Irish Church Quarterly

The Psalter and Martyrology of Ricemarch by Hugh Jackson Lawlor

Review by: F. Cabrol

The Irish Church Quarterly, Vol. 8, No. 31 (Jul., 1915), pp. 246-249

Published by: [Irish Church Quarterly](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30067517>

Accessed: 16/06/2014 19:32

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Irish Church Quarterly is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Irish Church Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

recent years, for the study of the early history of the Egyptian liturgy. This review of the whole field is followed by two chapters which might be read with advantage by everyone who is concerned with the rendering of the Church's worship. One of these chapters is a careful summary of our present knowledge of the development of the Liturgy in East and West. The other deals with the early conceptions of the Eucharist, as illustrated by the history of that development. Some of Dr. Srawley's conclusions on the questions here discussed are difficult to reconcile with many long cherished liturgical traditions. There is a wide gulf between the bald extempore prayer of thanksgiving, the grace before meat over a sacred meal, which the writer apparently considers to be all that is indicated by the earlier eucharistic allusions, and the doctrinally developed rites that are to be found everywhere throughout Christendom, at the close of this period, a few generations later. A Liturgy without the Words of Institution, without Invocation or Anamnesis, Creed or Sanctus, perhaps without even the Lord's Prayer, preceded rather than accompanied by the "Service of the Word," now somewhat meagrely represented by the Collects, Epistle, and Gospel, would be a form of worship that the most primitively minded of modern Prayer-Book revisers could hardly contemplate otherwise than with feelings akin to dismay. There is considerable risk in these matters of attaching undue importance to the argument from silence. Further light may yet be thrown on the obscure relationship of the more developed forms of the liturgy, in which the worship of Christendom ultimately settled down, to the sacrificial language of St. Paul and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and to the mystic ceremonial that surrounds the heavenly worship of the Lamb slain and yet alive, in the Apocalyptic Vision.

R. W. B.

THE PSALTER AND MARTYROLOGY OF RICEMARCH,
edited by Hugh Jackson Lawlor, D.D., Litt.D., Canon and
Precentor of St. Patrick's, and Beresford Professor of Eccle-
siastical History in the University of Dublin. 2 Vols. 8vo.
Henry Bradshaw Society. Vols. XLVII. and XLVIII. (Sub-
scription £1 1s.)

In the *Analecta Bollandiana* of 1913 (Vol. XXXII., p. 369), Father Delehaye expressed his astonishment that this precious manuscript of the Hieronymian Martyrology possessed by the Dublin University Library had never yet been edited. Henry Bradshaw, it is true, had made a copy of it, but this copy remained unnoticed among his papers. Hence it was, that Father Delehaye decided to undertake himself the editing of this manuscript.

While it was in course of being printed he learnt that the Henry Bradshaw Society was engaged in the same task. It was,

however, too late to withdraw, says Father Delehaye; the work was too far advanced to be abandoned. Thus, we have the advantage of obtaining two editions of the same text within two years—a real advantage since these two editions supplement one another. The learned Bollandist contents himself with giving us the correct text of the Martyrology, but the plan carried into execution by Dr. Lawlor is of considerably wider extent. Together with the edition of the Martyrology, he gives us an introduction dealing with the Irish Schools and with that of St. David's and containing studies on the manuscript of the Martyrology and the text of the Psalter. Besides this we have the "Versiculi" or Verses of Ricemarch and a collation of the Psalter, and in addition to the valuable notes and indices there is also an appendix on the "Lament of Ricemarch"—a little poem on the Norman invasion. This forms the matter of the first volume. The second contains a series of plates reproducing the entire text of the Martyrology together with the Solar Tables, a few pages of the Psalter (pls. II.-LXXXVI), and two pages of the treatise *De Trinitate* of St. Augustine—Cambridge, Corpus Christi, MS. 199, ff. 1v. and 41v. pls. LXXXVII, LXXXVIII).

The Manuscript of which the most important parts are here reproduced (Trinity College, Dublin Ms. A. 4. 20), was written for Ricemarch, one of the shining lights of the School of St. David's, by a scribe named Ithael, and illuminated by John, one of the brothers of Ricemarch, between the years 1064 and 1082—more precisely, before April 24th, 1082, between 1076 and 1081, or perhaps between 1079 and 1081. It is especially remarkable for its text of the Hieronymian Martyrology, and one may well join in Father Delehaye's astonishment that it has only now come to light, for even the latest editors of this well-known Martyrology, the learned Duchesne and De Rossi, were ignorant of the existence of this particular text. And yet it is one of the highest value and may be classed among the most important texts, such as the Codex Bernensis (B), the Fragmentum Laureshamense (L), the Codex Epternacensis (E), the Martyrologium Wissenburgense (W), and the Codex Richenouensis or Augiensis (Rich.), and even among these it occupies a place in the very first rank. On this point Fr. Delehaye and Dr. Lawlor are agreed. They are not altogether of the same opinion, however, when it is a question of establishing the relationship of the manuscript which Fr. Delehaye designates by the letter D (Dublinensis) and Dr. Lawlor by R (Ricemarcensis). Delehaye supposes that R is an abbreviated recension of a text of the type E (*Anal. Boll.*, vol. xxxii., p. 373 ff). Dr. Lawlor maintains that this hypothesis does not account sufficiently for all the facts and himself suggests another. His theory is that E is based upon two lost recensions. One of these was an abbreviated text from which R is derived (and which it faithfully repro-

