editors read it, a feature of our document which would seem to have escaped the notice of scholars like Morin, Mabillon, and Martène? The account which with all proper diffidence I propose is that in 'PAXFIDIS̄CA' we are to see a truncated 'Pax fides caritas' and to identify it with 'Pax fides et caritas', a formula which the writer of the *Expositio Breuis* of presumably the Paris ritual of the Mass has left upon record as having the authority of St Germanus: 'Constituerunt canones ut longiorem benedictionem episcopus proferret, breviorem funderet presbyter dicet [?'dicens'] "Pax fides et caritas et communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Domini sit semper uobiscum".'[1] If I am not mistaken, our 'Pax fidi s̄ca', disfigured and mutilated though it be, is the only known text that bears a resemblance better than merely remote to the 'Pax fides et caritas' of this passage. Certainly, the place given to it in the first Mass of our Sanctorale does not seem to accord with that contemplated by the writer of the *Expositio*; but I would suggest that the difficulty may be met by one or both of two considerations. First: the *Expositio Breuis* is a second-hand account, a none too carefully written and evidently unauthorized record of something said by St Germanus; and, since the manifest object of Germanus was to give the rationale of the shortness of a priest's mode of blessing, as compared with a bishop's, what he really said may in effect have been, 'A priest's formula is "Pax fides et caritas" and, again, "Communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Domini sit semper uobiscum"', the 'sit semper uobiscum' applying by zeugma to each formula, and the second 'et' being part of neither. Secondly: in addition to, or in place of, this account it may be suggested that the Paris ritual united two formulae which elsewhere and aforetime were kept separate[2]; one being proper to the kiss of peace which, as at Tours, for example, was given before the Preface, the other being the benedictory prayer which preceded the Communion.[3] But, whatever be the truth as to what St Germanus said and what the anonymous author of the *Expositio* conceived him to have said, we may rest assured that 'Pax fides caritas' or 'Pax fides et caritas'

[1] Migne *S. L.* lxxii 94 B.

[2] The 'et' before 'caritas' may be held to favour this hypothesis.

[3] In the Missale Gallicanum Vetus, whose only proper of a saint is the Mass in honour of St Germanus, the first *Collectio ad Pacem* for the season of Advent is 'Grata tibi sint . . . munera . . . et . . . tribue nobis *fidem* integram, *pacem* perpetuam, *caritatem* puram'; and the second, 'Sacrificium . . . placatus intende . . . et *communicatio* praesentis *osculi* perpetuae proficiat caritati' (Mur. ii 702, 704).

is the formula indicated by the 'Pax fidi sancta' of the printed editions, and must therefore be on our guard not to suspect a scribal transposition in what it may be our wisdom to regard as an evidence of the Poitiers ritual in and even before the last quarter of the sixth century.

II. In the 'Confiteantur tibi . . . benedicant te'[1] which obstructs the last Preface in the Sanctorale we may not unreasonably see the *Sonus*, the versicle from the psalter which by the ritual known as Gallican was sung during the oblation of the elements; for, in reply to the objection that in the Vatican MS it follows, instead of preceding, the words 'Vere dignum . . . et salutare', I would suggest that at a previous transcription the monogrammatic compendium of VD (='Vere dignum') had by clerical error on the part of scribe or rubricator been set before 'Confiteantur', its proper place being before 'Quoniam'.

III. 1. These two subsidiary additions together with the minor rubrics capriciously dispersed through political Mass and Sanctorale have the gross value of twenty-two lines, so that when they were inserted at the transcription notified as γ_3 *bis* the last item of the latter section ended on the last line of page lxv, not, as at γ_3, on the penultimate line of lxiiii (see above, p. 545). (2) The minor rubrics interspersed through the first four *missae cotidianae* at γ_3 *bis* had the nett value of a page, so that these now ended with page lxxvi, not, as previously, with lxxiiii (see above, p. 554). (3) Those introduced into the fifth and sixth *cotidianae* were the linear equivalent of all that at the previous recension had followed the Preface of this latter Mass, so that this constituent, still in its first value of 478 letters—'Per verbum tuum . . . quae ipse sustinuit'—was now conterminous with page lxxxii.

If, then, the words 'quae ipse sustinuit', which, by my hypothesis, brought the first text of the Preface of the sixth *cotidiana* to an end, were on the last line of page lxxxii at the final redaction of the second and third instalments, it follows (4) that the supplementary clause of the Preface, 'Unde nos . . . potentia resurgentis', now occupied the first four lines of page lxxxiii, (5) that the 'Sursum corda' and its response, the 'Gratias agamus' and its response, the 'Vere dignum' and the *Praefatio communis* filled the remaining lines of lxxxiii, and (6) that the 'Te igitur' began at the head of lxxxiiii. There must have been a purpose in all this. What, then, was it?

