

## CHAPTER XII

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF CEREMONIAL

ONE result of the fourth century transformation of the eucharist into a fully public act is a certain elaboration of ceremony in its performance. This does not directly concern the subject of this book, since the Shape of the Liturgy by which the eucharistic action is performed is hardly affected by this. The *introit-chant*, which covered the processional entrance of the clergy, seems to be the only item in the outline of the rite which was introduced for purely ceremonial reasons. The eucharistic action and its meaning remained in themselves what they had always been. But the actual performance of the action is to a certain extent formalised in a new way in the fourth century. There is a new emphasis on its earthly and human aspect, consistent indeed with the acceptance of a mission to human society as such and that sanctification of social living in time which the church first undertook in the fourth century, but also a symptom of the decline of the old eschatological understanding of the rite.

Yet here also the Constantinian and post-Nicene church made no deliberate breach with the past and was quite unconscious of any new beginning. As we have seen, from the very fact that it was a corporate action the pre-Nicene eucharist had had an aspect of ceremony ever since the first formation of the liturgical eucharist apart from the supper, in that it required a good deal of concerted movement by all the various 'orders' of participants for its performance. This core of the action, which was everywhere the same, is in its origin wholly utilitarian—it is the simplest and most natural way of getting the corporate eucharistic action 'done'. But by the fourth century it had already hardened into something very like a traditional ritual by the mere passage of centuries. The post-Nicene church had obviously every intention of conserving this pre-Nicene body of customs intact, and it does in fact form the whole basis of the later eucharistic rites. But it soon began to be overlaid and accompanied by a variety of new customs. Some of these, like the solemn processional entry of the clergy at the beginning of the rite, were suggested quite naturally by the new public conditions of worship and its more formal setting. Others, like the *lavabo*, were deliberately symbolical, and intended to remind the worshippers in various ways of the solemnity of what they were about. These may be innovations, but they seem natural products of the new situation. Now that not only the spiritually sensitive but the average man and woman were increasingly becoming regular attendants at christian worship, the introduction of such reminders of its solemnity was a necessary part of the church's care for her members. The Reformers of the sixteenth century,

who regarded the eucharist primarily as something 'said' by the clergy, set themselves to achieve exactly the same object by prescribing solemn and lengthy 'exhortations' to be said by the minister to the worshippers (of which specimens still remain to us in the 'Long' and 'Short Exhortations' of the Prayer Book rite). The fourth century church took more literally the command 'Do this in remembrance of Me', and therefore addressed such reminders to the people by symbolical gestures and actions rather than by words. But the purpose in both cases is exactly the same. It is the change made by regarding the rite as something 'said' and not something 'done' (which is essentially the work of the Latin middle ages and not of the Reformers) that makes it difficult for modern Western christians, protestant and catholic alike, to enter immediately into the mind of the early church.

Mr. A. D. Nock in his brilliant study of the psychological process behind the conversion of the pagan world to christianity has remarked that 'Even in the fourth century, when the Eucharist acquired a dignity of ceremonial appropriate to the solemn worship of the now dominant church, it is not to me clear either that there was a deliberate copying of the ceremonial of the mystery dramas or that any special appeal was made by the ritual to the mass of new converts'.<sup>1</sup> I venture to hope that what has been already written is sufficient comment on the question of possible copying of the mysteries in pre-Nicene times. We have seen that there is in fact no element in the eucharistic ceremonial, such as it was, of the first three centuries which is not completely explained by a directly christian or pre-christian jewish origin. As for any appeal of ceremonial to the fourth century converts, there is nothing in the evidence which suggests that this was its intention. The eucharist was now being performed in a world where every public act secular or religious had always been invested with a certain amount of ceremony as a matter of course. Christian worship was now a public act, and any different treatment of it was simply not thought of. A few notes on the chief adjuncts of ceremonial and their introduction and development will make clear, I think, how spontaneous the whole process of the post-Nicene development of ceremonial really was.

#### *Vestments*

What one may call 'official costume for public acts' both in the case of magistrates and priests had been common in classical Greece and usual all over the Near East for many centuries before the christian era. In Italy and the West, particularly at Rome, the wearing of such 'official' robes, either

<sup>1</sup> A. D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, Oxford, 1933, p. 204. Mr. Nock's conclusions are reached chiefly from the pagan evidence, on which his judgement is authoritative. But they coincide with my own, reached mainly on the basis of the christian evidence.

secular or religious, had always been much less developed; though the elements of the idea are to be discerned, *e.g.* in the *toga praetexta* of the magistrates (the ordinary dress of a gentleman, with a broad purple stripe) and the *apex*—the special skin cap worn on some occasions by the Roman pontiffs and flamens. But speaking broadly, the elaborately vested Macca-bean high-priest performing the rites of the Day of Atonement on the one hand, and on the other the pagan Roman *rex sacrorum* performing the not very dissimilar rites of the *poplifugium* in the toga which every Roman gentleman wore about the city every day, represent from one point of view a contrast of types whose basis is geographical much more than dependent on different ideas of worship.

It is therefore not surprising to find that the earliest mention of a special liturgical garment for use at christian worship comes from the Near East, and specifically from Jerusalem. We learn incidentally from Theodoret that *c.* A.D. 330 Constantine had presented to his new cathedral church at Jerusalem as part of its furnishing a 'sacred robe' (*hieran stolēn*) of gold tissue to be worn by the bishop when presiding at the solemn baptisms of the paschal vigil.<sup>1</sup> From the words employed this looks like some sort of special liturgical vestment. But this very characteristic initiative of the ritualistic Jerusalem church was not followed up. The next mention of such things comes likewise from Syria, in a rubric of the rite in *Ap. Const.*, viii. (*c.* A.D. 375) directing that the bishop is to celebrate the eucharist 'clad in splendid raiment'.<sup>2</sup> But the word *esthēta* in this case makes it clear that all the author has in mind is a sumptuous specimen of the ordinary lay costume of the upper classes at this period, not a special hieratic vestment (*stolē*) like those of the Old Testament high-priests. And in fact the Roman type of sacerdotal functioning in ordinary dress did prevail in christian usage everywhere over the graeco-oriental type of a special liturgical dress. All over christendom ecclesiastical vestments derive from the lay dress of the upper classes in the imperial period, and not from any return to Old Testament precedents such as the mediaeval ritualists imagined.

*The Chasuble, Tunicle and Alb.* Since the second century the old Roman *toga virilis* had been more and more disused as an everyday garment, and was no longer worn even at ordinary meetings of the senate.<sup>3</sup> In place of

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *ap.* Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 14, l. 8. For further incidental references to the 'splendour' of episcopal clothes *cf.* S. Gregory Naz. *Orat.* 20 and 32; Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 3, etc. Both christian and pagan authors refer to episcopal dress outside church as well as in, and make it clear (*a*) that there was no difference between the two, and (*b*) that there was no difference between clerical and lay dress in this period *c.* A.D. 375-400.

<sup>3</sup> Its history is exactly that of the English peer's dress of parliament robes. From being a customary dress it becomes a sort of full-dress uniform. Ultimately it is worn only at specially convened meetings presided over by the emperor (*cf.* opening of Parliament) and by certain magistrates on particular occasions, *e.g.* the consuls and the *praefectus urbis* (*cf.* Royal Commissioners in the House of Lords) and at the trial of a senator (*cf.* the trial of a peer).

the toga the upper classes adopted a costume, apparently Ionian in origin, consisting of a linen robe with close sleeves, covering the whole body from neck to feet, the *linea*, above which was worn a sort of tunic with short close sleeves (*colobium* or *tunica*) extending to the knees. On formal occasions and out of doors both men and women wore over this the *paenula* (also called *planeta*, *casula* and occasionally *lacerna*<sup>1</sup>)—a large round piece of stuff with a hole in the centre for the head to pass through, which fell in folds over the shoulders and arms and draped the whole body down to the knees.

The contemporary account of the martyrdom of S. Cyprian in A.D. 258 reveals him as wearing this dress. When he reached the place of execution 'he took off the red *lacerna* that he was wearing and folded it and knelt down upon it and prostrated himself in prayer to the Lord. And when he had taken off his *tunica* and handed it to the deacons, he stood up in his *linea* and awaited the executioners'.<sup>2</sup> These are in essentials the pontificals of a mediaeval bishop. But Cyprian is wearing them simply as the ordinary lay gentleman's dress of the day.

By the end of the fourth century this peaceful costume in turn was beginning to go out of fashion in favour of a more military style<sup>3</sup> brought in by the barbarian mercenaries whose commanders were becoming the most influential people in the state. By a law of A.D. 397, however, senators were ordered to resume the old civilian style of the *paenula* worn over the *colobium* or *tunica* and the ungirdled *linea*; while civil servants were ordered to wear the *paenula* over the girdled *linea* as part of their full dress.<sup>4</sup> (The *cingulum* (belt) was a distinguishing badge of military as opposed to civil office. Hence the *officiales*, whose service ranked as a *militia* and was subject to military not civil law, are to wear the girdle visibly, but the senator, as a civilian, does not.) In the rigidly organised late empire this law sufficed to fix the costume of the great nobles and the higher officials. Two centuries later, in the apparently contemporary portrait of Pope S. Gregory I standing between his father the senator Gordianus and his mother, the costume of all three is still exactly the same—chasuble worn over the tunic with the ungirdled linen alb. The mother wears a sort of linen turban, and the Pope is distinguished from the layman his father by the *pallium*—a sort of scarf of office which was the only strictly liturgical vestment which the Popes as yet tolerated. But otherwise the costumes of the bishop, the layman and laywoman are exactly the same.

*The Pallium and Stole.* Even the use of the *pallium* was not very ancient in the Roman church, dating perhaps from the end of the fifth century.

<sup>1</sup> There is some doubt about the meaning of this word, which sometimes means an open cloak. But there are certain passages where it clearly means the same garment as the *paenula*.

<sup>2</sup> *Acta Proconsularia S. Cypriani*, 5.

<sup>3</sup> The *tunica lamicata* (the origin of the modern shirt) and *chlamys* or cloak.

<sup>4</sup> *Codex Theodosianus*, xiv. 10, 1.

Before that time the whole idea of any such mark of distinction had been entirely contrary to the local Roman tradition. Pope Celestine I c. A.D. 425 had gone so far as to rebuke the bishops of the South of France, among whom the use of the *pallium* and girdle at the eucharist was already customary, with what seems unnecessary vigour: 'It is small wonder that the church's custom should be violated by those who have not grown old in the church, but entering in by some other way have introduced into the church along with themselves things which they used to wear in another walk of life (*i.e.*, the magistracy, from which so many bishops were then recruited). . . . Perhaps men who dwell in distant parts far from the rest of the world wear that dress from following local custom rather than reason. Whence came this custom in the churches of Gaul, so contrary to antiquity? We bishops must be distinguished from the people and others by our learning not by our dress, by our life not by our robes, by purity of heart not by elegance . . .'<sup>1</sup> To the plea that this is only a literal following of the evangelical injunction to have 'the loins girded', etc., he answers drily that they will need to stand at the altar with a burning lamp in one hand and a staff in the other to fulfil what follows, and roundly bids them to have done with such 'worthless superstitions'.

Yet there is evidence from the East as well as from Gaul that in other churches less sturdily old-fashioned than that of Rome some equivalent of the *pallium* had already been accepted as a special badge of the liturgical ministry almost everywhere during the later fourth century.<sup>2</sup> It is in fact the liturgical 'vestment' (*stolē*) of all orders at this time. In its episcopal form the *pallium* is simply the old 'scarf of office' worn by the emperor and consuls, a badge granted to numerous other officials during the fourth century. It was adopted by the clergy in various forms, becoming the *pallium* of the Pope and (later) of archbishops and certain privileged bishops in the West, but worn by all bishops since the fifth century in the East. For the lower clergy it becomes the 'stole' worn in different ways by bishops, priests and deacons as a badge of distinction.<sup>3</sup> Most *pallia*, lay and clerical alike, were of coloured silk. But the Popes when they adopted this little piece of vanity wore it in the form of a simple white woollen scarf

<sup>1</sup> Celestine I, *Ep.* iv. The same idea that it is not vestments like those of the O.T. priesthood but holiness which distinguish the christian priesthood is drawn out with an almost puritanical insistence in the Roman prayer for the consecration of a bishop in the present Roman pontifical, found already in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* c. A.D. 500. It probably goes back to the time of Leo I c. A.D. 450, if not to that of Celestine himself twenty-five years before.

