

(4) In the 'Ambrosian' Rite according to Beroldus (p. 14 Magistretti) St John the Evangelist was commemorated on 'vi Kal. Ian. ad concam' (i.e. in St John the Baptist's church, Milan) and *Ordinatio S. Iacobi apost.* on 'iiij Kal. Ian. ad S. Sebastianum'.¹ Magistretti tells us (p. 171) that St John the Baptist's church (which was the male baptistery, St Stephen's being the female) was destroyed in 1410, and (p. 193) that the Ordination of St James was removed from the 'Ambrosian' Breviary by Cardinal Friderico Borromeo in the sixteenth century.²

(5) All the Keltic Martyrologies are derived from the so-called Hieronymian Martyrology, which is a strange mixture of Eastern and Western elements. That collection assigns to Dec. 27 the Assumption of St John the Evangelist and the Ordination to the Episcopate of St John the Lord's Brother, the original Eastern association of the two sons of Zebedee being thus wrecked through the confusion of the two Jameses. And this confusion reappears in the Martyrologies of Oengus, Tamlaght, Gorman, and the Drummond Missal: that of Tamlaght even enters it thus 'Assumptio, et Ordinatio Iacobi Apostoli fratris Iohannis,' as if James the Less was not only confused with James the Great, but was also reckoned to have 'passed away' (i.e. without ordinary death) like John the Evangelist: but surely this can only be once more a scribe's mistake in omitting 'Iohannis' after 'Assumptio'.

This investigation does not, I admit, carry us very much further, but, so far as it goes, it serves to throw a little light on the Deans' arguments by means of Western service-books, and at any rate suggests a partial explanation of the dire confusion that reigns between the two Saints who were called James.

C. L. FELTOE.

LITURGICAL COMMENTS AND MEMORANDA.

II

THE canon of the Roman Mass has long been an object of curiosity in some circles; indeed of puzzled curiosity. At present it seems to form the centre of interest in what may be called the Neo-German Liturgical School. The seed sown by the solitary Probst in 1870 took a long time—the space of a generation—to germinate; but the progress made since 1900 is quite astonishingly rapid. The stages are marked by Professor Drews 1902 (*Entstehungsgesch. d. Kanons in der rom.*

¹ Cf. Ebner *Quellen und Forschungen Iter Italicum* p. 474.

² Apparently this was in the revision published in 1588: cf. Bäumer *Geschichte des Breviers* p. 464. Friderico was cousin of the more famous Carlo Borromeo.

Messe), Dr Anton Baumstark 1904 (*Liturgia Romana e Liturgia dell'Esarcato*), Drews again 1906 (*Die clementinische Liturgie in Rom*), Professor Buchwald 1907 (*Die Epiklese in der römischen Messe*), Professor Rauschen 1908 (*Eucharistie und Bussakrament*). Meanwhile the late Professor Funk consistently maintained in face of all this activity and learning the defensive attitude of criticism. Circumstances have made it necessary for me in the last week or two [February] to undertake a task of which I had (for reasons of my own) steadily hitherto kept clear; that is to read and examine the tract of Professor Buchwald, himself belonging to that Catholic Faculty of Theology at Breslau, of which the really learned and industrious, if not too critical or clear-headed, Probst was a generation ago an honoured member. Having accomplished the task, the heavy task as I think it, of sifting and analysing the work of Professor Buchwald, and, I trust, not without profit, I feel disposed to turn aside and ask others to give a few moments' attention to it also; not to the tract in general, but to dwell for a while on one single small point in it.

Nothing, I think, would be easier than to bring the writers named above into play against each other, bring out their contradictions, not merely each with the other, but of the same writer with himself. I am in no disposition to do so; but would rather, before we begin, emphasize the utility there is in reference to so difficult and uncertain a subject as ancient liturgy, in pursuing, exhausting, lines of enquiry that may in the event prove to have been conceived in a quite wrong-headed way. This may not only have the negative virtue of saving others, in certain directions, from going and doing likewise; but, in the labour oneself may expend on mastering the productions of these teachers, and in examining and testing their methods and conclusions, almost inevitably (such, at all events, is my experience) we come to acquire not merely a better knowledge of the Liturgies themselves, but also come to see and understand things which otherwise we might, but for such workers, have overlooked altogether; although I readily admit the grave difficulty there is for the reader who would profit by the writers named above, viz. the difficulty there is in keeping a clear head among them all.