PART V. THE TWO EDITIONS OF THE FOURTH INSTALMENT.

A summary of the paginal values of the four instalments of our document at the successive γ redactions which I conceive each to have

[1] Ps. cxliv 10. The Vulgate reading is 'benedicant tibi'.

undergone may be of interest to such of my readers as are disposed to think that my analysis has been accurate. In conjunction with the synopsis of values at the β and θ redactions, on p. 550, it elucidates what I believe to have been the interna history of the document from first to last.

	γ_1	γ_1 bis	γ_2	γ_3	γ_3 bis
Minor Orders	2+4		2+7	2+7	
Major Orders	22		22	23	
Virgins, Widows	7		9	10	
Consecration of Altar	5		6	6	=48
Political Mass	3	=43	4	4	$4\frac{7}{21}$
Sanctorale	6	8	9	12[=64]	$12\frac{14}{21}$
Missae Cotidianae	10+1	16+1	16+1	16[=80]	$17\frac{4}{21}$
	60	68	76		
Canon Actionis				7+1	$7\frac{17}{21}$
				88	
Transferred and additional Prayers					1+1
					92

Section VIII. The *Canon Actionis*.

The phenomena which characterize our document have led me to infer that at the general redaction notified as γ_3 the *Canon Actionis* in the wider sense of the phrase filled seven pages (lxxxi—lxxxvii), but that at the final transcription (γ_3 *bis*) an elaborate economy of rubric and text had the effect of setting the *Praefatio communis* and its accessories on the fifth and following lines of the *recto* side of a leaf (p. lxxxiii), and thus of making the 'Te igitur' begin, as before had not been the case, on a fresh page; with the necessary consequence that, if this with its accessories was to fill seven pages, it must meanwhile have received an increment, whether of text, or of rubrics, or of both, of the nett value of seventeen lines. What the increment may have been we must conjecture as best we can, for, by some deplorable accident to the Vatican Codex, its text of the Canon is cut short at the end of the word 'digneris' in the 'Nobis quoque' paragraph.[1]

Had Morin been so lucky as to read between the lines of the political Mass it might have occurred to him that our document, so

[1] It will be seen on an early page that by my computation the lost material is to be estimated at rather more than fifty γ lines, and that it would thus have occupied five leaves of the Vatican MS. This may, therefore, have lost its last fasciculus, which in that case would be a ternion. For relative values see above, p. 551.

far from being a single editorial achievement, was the product of successive developements of an ancient original, and that one or more of these had been executed before the Frankish occupation of western Gaul early in the sixth century. And, had it but occurred to Mabillon that the Canon might be, as the 'CUM CANONE' subjoined to the title of the *missae cotidianae* suggests, an *ex post facto* addition to that series, and that they in their turn might be of later date than the Sanctorale, he assuredly would not have assigned the document as a whole to the seventh century for the mere reason that the Canon contains Gregory the Great's 'diesque nostros' &c.

I venture to assert, moreover, that Mabillon was less accurate than was his wont when he said 'Canon idem est item cum Romano'. That so much of it as survives is substantially identical with the corresponding portion of what is customarily called the Gregorian Canon is beyond both doubt and cavil; but, this notwithstanding, it has numerous characteristics which would seem to be peculiar to itself, and which would further seem to set it in the same relation to St Gregory's *textus classicus* that an earlier recension bears to a later; and, besides these, a few readings which, though not proper to itself, favour that inference.

Where first to look for St Gregory's *textus classicus* is a question which in the opinion of some still awaits decision. I, for one, turn to the corrected text of the Canon in the Canterbury missal,[1] a text which claims the two recommendations of direct descent and a short pedigree; and, next to it in authority, because of the antiquity of the codex in which it lies, I place what some would set before it, that of the Petau sacramentary, No. 316 of the Queen of Sweden's collection at the Vatican.[2] In the following collation I use both; and notify, first, the instances in which Poitiers—by which I designate our document—Petau and Canterbury differ from each other; secondly, those in which Canterbury stands alone; thirdly, those in which Petau is unsupported by the other two; and, finally, those in which Petau and Canterbury agree, Poitiers differing from them: my hope being to learn whether or not the readings peculiar to the Poitiers text are such as to justify us in pronouncing this earlier than either of the others.

