CHAPTER XV

THE MEDIAEVAL DEVELOPMENT

A. The Development of the Eastern Rites

The main lines of all the Eastern traditions had been reached before the end of the fourth century, and after this the process in all of them is no more than one of adjustment and development of detail. No new principle arose in the fifth century, as it did in the West, to give a new turn to liturgical development. After the sixth century the process resembles to this extent that which we shall find in the West, in that it is one of approximation between all the Eastern rites, as there is after this date an approximation between all the Western rites. And in both cases the basis chosen is the rite of the 'holy city', Jerusalem in the East, Rome in the West. But in each case it is the rite of the holy city as modified in the dominant political centre, Byzantium in the East, the Frankish homelands of Gaul and the Rhineland in the West.

But there the resemblance between the Eastern and Western process of development ends, for the methods pursued in the two halves of christendom were different. The comparative freedom in which the churches were left to achieve the process in the West results in a real synthesis, in which the old local rites each contribute a good deal to the final result, and lose themselves in it. The methods employed in the East were different, consisting in political pressure and compulsory Byzantinisation. Not only did the Byzantine rite itself assimilate little or nothing from other sources after the sixth century, but the attempt was made to enforce its local development verbally and identically on all the churches which the emperor could reach.[1] The legacy of Byzantine bureaucracy was too bitter for such

[1] A characteristic example of the Byzantine mind is to be found in the great canonist Theodore Balsamon. In A.D. 1194 the Greek patriarch of Alexandria then visiting Constantinople caused a scandal in the capital by celebrating according to the rite of his own church, *S. Mark*, and alarmed at the outcry, consulted Balsamon as to the lawfulness of the use of *S. Mark* and *S. James*. Balsamon replies that 'the catholic church of the most holy and oecumenical throne of Constantinople in no way recognises these liturgies. We declare therefore that they ought not to be received. And even if they were written by these saints they ought to be condemned to entire disuse . . . all the churches of God ought to follow the custom of New Rome, that is Constantinople' (and use *S. Basil* and *S. John Chrysostom*); for the emperor Justinian had ordered 'On all points on which there is no written law, the custom obtaining at Constantinople shall be followed' (Balsamon, *Responsa*, I, M.P.G., cxxxviii, 953). The interesting thing is that Balsamon was at this time Greek patriarch of Antioch, and yet had never even troubled to discover whether there did or did not exist a liturgy of *S. James*, the traditional rite of his own see! He knew of it only by hearsay from the Trullan canons. Along with *S. Mark* (centuries older than the Byzantine rite) it is swept into limbo on the strength of a misapplied sentence from Justinian. Literally dozens of examples of this disastrous

tactics ever to succeed. The dissidents retained their liturgical independence of Constantinople by remaining outside the pale of orthodoxy.

But though the direct attempt of Constantinople to enforce its own liturgy failed entirely to bring about liturgical uniformity in the East, the general tendency, of which this was only a political perversion, to adopt a Syrian liturgy of the Jerusalem-Antioch type, has since operated throughout the East by voluntary 'Syrianisation'. The Egyptian monophysite version of *S. Mark* was heavily revised with borrowings from *S. James* and *S. Basil* in the fifth or sixth century. Later (? in the ninth century) it was replaced altogether, except on the Friday before Palm Sunday, by two alternative Syrian liturgies, a version of *S. Basil* (older than the present Byzantine text in some respects), and a liturgy addressed to the Son ascribed for some reason to *S. Gregory*.[1] (There is no reason to suppose it has anything to do with him.) So the tradition which had come down at Alexandria from the apostolic age through Athanasius and Cyril was laid aside at Alexandria by the Copts. The Greeks after heavily Byzantinising it for a while, abandoned it altogether at the end of the twelfth century in obedience to Balsamon. Only the three dioceses of Uniat Copts now use *S. Mark* (or *S. Cyril* as they call it) even once a year.

The East Syrian rite of *Addai and Mari* has likewise acquired a considerable number of Antioch-Jerusalem characteristics at various times since the fifth century; and two alternative liturgies of the ordinary Antiochene type, ascribed to Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia, have been brought into use. The Armenian rite has been affected both by the Byzantine version of the Syrian rite and by the Syrian rite of *S. James* itself, to the extent of becoming practically a rite of the Syrian type; though it still retains a few interesting native features, and some Latin borrowings it picked up in Crusading times.

The Byzantine rite itself,[2] clearly of Antiochene-Syrian derivation, continued to develop along its own lines down to the seventh century and did not become absolutely rigid until the ninth century. (Two complete revisions of the lectionary, for instance, can be traced in the seventh and the eighth centuries, none since). After that date only continual minor verbal changes in the prayers of the liturgy, and the accumulation of supplementary devotions during and before the preparation of the elements, can be

frame of mind could be given from Byzantine authors from the sixth century onwards. The result in this case was the final disuse of the Greek rite of Alexandria by the Greek church of Alexandria.

[1] There is reason to think that other liturgies than that of Alexandria continued in use in some Egyptian country churches, both in Greek and Coptic, as late as the eighth–tenth centuries (at least on occasion), but no complete texts have survived.

[2] The liturgy of *S. John Chrysostom* is something of a puzzle. It is *not* the ancient Constantinopolitan rite of the days of Chrysostom himself, as his citations shew. (I incline to think traces of this survive in the E. Syrian *Liturgy of Nestorius*.) *S. John Chrysostom* is probably a late sixth century composition put together at Constantinople on the Antiochene model. *S. Basil* appears to have come originally from Asia Minor, though it has been in some things 'Antiochenised'.

traced. It is now used with only the slightest verbal differences throughout the orthodox world in a variety of translations; and once there ceased to be a Byzantine emperor looming behind it, its prayers and ceremonies and customs (*e.g.* the *ikonostasion*) have increasingly affected the rites and churches of the dissidents, especially in modern times.

We in the West are accustomed to speak of the 'unchanging East' and its 'immemorial rites'. It is as well to be clear that this is a state of things which only begins in the seventh century. Before that date the East had shewn more tendency to innovate in the liturgy than the West, particularly in the fourth and fifth centuries; and its rites, if they shew fewer signs of later development than those of the West, underwent much more drastic changes in that period than has been generally realised. What caused them to cease to develop in the seventh and to grow rigid after the ninth century is a matter for discussion. It is worth noting that this rather sudden ossification is a phenomenon which is found at about the same period in the whole artistic and mental life of the world that looked to Constantinople. But so far as the liturgy is concerned I believe that the use of the term 'arrested development' is unjust and untrue. It is only a case of 'completed development'. Without some fresh principle, such as the effect of the calendar on the prayers gave to the Western rites, the Eastern rites simply had no further possibilities of growth along their own lines. They were complete and satisfying expressions of the eucharistic action and its meaning according to the tradition of the churches which used them. There was nothing more to be said, nothing to be added. And into the closed world of Byzantium no really fresh impulse ever came after the sixth century. The Byzantine state had exhausted its own traditions by the ninth century, and then became mummified and finally disappeared. The Byzantine church survived it because it is the church, though the Phanar, 'the royal church' of Constantinople itself, has done little since to make that survival either fruitful or dignified. Orthodoxy is a far greater and more christian thing than Byzantinism—rich in faith and holiness and above all in martyrs. Until this last twenty years it was still possible (though unfair) to call it a 'sleeping church'. But that sleep began not with the rule of the Turks in 1453, but in the ninth century, perhaps even earlier, in the sixth after Justinian. It will be fascinating to see what it makes of its magnificent patristic heritage in the modern world when it has been everywhere set free from its old entanglement with autocracy. One thing it will assuredly keep is the Byzantine rite by which all orthodoxy worships, and has saved itself from extinction by worshipping. This is the joint creation of Greek christian theology and the old Hellenic poetic spirit, working together on a Syrian rite. Along with the *Digest* of Justinian it is the greatest legacy of Byzantine thought to the world.

B. The Development of the Western Rites

The Western development is more complicated and diverse and continued for much longer. It will occupy the remainder of this chapter, and can most conveniently be set out by following up separately the various regional developments which come to their synthesis in the tenth century, and then continuing from that. But there are certain essential general observations which must be borne in mind all through, if we are to understand the matter.

The importance and interest of the special developments of the Gallican and Mozarabic rites have been much obscured in modern study. This is due partly to the fact that they have been for so many centuries virtually museum pieces, and it is correspondingly difficult to enter into their particular spirit. Partly also it is due to less excusable mistakings of their history and significance, the most serious of which is the persistent attempt to find for them a non-Western origin. These rites certainly contain Eastern elements (like the *Aios* and the *Kyries* and the *Sanctus*), just as the Roman rite contains Eastern elements (like the *Kyries* and the *Sanctus* and the *Agnus Dei*), and for the same reason—the deliberate piecemeal borrowing, now of one item, now of another, from Eastern and especially from Syrian sources. The Gallican and Mozarabic rites contain rather more of these items than the Roman only because Rome rather less readily admitted innovations from any source. But in all the Western rites these Eastern borrowings are relatively late and of superficial importance, matters of decoration rather than of substance. Structurally and in their fundamental spirit and origin these French and Spanish rites are as Western as any in Italy. Such structural differences as they exhibit from the Roman rite are due to slightly different arrangements of those lesser prayers of the 'second *stratum*', which only began to be introduced one by one into any of the Western rites about or after A.D. 400.

The question has often been debated as to the relation of these rites with those of Rome and Africa. Attempts have been made to shew that Africa used the 'Gallican' rite, or alternatively that it used the Roman. It has been held that the so-called 'Gallican' rite is really the original form of the Roman, faithfully preserved in the provinces when the mother-church (secretly and without record) turned its own rite upside down; or alternatively, that the churches of France and Spain originally used the pure Roman rite and that the whole of the Gallican and Mozarabic liturgical development is a novel and rootless local experiment of the dark ages. I can only say that this whole way of regarding the matter has come to seem to me not only mistaken but perversely unhistorical. And I suspect that it is not unconnected (however unconsciously) with partisan positions, for and against, on the modern problem of 'Rome'. In reality it is wholly unwarrantable to read back into the fifth and sixth centuries—or for the matter of

that with any rigour into the seventh or even the eighth centuries, though the conception was developing about then—anything like the modern conception of 'rites' as defined and separate entities, ranged alongside one another in conscious difference and even in rivalry. Who is going to tell us whether the compilers of the *Bobbio Missal* or the *Missale Francorum* on the one hand, or the various Frankish 'Gelasian' missals on the other, supposed their books with their heterogeneous contents to be books of the 'Gallican' or the 'Roman' rites? Even with modern scientific methods of classification it is difficult, sometimes impossible, to decide; and what is quite clear is that the compilers themselves never even asked themselves the question. In the fifth and even sixth century, as in the fourth, there were still no 'rites' in our modern sense, but only 'the liturgy', which everyone knew to be the same thing everywhere. Every local church had its own traditional way of doing it, which it was free to revise or augment or improve as it saw fit, from its own inventions or by borrowings from elsewhere. There were tentative efforts after local uniformity, like those of the Councils of Milevis and Vaison; but they were still occasioned by local circumstances, and limited and temporary in their real effect on what went on in practice at the altars in the churches. In every church contemporary fashions and novelties had their own attractions in each generation. Local tradition still played a preponderating part. In the long run *racial* temperament and characteristics (rather than geographical distinctions) made their different and immensely powerful influences felt on the wording of prayers and above all on the character of devotion and rites. In the circumstances this was inevitable; there were as yet no artificial national unities in the West, and Europe was in the melting pot. We know little enough about the African rites. But to an impartial view even the scanty evidence available indicates that they were neither 'Roman' nor 'Gallican' but *African*—the local development of the pre-Nicene African tradition, enriched by borrowings from other churches, not only Western but Eastern, but the whole moulded by the mind and spirit of the African local churches. The passage from the African sixth century prayer cited by Fulgentius (*p.* 297) indicates that it was *not* variable like the contemporary French and Spanish prayers. But it certainly is not 'Roman' any more than it is 'Gallican', though it is quite easily recognisable as 'Western'.

And it was the same elsewhere. All the Western rites have their roots in the old pre-Nicene tradition, which as regards the Shape of the Liturgy was oecumenically the same. As regards the contents of the prayer the Western rites as a group have preserved the old conceptions of the eucharist more faithfully in some things than those of the East, which underwent more radical changes during the fourth century. Certain peculiarities common to the whole of the West (*e.g.* the 'naming' in connection with the offertory) make their appearance in the fourth century, and grow into real distinc-

tions from the Eastern rites during the fifth and sixth centuries. (This is partly the result of *different* innovations being made simultaneously in the East.) All this is a consequence of the need for adapting the eucharist to a public worship. Most important of all for the future, the new Western principle of varying the prayers according to the calendar makes its appearance in the fifth century and is applied by the various Western churches in rather different ways, or perhaps it is truer to say, to a varying extent. In the course of the sixth–seventh century, when political confusion is great and intercourse between the Western churches much interrupted, these local Western differences in the application of a common principle harden into real distinctions, obvious to all and disconcerting to some minds, *e.g.* to that of S. Augustine of Canterbury.[1] The Roman 'rite', the Milanese and Beneventan 'rites', the Gallican 'rite', the Mozarabic 'rite', in our modern sense, are all substantially products of this period—it might even be said of the single sixth century. But in A.D. 600 men were not yet conscious of them as separate things, but still thought of them rather as different ways of doing the same thing. Each is the outcome of a local tradition and a local *population* living a local history; each is subject to particular influences from outside, as well as to local developments, working diversely upon the roughly similar basis all had inherited from the fixed rites of the fourth century, under the new influence of the ecclesiastical year and the calendar.

The Development of the French and Spanish Rites

Viewed thus, as the native and characteristic products of the French and Spanish churches of the fifth and sixth centuries from their old liturgical tradition, the Gallican and Mozarabic rites come into their own, by coming into real life. They are the living response of French and Spanish *christianity* to the sordid and desperate times when Europe had collapsed and civilisation was struggling for a tolerable existence and the Faith had somehow to redeem to christian goodness whole populations of uncouth and violent men and women. As such these rites have an exciting interest. And it is possible, I think, to shew that though they did not formally persist much beyond the dark ages which gave them this particular form, they yet handed on a permanent element to that synthesis of Western liturgy which is the slow work of the seventh to the tenth centuries.

The outstanding peculiarity of these rites is their treatment of the eucharistic prayer, in which, except for the text of the sanctus and the paragraph containing the narrative of the institution, the whole eucharistic prayer is varied, or 'proper', on every liturgical occasion. Both in France and Spain this prayer consists always of five paragraphs:

[1] *Cf. p.* 576.

1. The *Contestatio, Illatio* or *Immolatio*, or as we should say, 'preface'.

2. The *Sanctus*, sung by the people.

3. A short paragraph, linking sanctus and consecration, known as the *Post-Sanctus*.

4. The institution-narrative, said in silence and known therefore as *Mysterium* or *Secreta*.

5. A prayer for the communicants, later changed to one for the offerings, as communions became infrequent, known as *Post-Mysterium, Post-Secreta*, or *Post-Pridie*.

Let us take examples. Here is the prayer of the eighth century *Missale Gothicum* (French) for the feast of the Epiphany:

Contestatio: 'It is truly meet and right, just and right,[1] that we should always and everywhere give thanks unto Thee, O Lord holy, Father almighty, everlasting God; Who didst lift up Thy voice unto us from heaven above Jordan's banks like the sound of thunder: to point out the Saviour of the world, and shew Thyself the Father of the eternal Light, Thou didst open the heavens and bless the air and purify the waters, and shew Thine only Son by the Dove of the Holy Ghost. On this day the waters received Thy blessing and took away our curse; that they might offer to the faithful the washing away of all sins, and by regeneration make sons of God unto life eternal of those whom fleshly birth had brought forth to life in time. For those on whom death had laid hold by disobedience, life eternal recapturing them from death recalls to the heavenly realm. Wherefore with rightful exultation we join to the praises of the Angels our voices as we worship Thy glory in this wonderful sacrament on this day's feast and offer unto Thee the sacrifice of praise for the Epiphany of Jesus Christ our Lord and for the source of our own calling unto Thee (*i.e.* baptism) through Him our Lord, through Whom the Angels praise, the Dominations adore, the Powers fear Thy majesty. The heavens and the powers thereof and the blessed Seraphim in common exultation tell Thy praises. With whom we pray Thee bid that our voices also be admitted, with suppliant praises saying:

'Holy, holy, holy, etc.

Post-Sanctus: 'Truly holy, truly blessed is our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son, Who in token of His heavenly birth bestowed upon the world this day these wonders of His majesty: that He showed the worshipful star to the Wise Men, and after the passing of years turned water into wine, and by His own baptism hallowed Jordan's flood; even Jesus Christ our Lord:

Mysterium: 'Who on the day before He suffered . . . (There follows the institution).

Post-Mysterium: 'O Lord, we pray Thee, look with favour on these sacri-

[1] *Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et iustum est*, as in the fourth–fifth century Italian prayer cited on p. 540.

fices before Thee; wherein no more gold and frankincense and myrrh is offered, but that which by these same gifts is declared, is (now) offered, sacrificed and taken. Through Jesus Christ our Lord Thy Son: Who with Thee and the Holy Ghost etc.'[1]

This prayer illustrates a fairly common occurrence in the French prayers, the working in of prayers from the Roman rite into Gallican masses, as a rule in a rather different connection. The end of this Gallican preface for the Epiphany (from 'through Whom the Angels praise . . .') is taken from the Roman 'common' preface (not that 'proper' to the Epiphany); and the Roman offertory prayer for the Epiphany has been used for the Gallican *post-mysterium.*

Here, again, is a 'pure' Gallican prayer for use on any 'green' Sunday from the seventh century *Masses of Mone,* the oldest Gallican collection extant:

Contestatio: 'It is meet and right that we should ever give thanks unto Thee, O God in Trinity, Whose power created us by Thy Word, and deservedly condemned our offences, Whose love delivered us by Thy Son, and called us to heaven by baptism and repentance: Unto Whom (all Angels and Archangels deservedly give ceaseless praises saying:)[2]

'Holy, etc.

Post-Sanctus: 'O God Who willest that we should not only offer to Thee the hymn but also the deservings of heavenly spirits, and should have no less the holy offices than the songs of the Angels: Grant that we who in setting forth Thy praises take to ourselves the united strains of the heavenly Powers, may also by amending our evil ways take to ourselves the love of the heavenly life, now that we are about to say those words of our Lord Jesus Christ which He left us for the memorial of His passion: through Jesus Christ our Lord . . .

Mysterium: 'Who on the day before . . .

Post-Secreta: 'O God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, do Thou mercifully smiling down from heaven receive this our sacrifice with most indulgent love. May there descend, O Lord, the fulness of Thy majesty, Godhead, piety, power, blessing and glory upon this bread and upon this cup: and may it be unto us the eucharist Christ ordained[3] by the transformation of (*i.e.* into) the Body and Blood of the Lord: that whosoever among us, and howsoever often, shall partake of this bread and this cup, we may take unto ourselves a memorial (*monumentum*) of faith, sincerity of love, and untroubled hope of resurrection and unending immortality in the Name of

[1] *Missale Gothicum, ed.* Mabillon, *de Lit. Gall., pp.* 209 *sq.*

[2] This common Gallican form indicated by a cue in *Mone* is supplied from *Missale Gothicum.*

[3] So I translate *legitima eucharistia,* a phrase about which there has been some discussion; *cf. legitima oratio, ap.* Tertullian, *de Oratione* x.

the Holy Ghost Who proceedeth from Thee and Thy Son[1] in the communion of all saints, in the remission of all our sins. We believe, O Lord, that Thou wilt grant these things which we ask with unwavering faith. Through.'[2]

It should be said that the compiler has carried the principle of variability to the length of equipping this prayer with an alternative *contestatio* besides the one here given—a variation of a variation—though this is not uncommon in the Gallican books. The frequent incoherence of the Gallican prayers is illustrated by the *post-secreta* here.

Finally here is the eucharistic prayer of the Spanish rite for the feast of S. James (later the patron of Spain) which in the ninth century was kept on December 30th, the day after S. John:

Illatio: 'It is meet and right that we should always give thanks unto Thee, O Lord holy, Father eternal, everlasting God, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord: in Whose Name Thy chosen servant James healed the impotent man that cried unto him when he was being dragged to death, and by this miracle so moved the heart of him who mocked him that he brought him to attain to the glory of martyrdom when he had been instructed in the mysteries of the faith. So James himself fell slain by beheading for the confession of Thy Son: attaining in peace unto Him for Whom he bore this death. For He is Thy only-begotten Son Who gave His life as a ransom for many. Through Whom, O God the Father, do Thou bid that our sins be forgiven. Unto Whom all Angels and Archangels deservedly give ceaseless praises saying:

'Holy, etc.

