CHAPTER XIII

THE COMPLETION OF THE SHAPE OF THE LITURGY

We have seen that the two halves of what we call the eucharistic rite were originally two distinct rites, the synaxis and the eucharist, either of which could be and frequently was celebrated without the other. They had different origins, served different purposes and were to some extent attended by different people. The eucharist, the Liturgy of the Body of Christ, was for the members of the Body alone. They had an absolute obligation to be present at it every Lord's day, since the 'vital act' of the Body would be incomplete unless each member actively fulfilled in it what S. Paul calls 'its own office', the 'liturgy' of its order. Those outside the Body, whether casual enquirers or enrolled catechumens, could attend only the synaxis and not all of that, since they were dismissed before the prayers with which it ended. Yet the synaxis is not rightly regarded either as a mere propaganda meeting for outsiders or even primarily an instruction service for the faithful, though the lections and sermons enabled it to serve both purposes. By intention though not in form it was an act of worship, the Liturgy of the Spirit, in which the church indwelt by the Spirit adored as well as proclaimed the divine redemption wrought through Jesus. The intercessory 'prayers of the faithful' which followed demonstrated, so to speak, the efficacy of that redemption by exercising His priestly power of intercession for all men bestowed upon the church, and on the church alone, 'in Christ'. Though the individual's obligation to attend the Sunday synaxis may have been less strict than in the case of the eucharist, the faithful were expected to take part in this corporate witness to the fact of the christian redemption. They were the only people qualified to exercise its consequence in the concluding intercessions, by appearing corporately before God, 'accepted in the Beloved', to plead for the world.

We have traced out the exceedingly simple primitive structure of these two rites, which it may be convenient to set out again.

Synaxis.	*Eucharist.*
A. Greeting and Response.	*A*. Greeting and Response.
B. Lections interspersed with	*B*. Kiss of Peace.
C. Psalmody.	*C*. Offertory.
D. The Bishop's Sermon.	*D*. Eucharistic Prayer.
E. Dismissal of the Catechumens.	*E*. Fraction.
F. The Intercessory Prayers of the Faithful.	*F*. Communion.
(*G*. Dismissal of the Faithful.)	*G*. Dismissal.

(When it was held separately the synaxis seems to have concluded with some sort of dismissal of the faithful.)

We have now to trace the addition to this primitive nucleus of a 'second *stratum*', as it were, of additional devotions, filling in, supplementing and in certain cases obscuring this bare primitive outline which concentrates so directly upon the essential action of the rite. In dealing with this 'second *stratum*' it is unfortunately much more difficult to avoid being technical. We have to take account of more facts, and the facts themselves are more complicated. The need of the period in which the 'second *stratum*' was added (from the fourth century to the eighth) was to adapt the old pre-Nicene tradition of christian worship to its new 'public' conditions and function. But this need was felt by different churches with a different intensity and at different times. And the practical break-up of the christian empire in the fifth century—it still continued as a theory, so mightily had the universal dominion of Rome impressed the imagination of the world—forced the local churches to meet the new needs to some extent in isolation, so that different schemes of additions appeared in different regions.

Before the fifth century her existence within or alliance with an effective universal state had enabled the church readily to put into practice her catholic ideal by the intercommunication of distant churches. When the old Roman world began to break up, the christian world even in the practical breakdown of communications was still quite aware of its own unity; local churches were still quite willing and eager in most cases to borrow from elsewhere improvements and novelties in things liturgical. The result is that though the regional churches were in practice becoming sufficiently isolated to develop a considerable amount of variety in the new prayers of this 'second *stratum*', there was also a good deal of borrowing and cross-borrowing in various directions, due to occasional contacts, which complicates the individual history of the local rites a good deal. A new observance in the liturgy, *e.g.* of Milan in the fifth century, may be something evolved locally to meet a local need. Or it may equally well be something borrowed from Rome to the south, because of Rome's prestige as the Apostolic See; or from Gaul to the north-west, because it is new and interesting; or something brought back frcm Jerusalem by returning pilgrims, full of 'the way they do it' in the Holy City of men's holiest dreams and emotions in that age. All this needs careful disentangling if we are to make out the true history of rites, and above all the true reasons for changes, and their effects. And often enough the fragmentary evidence enables us to give only an approximate answer to questions we should like to ask about when and where such and such an observance, destined it may be to affect the development of eucharistic rites for centuries to come, first took shape and why.

It is impossible, therefore, to avoid a certain measure of complication in dealing with this 'second *stratum*' of prayers in the liturgy, though I have done my best to make it intelligible to the non-technical reader, because it

is an essential part of the history of the eucharistic rites which christians use to-day. But first it is necessary to say something of the process by which the two halves of the rite, originally distinct, came to be fused into a single continuous whole, for this process is the background of the addition of the prayers of the 'second *stratum*' to the old universal Shape of the Liturgy which had come down from pre-Nicene times to all churches alike.

A. The Fusion of Synaxis and Eucharist

Strictly speaking there was no conscious or deliberate process of fusion. As whole populations became nominally christian, there ceased to be anybody not entitled and indeed obliged as a member of the faithful to be present at both rites. Confirmation was now received in infancy along with baptism as a matter of course by the children of christian parents. In a christian population the only people whose attendance at the eucharist could be prevented were the excommunicated—those who for conduct or belief incompatible with membership of Christ's Body had been deprived of their rights and functions in the liturgical act of the Body. In Cyprian's phrase, they had been 'forbidden to offer', and by consequence to make their communion, for we must not forget that in primitive terminology those whom we call 'the communicants' are always called 'the *offerers*' —*offerentes*, *hoi prospherontes*, not *communicantes*, *koinōnoi*. The change of term to 'communicants' reflects an immense shift of emphasis in devotion. It goes along with a change in the status of the laity from participants in a corporate act with the celebrant to passive beneficiaries of and assistants at his act. These changes were not completed before the mediaeval period, and indeed constituted between them the essence of that mediaeval way of regarding the eucharist which has proved so unfortunate in different ways all over christendom.

The roots of these changes go deep, right into the subsoil of the modern church. As far back as the fourth–fifth century the laity in general, especially in the East, were becoming infrequent communicants, out of a new devotional sentiment of fear and awe of the consecrated sacrament, of which we shall say a little more later. Thus, though they remained in name the *offerentes* or *prospherontes*, the faithful did in fact largely cease to offer their *prosphorai* of bread and wine, at all events with the old significance and as a normal weekly rule. The introduction of the devotional novelty of a special 'holy loaf' made by clerical hands as alone sufficiently holy for sacramental consecration further robbed the survival of the lay oblation of bread and wine (in so far as it did survive) of significance. From being the matter of sacrifice and the substance of self-oblation, the layman's *prosphora* sinks to the sphere of the Eastern *eulogia* and the Western *pain bénit*, mere tokens of a holy thing which the unhallowed layman *ought* not to receive. It is not surprising that the distinction between the faithful and

the excommunicate became too difficult to enforce so far as mere presence at the eucharist was concerned (and nothing else but presence was now in question). The dismissal of penitents (*i.e.* those under discipline) vanished from most rites in the fifth–sixth century even in form, and was no more than an empty survival where it remained.

The deacons continued to proclaim the dismissal of the catechumens before the intercessory prayers as in the pre-Nicene church, but there were ceasing to be any catechumens to depart. By the seventh century this, too, had become a mere form. But where the prayers were kept up in some way at their primitive position after the sermon, the deacon's dismissal of the catechumens was generally maintained as a sort of prologue to them, though the bishop's departure-blessing of the catechumens which preceded it usually fell into disuse. Where the precedent—set at Jerusalem as early as *c.* A.D. 335—of transferring the intercessions from the synaxis to the second half of the eucharistic prayer had been followed, the deacon's dismissal of the catechumens was apt to disappear altogether from the rite, as *e.g.* in the Syriac *S. James.*[1]

With the disappearance or toning down of the dismissals the most emphatic mark of division between fully 'public' and specifically 'christian' worship was weakened, and the two services held one after the other on Sunday mornings soon came to be thought of as a single whole, because the same congregation now attended the whole of both rites as a matter of course. This stage had been reached in many places by the end of the fifth century. By the end of the sixth the holding of either rite without the other had come to be regarded as an anomaly.

But in the fourth century this fusion was hardly begun. The distinction is fully recognised, for instance, by Etheria in her account of Sunday morning worship at Jerusalem in A.D. 385: 'At daybreak, because it is the Lord's day, all proceed to the great church which Constantine built at Golgotha behind (the site of) the Crucifixion, and all things are done according to the custom everywhere (at the synaxis) on Sunday; except that (here) the custom is that of all the presbyters who sit (in the stalls round the apse) as many preach as wish, and after them all the bishop preaches. They always have these (many) sermons on Sundays, that the people may always be well taught in the scriptures and the love of God. And the preaching causes a long delay in the dismissal of the *ecclesia*, whereby it is not given before ten o'clock or sometimes eleven. But when the dismissal has been done, in the way it is done everywhere, the monks escort the bishop to (the church of) the Resurrection (on the other side of the great paved court enclosing Golgotha) and when the bishop arrives to

[1] In the West the dismissals were lost in the Roman rite probably in the sixth century, though they survived in S. Italy to a later date (*cf.* S. Gregory, *Dialogues*, ii. 23). In Gaul they survived till at least the eighth century in some places. They are still found in the Mozarabic books and traces of them remain in most Eastern rites.

the singing of hymns, all the doors of the basilica of the Resurrection are thrown open. All the people go in, but only the faithful not the catechumens. And when the people are in, the bishop enters and goes at once inside the screens of the *martyrium*[1] in the cave (of the Holy Sepulchre, where the altar stands). First thanks are given to God (*i.e.* the eucharistic prayer is said)[2] and then prayer is made for all (*i.e.* the intercessions). Afterwards the deacon proclaims aloud. And then the bishop blesses them standing within the screens and afterwards goes out. And as the bishop proceeds out all come forward to kiss his hand. And so it is that the dismissal from the eucharist is delayed nearly to eleven or twelve o'clock.'[3]

Here the two rites are not only distinct, but held in different churches. The synaxis is public, and at Jerusalem exceptionally lengthy. The eucharist is still exclusively for the faithful and comparatively short—less than an hour. Etheria is trying to be discreet in describing its details, in deference to the old discipline of not publicly revealing the content of the rite. But she manages to let her sisters in Spain know how 'the way they do it in Jerusalem' differs from things at home in Galicia—by the (rather overwhelming?) number of sermons, and the bishop's processional exit from the synaxis and entrance at the eucharist, and by the postponement of the intercessions from the synaxis to the eucharist, the hidden consecration, and the final blessing.

The postponement of the intercessions to the eucharist had a practical advantage at Jerusalem, arising out of the local custom of transferring the congregation from one church to the other between the two rites. The catechumens could be left outside in the courtyard without the delay of getting them out of the midst of the synaxis-congregation before beginning the intercessions. Perhaps the transference of the intercessory prayers to the eucharist began at Jerusalem out of this utilitarian motive. Shorn of the prayers the synaxis became a wholly 'public' service, and all the strictly christian worship was concentrated in the eucharist.

[1] This word shows how the martyr-cult had taken possession of the imagination of the age. It means strictly speaking the tomb, the actual resting place, of a martyr's bones. Here it already means simply the most important and sacred spot in a church. There was no *martyrium* in the church of the Resurrection, but only the cave-tomb from which our Lord had risen, in which the altar stood. (The eucharist was only celebrated once a year, on Maundy Thursday, in the other church, which may not have had a permanent altar at all.)

[2] It is noticeable that Etheria says nothing about the offertory, either by way of the people's oblation for themselves or of a procession of deacons, as in Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Byzantine rite. Cyril of Jerusalem also never mentions an offertory, and the present Syriac *S. James* has not got one. Is it possible that the liturgical 'new model' at Jerusalem had done away with the pre-Nicene offertory altogether, and that the bread and wine were simply 'discovered' on the altar when the congregation came in from the other church? It would force us to look elsewhere than Jerusalem for the origins of the 'Great Entrance' and the whole complex of ideas surrounding it in Theodore and the Byzantine rite—but not, I think, outside the limits of Syria and those regions of Southern Asia Minor which were vaguely dependent on the church of Antioch.

[3] *Peregrinatio Etheriae, ed. cit., p.* 74.

But when this local Jerusalem custom began to be imitated in other places where there was no second church, and both services were held one after the other in the same building,[1] the transference of part of the synaxis into the second half of the eucharistic prayer must have gone some way of itself towards fusing the synaxis and eucharist, by eliminating precisely that point of the rite at which the distinction between the 'public' and christian worship had hitherto been made.

Yet whatever other factors may have helped to break down the distinction between synaxis and eucharist, it was undoubtedly the disappearance of adult catechumens which finally ended the need for any such distinction. The moment at which the whole population (to all intents)[2] could be said to be nominally christian naturally varied a good deal in different places. A fair test is the lapse into disuse of the 'discipline of the secret'—the old rule of never describing the eucharist openly in the presence of the unconfirmed or in writings they might see. At Rome this stage had been reached *c.* A.D. 450. The sermons of Pope S. Leo preached in the presence of any catechumens there might be, and also his official correspondence, speak of the details and doctrine of the eucharist with a complete absence of that mystification still indulged in by S. Augustine in his sermons and by Pope Innocent I in his letter to Decentius only a generation before.[3] Yet at the opposite end of christendom a few years later Narsai makes it clear that at Edessa there were still adult catechumens, and their expulsion from the liturgy was still a living reality.[4] And the eucharist could still be celebrated there without being preceded by the synaxis, at all events at the paschal vigil, just as we find it at Rome in the second and third century.[5] But even at Edessa after another 200 years there are no longer any catechumens, and the deacons are ceasing in practice to command their withdrawal from the liturgy, though it still remains in the text of the Edessene rite.[6]

The fusion of synaxis and eucharist was thus taking place gradually *c.* A.D. 400–500 in most places. But during this period each continued to be celebrated without the other on occasion. Thus the Byzantine historian Socrates (*c.* A.D. 440) says that the synaxis 'without the mysteries' is still held every Wednesday and Friday (the old 'station days') at Alexandria in

[1] The removal of the congregation to another building for the eucharist was perhaps commoner than is supposed. S. Augustine mentions it in Africa, *Serm.* 325.

[2] There were still cliques of educated people professing classical paganism in the sixth century, chiefly in Byzantine academic circles, where it was a cherished pose. There was also a great deal of more sincere rustic immobility in ancestral peasant cults down to the seventh–eighth centuries in some provinces of the old empire—quite apart from the unevangelised heathenism outside the old imperial frontiers.

[3] *E.g.*, Leo, *Serm.* lxiii. 7; xci. (*al.* lxxxxix.) 3; *Ep.* lix. (*al.* xlvi.) 3. One may wonder how far Augustine and Innocent speak as they do in formal deference to a convention, not because the rule still had much practical value.

[4] *Hom.*, xvii., *ed. cit.*, *p.* 2.

[5] *Ibid.*, xxi., *p.* 55.

[6] James of Edessa (seventh century), *Ep. to Thomas the presbyter; ap.* Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 490, *ll.* 35–7.

his time.[1] But he looks on this as an old local peculiarity and seems to have no idea of its former universality. Perhaps he was confused because in the contemporary Byzantine rite such a synaxis without the eucharist already always took the form of the 'Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified', *i.e.* of a synaxis followed by communion from the reserved sacrament, as the close of a fast day—which rather disguises the nature of the rite.[2]

In the West the synaxis apart from the eucharist persisted chiefly in Lent, as a relic of the old instruction-classes for the catechumens. It was ultimately restricted first to Holy Week and finally to Good Friday only. When the Roman church first began to observe Good Friday as a commemoration of the Passion separate from that of the Resurrection on Easter Day (instead of both together at the paschal vigil)—in S. Leo's time *c.* A.D. 450 this change had *not* yet been made—the old Roman texts of the paschal vigil were transferred bodily with a minimum of adaptation to a synaxis without the eucharist on the Friday, to make way for the new series of lections at the Saturday vigil drawn up in the church of Jerusalem in S. Cyril's time.[3] In the sixth century this synaxis composed of the old Roman texts of the second century for the Saturday vigil continued to be the only strictly official observance on Good Friday at Rome.[4] This synaxis ended with the intercessory 'prayers of the faithful' in the Papal rite.[5] But the communion of the Pre-sanctified had attached itself to the synaxis in

[1] Socrates, *Eccles. Hist.*, v. 22 (21).

[2] In the Byzantine rite this is made up of elements drawn from vespers as well as the synaxis, followed by communion from the reserved sacrament, and is the only form of liturgy allowed in Lent except on Saturdays, Sundays and the Annunciation. It is first attested at Byzantium as the Lenten substitute for the liturgy by can. 52 of the Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 692), which takes it for granted that this is the only conceivable thing in Lent (which was not universally the case). But S. Sophronius at Jerusalem in A.D. 646 already calls it an 'apostolic' institution (*i.e.* it was in general use so far as he knew and not instituted within living memory). Though it is not always safe to assume that what was taken for granted in the East in one century had so much as been thought of two centuries before, something in the nature of the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified can be traced back to pre-Nicene times on fast-days in the West, so that we may believe it was in use at Byzantium *c.* A.D. 440. At all events I see no other explanation of Socrates' remarks about the synaxis at Alexandria 'without the mysteries' in his day.

[3] *Cf. p.* 339.

[4] See the (local) Roman *Ordo* for Holy Week in the Einsiedeln MS. *ap.* Duchesne, *Origins*, *ed. cit.*, *p.* 482. The text of the prayers is in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, *ed.* Wilson (H.B.S., 1915), *pp.* 51 *sqq.*

[5] So also did a similar synaxis on Wednesday in Holy Week at one time. The Roman Holy Week observance apparently consisted of a strict fast every day, synaxis without the eucharist on Wednesday and Friday, and the paschal vigil on Saturday night with its baptisms and confirmations followed by the midnight mass of Easter. The consecration of chrism at a mass on Maundy Thursday was apparently added in the fifth century. It seems meagre, but it is entirely characteristic of the Roman liturgical spirit in the fifth–sixth century. All else in the modern Roman rite—the procession of palms, the dramatic rendering of the passion gospels, the reproaches and veneration of the Cross on Good Friday, the prophecies of Holy Saturday—all these things so vivid and dramatic in their symbolism are demonstrably foreign accretions from Syrian, Spanish and French sources, only slowly and reluctantly accepted into the Papal rite between the seventh and fourteenth centuries.

the parish churches of Rome on Good Friday long before it was accepted in the official rite of the Pope. It was probably a survival, unchanged in the popular tradition of devotion since pre-Nicene times, of communion *at home* from the reserved sacrament on those fast days on which there was no celebration of the eucharist, which had transferred itself to the parish churches when domestic reservation began to be given up (? in the fifth century).

So much for the synaxis without the eucharist. The eucharist without the synaxis seems to have disappeared everywhere in the East after *c.* A.D. 500. It lasted longer in some places in the West, but only as a special survival on Maundy Thursday. On that day in some Western churches there were three eucharists[1]—one for the reconciliation of penitents in the morning, one for the consecration of the chrism at mid-day, and one in commemoration of the last supper in the evening.[2] At the first eucharist there was no synaxis, the long rite for the reconciliation of penitents taking its place. At the second the synaxis precedes the eucharist in the normal way. At the third the eucharist is celebrated without the synaxis, beginning, as we should say, at the offertory. This is, of course, the 'typical' eucharist of the year, and its holding in this primitive fashion may have been due to a lingering tradition of what constituted the rite of the eucharist proper. Since the synaxis had already been held that day, there seemed to be no need to impose it again on the congregation and celebrant already weary with the long fast.[3] But we hear no more of this evening eucharist on

[1] The multiplication of eucharists on that day seems to have begun at Jerusalem, where there were two in Etheria's time. S. Augustine *c.* A.D. 400, *Ep.* liv. 5 (*al.* cxviii. or *ad Januarium* I, iv.) refers with some irritation to the idea that this is the only 'correct' thing to do on that day: 'If some one on pilgrimage in another country where the people of God are more numerous and more given to attending services and more devout, sees for instance that the eucharist is offered twice on Thursday in the last week of Lent, both in the morning and evening; and on returning home where the custom is to offer it only in the evening—if he then makes a fuss that this is wrong and not the correct thing to do, that is a childish way to behave. We should not imitate it ourselves, though we may put up with it from others; but we should correct it among our flock'. One suspects that there must have been a good deal of this sort of feeling among bishops at the way lay ceremonialists on returning from Jerusalem treated the Cyrilline rite as the only 'correct' thing. One would like to have, *e.g.*, the entirely candid comments of Etheria's Warden about the repercussions of her jaunt to the holy places on the convent services after she got home to Spain. Christian human nature is endearingly the same after nearly 1,600 years!

[2] Rome may have had these three eucharists in the sixth century, but the texts of the prayers for them in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* (*ed.* Wilson, *pp.* 63–73) do not appear to be Roman, but Italian or French, except for the formulae for blessing the holy oils. The Roman prayers (for a single eucharist) are in the *Gregorian Sacramentary* (*ed.* Wilson, *pp.* 48 *sqq.*). Martène, *de Ant. Eccl. Rit.* iv., xxii., vi. 5, mentions a 'most ancient Roman *Ordo*' which agrees with the Gelasian practice. But this is now supposed to be a German monastic adaptation of a Roman *Ordo*, made in the (?) eighth century (No. xvii. in Andrieu's enumeration). Whatever its origin, this document is the latest piece of evidence I have found for the celebration in the West of the eucharist without a synaxis.

[3] Some modern Anglicans are said to celebrate the eucharist in the evening, beginning with the offertory and the invitation 'Ye that do truly'. There can, of

Maundy Thursday after the ninth century. Apart from the single exception of the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified (really a synaxis without the eucharist, though the appended communion from the reserved sacrament partly disguises the fact) the two rites had finally become a single indivisible whole all over christendom well before A.D. 800.

There is one further aspect of this fusion of the synaxis and eucharist which should be mentioned, though I am not in a position to answer the further questions which it raises. The period during which this fusion came about is precisely that in which mere *presence* at the eucharist, instead of the old liturgical and communicating participation in the eucharistic action, definitely established itself in most places as the substance of the ordinary layman's eucharistic devotion. Was there some connection between the two movements? At the pre-Nicene synaxis a passive part was all that was possible for the congregation; the reader, the singer of the gradual, the preacher, necessarily acted while the rest listened. It was only when the intercessions were reached that even the pre-Nicene synaxis became an effectively corporate act.

The transference of these intercessions into the second half of the eucharistic prayer, which was essentially the celebrant's own individual contribution to the corporate act, certainly went far to destroy their corporate nature. In the liturgy of *S. James* and even in S. Cyril's account of the matter they have become simply a monologue by the celebrant, in which the people have nothing to do but listen. I cannot think it is entirely accidental that this impulse towards 'non-communicating attendance' should apparently have begun in Syria, and that in the same period the Jerusalem rite, soon to be so widely imitated in the East, should have undergone this particular change. For it cannot have been without some effect that this most influential liturgy should have substituted at the very point at which the older rites prayed for the communicants and the effects of a good communion a very lengthy intercession for all sorts of other concerns, based on the novel doctrine of the special efficacy of prayer in the presence of the consecrated sacrament. This idea was taken up by the preachers, *e.g.* Chrysostom; and it has received 'extra-liturgical' developments in the mediaeval and modern Latin churches. It is not possible to deny its devotional effectiveness, though it may not be so easy to justify on theological

course, be no possible objection to the omission of the synaxis on grounds of primitive precedent, and if the fast is kept, it would even seem humane to do so. Indeed, if one wanted to Romanise in an old-fashioned way, this would be an excellent method of doing it. Back to Hippolytus! Most of the sixteenth century reformers, however, were insistent that 'the proclamation of the Word of God' was necessary to the *validity* of the eucharist, a position stoutly maintained by modern protestant theologians. I do not clearly understand what is meant by this doctrine, but it seems excessive that it should be thought necessary for those among us who have been suspected of protestantism to disavow it by the elimination of even one minute's Bible reading from the eucharistic rite. The liturgy of the Spirit ought not to be entirely neglected for the liturgy of the Body; and it is not adequately replaced by Evensong, the monastic origin of which gives it a different basis and direction.

as on psychological grounds. That is not here our concern. The point is that in the fourth century it was new, and the expression of it by *substituting another idea for that of communion* just before the communion act itself was new too. Coming at that particular point it can hardly have been without some effect on eucharistic devotion among those who paid attention to the prayers. Doubtless there were all sorts of psychological influences at work in producing the new idea of the laity's wholly passive function at the eucharist—the instinctive feeling that communion was not for everybody, the new language of 'fear' of the sacrament, and so on—as well as a certain inevitable lowering of the temperature of devotion in an 'established' church which was coming to include the average man as well as the naturally devout. But it may very well be that amongst those influences we have to reckon with some unforeseen effects of the liturgical changes made in the structure of the Jerusalem rite. And it remains a fact, explain it how we may, that the passive receptiveness—the being reduced to mere listening—which was always necessarily the layman's rôle in the first part of the synaxis, became his rôle also at the eucharist proper (which it had never been before) just in the period in which synaxis and eucharist began to be regarded as parts of a single rite.

B. The Completion of the Shape of the Synaxis

The tradition of the liturgy was as tenacious of its inherited forms in the fifth century as it had always been, and so the process of adaptation to new needs took the form of additions to the old nucleus much more often than of substitutions for it. This is noticeable in the synaxis. As the pre-Nicene church had transmitted it from the synagogues of the apostolic age, this rite might well seem unnecessarily abrupt in its opening. And however faithful to its origins and well adapted to its pre-Nicene purpose, it was everywhere defective in the elements of vocal praise and prayer, especially where the intercessions with which it should have concluded had been transferred to the second half of the eucharistic prayer. Once the decline of the catechumenate began to make it unnecessary to continue the old restrictions on these aspects of worship at the synaxis, it was right that attempts should be made to remedy these deficiencies. This was done by adding an 'Introduction' to the old nucleus, of a more directly worshipful character than the old conditions had allowed.

The Introduction

The uniformity of the ancient material in all churches will not have prepared the reader for the apparent complexity and diversity of the material added by the 'second *stratum*' in the various churches, as shewn in the table opposite *p.* 444 (which has been simplified in some columns by the omission of what are known to be mediaeval insertions). The items

A, B, C, D, E, are found in all.[1] These are the ancient nucleus. But of the other items prefixed to this, though each appears in several rites, none but the 'hymn' appears in all, and this in two different forms (β and 3) while some are in different positions in the rites in which they are found, *e.g.* the 'prayer' (§) in the Egyptian and Western groups.

Yet a few minutes' study of this table with due regard to the approximate date of the appearance of the items in the various rites reveals that all this complexity has a comparatively simple explanation. It arises from the fusion in various ways of three different forms of Introduction. These three forms I have called I, II and III, distinguishing their contents by three different prefixed symbols to assist their identification. Those of I are α and β; the single item of II is marked §; and the components of III are 1, 2, 3. All three forms (I, II, III) arose in the East during the fourth-fifth century, and have originally a geographical basis. We shall discuss them individually, and then ascertain the uses made of them in the Western rites, which form a fourth group (IV).

The 'Far Eastern' Introduction (I)

The first scheme consists of (α) a preliminary censing by the bishop or celebrant, followed by (β) the singing of a group of psalms, prefixed to the lections. Geographically it begins in what is for us the 'far east' of classical christendom, though (α) the censing was afterwards adopted by the central group of Greek churches. We think and speak of these Greek churches as 'the Eastern churches', but the Mesopotamians and other 'far Easterns' habitually called them 'the Western churches', and the Greek theologians 'the Western doctors'. The Greeks always stood for Western and European ideas in the mind of these semitic christianities, for whom the Latin West was generally too remote to be taken into account.

We have already noted the special importance attributed to the bishop's 'censing' by S. Ephraem in East Syria before A.D. 360.[2] The same notion of censing as a propitiation and a preliminary even to private prayer is found in Syria in the fifth and sixth centuries. Thus in A.D. 521 the hermit Zosimas in Phoenicia 'At the very moment of the earthquake at Antioch suddenly became troubled . . . called for a censer and having censed the whole place where they stood, throws himself on the ground propitiating God with supplications' and afterwards told his companions of what was then happening at Antioch—an instance of his well-authenticated 'second sight'.[3]

But the first description of censing as a preliminary to the liturgy, and of the Oriental introduction to the synaxis as a whole, is found in those remarkable writings which succeeded in imposing a system of neoplatonic

[1] With the possible exception of the first two columns (which represent Mesopotamia) where A, the preliminary greeting, may always have been absent.

[2] *Cf. p.* 428.

[3] Evagrius, *Eccl. Hist.*, iv. 7.

pagan mysticism upon all christendom under cover of the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, the convert of S. Paul.[1] The date and country, though not the identity, of this enterprising forger have been determined within narrow limits.[2] He wrote *c.* A.D. 485 in that interesting strip of country behind and to the north of Antioch, which forms a borderland between N. Syria and Mesopotamia on the one hand and Asia Minor proper on the other, a region which has given to mankind not only such minds as Poseidonius and S. Paul and Nestorius, but a multitude of ideas and inventions. In his high-flown way Pseudo-Denys describes the opening of the synaxis thus: 'The hierarch having ended a sacred prayer [? privately] before the divine altar, begins by censing there and goes throughout the whole enclosure of the sacred edifice. And returned once more to the holy altar, he begins the sacred melody of the psalms, the whole well-ordered ecclesiastical array chanting along with him the holy psalmic song'.[3]

These psalms (β) survive in the *marmitha* psalms of the present E. Syrian rite,[4] and also, apparently, in the 'psalm of the day' and *saghmos jashou* ('dinner-time psalms') of the Armenian rite.[5] This rite, however, has at some time incorporated into itself the whole Greek scheme of the introduction (III), part of it being interpolated into the middle of the (β) psalmody of the original Armenian Oriental scheme (I).[6] This (β) psalmody failed to establish itself in the Greek rites when (α) the censing was taken over by them, because the purpose of the psalmody was already served in the Greek liturgies by the 'hymn' (3) introduced at the same point in the Greek scheme *c.* A.D. 440. We find a preliminary censing before the liturgy mentioned at Constantinople *c.* A.D. 565,[7] and it is likely to have been used in the Greek Syrian rites before then, since the idea of censing as a preliminary to prayer was well known there before that date. But at Constanti-

[1] Acts xvii. 34.

[2] J. Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen der Ps.-Dionysischen Schriften usw.*, Feldkirch, 1895, makes out his case for the place and date of these writings as completely as his later essay, *Der sog. Dionysius Areopagitica und Severus v. Antiochen*, published in *Scholastik*, 1928, *pp.* 1–27, 161–189 (*cf. ibid.*, 1932, *pp.* 52 *sqq.*) fails to do for his proposed identification of Ps.-Denys with Severus of Antioch. (As the latter has won a certain following in this country I may call attention to the devastating criticisms by J. Lebon, *Rev. d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 1930, *pp.* 880 *sqq.*, and 1932 *pp.* 296 *sqq.*)

[3] Ps.-Denys, *de Eccl. Hierarch.*, iii. 2.