I. First, then, we have the following contrast, where (1) Petau may be defective, but where in Poitiers, as contrasted with Canterbury,

[1] My theory with regard to this is that, whether from inadvertence or for whatever reason, the scribe of the Canterbury missal, when engaged on the Canon, had not used St Gregory's authentic text as his exemplar, but that his handiwork was subsequently corrected into conformity with that text.

[2] Usually known by the speculative and provisional name of 'The Gelasian Sacramentary'.

we not improbably have the text of a Canon designed for the use of none but the Pope himself, or, in any case, primarily, if not exclusively, meant for him; and where (2) the 'catholicae et apostolicae fidei' would seem to be a carefully considered improvement on the therefore presumably earlier 'apostolicae fidei' of the Poitiers book :—

Poitiers [Petau] (Canterbury).

1. Te igitur . . . una cum *omnibus orthodoxis atque* (2) *apostolicae fidei cultoribus* [famulo tuo papa nostro illo et antistite nostro episcopo illo] (famulo tuo papa nostro N et antistite nostro et rege nostro et omnibus orthodoxis atque (2) catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus).

II. As between Poitiers and Petau, on the one hand, and Canterbury, on the other, we have :—

Poitiers, Petau [Canterbury].

1. Memento . . . *qui tibi offerunt* [pro quibus tibi offerimus uel qui tibi offerunt].
2. Communicantes . . . per *xp̄m* [eundem xp̄m] dn̄m n̄.
3. Unde et *memores sumus* [memores].
4. Supplices . . . per *xp̄m* [eundem xp̄m] dn̄m n̄.

Here the alternative 'pro quibus tibi offerimus' allowed at Canterbury would seem to be a disciplinary advance on 'qui tibi offerunt', and thus, in any case, a subsequent addition. I should imagine that it may have been inserted into the text of the Canon by Gregory himself for use by his missionaries in England when saying Mass for the conversion of heathens, or otherwise in their behalf; for of them, as unbaptized, 'qui tibi offerunt' could not be used. The second and fourth of the Canterbury readings are improvements on 'per xp̄m' such as might have occurred to Gregory when preparing copies of the Canon for the use of his missionaries. But, whatever be the right account of these variants, there can be no doubt that in each case Poitiers has the older or less eligible of the two.

III. Petau stands alone in six places :—

Poitiers, Canterbury [Petau].

1. Communicantes . . . gloriosae *semper* [semperque] uirginis . . .
2. *petri* [petri et] pauli.
3. Quam oblationem . . . *postquam* [posteaquam] caenatum est.
4. Inde (Unde) et memores . . . in *coelos* [caelis] ascensionis.
5. Supplices . . . per manus *sc̄i angeli* [angeli] tui.
6. Nobis quoque . . . partem aliquam *et societatem* [societatis].

Here the enclitic between 'semper' and 'uirginis' looks like an insertion by one to whom '*ἀειπαρθένου*' was an unknown phrase, and the 'et' between 'petri' and 'pauli' like that of one to whom it was a note of orthodoxy to assert that the two apostles had suffered on one and the same day; while the 'angeli tui', as against 'sc̄i angeli tui', may

have been a protest or a precaution against such as might pretend that by 'sanctus angelus' our Divine Lord Himself was meant.[1] In each of these cases the Poitiers reading must be regarded as the earlier of the two.

The 'postquam' in 3 is to me specially interesting, because in the Canterbury Missal it has been altered from 'posteaquam'. The 'caelis' in 4 is probably a mere Merovingianism.

IV. But the cases in which Poitiers stands alone exceed all of the foregoing in both interest and number.

Poitiers [Canterbury, Petau].