<sup>2</sup> The last exception that I know is at Ruspe in Africa, where S. Fulgentius (sixth century) according to the contemporary *Vita* refused out of humility to wear the *orarium* like other bishops. But this is noted as something peculiar. Fulgentius wore a chasuble (of common and coarse stuff) out of doors, as the ordinary dress of the day, but celebrated in his working clothes (*i.e.* without it).

<sup>3</sup> The fashion of deacons wearing the stole on the left shoulder seems to have spread from the region of Antioch. At least it is first attested there by pseudo-Chrysostom (*de Fil. Prod.* 3; perhaps by Severian of Gabala) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Catecheses*, ed. *cit.*, p. 84).

embroidered with black crosses.<sup>1</sup> And apart from the Pope's *pallium* Rome so far remained faithful to Celestine's principles as not to adopt the stole in any form, for bishops, priests or deacons, right down to the twelfth century, when it was introduced from beyond the Alps.

*The Maniple.* Just as the *pallium* and stole derive from the secular 'scarf of office', so the vestment known as the maniple (*fanon, sudarium*) derives directly from the *mappula*, a sort of large handkerchief which formed part of the ceremonial dress of consuls and other magistrates, carried in the hand or laid across the arm. The carrying of the maniple in the left hand at the liturgy did not die out at Rome or in England before the twelfth century,<sup>2</sup> though by then the present custom of fixing it to the left arm throughout the rite was firmly established in France. The use of the *mappula* by the clergy is attested at Rome in the sixth century,<sup>3</sup> but it is found as a special badge of the deacon in Egypt a century before this.<sup>4</sup>

*The Dalmatic.* This was a form of *tunica* with large sleeves, which came into use in the second century as a tunic which could be worn in public without the chasuble (though it was noted as a breach of decorum in the emperor Commodus that he appeared sometimes at the circus clad only in the dalmatic without the chasuble). In the fourth century it seems to have become a sort of undress uniform for high officials, and as such it began to be worn by important bishops, though always under the chasuble. It was adopted by itself, however, as a normal dress by the seven reginary deacons of Rome, whose duties, as superintendents of what was now virtually the whole poor relief system of the city (pauperised for centuries by the system of *panis et circenses*) and the estates which formed its endowment, were becoming administrative and financial rather than religious. For a while this remained a peculiarity of the Roman deacons, but it spread gradually to other Western churches,<sup>5</sup> where it eventually became the distinctive vestment of deacons. It is symbolic of a good deal in church history that the adoption of this dress, which was virtually a badge of preoccupation with secular affairs, was at Rome confined to the deacons, while in the Byzantine church it became the special vestment of archbishops.<sup>6</sup> Even the Roman deacons, arrogant and worldly as a long series

<sup>1</sup> It is this Papal *pallium* which still appears on the armorial bearings of the sees of Canterbury and York.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. the English miniatures reproduced as Plates i and ii in the *Lanalet Pontifical* (ed. G. H. Doble, H.B.S., 1937). The Eastern bishop's *epigonation*, now attached to his girdle, was similarly carried in the hand down to the ninth century.

<sup>3</sup> Duchesne, *Origins etc.*, E. T. 1931, p. 383.

<sup>4</sup> S. Isidore of Pelusium (c. A.D. 410), *Ep.* I. cxxxvi.

<sup>5</sup> When Pope Symmachus granted the use of the *pallium* and dalmatic to S. Caesarius of Arles c. A.D. 510, he also granted his deacons the right to wear the dalmatic 'as in the Roman church'. (*Vita S. Caesarii*, I, iv. ap. *Acta SS. Boll.*, v. 71). These are apparently not intended as purely liturgical ornaments but as civil distinctions.

<sup>6</sup> In Russia, of all bishops. The dalmatic has never been adopted by the dissident Eastern churches for their bishops, or by the deacons of any Eastern rite, whose garment, the *sticharion*, is derived from the ungirded linen alb, a form it still retains in Egypt.

of critics from the fourth to the sixth century declared them to be, hesitated to perform their liturgical functions in this uniform of a secular official. The Pope, who as the chief citizen of Rome sometimes wore a dalmatic, always covered it in church with the chasuble of the private gentleman. The deacons at least began their ministry at the altar dressed in the same way. But before performing his special 'liturgy' of singing the gospel (and down to A.D. 595 the preceding solo of the gradual) the Roman deacon put off his chasuble, which he only resumed after assisting to administer communion. There was no mystical or symbolic meaning in this; it was simply for convenience of movement. In Lent the Roman deacons acknowledged the special seriousness of the season by leaving off their dalmatics in church and wearing their chasubles throughout the rite. But even so they wore them from the gospel to the communion rolled up bandolier-wise around the body over the left shoulder and tied under the right arm—something like a British soldier's greatcoat in the period of the Boer War. (This curiously informal behaviour is still perpetuated in the ceremonial of the Roman rite in Advent, Lent and Ember-tides.)

*The Camelaucum or Tiara.* It is the same story with the other vestments that originated before the middle ages. The Papal tiara, for instance, is derived from the *camelaucum* or *phrygia*, a 'cap of state' worn by the emperors and very high officials in the fourth century. (The statue of Constantine on his triumphal arch at Rome is wearing one. A version of the same headgear was worn by the doge of Venice and other Italo-Greek potentates.) Its use seems to have been allowed to the clergy by the emperors everywhere in the fifth century. In the East, in the form of the 'brimless top-hat' doubtless familiar to most readers, it became the normal headgear of all clergy (white for patriarchs like that of the Pope, purple for bishops and black for others). Like the Western biretta, it began to be worn by Easterns in church as well as out of it during the later middle ages. Down to the tenth century the Popes kept it as a strictly non-liturgical vestment, to be worn to and from church and on other public occasions, but not in service time like the later mitre, though the latter seems to have evolved from it by a process of variation. When the Popes became secular rulers in their own right (from the ninth century onwards) they successively added the three crowns (the last was added in the fourteenth century) to the *camelaucum* as a secular headgear, but they have never worn this crowned *camelaucum*, the ornament of a secular ruler, while celebrating the eucharist.

*The Campagi or Shoes.* The special liturgical shoes and stockings of Western bishops also originated as a secular ornament, worn outside church as well as at the liturgy. As far back as the early days of the Roman republic consuls and triumphing generals were distinguished by high-laced shoes of a particular form and a bright red colour; and patricians were distinguished from plebeians by a particular form of black shoe. In

the fourth century A.D. when all dress was formalised and regulated with a sort of childish care into nicely distinguished badges of rank, the wearing of different forms of shoes by different orders of officials was a matter for imperial edicts. The purple boots of the Byzantine emperors became, like the purple chasuble embroidered with golden bees, the most jealously guarded symbol of imperial power, even more so than the diadem. To assume them was to claim the throne. In adopting the *campagi* as part of their liturgical dress, probably in the fifth century, the Popes were only carrying out their customary policy of celebrating the liturgy in the normal dress of important laymen of the time. But by the sixth century the *campagi* like the *pallium* must have come to be reckoned a distinctive sign of their episcopal office.<sup>1</sup>

These are the only ecclesiastical vestments worn in christendom before c. A.D. 800.<sup>2</sup> In their adoption there is evidence of a definite policy pursued everywhere during the fourth and fifth centuries, *viz.*, that the liturgy should be celebrated always in the garments of everyday life. The use of symbolical liturgical vestments like those of the Old Testament priests or the white dress of the neophytes after baptism in the pre-Nicene church was deliberately avoided. The only exception, if it can be called such, was the introduction of the stole; but scarves of office of all kinds were so commonly used in social and civic life in the later fourth century that this, too, can be brought under the same heading, even though Rome thought otherwise and refused to adopt it for seven centuries or so, except for the bishop.

What turned this clothing into a special liturgical vesture was mere conservatism. When the dress of the layman finally changed in the sixth and seventh centuries to the new barbarian fashions, the clergy as the last representatives of the old civilised tradition retained the old civilised costume. From being old-fashioned it became archaic (like the court-dress of the Moderator of the Scottish Kirk) and finally hieratic (like the chimere of the Anglican bishop, which begins prosaically in the twelfth century as a form of overcoat).

But this last stage was only reached by degrees, and was not complete before the seventh–eighth century. Where the old tradition lingered amongst the laity, there the old dress lingered for laymen too, as we see from the picture of S. Gregory and his father Gordian, c. A.D. 600. But though the old-fashioned patrician families of Rome might preserve the traditional dress in everyday life, elsewhere it had already vanished. The fourth Council of Toledo in A.D. 633 orders the public restoration before the altar of the chasuble, stole and alb to an unfrocked priest who is being restored to the use of his orders—a provision which tells its own story; the old costume has become a strictly clerical vestment, a liturgical symbol. The

<sup>1</sup> See the evidence cited by Duchesne, *Origins, ed. cit.*, p. 395.

<sup>2</sup> The amice or *anagolaium* appears for the first time in the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, and therefore may go back before A.D. 800. It is originally a convenience rather than a vestment—the equivalent of the British workman's 'sweat-rag'.



Byzantine emperors continued to wear it in proud assertion of their claim to continue in unbroken succession the office of the Roman Caesars. In 1453 the last emperor of Constantinople fell in the breach fighting to the end, still clothed in the purple chasuble embroidered with golden bees. Charlemagne adopted this with the purple buskins when he laid claim to the imperial dignity in A.D. 800; and from him it passed to the kings of France as their coronation robe. The last public use of it by a layman was at the coronation of Charles X of France at Rheims in 1825.

We can better understand the process if we compare it with the history of a garment with which we are more familiar. A century ago the black frock-coat was still the dress of every Englishman above the condition of a labourer. Even forty years ago a large proportion of the upper classes wore it on Sundays and on any occasion of formality. Now it is gradually becoming an undress uniform for royalty, diplomats and statesmen, and for people in certain formal positions, shopwalkers, undertakers, important station-masters—and Anglican dignitaries. Even bridegrooms had abandoned it for the morning coat before the war. It was adopted for use in conducting divine worship by many non-conformist divines in the last century, precisely because it was the normal lay dress of the time. But many of them retain it to-day when it has ceased to be so, and their people would be mildly shocked by a change. One delightful old Baptist lay-preacher whom I knew in Pembrokeshire nearly thirty years ago always referred to it as his 'preaching coat', and would never have used it for any other purpose. It is on its way—just like the chasuble—to becoming a vestment, a special royal and liturgical garment.

The case is, however, quite different with the vestments which developed later, the Mitre, Cope and Gloves, and the choir dress of Surplice, etc. These mediæval vestments were of deliberate clerical invention, and were meant in their ecclesiastical form to be worn only at the liturgy, and as clerical marks of distinction from the remainder of the worshippers.

*The Mitre.* The advocates of an inner connection of the catholic eucharist with the pagan mysteries have had interesting things to say in the past about the episcopal mitre, the headgear whose very name recalls the hierophant of Mithras. It is unfortunate for such theories that the mitre (*mitra*, *mitella*) first appears in christian use as the distinctive headgear of the only person who had no particular function in the liturgy—the deaconess. References to its use by deaconesses in Africa are found in the later fourth century.<sup>1</sup> It passed thence to Spain where a seventh–eighth century mention of the *mitra religiosa* in the form for the installation of an abess (reckoned *ex officio* a deaconess) is preserved in the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g. S. Optatus, *adv. Donatistas*, ii. 19; vi. 4 (ed. Ziwsa, pp. 54, 149).

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Férotin, 1904, pp. 66–7. The mitre of the Abbess of Las Huelvas which caused such alarm and despondency to canonists in the fourteenth century was evidently a survival of this old Spanish custom. It should perhaps be mentioned

The German scholar Pater Braun in his exhaustive discussion of every piece of evidence which has ever been alleged for the antiquity of the episcopal mitre appears to have proved decisively that no liturgical headgear whatever was ever worn by the clergy at the liturgy anywhere before c. A.D. 1000.<sup>1</sup> The change in this comes during the eleventh century in the West. The first mention of an episcopal mitre in literature is the grant on Passion Sunday A.D. 1049 by Pope S. Leo IX to his own former archbishop Eberhard of Trier of the right to wear 'at the liturgy' (*in ecclesiasticis officiis*) 'the Roman mitre', 'after the Roman fashion'. In 1051 the Pope grants the same privilege to the seven 'cardinals' (*i.e.* principal chaplains) of the cathedral of Besançon when acting as celebrant, deacon or subdeacon at the high altar on certain great feasts. This privilege of wearing mitres at the liturgy was granted to a number of other chapters of canons (even for their subdeacons) during the next half century or so, sometimes on the occasion of the grant of a mitre to their bishop, sometimes actually before this. In 1063 the mitre was granted to Abbot Elsin of S. Augustine's, Canterbury (the first of many such grants to abbots); and though Braun takes it for granted that this proves that the mitre had already been granted to his archbishop, Stigand's pontificals in the Bayeux Tapestry (which are very carefully portrayed) do not include the mitre at Harold's coronation.