Post-Sanctus: 'Truly holy, truly blessed is our Lord Jesus Christ the Son, Whom James leaving Zebedee his father so followed loving Him most dearly as to be chosen unto life, clean in conscience and approved in doctrine: at the last so commending his wisdom by his works that he died by beheading for Him Whom he knew had laid down His own life for himself and for all men.

'*Mysterium:* Even Jesus Christ our Lord Who . . .[3]

[1] . . . *in tuo Filiique tui Spiritu Sancto nomine.* There is something wrong with the text.

[2] This is Mass vi. according to Wilmart's rearrangement of the leaves of the MS. It is found as fragments of iv. and ix. in the editions of Mone (*pp.* 23 *sq.* and 35) and Forbes (*pp.* 10 *sq.* and 26).

[3] It is a curious fact that while the prayer after the *mysterium* is always called the *post-pridie* in the MSS. the word *pridie* does not occur in the institution-narrative of the Mozarabic rite, which begins 'Who in the night He was betrayed . . .' The text of this paragraph is almost always omitted in the MSS., but Dom Férotin found it twice, once in the *Liber Ordinum* (eleventh century) *ed.* Férotin, *col.* 238 and once in another eleventh century MS. (*Lib. Moz. Sac., p.* xxv.) in a slightly different form. It looks as though the wording of the institution-narrative in the Mozarabic rite had been changed at some point from the Western form *Qui pridie* to the Eastern '*In the night*'. The Roman form now used was inserted in A.D. 1500.

Post-Pridie: 'O God, bow down our necks under Thy yoke: that we may so bear Thy burden which is light unto them that love Thee with all desirable devotion, as James Thine Apostle was joyfully dragged to execution with a rope around his neck; that sanctifying these things which we offer unto Thee, Thou wouldst bless us by the partaking of this Host (*or* Victim). Through . . .'[1]

It is obvious that the Mozarabic and Gallican rites are, as regards the eucharistic prayer, variants of a single rite—scarcely even that, for the same technical terms, liturgical tags and phrases, even the same formulae, recur constantly in both. The distinction between them comes in the addition of two prayers of the 'second *stratum*', the 'collect' and 'thanksgiving', which the Spanish churches were behind the French in adopting. (We may probably see in this a result of the more direct contacts of the French with the Italian churches in the later sixth century.)[2] But as regards the eucharistic prayer the Mozarabic and Gallican rites may be treated as being a single collection of variable prayers.

Nor, structurally, does there seem to be much difficulty in tracing the origin of this form of canon. It goes back plainly enough to the general fourth century fixed type of Western prayer, as revealed *e.g.* in Mai's Italian prayers (*p.* 540). The preface and sanctus have replaced the 'thanksgiving series', with an allusion to the liturgical commemoration of the day in the place of the old general 'thanksgiving' for the redeeming work of Christ. But the opening is the same, and most Gallican *contestationes* (like most Roman prefaces) are careful to retain at some point the *per Quem* ('through Whom'), which is a notable feature of the Western 'thanksgiving series' as early as the prayer of Hippolytus. The *post-sanctus* is still the precise equivalent of 'the link' (Hippolytus *e*) between the 'thanksgiving series' and the institution narrative. But now it links the inserted sanctus with the institution. This latter is followed by a prayer for the communicants of precisely the same general type as that in Hippolytus (*k*) and the *Supplices Te* of the Roman canon. All that is missing from the Hippolytan outline is the *anamnesis* paragraph (*h*). But as we have seen, all the evidence

[1] *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum, ed.* Férotin, *coll.* 73 *sq.* It is right to add that some of the Mozarabic *post-pridie* prayers contain an invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the elements of the Syrian type, and there has been much discussion as to whether this was an original feature of the rite. Such invocations were certainly known in the seventh century in Spain, but the consensus of specialists on the Mozarabic rite both in England and abroad seems to be that they are a later borrowing from the East. (*Cf.* W. S. Porter, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, October, 1943.) A blessing of the elements in vague terms of the kind in the last clause of the prayer above is a usual feature of both Gallican and Mozarabic prayers, but this rather than a fully developed 'invocation' of the Eastern type is all that can be called 'normal' in these rites. (This is probably a fairly late specimen of a Mozarabic prayer. It is not an unrepresentative specimen, and the older ones are all inconveniently long for insertion.)

[2] Perhaps also the authority of S. Isidore's list of the prayers as being seven and only seven in number in the Mozarabic rite prevented the addition of these two for some centuries.

suggests that this was still a local Roman peculiarity in the third and fourth centuries.[1]

If we look back to the eucharistic prayer cited by S. Ambrose in *de Sacramentis* as the contemporary Milanese and Roman canon, we find that after the *laudes* (= 'thanksgiving series') and the asking of 'prayers for kings, for the people' (= the 'Names')[2] it runs as follows:

1. 'Make for us this oblation approved, ratified, reasonable, acceptable, seeing that it is the figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ:

2. 'Who the day before He suffered . . . (there follows the institution).

§ 'Therefore making the *anamnesis* of His most glorious passion and resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven,

§ 'we offer to Thee this spotless offering, reasonable offering, unbloody offering, this holy cup and bread of eternal life:

3. 'And we ask and pray that Thou wouldst receive this oblation at Thine altar on high by the hands of Thine angels, as Thou didst vouchsafe to receive the offerings of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thine high-priest Melchisedech offered unto Thee. (That as many of us as shall receive by this partaking of the altar the most holy Body and Blood of Thy Son may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace)'.[3]

The paragraphs marked § are already present in substance in the local Roman prayer of Hippolytus *c.* A.D. 200. For the rest, it seems easy to recognise in 1, 2, 3 'the link', the institution and the prayer for the communicants of the Gallican *post-sanctus*, *mysterium* and *post-mysterium*, and of Hippolytus *e*, *f* and *k*. The main differences between the Franco-Spanish and Italian developments are 1. That the Italian prayers place 'the Naming' in the second paragraph of their eucharistic prayer (this is probably a fourth century innovation)[4] whereas the Franco-Spanish rites place it at the offertory (probably the original Western position). 2. That the Roman prayer (if not other Italian prayers also) retains an old pre-Nicene peculiarity in inserting the *anamnesis* clauses (§ §) between the institution and

[1] *Cf. p.* 264. It is right to note that Cyprian, *Ep.* 63, 17, 'We make mention of *His passion* in all our sacrifices' taken in conjunction with Fulgentius, *Fragm.*, xxviii. (cited *p.* 297), 'Commemorating *the passion* of our Lord Jesus Christ, we ask that . . .' suggests that the African tradition was to make an *anamnesis* of the passion only, at the point where Rome commemorated the passion and resurrection. This is hardly certain, but it is worth remembering in considering the African rite in relation to other Western rites.

[2] S. Ambrose, *de Sacr.*, iv. 4, 14.

[3] S. Ambrose, *de Sacr.*, iv. 5 and 6 (21–7). On the last clause *cf. p.* 229. The previous clause ('And we ask—unto Thee') is very similar to clauses found in various Syrian prayers (*e.g.*, *Ap. Const.*, viii, Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 17, *ll.* 15 *sqq.*) and probably represents a fourth century Roman borrowing. It was already present in the Roman canon *c.* A.D. 385 when it is cited by the Roman 'Ambrosiaster', *Quaest. V. et. N.T.*, 109.

[4] *Cf. p.* 501.

prayer for the communicants.[1] But apart from this all the Western prayers have the same structure.[2]

When the evidence is set out, no one could easily suppose that the Gallican eucharistic prayers as they stand represent any very ancient survival. They are too completely affected in their contents by the sanctus

[1] The history of the Roman canon does not seem very difficult to make out in its main lines, once we discard theories about 'dislocation' and 'diptychs' and the 'primitive Roman epiclesis'. The preface and sanctus replaced the old 'thanksgiving series' in the fifth century. *Te igitur* and *Hanc igitur oblationem* are connected with 'the naming', introduced at this point in the fourth century. *Communicantes* was introduced by Gelasius (A.D. 492–6) to conform to the Jerusalem custom of 'naming' the saints. *Quam oblationem* is the survival of the pre-Nicene 'link'. There follow, institution, *anamnesis* and prayer for the communicants (*Qui pridie, Unde et memores, Supplices Te*, this last somewhat rearranged). The commemoration of the dead is originally a special insertion at funerals; *Nobis quoque* was introduced by Gelasius at the same time as *Communicantes* and for the same reason (*cf.* P. B. Whitehead, *art. cit. Speculum* III, 1928, *p.* 152). *Per Quem haec omnia* is the old blessing of fruits, etc., found attached to the eucharistic prayer at Rome in Hippolytus; *Per Ipsum* is the closing doxology. All the *variable* prayers in the canon are thus fifth century additions, of the period when the Gallican eucharistic prayer was beginning to be variable; *i.e.*, the prevailing Western fashion of the fifth century nearly carried the day at Rome also. The solid core of unvarying matter (from *Quam oblationem* to *Supplices Te*) corresponds in structure to the Gallican 'link', institution and prayer for the communicants (with the addition of the old Roman *anamnesis*). Thus at Rome the Western structure of the prayer *c.* A.D. 200 has survived the attentions of the 'improvers' of all the centuries and two major revisions (by Gelasius and Gregory) with only trifling alterations of order (in the *Supplices Te* and *Supra quae*). I believe that this account of the matter can be fully substantiated from the evidence, though it has not yet been done.

[2] These last three paragraphs and the relevant footnotes are intended to raise—tentatively and merely by way of recognition that it exists—the question of the *origin* of the whole group of Latin liturgies, Italian, Franco-Spanish and African. Is there *one* original type behind them all? If so, what was its original geographical centre? To what extent, if any, are these originally translated rites? These and other connected questions will form one of the major topics of discussion among scientific liturgists at some point during the next generation, and the solution of the problem will considerably affect the presentation of the early history of the liturgy in general. None of these questions is yet answerable; little 'pointers' of evidence are only just beginning to be noticed. But the questions ought to be being asked, and I fear that they are not. Hitherto the scientific approach to the early history of the Latin liturgies has usually seemed to stop short at an upward limit *c.* A.D. 500 with a curious abruptness. (In the case of many writers it might be truer to say that it stopped at S. Gregory a century later still.) Before that, all is left in confusion and obscurity, illuminated only by random and unconfessed guessing. It is my hope that in this chapter and the two which precede it some other investigator may find sufficient hints to enable him to push the whole problem back to the later fourth century and perhaps to carry it back from there, though for my own part I hardly see my way at present behind that point. It will be noted that I have assumed that the 'second half' of Hippolytus' *Greek* Roman prayer in the third century corresponds (at least roughly) with the articulation of the eucharistic prayers in use among contemporary *Latin* groups at Rome. The assumption seems to me justifiable, but it is an assumption. At present we know next to nothing about these groups except that they existed. They do not seem to me to be necessarily identifiable with the partisans of his rival Callistus; and though the structural evolution of their Latin prayers (I think) was along the lines revealed by his Greek one, it does not follow that it proceeded at exactly the same pace or under the impulse of exactly the same ideas. There are obscure traces in the canon of *de Sacramentis* of a combination of or compromise between Hippolytan and other (? African) ideas.

and the influence of the calendar, neither of which, as we have seen, make their appearance in the Western rites till the fifth century. The preface and the 'link' are dominated by both these influences, and even the prayer for the communicants is frequently overwhelmed by the allusion to the day (*cf.* the mass of S. James on *p.* 555). Their fidelity to tradition consists in arranging their new contents on the old Western scheme. Only the institution narrative itself, now regarded as too sacred and too important as the consecration formula to be lightly varied, has survived unchanged from before the acceptance of the new fashion of variability. For the rest, the very fact that a fresh composition had to be found for every liturgical day in the year prevents us from hoping to discover any surviving trace in the Gallican prayers of the actual wording used in Gaul and Spain in the fourth century before variability came in. At the best a church could only keep its traditional prayer as one variant, for days which had no particular liturgical associations, *e.g.* 'green' Sundays. But all the Gallican collections extant provide a whole set of alternatives for these, none of which fail to conform to the later Gallican type. The French and Spanish local eucharistic prayers of the fourth century and earlier seem to have transmitted only their structure, not their wording, to their successors.

The date when the Spanish and French eucharistic prayers first became variable with the calendar cannot be satisfactorily fixed. It is clear that when Pope Vigilius in answer to the enquiries of Bishop Profuturus of Braga (Portugal) described the fixed Roman canon with variable insertions on certain great feasts in A.D. 538,[1] he was already aware of a difference of practice in this between Rome and the Spanish churches, though he does not press the point. S. Isidore of Seville attributes the composition of 'prayers well adapted for various feasts and masses in an elegant style and lucid phrasing' to Peter, bishop of Lérida *c.* A.D. 500.[2] Though this does not specifically refer to the eucharistic prayer as such, Isidore, who used the Mozarabic rite, would doubtless not have considered a mass which did not include a complete 'proper' eucharistic prayer 'well adapted' for a feast. There is no reason to suppose Peter was the first author of Spanish variable prayers, but the names of the earlier authors have not been recorded.

In Gaul we seem to have such an earlier record. Musaeus, a presbyter of Marseilles (d. *c.* A.D. 460) is said 'to have compiled at the request of his bishop Saint Venerius lections from the holy scriptures suitable for the feast days throughout the year; and also responsories from the psalms and versicles and responses (*capitula*) fitting the seasons and lections; which book is so far considered a necessity by the lector in the church, that it relieves him of all fuss and worry and does away with delay, and at the same time instructs the people and gives fitting honour to the feast. And he also composed and dedicated to the bishop S. Eustace, the successor of the aforesaid man of God, a remarkable and fairly long Book of Sacraments,

[1] Vigilius, *Ep.* ii. [2] S. Isidore. *de Viris Illustribus*, M.P.L., lxxxii, 1090.

divided into sections for the sequence of offices and seasons, and for the text of the lections and the arrangement and chant of the psalms; but displaying his usual earnestness both in prayer to God and the acknowledgment of His goodness'.[1] Musaeus had some reputation as an exegete, but this part of his work was clearly liturgical. The book composed for bishop Venerius (d. *c.* A.D. 452) seems to be for the office, and it has been questioned whether the *volumen sacramentorum* dedicated to his successor was not a book of instructions or homilies rather than a 'sacramentary'. It seems sufficient answer to point out that *Liber Sacramentorum* is the official heading of the *Gelasian Sacramentary* compiled *c.* A.D. 475–510. Gennadius also tells us that Voconius, bishop of Castellanum in Morocco *c.* A.D. 460 wrote another *volumen sacramentorum*,[2] probably an African sacramentary, but there is no indication in this case that the prayers were arranged according to 'the sequence of the offices and seasons' (and presumably varied with them) as in the work of Musaeus.

Eustace seems to have become bishop *c.* A.D. 452 and Musaeus died *c.* A.D. 460. Once again, as in the case of the Milanese 'proper' prefaces, we are pointed to the period about or soon after A.D. 450 as that of the introduction of variable prayers in the Western rites. Musaeus may not have been the first author of such prayers in Gaul, but he is the first to be recorded. And Gennadius writing *c.* A.D. 495 gives a fairly full account of even the lesser ecclesiastical writers of southern Gaul in the fifth century. It seems hardly likely that he would have passed over ecclesiastics who had made any considerable name for themselves as liturgical authors in a new *genre* during this period. Musaeus need not be regarded as personally responsible for the invention of variable prayers in general, or even of only those of the Gallican rite. The idea seems to be too widespread too suddenly in the latter half of the fifth century to have had any single inventor. Probably it was in the air, a consequence of the new ecclesiastical year which had now dominated the whole celebration of the liturgy for more than a generation as a fixed and accepted institution of church life. The new fashion, coming in sporadically and haphazard, may well have been the occasion for Musaeus' orderly and systematic compilation much more than the consequence of it, even at Marseilles itself. And other South French churches doubtless made their own terms with it at about the same time, though they could not command the services of a well-known scholar to refurbish their liturgical traditions, and their obscure and tentative compilations have in consequence left no trace. Even Musaeus is not said to

[1] Gennadius, *de Script. Eccles.*, lxxix. As the text presents some obscurity at the end I give the passage relating to the 'Book of Sacraments': *Sed et ad personam S. Eustasii episcopi, successoris predicti hominis Dei, composuit sacramentorum egregium et non parvum volumen per membra quidem pro opportunitate officiorum et temporum, pro lectionum textu psalmorumque serie et decantatione discretum: sed supplicandi Deo et contestandi beneficiorum eius soliditate sui consentaneum.*

[2] Gennadius, *ibid.*, lxxviii.

have written variable *eucharistic* prayers, though the word *contestandi* inevitably recalls the Gallican term *contestatio* for the variable preface. In any case once the first paragraph of the prayer had been made to vary with the liturgical feast, the idea of varying other paragraphs of the prayer in accordance with it need not have been long in presenting itself to someone. The admission of merely alternative texts (not dependent on the calendar) of the whole prayer earlier in the century had already undermined the fourth century idea of a single fixed eucharistic prayer unvarying on all occasions. All things considered, I think we may safely date the general acceptance in France and Spain of variable eucharistic prayers in the latter half of the fifth century, with perhaps a period of preliminary and tentative beginnings in the ten or twenty years before that.

It hardly admits of question, from the mere identity of structure, that the Gallican and Mozarabic rites spring from a single source and are indeed only a single rite. Whether it originated in Gaul or Spain there are no decisive means of telling (though my own guess would be in favour of Gaul). The oldest surviving French MS. (the Reichenau palimpsest containing the *Masses of Mone*) is dated *c.* A.D. 650. The oldest Spanish MSS. are only of the ninth century, but what is recognisably the Mozarabic rite is described by S. Isidore of Seville in his *de Ecclesiasticis Officiis* in the early seventh century. Spanish tradition usually ascribed the rite itself to his compilation. But whatever lies behind the tradition, mention of Peter of Lérida as the author of some of the prayers more than a century earlier shews that Isidore's work can have been no more than a revision and reorganisation, akin to that carried out by S. Gregory in the Roman rite in the same period.

The great mutability of the eucharistic prayer in these rites was against the building up of any very stable tradition. When the laity expected to hear an entirely different set of prayers every time they went to church, they were not likely even to know whether this year's set, *e.g.* on Ascension Day, was the same as last year's, since only the celebrant had a book. The permanent tendency of the clergy to innovate in the text of the liturgy was thus released from the usual check of the layman's attachment to a familiar form, except so far as concerned the structure of the prayer and certain obvious cues, before the sanctus and the concluding 'Amen'. Thus though we can be sure that the special characteristics of this *type* of prayer were in general accepted by the churches of Spain and Southern Gaul by *c.* A.D. 500, it is not safe to take it for granted with our present knowledge that the *texts* which we have are necessarily much older than the extant MSS. which contain them. None of the seventh century texts of the *Masses of Mone* are found again in the eighth century Gallican books. Elipandus, bishop of Toledo in A.D. 794 cites from the masses found in the ninth century Mozarabic *Liber Sacramentorum* for such important days in the calendar as Maundy Thursday, Ascension Day and others, and he ascribes

each mass by name to its author. All those he mentions are bishops of Toledo after A.D. 650.[1] He is writing officially on behalf of the whole Spanish episcopate to the bishops of Gaul. His statements can hardly be made at haphazard; and if the attributions of the authorship of the various masses had not then been certainly known at Toledo, it is strange that the prayers should have been fathered on comparatively recent writers, and not on Isidore or some other great name of the more remote past, for Elipandus is anxious to impress. Of course, these seventh century bishops' 'authorship' may have consisted in no more than a mere revision of older work and the attachment to it of their own names. Yet little more than a superficial investigation of the Mozarabic and Gallican prayers is needed to shew that they come not only from many hands, but from more than one period of taste and latinity. Some may well be as old as the later fifth century (*e.g.* the Mozarabic masses for S. Martin) but others are undoubtedly from the ninth century, after the Moorish conquest. It may be that one day we shall be able to distinguish more easily than we can at present the earlier from the later in the main bulk of these prayers.

It remains to say something of their distribution and history. The Mozarabic rite was codified as the rite of the see of Toledo, whose archbishop is still 'Primate of the Spains'. But the ecclesiastical greatness of Toledo dates only from the conversion of the Visigothic kings from Arianism in the late sixth century; and it was only in A.D. 633 that its rite was made the standard for the whole of Spain and the Visigothic dominions in the South of Gaul. Previous to that the various provinces had tended to adopt the rite of the local metropolitan.[2] No doubt most of these were of the Mozarabic type, and some of the prayers of the Toledan missal were undoubtedly drawn from these older provincial and local 'propers'.[3] But the national council of the independent Suevic kingdom of Galicia held at Braga in A.D. 565 had ordered the use of the Roman rite. The use of the Toledan Mozarabic rite was enforced in Galicia as a political measure by the Visigoths when they conquered it, and it thus became the national rite of Spain.