1. Te igitur clementissime . . . pro *tua sca ecclesia* [ecclesia tua sca]
2. Communicantes *sed et* [et] memoriam uenerantes
3. *ancleti* [cleti]
4. Hanc igitur oblationem . . . *quam tibi offerimus in honore domni beati martyris tui ill. et pro peccatis atque offensionibus nostris ut omnium delictorum nostrorum remissionem consequi mereamur quaesumus dne* [quaesumus dne] ut placatus accipias diesque nostros . . . disponas atque nos
5. *eripias* [eripi] . . . et . . . iubeas . . . congregari.
6. Quam oblationem . . . facere *dignare* [digneris]
7. *quae* [ut] nobis corpus et sanguis fiat . . . qui . . . eleuatis
8. *oculis suis* [oculis].
9. *ad* [in] coelum ad te . . . tibi gratias
10. *egit* [agens] benedixit . . . dicens accipite et
11. *manducate* [manducate ex hoc omnes] . . . Simili modo . . .
12. *accepit* [accipiens] . . . calicem in scas
13. *et* [ac] uenerabiles manus . . . dedit . . . dicens accipite et bibite ex
14. *hoc* [eo] omnes.
15. *Inde* [Unde] et memores . . . filii tui.
16. *dni n* [dni di n] . . . passionis . . . resurrectionis . . . ascensionis offerimus . . .
17. *maiestati* [maiestati tuae] . . .
18. Supra quae . . . sereno uultu *aspicere dignare* [respicere digneris] et
19. Supplices te *rogamus et petimus* [rogamus] . . . iube
20. *perferri* [haec perferri] per manus sci angeli tui
21. *in sublimi altari tuo* [in sublime altare tuum] . . . ut quotquot
22. ex *hoc altari scificationis* [hac altaris participatione].

Of the Poitiers readings in these contrasts those numbered 15, 17, and 20 may fairly be dismissed as referable to the accidents of post-editorial transcription; but there can be no doubt that in a largely preponderating majority of the rest the reading which by universal consent would be regarded as Gregorian differs from its rival as does a revised text from the same text as it stood before revision. Thus:

[1] Since this was written I have found unexpected support of my hypothesis in a suggestion of Mgr Duchesne's (*Origines* p. 173 n. 1): 'Il ne faut pas oublier, quand il s'agit de formules aussi anciennes, que le Verbe divin est quelquefois qualifié d'ange du Seigneur. Je n'entends pas définir si c'est ou non le cas ici.'

if in 1 we assume 'pro tua sca ecclesia' to be the earlier reading, 'pro ecclesia tua sca' is explained by the danger of vocally converting, as would be only too likely to happen to careless or preoccupied readers of a sixth-century manuscript, the final letter of 'sca' and the initial of 'ecclesia' into a diphthong: and in 18 not only is the danger averted of pronouncing 'uultu aspicere' 'uult uaspicere', but a better idiom is secured by substituting 'respicere' for 'aspicere'.

Again: both sibilation, assonance, and the danger of a false vocal distribution will have been remedied if we assume that in 3 the words 'Communicantes sed et'—which with some readers might be made to sound like 'Communicantes et et'—have been replaced by 'Communicantes et'; while in 5 the reviser postulated by my hypothesis not only remedied a needless assonance when he superseded 'eripias . . . iubeas' by 'eripi . . . iubeas', but effected two striking parallelisms, balancing 'ut . . . (i) accipias diesque nostros in tua pace (ii) disponas' by 'atque ab aeterna damnatione nos (α) eripi et in electorum tuorum (iii) iubeas grege (β) numerari'. On the same assumption, sibilation and assonance were remedied in 8 by the omission of the needless 'suis' from 'elevatis oculis suis'; and sibilation in 21 reduced by the suppression of 'et petimus' in the phrase 'Supplices te rogamus et petimus omnipotens Deus'.

Again: needless assonances were, by my hypothesis, remedied when in 6 'Quam oblationem . . . facere dignare' was of set purpose replaced by 'Quam oblationem . . . facere digneris', and in 10 'gratias egit, benedixit, fregit' by 'gratias agens, benedixit, fregit'.

In the clause which introduces the words of institution we have, besides the change of 'oculis suis' into 'oculis', the further correction (9), as simple as it is desirable, of 'ad coelum ad te' into 'in caelum ad te'; nor can there be a doubt that in 12 the conversion of 'accepit' into 'accipiens' would serve to determine the scope of the initial and therefore emphatic formula 'Simili modo' to the culminating phrase, 'dedit discipulis suis dicens accipite et bibite' &c. . . . And in 13 the substitution of 'ac' for 'et' not only rectifies a needless departure from the wording of the 'in scas ac uenerabiles manus' which stand before the words 'Accipite et manducate', it averts the danger incident to a mode of writing in which words were not kept separate from each other, the danger of so pronouncing the words as if 'sanctas set uenerabiles' had been intended. In the case of so 'perilous' a formulary as the prayer of consecration no precaution against lapses like these could be too scrupulous. Nor can this consideration be too carefully borne in mind.

Of converse instances there are none; and there can be no doubt that in each of these the reading which *ex hypothesi* is the later of the

two is also the better of the two.[1] Besides them there are two in which the corrective motive of a careful theologian would seem to have been at work.