Great churches like Milan only obtained the privilege of the mitre at the beginning of the twelfth century,<sup>2</sup> and it was not until the middle or third quarter of that century that it came about that so many bishops had acquired the right to use it by specific Papal grant that it began to be regarded as an inevitable part of a bishop's costume, and the remaining non-mitred bishops simply usurped it without obtaining a Papal grant. Abbots, conventual priors and other dignitaries continued to obtain it individually by a privilege from the Pope in the old way until the seventeenth century, when the few remaining non-mitred abbots were granted the use of it *ex officio*.

The real origin of the liturgical mitre would therefore seem to be as follows: We know that in the tenth century the Popes still did not wear their *camelaucum* at the liturgy. But somewhere soon after A.D. 1000 they must have begun to do so, differentiating however between this use of it and that outside church by reserving the 'crowned' *camelaucum* (for the first of the three crowns had by now been added to the papal cap) for secular occasions. It is this new use of the *camelaucum* in church which is allowed to Eberhard of Trier; and the grant to the cardinals of Besançon in 1051 suggests that it was already used in church by the Roman cardinals

that the other modern derivative of the same headgear is the *bonnet rouge*, the 'Phrygian Cap of Liberty' of the French Revolution. It is a bewildering reflection that this traditional headgear of 'Marianne', the Anglican deaconess' bonnet and the Papal tiara are all by origin one and the same article—the *phrygia*.

<sup>1</sup> J. Braun, S.J., *Die liturgische Gewandung*, Freiburg-i-B., 1907, pp. 431-462.

<sup>2</sup> M. Magistretti, *Delle vesti ecclesiastiche in Milano*, Milan, 1897, p. 69.

before this. The mitre is thus the one and only liturgical ornament of purely Papal origin; and the right of others to use it, whether bishops or priests or deacons or subdeacons or even laymen (some mediaeval princes, e.g. the kings of Hungary and some dukes of Bohemia, were granted this as a compliment), depended originally on a Papal privilege even more strictly than did the use of the *pallium*. It is in no sense a symbol in itself of episcopal orders, even though it is now worn by all Western bishops, including Swedish Lutherans and others who are not in communion with the Pope. Apart from Papal initiative it would have remained an ornament not of the bishop at all, but of the deaconess.

The Eastern mitre, in the form of a crown, has a wholly different origin. It seems to derive from the *touphan*, a sort of jewelled turban borrowed by the Byzantines from the Persians.<sup>1</sup> But its use by ecclesiastics in church is not older than the sixteenth century. The great Byzantine canonist Balsamon states categorically c. A.D. 1200 that all Eastern ecclesiastics are bare-headed at the liturgy with the sole exception of the Patriarch of Alexandria and his twelve 'cardinary' priests, who wear a *loron* (diadem), a right which he says was acquired by S. Cyril as the Papal legate at the Council of Ephesus in A.D. 432.<sup>2</sup> The same statement is twice repeated by Simeon of Thessalonica in the fifteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

The *Cope*, of silk or velvet and embroidery, is an elaboration for the deliberate purpose of ecclesiastical display in church of the homely cape for keeping warm. It was invented in the great French capitular and conventual churches during the ninth century, and was in occasional use for semi-liturgical functions (e.g. the dialogue at the Easter Sepulchre) in England in the later tenth century. It was still not in use at Rome in the twelfth century.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See John Tsetses, *Chiliades*, viii. 184 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Balsamon, *Meditata*. ii. M.P.G., cxxxviii. 1048. B. (I take it that *Papa* in this passage refers to the 'Pope' of Alexandria, not of Rome, though Migne's note *ad loc.* assumes the opposite.) The story of the quasi-grant to S. Cyril in the form Balsamon gives it is clearly apocryphal, but the alleged Roman origin is interesting. The Armenians adopted the Western mitre when they were in communion with the Pope in the fifteenth century; but the Syrians and Copts have never adopted any form of mitre for their bishops, though the Coptic patriarch still wears a sort of golden helmet (of a quite different pattern from the Byzantine mitre), the *loron* of the patriarchs of Alexandria. The Abyssinians appear to have adopted the Byzantine mitre for use by *all* clergy at the liturgy in the course of the last two centuries, probably through contact with the Greek rite at Jerusalem.

<sup>3</sup> *Expositio*. 45. M.P.G., clv. 716; *Responsa*, etc. 20. *Ibid.* 871. Cf. Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 314.

<sup>4</sup> The various Eastern semi-liturgical robes like the Greek *mandyas* and the Syrian *burnus* which correspond vaguely to the Western cope have an independent origin, as adaptations of the traditional oriental 'robe of honour'. None of them seem to go back as ecclesiastical vestments beyond the thirteenth century, before which date the *phelonion* (chasuble) seems to have been the only church-dress of priests and bishops. It is perhaps worth remarking that this Eastern chasuble itself only assumed its present stiff and rather ungainly cope-like form after the thirteenth century. Earlier Greek and Syrian miniatures shew it as closely resembling the mediaeval Roman chasuble.

*The Episcopal Gloves.* The use of gloves does not seem to have been known in antiquity at all. They first appear as episcopal ornaments in Gaul during the ninth century and were adopted at Rome during the tenth or eleventh century. A trace of their late origin in episcopal costume is to be found in the fact that in the Western *Pontificale* they are assumed by a new bishop not when he puts on the old pontifical vestments at the moment of his consecration, but only after the communion (like that other afterthought the mitre, which is placed upon his head at the same point of the rite, after all that relates to his episcopal consecration has been concluded). Their liturgical name *chirothecae* suggests that they came into the Latin churches from the Greek countries; but the liturgical use of gloves (properly so called) is unknown in the East. Byzantine court-dress, however, included a pair of embroidered cuffs (*epimanikia, manualia*), which appear among the vestments of most Eastern rites. These were borrowed from Byzantium by some Spanish and French churches in the eighth century. They may be regarded as embryonic gloves. At all events, their use in the West as episcopal ornaments went out when that of gloves came in.

*Choir-Dress. The Surplice.* At the eucharist all the clergy down to and including the acolytes (with the partial exception of the deacons) wore the chasuble in the fifth century; and traces of this practice continued at Rome down to at least the ninth century.<sup>1</sup> But clerical dress at the divine office, at all events in the case of the lower clergy, seems to have been always the girdled *linea*, or alb, the 'undress' of the middle classes at home.<sup>2</sup> It was not a very warm costume, and the difficulty of heating the church, especially for the long night office, was solved by heating the man instead. Thick fur coats (*pelliceum*) worn under or over the alb were a necessity. The awkwardness of such bundlesome garments under the girdled alb led to the disuse of the girdle, and the surplice (*superpelliceum*) is simply the alb adapted for use 'over the fur coat'. The graceful flowing sleeves of the mediaeval surplice seem to have been added early in the thirteenth century, as part of the deliberate beautifying of all church vestments which is a noticeable feature of that period. Before that time the comparatively close sleeves of the *cotta* (then still a garment which came below the knees) preserved more nearly the original resemblance to the ungirdled alb.

*The Rochet* is simply the alb or *linea* retained as a secular dress by the clergy for use *outside* church. It is an unliturgical garment, over which both priests and bishops were perpetually being reminded by mediaeval synods that they ought to assume the surplice whenever they had to perform any

<sup>1</sup> The rubrics of the Greek rite still expect the lector (=Western subdeacon) to wear the chasuble like the celebrant (but not the stole) though I do not think this ever happens in practice now. Cf. Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 236. It was also used on occasion by the archdeacon of the palace at Constantinople.

<sup>2</sup> The monks from motives of asceticism never wore linen, and recited their office in their working clothes. Hence the older monastic orders never adopted the surplice for the office, but still say it in their habits.

properly ecclesiastical duty whatever. It retains its character as a secular dress for the clergy in the Church of England, as the distinctive robe of bishops at sittings of the House of Lords. As a semi-clerical but obviously non-priestly dress it was recommended by many councils as a suitable garb for sacristans and sextons, and for laymen who had not received even the first clerical tonsure when serving mass. Its origin as a properly liturgical vestment appears to lie in its tolerated use after the middle of the thirteenth century by parish priests for administering baptism, when the new long sleeves of the surplice were liable to trail in the font.

Apart from this, its use *in church* as a distinctive garment for prelates and dignitaries has a slightly unedifying origin. It appears that in the late twelfth century the canons of S. Peter's at Rome got into the way of not troubling to put on the surplice over the rochet (which they still wore as part of their out-door dress) for the daily recitation of the office in church. Ignorant copying of this slackness by foreign prelates visiting Rome set a new fashion, which by the fifteenth century had hardened into a general custom; though the rubrics of the liturgical books have never yet ceased to require the use of the surplice over the rochet by dignitaries for even the most trivial liturgical duties. The fastening of this little piece of mediaeval Italian slovenliness upon all Anglican bishops by the rubrics of the Prayer Book of 1552 is one of those curiosities of liturgical history which add at once to its interest and to its complications.

The various forms of *almuce*, *mozzetta*, *hood*, *tippet*, *scarf*, etc. are all mediaeval or later. They are all derived ultimately from the fur coat or cloth cape worn *over* the *linea* (instead of under it) for warmth. They are formalised in various ways (shape, colour, material) partly as badges of rank and distinction amongst the clergy themselves, partly in order to distinguish the ordained from the unordained cleric when all alike are wearing the surplice.

The Eastern church has never developed a choir-dress for the secular clergy, chiefly because since the seventh or eighth century the Eastern secular clergy has abandoned the regular recitation of the office to the monks, who like all monks recite it in their habits. When the oriental clergy do conduct parts of the office in public they wear their eucharistic vestments, as at the administration of all sacraments. This would seem to have been the practice of Western clergy, too, before the invention of the cope and surplice.

This review of the history of vestments, though sketchy, is sufficient to establish two main points:

1. That in the fourth century, as before, the 'domestic' character of early christian worship asserted itself even after the transference of the eucharist to the basilicas sufficiently to prevent the adoption anywhere of special ceremonial robes, such as were a usual part of the apparatus of the pagan mysteries. There was indeed no intention whatever of setting up any

distinction of dress between clergy and laity at the liturgy. (The adoption of the stole would find its modern equivalent, I suppose, in something like a clerical collar, or a steward's rosette at a secular meeting.) 2. That by the beginning of the middle ages such a distinction had grown up accidentally by the mere fact that the clergy in church retained the old universal costume after the laity had discarded it. The idea of a special liturgical dress for the clergy came then to be accepted as something right and desirable in itself—an idea which has persisted. For it is to be noted that the adoption by the minister of a Geneva gown and preaching bands, or of a surplice and academic hood, is as much the adoption of a special liturgical costume as the use of eucharistic vestments. For that matter in these days the Salvation Army's poke bonnet and the black frock coat with a white bow tie follow the precedent of the mitre and *pallium*, not that of the chasuble and dalmatic, in that the use of these things is deliberately intended to *distinguish* the wearer from his or her fellow christians at the liturgy; whereas the older vestments were originally intended to do exactly the opposite.

### *Insignia*

Ancient Rome might look a little askance at official costume, but it had no such tradition against the display of other insignia of office. The consul had his *fasces* borne by lictors and magistrates their curule chairs; the augur carried his curved wand, the *lituus*; the senator had his ivory rod, and so on. Such symbols are the Western equivalent for the official robes of Greece and the Near East, where insignia were less common (*e.g.*, the O.T. high-priest had vestments, but no equivalent to the pastoral staff). The general christian acceptance in the fourth century of the Western principle of *not* using special liturgical robes makes it a little surprising that the other Western practice of the display of symbols of office instead was not accepted. But that the church was very slow in adopting such things is clear from the evidence.

*Crosses.* Constantine set the example of using the cross in insignia, both by mounting it upon the imperial diadem (and on the shields of his troops), and especially by his use of it on the *labarum*, the most important of the standards borne before the emperors. This he now made to consist of a gilded cross surmounted by the monogram of Christ, from the arms of which hung a banner of purple silk. He also set a gilt cross above the figure of a dragon on a pole which had formed the cavalry standard of Diocletian's army.

