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PREFACE.

LITTLE is needed by way of preface to this edition of the "Leonian" Sacramentary. A tiro in liturgical lore, I was led to undertake the work in the course of publishing a selection of the Sermons and Letters of its once-reputed author, Leo Magnus, in Dr Schaff's Library of Post-Nicene Fathers (Vol. XII). The text has, I believe, never been published in England and I thought there was room for a handier and cheaper edition than Bianchini's and for one more accurate as well as cheaper than any of the more recent editions. My first ambition was to bring out my volume as a companion to Mr Wilson's "Gelasian" Sacramentary which came out two years since: proximus haec, longo sed proximus intervallo. But the Clarendon Press declined my overtures and I was fain to have recourse to my own Alma Mater, whom perhaps I should never have tried to forsake. I am greatly indebted to the Syndics of the University Press for undertaking the whole expense of the publication and to the printers themselves for the pains they have taken and the help they have given me. In spite of defects, if the work should be only in part as useful to students as I hope it may be, a large share of gratitude will be due to Professors Swete and Robinson, Canon F. E. Warren, Rev. H. A. Wilson and Mr F. C. Burkitt, each of whom has constantly given me the benefit of his advice and learning, when applied to. My thanks are due to the Chapter at Verona for giving me free access to their Library, as well as to their
Vice-Librarian, of whom I have spoken in the Introduction. I am also under obligations to Sir Edward Maunde Thompson for dating the MS. and to M. l'Abbé Duchesne for twice answering my inquiries on smaller points.

In the text itself, I have to some extent followed the peculiarities of spelling of the MS. and have usually indicated at the bottom of the page where another spelling has been adopted. A certain number of the abbreviations to be found in the original are also introduced: this was chiefly for brevity's sake, nor can any difficulty be caused thereby to any one likely to use the book. I have not paid much attention to the stops employed in the MS. But one kind is, I think, there to be found (viz. the point) and that rarely and irregularly, and more frequently perhaps for marking alternative readings than for the purpose of punctuation. Where points are used by the scribe to mark such readings, the fact is recorded in the footnotes. I have myself introduced into the text only such stops as seemed necessary to the sense. It will be seen therefore that the present edition does not offer an exact reproduction of the text, as it is written in the MS. But, as the notes will show, I have corrected some of the mistakes of former editions and have also been at some pains to gather together information of various kinds, which I trust will be of use for the illustration of the subject.

CHARLES LETT FELTOE.

Fornham All Saints',
Michaelmas, 1896.
INTRODUCTION.

The "Leonine" Sacramentary \(^1\) was, as is well known, discovered in the Chapter library at Verona by Joseph Bianchini and first published by him in the 4th volume of his uncle Francis Bianchini's edition of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (1735). It still remains among the treasures of the same library bound in white parchment uniformly with the rest of the Bianchini MSS. and books. It is only a fragment, but originally consisted of 20 gatherings (each containing 8 leaves) and 3 additional leaves at the end. Of these the first three gatherings are missing and the MS. begins towards the middle of Missa vi for April. Each leaf is about 9½ in. high by 8½ in. wide. The first remaining page is rather soiled and the writing is very indistinct: in the left-hand top corner is a thick red cross about 1 in. high by 1 in. broad followed by a short thick line about ½ in. long. The third specimen photograph shows the state of the last page but one, where the sacramentary proper suddenly breaks off: the writing on the last page of all, which is probably by the same hand as the latter part of the last page but one, is, if anything, more indistinct than that on the first. The document is otherwise on the whole in good preservation and has been comparatively little tampered with and seldom in such a way as to obliterate the original text. The specimen photographs give an accurate idea of the excellence of the handwriting, which hardly varies at all from first to last: it is in uncials of a slightly loose character. Sir Edward Maunde Thompson has expressed his opinion to me in writing thus: "I think you may put the MS. fairly early in the seventh century:" and this is the opinion a little less definitely expressed of Delisle\(^2\), adopted by Duchesne\(^3\).

\(^1\) It has not been thought advisable to change the familiar title as it need deceive no one now-a-days, and a change would only cause confusion. Assemani, however, in Tom. vi. of his Codex Liturgicus Excl. Unitio, prints the MS. under the title of Sacramentarium Veronense, although this only describes its present locality, not its origin.

\(^2\) Min. sur l'anc. Sacr., p. 65.