It remained such down to and after the moslem conquest in the early eighth century. In the eleventh century the fringe of independent christian principalities in the North and West began to adopt the now general Western rite. This was partly under the impulsion of French monks from Cluny who were unaccustomed to the Mozarabic, partly because, engaged as they were on a perpetual crusade for the reconquest of their country, the Spanish princes and peoples themselves were more conscious of their own

[1] *ap.* M.P.L., cl. 1328 *sq.*

[2] *Cf. e.g.*, Can. 1 of the Council of Gerona, A.D. 517, for the province of Tarragona.

[3] *Cf. p.* 380.

unity with the rest of the christian West. The Mozarabic remained the rite of the christians living under the yoke of the Caliphs of Cordova. But as the tide of christian reconquest advanced during the middle ages, so, too, did the Roman rite, which had now become the badge of freedom. By the end of the fifteenth century the Mozarabic rite had all but died out, being used only in some of the parish churches of Toledo and occasionally in the cathedral, and in some scattered churches elsewhere on a few occasions in the year. It was rescued from extinction by Cardinal Ximenes in A.D. 1500, who provided for its continuance in a somewhat Romanised form in seven Toledan parish churches and a specially endowed and staffed chapel in the cathedral.

The question of the diffusion of the Gallican rite is more difficult. Every single extant liturgical MS. of the Gallican rite can be traced back either to Burgundy or the country to the south-west of it (the Narbonnaise and Acquitaine) *i.e.* either to the region of France most accessible to Visigothic Spain and in intimate relations with it, or to the actual original nucleus of the Visigothic state. This is a fact not to be lost sight of in considering whether Gaul or Spain is the birthplace of the rite; but too much should not be made of it since the evidence of Gregory of Tours makes it probable that in the sixth century this rite was used also at Tours, which lay outside the Visigothic sphere after A.D. 496.

The problem arises as to the rite used in the North and East of France. The earliest MS. which has reached us from the church of Paris is a copy of the Roman *Gelasian Sacramentary* written *c.* A.D. 700, probably at S. Denis. And there is no doubt that the use of the Roman rite, at all events in certain churches, goes back in the North and East to a period a good way before A.D. 700 and probably before 600. This region *may* have used something like the Gallican rites of the South of France before that date. But we have seen that the Gallican rites really only begin to grow up in the South in the later fifth century. It is conceivable, therefore, that the Roman Gelasian book was the first compilation of variable prayers to succeed the old fixed rites in the North. There is no evidence either way.[1] We have also seen that Ireland used a form of the Roman rite soon after A.D. 600 and perhaps earlier. The Anglo-Saxon churches did the same from the landing of Augustine (A.D. 596). The real sphere of the Gallican rite after A.D. 600 seems therefore to have been confined to the centre and south of Gaul. Burgundian missions had begun to carry the Gallican rite to South Germany in the seventh century, just as Augustine found the Burgundian bishop Liudhard before him at Canterbury using the Gallican rite in the private chapel of Queen Bertha, who had been a Burgundian princess before she married the king of Kent. But the definitive conversion of both

[1] But it is perhaps relevant that a direct dependence on the surviving relics of the Western empire in Italy lasted longer in the North and East (to the death of the prefect Syagrius in A.D. 486) than in the rest of Gaul.

England and Germany was effected by missions using the Roman rite, and the Gallican never took root in either country.

In France itself it fell into great decay during the eighth century, though it held on in the South and South-West until the time of Charlemagne *c.* A.D. 800, who formally abolished it. It is possible, however, that it did not finally die out in scattered churches for another fifty years or so after his time. Thereafter it survives only in certain sporadic ceremonies continued in many French churches, and as a pervading influence in the Romano-French liturgical books which resulted from Charlemagne's reform.

The Gallican rite as a rite had therefore an effective life of some 400 years, from the fifth century to the ninth. The Mozarabic rite lasted for another two centuries in Spain, and took another three or four to fade into the position of an isolated local peculiarity in a handful of churches. In each country their disappearance coincides with the transition from the barbarian centuries to the new Europe and the beginnings of the resurgence of civilisation.

The Development of the Italian Rites

It is not possible to present the local Italian development of the liturgy from the fourth to the eighth centuries in complete isolation from development in Gaul during the same period, owing to the nature of the extant evidence. North of the Alps the renaissance of civilisation under Charlemagne *c.* A.D. 800 not only allowed the preservation of some evidence from before that period, but it brought about a recovery of civilised living which was never altogether lost again, even in the troubled period which followed under his weaker successors. But the later ninth and tenth centuries were in some ways the darkest of all in Italy, and this has seriously affected the extent to which older Italian MSS. have survived. It thus comes about that our earliest copies of Italian liturgical texts happen for the most part to have been written in France. They have undergone a certain amount of adaptation for use in the Frankish churches, though the underlying Italian basis can be disentangled, at least in outline, with a little trouble, and it is with this that for the moment we are chiefly concerned.

I choose the term 'Italian' rather than the usual one 'Roman', deliberately. From the fourth century to the sixth or seventh, the Roman rite is only the most important local rite amid a number of other Italian local rites, varying in the phrasing of their prayers but all having much the same general character. Even in the present very fragmentary state of the evidence they form a recognisable sub-group within the general group of the Western rites. Just so in the same period the Alexandrian rite is only the most important of a group of Egyptian local rites, the Antiochene one of a group of Syrian rites, and so on. It must be repeated that the 'second period' from the end of the fourth to the seventh–eighth centuries is a

confused period, when we must allow for two opposing tendencies at work on the liturgy all over christendom. The abiding influence of provincial and even parochial peculiarities handed down in local churches from the third century is crossed by the new tendency of whole regions to assimilate all their local rites to that of the provincial capital or the nearest oecumenically important see—of Egyptian country churches to approximate to the rite of Alexandria, and so on. And the rites of the two holy cities of the East and the West, Jerusalem and Rome, exercise a special and separate influence on those of other churches, that of Jerusalem being the more far-reaching. We have to remember that the process of 'borrowing' by one rite from another is not merely local in its effects; it can and does take place between churches geographically remote from each other—as Rome and Gaul and Africa and Spain all borrowed independently and differently and at different times from Syria. Yet out of these cross-currents the great historic rites slowly crystallise during the fifth–sixth centuries along the main lines each had formed for itself in the fourth-fifth centuries. The end of the universal empire with its easy communications and the break-up of the old oecumenical communion of the churches lie in the background of this hardening of local differences in the performance of 'the liturgy' into separate 'rites'.

Italy is no exception to this universal trend of liturgical history from the fourth to the seventh centuries, from local diversity to provincial and then regional uniformity. We can trace it in Spain by the aid of such enactments as those of the Council of Gerona in A.D. 517 and of the fourth Council of Toledo in A.D. 633.[1] The process was slower in Gaul and Italy only because in those countries there was as yet no effective national government to bring about a sense of regional unity over-riding the old provincial loyalties, which shewed themselves (amongst other ways) in the adherence to old local and provincial rites.

At the end of the fourth century Italy, like other regions, was full of local rites. The text of these has perished, but Mai's Arian author provides us with invaluable evidence that they existed. The fact, too, is admitted, resentfully enough, by Pope Innocent I in the opening of his letter to Decentius *c.* A.D. 415.[2] In the fifth century the tendency towards regional

[1] *Cf. p.* 561.

[2] 'If celebrants would only keep strictly to the institutions of the church as they have been handed down from the blessed apostles, there would be no contradictions and no differences in the ceremonies they observe and the prayers they say. But when every one believes that what ought to be followed is not what has been handed down but whatever he thinks fitting, there arise thence obvious differences in belief and worship between different churches and places; and this is a cause of scandal to the people; who, because they do not know what the ancient traditions were which have been corrupted by human presumption, either think the churches do not agree together, or that contradictory teachings were given by the apostles or apostolic men'. *Mutatis mutandis*, how often have we Anglicans not heard the same wail of the bureaucrat? And their remedy is always Innocent's 'Do what I do' (even though it be quite a recent innovation, as his particular fancies were).

uniformity operates by the gradual spontaneous adoption in the Italian provincial churches of the outline or Shape of the Roman Liturgy and of the text, perhaps with local modifications, of the Roman eucharistic prayer. This had already happened at Milan *c.* A.D. 390 in S. Ambrose' time, and may very well have been his doing. Other Italian churches may have been slower than Milan to do so. At all events, no Italian eucharistic prayer other than slightly variant forms of the Roman one, has come down to us from the sixth century and after.

But in the fifth century there arises also the new influence of the calendar on the liturgy, and the tendency towards local diversity concentrates itself upon the variable 'lesser' prayers (collect, offertory prayer, etc.), just then being incorporated one by one into the structure of the Western rites. Local diversity is given full play in the elaboration of the 'propers' in the sixth century. Thus in the fifth–sixth centuries the Italian local rites are built up, with the same framework and a number of different sets of variable prayers.

In the case of the local Roman rite we possess monuments of two stages in this process, the *Gelasian Sacramentary* (hereafter called Gel.) and the *Gregorian Sacramentary* (hereafter called Greg.) which may be dated for practical purposes *c.* A.D. 500 and *c.* A.D. 600 respectively. We have besides a third document of great value but more doubtful origin, known as the *Leonine Sacramentary* (hereafter called Le.).

The Gelasian Sacramentary

Though Gel. originates as a book of the Roman rite *c.* A.D. 500 the earliest complete copy of it we possess was written in France, probably at S. Denis, *c.* A.D. 700. Fragments of other copies and other evidence make it certain that this MS. is representative of many then in use in Northern and Eastern France and in England. It is certain, too, that this had been the case since *c.* A.D. 650, and probable that copies of Gel. had crossed the Alps well before A.D. 600, perhaps as early as *c.* A.D. 550. Edmund Bishop, who was the first to illuminate this period of the history of the Western liturgy, always insisted that this unique surviving MS. was only a typical copy of what amounted to a 'Frankish edition' of Gel. made for use in France *c.* A.D. 650, which he christened 'the Gel. of the seventh century'. In this Frankish revision a number of French customs and prayers were added to the imported Roman book, which are as a rule quite easily detected. The text of the Roman canon of Gel. was revised to accord with the current Roman text, as fixed by S. Gregory *c.* A.D. 595. (It is possible that these Frankish changes and additions in the 'Gel. of the seventh century' were made in more than one stage, but the total result was the same.) But with these exceptions Bishop claimed that this Frankish 'Gel. of the seventh century' represented in substance the book used at Rome itself from

A.D. 500 to *c.* A.D. 600, the book whose revision by S. Gregory produced Greg. *c.* A.D. 600.

It is doubtful if the matter is quite so simple as that. Frere[1] has since pointed out that after the Frankish accretions have been removed from the 'Gel. of the seventh century', the resulting book lacks some elements of the strictly *local* Roman rite, and incorporates feasts and prayers which suggest an origin not at Rome itself but in the country to the south of it, round Capua or Cumae. Mr. J. T. Sinclair[2] has carried the argument further by pointing out the very considerable divergence in the prayers of the 'proper' between Gel. and Greg. and the difficulty of considering Greg. as a direct revision of Gel. in this respect. It seems possible that we must interpose a further stage between the Frankish 'Gel. of the seventh century' and the Roman book of *c.* A.D. 500, which undoubtedly lies somewhere behind it. About A.D. 525 the current Roman book may well have been adopted in substance by some South Italian church, where the local propers were substituted for many of the proper prayers then used at Rome. And by some accident it was a copy (or copies) of this sixth century 'Italianised' edition of Gel. which was carried across the Alps soon after A.D. 550 and became the basis of the Frank sh edition of Gel.—the 'Gel. of the seventh century'—made *c.* A.D. 650.

This 'Italian' edition of Gel. *c.* A.D. 525 in fact illustrates very well the probable course of development in other Italian local rites in the sixth century. We know of another such compilation in this period. Bishop Maximian of Ravenna (A.D. 546–556) in a single 'large volume' 'drew up missals for the whole cycle of the year and of all the saints. As for the "quotidian" (*i.e.* what we should call "green") and lenten seasons, and whatever concerns the rite of the *ecclesia*, you will without difficulty find it there.'[3] Another such compilation (as I believe) from N. Italy is found in the *Leonine Sacramentary*, of which something must now be said.

[1] *Studies in the Early Roman Liturgy*, I, 1930, *pp.* 42 *sqq.*

[2] *Art. cit.*, *Theology*, xxxii (1936), *pp.* 144 *sqq.*

[3] Agnellus of Ravenna, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis* in *Mon. Germ.*, *SS. Rerum Langobardicarum*, *p.* 332 (cited E. Bishop, *Lit. Hist.*, *p.* 59, *n.*); Agnellus had personally examined the volume. It was evidently arranged in two books, a *temporale* and a *sanctorale*, as the 'Italianised Gel.' is drawn up in three, *temporale*, *sanctorale* and 'votives'. The Roman tradition as found in Greg. (and Le.) was to have a single book, fusing *temporale* and *sanctorale* and putting miscellaneous items at the end. It may have been the more convenient arrangement in separate divisions which caused the 'Italianised Gel.' to be taken as the basis of the Frankish 'Gel. of the seventh century' instead of the 'pure Roman Gel.' The 'Italian' tradition of separating the saints' day prayers from those of the seasons ultimately prevailed even in Roman MSS. (except for the saints in Christmas week; *cf.* the arrangement of collects, epistles and gospels in the Book of Common Prayer)—but only after the tenth century.

The Leonine Sacramentary

The seventh century MS. in the library of Verona cathedral in which this is found is now unique, but there is evidence that other copies were once in circulation in N. Italy, S.E. France, and even Spain. It is a somewhat disorderly compilation, originally containing a collection of variable prayers for the eucharist throughout the liturgical year, though a good deal of this MS. has perished and the collection is very incomplete. The 'propers' of the seasons and saints' days are mingled with each other in the Roman (as opposed to Italian) way. Masses for occasions like funerals and the provision for the 'green' seasons are mixed up with those for feasts in a very confused fashion. Some MSS. of this document evidently contained a pre-Gregorian text of the Roman canon[1] and perhaps an ordinary also; but this section of the extant MS. has gone, if it ever contained it. What is most remarkable about the book is that it gives a large number of alternative sets of variable prayers for use on the same feast, in some cases as many as ten or twenty complete sets for a single day. This is unique among books of the Roman rite, though it is as such that Le. must be classed.

Various theories have been put forward as to its origin. It has been represented as a mere collection of materials, not an official liturgical book at all, put together by a private compiler. But it is difficult in this case to see why it should have been so widely and carefully copied. This view seems to rest upon the suppositions (a) that the present MS. is the compiler's own copy, (b) that it was always unique, and (c) that it never contained the canon; all of which are unfounded. We know that other copies existed and were not confined to Italy. The scribe of the extant MS. has carefully noted variant readings in some of the prayers drawn from more than one MS., so it already had a certain circulation. And other copies certainly, and probably this one, were equipped with a text of the canon. The book was intended for practical use in church.

On the other hand Le. has been regarded as a copy of a book of unique authority, the mass-book of the fifth century Popes themselves, into which were collected the prayers which successive Pontiffs—occasionally exercising their still living episcopal prerogative of extemporising the prayers of the liturgy—composed afresh when they felt so moved, to celebrate various feasts each year. This theory seems impossible from the contents of the book. It contains matter not only from old Roman sources, but from the *non*-Roman source in the 'Italianised edition' of Gel.; there are also a few Gallican and some Milanese prayers, and some which are now found in no rite, but are known to have been in circulation in North Italy in the seventh century. And, most surprising of all, there are clear indications that its compiler knew the authentic text of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* compiled

[1] See Dom R. H. Connolly, *Downside Review*, xxxvi (1917), *p.* 58.

c. A.D. 595.[1] What, however, gives Le. its special importance is that among the sources upon which it has drawn is a genuinely Roman book of the period before Gregory's reform, which is not the 'Italianised Gel.' Possibly there is material from more than one such pre-Gregorian Roman *stratum* in Le. Duchesne has pointed out that such historical allusions as can be identified in the prayers seem to belong to the first half of the sixth century rather than to the fifth,[2] and this is true of the bulk of the material. But there are one or two items (*e.g.* the ordination prayers) of which it might be said that there is still a probability that they go back to the fifth century, perhaps even to the age of S. Leo himself (*c.* A.D. 450) though I am not aware that this could be proved.

But the supposed connection of Le. as a book with S. Leo, or with the Papal liturgy of the fifth century, must be abandoned. It was put together in the first half of the seventh century in some country church in N. Italy (a monastery seems more likely than a secular church on some counts) from a large variety of materials, amongst which was a Roman book of *c.* A.D. 550 (not 450). Le. is thus in some ways a N. Italian parallel to the S. Italian 'Italianised Gel.' though put together much less skilfully and about a century later in date of compilation. They are both specimens of the Roman rite adapted for use in various ways in Italian provincial churches, with the addition or substitution of other 'propers' drawn from various sources—from obsolete as well as current Roman books, and probably from other Italian local rites whose texts have vanished.

Italian Local Rites

The finished products of such 'Italian' local developments are found in such rites as those of Milan and Benevento,[3] when these are first revealed to us by extant MSS. of the ninth century and after. It is probable that

[1] *Cf.* the cases noted by E. Bishop, *Lit. Hist.*, *p.* 94, *n.*—which do not stand alone.

[2] Duchesne, *Origins*, *ed. cit.*, *pp.* 137 *sq.*

[3] The Beneventan local rite has only come to light in this century, and its texts are still incompletely published. H. M. Bannister, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, vi., *pp.* 603 *sqq.*, drew attention to one point in it as early as 1905. The credit for discovering that it was a complete local rite belongs to Mgr. Benozzi, Archbishop of Benevento (formerly a monk of Monte Cassino) who being unable to find time to publish it himself drew the attention to it of Dom Andoyer of the French Abbey of Ligugé. Such texts as are available are to be found: Dom Andoyer: *L'ancienne liturgie de Bénévent* in *Rév. du Chant Grégorien*, 1912–14 and 1919–21; Dom R. J. Hesbert: *Les dimanches de carême dans les MSS. Romano-Bénéventaines* in *Eph. Lit.*, xlviii (1934), *pp.* 3 *sqq.*; *L'Antiphonale Missarum de l'ancien rit Bénéventain*, *ibid.* lii (1938), *pp.* 28, 125, etc. (incomplete); *La tradition Bénéventaine* in *Paléographie Musicale*, t. xiv. (incomplete). Both these publications have been interrupted by the present disturbances on the Continent, as the original articles of Dom Andoyer were in 1914. Briefly, the history of the rite seems to be that all the local propers are older than *c.* A.D. 800, when local composition ceased; new masses were taken over after that from the Roman rite when required. The old collection of local propers, which dropped out of use in the thirteenth century, was replaced by the corresponding texts from the Western missal then coming into general use in S. Italy.

these are only chance survivors of a number of such rites, all 'Roman' in the Shape of their Liturgy and the text of their canon since the fifth century, but with their own sixth century propers. These local rites received their final codification in the sixth and seventh centuries, much as the local Roman rite received its final codification from S. Gregory and his seventh century successors. Some of them may still have continued in use after the ninth century, but ultimately failed to transmit their MSS. after they fell into disuse during the middle ages. It is to be noted that within the Beneventan rite itself there are local variations, MSS. from Bari not being altogether identical with those from Benevento.

Both Milan and Benevento have complete local traditions of the proper, not only for the eucharist but for the office; and these local traditions included their own proper chants as well as the texts. Some of the melodies in each case are in substance the same as the corresponding Roman ones, but in each church some of these borrowed melodies have been re-written. In other items, sometimes the text, or the music, or both, have been borrowed by Benevento from Milan (or *vice versa*), and these borrowings too have been freely adapted. But much in the proper of each rite is peculiar to itself, either the product of local talent or borrowed from yet other sources no longer extant. There must have been in circulation in Italy a very large *corpus* of variable prayers, (collects, prefaces, etc.) all of them 'Roman' in general type, but many of them of provincial manufacture and never included in the strictly local Roman books. They make their appearance in these various Italian rites, not always assigned to the same day. Some of them, preserved by chance on scraps, are never found in any extant rite;[1] some are found in more than one form. If we say that Italy as a whole, including Milan but excluding the Greek colonies in the South, had come to use the 'Roman' rite before the seventh century, we must be careful to recognise what a wide local variety such a term then covered. And some of these rites incorporated not only non-Roman, but also non-Italian material. The *Bobbio Missal* for instance, though it uses the Roman canon and has a largely Roman Shape of the Liturgy and was used at an Italian altar, is quite fifty per cent. Gallican in its contents. The Milanese rite has adapted to its Roman framework quite a lot of Gallican material. It is a remarkable fact that the only pure and unabbreviated text of the Gallican preface of S. Martin—a French saint if ever there was one—is found not in the professedly Gallican books but in the 'Roman' Milanese missal. On two days in the year Milan even admitted Gallican 'patches' into its local text of the Roman canon.