[4] Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 253.

[5] *Ibid.*, *p.* 425.

[6] The history of the Armenian rite is obscure. It seems to have begun as a rite of the Cappadocian type (of which *S. Basil* is the main relic), to have undergone influence from Jerusalem, and finally to have been heavily Byzantinised, while certain details of the Western Roman and Dominican rites were taken over by it during the period of union with the West in the fifteenth century. It is difficult in its present form to know whether to treat it as a fundamentally Byzantine rite incorporating certain old local features (in which case (α) and (β) in col. 3 should be bracketed and 1, 2, 3 left clear) or as an Anatolian rite heavily overlaid with Byzantine details, as I have done. What is certain is that it combines the whole of Introductions I and III.

[7] *Vita Eustathii Patriarchae* (A.D. 552–582), M.P.G., lxxxvi., 2377.

nople the preliminary censing was performed by the deacon and not by the bishop as in the East, because the Greek bishop continued to enter the church only during the 'entrance chant' (1) of the original Greek introduction scheme (III), to which the censing (α) drawn from the Eastern scheme (I) had been prefixed. In Egypt we have a mention of the same sort of preliminary censing (α) before the synaxis in a document which in its present form can hardly be as old as the fifth century and seems more likely to be of the later than the earlier part of the sixth.[1] Roughly speaking, the preliminary censing (α) of the 'Far Eastern' Introduction (I) had been incorporated into all Eastern rites but one before A.D. 600. Curiously enough the E. Syrian rite of Edessa has no censing (α), though it has the psalmody (β). It may be that it once existed in this rite, but the prefixing of a long formal preparation of the elements and the celebrant on the Byzantine model in later times has eliminated it. Or it may be that the (β) psalmody before the lections was introduced in the earlier fourth century before there was any use of incense in church; and that *Addai and Mari* thus preserves the first stage (β psalmody alone) of the type of Introduction of which Ps.-Denys in the next century gives us the developed form (α censing followed by β psalmody).

The first censing of the altar in the Western rites does not appear before about the tenth century in Gaul, and was not adopted at Rome until the twelfth; it spread not very rapidly in the derived Western rites during the middle ages. In view of the fact that some early Western ceremonials, *e.g.* at Milan, give this initial censing to deacons or minor ministers and not to the celebrant, it is conceivable that it began in the West as an imitation of Byzantine ways. But the Gallican ceremonialists were quite capable of developing this rite for themselves out of the old fourth century Western custom of merely carrying a smoking censer before the bishop in the entrance-procession as a mark of honour. And it is to be noted that the Western rites, unlike the Easterns, all kept the entrance-chant as the effective opening of the rite, and did not prefix the censing to it, as at Byzantium. The Western initial censing, late in making its appearance, never became more than an accompaniment to something else in the rite, a piece of ceremonial performed while something else was going on, and did not develop, as in the Eastern rites, into an item in the structure of the rite on its own account.

The Egyptian Introduction (II)

The second scheme seems to be locally Egyptian in origin. It consisted simply of the old pre-Nicene greeting (*A*), followed by a prayer (§), prefixed to the lections. In the earliest document of the Egyptian rite available (Sarapion, *c.* A.D. 340), we find that the synaxis begins with a prayer headed 'First Prayer of the Lord's (day).' It runs thus:

[1] *Canons of Athanasius*, 7, *ed.* W. Riedel and W. E. Crum, 1904, *p.* 16.

'We beseech Thee, Father of the Only-begotten, Lord of the universe, Artificer of creation, Maker of the things that have been made; we stretch forth clean hands and unfold our thoughts unto Thee, O Lord. We pray Thee, have compassion, spare, benefit, improve, increase us in virtue and faith and knowledge. Visit us, O Lord: to Thee we display our own weaknesses. Be propitious and pity us all together. Have pity, benefit this people. Make it gentle and sober-minded and clean; and send angelic powers that all this Thy people may be holy and reverend.[1] I beseech Thee send "holy Spirit" into our mind and give us grace to learn the divine scriptures from ⟨the⟩ Holy Spirit, and to interpret cleanly and worthily, that all the laity here present may be helped; through Thy Only-begotten Jesus Christ in ⟨the⟩ Holy Spirit, through Whom to Thee be glory and might both now and to all the ages of the ages. Amen.'

This prayer immediately preceded the lections. It is, by its position, the earliest 'collect' we possess, and a surprisingly early case of disregard for the rule that prayer might not be offered in the presence of the catechumens. Perhaps Sarapion would have argued that this was not so much a prayer 'with' them as 'for' them, which was allowed. This Egyptian collect is not, as with our eucharistic collects, a variable prayer connected with the day in the ecclesiastical calendar, but one always the same, closely connected by contents and position with the reading of the lections which it introduces. The bishop prays not only in the name of his church—'we beseech Thee'—but in his own name—'I beseech Thee'—when he prays for himself, for the special gift of the Holy Spirit to interpret the message of the scriptures for the laity. The whole construction suggests an originally private devotion of the bishop which has been turned into a public and audible preliminary to the lections.

Sarapion gives us only the prayers said by the bishop-celebrant, not their setting in his 'dialogues' with the people and the responses and other parts of the corporate worship offered by the deacon and others. For this we must turn to the Greek *Liturgy of S. Mark*, the mediaeval descendant of the fourth century rite of Alexandria. In this late form the Introduction has been Byzantinised. The Byzantine formal entrance of the bishop has been introduced, accompanied by the sixth century Byzantine processional chant, the *Monogenes*. After this follows at once the original Alexandrian opening of the synaxis. The deacon cries 'Stand up for prayer'—calling the church to order, as it were; and the celebrant greets the church, 'Peace be to all', and is answered, 'And with thy spirit'. The deacon repeats 'Stand up for prayer', to which the people answer 'Lord have mercy'. Then the celebrant chants his collect:

'Master, Lord Jesus Christ, the co-eternal Word of the everlasting Father, Who didst become like unto us in all things, sin excepted, for the salvation of our race; Who didst send forth Thy holy disciples and apostles

[1] Almost the meaning is 'respectable'.

to proclaim and teach the gospel of Thy kingdom, and to heal every disease and sickness among Thy people: Do Thou now also, Master, send forth Thy light and Thy truth, and illuminate the eyes of our understanding for the comprehending of Thy holy oracles, and enable us to hear them so that we be not hearers only but doers also of the word, that we may be fruitful and bring forth good fruit thirty and sixty and an hundredfold, and so be worthy of the heavenly kingdom . . .'[1]

This is addressed to the Son, and contains a number of technical anti-Arian terms (*e.g. synaïdios*) which were specially emphasised at Alexandria in the time of the teacher Didymus the Blind, in a particular phase of the Arian controversy *c.* A.D. 370.[2] They suggest that this also is a fourth century composition, though somewhat later than Sarapion's. Here again the Egyptian collect is directly connected with the lections, and asks for the fruitful hearing of the apostolic proclamation of redemption by the lessons and the sermon. This preliminary prayer (§) forms the whole of the Egyptian Introduction to the synaxis (II).

We shall deal later with its borrowing by the Western rites. It was never incorporated into the other Eastern Introductions. Instead the Egyptian rites themselves later incorporated the censing (α) from the Far Eastern scheme (I) and the entrance chant (1) and hymn (3) of the Greek scheme (III).

The Greek Introduction (III)

This is rather less homogeneous than the other two—or rather, perhaps, its full development was reached somewhat later. It consists of (1) a solemn processional entry of the bishop and clergy to the singing of a chant of some kind (*Eisodikon*), followed at once by the old opening greeting (A). There follow (2) a litany and (3) a hymn before the lections (B).

1. *The Entrance Procession and Chant.* We have seen that at Jerusalem in Etheria's time the bishop's entrance into the church of the Resurrection for the eucharist was specially delayed until all the people had taken their places, in order that he might enter in procession through their midst; and this though they had all been gathered together just before at the synaxis in the other church across the courtyard. Etheria does not describe the entrance of the bishop for the synaxis. But since she tells of a similar formal entrance of the bishop for two of the daily offices, and a processional departure of the bishop from both synaxis and eucharist it seems a fair inference that the synaxis also began with a processional entrance of the clergy—a typically Cyrilline touch of ceremony.

[1] Brightman, *p.* 117.

[2] Had this prayer been composed in the fifth or sixth century, the interest would have shifted to the Nestorian or Monophysite questions. The Coptic rite substitutes a much later prayer (Brightman, *p.* 147) but retains a heading reminiscent of Sarapion's—'The first prayer of the morning'.

There is no procession or opening greeting in the liturgy of *Ap. Const.* (Bk. ii. or Bk. viii.), which begins straight away with the first lection, like the Roman synaxis on Good Friday. But S. John Chrysostom in homilies preached at Antioch *c.* A.D. 390 and at Constantinople soon after A.D. 400 refers to some sort of formal entrance and the immediately following greeting: 'When the father enters he does not mount up to this throne before beseeching for you all this peace.'[1]

The fifty-sixth canon of the Council of Laodicea in Asia Minor (*c.* A.D. 363) lays it down that 'Presbyters ought not to enter and sit down on the *bema* (in their stalls round the apse) before the entrance of the bishop, but to enter with the bishop'—an indication that the old informality was beginning to give way to the more dignified arrangements of a fully public worship in this region during the latter half of the fourth century. I can find no mention of any sort of formal entrance of the clergy for the liturgy in the writings of the Cappadocian fathers from the Eastern part of Asia Minor in this period. But S. Basil specifically tells us that much in the performance of the liturgy in his church of Neo-Caesarea—the chief church of this region—was rather 'slovenly, owing to its old-fashioned arrangement', and this may be a point he has in mind.[2] (This equation of 'slovenliness' with 'old-fashioned' is a permanent feature of the history of liturgy and is worth pondering by the 'up-to-date' of all periods—perhaps with some searchings of heart.)

In all this fourth century Eastern evidence, however, though the entrance procession of the bishop and clergy seems to be taking shape, there is no direct mention of a chant. The first talk of this seems to come from Rome in the time of Celestine I (A.D. 422–432). It may be that Rome for once set a new fashion in the liturgy.[3] Yet we must remember that the processional entrance itself is attested in the East, *e.g.* at Laodicea, some sixty years before this, and that Etheria's 'hymns' during the bishop of Jerusalem's procession between the two churches may have continued while he passed between the ranks of people in the basilica of the Resurrection, though she does not say so. On the other hand the 'silence' of the offertory procession is emphasised by Theodore of Mopsuestia[4] in a way which suggests that silent processions may have been found particularly impressive by Easterns at this time, though to modern Western eyes they usually seem slightly depressing.[5]

[1] S. Chrysostom: *adv. Judaeos*, iii. 6; *in Mat.* xxii, 6; (preached at Antioch), *cf. in Col.* iii. 3 (at Constantinople).

[2] S. Basil, *de Spiritu Scto*, xxix. 74.

[3] There is no mention of singing in the description of a bishop's processional entrance by Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina*, xiv (*c.* A.D. 400). There was no introit, apparently, in the African rite.

[4] *Cf. p.* 283.

[5] The *Acta* of a Council at Constantinople in A.D. 536 (Labbe-Cossart, *Concilia*, v. 1156 D) speak of the singing of the *Benedictus* after the entrance of the bishop but before the *Trisagion*, which has given occasion to a number of authors to suggest or

We reach firmer ground as to the Greek entrance-chant in A.D. 535-6. The emperor Justinian at the close of his pro-Monophysite period, at a time when the monophysite patriarch Severus of Antioch was actually staying as his guest in the palace, composed a 'prose hymn' generally known from its first word, *Monogenes*.[1] This class of composition is known to us in the West chiefly by specimens of Eastern origin (*e.g. Gloria in excelsis* at the eucharist).

Justinian's hymn forthwith became the entrance-chant at Constantinople and Antioch. But shortly after this he changed sides, and proceeded to persecute the Monophysites with his usual cold-blooded efficiency. The Syrians and Egyptians soon came to execrate him as the incarnation of Byzantinism, and accordingly the monophysite rites of Syria and Egypt do not contain his hymn. To the 'royalist' Greek churches of Antioch and Alexandria his authorship was on the contrary a recommendation, and the *Monogenes* remained the first item of the Greek Introduction in the Greek rites. The Armenians (who had largely escaped Justinian's missionary methods and therefore felt less strongly about his authorship) adopted it when they incorporated the Greek Introduction (III) into their own rite, though they have spasmodically patronised a monophysite or anti-Byzantine interpretation of the Creed.

2. *The Litany.* The origin of litanies and their first position in the rite, at the 'prayers of the faithful' after the sermon, are more conveniently dealt with later. Here we are concerned with the insertion of a litany in the Introduction to the synaxis between the entrance-chant and the hymn.

It will be noted that the Byzantine rite contains no litany at this point, and I know of no evidence that it ever did so. The Greek *S. James*, the rite of Antioch-Jerusalem, does contain one. There seems to be no evidence as to when it appeared in the local rite of Antioch, but it cannot be traced before the ninth century. Yet besides the fact that *S. James* now contains a litany at this point, which despite its Byzantinised text was not taken over in this position from Byzantium, there is the fact that when the Roman and Milanese rites came to take over the Greek scheme of Introduction in the

repeat that this was the original entrance-chant in the rite of that city. I cannot think that anyone reading the context carefully could doubt (*a*) that on this occasion *Benedictus* was not sung during the bishop's entrance, but some while after it; (*b*) that it was not part of the rite at all, but the climax of the disorder and 'brawling' which disturbed this particular celebration of the eucharist. It was not sung by the choir but by the rioters.

[1] Theophanes, *Chronographia*, 6029. This has been questioned, but see V. Grumel's brilliant vindication, *Echos d'Orient*, xxvi. (1923), *pp.* 398 *sqq*. *Monogenes* is no longer the Byzantine entrance-chant, having been transferred to the *Enarxis*, a preparatory rite borrowed from the *Typica* (part of the divine office) about the ninth century. In the Antiochene, Alexandrian and Armenian rites, which all borrowed this piece from Byzantium, it is an entrance-chant, which sufficiently indicates its original function in their common source. The present Byzantine *Eisodika* (variable entrance-chants) are also taken from the office for the day, but I have failed to find evidence as to when they replaced the *Monogenes* in this function. (Was it when the *Enarxis* was inserted?)

fifth–sixth century they both inserted at this point a litany, whose text in each case is based on a Greek original. The 'Three Great Prayers', the Egyptian equivalent of a litany, occur at this point in the Coptic *S. Mark*.[1] All these facts would be adequately explained by the supposition that the litany here originated in the local use of Jerusalem (as to which unfortunately we have very little evidence in the fifth–eighth century) and that it spread north to Antioch and (after a fashion) south to Egypt and West to Rome, as local Jerusalem customs were so apt to do. And as for its peculiar position, before the hymn instead of after the sermon, there is a possible explanation in the fact that when litanies were becoming fashionable in the East as a substitute for the old prayers of the faithful—in the fifth century —the Jerusalem church was precluded from making use of this, the latest liturgical novelty, at the position normal in other rites, by the fact that it had long ago transferred these particular prayers to a point after the consecration. Whether this be the right explanation of affairs at Jerusalem or no, we shall find that when Pope Gelasius at Rome (A.D. 492–6) wanted to get rid of these same antique 'prayers of the faithful', and at the same time wanted to take over the new fashion of litanies, he did adopt precisely this expedient of inserting it after the entrance-chant, just where it stands in the liturgy of *S. James*.

3. *The Hymn.* The equivalent of the group of psalms (β) before the lections in the Oriental scheme (I) is found in the Greek scheme (III) as another 'prose hymn' (3). In the Greek rites this is the *Trisagion*, the words 'Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us', repeated three times to a particularly noble melody. This hymn is said to have been divinely revealed (variously to a boy, or a presbyter or the patriarch himself) at Constantinople in the time of the patriarch S. Proclus (A.D. 434–446) as the authentic text of the hymn sung by the angels in heaven. Whatever we may think about this, we have the contemporary testimony of Proclus' banished predecessor, the heretical ex-patriarch Nestorius, that it was inserted into the liturgy at Constantinople between A.D. 430 and 450.[2] It had been adopted at Antioch before A.D. 471 when the monophysite patriarch Peter 'the Fuller' caused a great commotion by adding the clause '... immortal, *Who wast crucified for us*, have mercy ...' and thus turned this Trinitarian hymn into a proclamation of the monophysite doctrine of Christ's single Divine Nature. In this interpolated form it was adopted by all the Syrian and Coptic Monophysites, who at some time have transferred it from before the lections to a place among the chants between the epistle

[1] The Greek now places them among the preparatory devotions later prefixed to the censing and *Monogenes*. But the opening part of both versions of *S. Mark* has been perturbed by 'Syriacisation' in the case of the Coptic (sixth–eighth century) and 'Byzantinisation' in the case of the Greek (eighth–eleventh century) so that the dating of each item has to be considered independently, and the original order cannot always be discerned.

[2] Nestorius, *Bazaar of Heraclides*, *ed.* Bedjan, *p.* 499.

and gospel. The East Syrians (Nestorians) had adopted it in the Greek position before the eighth century, when it is mentioned by the Nestorian Abraham bar Lipheh. I cannot trace the date of its adoption by the Armenians.

The Greek Introduction is thus made up of elements from two centres, Jerusalem and Constantinople. But it is a scheme as clearly marked as the Oriental and Egyptian schemes, and has spread even more widely than its two rivals. The general trend of influence in liturgical history is always from East to West. The Egyptian Introduction has spread to the Latin churches but not eastwards; one item of the Oriental scheme has spread westwards into the adjacent Greek churches; the Greek Introduction has been copied among the Latins. Only the influence of Jerusalem has been strong enough to work against this current, and spread some marks of the Greek Introduction into the Oriental area.

The Western Introductions (IV)

a. At Rome. The history of the Roman rite is better documented in the fifth–sixth centuries than that of other Western rites, and since Rome exercised an influence of its own in the West, it is convenient to begin with that. When we look at the developed Roman Introduction: (1) Introit or Entrance Chant, (2) Litany, later replaced by the *Kyries*, (3) Hymn (*Gloria*), followed by the Greeting and Prayer or Collect, it is clear that it consists structurally of the Greek Introduction (III) followed by the Egyptian one (II) as a sort of double prelude to the lections. It might even be made to appear that the Egyptian (II) scheme was added in the later fourth century and the Greek Introduction (III) prefixed to that during the fifth. This is a neat solution, and may even be true, though it depends on the date of the institution of the collect at Rome. Probst and others have attributed this to Pope S. Damasus (A.D. 366–384). But the documents hardly bear out this tidy idea of the development of the Roman Introduction when the evidence for each item in it is examined separately.

1. *The Introit.* That erratic document the *Liber Pontificalis* says of Pope Celestine I (A.D. 422–432) that 'He ordained that the 150 psalms of David should be sung antiphonally by all before the sacrifice, which used not to be done, but only the epistle of blessed Paul used to be read and the holy gospel'.[1] The singing of the entire psalter by the congregation at one session before the eucharist can hardly be what is meant; and Duchesne interprets this as referring to the first beginnings of the public recitation of the divine office in the Roman basilicas (as distinct from semi-private services in the oratories of the Roman monasteries). It seems to me that the psalm-chant here described is something much more closely connected with the eucharist than that; certainly it is 'before the sacrifice', but no more so than

[1] *Liber Pontificalis, ed.* Duchesne I, *p.* 230.

the epistle and gospel in the compiler's eyes, *i.e.* it refers to the institution of a chanting of psalms in the synaxis. The tract and gradual between the lections are certainly older than this, and there remains only the introit, the psalm which by the sixth century was certainly customarily sung at Rome to cover the Pope's processional entry.[1] The entrance procession had been adopted in the East in some churches at least sixty years before. The chanting of psalms at the eucharist was being extended from the old chants between the lections to other parts of the rite in Africa (though we hear nothing of an introit there) some years before this.[2] The adoption of the procession would appeal to the Roman sense of dignity; and some sort of accompanying chant would hardly be long in making its appearance, just because of the slightly depressing effect of silent processions.

2. *The Litany.* Alcuin has preserved for us the text of a Latin litany which he styles *Deprecatio Gelasii* (*The Intercession of Gelasius*).[3] It is manifestly based on an Eastern model, but Edmund Bishop has shewn that it is undoubtedly of local Roman manufacture in the details of its phrasing, and that there is reason to accept the attribution to Gelasius.[4] Quite recently Dom B. Capelle has pointed out that down to the time of that reputed reformer of the Roman rite Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492–6), the intercessions are frequently referred to at Rome as coming at the end of the synaxis in the old form. After his time they completely disappear at that point except in Holy Week[5] (when they might very well keep their old place as a climax to the synaxis celebrated without the eucharist, to avoid ending abruptly with the sermon). In the sixth century a litany was certainly employed in the Introduction at Rome. These coincidences are too numerous to be accidental. Though the *Liber Pontificalis* says nothing about it in its vague notice of Gelasius' liturgical innovations—but then it says nothing of his work upon the Roman eucharistic prayer either—it seems that Gelasius inserted the litany into the Roman Introduction.

It still retained the form of an Eastern litany, with responses said by the people to petitions by the deacon (or by the choir), at least on occasions, down to the time of Pope S. Gregory the Great (*c.* A.D. 600). But changes were made by him, or more probably had already begun before his time. Writing to the bishop of Syracuse in self-defence against the charge of

[1] The phrase *Constituit ut psalmi David CL . . . psalli* is odd. Could *CL* possibly be a corruption for *ctm*? *ct* or *cts* is found as an abbreviation for *cantus* ('chant') in some later MSS. of the *Antiphonarium Missae.*

[2] *Cf. p.* 492.

[3] M.P.L., ci. 560 *sq.* The full title is 'The Intercession which Pope Gelasius ordained to be sung for the universal church'.

[4] E. Bishop, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1911), *pp.* 407 *sq. Cf.* W. Meyer, *Nachrichten der k.G.d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen, philol.-hist. Klasse*, 1912, *pp.* 84 *sqq.*, who reaches the same conclusion on purely philological not liturgical grounds.

[5] Dom B. Capelle, *Rév. d'hist. ecclés.*, xxxv. (1939), *pp.* 22 *sq.* The last previous reference to the old intercessions is in the time of Gelasius' immediate predecessor, Felix III, in A.D. 487–8; *cf.* A. Thiel, *Epistulae Rom. Pont. genuinae*, Braunsberg, 1868, I, 263.

Western purists that he had followed the customs of Constantinople in the changes he had recently made in the Roman rite, S. Gregory says: 'We neither used to say nor do we say *Kyrie eleison* as it is said among the Greeks. For among them all (the congregation) sing it together (as a response to the deacon). But with us (something) is sung by the choir and the people answer it (*a populo respondetur*). And *Christe eleison* which is never sung by the Greeks is (at Rome) sung as many times (as *Kyrie eleison*). But on non-festal days we omit certain things usually sung (*i.e.* the petitions) and sing only *Kyrie eleison* and *Christe eleison*, so that we may spend somewhat longer on these words of supplication.'[1]

Whether the omission of the litany on ordinary days had begun before S. Gregory's time we cannot say for certain, because the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, our chief clue to the Roman rite in the century before S. Gregory's reform, does not contain an *Ordinary* or outline of all the invariable parts of the rite, but only the text of the prayers said by the celebrant. But it is probably significant that in its rubric directing the omission of the synaxis at the reconciliation of penitents on Maundy Thursday (a 'non-festal' mass which would in any case not include the *Gloria*) the *Gelasian Sacramentary* simply directs 'On this day there is no psalm (introit) nor greeting, that is he does not say "The Lord be with you" ' (but begins straight away with the prayers for the penitents).[2] But at the baptismal eucharist at the end of the paschal vigil (the festal mass of Easter) we find 'Then while the litany is sung (the bishop) goes to his throne, and intones Glory be to God on high'.[3] Here the litany seems plainly to be as much a feature of the rite reserved for festivals as is the *Gloria*. And there are no *Kyries* between Introit and Greeting-Collect at non-festal masses like that of the penitents on Maundy Thursday because S. Gregory had not yet invented them.

What S. Gregory's work on this part of the Roman rite seems to amount to is this: he left the litany on festal days perhaps more or less as it had been before (though it is as well to note that we have no evidence either way whether or not the text of the *Deprecatio Gelasii* as preserved by Alcuin still represented the current usage at Rome at the end of the sixth century). On non-festal occasions S. Gregory instituted repetitions of *Kyrie eleison* and *Christe eleison* between the introit and the greeting and collect, where previously nothing had intervened on non-festal days when the litany was not said. Though there is no direct evidence on the point I see no reason to doubt that these as S. Gregory fixed them numbered nine

[1] *Ep.* ix. 12 (*ed. Ben.*) written A.D. 598. All is not quite plain here. Did the choir (not the deacon) sing the petition at Rome in the old usage? Or does he mean that the text sung by the choir is the first *Kyrie*, to which the people 'respond' the second, and the choir the third and so on, as between priest and server at a modern low mass? I think the second sentence ('But on non-festal days' etc.) refers to S. Gregory's own new usage, not to the old 'litany' in the strict sense.

[2] *Gelasian Sacramentary*, *ed.* Wilson, *p.* 63.

[3] *Ibid.*, *p.* 87. There is no introit psalm because the Pope has already been in the church for some hours, officiating at the vigil and baptisms and confirmations.

(with *Christe eleison* for the middle three) sung alternately by the choir and people.[1]

But S. Gregory's innovation of the *Kyries* used as a chant *instead of* the litany on non-festal days soon ousted the use of the litany on festivals also. The text of the litany as used on festivals has left no trace in any extant MS. of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*. The litany, greatly developed and in some things transformed, continued to hold a place in Roman usage, but as an almost separate rite[2] conducted in procession through the streets outside the church as a preliminary to the eucharist on days of solemn supplication. It was thereby enabled to survive as an actual part of the Roman eucharistic rite at the Easter and Whitsun baptismal masses and (transferred to a later point in the rite) at ordinations and monastic professions. In this form, as a solemn supplication, it was adopted in France for occasions like the processions of the Rogation Days, at first as an addition to and then instead of the old French 'procession' of penitential psalms, certainly before the end of the eighth and perhaps before the end of the seventh century.[3]

3. *The Hymn*. We have seen that before the time of Pope Celestine I nothing whatever preceded the lections; and even after he had introduced the introit it formed the whole of the Roman introduction, according to the

[1] The statement of *Ordo Romanus I* that the number of *Kyries* depends on the caprice of the Pope, who nods to the choir master when he has had enough, takes no account of the Roman peculiarity of singing *Christe eleison* 'as many times' (*totidem vicibus*). I cannot help thinking the *Ordo* has here suffered some Frankish alteration. The first document which attests the present usage is *Ordo Romanus II* (*IV.* in Andrieu's enumeration, Duchesne's *Ordo of S. Amand*). The leaving of the number unfixed would be very unlike that sort of orderly precision which distinguishes the rest of S. Gregory's liturgical work, and which is indeed a most obvious trait in his whole personal mind and character.

[2] Nevertheless its original function as part of the Introduction to the eucharist was never forgotten, *cf.* the rubric in the *Gregorian Sacramentary, ed.* Wilson, *p.* 1.

[3] A word should be said here as to the transformation wrought in the form of the Roman litany by the prefixing to it of a long series of invocations of saints with the response 'Pray for us'. This has been treated excellently by E. Bishop, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vii. (1905), *p.* 122, and his conclusions carried further by F. J. Badcock, *ibid.*, xxxiii. (1932), *p.* 167. The results of their enquiries appear to be that Anglo-Saxon England was the first chief focus of this new devotional addition to the litany in the West, *c.* A.D. 700, and that it was propagated in Gaul and on the continent generally chiefly by Anglo-Saxon and Irish influence. But here, as is so often the case with what appear to be 'insular' innovations in Western practice, the real roots lie in the East. What lies behind the Anglo-Saxon devotions is a *Greek* document, perhaps introduced into England during the pontificate of the Greek-Syrian Pope Sergius I, A.D. 687–701, but coming ultimately from Asia Minor in the fourth–fifth centuries. This Greek document seems to have had no immediate effects on local Roman usage in respect of invocations in the litany. These invocations came to Rome as it were 'on the rebound', by Anglo-Saxon influence *via* Gaul. The original Roman litany, the *Deprecatio Gelasii*, knows nothing of them. It is interesting to reflect that Cranmer in 1552, by removing such invocations as remained in his 1544 litany, actually removed the one substantial English contribution to the Western litany form, and made the Prayer Book litany much more 'Old Roman' in structure, as well as in the occasions prescribed for its use. On the early history of litanies in the West *cf.* also E. Bishop, *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, xii. (1911), *pp.* 405 *sqq.* (and *Appendix* to Dom Connolly's *Homilies of Narsai*, *pp.* 117–121) and a characteristic letter posthumously published, *Downside Review*, xl. (1921), *pp.* 91 *sq.*

Liber Pontificalis. This was probably the Constantinople and Jerusalem usage of the time, and lasted at Rome from *c.* A.D. 430 till the introduction of the collect, of which we shall say more in a moment. Jerusalem may have introduced the litany after the entrance chant quite early in the fifth century; Rome certainly followed suit at the very end of the century. Meanwhile Constantinople had introduced the hymn of the *Trisagion* between the entrance chant and the lections (before A.D. 450), and Antioch (and probably Jerusalem) had done the same before *c.* A.D. 470. Once more Rome followed the Eastern custom, but after a generation or two. Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498–514) 'Ordained that on every Sunday and martyr's feast the hymn "Glory be to God on high" should be said.'[1] Both the position of this hymn and the frequent Roman description of it as 'the Angels' hymn' witness to its relation to 'the Angels' hymn' of the *Trisagion* at Constantinople. The Eastern structure of *S. James*—(1) *Eisodikon* (=entrance chant, *Monogenes*), (2) litany, (3) *Trisagion* ('hymn of the Angels') is exactly reproduced by the Roman (1) *Introitus* (=entrance chant', a psalm), (2) litany, (3) *Gloria* ('hymn of the Angels'). The Roman church refused to change its old scriptural entrance-chant of a psalm for the new Greek *Monogenes*, composed by an emperor of dubious orthodoxy; and likewise substituted *Gloria in excelsis* as the scriptural 'hymn of the Angels', to avoid being committed to the apocryphal legend of the divine revelation of the *Trisagion*. But it adopted the whole (III) Greek structure of the Introduction—entrance chant, litany, hymn—nevertheless, though it did so only item by item.