But this will make no difference here, since we are going to examine only a single point; even so slight an excursus, however, will (I fancy) shew by an example in what way I think the method followed by these writers is defective, without their having seemingly any consciousness of deficiency in the matter. Still, I should probably not have written the Memorandum that follows merely for this reason; the moral, the use, of it is, to my mind, all gathered up in a page at the end.

And now *à l'œuvre*.

It is well known that the prayers *Supra quae* and *Supplices* in the Roman canon of the Mass are profoundly troubling elements to the scientific liturgiologist; this trouble may be said to lie at the heart of the several treatises enumerated above. Prescinding from the accounts and ideas put forth by his companions let us take here Professor Buchwald's account of the history of *Supra quae* and *Supplices*, to which his whole tract is devoted, and he writes with the benefit of the light thrown on the subject by his predecessors.

This, then, according to their latest historian, is the history of these two prayers, beginning from the last stage and proceeding upwards to their primitive origins.

(1) They were thrown into their present form when Gregory the Great, cancelling the Epiklesis of the Holy Ghost which had formed part of the Roman canon that had come down to him from those that went before, distributed shreds of it in various parts of the canon that he constructed (the present Roman canon); and some such shreds he assigned to the *Supra quae* and *Supplices*, revised in the form in which we have them at present.

(2) Before Gregory's time these two prayers stood in the canon in the form in which they are found in the *de Sacramentis* (see the text in e.g. Duchesne, *Origines*, La messe romaine, 7^o), and in this form they had been borrowed by Rome from Aquileia. This borrowing happened at a date at any rate earlier than about 370-80. That this is so appears from the author of the *Quaestiones V. et IV. Test.* (cf. Duchesne *ubi supra*).

(3) But in Aquileia these prayers were not originals, were not native; Aquileia had borrowed too; but she had also (as is perceptible even now in the Roman canon by the change of grammatical construction) added eight words of her own invention: 'et quod tibi . . . Melchisedech.' The particular church from which Aquileia had borrowed in its turn was Alexandria.

(4) The particular part of the Alexandrine Mass (St Mark) in which the Aquileian church had found the material it wanted was the prayer for the 'offerers' in the Markan Great Intercession (Brightman, *L.E.W.* 129. 20-32; Coptic 170. 32-171. 11).

(5) But this prayer for 'offerers' in 'St Mark' was itself a derived form; for originally its substance was part of the original Markan Epiklesis—an Epiklesis, be it noticed, which (taking account of the borrowings as above) must have been discarded, it would seem, as early as the close of the third century or the beginning of the fourth. But even so we have not done with the case yet; for there was a primitive use of the material of the prayer for 'offerers' at a period earlier than the constitution of the discarded Epiklesis. The earliest primitive use of this

material is to be found in the prayer of incense of 'St Mark', *Θυμίαμα προσφέρομεν* (Br. 118. 26-31).¹

Taking breath now for a moment to survey the ground thus rapidly traversed we observe how entirely at one in his method and his conceptions is Professor Buchwald with Professor Drews. They both carry us along as it were with a rush up into the obscurity of the most remote and primitive antiquity. It is thus that Professor Drews lets us see (1906) how the primitive Roman canon (which was derived from the Clementine Liturgy in the course of the second—or is it the first?—century) had, by somewhere about the year 200, received an accession of elements derived from the Hierosolymitan Liturgy that we call 'St James'; whence (as he observes, *Die clem. Lit. in Rom* p. 160) 'this Liturgy ("St James") must be of a much higher antiquity than is commonly allowed'. What is more, Professor Kruger has pronounced (*Theol. Jahresber.* xxvi, 1906, p. 336) that this 'Hauptresultat' of Drews's investigations 'wird sich schwerlich erschüttern lassen'. Here some chance reader, who may be able to carry back recollections of his interests in these subjects to the sixties of the last century, may recall the days when that great (and now, I think, unduly depreciated) scholar Dr Neale used to rejoice (with Dr Littledale) in the discovery that St Paul in one of his epistles actually quoted the Liturgy of Jerusalem (our actual 'St James'). Truly things seem to have their appointed courses in this world, and there is nothing quite new under the sun.