[1] Of the forty 'Roman' collects copied without heading or rubric on the back of a roll of the eighth–ninth century from Ravenna (publ. by A. Ceriani, *Il rotolo epistolografa del principe Antonio Pio di Savoia*, Milan, 1883) only one appears in any known sacramentary, Le. Of seventeen others, scribbled in seventh century shorthand on a scrap from Bobbio, most but not all are also found in Le. (publ. by G. Mercati in *Studi e Testi*, vii (1902), *pp.* 35 *sqq.*)

The Gregorian Sacramentary

It is upon this background of a whole group of closely related Italian rites, all being more or less simultaneously enriched and revised in the same period, that we must see S. Gregory's purpose in his revision of the local rite of Rome *c.* A.D. 595. It is true that this had vastly greater repercussions on the later liturgical history of the whole West than any revision of the Milanese or Ravennate rite could have had. But that could hardly have been foreseen at the time. The Roman rite was then much further from being the rite of the whole West than the rite of Alexandria was from being that of all Egypt, or the rite of Antioch from becoming that of all the remaining orthodox churches of Syria. In Gregory's time all Spain and half Gaul used a quite different development of the general Western type of the fourth century, and Burgundian missions were just beginning to carry this to England and Germany. In Latin Italy we have seen with what freedom the Roman rite was adapted by the local churches; and in the East and South of the peninsula and Sicily were the Greek Byzantine colonies, much more Eastern than Roman in rite,[1] though these were just then less important than they had been and would be again. And in so far as the Roman rite was already used outside Italy, it had spread in the 'Italian edition' of Gel. and not in the authentic Roman text. Nor had Pope Gregory himself any idea of setting up his own text as a standard necessarily to be accepted elsewhere. He advised Augustine at Canterbury to take what seemed best out of both the Gallican and Roman rites, and form a new mixed rite for the Anglo-Saxon church;[2] he advised the bishop of Milan to continue old Milanese customs; he recognised without *arrière pensée* that the customs of Ravenna are in some things not those of Rome, and insists that they shall be maintained. He is no exponent of that theory of the 'purity' and self-sufficiency of rites which modern liturgists have invented for themselves, but just an old-fashioned believer in the ancient liberty of local churches to order their own rites—within the bounds of orthodoxy and a decent conformity with tradition—and enrich them with the best they can find elsewhere if they are so minded. And this liberty he proceeded to exercise with the local rite of his own church when he embarked on its revision.

We have already discussed his changes in the Shape of the Liturgy—the insertion of the *Kyrie* hymn (imitated from the Gallican rite?) as an alternative to Gelasius' litany, and his insertion of the Lord's prayer in its Jerusalem position after the canon. He made certain verbal changes in the text

[1] Some used the Roman rite in Greek, some the Byzantine rite, others *S. James* and yet others *S. Mark*. Some appear to have used all four liturgies indifferently, since they are found copied in one MS.

[2] Bede, *Eccl. Hist.*, I, 27.

of the canon,[1] adding a whole clause to the *Hanc igitur* paragraph[2]—the last official addition to the wording of the Roman eucharistic prayer. Butit was rather on the texts of the proper and the chants that he seems to have bestowed his chief pains. A series of brilliant and discerning studies by a group of Belgian liturgists has of late years made plain something of the minute care and delicate sense of the music of words with which the great Pope personally revised the individual collects and other lesser prayers for the whole cycle of the year.[3] The invalid and harassed Pope bore the burdens not only of Rome and Italy but of all Europe in the years when the skies were darkening for the final fury of the barbarian storm. It must have been some relief to turn for an hour from the horrors of the Lombard wars to a task so congenial to one who never ceased to be a monk at heart.

A careful examination of his work reveals that many of the prayers he revised left his hands not indeed new, for he keeps closely to the old style and matter, but with an added quality. If what Frere called 'the poised word of Leo' gave to the Roman collects their penetrating thoughtfulness and that pointed form they never lost till the Franciscans of the middle ages took to writing collects, it is Gregory as often as not who gave them their

[1] The best discussion of the early variants in the text of the Roman canon is still that of E. Bishop, *Lit. Hist.*, *pp.* 77 *sqq.*, though further materials will be found in the critical text *ed.* by Dom B. Botte, *Le canon de la Messe Romaine*, Louvain, 1935. Bishop's conclusions stand, that S. Gregory's text has come down in two main recensions: *A*, an early seventh century text, of which the only extant witnesses have relations with Ireland; this is in the main 'Gregorian', but contains three or four 'pre-Gregorian' readings; [*i.e.*, it has the appearance of an attempt to conform the pre-Gregorian text, as used in Ireland, to S. Gregory's revision, not quite meticulously carried out.] *B*, a text current in Italy in the seventh century, but attested rather later than *A* in extant MSS. [This is probably an accident.] Both *A* and *B* texts were current in France in the later seventh century. The present text in the Roman missal is related to *B* more closely than to *A*, though not quite verbally identical. [Bishop excludes the Milanese text from consideration. It seems to be a later re-working of *B* with some older Milanese readings.]

[2] It is to be noted that this destroyed the original connection of this para. with 'the Naming', which had been maintained, at least occasionally, in the sixth century (*cf.*, *e.g.*, *Gelasian Sacramentary*, *ed.* Wilson, *p.* 34). In Le. the *Hanc igitur* appears to have come before *Communicantes*, instead of after it (*cf. Leonine Sacramentary*, *ed.* Feltoe, nos. 24, 25), which is what one would expect from comparison with the prayer cited on *p.* 540. It is possible that S. Gregory was responsible for the change in the order of *Hanc igitur* and *Communicantes*; and probable that he expanded and re-arranged the two lists of saints in *Communicantes* and *Nobis quoque* (*cf.* V. L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Roman Canon*, Rome, 1938). Altogether this amounts to a rather more extensive revision of the canon than he is generally credited with.

[3] See Dom B. Capelle, *La main de S. Grégoire dans le sacrementaire Grégorien*; *Rév. Ben.*, xlix (1937), *pp.* 13 *sqq.*; G. Callewaert, *L'œuvre liturgique de S. Grégoire*: *Le temps de la Septuagésime et l'Alleluia*; *Rév. d'hist. ecclés.*, xxxviii (1937), *pp.* 306 *sqq.*; G. Verbeke, *S. Grégoire et la messe de S. Agathe*; *Eph. Liturg.*, lii (1938), *pp.* 67 *sqq.*; G. Callewaert, *Texte liturgique composé par S. Grégoire*; *ibid.*, *pp.* 189 *sqq.*; Dom B. Capelle, '*L'Aqua Exorcisata*' *dans les rites romains de la dédicace des églises au VIème siècle*: *Rév. Ben.*, l. (1938), *pp.* 306 *sqq.*; G. Callewaert, *S. Grégoire, Les Scrutins et quelques Messes Quadragésimales*; *Eph. Liturg.* liii. (1939), *pp.* 191 *sqq.*; to these may be added, Dom B. Capelle, *Note sur le lectionnaire romain de la messe avant S. Grégoire*; *Rév. d'hist. ecclés.* xxxix (1938), *pp.* 556 *sqq.*, throwing light on his revision of the lections.

lovely simplicity. Again and again he drops or adds half a clause or changes a word or two, and the result is luminous, where the old form for all its sonority and force must have been hard to follow when *heard*. It is a token of the sympathy of the Pope who wrote *The Pastoral Care* with those whom he so often calls the *plebs sancta Dei*—'the holy common folk of God', of that sensitive and apostolic spirit that was moved to such practical purpose by the sight of heathen slave boys from Northumbria for sale in Rome—whom so many others saw, and nothing followed from the seeing! 'Gregory our father, who sent us baptism', as the English called him.

But apart from the details of his revision—which are fascinating—there is a much greater aspect of his liturgical work, which is an aspect of the greatness of his own mind. Edmund Bishop once expressed the hope that the day would come when historical understanding would have been sufficiently cultivated 'to see how Gregory discarded earlier practices, now out of date and almost meaningless, and modernised the rite. On the other hand—and this is much more important and may to some appear more attractive—it will be possible to appraise the religious implications of the Gregorian book and understand what is, I venture to think, an almost astounding as it is a unique survival and conservation of old and simple ideas in regard to some matters which most deeply touch the christian life.'[1]

Liturgical studies have not progressed altogether satisfactorily in England since Edmund Bishop's death—twenty-six years ago to-day as I write this—largely, perhaps, because we have so much neglected the lessons that he taught, of which the most important was that the study of liturgy is primarily a study of *people praying*, and not of the history of regulations. But whether it be yet recognised or not, this is the true importance of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* in the history of European religion. It does not lie in any archaeological meticulousness. Gregory, though he was conservative, could be quite ruthless with mere antiquarian details. Its quality lies in its deliberate and faithful adherence to certain old and simple ideas about the eucharist, just because they were both simple and true, which every other rite in christendom has to a greater or lesser extent overlaid with later and more complicated ones. If the Roman rite to-day, in comparison with some other rites, still pays for this particular kind of primitiveness with a sort of abruptness, it nevertheless retains under all its carolingian and mediaeval ornament the pre-Nicene and even apostolic directness of concentration upon the eucharistic action to the exclusion of all else. Just so the New Testament accounts of the institution neglect the circumstances—the emotions of those who were there, and even the supper itself—to rivet attention on the creative acts of Christ before and after supper, which alone constitute the eucharist.

With Gregory's revision the local evolution of the Roman rite at Rome is virtually over. About a dozen masses were added in the century after his

[1] *Lit. Hist.*, *p.* viii.

death, partly pieced together from old texts, partly new. And a complete outfit of prayers for the lesser Sundays—for which he had omitted to provide, in the antique fashion—was taken over almost unchanged from the 'Italian edition' of Gel. by some seventh century Pope. But by and large the *Gregorian Sacramentary* as S. Gregory left it, with its practical thoughtfulness, its deep roots in tradition, its unemotional sobriety, remained the final contribution of the old local church of Rome to that general synthesis of Western liturgy which is the accompanying sign of the rise of the new Europe in the West. The old Europe of Diocletian and Theodosius had been based on a political unity, resting on the civil authority of the emperors invested with a sort of spiritual sanction by their deification. The new Europe was based on a spiritual unity, expressed in the spiritual leadership of the popes, invested (in theory) with a sort of temporal sanction by their coherence with the revived Western empire. Rome, the city of Augustus and of Peter, was the link that bound the new world to the old. The best of the traditions from the old world of organised human living, both by liturgy (in the life of the spirit) and by law (in the life temporal) were transmitted in her name to the new. The first of these transmissions was chiefly the work of Gregory, the second of Justinian, the last respectively of the classical popes and emperors, men born out of due time. After them—between them and the new Europe—comes the real deluge, the most destructive of those barbarians and the most sterile of those Byzantines, whose first waves had already combined to ruin the old Europe during the fifth century.

The Western Synthesis

The later fourth century had seen the general 'Western' outline of the liturgy take shape within the framework of the old universal tradition. The fifth witnessed its adaptation to a public worship and the rise of the influence of the calendar. In the sixth the various regional developments of this common Western basis in Gaul and Spain and Italy (and, no doubt, in Africa, though we know little about it) each come to such maturity as is possible along their own separate lines. This is a rough account of the stages of the process, but it holds broadly true right across the West. In the seventh century and after there comes a change of direction. It is in one sense the period of the *nadir* of christendom, of the darkest barbarism in the West and of quick recession before Islam in the East. But in the West it is also the time of the first faint stirrings of new life. Tentatively in the seventh century, clearly in the eighth and after that consciously and deliberately, the period from the seventh century to the tenth is the period of a new liturgical synthesis in the West, which marks a new synthesis of European *life*. It was achieved not at Rome but in the new creative centre of Western thought, in Gaul.

Just as the old Roman Gel. book, first compiled *c.* A.D. 500, had crossed the Alps and been brought into use in some churches in Gaul between A.D. 550 and 600, so the new Roman Greg. book, compiled *c.* A.D. 600, also crossed the Alps at a date variously placed between A.D. 640 and 690. The effects of its arrival are obvious on all French liturgical MSS. written after *c.* A.D. 700, not only on French versions of the Roman rite, but on the books of the Gallican rite themselves. The *Missale Gothicum* has borrowed some Greg. prayers, and it was written *c.* A.D. 700. (It has also more from Le. and some from Gel.) The *Missale Gallicanum* has borrowed more; and the *Missale Francorum* has so many that Duchesne felt obliged to treat it as substantially a Roman book with some Gallican survivals, though its compiler probably thought of it as an ordinary South French book, not an 'Italian' one. The *Bobbio Missal* has not only borrowed from the Greg. propers but supplanted the very principle of the Gallican variable canon by the fixed Roman one. Only the *Masses of Mone* (copied *c.* A.D. 650) have no Roman borrowings.[1]

The impact of the new Greg. on the Roman rite as used in Gaul is equally clear. The unique MS. of the old Frankish 'Gel. of the seventh century'[2], copied *c.* A.D. 700, has already a Greg. text of the canon and has been adapted to Greg. in certain other details, even though the book as a whole is still decidedly a Gel. not a Greg. book. In the course of the century (probably rather after A.D. 750) there appeared a more thoroughgoing adaptation of the old Frankish Gel. book, which Edmund Bishop christened the 'Gel. of the 8th century'.[3] The name is not perhaps the best that could have been chosen; it conceals the fact that this book is much more than a fresh edition of the Frankish 'Gel. of the 7th century'. Its foundation is no longer its Gel. but its Greg. element, though it retains from the Frankish 'Gel. of the 7th century' many of the prayers and ceremonies which the latter had inherited from the 'Italianised Gel.' of the sixth century, as well as most of the properly French additions Gel. had received in the course of some two centuries' use in France. The result is not merely a 'Gelasianised Gregorian' book, less austere and sober in tone than Greg. as S. Gregory had left it. It can only be described as an ingenious combination of French taste and feeling with the old Roman sense of

[1] The Spanish books are much more free than the French ones from Roman borrowings. The ninth century *Lib. Sacr.* has a few, all, so far as I have noticed, from Le. (*e.g.* coll. 519–520.) The eleventh century *Lib. Ord.* has more, and the influence of Greg. is obvious (*e.g.* coll. 227 *sqq.*). The earliest extant Spanish books of the Roman rite are of the tenth–eleventh century (two from San Millan, noted by Férotin, *Lib. Sacr., coll.* 911 *sq.*, and also *B.M. Addit.* 30, 847, from Silos). They appear to be based on Greg. as adapted in France, the 'Gel.-Greg. of the tenth cent.' (see below); but none of them have been edited.

[2] This is the book *ed.* by H. A. Wilson as *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, Oxford, 1894.

[3] Dom P. de Puniet has suggested that it was put together in Burgundy, *Eph. Liturg.*, xliii (1929), *p.* 96.

form. The Western synthesis is being effected in the eighth century, though it is not yet complete.

The Reforms of Charlemagne

The surviving MSS. of this 'Gel. of the 8th century' differ a good deal as to the proportions in which they blend their Gel. and Greg. and other elements.[1] Even in those churches in Gaul which used the Roman rite (covering by *c.* A.D. 750 probably a good half of the country) there can have been little uniformity, 'Gel. of the 7th century', 'Gel. of the 8th century' and probably 'pure' Greg. books variously adapted being found in use even at different altars in the same church. As for the Gallican rite, that was falling rapidly into decay all through the eighth century, as the increasingly wholesale substitution of Roman and Spanish prayers in the later Gallican MSS. indicates. The French church was in a very disordered and corrupt condition, which reflects itself in its liturgical life.

The man who reorganised the churches of Gaul was the great emperor Charlemagne (A.D. 768–814) who, layman though he was, took a more than clerical interest in the details of liturgical worship and ceremonies. This was a subject upon which his views were decided and obstinate, and not free from the passion and narrowness which so often mark the amateur. His orderly mind was offended as much by the ceremonial and liturgical diversity of the churches in his dominions as by the disorder and disorganisation of episcopal administration which were its underlying cause. He determined on a liturgical 'fresh start', on the basis of a universal adoption of the authentic Roman rite.

There was more in this scheme than the mere prejudice of an autocrat with a hobby. Rome with its imperial legend was in one sense the goal of all his policy, but in another it was from the first its foundation. His dynasty was already the traditional ally of the Popes, and it was as the heir of the traditions of the empire that Charlemagne stood before the West long before he was crowned as Roman emperor by the Pope in S. Peter's on Christmas Day A.D. 800. If there was to be a uniform rite in his realms it could only be some form of the Roman rite, as a matter of practical politics, quite apart from the magic of the name of Rome in those particular decades. The Roman rite in a Frankish dress already served half the churches of Gaul, and those the Frankish ones in the heart of his empire. Even the Gallican books contained a steadily increasing proportion of Roman material. But Charlemagne's dominions included more than Gaul. Italy and Rome itself would never change from their indigenous tradition, as Gaul was in process of doing. East of the Rhine and in the Low

[1] Perhaps the most representative are the *Sacramentary of Gellone*, *ed.* by Dom P. de Puniet and that of *Angoulême*, *ed.* by Dom Cagin. That nearest to the original is probably the MS. now at Padua, *ed.* by Dom Mohlberg.

Countries, also within Charlemagne's grasp, the Roman rite was already in full possession. If he looked to the North or the East or the South-East of his Eastern frontier, all that was christian was already more thoroughly Roman in liturgy than any other part of Europe north of the Campagna. We must go back a little to explain how this had come about.

The English Influence

When the Roman missionaries under S. Augustine arrived at Canterbury in A.D. 596, they found a small Burgundian mission under Liudhard using the Gallican rite. Augustine himself was consecrated to the episcopate by Aetherius, bishop of Arles, where again he may have found the Gallican rite in use. He must have encountered it more than once on his passage through Gaul. He wrote to S. Gregory in some perplexity, both at the existence of these differences of rite, and as to the policy he was to adopt in the infant Anglo-Saxon church in face of them. Augustine, saint though he was and our English apostle, seems occasionally to exhibit more than one trait of the typical Italian *monsignore*. There is his occasional timidity combined with a real devotion to duty; there is his serious and humble realisation of the responsibilities of his office, combined with an almost childish touchiness about the deference due to his official position. But nothing is more characteristic than this perturbation of mind at the discovery that there were quite good catholics who did not use the Roman rite at all, let alone the authorised current edition of the *curia*. At all events, Augustine did not take the Pope's large-minded advice to draw on the best in both rites, but introduced at Canterbury the new *Gregorian Sacramentary* which had just been introduced at Rome. On this we have the testimony both of Archbishop Egbert of York and S. Aldhelm of Wessex.[1] Whatever may be the truth in the much-disputed question as to the survival of any organised remains of Romano-British christianity in Eastern Britain, nothing can be more certain than that the new archbishopric of Canterbury inherited—and intended to inherit—from the old Romano-British church of S. Alban and Bishop Fastidius neither jurisdiction nor succession of orders, neither radition of doctrine nor anything in its liturgy. Under a succession of archbishops who were all either missionaries from Italy (this includes the Greek S. Theodore) or Saxon disciples trained in their school, the Anglo-Saxon church was 'Roman of the City' in its rite, in its calendar, in the dedications and fittings of its churches,[2] in its church music[3] and in ecclesiastical details generally. Even in the North, where the Roman missions for the most part only reaped a harvest sown by Celtic missions from Iona, the same state of affairs came to prevail after the Synod of Whitby in A.D. 664. S. Wilfrid of York and Ripon is a declared ultra-

[1] Cited and discussed by E. Bishop, *Lit. Hist.*, *pp.* 42 and 104 *sq.*
[2] Bede, *Eccl. Hist.*, I, xxix; IV, xviii; etc. [3] *Ibid.*, II, 20.

montane; S. Benedict Biscop is an enthusiastic importer of Roman books and ecclesiastical paraphernalia generally;[1] the Venerable Bede is an avowed partisan of Roman ways against the errors of the *Britones*.[2]

But was there in fact a 'British' rite akin to the Gallican, as has often been assumed? The Irish church in the seventh century used a form of the Roman, and the influence of Ireland was then predominant among the Celtic churches. We hear of no questions raised between the Welsh and Anglo-Saxon churches about the rite of the eucharist, but only about baptism and the tonsure and the date of Easter; though both sides were in a frame of mind not to pass over any questions that could be raised. We have no direct evidence either way. But whether the British churches used a form of the Gallican or the Irish-Roman rite, it made no difference to their relations with the Anglo-Saxons. Their clergy would not eat or sleep in the same house with a Saxon cleric. And from the eighth century onwards a kind of loathing of the *Scotti* and all their doings and all their ways seems to have swept over the English, in which racial bitterness and ecclesiastical prejudice were probably nicely blended. The canons of the national synod of Celcyth in A.D. 816 excluded all 'Scottic' ecclesiastics from any form of ministration whatever in English churches. They forbade English bishops to ordain them or to accept their orders, the English clergy to tolerate their ministering in English parishes, and the English laity to receive baptism or holy communion at their hands or even to hear mass when they celebrated it. It was the English reply to the former Welsh refusal on racial grounds to assist in the evangelisation of their invaders. Irish influence on English religion—and in the field of private extra-liturgical devotion the Irish contribution to English religion is not inconsiderable—is either earlier than this in date or else represents something which has filtered indirectly into England by way of the Continent.

