

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]

THE CORONATION ORDER IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

I

THE anonymous *Life of St Oswald* contains a detailed account of the Coronation of King Edgar at Bath in 973 by the two archbishops Dunstan and Oswald.¹ This account follows so closely the Order found in the Cotton MS, Claudius A. iii, as to make it certain that the writer had before him either this very codex or one more like it than any other that we know.

The Coronation Orders of the latter part of the tenth century represent two stages of development. The earlier stage is found in the Corbey Sacramentary, which was written, probably in the abbey of St Vaast at Arras, by the order of Ratoldus abbot of Corbey, who died in 986.² Akin to it is the rather later form found in a MS written in the province of Rheims, which Wattenbach was inclined to assign to Cambray.³ Now at this period Arras was part of the diocese of Cambray, and it is natural to believe that these two Orders were derived independently from an English codex brought to that region between 960 and 980, possibly by the Corbey monks who came to Abingdon at Ethelwold's invitation to instruct his choir in chanting.⁴

The later stage is represented at its first appearance by the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert, the Coronation Order of which stands nearer to the Ratoldus Order than do the forms found in Claudius A. iii (which used to be called King Ethelred's Order) and the other MSS which group themselves with it. The distinctions within this group will concern us later; but at present we may confine our attention to Ratoldus, Claudius A. iii, and the *Vita Oswaldi*.

¹ Historians of York, Rolls Series, i 399 ff.

² Printed by Ménard as an appendix to his Gregorian Sacramentary, Paris, 1642, pp. 278-284 (Migne *P. L.* lxxviii 255-260).

³ Printed by Waitz *Die Formeln der Deutschen Königs- und der Römischen Kaiser-Krönung*, Göttingen, 1873. The MS is now at Cologne Cathedral Library (no. 141), 's. x-xi'. This Order is not noticed, so far as I have observed, by our recent English writers on the subject, though it appears to be referred to in the preface to the Surtees Society's edition of the 'Egbert' Pontifical.

⁴ See the Abingdon interpolation in the Lambeth MS of Florence of Worcester under the year 948. The passage is not printed in the editions, but is given by Wharton *Anglia Sacra* i 136 ff. The statement about Corbey is repeated in the earlier form of the *Historia Abboniensis* (Rolls Series, i 129).

(1) The Ratoldus Order begins with the Petition, which is ordered to be read out by one of the bishops, asking the king to grant to the bishops and their churches canonical right and justice—‘A vobis perdonari petimus’: followed by the Response of the king—‘Promitto vobis et per dono’. The Three Rules of Government proclaimed by the king are not given at this point, but are appended, as ‘Rectitudo regis’, at the close of the service—as in the Order found in the Leofric Missal, and in the longer Order which is given in the so-called Pontifical of Egbert.¹

But in Claudius A. iii the Order opens thus:—

Incipit consecratio regis, quem de conventu seniorum per manus producant duo episcopi ad ecclesiam; et clerus hanc decantet antiphonam duobus episcopis praecinentibus. A. *Firmetur manus tua [et exaltetur dextera tua: iustitia et iudicium praeparatio sedis tuae: misericordia et veritas praecedant faciem tuam. Gloria patri et filio et spiritui sancto]*.²

There is nothing of this in the ‘Egbert’ Order, as neither in that of Ratoldus. But clearly it was known to the biographer of St Oswald, who writes thus (p. 436):—

Coronatum atque electum regem gloria et honore perduxerunt ad ecclesiam, quo conventus erat omnium optimatum eius, quemque expectabat omnis plebs: cum quo ibant et revertentur probatissimi viri et dignissimi abbates niveis vestibus induti ostro atque corporis (*sic*). Hunc inelytum exercitum sequebantur matronae eximiae virtutis abbatissae cum filiabus gloriosis: quos et quas multitudo presbyterorum, quos gerontas seniores appellabant, secuti sunt cum agminibus clericorum. Acceperunt dehinc duo episcopi manus regis, qui eum deduxerunt ad ecclesiam, cunctis alta et modulata concinentibus voce hanc antiphonam: *Firmetur manus tua, et exaltetur dextera tua: iustitia et iudicium praeparatio sedis tuae: misericordia et veritas praecedant faciem tuam.* Hac finita antiphona, *Gloria patri et filio et spiritui sancto* adiunxerunt.

King Edgar had sat on the throne of the reunited kingdom fourteen years: it is as already ‘coronatus atque electus’ that he proceeds to the church. But the phraseology of the rubric reappears in ‘conventus

¹ Paris, B. N. lat. 10575: a late tenth-century MS (‘um 1000’, Liebermann *Gesetze* ii 562 col. 3). Although I find no reason for connecting it in any way with Abp Egbert, yet for convenience I speak of it in what follows as ‘Egbert’ or Ps-Egbertine. It was long supposed to be a copy of a genuine Pontifical of Egbert (archbishop of York 734–766), owing to the presence at the beginning of the codex of matter now known to be derived from a tenth-century compilation of Ps-Egbertine Penitential Canons, found e. g. in Bodl. MS 718. For this information I am indebted to a memorandum by the late Mr Edmund Bishop.

² Claudius has only: ‘Firmetur manus tua. Ut supra.’ The supplement is from the Benedictinal of Abp Robert.