\(^3\) Origines du culte Chrétien, p. 139.
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The contents of the MS. are in many ways unique. In the first place, not to mention the absence of the Canon Actionis, which was perhaps contained in the missing pages, the MS. is remarkable for the large number of alternative Missae frequently found under one heading: e.g. there were originally xiiii or more such Missae in April, apparently for the "common" of martyrs, though the heading of this section (viii) is now lost, viii for SS. John and Paul, xxviii for SS. Peter and Paul, xiv sets of preces et orationes diurnae, xiiii for S. Lawrence, xxii in nat. episcoporum, and so on. Investigation however shows that this feature is more or less accidental, being sometimes only due to incompleteness in the use of headings or to want of method in arrangement: for Missae, which, as the collector must have known quite well, belong to a different occasion, are often included under the same heading as the foregoing or the following Missae. This is in some cases remedied to a certain extent by marginal or other notes in red or black ink (e.g. on pp. 11, 15, 25, 31, &c.). In other cases no such indication is given: e.g. the Missae from viii onwards in nat. episcoporum seem to be almost entirely without connexion with their heading and to belong rather to the post-Pentecostal season. With regard to the heading orationes et preces diurnae, I take this to indicate roughly the non-festal or post-Pentecostal period of the Kalendars, and indeed several of the forms included especially towards the end of the section (xviii) belong to that season in other books: e.g. in xxviii (omnit et misererei Dei, &c.), in xxx (sit nobis, &c.), in xxxii (munusmus, &c.), in xxxiii (omnis semper Dei, &c.) in xxxvi (tantis, &c.), in xxxvii (lactifert, &c.), in xxxviii (sentiamus, &c.), in xlviii (da nobis, &c., and repleti, &c.), in xliii (ad aures, &c., and preface). Thus the Kalendar, as it would be made out by a mere reference to the headings, is not quite as complete as an examination of the Missae themselves would warrant.

In the second place a large number of the prayers and other forms, very often whole Missae, do not seem to occur in any other extant service books, though the somewhat laborious examination to which I have subjected the various parts reveals that a good many more prayers and prefaces are found elsewhere than previous editors have discovered or at all events recorded. By the aid of such books as Muratori's Liturgia Romana vetus, and Mr Wilson's most useful Index to it, Gerbert's Monumenta v. Lit. Alem. and Pameli Liturgica Latinorum vol. i., I have compared this Sacramentary as thoroughly as I could with the Gelasian, the Gregorian, the Ambrosian, the Missale Gothicum,

1 Muratori (Dissert. col. 39) has already pointed out that there are certain considerable coincidences between the Kalendar of our MS. (if we may so speak) and the Bucherian Kalendar (iv. cent.): see pp. 60 &c., and notes in loc.
the Missale Francorum, the Missale Gallicanum vetus, the Sacramentarium Gallicanum, and the Leofric Missal (Mr Warren's edition); and I have also noted the few cases in which our English Book of Common Prayer contains common matter, and very frequently those where the Roman Missal of to-day does the same. The adducing of these last two authorities may seem to some superfluous, but to others it may increase the interest of my labours. One result of this investigation is somewhat curious, and may possibly prove significant: besides the many whole Missae which are apparently peculiar to our MS., there is an even larger number of Missae which contain only one collect or other form which can be traced to other books. Perhaps if we had all the service books at hand which the collector had, the number of such Missae might be considerably reduced, but in the present state of our information the impression is distinctly produced that the singularity is not unintentional; it seems as if the collector had intended to amplify his collection of Missae in that particular way, viz. by taking one form already recognized and fitting on to it forms of his own composition, or derived from private sources, in order to make a complete Missa.

A third feature in the contents of our MS. is the confused order it frequently displays: e.g. the Missae for S. Stephen the Protomartyr are placed in August instead of December; this is apparently through a mistaken identification of him with S. Stephen the Pope, though many of the forms introduced show clearly enough a connexion with the Christmas season; the December fast is placed after the Christmas Feast instead of before; a preface for S. Eufymia seems to be inserted in the middle of a Missa for SS. Cornelius and Cyprian, and so on.

And fourthly, closely connected with this feature is the fact that very often the same prayer, sometimes even a whole Missa, is repeated with slight, if any, verbal changes: instances of this need not be given here; they are in each case mentioned in the notes.

A fifth point in respect of the contents is connected with what may loosely be called the rubrics. The headings to the various sections are in red and seem to be in most, if not all cases, by the same or a contemporary hand. Especially towards the beginning of the MS. the

---

1 This inference of course proceeds on the assumption that our MS. is the compilation of a collector.

2 By "private sources" here are meant quotations from patristic writings &c. Three or four such quotations have already been discovered by previous editors from Leo Magnus; and I cannot doubt that a competent acquaintance with other patristic writings would reveal a great number of similar instances, particularly in the prefaces. Duchesne (Orig. du culte Chrétien, pp. 170, 1) remarks with regard to these latter "'le sacramentaire léonien donne lieu de croire que l'improvisation, ou du moins l'intercalation de phrases préparées par l'officiant lui-même était encore pratiquée au sixième siècle.'
rubrical notes, &c. are sometimes inserted, as if by an afterthought, either at the end of a line (e.g. p. 11) or between the lines: further on in the MS. (perhaps because the scribe became more accustomed to his work) they are inserted with greater regularity: very often, however, from first to last they are in the margin. These minor notes are sometimes in red like the headings of sections; more frequently, however, they are in black, and seem likewise mostly of a contemporary character.