And now let us take up again the threads of our investigation.

We are not to suppose that all that Professor Buchwald has told us of the history of liturgical texts in Alexandria is solely matter of inference from the texts themselves. No; but external witness comes to our aid. Origen actually attests the existence in his day of portions of the prayer for 'offerers' as now found in 'St Mark'; that is to say as early as the first half of the third century he witnesses to the stage of development indicated at (4) above.² At this point we must have

¹ The two MSS of 'St Mark', both early cent. 13, have different incense prayers; this naturally escapes Professor Buchwald, who seems to use, exclusively, Mr Brightman's volume.

² Buchwald is not wholly original here; or indeed elsewhere sometimes also. I endeavour to refrain from giving more references than those absolutely necessary. But persons further interested may refer for earlier stages to Baumstark (1904) p. 59; Drews (1902), pp. 20 sqq. Probst *Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* 1870 (pp. 155-156) had only called attention to the passage in Origen, putting it in its place in his account of Origen's liturgy without bringing it into connexion with 'St Mark'. For Drews 1906 and the *Supra quae* and *Supplices* see *Clem. Lit. in Rom* pp. 147 sqq., and for Rome and the Alexandrine liturgy, p. 142 n. 1.

before us the relative passages of Origen and the Liturgy of 'St Mark':—

ORIGEN¹

αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται (a quotation by Origen, source not identified; Origen *on Prayer*, ed. A. Koetschau, p. 333. 9, and p. 299. 20, 21).

'Quapropter surgentes oremus Deum ut . . . pro terrenis caelestia largiatur' (Homil. in Luc. xxxix in Migne *P. Gr.* xiii, 1901 seq.; in Buchwald, p. 20).

'ST MARK'

καὶ ἀντίδος αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ τῶν φθαρτῶν τὰ ἀφθάρτα, ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπιγείων τὰ οὐράνια, ἀντὶ τῶν προσκαίρων τὰ αἰώνια (Br. 129. 30-32, cf. p. 559; Swainson, 42 col. 1).

Professor Buchwald, who is nothing if not ingenious, seizes on that word 'surgentes' in the *Homil. in Luc.*, and points out how in the Coptic (Mr Brightman's 'Liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites', pp. 170-171, Dr Swainson's 'St Cyril') this prayer for 'offerers' is said by the bishop in response to a *προσφώνησις* of the deacon; but it is, as we know, of the nature of such prosphonic form of prayer that during the *προσφώνησις* the people are on their knees or deeply bowed, and for the prayer itself that follows they stand erect: as witness the familiar example of the *Flectamus genua* and *Levate* of the Roman Liturgy. Hence, too, as we are bidden to observe, the words of Origen 'surgentes oremus' seem pretty clearly to indicate the anteriority and genuineness of the Coptic as compared with the Greek, an indication which (as Professor Buchwald points out) finds confirmation at other stages of his enquiry.

There is a certain charm in thus being led back by the hand, as it were, into a remote antiquity, and to have this knit up before our eyes with the present by a practice obviously remote from modern sense and feeling, and yet observed by us still; and the idea of this conjuncture of Origen and modern Catholicism has about it something almost *savoureux*. But we must not be led aside from our simple and single purpose by any of the good things Professor Buchwald has the art of so seductively preparing for us by the way.

Having simply followed him up to this point, viz. just to the point where Origen is adduced to witness to the great antiquity of a passage of 'St Mark', it is disconcerting to be met in one's own mind by one of those inconvenient things—facts—which my guide does not see standing in his path. It is this: that the very passage (though with an inversion of the first two of its three members) of the Liturgy of St Mark

¹ For these texts I rely on citations in the books quoted; Origen is not accessible to me.

cited above occurs in three out of the four texts of St James printed in parallel columns in Swainson, pp. 288-289. The passage is absent, however, from the 4th MS, Paris 2509, and is therefore not to be found in Mr Brightman's volume; nor is it in our recently recovered earliest text of St James, a text possibly as early as about the year 700, now (since 1905) available in Cozza-Luzi's tenth volume of Mai's *Patrum Nova Bibliotheca*, part 2, p. 82.

