CHAPTER I

THE LITURGY AND THE EUCHARISTIC ACTION

THE LITURGY AND ITS SHAPE

'LITURGY' is the name given ever since the days of the apostles[1] to the act of taking part in the solemn corporate worship of God by the 'priestly' society[2] of christians, who are 'the Body of Christ, the church'.[3] '*The* Liturgy' is the term which covers generally all that worship which is officially organised by the church, and which is open to and offered by, or in the name of, all who are members of the church. It distinguishes this from the personal prayers of the individual christians who make up the church, and even from the common prayer of selected or voluntary groups within the church, *e.g.* guilds or societies. In the course of time the term 'The Liturgy' has come to be particularly applied to the performance of that rite which was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself to be the peculiar and distinctive worship of those who should be 'His own';[4] and which has ever since been the heart and core of christian worship and christian living—the Eucharist or Breaking of Bread.

The profound reasons for this centring of the general christian experience on the eucharist will be touched on later. Here it is enough to say that all eucharistic worship is of necessity and by intention a *corporate action*—'*Do* this' (*poieite*, plural). The blessed Bread is broken that it may be *shared*, and 'we being many' made 'one Body'; the blessed Cup is delivered that it may be a '*partaking* of the Blood of Christ'.[5] It is of the deepest meaning of the rite that those who take part are thereby united indissolubly with one another and with all who are Christ's, '*because*' (*hoti*) each is thereby united with Him,[6] and through Him with the Father, with Whom He is One.

This understanding of the rite, as essentially a corporate action, is clearly expressed in the very first christian description of the way in which it was performed. Writing at the close of Domitian's persecution, in the autumn of A.D. 96, S. Clement of Rome reminds the Corinthian church: 'Unto the high-priest (=the celebrant-bishop) his special "liturgies" have been appointed, and to the priests (=presbyters) their special place is assigned, and on the levites (=deacons) their special "deaconings" are imposed; the layman is bound by the ordinances for the laity. Let each of you, brethren, make eucharist to God according to his own order, keeping a good conscience and not transgressing the appointed rule of his "liturgy".'[7]

Writing from one apostolic church to another at a date when some of

[1] Acts xiii. 2. [2] 1 Peter ii. 5. [3] Eph. i. 22, 23.
[4] John xiii. 1. [5] 1 Cor. x. 16. [6] 1 Cor. x. 17.
[7] 1 Clem. 40, 41.

the actual disciples of the apostles must have been still living (even if he were not such himself) Clement in the preceding context seems to imply that these 'appointed rules' for the 'liturgies' of the different 'orders' are of divine institution, apparently from our Lord Himself. Be this as it may, here in the first century the eucharist is emphatically a corporate action of the whole christian body, in which every 'order' from the layman to the bishop has its own special 'liturgy', without the proper fulfilment of each of which the worship of the whole church cannot be fulfilled.[1]

The eucharist is here the vital expression towards God of what the church fundamentally *is*, a corporate 'holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ'.[2] If such a conception of the rite as a united and uniting action towards God of the whole church is to be realised, there are needed three things:

(*a*) If the whole eucharist is essentially one action, the service must have a logical development as one whole, a thrust towards that particular action's fulfilment, and not merely a general purpose of edification. It must express clearly by the order and connection of its parts what the action is which it is about, and where the service as a whole is 'going'. It is this logical sequence of parts coherently fulfilling one complete action which I call the 'Shape' of the Liturgy.

(*b*) The structure of the service itself ought somehow to express the particular function of each 'order' in the church, its 'special liturgy' in Clement's phrase, and bring this into play in fulfilling the corporate action of the whole.

(*c*) For a corporate action there must be in the minds of all a common agreement at least on what the action itself *is* on which they are solemnly engaged together. Agreement on what it *means* is less absolutely necessary, even if very desirable.

It is the sequence of the rite—the Shape of the Liturgy—which chiefly performs the eucharistic action itself, and so carries out the human obedience to the Divine command 'Do this'. It is the phrasing of the prayers which chiefly expresses the *meaning* attached to that action by the theological tradition of the church. Both are essential parts of eucharistic worship. But they have an independent history, even though they are always combined in the tradition of the liturgy.

The Liturgical Tradition

In considering the primitive history of the eucharist we have to keep in mind continually the circumstances of a church life whose conditions were

[1] The laity are an 'order' in the church no less than the 'holy orders' of the clergy, and were anciently required to undergo a three years' preparation and training before they were allowed to enter it by baptism and confirmation. Under the shadow of persecution in a heathen world this would appear more obvious than in times when the christian laity could be confused with the general body of ratepayers.