The church, however, did not quickly adopt this carrying of a cross from the ceremonial of the court into that of the liturgy. The first we hear of crosses in a christian procession is some seventy years later. Chrysostom at Constantinople organised torch-light processions to counter the street-propaganda of the Arians, and these carried silver crosses, to the arms of

which were affixed burning candles. But it is clear that this was not a transference to the streets of something already practised in the liturgy, but a novelty devised to attract attention, for the crosses were specially presented by the empress for the occasion.<sup>1</sup> The carrying of 'handcrosses' (perhaps originally reliquaries) by dignitaries in church came in during the sixth century, and we hear of crosses carried in procession in Gaul during the fifth and sixth century. One was carried at the landing of Augustine of Canterbury in Thanet in A.D. 596, but here again it is possible to suspect an *ad hoc* device to attract attention rather than a piece of customary ceremonial.

In the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, which though it was compiled c. A.D. 800 seems to reflect the Papal ceremonial of the seventh-eighth century with considerable exactness, there is twice mention of a number of crosses carried *behind* the Pope, apparently not by clerics but by lay servants. It reminds one of the eagles and other standards carried by slaves behind the consul and other Roman magistrates. It is a piece of secular rather than religious pomp. But there is nothing in the Papal procession at this date corresponding to the later Western processional cross at the head of the procession, or to the special Papal cross. These both seem to owe their origin at Rome to a suggestion which that lover of ceremony for its own sake, the Frankish emperor Charlemagne, made to Pope Leo III in A.D. 800. When the Pope tactfully agreed with the happy idea of his distinguished visitor, he was at once presented with a magnificent jewelled cross for the purpose. This he ordered to be carried before him annually at the head of the procession of the 'Greater Litanies' on April 25th (not yet kept at Rome as S. Mark's day).<sup>2</sup> From the Papal procession the idea spread to the parish churches of Rome, which all acquired 'stational crosses' for use in procession during the ninth century. But the practice must have been well established at France long before Charlemagne brought about its adoption at Rome. Not only have we the occasional mentions of processional crosses by Gregory of Tours and other authors of the fifth and following centuries; but every parish church has already its own 'stational cross' for use in the Gallican 'Litanies' on the Rogation Days, in Angilbert's *Ordo* at S. Riquier in Picardy c. A.D. 805.

The bearing of a special cross before archbishops everywhere within their own province appears to be a copying of this special Papal custom inaugurated by Leo III c. A.D. 800. It had already come into general use before the eleventh-twelfth century, when it caused continual troubles in England between the sees of Canterbury and York.

*Altar Crosses.* The placing of a cross actually upon the altar during the liturgy is often said to be derived from the use of the processional cross, the head being detached from the staff after the procession and stood before

<sup>1</sup> Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.*, viii. 8; Palladius, *Dial. de Vita Chrysost.* 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Liber Pontificalis*, *Vita Leonis* iii.

the celebrant during the eucharist. It does not seem that this was the origin of the altar cross, though it was the custom in some thirteenth–fourteenth century churches. The placing of anything whatever upon the altar except the bread and cup for the eucharist was entirely contrary to normal christian feeling down to c. A.D. 800.<sup>1</sup> In the ninth century, however, this was so far modified that out of service time the gospel book, the pyx with the reserved sacrament and reliquaries began to be admitted as ornaments placed upon the altar itself. But we still hear nothing of altar crosses. For centuries precious crosses had sometimes been hung above the altar, as had crowns, lamps and other ornaments; and standing crosses now began to be set up near it.<sup>2</sup> But the first definite reference to an altar-cross of the modern type appears to be by Pope Innocent III (then still a cardinal) c. A.D. 1195, who tells us that at the solemn Papal liturgy a cross between two candlesticks is placed actually upon the altar. The custom spread gradually through the West during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though it hardly became universal before the sixteenth. The Roman custom, however, during most of the middle ages was to remove these novel ornaments as soon as the liturgy was over, leaving the altar outside service-time as bare as it had always been in the past. This removal was still practised in many French churches down to the eighteenth century, and survives in a few Spanish churches to this day.

*The Pastoral Staff.* We have seen that Pope Celestine c. A.D. 425 regarded the use of a special staff by a bishop in the light of a *reductio ad absurdum* of superstition. Rome has so far proved faithful to his ideas that the Popes have never yet adopted the use of a pastoral staff.<sup>3</sup> Pastoral staves, however, did come into use elsewhere. They seem to be mentioned first in Spain in the early seventh century.<sup>4</sup> They were then borne by Spanish abbots and abbesses as well as bishops, as symbols of office.<sup>5</sup> From Spain they appear to have been adopted first by the Celtic and then by the Anglo-Saxon churches,<sup>6</sup> and to have spread over the West outside Rome in the eighth–ninth centuries.

<sup>1</sup> There seems, however, to be a cross ('the adorable wood') upon the altar, along with the gospel book in Narsai, *Hom.* xvii. ed. R. H. Connolly, p. 12 (Edessa c. A.D. 450). This is, I think, the earliest instance.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., one in S. Peter's 'of silver gilt which stands beside the high altar', *Lib. Pont., Vita Leonis* iii.

<sup>3</sup> This has been denied e.g. by Kraus, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*, ii., p. 500, and by other authors. But all the locally Roman evidence of an early mediaeval use of a staff by the Pope seems to relate to the *ferula*, a sort of secular sceptre not used in church. Pope Innocent III specifically denies that the Popes had ever used the *baculum*, the pastoral staff proper; and he seems to be correctly reporting the tradition.

<sup>4</sup> S. Isidore of Seville, *de Officiis Eccles.* 5; ivth Council of Toledo, *can.* 28 A.D. 633).

<sup>5</sup> *Liber Ordinum*, ed. cit., coll. 60, 68.

<sup>6</sup> *Penitential* of Archbp. Theodore of Canterbury, c. A.D. 690, P.L., xcix. 928–9. It is noticeable that the Anglo-Saxon abbot is here invested with staff, *pedules* (i.e. liturgical shoes) and *stammia* (? = dalmatic). I do not know when these English



The Greek episcopal staff has a separate origin. It is derived, as its form indicates, from the crutch or leaning-stick employed by the Eastern monks as a support when standing through the long offices. Eastern bishops being recruited almost entirely from the monastic orders, they retained as bishops the staff to which they were already accustomed, merely giving it a more expensive and dignified form.

*The Episcopal Ring.* Signet rings were, of course, worn by bishops as by other christians from early times. The first mention of a ring as being, like the *pallium* and staff, a special symbol of the episcopal office is in the twenty-eighth canon of the Spanish Council of Toledo in A.D. 633.

None of these symbols of office, however, appear to go back to the period of transition from a pagan to a christian world in the fourth century. They developed only by degrees, in the seventh-ninth centuries, when deliberate imitation of the pagan rites of antiquity is, to say the least of it, very improbable. It remains, however, to notice one set of christian insignia which do go back certainly to the later fourth century, and to point out their significance.

*Fourth Century Insignia.* A document called the *Notitia Dignitatum Imperii Romani*, a sort of combination of Burke's Peerage, Imperial Gazetteer and Directory of the Civil Service, reveals that *c.* A.D. 400 certain high officials had the privilege of being preceded on occasion like members of the imperial family, by attendants bearing lighted torches and incense. When entering their courts to dispense justice these officials added to these *insignia* their *Liber Mandatorum* or 'Instrument of Instructions', a document which they received on taking up their office, setting forth the general line of policy which the reigning emperor intended them to follow. The particular copy of the *Notitia* which happens to have survived seems to have been drawn up at two different times. The portions dealing with the Western part of the empire reflect conditions *c.* A.D. 405; those dealing with the East seem to refer to a rather later period. But a number of scattered references in much earlier writers make it certain that the distinction of being preceded by incense and torches is something which goes back for some centuries before this in the case of Roman magistrates.<sup>1</sup>

This custom seems to have been adopted by christian bishops in some places towards the end of the fourth century, at which time the state was placing upon them some of the duties of civic magistrates in their see-towns. But though these distinctions would thus seem to have originated much more from the secular than the strictly religious aspect of their position, a religious turn was given to it by the substitution of the gospel book as the 'Law of Christ' for the *Liber Mandatorum* of the secular official.

The first fairly certain reference to the episcopal use of these insignia abbatial ornaments became so confused with properly episcopal privileges as to be supposed to require a special Papal grant for their use; but presumably it came about after the Norman Conquest by false analogy with the mitre.

<sup>1</sup> Horace, *Satires* I, v. 36; Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, 35; etc.

appears to be in a poem by the Italian S. Paulinus of Nola just after A.D. 400;<sup>1</sup> and there can be little doubt that its adoption, in some churches at least, both in the East and West, dates from about or rather before this time. It may be connected with the introduction of a solemn processional entry of the bishop and clergy at the beginning of the liturgy, which replaced the old greeting of the assembled church after an informal arrival, as the opening of the synaxis. We are rather in the dark as to when this procession was first introduced, except that at Rome the chant which accompanied it, the *introit-psalm*, is said to have been an innovation of Pope Celestine I (A.D. 422-432). The procession itself may be rather older than the practice of accompanying it by a chant; and taking into account the normal delay at Rome in the adoption of new liturgical practices, we might well suppose that the procession was at least twenty or thirty years older in some Western churches.

At all events, *c.* A.D. 400 and perhaps rather earlier, the bishop on entering and leaving the church began to be preceded by the torches, incense and book of a magistrate, a practice which had originally no particular christian symbolism at all. An exact modern parallel is the preceding of Anglican dignitaries in procession by a beadle or verger carrying just such a 'mace' as precedes the Speaker of the House of Commons or a Mayor. At its beginning the use of these episcopal insignia had no more significance than that of the cathedral verger 'poking' the canon in residence to read the second lesson. But when we first meet these processional lights before the bishop in the Roman rite they have already become seven in number (instead of the Praetorian Prefect's four and the lesser magistrate's two). It may be that here the seven golden candlesticks of the Apocalypse have come in to give a christian turn to the old secular emblem. The bishop is the earthly representative of Christ, as the eucharist is the earthly manifestation of the heavenly worship, and the adaptation would easily suggest itself.

The use of the seven processional torches at the bishop's liturgy spread widely through the West from the ninth century onwards, chiefly through an adaptation of the *Ordo Romanus Primus*<sup>2</sup> made *c.* A.D. 800 which formed the basis of episcopal ceremonial in France for some centuries to come, and which was more or less widely adopted from there in England and Germany. Its only survival to-day other than in the Papal mass is in the special pontifical ceremonial of the archbishop of Lyons (which is not 'Gallican' in origin as has been too often supposed, but represents the ceremonial of the Papal rite as modified for adoption in the palace chapel of Charlemagne, which was introduced at Lyons by Bishop Leidrad, *c.* A.D. 810).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Carmina*, xxii. 203 sq.

<sup>2</sup> The so-called *Ordo Romanus Secundus*.

<sup>3</sup> See Dom D. Bruenner, *L'Ancienne liturgie romaine: le rite lyonnais* (Lyons and Paris, 1935).

Whether the use of seven candles upon the altar by Western bishops when pontificating has any direct connection with the Pope's seven processional torches (as has often been suggested) seems more than doubtful. When candles first appear upon the altar at the Pope's eucharist they are not seven but two; and the seven altar candles when they do appear in the Papal mass do not replace the seven torches, but are an addition to them.

The use of two torches carried before the presbyter as celebrant of the eucharist seems to perpetuate the original form in which this honour was paid to bishops. It was probably an unreflecting continuance of custom when bishops finally ceased to be the normal celebrants of the eucharist for all their people at a single stational eucharist, and parish priests became their regular substitutes for particular districts. As the bishop's delegate, no doubt, any celebrant seemed entitled to the same marks of honour, even though originally these particular insignia denoted rather the bishop's personal importance as a civic leader than his sacerdotal character as celebrant of the eucharist.