Every item of liturgical evidence we possess from the Anglo-Saxon church without exception reveals the use of the Roman rite, either in the form of the Greg. sacramentaries brought by S. Augustine, or in copies of the Frankish 'Gel. of the 8th century' introduced across the channel later on. And it was to Anglo-Saxon missions, bringing with them as a matter of course the Roman rite by which the English worshipped, that Holland and Frisia, parts of Flanders, Central and in part Southern Germany all owed their conversion during the eighth century; and by such missions that the conversion of Scandinavia and North Germany was begun in the ninth century. Right down to the end of the middle ages the impress of the first Anglo-Roman liturgical books brought from England by these missionaries on the calendars and missals of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Hesse, Thuringia and Bavaria is never effaced.

The success of the Roman mission at Canterbury had in effect outflanked the Gallican rite, though such a result had been far from Gregory's

[1] *Ibid.*, IV, 18. [2] *Ibid.*, V, 22.

thoughts. It was a further unforeseen result of his initiative that the eighth century English missions to the other Teutonic peoples made the Roman rite, probably for the first time, the rite of the actual majority of Western christians. Not only so, but the continual and cordial relations of the new Anglo-German churches with the Papacy ensured that the Roman rite as they practised it should take a much purer form than it had hitherto done in Gaul or even in North Italy. This in turn reacted after a while on the more free and easy use of it among the Franks. When the English archbishop of Mainz, Bonifaee the apostle of Germany—perhaps the greatest missionary Europe had seen since S. Paul—was repeatedly called in *c.* A.D. 750 by the Frankish churches to assist as Papal legate in their own reform, one of the points to which he turned his attention was the Frankish liturgy. It is possible that the Frankish 'Gel. of the 8th century' is partly a result of his initiatives.

But the time was not yet ripe for reconstruction in Gaul. There was no effective primatial centre, like Toledo in Spain, to take the lead; there was no national unity between the half-German Franks, the Celtic Bretons, the Latin *méridionaux* and the half-Spanish Goths of the South-West, to create such a centre. (To this day there are at least five prelates in France who bear the title of *Primat de Gaule.*) The new Caroling dynasty was not yet firmly enough set upon the throne to take the lead in reform in the absence of a leader from the church. Boniface, a foreigner, distracted by the incessant calls of his German missions, could not supply that lack. He found the bishops recalcitrant to all reform; and he seems to have felt that the Frankish king Peppin, the father of Charlemagne, had neither the organising ability nor the steadiness of purpose for enforcing it. The task was left for Peppin's son and another Englishman to carry through between them. It was as well, for the licentiousness and illiteracy of the eighth century French bishops which were the real obstacle to every reform were too deep-seated to be cured by anything but death and a whole generation of new and better appointments. The spasmodic efforts of Boniface made no lasting improvement for the moment, but they pointed to the path which would have to be taken a generation later.

The Work of Alcuin

It was therefore by no arbitrary personal whim of Charlemagne that the reform of the liturgy followed the path it did, but as the natural fulfilment of a movement to which everything had been converging for more than 200 years. If there was to be a unification of rites, the basis must be the Roman rite in some form, since it was already spontaneously used in the large and growing majority of the churches concerned. And it had the further advantage of having received an admirable latinity and a standardised text from S. Gregory's revision, now canonised by the passage of

two centuries of reverence. Charlemagne's difficulty was not to introduce the Gregorian reform into the French churches, but to secure an authentic and standard text among the multitude of copies already in use, all unofficially altered and emended to suit French ways. Charlemagne therefore applied to the Pope Hadrian I, for an authentic copy of Greg. as early as 781. The Pope was a busy man, and irritatingly uninterested in the great project of securing perfect conformity throughout the West to the rite of his own see. No book arrived, and Charlemagne was forced to repeat his request. At last, somewhere between 785 and 791 the long-awaited copy came. After all this delay the book the Pope had sent turned out to be unusable as it stood for Charlemagne's purpose. Not only had the text been carelessly copied, but the book itself must have seemed to the emperor strangely defective. It contained no proper provision for the 'green' Sundays or even for those of Eastertide; next to no 'votives' for weekdays when the liturgical cycle ordered no feast or fast; practically nothing for funerals or weddings, for the profession of nuns or the reconciliation of penitents, or other occasional needs.[1] The old-fashioned Roman rite *c.* A.D. 600 had not felt the need of these things, and tnis was a copy—freshly but not very carefully made—of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* as it had left S. Gregory's hand, with a few seventh century additions. It is perhaps regrettable that history records no expression of Charlemagne's opinion of the Pope or his book when the latter was presented to him after getting on for ten years of expectation.

The Roman model was thus itself in need of some touching up by Charlemagne's standards. Fortunately Charlemagne had at hand the very man for the work in the person of Alcuin, an Englishman, the first scholar of his age and Charlemagne's wisest adviser in all that concerned the department of education and literature.[2] Alcuin carefully revised the text of Pope Hadrian's MS. with the aid of older copies of Greg. already circulating in France, producing a good critical text. He added the masses for the missing lesser Sundays, presumably also from these MSS. (They had already been added to current MSS. of Greg. even at Rome itself, from the old pre-Greg. 'Italianised edition' of Gel. during the seventh century.) He supplied a number of items not found in Hadrian's MS. to make the book 'workable' for contemporary church life in France.

But he went further. His scholar's sense of broad questions, and the shrewd Englishman's knack of knowing men which comes out so often in his letters, told him instinctively that the severity of the Roman book as it

[1] The text of Hadrian's book has been edited from two Cambrai MSS. by H. Lietzmann, *Das Sacram. Greg. nach dem Aachener Urexemplar*, Münster, 1921.

[2] It is an interesting and little-known fact that Alcuin is ultimately responsible for the modern form of our printed letters, which are derived from the script specially evolved for legibility in the *scriptorium* of his monastery at Tours. It is an instance of the practical bent of his scholarship.

stood would prove too bare for the Franks, or indeed for the Northern peoples generally. Accustomed to elaborate symbolical ceremonies and the more rhetorical and flowery style of the Gallican and 'Frankish Gel.' prayers, the people and clergy of the North were likely to view the simplicity of Greg. as baldness, its sobriety as dullness and the pregnant brevity of its prayers as cramping to their own more exuberant and affective devotional style. As it stood they would never bring themselves to make it the framework of their own devotion. And so Alcuin added to the authentic Greg. book a 'Supplement' as long as the book itself, containing prayers and rubrics for certain extra ceremonies and occasions dear to the Northern piety. In this was to be found a considerable collection of the best things in the 'Frankish Gel.' books of the seventh and eighth centuries, supplemented by some prayers drawn from Gallican sources and others from the Mozarabic rite of Spain, adapted for use in the framework of the Roman rite. It was all chastened a little in style and expression by Alcuin's careful revision. But it formed a corpus of Frankish or Northern devotions whose origin is as unmistakable in its warmth and colour as is that of the Gregorian book in its quite different way.

Between Greg. and its new Supplement Alcuin set a 'Little Preface' (known as the *Praefatiuncula Hucusque*, from its first word), explaining how the book is to be used. All that precedes the preface, the work (with small exceptions) of the great Gregory, is to be used by everybody, entirely and without any variation—'anyone will reject it in any particular only at his own peril.' (There is an intimation of Charlemagne in the background behind Alcuin here.) But though Greg. is thus made universally compulsory, Alcuin goes on to explain that the use of his own Supplement—about which he is disarmingly humble—in any or all of its contents is entirely optional. Those to whom these prayers are dear and familiar—*cui animo sedent*, an understanding phrase!—will draw on them as they please. Others, the purists of the new *régime*, will use the Greg. book in its authentic form without these tolerated frills. And both parties are to follow their own preference *placabiliter*—'without bickering'.[1] Alcuin the Englishman had a tolerably good notion of the way to work a compromise.

Such was the liturgical reform of Charlemagne—the introduction of a book in which the framework and about forty per cent. of the contents were genuinely Roman, while the rest came from Gallican and 'semi-Gallicanised' sources. And the church was left a good deal of freedom to determine by actual use the proportions in which the two elements were finally to be mingled. It was the decisive moment in the Western synthesis.

[1] Alcuin's book is that *ed.* by H. A. Wilson as *The Gregorian Sacramentary*, H.B.S., 1915.

The End of the Gallican Rite

One immediate result was the end of the Gallican rite as a rite wherever it still survived. Charlemagne peremptorily forbade its use. It was followed two centuries later by the slower decline of the sister Mozarabic rite in Spain. It is always with a certain regret that one comes to 'the end of an auld sang', when a tradition for which and by which many men and women have lived fades irremediably into the dead past. More especially ought this to be so for a christian in the case of a liturgical tradition sprung from the soil and native to the minds and hearts of a population, which has formed for God whole generations of men and women, nameless and unremembered for the most part, but still praying men and women and bone of our bone 'in Christ'. Every liturgy has been the road to God and their eternal destiny of so many of the *plebs sancta Dei*—and the footsteps of the great multitude of the unknown saints are holy in the dust even on long-forgotten paths.

In the case of the Gallican rite this regret will perhaps be tempered for the student by the Gallican documents themselves, which plainly indicate that the end was not very far off when Charlemagne so abruptly hastened it. The barbarous boisterous Merovingian Latin in which they were composed would never have suited the clerks of the Carolingian renaissance, no Ciceros in reality but very proud of their culture, and certainly incomparably better educated than their predecessors only fifty years before. These clumsy old prayers have indeed a moving kind of poetry of their own, rather like that of the surviving fragments of the Frankish epics. But quite apart from their barbarisms of syntax and accidence, they bear very plainly written in their substance the marks of their own times, and could never have served another. They voice the desperate cries of an age horror-stricken by its own unending turmoil, and yet quite unable to check the violence of its lusts and brutalities. 'Let not our own malice within us but the sense of Thy longsuffering (*indulgentiae*) be ever before us; that it may ceaselessly keep us from evil delights and graciously guard us from the disasters (*cladibus*) of this life'.[1] Doubtless that is a prayer which christians can never wholly omit without peril. But one feels that in these ever-repeated entreaties from the heart of the dark ages the struggle with evil and calamity is so close and so terrible that there is never time or breath to stand for a moment and look at the holiness and beauty and redeeming wisdom of God, which is—after all—the end of religion. The whole energy of the christian life is taken up in the negative battle with sin. Perhaps it was an instinctive feeling for the need of a more balanced and serene contemplation of the economy of redemption, such as many of the old Roman collects provide, which led in the better times of the eighth century to the

[1] *Contestatio* of Mass XX in the *Miss. Francorum, ed.* Mabillon *de Lit. Gall.*, 1729, *p.* 324.

large-scale adoption of Roman prayers in books which professed to follow the Gallican rite.

This increasing and voluntary self-Romanisation of the Gallican rite is in fact the clearest confession of its own inadequacy to serve the needs of the time. And it laboured under other disadvantages. Men were beginning to *think* again, penetratingly, philosophically, theologically. And the Gallican prayers, though they contain gems of poetry, have for the most part a fatal verbosity, a tendency to substitute words for meaning, which on occasion degenerates into sheer vapidity. This would prejudice educated men, who were still a small minority. But there was another disadvantage which affected the rank and file of the clergy. The Gallican style was florid; its prayers were longer than the terse Roman prayers; it needed a different eucharistic prayer for every day in the year. A full Gallican book was bound to be longer than a full Roman one, with its unchanging canon which only had to be copied once. When every liturgical MS. for use at the altar had to be copied by hand, and country priests were still apt to need a portable altar book in their large and scattered parishes, this must have told heavily against the survival of the Gallican rite in the long run.

The Adoption of Alcuin's Missal

But though we may admit that it had no future and that Charlemagne adopted the only practical course in basing his reform on Greg., there is less to be said for his method of carrying it out by the use or the threat of his secular authority. This was in line with the theocratic view of royal and imperial authority which he sedulously fostered, and which was in fact an inheritance from the fourth century post-Constantinian Roman empire. But even so his imperious Act of Uniformity might have been difficult to enforce, but for the tact and wisdom of Alcuin in compiling his permissive Supplement of familiar Frankish prayers. Even as it was, it is doubtful how far the emperor was obeyed in actual practice at the altars of the Frankish realm, despite the straitness of his command and the eager compliance of his bishops. It is noteworthy that at the Abbey of S. Riquier near Abbeville in Picardy the inventory of A.D. 831 reveals that there were in use in the church nineteen Gelasian missals, three Gregorian books and only one copy of the authorised 'Gregorian and Gelasian missal recently arranged by Albinus' (*i.e.* Alcuin). The inventories of half-a-dozen village churches near Rheims *c.* A.D. 850 have chanced to survive. Of these, all were 'Roman' not 'Gallican' in rite, but three used Greg. only (with or without the supplement?). Two had both Greg. and Gel. missals. One had still only a copy of Gel.[1] Allowing for the inevitable delays of an age when MSS. could only

[1] E. Bishop, *Lit. Hist.*, *pp.* 47–8. It is proper to say that I have drawn largely in this section on both the conclusions and evidence of Bishop's essays on *The Gelasian Mass Book* (*op. cit.*, *pp.* 39 *sqq.*), and *The Liturgical Reforms of Charlemagne* (*Down-*

be slowly provided by hand, fifty years is a long time for the carrying out of a heartily desired change. There are, too, quite a number of MSS. of the 'Gel. of the 8th century' in ninth century script, books which ought never to have come into existence, if orders were being strictly obeyed. The evidence is too scanty for generalisation. But it looks as though there had been for a while a certain amount of passive resistance by the clergy.

One thing is quite certain from the MSS. themselves—the popularity of Alcuin's supplement in Gaul. While the Greg. book without the Supplement, or any part of it, still continued to be copied in Italy in the late ninth and even tenth century—in itself a significant indication of the different devotional ethos to be found north and south of the Alps—there are, I think, only two copies from ninth century Gaul of the unsupplemented Greg. text, despite its much shorter length and the consequent temptation to copyists and purchasers to be content with the compulsory part alone. Alcuin's careful delimitation between the official rite and the optional appendix soon disappeared. First the text of the preface, and then all distinction between Greg. and the Supplement, were omitted from new copies. It means that the optional additions were everywhere wanted and everywhere in use in Gaul. As the ninth century progresses these additions are inserted into the body of the text of Greg. at the appropriate places, and the Roman and Frankish elements become inextricably fused into a single book. In the troubled times that came again after Charlemagne's death the eye of authority upon the scribes and clergy was distracted, and even at court the fashion changed a little from 'pure' Roman to Roman *à la française*. In late ninth and tenth century MSS. a considerable number of old 'Frankish Gel.' items which Alcuin had omitted have found their way back into the mass-book and even a few more of the forbidden Gallican prayers. The missal thus greatly supplemented begins to spread into England and Italy in the tenth century, and had silently ousted the Roman 'pure' Greg. books at Rome itself before the eleventh century was over. This seems to have taken place insensibly, probably in the course of the eleventh century reform of the Papacy. This was largely conducted by German Popes, who must have brought with them the liturgical usages and books to which they were accustomed from beyond the Alps.

The Western Missal

With these 're-Gelasianised Gregorian' books of the tenth century the Western synthesis is complete, after a process of 300 years. They are the direct origin of the missals[1] that served the whole West (with diminishing

side Review, xxxvii (1919), *pp.* 1 *sqq.*), though I have modified Bishop's views in certain respects from my own study. But there is no other full and scientific approach to the matter than Bishop's discussions.

[1] And also of much in the Pontifical and Ritual.

exceptions) for six centuries, and of that which serves half of all christendom to this day. The decisive point in the history is the work of Charlemagne, or rather, as I believe, the special idea of Alcuin. If the emperor saw that the old Roman framework of the rite with its old and simple ideas could alone provide a satisfactory basis for unity, it was the insight of Alcuin which understood how its spirit must be made less rigid if it was to contain the fulness of Western devotion. And it was his wisdom which left to the churches—the christian people and clergy in their unofficial multitudes—a large measure of freedom to decide for themselves by the experience of practical use how far this process was to go. In the event it went further than even he expected. Alcuin was indebted to predecessors for ideas as well as materials. Seventh century books like the *Bobbio Missal* and the 'Frankish Gel.' had been fumbling after what he did; the 'Gel. of the 8th century' and the *Missale Francorum* come nearer to it. Alcuin's merit lies in two things, the skill with which he selected his materials, and the relative freedom which he left to the church at large to continue the process of selecting and blending along the lines he had laid down.

It is a mistake to call the final product 'Roman', in the sense that the *Gregorian Sacramentary* is Roman. To compare the book that Hadrian sent to Charlemagne with the book the Franco-German church sent back to Rome three centuries later is to understand that the Mozarabic and Gallican were not the only old local rites which were obliterated by the new Western missal. Amongst others this killed also the old local rite of Rome. It is true that the Greg. element which Charlemagne and Alcuin made its basis is never eliminated thenceforward from the Western missal; that structurally the Western mass is thenceforward Roman and not 'Gallican'; that a recognisable proportion of the variable prayers are still as Roman in spirit and feeling as when they left the pen of Gregory; that the name *Missale Romanum* attaches to the whole. But the old Roman element has been overlaid and very greatly enriched in its grasp by a larger quantity of material from other churches.

Into the Western missal have gone important elements brought to the West in the fifth and sixth centuries from the rites of Jerusalem and Antioch, Constantinople, Egypt and Africa; and others, mostly of rather later date (sixth–ninth centuries), from Italy, Spain, Ireland and Gaul. Treasures from all over christendom were poured into a Roman vessel, which had kept better than others the simple classic shape. But they were mostly not Roman, and they were not collected by a Roman. The real scene of the synthesis was the palace chapel of Charlemagne at Aachen, built by Frankish labour from German stone pieced together with old Italian and Byzantine and Syrian marbles and columns brought from Ravenna and from Rome. And England's contribution to the Western synthesis was the Blessed Alcuin of York, the final begetter of the Western rite.

Mediaeval and Post-Mediaeval Developments

The Western rite never shewed any signs of reaching that immobility which finally sets in in the Byzantine rite in this very period. But the wisdom of Alcuin is shewn by this, that there are no more changes of shape or principle in the Western liturgy, but only a continual and vivacious development within the principles he had fixed. Even the most remarkable of the 'derived rites' of the Middle Ages—Paris, Carthusian, Trier, Sarum, Autun, Dominican, Rouen, Hereford, Carmelite and the forty or fifty others—are none of them new 'rites' in the technical sense, still less different rites from the Western rite, as *e.g.* the old Alexandrian, Antiochene and Roman rites had really been different rites from one another. They are only local dialects, some of them hardly more than 'accents', of the one universal 'Western' rite which the work of Alcuin had created.[1] Their variants lie in details of ceremonial, which are sometimes quite striking, and in the texts of the propers and the priest's private prayers.

The old freedom to compose and use local propers was hardly affected by Charlemagne's reform. In practice the freedom to replace the texts of the propers of seasons by new compositions was not much used, but for the saints' days the formation of local propers continued unabated throughout the middle ages. It gave rise to 'sub-dialects', as it were, within the derived rites themselves, so that the prayers for the saints' days in a Norwich-Sarum book are not entirely the same as those of a Salisbury-Sarum one. Even within the centrally controlled rite of the modern post-Tridentine church, liberty is still found for a supplement of propers for each diocese and abbey of the Latin rite—some 1,500 in all—thus continuing the old freedom of the propers, which the Popes had naturally always respected as an inheritance from the second and third century, and which Alcuin had wisely retained. The old practice of borrowing feasts and texts between different local churches, too, continued unaffected, so that *e.g.* the English feast of the Conception of our Lady appears at Lyons, carried thither by an English canon of Lyons, Gilbert, later bishop of London, even before it had been officially authorised by the Norman bishops of England; and the new Belgian feast of the Holy Trinity invented by Stephen of Liége was providing the dedication of new English cathedrals like Norwich and Chichester before it was accepted (or apparently heard of) at Rome. The writing of new 'votives' for all sorts of devotional *attraits* and necessities of secular life also continued throughout the middle ages and beyond. It was a form of piety which Alcuin himself had found attractive—the mass in the present missal 'in time of war', amongst others, seems to be his compilation from older materials—and some of the mediaeval votives (*e.g.* 'the Five

[1] Adrian Fortescue says somewhere that to speak of the 'Roman, Sarum and Gallican rites' is like speaking of 'English, Yorkshire dialect and French' as three different languages.

Wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ' and 'against the pagans') are fine compositions.

The insertion of new feasts not only of modern saints but of our Lord (*e.g.* 'the Precious Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ' by Pius IX and 'Christ the King' by Pius XI) has slowly been centralised in the hands of the curial Congregation of Rites in the post-Tridentine church. The French dioceses continued to do this for themselves (in the old Frankish way) down to the French revolution; and the system of curial control as a whole never became fully effective until the nineteenth century. Yet even thus limited, the freedom of the propers and the special influence of the calendar on the Western rites (which had brought in the variable prayers not only of the propers but the votives) have continued to prevent that fossilisation of the liturgy which inevitably beset the Byzantine rite once it had perfected its two alternative sets of celebrant's prayers. No doubt when unwisely exercised these qualities can degenerate into the fostering of cults which are mere devotional side-issues at the best, distracting popular interest from the grand facts of redemption to some aspect of them which happens to have become a pious fashion at the moment. But christian good sense has a way of re-asserting itself in the end over all sacristy pieties. The history of Western catholicism is littered with discarded devotions of all kinds, most of which found their representation in the missal for a while until popular interest waned and that mass was removed. These are the inevitable effects of a living contact of the liturgy with the prayers of the christian people in each age. The people have a certain right to be vulgar; and the liturgy, even while it must teach them, has never a right to be academic, because it is their prayer. The ease with which the Western system of variable prayers can enable it to respond to the people's special interests and devotions at any time may have its dangers. But it has given the Western rite a closer and more intimate grasp of human life than any other.

From the time of S. Gregory's revision of the local Roman rite *c.* A.D. 595 to that of S. Pius V undertaken at the request of the Council of Trent nearly 1,000 years later no Pope ever officially touched the Roman ordinary. After Alcuin's revision just before A.D. 800 there was never a further official edition put out for general use before the Pian missal. All that vast general conformity of the whole West to the same outline of the rite during 700 years was in reality a largely *voluntary* conformity to something which met the church's needs, and yet allowed of sufficient local freedom. It is true that Popes from time to time put forth Bulls promulgating new feasts and new masses. But the initiative in adopting these was in practice, if not in theory, a local one. Thus the feast of Corpus Christi was promulgated for the whole church by Urban IV in 1264, but the majority of churches even in Italy had not yet adopted it fifty years later, though it was by then just beginning to be taken up by churches in the North.[1] Often

[1] The decade 1320–1330 sees its beginning in many important dioceses.

enough the mediaeval promulgation of a new feast or mass takes the form of a 'grant' of it to particular churches or countries or orders which had asked for it. Almost always they had been observing it on their own authority for some while previously, and now wished to confirm their practice with the highest sanction they could find. Even the feast of Corpus Christi, the most important Papal initiative in the liturgy during the whole middle ages, had been kept at Liége nearly twenty years before Urban IV 'instituted' it.

Uniformity

There is thus remarkably little foundation for the idea which has been assiduously propagated of late years in England that 'the catholic priest, at least if he has any tincture of the true catholic and priestly spirit, would rather say the most jejune and ill-arranged rite, which was that imposed upon him by authority, than the most splendid liturgy devised by himself.'[1] Either the whole church from the second century to the sixteenth was devoid of 'any tincture of the true catholic and priestly spirit', or such statements are comprehensively mistaken. Even in the first century the use of the liturgical eucharist apart from the supper must have spread by mere borrowing from church to church, as is proved by the verbal identity everywhere in the pre-Nicene church of the dialogue before the *eucharistia* (unless we are to imagine that there then existed some central liturgical authority whose dictates were obeyed without variation everywhere). And after that in every century every liturgy borrowed where it chose, without the intervention of 'authority' in the matter at all, till we come to the edicts of Byzantine emperors and Charlemagne. It is true that in every church the rite was from time to time codified in a revision by the local bishop—a Sarapion, a Basil, a Gregory. But it is also true that their work never endures as they leave it. The same process of unauthorised alteration and addition and borrowing begins again, as it began again within fifty years of the imposition of Alcuin's authorised rite. The proof is written in almost every liturgical MS. in existence. The primitive bishop had control of the text of the prayers because their recitation was his special 'liturgy'; he was the normal celebrant. When he passed on that 'liturgy' to individual presbyters, in practice if not in theory the same control tended to pass to the new normal celebrant, however objectionable in principle the fact may now seem to us. The presbyter was largely ruled by tradition—as the bishop had been. But I have a not altogether inconsiderable experience of ancient liturgical MSS. Setting aside mere copyists' errors, I do not remember any two professing to give the same rite which altogether agree on the text of the celebrant's prayers.

[1] Cited from *The Church Times*, Jan. 22, 1937, by the Rt. Rev. Dr. G. K. A. Bell, bishop of Chichester, in his Charge, *Common Order in Christ's Church* (1937), *p.* 49.

We have heard a lot in England of late years of the bishop's *jus liturgicum*. The term is entirely unknown to the canon law or to any writer in any country before the later nineteenth century, when it comes into use among a certain group of Anglican ecclesiologists, who invented it as a means of lifting the dead hand of parliamentary statutes off Anglican worship. So far as the primitive bishop had any such right he had it not so much as bishop but as celebrant. When he ceased to be the normal celebrant it passed as a practical fact to other people. If any one were to say that from the sixth century to the eleventh it was habitually exercised much more by the copyists of liturgical MSS. than by bishops, it would not be easy to bring factual evidence to refute him. And *in practice* there is no doubt that it was exercised by the parish priest, 'doing the liturgy' for his flock under the guidance of tradition from such MSS. as he had, which he did not feel much scruple about adding to or altering with his own hand.

This state of things was coming to an end from the thirteenth century onwards. The more centralised religious orders (Cistercians, Mendicants, etc.) tried hard from the first to secure uniformity in all their churches, though the old ways died hard and their general chapters complain a good deal about the growth of variations. The older Benedictines and Augustinians kept up the old local freedom and allowed each house its own missal. In the same period the parish churches began to come to a general conformity with the cathedral of their own diocese, though there were still more traditional peculiarities of ceremonial and calendar in the parish churches of the fifteenth century than a modern catholic would expect. There was a tendency in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for diocesan rites which had acquired a certain reputation for their completeness or 'up-to-dateness' to be adopted by their neighbours, as the Sarum rite was adopted by many South English dioceses (in the secular churches) and even in some Irish ones. But even here, when a diocese took over the general arrangement of the rite from a neighbour, it usually made some modifications of its own, and always retained its own local propers of the saints, and often added new ones. Often, too, it kept much of its own traditional ceremonial.

What ended the continuing relics of the old local freedom in the West were, 1. the invention of printing, and 2. the energetic measures taken by the Papacy within its own communion after the Council of Trent and (more especially) by the secular governments of the protestant powers in the same period, to enforce uniformity down to the last comma.[1] The Papacy respected the old freedom of the propers everywhere, and exempted

[1] The most extraordinary instance of this is in Sweden, where on each Sunday every pastor in the country must preach on the same text, chosen and published beforehand, by the Minister of Public Worship. A series for the whole year is put out by his authority every December.

from the scope of the new decrees all local customs which could be proved to be more than 200 years old.

In the East, Byzantine centralisation had always striven for exact uniformity under the aegis of the secular power. Among the Eastern dissidents, however, where the liturgy was still recited from MSS. and not from printed books until quite recent times, borrowing of prayers and customs and even whole liturgies, across the barriers which separated them from the orthodox and from one another, continued at least to the end of the nineteenth century.[1]

There is no need to argue from these facts that the restoration of the old local freedom in its fulness is either possible or desirable. But we shall never understand the history of the early liturgy or even that of the early middle ages, if we try to view it in the light of the drive of the Western churches for uniformity since the sixteenth century. However much ecclesiastical administrators like Innocent I and Charlemagne may have lamented the fact, the churches in the earlier ages did not desire uniformity. And those who have taken part with any understanding in the worship of provincial and country churches in France and Spain and Italy and Germany—or in the parish churches of England—may wonder whether they really care very much about it now.

The Mediaeval Presentation of the Liturgy

It is easy enough for the student to see the connection between the way in which the eucharist is celebrated in the *Ordo Romanus Primus c.* A.D. 700 and the way the primitive bishop-celebrant performed the eucharist—say, in the time of Hippolytus. Due allowance made for the change of scale, they are both in broad outline the same 'way' of doing the rite. And once the main clue—the changed position of the bishop's throne—has been understood, it is not difficult to see the connection between the rite and ceremonial of the *Ordo Romanus Primus* and a modern pontifical mass sung by a bishop. There have been both simplifications and complications in the ceremonial since the eighth century, but there is a real and obvious derivation of the modern rite of the bishop from the early mediaeval one, and of the latter from the pre-Nicene ceremonial and way of doing things. It is a good deal more difficult to trace the connection of the modern Western 'simple said service'—whether it takes the form of a Roman low mass or an Anglican eight o'clock celebration or a Wesleyan communion service—with the kind of eucharist described by Hippolytus *c.* A.D. 200 and traceable in Clement's epistle *c.* A.D. 96, with the considerable amount of *corporate* action and movement these writers imply.

[1] *Cf. e.g.*, the adoption in the seventeenth century of the Monophysite *S. James* by certain Malabar churches which traditionally used the Nestorian *Addai and Mari*; the increasing Byzantinisation of the modern Coptic rite, and so on.

The 'simple said service' does derive from the primitive ceremonial, like the pontifical mass, and this through the type of thing described in the *Ordo Romanus Primus*. But there are a further two stages interposed between our practice and that of the primitive church, which have no place in the evolution of the pontifical rite. These are: (1) High mass—a sung eucharist celebrated by a single presbyter, assisted by a deacon and subdeacon and various assistants. (2) Low mass—a eucharist *said* by a single presbyter, assisted by a single minister or even just answered by a congregation. The evolution through these two stages took place during the middle ages. The former is common to East and West alike in its main outlines. The latter is entirely confined to the Latin West.

There was nothing new about presbyters celebrating the eucharist when the middle ages began. They had been deputising for the bishop as celebrants ever since the second century. After the middle of the fourth century, as christianity spread to the countrysides and churches in towns multiplied, perhaps the actual majority of christians on any given Sunday morning might have been found to have assisted at a eucharist celebrated by a presbyter (or concelebrated by several) without the presence of their bishop. But in this period the idea of the bishop's 'stational' eucharist as the central liturgical observance of his whole flock was still strong. There are signs that in some of the little Italian city-bishoprics with their very small area the tradition was still a living reality in the sixth century. Even at Rome with its multitude of churches it was not wholly lost sight of before the 'captivity' at Avignon in the fourteenth century. North of the Alps, where much larger 'tribal' dioceses were the rule from the start (outside Provence) the position was always different. The bishop's liturgy was indeed the central observance in his own see-town; but elsewhere the mass of the 'parish priest' assumed from the first the place which the bishop's liturgy had held in the pre-Nicene church.

It is not quite easy to make out the outward circumstances and ceremonial of these eucharists celebrated by presbyters from the second and third century onwards, because all descriptions of the eucharist down to the early ninth century continue to make the traditional assumption that the bishop is the normal celebrant, and the pontifical eucharist the norm of the rite. But without exception all the evidence I have been able to gather—it is considerable in quantity but very fragmentary—suggests that outwardly, in ceremonial and performance, there was no difference whatever in the fifth century between the rite as celebrated by a presbyter and that of a bishop. The celebrant presbyter performed his liturgy from a chair behind the altar like the bishop, with the assistance of a number of deacons, etc., and of concelebrants if other presbyters were present. Except for the *pallium* or *orarion* there were still no special episcopal—or for that matter ecclesiastical—ornaments like the later mitre and gloves. There was in fact nothing to make any ceremonial difference between the rite of the bishop and that of

the presbyter. A ceremonial on these lines, with a presbyter-celebrant and assistant presbyters and four or more deacons, continued in use in some French cathedrals on certain days down to the French revolution.[1]

The first great change in Western ceremonial, the bringing of the celebrant round from behind the altar where he faced the people, to before it where he had his back to them, appears to have begun, almost accidentally, in Gaul and the Rhineland during the eighth–ninth century. It was due to certain architectural and devotional changes of fashion. The placing of bodies or relics of the martyrs *under* the altar, in imitation of Rev. vi. 9, goes back certainly to the fourth century, probably to pre-Nicene times. In Merovingian France the usual Western desire to 'see' led to the relics being placed *upon* the altar in costly reliquaries, a cause of some inconvenience on the small square altars of the period. Ultimately they were placed on pedestals behind it, blocking the celebrant's access to his old position.

His consequent coming round to the front involved certain changes of ceremonial. The bishop kept his throne, the symbol of his teaching office; but it was now placed on the gospel side between the altar and the people, to give him easy access to his new position at the front of the altar while making it possible for him still to see and address the people from his throne. He continued as of old to conduct the synaxis sitting on his throne, but in this new position, only going to the altar at the offertory. The presbyter, having as such no teaching office, abandoned the use of the chair and began to conduct all that part of the synaxis which concerned him at the altar itself, only retiring to a seat on the epistle side to listen to such parts of the synaxis as formed the special 'liturgy' of the lesser ministers—the lections and chants. Thus was developed one obvious difference between the eucharist as celebrated by a bishop and by a presbyter—that the bishop as in pre-Nicene times continued to preside over the synaxis from his throne, though its position had been altered in many churches; the presbyter now conducted the synaxis, so far as concerned his own 'liturgy' in it—the prayers—from the altar itself like the eucharist.[2] And because presbyter celebrants were now far more numerous than episcopal ones, from the people's point of view this became the normal thing, and the bishop's ceremonial a peculiar and exceptional thing.

In a work by Alcuin's pupil, Rabanus Maurus, we get for the first time a description of a celebration by a single presbyter, assisted by a deacon and sub-deacon and other ministers, but much less elaborate than the old corporate rite of a bishop with the whole clergy and laity of his church.[3]

[1] A version of it was also the Lincoln use on festivals in mediaeval England.

[2] The frequent journeyings of the ministers to the *sedilia* in the first part of high mass are apt to seem to many people rather unnecessary. But historically it is the saying of any of this part of the rite at the altar which is the innovation, and the sessions at the *sedilia* which represent the continuance of ancient custom.

[3] Rabanus Maurus, *de Institutione Clericorum*, I, 23.

This is presented as being now the normal way of performing the rite, which every cleric ought to know. As he describes it, it is clearly a deliberate simplification of the bishop's rite of the *Ordo Romanus* made for the ordinary parish church. But it is equally clearly the essential outline of that rite which the middle ages called high mass. The modern Roman ceremonial has preserved it very much as Rabanus Maurus describes it in the ninth century. Some of the mediaeval French rites complicated it a good deal with symbolical ceremonies of the kind always dear to the Gallican mind, and also with a good deal of what appears to the modern taste mere fuss.[1] But these are only the characteristics of the Roman and Gallican types all through history. What is important is that high mass, whatever its particular brand of ceremonial, is in essence an early mediaeval simplification of the old bishop's rite, for the public liturgy conducted by a *single* presbyter. High mass is the 'public' half of the consequences of a very important change which had been going on slowly for centuries in the West without attracting any attention at all. *Concelebration* by a number of presbyters with or without a bishop *was falling out of use*. By the thirteenth century, though S. Thomas Aquinas fully recognises the principle,[2] it had become a survival confined chiefly to ordinations, when the newly ordained priests still concelebrate with the bishop to this day in the West.

The old corporate eucharist was not normally celebrated daily in pre-Nicene times. The fourth century had greatly increased the frequency of celebrations by its elaboration of the calendar. A daily celebration, like the daily offices, had been introduced in Africa in S. Augustine's time, though not all Western churches had yet followed this example. Rome especially was slow to adopt a *daily* eucharist as such, keeping the rite for those days on which the calendar provided a special commemoration, feast or fast. There was not even an official eucharist on quite every day in Lent at Rome until the seventh century. (The East has remained at this stage officially down to this day, though a daily liturgy was not unknown in monastic churches, and even some secular churches, in Russia before 1914.) But even this daily liturgy, where it had come in, is still in the fifth century a single corporate concelebration by the bishop and all his presbyters assisted by all the deacons, etc., though naturally the majority of the laity could not be present at so full a rite on weekdays. Some individuals are known to have celebrated daily in the fifth and sixth centuries as a matter of devotion (just as some of the laity communicated daily). But these are chiefly bishops, who doubtless celebrated publicly for their churches.[3]

The real change comes with the breakdown of the bishop's 'stational'

[1] A Dominican high mass is the nearest modern survival of these rites, being a simplification of the thirteenth century rite of Paris. It can be witnessed *e.g.* at Haverstock Hill or Blackfriars, Oxford.

[2] *S. Th.*, III, lxxxii, 2.

[3] A useful collection of the early evidence on daily celebration is found in *Sacrificial Priesthood* by Fr. Joseph Barker, C.R., London, 1941.

liturgy as an effective system, which occurs in different regions at different times. As churches multiplied, presbyters more and more become not concelebrants with their bishop or occasional deputies to celebrate the 'stational' liturgy in his absence, but permanent delegates who are the normal celebrants for a detached congregation in a 'parish church', which the bishop only occasionally visits. Once the 'liturgy' of the christian eucharistic 'high-priesthood' has become a regular part of the presbyter's office as such, as it had always been a part of the bishop's, the same devotional tendency which had led to a daily corporate eucharist for the communion of the laity and the daily exercise of the various 'liturgies' of all the orders, inevitably led the earnest presbyter to wish to celebrate daily that he might exercise his 'liturgy' fully.

The practice develops most markedly in the Frankish churches, partly because the 'stational' system had never been fully effective in the large Frankish dioceses with their many rural churches, partly because a larger proportion of monks in the Frankish monasteries of the seventh century seems to have been in priest's orders than was commonly the case elsewhere. Presbyters are much more numerous than bishops everywhere. The desire of many individual presbyters to fulfil their own 'liturgy' frequently cannot be met if each is to have the full assistance needed for high mass. The solution is 'low mass'—the simplification of high mass in order to multiply possibilities of celebrating by discarding all assistance but that of a single minister to answer the priest. The reference to 'morning masses' as opposed to the 'public mass' by the Council of Vaison suggests that something like this was already well known in the South of France in A.D. 529.

A second cause is the desire of individuals or groups among the laity to have the eucharist offered for a special reason. There had always been occasions which the church reckoned desirable for the eucharist which did not properly concern the whole church, *e.g.* weddings and funerals. If the eucharist is that act by which Jesus of Nazareth brought Himself and all His circumstances finally under the realised Kingship (or into the Kingdom) of God,[1] then it is right that those who are His members should seek to bring themselves and particular circumstances which affect their whole individual life (*e.g.* marriage, sickness) under that Kingship, by a deliberate entering into His act. Even though the whole church is not concerned with them in this, they do so as members of His Body, with and through the authorised representative of that Body. The rise of the Western variable prayers had opened to the liturgy a great opportunity of direct association with and consecration of the joys and sorrows and cares of daily life. The old Gel. books to a special extent, and all the Western rites of the sixth century to some extent, had provided a large number of 'votives', special sets of variable prayers 'for travellers', 'for the sick', 'against judges acting

[1] *Cf. p.* 75.

unjustly', 'for the amending of a quarrel', and so on—for just such semi-private occasions and needs, to be used on days when the calendar prescribed no special observance.

Partly in gratitude for the special prayers of the clergy in this way, partly to secure them, the laity presented alms and endowments to monasteries and parochial churches, and the clergy repaid their generosity with such offerings of the eucharist for the special intentions of the benefactor. One result is the Frankish addition to the original Roman text of the canon of the clause *'for whom we offer or* who offer for themselves'.[1] Here we have the seemingly innocent root of the whole unsatisfactory system of mass-stipends, and also of something much more important. When the priest offers the eucharist with and in the midst of the laity concerned (as the Roman text presupposes) he is still fulfilling a 'liturgy' in a corporate action, even when the occasion is 'private' and does not concern the whole church. But when he offers it for absent benefactors (as the Frankish text presupposes) the conception has shifted—or is liable to shift—a good deal. The eucharist is becoming something which the priest does *for*, not *with*, the laity, even though they are 'with' him in spirit and he does it at their request.