[2] 1 Peter ii. 5.

profoundly different from our own. The New Testament documents, in sharp contrast with the fulness of Old Testament directions for worship, contain no instructions as to the form of the eucharistic rite, or detailed accounts of its celebration, beyond the brief notices of its institution. There are a number of N.T. allusions to its existence, and S. Paul regulates certain points in connection with it for the Corinthians. But such information as the N.T. offers is theological or disciplinary rather than liturgical, *i.e.* it deals with the meaning and effects of the rite and the spirit in which it is to be performed, rather than the actual way in which it is to be performed, which the N.T. everywhere takes for granted. This is quite natural. The eucharist had already been at the heart of the religion of christians for twenty years before the first of these New Testament documents was written. It had trained and sanctified apostles and martyrs and scores of thousands of unknown saints for more than a century before the N.T. was collected and canonised as authoritative 'scripture', beside and above the old jewish scriptures. Christians of the first two or three generations naturally tended to see their own worship in the light of their bible, *i.e.* of these jewish scriptures of the O.T., which had formed the only bible of Jesus and the apostolic church, for which the altar of sacrifice on Mt. Moriah was the centre of all human life, the link between the world and God.[1] The results of this were not more than superficial, a matter of metaphors and illustrations, though the Old Testament in this way formed a useful barrier to the infiltration of purely pagan conceptions into eucharistic theology, in the period before christian thought in the gentile churches was mature enough to protect itself. But it is important for the understanding of the whole future history of the liturgy to grasp the fact that eucharistic worship from the outset was not based on scripture at all, whether of the Old or New Testament, but solely on *tradition*. The authority for its celebration was the historical tradition that it had been instituted by Jesus, cited incidentally by S. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. and attested in the second christian generation by the written gospels. The method of celebrating it, the primitive outline of the liturgy, was from the first prescribed, not by an authoritative code, but by the tradition of custom alone.[2]

One remarkable feature of the N.T. allusions to the eucharist is the rich

[1] *Cf. e.g.* the Ep. to the Hebrews or 1 Clem. 41 above, or other documents. The tendency in some form was universal.

[2] This final authority of custom over the liturgy continued down to the sixteenth century, when in the West the command of positive law begins to supersede custom. Thus *e.g.* the 'Uses' of Sarum, etc. are superseded in England by the 'enactment' of a rite prescribed in detail by a parliamentary statute. The same thing happened in the Church of Rome at the same period—*cf.* the language of the Bull *Quo Primum* 'imposing' the reformed missal of Pius V. The principle is the same; there is only a difference in the legislator. In the East, despite frequent interference with the liturgy by Byzantine emperors from the fifth to eighth centuries, custom is to this day nominally authoritative for the liturgy. But there custom has acquired a more rigid force than it had in the West making it virtually equivalent to positive law.

variety of meanings they already find within the single rite of the broken Bread and the blessed Cup. It is the solemn proclamation of the Lord's death;[1] but it is also the familiar intercourse of Jesus abiding in the soul, as a friend who enters in and sups with a friend.[2] It fulfils all the past, as the 'true'[3] and the 'secret'[4] manna, the meaning of all sacrifice,[5] the truth of all Passovers.[6] But it also looks forward to the future beyond the end of time, as a mysterious anticipation of the final judgement of God,[7] a foretaste of the eternal Messianic banquet of heaven,[8] a 'tasting of the powers of the world to come.'[9] It foreshadowed the exultant welcome of His own at that Second Coming,[10] for which those who had first lost their hearts to Him in Galilee looked so wistfully all their years after, that the echoes of their longing murmured on in the eucharistic prayers of the church for centuries. By the time the New Testament came to be written the eucharist already illuminated everything concerning Jesus for His disciples—His Person, His Messianic office,[11] His miracles,[12] His death[13] and the redemption that He brought.[14] It was the vehicle of the gift of His Spirit,[15] the means of eternal life,[16] the cause of the unity of His church.[17] This is not an exhaustive analysis of New Testament teaching about the eucharist. Nor do I suggest that all these passages are intended to be directly about the eucharist (they are not) but that in all of them the experience of the eucharist is at least colouring and affecting the author's presentation in some cases even of other matters, which is what is significant for our purpose. They shew that the church had found in the eucharist an entire epitome of 'the Gospel' before our four gospels had been written.