Another symbol of the same kind which *may* have come into use in the late fourth or early fifth century is the *umbrella*, a sort of flat 'state umbrella' carried over the heads of Byzantine magistrates and officials.<sup>1</sup> It was also carried in front of the Byzantine emperor as a symbol of authority. In this fashion it seems to have been used by some of the Popes as a symbol of quasi-ducal authority in Rome after the ninth century, as it was by the doges of Venice and certain other Italian potentates in the early middle ages. It is doubtless from this that its use above the arms of the Cardinal Camerlengo of the Roman church during vacancies in the Holy See is derived, since the Chamberlain acts as emergency *locum tenens* of the temporalities of the see during the *interregnum*. But it never became a part of the Papal liturgical insignia<sup>2</sup> nor a general symbol of the episcopal office. It had in fact no more religious significance than the state umbrella and fan

<sup>1</sup> See the curious Byzantine regulations about colour and materials, etc. for different offices in Codinus Curopalata, *de Officiis*, iv. (ed. Paris, 1648, pp. 50 sq.).

<sup>2</sup> It does not appear in the Papal procession at mass. Its use as a sort of canopy over the reserved sacrament appears to derive from the carrying of the sacrament before the Pope on journeys, first *along with* the *umbrella*, and then beneath it. The perpetual preceding of the Pope by the sacrament in the middle ages is itself a relic of primitive times. In the fourth century bishops usually carried the sacrament about with them in *enkolpia* or pyxes, for the purpose of giving communion at need; the Popes did not abandon this custom in some form right down to the sixteenth century. See the interesting evidence collected by W. H. Freestone, *The Sacrament Reserved*, London, 1917, p. 65. It is perhaps worth remarking that though fans figured among the insignia of the imperial procession, the two carried behind the Pope appear to be derived rather from the liturgical fans of the fourth-fifth century (cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, cited p. 282), whose use did not altogether die out in the West till the fifteenth century. Like the *sedia gestatoria*, or portable throne, on which the Pope is now carried into S. Peter's, the fans only appear in the Papal procession in Renaissance times. The earlier rule was that the Pope always rode in procession to mass, except on penitential days when he walked. The *sedia* has no direct connection with the litter or sedan chair of the classical period.

now carried behind the Viceroy of India in public. But in a small number of ancient parish churches round about Arles in Provence—that stronghold of the old usages of *Romania*—the *umbella* is still carried over the head of the parish priest (but not, it is said, of anyone else) when he goes to the altar to sing mass on great feasts. I should be prepared to believe that this custom has come down by unbroken tradition from the last days of the empire in these cases, though I know of no evidence to prove it.

Here again, then, in the use of symbols and insignia, it seems quite impossible to bring home to the fourth century church any imitation of the pagan mysteries. The carrying and exhibition of symbolic objects in processions and liturgical rites was a notable feature of the mysteries in so far as they were public cults—and indeed of classical pagan worship generally. But what emerges from the evidence is that the christian church made *no* ceremonial use of such things in the fourth century at all. The only possible exception is the Eastern offertory procession of the Great Entrance, first attested in its developed form by Theodore of Mopsuestia<sup>1</sup> early in the fifth century. Those who wish to may lay emphasis on the general resemblance of this to a mystery rite, though I have failed to find any particular pagan rite to which it can be compared at all closely in detail. For my own part, given the Syrian custom attested by the *Didascalia* in the third century, of the deacons bringing the people's offerings of bread and wine from the sacristy at this particular point of the rite, I think the 'Great Entrance' much more likely to be simply a ceremonialised form of this purely utilitarian bringing of the bread and wine to the table when they were required for the eucharist, than anything derived from the procession of the 'dead Attis' or such-like mystery cult functions.

Apart from this, the only portable symbols which were adopted anywhere before the end of the fourth century were the gospel book and the torches and incense carried before the bishop; and these were taken over from the civil ceremonial of the magistrate, not from the pagan cults, and had no religious significance. It is only centuries afterwards, when the pagan mysteries had long been forgotten, that the natural symbolic instinct produced the carrying of such objects as crosses and pastoral staffs in the christian liturgy.

### *Lights*

The episcopal insignia first introduced two things into christian eucharistic worship, portable lights and censers, which play a considerable part in later ceremonial both in the East and West. But torches and candles have also been used in catholic worship in other ways which have not all this origin.

*At Funerals.* The lighting of torches at funerals was a mourning custom common to all mediterranean religions, to which pre-christian judaism

<sup>1</sup> *Cf. p. 282.*

had been no exception. The contemporary *Acta* of S. Cyprian's martyrdom (A.D. 258) reveal that the pre-Nicene christian church also made no difficulty about accepting this universal token of mourning. It describes how after a hasty temporary burial Cyprian's body was subsequently removed by the christians 'with candles and torches'.<sup>1</sup> There was no change made about this after the peace of the church. Eusebius describes the candles burning on golden stands around the bier at the funeral of Constantine in A.D. 337<sup>2</sup> and S. Gregory of Nyssa describing his own sister's funeral in A.D. 370 tells how deacons and subdeacons two abreast bearing lighted candles escorted the body in procession from the house.<sup>3</sup> The custom was universal both in the East and the West, and continues so to this day.

Here (at last) is something in catholic custom which is certainly of pagan origin. Both the bier-lights (which have never died out at state funerals in post-Reformation England) and the Western *chappelle ardente*, and the candles held by the mourners at the Western requiem and the Eastern *panikhida* have all a common origin in very ancient pre-christian pagan observance. Mourning customs are always one of the most persistent elements of older practice through all changes of religion, chiefly because they depend on private observance by grief-stricken individuals much more than on official religious regulation; and no ecclesiastic is going to go out of his way to rebuke harmless conventions which may do a little to assuage sorrow at such a time. (So *e.g.* the modern West African christians, both catholic and protestant, wear white at funerals in Ashanti, simply because a plain white 'cloth' in place of the normal brightly coloured native dress is the traditional mourning of Ashanti pagan custom.)

*At the Gospel.* S. Jerome writing in A.D. 378 from Bethlehem says that 'throughout all the churches of the East when the gospel is to be read lights are kindled . . . not to dispel the darkness but to exhibit a token of joy . . . and that under the symbol of corporeal light that light may be set forth of which we read in the psalter, "Thy word is a lantern unto my feet and a light unto my paths".'<sup>4</sup> This is one of those little symbolical actions like the *lavabo* with which, as we have said, the fourth century churches soon began to overlay the bare outline of the pre-Nicene rite, a process in which the Jerusalem church was the pioneer. In this case the context suggests that these lights were not so much part of the official ceremonial as kindled and held by the people. It is therefore probably more closely connected with that popular pagan custom of lighting lamps and candles both at home and in the sanctuary as a general sign of religious festivity, than with the later christian ceremonial carrying of two candles by acolytes at the reading of the gospel. It had from time immemorial been a pagan usage to hang lighted lamps about the doorways of the house on days of religious festivity,

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Proconsularia S. Cypriani*, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Vita S. Macrinae, ad fin.*

<sup>3</sup> *Vita Constantini*, iv. 66.

<sup>4</sup> *contra Vigilantium*, 3.

about which more than one of the pre-Nicene fathers make scornful observations.<sup>1</sup> Popular piety carried on the practice to celebrate christian festivals, though it was discouraged by the church.<sup>2</sup> But this popular use of lighted candles with their natural symbolism of cheerfulness and joy was too harmless to be rigidly excluded (*cf.*, *e.g.* the use of candles on christmas trees in Wesleyan chapels) and they make their way into various minor ceremonies of the liturgy towards the end of the fourth century. It is *e.g.* at this time that the presentation of a lighted candle to the neophyte after baptism (as well as the pre-Nicene white robe) begins to be introduced; and it is likely that this kindling of lights at the gospel in the East of which S. Jerome speaks is another quasi-liturgical observance of the same kind, introduced about the same time.

The more strictly official carrying of two lights at the gospel is first mentioned by S. Isidore of Seville early in the seventh century,<sup>3</sup> but since he mentions that they were extinguished as soon as the gospel had been read, this may have a purely utilitarian origin, like the use of the prelate's 'hand-candle' (*scotula*), the origin of which seems to be lost in antiquity. Anyone who has inspected ancient liturgical books, with their close writing and frequent contractions of spelling, will understand the need of a light near the book even in daylight for the public reading of the text. It is possible that once more Rome was somewhat behind other churches in the adoption of the lights at the gospel. The absence of them at the paschal vigil mass (on Holy Saturday) is probably a little piece of conservatism at this most archaic service in the whole year,<sup>4</sup> reproducing the customary absence of ritual pomp at the singing of the gospel at Rome perhaps as late as the fifth or sixth century. It is only in the *Ordo Romanus Primus* that we first hear of two candles carried at the singing of the gospel in the Roman rite. Here it is clear from the whole setting and from what is done with them that they have a ceremonial, not an utilitarian, purpose. They precede the subdeacons with the censer (the book is not censured as yet), but the gospel is sung from the top of the *ambo* (pulpit) steps while the lights remain below. The gospel book preceded by lights and incense has in fact come to be treated as symbolic of the Person of Christ proclaiming the gospel. Probably the lights which had been carried before the bishop for two or three centuries by now had introduced this new idea in connection with the book of the gospels.

*Illumination.* We have already seen (*p.* 87) that the ceremonial bringing in and blessing of a lamp was a customary part of the ritual at a *chabúrah*

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, *de Idololatria*, 15. Lactantius, *Instit.*, vi. 2; etc.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, S. Gregory Nazianzene, *Oratio* v. 35. S. Jerome, *loc. cit.*, though he half defends such practices against the puritan Vigilantius, declares it is due to 'the ignorance and simplicity of laymen or at least of over-devout women'.

<sup>3</sup> *Etymol.* VII. xii. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Their absence at the Passion gospels in Holy Week has a symbolic reason, and is almost certainly a later touch in the ceremonies.

meal such as the last supper.<sup>1</sup> But this continued in christian liturgical use only at the agape, not at the eucharist. It survived at the vigil also, and was introduced into the public service of the *lucernarium* from the practice of christian domestic piety when public evening services began to be held in the later fourth century.

Nevertheless, illumination was, of course, sometimes needed for practical purposes at the early morning eucharists of the pre-Nicene church, and was provided in the ordinary way, as the candlesticks and lamps of the church of Cirta show.<sup>2</sup> But there was no ceremonial or symbolical use of lights whatever at the eucharist in the pre-Nicene church. After the peace of the church a number of fourth century authors speak incidentally of the great quantity of lights, both candles and lamps, sometimes employed in the churches at Vespers and the Night Office.<sup>3</sup> We have already noticed the lavish scale on which Constantine provided for the lighting of S. Peter's.<sup>4</sup> But though there is an advance here from mere utility to decoration, there is nothing corresponding to the later symbolic use of altar lights; though perpetually burning lamps at the martyrs' tombs are found before the end of the fourth century. Curiously enough neither the precedent of the seven-branched lampstand of the O.T. Tabernacle nor that of the seven lamps burning before the throne of God in the Apocalypse seems to have exercised any marked influence before the beginning of the middle ages.

*Candles on the Altar.* For reasons already stated the standing of any object whatever on the altar was entirely contrary to the devotional conventions of the early church. Lamps and candelabra were hung above it, and standard candlesticks were stood around—sometimes six or eight of them. But the altar itself remained bare of such ornaments for almost the first thousand years of christian history in the West, and perhaps to an even later date in the East.<sup>5</sup> This feeling of the special sanctity of the altar began to break down in Gaul in the eighth century in certain respects, but it is not until the ninth century that we find candlesticks being stood upon it, and for some while they were not common even in great churches. There was one which was placed upon the altar in Winchester cathedral c. A.D. 1180, but apparently as a special little ceremony on Christmas day only, and this is the earliest English reference to such a practice that I

<sup>1</sup> For the rabbinic rules see *Berakoth*, M. viii. 5, 6, 7; T. vi. 7, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Cf.* p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Etheria, *Peregrinatio*, ed. Geyer (C.S.E.L. 38), p. 72; Paulinus of Nola, *Carmena*, xxxvii. 389 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Cf.* p. 310.

<sup>5</sup> The date when the Easterns first set candlesticks actually upon the altar seems impossible to determine. J. Braun, *Das christliche Altargerät* (Munich, 1932), p. 498 even suggests 'the end of the middle ages'. Narsai, *Hom.*, xvii., p. 12 knows the cross upon the altar, but has no mention of candles, only 'lamps'. What I think is certain is that, in the East as in the West, 'standard' candlesticks around the altar and processional lights are at least five or six centuries older than the altar-candlesticks themselves.

know.<sup>1</sup> This custom of one altar candle (moved around with the book at low mass) became fairly common in France in the thirteenth century, and was still not unknown in England as late as the fifteenth century. It is said to survive to this day at low mass in Carthusian monasteries.