We are in fact getting near the practical divorce of those complementary ideas of the corporate offering and the priesthood of the priest, whose combination is essential to any organic doctrine of the church as well as of the eucharist. Without it the eucharist is turned into something which a priest alone can do simply in virtue of his personal possession of holy orders, without sufficient regard had to the fact that the eucharist is the corporate act of the church. To this, indeed, his 'order' is necessary; but it is only one 'order' within a hierarchical unity which is incomplete without the co-operation of the other 'orders' in the organic Body of Christ. The addition of a theory which assigned a value and efficacy to this special sacerdotal offering separate from (though dependent on) that of Calvary (as *e.g.* that the sacrifice of each mass by a priest did away venial sin, as the sacrifice of Calvary did away mortal sin) was all that was needed for the whole conception to become obviously different.

Lay Religion in the Dark and Middle Ages

We have to add, moreover, the further disturbance of the primitive understanding of the rite brought about by the general cessation of lay communions, for which the mediaeval Latin church cannot be held altogether responsible. It had begun in the East in the fourth century, in deference to the new Syrian devotional emphasis on the 'fear' and 'awe' attaching to the consecrated sacrament. It spread to the churches of Gaul in the fifth century, where it occasioned frequent remonstrances, but in

[1] *Cf. p.* 501. (Frankish addition italicised.)

vain. S. Paul's word 'eateth and drinketh judgement (*krima*) unto himself' (1 Cor. xi. 29) interpreted, perhaps over-pessimistically, as 'condemnation', led to an over-emphasis on the *achieved* high state of sanctity required of the christian communicant rather than the earnestness of his desire to achieve it, and 'the food of men wayfaring' came to be looked upon rather as the reward of the saints, so far as the laity were concerned.

It was a turn of spirituality which had in the end many grave consequences, but it had at least a partial explanation in the state of the times. The population of the empire in the fourth century may have been exhausted and corrupt, but it was at least still intelligent. Where an individual's will and moral sense could be touched through his mind he could be brought to an understanding of the responsibilities of the christian communicant. The increasing collapse of civilisation in the fifth century presented the church with the problem of hordes of immigrant barbarians who though vigorous were for centuries manifestly incapable of even the intellectual exercise necessary to build a stone building larger than a hut, and also of whole populations of Roman provincials already more or less christian but rapidly sinking back to the intellectual level of their conquerors. The almost incredible childishness of thought and language to which a man of real ability like S. Caesarius of Arles found it necessary to descend in explaining the creed to adult catechumens early in the sixth century is very revealing when compared with the intelligent sort of simplicity with which men like Augustine and Ambrose had found it possible to discharge the same duty a century or so before.

The barbarians followed their chiefs submissively into the fold of the church, which was thereby enabled to continue to work for a christian society. But that did not in fact make them responsible christians. Their mass-movements into christianity or from Arianism to orthodoxy did not betoken any sort of change of heart. Instead, many of them began to add the vices of the decadent provincial populations with which they were now mingling to the unthinking brutalities of the healthy savage. It is only when one has studied the depressing literature of the *Penitentials* or manuals for confessors; or the horrible domestic annals of the Merovingian princes with their monotonous record of parricides, adulteries, casual murders and unending civil wars; or the history of the Lombard wars; all of which present us with a practical view of the human material with which the church then had to work—it is only then that one understands the reason for the rigorist spirit in which the church of the dark ages approached the question of preparation for communion. It may have been the wrong line to adopt, but the alternative is not easy to contemplate. The sordidness of conduct in those times has to be studied to be believed.

One may, of course, blame the church for accepting these mass-conversions in the fifth and sixth centuries. Certainly the standard of instruction and of sincerity required was much lower than it had been in the fourth.

But again one must remember that the church's own resources for giving instruction had been immensely decreased by the very catastrophes which increased the need of it. The decline of the schools in the West was one of the first consequences of the barbarian invasions; there was no longer a large well-educated class from which an intelligent clergy could be recruited. Such intellectual life as remained the church had now to provide for the world, instead of—as in the fourth century—the educated world providing a constant stimulus and material for the church. The conversion of the barbarians could not, indeed, have been brought about by intellectual processes; it had to be the work of sheer faithfulness and goodness by men of God, like Martin and Patrick and Remigius and Boniface, who were wise but not learned. To have refused the mass-conversions when they came would have been not only impossible but wrong. The barbarians were everywhere the masters of the situation. To have excluded them from the church if they were willing to enter it would have been to close the only door to any bettering of the conditions.

The fifth century church is, I think, more open to attack in principle than that of the fourth on the ground of accepting easy conversions, but not more so if the practical facts of the situation are taken into account. In both cases it is very hard to see how the situation could have been differently handled than it was. But the consequences were serious. All through the dark and middle ages there is an immense drab mass of nominal christianity in the background, looming behind the radiant figures of the saints and the outstanding actions of the great men and women who make up the colourful foreground of the history—a mass of ignorance, squalor and poverty on which no one made any deep impression before S. Francis. A noble and faithful pastoral work must, indeed, have been done by the nameless and rustic clergy of the dark ages and the early mediaeval parish priests. Otherwise the civilisation that flowered in a S. Thomas, a Dante, a S. Louis could never have sprung from the conditions of the sixth century, and the faith would never have been transmitted as it was. The people came to church in the dark ages, or most of them did, and morals and manners were in the course of centuries to some degree tranquillised. But down to the end of the middle ages this great lay mass, the product of the mass-conversions, was never fully absorbed by the church.

Perhaps when it got to church there was not enough preaching. The Reformers thought not, though there was certainly more than the Reformers said there had been, particularly after the thirteenth century. But there is an aspect of the remains of mediaeval sermon literature which I have never seen mentioned, though it seems to stand out from almost every collection I have read. There is very little of this comparatively large class of literature which is concerned with instruction. In nearly all of it the note of moral exhortation is sounded clearly and continually. There are attempts to arouse the people's emotions by descriptions of the passion and various

other incidents of the life of our Lord like the nativity, some of which are very moving. But always the end is to move the *will* to goodness, to moral endeavour. The good conduct inculcated is described plainly and practically enough. But there is hardly ever an attempt to make the people *understand* their religion, to instruct them 'apologetically', so to speak, in the faith. No doubt, the faith was not publicly questioned; there was no need for defence. But this lack of the element of instruction in preaching meant that the mediaeval layman's religion was necessarily a very ignorant religion. One may say that the clergy were leaving the people in their ignorance and superstitions; or one may say that in putting this emphasis on right conduct with a population still for the most part unlettered and very barbarous the clergy were putting first things first. It is a fact that the sudden stop put to any preaching but protestant polemics in the reign of Edward VI led to an open and general collapse of morals in England, which the Reformers themselves lamented in no measured terms. It is also a fact that the people's astonishing ignorance of the real teaching of the traditional catholicism was one of the Reformers' most powerful weapons against the old religion. Here I believe are the proofs both of the virtue and the weakness of mediaeval preaching and of the church's traditional method of dealing with the nominal christian mass.

Lay Communions

It is only when we bear in mind this situation of a very large proportion of the laity from the fifth century onwards that the history of lay communion becomes really intelligible. So we find in the sermons of S. Caesarius of Arles *c.* A.D. 500–530 a curious contradiction. He makes strong appeals to the laity to come more often to communion, but there are other indications that he really does doubt whether a lot of them ought to. He has vigorous denunciations of open evil living among those who do come to communion; there is a continual firm insistence on the need of penitence before communicating—and it is a practical penitence which will do something towards amendment of life at once. The Council of Agde (A.D. 506) at which he presided, felt bound to be content with the statement that those who will not communicate at least at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost 'are not to be accounted catholics'. Even this standard was found to be too high, and later Gallican councils are content with the rule of once a year at Easter. At Rome itself the tradition of a general communion of the people on all Sundays and great feasts persisted in the eighth century,[1] and even in the eleventh century Roman clergy brought up in the urban tradition like Pope Gregory VII were still encouraging the laity to frequent communion. With the retention of the people's communion, Rome still retained

[1] Bede, *Ep.* II

the rite of the people's offering of bread and wine, and the general sense that the eucharist was a corporate rite.

Elsewhere in the West holy communion became practically a clerical and monastic monopoly after the fifth century. The position improved in the twelfth century, and frequent communion for all was at least recognised as theoretically desirable by thirteenth century theologians like S. Thomas[1] and S. Bonaventura,[2] though with some hesitation as to those for whom it is helpful. Again one feels the difficulty arising from the recognition of the great mass of nominal christianity which comes to church. From that time on, monthly, weekly and in some cases daily communion for devout layfolk is by no means unknown. But it is clear from a good many incidents in the lives of the saints that right down to the sixteenth century the mere fact of frequency was apt to arouse suspicion of extravagance or illuminism. It remained true, broadly speaking, of even later mediaeval religion, that the priest as such was normally the only communicant.

The seriousness of this disappearance of lay communion was increased by the fact that partaking of communion had always been so closely linked in the West with the right of *offering*. When the layman ceased to communicate, he ceased as a matter of course to have an active part in the offertory; and when the partial recovery of lay communion came in the twelfth-thirteenth centuries, the custom had lapsed, and the layman's offering of bread and wine at the offertory was not recovered. Thus along with the increased emphasis on 'consecration' (the 'liturgy' of the celebrant alone) there went a parallel movement by which the layman lost all active participation in the rest of the rite, the offertory and the communion—his 'liturgy'. He became a mere spectator and listener, without a 'liturgy' in the primitive sense at all.

Later Mediaeval Eucharistic Devotion

If we put together all these things—the isolation of the priesthood of the priest from the corporate offering; the false theory of a separate value of the sacrifice of the mass from the sacrifice of Calvary; the elimination of the layman's 'liturgy' of offering and communion, which makes the holy communion (in practice) a part of the celebrant's 'liturgy' and nobody else's; the reduction of the laity's part in the rite to 'seeing' and 'hearing' (the latter being reduced very much in importance through the use of Latin, which placed an over-emphasis on 'seeing' the consecrated sacrament);—and in consequence of all these, the placing of the whole devotional emphasis in the rite on the consecration and conversion of the elements—if we put all these things together, we can see what the mediaeval liturgical development is doing. It is steadily building up the material for all the doctrinal controversies about the eucharist in the sixteenth century. And I believe

[1] *S. Th.*, III, lxxx, 10

[2] *In IV Sent., dist.* xii, *ptm.* ii *art.* 2, *q.* 2.

that it can be shewn that in all their mistakes the Reformers were the victims—as they were the products—of the mediaeval deformations they opposed.

At all events this was the mediaeval Western presentation of the rite: 1. On occasions, pontifical mass, a form recognisably derived from the way of doing the eucharist practised in the pre-Nicene church. 2. High mass, an eighth–ninth century simplification of 1. which retained much of the old corporate character, being sung and allowing of the fulfilment of the separate 'liturgies' of all the 'orders', deacon, subdeacon, acolytes and laity as well as of the celebrant, in a single corporate act of worship. Nothing but custom prevented it from being the occasion of a general communion, though the custom was not often broken except in some monastic churches. Throughout the middle ages this was the official norm of the rite, its proper 'public' presentation—usual in well-equipped parish churches on all Sundays and holidays, and offered daily in cathedral and collegiate churches, in religious houses and even some large parish churches.[1] 3. Low mass—the devotional expedient of the individual presbyter for fulfilling his own 'liturgy' in the Body of Christ fully and frequently. As such it provided adequately for the fulfilment of no 'liturgy' but his own. The service was said in a low voice, and answered by a server, who was rather a convenience to enable the priest to perform the rite than an adequate substitute for the corporate concurrence of all the other 'orders' of the church in the action, which however in theory he did represent.

Nevertheless low mass was performed publicly, the laity could attend it —and it was short. Human nature being what it is, it was never unpopular. And it had certain advantages. It did—probably for the first time—make it possible for busy layfolk to be present at the eucharist on week-days if they wanted to. And they found in it a real way of assisting their own devotion. The quiet of low mass afforded the devout an excellent opportunity for using mentally the vernacular prayers which they substituted for the Latin text of the liturgy as their personal worship, which the corporate rite of high mass with its singing and music tended to distract.

Let us be quite clear what this last development really means. The old corporate worship of the eucharist is declining into a mere focus for the subjective devotion of each separate worshipper in the isolation of his own mind. And it is the latter which is beginning to seem to him more important than the corporate act. The part of the individual layman in that corporate action had long ago been reduced from 'doing' to 'seeing' and 'hearing'. Now it is retreating within himself to 'thinking' and 'feeling'. He is even beginning to think that over-much 'seeing' (ceremonial) and 'hearing' (music) are detrimental to proper 'thinking' and 'feeling'. While the catholic doctrines of the priesthood and the conversion of the elements were

[1] In England especially, special bequests were often made by parishioners to make this possible.

retained, the remnants of the corporate action still provided an objective centre which was identical for all present. But it needed only a continuation of the shift of emphasis for the eucharistic action itself to come to be regarded as a mere *occasion for* or accompaniment to the individual's subjective devotion and thoughts. This shift of emphasis was growing in the fifteenth century,[1] and it reached full development in the sixteenth. We call it 'the protestant conception of the eucharist'.

The logical development would have been to remove the external action altogether, and so leave the individual's mental appreciations of and reactions to the passion and the atonement in complete possession of the field. But official protestantism (apart from the Quakers) felt unable to do this, at all events for a long time. The tradition that the eucharist was the culminating point of christian worship was too strong to be overthrown at once. The New Testament represented our Lord as having instituted this action for His followers, and great attention had to be paid to that fact.

The Reformers themselves therefore tried hard to retain a central importance and meaning for the eucharist in christian worship. But in every case they failed to carry their followers with them. Throughout the churches of the Reformation the eucharist rapidly assumed the position of an occasional addition to a worship which ordinarily consisted only of praises, prayers, exhortation and reading, somewhat similar to that which the primitive church had considered suitable for the catechumens at the synaxis.

But it is noticeable that in orthodox protestantism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the general purpose and aim of this normal 'edifying' worship is concentrated on stimulating devout emotions and reactions in the minds of the worshippers to the thought and memory of *the passion and the atonement*, to the practical exclusion of all other aspects of the christian redemption. Anyone at all well acquainted with the fifteenth century devotional books for the use of the layfolk at low mass will find himself in a quite familiar atmosphere. It is too strong to say that protestant worship in its orthodox period represents no more than the layfolk's devotion at mass with the eucharistic action altogether removed. But that is only an exaggeration of a real and observable resemblance and derivation. And this derivation is even more clearly observable in the *devotional* ethos of the protestant eucharistic rites. Such a statement may well appear disconcerting to the modern catholic and protestant alike, conscious as they are of great doctrinal differences. Yet I believe this is true, as I have often had occasion to note in looking over devotional literature from the unreformed fifteenth and the very reformed sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We will not labour the point here, but give what may be a sufficient illustration of the fact in a separate note, to which I venture to draw special attention.[2]

[1] *Cf. p.* 249. [2] See *Additional Note, p.* 605.

Protestantism has in fact always been in a difficulty what to do with the eucharist, and whether or how to give it that central position in worship which it obviously held in the life of the primitive church. To criticise or even analyse the worship of one's fellow-christians is an invidious business, and I pray that I may write without offence. But it seems to me that the difficulty arises precisely out of the only meaning which protestantism *could* assign to the eucharist which did not contradict its own basic principle of 'justification by faith alone'—*viz.* that the service is a very specially solemn and moving *reminder* to all who attend it with faith of the passion and atonement of Christ, and so a valuable means of eliciting devout feelings of gratitude, love, confidence and union with Him in those who make use of His ordinance. To partake of the sacrament after His example is the most solemn pledge of re-dedication to God's service which His followers can give.

The difficulty with this view is that the eucharist thus simply duplicates the function of the normal *non*-eucharistic protestant worship. But this is complicated by a communion in bread and wine which, despite its traditional and recognised solemnity and sanctity, is difficult to relate specifically to the psychological reactions of the individual. After all, recollection of the passion and redemption, and loving aspirations of confidence and faith and union with our Lord, are commonplaces of every sincere christian's spiritual life, in no way limited to the performance of the eucharist. We all of us pledge ourselves afresh to the service of God 'in Christ' a dozen or a hundred times a day. Such devout thoughts often come more readily and are felt more intensely in the silence of solitary mental prayer than in the inevitably distracting presence of a number of other people. Of course, corporate worship in general supplies certain aids and values which solitary devotion cannot give. But unless the eucharistic action in itself *effects* something specific and *sui generis* both in the church which performs it corporately and in the individual who takes part, it is difficult to see why the eucharist should necessarily be preferred to other forms of corporate worship. Where its whole value and purpose is held to lie in the subjective effects it stimulates in the psychology of the individual, there is a good deal to be said for celebrating it infrequently. The added solemnity may increase its psychological effect, while a frequent repetition may lead to either over-familiarity or psychological strain. Given the general suspicion of any external forms and actions in worship common to all forms of puritanism, christian and non-christian alike; given, too, the particular reasons which protestantism had for denying any effect or value *ex opere operato* to this particular action; given the dogma of 'justification by faith *alone*'—there was every reason to expect that the eucharist would not be able to maintain either a predominance in protestant public worship or a central and unique place in the spiritual life of protestant individuals.

Its New Testament sanction and traditional position[1] as the centre of christian devotion secured for it a long continuance in high reverence, though infrequent practice, in most protestant churches. But when the original protestant insistence on the atonement by the Blood of Jesus had finally worn itself out in the nineteenth century, the eucharist with its emphasis on 'the Lord's death' became irrelevant to the general tone of protestant piety, which was openly replacing the doctrines of 'imputed righteousness' and 'salvation by the Blood of the Lamb' (with their old-world implications of sacrifice and atonement) by a new theory of ethical progress to be achieved by following the example of Christ's life, which was really derived from the nineteenth century theory of evolution.[2]

The way was thus cleared for that largely non-eucharistic piety of modern popular protestantism, in which the eucharist is an occasional and entirely optional appendage to a normal worship of 'edification'. A little conversation with most protestant laity, or even many ministers, will make it clear that in their eyes it is no longer the fact of being a communicant (or even of having been baptised) which constitutes a man a 'member' of their churches, but more or less regular attendance at this *non*-eucharistic worship, supplemented by the requirement in the case of some bodies that he shall have undergone certain subjective experiences and taken certain interior decisions constituting 'conversion'. 'Going to communion' is reckoned by them a *consequence* of these things, not these things of 'going to communion', as among catholics. All this seems a consistent development from the adoption of the principle of 'justification by faith alone'. What I am concerned to insist upon is that though it is at the opposite pole from the ideas about the eucharist of the primitive church, its *devotional* roots go back behind the Reformation to the practice of mediaeval Western eucharistic piety.[3] What the Reformation did was to take the mediaeval layman's *practice* of piety at the eucharist, centre it on the communion of which he had been deprived, and then transform the mediaeval practice into the protestant theory of what the eucharist must be.

It was not accidental that all the Reformers took as their model for the performance of the eucharist, not the primitive corporate action with its movement and singing, but the mediaeval Western development of low

[1] Probably the latter operated more powerfully on the protestant churches than they realised. Clear New Testament sanction (Mark vi. 13; James v. 14) did not, for instance, avail to save the rite of unction in protestantism anywhere.

[2] The exact process by which the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone' thus finally issued in a doctrine of 'justification by works' and 'it doesn't matter what a man believes provided he does what's right' would make a most interesting study.

[3] This is the chief reason why the East has never spontaneously produced anything similar to protestant ideas either in worship or doctrine, and never seems able to arrive even at a clear understanding of what protestantism is about. The latter is a movement which grows out of the special characteristics of mediaeval Latin catholicism, by way both of reaction and development. Without that particular background it must remain largely unintelligible to the patristic Eastern tradition.

mass—the 'simple said service' performed by a single minister, at which the people had only to look and listen and silently pray. When the English puritan divines spoke of 'the minister being appointed for the people in all publick services appertaining unto God, and the Holy Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments intimating the people's part in publick prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto'[1], they spoke, however unconsciously, out of a tradition built up by eight centuries of low masses.

Mediaeval Liturgy

Yet it would not be just to judge the mediaeval Western liturgy by the *régime* of low masses alone. They were a devotional by-product, even an unavoidable one, though one with momentous consequences. Rather our judgement must be based on the complete round of the liturgy as it was meant to be performed, not so much in a religious house[2] as in one of the great secular churches set in the midst of a busy city, like old S. Paul's or Notre Dame de Paris or the Duomo of Milan or the Dom of Cologne. There the day began with quite a large staff of clergy and clerks rising before dawn for the long office of mattins and lauds, to praise God on behalf of the citizens before the city's day could be spoiled by sin. All through the day the public recitation of the Hours of the office followed one another to the *Nunc dimittis* of compline, voicing prayer and penitence and praise on behalf of the whole population working in the streets around the church—making the sign of the cross continually over the city's daily bread. But the centre of it all was the mass. The thirty or forty low masses going on continually through the earlier hours of the morning were offered for the special intentions of individuals, and they made it possible for any who wished to join in the central act of christian living before daily work began. The chapter high mass, offered corporately and solemnly every day in the name of every christian soul in the diocese, lifted to God and brought under His kingship the cares and joys and troubles and work of the whole christian people as members of Christ.

