

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

CHRONICLE

LITURGICA.

IN *The Stowe Missal* vol. ii, issued by the Henry Bradshaw Society in the autumn, Sir George Warner completes his edition 'of the oldest Mass-book of the early Irish Church known to have survived'. Vol. i, containing a photographic facsimile of the Missal and of the Irish tract on the Mass, which follows it in the MS, was issued in 1906. The new volume consists of (1) a reprint of the text of the Missal, with the contractions expanded, and the later hands distinguished from the first hand by small type, and with an apparatus of notes which are chiefly textual, but also include references to other ritual books where the same prayers occur; (2) a reprint of the Irish tract, similarly treated, and of Stokes and Strachan's translation of it; (3) an Introduction of fifty-two pages, treating of the history, structure, palaeographical character, and date of the Missal, and of the character and date of the *cumdach* or casket in which it is contained; and, parenthetically, of the palaeography and date of the Latin fragments of the Fourth Gospel which are bound up with the Missal; and (4) photographic plates of the several parts of the *cumdach* and of three of the pages of the St John fragments. In dealing with the text of the Missal Sir George Warner confines himself by choice to palaeographical considerations, though happily he transgresses these limits in discussing the lists of Saints which occur, in their bearing on the date of the book. The discussions which he allows himself both on the text and on the casket seem to be exhaustive and final. And the story which results from his investigations is something like this. The Missal was written in the Monastery of Tallaght, near to Dublin, early in the ninth century, and during the reign of Echaïdh, abbot and bishop, 792-812, being copied from an archetype of some fifty years earlier. Being intended to supply the young house of Tallaght with an authoritative use, it was tentative, and consequently it was almost immediately subjected to considerable correction, especially at the hands of a scribe by name Moelcaich, who made additions partly over erasures and partly on new inserted leaves. The MS remained at Tallaght for 200 years, and then was carried off by Donchadh mac Briain, king of Munster, at his invasion of Leinster in 1026, and being regarded as a sacred relic it was enshrined in a *cumdach* wrought by Dunchad O'Tagan. In about 1375 it was still in Munster, when the casket was partly reconstructed by one Domhnall

O'Tolari. Henceforth nothing is known of the book till the end of the eighteenth century, when it was acquired on the continent by 'John Grace', who was probably either John Grace, captain of carabineers in the imperial service, who died at the siege of Belgrade in 1789, or John Dowell Grace, captain of the Würtemberg dragoons, who died in Ireland in 1811. Anyhow there is little doubt that it was Richard, the second Marquess of Buckingham, who obtained the MS from the Grace family, with which he was connected by marriage, and added it to the Library at Stowe House. The Stowe collection was sold to Lord Ashburnham in 1849 and removed to Ashburnham House, where it remained till 1883, when it was bought by the nation, and those MSS which were of Irish interest were given to the Royal Irish Academy, in the Library of which the Stowe Missal still rests. All this is here, of course, put more dogmatically than it is by Sir George Warner: the evidence for it is to be found in his Introduction. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that the contents of the Missal are, a Litany, some of the leaves of which have got displaced and are now ff. 30 sq.; the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, in the main Roman, but with Gallican additions (especially the common prayers after the Epistle, here in the form of a Litany derived from the Byzantine rite, and interpolations in *Memento* and *Hanc igitur*, and the diptychs in *Memento etiam*); a common mass for saints, and one for the dead; an Order of Baptism; and an Order for the Visitation and Communion of the Sick.

