



HANDBOOKS OF
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

THE EUCHARISTIC
OFFICE OF THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER

LESLIE WRIGHT, M. A., B. D.



THE EUCHARISTIC OFFICE OF
THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

HANDBOOKS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

THE EUCHARISTIC
OFFICE OF THE BOOK
OF COMMON PRAYER

BY THE REV.

LESLIE WRIGHT, M.A., B.D.

LATE SCHOLAR AND SENIOR FISH EXHIBITIONER OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD
DIOCESAN INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS FOR THE DIOCESE OF CHICHESTER

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1919

UXORI MEAE
CHRISTINAE JOANNAE
AMICARUM FIDELISSIMAE
SOCIARUM GRATISSIMAE

PREFACE

THESE pages were not originally written with a view to publication. They are merely the result of several years of study. I only publish them now on the advice of a friend whose judgment in matters liturgical I am bound to respect. For I am fully conscious of the defects of this little book. Liturgical study demands an amount of sustained concentration and exactitude which is practically incompatible with the busy and broken life of a Diocesan Inspector.

Such as it is, however, I hope my book may be useful to students and teachers and to those laymen and laywomen who desire knowledge of our English rite but are not prepared to master so exhaustive a work as Dr. Brightman's monumental treatise.

I should like to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Rev. J. H. Clayton, Vicar of Bognor, and E. G. P. Wyatt, Esq., of Rustington Hall, Sussex. Both of them read my work in MS. and sent me valuable suggestions, some of which, with their kind permission, I have incorporated in the notes.

L. W.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER: THE PARENT RITE .	13
I. TO THE END OF THE COMMANDMENTS . . .	26
II. FROM THE COLLECTS TO THE END OF THE CREED	42
III. THE OFFERTORY	54
IV. THE PREPARATION FOR COMMUNION . . .	74
V. FROM THE SURSUM CORDA TO THE END OF THE CONSECRATION	78
VI. THE COMMUNION AND OBLATION	101
VII. TO THE END OF THE SERVICE	114

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Brightman . . = Brightman, F.E., *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*.
Vol. I. Oxford, 1898.
- Dearmer . . = Dearmer, P., *The Parson's Handbook*. London,
1902.
- Duchesne . . = Duchesne, L., *Christian Worship: Its Origin and
Evolution* (translation of *Origines du Culte Chrétien*). 4th Edition. London, 1912.
- Fortescue . . = Fortescue, A. *The Mass*. London.
- P. G.* . . . = Migne, *Patrologia Græca*.
- P. L.* . . . = Migne, *Patrologia Latina*.
- Pullan . . . = Pullan, L., *History of the Book of Common Prayer*.
London.
- Wickham Legg = Wickham Legg, J., *Three Chapters in Recent
Liturgical Research*. London, 1903.

THE EUCHARISTIC OFFICE OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

THE PARENT RITE

THE Roman rite, now used so far and wide, is, as will be seen, full of Gallican additions. In early centuries its use was comparatively local—not even North and South Italy used it. In Central Italy alone was it used; in fact, it was a diocesan liturgy for Rome and its neighbourhood. It bears clear marks of its Roman origin, especially when separated from the accretions which have been added later.

“The Roman rite evolved out of the (presumed) universal, but quite fluid rite of the first three centuries, during the (liturgically) almost unknown time from the fourth to the sixth century.” The developed and later stage of it is found in the Leonine and Gelasian Sacramentaries.

Since the sixteenth century it has practically supplanted all other uses in the West. The Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites remain, the former in Milan, the latter in Toledo and Salamanca, and the Greek rite in Southern Italy, Sicily and Corsica. The Decree of

Pope Pius V in 1570 suppressed all rites which were less than two centuries old, and, from those days until now, the tendency has been to insist upon the use of the Roman rite (as used in Rome itself) to the exclusion of all variant and diverse uses. Its adoption far and wide may be attributed to a great extent to the growing influence of the patriarchal See of Rome and the gradual extension of its claim to jurisdiction. It bears traces of extreme antiquity, and has certain peculiar features which separate it from other rites, Eastern or Gallican.

The earliest books of the Latin rite known to us are the Sacramentaries, *i.e.* books containing the priest's prayers, for the Eucharist and for other occasions. The name "sacramentarium" means the "liber sacramentorum"—of which a number are still extant. The most representative and important of these are the Leonine, the Gelasian and the Gregorian.

The Leonine, which is the oldest, exists in a single seventh-century MS.¹ The attribution of it to St. Leo was a conjecture of Bianchini, who discovered it in the cathedral library of Verona in 1735. It is not an altar book, as we commonly understand that term—the Ordinary and Canon are wanting. It is practically a collection of alternate Masses dating from January; twenty-eight, for instance, are given for the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul.² The arrangement in parts is confused, and some of the Masses are out of place. It is, however, full of local reference to

¹ Edition by Feltoe. Cambridge, 1896.

² Feltoe, pp. 36-50.

the city and Church of Rome,¹ and throughout is obviously pure Roman. Duchesne, who discusses the book in his *Origines*,² contends that it is a private collection, copied out from the official books, somewhere about the year 538,³ by a somewhat careless writer. Muratori dated it in the reign of Felix III, 483-92.⁴ Probst dates the Sacramentary between 366 and 461. Buchwald suggests Gregory of Tours (*d.* 594) as the author, and thinks it was drawn up as a book of liturgical materials for Gaul.

The Gelasian Sacramentary is a Roman book with some Gallican infusions, the stages of which are represented in the different MSS. extant. The earliest is seventh century.⁵ It is a fuller document than the Leonine book, and is in three parts: 1. The Book of Sacraments. 2. The Propers and Commons of Saints. 3. The Canon of the Mass, Sunday Masses and Votive Masses.

Duchesne⁶ thinks it is a specimen of the seventh- or eighth-century service books, but that it is too Gallicanised to afford much "uniform evidence to the customs of the Roman Church." It was probably composed in the Frankish dominions—the allusions to Rome, so constant in the Leonine book, are entirely

¹ Mass of St. Peter and St. Paul. Note the words "our city." Feltoe, p. 47.

² Duchesne, pp. 134-44.