(optimatum)'; and the word 'seniores' is transferred to the presbyters 'quos gerontas seniores appellabant'—a characteristic little show of learning on the writer's part. For the rest the correspondence is complete.

(2) In Ratoldus two bishops now ask the consent of the people: this given, two bishops lead the king to the altar, before which he prostrates himself while the *Te Deum* is sung.

The Claudius MS proceeds:—

Perveniens rex ad aecclesiam prosternat se coram altare, et ymnizetur: *Te deum laudamus, Te dominum confitemur*. Quo finetenus ymnizato, rex erigatur de solo et, ab episcopis et a plebe electus, haec tria se servaturum iura promittat, et clara voce coram deo omnique populo dicit:

Haec tria populo Christiano et mihi subdito in Christi promitto nomine. In primis ut aecclesia dei et omnis populus Christianus veram pacem nostro arbitrio in omni tempore servet. Aliud, ut rapacitates et omnes iniquitates omnibus gradibus interdicam. Tertium, ut in omnibus iudiciis aequitatem et misericordiam praecipiam, ut mihi et vobis indulgeat suam misericordiam clemens et misericors deus, qui vivit. His peractis omnes dicant Amen.

Again it will be seen how closely the *Vita Oswaldi* follows this text:—

Cumque pervenissent in ecclesiam et rex ante altare se prosterneret, deponendo prius diademam de capite, incepit princeps episcoporum Dunstanus hymnum gloricum excelsa voce, *Te deum laudamus, Te dominum confitemur*. Ipse autem nequaquam potuit se propter gaudium et regis humilitatem abstinere a fletu, quia intellexit quod gens ista non meruisset tam humilem tamque sapientem habere. Finito hymno elevaverunt episcopi regem a terra. Tria, interrogante archiepiscopo, iura promisit se servaturum: *In primis promitto ut ecclesia dei et omnis populus Christianus veram pacem nostro arbitrio in omni tempore conservet. Aliud promitto, ut rapacitates et omnes iniquitates omnibus gradibus interdicam. Tertium, ut in omnibus iudiciis aequitatem et misericordiam praecipiam, ut mihi et vobis indulgeat suam misericordiam clemens et misericors deus.*

Having brought the king in 'coronatus et electus', the writer must needs omit the clause as to his election by the bishops and people: on the other hand, he makes him lay aside his diadem.

(3) The Claudius MS continues:—

Et haec sequantur orationes a singulis episcopis singulae super regem dicendae: *Te invocamus*, etc. . . . (after the fourth comes the rubric) Hic unguatur oleo, et haec cantetur antiphona. A. *Unxerunt Salomonem Sadoch sacerdos et Nathan propheta regem in Gion: et accedentes dixerunt, Vivat rex in aeternum.*

The same prayers and the same anthem are found in Ratoldus, where, however, there are some important points of difference of which

it is not necessary to speak at this moment. It will suffice to say that Ratoldus has no rubric directing that the prayers should be said by different bishops. The account in the *Vita Oswaldi* is as follows:—

Explicitis promissionibus stetit archipraesul et oravit pro eo orationes quae in illorum libris scriptae sunt. Deinde secundam dixit Oswaldus Christi minister satis eleganter. Post haec, sicut constituit pater cuius imperiis omnes parebant, peracta consecratione unxerunt eum, et nobili concentu decantaverunt antiphonam: *Unxerunt Salomonem Sadoc sacerdos et Nathan propheta regem in Sion: et accedentes dixerunt, Vivat rex in aeternum.*

The phrase ‘peracta consecratione unxerunt’ is explained by the title (‘Consecratio regis’) of the prayer after which in the Claudius MS the anointing takes place. It is noteworthy that both in Claud. and in *Vit. Osw.* ‘laeti’ is omitted after ‘accedentes’ in the anthem. It is omitted also in the Benedictional of Abp Robert, but not in Ratoldus or any of the other Orders.

(4) For the remainder of the service the *Vita Oswaldi* is in agreement with both Ratoldus and the Claudius MS; it runs as follows:—

Post unctionem dedit ei archiepiscopus annulum, dehinc cinxit eum gladio, et post haec dedit coronam in capite et benedictionem; contulit ipsi et sceptrum atque virgam: quae omnia complevit praefatus episcopus et missam peregit, et diem solemnem fecerunt.

It is important at this point to enlarge upon what has been said above, that the Order of Abp Robert’s Benedictional represents a recension intermediate between Ratoldus on the one hand and Claudius and the rest on the other hand. Fortunately we have an excellent edition of Abp Robert’s book by Mr Wilson in the Henry Bradshaw Society’s publications. His Introduction gives a valuable account of the allied MSS which contain the Coronation Order. Mr Wilson suggests with great probability that this Benedictional was written at Winchester between 980 and 990, and may have been given to her brother Robert of Normandy, archbishop of Rouen (990–1037), by Queen Emma, the widow of King Ethelred, who was afterwards married to King Canute. Accordingly the Order which it has embodied might have been drawn up for Edgar, Edward, or Ethelred.

