

that the beginnings of Christian Archaeology, of an interest in 'primitive' Christian times, can be dated round about 200 A.D. It was then that 'the places', the Palestinian sites, began to be visited; it was in that generation that Irenaeus appealed to the Roman heritage of Apostolic Scriptures as the norm of teaching. A little later came the 'Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις' of Hippolytus,¹ a work based on what the author at least believed to be Apostolic tradition. This work, like the Didache, gives directions how Christian services are to be conducted and how Christians should order their lives. It was only too successful, for it was so much used as an actual manual of Christian praxis that it was re-edited and brought up to date in all sorts of ways, so that its original form only survives as palimpsest fragments in a Latin translation, i.e. Hauler's *Verona Canonum Reliquiae*. The Didache, its earlier rival, has been more fortunate, owing to the preservation of the MS discovered by Bryennius, now at Jerusalem. But for the existence of that MS we should know less about the Didache than we do about the work of Hippolytus.

All the last paragraph, of course, is generalized deduction, and goes far beyond the scope of Professor Muilenburg's modest Dissertation. But it is directly connected with it. He has, so it seems to me, proved what Dean Armitage Robinson had indicated and rendered extremely probable, viz. that the Didache depends upon Barnabas, and that Barnabas is an original document, which there is little reason to suppose dependent upon any other writings than Scripture itself. In any case he has produced a full and methodical study of the literary connexion of Barnabas and the Didache, and any one in the future who treats the Didache otherwise than as directly dependent upon Barnabas must take serious account of his work.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE 'IRISH' AND 'ROMAN' TEXTS OF THE CANON OF THE MASS

I HAVE read with interest, and for the most part with agreement, Professor Burkitt's paper on 'St Felicity in the Roman Mass', in the *JOURNAL* for April last. The parallel he draws between the 'Irish' and 'Roman' types of the text for the Canon of the Mass and the 'Western' and 'Alexandrian' texts of the New Testament strikes me as a very happy one. The 'Irish' text, as he says, 'represents a very old

¹ See Connolly *The So-called Egyptian Church Order* p. 147.

branch of transmission and amidst many errors seems to preserve a certain number of original readings lost elsewhere'.

I agree in particular with Professor Burkitt, as against the late Edmund Bishop, that the St Felicity of the Roman Canon was originally meant to be the Roman and not the African saint, and this has been my view now for some years past. I am inclined to agree also that the order of the names in which Felicity is separated from Perpetua—as in the *Bobiense* and the Stowe Missal supported, or followed, by St Aldhelm—is one of the original, in the sense of older Roman, readings preserved by the Irish tradition, and not a mere instance, as Bishop says, 'of the Irish method of improving upon liturgical texts'. I should be quite convinced of this on internal grounds, if I were also fully convinced that the Felicity who is joined with Perpetua in the 'Roman' texts was the African and not the Roman Felicity. But I have a suspicion that even here she may originally have been intended for the Roman matron; for how should the African Felicity come to be put *before* Perpetua, her mistress, the bright particular star of the ancient Acts and the actual narrator of a large part of them? If, on the other hand, the Roman Felicity was intended, she would naturally take precedence of Perpetua, both as a Roman and as being (according to her story) the more ancient.

Further, I do not feel sure about the Bobbio-Stowe-Aldhelm order representing an original *Gregorian* reading. Aldhelm's support of Bobbio-Stowe in this case may possibly be due to the fact that his text of the Roman Canon was *as a whole* of the Irish type, as Bishop seems to suggest when he says, 'whilst the actual Canon text familiar to Aldhelm (as reported in the passage cited above) was of the type *Bo-St*, &c. And as to Aldhelm's appeal to 'our Gregory', I think Bishop's valuation of it may very well be right: 'Aldhelm indeed knows of Gregory by tradition as the author of the Canon he uses: but this is no sufficient proof that the order of the four names given by him is Gregory's order, still less is it proof that *Bo, St* preserve St Gregory's text of the Roman Canon.'