The *Gloria* was no new composition when it was put to this new use at Rome *c.* A.D. 500. It is found in Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor in the fourth–fifth century, and is said to have been introduced into the West by S. Hilary of Poitiers *c.* A.D. 363, who had come upon it during his banishment in the East. The number of local variants in the text of the hymn already found in the fourth century indicate an origin in the third, or even perhaps the second century. It had been a pre-Nicene Eastern 'hymn at dawn', and thus found its way into the new public morning office of Lauds in the East, where it formed a sort of 'greater doxology' at the end of the psalmody. In this position the Roman church seems always to have employed the *Benedictus* or Song of Zachariah. The *Gloria*, the old hymn which began with the song of the angels at Bethlehem, was therefore available at Rome for use at the eucharist, when current fashion suggested the need of an 'Angels' hymn' before the lections of the synaxis. There could indeed be

[1] *Lib. Pont., ed.* Duchesne, I, *p.* 263. It seems hardly necessary to refute the assertion of the same authority that Pope Telesphorus (martyred *c.* A.D. 130) 'ordained that before the sacrifice the Angels' hymn . . . should be said but only on Christmas at night' (*Ibid.*, I, *p.* 129). The festival of Christmas did not exist until, at the earliest, a century and a half after Telesphorus. At the most the statement may attest a vague tradition that the *Gloria* was occasionally used at Rome before Symmachus systematised and made official a growing practice. The *Gloria* was in fact more closely connected with Easter than Christmas at Rome.

no more suitable text than this to celebrate the redemption which the scriptures announce.

But it is perhaps a symptom of the reluctance with which the Roman church accepted innovations which had not an obvious practical purpose (like the introit), that both the litany and the hymn, which in the East became at once fixed and unvarying parts of the rite whenever it was celebrated, were adopted at Rome only as 'decorations' suitable to elaborate it for festivals, but not integral to the real purpose of the liturgy. This 'occasional' use may, too, reflect the growing influence of the calendar on the Western rites, which gives rise to the use of variable prayers in the West during the fifth century, an innovation which the East did not adopt in that form.[1] But there is also something of the Roman concentration on the main purpose and end of the liturgy and the sense of its form (which comes out again in the directness and brevity of the Roman prayers) about this reluctance to amplify the rite on all occasions with purely decorative additions. It seems indeed to have been felt at Rome that a hymn at this point was suitable even on feast-days only at the specially solemn 'stational' eucharist of the bishop. It is mentioned only once in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, at the Easter vigil (when any celebrant might use it). But the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, though it follows Pope Symmachus' ruling that the *Gloria* was to be used on Sundays and feasts, restricts this to the stational eucharist celebrated by a bishop for his whole church. Presbyters are permitted to use it only on Easter Day (to which later custom added the anniversary of a priest's own ordination). It was only in the eleventh or twelfth century that priests began to use it on all Sundays and festivals like bishops.[2] The omission of the *Gloria* on Sundays in Advent and from Septuagesima to Easter is not indicated in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, but is suggested by the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, where it is used *si tempus fuerit* 'if it is the season for it'. This further restriction in the use of the hymn (which is not found in the Eastern use of the *Trisagion*) may not have suggested itself until the seventh century.

4. *The Greeting and Prayer*. The synaxis on Good Friday in the Roman missal—the only really ancient specimen surviving of the old form of the Roman synaxis—opens abruptly, without introit (or of course *Kyries* and *Gloria*) and also without a collect. This seems to bear out the statement of the *Liber Pontificalis* that when Celestine first prefixed the introit no other text intervened between it and the lections. It is true that modern liturgical scholars have almost unanimously attributed the origin of the Roman collect to S. Damasus fifty years before Celestine. But this question is so closely bound up with the whole problem of the origin of prayers varying with the calendar, in the Western rites as a group and not the Roman rite

[1] *Cf. pp.* 529 *sq.*
[2] Berno of Reichenau, *de Quibusdam, etc.*, ii. (eleventh century) M.P.L., cxlii., 1059, still complains of the restriction.

alone, that it seems better to leave it for discussion in this larger setting in the next chapter, and to rest the case for the moment upon the evidence of the *Liber Pontificalis* that there was still no collect in Celestine's time *c.* A.D. 430. But if its insertion is later than this, there is reason to think it appeared not very much later, say within the next twenty or thirty years.

From the fact that the greeting at Rome is placed before this prayer, as in the Egyptian rite (and not immediately after the entrance chant as at Constantinople, or in its original place immediately before the lections as in Spain), we may be justified in supposing that the custom of a prayer before the lections was borrowed at Rome from Alexandria; and we do in fact find that from *c.* A.D. 430–445 relations between the Roman and Alexandrian churches were closer than at any other time between the visit of Athanasius to Rome in A.D. 339 and the last *rapprochement* of these two sees in the time of S. Gregory the Great *c.* A.D. 595. But it must be noted that while the Alexandrian collect of the fourth century is an unchanging prayer, the same on all occasions, the Roman collect when we first meet it is already one which varies with the occasion. There may have been a period when the Roman collect also was unvarying and referred simply to the hearing of the scriptures, like the Egyptian ones. But if so, this period must have been short, for it has left no trace whatever in the Roman evidence.

The following seems, then, to be the approximate history of the Roman Introduction to the synaxis. Celestine I prefixed the introit, the chanting of a psalm during the entrance procession, *c.* A.D. 430. Before that time there had been no Introduction whatever at Rome before the lections. In the next twenty years or so the Egyptian Introduction (II) of a Greeting and Prayer was set between the introit and the lections. There must after that have been a period when the Roman Introduction consisted simply of introit, greeting and collect, followed by lections. This is precisely the arrangement still implied for non-feast days in the first rubric of the sixth century *Gelasian Sacramentary* cited on *p.* 453. At the very end of the fifth century Gelasius added the litany, probably from the rite of Jerusalem, between the introit and the greeting. A few years later Symmachus again added the hymn between the new litany and the greeting. Perhaps the litany, and certainly the hymn, were from the first special to Sundays and feasts. They were placed where they were to avoid disturbing the Egyptian 'group' of greeting and prayer; which suggests that the Egyptian idea of the prayer as specially connected with the lections immediately after it had at one time obtained a foothold at Rome. The whole Roman Introduction is therefore a product of the period between *c.* A.D. 430 and *c.* A.D. 500, precisely the period when we have seen that the adult catechumenate was ceasing to be of any practical importance at Rome. The Introduction at Rome represents, therefore, the adaptation of the old pre-Nicene synaxis,

which had had to serve the purposes of propaganda outside the ranks of the faithful, to the needs of a 'public' worship in the new christian world.

b. The Western Introduction outside Rome. We are on much less secure ground in dealing with the Western rites other than that of Rome right down to the seventh, and in many matters the ninth, century. Before then the evidence available is both less in quantity and more ambiguous in quality than in the case of the Roman rite; and the subject is encumbered with modern theories, no one of which seems to account for all the facts. We shall not enter upon them, but merely note what evidence is available, and what it indicates.

It is necessary at the outset, however, for the sake of those who have read the usual manuals, to take account of two modern discoveries which seriously alter the bearing of this evidence. Dom Wilmart's demonstration —the word is not too strong—that the so-called *Epistles of Germanus of Paris* (*d.* A.D. 576) have nothing to do with Germanus or Paris, but were composed in the South of France (or perhaps in Spain) *c.* A.D. 700, will necessitate a considerable reconstruction of what one might call the 'usual' theory—though in fact it is mainly of French construction—of the history of the 'Gallican' rite.[1] The term 'Gallican' was first used to cover only the old local rites used in some parts of what is now geographically France before the end of the eighth century.[2] These rites have some clear resemblances to the Spanish Mozarabic rite. Successive French authors—Martène, Le Brun and above all Duchesne—grounding themselves on these resemblances, and noting parallels real or supposed in other Western rites, and assuming always that the 'French' rites were the parent, or at all events the purest representative, of the whole group, have extended the term 'Gallican' to mean in practice 'all Western European rites other than that of the city of Rome'. Not content with thus stretching the meaning of the term, some disciples of this school speak of '*the* Gallican rite' as originally observed throughout the whole West including Africa, leaving the Roman rite as an isolated enigma confined to the city and suburbs of Rome. Upon analysis, it will be found that the key-point of the theory is

[1] See Dom A. Wilmart, art. *Germain de Paris* (*Lettres attribuées à Saint*) in the *Dict. d'arch. chrét. et de lit.*, vi., 1049 *sqq.* (1924). The headlong onslaught, on the contributor almost as much as his contribution, by the editor in a later art. of the same work, *s.v. Messe*, § xxxiii., *ibid.*, x. 648 *sqq.*, does not restore the credit of the *Letters*. For Duchesne's misuse of them see *Origins* (*ed. cit.*), *p.* 189 *sq.* Doubts were first hinted as to the authenticity of the document by the patristic scholar H. Koch, and later by O. Bardenhewer; they were first plainly stated on liturgical grounds by E. Bishop, *App. to Narsai*, *p.* 89, *cf. Liturgica Historica*, *pp.* 130 *sq.* Duchesne never defended his dating of 'Germanus', and the note (incomprehensible from so great a scholar) appended to the later French edd. of his *Origines* (E. T. 1931, *p.* 574, *n.* 2) seems to shew that he failed to recognise the disastrous effects of the new view on his whole theory of the history of Western liturgy in general. Batiffol attempted to rescue the impugned authorship of Germanus, *Etudes de liturgie, etc.*, 1919, *pp.* 245 *sqq.*, but was refuted by Dom Wilmart, *art. cit.*

[2] This is *e.g.* its sense in Dom Mabillon's *de Liturgia Gallicana*, the pioneer work on the subject in 1685.

always the *Letters of Germanus*. Now that these turn out to be at least as much Spanish as French,[1] and to represent 'Gallicanism' not in its early purity but in the period of its admitted decadence after it had been transformed by a number of foreign elements, the term needs to be handled with more caution. We are thrown back on the older genuinely French evidence for the French rites, which is less abundant than one could wish. To avoid begging any questions the word 'Gallican' ought to be used only in its original sense of rites which existed within the geographical boundaries of what is now called France, which was then neither a racial nor a political nor an ecclesiastical unity. (When it is used in the wider modern sense of 'Western but not Roman' it will henceforward be placed in inverted commas.)

The second fact of which account must be taken is Dom Connolly's vindication of the authorship of the treatise *de Sacramentis* for S. Ambrose of Milan *c*. A.D. 400.[2] Here at the end of the fourth century Milan is already using what is recognisably an early form of the Roman canon. It means that the Milanese rite is fundamentally a Roman—or as I should prefer to put it, an Italian—rite, which in the course of later history has received some 'Gallican' decorations,[3] and not an originally 'Gallican' rite which has been subsequently Romanised. With the recognition of this we must abandon forthwith Duchesne's theory that Milan was the centre of diffusion for the 'Gallican' rite in the West, whither he supposed it had been imported from the East by Ambrose' oriental predecessor, Auxentius, *c*. A.D. 360. With the elimination of the theory of an oriental origin for all non-Roman Western rites the greatest single unnecessary obstacle to a clear understanding of the development of the eucharistic liturgy in the West is removed.

So much by way of general preface to the special question of the Introduction to the synaxis in the West outside Rome. We shall return to the larger issues later; here the facts are these:

At Milan. We know virtually nothing of the development of the Milanese rite between the late fourth century (in *de Sacramentis*) and the ninth, when its text comes into view in the *Sacramentary of Biasca*.[4] The Introduction

[1] The region of Narbonne, to which Wilmart attributed them, belonged to the Visigothic kingdom of Spain, and its inhabitants were at this time more Spanish than French, both in race and feeling, and by ecclesiastical attachments, *e.g.* its bishops usually attended Spanish councils. Some scholars would probably prefer to say outright that 'Germanus' is a Spanish document both geographically and liturgically; though there seem to me to be some French elements in the rite it describes. But was this rite ever in practice used as it stands in any church?

[2] *Art. cit. Downside Review* LXIX (1941), *pp.* 1 *sq. Cf.* also Dr. J. H. Srawley in *J.T.S.*, *XLIV* (July 1943), *pp.* 199 *sqq.*

[3] This has always been the view of the best Milanese experts, *cf. e.g.*, A. Ceriani, *Notitia Liturgiae Ambrosianae, etc.*, Milan 1895. For a characteristic and charming *boutade* of Duchesne's in reply, *cf. Origins, ed. cit.*, *p.* 89, *n.* 1.

[4] Collated by A. Ratti and G. Mercati in *Missale Ambrosianum Duplex*, Milan, 1913, under the symbol A.

is arranged thus: 1. The *Ingressa*, a psalm chant analogous to but not identical with the Roman introit. 2 (*a*). A diaconal litany, which like the Roman *Deprecatio Gelasii* is based on an Eastern text, but not identical with the Roman version. There are two forms of this litany at Milan, one used on the first, third and fifth Sundays in Lent, and the other on the second and fourth. It is not used at other times. *Or* 2 (*b*). When the litany is *not* used at Milan there is a hymn, consisting of *Gloria in excelsis* (in somewhat expanded form). 3. After the litany or the *Gloria*, there always follows *Kyrie eleison* repeated thrice. 4. After the *Kyrie* follows the greeting and the collect as at Rome[1] (and then the lections).

This differs from the Roman Introduction, *a.* in making the litany and hymn alternatives; *b.* in the insertion of the threefold *Kyrie* after the hymn, or after the litany in Lent.

a. The atrophy of the litany seems to have taken rather different forms at Milan and Rome. At Rome it disappeared altogether, replaced by the ninefold *Kyrie*, first inserted as an alternative to it by S. Gregory *c.* A.D. 595. At Milan it survived in Lent, as a special observance.

b. The Milanese threefold *Kyrie* does not seem to be any sort of survival of a litany, despite all that has been said to that effect by French scholars.[2] There are no petitions by the deacon, and no trace that there ever were any. On the contrary, the threefold *Kyrie* is *appended to* the Milanese litany when it is said, just as it is to the *Gloria* at other seasons. Musically, it is treated as a hymn. A similar threefold *Kyrie* as a hymn is found in some of the French rites, where it goes back to the Council of Vaison in 529, which instituted it in France, in imitation of 'a custom which has been introduced both in the Apostolic See and in all the Eastern and Italian provinces.'[3] 'Italy' means at this time what we call 'North Italy'—the region of Milan. The Milanese *Kyrie* is therefore not a 'Gallican' feature imported into the Milanese rite, but something which existed at Milan before the French rites borrowed it. It seems in fact to be the original Milanese form of 'the hymn' before the collect. We do not know when it first came into use there for this purpose, but it seems (from the phrase *intromissa est* used at Vaison) to have been supposed to be fairly new everywhere in A.D. 529, *i.e.* the *Kyries* were adopted at Milan about the same time as the *Gloria* at Rome.

[1] At Milan the collect is called *oratio super populum*, which at Rome meant a sort of blessing (*cf.* *p.* 518). But the Milanese *orationes s. p.* are the exact equivalents of the Roman collects, and in some cases the same prayers are used.

[2] Doubtless some confusion has been caused by the inveterate habit of associating the Roman ninefold *Kyrie* with the litany it replaced. But the *Kyrie* is not a 'litany' in the Eastern or Milanese or Gelasian sense, since there are no petitions, the essence of the Eastern litany form. S. Gregory more or less admits to having made a new departure in this, and it is much better to keep the word 'litany' for a single type of prayer.

[3] This canon does not necessarily mean that the *Kyries* (without petitions) antedate S. Gregory at Rome. It does not state at what services the *Kyrie* had been introduced in other churches, probably because customs varied; but sets out the use it intends to be followed in France 'at mattins, mass and vespers'.

Both met a need instinctively felt for a 'hymn' before the lections, to adapt the old synaxis form to the new conditions. When, later on, the Roman hymn spread northwards, the native Milanese equivalent, the threefold *Kyrie*, was short enough to be added to it instead of being displaced.[1]

So far as its Introduction goes, therefore, the Milanese rite developed under much the same conditions as the Roman rite, and in the same period. It shews later signs of the influence of the Roman rite to the south of it during the sixth-ninth centuries, just as naturally as it shews other signs of the influence of its other neighbours, the Gallican rites to the north-west of it, during the same period. Eucharistic rites never have existed in water-tight compartments or rigidly excluded each other's influence. On the contrary they have borrowed freely from one another in all ages down to the sixteenth century, and this even across the barriers erected by open breaches of ecclesiastical communion. The Milanese rite in its basis is neither French nor Oriental but Italian, like the Roman. And like the Roman rite it has had its own local history within the general Italian setting, which has left its marks upon its modern form. All things considered, this account of the matter is only what might have been expected.[2]

In Spain. The exact history of the Spanish Introduction is not very easy

[1] This threefold *Kyrie* is repeated at Milan at the offertory and again after the communion. This is a convenient point at which to kill a hare assiduously pursued by various amateur liturgists in England. Starting from the assumption that the Milanese *Kyries* represented a litany and forgetting for the moment that the litany at Milan is alternative with the *Gloria*, they enunciate a theory that the *Gloria* at Milan is in its 'correct' place before the litany, whereas in the Roman rite it forms an 'interruption' between the litany (represented by the *Kyries*) and its concluding collect. There appear to be six separate errors combined in this theory. (*a*) The *Kyries* at Rome and at Milan are not a litany but a hymn. (*b*) The collect at Rome and at Milan is connected both by origin and contents with the lections not the litany. (*c*) The collect entered the Western rites some fifty years before the deacon's litany and from quite different sources. (*d*) If the collect *had* any connection with the litany, the interposition of a piece of music between a litany and a prayer by the celebrant is not unusual (*cf. e.g.*, the three consecutive examples in the Byzantine rite, Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 362-7; there are others). (*e*) At Milan itself the original arrangement seems to have been litany, *Kyrie*-hymn, collect—*i.e.*, precisely the Roman arrangement, but with a different hymn. (*f*) The notion that the Eastern litanies are concluded by a prayer seems itself to be mistaken (*cf. p.* 479).

[2] P. Lejay (*Dict. d'arch. chrét. et de lit.*, *s.v. Ambrosien* (*rit.*) I, 1402) suggested that the *Benedictus* was at one time used in the Milanese Introduction as in France, on the ground that an occasional collect in Milanese MSS. is headed *collectio super prophetiam*. He gives no references and I have wasted a good deal of time in verifying the fact that no collect in either of the two earliest MSS. is headed anything but *oratio* or *oratio super populum*. I am at a loss to account for his statement unless (like Mr. E. C. G. F. Atchley, *The Ambrosian Liturgy*, 1909, *p.* xi.), he mistook the *Bobbio Missal* for an Ambrosian book. This miscellany might be classified as Irish or Gallican or Roman or, at a pinch, Mozarabic, but certainly not Ambrosian; though it has borrowed three collects which now appear only in Ambrosian books. Nevertheless, three English writers have since repeated without investigation the statement that the *Benedictus* once followed the *Kyrie* hymn at Milan but has now 'entirely disappeared'. There is no evidence whatever for this statement.

to make out, but the following are the main facts. The Mozarabic Introduction is as follows: 1. The *Antiphona ad praelegendum*, (usually) a psalm-chant, corresponding to the introit. (2. On great feasts, an interpolated version of the *Trisagion*, the interpolations varying according to the day.) 3. On Sundays and all feasts *Gloria in Excelsis*. 4. The collect. 5. The greeting. 6. The lections. We are handicapped as to the history of the different items by the fact that neither of the two earliest known Spanish MSS.—the *Antiphoner of Léon* (ninth–tenth century)[1] which contains the chants and the music of the rite, and the *Sacramentary of Toledo* (ninth century)[2] which contains the prayers—is equipped with an 'Ordinary' of the rite as a whole. Furthermore, it is uncertain just how old the arrangements are to which either of these MSS. witnesses. Both of them are substantially copies of older MSS. going back to the later seventh or eighth centuries. But it is possible (*a*) that one or both of the extant MSS. have to some extent been brought up to date, to conform to current custom when they were written, (*b*) that in some things this was not done, and that they witness to a state of affairs which was obsolete or obsolescent in the ninth century. The following facts are to be noted:

1. On all fast days the modern Mozarabic mass begins without any introduction at all, but simply with the greeting and lections, like the primitive rites. In the *Antiphoner of Léon*, however, the *Antiphona* is always said, even on fast days, unless the office of None has just been said in choir (when there would naturally be no entrance-procession, since the clergy would be already in church). This appears to witness to two stages: *a.* A period when there was no Introduction at all beyond the preliminary greeting, as at Rome before Celestine, *c.* A.D. 430.[3] (It is noteworthy that the African rite, which has been supposed to have some affinities with that of Spain, seems never to have developed an Introduction at all.) *b.* A period when the Introduction consisted only of entrance chant (*Antiphona*) followed at once by greeting and lections, as at Rome in the period immediately after Celestine's innovation.[4]

2. The variable *Trisagion* on great feasts is evidently an instance of that growth of Byzantine influence which followed Justinian's reconquest of part of Spain in the sixth century. How soon it was interpolated into the rite after that date it is impossible to say. The first evidence of its use (on four days in the year) is in the ninth century *Antiphoner*,[5] to which some eleventh century MSS. add three other days. In the earliest MS. which gives any sort of 'Ordinary' (*Toleten.* 35, 4)[6] of the tenth century, it is

[1] *Ed.* by the Benedictines of Silos under the title of *Antiphonarium Mozarabicum*, Léon, 1928. I am indebted to the Rev. W. S. Porter for drawing my attention to the importance of this MS., and for other information about the Mozarabic rite.

[2] *Ed.* by Dom M. Férotin under the title of *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum*, Paris, 1912.

[3] *Cf. p.* 453.

[4] *Cf. p.* 458.

[5] *Ed. cit. pp.* 29, 38, 45, 160.

[6] *Lib. Moz. Sac., col.* 697.

ignored altogether, but this is not unnatural in the case of an exceptional festal feature of the rite. All things considered, it may well have formed part of the late seventh century arrangements which were copied into the ninth century *Antiphoner*, but it is hardly likely to be much older than that. It is noticeable that S. Isidore in his description of the Toledan rite in the early years of the seventh century does not mention it.[1]

3. The first reference to the use of *Gloria in excelsis* in the Spanish mass 'on Sundays and all feasts' appears to be in the late eighth-century writing of Beatus of Liebana and Etherius of Osma *adv. Elipandum*.[2] It is found (apparently with three different musical settings) in the ninth century *Antiphoner*,[3] in one of which the wording contains variants somewhat akin to those of the Milanese version. Its use is evidently borrowed from Italy as the use of the *Trisagion* is borrowed from the East, perhaps at about the same time, though it became the normal hymn of the Introduction, while the *Trisagion* was an occasional extra for special feasts. The Roman rite as a whole was in use in some parts of Spain, *e.g.* Galicia, in the later sixth century, which may have led to the adoption of the Roman hymn in other places which were properly Mozarabic in rite. But such early seventh century references to the *Gloria* as I have found in Spain all seem to refer to its use at Lauds (*e.g.* can. 12 of the fourth Council of Toledo A.D. 633).

4. The Collect. There is some contradiction in the evidence about this. S. Isidore in the early seventh century says nothing of a collect before the lections, but specifically calls the *Missa* after the sermon the '*first* prayer' of the rite. The ninth century *Lib. Moz. Sac.* likewise makes no provision for what we should call a 'collect' at all, and though some of the masses in the eleventh century *Liber Ordinum* have a variable collect, others, like those of the ninth century *Sacramentary*, are still without any prayer in this position. It would appear from all this that the variable collect made its first appearance in the Spanish rite surprisingly late—in the tenth–eleventh century.

The only difficulty in accepting this account of the Spanish Introduction is a little rubric in the *Antiphoner*, which orders that on Palm Sunday after the *Antiphona ad praelegendum*,[4] '*Kyrie eleison* is not said' (as though it *were* said

[1] Dom Séjourné, the chief authority on this period of Spanish history, also concludes that the *Trisagion* is a seventh century interpolation (*S. Isidore de Séville*, Paris, 1929, *p.* 168). It should also be noted that in the modern rite *Benedictus* (the Song of Zachariah) is sung in place of this *Trisagion* on the Sunday before the Nativity of S. John the Baptist. In the ninth century *Antiphoner* it is sung instead of the *Gloria* on the feast itself (*ed. cit.*, *p.* 164). This appears to be only indirectly connected with the Gallican custom of using *Benedictus* as the normal 'hymn' of the Introduction, and to be suggested by its suitability to the day. *Benedictus es* (the Song of the Three Children, *vv.* 29–63, selections) is found in two MSS. between the collect and the lections; but the fourth Council of Toledo in A.D. 633 had ordered it to be sung between the O.T. and epistle lections, and this is its normal place in eleventh century MSS. (*cf. Antiphoner*, *ed. cit.*, *p.* 235).

[2] P.L., xcvi. 935.

[3] *Ed. cit.*, *pp.* 234–5.

[4] *Antiphoner of Léon*, *ed. cit.*, *p.* 110. The Latin is *Quumque ipsius antifone caput repetierint et explicaberint, non dicitur kirieleison sed statim colligit episcopus orationem, et post collecta oratione, etc.*

on other occasions) 'but the bishop forthwith says the collect, and after the collect there follow the lections.' This looks as though the Roman Introduction (of penitential seasons), introit, *Kyries*, collect, lections, were the normal thing in some Spanish churches when the *Antiphoner* was compiled. Whether this was the case or not, I am unable to say; but I know of no other evidence for it, or for the use of the *Kyries* at all in the Spanish Introduction.[1]

If we may ignore this tantalising statement, the history of the Spanish Introduction appears to be approximately as follows: It begins, like the Roman, as an entrance-chant followed by the greeting and lections. Perhaps in the late sixth century, more probably in the seventh, the Roman 'hymn' was inserted on Sundays and festivals, supplemented on great feasts by the Byzantine one. This formed the whole Introduction down to the tenth century. Then the use of the variable collect before the lections was taken over from the other Western rites; but it was attached in thought to the Introduction which preceded it[2] rather than to the lections which followed it, as in the Roman idea. The greeting therefore was left preceding the lections in the primitive position, to mark the break between them and the Introduction, and not placed before the prayer as in the Egyptian and Roman rites.

The Gallican Rites. We are now in a better position to approach the real difficulty in discerning the development of the Western Introductions—the French evidence. Deprived of the delusive certainties of 'Germanus', our information has to be pieced together from various sources, always a process which offers plentiful opportunities of error.

'Germanus' presents us with the following elaborate opening: 1. The *Antiphona*, an entrance-chant (a psalm?). 2. Greeting. 3. *Trisagion* (which he calls by its Greek name, *Aius*). 4. A *Kyrie*-hymn, like that at Milan. 5. The *Benedictus* (Song of Zachariah). 6. The O.T. lection and Epistle. 7. *Benedictus es* (Song of the Three Children). How much of all this can we verify from other sources?

1. No other early Gallican document offers any evidence of such an entrance-chant, and since 'Germanus' calls it by its Spanish name *Antiphona*, we may perhaps dismiss it from the original Gallican rite as a later Spanish importation. 2. The Greeting. What is noticeable is that this is placed in the Antiochene position immediately after the entrance, and not as in Italy before the collect; or as in Spain, before the lections. 'Germanus' has no reference to a collect in the Introduction at all, though the Gallican

[1] There may be some confusion in the *Antiphoner* between the Introduction of the mass and a point in the blessing of palms (before the procession) on the same day where there is a threefold *Kyrie* after which *colligitur ab episcopo haec oratio* . . . (*Lib. Ord.*, *ed. cit.*, *col.* 182). But if so, I do not see how it has come about.

[2] Some of the variable collects take up the words of the *Antiphona ad praelegendum*, *cf. Lib. Moz. Sac.*, *col.* 905 (MS. *Emilianensis* iv., eleventh cent. Collect for Lent iv.) *Lib. Ord.*, *col.* 231, 366. Just so some of the Gallican collects take up the words of the *Benedictus* preceding them, *cf. p.* 467.

evidence of the seventh-eighth century places one after the *Benedictus*. Taken in conjunction with the absence of a collect from the Spanish rite down to the ninth-tenth century, this omission in 'Germanus' is significant of its 'Hispanising' tendency.

One notes next the collocation of the opening *Antiphona* with a version of the *Trisagion*, as in Spain. The group of three successive chants *Trisagion*, *Kyrie* and *Benedictus*, seems elaborate, but here 'Germanus' begins to make contact with other Gallican evidence. The *Bobbio Missal* (seventh-eighth century) which, though probably compiled originally by an Irishman and written in Italy, contains a great deal of French material, makes provision in the Introduction for the *Trisagion* (which it calls *Aios*), the *Gloria in excelsis*, the *Benedictus* (which it calls *Prophetia*) and a deacon's Litany (which it calls *Prex* or *Preces*). It places them in that order, but does not specify the way in which they are to be fitted into the rite. The *Gloria* and the Litany come, however, from a Celtic Ordinary, as we shall see; so that we are left with *Trisagion* and *Benedictus* in that order, as the compiler's idea of the Gallican Introduction, as in 'Germanus'. (Probably in arranging for all four chants the compiler of *Bobbio* is trying to make his book do for churches which used either system, though he does not say that they are alternatives.)

We have, however, an earlier reference to the *Trisagion* in Gaul, in the almost contemporary life of S. Gaugericus, bishop of Cambrai *c.* A.D. 600.[1] It is to be noted that while the Spanish books have their *Trisagion* in the orthodox form, the *Bobbio Missal* plainly implies that it expects it to be sung in the Gallican use with the Syrian monophysite interpolation 'Who wast crucified for us'. Furthermore, there is a threefold *Kyrie eleison* after the *Trisagion* in the Syriac *S. James*, as in 'Germanus'.[2] Taking this in conjunction with the Antiochene greeting immediately before the *Trisagion* in 'Germanus', it seems fairly easy to see whence the model for all this part of the 'Germanus' rite in its present form was derived—from Syria.[3]

The *Kyrie*-hymn is appended to the *Trisagion* in Gaul as it is appended to the *Gloria* at Milan, and probably for the same reason—that it is the original opening chant, dating from can. 3 of the Council of Vaison in

[1] *Analecta Bollandiana*, vii. (1888), *p.* 393. But the occasion on which he is said to have used it is not at the eucharist, as Duchesne implies, *Origins*, *p.* 192, *n.* 1.

[2] The text of 'Germanus' at this point is corrupt. It is possible that he means *Kyrie eleison* was sung once only by three singers.

[3] At the same time this does not demonstrate its late date. Syrian ecclesiastics occupied some important positions in sixth century Gaul. (*Cf.* L. Bréhier, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xii (1903), *pp.* 1 *sq.*, and especially 27-8.) There was too (which Bréhier does not note) a Syrian merchant, Eusebius, who became bishop of Paris *c.* A.D. 592 and upset people by filling the place with Syrian clergy. (Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, x. 26.) For a Syrian bishop in Spain see can. 12 of the Council of Seville in A.D. 618. In such circumstances it is not surprising to find foreign Syrian elements imported into the Western rites. Unless and until liturgists will pay some attention to this sort of historical influence at work, and allow for it, the history of the liturgy will remain incomprehensible.

A.D. 529. The *Trisagion* was imported into Gaul from Syria later in the century, but the native hymn was brief enough to survive as an appendage to the new importation.[1] We do not hear of the *Trisagion* in Gaul until the very end of the sixth century, which is the period when evidences of the importance of Syrians in Gaul are most numerous.