In its general scheme this Order agrees, as against Ratoldus, with Claudius and the rest: as, for example, in not giving ‘A vobis perdonari petimus’, but placing at the outset ‘Haec tria . . . promitto’, a modified form of the ‘Rectitudo regis’, which in Leofric, ‘Egbert’, and Ratoldus came at the end of the service. The wording of its rubrics indeed is to a considerable extent peculiar to itself, but the sense is almost always the same as in Claudius and the others. On the other hand, the triple ‘Vivat rex’, which is ordered at the close of Ratoldus, appears

here as an anthem before 'Sta et retine': it has disappeared from the other forms, but reappears (after 'Sta et retine') in C.C.C.C. 44, which has many quite peculiar variations. Like Ratoldus, Abp Robert's book gives no special prayers for the mass at the end. What is more significant is that it goes with Ratoldus against all the rest in retaining the third person in the formula 'In diebus eius' as in the Leofric and 'Egbert' Orders: the other MSS change this to 'In diebus tuis', and make several consequential alterations. Other points of agreement with Ratoldus against the rest are: 'Et (for 'hic') totius regni' in the 'Consecratio regis'; 'conecti' (for 'conectere') in 'Accipe anulum'; 'terrae' (for 'Britanniae') and 'semper' (for 'super') in 'Omnium, domine'; and, in accordance with 'Egbert' also, 'Benedic, domine, hunc presulem (for 'praelectum') regem.'

It will, therefore, hardly be disputed that the Order found in Abp Robert's Benedictional offers us a transitional recension between Ratoldus and the group to which Claudius A. iii belongs. Within this group the Douay Pontifical and (apart from its peculiarities) C.C.C.C. 44 have special points of agreement with Claudius A. iii; while C.C.C.C. 146 and the so-called Pontifical of St Dunstan shew greater affinity to Abp Robert's book: but the points of agreement and difference are minute in comparison with the variants which distinguish the whole of this group from the Order of that Benedictional.¹

If now it be granted that Robert is an earlier recension than Claudius, standing as it does in a closer relation to Ratoldus, the question may properly be raised whether Robert and not Claudius gives us the recension which the biographer of Oswald made use of. Both Robert and Claudius omit 'laeti' from the anthem 'Unxerunt Salomonem', and the omission is not found in any other MS. The anthem 'Firmetur manus' is given in the *Vita Oswaldi* in full, just as it is found in Robert, whereas Claudius gives only the opening words. But, on the other hand, the biographer followed Claudius in writing 'Te deum laudamus, Te dominum confitemur', whereas Robert has no more than 'Te deum laudamus': and we may reasonably suggest that the citation of the second clause was not very likely to have been made, if the writer had no more than the first clause before him in the MS which he was using; whereas the anthem 'Firmetur manus' would almost necessarily be written out in full by an author who was giving the description of a ceremony, and not writing a liturgical book in which a cue might suffice. Moreover, the words 'ut supra' in Claudius imply that earlier in the book the anthem was given in full. C.C.C.C. 44 is the only MS which does not give it in full, and it has the same 'ut

¹ This comparison has been greatly aided by the full record of variants given by Dr J. Wickham Legg in his 'Three Coronations Orders', H. B. S. 1900.

supra', which suggests that the writer actually used the Claudius MS. It is most probable that the tenth-century original of Claudius had the anthem in full. One other small point may be thrown into the scale. Robert, in introducing the king's promise, says: 'Haec triplicia iura se servaturum promittat'; Claudius, as we have seen above, has: 'Haec tria se servaturum iura promittat.' Oswald's biographer, fond as he is of elaborate expressions, has 'tria' and not 'triplicia'. The balance therefore inclines on the side of Claudius; and indeed we might expect that the later of the two forms would more probably have been available to the biographer at the time at which he was writing.

Thus far I hope that I have been able to shew (1) that the biographer of St Oswald drew his account of the details of the Bath Coronation from a MS more nearly akin to Claudius A. iii than any other which is extant; (2) that the sequence of these later tenth-century orders is: Ratoldus, Robert, Claudius.

We have next to consider the historical bearing of this somewhat tedious enquiry. The coronation of King Edgar at Bath in 973 has been a problem to historians since the beginning of the twelfth century. Was his coronation deferred, as some of the old writers maintained, as a penance imposed by St Dunstan for a grievous breach of morality? Or was it repeated, as the moderns suggest, in order to mark the almost imperial position to which he had attained? If we cannot hope to throw fresh light on the main problem, we may at least release it from the complication introduced in recent years by the publication of that fascinating book, the anonymous *Vita Oswaldi*. Bishop Stubbs, who called attention to it five years before it appeared in print, wrote thus in 1874: 'As it gives at length the Promissio Regis, as taken on the occasion, it is clear that it was not a mere crown-wearing festival.'¹ Quite possibly it was not: but the evidence must now be sought from some other source than this.

The biographer of St Oswald was a Ramsey monk, who seems to have written about the year 1003; for he quotes the earliest Life of St Dunstan, which is to be dated c. 1000; and he refers to Archbishop Ælfric († 1005) in terms which suggest that he was still living. That is to say, his description of the Bath Coronation was written thirty years after the event; and our investigation has shewn that he drew it from a Coronation Order which might quite as well be that of Edward or Ethelred as that of Edgar. His source of information as to the event itself may have been exactly the same as ours to-day, viz. the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles. Now A (the Winchester Chronicle) is not a very satisfactory witness for the period in question. The entries from

¹ *Mem. of St Dunstan* (Rolls Series) p. ci.