An interpolation from 'St Mark' into late texts of 'St James' is naturally the first reflexion. But this will not do: for there is something more.

In the same prayer for 'offerers' of 'Mark' there is another passage that occurs in all five texts of 'James', and therefore has a claim that can hardly be contested to be considered an integral and genuine part of the Liturgy of St James itself.

' MARK '

καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ
τὰς προσφορὰς προσενεγκάντων
(Br. 129. 24-25; Sw. 42).

' JAMES '

καὶ τῶν τὰς προσφορὰς ταύτας προσ-
ενεγκάντων ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ (Br. 56.
16-17, cf. μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας
57. 15; Sw. 288-289; Cozza-Luzi 2
p. 82).

Moreover, this is no mere isolated case; the verbal resemblances between the Anaphora of 'Mark' and that of 'James' are frequent; and not resemblances with 'James' only, but with other liturgies also. Let us take, for instance, the prayer for the emperor in the Great Intercession of 'Mark', Br. 128. 8-21. It shews these curious features:—

' MARK '

l. 10 βασιλέως . . . γῆς = Intercession of Basil, Br. 333. 6-8.

ll. 10-11 ἐν εἰρήνῃ . . . διαφύλαξον = Intercession of Syriac 'James',
Br. 168. 31-32.

ll. 11-12 καθυπόταξον . . . πολέμων cf. Basil, Br. 333. 15-17.

l. 13* ἐπιλαβοῦ . . . αὐτοῦ = 'James' Br. 55. 16-17.

l. 15* ἐπισκίασον . . . πολέμου = Basil 333. 10-11.

ll. 17-19 λάλησον . . . λαοῦ = Basil 333. 19-22.

ll. 20-21* ἵνα . . . σεμνότητι cf. James 55. 18-19.

In this last case the words καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ γαληνότῃ αὐτοῦ are not found in Mr Brightman (= Paris MS 2509), nor in the ancient text of Cozza-Luzi, nor in Paris MS 476 in the fourth column of Dr Swainson, p. 285; but they are in the two Sicilian MSS (Sw. p. 284); here, then, is a case very similar to that of the passage ἀντίδος from which we started. Moreover, the three passages marked with an asterisk are (= entirely) scriptural quotation. But every possible deduction that can be made

does not do away with, indeed, hardly affects, the character of this passage of 'Mark' as a cento of passages found in other liturgies.

Or, to take another case which shews another character, that of consistent resemblance between 'Mark' and 'James', viz. the Recital of Institution and Epiklesis. When these are thrown in parallel columns and compared, it seems clear, as regards the Recital of Institution, either that one has copied from the other wholesale or that the Churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria have both carefully and verbally preserved a single primitive tradition. Which of these views is the just one? The two texts of the Epiklesis that follow leave, I imagine, no room whatever for doubt that 'Mark' has copied 'James'; and that in a wholesale way, and at a relatively late period. To convince ourselves of this it is only necessary to draw out in parallel columns the epithets applied to the Holy Spirit in both; adding in a third column the parallel passage from the normal Syriac St James (Brightman, p. 88), and (as confirmatory of the latter), a fourth column for the Liturgy of 'Cyril of Antioch' (of the Syriac St James type) mentioned above in the first of these Memoranda (p. 448) as recently printed in *Oriens Christianus*.

The recension of 'James' in Cozza-Luzi is attested by about the close of the seventh century, or in the first half of the eighth; whilst the recension afforded by Syriac 'James' and Cyril of Nisibis may conjecturally be taken as representing the development of the Epiklesis of 'James' at about the middle of the fifth century. And, so far, a presumption is raised that the 'Mark' Epiklesis was borrowed from 'James' some time between A. D. 450 and A. D. 700.

The point we have arrived at, then, is this: a perception that the text of 'Mark' as we have it is not to be relied on, perhaps at any part, except for reasons that can be definitely stated, as evidencing the text of the Alexandrine Liturgy of the third century. And now let us recall the question from which we started: that is, whether the passage *καὶ ἀντίδος* (Br. 129. 30-32) quoted above (p. 596) is witnessed to by Origen as a text of the Alexandrine Liturgy in his day.