The evidence for the use of the *Benedictus* in the Gallican rite is solid and satisfactory. Two collects in the Burgundian *Missale Gothicum* (eighth century), seven in the *Bobbio Missal* (seventh-eighth century) and two in the oldest extant Gallican missal, the *Masses of Mone* (seventh century) are all plainly intended for use after the *Benedictus*. Gregory of Tours in the sixth century speaks of the bishop intoning the *Benedictus* at an early point in the liturgy at Tours.[2] It evidently held the place in the sixth century French rites that *Gloria in excelsis* held in the sixth century Italian rites, as the 'hymn' before the collect. Its use in place of the *Gloria* is probably due to the fact that in the sixth century the *Gloria* in France was used at Lauds in the place where the Italian office-books used the *Benedictus*.[3]

Little can be inferred from the use of the 'Song of the Three Children' after the epistle in 'Germanus'. The true Spanish place for it was before the epistle, between that and the preceding O.T. lesson, but this was not always adhered to.[4] The Gallican lectionary of Luxeuil mentions it twice—once after the O.T. lesson and once after the epistle—which does not help. It is found in the Roman rite after the last O.T. lesson on Ember Saturdays, so that its use is common to all the Western rites. Gregory of Tours mentions it only at Mattins in Gaul.[5]

We find in Gaul, therefore, *c.* A.D. 600 an Introduction consisting of (1) the *Trisagion*, (2) the threefold *Kyrie*, (3) *Benedictus*, (4) greeting and collect. It is obvious that the developed Gallican structure is precisely the same as the developed Roman one—(1) entrance-chant, (2) *Kyries*, (3) hymn, (4) greeting and collect, though the texts used are not the same and the *Kyries* in Gaul are older by three-quarters of a century than at Rome. It is further noticeable that the Gallican rites of the seventh (and presumably the sixth) century, have the greeting and a variable collect immediately before the lections—a feature which did not

[1] Duchesne supposes that the same canon of Vaison instituted the *Trisagion*, since it orders that *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus* shall be sung at all masses, including those of Lent and requiems, 'in the way it is now sung' at public masses. But this seems to refer to what we call the sanctus, not the *Trisagion*, which in Gaul was always sung in Greek, and went by the name of the *Aius*. If the fathers of Vaison had meant a Greek chant, they would not have translated the name, as is demonstrated by what they say of the *Kyrie eleison* in the same canon. That the sanctus proper should first have entered the Western rites about this time, and as a festal chant like the Greek *Gloria in excelsis*, is not surprising (*cf. pp.* 538 *sqq.*).

[2] Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, viii. 7.

[3] S. Caesarius of Arles, *Regula SS. Virginum* (*Recapitulatio*), 69, *ed.* Dom Morin (Bonn, 1933), *p.* 24.

[4] *Cf. p.* 464, *n.* 1.

[5] Gregory of Tours, *Vitae Patrum*, vi., *ad fin.*

yet exist in the Spanish or African rites, or indeed in any but the Italian ones. The coincidence can hardly be accidental. The Roman Introduction, completed by the end of the fifth century, was known and deliberately imitated by the French churches of the sixth century, even though the imitation was by no means servile.

The question now seems legitimate—was S. Gregory in instituting the ninefold *Kyrie* at Rome influenced rather by the use of the threefold *Kyrie*-hymn at Milan and in Gaul than by any reminiscences of the Roman litany already obsolescent as a normal feature of the Roman rite? For what its evidence is worth for Roman practice in the sixth century, the *Deprecatio Gelasii* witnesses that *Kyrie eleison* was *not* the old Roman litany-response, but the Latin phrase *Domine exaudi et miserere*.

The Celtic Introduction. The *Bobbio Missal*, as we have said, has a 'mixed' Introduction which sets Irish and Gallican elements side by side. The subtraction of the latter leaves an 'Ordinary' or outline of the rite almost identical with that found in the pure Irish *Stowe Missal*. This latter was copied *c.* A.D. 800 from an older Irish MS. written not later than *c.* A.D. 650 and probably somewhat earlier. The common elements of the *Bobbio* and *Stowe* books present us, therefore, with the Irish rite of the first half of the seventh century.

This earliest known Irish rite is recognisably the Roman rite both in structure and contents. It is, of course, 'Roman' in the usual Irish way, both old-fashioned and curiously embellished, for Ireland was a long way off and Irish scribes were inveterate and often wayward 'improvers' of the texts they copied, whose taste in things liturgical was always for the unusual. But apart from such 'tinkerings' (as Edmund Bishop was wont to call the Irish way with liturgical documents) the Irish rite is Roman not only in substance but in eighty per cent of its details.

The Introduction in *Stowe* is as follows: 1. A collect (drawn from the *Gregorian Sacramentary*) is sung: 'O God Who having confided unto blessed Peter Thine apostle the keys of the kingdom of heaven didst bestow on him the pontifical office of loosing and binding souls: mercifully receive our prayers; and by his intercession we entreat Thee, O Lord, for help that we may be loosed from the bondage of our sins; through . . .' There follows 2. *Gloria in excelsis*, 3. the greeting and collect, 4. the epistle, followed by 5. a gradual chant and a deacon's litany, which is related to the *Deprecatio Gelasii* (*i.e.* it seems to be an independent translation and re-working of the same Greek original).[1] The Celtic Introduction when we first meet it thus consists of 1. a Roman prayer, 2. the Roman hymn, 3. the Roman variable collect—with a litany similar to the Roman

[1] *Bobbio* reproduces the scheme thus: 1. The same fixed collect, 'O God', etc. (2. The Gallican *Trisagion*.) 3. *Gloria in excelsis*. (4. The Gallican *Benedictus*.) 5. The greeting and collect. 6. Old Testament lection and epistle. 7. The *Prex* (apparently a deacon's litany after the epistle, but it does not give the text).

one, but after the epistle instead of before the hymn.[1] There is not much doubt of where the materials of the Irish rite were drawn from, even if *Stowe* did not professedly give them as the 'collects and prayers of the mass of the Roman church'. Though evident traces of S. Gregory's reforms of the Roman rite are to be found in both *Stowe* and *Bobbio*, both books preserve details of the pre-Gregorian Roman rite, notably in some readings in the canon.[2] It is conceivable that what we have is a revision of an older Irish version of the Roman rite, brought into line *c.* A.D. 620–650 with the recent Gregorian reforms.

Conclusion. This has had to be a lengthy and somewhat technical consideration, but it has enabled us to clear up a series of problems which have evidently given rise to much perplexity in the minds of all the compilers of liturgical histories and text-books. The facts appear to be as follows: The original nucleus of the synaxis sufficed the church as long as she existed in a heathen world and for a generation or two afterwards. When the world at large began to turn towards christianity and the synaxis began to need adaptation to a *public* worship, three different schemes of Introduction arose in the East, which had all found their final form before the end of the fifth century. The same needs were felt in the West, but development there was rather slower. The Roman Introduction which combined the Greek and Egyptian schemes was built up piece by piece between *c.* A.D. 425 and 500, and the Roman scheme thus formed was the basis of the other Western schemes. The frequency with which we find that it was borrowed *without* the Gelasian litany suggests that it spread chiefly in the later sixth century, when it appears that the litany was dropping out of regular use at Rome itself. It can be suggested that, in return for the Roman outline of the Introduction, the other Western churches contributed to the Roman rite the *Kyrie*-hymn with which S. Gregory replaced the Roman litany; though S. Gregory gave it a local Roman adaptation in making it ninefold instead of threefold, and inserting *Christe eleison.* Just so the other Western rites adapted the Roman Introduction to some extent when they took it over. So in the same way we find that in adopting elements of the Eastern Introductions the Roman and other Western churches freely exercised their own taste and judgement.

All over christendom the addition of the Introduction was intended to serve the same purpose—to strengthen the element of *worship* in the synaxis, once the decline of the catechumenate had removed the restriction on this caused by the presence of non-christians. It is thus natural that the

[1] *Stowe* calls this litany the '*Deprecatio* of S. Martin' (of Tours). The text is found in other Irish MSS. without this ascription, but it might indicate the region where the compiler of *Stowe* supposed it to have come from, though little reliance can be placed on his ascriptions of prayers to 'S. Augustine', 'S. Gregory' and so forth, in other cases. It is noteworthy that the French rites, so far as they give evidence of a litany, place it after the sermon, but the Spanish rites have a sort of litany after the epistle in Lent.

[2] *Cf.* E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, *pp.* 90–94.

only item of the Introduction which is found in all rites in some form is the 'hymn' before the lections,[1] whether it be drawn from the Psalter as in the 'Far Eastern' rites, or is in the form of a 'prose hymn' as in the Greek and Western rites.

The Lections and Chants

Though the order in which lections from the various parts of the Bible were read was already fixed in pre-Nicene times,[2] there appears to have been no such general agreement then as to the number of lections which should normally be read at the synaxis. The absence of other elements than lections (with the accompanying chants and sermon) gave time for a relatively large number of passages to be read without unduly prolonging the service. This multiplicity of the pre-Nicene lections continued in some churches in post-Nicene times, especially in Syria.[3] But towards the end of the fourth century the growth of other elements in the synaxis brought about the limitation of the lections in most churches to three, (1) from the O.T., (2) the apostolic writings and (3) the gospel, as a normal rule. In Africa, Spain and Gaul, and perhaps in some other churches, it was then customary on martyrs' feasts to substitute for the O.T. lection an account of the martyr commemorated on that day; and in some churches lections from apocryphal 'apostolic' writings were even substituted on occasions for the second lection from the canonical epistles.[4] The use of uncanonical gospels for the liturgical lessons is attested in the second century,[5] and that of 'harmonies' or conflations of the four gospels like Tatian's *Diatessaron* (second century) lasted on, especially in Holy Week, to as late as the seventh or eighth century in many churches from E. Syria to Spain. At Rome, however, a rigidly scriptural tradition always prevailed in the matter of the lections, which excluded not only apocryphal writings and 'harmonies' but also the historical 'acts' of the martyrs from the eucharistic liturgy; though the latter were accepted into the lessons of the Roman office, apparently in the seventh century. One main result of the general spread of Roman influence through the Western churches was the elimination of all non-scriptural lections at the eucharist in the West.

[1] Except, as stated on *p.* 451, among some Monophysites who have transferred it to after the epistle, and among Anglicans who have transferred it to after the communion and thanksgiving. In other post-reformation rites, *e.g.* the Swedish Lutheran, the 'hymn' remains in its oecumenical position, as it did in the first Anglican Prayer Book of 1549.

[2] *Cf. p.* 39.

[3] So *e.g. Ap. Const.*, viii., whose relatively undeveloped synaxis, without any Introduction, has five lections from the Law, Prophets, Epistles, Acts and Gospel. Four or five or even more lections are still found in the E. Syrian (Nestorian) and Monophysite rites on occasion, and also at Rome on Ember Saturdays.

[4] Two such have survived in the *Bobbio Missal*, *ed.* E. A. Lowe, (H.B.S.) I., *pp.* 106, 129.

[5] Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 12.

In the fifth century the church of Constantinople began to reduce the normal three lections to two by the abolition of the first (from the O.T.). Rome followed suit in the late fifth or early sixth century, though the process was slower at Rome; the full three lections are still found provided for a few days in the year in the seventh century Roman lectionary list known as the 'Wurzburg Capitulary'. Indeed it may be said that the process of 'dropping' the O.T. lesson was never completed at all in the Roman rite, since the Wednesday and Saturday Ember Days still retain two and five O.T. lections each in the Roman missal; and on the weekdays of Lent and certain other days it is not the O.T. lesson but the epistle which has vanished. It does in fact not infrequently happen that the aptest comment on a passage of the gospels is furnished not by the New Testament but by the Old. In retaining the liberty of using passages from any part of the Bible in combination with the gospel the sixth century Roman church shewed good judgement, though the subsequent dislocation of the Roman lectionary[1] prevents this wisdom from being always apparent in the modern missal.[2] The omission of the third lection from other rites than the Byzantine and Roman was both later and less usual, though it had begun in many churches by the seventh–eighth centuries, at least on ordinary days.[3] It is sometimes suggested that the possession of three lections is a characteristic of the 'Gallican' rite while two is 'Roman'. But all rites, or at all events all Western rites, were three lection rites in the early fifth century. The retention of three lections therefore gives no real clue to the *origin* of a particular rite; it is at the best one indication of its later history.

The chants which came between the lections have their own history, which is still obscure in certain points, but which need not detain us here. The psalm-chant with Alleluias (gradual), which came down from the synagogues of our Lord's time was always reserved for the place of honour immediately before the gospel.[4] The invention of Lent in the fourth century led to the suppression of the Alleluias during this penitential season (and of the verse which had been added after them in the Roman rite, apparently from Byzantium, during the seventh century). In their place was substituted the Tract, a psalm-chant which had formerly intervened between the Old Testament lesson and the epistle, the retention of the O.T. lesson during this season apparently leading to the retention of the chant which was regarded as a comment upon it. The Gallican rite made various innovations in the way of elaborating and adding to

[1] *Cf. p.* 364, *n.* 1.

[2] For examples see Dom B. Capelle, *Note sur le lectionnaire romain de la messe avant S. Gregoire, Rév. d'histoire ecclésiastique*, xxxiv. (1938), *pp.* 556 *sq.*

[3] The majority of masses in *e.g.*, the *Bobbio Missal* (which in respect of its lectionary is a Gallican book, with a lectionary similar in contents to the Gallican lectionary of Luxeuil) have already lost the first lection.

[4] Except in the Mozarabic rite, where it was transferred to immediately after the gospel by can. 12 of the fourth Council of Toledo in A.D. 633, for reasons which cannot now be discovered.

the chants between the epistle and gospel, of which the latest were the mediaeval Sequences, metrical compositions (not always of a very edifying character) of which five of the best are still to be found in the modern Western rite.[1] But all these changes are characteristically French mediaeval elaborations upon the simple psalm chants, with Alleluias added before the gospel, which had always been interposed between the lections of the synaxis since the time of the apostles. These are still found in every rite of catholic christendom with one exception. Archbishop Cranmer directly forbade the use of any chant whatever between the epistle and gospel in 1549.

The business of the preacher of the sermon which followed was to expound and interpret the salvation declared in the scriptures which had just been read, as is clear *e.g.* from the Egyptian prayers before the lections already quoted.[2] The same note is echoed in the prayer after the sermon in Sarapion's collection, a feature of the Egyptian rites which appears to be unique as a developed formal constituent of the rite.

The Prayer after the Sermon

In the synaxis rite of Sarapion it runs thus:

'After the rising up from the sermon—a prayer:

'O God the Saviour, God of the universe, Lord and Fashioner of all things, Begetter of the Only-begotten, Who hast begotten the living and true Expression (of Thyself, *charactēra*, *cf.* Heb. i. 3), Who didst send Him for the rescue of the human race, Who through Him didst call mankind and make them Thine own possession; we pray Thee on behalf of this people. Send forth "holy spirit" and let the Lord Jesus visit them; let Him speak in their understandings and dispose their hearts to faith; let Him Himself draw their souls to Thee, O God of mercies. Possess Thyself of a people in this city also, possess Thyself of a true flock: Through . . .'

Apart from the renewed insistence on the theme of the 'rescue' of humanity in Jesus, we may note here the survival of the notion—becoming a little old-fashioned in Sarapion's day—of impersonal 'holy spirit' (without the definite article) as the medium whereby the Lord Jesus 'visits' His members on earth and Himself speaks in their understandings and disposes them to believe. Theology in the fourth century was beginning to attribute such operations to the *Personal* action of the Holy Spirit, but a brief comparison of Sarapion's expressions with *e.g.* another Egyptian work, S. Athanasius' *de Incarnatione*, will shew that he was by no means alone in still retaining the older attribution to the Logos, the Second Person. His 'invocation' of the Logos to supervene in the consecration of the eucharist is quite of a piece with the rest of his theology.

[1] *Victimae paschali laudes* (tenth cent.) for Easter Day is the oldest.
[2] *Cf. p.* 447.

The prayer after the sermon has disappeared from the text of the Alexandrian liturgy of *S. Mark* (no doubt through the infrequency of preaching in Byzantine times). But it is referred to several times by Origen in his homilies at Alexandria during the third century,[1] and once by S. Athanasius in the fourth.[2] Evidently the rule against praying in the presence of catechumens was differently interpreted in Egypt from the way in which it was understood elsewhere.

In the later fourth century in Africa, and perhaps elsewhere, the place of this prayer was to some extent supplied by a long fixed 'ascription' at the end of the sermon. Three of Augustine's sermons have preserved the full text of this as their concluding paragraph,[3] and the cue for it ends quite a number of others: 'Turning unto the Lord God the Father Almighty with a pure heart let us render unto Him, so far as our littleness may, most hearty and abundant thanks: beseeching His singular goodness with our whole intent that of His gracious favour He would vouchsafe to hear our prayers; and by His might drive far the enemy from all our doings and thoughts; increase in us our faith, govern our minds, grant unto us spiritual desires and bring us to His everlasting bliss; through Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, Who with Him liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God for ever and ever. Amen.'

The way in which this prayer takes the ostensible form of an address or exhortation to the people (known as a *praefatio* by contrast with an *oratio* addressed directly to God) is a characteristic of Western rites which we shall meet again. But the sermons of S. Fulgentius of Ruspe, an African bishop a century later than Augustine, end not with an invariable ascription but with a variety of formulae, frequently containing a reference to the feast or saint of the day. It is a little indication of the way in which during the fifth century the ecclesiastical calendar came to exercise an influence over the old fixed prayers of the liturgy in the West, a tendency which had hardly begun in Augustine's day. S. Leo's sermons at Rome *c.* A.D. 450 end with the simple ascription 'through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen', occasionally elaborated into a Trinitarian form with the usual Roman collect ending 'Who liveth and reigneth . . .'—an instance of the Roman temper of simplicity in such things.

C. The Junction of Synaxis and Eucharist

After the sermon followed the dismissals of the catechumens and penitents and the intercessory 'prayers of the faithful'. These latter, a part of the synaxis but attended only by those about to attend the eucharist, had always formed a sort of intermediate section between the two rites when they were celebrated in sequence. The fusion of the two separate services

[1] Origen, *in Gen.* ii. 6; *in Num.* xvi. 9; xx. 5; etc.
[2] Athanasius, *Hom. de Semente*, 17.
[3] Augustine, *Sermons* xxxiv; lxvii; cclxxii.

in the fifth century did not destroy this special character of this part of the liturgy, though it brought changes of various kinds, due to the need for adapting the pre-Nicene tradition to the new purposes of a public worship. It was natural, too, that new items which it was desired to include somehow in the Shape of the Liturgy, but which had no obviously indicated place in the structure of the rite—*e.g.* the creed—should tend to be inserted at this point.

In the fifth century christendom was markedly beginning to fall apart. The question of Byzantine centralisation was dividing Syria and Egypt from the Balkan and Anatolian churches. The West was being parcelled up between a number of barbarian tribal kingdoms, though the old Romanised populations carried on a good deal of the tradition of the fourth century underneath the political overlordship of the new masters, and the Western churches were now the mainstay of what remained of the civilised tradition. But the growing political divisions meant that the fifth century changes in the liturgy were carried out by churches no longer in the close contact with each other that alliance with the universal empire of the fourth century had ensured. The result is a growing diversity again (after the period of convergence in the fourth century) among the various liturgies, which probably reached its height in the seventh–eighth century. After that the restoration of the Western empire by Charlemagne in A.D. 800 results in a general tendency towards uniformity in the West on the basis of the Roman rite, in the particular form in which the emperor had adopted this in his palace chapel. Despite a certain reaction against this 'Romanism' during the political confusion which followed Charlemagne's death, most of the effects of his work were never undone in Western liturgy until the sixteenth century. In the East, the submersion of the christian churches of Egypt and Syria under successive waves of mohammedan conquest in the seventh–eighth centuries, eventually caused the christians living as serfs under Islam to look towards Byzantium as in some sort the christian stronghold of the East. Though their experience of Byzantine bureaucracy and Byzantine ecclesiastical politics had been so disastrous that they never forgot their bitterness against her sufficiently to enter again into communion with the Byzantine 'orthodox' patriarchs, yet Byzantium had at least the prestige of being the one free church of the East, and Byzantine ecclesiastical ways tended to spread among the dissidents in consequence.

The result of all this is a good deal of diversity in the arrangement of the items which belong to this 'second *stratum*' in the Shape of the Liturgy, and in the way in which various churches fitted them into the traditional outline which had come down everywhere unchanged from pre-Nicene times. Nevertheless one can distinguish certain groups in the table opposite (*p.* 475). I do not propose to go into all the diversities, some of which are unimportant. Others, however, have had a considerable effect upon the devotional ethos of the rites in which they are found.

The dismissals and prayers belong to the old synaxis. The latter were

East Syrian	Byzantine	Jerusalem	Egyptian	Roman	Franco-Spanish
—	—	—	Prayer after Sermon	—	—
Dismissals	Dismissals	⟨Dismissals lost in ? 5th cent.⟩	⟨Dismissals attested in 5th cent.⟩	⟨Dismissals lost in 6th cent.⟩	Dismissals
⟨Prayers lost in 5th cent.⟩	⟨Prayers now replaced by a Litany⟩	⟨Prayers moved in 4th cent.⟩	Prayers	⟨Prayers lost *c.* A.D. 495⟩	⟨Prayers lost before A.D. 600⟩
		End of the Synaxis			
—	—	—	—	⟨Prayer 'of the day' lost in 6th cent.⟩	Prayer 'of the day'
Offertory Procession	Offertory Procession	[Offertory Procession placed here in ? cent.]	—	—	[Offertory Procession introduced ? 6th cent.[1]]
—	Offertory Prayer	[Byzant. Off. Prayer placed here in ? cent.]			
Creed	Creed	Creed	Creed (Here in Coptic; during Offertory in Greek)	[Creed introduced 11th cent.]	[Creed introduced 8th–9th cent.[2]]
Pax	Pax	Pax	Pax	⟨Pax moved *c.* A.D. 400 to after Fraction⟩	⟨Pax moved ? cent. to after Offertory⟩
—	—	⟨Original Offertory Procession ?⟩	Oblation	Oblation	Oblation
Names					Names
—		Offertory Prayer	Offertory Prayer	Offertory Prayer	Offertory Prayer Pax
Beginning of Euch. Prayer	Beginning of Euch. Prayer	Beginning of Euch. Prayer	Beginning of Euch. Prayer containing Names	Beginning of Euch. Prayer containing Names	Beginning of Euch. Prayer

[1] The Offertory Procession is now placed *before* the *Missa* and *Alia* or Prayer of the Day, but this is probably its position when first introduced.

[2] Creed after Fraction in Spain, introduced in 6th cent.

declining in popularity during the fifth century, and being replaced either by newer forms of intercession like the litany, or by various ways of commemorating the living and the dead in the eucharist proper—a practice which I have called 'the Names', to avoid begging certain questions connected with the particular custom known as the 'recitation of the diptychs'. Only in the Egyptian rites did the old 'prayers of the faithful' persist in something like their original form as well as position.

For the rest, the columns fall easily into two groups—those which have the 'oblation' by the people for themselves before the altar, comprising the Egyptian and Western rites; and those which have instead the 'offertory procession' of the deacons from the sacristy, in the form first fully described by Theodore of Mopsuestia. The primary example of these is the Byzantine rite; but the position of the offertory in the East Syrian and Jerusalem rites is somewhat obscure,[1] though it is probable that they were

[1] The order in the present E. Syrian rite is, 1. The *Caruzutha* (now a form of litany, originally a long 'bidding' by the deacon) followed by a blessing, apparently a trace of the old dismissals. 2. The Dismissals (in a later abbreviated form). 3. The Offertory (placing of the elements upon the altar by the priest; but though the deacons enter the sanctuary in procession at this moment, they do not *bring with them* the elements, which have been on a sort of credence since their preparation before the synaxis). 4. The Creed. 5. The 'Names'. The order in Narsai is, 1. Dismissals. 2. Offertory procession *actually bearing* the elements from the sacristy. 3. The Creed (*ed. cit.*, *p.* 3). 4. The deacon announces 'the Names'. 5. A prayer ('of the veil'?) by the celebrant. 6. The deacon announces the Pax. 7. During the giving of the Pax the deacon reads out 'the Names'. The order in Ps.-Denys is as in Narsai, except that the creed seems to precede, not follow, the offertory procession. There has evidently been a good deal of variation in the order of the items in this part of the E. Syrian rite at different times. The case of the Jerusalem rite is even more obscure: S. Cyril says nothing about an offertory; and *S. James* in its Syriac form has no offertory procession, the elements being upon the altar before the service begins. The Greek *S. James* has the procession in the Byzantine place and in so heavily Byzantinised a form that I am disposed to take the whole item *at this point* for a fairly late Byzantine interpolation. But the Greek *S. James* also has two 'offertory prayers' proper after the kiss of peace, which suggests that this is the original point of the offertory in all the Syrian rites, since it is found there in *Ap. Const.*, viii. The Egyptian rites have adopted the Byzantine preparation of the elements before the synaxis (but on the altar, not at a separate table) immediately after which there is a sort of procession in which they are carried three times round the altar and replaced upon it. There is no procession at the offertory in the Coptic rite (though the Greek *S. Mark* has adopted it from Byzantium in one late MS.) and the deacon's command to the people to bring up their offerings still remains in its ancient position, before the offertory prayer. Some French rites had adopted the offertory procession in the sixth cent. (Gregory of Tours, *de Gloria Mart.* I, 96) and there is one in 'Germanus'. The Spanish rite also has one in the modern text. But the Council of Mâcon can. 4 (A.D. 485) and the Council of Elvira can. 29 (*c.* A.D. 305) guarantee that both these rites were originally 'oblation' not 'procession' rites. At Milan there is now a 'procession' with the *empty* vessels at the Byzantine position, but the 'oblation' of the people still takes place at the original Western position, in the ritual form of an offering of bread and wine by a college of almsmen and almswomen, the *vecchioni*. The Anglo-Saxons had the 'oblation' before the Norman Conquest, but the Frenchified rite of Sarum in the thirteenth century destroyed the native English tradition by an imitation of the Gallican 'procession'. The first spread of the 'procession' rite in the West appears to coincide with Justinian's partial restoration of Byzantine rule in the Western Mediterranean during the sixth century.

both 'procession' rites, not 'oblation' rites, from at all events the fifth century.[1]

A further interesting subdivision arises from the fact that all the Western rites seem to have stood together in the fifth century in placing a variable prayer before the Pax and the offertory, which I have called the 'Prayer of the Day', of which all the Eastern rites (including the Egyptian) know nothing. The Western rites might in fact be placed in a single column in this table but for the awkwardness of shewing two facts. One is the curious position of the Pax (after the offertory prayer) in the Spanish and Gallican rites. This can hardly be its original position, but it was already placed there traditionally in Spain in the time of S. Isidore of Seville (*c.* A.D. 600), and there seems to be no evidence as to when or why it was moved from its (presumable) original position *before* the offertory, where it stood in all the pre-Nicene rites. The other point in which the Western rites vary among themselves is that in Spain and Gaul the recital of the 'Names' of the offerers is attached to the offertory, as early as can. 28 of Elvira (*c.* A.D. 305) in Spain; while at Rome and Milan, as in Egypt, it was inserted at an early point in the eucharistic prayer, and this apparently before *c.* A.D. 390.

In the Eastern rites, as in the Western, the offertory prayer naturally follows immediately upon the placing of the elements on the altar. This later insertion of an explicit offertory prayer links the offertory closely to the eucharistic prayer, but the Eastern rites have spoilt the connection by the insertion at this point of the creed, a late sixth century innovation, and the transference to this point of the Pax, originally the prelude to the offertory.[2] The East Syrians seem never to have adopted the offertory prayer in the strict sense, retaining, I suppose, the primitive notion that the solemn placing of the elements upon the altar *is* an offering of them, needing no explicit verbal expression.[3] It remains to discuss certain particular changes and insertions in the various rites, the reasons for them (where these can be discerned) and their consequences for the particular ethos and devotional convention of the rites in which they were made.

The Invention of Litanies

The litany form of prayer appears for the first time fully developed in the North Syrian rite of *Ap. Const.*, viii. *c.* A.D. 370. It is interesting to note the

[1] *Cf. pp.* 122 *sq.* But *cf.* also *n.* 2 on *p.* 438.

[2] *Cf.* Matt. v. 23, 24. Was the Pax transferred to this point when all the deacons came to be occupied with the elaborated 'procession' and so could not proclaim the Pax at the old place? It is still *before* the offertory in *Ap. Const.*, viii. and in the homilies of Chrysostom *c.* A.D. 400.

[3] So in the modern rite (*cf.* Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 267 *sq.*). The prayer which Narsai outlines after the creed (*ed. cit.*, *p.* 8 top) is nearer in substance to the usual Eastern 'prayer of the veil' than to an 'offertory' prayer proper, as found in other Eastern rites.

exact forms in which it is found there. The dismissal of the catechumens begins by their being commanded by the deacon to kneel; he then proceeds to proclaim a series of petitions on behalf of them, to each of which the laity answer *Kyrie eleison*: 'that He Who is good and loveth mankind will pitifully receive their prayers and entreaties' (*Kyrie eleison*); 'that He will reveal unto them the gospel of His Christ' (*Kyrie eleison*); 'that He will enlighten them and establish them with us' (*Kyrie eleison*)—and so forth. These are prayers *for* the catechumens, in which they themselves take no part. After eighteen of these petitions, the catechumens are bidden to rise and then to pray for themselves: 'Entreat for the peace of God through His Christ'; 'Entreat that this day and all the days of your life be peaceful and sinless'; 'that you make christian ends', and so forth. Then they are bidden to bow for the bishop's blessing, which he gives in the form of a longish prayer, and the deacon proclaims 'Depart in peace, ye catechumens'.

There follow three more sets of dismissals on the same plan; for those possessed by evil spirits, those in the last stages of preparation for baptism and the penitents respectively. Each class is prayed over by the deacon and people in a series of petitions with the response *Kyrie eleison*, and dismissed with the bishop's blessing in the form of a prayer. The whole business seems very elaborate and can hardly have taken less than twenty minutes or so to perform. But the evidence of Chrysostom's homilies preached at Antioch[1] guarantees that the compiler has not imagined this system, but has on the whole kept faithfully to the Antiochene practice, though he has probably expanded it in some respects.

There follow the real 'prayers of the faithful', intercessory petitions for the world at large proclaimed by the deacon, answered by the prostrate people with *Kyrie eleison*. But these petitions are slightly different from those said over the catechumens etc. in their construction: 'For the peace and good order of the world and the holy churches let us pray; that the God of the universe may grant us His own everlasting peace that cannot be taken away and preserve us to pass all the days of our life in unmoved righteousness according to godliness.'[2] If we look back to the old intercessions (*p.* 42) we shall find that they consisted of 1. a subject given out by the deacon or celebrant, 2. the people's prayer in silence, 3. a brief collect or prayer by the celebrant, summing up the people's prayers. What seems to have happened here is that the celebrant's collect after each pause for silent prayer has been slightly adapted and *appended to the deacon's bidding*. 'For the peace . . . let us pray' is the old deacon's bidding; 'that etc.' (which has no parallel in the biddings over the catechumens) is the celebrant's collect.