969 to 1001 are made by a hand which is dated *c.* 1000.¹ It has here, however, the confirmation of B and C, which give the same entry, though under the year 974. The most that the chronicler can give us is a ballad which says that at Pentecost, 973, Edgar was 'hallowed to king' (*to cyninge gehalgod*), with a great company of priests and monks in attendance, 'as I have been told' (*mine gefrege*). The later Chronicles (D, E, F) have a common entry to the same effect in prose, which not improbably is based on the poem. Curiously enough, this entry says that 'Edgar *etheling* was hallowed to king', although 'Edgar the king' has been constantly spoken of before.² There is more than one error of calculation in the entry, and it cannot safely be regarded as of independent value; but the statement which follows it, that 'soon after' six kings came to Edgar at Chester and swore fealty to him, bears out the belief that the ceremony at Bath was more than 'a mere crown-wearing festival', and possibly had some sort of imperial significance.³

Having cleared out of our way the confusion momentarily introduced by the narrative in the *Vita Oswaldi*, our next step must be to enquire into the origin and mutual relations of the Coronation Orders found in three tenth-century MSS, the Leofric Missal, the Pseudo-Egbertine Pontifical, and the *Pontificale Lanaletense*.⁴

II

The earliest Order of Coronation known to us is that used by Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, when Judith the daughter of Charles the Bald was married to Ethelwulf king of Wessex, and at the same

¹ Plummer *Two Saxon Chronicles* ii p. xxvii, n. 2.

² The word 'etheling' may have been unconsciously repeated from the brief entry immediately preceding, viz. '970. Her forðferde Eadmund æþeling'.

³ When the implications of the word 'gehalgod' are enquired into, account must be taken of two passages in the A. S. Chronicles: (1) A tells us that Pope Leo 'hallowed to king' the boy Alfred at Rome in 853, whereas the Pope's letter gives a different impression from that of a royal consecration or coronation; (2) under 978 E says: 'This year was K. Edward martyred, and Æthelred Etheling his brother came to the throne; and in that same year was he hallowed to king.' Then under 979 he says: 'This year was Æthelred hallowed to king on the Sunday fortnight after Easter at Kingston; and there were at his hallowing two archbishops and ten suffragan bishops.' Unless we suppose the writer to have been extraordinarily careless, this must mean that a more solemn coronation supplemented the hurried ceremony of the previous year; but we may doubt whether the repetition of the term 'hallowed to king' necessarily implies more than one ceremony of unction.

⁴ This is an English Pontifical which came into the hands of a bishop of Alet in Brittany: it is now at Rouen (MS A. 27). We are promised an edition of it by Mr H. A. Wilson for the Henry Bradshaw Society. The Coronation Order is printed from it by Mr Leopold Wickham Legg in *English Coronation Records* (1901).

time anointed and crowned, on October 1, 856. It was published by Sirmondi in 1623 from a MS of St Laurence of Liège (no longer extant), and reprinted among his works, vol. iii, col. 395 ff (Paris, 1696).¹

The Coronation Prayers begin with '*Benedictio Reginae*. Te invocamus', which corresponds very closely with the first of the Coronation Prayers in Leofric, Ps-Egbert, and *Lanaletense*. This is followed by '*Sursum corda*' (as a rubric): 'Domine sancte, pater omnipotens, aeternae deus, electorum fortitudo,' which for some twelve lines is identical with the prayer after anointing in Leofric, &c.: 'Deus electorum fortitudo.' It then goes on to speak of the anointing of Judith and of Esther, and returns to the language of the Leofric prayer ('ut per huius creaturae pinguedinem'), though after this it shows considerable divergence of phraseology. Next we have '*Coronatio*. Gloria et honore coronet te dominus', a form not known elsewhere. Then '*Benedictiones*. Benedic, domine, hanc famulam tuam, qui regna regum a saeculo moderaris. Amen. Opera manuum', &c. (six benedictions in all). The first of these corresponds to the first of the sixteen short benedictions after the 'sceptrum' in Leofric, &c.: 'Benedic, domine, hunc presulem principem, qui regna regum omnium a saeculo moderaris. Amen.' The next four consist of phrases which with some variations occur in Leofric, &c., in two longer benedictions; of which the first (after the 'baculum') is a combination of Gen. xxvii 28 f with Gen. xlix 25 f, and the second is made up from Deut. xxxiii 11-17, 24, 26. The sixth is really a *Post Communionem*, beginning 'Concede, quaesumus'. This ends the Order.

The impression produced by a collation of the parallel passages is that the whole of the Coronation Service of Judith, with the exception of the brief prayer at the crowning and the Post-Communion at the end, is adapted from an Order closely resembling that found in Leofric &c.² If this be a just conclusion, it is of great importance as shewing that such an Order, for which otherwise we have no documentary evidence earlier than c. 925 (in the Arras region), was current in Rheims before 856.

We may now turn to the Order in the so-called Leofric Missal, and ask what other elements in it find attestation at any period earlier than

¹ Reprinted by Pertz, *Mon. Hist. Germ. Leges* i 450 (Migne *P. L.* cxxxviii 639).