The analysis made above of the prayer for the Emperor in the 'Mark' Intercession by its mention of 'Basil' suggests a clue. The rite of an imperial city, a royal capital, a Residenz, may always be expected to be intrusive. Let us consult, then, the Intercession of Byzantine 'Basil'. Here is what we read: 'Remember, Lord, them that bring forth fruit and do good works in Thy holy Church, and are mindful of the poor; requite (*ἀμειψαι*) them with Thy rich and heavenly graces; *χάρισαι αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπιγείων τὰ ἐπουράνια, ἀντὶ τῶν προσκαίρων τὰ αἰώνια, ἀντὶ τῶν φθαρτῶν τὰ ἀφθάρτα*' (Br. 332. 25-28).

But since we are in company with writers of the Neo-German School, who are continually bidding us go back and carrying us up higher into

the gloom of a dim past, let us follow their example. There seems to be a liturgical text that stands behind 'Basil'. In the first diaconal Litany of the Mass of the Faithful in the Clementine Liturgy are the following suffrages (Br. 11. 5-12):—

Ὑπὲρ τῶν καρποφορούντων, κτλ.

Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς προσφερόντων . . . ὅπως ὁ πανάγαθος Θεὸς ἀμείψῃται αὐτοὺς ταῖς ἐπουρανίαις αὐτοῦ δωρεαῖς . . . καὶ χαρίσθῃται αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ τῶν προσκαίρων τὰ αἰώνια, ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπιγείων τὰ ἐπουράνια.

Before closing the enquiry let me follow the example of Professor Buchwald, and adventure myself in drawing up a brief outline of the story of the clause *καὶ ἀντίδος* as it appears to me.

(1) This text *καὶ ἀντίδος . . . αἰώνια* now in Mark (Br. 129. 30-32) was originally no part of the Liturgy of 'St Mark', nor does Origen refer to this in the passages cited from him.

(2) Of course, the ideas embodied in it are a mere commonplace of Christian thought; as Mr Brightman points out so well (p. 559) in that invaluable part of his book, pp. 553-567, thus: '129. 31: 1 Cor. ix 25; Jo. iii 12; 2 Cor. iv 18.'

(3) Its first liturgical expression (be this said with all due reserve) is in the diaconal Litany at the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful of the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions; we can therefore carry it up presumably, at all events, to the fourth century.

(4) Counter to the views of some writers (and, I suppose, the accepted view also) I knit up in my own mind the Clementine Liturgy with 'Basil'; and the early Antiochene Liturgy with the Byzantine, rather than with Jerusalem and 'St James'. From this point of view there is no reason to be surprised at finding the passages of the Clementine Litany utilized in the Intercession of 'St Basil'; a liturgy which there is ground for thinking had assumed its present form generally at all events by the sixth century.

(5) From Constantinople the passage may easily and naturally enough have been introduced into either the Liturgy of St Mark or into western recensions (e.g. Sicilian) of St James; whether independently or by way of one copying from the other must, here at any rate, be left an open question.¹

¹ The whole prayer for 'offerers' in the Intercession of 'Mark' shews traces of late and unskilled compilation (cf. Baumstark, pp. 115-124). In part it relates to the bread and wine brought by the 'offerers'; in part to alms, money. But even in the former part ideas are expressed (viz. the carrying up on to the heavenly altar of the bread and wine offered by the people) which naturally seem appropriate only for the consecrated Gifts. And indeed this distinction is carefully observed in the Clementine Liturgy. This Liturgy has a petition *before* the consecration for the requital of the earthly gifts brought by the offerers by a divine bestowal of

The Epiklesis of 'Mark' compared with that of 'James': Epithets, &c., applied to the Holy Spirit.