In form the change may not appear very great, but the effect is consider-

[1] Collected by Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 470 *sq.*

[2] Chrysostom's evidence (*loc. cit.*) seems only to bear out the first half of these petitions, omitting in each clause everything after 'that . . .'

able. Under the old system the whole church did the substance of the *praying*, individually and in silence. The 'liturgies' of the deacon and celebrant only acted as a sort of 'framework' in what was a really corporate intercessory act. In the litany this has been altered. It has become a dialogue, between the deacon and the people, with the former very much predominant; and the celebrant has been eliminated. It is true that the people now have a vocal part, the *Kyrie*, but they are no longer the obvious active interceders; they have become a sort of chorus. And the celebrant has been excluded altogether from the intercessions.[1] It is true that in *Ap. Const.*, viii. the litany is followed by a prayer by the bishop. But if it be compared with the prayers over the catechumens and penitents which have just preceded the litany of intercession, it will be found that this prayer is not any summary or conclusion of the prayers 'for all sorts and conditions of men' which have been offered in the litany. It is a departure-blessing or dismissal of the faithful there present, a prayer *for* not *with* those who have been interceding, exactly comparable to the blessings of the catechumens, etc. before they leave the assembly. It marks the end of the synaxis, still an independent rite. Even if the eucharist is to follow, it may do so in another building or after an interval. But there is no justification in this case—or I would add in any other—for supposing that a prayer by the celebrant necessarily *summed up* or *concluded* the intercessory litany in the East. That consisted simply of the people's response to the deacon's petitions, which had absorbed the old celebrant's part in the intercessions.[2]

This curious evolution asks for some explanation beyond mere caprice,

[1] I suggest that anyone interested in the development of litanies should study in this order, 1. The 'Prayer for the People' (No. 27) in Sarapion, which is a sort of incipient litany. 2. The Coptic Intercessions (Brightman, *pp.* 172–3, then *pp.* 165–171, 160–1, 114–15). 3. The Nestorian *Caruzutha* (which was not originally a litany, but a long proclamation by the deacon; but that does not affect the interest of its evidence on the development of the litany form)—first the form in Brightman, *pp.* 263 *ll.* 22 *sqq.*, and then the alternative form *ibid.*, *p.* 262. This will shew every stage of the elimination of the celebrant from the Eastern intercessions. I should add that the litany in *Ap. Const.*, viii. has 29 petitions, of which 8 have no 'that' clause added to the deacon's bidding. Some of these certainly, and all of them probably, were invented by the compiler; and so his source contained no celebrant's collect to append to these biddings, and for some reason he did not trouble to invent one.

[2] It may be asked, what of the prayers now recited silently by the celebrant in the Eastern rites during the litany-dialogue of the deacon and people? It is commonly said that these were formerly recited aloud after the litany, but this seems to be a mere guess, unsupported by evidence. And if one reads the prayers it is very difficult to see how it could ever have been supposed that they had any real connection with the litanies, *e.g.*, the two 'prayers of the faithful' in the ninth cent. rite of *S. Basil* (Brightman, *pp.* 316 *sq.*) or the two alternative forms in *S. Chrysostom* (*ibid.*) are obviously private devotions of the priest, protesting his personal unworthiness to offer the eucharist. They seem from their contents to have a connection with the prayer mentioned by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Catecheses*, *ed. cit.*, *p.* 89 (who has no litany), but prayers of this tenor are common in all the Eastern (non-Egyptian) rites. There is ground for thinking that in some cases the people's litany is secondary, put in to occupy their attention while the priest proceeds with the liturgical action at the altar, and in other cases the private prayer is provided to fill up the priest's time while the litany is proceeding.

and it seems to have had an entirely practical origin. In Syria in the later fourth century there had been introduced the 'sanctuary veil', a silk curtain cutting off the celebrant and the altar altogether from the sight of the congregation during the celebration of the eucharist.

The Veil and the Screen

To understand the real meaning and purpose of this innovation we must go back a little. We have already noted in S. Cyril's *Catecheses*[1] the first beginnings of the use of words like 'awful' or 'terrifying', and the 'language of fear' generally, in reference to the consecrated sacrament. By the last quarter of the century this novel idea had taken a firm hold in Syrian devotion—it is notable, for instance, in Chrysostom's sermons. Perhaps it found a specially congenial soil in Syria, where since time immemorial 'the holy' had also meant in some way 'the dangerous'.[2] It spread outside Syria northwards very soon. We find it, for instance, in Theodore (an Antiochene by training) at Mopsuestia,[3] who does not hesitate to say that the faithful '*should be afraid* to draw nigh unto the sacrament without a mediator and this is the priest who with his hand gives you the sacrament.'[4] We are evidently far in thought (but only a few years in time) from the days when the laity communicated themselves daily at dawn from the sacrament reserved in their own homes. It is a symptom of that decline—swift and sudden in the East, slower but steady in the West—in the understanding of the position of the laity as an 'order' in the church, a decline which begins in the fourth century. The word *laïkos* 'a layman' in the East *c.* A.D. 300 still meant 'one of the People *(laos)* of God', with all the rights and high duties and destinies that implied. By *c.* A.D. 450 it had almost come to mean 'profane' as opposed to 'sacred'. (There is required only one more step to reach the modern French meaning, *e.g.* in the phrase *lois laïques*, where it means 'anti-christian'.)

The veil which hid the sanctuary during the eucharist in the Syrian churches is the natural product of this frame of mind. 'Liturgy' is becoming the special function of the clergy alone, for their sacred character protects them in the 'numinous' presence of the sacrament, charged as it is with 'terrifying' power. The 'profane' laity have no such safeguard, and therefore the veil was introduced, to hide them from it rather than it from them. Perhaps the Old Testament precedent of the tabernacle veil had something to do with the innovation, but an origin in the same frame of mind rather than in deliberate imitation seems the truer explanation. And the earliest reference to the veil that I can find is in a homily of S. John Chrysostom preached at Antioch soon after A.D. 390: 'When the sacrifice is borne forth (for the communion) and Christ the Victim and the Lord the

[1] *Cf. p.* 200.
[2] *Cf.* 2 Sam. vi. 7.
[3] *Cf. p.* 283.
[4] Theodore, *Catecheses*, vi., *ed. cit.*, *p.* 119.

Lamb, when thou hearest (the deacon proclaim) "Let us all entreat together . . .", when you see the veil drawn aside—then bethink you that heaven is rent asunder from above and the angels are descending.'[1] There is no veil in *Ap. Const.* and it may not yet have been common outside Antioch. But if we are thinking of origins, I should be inclined to look behind Antioch to the church of the *Anastasis* at Jerusalem, where, as Etheria has told us,[2] the sacrament was consecrated, not exactly behind a veil, but still out of sight of the congregation, inside the cave of the Holy Sepulchre behind its great bronze screens. So far as the evidence goes, it was at Jerusalem that 'the language of fear'—which is at the very roots of this whole conception—first began to be used about the sacrament.

The atmosphere of 'mystery' and 'awe' which is the special ethos of the Byzantine rites seems to be very largely a product of the local churches of Syria in the fourth century. It is true that the veil in modern orthodox churches is only a relic of its former self, a mere door-curtain inside the central gates of a solid masonry screen, whose outer face is covered with the sacred ikons. The first occurrence of this further barrier between the laity and the consecrated sacrament seems to be in Justinian's glorious rebuilding of the cathedral of the Holy Wisdom at Constantinople *c.* A.D. 570.[3] It would appear, too, that in its main features (apart from the decoration with ikons, which may be a later development) this screen was originally nothing but a straightforward copy of the traditional back-scene of the Byzantine theatre with its three double doors. The idea was perhaps not so inappropriate as it may seem. The Byzantine rite had by this time taken on some of the characteristics of a drama.

What I am concerned to emphasise here is that the sixth century introduction of the solid screen at Constantinople did no more than confirm the great consequence of the introduction of the veil in Syria in the fourth century. This was the *exclusion* of the laity from the process of the liturgical action. When all has been said that is true—and very much is true—of the real spiritual participation of the orthodox laity at all periods in the liturgical worship, it also remains true that the screen to a large extent forces upon the Eastern liturgies the character of two simultaneous services, the one proceeding outside the screen for the people, conducted chiefly by the deacon; the other—the real liturgical action—proceeding inside the screen conducted by the celebrant. Despite the general connection of the two and their spasmodic unification, and the function of the deacon who acts all the time as a connecting link, this duality is unmistakable at the actual performance of the liturgy in an orthodox church. And that character was originally given to it by the adoption of the veil and the hidden consecration in Syria during the fourth century. It is a quite different tradition of

[1] Chrysostom, *in Ephes.*, iii. 5. [2] *Cf. p.* 438.

[3] K. Holl's article on this in *Archiv. f. Religionswissenschaft*, ix. (1906), *pp.* 365 *sqq.*, appears to be still trustworthy on the architectural side, though its liturgical conclusions need revision in the light of the discovery of Theodore's *Catecheses*.

worship from our own, though we need not therefore condemn it or even criticise it. But we must grasp the essential difference between Eastern and Western eucharistic devotion, which begins in the fourth century—that while in the East the whole assumption and convention of the devotional tradition is that the people ought *not* to see the consecration, or indeed the progress of the liturgical action, in the West the devotional tradition assumes that they *should* see it. And when the new liturgical fashion for the 'eastward position' of the celebrant had for the first time made this difficult in the West, the new ceremony of the Elevation was deliberately introduced to shew them the sacrament.[1]

The litany in the Eastern rite is more comprehensible in the light of all this. After the catechumens, etc. had retired the celebrant blessed the faithful at the end of their prayers as he had blessed the others, and so dismissed them in their turn. But if—as normally on Sundays—the eucharist was to follow, this final blessing of the faithful was not given. Instead the celebrant retired at once within the veil to prepare to celebrate, murmuring private prayers of deprecation for his own unworthiness (of the kind which now figure as the 'prayers of the faithful' in the Byzantine rites)[2] leaving the intercessions to be conducted by the deacon outside the veil. It would be difficult, and in any case unedifying, to conduct the old 'trialogue' of deacon, people and celebrant through the curtain; it was much easier to allow the deacon to add the celebrant's part in the intercessions to his own. Hence the litany.

Silent recitation—at least in great part—of the prayers at the eucharist would in any case have been likely to follow from this new separation of the celebrant and people, even if the psychological question of 'reverence' had never occurred to anyone. But it seems that in fact the latter was the determining cause of the introduction of the silent recitation of the eucharistic prayer, in the far East and the West at all events.[3]

[1] The assertion is sometimes made that at Rome or in France in the sixth or seventh century the altar was hidden at the consecration by curtains, but the evidence appears very uncertain. The Western solid choir-screen began in the great conventual and collegiate churches of the North as a protection for the chapter and singers—the only usual congregation in such buildings—against draughts. In other words the Eastern screen was meant to shut the congregation *out*, the Western one was meant to shut them *in*. The pierced screens of our parish churches are an imitation of the greater churches, but adapted to let the congregation see. The mediaeval Lent veil which did hide the Western altar, has an obscure origin, but I suspect that it was imported from Syria, first in Sicily.

[2] Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 316 *sq.*

[3] The historical facts about this practice, which many people find so irritating, seem to be, 1. That the whole prayer was originally chanted aloud on a sort of *recitative*, like the ancient jewish prayers. 2. That the whole prayer except certain cues (before the sanctus and the concluding Amen) was already said inaudibly in E. Syria in the time of Narsai in the fifth century (where there was still *no* veil). 3. That in the sixth century the same custom was being introduced in some Greek churches, and by the seventh–eighth the silent recitation of most of the prayer (including the invocation but not the words of institution) had been adopted at Constantinople. 4. That except for the preface and certain cues, silent recitation

The main action of the eucharist was thus removed from the sight of the Eastern people. Except for the Great Entrance and the Communion all took place behind the veil or screen. It is not surprising that the 'Great Entrance' procession, when the sacrament was 'carried to burial' with solemn pomp, and its reappearance after an interval dramatically brought forth 'resurrected' at the moment of communion, became the twin focus of popular eucharistic devotion in the Greek churches.

Those who will may emphasise the 'Eleusinian' parallel thus produced in the Greek rite. For my own part I am clear that this interpretation of the eucharist was only built up by very gradual stages in the Greek churches and by successive independent changes in the presentation, not the contents, of the Greek liturgies, the prayers of which do not lend themselves very patiently to this interpretation. Some of the changes which ultimately had the most 'Eleusinian' effects began not in Greece at all but in Syria. Taking into account the late date at which the parallel—which can, I admit, be made to appear very striking—was finally developed, there can be little question of any direct imitation of hellenistic mysteries in the Byzantine rites. At the most all that could be suggested is a similar temper of thought underlying the Eleusinian mysteries and Greek eucharistic devotion. But we know too little about the former for any such parallel to be much more than an exercise of the imagination.

The Eastern people retained as their part in the liturgy listening to the lections (which the orthodox populations have always done with assiduity) and participation in some of the chants (though the admirable melodies of most of these were too difficult for the people and had to be left to the choir)—and the litany! It was natural this should be popular; it was the only devotion in the whole rite in which the laity as such now had any active part. From being used only at the intercessions which closed the synaxis it began to be repeated at other points in the rite, as an act of corporate prayer *accompanying* the liturgical action proceeding in mystery beyond the veil. It is now repeated no less than nine times in various forms, in whole or in part, during the Byzantine eucharist. With so many of the liturgical prayers said in silence, the litany forms the main substance of the people's prayer.

There may be a certain evidence of liturgical decadence in this acceptance of the need to occupy the attention of the congregation with irrelevant devotions while the liturgical action—the eucharist proper—proceeds apart from them behind the screen. But even so, Westerns are hardly in a position to remark upon it. The Eastern litany is at least a corporate

was the rule at Rome before *c.* A.D. 700 (where also there was *no* veil). 5. That in Gaul all the prayer was sung aloud except for the paragraph containing the words of institution, which in the seventh century was already called *secreta* or *mysterium*. The use of the normal speaking voice for the eucharistic prayer appears to be an innovation of the Lutherans in the sixteenth century. Anciently it was either sung or whispered.

devotion provided by the church for the faithful, magnificently phrased and noble in its all-embracing charity. The Western 'low mass', dialogued in an undertone between priest and server, is in a different way just as degenerate a representative of the old corporate worship of the eucharist. The faithful, it is true, can see the action and associate themselves continually with it in mind in a way that the Eastern layman cannot quite do. But the Western laity, unprovided with any corporate devotions whatever, are left with no active part in the rite at all. They listen and pray as individuals, adoring in their own hearts the Host elevated in silence, and then passively receive communion. All this throws the whole emphasis in Western lay devotion upon *seeing*, and on individual silent prayer. This question of 'seeing' is really at the basis not only of the difference of Eastern from Western eucharistic devotion, but of Western catholic and Western protestant doctrinal disputes. Is what one *sees* elevated or 'exposed'—a significant word!—to be *adored* as such? Posed thus, apart from its context in the corporate offering, the question is distorted. But what caused it to be posed in this way in the sixteenth century, and made the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ a centre of controversy in the West as it never had been in the East, was precisely the growth of low mass as the normal *presentation* of the eucharist to the laity during the mediaeval period.[1]

We see, too, now why the litany never proved nearly so popular in the West as in the East. Though it was introduced at some time or another

[1] I am not attacking the practice of the 'simple said service' or even of private masses. They are a necessity under modern conditions. But it is important to take account of this Latin invention of the 'simple said service' as the *normal* presentation of the eucharist in explaining the history of eucharistic devotion and doctrine in the West. There are two sides to the matter. In extending to the presbyter the liturgical 'priesthood' of the bishop and making him the usual celebrant of the eucharist, the church has laid upon him the necessity of fulfilling his 'liturgy' regularly and frequently. His 'liturgy' is not merely his 'possibility', it is the ground of his 'being' in the Body of Christ. And he does not fulfil this by simply attending the eucharist celebrated by another priest. On the contrary in so doing he abdicates his function and usurps that of a layman, which is a double violation of the principle of 'order'. On the other hand, 'concelebration' has died out of our tradition. It is not found entirely satisfactory even in the East, where the alternative custom of quasi-private sung celebrations in *parecclesiai* (little 'churches' adjoining the main church, in effect side-chapels, though they are treated as separate churches to conform nominally to the rule of only one eucharist in a church on one day) has long been practised in monasteries and other churches where there are many priests. On the other hand, if every priest *ought* to celebrate regularly and frequently, he cannot be provided every time with all the assistance for a high mass. The 'simple said service' is the only way out, and the lay devotional tradition of the West, not least in England, has in the course of centuries not only conformed to it but come on the whole to prefer it. The modern problem is how to get the laity to participate *actively* in the liturgy, and we shall not solve it merely by diminishing opportunities of celebrating for the clergy. The *messe dialoguée* of the French 'liturgical movement' is one way of doing this. But here again, the emphasis is laid on their participation in certain devotions like the 'preparation' which are by origin and nature *private* devotions of the priest. Their real participation, which was originally not only in the [illegible] but in the *action* of the liturgy, is a thing much more difficult to restore.

into most Western rites—I see no evidence that it was ever used in Africa—it disappeared from them again often without trace, because the people felt no need of it. It was the Eastern laity's substitute for *seeing* the action of the liturgy, their way of associating themselves with it beyond the screen. The particular conditions which made it so popular in the East simply did not exist in the West, where the people found other substitutes in sight and private prayer for their old active participation in the rite.

The Creed

The introduction of the creed into the liturgy has a curious history. Its original usage was at baptism. From the earliest days repentance and the acceptance of the belief of the church was the condition *sine qua non* of baptism into the Body of Christ,[1] and formal interrogation as to both was made of converts before they received the sacraments. A statement of belief that 'Jesus is Messiah' with all that this implied might be accounted sufficient in jewish circles, with their background of unwavering monotheism. But more was rapidly found necessary among the gentiles, to furnish security that the convert was not simply accepting 'the *Kyrios* Jesus' as one more 'Saviour' among his 'gods many and lords many'. The baptismal creed was elaborated as a series of three questions dealing respectively with the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, and clear traces of it in this short form are to be found in the first half of the second century. The prevalence of gnosticism with its denials of the goodness of creation and the reality of our Lord's Manhood brought further elaboration in the later second century—the affirmations that 'God the Father' is 'Maker of heaven and earth' (and therefore that creation is essentially good as the act of a good God); that Jesus Christ is not only 'His only Son' and 'our Lord', but was truly conceived and born of a human mother, the Virgin Mary, and truly 'suffered' at a particular point in history 'under (*i.e.* in the governorship of) Pontius Pilate' and 'died' as all men die, and was 'buried' as a dead body (and was not spirited away into heaven from the Cross or before the crucifixion, as the gnostics taught); and further that 'the Holy Spirit' is 'in the Holy Church' (alone, not in self-constituted gnostic cliques). We find it in this form in Hippolytus' account of baptism,[2] as a threefold question and answer, in a text which is the obvious parent of our 'Apostles' Creed'.

The Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325 carried the use of the creed a stage further. It was no longer to be only a test of belief for those entering the church from outside. Since misbelief had shewn itself to be prevalent in the East not only among those who had been baptised but amongst bishops and clergy, the creed was to be made a test for those already within the church, by solemn affirmation of which they might prove that they believed what the church had always believed and not some new private invention

[1] Acts ii. 38; viii. 37; etc.

[2] *Ap. Trad.*, xxi. 12 *sqq.*

of their own. And since the old formulae, however well they might serve to distinguish a pagan or a jew from a christian, were too imprecise to distinguish an Arian from an orthodox christian, the Council drew up a new creed, that which in an elaborated form we know as the 'Nicene Creed'. The basis appears to have been the old baptismal creed of Jerusalem, but the council added to the second section dealing with our Lord Jesus Christ a carefully worded formula—'God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God begotten not made, of the being of the Father, of one substance with the Father', which no Arian could conscientiously recite. In acting thus the Council was acting in precisely the same way as the church of the second century in adding the anti-gnostic clauses, and indeed as the apostles had acted in requiring the original affirmation that 'Jesus is Messiah', which no unconverted member of the old Israel would make.

The precise stages by which the Nicene Creed as drawn up by the Council became our present 'oecumenical' or 'Niceno-Constantinopolitan' Creed are obscure. What is certain is that the Council did not draw it up with any intention of inserting it into the liturgy in any connection, and that it did not replace the older local creeds at baptisms, even in the East, for a considerable time. In the West the old Roman creed which we call the Apostles' has everywhere persisted to this day as the test of a catechumen's faith at baptism. The Nicene Creed was a theological statement of the church's faith for christians, not a test for converts from paganism.

In the monophysite troubles of the fifth century which followed upon the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) it became the policy of the monophysite or federalist party to cry up the Council of Nicaea in order to slight 'the emperor's Council' of Chalcedon, which they rejected. With this end in view the monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Peter 'the Fuller' in A.D. 473 instituted the custom of publicly reciting the Nicene Creed at every offering of the liturgy, as an ostentatious act of deference towards the venerable Council of Nicaea, whose teachings he declared that the Chalcedonians had abandoned. In A.D. 511, the patriarch Macedonius II of Constantinople—a pious but not very wise eunuch—was banished and deposed by the monophysite emperor Anastasius, after a series of diplomatic manoeuvres which has few equals for unsavouriness even in the annals of Levantine christianity. Macedonius' intruded successor, Timothy—a man who appears to have had as little real concern for Nicene theology as for the Ten Commandments—at once introduced the monophysite practice of reciting the Nicene Creed into the liturgy of Constantinople, in order to secure the political support of the monophysite emperor and the federalist party generally. When by the vicissitudes of political fortune the orthodox once more secured control of the see of Constantinople, they dared not incur the odium of seeming to attack the memory of Nicaea by discontinuing this use of the creed; and so this originally heretical practice became a permanent feature of the Byzantine liturgy.

The West held aloof for a while, but the third Council of Toledo (can. 2) in A.D. 589 directed that 'For the fortifying of our people's recent conversion' from Arianism the creed should be recited 'after the fashion of the Eastern fathers' by all in a loud voice. But this Spanish Council placed this recitation after the fraction[1] 'that first the people may confess the belief they hold, and then with their hearts purified by faith' proceed to their communion. Its adoption among the Goths in Spain thus put it to its original purpose as a test for Arians, but in a new way, by making its recitation a preliminary to communion. In this unusual position it remains in the Mozarabic rite. Spanish catholicism was always apt to make use of its belief as a weapon, witness the 'damnatory clauses' of another Spanish document, the so-called 'Athanasian Creed'. It was in Spain also that the *Filioque* clause was first added to the Nicene Creed as an anti-Arian declaration, which subsequently caused so much unnecessary trouble between the West and the East.

In Gaul the emperor Charlemagne seems to have been the first to introduce the singing of the creed, in the liturgy of his palace chapel at Aix in A.D. 798. Some other churches of his dominions did not adopt it until almost a century later, but it spread generally in Frankish churches fairly quickly. Some Frankish monks at Jerusalem got into trouble for singing it with the *Filioque* as early as A.D. 806, and defended themselves with the plea that they had heard it 'sung thus in the West in the emperor's chapel.'[2]

Charlemagne thus used the Spanish text of the creed, but he did not place it at the Spanish position after the fraction, but where we now recite it, immediately after the gospel. There seems to be no doubt that this was a usage which had been growing up in the Italian churches outside Rome. It stood in this position in the rite of Benevento in the eighth century,[3] and there is some evidence that the same custom had been introduced at Aquileia in N. Italy by its bishop Paulinus (A.D. 786–802).[4] Rome, perhaps from mere conservatism, or perhaps misliking the heretical origin of the custom, long held out against the innovation. The recitation of the creed at the eucharist was first adopted by Pope Benedict VIII in the year A.D. 1014, under strong pressure from the Emperor Henry II, who was shocked when visiting Rome to find that it had no place in the Roman rite as it had in that of his own chapel.[5] Even then Rome adopted it somewhat

[1] The order in Spain was fraction, creed, *praefatio* and Lord's prayer. The *praefatio* and Lord's prayer (without the creed) followed the fraction in Gaul also, instead of preceding it as at Rome and in the East.

[2] Diplomatic complications ensued, involving Pope Leo III, who still did not use the Spanish *Filioque* at all, and wished that the emperor should not do so either.

[3] Dom R. J. Hesbert, *L'Antiphonale Missarum de l'ancien rit Bénéventain* in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, lii. (*N.S.* 12), 1938, *p.* 36.

[4] Dom B. Capelle, *L'Origine antiadoptianiste de notre texte du Symbole* in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, I (1929), *pp.* 19–20.

[5] Berno of Reichenau, *de Off. Missae*, ii. (M.P.L., cxlii. 1060). The attempts to show that the creed was recited in the Roman rite before this all break down upon examination.

half-heartedly. It never became there, as in the East, an invariable element of the rite, but was reserved for Sundays and the greater feasts, as an appropriate expansion offering opportunities for singing. In later times there has been added the recitation of the creed at the eucharist on the minor feasts of those saints who are venerated as 'Doctors of the Church', who by their writings have expounded and defended the faith which the creed sets out. Once more we can trace the repugnance to the Roman liturgical instinct of all additions to the rite which play no clear logical part in the performance of the eucharistic action, and so may confuse the bare simplicity of its outline, even while adorning it.

The Prayer 'of the Day'

This prayer is peculiar to the Western rites. It seems to have stood at the same point in all of them in the fifth century, *viz.* after the dismissals which closed the synaxis and before the kiss of peace which formed the ancient opening of the eucharist. It thus formed a new opening prayer to the eucharist proper. It varied with the day, and its introduction is probably one of the earliest examples of that special influence of the calendar on the prayers of the eucharistic rite which is a peculiar feature of the Western liturgies as a group. The simplest thing is to give some examples of this prayer in the various rites, beginning with that in which it is most fully developed and has most completely maintained its function, the Spanish Mozarabic rite.

In the Spanish books this prayer is always constructed in two parts, the one addressed to the congregation, the other directly addressed to God, known respectively as the *missa* and *alia*—'the mass' and 'the other' (prayer). Here is the ninth century Mozarabic prayer 'of the day' for Tuesday in Holy Week:

Missa: 'Offering the living sacrifice to our most loving God and Redeemer, we are bound, dearly beloved brethren, both to entreat Him by our prayers and do penance by our tears: for His holy Pascha draws near and the celebration of His passion is at hand, when by the penalty of the torment laid upon Him He burst the gates of hell. Let us serve Him by fasting and worship Him by contrition of heart, seeking of Him that He will through abstinence cleanse our flesh burdened with sins and rouse our dull mind to love Him by the approaching celebration of His death.

Alia: 'O Christ our Saviour, God, at the approach of Whose passion we rejoice, and by the yearly return of the celebration of Whose resurrection we are raised up: do Thou cleanse our flesh brought low with fasting from the weight of our sins. Do Thou sanctify the soul that has earnestly desired Thee: grant light unto the eyes: give cleanness to body and soul: that worthily adorned (*vestiti*) with all virtues we may be found meet to behold the glory of Thy passion.'[1]

[1]*Lib. Moz. Sacr., ed. cit., coll.* 228 *sq.*

Though the Mozarabic terms are *missa* and *alia*, this is an example of the old Western *praefatio* and *oratio* structure of which we have already spoken, the two parts forming a single prayer. After the *praefatio* there was originally a pause for silent prayer, followed by the celebrant's *oratio*. We have had an example of the same structure in the Roman intercessory prayers, with the celebrant's bidding 'Let us pray, beloved brethren, for...' (followed by the deacon's command to kneel at the great intercessions, and perhaps on other occasions in penitential seasons) and then after the people's silent prayer, the collect.[1] Another survival of the same thing in the Roman rite is the celebrant's address before the Lord's prayer after the canon, 'Let us pray: Instructed by saving precepts and taught by divine example we make bold to say: Our Father ...'. In this case the Lord's prayer itself takes the place of the pause for silent prayer, and the celebrant concludes with a collect which is now said inaudibly in the Roman rite (except on Good Friday at the communion of the Pre-sanctified) but is still always recited aloud at Milan. Other Roman survivals of the full *praefatio* are to be found before the collects in ordination masses. Indeed, it has not entirely disappeared before any Roman collect, for the celebrant always 'prefaces' his 'prayer' (*oratio*), addressed to God, with *Oremus*, 'Let us pray', addressed to the people. The Eastern rites have no such address before their prayers. It is very typical of the different genius of the two Western liturgical types, Italian and Franco-Spanish, that starting from the same sort of formula of a single sentence or so, the one should tend to cut it down always to the same single word, and the other should expand it to a paragraph or more (some Mozarabic *praefationes* are fifty or sixty lines long) and vary it on every occasion that it is used.

There are sufficient indications that throughout the West *all* the prayers of the liturgy except the eucharistic prayer were at one time constructed in this way, with an address to the people followed by the prayer proper. But by the time our oldest extant liturgical MSS. were written the system was in full decay, the address being often reduced to a few words, or more usually omitted altogether. The cumbersomeness, and also the somewhat offensive clericalism, of prefixing an exhortation to the people by the priest every time prayer was to be offered was too much for the tradition. And even Spanish fecundity of liturgical expression boggled at the task of finding a sufficient number of different 'prefaces' for all the variable prayers of this most mutable rite. The *missa* and *alia*, however, in the Mozarabic rite retained the full form and even expanded it considerably,[2] for a particular reason. There was no collect or other prayer in the Mozarabic rite before the lections until the tenth century or so. Thus the *missa* and *alia* together formed the *first* prayer of the day, and had the function of 'striking the keynote' as it were of the special liturgical character of the

[1] *Cf. p.* 42.

[2] The example above was chosen chiefly as being one of the shortest in the year.

mass. When the variable 'collect' before the lections was introduced into the Spanish rite, it more or less duplicated this function; but by then the *missa* and *alia* were too strongly entrenched in Mozarabic tradition to be attenuated. At Rome the 'prayer of the day' disappeared, but it was the 'collect' not the 'prayer of the day' which tended to be eliminated in Spain, being altogether omitted on all fast days. Mozarabic masses were cited by the first words of this prayer (whence the name *missa*?) just as Roman masses were and are cited by the first words of the introit, as a convenient way of referring to the mass of different occasions and days (*e.g. Requiem, Laetare, Quasimodo*, etc.).

In Gaul we find the same arrangement of *praefatio* and *oratio* at the same point of the rite. But here the Roman 'collect' before the lections was introduced much earlier than in Spain (sixth–seventh century?) and in the later Gallican books is already tending to oust the *praefatio* and *oratio* from their original function of emphasising the particular point of the liturgy of the day. Originally the Gallican 'collect' before the lections appears to have had the character of a mere preparatory prayer, leaving the reference to the saint or the day to the prayer 'of the day' after the gospel. The following, from the mass of S. Germanus of Autun in the oldest Gallican collection extant, the *Masses of Mone*, will make the difference plain:[1]

Collect (*before the lections*): 'O pitiful and pitying Lord, Who if Thou didst repay us according to our deserts, wouldst find nothing worthy of Thy forgiveness; multiply upon us Thy mercy that where sin hath abounded, the grace of forgiveness may yet more abound. Through . . .