It is twenty-five years since Dom Gasquet and Mr Edmund Bishop called attention to the Brit. Mus. MS Royal 7 B iv, and made it the point of departure of their work *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, in which also they printed a considerable part of its contents. Dr J. Wickham Legg has now printed and edited the whole text of the MS for the Henry Bradshaw Society, under the title of *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects* (1915). As every one who is interested in it knows, the text contains two schemes for a revised Divine Service, the first consisting of two offices, for morning and evening respectively; the other perpetuating the traditional order of seven day offices and a night office; while at the end there is a Kalendar, and a Table of Lessons adapted to the form of neither scheme, and possibly being all that survives of a third scheme. The MS is written in five hands: viz. hand A, that of the Kalendar and Table of Lessons of the first scheme (ff. 4-6); hand B, in which is written the first scheme down to the Fourth Lesson of March 9 (ff. 7-47); hand C, that of ff. 48-132, completing the series of Fourth Lessons of the first scheme, and ff. 133-150 containing the office of the second scheme; Cranmer's own hand, in which is written the Table of Lessons of the second scheme (ff. 151-

156); and lastly, hand D (ff. 157-159) covering the final Kalendar and its table of lessons. Of these hands, A, B, and D may possibly be one and the same; C is the hand of Ralf Morice, Cranmer's chaplain; and the work of A, B, and C has been corrected at many points by Cranmer himself. Dr Legg divides the text into three parts: 'Part I', which contains the two-office project—Kalendar and Table of Lessons, Preface, Rules for the recitation of the Psalter and the reading of Holy Scripture, the scheme of Service, the metrical Hymns, the Collects, and the uncompleted series of Fourth Lessons for the morning of certain immovable feasts; 'Part II', containing the second project, which is arranged like the Breviary, but without the text of the Psalms, and with only the *incipit* and *explicit* of proper Lessons, and the *incipit* of Hymns, followed by a Table of Lessons for Sundays and ferias; and the third part—which Dr Legg has not marked off so definitely from 'Part II' as he has marked off 'Part II' from 'Part I'—consisting of a Kalendar and a Table of Lessons, which, as was noted above, fits neither of the two projects. Throughout, Cranmer's corrections are noted in the margin. In the Introduction, after describing the MS, and after noting and illustrating the liturgical tendencies of the period, Dr Legg discusses the structure, contents, and sources of the two schemes and their several parts; and in the result he confirms the conclusion that the longer office ('Part II') in point of structure approximates to the second recension of Quignon's *Breviarium Romanum*, while its content is almost exclusively Sarum matter; and as to the shorter office ('Part I'), after examining a number of Lutheran schemes, while he inclines to the view that none of them affected Cranmer's work, and that similarities between the German and the English schemes are sufficiently accounted for by their common derivation from the traditional rite, he concludes that, if any of the German *Kirchenordnungen* did affect Cranmer at this point, it was most probably Bugenhagen's *Pia et vere catholica ordinatio* of 1535. In the 'Notes' at the end of the volume Dr Legg traces the sources in detail and discusses other points that arise. An Appendix puts in parallel columns the Prefaces of the two recensions of Quignon, and their derivatives, viz. the Preface of 'Part I' and that of the Book of Common Prayer of 1549, i.e. our present 'Concerning the Service of the Church'; and lastly, six facsimiles, inserted after the Introduction, illustrate the several handwritings of the MS. Dr Legg has probably said nearly all that needs to be said or can be said about Cranmer's projects, at least for the present. Among what appear to be new points that he has made are these. Whereas it is commonly and naturally supposed that 'Part II' is prior in date to 'Part I', Dr Legg notices that this cannot be taken for granted, and that there are some, if inconclusive, reasons for the view that the order