Page line	'James' (Br. pp. 53-54)	'Mark' (Br. 133-134)	Syriac 'James' (Br. 88)	Cyrilic of Nisibis A.D. 793-817 (Or. Chr. v 187)
53	21 καὶ ἑπιστάτευον	133 32 ἐπιστάτευλον	and send	et mitte
	22 τὸ πνεῦμά σου	134 1 τὸν παράκλητον,	Thine holy spirit	spiritum tuum
	24 τὸ πνεῦμα σου	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,	the Lord and Lifegiver	sanctum
	25 τῷ ἁγίῳ σου	τὸ ἅγιον,	who shareth Thy Throne	
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	τὸ ζωοποιόν,	God and Father and shareth the Kingdom with the Son,	
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	τὸ ἐν νόμῳ		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	καὶ προφήταις		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	καὶ ἀποστόλους λαλήσαν,		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	3-5 τὸ πανταχού παρὸν . . . εὐδοκίᾳ		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	τῆ σῆ,		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	5-6 τὸ ἀπλὸν . . . πηγῆν,	who is of one substance and coeternal,	τὴν οὐσίαν et aeternitate tibi
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	6 τὸ σὸ ὁμοούσιον,	who spake by the Law, and the prophets	qui διὰ τοῦ νόμου et per prophetas
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	τὸ ἐκ σοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον,	and Thy new testament, who descended in the likeness of a dove	et per apostolos locutus est, illum
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	7-8 τὸ σύμβρονον τῆς βασιλείας σου	upon our Lord J. Chr.	qui super D. N. I. C. in Iordane
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου ἢ ὁ		flumine apparuit,
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου Χριστοῦ		illum
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	9-10 ἔπιθε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ (ἐπιστάτευλον) ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτους τούτους	who descended upon the Apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues,	qui in linguis ignicis super apostolos requievit
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ποτήρια ταῦτα		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	10 τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον	that coming down	ut obumbrans
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	ἵνα αὐτὰ		
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	11-12 ἁγίαση καὶ τελειώση	he may make	efficaciat
	τὸ πνεῦμα σου	ὡς παντοδύναμος Θεὸς καὶ ποιῆση . . .		

And with all these we may compare the recently published 'Liturgical papyrus of Oxford'. I copy it according to the Dom de Puniel's restoration of the text in *Revue Byzantine*, January 1909, p. 45; and, indeed, it is a subject of gratulation for liturgists that this piece should have fallen for publication and illustration first of all to one so careful and discreet as Dom de Puniel. The papyrus itself is supposed to be of the seventh century. Here at any rate is the simple text of its Epiklesis: καὶ ἐπίστατευσον καταπέμψαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σου ἐπὶ τὰ κτίσματα ταῦτα [καὶ ποτήριον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον κτλ.]. The letters in brackets are a restoration.

And now to come to the end, the practical matter. The subject of our consideration in the beginning was the 'Neo-German Liturgical School'. Up till now it has taken one line, adopted one method, and that method is described and characterized by Professor Drews himself (*Die Clem. Lit.* pp. 9-11). There is also a Neo-French school of whom Monsignori Duchesne and Batiffol are the recognized and brilliant chiefs. There is, however, another French school, that which has been called in the past the School of Solesmes; will it in the future be true to the primitive liturgical method of Dom Guéranger, or (as I trust with all my heart) prove on that particular point simply faithless, only to be in itself and for others the more faithworthy? Time alone can shew; but indications seem to promise that the School of Solesmes (now Quarr-Farnborough) intends to profit by the lessons of its own past. There is room alongside of all these for an English school that looks to the future, not to the past. The English school that, speaking generally, has prevailed until now is to be traced up to the ex-Lutheran Grabe and that little coterie of Non-jurors who mixed themselves up with the study of Liturgy, not in the grand style of a Renaudot or a Richard Simon, but really for the sake of an intrigue that failed. Twenty-five years ago there was some one who pointed out a new way; I mean the late Dr Swainson. I have heard his book, *The Greek Liturgies*, depreciated; and, in some respects, it would seem to be a good deal neglected. If I may speak from my own experience I should say that any real knowledge of, or insight into, those Liturgies I may have gained is due to that particular book. Indeed, I venture to think that it may prove to mark the beginning of a new era in these studies. But it needs to be followed up; the case of the Neo-German school, with its long neglect of Probst, shews that such neglect is no necessary cause for discouragement. But Dr Swainson's work is to be carried on not by imitation, but by progress in the direction he indicated. A textual investigation of the Liturgy of St Mark would be a specimen of just the sort of work that should attach itself as a continuation of Swainson's. I should not have the courage to say so much if I had not attempted a little essay of that kind myself—for strictly personal purposes of trying to learn; an essay, so to speak, merely for 'workshop' use. But it has been enough to teach me how profitable such a piece of work would be for liturgical studies, for the understanding of the history of divine