Praefatio (*after the gospel*):[2] 'With one accord, my dear brethren,[3] let us entreat the Lord that this our festival begun by the merits of our blessed father the bishop Germanus may by his intercession bring peace to his people, increase their faith, give purity of heart, gird their loins and open unto them the portal of salvation. Through . . .

Oratio ante nomina. 'Hear us, O Lord holy, Father Almighty, everlasting God, and by the merits and prayers of Thy holy pontiff Bishop Germanus, keep this Thy people in Thy pity, preserve them by Thy favour, and save them by Thy love. Through . . .'.

At Milan the prayer 'of the day' is known as the 'prayer over the corporal' (*oratio super sindonem*) *i.e.*, the first prayer said after the cloth has

[1] These prayers appear as the second of Mass x. and the first and second of Mass xi. in the editions of Mone (*p.* 37) and Neale and Forbes (*pp.* 28 *sq.*). But Dom Wilmart's article in the *Révue Benedictine* (1911), *p.* 377, based on a fresh examination of the MS., rearranges its leaves, so that these form items 2 and 3 of Mass vii. (item 1 being an *apologia* or private prayer for the celebrant). There is need of an entirely new edition of this, the key-document for the history of the Gallican rites.

[2] Mis-headed in MS. as *Collectio*.

[3] *Fratres carissimi*, the normal Gallican substitute for the Roman *fratres dilectissimi*. Anyone who has heard a modern French *curé's* frequent apostrophes to *mes chers frères* will recognise the survival.

been spread by the deacon upon the altar, which as we have seen[1] was the first preparation made for the celebration of the eucharist proper. It is preceded by 'The Lord be with you', 'And with thy spirit', and 'Let us pray' —precisely like the collect before the lections, from which in the Milanese rite it is indistinguishable in function by its contents. Indeed a few prayers which are employed in one Milanese MS. as collects proper are exchanged by others with the corresponding *super sindonem* prayers, without the mistake being detectable from the contents of the prayers.

In the Roman rite there is no longer a prayer 'of the day'. But before the offertory the celebrant still turns to the people for 'The Lord be with you', 'And with thy spirit', and turns back saying 'Let us pray'—but no prayer follows. Something has dropped out of the rite, and the close analogy of Milan suggests that it is a *super sindonem* prayer.[2] Nor perhaps are we altogether without information as to the actual 'prayers of the day' used on some of the days of the liturgical year at Rome in the fifth–sixth century. Liturgists have long been puzzled to account for the fact that while the masses of the Roman *Gregorian Sacramentary* have only a single collect before the lections, the pre-Gregorian *Gelasian Sacramentary* usually gives two. A certain number of these supplementary Gelasian collects reappear in the Milanese rite as *orationes super sindonem.* I suggest that when the prayer 'of the day' was abolished at Rome (was it by S. Gregory?) some Italian church south of Rome did not at once follow suit, and retained the *super sindonem* prayers. Our unique copy of the *Gelasian Sacramentary,* though it reproduces the substance of a pre-Gregorian Italian book, was made in France *c.* A.D. 700. It was thus written a century or more after the Gregorian reform (*c.* A.D. 595) and with full knowledge of the changes introduced by S. Gregory, to which in many important details it has been accommodated (*e.g.* it incorporates all the changes he had made in the text of the canon). But it descends, so far as its 'propers' are concerned, not from a sacramentary used in the city of Rome itself, but from an Italian book from the country south of Rome (? Capua), as is proved by its calendar. I suggest that this South Italian book retained the *super sindonem* prayers, which the scribe of our *Gelasianum* MS. has preserved, merely omitting their headings to bring the copy he was making into line with the current Roman and Frankish use.

We can, I think, understand the disuse of the prayer 'of the day' in the Roman rite. Once the variable 'collect' before the lections had made good its footing in the rite, it anticipated the function of the prayer 'of the day' after the lections. The first prayer thus 'struck the key-note' of the day at a

[1] *Cf. p.* 104.

[2] Duchesne (*Origins, ed. cit., p.* 172), suggests that this abortive 'Let us pray' is a trace of the old Roman intercessory prayers of the faithful. The difficulty is that these prayers, as they have survived on Good Friday, do *not* begin with 'The Lord be with you', but in the still older fashion with *Oremus, dilectissimi fratres*—a *praefatio.*

more appropriate point in the rite than did the second, once the lections of the synaxis had come to be thoroughly fused with the eucharist proper as parts of a single whole. And so, finding itself with what were virtually two 'collects', one before and one after the lections, both fulfilling the same function, the Roman church dropped the 'prayer of the day' at some time in the sixth century in favour of the 'collect' before the lections; though the latter was a custom imported from Egypt in the course of the fifth century, while the prayer 'of the day' was an element in the Roman rite which it shared with the other Western churches.

We have insufficient evidence about the African rite to be sure whether it contained a prayer 'of the day', though there are texts which might reasonably be conjectured to refer to it.[1]

The interest of this prayer 'of the day' is twofold. First, it is a feature which is common to all the Western rites and missing from all the Eastern ones. It thus gives an indication that the Western rites under their later divergence originally form a real group, going back to a common type. Secondly, from its character and position its introduction must go back to the period before the synaxis and eucharist were properly fused, but after the formation of the liturgical year—say round about A.D. 420–30. Only at that time could it have been felt necessary to insert a prayer specially intended to bring the fixed prayers of the eucharist proper into direct relation to the lections that had just been read, and to the day in the liturgical calendar. Its institution is thus probably the earliest effect of the calendar on the prayers of the eucharist, which became so marked a feature of all Western rites in the fifth century and after.

Offertory Chants

We have seen that the offertory procession at Mopsuestia in Theodore's time advanced from the sacristy to the altar in dead silence, a point on which Theodore lays special emphasis;[2] and there is no mention of music or singing at this point of the rite in Narsai.[3] It is interesting to find that the Western oblation by the people before the altar appears also to have been originally performed in silence. The interest of the pre-Nicene church both East and West is concentrated on the *action* of offering. No need was felt to 'cover' this, as it were, with music. The first we hear of an offertory chant is from S. Augustine in Africa, who notes in his *Retractations* the introduction in his own days at Carthage of 'the custom of reciting (*dicerentur*) at the altar hymns taken from the book of psalms both before the oblation and while that which had been offered was being distributed to the people', and how he himself had been obliged to write a pamphlet in defence of the innovation.[4]

[1] *Cf. p.* 498, *n.* 1. [2] *Cf. p.* 283. [3] *Hom.*, xvii., *ed. cit.*, *pp.* 3–4.
[4] S. Augustine, *Retractations*, II, 11 and 17.

So far as can be made out from the obscure and scanty evidence the original form of this psalmody was what the ancients called 'responsorial', *i.e.*, a solo singer sang the verses of a psalm to an elaborate setting, the people and choir joining in with a chorus or refrain between each verse—the 'antiphon'. At Rome, when the offertory and communion psalms were adopted, a plain psalm chant sung by the people seems to have been adopted for the verses, the 'antiphonal' melody being more elaborated and left to the choir. When the people's oblation gradually fell into disuse on normal occasions (as lay communions grew more infrequent) less music was required to 'cover' the offertory ceremony; and so the psalm verses were cut down until by degrees they vanished altogether (except at requiems), leaving only the elaborate melody of the antiphon to be rendered once by the choir as a sort of 'anthem' at the offertory. The same thing happened with the communion psalm. But two or three psalm 'verses' are still found on occasion attached to the antiphon in Roman choir books of the eleventh century. We do not know when the Roman church adopted the African custom of singing psalms at the offertory and communion, in addition to the pre-Nicene chants between the lections and its own early fifth century innovation of a psalm-chant during the processional entry. But a careful study of the texts of the offertories and communions in the Gregorian antiphonary suggests that they are a later development than the introit psalms. Not only are there few (if any) survivals of the pre-Vulgate text of the scriptures in these chants, of a kind which are not infrequent in the graduals and tracts and found occasionally in the introits; but they are usually chosen without close connection with the introit (which often has a connection of thought with the gradual). On the other hand, offertory and communion often seem to have a connection of thought between themselves. Perhaps a simultaneous adoption at Rome later in the fifth century than the introit would satisfy all the known facts.[1]

The Western rites thus equipped themselves with offertory chants independently of and before those of the East. There does in fact seem to have been much more general interest taken in church music in the West than in the East from the fourth century onwards. There was singing in the Eastern liturgies, at all events in the synaxis and (after its adoption) at the sanctus of the eucharist. The Eastern rites would have been untrue to the primordial origins of the eucharist in the *chabûrah* supper with its psalm-singing if they had excluded singing altogether. But if one looks at an Eastern exposition of the liturgy earlier than the seventh or eighth century, whether it be Cyril of Jerusalem or Theodore or Narsai, one finds that when music is mentioned it is passed over as something incidental, which excites no interest. In the West there is a series of writers beginning with Augustine who discuss with evident appreciation the part of church music

[1] There are no *offertorium* and *communio* chants in the very archaic mass for the Easter vigil on Holy Saturday

in worship, its legitimacy, its appropriateness and emotional effects, in a way which so far as I know is unparalleled in the East at this date. And whereas when the Eastern writers wish to dilate on the impressiveness of the eucharistic rite their emphasis is regularly on what strikes the eye—on the ceremonial and the vestments[1]—comparable Western writings like S. Isidore *de Officiis* and pseudo-Germanus lay their emphasis rather on the splendour of what is *heard*—the church music; and they evidently ascribe the same sort of emotional effect to this as is made on the Easterns by the ceremonial.

There is here not much more than a difference of psychology, so far as the early centuries are concerned. The Easterns developed a church music of a very high order. The researches of Herr Egon Wellescz and Professor Tillyard are teaching us that Byzantine church music of the golden age (much of which has a Syrian origin) was equal to the best that the West could produce. And the Westerns developed a ceremonial, stately enough in its own way though it never attained to anything like the dramatic quality found in the Eastern rites; and in Gaul (and perhaps during the middle ages generally) Western ceremonialists were apt to mistake mere fussiness and elaboration for dignity. But that the popular emotional interest in the East and West varied between ceremonial and music in the way described seems clear. This had some effect on the later liturgical history of the two halves of christendom. It was the special perfection and completeness of the Roman chant which as much as anything else spread the Roman rite in the West from the eighth century onwards, for the chant fitted the rite and it was difficult to adopt one without the other. But it is the spread of Byzantine ceremonies (*e.g.* the 'prothesis' or ceremonial preparation of the elements before the synaxis, and the 'great entrance') which has so largely Byzantinised the rites even of the dissidents in the East.

The Western appreciation of and interest in the music of worship has survived even the triumph of the puritan ideal among the churches of the Reformation, except among the most austerely consistent of the sects. This is true not only *e.g.* of the Anglican 'cathedral tradition', but among Prussian Calvinists whose grim worship still admits their lovely *chorales*. The point is that oriental puritans admit no such illogicality. Islam has neither instrumental nor choral music in its corporate worship. As a mohammedan *mallaum* once shrewdly remarked to me of a Wesleyan mission—'They will have beautiful sounds but not beautiful sights or odours like you in their worship. Yet the sounds are more distracting from true prayer than the sights or odours would be, which is why we true believers

[1] *E.g.* Narsai: 'The priests now come in procession into the midst of the sanctuary and stand there in great splendour and in beauteous adornment' (*p.* 4). 'The sacrament goes forth on the paten and in the cup (for the communion) with splendour and glory, with an escort of priests and a great procession of deacons' (*ibid., p.* 27).

admit only words'. That is the puritan theory of worship in a nutshell—to 'admit only words'. The Western interest in 'church song' which begins in the fourth century with Ambrose and Augustine has certainly shewn itself very strong to overcome this instinct of puritanism in any department of worship. It is curious that it has nowhere (I think) been strong enough to retain among protestants the old *recitative* or intonation of lections and prayers to a very simple chant as in the synagogue and the primitive christian church—the one and only sphere in which Islamic custom has preserved music in its liturgy.[1]

Offertory Prayers

We have seen that none of the pre-Nicene rites contain any offertory prayer at all. The interest is concentrated upon the action, and the setting of the bread and wine upon the altar in and by itself constitutes the offering of them to God. The addition of an explicit commendation of them to God is an innovation of what I have called the period of the 'second *stratum*', the fifth–eighth centuries. It is an indication that the period when the eucharist is recognised as primarily an action, in which every member of the church has an active part, is passing into the later idea of the eucharist as primarily something 'said' by the clergy on behalf of the church, though it was centuries before this idea took complete control of the presentation of the liturgy.

There is still no offertory prayer in Sarapion; nor is there any such prayer in *Ap. Const.*, viii, thirty or forty years later in Syria. There is no means of telling how old the offertory prayer found in the ninth century text of the liturgy of *S. Basil* may be, but it is likely to be as ancient as any used in the East and is in itself so fine a prayer as to be worth citing as a representative of the later Eastern prayers:

'O Lord our God Who didst make us and bring us into this life, and show us the ways unto salvation, and grant us the grace of the revelation of heavenly mysteries: Thou art He Who did set us in this ministry in the power of Thy Holy Spirit. Be graciously pleased, O Lord, that we should be ministers (*diakonous*) of Thy New Covenant, officiants (liturgisers, *leitourgous*) of Thy holy mysteries. Receive us as we draw near unto Thy holy altar in the multitude of Thy mercy that we may be made worthy to offer unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice on behalf of our own sins and the ignorance of the people. Receive it upon Thy holy and heavenly and spiritual altar for a savour of sweetness, and send down in return upon

[1] I hope it will not seem shocking to compare moslem and christian methods of worship. But as I have said (*p.* 312), the puritan and ceremonious conceptions of worship are a cross-division which cuts right athwart creeds. And from the standpoint of comparative religion it is more scientific to treat Islam as an erratic deformation of the judaeo-christian development than as an independent faith. It did not arise independently of the latter.

us the grace of Thy Holy Spirit. Look upon us, O God, and behold this our worship, and accept it as Thou didst accept the gifts of Abel, the sacrifices of Noah, the whole-burnt-offerings of Abraham, the priestly offerings of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offerings of Samuel; as Thou didst acceof from Thy holy apostles this true worship, so accept also from the hands pt us sinners these gifts in Thy goodness, O Lord, that being found worthy to liturgise blamelessly at Thy holy altar we may receive the reward of faithful and wise stewards in the day of Thy righteous repayment, through the mercies of Thy only-begotten Son with Whom Thou art blessed with Thine all-holy and good and life-giving Spirit, now and for ever and for ages of ages. Amen.'[1]

The earliest suggestion of such a prayer in christian literature is, as we have said, in the letter of Pope Innocent I to Decentius (*c.* A.D. 415), but we have no evidence when the Roman prayers first assumed their present form,[2] of which the following are specimens taken almost at random:

For the Epiphany: 'We beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously to behold the gifts of Thy church: wherein is set forth no longer gold and frankincense and myrrh, but what by those gifts is declared and sacrificed and received, even Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord . . .' For the second Sunday after Epiphany: 'Sanctify, O Lord, our offered gifts: and cleanse us from the stains of our sins; Through . . .' For Low Sunday: 'Receive, we pray, O Lord, the gifts of Thy jubilant church, and since Thou hast given her reason for such mighty joy, grant her also the fruit of endless bliss. Through . . .' For the fifth Sunday after Pentecost (fourth after Trinity): 'Be gracious, O Lord, unto our supplications and mercifully receive these oblations of Thy servants and handmaids; that what each has offered to the honour of Thy Name, may avail for the salvation of all; Through . . .'

These set forth with simplicity the spirit of the people's oblation, brought into contact now with the offerings of the wise kings, now with the thrill of the Easter joy, and in the 'green' seasons with the endless desire of the soul for purity and salvation.

The offertory prayers of the other Western rites are rather less directly expressed. Here for instance is the Mozarabic *post nomina* or offertory prayer for Easter Day: 'Having listened to the names of those who offer, we pray Thee, Lord of love, to deign to be present to us at our prayer, to be found when Thou art sought, to open at our knocking. Write the names of the offerers in the heavenly book, shew forth Thy promise in the holy, Thy mercy in the lost. And because the prayer of our infirmity is weak, and we know not what to ask, we call to the aid of our own prayers the patriarchs taken into the heavenly company, the prophets filled with the divine

[1] Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 319 *sq.*

[2] I cannot help doubting whether Innocent I is referring to a *separate* 'offertory prayer'. I suggest that he has in mind the prayer which now forms the first paragraph of the Roman canon (*cf. pp.* 500 *sqq.*).

Spirit, the martyrs crowned with the flowers of their confession, the apostles chosen for the office of preaching. Through whom we pray to Thee, our Lord, that all who are terrified by fear, afflicted by want, vexed by trials, laid low by sickness, bound captive by sufferings, may be released by the presence of Thy resurrection. Be graciously mindful also of the spirits of them that sleep (*pausantium*), that the outstretched pardon of their offences may allow them to attain to the bosom of the patriarchs, by the help of Thy mercy Who livest . . .'[1]

The custom of reading out 'the Names' between the oblation and the offertory prayer in the Spanish church, and also the adoption of the oriental fashion of the diptychs have done a good deal to confuse the tenor of most of the Spanish offertory prayers. But even making allowance for this, there is usually a lack of simplicity about them and a striving after effect which results in turgid language; here, for instance, the allusion to Easter as 'the presence of Thy resurrection' releasing sufferers is clumsily made.[2] One reason at least why the Roman rite was so largely adopted in the West without compulsion and by the gradual acceptance of so many local churches in the seventh–tenth centuries[3] lies precisely in this, that on the whole it was a simpler and more expressive rite. The old local rites were redolent of the soil on which they arose, and rightly dear to those who used them from ancestral tradition. But rite for rite and prayer for prayer the Roman was apt to be both more practical and better thought out; and those who compared them carefully could hardly fail to notice it. Hence the growing voluntary adoption of Roman prayers and pieces and chants, and ultimately of the Roman Shape of the Liturgy as a whole, which is so marked a feature of liturgical history in the territories of the Gallican and Mozarabic rites during the seventh and eighth centuries, when the Popes were in no position to bring pressure to bear on anyone to adopt their rite.

To complete our survey: the Milanese offertory prayers, though by no means identical with the Roman series, are cast in the same mould, and need not be illustrated. The Gallican ones are usually similar to the Mozarabic. The following from the *Missale Gothicum* for Easter Day will serve for comparison: 'Receive, we beseech Thee, O Lord, the Victim (*hostia*) of propitiation and praise and be pleased to accept these oblations of Thy servants and handmaids which we offer at the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the flesh. And grant also by the intercessions of Thy saints unto our dear ones who sleep in Christ refreshment in

[1] *Lib. Moz. Sacr.*, *ed.* Férotin, *coll.* 255 *sq.*

[2] For purposes of comparison here is the Roman offertory prayer for Easter: 'Receive we pray Thee, O Lord, the prayers of Thy people together with the offering of their hosts, that by Thy operation they may suffice us for the receiving of that heavenly remedy which had its beginning in the Easter mysteries:' . . . where the *paschalia mysteria* is a double allusion to the first Easter Day and the paschal baptism and first communion of each communicant.

[3] This was not universally the process by which it was adopted (*cf. pp.* 561 *sqq.*) but it does account for a great deal of its progress.

the land of the living: Through . . .' Here again the reading of 'the Names' of the departed and the saints immediately before has produced the incongruous addition of the last clause; though the undying French devotion to the memory of their dead, their *cari nostri*, which on the 2nd of November can still always bridge the great gulf between the French clerical and anticlerical, is something very near the heart of French religion in every age.[1]

The 'Names' and the 'Diptychs'

The intercessory 'prayers of the faithful' at the synaxis, like the petitions of the later litany which replaced them in the East, were general prayers—*i.e.*, they spoke of classes of people, catechumens, penitents, travellers, pagans and so forth, without specifying individuals. The congregation were no doubt expected to particularise silently those in whom each was personally interested during the pause between the bidding and the collect. The only names publicly mentioned seem to have been those of the Roman emperor and the local bishop. But while this public intercession 'by categories' sufficed at the synaxis, the eucharist even in pre-Nicene times was felt to require something more personal, as the domestic gathering of the household of God.

It may be that the need for particularisation was first felt at that peculiarly personal occasion, the eucharist offered for a departed christian, when S. Paul's teaching that the eucharist is always an anticipation of the judgement of God[2] takes on a special poignancy. At all events, the earliest mention of the naming of an individual in the prayers of the eucharist proper, in the first epistle of S. Cyprian of Carthage, occurs in this connection. It deals with the awkward case of a bishop lately dead, who had deliberately violated a rule made by a recent African Council against the inconvenient practice of appointing clergymen as executors. Cyprian decides in accordance with the Council's ruling that 'there shall be no oblation on his behalf (at the offertory) nor shall the sacrifice be offered for his repose, for he does not deserve to be *named in the prayer* of bishops who has sought to distract the bishops and ministers from (the service of) the altar.'[3] Thus in Africa *c.* A.D. 240 it was already customary to name individual dead persons in the course of the *prex*, the eucharistic prayer, at all events at funerals and requiems. (Cyprian is not legislating for the deceased's own church, where the actual funeral would take place, but for Carthage and other churches where a eucharist would customarily have been 'offered for his repose'). It may be an accident, but Cyprian appears never to mention any 'naming' of living individuals at any point of the rite.[4] S. Augustine a

[1] There was an *oratio* at the African eucharist before the eucharistic prayer (*cf.* Augustine *Ep.* cxlix. (*al.* lix.) 16). But whether it was a 'prayer of the day' or an offertory prayer I am unable to say from the evidence.

[2] I Cor. xi. 29, 32.

[3] Cyprian, *Ep.* I, 2.

[4] *Ep.*, xvi. 2, might just possibly be pressed to mean this.

century and a half later has likewise no mention of the 'naming' of living individuals in the African rite, but his evidence as to the 'naming' of the dead is difficult to interpret.[1] What he does make clear is that by his time the Jerusalem practice of 'naming' certain martyrs in the course of the eucharistic prayer had been adopted in Africa.[2]

We have already noted[3] that in Sarapion's eucharistic prayer there is to be a pause for 'the reading out (*hypobole*) of the names' of the departed only. Likewise in Cyril's account of the Jerusalem rite particular dead persons are named in the intercessions which follow the consecration, because of 'the special assistance of their souls for whom prayer is made in the presence of the holy and most awful sacrifice'.[4] From the defence of the practice which Cyril thinks it right to make, one would suppose that this naming of individual souls in the eucharistic prayer was a fairly recent innovation at Jerusalem, and had been causing some discussion there. In Sarapion's rite likewise, the 'naming' of the dead appears to be a fairly recent interpolation, with no connection with what precedes and follows.

So much for the early evidence for the naming of the dead at the eucharist. Now as concerns the naming of the living. The earliest evidence of this comes from Spain. The Council of Elvira (*c.* A.D. 305) in its 29th canon forbids the names of those possessed by evil spirits 'to be recited at the altar with the oblation'.[5] Canon 28 prohibits an abuse which had grown up by which persons under excommunication—probably those who for social reasons had made some excessive compromise with pagan conventions—were allowed to offer their *prosphora* and have their names read out with the rest, provided they did not actually make their communion. All this would suggest that this 'naming' of the living in the Spanish rite was practically a roll-call of the faithful, and took place as each made their oblation or perhaps all together immediately afterwards. We can see now why the Spanish offertory prayers are called 'the prayer *ad nomina*' ('at the names') and why they take the form they do. In a small church where the members were well known to one another the omission of a name week by week would leave a stigma, and perhaps that is the origin and purpose of the custom. The 'Names' are those of the communicants (or 'offerers' as the ancient church thought of them) of that particular eucharist. Some of the later Mozarabic prayers are explicit that they are the names *offerentium et pausantium* 'of the (living) offerers and the departed'. It is possible that this was already so in pre-Nicene times, the relatives or representatives of

[1] E. Bishop, *Appendix* to *Narsai*, *p.* 112, comes to the conclusion that there was no 'naming' of the dead, but only a 'general commemoration' in Augustine's rite. I cannot help thinking he is somewhat arbitrary in his interpretation of Augustine *de Cura Gerenda pro Mortuis* 6, which seems to me to imply that there *was* a 'naming', as well as a general commemoration. *Cf.* also *Serm.*, clix. 1.

[2] *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 10; *Serm.*, clix. i. *de Sancta Virginitate* 45, etc.

[3] *Cf. p.* 164.

[4] Cyril, *Cat.*, xxiii. 9 (*p.* 195).

[5] Can. 37 forbids them to be baptised, or if already christians, to receive holy communion except on their deathbeds.

the dead offering in 'the name of' those departed from that church in its peace and communion, a touching illustration of the vividness of belief in the communion of saints and the unity in Christ of all christians living and dead. But though the early Spanish evidence does not contradict such an idea, it does not explicitly support it. Early practice in Africa and Spain was evidently not the same. Cyprian's 'naming' of the *dead* is in the course of the eucharistic prayer. The Spanish 'naming' of the (living) '*offerers*' is before it begins.

Before turning our attention to the East it will be as well to take here the earliest Italian evidence on the subject, though it is only at the end of the fourth and early in the fifth century that any is available. S. Ambrose at Milan tells us that 'prayers are asked for kings, for the people and the others'[1] at an early point in the eucharistic prayer itself. We shall find that another N. Italian prayer of about the same date seems to have had the same arrangement. It is also the point which seems to be implied in Innocent I's description of the Roman rite *c.* A.D. 415: 'Your own wisdom will shew how superfluous it is to pronounce the name of a man whose oblation you have not yet offered to God (?by the offertory prayer).... So, one should first commend the offerings and afterwards name those who have made them. One should *name them during the divine mysteries and not in the part of the rite which precedes*, so that the mysteries themselves lead up to the prayers to be offered'. Whether the offerings are here 'commended' to God by a detached offertory prayer proper, or whether Innocent simply has in mind the first paragraph (*Te igitur*) of the present Roman canon (which also 'commends' the offerings) there can be no doubt that *c.* A.D. 400 the 'Naming' of the offerers at Rome comes in approximately the same place as at Milan, in the eucharistic prayer itself.

As now arranged the canon runs as follows: After the whispered offertory prayer by the celebrant (and the preface and sanctus, which in their present form are a later interpolation not contemplated by Innocent I),[2] the prayer opens abruptly:

'We therefore humbly pray Thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord and beseech Thee that Thou wouldest hold accepted and bless these gifts (*dona*), these 'liturgies' (*munera*)[3], these holy and unspotted sacrifices: which first we offer for Thy holy catholic church, that throughout all the world Thou wouldst be pleased to give her peace, safety, unity and Thy governance:

[1] S. Ambrose, *de Sacramentis*, iv. 4, *c.* A.D. 395.

[2] *Cf. p.* 539.

[3] *Dona* are 'free gifts', *munera* are payments which fall on a man by virtue of the office he holds, *i.e.* exactly 'liturgies' in the old sense. This sense persisted in the local Roman liturgical terminology down to at least the sixth century, *cf.* the examples collected by Dom O. Casel, *Oriens Christianus* (series III), vii. (1932), *pp.* 289 *sqq.* Note that in the Roman conception the people's oblation is still their *munus*, or 'liturgy' in the Pauline sense. The *people* are still in the old phrase the 'offerers', along with the priest.

'Together with Thy servant N. our Pope [and N. our bishop and all the orthodox and the worshippers ⟨who are⟩ of catholic and apostolic faith] remember Thy servants and handmaids N. and N. and all who stand around, whose faith is accepted of Thee and whose devotion known [for whom we offer unto Thee, or][1] who offer unto Thee this sacrifice of praise, for themselves and all who are theirs . . .'[2]

Just as the Mozarabic rite with its *ad nomina* offertory prayer still preserves the 'naming' of the offerers at the same point of the rite as in the days of the Council of Elvira *c.* A.D. 305, *viz.* at the offertory; so the Roman rite equally seems to preserve the position of the 'naming' customary in Italy *c.* A.D. 395, *viz.* soon *after* the offertory, in an early passage of the eucharistic prayer itself. Which of these represents the older tradition in the West is a point on which opinions will probably differ.[3]

We may note here two points: 1. That whereas in Sarapion and at Jerusalem and probably in Africa, the only names read out appear to be those of the dead; at Rome and in Spain, so far as the evidence goes, the only names anciently read out were those of the living. And in fact it has been demonstrated[4] that the commemoration of the dead which now appears as an invariable paragraph of the Roman canon, though it is genuinely ancient and of Roman composition, was originally only inserted in that prayer at funerals (and requiems generally), and formed no part of the Roman rite on other occasions. Its transformation from an occasional to an invariable part of the canon began in France in the eighth–ninth century, and was not accepted at Rome until the ninth–tenth, and in some Italian churches not

[1] This, like the other clause bracketed earlier in the paragraph, is a later Frankish interpolation into the authentic Roman text, *cf.* E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, *p.* 95. In the Roman idea it is *the people themselves* who are the offerers; in the Gallican interpolation it is the priest who offers *for* them.

[2] For a special example of the 'Naming' at this point in the Roman canon see the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, *ed.* Wilson, *p.* 34 (the Lenten 'Scrutiny' masses). I am unable to be sure of the date and provenance of this particular example (whether Roman, Italian or French, and of the fifth or sixth century).

[3] My own guess is that the Mozarabic position is likely to be the original one. Innocent is objecting in his letter to Decentius to the practice in Italian country churches in 1. giving the Pax and 2. reading the 'Names', both before the 'offertory prayer'. They were therefore *not* copying 'Gallican' customs (whatever modern scholars may have supposed) since the distinctive Mozarabic-Gallican custom was, 1. Names, followed by 2. Pax. On the contrary, we know that since the time of Justin the Pax had been the first item in the Western rite. Rome in Innocent's day had transferred it to immediately before the communion, but these country churches kept it in the original position. It is likely that their other difference from the current Roman rite (in which they agree with the practice of Spain and Gaul) was also due to conservatism. I suggest that it is the *introduction* of an offertory prayer towards the end of the fourth century which brought about the rearrangement of this part of the Western rites. It was inserted *before* the old 'Naming' in some rites (*e.g.* Rome and Milan), *after* it in others (*e.g.* Spain and Gubbio). Perhaps it was likewise the introduction of the 'Prayer of the Day' about the same time which was responsible for the transference of the Pax (to different positions) in both the Italian and Spanish-Gallican rites.

[4] E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, *pp.* 96 *sqq.*

till the eleventh century. 2. It is also plain that all this early evidence contemplates only the reading out of names of strictly local interest, whether they are those of living communicants or of deceased members of the local or neighbouring churches. The 'Names' are in fact the 'parochial intercessions'.

In all this, however, we have met nothing which quite corresponds to the Eastern 'Diptychs'. These were two conjoined tablets, the one containing the names of living persons to be prayed for, the other containing a list of saints commemorated and of the dead persons recommended officially to the prayers of the church.[1] It is first and foremost this *combination* of lists of the living and dead which distinguishes the 'diptychs' proper from the various customs of 'naming' which we have just been studying.