Edmund Bishop was quite alive to the possibility that the 'Irish' type of witnesses for the Canon text might here and there preserve older Roman readings (see *Liturgica Historica* pp. 92-93 and 102-103); and on page 93 he points to a couple of cases in which they appear to reproduce a certainly pre-Gregorian form of text, that found in the treatise *De Sacramentis*, which can hardly be more than a century later than the time of St Ambrose and probably (I think) falls well within the fifth century. And this brings me to a point which forms the occasion of the present note.

The *De Sacramentis* is not a Roman work, but comes from some

North Italian church. Nevertheless the Canon of the Mass of which it gives a lengthy extract is so evidently an earlier descendant from the same ancestor as the Roman Canon of the Sacramentaries that we may safely regard it as at least a sort of first cousin to the Roman text of its own date. It may be used, therefore, without hesitation as a means of identifying old Roman readings in Irish, Gallican, or Mozarabic books which happen to shew coincidences with it.

What is the antecedent likelihood that a Roman mass text of the fifth or sixth century would, in Ireland, Gaul, or Spain, come to influence a later Roman text after the arrival of the latter in those countries? Granting its circulation there before the advent of the newer Roman text, the same result might be expected as is found in manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate: the new text of the Canon would tend to be modified by the old, just as the Vulgate text of the Bible became contaminated with readings from Old Latin texts; or the new and the old would continue in use for a time side by side; and either, or both together, might be worked up in the composition of 'native' Irish, Gallican, or Mozarabic prayers.

But to leave speculation and come to facts. Instances do exist of the survival of pre-Gregorian readings in non-Roman Sacramentaries or Missals. Some years ago I made a note of two such readings with the idea of printing it somewhere; but as no suitable occasion presented itself the note was put away and hardly looked at again till the other day when I read Professor Burkitt's paper on St Felicity. Now it seems to me that it may have some interest as bearing on certain points raised by Professor Burkitt, and so I offer it here in the form in which it was originally written, with no more than a few verbal changes. I had previously drawn attention to the first of the two passages in the *Downside Review* for October 1917, not knowing at the time that Dom Cagin had already pointed it out as long ago as 1896, in the *Paléographie Musicale* vol. v, pp. 91-92. It is not improbable that some one has already dealt with the second passage also,¹ but as a fact I came across both independently.

TRACES OF A PRE-GREGORIAN TEXT OF THE ROMAN CANON

The late Edmund Bishop was of opinion that the three non-Roman service books which contain the Roman Canon of the Mass (the Bobbio Missal, the Stowe Missal, and the *Missale Francorum*) preserve some traces of an earlier text than that in the Gregorian Canon, which is substantially the text of the present Roman Missal. As evidence of this he pointed to certain passages in which these books exhibit readings that differ from the Gregorian text and in one or two instances agree

¹ [See Batiffol, *Leçons sur la Messe* pp. 220 sqq. F.E.B.]

with the text of the Canon quoted in the fifth-century treatise *De Sacramentis* (see his *Liturgica Historica* p. 93). The points indicated were small and hardly sufficient by themselves to carry full conviction. But there is some further evidence which will, I think, tend to shew that Bishop's trained sense in such matters had guided him aright.

The 'Leonian' and 'Gelasian' Sacramentaries, and even the Gregorian, had found their way into Gaul and Spain long before the end of the eighth century, when Charlemagne officially introduced the *Gregorianum* (with some additions) and imposed its use upon all churches within his dominions; and the three Roman books have left their mark on all the Gallican and Spanish collections that have come down to us.

Many of the formulæ in these collections are drawn not from the Gregorian but from the Leonian and Gelasian books; others shew more or less clearly the influence of Roman prayers from the same sources; in not a few there are traces of the Roman Canon itself, though frequently the type of text employed—whether Gregorian or pre-Gregorian—cannot be determined. There are two prayers, however, which shew us at a glance that the text of the Roman Canon on which they rest is of an earlier type than the Gregorian.

I. The first to be noticed is a *Post secreta*, or one of the variable prayers following the recital of Institution, in the so-called *Missale Gothicum*, the unique manuscript of which (we are told) was written shortly before or after the year A.D. 700. A feature of this book is the large number of Roman prayers that it contains; and it is worthy of note that a greater proportion of these prayers is drawn from the oldest Roman book, the Leonian, than from either the Gelasian or the Gregorian (which last contributes relatively few). The proportion would doubtless appear still larger if we had a complete copy of the *Leonianum*, but the one existing MS of it is defective at the beginning. The Canon of the Mass, if that formed part of its original contents, is among the lost matter.