It is not, however, until the very end of the twelfth century (c. A.D. 1195) that we first find candles upon the altar at Rome; and then they are two in number at the Pope's 'stational' mass on the most solemn feasts.<sup>2</sup> By A.D. 1254 the number on such occasions had risen to seven.<sup>3</sup> Further than that it never went. The Papal custom of two candles on the altar was widely adopted in the early thirteenth century, and lasted without change in some of the great French and Spanish collegiate churches down to the eighteenth century.

It is by no means clear how the current notion that two candles was the specifically 'English Use' originated. The multiplication of altar candles was in fact rather characteristic of England and the North generally, once the custom of having them at all had come in. Thus *e.g.*, at Chichester before the end of the thirteenth century the custom on feasts was to burn seven tall lights each of two pounds' weight of wax upon the altar and eight more *in trabe* (on a shelf above the altar-screen—the fore-runner of the Renaissance 'gradine').<sup>4</sup> At S. Augustine's Canterbury there were two such *trabes* with a row of six candles on each, and apparently a third row of six actually upon the altar.<sup>5</sup> At Exeter early in the fourteenth century there were still no candles on the altar itself, but a row of ten behind it.<sup>6</sup> At Lincoln there were five;<sup>7</sup> at S. David's cathedral there were fourteen;<sup>8</sup> and so on. There appear in fact to be instances from mediaeval England of every number of altar candles from one to twenty, except seventeen and nineteen.<sup>9</sup>

If we enquire the reason for the widespread increase in the number of altar candles during the thirteenth century, it is to be found, I think, in the change in the shape of the Western altar from the antique fashion of a cube

<sup>1</sup> See the list of church ornaments presented by Bp. Henry of Blois to the cathedral. E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, p. 400.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent III, *de Sacro Altaris Mystero*, ii. 21.

<sup>3</sup> E. Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

<sup>4</sup> *Archaeological Journal*, xxxv., p. 386.

<sup>5</sup> *Customary of S. Augustine's Canterbury, etc.*, ed. Sir E. M. Thompson (H.B.S. 1904) ii., p. 271.

<sup>6</sup> *Ordinale Exon.*, ed. J. N. Dalton (H.B.S. 1909), ii., p. 540.

<sup>7</sup> H. Bradshaw and C. Wordworth, *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral*, 1892, i., p. 288.

<sup>8</sup> *Brit. Mus. Harl. Ms.*, 1249, f. 5, cited E. G. C. F. Atchley, *History of the Use of Incense*, London, 1909, p. 325.

<sup>9</sup> Perhaps the origin of the 'English two candles' myth lies in the Royal Injunction of 1547 to the clergy 'to suffer to remain still' (*i.e.* when the rest have been taken away) 'only two candles upon the High Altar'. The explanation lies, not in any care for old customs, but in the further order issued later to collect all superfluous church plate for the benefit of the Privy Council. Part of the wording of this Order in Council, then still in force, was embodied by Cranmer in the rubrics of the book of 1549. This may or may not constitute an authoritative Anglican ruling on altar lights, but it had nothing to do with 'old English customs', which varied indefinitely.



some 3 ft. square to that of oblong altars 10, 12, or more feet long, in the new gothic churches. The increase in the number of candles comes in first in the great churches, which were mostly being rebuilt about then in the new style, only because the new shape of altar came in first in the great churches, which always tend to set fashions.

Such things have nothing to do with religion or its practice (or even with what is called 'loyalty'), as the mediaeval churchmen were sensible enough to perceive. But the portentous behaviour of nineteenth century English bishops and lawyers, and the 'fond things vainly invented' by some ritualists, have succeeded in impressing it upon the mind of most modern Englishmen that they somehow closely concern the genius of christianity. Such questions were formerly decided by custom, by aesthetics or by mere convenience, not by courts of law. To the mediaeval taste a row of candlesticks looked better than two on a long altar, and so they had a row—of three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten or whatever number their finances or fancy or just the fashion of the moment suggested; or they varied the number on different days according to the rank of the feast or the dignity of the celebrant. In Germany and Holland in the fifteenth century some churches took to having hundreds; in the same period in Sicily and Sardinia some churches preferred to retain only two; and nobody questioned their right to do as they liked in either case. The modern Anglican celebrant can have six candles upon his altar like some of the Avignon Popes in the fourteenth century, or seven like the Popes at the end of the thirteenth century, or two like the Popes at the end of the twelfth century, or even none at all like the Popes at the end of the eleventh century—and be happily conscious that historically he is being just as 'Roman' whichever he does. If he really wants to be 'primitive' in such matters, he must celebrate facing the people across the altar—like all the Popes in every century—and with no candles and no cross (and no vases of flowers or book-stand)—like all the Popes for the first thousand years. What preposterous nonsense it is to try to erect sacristy orthodoxies and even tests of theological allegiance out of these minute details of pious furnishing, that have varied endlessly throughout christian history and have never meant anything in particular by all their changes!

*Lights as Votive Offerings.* The burning of votive candles as well as other lights (and incense) at the tombs of 'heroes' and before the statues of the gods was a general practice in mediterranean paganism, and was not unknown in pre-christian judaism at 'the tombs of the prophets'. The introduction of this form of popular devotion at the tombs of christian martyrs even before the end of the pre-Nicene period seems to be witnessed to by a canon (34) of the Spanish Council of Elvira c. A.D. 300 forbidding it (through this interpretation of the canon is not quite certain). The Council's prohibition certainly did not end the practice, even in Spain. A century later the Spaniard Vigilantius of Barcelona, exhibiting that impatience of folk-

religion which is at once the strength and the limitation of puritans in every age, made a violent attack on the general use of this practice in his own day by christians at the tombs of the martyrs. To this S. Jerome made an equally intemperate reply, comparing those who observed it to the woman who poured ointment upon the Lord, and their critic to Judas Iscariot.<sup>1</sup> More than one bishop made attempts to restrain the practice, but as such expressions of popular piety are usually wont to do, it proved stronger in the end than all ecclesiastical regulations. The lighting of lamps and candles at the tombs of the saints became a normal feature of all such christian sanctuaries and places of pilgrimage from the fifth century onwards, if not from the end of the fourth.<sup>2</sup>

*Candles offered to Images.* The cultus of relics of the saints concerned the honouring of the actual bodies of the martyrs or portions of them, something which has been and will be again at the last day an integral element in their personalities. A further step was taken when the same honours were paid to statues and pictures of the saints and of our Lord Himself. The fourth century church accepted the cultus of relics without much question, but it was much more reluctant to allow this second step to be taken, being still very sensitive on that question of 'idolatry' upon which the conflict of the martyrs had turned. Pictures of our Lord and of the saints had been known as decorations (in the catacombs and elsewhere) and means of instruction (*e.g.* the baptistery at Dura) since the late second or early third century at the latest. As such, pictures and statues continued in use during the fourth century, though there were protests about this,<sup>3</sup> and the Spanish Council of Elvira had forbidden such decorations in churches.<sup>4</sup> But there is no single case, I think, of that ecclesiastical toler-

<sup>1</sup> *adv. Vigilantium*, 7.

<sup>2</sup> How inveterate and—presumably—how harmless the instinct to do this can be, is shewn by the lighting of candles on occasion around the 'shrine' of the Unknown Warrior by the Anglican authorities of Westminster Abbey. This has become in our days a place of pilgrimage fulfilling in popular devotion very much the same rôle as the martyrs' tombs in the fourth century—witness the scenes enacted there in September 1938 and 1939.

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.* Eusebius, *Ep. to Constantia*.

<sup>4</sup> *Can.* 36, 'Pictures ought not to be in a church, lest that which is worshipped and adored be drawn on the walls'. The exact turn of thought here is worth noting. The motive of the prohibition is not so much the fear of idolatry, of their being worshipped, as the idea that there is irreverence in the very attempt to portray the infinite Divine. This seems to be the general pre-Nicene, and for that matter post-Nicene, attitude towards pictures of the Godhead, down to the eighth century. (*Cf.* S. John Damascene, *Orat. de Sacris Imaginibus*, ii. 5, where arguing for the cultus of images he still insists: 'We should indeed be in error if we made an image of the invisible God'.) Representations of our Lord's Humanity and of the saints could not be subject to this objection, unless, like Tertullian, christians were to adopt the semitic dogma (found both in Judaism and Islam, but it is a racial—Bedouin—feeling rather than an intellectual belief) that *all* representational art is as such morally wrong. (How far was Tertullian's Carthaginian—ultimately Phoenician?—temperament the cause of his rigidity?) There is ample evidence that the pre-Nicene church did not adopt this line about art. (*E.g.*, the professional painter is to be admitted to baptism provided he is not employed in the manufacture of idols,

ance and even encouragement then given to the popular cultus of relics being extended to the cultus of pictures or statues of Christ or the saints during the fourth or the first half of the fifth century. There is, too, a noticeably academic tone about christian homilies on 'the peril of idolatry' in this period,<sup>1</sup> which contrasts with the urgency of clerical denunciations of abuses in connection with the relic cult, and suggests that any tendency towards an undue veneration of pictures and images was not a very widespread problem in the church, before the fifth century at all events. The distinction of christian ideas and practice from those of a still living and observable paganism was as yet too obvious to need much emphasis. It was only *after* the disappearance of paganism that disputes began about the christian use of images—a point which needs more consideration than it has received in most histories of the controversy.

There remained, however, in the new christian world one particular survival from the past which was outside the control of the church, and which was bound sooner or later to raise in some form the whole question of the cultus of images. The emperor-cult had always been the centre of the practical problem of 'idolatry' for christians. The usual test for martyrs had been whether they would or would not 'adore' the emperor's image with the customary offering of incense. But the *Notitia Dignitatum* (c. A.D. 405–425) reveals that this particular method of demonstrating loyalty had survived in full working right through the period of the conversion of the empire.<sup>2</sup> In the fifth century the portrait of the reigning emperor was still set up in the courts of justice and in the municipal buildings of the cities surrounded by lighted candles, and incense was still burned before it. The Arian historian Philostorgius brings a charge of idolatry against the orthodox of Constantinople in his day (c. A.D. 425) in that they burn incense and candles before the statue of the emperor Constantine, the founder of the city.<sup>3</sup> (It is worth remarking that this seems to be more than a century before we have any definite evidence of a similar cultus paid to specifically *religious* pictures and images.) One can see how this had come about. When Constantine and his successors became personally christians, they still as emperors remained 'divine' (or at all events the working centre of the old state religion)<sup>4</sup> for that large majority of their subjects who still remained pagan. For these the old forms of reverence simply remained in use. To change them might have been politically dangerous; it would certainly have been unsettling to pagan public opinion. And now that the emperor

*Ap. Trad.*, xvi. 11.) And though it was not unknown for individuals to adopt it in the fourth century, it was not the common or normal attitude either of laymen or ecclesiastics about either art in general or specifically 'sacred' art.

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. cxiii*, ii. 5; *Ep. cii*, iii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Not. Dign.*, ed. Boecking, *P. Orient.*, iii., p. 12; *P. Occid.*, ii., p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Philostorgius, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. 17.

<sup>4</sup> They retained the pagan title and office of *Pontifex Maximus* and the political control of pagan worship which that gave them down to the time of Gratian (A.D. 375), though they did not personally fulfil its ritual functions.

publicly disbelieved in his own divinity, many christians found it more possible to pay the conventional 'adoration'<sup>1</sup> to the imperial portrait as a matter of etiquette.

Yet this cultus of the emperor's ikon was by tradition a religious veneration and was well understood to be so. It was bound to suggest the lawfulness of a similar cultus to the ikons of the King of heaven and the saints, and we do in fact find it brought forward as an argument in favour of the cultus of christian images, once that began to be debated.<sup>2</sup> This is not the place to consider the immense disturbance which the facing of that question occasioned all over christendom in the eighth and ninth centuries, or the rather different lines on which it was settled in the East and West respectively.<sup>3</sup> All that concerns us now is the extent of the connection of such cultus of images with the official liturgy of the church and the date when it began.

In the West there is virtually never any such connection at all. The Western church has officially practised and encouraged the cultus of images by the clergy and laity in a variety of ways; but it has always kept it dissociated from the eucharist and the office. At the most all that could be cited is the setting of a crucifix upon the altar during the celebration of the eucharist, and its incidental censoring during the censoring of the altar.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Proskynesis*, a word of elastic meaning. It could mean religious adoration in the strict sense; it could also imply that lesser reverence formerly demonstrated, e.g., by serving kings on bended knees.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, *Concilia*, t. xii. 1014, 1068.