This fact of a great variety of meanings found within the single rite of the eucharist by the apostolic church of the first generation had important consequences for the future of the liturgy, though it has been curiously little appreciated in modern study. The theory still generally accepted in liturgical text-books is that there was a single primitive type or model of the rite, not only of outline or shape of the rite as a whole (which is true) but also of its central formula, the 'great eucharistic prayer', originally the only prayer which the service contained.

The fact is that the liturgical tradition of the text of the eucharistic prayer in the great historic rites—Syrian, Egyptian, Roman and so forth—only begins to emerge into the light of secure and analysable evidence in

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 26. [2] Rev. iii. 20. [3] John vi. 52. [4] Rev. ii. 17.
[5] Heb. xiii. 10. [6] 1 Cor. v. 7; Luke xxii. 18. [7] 1 Cor. xi. 30, 31, 32.
[8] Luke xxii. 30. [9] Heb. vi. 5. [10] 1 Cor. xi. 26.
[11] John vi. 33, 35, 48.
[12] The accounts of the feeding of the multitude are obviously 'coloured' by the eucharist.
[13] 'It was not the death upon Calvary *per se*, but the death upon Calvary as the Last Supper interprets it and gives the clue to its meaning, which constitutes our Lord's sacrifice. The doctrine of sacrifice (and of atonement) was not read *into* the Last Supper; it was read out of it' (The present Bishop of Derby, in *Mysterium Christi*, ed. G. K. A. Bell, London, 1930, *p.* 241).
[14] John vi. 51. [15] 1 Cor. xii. 13b. [16] John vi. 53 54. [17] 1 Cor. x. 17.

the third–fourth century, and even then there are big gaps in our knowledge. In the *later* fourth century, when our knowledge is more definite, we find three facts which can be taken as certain: (*a*) The outline of the rite—the Shape of the Liturgy—is everywhere most remarkably the same, after 300 years of independent existence in the widely scattered churches. (*b*) The content of the eucharistic prayer is by then also to some extent the same in arrangement and even in certain phrases. But (*c*) the great historic families shew strongly marked peculiarities of their own. It is the combination of the first two ascertained facts together with the discounting of the third which has led to the assumption that all eucharistic rites, not only in their outline but in the formula of their eucharistic prayer, are originally derived from a single 'apostolic' model.

I believe that this assumption, which has been the accepted view on the matter ever since the seventeenth century, has caused a serious misunderstanding of the early history of the eucharist, and among ourselves has been an indirect cause of some of our liturgical difficulties. Now that research is beginning, tentatively but with increasing success, to push back our knowledge of the liturgy into the period *before* the later fourth century, the evidence is beginning to wear a different appearance. The outline—the Shape—of the Liturgy is still everywhere the same in all our sources, right back into the earliest period of which we can as yet speak with certainty, the earlier half of the second century. There is even good reason to think that this outline—the Shape—of the Liturgy is of genuinely apostolic tradition. On the other hand, the further back we trace the contents of the eucharistic prayer, the more remarkable are the differences which begin to appear between the various groups of churches; though, as I have said, the different traditions of the prayer revolve always around the same essential action, and it is possible, even probable, that they were all originally rooted in a single type. This is not to say that there was an original 'apostolic' fixed *text* of the eucharistic prayer; there is no evidence of that. But because the eucharistic action was everywhere the same, the prayer which expressed the meaning of that action had necessarily certain fixed characteristics, though these were phrased and expressed in a great variety of ways by different churches.

The explanation is that the pre-Nicene[1] church faithfully reflects in its eucharistic practice the conditions of the most primitive period of christian history, the period before the canonization of the New Testament, before the great intellectual structure of doctrinal orthodoxy had reached more than a rudimentary stage, before the nascent canon law had established any but the vaguest effective organisation above the local churches, which

[1] Pre-Nicene = the period before the first General Council of Nicaea A.D. 325. The final toleration of Christianity by the Roman empire dates from A.D. 312–321. So 'pre-Nicene' roughly means the period of the persecutions, during which christian worship was always a *private* not a public worship.

were therefore largely self-administered in their internal daily life under their own bishops. But the vigour of this local life of the churches must not conceal from us the fact that they conceived of themselves not as a 'federation' but as a 'unity'.