Here is the *Post secreta* of the *Missale Gothicum* ('Missa dominicalis' 5, ed. Bannister p. 138, no. 527) with the corresponding portion of the Canon in the *De Sacramentis* (book iv, ch. 6, § 27).

Missale Gothicum

Memores gloriosissimi (sic) Domini passionis et ab inferis resurrectionis, offerimus tibi, Domine, hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationalem hostiam, incruentam hostiam, hunc

De Sacramentis

Ergo memores gloriosissimæ eius passionis et ab inferis resurrectionis et in caelum ascensionis, offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationabilem hostiam, incruentam

*panem sanctum et calicem salutarem,*¹ obsecrantes ut infundere digneris Spiritum tuum sanctum edentibus nobis vitam aeternam regnumque perpetuum conlatura potantibus (*sic*). *hostiam, hunc panem sanctum et calicem vitae aeternae*¹; et petimus et precamur ut hanc oblationem suscipias in sublimi altari tuo per manus angelorum tuorum, sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel et sacrificium patriarchae nostri Abrahae et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Melchisedech.

In these parallels there is no question of mere reminiscence: the compiler of the prayer in the *Gothicum* has before him a text of the Canon from which he makes a continuous extract, and we can see that that text must have run nearly word for word with the corresponding part of the Canon in the *De Sacramentis*. In view of the large use made of Roman prayers in the *Gothicum*, and of the specially large draft on the *Leonianum*, I have suggested elsewhere that we may possibly have here an extract from the lost Canon of this last-named Roman book.² There is, at all events, no need to suppose that the compiler of the above prayer in the *Gothicum* was indebted to the treatise *De Sacramentis*: his source, it is more probable, was a Roman text of the Canon, and it was an earlier form of text than the Gregorian. Our second passage will tend to confirm this view. But in the mean time a word must be said as to the non-Roman addition at the end of the prayer.

The final clause, 'obsecrantes . . . potantibus', is incapable of translation, the participle 'conlatura' hanging in the air without antecedent. No doubt the explanation of this is that the words 'obsecrantes', &c., have been taken from their context in another Gallican prayer and added here without regard to grammar. The other prayer in question is *Miss. Goth.*, no. 154 (ed. Bannister), where we read: 'obsecrantes ut immiscere digneris spiritum tuum sanctum supra haec sollempnia, ut fiat nobis legitima eucharistia . . . edentibus nobis vitam aeternam regnumque perpetuum conlatura bibituris.'³

¹ The relative portion of the Gregorian Canon is as follows: 'Unde et memores sumus, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta, Christi filii tui Domini Dei [*Bo, St, and Fr omit 'Dei'*] nostri tam beatæ passionis, nec non et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in caelos gloriosæ ascensionis: offerimus praeclaræ maiestati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeternæ et calicem salutis perpetuæ' (Bishop *Liturgica Historica* p. 87). Here *Bo, St, and Fr* shew no variant but the one noted.

² *Downside Review*, October 1917, p. 59.

³ The same formula, with variants, is to be seen also in Férotin's *Liber Sacramentorum*, no. 854.

II. The second prayer to which I would call attention is a *Post pridie* (equal to what the *Miss. Goth.* calls *Post secreta*) in the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum*.¹ For convenience of reference I divide it into four parts.

1. Credimus, Domine sancte, Pater aeternae, omnipotens Deus, Ihesum Christum filium tuum Dominum nostrum pro nostra salute incarnatum fuisse, et in substantia deitatis tibi semper esse aequalem.

2. Per quem *petimus et rogamus*, omnipotens Pater, *ut accepta habeas et benedicere digneris haec munera et haec sacrificia inlibata, quae tibi in primis offerimus pro tua sancta ecclesia catholica, quam pacificare digneris per universum orbem terrarum in tua pace diffusam.*

3. Memorare etiam, quaesumus Domine, servorum tuorum, *qui tibi in honore sanctorum tuorum Illorum reddunt vota sua Deo vivo et vero*, pro remissione suorum omnium delictorum.