² The Prayer 'Deus electorum fortitudo' is based on the Preface for the Blessing of Oils in the Mass *in cena domini* (Gr. 55), and the language in the Judith Order diverges somewhat more from that Preface than the language of the Leofric Prayer: moreover, when we come to the final Benedictions, we find that the biblical passages are closely followed by Leofric, &c., whereas in the Judith Order we have only modified excerpts.

the date of its writing, viz. c. 925. It does not contain the forms for the Mass which are found at the beginning and at the end of the Orders in Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense*, but begins:—

1. '*Benedictiones super regem noviter electum. Te invocamus.*' We have found this prayer with but few variations in the Coronation of Queen Judith in 856.
2. '*Alia. In diebus eius oriatur.*' To this we have no earlier testimony.
- *3. '*Alia. Deus electorum fortitudo.*' This again is in the Judith Order, but as part of a Preface, and with some variation at the close.
4. '*Benedictio. Benedic, domine, hunc presulem principem.*' This is the first of sixteen brief benedictions. We have seen that it occurs with the necessary modification in the Judith form. It is also to be observed that the first ten of these benedictions are found in an Order printed by Martène (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* ii 216) from a MS of the monastery of St Thierry near Rheims, which he regarded as being of the tenth century. The closing prayer has a rubric before it which says that it was used by Pope John [VIII] when he blessed Louis [the Stammerer] at Troyes [in 878]: and it is reasonable to suppose that the four preceding prayers were used on the same occasion. One of them begins '*Benedic, domine, super hunc principem*' and contains 1-4 and 6-9 of the Leofric benedictions: another, beginning '*Deus inenarrabilis auctor mundi*', contains towards the end nos. 5, 10, and 16, followed, as in Leofric, by '*Quod ipse*'. Nos. 11-15, therefore, alone remain unattested.
5. '*Item super regem. Omnipotens deus det tibi.*' See on no. 6.
6. '*Alia. Benedic, domine, fortitudinem principis nostri.*' Of this and the previous benediction we have already said that they represent a fuller form, more closely following the Scripture passages, than the parallel benedictions in the Judith Order.
7. '*Tunc dicat omnis populus cum episcopo .iii. vicibus: Vivat rex .ill. in sempiternum. R̄. Amen. Et confirmabitur cum benedictione omni populo in solio regni: et osculant principes, in sempiternum dicentes Amen, Amen, Amen.*'
8. '*Deus perpetuitatis auctor.*' This prayer occurs also as *Oratio super militantes* immediately before the Coronation Order in Leofric.
9. '*Rectitudo regis est noviter ordinati.*' This appears here for the first time.

Thus we see that practically the whole of the Leofric Order (apart from *In diebus eius, Deus perpetuitatis* and *Rectitudo regis*) can be traced in the forms used for the coronation of Judith in 856 and of

Louis by the Pope in 878. The Order comes to us in a MS written in the Arras region *c.* 925, and brought to England *c.* 950, shortly after which date it can be shewn to have been at Glastonbury. The Leofric text is often corrupt, and though at many points it is superior to that of Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense* it cannot be regarded as the actual text from which the Order in these two Pontificals is derived.

If, therefore, we are to consider the Leofric Order as wholly continental in its origin—and the evidence so far points that way—we may suppose that another copy of it came to England about the middle of the tenth century, and was made the basis of the texts in Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense*, in which this Order is inserted into the *Missa pro regibus* (Greg. Suppl. 187).

Other points of difference between the Leofric Order and that of the two English Pontificals are: that they prescribe for the anointing the anthem *Unxerunt Salomonem*, followed by the psalm *Domine, in virtute*; and that their rubrics generally are much more explicit. Moreover, in both of them we find the prayer *Deus qui populis* inserted between *Te invocamus* and *In diebus eius*. In Ps-Egbert indeed the prayer is not inserted in full: we have only the words *Deus qui populis* followed by *requiritur* (?) *in capite libri*. Evidently this is an addition, made by a later scribe (in this MS or in that from which it was copied), who had not room for the prayer on the page and so wrote it on a blank space at the beginning of the book; it did not occur to him to insert the rubric '*Alia*' to correspond to the '*Alia*' which introduces the following prayer. The fact that it is an addition is further shewn by the rubric which designates *Deus perpetuitatis* as *orationem septimam*, though as it now stands it is the eighth prayer: *Lanaletense* contains *Deus qui populis* in full, with *Alia* before it, and drops the rubric as to the 'seventh prayer'.

This prayer, *Deus qui populis*, has a curious history. Our examination of the Leofric Order shewed no points of contact with the coronation of Charles the Bald as king of Lorraine by Hincmar of Rheims in 869, or with that of Louis the Stammerer as king of France by the same prelate in 877. But this prayer, which is not in Leofric, takes us back to both these Orders.

We find as an *Oratio In Natali Papae* in the Gregorianum (Gr. 243) the following prayer:—

Deus, qui populis tuis indulgentia consulis et amore dominaris: da spiritum sapientiae quibus dedisti regimen disciplinae; ut de profectu sanctarum ovium fiant gaudia aeterna pastorum; per.

Now in the first of these two Orders Hincmar adopted this prayer, giving it a new ending appropriate to the occasion. In the second Order he recast it, and included a phrase which had occurred in one of

the brief benedictions of the first Order, namely, *ut tuo munere dirigantur et nostra securitas et devotio Christiana*.¹ Thus :—

869.

Deus, qui populis tuis indulgentia consulis et amore dominaris: da huic famulo tuo spiritum sapientiae, cui dedisti regimen disciplinae; ut tibi toto corde devotus et in regni regimine maneat semper idoneus in bonis operibus perseverans ad aeternum regnum te duce valeat pervenire; per.