of the MS represents the order of events, and that Cranmer's unstable mind reacted from the excessive simplification of 'Part I'. Again, he has explained the Kalendar of 'Part I', with its strange assortment of Scriptural names, by noting that these correspond to one of the Lessons of the day, being in each case the name, either of the author of the book then beginning to be read, or of the subject of the story; while only a few more than half of them were to be commemorated, and then only by a Fourth Lesson at Matins in the shape of a short sermon on the moral of their lives. And again, Dr Legg points out that in these Fourth Lessons Cranmer generally uses the version of Erasmus (1519) in place of the Vulgate of the New Testament. The only section on which Dr Legg appears to have left room for any considerable addition to his notes is that of these same Fourth Lessons. He has not identified the sources of a number of them. This is only natural, and it is unimportant. But if any one wants an amusement for his leisure, he may find it in endeavouring to run to ground some more of Cranmer's quotations. Here are some contributions, and incidentally some corrections in detail. P. 54 ll. 35-41 are from Erasmus's *Paraphrase* on Acts xvi (hence delete the note on l. 36; also correct the note on p. 55 ll. 6-13, where there is no Vulgate except what Erasmus has in common with the Vulgate). P. 55 ll. 39-41 is expanded from the entry in the *Martyrologium* of Usuard. P. 57 l. 7 'Nam cum'—l. 18 'suis' is from Rufinus *Hist. Eccl.* x 36. P. 57 ll. 23 sq. 'conversus . . . Paulum' is from St Bernard *in Conv. S. Pauli Serm.* ii 1; ll. 24 sq. 'conversus . . . mundo' and p. 58 l. 31—59 l. 19 from *ibid.* i 1, 2, 5, 6; and with p. 59 ll. 20-25 cp. the popular verse 'Clara dies Pauli' &c. P. 60 ll. 15 sq. ('sic . . . recepissent') comes from Erasmus *Paraphrase* on Acts ix 10 sqq. The middle part of the Lesson on St Chrysostom, p. 62, the Gainas incident, must come from Theodoret *H.E.* v 32, not from Socrates. P. 63, nearly all that is not taken from St Jerome is from Eus. *H.E.* iii 36 (Rufinus), viz. ll. 17-19, 28-30, 36. Pp. 69 sqq., the Lesson on the XL Martyrs is not only 'based upon' St Basil's Homily, but in the main is quoted from the sixteenth-century Latin version of it, which is reprinted in Fronto Ducaeus's edition of St Basil's works, Paris, Morel, 1618. P. 73: correct the note and for 'll. 23-35' read 'll. 18-39'; for '15' read '15-17'; and delete the last two sentences as needless, since the allusion to Philo is derived from Jerome. P. 89: correct the note and for '16-21' read '18-21'. P. 89 l. 23—90, l. 21 is wholly taken from St Jerome (see note p. 217). P. 98 l. 33-100, l. 27 is translated from St Gregory Nazianzen *Hom.* xviii: pp. 100 l. 27—102 l. 9 is from a *Passio S. Cypriani*, which has been ascribed to Paulus Diaconus, and is only an interpolated and spoiled recension

of the *Acta proconsularia*. P. 105 ll. 28-41 'conscriptis' is from Eus. *H. E.* iii 4 (Rufinus); the rest of the Lesson from St Jerome *Catalogus* 7. The authority for the date, vii Kal. Feb., of St Polycarp's martyrdom, which Dr Legg has failed to discover (p. 205), is *Martyrolog. Rom. Vet.* and *Martyrolog. Hieronym.* (discussed in Lightfoot *Ignatius* i p. 688); and with reference to the same page, the martyrdom was not on 'the Great Sabbath' i.e. Easter Eve, but on 'a great sabbath' (see Lightfoot *in loc.*). P. 110 ll. 5, 6 (not 5-8) and ll. 28-32 (not 30), and p. 111 ll. 22 sq., 25-29, 34 'confectus' -36, come from St Jer. *Catal.* 9; p. 110 ll. 7-20 from St Jer. *adv. Iovin.* i; ll. 20-27 from Anianus's Latin version of St Chrys. *in Matt.* i 3; l. 32-p. 111 l. 21 from St Chrys. *in Ioan.* ii 1-3; p. 111 ll. 23 ('Ephesi'), 24 are a conflation of St Jer. *ad Iovin.* i and Quignon; and ll. 31-33 ('columna . . . recubuit') are from St Chrys. *in Ioan.* i 1. The only printed edition of the works of St Jerome which existed in Cranmer's days was that of Erasmus, Bâle 1516-1520 and Paris 1534, and of each of these prints Cranmer possessed a copy (Burbidge *Liturgies and Offices* p. xxii). It is therefore likely that Cranmer would use Erasmus's text. And in fact he did. For first, the curious reading 'ultimam Hamam Hadriani' on p. 75 l. 14 is explained by Erasmus's text; the scribe has simply included the catchword at the bottom of the *recto* of vol. i f. 120 (ulti[mam Ha]mam Hadriani). And again, Erasmus's text of the *Catalogus* is interpolated, and Cranmer has reproduced some of the interpolations: thus p. 52 l. 7 sq., p. 68 ll. 10-12, p. 95 ll. 20 sq., 32, words in p. 106 ll. 1-4, 9-12, and p. 111 l. 27 ('pertinace'), are all found in the text of Erasmus. Dr Legg holds that Cranmer is dependent on Geo. Witzel's *Hagiologium* (Mainz 1541) for some of these lessons. It may be so: but the supposition seems to me gratuitous. The points at which Dr Legg cites Witzel are p. 55 ll. 38 sqq., where there are only a few words in common and these Usuard's; p. 73, on St Mark, where Cranmer anyhow has read Eusebius further than as he is represented in Witzel; pp. 77 sqq., for Gordius, for whom St Basil is the obvious and only authority, while both Witzel and Cranmer only reproduce the sixteenth-century translation of St Basil mentioned above; pp. 83 sq., St Basil, for whom St Gregory Nazianzen is again the obvious authority; p. 94, for an obvious quotation from Eusebius; p. 95 l. 32, which, as we have seen, comes from Erasmus's Jerome; pp. 100 sqq., the Passion of St Cyprian, which Witzel marks as '*ex Cypriano*', i. e. from Erasmus's edition of St Cyprian, where it is printed before the text; and p. 105, where, as we have seen, the passage in question is an obvious quotation from Eusebius. There is in fact nothing supposed to be borrowed from Witzel which it was not quite obvious to anybody to take directly from Witzel's sources. Finally,