Every local church had received the *rite* of the eucharist—the way of performing it—with its first evangelisation. This is important. It means that the living tradition of the liturgy as the heart of its corporate life went back into the very roots of every apostolic church, in a way that its theological tradition *about* the eucharist, which was necessarily in large part the product of experience and reflection, could not go back. Some interpretation of the rite there must have been from the outset, given by the founders when they taught their first converts about the eucharist and celebrated it among them. But that interpretation was not then given as a complete and final thing. For the N.T. allusions to the eucharist shew by their variety that there was no complete and fixed interpretation in the apostolic age, but only a rapidly growing and wonderfully rich experience by individuals and churches of the many meanings the single rite could have. The single primal fact of the rite had been given by Jesus without commentary, beyond the identification of the elements with His own sacrificial Body and Blood. It was left to the church to explore for herself the inexhaustible depths of its meaning; and from the first every local church was joyfully at work on doing so.

And even the developed local tradition of the *meaning* of the eucharistic action—which was what was expressed in the local tradition of the eucharistic prayer—could not be an entirely static thing, because the prayer was not yet a fixed formula. Within a customary outline the celebrant-bishop was to a considerable extent free to phrase the prayer as seemed to him best.[1] Thus the local tradition of the prayer in any church could grow from many sources besides the teaching of the original founders—from the prayers and meditations and happy (or less happy) inspirations of subsequent bishops; from the devout study by them or by others of the Old Testament scriptures, and later on of the new christian writings; or by deliberate borrowings from other churches far or near. Over the lapse of a century or two the corporate religious experience of the eucharist by a local church would insensibly demand some expression in its prayer, and would in turn be largely moulded by the ideas this expressed. Here the particular genius of races and languages played a quite recognisable part. And as the church at large from the second to the fourth century penetrated more deeply into the meaning of revelation, and so theological science grew, we can actually trace, even in the scanty and fragmentary surviving evidence, the continual repercussions of general theological advance on the phrasing of all eucharistic prayers, by a process of ceaseless liturgical

[1] *Cf.* Justin Martyr, *Apology*, I. 67 (*c.* A.D. 150); Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.*, x. 4, 5 (*c.* A.D. 215).

revision carried on independently in every local church.[1] Liturgical texts were becoming more fixed in the fourth century, but the traditional freedom of phrasing allowed to celebrants ensured a certain elasticity in the prayer at least until well after A.D. 350 in most places.[2]

The eucharistic prayer was, however, the only thing in the rite which was thus pliable, because it was the 'president's' own 'special liturgy', in Clement's phrase, *i.e.* that part of the worship of the corporate body which he contributed to the whole eucharistic action, and which he recited alone. It was comparatively easy for one man to add new phrases to a traditional framework, or to compose a wholly new prayer and read it from a manuscript. But the deacons and the people did their parts by custom and by rote; and to change these, which were as much their 'special liturgies' as the celebrant's prayer was his, was a much more difficult matter. Thus there is a constant tendency for the people's responses, the deacon's proclamations, etc., which form the framework in which the celebrant's prayer (or prayers, as the rite developed) is set, to remain more archaic than the prayers themselves.[3] Theology is a progressive technical science, and remains therefore always the professional preserve of the clergy and the interest of a comparatively small educated *élite* of the laity. Liturgy, on the contrary, is a universal christian activity, and so a *popular* interest; and therefore always remains a very conservative thing. It was the fact that the eucharist as a whole was a corporate act of the whole church which everywhere maintained the rigid fixity of the outline of the liturgy, through the conservatism of the laity. Changes in this outline only began when the rite as a whole had been partially 'clericalised' by becoming something which the clergy were supposed to do *for* the laity, and the laity for the most part had lost their active share in its performance. It was the fact that the eucharistic prayer was always precisely the one thing which the clergy did perform (and were there to perform) by themselves on behalf of the whole church, which made it always the most mutable thing in the rite. But even in the prayers themselves the silent pressure of the conservatism of the

[1] Hippolytus' eucharistic prayer (*c.* A.D. 215) in some of its phrases expresses his own peculiar theology of the Trinity; the opponents of this theology, even if they used a prayer of that type, would not have used those particular expressions. So the prayer of Sarapion (Egypt *c.* A.D. 340) reflects the third century 'Logos-theology' of the Egyptian school, but with a fourth century explicitly anti-Arian turn, which can only be due to his own revision of the old prayer of his church of Thmuis; and so on.

[2] The church of Rome was always conservative, and early tended to fixity of forms. By A. D. 450 the addition there of an adjectival phrase to the fixed traditional form of the prayer by S. Leo the Great becomes a matter of remark and worthy of record. Yet the Roman canon has suffered one great upheaval since his day, probably under S. Gelasius (A.D. 494–6) and, oddly enough, without any record being preserved of what was done; and there was a further revision *c.* A.D. 600.