heavenly gifts (Br. 11. 9); whilst it is the consecrated Eucharist which this Liturgy prays may be received by God on the heavenly altar (Br. 23. 15-17). Here we are in touch with ideas that lie at the root of early Christian liturgical development (see Fr. Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio*, München, Lentner, 1906, pp. 45 sqq., 108 sqq.; and for a contrary view, Fr. Wieland, *Die Schrift 'Mensa und Confessio' und P. Emil Dorsch S.J. in Innsbruck*, 1908, pp. 32-50).

worship and the forms in which it has clothed itself, and how honourable it might even be for English scholarship. I will not end without indicating what I think might probably be the upshot of such a work. Something like this: that whilst our present text of 'Mark' contains buried in it most precious and ancient remains of the early Egyptian and Alexandrine Liturgy, this primitive element has been also largely overlaid by foreign elements, chiefly Hierosolymitan, either adopted almost verbally, or worked up in a literary manner; finally a third element, a quantity, and that not inconsiderable, of tawdry rhetorical embroidery, the work of some self-complacent 'scholasticus'. It is just in regard to this third element that the greatest care and discretion would have to be exercised. I have spoken of it as a whole in a somewhat contemptuous manner; and that is the result of the impression it makes upon me as a whole; but the liturgist will always do well to treat nothing of the material that is found between the two covers of Dr Swainson's book, as 'commune et immundum'; we may sift and sort as finely as we can, and yet it is necessary always to remember that among the rejected scoria there may be still elements of pure and precious metal unrecognizable only because we happen, as yet, to be unable to remove the surface impurities with which it has become encrusted in long lapse of time.

Perhaps before ending this Memorandum I should add one word more; except on one, and that a most important point, which, however, he dismisses in a few lines, I believe the thesis Professor Buchwald propounds, and its demonstration too, to be, both of them, thoroughly mistaken.

It had been intended by me that Memorandum II should have related to something quite different; an accident as explained at the beginning of it has made II to be as it is found above. But it will be as well to mention here at once what is the subject the treatment of which is now deferred. A reference, mediately by way of Hefele, in Mgr Mercati's article 'More Spanish Symptoms' to Helfferich's *Der westgothische Arianismus* (*J.T.S.* vol. ix p. 424 n. 2), reminded me how there was a book that had stood on my 'list' for the last thirty years, and was still not looked at. A copy was soon obtained. What was now my surprise¹ on opening it to find that nearly fifty years ago—to be precise, forty-nine—Helfferich had actually printed the very Toledan prayers which Elipandus had cited in the Adoptianist controversy, thus verifying Mgr Mercati's perspicacity and sound historical sense when

¹ Such surprise was quite out of place, for the existence of these prayers in Helfferich had been already clearly indicated (1904) in *M. G. Conal* II. 1 p. 113 n. 5.

(*J.T.S.* p. 425 n. 2) he put in a plea for the common honesty of that simple old man whose last years were spent in especial bitterness through his very simplicity and unadvisedness in defence of orthodoxy against the hair-brained Migetius and his coadjutor the Frankish bishop Egila who, bent on mission work, had thrust himself into Southern Spain. There is one prayer which Helfferich says (p. 97) that he could not find, viz. that from the Mass for the dead. But this happens to be just the prayer which now some seven years ago I pointed out (see *Book of Cerne*, p. 270; cf. pp. 252-253 No 25 and *Liber ord.* ed. Férotin, 1904, coll. 110-111) as worked up in the non-Roman set of Masses for the dead now found at the end of the *Gelasianum*, and as used also in its entirety in the Mass for the dead in the Stowe missal. Although calling attention to this at once, I propose to deal with the matter in detail on another occasion.

EDMUND BISHOP.