there are two or three questions I should like to ask. On what principle are words obelized in the text? The obelus presumably means that the word so marked is obviously a mistake on the part of the scribe of the MS, not of the editor. But there are numberless evident mistakes left un-obelized (e. g. p. 76 'augebat' for 'angebat', p. 97 'clauculum' for 'clanculum'; p. 105 'velum . . . sumante' for 'velis . . . sinuatis'), which can scarcely be attributed to the editor. Then, why does Dr Legg apparently ignore Cranmer's correction of pp. 116 sq. and adopt as intended what surely is only a mistake of the scribe—viz. the assignment of *Pater noster* and *preces* to Sunday Lauds, and of the collect of the day to Prime? And finally, why did not Dr Legg tell us his opinion as to what Dom Gasquet and Mr Bishop took for granted, viz. that this MS is the document which was asked for by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1547?

Mr H. A. Wilson has added to his many services, notably that of his edition of the *Gelasianum*, by editing, for the Henry Bradshaw Society, *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great* (1915). As is well known, what is called the *Gregorian* is not the Roman Sacramentary in the state which it had reached in the pontificate of St Gregory the Great—whether reformed by St Gregory or not—but a composite work consisting of the papal Sacramentary as transmitted to Charlemagne by Hadrian I, then regarded as the work of St Gregory but including some matter of later date, and a supplement, compiled out of matter of the *Gelasianum*, of Hadrian's book itself, and other sources, supplying further masses both to fill up the year and for other occasions, and other matter, together with a long series of proper prefaces and of episcopal benedictions. This supplement was almost certainly the work of Alcuin, and the compiler prefixed to it a *prae-fatiuncula*, explaining its purpose as for optional use in the Frankish Church. In later copies the *prae-fatiuncula* was omitted and the book thus made continuous; and later still the book was thoroughly unified by the orderly rearrangement of its contents. Mr Wilson's edition exhibits the text in its original form as arranged by Alcuin. He uses three MSS: viz. Vatican *Reginae* 357, written in France in the ninth century and probably before 850; Vatican *Ottobon.* 313, of the first half of the ninth century and probably in use in the cathedral church of Paris before 850; and Cambrai 164, a copy of the papal book, without the supplement, written for use at Cambrai in 811 or 812, and probably derived from Hadrian's archetype by a tradition independent of that which issued in Alcuin's compilation. Mr Wilson adopts the text of *Reginae* 357, supplying the omitted *prae-fatiuncula* from *Ottobon.* 357; and at the foot of the page he gives the variants of the other