877.

Deus, qui populis tuis virtute consulis et amore dominaris: da huic famulo tuo spiritum sapientiae cum regimine disciplinae; ut tibi toto corde devotus in regni regimine maneat semper idoneus, tuoque munere ipsius temporibus securitas ecclesiae dirigatur et in tranquillitate devotio Christiana permaneat; per.

It occurred to some one later to add to the form of 877 the last clause of the form of 869 ('*ut in bonis . . . valeat pervenire*'). But the patching of collects is a perilous proceeding. Even Hincmar, though he greatly improved his form, made 'regimine' come twice in two lines. And the new compiler did not perceive, when he introduced 'valeat' after 'permaneat', that the two verbs had different subjects. In this form the prayer stands in Ratoldus and the other tenth-century Orders, and indeed in the Liber Regalis itself. But the compiler of the text found in *Lanaletense* was offended by the blots above mentioned, and gave us the prayer in this form :—

Deus, qui populis tuis virtute consulis et amore dominaris: da huic famulo tuo *N*. spiritum sapientiae cum regimine disciplinae; ut tibi toto corde devotus in regni *fastigio* maneat semper idoneus, tuoque munere ipsius temporibus securitas ecclesiae dirigatur, et *sic* in tranquillitate Christiana *devotus ipse* permaneat, ut in bonis operibus perseverans ad aeternum *deinceps* regnum te duce valeat pervenire; per.

He had corrected two faults, but he had himself introduced 'devotus' a second time. He found no followers, and his text remains unique.

Although the Order found in Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense* comes to us in books written in England, yet it contains nothing that marks it off from the shorter Order in Leofric as being distinctively English. Yet the fact that it is found only in English books, together with the fact that so much of it reappears in the great English Order variously represented by Ratoldus, Robert, Claudius, &c., makes it reasonable to suppose that it had been used for some of our English kings. The question accordingly arises whether in fact it is the Leofric form or the Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense* form that is thus made use of in this new

¹ This benediction is itself an adaptation of the Leonian prayer: 'Nostris, quaesumus, domine, propitiare temporibus; ut tuo munere dirigantur et Romana securitas et devotio Christiana; per.' (L. 375; cf. Gr. 252 with 'dirigatur').

Order. In other words, does the new Order reproduce any of the peculiarities which distinguish those two texts from the briefer text of Leofric ?

1. The insertion of the Coronation Order into the *Missa pro regibus* is not reproduced in the new Order. In Ratoldus a mass is ordered at the end of the service, but its details are not specified. In Robert there is no mass and no order for a mass. In Claudius, &c., there is a mass at the end of the service, but it is the *Missa quotidiana pro rege* (Gr. Suppl. 188).

2. The insertion of *Deus qui populis* between *Te invocamus* and *In diebus eius* is a feature of the new Order ; and we have seen that its absence distinguishes Leofric from Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense*. But we have also seen that in Ps-Egbert it has been foisted in as an afterthought, and that in *Lanaletense* it appears in a peculiar form which is a later modification of the form found in Ratoldus and the subsequent texts.

3. The rubrics in Leofric are brief, whereas those found in Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense* are much more explicit. In the wording of the rubrics in Ratoldus there is nothing that points to the longer rather than the shorter rubrics.

4. On the other hand we find in Ratoldus, inserted into the middle of a sentence in the middle of a long consecratory prayer, the direction '*Hic ungtur oleo. An. Unxerunt Salomonem . . . in aeternum*'. There is nothing of the kind in Leofric. Ps-Egbert, however, and *Lanaletense* have an elaborate rubric for the anointing, and not only the anthem but also the psalm *Deus in virtute*. The absence of the psalm may be set against the presence of the anthem. If the compiler of the Ratoldus form took over the anthem from the fuller text, why did he not take over the psalm at the same time ?

There is nothing, therefore, in the structure of the Order in Ratoldus &c. which points decisively to Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense* rather than to Leofric. Is there anything in the minor textual variations that will help us to answer our question ?

Leofric has a certain number of readings which are unique, and at these points Ratoldus, &c., agree with Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense*. But many, if not all of them, are scribal errors which probably were not found in the sister codex which we may suppose to have been used by the compiler of the Ratoldus form. In the prayer *In diebus eius*, indeed, Leofric has *temporalia bona*, and Ratoldus follows the other two texts in reading *tempora bona* ; but, strange to say, *temporalia bona* turns up again in Claudius and the Douay Pontifical. Either reading gives good sense ; but probably *temporalia* is the right word, and the change to *tempora* was an easy one which might be made independently by more than one scribe.

On the other hand the following variants suggest a dependence of Ratoldus on a text like that of Leofric.

In diebus eius. finem perfectum] Leo. Rat. : finem perfectam Eg. Lan.

Deus electorum. *Alia* (prefixed)] Leo. Rat. : *om.* Eg. : sequitur oratio Lan.

reges] Leo. Rat. : ac reges Eg. Lan.

Benedic domine. daviticum teneat sublimitatis sceptrum salutis] Leo.* Eg. Lan.

davitica teneat sublimitate sceptrum salutis Leo.^{corr} Rat.