It may have been a great burden of worship for those who offered it to bear easily, especially with the additions of the Office of our Lady and the Office of the Dead which the ninth and tenth centuries had unconsideringly added to the daily round. Few mediaeval visitations failed to reveal

[1] *Exceptions* of the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, §3 (Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences, etc.*, 1840, *p.* 305). I owe this quotation to the kindness of the Rev. E. C. Ratcliff.

[2] The monk always remained something of an individualist, a man who had chosen for himself a life of personal communion with God. Though his corporate worship was offered for and with the church, it was essentially directed towards, and the product of, that personal inward life. The canon of a secular church had a different function. His *business* was public worship as such. He was maintained by society to carry on public worship for the public, as society's representative.

evidence of routine and formalism and sometimes downright irreverence in such corporations. Yet there is this to be said: Society at large supported these quite considerable bodies of men in leisure for continual public worship, because it was then convinced that God *ought* to be assiduously praised and thanked for the redemption of the world through our Lord Jesus Christ. Of course, where the substance of worship is held to lie in the sincerity of the individual's interior response to God and his own *consciousness* of that response, the whole conception of such a 'worship by representatives' will seem meaningless or worse. Protestantism has been consistent in its general abandonment of a liturgical worship offered on behalf of society. Its public worship is held not as representative of society, but as an opportunity for each of the individuals in society to attend and be 'edified' for himself in company with the others. But mediaeval men had not a purely subjective notion of worship; it was still for them, as for the primitive church, largely something 'done'. Nor had they arrived at the notion of society as essentially composed of isolated individuals. On their own grounds they too were consistent in what they did.

It is a historical mistake to idealise and romanticise the middle ages. The ordinary mediaeval man lived in a world which was horribly uncomfortable and dangerous, very poor in material resources, and also very sinful. And he knew all that quite well. But his literature, from the popular literature of the ballads up to the great works of genius, reveals a world that was hopeful nevertheless, and had a great zest for living. Our own world is also uncomfortable and dangerous; it is much better equipped with material resources, though it has made poverty its nightmare. And it is reluctantly returning to the conviction that it is sinful. But it is hardly what one would call hopeful, and it has a fear of living. This is because our world has forgotten or has ceased to believe that it has been redeemed.

It is probable that the conventional religion of most men in the 'Ages of Faith' went not much deeper really than the conventional irreligion of most men to-day. Yet religion did penetrate all human life then with a hopefulness and a purpose beyond its human littleness which it is very hard to imagine in our secularised society. That continual solemn and public rendering of society's worship and thanksgiving for redemption in the choirs of christendom by day and night did keep the fact of redemption before men's thoughts continually. Any setting aside and maintenance of large delegations of men for the *business* of public worship, to *do* it on behalf of their fellows continually (as others, *e.g.*, judges, mathematical dons, soldiers, etc., are set aside and maintained for other apparently uneconomic functions) does in itself glorify God and edify men and sanctify life, because it publicly acknowledges in the most obvious way the claim of the spirit over the body and of God over all the temporal living of men But the mediaeval public liturgy of the West did more. By making the corporate eucharist its daily centre it asserted to the world in an unique way

the dogmatic fact that in and through Jesus of Nazareth *alone* those claims are completely fulfilled. The mediaeval devotional approach to the eucharist was seriously defective in more than one way. But so far as its public use of the liturgy is concerned—what else is this but the meaning of S. Paul's 'Ye do proclaim the Lord's death'?

ADDITIONAL NOTE

MEDIAEVAL EUCHARISTIC DEVOTIONS FOR LAYFOLK AND THE PROTESTANT CONCEPTION OF THE EUCHARIST

THE point outlined on *p.* 600 may quite well appear paradoxical, and could only be decisively proved by a somewhat elaborate survey of the literature. But it may be illustrated—sufficiently, I hope, to set others to work to examine the matter for themselves—by two books which happen, by no pre-arranged selection, to be within reach of my hand as I sit and write.

The first is a little collection of fifteenth century English mass-devotions for layfolk, entitled *Langforde's Meditations in the Time of Mass* (edited by J. Wickham Legg in his Volume of *Tracts on the Mass*, H.B.S. 1904, *pp.* 19 *sqq.*). There is no need to give the whole work, or to retain the fifteenth century spelling. We know nothing of 'B. Langforde' save that he was an Englishman, and presumably a priest, who was anxious to give his people 'Meditations for ghostly exercise in the time of mass'. For him in 'the process of the mass is represented the very process of the passion of Christ'. 'Let this' (*i.e.* the mass) 'be your *daily meditation*, to stir you to the diligent and compendious remembrance of the passion of Christ'. 'Our intent is to move souls to the devotion of the mass and to the loving remembrance of the passion of Christ.' Here are specimens of his method:

'At the offertory when the priest doth take the chalice and hold it up and forms the oblation:

'Have meditation how our Lord, the Saviour of all mankind, most willingly offered Himself to His eternal Father, to be the sacrifice and oblation for man's redemption; and offer yourself to Him in return both body and soul, which He so dearly bought. Rendering in recognition of the same to His grace by devout meditation all the thanks of your heart, that it would please His goodness to be the ransom for your trespass and sins.'

(At the beginning of the canon:)

'Have you in hearty meditation the process of our Lord's Maundy with all the ceremonies of meekness which His grace did in His own Person shew for our information. In the which Maundy He did feed His disciples with His precious Body and Blood, consecrated under the form of bread and wine. So every man and woman that is in grace both the living†and

the dead†may be refreshed by that blessed sacrament. For not only it reneweth and feedeth by grace and augmentation of the same the souls of them that living do duly†honour†it†but also it is remission of pain an indulgence to all the souls that be in purgatory† . . . Therefore with pure heart and contrite soul in all your whole affection and love honour this blessed sacrament to the profit of your own soul, your friends and all Christian souls, both quick†and dead†. . . .'

(After the elevation:)

'Call to remembrance and imprint inwardly in your heart by holy meditation the whole process of the passion from the Maundy (last supper) unto the point of Christ's death; first the prayer in the garden where in great agony He sweated blood and water . . .' Then follows a detailing of the sufferings of the passion, charmingly phrased—'with a garland of sharpe thornes crownyd and a reed for a septur of golde'—and all obviously directed to arousing the emotions of the layfolk using it. This 'is a meditation of sweetness unspeakable to them that inwardly can consider it, and in the same to remember . . . the great mercy and tender charity of Him that did vouchsafe to suffer that confusion for our sakes. This I commend to your memory, trusting that ye will give thanks to our Lord therefor with all your heart . . . the Son of God suffered for us all the night before, labouring in watch, pain and abstinence, in great silence, patience and meekness, like a lamb among lions, wolves and dogs, labouring all that long time in the winepress of His blessed passion. I tarry the longer and make repetition of this foresaid meditation, because it should not lightly pass over, but rather be graved in the soul of man and imprinted in his heart . . .'

(At the Our Father) 'in which prayer are vii petitions contained', . . . 'remember the vii words of great mystery which our Lord did speak hanging quick upon the cross in His great agony, distress and pain of death; and specially follow the example of that holy word in the which He prayed for His enemies, . . . See now that you likewise forgive all enmities, displeasures, wrongs and occasions for the love of Him that thus meekly and mercifully did forgive His trespassers. Then shall you be His disciples, then shall you be the chosen vessels apt to receive His grace, and both meet and able to receive the fruit of this most blessed sacrament . . .'

(At the Pax:)

'Remember the peace betwixt God and man which our blessed Saviour did merit for us in His blessed death, reconciling us to His Father in heaven, God omnipotent. . . . Wherefore remit all enmities, whether they be ministered of superiors or inferiors, and evenly dispose you at this time of the mass in a charitable, contrite and clean heart to receive our Lord spiritually, and so by Him to receive all these great benefits rehearsed . . .'

(At the Agnus Dei:)

'Have in meditation with perfect remembrance and your whole mind,

considering the most tender mercy and love of our sweet Lord and Redeemer Jesu ... to suffer in our nature most shameful, terrible and cruel death, and all to win our love. Which precious death is signified at this time of the mass in the oblation of the blessed Body and Blood of our most merciful Saviour ministered to us under the savour and taste of bread and wine.... For like as bread and wine be those things which most conveniently sustain and relieve the necessities of the body, so our blessed Lord will give unto us under the qualities and taste of bread and wine His blessed Body and Blood as most convenient and wholesome food, to restore and relieve all the necessities of soul and body unto everlasting glory ...'

We may leave it at that, with this anticipation of the Anglican Catechism to emphasise the point. First, excepting perhaps the three little phrases I have obelised, is there anything in these manly, devout and thoroughly evangelical meditations of the unreformed fifteenth century which the sternest protestant that ever came out of Ulster could conscientiously refuse to use? Do they not rather anticipate many of the actual phrases of our own *liturgy* as well as our eucharistic devotional books? Secondly—and this is important—all this admirable devotional exercise is suggested by and accompanies the eucharistic action, *but it is no part of it*. It goes on entirely within the individual worshipper's own mind. Meanwhile the liturgical action, performed exclusively by the priest and server, proceeds in front of the layman in complete detachment from him. What preoccupies his devotion is the *different* thought of the passion as it historically happened, and his own subjective reactions to that. He does not even join in the Lord's prayer as such; it only reminds him of the seven words from the cross! Except as the occasion for the meditation, the liturgy might just as well not be happening at all. I submit that a churchful of worshippers each silently contemplating the passion and atonement in his or her own mind, and each forming devout affections upon that, while a priest and server offer the eucharist inaudibly and in another tongue, is very near a different thing altogether from the corporate action of the primitive eschatological rite. The prayers of the liturgy treat of many aspects indeed of christian truth besides the passion, but the devotion of the worshippers takes no account of them. They do not communicate, but make a 'spiritual communion'—which all ascetic authors tell us not only can but *should* be repeated frequently during the day in all sorts of circumstances, not only at the liturgy. What has the liturgy here to do with the layman's worship? Only at one point in 'Langforde' does it impinge actively upon his exercises—at the elevation—when he is told '*If it like you* ye may say ... this little orison', and there follows a short act of adoration. 'In the second elevation at *your pleasure* ye may say thus ...' and there follows a salutation to 'the precious Blood of our redeemer, the pledge of our eternal inheritance.... Blessed be my Lord God Jesus Christ from Whose side thou wast shed for the redemption of the world'. The whole meditation is concerned with the atonement,

but at the one point where this might be closely connected with the progress of the liturgy, the connection is left entirely optional! Yet in fact the introduction of the ceremony of the elevation had originally come about in order that it might be possible for the laity to *see* the consecrated sacrament, and at least then relate their private devotions to the supposedly corporate action. If this tradition of subjective individual devotion to the passion and atonement were to be maintained, and the catholic doctrines of the priesthood and the conversion of the elements were to be removed, what need could there be for maintaining the performance of the eucharist as the centre of christian worship? It would surely be inevitable that some form of worship more closely directed to the stimulation of devout affections on the passion would be found more suitable. So it was—after the Reformation.

The other document which happens to be to hand is *The Reformed Liturgy* which Baxter and his fellow puritans put forward at the time of the Savoy Conference as a preferable alternative to that of the Book of Common Prayer.[1] It is of portentous length; even the prayer for the king occupies forty-six lines. And in accordance with puritan principles the part of the people is markedly 'only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto'. Even the Nicene Creed (for which 'sometimes' the Athanasian is to be substituted) is to be recited by the minister alone, and the Ten Commandments are to be recited without any intervening responses by the people. The minister also says the 'Confession of Sin' for the people (three and a half pages) preceded by the recitation of fourteen texts 'for the right affecting the People and moving them to a penitent believing Confession'—('Uncomfortable Words'?). Instead of an absolution it is followed by the Lord's prayer (said by the minister alone), and nine more texts as 'Comfortable Words' and a further series of eighteen texts (some of three or four verses) that they may 'Hear what you must be and do for the time to come if you would be saved.'

In that part of the rite which corresponds to the eucharist proper of the primitive church, the congregation never once open their mouths except to receive holy communion. It begins with a long 'Explication of the Nature, Use and Benefits of this Sacrament' addressed to the congregation, to be used at the discretion of the minister, which is of interest for our purpose:

'The Lord's Supper, then, is an holy sacrament instituted by Christ, wherein bread and wine being first by consecration made sacramentally, or representatively the Body and Blood of Christ, are used by breaking and pouring out to represent and commemorate the sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood upon the Cross . . . and they are received eaten and drunk by the church to profess that they willingly receive Christ Himself to their justification, sanctification and glorification; and to signify and solemnise

[1] Baxter, *Works*, *ed.* Orme, 1830, vol. xv., *pp.* 451 *sqq.*

the renewal of their covenant with Him and their holy communion with Him and with one another . . . we offer and deliver to Him ourselves as His redeemed sanctified people to be a living acceptable sacrifice . . .

'The holy qualifications to be before provided, and in receiving exercised, and after receiving, are these:

'1. A true belief in the articles of the Christian faith . . . (Trinity and Incarnation.)

'2. The sense of our sinful and undone condition . . . so as humbly to loathe ourselves for our transgression.

'3. A true desire after Christ for pardon . . .

'4. A thankful sense of the wonderful love of God . . .

'5. The exercise of holy love and joy in the sense of this unspeakable love; if these two be not felt before we come, yet in and after the sacrament we must strive to exercise them.

'6. A love to one another and forgiving wrongs to one another . . .

'7. The giving up ourselves in covenant to God . . .

'8. A patient hope for the coming of Christ Himself and of the everlasting kingdom . . .

'The benefit of the sacrament is not to be judged of by present experience and feeling, but by faith . . . whatever we feel at present, we may and must believe that we sincerely wait not on Him in vain'.

This is followed by a long 'Exhortation' in a fervent strain, '. . . See here Christ dying in this holy representation. Behold the sacrificed Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world! It is His will to be thus frequently crucified before your eyes. O how should we be covered with shame and loathe ourselves, that have both procured the death of Christ by sin and sinned against it! And how should we all be filled with joy, that have such mysteries of mercy opened and so great salvation freely offered to us! O hate sin, O love this Saviour . . .' and so on for two pages. Then follows a further two-page prayer of contrition and for pardon and that we may *feel* all these emotions: 'O love us freely and say unto our souls that Thou art our salvation . . . receive us graciously to the feast Thou hast prepared for us, cause us to hunger and thirst after Christ. . . . Give us to know Thy love in Christ which passeth knowledge . . . let us rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory . . . speak and seal up peace to our sinful wounded souls . . .', and so on. I do not think it will be denied that all this is primarily directed to evoking emotions in those present, and that the object is simply a meditation on the passion. It is a purely subjective devotion, just like that of Langforde's *Meditations*; and the emotions aimed at are the same and have the same object. The difference is that while Langforde's devotions are intended to accompany an objective liturgy, Baxter's have replaced it and become themselves the liturgy.

After this we come to the eucharistic action itself.

'*Here let the Bread be brought to the Minister and received by him and set*

upon the Table and then the Wine in like manner . . . let him bless them, praying in these or the like words:

'Almighty God, Thou art the Creator and the Lord of all things. Thou art the Sovereign Majesty we have offended: Thou art our most loving and merciful Father, Who hast given Thy Son to reconcile us to Thyself, Who hath ratified the New Testament and Covenant of Grace with His most precious Blood; and hath instituted this holy Sacrament to be celebrated in remembrance of Him till His coming. Sanctify these Thy creatures of bread and wine which according to Thy institution and command we set apart to this holy use, that they may be sacramentally the Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ. Amen.

'*Then (or immediately before this Prayer) let the Minister read the Words of the Institution saying:* 'Hear what the Apostle Paul saith: For I have received of the Lord . . . (1 Cor. xi. 23–6).

'*Then let the Minister say:*

'This bread and this wine being set apart and consecrated to this holy use by God's appointment, are now no common bread and wine but sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ.' [There follows a brief prayer for 'the pardon of our sins and Thy quickening Spirit without which the flesh will profit us nothing'.]

'*Then let the Minister take the bread and break it in the sight of the people saying:*

'The Body of Christ was broken for us and offered once for all to sanctify us: Behold the sacrificed Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.

'*In like manner let him take the Cup and pour out the Wine in the sight of the Congregation, saying:*

'We were redeemed with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.'

[There follows a short prayer for a good communion addressed to the Holy Ghost.]

'*Then let the Minister deliver the Bread thus consecrated and broken to the Communicants, first taking and eating it himself as one of them, when he hath said:*

'Take ye, eat ye, This is the Body of Christ which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of Him.

'*In like manner he shall deliver them the Cup, first drinking of it himself, when he hath said:*

'This cup is the New Testament in Christ's Blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins, drink ye all of it in remembrance of Him.'

It is interesting to find that the eucharistic action takes just two pages of print out of the thirty-four occupied by the whole rite. It is, from the traditional standpoint, better arranged than Cranmer's,—offertory, consecration, fraction and communion following one another connectedly, with

only brief devotional prayers between, though both the dialogue and the whole 'thanksgiving' element, the original nucleus of the rite, have completely disappeared. But the contrast with the primitive rites comes out unmistakably in the facts, 1. That it is very far indeed from being a corporate action of the church. It is on the contrary designedly and thoroughly something which the minister alone does for the church; and something to which, so Baxter and his fellows contended, each minister must have it in his sole discretion whether he would *admit or refuse admission* to any individual. 2. That this eucharistic action, so far from being an entering into the eternal action of Christ, and as such addressed to God, is now a separate repetition of His action, addressed by the minister to the congregation, to stir up in them those interior resolutions and affections which have become the primary purpose of worship. Whatever relics of primitive language and form may remain, the primitive conception of the rite has wholly vanished. But (to me, at all events) any contrast of *type* with the mediaeval low mass is much less evident. As at a low mass said by the priest alone, the people meditate on the passion in silence, till the sacerdotally-consecrated victim is brought to their notice, by the priest with his action at the elevation, by the puritan with the words of his declaration. The communion of the people has been restored; the essential core of low mass has been put into a new setting of emotional prayers and exhortations. But Baxter's rite remains essentially low mass in all that distinguishes it from the primitive presentation of the rite. And even the 'devotional' setting fulfils precisely the purpose of the mediaeval layfolk's devotions. All that has happened is that now instead of being a private and silent accompaniment to the rite, these devotions have been made into the public and spoken substance of the rite.

Baxter's *Liturgy* concludes with a prayer of thanksgiving of a page and a half,—'with our thanks and praise (we) present ourselves a living sacrifice to be acceptable through Christ'—and an Exhortation: 'Dear brethren, we have been here feasted with the Son of God at His table, upon His Flesh and Blood in preparation for the feast of endless glory. You have seen here represented what sin deserveth, what Christ suffered, what wonderful love the God of infinite goodness hath expressed to us . . . O carry hence the lively sense of these great and excellent things upon your hearts . . .' and so forth; then comes a psalm followed by a blessing.

Looking at the proposals as a whole, the modern Anglican may well be puzzled as to what the puritan objections to the use of the Anglican Prayer Book in the seventeenth century really amounted to. Their 'Exceptions' put forward in 1660, though they make somewhat finical objections to some of the rubrics of its eucharistic rite, contain no sort of objection to its eucharistic doctrine.[1] And this, their desired alternative rite, is clearly

[1] The nearest they come to it is on the 'Prayer of Humble Access', in which the clause 'that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed

based on that of Cranmer against which they were protesting. To an Anglican it must read like a pathetically unpractical and verbose attempt to do again exactly what Cranmer had already done with much greater judgement and literary skill. But that is a thought which suggests that the contrast is not to be drawn between Baxter and Cranmer, but between both and Hippolytus or Sarapion, a question which requires separate consideration.

through His most precious Blood' moved them to the objection that 'these words seem to give a greater efficacy to the Blood than to the Body of Christ'. This is reasonable. The idea that the sacrament was instituted under both kinds, the Body for our bodies and the Blood for our souls, though it is grounded upon no warrant of holy scripture, is a fairly common speculation among mediaeval theologians (*cf. e.g.* Paschasius Radbert, *de Corp. et Sang. Dni*, 11; S. Thomas Aq., *S. Th.*, III, lxxiv, 1, etc.). Cranmer held strongly to this notion (*cf. p.* 644). But there is no particular reason why people should be made to *pray* mediaeval speculations in a Reformed church.