³ For date cf. Feltoe, p. 73. The Secret in the Easter Mass is thought to refer to the raising of the siege of Rome by the Goths.

⁴ *Lit. Rom. Vetus*, xxvi.

⁵ Edition by H. A. Wilson. Oxford 1894.

⁶ pp. 125-34.

wanting. Bishop¹ would date it much earlier than Duchesne, and puts it in the sixth century.

The Gregorian Sacramentary dates, in its essential parts, from 781-91. It was the book sent by Adrian I at the request of Charles the Great. It was copied many times, and the extant versions contain additions made by the copyists.² Adrian's book can be distinguished easily from the later additions. These additions (made first, according to Pamelius, by the Frankish Abbot Grimold, and afterwards by Alcuin) were carefully noted in the margin, and subsequently were merged altogether into the text of the book. Adrian himself said that the book he sent was written "by our holy predecessor, the divinely speaking Pope Gregory." Whether that was true of the complete work it is difficult to say. John the Deacon, when writing the life of the great Pope, says, "He collected the Sacramentary of Gelasius in one book, leaving out much." The nucleus of the book, we need not doubt, is Gregorian, and Probst (quoted by Fortescue) maintains that the Sacramentary, as we have it now, is "a Gelasian book, reformed according to the Gregorian."

It is in three parts: 1. The Ordinary of the Mass. 2. The Propers for the year. 3. The Ordination rites. These last in some MSS. come first. Duchesne thinks it was "a copy for the Pope's special use." It represents, he thinks, the Roman rite of the eighth

¹ In the *Dublin Review*, 1894. "The Earliest Roman Mass Book."

² *P. L.*, lxxviii. 25-602. Muratori, *Lit. Rom. Vetus*, i

century, and he would prefer to call it the "Sacramentary of Adrian." It was much copied for practical purposes, and much has, no doubt, been added at subsequent times according to the need of the church for which that particular copy was destined. These additions were partly Gelasian, partly Gallican.

During the period between the ninth and eleventh centuries this book, so altered, was taken back to Rome. There it displaced the pure and original Roman rite, and became the foundation of the present-day liturgical books of the Roman Communion.

It will be necessary, also, during this book to refer occasionally to the fifteen consuetudinaries, now known as *Ordines Romani*. They were first printed by Mabillon in his *Museum Italicum* (1689).¹ They are documents giving instruction concerning liturgical functions, and constitute a trustworthy source of information as to the usages of the Roman Church from the eighth to the sixteenth century, though it may be doubted whether they represent an absolutely pure Roman tradition.

When considering the Roman rite careful attention should be given to a paper entitled, "The Genius of the Roman Rite," by Edmund Bishop,² and to J. Wickham Legg's tractate upon it.³

In these papers an attempt is made to separate the native Roman elements of the rite from the later additions. It can clearly be seen that in the Roman

¹ *P. L.*, lxxxviii. 851 *et seq.*

² Printed in *Essays on Ceremonial*, and separately.

³ Being the first paper in *Three Chapters in Recent Liturgical Research*. S.P.C.K., 1903.

liturgical books as they now stand there are two distinct types of prayers: the one "pithy, precise, clean cut, definite," the other exhibiting an "extraordinary diffuseness and verbosity."¹ The former are easily distinguishable as the old Roman forms, the latter as the Frankish or Gallican. From a close examination of MSS. concerning which Mr. Bishop is able to say, "I have seen, I think, every manuscript of real importance for the history of the missal at the critical period,"² it is possible to trace the fusion of the two elements, "one of them . . . genuinely Roman, without foreign admixture; the other, though the substratum—indeed, the bulk of it—is Roman, has been considerably modified by Gallican hands."³ This process of fusion took place during the ninth century.

The important added elements are:—

1. The Approach to the Altar—late.
2. The Kyrie—imported from the East in the second half of the fifth century.
3. The Gloria in Excelsis—introduced in the sixth century.
4. The Credo—introduced in the early eleventh century.
5. The prayers during the Offertory—late Gallican.
6. The Agnus Dei, possibly. Its history is obscure.
7. The three prayers before communion.

¹ J. Wickham Legg, p. 4.

² *Essays on Ceremonial*, v. 10, p. 290.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 290.

8. The prayer "Placeat," Blessing and last Gospel—all late.

The four chants—Introit, Gradual, Offertory and Communion—did not originate in Rome, but were adopted there as soon as they arose. They are simply examples of the way in which the Psalter, which was the hymn-book of the early Church, was utilised so as to cover the pauses in the Liturgy.

The elements remaining¹ are the true elements of the pure Roman rite:—

1. The Collect.
2. The Epistle.
3. The Gospel—with the Blessing before it.
4. Orate Fratres.
5. The Secret.
6. The Preface.
7. The Canon.
8. The Lord's Prayer.
9. Pax.
10. Post Communion Collect.
11. Ite Missa est.

Those who have grasped the native characteristics of the Roman most clearly will at once recognise how truly this represents his religious attitude—solid, practical, opposed to any elaboration. There is something in the British nature which is closely akin to the "genius of the old Roman," which makes it possible to appreciate the true beauty underlying the sim-

¹ Cf. the description in Nos. 1-21 of *Ordo Romanus*, i. which probably describes a Stational Mass of the time of Gregory the Great. Grisar, *Analecta Romana*, i. 193:

plicity of the original rite, and to feel that in its old form it was more devotional and more powerful than it is in its modern dress. The elements which, in modern days, are usually held to be most typically Roman Catholic in the rite, are just those elements which are not Roman at all: the features which are felt to be the natural and obvious parts of a proper liturgy are those which are most truly Roman.

We have already, in speaking of the Gregorian Sacramentary, referred to that fusion between the Roman and non-Roman parts of the present Roman rite. It would appear that, when Charles the Great ascended his throne in 769, he found no enduring tradition at all in the Frankish dominions. It was with the desire to attain something like order and uniformity that he requested Pope Adrian to send him a copy of the Sacramentary which he had seen in use at Rome. A closer study of it made the stern reticence of the old Roman rite appear unduly cold and meagre to Charles. The "enriching" of it with prayers borrowed from the liturgical books in Gaul, was the beginning of a process by means of which the old rite was transformed into the one now in use, a process which did not end until the reform of Pius V.