Deus perpetuitatis. eum *bef.* conserva] Leo. Rat. : eum *earlier* Eg. Lan.

We may note that 'sacerdotes, reges et prophetas' (without 'ac' before 'reges') is the reading of the Judith Order, as it is of the Gregorian Preface on which the prayer is founded. The reading 'davitica . . . sublimitate' is a change introduced to improve the sense, which had been marred by the addition of 'salutis', which is not in the Order for Louis in 878. As the correction in Leofric may have been made by a later hand from Ratoldus or a subsequent text, we cannot found an argument upon it.

On the whole, the evidence seems to confirm the view that the compiler of the Ratoldus form used a text akin to the Leofric text rather than to that represented in Ps-Egbert and *Lanaletense*.

We are now free to consider systematically the method of construction of the great English Order of the tenth century. Unlike its predecessors, it is distinctly and unmistakably English, and we need not hesitate to ascribe it to the hand of the greatest ecclesiastical statesman of the century, Archbishop Dunstan, who crowned Edgar (once, if not twice) and his sons Edward and Ethelred. We have seen that already in that century it appears in three well-marked stages of development represented (1) by Ratoldus, (2) by Robert, and (3) by Claudius and the allied texts. Our immediate task is to enquire what materials Dunstan had before him and what use he made of them in constructing the new Order as we find it in its earliest stage, i. e. in Ratoldus.

We may say at once that he embodied in his new Order the whole of the Order found in Leofric, with the exception of some of the benedictions at the end. He also embodied (again with the exception of a few of the benedictions) the whole of the Order drawn up by Hincmar for the coronation of Louis the Stammerer in 877, together with three out of the five prayers used at the benediction of the same king by the Pope in 878. Other formulæ were drawn in from various sources, and the whole of this foreign material was impressed with the stamp of Englishry. The work needed polishing, and received it in two succes-

sive recensions, both of which fall within Dunstan's period. The result was an Order splendid and dignified, typical of the new England which Dunstan did so much to create, especially in its power of claiming and remoulding to national uses the better elements of continental progress. It quickly passed back to France, where it formed the basis of the Coronation Orders of the French kings for many centuries; and its influence can be traced also in the Orders used in Germany and in Italy.

The accompanying table will shew at a glance the sources of the new Order, so far as they can be traced with certainty in older documents. To some extent they may have been brought into combination before Dunstan's time, though at present we have no evidence to prove it.

ORDER IN RATOLDUS.	SOURCES.	
1. <i>Election.</i> A vobis perdonari Promitto vobis	} Louis, 877	
2. <i>Consent of people.</i> Te Deum		
3. Te invocamus	Leofric	
4. Deus qui populis	Louis, 877 (Charles, 869)	
5. In diebus eius	Leofric	
6. Omnipotens sempiternae	Louis, 877	
7. Deus electorum	Leofric	
8. Deus dei filius		
9. Accipe anulum		
10. Deus cuius est	Louis, 878	
11. Accipe hunc gladium		
12. Deus qui providentia	(G. 729, Gr. 202)	
13. Coronet te	Louis, 877	
14. Deus perpetuitatis	Leofric	
15. Accipe sceptrum	Louis, 877	
16. Omnium domine	Louis, 878	
17. Accipe virgam		
18. Extendat omnipotens Et tribuat Angelos suos Inimicos tuos Victoriosum Et qui te voluit	} Louis, 877	
19. Benedic domine Et tali eum Da ei a tuo		
20. Sta et retine		Leofric
21. Rectitudo regis		Leofric
22. <i>Et tunc deosculatur</i> <i>Tribus vicibus</i> Vivat rex		} Leofric
23. <i>Missa.</i>		
24. <i>Post pergant ad mensam</i>		

We are left with five formulae still untraced: *Deus dei filius, Accipe*

*anulum, Accipe hunc gladium, Accipe virgam, Sta et retine.*¹ They appear in later compilations, such as Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus*: but there seems to be no reason for connecting them with Rome, and some at least of them may have been borrowed from this English Order. The opening phrase *Deus dei filius* is not found in collects of the Roman Sacramentaries; it occurs frequently in Mozarabic books.²

It is not necessary for the purpose of this paper, which is primarily historical, to examine the modifications introduced by Dunstan into the various prayers indicated in the second column of our table. Two points only must be dealt with.

1. In the benediction *Extendat* the clause *sanctae Mariae et omnium sanctorum intercedentibus meritis* is amplified by the insertion of the words *ac beati Petri apostolorum principis sanctique Gregorii Ang[e]lorum apostolici.*

2. A far bolder step in the nationalization of the service was taken by the insertion into the Consecratory Prayer of a passage which nearly doubled its length. This prayer, an unusually long one already, was written by Archbishop Hincmar for the coronation of Louis the Stammerer in 877. The central part of it embodies the form which he had used in anointing Charles the Bald in 869. But on that occasion it was introduced by the inappropriate words *Coronet te dominus corona gloriae*, which were repeated as the opening of a benediction at the crowning immediately afterwards. The change was a good one, and the result was the dignified prayer *Omnipotens sempiternus deus, creator, &c.*, which was taken over into the Order in Ratoldus, and thereafter had a long and strange history. In the Ratoldus Order the prayer is cut in two in the sentence *et hunc famulum tuum virtutibus, quibus praefatos fideles decorasti.* The passage inserted at this point is the first demonstrably English element that meets us in the Coronation Orders, and its language deserves the attention of our historians. It is here given in full, the insertion being indicated in brackets.