Besides these, there are a few scribblings in the margin and a good many annotations in more or less recent hands. One kind of rubrical note has baffled my powers of interpretation, viz. those consisting chiefly of single letters: thus we have Æ Æ Æ 3 times running at the end of a Missa, Æ Æ Æ Æ 2 times at the end of a Missa, Æ Æ Æ Æ 2 times after 1st collect, Æ Æ Æ Æ 2 times after 2nd collect, Æ Æ Æ Æ 2 times after 3rd collect, Æ Æ Æ Æ 2 times at end of a Missa, and Æ Æ Æ Æ once after 2nd collect and once at end of a Missa. In this list Æ Æ always come together (?=factendum est), Æ Æ 5 times out of 10: and 6 times out of 10 the letters come at the end of a Missa. They are always in black. The first time such letters occur is on p. 11, Pascali Æ Æ Æ Æ, where they are in black at the end of the prayer (sacrificium, &c.), and are now so faint as to be almost illegible: they refer no doubt to the succeeding Preface, which is of a Paschal character. Again, on p. 27 we have Præce Æ Æ before the second collect in a Missa that has no Preface (?=preces sunt faciendae). And on p. 104 we have preces Æ Æ in æci Euphemia at the end of the preceding prayer and probably referring to the succeeding preface which seems to be out of its place (?Æ = habedae or haec)1. One other kind of mark must be mentioned: towards the middle of the MS. and onwards letters of the alphabet occur in black ink and in alphabetical order against many of the prayers (but not always consecutive prayers), and sometimes throughout the MS. such signs as Æ or æ or Æ, generally in black. These probably have something to do with indicating the sources from which the collector was drawing, though the clue to them is not in our possession yet, and it is doubtful if it ever will be.

Three other points in connexion with the contents remain for notice:

(1) The number of "Roman" allusions of various kinds is considerable and goes far towards fixing the provenance of the document at

---

1 It is perhaps worth while to notice that in the Library copy of Anastasius at Verona the same hand which has so often annotated the MS. itself, tries to interpret these letters thus: Præce Æ Æ = preces super frater in preces spiritualia ferenda (sic), Æ Æ Æ Æ = facia eucharistia super populum: here Bianchini suggests preces feriales; Æ Æ Æ = preces sup. pop. facta eucharistia, Æ Æ Æ Æ = preces facta eucharistia sup. pop., Æ Æ Æ = post sanctum factum eucharistiam sup. pop., and Æ Æ = post factum eucharistiam.
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Rome: e.g. phrases like hostes Romani nominis (p. 27), Romani nominis securitas (p. 63) where Amb. (372 Pam.) reads Xrían for Romani, and statum Romani nominis (p. 75) often occur; so too we have references to Romani principes (p. 77) &c.; the traditional connexion of SS. Peter and Paul with Rome is assumed on pp. 40 and 47; the catacombs of Rome seem to be referred to as the burying places of SS. John and Paul on p. 34 and of S. Xystus on p. 90; several Roman "stations" are given in the rubrics (Callisti, Prætextati &c.); several Roman bishops and other celebrities are commemorated (e.g. S. Xystus, S. Lawrence, S. Clement, S. Silvester and S. Simplicius), and other Roman localities besides the stations are probably alluded to (e.g. on p. 15, the dedication of S. Peter’s basilica, and on p. 106 of S. Michael’s).

(2) Distinct references to early conditions of church life are but scanty: the incompleteness of the Kalendar as evidenced by the commemorations in the MS. is probably due to the general character of the compilation rather than to any other cause: the blessing on the water, honey, and milk used after baptism on p. 25, which has been adduced by Muratori, is found also in Greg. (505 Mur.) of 9th cent. and in Leofr. (224 W) of 10th cent. and therefore is again uncertain. It is possible, however, that on p. 9 there is an allusion to an early condition of church life in the distinction drawn between veri confessores falsique: see notes in loco.

(3) A few Biblical quotations seem to be made from a pre-Hieronymian text. It must, however, be remembered that Biblical quotations or references in a service book cannot as a rule throw much light upon the sources or the antiquity of the liturgical forms in which they occur. Their witness is weakened by the essential character of a prayer or a preface: verbal accuracy of quotation is not at all characteristic of primitive or mediaeval prayers: the thought is seized upon and used, and the language freely adapted to the rhythm. So that even in cases, where the wording differs materially from the Vulgate, too much stress must not be laid upon the variation. Still there are a certain number of cases, where an earlier or at least a different version of the Bible has been or may have been the basis of the quotation or reference. I proceed to give a list of them¹, marking the more important instances with *:

p. 1. post salutaria tua curramus. Perhaps here salutarías = σωτήρ (Vulg. pacifica) of Exod. xx. 24 &c. though on the other hand we may compare pp. 79 and 133 ad...salutarías mandata

¹ I am much indebted to Mr F. C. Burkitt in dealing with this branch of the matter.