"Rome itself seems to have taken the least possible interest in all that was going on; and ended in accepting from the hands of the stranger, in place of the old Gregorianum, the mass book thus compiled in France."¹

¹ E. Bishop, *op. cit.* p. 303.

The actual origin of the old Roman rite lies shrouded in the dim centuries when our knowledge of liturgical matters is small. It bears traces of extreme antiquity, and has features which differentiate it from all other rites, Eastern or Gallican.

The Roman rite has certain peculiarities which demand attention. It has no Epiklesis—at any rate, none in the usual form—and a Canon of which the order and arrangement are more than puzzling. In every other known liturgy the Great Intercession is contained in one long prayer. In the Alexandrine family of rites this comes in the Preface; in the Antiochene after the Consecration. In the Roman Canon, on the contrary, it is broken up and inserted in the Canon in two blocks.¹ Clearly this was not its place in the time of Justin Martyr; but the change had been made by the time the Gelasian Sacramentary was written. It is impossible to say more than that the change was made somewhere between these two.

(i.) There was always a close connection in liturgical matters between Rome and Africa, and the African Liturgy of the third century has many points of contact with the old Roman rite. Fortescue speaks of it as “the oldest Latin rite.”² Owing to the destructive tendencies of the Saracens no liturgical texts of the African Eucharist now exist. The general form of the rite can be reconstructed from Tertullian (whose writings are especially rich in their

¹ “Scattered throughout the Canon,” Fortescue, p. 111.

² p. 39.

testimony to the liturgical customs of his day) and St. Cyprian. The result of a scholarly estimate of the available evidence can be seen in Cabrol and Le Clercq's *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, under the article, "Afrique (Liturgie antenicéenne)." The Mass of the Catechumens resembles the description given in the Second Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. Tertullian calls it the "administration of the Word"—the Liturgy of the Faithful he calls "the offering of the Sacrifice."

The Liturgy was celebrated "just before the dawn,"¹ the mixed chalice was used, and the communicant received the form of bread in his hand.

A conjectural reconstruction of the African Eucharist gives us this result:—

MASS OF THE CATECHUMENS

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lessons from the Law, the Prophets,
the Epistles and the Gospels.
Antiphonal psalmody. 2. Sermon. 3. Prayers for catechumens and penitents. 4. The dismissal of catechumens and penitents. | } | <p>These are mentioned by Tertullian in the <i>De Anima</i>.</p> |
|--|---|--|

MASS OF THE FAITHFUL

- I. Prayers of the Faithful? The Litany. (Cabrol, *op. cit.* i. 606.)

¹ Tertullian calls it "antelucanus." *Apol.* 2 and St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiii. 15-16.

2. Pax. (Tert. *De Orat.* 18.)
3. Collection of Alms.
4. Offertory.
5. Sursum Corda—Preface—Sanctus. (Tert. *De Orat.* 3.)
6. Recital of the narrative of the Institution. (Tert. *De Anima*, 17; St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiii. 9.)
8. Anamnesis.
9. Intercession.
10. Lord's Prayer. (Tert. *De Orat.*)
11. Communion. (Tert. *De Corona*, 3.)
12. Dismissal.

The African Liturgy is valuable because it throws light on the probable condition of liturgical customs in Rome during the third century.

(ii.) During the Middle Ages, when no attempt was made to secure the rigid liturgical uniformity which has been so widely insisted upon in later days, many local variations of the Roman rite existed in various parts of Europe. These were simply modifications of the Roman Liturgy. The amount of alteration in them differed in different "uses," but the base was always Roman. Such were the local or diocesan uses of Paris, Lyons, Sarum, York, Rouen, and many others. Most of them are no longer used, though some survive, *e.g.* Lyons and the rite used by the Dominicans, which is that of Southern France (? Languedoc) in the thirteenth century.

One of these latter is of especial interest, as being the immediate ancestor of the English Liturgy. This

is the "use" of the diocese of Salisbury, more usually known as the "Sarum use."¹

The Sarum use was the most popular of the old English variations of the Roman Liturgy. It was used over most of the south of England, and later over the greater part of Scotland and Ireland. The Aberdeen Breviary, for instance, is almost identical with the Sarum. The use is the work of the noble St. Osmund, made Bishop of Salisbury by William I in 1078, and bears traces of Norman liturgical traditions. As the use of the Sarum books spread, laudable local customs were adapted to the Sarum plan and gave rise to local diversities now often regarded as different uses. The Aberdeen book, already quoted, is an example—it is really the Sarum use. The reforms propagated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, under the influence of the Franciscans, penetrated but slowly into England, and the Sarum use to the end retained the general characteristics common to the other variants of the eleventh-century Roman rite—such as that of the Dominicans and the Calced Carmelites.

The Sarum use was, as we have said, Roman, but it marks a transition stage in that process by which the Roman rite has developed into its present state. The Psalm "Judica me" (43) was said not at the foot of the Altar, but in the vestry. The Last Gospel was recited on the way back from the sanctuary when the Mass was over. These differences show us

¹ *Sarum Missal*. Cambridge, 1880. Frere, *Use of Sarum*. Cambridge, 1898.

something of the way in which devotions belonging to the sacristy gradually found their way into the sanctuary and became attached to the Liturgy itself. The Offertory Prayers and the Prayers before Communion differ entirely from those of the Pian Missal, but in all the truly Roman elements the Sarum use is identical with the old rite. Peculiar Sarum features which have become familiar to us through the Book of Common Prayer are the selection of days which we know as black-letter days (especially St. Crispin, October 25, and the Holy Name of Jesus, August 7), and the custom of naming the summer Sundays "after Trinity" instead of "after Pentecost." Among the Sunday offices which perpetuate the Sarum tradition may be noticed the Second Sunday of Lent, which has its own Gospel—whereas the modern Roman Missal repeats the Transfiguration from the previous Saturday—and the postponing of Advent I, II and III—which in the Prayer Book are II, III and IV.