Thus, the relation of effect to cause is in 7 more clearly and more happily expressed by 'ut' than by 'quae', admirable in itself as is the construction yielded by the relative pronoun—'Quam oblationem tu dŝ benedictam adscriptam ratam rationabilem acceptamque facere digneris ut [instead of 'quae'] nobis corpus et sanguis fiat' &c. And, indeed, the reviser postulated by my hypothesis may have deemed 'ut' a dogmatically safer word than 'quae', for the further reason that he conceived it possible that 'facere digneris' might be thought to have a governing force such as would be proper to the metaphrasis 'dignam facias'; in which event the sense would have been 'Quam oblationem tu dŝ benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptam facias, et dignam quae nobis corpus et sanguis fiat' &c.

To this instance we may add 16, where the hypothetically later variant 'dñi di n̄' is, for an evident theological reason, preferable to 'dñi n̄'.

That in the present list of contrasts between Poitiers on the one hand and Canterbury and Petau on the other, the latter category represent the *textus classicus* of St Gregory's revision of the Canon is a proposition which is not likely to be challenged; but I make bold to hazard the opinion that, if we neglect the Poitiers readings in 17 and 20—for they are evidently scribal, and not improbably post-editorial, blunders—and, for reasons to be explained presently, except those in 3 and 11 as doubtful, the former category exhibit to us the text of which St Gregory's *classicus* was the recension. Indeed, if we could but certainly know that, when the Poitiers copy of the Canon reached its destination, it had already been reinforced by St Gregory's own interpolation, the 'diesque nostros' clause, we might with some confidence assert that—allowance made, as I have just intimated, for the possible exception of 'Anacleti' as against 'Cleti', and of 'manducate' as against 'manducate ex hoc omnes'—its text was the very text which Gregory himself used in the earlier years of his pontificate. But even if, instead of holding this opinion to be probable until disproved, as for all argumentative purposes we should be bound to do, we content ourselves with the more philosophical alternative of treating it as merely possible, there remain one or two readings proper to the Poitiers text which have a claim on our attention for considerations

[1] For many instances of very closely analogous contrasts between a presumably late and a presumably early text of St Gregory's *Antiphonary*, each of them in all moral certainty authentic, see pp. cxxxv-cxli of my Introduction to the Missal of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury.

much higher than those of idiomatic clearness, euphony, and vocal accuracy.

In the 'Supplices' paragraph the Poitiers reading is 'iube (haec) perferri per manus sc̄i angeli tui (21) in sublimi altari tuo [*as against* 'in sublime altare tuum'] in conspectu diuinae maiestatis tuae ut quotquot (22) ex hoc altari sc̄ificationis [*as against* 'ex hac altaris participatione'] sacrosc̄i filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamur'. Except on the barely tenable hypothesis of a Merovingian ablative in place of an accusative, this 'perferri in sublimi altari tuo' must be regarded as fraught with danger, for it might be deemed a *constructio praegnans*, and interpreted as meaning 'Command these gifts to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy heavenly altar and there by him presented to Thee'. St Gregory's phrase, by which I mean St Gregory's happy substitution of the accusative inflexion for an ablative, gives a sense which from the theological point of view is diametrically different: 'Command them to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy heavenly altar'; this and nothing more; this and with it no suggestion that the function of there making atonement devolves on the angel minister, or any created being whomsoever. It would be impossible to overestimate the service here rendered to sound theology by a textual modification which may reasonably be attributed to St Gregory.

The contrast exhibited by the next pair of readings is equally instructive; for it would well have become so trustworthy a teacher as St Gregory, by neglecting 'ex hoc altari sc̄ificationis' for 'ex hac altaris participatione', to call off the thoughts of the hearers of the Canon from an exclusive contemplation of the material '*hoc altare*' at which they were gathered to that '*altare tuum*' within the veil of which all in all ages are partakers, the altar of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle.[1]

Turning from these very sacred topics to the contrasted readings in the present list which yet await notice, we find that in the third instance and the eleventh the Poitiers text seems to reveal a distinctly different literary tradition from that observable in what I conceive to be St Gregory's *textus classicus*.

Scholars have no need to be reminded that in some catalogues of the Bishops of Rome the immediate predecessor of St Clement is called, like St Clement's immediate successor, not Cletus, but Anacletus. Whether the truth be that the earlier of these had two names, or that

[1] In this connexion compare the following from the *Orationes Paschales* &c. of the Missale Gothicogallicanum: 'In sanctorum sancta admissi et altaris caelestis sacerdotii aeterni participes effecti . . . deprecemur' &c., Mur. ii 586 (Migne *S. L.* lxxii 271 B).