The diptychs come into sudden prominence at Constantinople *c.* A.D. 420 in the course of the disputes which took place there over the insertion or omission of the name of S. John Chrysostom, the 'deposed' bishop of that city who had died in exile in 407. From the official correspondence with other churches which arose about this[2] we learn that at that time at Constantinople the diptychs (1) comprised separate lists of names, of the living and dead; (2) that each list was arranged in 'ecclesiastical' precedence, bishops first, then other clergy and finally laity; (3) that the whole succession-list of past bishops of Constantinople was included in the diptych of the dead, while the list of dead emperors headed the departed laity. It is clear also that at Antioch and Alexandria there were then diptychs of some kind, or at least lists of the dead. From the fact that these two churches were urged (and in the one case agreed and in the other indignantly refused) to follow Chrysostom's own church of Constantinople in inserting his name among the dead, it is clear that some non-local names (besides departed emperors) must have been included in the case of the two southern churches; one would expect it to have been the same at Constantinople, though the evidence does not actually make this clear. But of the principle upon which such foreign names were selected—and some selection was necessary if the lists were not to grow intolerably long—we learn nothing.

From this time onwards, and especially down to *c.* A.D. 600, the diptychs are constantly in question in the East in connection with ecclesiastical politics, and accusations and counter-accusations of heresy. From the fifth century onwards the four great Eastern sees[3] were supposed each to name

[1] Two texts of the Jerusalem diptychs (eleventh and nineteenth centuries), and one of the Constantinopolitan diptychs (fifteenth century) will be found in Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 501–3 and 551 *sq.*

[2] *ap.* Nicephorus Callistus, *Eccl. Hist.*, xiv., 26 *sq.* The information it contains about the diptychs is anatomised by E. Bishop in the *Appendix* to Dom Connolly's *Hom. of Narsai*, *pp.* 102 *sqq.*, which is summarised above. Though I have carefully examined the texts for myself, there is—as so often—no gleaning behind that great scholar.

[3] Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople and Jerusalem. When in communion with Rome they named the Pope also, but Rome never adopted diptychs, and so was unable to return the compliment.

the reigning patriarchs of the others in their diptych of the living. But in the interminable disputes and alliances and counter-alliances of patriarchates which went on under theological pretexts in this period (in all of which the question of the centralisation of the political control of the East at Byzantium was seldom far from anyone's mind), the solemn insertion or erasure of names and sees in the diptych of the living was little more than a public register of how the political position stood at the moment. The confusion was just as great in the diptych of the dead. As the political balance between Melchites ('King's Men', as the orthodox were called) and Monophysites (or federalists) swayed to and fro, royalists and heretics succeeded one another in the same bishopric, and solemnly inserted or re-inserted, or ejected with anathemas the names of their predecessors in the local diptychs. The name of Dioscorus, the monophysite patriarch of Alexandria condemned by 'the emperor's Council' (as both heretics and orthodox termed the Council of Chalcedon in the East) was removed from the Alexandrian diptychs by his orthodox successor Proterius, the nominee of the Byzantine government. When Proterius in turn was murdered by *his* monophysite successor, Timothy 'the Weasel', the name of Dioscorus was restored, and that of Proterius removed with execration at the very moment when Constantinople was loudly numbering him among the martyrs. Names were removed or reinserted wholesale in some churches, according as the dead bishops had or had not agreed with the living one. Bishop Peter of Apameia in Syria removed the names of all his predecessors for some fifty years back at one stroke. Nothing much less like an 'intercession list' than the diptychs in actual Eastern practice can be imagined.

Yet it seems certain that it was in this that they had originated. In the liturgy of *S. James* the diptychs have always stood at just that point of the rite at which Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 347) mentions the 'naming' (of the dead only)—in the intercessions after the consecration; and they stood at the same point in the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan rites *c.* A.D. 390–400.[1] But it is noteworthy that as at Jerusalem in Cyril's time, so at Antioch and Constantinople fifty years later, *only* the dead are spoken of as being actually 'named' individually; and those named are very clearly, from what both Cyril and Chrysostom say, the 'parochial' dead, those personally known and loved and mourned by members of the congregation, together with a list of the past bishops of the see. But it is entirely clear from the course of the disputes about the insertion of the name of Chrysostom *c.* A.D. 420 that the lists by then had assumed a somewhat different character. They were now *officially* compiled, and admittance to them implied something more than just being dead. It was a judgement of the orthodoxy and of

[1] E. Bishop, *Appendix* to *Narsai*, *pp.* 109–11 (*cf. Journal of Theol. Studies*, xii. (1911), *pp.* 319–28; and *ibid.*, *pp.* 400 *sqq.*) has shewn that Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 535–6, must be corrected on this point in the light of S. John Chrysostom, *Hom. xli. in* 1 *Cor.*; *Hom. xxi. in Act.*

the eminence of the departed. It would appear, therefore, that the diptychs, in the form they finally took in the East—*i.e.* a combination of lists of both living and dead persons—and for the purpose they came to serve in the Greek churches—*i.e.* an index of ecclesiastical politics—are a development of the church of Byzantium in the years between *c.* A.D. 405 and 420. When one considers the peculiar state of that particular church at that time, as it is described in the lively but disillusioning pages of the Byzantine layman Socrates, I for one am not entirely surprised.

Whether in the properly Greek churches amid all this clash of great names and high policy the ordinary parochial dead—the communicants or the presbyters and deacons who did the pastoral work that must have gone on—ever got remembered in the diptych of the dead by name, we have not sufficient evidence to decide. So far as the great churches are concerned it is very unlikely; in the countrysides it may have been different. Nor do I see anything to suggest that the names of the living *communicants* (as in the West) or subjects for parochial intercession like the names of the sick, were ever entered on the Greek diptych of the living. That was reserved for the emperor and his family, the patriarchs of the great sees and the local bishop. First and last, the Greek diptychs properly so called have always been what they already are when we first hear of them at Constantinople *c.* A.D. 420—instruments of strife in high places and not much more.[1]

The entry of the four oecumenical councils, inserted (rather oddly) into the diptych of the dead by the church of Constantinople in A.D. 518, removed the diptychs further than ever from the notion of an intercession list. But this too was a political move. The Byzantine (or 'centralising') party had just recovered control of this see from the Monophysites who rejected the Council of Chalcedon. It was at first proposed to insert in the diptych only a commemoration of the first two general councils, which everyone accepted. The Byzantines changed their minds and inserted the fourth (Chalcedon) and with it the third, not so much because it was orthodox (they had themselves originally proposed the commemoration of the first two councils only) as because they realised that this would affirm the renewed opposition of the church of Constantinople to the federal claims of Syria and Egypt, which rejected the fourth Council.

The case is rather different with the history of the diptychs in the Egyptian and East Syrian rites.

In Egypt in the liturgy of *S. Mark* there is in fact only one diptych in which individuals are named—that of the dead. It consists, as in Sarapion, simply of a list of names read out in the course of the eucharistic prayer, which cannot be set down in the liturgical MSS. because it is not an

[1] The riots, accompanied in some cases by murder, which took place in Greece about A.D. 1920 over the entry or extrusion of the names of King Constantine and the patriarch Meletios Metaxakis of Constantinople adequately maintained ancient practice.

'official' list at all, as in the Greek diptych. It varied from church to church and from month to month, the names entered being those of the 'parochial' dead.[1] But though the Alexandrian rite has thus retained exactly the form of the 'naming' of the dead found in Sarapion's rite *c.* A.D. 340, it has shifted its place, and appended it to the lengthy intercessions 'by categories' for the church and the world—*for the living*—which it places after the first paragraph of the eucharistic prayer. This is precisely the point at which the Roman and Italian evidence of the late fourth and fifth centuries places its (much less developed) intercession for the church followed by the 'naming' of the *living*. (This is one of several coincidences of structure between the Alexandrian and Roman rites *c.* A.D. 400 which deserve more attention than they have received in modern study.)

The coincidence may well have been even more striking in some Egyptian country churches than at Alexandria itself. The chance discovery of a seventh century Egyptian diptych from the region of Thebes in Upper Egypt[2] reveals that there, besides the patriarch of Alexandria and the local bishop, it was precisely the *living* communicants, the 'offerers', who were named, as in the West: 'And for the salvation of the most pure clergy standing around and the Christ-loving laity; and for the salvation and bodily health of the offerers so-and-so (*masc.*) and so-and-so (*fem.*) who have offered their oblations this day, and of all offerers' (*i.e.* of all who are regular communicants, but are not 'offering' at this particular celebration).

In the East Syrian rite what Brightman calls 'The Diptychs' are read out at the offertory[3]—as in the Mozarabic rite. There are two 'books', of the living and dead, not quite the same in character. That of the living is brief and general in its contents, a summary of categories of people, in which the only individuals mentioned by name are the Nestorian patriarch and the local Nestorian bishop. The 'book of the dead', on the other hand (with various alternative forms) takes up approximately eleven times as much space as its fellow in Brightman's print. It consists of long lists of proper names, which include not only the great saints of the Old and New Testament and the succession-list of the Nestorian patriarchs of Mesopotamia, but all sorts of local worthies like 'Rabban Sabha and the sons of Shemuni who are laid in this blessed village' and 'the illustrious among athletes and providers of churches and monasteries, generous in alms, guardians of orphans and widows, the Emir Matthew and the Emir Hassan and Emir Nijmaldin who departed in this village.' And these loving and intimate local details vary from one MS. to another in a way that the stereotyped form of the Greek diptychs has never varied. It is clear, I think, that while the East Syrian diptych of the dead represents a genuine

[1] Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 126 and 165.
[2] Publ. by W. E. Crum, *Proceedings of the Soc. for Biblical Archaeology*, xxx. (1908), *pp.* 255 *sqq.*
[3] Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 275 *sqq.*

survival of the 'naming' of the 'parochial' dead, known and mourned by the congregation, the diptych of the living on the contrary represents an imitation of the formal Greek practice, inserted in the period when it had come to be taken for granted that there ought to be two diptychs.

It is clear from Narsai[1] that in the later fifth century the East Syrian rite already contained both diptychs in much their present form. But the little prayer which according to him the people add after them runs thus: 'On behalf of all the *catholici* (Nestorian patriarchs), on behalf of all orders deceased from holy church; and for those who are deemed worthy of the reception of this oblation, on behalf of these and of Thy servants in every place, receive, Lord, this oblation.' In most rites the people's prayers have a way of being more archaic than the clerical formulae they accompany. This prayer would suggest that it originally followed a 'naming' of the dead (headed by a succession-list of the Nestorian patriarchs) which was *not preceded* by a diptych of the living; and that if any living persons were subsequently 'named', they were *the communicants*, as in the West.

It may be said, What then of the Western diptychs? What of those famous Roman diptychs, which as a number of modern scholars (beginning with Bunsen a century ago) have pointed out, resulted in the 'dislocation' of the Roman canon? What of the old Irish diptychs in the *Stowe Missal*, which once proved (somewhat inadequately) the 'non-Roman' character of the Celtic rites? What of the Mozarabic rite, which it has been said 'has retained the diptychs in the position they originally occupied in all the primitive rites'?[2] What of actual surviving ivory tablets which served this purpose, like that containing the list of the early bishops of Novara now at Bologna, or the Barberini diptych in the Louvre? In order to ascribe one of the institutions most venerated by generations of liturgists to a comparatively late initiative of the Byzantine church, are we not overlooking the multitudinous evidence that the West also, Rome included, once had diptychs?

I think we must distinguish carefully what we mean by 'diptychs'. If we mean simply lists of 'names' read out at the eucharist, whether of the communicants or (alternatively) of the dead, then the West had these customs before ever Constantine came to Constantinople. But if we mean that *combination* of lists of the eminent living and dead, officially drawn up and regulated from time to time by the higher ecclesiastical authorities, which is what 'the diptychs' were understood to mean by the church of Constantinople when it first instituted them, then the West never had any 'diptychs' properly so called at all. In the fifth and sixth centuries there was a tendency to copy *some* of the new Eastern fashions in this matter in many Western churches, including Rome. But it will be found upon examin-

[1] *Homilies, ed. cit., p.* 10.

[2] W. C. Bishop, *The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites* (*Alcuin Club Tracts*, xv., 1924, *p.* 33).

ation that it was Syrian rather than Byzantine customs which chiefly proved attractive.

The Roman 'diptychs' are a myth. The most prominent feature of the Byzantine diptych of the living was the commemoration by each great church of the reigning patriarchs of all the other patriarchal churches. The local Roman 'naming' of the living at the beginning of the canon never mentioned any prelate whatever except the local bishop, the Pope. In the occasional pothers about the insertion of the Pope's name in the Eastern diptychs, when communion was restored after a schism at various times from the fifth to the eighth centuries, there was never a suggestion by either side that Rome should return the compliment. Both parties knew that the Roman rite contained no opportunity of doing so, having retained the old purely local or parochial character of its 'naming' of the living.

As for the diptych of the dead, it did not exist at Rome. Edmund Bishop has shewn by the irrefutable evidence of the earliest extant MSS. of the Roman canon that the commemoration of the dead now found in the second half of that prayer has had a somewhat involved history.[1] It is ancient and of genuinely Roman composition, but at Rome itself down to the ninth century it formed no part of the Roman canon as recited in the public masses of Sundays and festivals. It was a peculiarity of funeral and requiem masses, like a 'proper' preface for a festival, only inserted on specifically funerary occasions. Its use as an invariable part of the canon on all occasions begins in Frankish Gaul in the seventh-eighth century. The particular recension of the text which was eventually adopted betrays the hand of those Irish monks who in so many matters are at the bottom of Western innovations in liturgy during the dark ages. The Roman church only began to adopt this French novelty of commemorating the dead in *all* masses during the ninth century, and Italian MSS. of the Roman rite which did not allow for the new fashion were still being copied in the eleventh century. The absence of any 'naming' of the *dead* whatever in the authentic Roman rite on ordinary occasions[2] is one contrast with the Eastern diptychs, which as we have noted owe their origin to the 'naming' of the dead in the fourth century Jerusalem liturgy. The purely local and parochial character of the 'naming' of the *living* in the Roman rite, by contrast with the international and diplomatic emphasis of the 'naming' of the living in the Byzantine diptychs, is another. Between them they make any application of the Byzantine term 'diptych' to the Roman 'commemorations' wholly misleading.

In so far as the alleged 'dislocation' of the Roman canon does not arise from mere modern misunderstandings of the tenor of its exceptionally archaic prayers, its cause must be looked for chiefly in things like the

[1] E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, *pp*. 96 *sqq*.
[2] Note that there is no prayer for the dead in the old Roman synaxis intercessions (as these are preserved in the *Orationes Solemnes* of Good Friday).

clumsy insertion of the sanctus in the fifth century. But there is one element connected with the *origins* of the diptychs at Jerusalem, which has had some effect. Cyril's account of the 'naming' of the dead there *c.* A.D. 348 mentions the saints and a catalogue of the dead bishops of Jerusalem, as well as the more ordinary 'faithful departed'.

We have seen that a 'naming' of martyrs in the eucharistic prayer had been adopted in S. Augustine's rite (from Jerusalem) *c.* A.D. 410, though we hear nothing of a catalogue of the dead bishops of Hippo. The 'naming' of the saints in the eucharistic prayer was adopted at Rome, somewhat awkwardly and in a rudimentary fashion, apparently in the time of that innovating pontiff, Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492–6).[1] The lists were elaborated by haphazard additions during the sixth century, but their present arrangement appears to date only from the reforms of Pope S. Gregory I, *c.* A.D. 595. By contrast with the deliberately 'international' character of the lists of saints in the later Jerusalem diptychs, the Roman lists never quite lost their old-fashioned parochial character. The list of men martyrs still includes only four non-Roman names out of sixteen; and one of these, Ignatius of Antioch, had been martyred at Rome. The women martyrs contain four foreigners out of seven, but two of them, the Sicilians Agatha and Lucy, were introduced (almost certainly) by S. Gregory himself in his final revision; and the Balkan Anastasia, though her popularity was chiefly due to Greek settlers at Rome, seems to have got into the canon by confusion with the 'Anastasia' who had built an old Roman parish church, the *titulus Anastasiae*.[2] The Roman canon never adopted the other Jerusalem innovation of a catalogue of the past bishops of Rome, despite the occurrence of the names 'Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus', which has been supposed to be the relics of one. It appears probable that Pope Sixtus II (martyred A.D. 258) had been commemorated in the canon for about a century before the name of Clement was added, and that Linus and Cletus were only inserted later still by S. Gregory I, in the final revision.

In the Irish *Stowe Missal*, however, there is a 'diptych of the dead' (though not one of the living) fitted into the text of the Roman canon. It contains a long list of Irish names, the owners of which with one doubtful exception—Maelruen—had all died before A.D. 739. (It may be remarked that the diptych had thus received at the most one addition in the century before the present MS. was copied, which suggests that the diptych of the dead was not a very living institution in the Irish rite.) But a comparison

[1] P. B. Whitehead, *The Acts of the Council of* 499 *and the date of the prayers Communicantes and Nobis Quoque, etc.*, in *Speculum*, iii. (1928), *pp.* 152 *sqq.*

[2] On all this question see V. L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass* (*Studi di antichità cristiana* XIV), 1938. To complete, *cf.* V. Maurice, *Les Saints du canon de la messe au moyen âge* in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, lii (1938), *pp.* 353 *sq.* (The older literature is summarised in Kennedy.) I take it, despite Edmund Bishop's argument to the contrary, that Felicity in the canon is the Roman widow, not the African slave-girl.

of the *Stowe* diptych[1] with that found in the Mozarabic rite[2] will, I think, convince anyone of the origin of this supposed Irish practice. The Spanish diptych has been 'localised' and adapted in the usual Irish way; but the Irish document is not a native product, but a direct copying of Spanish custom.

And if one wishes to pursue this 'key' Western diptych of the dead in the Mozarabic rite to its source, a comparison of it with the diptychs of the dead in the Syrian rites[3] will at once supply the solution. The Mozarabic document is simply an adaptation of the Syrian custom.[4] Some Western churches adopted the Jerusalem custom of reciting a complete succession-list of their bishops in the eucharistic prayer, which in some cases lasted as late as the fifteenth century. What does not exist is any Western example of the specifically Byzantine custom of naming the chief foreign bishops with whom the local bishop was in communion in the diptych of the living.[5]

It may be well to sum up here what is known about the practice concerning public intercessions in the course of the liturgy in various churches, since nothing has caused more confusion in the various manuals of liturgical history, and far-reaching (and quite erroneous) theories have been based upon those confusions.

We have to distinguish clearly as regards origins between the intercessions at the synaxis and those at the eucharist. Those at the synaxis were offered for *categories* of persons, the only individuals mentioned by name being the local christian bishop and the Roman emperor. They took the form of a bidding, a pause for silent prayer and a collect. In the fourth century at Jerusalem these 'prayers of the faithful' were transferred bodily from the end of the synaxis to after the consecration, and made a part of the celebrant's eucharistic prayer. This innovation was afterwards widely

[1] *The Stowe Missal, ed.* Warren, (H.B.S.) II, 1915, *pp.* 14–16.

[2] *Missale Mixtum, ed.* Lesley, M. P. L., lxxxv., *coll.* 114 *sq.*

[3] Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 92 *sqq.*, 276–277, and 501 *sq.*

[4] The same is less obviously true of the diptych of the dead from the monastery of S. Cross at Arles, found attached to the 'Rule' of S. Aurelian of Arles (*d.* A.D. 546) printed in Migne, P. L., lxviii., *coll.* 395 *sqq.* All the Western documents have the tell-tale Syrian peculiarity of arranging the saints in a rough chronological order of death, 'John Baptist, *Stephen*, Peter, Paul'. From the number of dead abbots it contains this particular Arlesian diptych can hardly be older than the seventh century, and the peculiarities of its list of saints are obviously connected with the relics which the monastic church enshrined.

[5] With the exception, of course, of the Pope. But even this comes in rather late. The diptychs of every *Eastern* church in the fifth century named the local patriarch as well as the local bishop, and the custom spread to the West, though the Popes as a rule shewed little interest in enforcing it. The Council of Vaison in Gaul ordered it in A.D. 529, but I do not think any evidence that this was carried out is to be found in Gaul before the ninth century. Ennodius (*Libellus de Synodis*, 77) informs us that the Pope was already 'named' at the eucharist in Italy in the sixth century, and a *Greek* Sicilian diptych of the eighth century inserts Pope Hadrian I as 'Hadrian, patriarch of the City' (*Dict. d'arch. chrét. et de lit.*, iv. 1089). The Pope is 'named' in the Mozarabic diptych in the eleventh century *Liber Ordinum* (*ed.* Férotin, *col.* 235) and the custom was becoming general in the West by this time.

imitated in the East. In christendom as a whole these prayers at the end of the synaxis suffered an eclipse during the fifth century. In the West they disappeared altogether (except for special survivals in Holy Week). In the Byzantine church they were replaced by the new Antiochene fashion of litanies. Later imitations of this Byzantine novelty in some sort re-introduced traces of them into some Western rites (*e.g.* the Mozarabic) in the form of litanies. But a comparison proves in every case, I think, the dependence of these later Western litanies on the Constantinopolitan text, and forbids us to treat them as any sort of authentic survival of the ancient Western pre-Nicene 'prayers of the faithful'. These had been dropped from the Western rites perhaps a century before the first Western imitations of the Byzantine litany made their appearance. Only in the Roman rite on Good Friday, and in the Egyptian liturgy of *S. Mark*, do the pre-Nicene 'prayers of the faithful' still survive in something like their original form.

The pre-Nicene intercessions at the eucharist proper were much more personal than those at the synaxis, and 'named' specific individuals. In Spain and Italy these were names of *living* persons, chiefly the communicants, and the same may have been the case originally in Syria and in some Egyptian churches. But in the oldest known Egyptian rite (Sarapion), and at Jerusalem, Antioch and Constantinople, the first evidence we have is of the 'naming' of the *dead* only, and the same appears to be true of pre-Nicene Africa. There is good ground for thinking that the original position of these lists of 'names' of the living was at the offertory, at all events in the West. The 'naming' of the dead after the consecration at Jerusalem may conceivably have been transferred to that point from the offertory at the same time as the intercessions from the synaxis, but there is no evidence on this. And in Africa in pre-Nicene times the dead were 'named' in the course of the eucharistic prayer.

The first *combination* of lists of names of living and dead, 'the diptychs' properly so-called, was made at Constantinople in the early fifth century, but these did not so much replace the old intercessions (now attached to the eucharistic prayer) as fulfil a new official and diplomatic purpose. Outside the properly Greek churches, in East Syria, Egypt and the West, the older custom of 'the Names' continued in force at the old position, at the offertory. Imitation of Byzantium brought about the partial adoption of the *form* of diptychs in Syria, whence it spread to some Western churches in the sixth–seventh century. But in the non-Greek churches these imitations of the Greek diptychs always retained a 'parochial' and local interest, by contrast with the purely official character of the Byzantine custom. In the non-Greek rites, after the fusion of synaxis and eucharist these very ancient lists of 'Names' coming after the offertory in some sort supplied for the loss of the old 'prayers of the faithful' before the offertory, though they have no original connection with them. The 'prayers of the faithful' were the inter-

cessions of the synaxis, the 'Names' were the intercessions of the eucharist, in the days when these were still two separate rites.

D. The Completion of the Shape of the Eucharist

Just as the period of the 'second *stratum*' equipped the rite of the synaxis with a wholly new Introduction, so it equipped the rite of the eucharits with a wholly new Conclusion. Just as the tendency of the synaxis was to prefix new items before the old nucleus, so the tendency at the eucharist was to append them, leaving the old core of the rite relatively unchanged in both cases. The 'second half' of the eucharistic prayer had begun to be added to the original 'thanksgiving series' in the second century, and various additional items and paragraphs had been appended and then fused into the prayer in the course of the third and early fourth century. Then at Jerusalem, by the time of Cyril, the Lord's prayer had been appended to the whole. Its independent existence as a prayer outside the eucharist had secured for this last addition that it should be allowed to remain as a separate item, and not be fused into the eucharistic prayer itself, as had happened to previous additions to that prayer. But even in this case we have seen that at Milan the Lord's prayer was for a while placed between the body of the eucharistic prayer and its concluding doxology.

In the fourth century the tradition that in the rite of the eucharist proper there could be only a single prayer—'*the*' prayer, the *eucharistia*—was beginning to break down. Supplements come to be made in this period which are no longer incorporated perforce into 'the' prayer itself, but are separate items. One such is the separate offertory prayer (of the ?5th century). This puts into words the meaning of the offertory, which the pre-Nicene church had been content to express by the bare action. Other such separate prayers were added even earlier to put into words the meaning of the fraction and the communion, which formerly the church had also been content to leave to speak for themselves.

There appears, too, for the first time something which would one day become the keynote of mediaeval and modern eucharistic devotion, the idea of special prayers in preparation for the individual act of receiving communion. However strange it may seem to us, this is an innovation in the fourth century. The old rite of offertory, prayer, fraction and communion had been unable to express this 'communion devotion', except in the course of the eucharistic prayer. We can see the beginnings of this in Hippolytus (*k*), but here the emphasis is still on the *corporate* effects of communion—that all the communicants 'may be made one'. Sarapion (e^2) strikes a new note: 'Make all who partake to receive a medicine of life . . . *not for condemnation*, O God of truth . . .' It remains to be seen how this is amplified outside the eucharistic prayer itself.

In Egypt

Sarapion has no trace of the Lord's prayer after the eucharistic prayer, but continues at once from its closing doxology and Amen with the rubric:

'*After "the" prayer the fraction and in the fraction a prayer*:

'Account us worthy even of this communion, O God of truth, and make our bodies to compass purity and our souls prudence and knowledge. And make us wise, O God of compassions, by the partaking of the Body and the Blood, for unto Thee through Thy Only-begotten ⟨is⟩ glory and might in holy Spirit . . .

'*After giving the fraction to the clerics, laying on of hands* [*i.e. a blessing*] *on the people:*

'I stretch out the hand upon this people and pray that the hand of the truth may be outstretched and a blessing be given unto this people through Thy love of men, O God of compassions, and through the present mysteries. May a hand of piety and power and discipline and cleanness and holiness bless this people, and continually preserve it to advancement and progress: through . . .

'*After the distribution to the people a prayer*:

'We thank Thee, Master, that Thou hast called those who have strayed, and hast taken to Thyself those who have sinned, and set aside the threat that was against us, granting mercy by Thy loving-kindness and wiping ⟨that threat⟩ away by repentance and casting it off by the knowledge ⟨that leads⟩ to Thee. We give thanks to Thee that Thou hast granted us communion of ⟨the⟩ Body and Blood. Bless us, bless this people, make us to have a share in the Body and Blood: through Thy Only-begotten Son, through Whom . . .'

[*There follows a blessing of oil and water offered for the sick,*[1] *followed by the final blessing of the eucharistic rite.*]

'*Laying on of hands after the blessing of the water and oil:*

'O God of truth that lovest mankind, let the communion of the Body and the Blood go forth along with (*symparabaineto*) this people. Let their bodies be living bodies and their souls be clean souls. Grant this blessing to be a safeguard of their communion and a security to the eucharist that has been held. And beatify them all together and make them elect: through Thy Only-begotten Jesus Christ in 'holy Spirit', both now and for ever and world without end. Amen.'

The old eschatological note is almost entirely missing from all this, only appearing in the last sentence of the final blessing. For the rest it is recog-

[1] The opening of this blessing is an interesting example of survival of the old idea of the power of 'the Name of God' of which we have found traces in Sarapion's eucharistic prayer (*cf. p.* 170): 'We bless these creatures through the Name of Thy Only-begotten Jesus Christ; we name the Name of Him Who suffered, Who was crucified and rose again, and Who sitteth on the right hand of the Uncreated, upon this water and upon this (oil) . . .'

nisably the 'modern' feeling of sacramental devotion that it expresses, concentrated on *reception*. The prayer at the fraction (carefully distinguished from 'the' prayer) shews that the fraction is still looked upon as a mere utilitarian preparation for communion, not a dramatic or symbolical act. Particular attention may be called to the blessing of the people *before* communion, which is found in all rites by the end of the fourth century. Its pointed bestowal upon the people after the clergy have made their communion suggests that it is a symptom of that increasing feeling that the 'profane' laity ought not to communicate, which soon led to their general abstention. It is designed to encourage and fit them to receive. The discerning reader who compares *the things asked* for the communicants in Hippolytus *k* (*p.* 151) or *Addai and Mari i* (*p.* 179) with those in Sarapion (e^2 *p.* 164) and the prayers on *p.* 512, may detect the beginnings of a new psychological attitude towards the act of communion in the fourth century.

In Syria

Cyril of Jerusalem has a different system, though its emphasis is the same. He does not mention the fraction and there is no blessing of the people, so that Sarapion's first two prayers have no equivalent in the contemporary Jerusalem rite. Instead, the Lord's prayer, with its petitions for daily bread and the forgiveness of trespasses 'as we forgive' (both of which Cyril explicitly interprets as a preparation for communion),[1] acts as the people's preparation. Then comes the bishop's invitation 'Holy things for the holy' and the people's reply 'One only is holy'. The people receive communion with bowed heads 'as adoring and worshipping', and answer 'Amen' to the words of administration. Meanwhile a solo singer chants Psalm xxxiv, with its refrain or chorus 'O taste and see how gracious the Lord is'. Finally they are bidden, 'While you wait for the prayer give thanks to God Who has accounted you worthy of such great mysteries'.[1] Evidently there was now a post-communion prayer at Jerusalem, but whether it corresponded more closely to a 'thanksgiving' or a 'blessing' is doubtful in view of the other Syrian evidence.

The North Syrian 'communion developments', as represented by *Ap. Const.*, viii. (supported in some points by the Antiochene writings of Chrysostom) are different again. There is no Lord's prayer, but immediately after the doxology which concludes the intercessions attached to the eucharistic prayer the bishop greets the church 'The peace of God be with you all'[2] to which the people answer 'And with thy spirit'. There follows a series of 'proclamations' by the deacon, 'bidding' the people to pray for various objects, some connected with their communion, others being brief intercessions. There is no direction that the people shall answer *Kyrie*

[1] S. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.*, xxiii. 22.
[2] *Cf.* the Roman formula at the same point, 'The peace of the Lord be always with you', to which the kiss of peace is attached.

eleison, but the whole has the appearance of a litany. It was apparently during this bidding that the fraction took place. There follows a solemn blessing of the people by the bishop: 'O God the mighty and mighty-named, mighty in counsel and powerful in deeds, God and Father of Thy Holy Servant (*pais*) Jesus our Saviour: Look upon us and upon this Thy flock which Thou hast chosen through Him unto the glory of Thy Name. And hallow our bodies and soul (*sic*); make us worthy, being purified from all defilement of flesh and spirit, to receive of these good things here lying before Thee; judge none of us unworthy, but be Thou our helper, our succour and defender, through Thy Christ with Whom unto Thee be glory, honour, praise and laud and thanksgiving with the Holy Ghost for ever. Amen'. (Even more clearly than in Sarapion this blessing is an encouragement and preparation of the communicants.)