CHAPTER I

TO THE END OF THE COMMANDMENTS

THE Eucharistic rite of the Book of Common Prayer is of the Roman family of liturgies through the Salisbury "use." Its general outline, both in what it contains and in what it lacks, shows a resemblance to the old Roman rite. It gives, moreover, the same general tone of "sobriety and sense" which are the salient qualities of the old liturgy. There is a resemblance between the two which can hardly fail to strike a careful reader who will compare our own rite with the native rite of Rome, as given in Dr. Wickham Legg's paper on "Mr. Edmund Bishop and the early Roman Liturgy."

Like all other liturgies it has two parts—corresponding to the *Missa Catechumenorum* and the *Missa Fidelium*. These two parts, it seems more than likely, have no necessary connection with one another.¹ The former Dom Cabrol attributes to the early Christian assembly for prayer (the "*Synaxis aliturgica*"), such as that to which reference is made in Pliny's letter—the inference in which is that an appreciable time elapsed after the meeting for prayer

¹ Cf. Cabrol in *Revue du Clergé Français*. Août, 1900, p. 61 and Sept., p. 6.

before the Christians met again to partake of the Sacrament. The "breaking of bread" was a separate service altogether at first, very often, but not always, following the other. The same seems to be witnessed to as an ancient custom by Socrates Scholasticus at Alexandria,¹ and the passage is quoted by Brightman² as an Egyptian example of "table prayers."

Naturally, in time the union of the two would become constant, until the idea of having the one without the other would fade out of mind.

The point at which the two have been united is quite clear in all rites, and they are now one service everywhere, in the sense that the later part, or *Missa Fidelium*, is never celebrated without the introductory *Missa Catechumenorum*. The custom of using this latter part alone, however, has never died out. In the Orthodox Church, both Greek and Russian, it remains under the name of *Typica*, and is used on those days when the rule of the Eastern Church does not permit the consecration of the Eucharist, *e.g.* the Wednesday and Friday before Lent, and the Lenten week-days, except Saturday; and on days when, for practical reasons, the Eucharist cannot be celebrated. The Church of England also retains it for Sundays and holy days when there is no Communion, as will be discussed more fully later. In the Latin Church it seems to have continued as late as the eighteenth century at least.³

Before passing on to consider the actual service

¹ *Hist. Eccl.* v. 22. Oxford, 1878.

² *J. Th. S.* Oct. 1899.

³ Wickham Legg, p. 33.

of the English Church, it would be well, in parallel columns, to compare it with the old form of the parent rite, to which, as we have said, it shows such close likeness.

OLD ROMAN RITE	ENGLISH RITE
Kyries (fifth century). Collect. Epistle. Gospel (with its blessing). Creed (eleventh century). (Psalm at Offertory, not Roman, but adopted as soon as it appeared as a part of the Liturgy.) Orate Fratres.	Preparation (Lord's Prayer and Collect for Purity). Kyries. Collect. Epistle. Gospel. Creed. Offertory Sentence.
Secret.	Possibly the bidding before the Church Militant Prayer, but this is not probable. Omitted except so far as contained in the Prayer for the Church.
(Inserted in two blocks in the Canon.) (Confession, etc. Mediæval and different in character.)	Prayer for the Church. Short Exhortation—Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words. Preface. Prayer of Humble Access.
Preface. (Three Prayers before Communion, after the Lord's Prayer—mediæval.) Canon.	Canon—broken into parts. Lord's Prayer and second part of the Canon put after Communion.
Lord's Prayer.	Pax transferred to the end and joined to the Blessing. ¹
Pax.	

Mass of the Catechumens.

Mass of the Faithful.

¹ Because this is the only equivalent of the Pax in the English rite; but it should be remembered that in the Prayer Book of

Post-Communion.

(Gloria in Excelsis, sixth century, just after Kyries at the beginning of the Mass.)

Ite Missa est.

Mass of the Faithful.

Thanksgiving (as an alternative to the second part of the Canon).

Gloria in Excelsis.

Pax and Blessing.

(The Rubric, "Let them depart with this blessing," shows that, like "ite missa est," it is the dismissal.)

Without attempting to determine the binding nature of the rubrics, it will be necessary to deal with them as being the embodiment of the traditional way of using the rite. Canon Lacey tells us that the name first denoted "abstracts of chapters and marginal references in books of the civic law, which were written in red ink expressly that they might be distinguished from the authentic text; it was afterwards applied to similar notes in ritual books." The earlier books of the kind were scantily, or not at all, supplied with such notes. In ancient times, according to Pliny, it denoted the red earth with which a workman marked upon wood the line he desired to cut. In time it passed to denote, in ecclesiastical usage, what was to be done, as apart from what was to be said. The rubrics were the latest part to be written down, but embodied a tradition which would be as old as the rite itself in their main essentials. They are found in the old Sacramentaries (as, for instance, in the Gregorian Book, which instructs priests not to

1549 the Pax appeared in its original position at the end of the Canon, as well as before the Blessing.

say the Gloria in Excelsis except on Easter Day),¹ but they are very few, and are confined to salient features of the rite. The gradual elaboration of the ceremonial of the Papal Court necessitated the drawing up of accurate directions. These were called "Ordines," and indicated how the rite should be used. The *Ordines Romani*, produced at different times between the eighth and the fifteenth centuries, are examples of this kind. They contain no prayer, and are simply meant to be supplementary to the altar and choir books. Thus "the ancient Sacramentaries, the MSS. missals, and even the early printed missals contain some, but very few, rubrics. There is every reason to believe that they were contained in special collections, known as Ordinaries, Directories and Rituals." The insertion of rubric into the text of the rite must have originated simply in convenience.

The first thing to be considered is the title—"The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion." These two are a selection out of many names for the Eucharist. ("Liturgy" and "Eucharist," both of them extensively used in the East, are Biblical words round which an intensive meaning has grown.)

The first Prayer Book of Edward VI had the title, "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." This latter phrase was dropped in 1552. It is a short and convenient term of wide vogue in the West, but there does not seem to be any grave reason to lament its disappearance.

¹ P. L. lxxviii. 25.