<sup>3</sup> Briefly, the West took in the end what seems the commonsense view, that it is hardly possible for an educated Western man to commit what the O.T. means by 'idolatry', viz. the paying of divine honour literally to an image. There is always a mental reference to that which it represents. (Cf. S. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, III., xxv. a. 3.) Whether this solution holds equally good for all parts of the mission field, or even in all parts of Europe, is perhaps another question; though I found in West Africa that the ju-ju priests, and perhaps the worshippers, look on their fetiches in much the same way. (That great field-anthropologist, the late R. L. Rattray, once told me that he fully agreed with this estimate.) The Eastern view, as stated by S. John of Damascus and S. Theodore of the Studium, is more alarming to the protestant mind. There is, however, a most interesting exposition and defence of it, against the Western Thomistic view, by the (R.C.) V. Grummel in Vacandard, *Dict. de Theol. Cath.*, s.v. *Images (Culte des)*. The whole question has recently been treated with his usual sympathy and learning by Prof. E. Bevan in *Holy Images* (1940), (part of his Gifford Lectures, but published separately) but without coming to any very clear conclusions. If I may be allowed a personal word, I think a great deal of christian iconoclast violence on the subject has been due to the inveterate tendency of all puritans to 'verbalism', to restricting worship and prayer to what can be expressed in words, with direct mental attention. I have never personally been assisted to vocal prayer in any sort of way by an image or crucifix; but I have frequently been assisted to 'recollection' for mental prayer by the sight of them, or by holding a crucifix. If words formed or thought with attention be the only thing conceived of as 'prayer', then images are certainly either distractions or idols. But if prayer be something which can be both wider and deeper than that, then it would seem that they can be, as the orthodox have always contended, both an assistance and a medium of true worship.

<sup>4</sup> In the office, statues (or side-altars) of saints are sometimes censored during *Magnificat* at Vespers on their feasts, but this is a permitted, not a prescribed ceremony of the rite.

But even this slight connection does not begin until the thirteenth century.

In the East the connection is stronger. Not only does the veneration of ikons play a much greater and more intimate part in the personal devotion of the Orthodox East<sup>1</sup> among clergy and laity alike than is common in the West, but their censuring and veneration in a carefully prescribed order is laid down as an official part of the orthodox liturgy, both at the eucharist and at the office, as well as at other services. They are regarded not as mere reminders of what they portray, but as actually *mediating* the participation of their originals in the earthly worship of the church. Accordingly their veneration is an integral part of divine worship, just as rejoicing in the fellowship of our Lady and all saints and angels will be a real part of the joy and worship of the redeemed in heaven, which the earthly worship of the church 'manifests' in time. But here again it is doubtful if this conjoining of the veneration of images with the official liturgy is really ancient in the Byzantine church. It probably began in the ninth century, as part of the great renewal of emphasis on the cultus of images which accompanied the final overthrow of the iconoclast emperors. In any case it can hardly be older than the introduction of the custom of a preliminary censuring of the altar and sanctuary, which is first mentioned in Syria only in the late fifth century<sup>2</sup> but probably was not adopted at Constantinople till the sixth-seventh century.

#### *Incense*

The use of incense both for domestic purposes and in the cultus goes back for some centuries before the christian era all round the mediterranean basin. In the Near East it is much older than in the West, doubtless because the materials—gums and spices—are indigenous to those countries and not to the West. Its religious use in the Old Testament need not detain us, since it has no early connection with its use in christian worship other than through the use of Old Testament symbols in various ways by the writers of the New.<sup>3</sup>

*At the chabûrah meal.* There is, however, a domestic use of incense in judaism which is worth recording because of its possible connection with the last supper. The burning of spices in the room after the evening meal was a common custom in all the mediterranean countries, but among the jews it was—like everything else—given a religious colouring, especially at the domestic rite of supper on formal occasions, of the type under which the *chabûrah* meeting was included. The ceremonial introduction and blessing

<sup>1</sup> The dissidents are much less demonstrative in this respect. The Nestorians have no ikons. The Monophysites use them as decorations, and are said to have begun to copy Orthodox customs in their veneration to a certain extent in quite modern times.

<sup>2</sup> Pseudo-Dionysius Areop., *de Hier. Eccl.*, iii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Phil. iv. 18; Rev. v. 8, etc.

of a lamp has already been spoken of. It was at this moment that the spices also were introduced and blessed and burned. In the first century A.D. the question was disputed between the rabbis as to the order in which the lamp and the spices (or the chafing dish in which they were burned) were to be blessed. The school of Shammai held that first the lamp was to be blessed, then the 'Thanksgiving' was to be said, then the spices were to be blessed and burned. The school of Hillel held that both lamp and spices were to be blessed and used before the 'Thanksgiving' was said.<sup>1</sup> This was not an exceptional rite but one of such normal occurrence that the omission of the bringing in of spices (to save unnecessary labour on the Sabbath) at the Friday evening meal with which the Sabbath began, became a special sign of the Sabbath; as their reappearance at the Saturday evening meal was a sign that it was over. The reappearance of the burning spices on Saturday evening was especially associated with the *habdalah*, the prayer with which the domestic keeping of the Sabbath ended.<sup>2</sup> In the form of the 'habdalah spice-box' this domestic use of incense has descended into the practice of the modern orthodox Jewish home, though it is not now burned, but only smelled at.<sup>3</sup> The last supper was a formal *chabûrah* meal, at which the ordinary rules for such occasions were observed, and it was not held on the eve of sabbath, which was specially marked by the omission of the burning of spices. It is true that the N.T. accounts do not mention this; but then neither do they mention the bringing in and blessing of the lamp, with which the spices were closely associated, though we may infer that there must have been one.<sup>4</sup> They are not meant to be full reports of every detail of the meal.

*In Christian Worship.* It is probably due to familiarity with the hallowed usage of incense in the Temple worship and also in this domestic way at the *chabûrah* meetings of the primitive church at Jerusalem, that there is no trace in the New Testament of hostility to the use of incense in worship. It is even taken for granted as playing a prominent part in the ideal Christian public worship of heaven.<sup>5</sup> Such hostility developed later in the Gentile churches during the persecutions.<sup>6</sup> The mere fact that the ordinary test for a Christian was the command to burn incense to a heathen divinity was sufficient to cause it to be regarded with something like horror, despite the precedents of the Old and New Testament. These were allegorised away as referring only to 'prayer',<sup>7</sup> and the rationalistic arguments of pagan philosophers against the employment of incense in pagan worship were rather curiously seized upon as part of the Christian apologetic for its dis-

<sup>1</sup> *Berakoth, Mishna*, viii. 5. Cf. *Tosefta*, vi. 6 (pp. 68-9).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. I. Abrahams, *Notes on the Jewish Authorised Prayer Book*, p. clxxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> That it was anciently burned cf. *Berakoth, M.*, vi. 6 (p. 48).

<sup>4</sup> John xiii. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. v. 8; viii. 3, 4, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Tertullian, *de Idololatria*, ii.; Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, vi. 1; Lactantius, *Instit.*, vi. 25, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*, IV. xx. 11; Origen, *contra Celsum*, viii. 17, etc.

use.<sup>1</sup> *Turificati*, 'incense-burners', without further description, became a technical name for the apostates who by obedience to the magistrate's command had forfeited not only the heavenly crown of martyrdom but all participation in the earthly worship of the church. Nothing can be more certain regarding the worship of the pre-Nicene church than that incense was not used at it in any way during the second and third centuries.

It was only after the peace of the church that the burning of perfumes in christian churches began.<sup>2</sup> It must have become fairly widespread before the end of the fourth century for we hear of it almost simultaneously at Jerusalem and at Antioch in the East<sup>3</sup> and at Milan and Nola in Italy.<sup>4</sup> But there is nothing in most of these fourth century references to suggest more than a 'fumigatory' use of incense to perfume the churches. We do not even know that it was burned during service time, and not simply as a preparation for the assembly of a large and somewhat mixed gathering of people in a not too-well ventilated building. This is much more analogous to the domestic than the liturgical use of incense. The use of it borne before the bishop as a mark of honour, which comes in at about the same period, is nearer to a ritual usage, but even this is a borrowing from secular customs and not religious in its origin.<sup>5</sup>

By the end of the fifth century some use of incense in christian churches appears to have been more or less universal. But it is clear that in the large majority of cases this had still no more directly religious significance than, e.g., the use of music. It was now an accepted part of the general setting in which the eucharist was held; but the Old Testament notion of incense as in itself an *offering* to God (whether in combination with other sacrifices or alone) had hardly made its appearance. The text of Malachi i. 11 'in every

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Praep. Evangelica.*, iv. 10 (citing Porphyry); iv. 13 (citing Apollonius).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 310.

<sup>3</sup> Etheria, *Peregrinatio*, ed. cit., p. 73; Chrysostom, in *Mat. Hom.*, lxxxix. 4; cf. *Apostolic Canons*, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Ambrose, *de Cain et Abel*, I, v. 19; Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina*, xiv. 100; xxvi. 410.

<sup>5</sup> Etheria (*loc. cit.*) refers to the use of incense at Jerusalem while the gospel is read by the bishop (at Lauds, not at the synaxis, but she never describes the synaxis rite). This may well be a ceremonial use, but is probably more closely connected with veneration for the bishop than for the gospel. There is mention of burning incense in the funeral procession of Peter, bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 311 (*Acta*, M.P.G., xviii. 465). But since these were compiled in their present form only in the seventh century they are quite unreliable for a detail of this kind, even though they appear to rest on good older sources. The earliest contemporary reference to incense in a christian funeral procession appears to be at the death of S. Honoratus in Gaul A.D. 430 (Hilary of Arles, *Sermo de Vita Scti. Honorati.*, vii., M.P.L., I. 1269). Both jews (cf. *Berakoth*, M., viii. 7) and pagans had burned incense at funerals, perhaps originally only as a deodorant, though it came to have a religious significance. But there is no pre-Nicene evidence that the christians accepted this custom as they accepted the funeral torches. The use of spices and unguents poured on the corpse as a preservative (cf. the burial of our Lord) was also common to jews and pagans—see Prof. A. O'Rahilly, *The Burial of Christ*, Cork, 1942, pp. 6-11—a most interesting collection of evidence—and this was continued without question by christians. Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 42.

place *incense shall be offered* unto My Name and a pure offering' had, as we have seen, done yeoman service ever since the second century in expounding the sacrificial nature of the eucharist as the 'pure offering'; but the reference to incense had invariably been ignored or allegorised away.

There is, however, one exception to this way of regarding the use of incense. Lietzmann has rightly drawn attention<sup>1</sup> to a passage in the *Carmina Nisibena* of the East Syrian S. Ephraem composed in A.D. 363, which reveals that this thoroughly Jewish idea of the smoke of incense as in some sense an atonement or 'covering' for sin<sup>2</sup> was already fully accepted in these predominantly Semitic churches. Addressing Abraham, the contemporary bishop of Nisibis, Ephraem says:

'Thy fasts are a defence unto our land,  
Thy prayer a shield unto our city;  
Thy burning of incense is our propitiation;  
Praised be God, Who has hallowed thine offering.'<sup>3</sup>

Clearly this propitiatory 'censing' here is a liturgical function which the bishop performs on behalf of his flock, like prayer or the consecration of the eucharist. A large number of other Syrian texts of the same character can be cited from the late fifth to the eighth century, all indicating the acceptance of the same idea of incense as a 'sin offering'. In this period the notion passed into the Christian liturgies. A 'prayer of incense' found in the oldest MS. (ninth century) of the Jerusalem *Liturgy of S. James* runs thus: 'Thou that art made High-priest after the order of Melchizedek, O Lord our God, Who offerest and art offered and receivest the offerings; receive even from our hands this incense for a savour of sweetness and the remission of our sins and those of all Thy people'.<sup>4</sup> A variant of this idea is to be found in the Alexandrian *Liturgy of S. Mark*: 'We offer incense before the face of Thy holy glory, O God; and do Thou accepting it upon Thy holy and heavenly and spiritual altar send down upon us in return the grace of Thy Holy Spirit'.<sup>5</sup> Other examples could be cited from all the Eastern rites.

<sup>1</sup> *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 86. Having criticised certain parts of his book, it is only just that I should draw attention to the soundness of this section of it—an improvement on E. G. C. F. Atchley's *History of the Use of Incense* (1909) which is not much more than a valuable collection of materials.