two MSS, as well as the marginal Antiphony-cues of *Ottobon.* 357. Since the final collections of proper prefaces and episcopal benedictions are different in the two Vatican MSS, and the original series is at present unrecoverable or unrecognizable, Mr Wilson prints both collections at length; and in an Appendix he has added certain masses found in the margin of *Ottobon.* 357 and some additional matter written on a blank page of it. The two Vatican MSS are those which were used by Muratori for his *Gregorianum* in *Liturgia vetus Romana* i; but, as Mr Edm. Bishop pointed out some years ago, Muratori's edition is quite misleading by reason of a serious dislocation in the order of the contents. Mr Wilson, in supplying a text, for the excellence and finality of which his name is a sufficient guarantee, has rectified the order; while he has pointed out, in a footnote, that Muratori's confusion is not, as Mr Bishop suggested, the result of the printer's mistake in numbering and binding up the leaves, but of some remoter cause. In his Introduction Mr Wilson gives an account of former editions of the *Gregorianum*—those of Pamelius, Rocca, Ménard, and Muratori; describes and discusses his MSS in detail; and compares them with one another in respect of contents, which in the *Ottobon.* and *Reginae* MSS differ quite slightly, except in the supplementary Prefaces and Benedictions. Finally there are three indexes; one of liturgical forms; a second of marginal cues; and a third of subjects. I have only noticed one thing of the nature of a misprint: if I rightly understand the structure of the paragraph, lines 19–26 of p. xxxiv ought to occupy the full width of the printed page and not to be contracted to the length of the preceding lines.

The Canticles of Holy Scripture—represented in our own rite by *Benedicite*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc dimittis*—are used, in numbers varying according to rite, in the Divine Service everywhere, and together with other hymns of later origin, like *Gloria in excelsis*, *Te Deum*, 'Ο *μωυουενης*, and the *Cherubicon*, used whether in Divine Service or in the Liturgy, and sometimes also with the Creeds and the *Pater noster*, are commonly appended to the Psalter. In *The Canticles of the Christian Church Eastern and Western in early and medieval times* (Cambridge 1914) Mr J. Mearns has catalogued a large number of the MS collections and their contents, belonging to all rites and in all the ecclesiastical languages: Greek, Graeco-Latin, Arabic, Georgian, Persian, and Slavonic; Armenian; Coptic; Syriac (Melchite, Jacobite and Maronite, Nestorian and Chaldaean); and Latin-Roman, Milanese, Frankish, Gallican, Irish, Mozarabic, and Monastic; noticing also the usages indicated by the ecclesiastical writers; e.g. by Nicetas for the Danube lands, and by St Augustine for Africa. To each section

Mr Mearns prefixes a short account of the community to which the following collection appertains; and he illustrates his MSS by three facsimiles, two Greek of the eleventh century, and one Syriac of about A.D. 900. He thus provides much material for the study of these collections and of the history of the use of Canticles in the several rites. Two or three points suggest a remark. Φῶς Ἰλαρον (p. 16) is found also in Armenian and is used in Armenian Sunday Vespers (Conybeare *Rit. Arm.* p. 478). Ὁ μονογενῆς (p. 17) is primarily Byzantine, and in St James is borrowed from the Byzantine rite; and it is used also in the Syrian Jacobite Liturgy (*Litt. E. and W.* p. 77). Similarly (p. 18) the two *Cherubica*, Οἱ τὰ Χερουβίμ certainly, and Σιγησάρω probably, are Byzantine, and only borrowed in St Mark and St James respectively. The Georgian 'books' of the Psalter (p. 37) are evidently identical with the Greek καθίσματα. And the *lingua Bessa* of the *Itinerary* of Antoninus (p. 94) is surely not Abyssinian, but the language of the Bessi of the Balkan slopes, numbers of whom were to be found as monks in the Judæan desert and the Jordan valley in the fifth and sixth centuries and used a vernacular rite: see Theodore *Life of St Theodosius* (ed. Usener p. 45); Cyril of Scythopolis *Life of St Saba* 86; John Moschus *Pratum spirituale* 157 (the two latter cited by Usener in his note).