[3] *E.g.* the people's response at the end of Sarapion's eucharistic prayer (A.D. 340) is the one already traditional at that point in Egypt, but it does not grammatically fit the end of his particular prayer. We have an instance of the same thing among ourselves in the survival of the people's responses before and after the gospel by continuous *popular* tradition, where the official rite no longer provides for them at all.

worshippers (in whose name, after all, they were uttered) often maintained very ancient phrases and features down to comparatively late dates, with which contemporary theology could not always easily come to terms, and which it constantly attempted to modify or to explain away.

Throughout the pre-Nicene age these local eucharistic prayers were continuously developing, dear to the people from local tradition and lifelong personal associations and the habits of devotion, and hallowed by the memory of great saints and martyrs who had observed or ordained them.[1] In an age when scripture, doctrinal tradition, ecclesiastical machinery of all sorts, and so much else which we can take for granted, were not yet such firm elements in the framework of church life and christian thinking as they are with us, the liturgy was the great channel of the life of the church, on which all else depended. The fixed traditional outline of the rite, everywhere and always the same, maintained and expressed the church's cohesion. The 'living voice' of the liturgical ministry, teaching through the traditional yet free medium of the prayer and through the liturgical sermon (which had, as we shall see, a rather different function from that which it has with us), guided the church's faith and thought and inner life, to a degree we find it hard to recognise.

The fourth century brought imperial recognition of the christian religion and the end of persecution, and with that the possibility of a world-wide instead of a local framework of organisation. There was now the opportunity and the desire for the comparison and exchange of traditions between the churches, for their mutual enrichment and imitation, on a scale unknown before. The Shape of the Liturgy was still everywhere the same. And now the greatest differences between the churches in what did differ in their rites, the contents of their eucharistic prayers, begin to a certain extent to be 'ironed out', as it were, by a mutual adjustment. The patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria in the East, and the rather different sort of pre-eminence of Rome in the West, take on a more solid organisation. The rites of their daughter churches tend to assimilate themselves to those of the patriarchal ones in each case, even where there was no direct pressure from the presiding sees to do so. And between these great groupings there is assimilation, though each retains marked characteristics of its own. We can actually trace a number of verbal borrowings in the eucharistic prayer by Egypt from Syria, and by Syria from Egypt, and by Rome perhaps from both; and there is at least one instance of a reverse of influence from Rome upon the other two, directly or indirectly.[2] In the fourth or early fifth

[1] *Cf. e.g.* the letter of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus *c.* A.D. 195 (*ap.* Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* V, xxiv, 2) for the pride which churches already took in their local customs and the local saints to whom they were attributed, before A.D. 200. By then the last living links with even the sub-apostolic age—men like the nonagenarian bishop Pothinus of Lyons, martyred *c.* A.D. 180—were being broken, and there was beginning to be a 'christian antiquity' to study and to revere.

[2] *Cf. p.* 264.

century it looked as though there were a real possibility that the political unity of the christian world would eventually bring with it a large measure of liturgical uniformity too. It is an instance of that effect of political history upon the liturgy of which we have another in sixteenth century England, when the new royal centralisation of English life into a much more conscious national unity destroyed the old local 'uses' of England in favour of one national uniform rite.[1]

But with the collapse of effective political unity in the old Roman empire, a reverse tendency begins in the fifth century. East and West go their own ways, overlaying the partial uniformity reached in the fourth century with a fresh series of different developments, this time in the outline as well as in the prayers of the rite. This second flourishing of local varieties after the fifth century goes much further in the West than in the East, because the West becomes much more completely disintegrated politically. This made contacts between provincial churches and between the provinces and the central church of Rome more difficult and infrequent.[2] Only when Charlemagne once more brings the West in large part under a single political control, round about A.D. 800, do we find another impulse towards uniformity arising, this time under direct imperial encouragement. This dies away once more into a renewed growth of purely Western local variations (less pronounced this time) as the Carolingian empire breaks up again in the later ninth century.

In the East the continued unity of political rule in the shape of the Byzantine empire continued to foster the tendency towards liturgical uniformity. But the rite which eventually prevails in the East is again the rite of the *political* capital, Byzantium (Constantinople), which had hoisted itself into the position of a new patriarchate, at first beside and then dominating the older patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch. By the thirteenth century this Byzantine rite had virtually ousted the old patriarchal rites of Egypt and Syria from their own churches among the Orthodox.[3]

[1] In England the state hastened the process by force, whereas in the fourth century it was natural and voluntary. But it would probably have happened in England at some point in any case, had the state not intervened; leaving perhaps isolated local peculiarities in some places, like the Lyons use in France, or that of Milan in Italy, or those of Toledo or Braga in Spain and Portugal, as interesting survivals.