<sup>2</sup> When the Jewish high-priest on the Day of Atonement went into the Holy of Holies to sprinkle the blood of the sin-offering before the mercy-seat, he carried a censer in his hand. The idea was apparently that only through the cloud of the incense smoke could a sinful man even in so representative an office come *safely* face to face with the presence of an infinitely holy God. It is probably this conception which leads the author of Hebrews to ignore the censer in his detailed application of the rites of the Day of Atonement to our Lord's high-priestly entry 'into the holy place' (ix. 11 sq.) though he had mentioned the 'golden censer' in ix. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Ephraem Syrus, *Carmina Nisibena*, xvii. 37 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Lit. of S. James*, ed. J. Cozza-Luzzi, ap. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, t. x., p. 46 (not in Brightman's text).

<sup>5</sup> Brightman, *L. E. W.*, p. 118, l. 26sq.



Similar ideas reached the Gallican churches about the tenth century, probably from Eastern sources, and began to penetrate into the liturgies in the same sort of phrases. I cite the two following because these alone eventually passed from Gaul into the official Roman rite of the *Pian* missal in the sixteenth century, and so became more or less universal in the West. (a) A blessing of incense at the offertory: 'By the intercession of blessed Michael<sup>1</sup> the archangel standing at the right hand of the altar of incense and of all His elect, may the Lord graciously bless this incense and accept it for an odour of sweet savour. Through Christ our Lord.' (b) During the censuring of the oblations which follows: 'May this incense which Thou hast blessed ascend up unto Thee, O Lord, and may Thy mercy descend upon us'; where the Egyptian idea of an 'exchange' of incense for grace seems to be latent though somewhat vaguely expressed.

In the development of the christian use of incense we seem therefore to be able to trace the influence of three different factors: (1) The domestic or 'fumigatory' use. (2) The 'honorific' use of it before the bishop, which no doubt made it easier to transfer the idea of burning incense before the altar as a mark of reverence and so of an offering to God. There can be little doubt that this is the genesis of the Western censuring of the altar. It is probable, too, that the contact with the instincts of folk-religion in the popular martyr-cult assisted in this. The custom of burning incense at a martyr's tomb in his honour, which is attested in some places in the fifth century, shades off easily into the idea of an 'offering' to the saint to procure his intercession. (3) The purely Old Testament idea of incense as a sin-offering, which begins to infiltrate into christian worship in Syria in the fourth century, and spreads gradually over the East and then penetrates into the West. Though this idea is accepted in isolated phrases in the liturgical texts, and has certainly—combined with (2)—operated to affect ceremonial in obvious ways both in the East and the West, it has never been formally accepted as a doctrine anywhere. It is noteworthy that in the conservative Roman rite all blessings of incense and censuring of persons and objects were still unknown as late as the twelfth century,<sup>2</sup> though by then they were more or less universal everywhere else. In the Papal mass of the twelfth century incense was still used as it had been everywhere (except in Syria) in the fifth century, only to scent the air and as a mark of honour carried before the bishop and the gospel book.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Gaul 'Gabriel', in allusion to Luke i. 11. The substitution of Michael transfers the ref. to Rev. viii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> At the same time, S. Gregory I, *Ep.* 52, 'We send you by the bearer . . . incense to be offered to the bodies of the holy martyrs' shows that the idea had been accepted at Rome in the highest quarters by A.D. 599 in connection with the cultus of relics, though still excluded from the rigid tradition of the liturgy there.

<sup>3</sup> The only place where the Roman use of incense can still be seen in its original fashion seems to be Chichester Cathedral (where however, they add an extra use of it in a Gallican procession of the elements). But this is a modern piece of Romanising, not a restoration of the mediaeval Chichester use, which was more elaborate.

Such post-Reformation Anglican use of incense as there was before the later nineteenth century did not develop so exclusively as one might expect along the lines of the early 'fumigatory' use, though this was commonest. But the puritans under the Laudian *régime* were loud in their denunciations of censings 'to' altars, which suggests that the Carolines were influenced chiefly by Eastern precedents. It is a pity that we have no detailed description of the use of censuring at Ely Cathedral, where it continued at least down to A.D. 1747. It ended because 'Dr. Thos. Green, one of the Prebendaries and now (1779) Dean of Salisbury, a finical man, tho' a very worthy one, and who is always taking snuff up his Nose, objected to it under Pretence that it made his Head ache.'<sup>1</sup>

### Summary

This brief and inadequate survey of the development of the accessories of ceremonial will have served its purpose if it makes clear how far it was from the intention of the fourth century church to convert men from heathenism by any imitation of the pagan ceremonies to which they were accustomed. The whole core and substance of the ceremonies as well as the rites of the eucharist in the fourth century were continued unchanged from pre-Nicene times; they can be traced back uninterruptedly through the formation of the 'four-action shape' of the eucharist to the *chabûrah* rite of the last supper. Even such things as vestments, lights and incense in their use at the eucharist only begin to take on a properly ceremonial or symbolic character after the fifth century (at the very earliest), by the lapse of time through several generations. They have all either a utilitarian or secular origin in their liturgical use, and are given a particular christian meaning only through the inveterate instinct of men to attach symbolic interpretations or at least a ceremonious performance to all public acts which are regularly repeated.<sup>2</sup>

Yet there undoubtedly was a measure of assimilation both in practices and beliefs to the old pagan folk-religion during the fourth century. But it is in the practices of the martyr-cult, not in the eucharistic liturgy, that this is to be found. It is certain that in this field pagan practices and ideas did in the end succeed in naturalising themselves within catholic christianity, and came to be not only tolerated but encouraged by the clergy after the fifth

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 5873, f. 82 b, cited in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, ed.<sup>2</sup> Vernon Staley, London, 1902, ii., pp. 183 sq. The devastating effects of incense on the physical system of many modern English protestants are well known. Curiously enough there are no complaints of them from the seventeenth century English puritans and they were totally unknown to the jews and pagans of antiquity, or to the christians of the first 1,500 years. Dr. Thomas Green appears to be the first recorded sufferer, and deserves to be sympathetically commemorated as such.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. e.g. the ceremonies which have come to surround the taking and presentation of the collection in Anglican churches (especially in some cathedrals). And now in some dioceses in the mission field the people have come to add a sign of the cross and a bow by each contributor as he puts in his money, in token of 'giving to God'.

century. The whole apparatus of the cultus of images, relics, holy wells, etc. in the forms which it was allowed to assume during the dark ages has a recognisable relationship to the same things in pre-christian paganism. But it is relevant to remark that just those elements in paganism which were taken over into christian popular devotion were many thousands of years *older* than that 'official' paganism of the emperor-worship and the Olympian gods and the Eastern mysteries which the church overthrew. These popular practices had been assimilated by pagan 'theology', as it were, and underlay it and survived it, just as they have survived conversion to christianity, and also conversion to judaism and Islam. Similar practices of offerings of lights and incense at the reputed tombs of *welis* and saints and prophets and marabouts are to be found in the popular mohammedanism and judaism of the Near East and North Africa to this day.

It is not a sufficient defence of such practices in themselves to say that they are an instinctive popular way of practising any religion, which has come down unchanged from the morning of the mediterranean world. Yet this does make clear the process by which they passed over into christian usage. It was not by way of the liturgy, which was under the control of the clergy, but through the individual expressions of piety of a multitude of half-instructed converts in the latter half of the fourth and especially the fifth century. The church allowed personal piety free play—how could she do other?—outside the liturgy; and in various ways it took the old instinctive lines. But these found their only point of contact with christian public worship at the shrines of the martyrs. This is a rather different thing from the old charge of the deliberate paganising of christian worship. It should always have been obvious to intelligent students of the period that when the clergy were preoccupied (as they were in the fourth and fifth centuries) with deeply philosophical problems of the nature and being of God and their relation to the incarnation, Plato and Aristotle were likely to present a much greater temptation to the fundamental paganising of christian thought by the clergy than the lower strata of the old peasant superstitions which haunted the countrysides, but which had been despised by all educated pagans for centuries.

It would certainly have been more satisfactory to the modern mind if the church had taken a firmer line with these things in the fourth and fifth centuries, and prevented their recrudescence within christianity; though to one who considers the actual field of their infiltration in the contemporary setting the practical difficulty of preventing it seems very great. The academic critic must make his reckoning with the fact that the actual compromise with them achieved in the fifth and following centuries is in itself no more, but also no less, defensible than the failure to deal firmly with the similar superstition that 'An angel went down at a certain season into the pool of Bethesda and troubled the water: whosoever then first stepped in was made

whole of whatsoever disease he had'.<sup>1</sup> In the dark ages when 'not many wise men after the flesh' were available, the church was content to believe with the apostle that 'God has chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and base things of the world and things which are despised hath God chosen, yea and things which are not'.<sup>2</sup> It may be a pity, but it is a fact, that it is impossible to reduce christianity either to a spiritual philosophy or even to a pure theology. It is always a *religion*, which means partly a practice, for—amongst others—the immense numerical majority of uneducated people, who have their own place and office in the Body of Christ. What the church of the dark ages did not do, at all events in the West, was to allow such practices any foothold in the liturgy of the eucharist. Even in the East they remained on the margin of the liturgy.

The deliberate invention of symbolical gestures and actions and ceremonies in the liturgy to express and evoke adoration, purity of intention and so forth, is something which begins, as we have seen, in the fourth century with the transformation of the eucharist into a public worship. It is a subject with immense ramifications and fascinating bye-ways into which this is not the place to enter. But I think it can be laid down as an almost invariable rule that when each separate instance (*e.g.*, genuflection, the *lavabo*, censing of the altar, etc.) is traced up to its beginnings, they have always the same history. They begin in Syria, usually in the fourth-sixth century, and radiate outwards, south to Egypt and north to Byzantium. In the West (to which they came sometimes by way of Byzantium, sometimes from Syria, and often first to Spain) the great Western centre of interest in such devotional side-issues is always France, the first home or at least the chief propagator of so many modern popular devotions—the Rosary, the Sacred Heart, 'Reparation', and so forth. From France they spread outwards to England, to Germany, to North Italy—and ultimately to Rome.

We shall not get very far in understanding the inner process of the history of the liturgy unless and until we understand that it expresses and must express something of the *life* of the christian peoples; and that their natural characteristics do to a large extent enter into their religious life to be supernaturalised by grace. The perfervid devotionism of the Syrian, which comes out so strongly, *e.g.*, in Ignatius of Antioch *c.* A.D. 115 (and for that matter in Saul of Tarsus and some of the O.T. prophets)—the ceremoniousness of the Byzantine, with his love of etiquette—the *naïveté* of the Copt and his love of repetitions—the French mutability and love of some new thing—that special 'tenderness' of English devotion, which manifests itself in a love of rather sentimental hymns and vocal prayers in the first Anglo-Saxon private prayer books that we have—the prosaic practicality and the almost stuffy conservatism of the local church of Rome—these things do not change from century to century, and they are not annihilated when men come to pray. It is no accident that the deacon still leads the

<sup>1</sup> John v. 4.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. i. 26 sq.

intercessions of the people in the Byzantine litanies with the very gestures and phrases prescribed by etiquette for the spokesman of a deputation to the Eastern emperor—that the Gallican ceremonial and rites are florid and have a greater number of variable prayers than any other—that the chivalrous doctrine that the Mother of God was never under the guilt of original sin appeared first in Anglo-Saxon England, where the treatment of women was much in advance of that common in Europe in the eleventh century—that Irish devotion has enthusiasm but practically no 'liturgical sense' whatever right through the centuries—that the Roman rite has about it still an archaic angularity and abruptness, a concentration on the performance of the eucharistic action rather than talking about it, which is no longer found in any other rite.

These matters of temperament are not only relevant to—they are the actual *cause* of—the course which the history of liturgical details has taken in christendom. To ignore them is to make that history incomprehensible. But having understood their importance, we shall not be misled into making them a justification for misunderstanding the unity of the eucharist. They affect the details only of its performance. The main structure of the liturgy is always and everywhere the same, however much it be overlaid with local ways and decorations, because the eucharist is always identically the same action—'Do this'—with the same meaning—'For the *anamnesis* of Me.' In so far as the christian Syrian and Byzantine and Copt and Englishman and Frenchman and Roman are all christians and so partakers in the one eucharistic action and experience of the one Body of Christ, the Shape of the Liturgy by which that action is performed is bound to be the same in all essentials for them all.