'Anacletus' is in the case of this Pope an error for 'Cletus', 'Anacletus' is favoured by Greek writers and 'Cletus' by Latin. Hence the possibility that our 'ancleti'—by which I assume 'anacleti' to be meant—is a reading which had been substituted in place of an authentic 'cleti' in obedience to an immemorial tradition of the Gallican Church, a tradition based on the literary authority of St Irenaeus. But, whether we suppose that 'anacleti' is the original and Roman reading of the Canon which found its way to Poitiers, or that 'ancleti' is, as I have just ventured to suggest, a Gallican substitute for an original and Roman 'cleti', we cannot doubt that 'cleti' is the reading of St Gregory's *textus classicus*, and 'ancleti' a true variant.

Similarly, the Poitiers 'Manducate' in the words of institution is, I apprehend, a true variant; though here again it may be difficult to decide whether 'Manducate' on the one hand or 'Manducate ex hoc omnes' on the other is purely textual or purely traditional; and equally difficult to decide whether a Gallican bishop who had been accustomed to 'Manducate' would be likely, out of respect for the tradition of his own Church, to elide 'ex hoc omnes' from his copy of the Roman Canon, or whether St Gregory's predecessors at Rome having always said 'Manducate', Gregory himself would venture to add 'ex hoc omnes'. But, whatever be the right account, 'Manducate' must be regarded as the true Poitiers reading, 'Manducate ex hoc omnes' that of St Gregory's *textus classicus*.

We are on different ground when we come to the only pair of variants (4) that now awaits consideration; for here there is no reason to suspect that the Poitiers reading may not at one time have been in use at Rome. When dealing with I 1, I suggested, as the reason why the Poitiers text contains no prayer for either Pope or local bishop, that the Poitiers text is, as mere matter of fact, a papal text, and a papal text in the stricter acceptation of the term; a text, that is to say, which had been designed primarily, if not exclusively, for use by a Bishop of Rome. When dealing with II 1, I thought it possible that the formula 'pro quibus tibi offerimus' had been inserted into the *Memento* of the living by Gregory the Great, his design being to make that paragraph applicable to occasions on which Mass might be said on behalf of heathens, for of these the phrase 'qui tibi offerunt' could not be used. And here, in the 'Hanc igitur' paragraph, we seem to have an adaptation to new, though not necessarily non-Roman, circumstances by means of a cancelled, not a substituted, text. Shall I be deemed too bold if I attribute this also to St Gregory? So long as the immemorial custom was as yet unbroken in obedience to which Bishops of Rome celebrated the anniversary of a martyr's death or deposition by saying Mass on the site of that martyr's tomb, and so long as Bishops of Rome were the sole or

primary users of the Canon, so long would it be apposite that the Canon should comprise as part of its normal text the formula 'quam tibi offerimus in honore domni beati martyris tui *illius* et pro peccatis atque offensionibus nostris' &c.; this bearing to the special clauses to be interpolated at Easter, at Pentecost, and on exceptional occasions the same sort of relation that the *Praefatio Communis*, the normal prefix to the Canon, bears to proper Prefaces. But when, in the course of Gregory's pontificate, the continued occupation of the Campagna by the Lombards had thrown the custom just mentioned into desuetude that promised to be final, and when the policy was firmly established which set no geographical limit to the extra-Roman use of the Canon, a reviser who had an official and personal authority like Gregory's might well deem it his wisdom to cancel the clause. And this could the more conveniently be done now that the phrase 'diesque nostros ... numerari' was present to give, what otherwise had been lacking, substance and purpose to the words 'Hanc igitur oblationem ... quaesumus ut placatus accipias'.

I submit these considerations on the Poitiers text of the Roman Canon to the judgement of scholars not only because, as was intimated in my remarks on the first of the variants just examined (I 1), I believe it to have been transcribed from a papal copy—papal in the more restricted sense of the phrase—but also for the more interesting reason which my readers have by this time surmised, that its characteristics justify us in inferring it to be the text on which Gregory founded his better known recension, and to represent the period in his literary labours which lay between his introduction of the 'diesque nostros' clause and his adjunction of the Lord's Prayer.