Respice propitius ad preces nostrae humilitatis, et [super] hunc famulum tuum [quem supplici devotione in regnum N. Albionis totius videlicet Francorum pariter eligimus, benedictionum tuarum dona multiplicata, eumque dextera tuae potentiae semper ubique circumda: quatenus praedicti Abrahae fidelitate firmatus, Moysi mansuetudine fretus, Iosue fortitudine munitus, David humilitate exaltatus, Salomonis sapientia decoratus, tibi in omnibus complaceat, et per trami-

¹ The words *Sta et retine amodo statum quem hucusque paterna suggestione tenuisti, haereditario iure tibi delegatum per, &c.*, raise interesting historical questions. Can *hucusque* allude to Edgar's delayed coronation? Or were the words borrowed from abroad? And what, in any case, does *paterna suggestione* signify? In later times *suggestione* was altered into *successione*.

² See the index to Dom Férotin's *Liber Mozarabicus Ordinum*.

tem iustitiae inoffenso gressu semper incedat; et *totius Albionis ecclesiam deinceps cum plebibus sibi annexis* ita enutriat ac doceat, muniat et instruat, contraque omnes visibiles et invisibiles hostes idem potenter regaliterque tuae virtutis regimine amministret, ut *regale solum videlicet Francorum sceptrum non deserat*, sed ad pristinae fidei pacisque concordiam eorum animos te opitulante reformet; ut utrorumque horum populorum debita subiectione fultus, condigno amore glorificatus, per longum vitae spatium paternae apicem gloriae tua miseratione unatim stabilire et gubernare mereatur; tuae quoque protectionis galea munitus, et scuto insuperabili iugiter protectus, armisque coelestibus circumdatus, optabilis victoriae triumphum de hostibus feliciter capiat, terroremque suae potentiae infidelibus inferat, et pacem tibi militantibus laetanter reportet:] virtutibus [necnon] quibus praefatos fideles tuos decorasti multiplici honoris benedictione condecora, . . .

Our first business is to reconstruct the form which lies behind the Ratoldus text of this passage and the text found in the Rheims (or Cambray) Pontifical to which reference has been made above. In both texts an unsuccessful attempt has been made to correct the prayer for use at a French coronation. The attempt in Ratoldus at the three points in question is before us: at the third point only has it been such as to obliterate the original phrase, which has been displaced by the words *videlicet Francorum sceptrum*.

Happily the Rheims Pontifical comes to our rescue. It omits *Albionis totius* leaving *regnum* by itself: then it substitutes *totius regni* for *totius Albionis*: but, where Ratoldus has *videlicet Francorum sceptrum*, it gives *videlicet Saxonum, Merciorum, Nordanhumbroborumque sceptrum*, which is plainly what we want.¹

We may be confident that we have thus recovered the text of the English Order which was brought to the Corbey-Arras-Cambray district in the time of Abbot Ratoldus († 986), and was the parent of the two texts which we have been examining.

Now the language of the passage thus inserted into the Consecratory Prayer implies a recent breach of concord and a division of allegiance between two peoples, and it is even hinted that the king had been to blame. The prayer is that the newly anointed king 'may so nourish and teach, defend and instruct the Church of all Albion henceforward with the folks to him united . . . that he desert not the royal throne, to wit the sceptres of the Saxons, Mercians and Northumbrians, but by thy assistance may refashion their minds to the concord of their

¹ This clause, which specifies the Saxons, Mercians, and Northumbrians, survived in the Coronation of French kings as late as 1364: see *The Coronation Book of Charles V of France*, edited for the H. Bradshaw Society by Mr Dewick in 1899.

former faith and peace; that, supported by the due subjection of both peoples and honoured with fitting love, through the course of a long life he may be allowed by thy mercy to stablish in unity and to govern the eminence of his father's [*or* his ancestral] glory . . .'

This language exactly fits the circumstances of King Edgar's accession after the failure of his brother Edwy to hold the kingdoms north and south of the Thames together under one crown. It suggests a failure to work with the ecclesiastical authorities, and a desertion of the royal throne by allowing the division of the kingdoms.¹

A difficulty suggests itself that the words, which at the outset of King Edgar's reign would be so appropriate, would hardly have been written for his coronation at Bath after fourteen years of rule. But we do not know that he had not been crowned before, when the kingdoms were reunited after Edwy's death.

It is the Bath Coronation that still defies all efforts to explain it. The grandeur of Dunstan's new Order, and the labour expended on its construction, tally well enough with the late date of the coronation and with its exceptional magnificence. It may be that Edgar was anointed and crowned as king of the Mercians, and that no necessity was felt for a repetition of the ceremony when he succeeded naturally to the other half of his father's realm on Edwy's death. If so, we can understand that Dunstan might desire in the heyday of Edgar's glory, by a ceremony such as England had never witnessed before, in the border-city of the ancient kingdoms of the Mercians and West Saxons, to seal the recovered unity of 'all Albion' which, as a fact of history, has never been broken since that day.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

¹ If we are right in the supposition that the Order in Ratoldus was composed for the coronation of Edgar, then the two later recensions, Robert and Claudius, may have been made for Edward and Ethelred respectively.