The 'Alcuin Tract' x (1913) is Mr R. M. Woolley's *The Bread of the Eucharist*. Mr Woolley's treatment falls into two parts. In the first part he deals with three points. (1) He examines once more the question of the date at which the use of unleavened bread was adopted in the West, and confirms what is, I suppose, the accepted conclusion, that unleavened bread became the general usage at earliest in the eighth century. He makes Alcuin, with some hesitation, it is true, a witness for it; but in fact Hrabanus Maurus is the first quite definite witness, and Alcuin's evidence is more than doubtful. (2) He sketches the history of the attack of the Greeks on the use of azymes in the eleventh century, and rightly emphasizes the reasonableness and tolerance of the West as against the general intolerance of the East: and here he could have cited also St Gregory VII *Ep.* viii 1. (3) He treats of English use both in the Middle Ages, and particularly in and after the sixteenth century. In the second part, Mr Woolley describes, and illustrates by photographs, the form of the altar-breads of the several Eastern Churches, and adds notes on what needs annotation in reference to each of them; and in particular he treats of the history of Armenian azymes at some length. It is not clear why, in his second part, he confines himself to the East; there are things to be said about the West as well. And in fact he might have a little enlarged his scope throughout,

and picked up the fragments of information about the bread of the altar that are to be found scattered up and down. In general Mr Woolley's treatment is otherwise quite satisfactory; but in detail it is possible to criticize his argument now and again: e.g. he gives the impression that 'unfermented' bread was practically unknown in the Empire outside of Palestine; but Celsus *de Medic.* ii 24, 25, 28, and Pliny *H. N.* xviii 26 (quoted by Dom Cabrol *Dict. Arch. et Lit. chrétienne* s. v. 'Azymes') seem to be sufficient to shew that it was not unfamiliar; and if Tacitus calls it *panis iudaicus*—well, what of French beans, Brussels sprouts, Indian corn, American cloth, and so on? Again, he curiously takes it for granted that it is impossible to make an unleavened loaf of size sufficient to satisfy the requirement of 'one bread'. But even if St Paul meant anything so precise and exclusive, and if a conscience was made of preserving this particular symbolism, yet unleavened bread need not be a small wafer—I have myself used bread cut from a small unleavened loaf, and there did not seem to be any reason why it should not be of any required size. There are some points of detail which it is difficult to agree with, and points which need correction: e.g. the conclusion from the Gospels that the Last Supper was 'probably' the Paschal Supper (p. 3); the strange distinction between *āpros* and *ō āpros* as respectively 'loaf' and 'bread' (p. 7); the inference that leavened bread was used under the rite of 1549 (p. 34), which may in fact have been the case in some quarters, but the authority cited for it surely refers to the book of 1552; that the question of leavened or unleavened bread was raised at the Savoy Conference (p. 42): I cannot recollect that any such question was raised—why should it be?—and Cosin presented no book to the Conference (*ibid.*), while the passage quoted is in fact from the 'Durham Book', and does any one still suppose that the 'Durham Book' was Cosin's to present to anybody, or that in fact it existed during the sessions of the Conference? Again, it is not the case that the Greeks offer only one loaf (p. 45); for centuries the rite has formally provided for five *προσφοραί*, to say nothing of the oblates offered by individuals. And why are the Syrian Jacobites described as the 'Orthodox Syrians'? And if they are, why not the Copts and Abyssinians as well? They all may be and probably are and always have been materially orthodox, but to describe them as 'Orthodox' is only misleading. I may add, that I should like to see the evidence that the Armenians ever ate the 'Old Zatik' on Maundy Thursday (p. 56), before I believe it. It might have been useful if Mr Woolley would have explicitly refuted the deluded Greek argument that, as unfermented 'wine' is not wine, so unleavened bread is not bread; and it would have been for the convenience of readers if he had made his references more complete, and indicated not only his authors and documents, but where the documents are to be found in print.