The defective condition of this our only copy of what I believe to be the proto-Gregorian text of the Roman *Canon Actionis* cannot be too deeply deplored; but I believe that if the missing leaves of the Vatican Codex should ever come to light they will be found to justify the view formulated in the subjoined syllabus of linear values; that, whereas at the last general recension, notified as γ_3, the document had occupied eighty-eight pages, four more, the equivalent of a membrane, were employed at the subredaction γ_3 *bis*, the main object of this enlargement being to find room for the Lord's Prayer and its textual accessories. True it is that no more than seventeen lines were required for these: but space of the value of two pages was now allotted to minor rubrics interspersed through the political Mass, the Sanctorale, and the first four *missae cotidianae*[1]; space of the nett value of nine lines was now given to minor rubrics in the fifth and sixth *cotidianae*,[2] the Preface of this last being carried forward from the end of p. lxxxii and through the first four

[1] See above, pp. 538, 544, 545, 554. [2] *Ib.* p. 555.

		Scheme γ_3	Scheme γ_2 bis
		Eight pages	Nine pages
INCIPIT CANON ACTIONIS		lxxxi 3	*
Sursum corda. *Resp.* Habemus ad dñm	26	1	*
Gratias agamus dño dõ ñ	18	1	*
Dignum et iustum est	16	1	*
Vere dignum et iustum &c.	338	12	*
Te igitur clementissime &c.	311	11	lxxxiiii 12
Memento dñe famulorum &c.	250	9	9
Communicantes sed et &c.	430	15	15
Hanc igitur oblationem &c.	345	12	12
Quam oblationem &c.	165	6	6
Qui pridie quam &c.	206	7	7
Simili modo postquam &c.	335	12	12
Inde et memores &c.	314	11	11
Supra quae propitio &c.	193	7	7
Supplices te rogamus &c.	244	9	9
Memento etiam dñe &c.	175	6	6
Nobis quoque peccatoribus &c.	367	13	13
Per quem haec omnia dñe &c.	180	7	7 = 126
Oremus	5		xc 1
Praeceptis salutaribus &c.	66		3
Pater ñ qui es in caelis	18		1
Rubric	10		1
Sed libera nos a malo	16		1
Libera nos quaesumus dñe &c.	289		10
Pax dñi sit semper uobiscum	22	1	1
Et cum spũ tuo	10	1	1
Explicit		2 = 147	
Last page		lxxxviii BOOK ENDS.	
Explicit of *Canon Actionis*			2 = 21
Postcommunion of *cotidiana* VI			xci 4
Ad plebem of *cotidiana* VI			3
Additional prayers			12
Explicit			2 = 21
Last page			xcii BOOK ENDS.

lines of lxxxiii by means of the added 'Unde nos . . . resurgentis'. The two remaining constituents of the last *cotidiana* being relegated to a distant page, the incipit of the Canon now found itself in a place which ill became it; but, awkward as this arrangement unquestionably was, the awkwardness was redeemed by three consequent felicities; for now,[1] as had not been the case before, the Canon κατ' ἐξοχήν, the formula of consecration itself—the formula beginning with the mystic *tau*, the initial letter of the paragraph 'Te igitur'—began on the first line of a page (p. lxxxiiii); now the Canon κατ' ἐξοχήν ended on the last line of a *recto* page (p. lxxxviiii); and hence the *Pater noster* with its accessories, which, as Gregory himself had taken care to explain to his friends, was no part of the Canon, now stood on the *verso*, p. xc. Page xci was

[1] See table above

devoted to the transferred 'Post communionem' and 'Ad plebem' of the last *missa cotidiana*, and a few supplementary prayers; after which p. xcii, left blank, closed the volume.

Yet nothing would have been easier than to make the introductory portion of the *Canon Actionis*—the *Praefatio Communis* and its accessories—fill precisely the whole of p. lxxxiii; for, as the reader will perceive on reverting to the table of the linear values of the *missae cotidianae*, nothing could have been easier than (1) to assign six minor rubrics instead of ten to the last two of these, (2) thus giving the *capitulum* of the Canon its due place and dignity in the first three lines of p. lxxxiii, and (3) to prolong the *Praefatio Communis* and triumphal hymn from 338 letters to 429 (that is to say, from twelve lines to fifteen) by adding to the latter, which now ends at 'sabaoth', the complementary phrases 'Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua. Osanna in excelsis. Benedictus qui uenit in nomine dn̄i. Osanna in excelsis'. The admirable concinnity of arrangement which would have been achieved by these transparently simple economies leaves me absolutely certain that—except on the extremely improbable hypothesis of clerical caprice or error—the now immemorial phrases just cited were not regarded by the Church of Poitiers as necessary part of the ordinary of the Mass at the time of the last rehandling of our document. What may have been the use of other dioceses than Poitiers, or of other provinces than Bordeaux, is a question irrelevant to the present subject.