[2] The attempt to keep them up was nevertheless made in matters of liturgy. *E.g.* the Council of Vaison in Gaul (A.D. 529) prescribes conformity to the use of *Kyrie eleison* in Gaul, as it had recently been introduced at Rome and in most other western churches. But the attempts at uniformity were spasmodic, and died away as the political confusion grew worse during the sixth century.

[3] The liturgy of Alexandria finally gave way to that of Byzantium among the Egyptian Orthodox churches under Byzantine pressure in A.D. 1193, but it had been considerably 'Byzantinised' before that. In Syria the Greek rite of *S. James* was still occasionally used in the thirteenth century, but its use even on the feast of S. James finally died out altogether. It was revived for use on S. James' Day once a year at Jerusalem in 1905, not with the old Jerusalem text, but in the Byzantinised form in which it had survived once a year as a curiosity in the island of Zante.

Only the political revolt of racial groups in Syria and Egypt preserved the old patriarchal rites in the vernacular as symbols of political independence, in schismatic churches which began rather as instruments of nationalist aspiration than in genuine theological differences. Thus was completed the development of a single uniform liturgical use throughout the *Orthodox* East, which has come in the course of time to influence very considerably even the rites of the dissidents.[1]

In the Latin West modern ease of intercourse between the churches has brought about much the same state of affairs in spite of political disunity. The early mediaeval 'third crop' of local varieties which arose after the ninth century has been steadily assimilated to the current Roman rite, though relics of them are now carefully preserved in certain places (Milan, Lyons, Braga, etc.). Elsewhere in the West, as a consequence of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, there has arisen what from our point of view must be considered as a large 'fourth crop' of local variants of the basic Western type, in the rites of the Reformed bodies. It is true that those who use them do not as a rule think of them in this way. Their compilers were far more concerned to follow what they regarded as 'scriptural warrant' than anything in the liturgical tradition against which they were in revolt. But the Reformers themselves thought largely in terms of the Western tradition within which they had been trained. In consequence their rites all reveal under technical analysis not 'primitive' characteristics at all, nor anything akin to the special Eastern tradition, but a marked dependence on the basic Western liturgical tradition at a particular stage late in its development. In saying this I am well aware of the theological differences which distinguish the Protestant 'Supper' from the Roman Catholic 'Mass'. Nevertheless, when strictly liturgical ethos and characteristics are in question, it is a fact that the former is really only a group of varieties of the latter, or better, a group of rites derived from the latter, and markedly dependent upon it for some of their special features.

So we have reached the position to-day of two main types of liturgy, Eastern and Western, by the elimination of a large number of other rites, some of them at least as ancient as the two which have survived. The present main Eastern type has developed from the fourth century rite of the Eastern 'holy city' Jerusalem, as remodelled and expanded in the Eastern political centre, Constantinople. The present main Western type has developed from the fourth century rite of the Western 'holy city',

[1] The vernacular is the badge of the dissident churches of the West as it was in some measure in the East. But the rites they maintain in the West are not *ancient* local rites adopted as badges of national independence under a theological cover (as in the East), but products of the genuine theological revolution of the Reformation; though political differences had a great influence here, too. The tendency of the followers of the catholic revival in nineteenth century Anglicanism to 'Romanise' in their use of the Anglican liturgy is exactly parallel to the tendency of the later Copts and Jacobites to 'Byzantinise' their own rites, by the introduction of the *Prothesis*, the *Monogenes*, the Great Entrance, and other purely Byzantine features.

Rome, as remodelled and expanded in the Western political centre, the nucleus of Charlemagne's empire in Gaul and the Rhineland. The most important formula, the eucharistic prayer, in these two types seems to have been sufficiently similar in the second and third centuries for us to be able to postulate an original similarity, at least of general type in the first century.[1] But the two rites are now very different from each other after a separation of 1,600 years, even in striking features of what anciently was uniform everywhere, the Shape of the Liturgy. Yet under this later growth the Eastern and Western types of rite both still maintain what may be called the classical form of the eucharistic action—that fixed outline, the core of which descends from the time of the apostles, and which it is our purpose to study.

[1] *Cf.* p. 231 *sqq.*