The deacon then cries 'Let us attend' and the bishop gives the invitation —'Holy things unto the holy' to which the people reply with a sort of prose hymn, 'There is one holy, one Lord Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father, blessed for ever. Amen. Glory be to God on high, and in earth peace, goodwill towards men. Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. God is the Lord Who hath shewed us light. Hosanna in the highest.'

The communicants answer 'Amen' to the words of administration—'The Body of Christ', and 'The Blood of Christ, the cup of life'. Meanwhile Psalm xxxiv is chanted, as at Jerusalem. There follow (1) a thanksgiving prayer (which rather wanders from the point into a repetition of the intercessions) and (2) a lengthy blessing, *after* which the deacon's 'Depart in peace' dismisses the people.

The Antiochene rite as described by Chrysostom does not altogether support *Ap. Const.* in its details. The Lord's prayer is said at Antioch as at Jerusalem. The psalm sung during the communion is cxlv (in the English numbering, cxliv in that adopted by the primitive church) which is certainly no less appropriate. After the communion there is a thanksgiving prayer, but it appears to have been of recent introduction, since Chrysostom has some difficulty in persuading the people to remain for it. He compares those who hurry out at the communion (the ancient completion of the rite) to Judas bursting out of the upper room on his mission of betrayal, and those who remain to his fellow-disciples awaiting the psalm at the end of supper and going out with the Lord.[1] We shall meet again this inclination of the laity, based on traditional practice, to treat the post-communion as an optional 'extra'. He has nothing about a final blessing after the thanksgiving. The conclusion is still the deacon's 'Depart in peace'.

Theodore's rite at Mopsuestia, however, omits the Lord's prayer like *Ap. Const.*, viii. Evidently this Jerusalem innovation had not yet reached his church. The fraction follows immediately upon the intercessions that

[1] *de Bapt. Christi*, 4 (*opp.*, *ed. cit.*, ii. 374 C. *sq.*).

conclude the eucharist prayer and is done 'so that all of us who are present may receive (communion)'.[1] This is accompanied, as in Sarapion, by a prayer of 'thanksgiving for these great gifts',[2] and a blessing of the people. Then comes the 'signing of the Body with the Blood', and the placing of a portion of the Host in the chalice. Then the deacon says 'We ought to pray for those who presented this holy offering'. 'The priest finishes the prayer by praying that this sacrifice may be acceptable to God and that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come upon all, so that we may be able to be worthy of its communion, and not receive it to punishment', and again blesses the people.[3] Then follows the invitation 'Holy things . . .' and its answer. Then follows the communion received with 'adoration' and 'fear'—the actual phrasing of Cyril's *Catecheses* obviously inspires Theodore's instructions at this point—but there is no mention of an accompanying psalm. 'After you have received . . . you rightly and spontaneously offer praise and thanksgiving to God. . . . And you remain, so that you may also offer thanksgiving and praise with all, according to the rules of the church, because it is fitting for all those who received this spiritual food to offer thanksgiving to God publicly . . .'[4] There is nothing about a final blessing or the deacon's dismissal in Theodore.

In the Byzantine Rite

It is clearly the North Syrian rite of Chrysostom's time which has governed the 'communion devotions' and post-communion of the present Byzantine rite, but the exact form does not appear in any of our extant North Syrian sources. There is the double blessing (as in Theodore) with the Lord's prayer between them (as in Chrysostom). The deacon's proclamation 'Let us entreat on behalf of the holy gifts that have been offered and hallowed' is followed by other intercessions, and the priest's prayer for worthiness of reception 'and not unto judgement' and the gift of the Holy Ghost, are as in Theodore.

The manual acts (fraction, etc.) have been complicated by the peculiar and mysterious addition of the pouring of a few drops of hot water into the chalice by the deacon (known as the *zeon* or 'living water'). This ceremony is found only in the Byzantine rite, but it appears to be ancient there. In the sixth century the refractory Armenian patriarch Moses when summoned to Constantinople to appear before the emperor Maurice is reported to have answered, 'God forbid that I should cross the River Azat or eat leavened bread or drink hot water.'[5] Since the second of his disinclinations reflects on the Byzantine eucharist, the third may very well refer to the *zeon*

[1] Theodore, *Catecheses*, vi., *ed. cit.*, *p.* 107. [2] *Ibid.*, *p.* 105.
[3] *Ibid.*, *p.* 108. [4] *Ibid.*, *p.* 114.
[5] Cited by P. Le Brun, *Explication de la Messe* (1726), ii., *p.* 413, *n.* 29. I have not been able to ascertain what oriental authority underlies P. Combefis, *Narration touchant les Arméniens*, *Auctarium Bib. PP.* iii., *p.* 282, which is all that Le Brun cites by way of authority, nor how far it is reliable.

as an already established Byzantine peculiarity. The Greek devotional tradition explains it variously as symbolising 'the fervour of faith' or 'the descent of the Holy Ghost'. But these are explanations devised for an existing traditional practice, not its originating cause—as to which, however, I am unable to make any suggestion.

The communion in the Byzantine rite is now accompanied by two chants, the one 'Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord, God is the Lord who hath shewed us light' (*cf. Ap. Const.*, viii.), the other a Byzantine 'prose hymn' with a peculiarly striking melody:

> O Son of God, take me this day for a partaker
> Of Thy mystic supper,
> For I will not tell Thy secret to Thine enemies,
> I will not betray Thee with a kiss like Judas
> But like the thief confess Thee;
> Remember me, Lord, in Thy kingdom.

Immediately after the communion there is a further blessing of the people with the consecrated sacrament, of which a good deal is made in the Byzantine liturgical commentaries, in which it is said to symbolise our Lord's blessing of His disciples at the Ascension.[1] It is in fact a sort of *substitute* for communion devised to satisfy Byzantine non-communicant eucharistic piety.

The choir then sings the 'departure chant' of the day, a variable chant corresponding to the Western communion chant.[2] The 'thanksgiving' proper has disappeared from the modern rite, though a short thanksgiving prayer was still found here in the ninth century, in the liturgies both of *S. Basil* and *S. Chrysostom*.[3] All that is now left is a truncated version of a diaconal litany which formerly preceded the thanksgiving, followed by the dismissal 'Let us depart in peace', said by the deacon. The 'prayer behind the pulpit' (*opisthambōnos*), for which the priest comes out of the sanctuary, represents a sort of 'conducted devotion' after the service rather than an integral part of the rite, though its opening sentence fulfils also the purpose of a departure-blessing.

The Eastern communion devotions and thanksgiving are thus a product of the fourth century, and their development may be said to have been completed in principle by A.D. 400. In the West, development was less rapid.

[1] Some of the comments made upon it by Byzantine devotional authors are curiously anticipatory of devotional writings about the rite of Benediction in nineteenth century France, though I do not think there is any direct dependence of the Western authors on their Eastern predecessors.

[2] An old fixed chant known as the *Plērothēto*, introduced by the patriarch Sergius in A.D. 624, has disappeared at this point since the fourteenth century.

[3] Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 342.

In Africa

We have seen that the singing of a psalm during the communion was a novelty in Africa[1] (adopted from Jerusalem?) early in the fifth century, and does not appear to have been taken up elsewhere in the West for some time after that. A letter of Augustine's written *c.* A.D. 410 rather before the adoption of this novelty gives us the order of the prayers of the eucharist 'which' he says 'every church or almost every church customarily observes'. There is a prayer 'before that which is upon the Lord's table begins to be blessed'; (the 'prayer of the day', or an 'offertory' prayer?). There follows the eucharistic prayer 'when it is blessed and hallowed and broken for distribution, which whole prayer almost every church ends with the Lord's prayer'. (It is interesting to find the prayer at the fraction and Lord's prayer included within the eucharistic prayer; it shows how the appending of items to 'the' prayer was understood not to violate the old rule that the eucharistic prayer proper must be a single whole.) The kiss of peace followed at this point. Then 'the people are blessed. For then the bishops like advocates present those whose cause they have undertaken before the most merciful judgement seat of God by the laying on of hands. When all this has been done and the great sacrament partaken, the thanksgiving ends all'.[2]

It seems certain that there was less uniformity even among the Western churches at this time than Augustine supposes; but this outline probably holds good in the main for all the African churches at least. What is particularly interesting is to find the blessing of the people before communicating in the African rite at this early date. During the Pelagian controversy Augustine was accustomed to quote the custom of blessing the people, and also the contents of some of these blessings, as an argument against Pelagius.[3] It seems to be assumed by those liturgical authors who have treated of the matter that it is always to this pre-communion blessing that Augustine is referring. I see no grounds for this assumption in the evidence, since this was not the only occasion when a blessing was given in public worship. It is unlikely—given his usual reserve about the contents of the eucharistic prayers—that Augustine would cite a eucharistic blessing, when others given at the more 'public' worship of the synaxis and the office were available to prove his point. But if the assumption is justified, it is important to note that Augustine cites more than one formula, adding on one occasion 'and others like these' (*et caetera talia*). If these are pre-communion blessings, then in Africa this had already become a variable formula, not a fixed one, as it remained in the East. (This would be one of the earliest suggestions we have of the introduction of variable prayers at the eucharist, which afterwards became a notable feature of all Western rites.)

[1] *Cf. p.* 492. [2] Augustine, *Ep.*, cxlix. (*al.* lix.), *ad Paulinum* (of Nola), 16.
[3] *Epp.*, clxxv. 5; clxxix. 4; *Serm. Fragm.*, i (*al.* iii.), 3; etc.

The Roman Communion Blessing

At Rome also there appears to have been a blessing of the people before communion in the late fourth century. The mysterious Roman author who goes under the name of 'Ambrosiaster' (*c.* A.D. 385) tells us: 'The priests, whom we call bishops, have a form drawn up and handed down to them in solemn words, and they bless men by applying this to them . . . and though a man be holy, yet he bends his head to receive the blessing.'[1] This looks like a fixed form, as in the East, not a variable one as later in the West.

The custom had fallen out of the Roman rite by *c.* A.D. 500, but Dom Morin has suggested[2] that some of the formulae have survived in the special *oratio super populum* (prayer 'over the people') now appended to the post-communion thanksgiving prayers in the Roman rite during Lent. These prayers (of which there is one for each week-day in Lent) are now not always distinguishable from ordinary collects in structure. But in a number of them the celebrant instead of praying *with* the people (in the first person plural) prays *for* them (in the third person plural), making a sort of 'prayer-blessing' (like the final blessing in Sarapion, *p.* 512), and this appears to be the original type.[3] And they are preceded by a 'proclamation' by the deacon, 'Bow down your heads unto the Lord', which is verbally identical with the deacon's 'proclamation' before the pre-communion blessing in some of the Eastern rites.

Whether it be true that the Lenten *oratio super populum* at Rome is a survival (transferred to after the thanksgiving) of the blessing before communion, or whether this Lenten peculiarity has some other origin, the fact that the Roman rite in the fifth century always had a blessing before the communion appears to be certain.[4] And it has this much importance, that it is one more little piece of evidence going to shew that in the fifth century all the Western rites formed a group and were similar in structure. For this pre-communion blessing perpetuated itself in some of the non-Roman Western rites, and persisted as a special local custom in many Western churches even after the adoption of the Roman rite.

In Spain

Before discussing the Roman thanksgiving prayer it will make for clarity to turn to the early Spanish and French rites. The ninth century Spanish *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum* presents us with the following preparation for communion. After the (variable) eucharistic prayer comes the

[1] Ambrosiaster, *Quaest.* 109.

[2] *Revue Bénédictine,* xxix. (1912), *p.* 170 *sq.* (The arguments are suggestive rather than conclusive.)

[3] *Cf.* this (for the Ember Saturday in Lent): 'O God, may the blessing they have desired strengthen Thy faithful people: may it cause them never to depart from Thy will, and ever to rejoice in the gifts of Thy loving-kindness: through . . .'

[4] *Cf.* Dom Ménard's note on the *Gregorian Sacramentary,* M.P.L., lxxviii. 286–8.

fraction, then the creed, followed by the *praefatio* to the Lord's prayer (varying in every mass), then the Lord's prayer itself; after this, a threefold blessing and the communion. The following, for New Year's Day, is likely to be one of the older compositions in the book and will serve for an example:

Praefatio: 'O Lord Who art the great day of the angels and little in the day of men, the Word Who art God before all times, the Word made flesh in the fulness of time, created beneath the sun Who art the sun's creator: Grant unto us the solemn assembly of the church's dignity in Thy praise on this day (*sic*), that we who have consecrated the beginning of the year to Thee with these firstfruits, may by Thy grace sacrifice to Thee the whole time of its course by such ways and works as shall please Thee (*totius temporis spatium tibi placitis excursibus atque operibus facias inmolari*). For at Thy command we pray to Thee from earth, Our Father . . .' There follows this threefold blessing, preceded by the deacon's proclamation, 'Bow yourselves for the blessing.' 'May all of you who welcome the beginning of this year with His praises be brought without sin to its ending by the abiding protection of our Saviour. Amen. And may the same our Redeemer so grant unto you that this year be peaceful and happy that your heart may ever be waiting upon Him. Amen. That blessed of Him Who made heaven and earth that which you now begin in tears you may afterwards fulfil with spiritual songs. Amen.'[1]

What is interesting is to find that in the ninth century this threefold blessing is still the concluding text of the rite so far as the celebrant is concerned. Just as the Spanish rite at that date had developed no collect in the introduction before the old nucleus of the synaxis, so it had developed no thanksgiving-prayer after the old nucleus of the eucharist, but virtually ended with the communion. The fourth Council of Toledo in A.D. 633 (can. 18) had sternly reprimanded those who attempted to transfer the blessing from before the communion to after it, and had ordered that communion should end the rite as heretofore; and the Council's legislation had evidently maintained the old ways for another 200 years in Spain. But when the *Liber Sacramentorum* was written the custom of saying a short public thanksgiving prayer (*completuria*) after the communion was just beginning to spread, doubtless through imitation of the Roman rite. Four days in the year are provided with a *completuria* in this MS.; more are found in those of the next century, and in the eleventh century *Liber Ordinum*, the majority of the masses are so equipped. But by that time the episcopal blessing before the communion was so unalterably fixed in Spanish tradition that it was never transferred to the end of the rite, even after the thanksgiving prayer had been added in the ninth–tenth century. It still remains where the fourth Council of Toledo fixed it, before the communion.

[1] *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum, ed. cit., col.* 85 *sq.*

The developed Mozarabic post-communion of the middle ages runs thus: after the communion the choir sing an anthem (corresponding to the Roman *communio*) followed at once by a brief (variable) thanksgiving collect. Then the celebrant greets the church with 'The Lord be always with you'; ℟. 'And with thy spirit.' The Spanish deacon's ancient dismissal, 'Mass is over', is amplified to 'Our solemnities are completed in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ. May our devotion be accepted in peace.' ℟. 'Thanks be to God.' This presents in its structure a close parallel with the early mediaeval Roman conclusion.

In Gaul

In Gaul the arrangement was slightly different. The fraction came immediately after the end of the eucharistic prayer; then followed the Lord's prayer with its *praefatio*. Then the deacon sang 'Bow down for the blessing' and the bishop pronounced the threefold blessing divided by the people's 'Amens' as in Spain.[1] But in France the blessing in its full form became a special episcopal prerogative, and priests used a shorter and less elaborate form. The 'episcopal benedictions' became a special feature of the eucharist in France. Pope Zacharias already viewed them somewhat severely in A.D. 751 as 'not according to apostolic tradition but done out of vainglory, bringing damnation on themselves, as it is written "If any one preach unto you another gospel than that which was first preached unto you, let him be anathema".'[2] Nevertheless, they survived the adoption of the Roman rite under Charlemagne, and lasted in many French churches into the eighteenth century, and at Autun into the twentieth.

A different set of these benedictions was provided for every liturgical day in the year, some of them with five, seven, eight or nine clauses, all divided by 'Amens'. From Gaul the custom spread to England, Germany, and even one or two Italian and Hungarian churches.[3] In England they lasted down to the Reformation at the mass of a bishop or abbot.

The interesting thing is that the early French evidence reveals the same absence of a thanksgiving prayer as in the early Spanish rite. Not only does the Council of Orleans in A.D. 512 (can. 1) insist that the bishop's blessing before the communion is the end of the rite, before which no one must presume to depart; but S. Caesarius of Arles in sermons preached about the same time reveals the difficulty of inducing the laity, now that they no longer communicated, to remain even as long as that. He repeatedly

[1] *Cf.* the Gallican *Ordo* printed as *Ordo Rom.*, vi. (M.P.L., lxxviii., 993).

[2] *Ep.* to Boniface of Mainz, *M.G.H.*; *Epist. Merov. et Karol, I, p.* 371.

[3] The full Gallican collection of the seventh century can be reconstructed from a Freising MS. of the eighth century to which Dom Morin drew attention in *Rév. Ben.* (*art. cit.*) in 1912, which appears to be still unpublished. This is a pity, since this collection apparently underlies all those of other countries, except perhaps the Spanish ones. And comparison with these latter might help to clear up the difficult question of the relation of the seventh century Gallican rite to the Mozarabic.

exhorts them to stay until 'the whole mass' (*missas ad integrum*) has been completed, which, he says, is not until the bishop's blessing after the Lord's prayer has been given.[1] The earliest Gallican liturgical MS., the *Masses of Mone*, has added a short thanksgiving collect after the communion at all masses, varying with the day. But this is evidently a seventh century addition to the true Gallican rite, based on the Roman model. 'Germanus', for what its evidence is worth, has still no prayer of any kind after the benediction before communion. But since it also prescribes the saying of the creed as a preparation for communion, which is a Spanish not a French custom, it is perhaps no longer representative of what had come to be the general contemporary French practice *c.* A.D. 700.

The Roman Post-Communion

When the episcopal blessing before communion formed the final prayer of the rite, followed only by the communion (in which the majority of the laity no longer took part), it naturally came to be regarded as a sort of climax. What appears to have caused its removal at Rome is the introduction of a brief thanksgiving or post-communion prayer after the communion, parallel to the collect before the lections. When this was first adopted at Rome is obscure, but it must have been some time during the fifth century. Post-communions are provided as systematically as collects for all masses in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, whose groundwork seems to date from *c.* A.D. 500. But I have been unable to discover any earlier reference to any thanksgiving prayer at Rome, and the analogy of the Spanish and French rites suggests the possibility that its adoption took place after that of the collect, perhaps only towards the end of the fifth century. Many of the postcommunions themselves are hardly comparable with the collects in their workmanship, either for range of ideas or expression, which suggests that they may date from a rather different period, though both sets of prayers have the same structure.

The Western Conclusion

The introduction of a concluding prayer after the communion may well have suggested to the Roman sense of form the idea of removing the solemn blessing, which had previously come before the communion, to after the thanksgiving (the position of the *super populum* in Lent). But the old tradition that the deacon's dismissal ought to end the rite died hard at Rome. The blessing after the thanksgiving was in form hardly distinguishable from a second postcommunion collect and served no particular purpose, since it was still followed by the deacon's *Ite missa est*. And so it was dropped altogether (except in Lent, a season when archaisms are apt to survive in all rites).

[1] *E.g.*, *Serm.* 281, 2; 282, 2; in the *App.* to the *Sermons* of S. Augustine (which are by Caesarius).

The brief blessing 'May God Almighty, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, bless you' which now follows the *Ite missa est* in the Roman rite begins as a sort of informal piece of politeness. In the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, as the Pope goes out to the sacristy after mass other bishops step forward to ask his blessing, and he replies 'May God bless *us*'—a courtesy. The people bow to him as he passes through the congregation in procession to the sacristy, and he replies by signing them with the cross. Only in the eleventh century did priests as well as bishops begin to bless the people as they went from the altar. The custom spread, apparently from France, but not very quickly, during the middle ages. In England the mediaeval derived uses (*e.g.* Sarum, Westminster and Hereford) did not adopt it. The present forms (differing for priests and bishops) were not finally fixed in the Roman missal until the pontificate of Clement VIII in the seventeenth century.

The blessing is always *said* by priests in the Roman rite, even at a sung eucharist, an indication that it is no inherent part of the public rite,[1] but rather to be classed with those semi-private devotions like the 'last gospel' (John i. 1–14) and the 'preparation', which grew up as a sort of 'third *stratum*' during the middle ages, around the completed Shape of the Liturgy, rather than as part of it. The real end of the rite is communion and the deacon's proclamation that it is complete. To this the 'second *stratum*' added a brief and formal thanksgiving—for how can *public* thanksgiving for such an intimate thing as the union of the soul with God be anything but formal? Even though it is right that we should all give thanks together for the same gift, it was also a right instinct which made it brief—a gesture only—and left the soul to its Lord, sending it back with Him to daily life with 'Depart in peace' or some such phrase. There is a certain 'clericalism' about reinforcing *communion* with a priestly blessing, however true it be that 'the blessing of a good man availeth much'. The primitive church rejoiced in such blessings and multiplied them, but she did not choose this particular moment for imparting them.

E. THE 'THIRD STRATUM'

The Shape of the Liturgy as it stood *c.* A.D. 800 all over christendom remains substantially intact henceforward, because it is an organically completed thing, logically adapted to express the eucharistic action it performs in a society which is nominally christian in its assumptions about human life as a whole. It consists roughly of four parts: the introduction (added by the 'second *stratum*'); the old nucleus of the synaxis (minus the concluding intercessory prayers which had atrophied in different ways in all rites); the old nucleus of the eucharist; and a brief appended thanksgiving (the other addition of the 'second *stratum*'). Henceforward the

[1] The bishop seems always to have sung his final blessing. Perhaps this is a trace of its indirect derivation from the old solemn blessing before the communion.

additions and changes made have about them the character of mere decorations, rather than of structural changes, though they are numerous and various and continual enough in all rites.

A sufficient illustration is the history of the *Agnus Dei* in the Roman rite. This little prose hymn 'O Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us' was first introduced into the Roman rite during the fraction immediately before the communion by Pope Sergius I (A.D. 687–701). This act of adoration of our Lord present in the sacrament (for it is intended as such) is a somewhat 'un-Roman' form of eucharistic devotion. But its origin is explained by the fact that Sergius was himself a Greek, born in Syria; the idea of 'the Lamb of God' had for centuries attracted a special devotion in the Syrian church. The *Agnus Dei* is in fact only one more of those 'Syrian importations' of which we have had other instances, which were constantly enriching Western forms from the fourth century to the eighth. As Sergius introduced it the hymn seems to have been sung twice, once by the choir, and then repeated by the people. This continued down to the eleventh century. In the twelfth century the liturgist Beleth describes it as being sung three times in French churches, with 'grant us peace' substituted for 'have mercy upon us' at the third repetition. At the end of the thirteenth century, however, it was still being sung at Rome without this new variation, a custom maintained to this day in the Pope's cathedral, the Lateran basilica. Yet another little variation for use at funerals had made its appearance in France during the eleventh-twelfth century—the substitution of 'grant them rest' for 'have mercy upon us'. This in turn led to the further change of adding '. . . rest *everlasting*' at the third repetition at funerals, in those churches which substituted 'grant us peace' at the third repetition on ordinary days.

When a single small item of late introduction can go through so many variations in a few centuries it is obvious that the following of all the innumerable changes in the details of rites ceaselessly made and remade all through the middle ages would be a wearisome and lengthy business. Especially is this the case with the additions made by what I have called the 'third *stratum*'—*c.* A.D. 800–1100. These additions were not protected from change either by their structural usefulness, like those of the 'second *stratum*', or by immemorial tradition like the primitive nucleus; and in consequence the persistent innovating tendency of the clergy in all ages with regard to details of the liturgy had comparatively free play with these, and also with minor matters of ceremonial whose development or alteration goes on persistently in all rites down to the sixteenth-seventeenth century. But these little matters of fashion and fancy change nothing in the main outline of the Shape of the Liturgy, which remains everywhere much as it was *c.* A.D. 800.

After this the persistent desire to improve upon the traditional liturgy, restrained by its 'completeness' as a whole, finds expression chiefly in the

composition of 'devotions' preparatory to and looking back upon the liturgical action itself—'preparations' and 'thanksgivings'—which are of the greatest interest from the point of view of the history of religious psychology, but are less closely connected with the history of the liturgy itself.

A few words must be said, however, of the instances of this tendency which have managed to attach themselves as official and prescribed parts of the rite in the liturgies of the East and West alike—the 'preparation' and various post-liturgical devotions.

In both the Byzantine and Roman rites there is now an officially prescribed 'preparation', a series of devotions for the priest and his assistants, before the service begins. The forms now in use in both cases begin to take shape about the eleventh-twelfth century,[1] and reach their present text in the sixteenth century. In both cases the process begins with the prefixing of a single private prayer to be said by the celebrant in the sacristy, which is found in both East and West as far back as the seventh century. Certainly private devotion had always exacted devout preparation from clergy and laity. But it is a different thing when official regulation begins to prescribe the form of private devotion, and to draw its exercise into the sphere of the fixed liturgical action instead of leaving it to its own natural field—the individual's personal preferences under the action of grace. It presages a good deal that has subsequently taken place in the way of 'psychologising' the eucharist, and removing the emphasis from the corporate action to the individual's subjective feelings and thoughts about that action.

It is further noticeable that whereas this earliest Eastern 'prayer of preparation' in the seventh century is concerned with the preparation of *the elements*, the earliest Western prayers (*apologiae* as they are called) are true to the inherent Western bent for 'psychologising', and are wholly concerned with the preparation of *the priest*. This original difference of bias in the devotion of the two churches is something which has persisted, not only in their preparatory devotions but in their eucharistic devotion as a whole. Thus while the Eastern veneration for even the unconsecrated elements has made the great entrance one of the moments of supreme worship in the rite, the Western tendency has been to make of these psychological reactions of the individual not merely a preparation for the rite, but something which is of its very structure. We find these *apologiae* prefixed to the Western rites in the seventh century; but from the thirteenth onwards the missals prescribe them for the celebrant to say while the choir are singing the introit, *Gloria*, gradual and creed, in fact at every moment the liturgical

[1] The history of the Byzantine forms can most usefully be studied in Dom P. de Meester's valuable essay, *Les origines et les développements du texte grec de la liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome* (*Chrysostomika* II, Rome, 1908, *pp.* 245 *sqq.*), supplemented by Brightman, L. E. W., *pp.* 539–551. The best general account of the Western forms is still that in Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum Lib.*, II, ii (Paris 1672), *caps.* 1 and 2, though it needs supplementing from texts discovered since.

action leaves him free.[1] It is in this period too that we begin to find private prayers of the same kind inserted between the old public *Agnus Dei* and the priest's communion. Let us be quite clear as to the point. Piety and edification may take many forms, and modern eucharistic piety still feels this particular mediaeval form to be entirely good and natural. But it is legitimate to point out the difference between this and the piety of the primitive church, for which the *corporate liturgy itself* formed the substance of devotion, and the *corporate action* its expression. In the middle ages it begins to be the *supplementary prayers* and the *private emotions* which take their place in this respect.

It is true that in the middle ages these 'devotions' are still only something which *accompanies* the liturgy, which continues uninterrupted by them, as it were, in the centre of the field. In the sixteenth century a further stage is reached in practice. Either, as in a good deal of Latin devotion, the text of the liturgy is ignored altogether for purposes of devotion, and 'methods of hearing mass' entirely composed of these supplementary prayers are put together for the benefit of all but the celebrant. Or else, as in the sixteenth century Anglican rites, the supplementary devotions invade the liturgical action and become formal parts of it—even main parts of it, which break up the old apostolic and primitive action by an elaborate com, mentary of prescribed subjective repercussions which it is thought desirable that it should have on those present. The Anglican exhortations, the confession with its highly emotional language, the comfortable words and prayer of access—all of these are thoroughly in line with the piety of the mediaeval *apologiae*, and echo their language. The only change is that they are no longer private and supplementary prayers, but public and prescribed, and have been made a part of the liturgical action itself. Coming where they do, as a lengthy interpolation between the offertory and the consecration (which primitive christian thought had seen as two parts of a single action so closely united that a single word *prospherein* would cover them both) these devotions would have been incomprehensible to the pre-Nicene church. That church never developed anything comparable because it understood the eucharist as being for all who took part in it an *action*—'Do this'—not the *experience* of an action. Even when the post-Nicene church began to develop something of this kind, it placed them at the obvious point for such a development—before the communion. The mediaeval church on the contrary would have understood easily enough what Cranmer intended, even though it was itself still too loyal to primitive

[1] There are *e.g.*, six *apologiae* prescribed to be said by the celebrant during the *Gloria* in the Westminster Lyttlington Missal (fourteenth century). The practice had certainly begun in the twelfth century or even earlier; *e.g.*, S. Thomas of Canterbury was accustomed to use the devotions compiled by S. Anselm while the choir was singing, because he found them particularly moving (*Vita S. Thomae*, by Herbert of Bosham, iii. 13, *ed.* J. C. Robertson, *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, London, 1873, III, *p.* 209 *sq.*). But I do not recollect noticing such prayers provided in the *altar-books* before the thirteenth century.

forms to bring about such an upheaval of the Shape of the Liturgy as this long interpolation involves.[1]

The additional devotions after the liturgy which correspond to the 'preparation' before it—the 'last gospel' (John i. 1–14) and thanksgiving office (*Benedicite*, Ps. 150, etc.)—have much the same history. They begin as private devotions in the eleventh-twelfth century and have become a prescribed appendage to the rite by the sixteenth. They are part of that ceaseless process of accumulating 'devotional extras' around the essential liturgical action, which is the special mark of the piety of the 'third *stratum*'. In these cases its result is obviously edifying and good; in some others (*e.g.* the interlarding of the rite with private *apologiae* of the priest) it is difficult not to see in its manifestations only a false emphasis on inessentials.

[1] How incurably mediaeval our Anglican eucharistic devotion remains is illustrated by some regulations issued by an English bishop to his diocese in December 1941. Urging the retention of these devotions even when no communicants other than the celebrant are expected, he writes: 'Without this section the element of confession and humility, which is as essential for a corporate approach to the Prayer of Consecration as it is for the individual human approach to it, is absent from the service'. It is regrettable that the whole primitive and patristic church should thus have been without the 'essential' corporate approach to the consecration; and it must be said that the idea that one cannot worthily be present at the consecration without first expressing confession and humility—but can profitably hear the Word of God in the scriptures at the synaxis without doing so?—was the heart of mediaeval eucharistic piety. One had supposed that it was the primary purpose of our Reformers to destroy it. These devotions were not placed where they are by Cranmer as a preparation for the consecration—he repeatedly said he did not believe there was any 'consecration' in this sense—but as a substitute for the offertory (*cf. pp.* 662 *sq.*). The confusion in our ideas had been caused by the revisers of 1662 who re-established the idea of a 'Prayer of Consecration' which Cranmer had deliberately eliminated, and restored the offertory of bread and wine, and yet left these devotions in the position at which he had placed them with a wholly different understanding of the eucharist in view. They must now be treated either as 'communion' devotions in the strict sense (in which case they should now come before the communion), or else as meaningless survivals which now unnecessarily destroy the structural logic of our rite (and foster the sort of unhealthy mediaevalism illustrated by the well-meaning regulation above, by over-emphasising the consecration at the expense of the action as one whole).