The practical purpose of Mr E. G. P. Wyatt's *The Eucharistic Prayer* (Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets, V, 1914) is 'to deal with the question whether it be desirable that revision' of the English Divine Liturgy 'should take the direction of approximation to the Roman Canon or not'. To this end, Mr Wyatt seeks to supply his readers with grounds for forming their own judgement by a careful and succinct summary of 'the state of the case' with regard to the criticism of the Roman Canon. The pamphlet contains three chapters. In the first, after indicating the acknowledged incoherences and perplexities of the Roman Canon, in contrast with the continuity and intelligibility of the corresponding tract of the Gallican rite, Mr Wyatt brings out the three points: (1) that if the paragraphs *Te igitur* to *Quam oblationem* and also *Memento etiam* and *Nobis quoque* are ignored, the residuum is identical, in point of structure and drift, with the Gallican, except in so far that it lacks a *postsanctus*, i. e. a paragraph to connect the *Sanctus* with the *Qui pridie*; and in relation to this, he shews that there are features to be found here and there in the Roman rite which suggest that the Roman Canon once possessed a paragraph analogous to what is found at this point in Gallican rites; (2) that the survival in the Milanese form of the Roman Canon of a *Vere sanctus* in place of *Te igitur*—*Quam oblationem* on Easter Even, and the direct passage from *Post pridie* to *Per quem* on Maundy Thursday, suggest that the Ambrosian was originally identical in structure with the Gallican and the Mozarabic; and (3) that this structure is practically identical with that of the earliest anaphora still available. It is a pity that this anaphora is here described as 'the following Ethiopian Church Order'. It is true that it occurs in the Ethiopic version of the so-called *Egyptian Church Order* and is still embedded in the normal Abyssinian anaphora; but it is neither itself the 'Church Order', nor 'Ethiopian'. Both the Ethiopic and the Latin text are translations from Greek; while there is good reason to suppose that it is the work of St Hippolytus; and if so, it is even more relevant to Mr Wyatt's purpose than he realizes. In the second chapter Mr Wyatt deals with the apparently interpolated paragraphs, *Te igitur*—*Quam oblationem* and *Memento etiam*, and demonstrates their 'instability', i. e. that in the liturgical texts they or parts of them occur in several different positions and connexions; e. g. *Communicantes*, *Hanc igitur*, and *Memento etiam* are found with the diptychs or the offertory, and *Te igitur* and *Quam oblationem* in the *postpridie*. In the last chapter, after a speculative reconstruction of the early history of the Roman *Missa fidelium*, Mr Wyatt makes his suggestions for the reform of the English rite, deprecating any change in the position of the Intercession, and proposing only the rearrangement of the prayers of the Eucharistia with a minimum of added connecting words, as securing

a so far satisfactory result with the least possible change, and one that would not have to be disturbed, but only supplemented, if further reform were desired in the future. The only point in the arrangement which seems to me to be unsatisfactory is the proposal to convert 'We do not presume' into an *embolismus* of the *Pater noster*. Whether on general grounds or on grounds of precedent, there might be something to be said for prefixing it to the *Pater noster* and its preface; but surely it is as wholly unfitted to be an *embolismus* as anything could be. It may be added that both text and translation of the Roman anaphora on pp. 2 sqq. leave something to be desired; and in particular, surely for 'pro quibus tibi offerimus', p. 4, should be read 'qui tibi offerunt', while 'sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam', the Leonine addition to *Supra quae*, is not the antecedent of 'quod tibi obtulit', but is in apposition to the first 'accepta', 'sicut . . . Melchizedech' being in effect a parenthesis. The argument on pp. 27-40 is not quite clear, or rather perhaps the passage is out of place and would come better after clause 7 on p. 15. Otherwise the pamphlet is straightforward, lucid, and useful, and includes a lot of matter in a short compass. Of course Mr Wyatt acknowledges his obvious debt to Dom Cagin.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.