De Sacramentis

4. Quorum oblationem benedictam, ratam, acceptabilemque facere digneris: quae est imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Ihesu Christi filii tui (Domini)² ac redemptoris nostri.

Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem [the Oxford MS omits 'rationabilem'],³ acceptabilem, quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

It will be seen that the above prayer, after the first sentence, is built upon three items in the Roman Canon of the Mass: no. 2 answering to the *Te igitur*, no. 3 to the Memento of the living, and no. 4 to the *Quam oblationem*. As regards the text there are several points which deserve notice.

In no. 2 the underlying Roman text would seem to have been of a shorter and earlier type than that of the Gregorian *Te igitur*. We notice 'haec munera et haec sacrificia inlibata' where *Greg.* has 'haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata'; and again, only 'quam pacificare digneris' for 'quam pacificare, custodire, adunare et regere digneris'.⁴ Further, the order 'pro tua sancta ecclesia catholica' (for which *Greg.* has 'pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica') is that found in the Stowe Missal and the *Missale Francorum*.

¹ Ed. Férotin coll. 321, 322. The same prayer appears again, with variants, in the *Liber Sacramentorum*, ed. Férotin col. 641.

² 'Domini' supplied from *Lib. Sacr.*

³ So Prof. Burkitt informs me.

⁴ Yet Pope Vigilius (537-555) writes: 'Antiqua in offerendo sacrificia traditione deposcimus exorantes ut catholicam fidem adunare, regere Dominus et custodire toto orbe dignetur' (*P. L.* lxix 22).

But it is the fourth clause of the Spanish prayer which shews the most remarkable departure from the Gregorian Canon. The latter has, in the *Quam oblationem*, the petition 'ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat' where the Mozarabic prayer has the statement 'quae est imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis'. But this latter is supported by the *De Sacramentis*, which has the equivalent phrase 'quod est figura corporis et sanguinis'. The difference in the wording suggests only that the compiler of the prayer is not dependent on the *De Sacramentis* itself, but is still using a Roman text of the Canon. Now the very phrase 'imago et similitudo' appears to be attested by Pope Gelasius I as existing in the Roman Canon at the end of the fifth century: 'Et certe *imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi* in actione mysteriorum celebrantur.'¹

The full Gregorian text here is: 'Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus, quaesumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem acceptabilemque facere digneris; ut [quae, *Bo, St, Fr*] nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini Dei nostri Iesu Christi.' And I venture to think that *quae* (for *ut*) in the Irish texts is a relic of the old purely relative clause attested above: it is found also in the Biasca and Bergamo MSS of the Ambrosian Canon. R. H. CONNOLLY.

WHAT WERE THE TERAPHIM?

PROFESSOR BARNES'S interpretation of 1 Sam. xix 13, 16, and his comparison of American Indian devil magic in *J. T. S.* xxx 177, removes so many difficulties in understanding the nature of the teraphim, and so immediately suggests Babylonian analogies that an old suggestion, advanced by various authorities only to be rejected, deserves reconsideration.

In the rituals which may be found translated in Dr Woolley's article on Babylonian prophylactic figures in *J. R. A. S.* 1926, 695 ff., there are descriptions of small terracotta and copper figures of deities, &c., buried under the floors or in the walls of rooms where the sick might be treated; these were intended to drive away devils from the sick man's bed, and to prevent the entry of any new disease, in precisely the manner attributed to the strings by the American Indians. These figures are then a striking analogy to the interpretation Professor Barnes advances of the teraphim. We may go further, and suggest that many of the rough terracotta reliefs and figurines found in excavations in

¹ *Adv. Eutychem et Nestorium*, tract. iii c. 14; Thiel *Epist. Rom. Pont.* i p. 541. For *actio* in the sense of the Mass, or Canon of the Mass, see Gelasius *Ep.* xiv 6 (*Ibid.* p. 365): '(Presbyter) non praesente quolibet antistite, nisi fortasse iubeatur, vel orationis vel actionis sacrae suppetere sibi praesumat esse licentiam.'