Strictly speaking, it only denotes the Latin Liturgy, being derived from "missio," of which word it is a later Latin form, denoting simply "dismissal." The Rule of St. Benedict gives several times the direction "fiat missæ" at the end of the Divine Offices. It has grown to denote the Eucharist, especially among Latin Catholics—a fact which a prominent Roman Catholic scholar (Dr. Fortescue)¹ notes with surprise, seeing that it is (he says) "the name of an unessential detail." As this detail ("ite missa est") is not present in our office, the use of the word to indicate the English rite seems a little meaningless. Save in association, the word is doctrinally colourless, but truly understood it is unobjectionable. It is valuable to remember the words of Archdeacon Hammond of Chichester, "The Protestants of the Church of England believe and reverence, as much as any, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, as the most substantial and essential act of our religion, and doubt not but the word Missa, Mass, hath fitly been used by the Western Church to signify it, and herein abhor or condemn nothing but the corruptions and mutilations which the Church of Rome, without care of conforming themselves to the universal Church, have admitted in the celebration."²

There has been a tendency in certain quarters to shun the term "Lord's Supper" as a name for the Eucharistic Sacrifice, under the impression that it was un-Catholic in meaning. It seems to be quite clear that such a conclusion is unjustifiable, and that the

¹ p. 400.

² *Dispatcher Dispatched*, 1659.

words have borne, and rightly regarded do bear, a sacrificial meaning. The expression comes, of course, from the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, but it is found as denoting the Eucharist in Tertullian.¹ In the Middle Ages it was quite a common term for the Eucharist.² Blunt says, "The use of this name for the Eucharist is almost entirely modern." He thinks it was adopted from the early Lutherans, who used it at the Confession of Augsburg (1530), and that its use in England only dates from the Act of Parliament of 1547, where, in speaking of the Eucharist, it says that it is "commonly called . . . in Scripture the Supper . . . of the Lord." The balance of evidence seems to be against Blunt's contention. The term, in fact, seems to have quite a reasonable history behind it.

The second term, the one most commonly used by English people, has, to some extent, the same disadvantage as the word "Mass," namely, that it describes the whole service by the name of one action in it—with this great difference, that, whereas the word "Mass" is derived from a liturgical detail, "Holy Communion" denotes one of the two principal features of all liturgies. Originally it meant "fellowship." In the New Testament it denotes sometimes almsgiving, sometimes simply association. St. Paul employs it in a quasi-technical sense to denote the result of the service, *i. e.* the Communion of the

¹ *Ad uxor.* ii. 4.

² Proctor and Frere, *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, ed. 1902, p. 432 *n.* Pullan, p. 53 *n.*

Body and Blood of Christ. From that, throughout Christendom, it has acquired a technical signification. Cardinal Bona was able to say, "The term is applied not only to the use of the Sacrament, but also to the Sacrifice of it."¹

The first rubric deals with a matter of discipline. It has almost entirely fallen into abeyance. In 1549 it read, "overnight or else in the morning," "afore the beginning of Matins or immediately after." The present rubric, if enforced, would require notice on the previous day. The rubric of 1549 implied clearly that Matins, Litany and Holy Communion were not intended to be joined into one "morning service," but that after Matins there would be a pause, and that the Litany (the "Anglican Introit") and Holy Communion would come later. This, according to Peter Heylin, was the custom at Winchester and Southwell in 1637.² The second and third rubrics are reiterations of ancient order, and are disciplinary rather than liturgical.

The fourth rubric gives instructions concerning the Holy Table. It is to be covered "at the time of Communion with a fair white linen cloth." The Canon of 1603 repeats this command to have a "fair linen cloth at the time of the ministration," and also requires a "carpet of silk or other decent stuff." The gaudy, naked altars of modern continental churches are, fortunately, forbidden in England. The "fair white linen cloth" ("venustus," or "decorus") does not, according to Blunt, indicate the big cloth

¹ Quoted by Blunt *ad loc.*

² *Anti-dotum*, iii. 61.

which in bygone days was spread all over the Altar, but one of the corporalia—the palla linea. It conveys, “not the idea of the meal, but of the linen clothes.” It may be quite conceivable that it is intended to convey both ideas. Dr. Wickham Legg maintains that it should reach the ground nearly on all sides, and quotes the customs of Angers and Rouen, or the communicant’s custom among the Cistercians of wrapping his hand “in palla qua Altare co-opertum est.”¹

As far as the standing of the Altar in “the body of the church” is concerned, it may be noticed that the practice continued until the reign of Charles I. It would, however, be difficult to instance examples of it since Laudian days. Cosin² speaks of “the table always standing in the midst at the upper end of the chancel.”

With the restoration of the Holy Table to the altar-wise position, the priest of necessity faces eastwards. So it was recognised in the Lambeth Judgment. This position has now become more or less general. It is hardly possible to say that it is absolutely essential, but the practice is so ancient that it seems needless to desire its alteration. The habit of the Christians of earlier centuries of worshipping eastward was sufficiently general to give rise to the idea that they were sun-worshippers.³ In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, also, it was laid down that

¹ *Essays on Ceremonial*. “On Some Ancient Liturgical Customs,” p. 51.

² *Durham Book*.

³ Tertullian, *Apoi.* 16.

churches should be orientated.¹ The practice may have arisen in the idea of the "earthly paradise." In the East the rule was generally kept. In the West, however, the great basilicas of Rome, *e.g.* St. Peter's, the Lateran and St. Lawrence, face the west. This may possibly be due to the fact that in the fourth century the celebrant faced the people, and therefore would still be looking east. The basilicas which have been rebuilt, *e.g.* St. Paul, St. Peter ad Vincula and the great basilica at Ravenna, have been reconstructed with an eastern apse. The general principle of orientation for churches has been admitted since the end of the seventh century.

The exact meaning of "north side" has been much argued. The contention that it means "north end"—sideways to the people—is generally discredited. Indeed, had the rubric meant this, nothing would have been simpler than to have said it. In opposition to this, it has been argued that the rubric must be disregarded altogether, and that, with the moving of the Altar, the old position naturally came back. "The position of the Holy Table had, in 1662, been lawfully changed; but yet the revisers left the old rubric, 'standing at the north side,' although the tables now stood altar-wise, and had no north side in the sense of the rubric; therefore the words 'at the north side' are now impossible of fulfilment in the sense originally intended."² The Lincoln Judgment describes the use of the north part

¹ *Apost. Const.* ii. 7.