duces)—he calls this text ρ ; the other an unabridged text resembling both B and W; this he calls β ; it is probably descended from a common ancestor of these manuscripts (see for proofs of this, Lawlor, pp. xxv., xxvi.). This conclusion also disagrees with that of Mgr. Duchesne, who attaches too great importance to E. While fully admitting the high value of this latter, Dr. Lawlor considers it to be composite and thinks that it should only be made use of with great caution (p. xxxi., note 2). According to his theory, R is of equal value—it descends from ρ like E, but the latter borrows as well from β . Dr. Lawlor illustrates this genealogy by means of the following diagram:—

Whatever side one may take in this discussion, the importance of R remains none the less certain; its readings are of the highest interest and are for the most part worthy of special attention. We will not attempt to give examples here; Fr. Delehaye as well as Dr. Lawlor has pointed out the most striking, in particular where there is question of the topography of Rome (see, especially, note on the *Quatuor Coronati*, p. 55).

It is scarcely necessary to say that R possesses certain characteristics of its own and that it bears the impress of Irish influence. It could hardly be otherwise in the case of a manuscript written in the School of St. David's—a School founded in Wales by Ricemarch's own father who had sought in the Schools of Ireland for his inspiration and his models (pp. xv., xvi.).

We shall say but a few words concerning the other Texts edited together with the Martyrology.

The Psalter, written about 1079 (cp. p. xxi.) by Ithael who, as we have already seen, probably wrote the Martyrology as well—is a copy of St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew. Of this document, Dr. Lawlor gives us but a collation. It may be added that this collation is based on the text of Vallarsi, which is very faulty, and not on that of Lagarde, by far superior to Vallarsi, but not easily accessible. The text of Ricemarch's Psalter is related in many ways to the Manuscripts made use of by Lagarde (*Codex Augiensis* and *Codex Babenbergensis*). It would seem, however, to be even more closely related to *Codex Amiatinus* (p. xxxv.). The Solar Tables, also edited by Dr. Lawlor, furnish an occasion for some useful remarks; it is by

means of these tables that he has been able to establish the approximate date of the manuscript.

The Lament of Ricemarch must have been written during the Norman invasion of 1094 or a little later. Besides this poem, there are also some other verses, on the Psalter—*Versiculi Ricemarch*—which, although not evidencing any great poetical power, are at least a proof of the patristic learning of their author. Finally, a few words may be said regarding the way in which the editor has conceived and carried out his task. His work gives evidence of the greatest patience, care and erudition. His object was not to bring out, after De Rossi and Duchesne, another edition of the Hieronymian Martyrology; he has contented himself with giving the exact text of R, comparing its principal readings with other manuscripts, and proposing, at the same time, certain corrections of the text.

One small criticism of this edition may be permitted. Dr. Lawlor has considered it advisable to put the various readings as well as his notes at the end of his volume. It would have been better—at least as regards the variants and the shorter notes—to have placed them at the foot of the page. We also regret that instead of giving a new edition of the Psalter of Ricemarch, the author has restricted himself to a mere collation. In this case, however, he may not have been free to choose.¹

In any case, we cannot but be deeply grateful to Dr. Lawlor for having devoted his time to this work, and also to the Henry Bradshaw Society for its excellent reproduction of the manuscript. The illuminations on certain of its pages are of interest for the history of the art of Calligraphy in the eleventh Century.

F. CABROL.

THE PAPAL QUESTION. By George Bayfield Roberts, B.A.
"The St. Paul Handbook Series" (Isaac Pitman and Sons).
2s. 6d.

The attitude of the third century African Bishops towards the Bishops of Rome would seem to afford a perpetual source of interest to a certain type of mind. Since Newman's time in particular there seems to be a feverish desire to find Cyprian on one's side. Those who have read Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims* and Chapman's reply will be prepared for this attitude of mind; and now we have this very satisfactory contribution to the controversy from the pen of Mr. Roberts. So far as it goes the

¹On p. 55, *Sollemniacum* should be translated not by *Solesmes* but by *Solignac*—in the diocese of Limoges. Again, Tillo was most probably not the Abbot but a simple monk.