Conclusion.

The external history of the document may with probability be summarized thus :—

First, at a comparatively late date in the fifth century, and in a newly written *libellus*, the earliest ascertainable pontifical of the Roman Church, carried to Gaul for the use, if of any one, of a bishop; and there through a long series of years, which may have included the whole of the sixth century, adapted to the ritual of first one, then another, perhaps even a third, diocese or province.

Secondly, a political Mass and a short Sanctorale, which, accruing to the pontifical about the year 474, were thenceforth amplified concurrently with it, though not at each of its many redactions.

Thirdly, and after the lapse of perhaps a human generation; a group of *missae cotidianae* annexed to the foregoing and, though originally framed in conformity to the Roman rite, in such wise developed as to suit the requirements of the rite usually known as Gallican.

Fourthly, and with the year 590 as its *terminus a quo*, the Roman *Canon Actionis* in its proto-Gregorian text subjoined to the triple document at a moment when the Sanctorale in this reached its final stage of

textual developement. If the Vatican Codex were but complete we should in all moral certainty be able to say that the Lord's Prayer was subsequently added; perhaps during or soon after the journey through Gaul, in 596, of St Gregory's missionaries to England, but probably at a much later date.

I suspect that inferences more explicit than these are to be deduced from a careful scrutiny of the many items of the document. But all that I at present venture to suggest is that the transportation into Gaul of the primary nucleus, the hitherto unsuspected text of the first ascertainable pontifical of a Bishop of Rome, must be referred to Sidonius Apollinaris, the illustrious Gallo-Roman, who, *Praefectus Urbis* in 468, the year which witnessed the election of Pope Simplicius, was himself consecrated Bishop of Clermont[1] a year or two later; and that to him are due the successive editions notified in the foregoing essay as θ_1, θ_2, and θ_3, the two-page political *missa* in the last of these being compiled and used by him during the terrible siege of Clermont by the Visigoths in 474,[2] and the first scheme of the Sanctorale being also his[2]; that when, on the cession of Auvergne, in 475, Sidonius was sent into banishment, he took his *libellus* with him; that he left a copy of it at Bordeaux, where part of his exile was spent; and that there, in or about the year 500, it was amplified by formulae for the blessing of paten and chalice[3] and a group of *missae cotidianae*[4]; that from Bordeaux it found its way to the suffragan see of Poitiers; that here it was three times re-edited throughout, but that between the first (γ_1) and second (γ_2) of these editions[5] the Sanctorale and *missae cotidianae* underwent a very considerable developement (γ_1 *bis*), being, by this means, adapted to a ritual which, though subject to local variation, was of the type known as Gallican; that at the second and third (γ_2 and γ_3) general γ revisions[6] the pontifical received some very curious accessions; that on the last of them (γ_3) the *Canon Actionis* was incorporated into the document in a text identical, save for two possible concessions to Poitevin tradition, with that which was in use at Rome in the early years of Gregory the Great[7]; and that a yet later edition followed, perhaps at Poitiers, perhaps in some other diocese, the main characteristic feature of which was that the Lord's Prayer had been added to the Canon.[8]

[1] Professor Dill in the learned, though not perhaps duly appreciative, account of Sidonius which forms one of the many charms of his *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, makes the remarkable mistake of styling him Bishop of Auvergne. Arverni—like the analogous Cenomanni or Treviri—was not a province, but a city. The modern name of the place is Clermont-Ferrand.

[2] See above, pp. 538 and 544, 545.

[3] See p. 247, in column headed 'Scheme θ_3 bis'.

[4] See above, pp. 554, 555.

[5] *Ib.* p. 544, 545 and 554, 555.

[6] See pp. 234, 235, 243, 244.

[7] See above, pp. 560–568.

[8] *Ib.* 568–570.

The last component section of this bridge of many spans has fallen into ruin; but the foundations of the first may have been laid by Leo the Great, and this is as perfect now as when Simplicius, Leo's second successor, completed it. The last span but one was fashioned by contemporaries of St Gregory.

MARTIN RULE.

POSTSCRIPT. In my previous article there are two uncorrected inaccuracies. On p. 237 (line 27) *for* 'the Leonianum text has a change' *read* 'the Leonianum text has a clause'. On p. 246 (line 6 of paragraph '3') *for* 'then looks' *read* 'thus looks'