² *Lincoln Judgment*, quoted in Dearmer, p. 355.

of the front of the Altar as a position which can be regarded only as an accommodation of the letter of the rubric to the present position of the Table.¹

This seems, however, in the light of subsequent study to be inexact. The wording of the rubric was deliberately left in 1662, in order to indicate the old position ordered in the Sarum Missal. This book directs the priest to begin by vesting at the north side, during which time he was instructed to recite prayers which included actually the Lord's Prayer and Collect for Purity which we now say at this point. This custom obtained also at Westminster Abbey and in the Cluniac houses,² and is characteristic now of the Carthusian order.³ It would seem, therefore, that "side" is a translation of "latus," or "cornu," and that the rubric intends the priest to stand at the north part of the front.⁴

With regard to the Prayer Book phrase "Table," "Holy Table," "Lord's Table," we may also assert that it was not a new term. Amularius⁵ tells us of the early resemblance seen between the Christian Altar and the Table of the Lord—meaning either the actual table at the Last Supper, or the Cross itself. The word "altar" occurs in the Canons of 1640, and in the coronation services. On the other hand,

¹ *Lincoln Judgment*, p. 41.

² "Stat prope sinistrum . . . dicit confessionem."

³ Cf. *Missale Cartusienis Ordinis*, Lyons, 1713. "Pergit . . . ad cornu Evangelii ibique stans," p. 182, rubric.

⁴ Cf. also *Missale ad Usam Eccl. Westmonast.*, 1370. Bradshaw Society, 1893. Fasc. II, Col. 8. "Juxta sinistrum cornu altaris."

⁵ *De Eccl. Offic.* I. xxiv.

“table” or “board” comes in pre-reformation literature.¹ In earlier liturgical books the word “mensa” occurs, as also in later post-reformation books. The word “altar” was used in the Prayer Book of 1549, but was omitted in 1552 “to avoid superstition” and “to emphasise Communion.” Yet it is always the “Lord’s Table,” not the “Communion Table”—a term not found in the Prayer Book. Strictly speaking, the “Table” is simply the slab upon which the vessels rest, which has always been called the “mensa,” as opposed to the “stipes,” *i.e.* the supports or legs. The words “Lord’s Table” were a “usual mediæval term . . . for the Altar,”² and the phrase is, therefore, quite in accord with regular and ancient usage.

The office opens with a “preparation,” consisting of the Lord’s Prayer and the Collect for Purity of Heart. These are drawn from the *Ordinarium Missæ* of the Sarum use. The priest was instructed (“*dum . . . induit se sacris vestibus*”) to recite the hymn, “*Veni Creator Spiritus*,” which was followed by the *℣*. *Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur, ℞. et renouabis faciem terrae*, and the Collect, “*Deus cui omne cor patet*,” which is now in our office; the Paternoster followed among the prayers recited at the foot of the Altar. The Collect is found in the *Sacramentary* of Alcuin, but not in any other English use, nor in the Roman rite itself. It is “probably a prayer of the early Church, but preserved almost solely by the Church of England.” The “Amen” to the Lord’s

¹ e.g. *The Lay Folks’ Mass Book*.

² Pullan, p. 53 *n.*

Prayer is to be said by the priest alone, as the printing indicates; that to the Collect is meant for the people.¹

“Then shall the Priest . . . rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments; and the people . . . shall, after every Commandment, ask God’s mercy.”

The Kyries are very ancient ejaculations, which may be traced in both the Old and New Testaments.² The New Testament examples seem to have a quasi-liturgical ring about them. They are “a remnant of the litany form of prayer.”³ They occur first in the diaconal litanies of the Eighth Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*,⁴ as being the proper answer to the various petitions. The Mass at Rome was once said in Greek, and it is tempting to look upon our Kyrie Eleison as a surviving fragment from that time.⁵ This, however, is not the case. It is an introduction from the East which dates from the second half of the fifth century. The Latin fathers before St. Chrysostom’s time know nothing of it in the Roman Liturgy.

The Kyrie seems to have come from Antioch—indeed, it was at first an Antiochene peculiarity. Etheria, in the *Peregrinatio*, testifies to having heard it at Jerusalem. To her it was a novelty. It spread thence throughout the East and later came

¹ There does not, however, appear to be any support for this distinction in the MS. annexed to the Act of 1662.

² Isaiah xxxiii. 2; St. Mark ix. 27.

³ Duchesne, p. 164.

⁴ In Book ii. they are interpolated.

⁵ Fortescue, pp. 230-1.

to Rome. In the Eastern rites it occurs more frequently and at different points in the service; in the Alexandrine and Antiochene also before the communion; in the Byzantine at various points throughout, notably at the Dismissal.¹ In the West it occurs now in the Mozarabic rite, but it is quite obviously a Roman interpolation. At Milan it also occurs after the Lessons.

In earlier times at Rome, as at Constantinople, the Eucharist opened with a litany. In this litany it is necessary to notice that the Kyrie, which in the East is the people's answer to the petitions, in the West is confined to the beginning and the end, because the Kyrie was "adventitious in the Roman Church." This seems the more clear because in the eighth century and in the Middle Ages the Kyrie was omitted on the Litany days.² On the great ritual feasts, moreover—Easter Eve and Whitsun Eve (which in the Roman Missal retain many archaic peculiarities)—the Litany is still sung before Mass and the Introit and Kyrie omitted, *i. e.* the Kyrie is simply the final chant of the Litany itself. This exactly corresponds to the position of the Litany in the East. It seems reasonable, therefore, to think that towards the end of the fifth century, the practice of saying the Litany at the beginning of the Mass came to Rome from the East, and that the Kyrie is a fragment of the practice. Our custom of using the Prayer Book Litany just before the Eucharist, as at Ordination, is a parallel to the Syrian Synapte—save

¹ Brightman, p. 379.

² *Ordo Rom.* xi., lxiii.

only that we repeat the Kyries again in the service of Holy Communion itself.

In the first Prayer Book the Kyries were given in the peculiarly Roman form, *i. e.* with "Christ, have mercy," as the alternating petition, as in the Divine Office; but, with the alteration made in the whole section of the rite at the later revision, a return was made to what, in reality, is the more ancient form.

In the Middle Ages it was a common custom to "farce" the Kyries, a practice which consisted of introducing additional phrases, and which originated in the elaborate "neums" to which they were sung. Our present Kyries are a revival of the custom.¹ Twenty-nine specimens may be seen in the York Missal.²

The recitation of the Ten Commandments in the Eucharistic service is a feature "quite peculiar to the Church of England." Blunt traces the immediate origin to the Order of Council published with the Homilies set forth in 1547, and surmises that the idea was suggested by the custom of reciting and explaining them, which had often been insisted upon by the bishops and synods of the Church of England. Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, had, in 1552, instructed the clergy of his diocese to read them to the communicants.³ Wickham Legg, on the other hand, considers that the recital of the Decalogue corresponds to the "reading of the Old Testament,"

¹ Pullan, p. 55.

² Edition by Henderson.

³ Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 291, n. 1.

or Prophetic Lesson, and that "our variant of the Kyrie" corresponds to the psalmus responsorius.¹ Dearmer thinks the same. "They" (*i.e.* the Commandments) "are liturgically a lesson."² This is the opinion also of Mr. E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley:³ "The next thing" (*i.e.* after the Collect for Purity) "in the Anglican ritual is a lesson from the Old Testament, called the Ten Commandments, farced or interlarded with the Kyries. This custom of farcing with extraneous matter more or less appropriate was common in the Middle Ages. For example, there was a prophetic lesson at the cock-crow Mass of Christmas Day." The rubric, however, says "rehearse," not "read," and lessons are not usually rehearsed.

¹ Wickham Legg, p. 51, and *Essays on Ceremonial*, p. 74.

² *Op. cit.* p. 357, n. 3.

³ *English Ceremonial*, p. 14.

CHAPTER II

FROM THE COLLECTS TO THE END OF THE CREED

OF the Collects for the King, the first is ancient in substance, the second was composed in 1549. They seem at first sight a little unnecessary, as the idea of them is included in the Prayer for the Church Militant. In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, however, the Church Militant prayer still formed part of the Canon, and came after the Sanctus. It is possible, therefore, that these Collects were inserted to ensure the intercession for the King being offered on days when "table prayers" alone could be said.

"Then shall be said the Collect of the Day." The order was disturbed here later. In 1549 the Collect of the Day came after the Commandments, and was followed by the Collect for the King, which was a "memorial" after the ordinary manner. The change may have been due to the desire to obviate the turning of the book. In any case it is immaterial. The "correct" idea that the Collect of the Day must be the first prayer of the Eucharist is not borne out by the facts, as a reference to the structure of the ancient Ember Masses in the Roman Missal clearly proves.

With the exception of Good Friday and the commemorations in Lent, Advent, during the feasts of

Christmas week, and when a feast falls upon a Sunday, the English office retains the ancient custom of having but one Collect at the Eucharist—this is, of course, excluding the fixed memorial of the King. The contrary practice seems to have originated at Rome early in the ninth century. Our own custom, therefore, is a return to a more ancient state of things. The Collect originated in the gathering together of the people for the "Station." This would be made at some other church than that in which the Mass was to be said. When the assembly was complete and ready to set out, a prayer was said "ad collectionem populi"—this was the "oratio ad collectam," or Collect. The word "collecta" (which is a late form of "collectio," as "missa" for "missio") corresponds with the Greek "Synaxis." When the people came to the church where Mass was to be said, this prayer, it would seem, was generally repeated. "It thus formed the opening prayer by the celebrant after the common prayer (Litany) and hymn (Gloria)."¹ The value of the Collects is inestimable; their pithy phraseology and their terse and austere dignity makes them one of the most valuable parts of our liturgical inheritance. Of their origin and earliest history nothing is known. They are the growth, mainly, of the fifth and sixth centuries, though the Sacramentaries of that time which give them are based upon other liturgical books now lost.

The Collects are a peculiarly Western feature. Their original principle has been attributed to Pope

¹ Fortescue, p. 245.

Damasus. Buchwald thinks that they originated in the Masses said at the tombs of the martyrs. The whole matter is too much wrapped in obscurity to make it safe to dogmatise.

The Collects from the Leonine Sacramentary are the oldest. These are represented in the Prayer Book by Easter III, and Trinity V, IX, X, XII, XIII, XIV. A great number are taken from the Gelasian book—Advent IV, Holy Innocents, Palm Sunday, Good Friday II and III, Easter Day, Easter IV and V, Sunday after Ascension, Trinity I, II, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI. From the Gregorian Sacramentary come St. Stephen, St. John, Circumcision, Epiphany, Epiphany I, II, III, IV, V, Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Lent II, III, IV, V, Good Friday I, Ascension, Whitsunday, Trinity Sunday, Trinity III, IV, XVII, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, St. Paul, Purification, Annunciation, St. Mark, St. Bartholomew, St. Michael. A few are adapted from other prayers—Advent I, Christmas, Ash Wednesday, Easter I. The rest are newer compositions, *e.g.* Easter Eve, Advent III and Epiphany VI are probably the work of Cosin.

The present way of saying the Collect is the remaining fragment of a more elaborate method. The solemn Collects as given for the Altar Service of Good Friday in the Roman Missal are a specimen of the older way. First came a bidding, *e.g.* "Oremus dilectissimi nobis, pro Ecclesia Sancta Dei ut," etc., after which the deacon said, "Flectamus genua." The people then knelt with him and a silent time for

prayer followed. When sufficient time had passed the sub-deacon said, "Levate." All rose up, and the celebrant finished the whole act of prayer by the short and pithy form which we know as the Collect. Of all this only the word "Oremus" remains, and that, of course, referred to the silent prayer rather than the Collect which followed. This form remains in the English office before the Collect for the King; the fuller bidding (which may possibly be based upon the actual specimen above quoted) is given later in the service before the Prayer for the Church Militant.

"And immediately after the Collect the Priest shall read the Epistle. . . . Then shall he read the Gospel."

This does not necessarily mean that the priest himself "must" read these both, unless he have no assistants.¹ The first Prayer Book read, "the priest or he that is appointed," and the rubrics of the Ordinal seem to indicate that the old practice of delegating the Lessons at Mass to subordinate ministers is intended to continue, as does also the Twenty-fourth Canon.

The Lessons are one of the most ancient portions of the Liturgy. The Liturgy of the Catechumens itself was a Christian form of the Synagogue Service and composed of the same elements to a large extent. The practice of reading portions of Holy Scripture at public religious meetings was familiar, therefore, to all converts from Judaism. St. Paul's injunction concerning his Epistles (as in 1 Thess. v. 27), ordering that his letter be read in the church of the Laodiceans,

¹ Cuthbert Atchley, *op. cit.* p. 16.

seems to assume also that the reading will take place at the Synaxis. From the nature of the case, these readings were not originally fixed in quantity: "as long as time allowed," was the length of the Lesson, *i. e.* until the bishop signalled the reader to stop. The marking off of determinate portions was a natural and gradual process in the course of time. At first the sections to be read, called "pericopes," were indicated by marginal references. Certain lists of these, or "indices," still remain, and may be studied in Dom Baudot's book on the Lectionary.

Our present number of Lessons is fixed at two, from which the English rite does not deviate. But this number is the result of a long process, and is by no means the uniform use of Christendom. Originally, it may be taken as certain that the number of the Lessons (as also their length) was variable and undeterminate. They have tended to become systematic, but in different ways in different rites. The *Apostolical Constitutions*, Book viii., gives five; several Eastern rites—Syriac and Coptic, for instance—have several Lessons.¹ In the Temporale of the Roman rite of to-day the older custom can still be seen, three or five Lessons being provided on many Greater Ferias, and sometimes as many as twelve on the great fasts such as Easter Eve. Three was, perhaps, the most general arrangement in early times—the Prophet, the Apostle, the Gospel—and, as we have seen, it is possible to see in our custom of reading the Decalogue a survival of this ancient method.

¹ Brightman, pp. 76, 152.

Of the two Lessons now existing, the first is called in the Prayer Book the "Epistle." It is not necessarily, nor ever was consistently, taken from the Epistles properly so called in the New Testament Canon. It was frequently from the Old Testament, the Acts of the Apostles or from the Revelation. The Gregorian Sacramentary called it the "Apostle";¹ the *Ordo Romanus* i. gives, "deinde legitur lectio." In Eastern rites it is called "the Apostle" to this day. The English rubric orders that, on days when the liturgical Epistle is not from one of the New Testament Epistles, it is to be announced as, "the portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle." The alteration was made owing to one of the objections brought forward by the Puritans, and in itself is unimportant. The termination, "Here endeth the Epistle" (which apparently is to be used always), is a new alternative for the ancient response "Deo gratias"—though this latter is not very old. It does not exist in the Dominican Missal, which at its base is the typical French rite of the thirteenth century.

The reading of a passage from the Gospels has formed a part of the Eucharistic service almost from the beginning. It formed in all Eastern liturgies part of the Liturgy of the Catechumens.² In the West, in some places, it was considered to be part of the "disciplina arcani," and was not read until the catechumens had been dismissed. *Ordo Romanus* vii. says that they were dismissed after the Gradual.

¹ *P. L.* lxxviii. 28.

² Brightman, p. 5.

The evidence for the reading of the Gospel at the Liturgy is too widespread and well known to need quoting ; the testimony is from Syria,¹ from Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Antioch, Constantinople, from Egypt,² from Africa.³

Everywhere, in fact, the mind of the Christian Church clearly felt that the truest instruction was to be found in the sacred narrative of the Saviour's life and death. It was, in fact, this reading which was the prominent factor in differentiating the four Gospels which we now hold as canonical from all others.

The indices which showed the passages to be read (after these passages had become fixed) were commonly written in one or other end of a Bible. The full indices, giving the references for all the Lessons to be read, were called a Comes or liber comitis— which itself broadened out into an actual transcription of the passages referred to, or a Lectionarium.

The principle which governed the selection of Gospel passages is not easy to ascertain. In the Antiochene rite, in early days, composite narratives were used (was this the origin of the Diatessaron of Tatian ?), but the more usual practice has been, as now, to read unaltered a passage from a single Gospel. Appropriate passages, no doubt, from early days would be chosen for feast days, *e.g.* Etheria, in the *Peregrinatio*, gives several lists of such. The Homilies of the fathers on the Gospels show that the Gospels

¹ *Ap. Const.* viii. 5.

² St. Cyril, *P. G.* lxxvi. 471.

³ Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 1.

were read straight through, save for these interruptions. This was the custom in the Byzantine rite, and the same idea rules the liturgical custom of the East to this day.¹

The present custom of the West seems to defy a final explanation. The practice of consecutive reading has been long since abandoned, leaving us to-day with a mere selection of representative passages, chosen mostly with reference to the events or teaching of the feast or season. It has been suggested that, given the selected Gospels of the great cycles and Feasts of the Temporale, the rest are a filling in of the complete picture of our Lord's works and ministry.

It was from the liturgy that the custom of reading Lessons or passages of Scripture came into the office. The Divine Office originally consisted entirely of psalmody. In the East, at least, this was the case, and it was so in the West, too, if the testimony of Theodemar, abbot of Monte Cassino (A.D. 787), is to be received.² Later the office was enriched by a lectionary. The Gospel, in particular, was read as a distinctive feature, and so remains in some offices to this day. The Roman Office reads a few verses before the Homily (a remnant of better things), but the whole Gospel is still read in the monastic rites by the abbot or prior immediately after the *Te Deum*,

¹ Baudot, *Les Évangélistes*, pp. 18-21, 24-32. (Paris, 1908.)

² "Necdum eo tempore in Ecclesia Romana, sicut nunc leguntur, Sacras Scripturas legi mos fuisse; sed post aliquod tempus hoc institutum esse, sive a beato Gregorio sive ut ab aliis affirmatur ab Honorio." *Epist. ad Carolum*. P. L. xcvi. 1584.

and its recitation is still retained in the Greek dawn Office of the Orthros, the equivalent to the Western Lauds.

The order of our Gospels differs during the Trinity season from the customary Roman order of to-day. The Roman rite counts the Sundays from Pentecost, and is ahead of our reading one Sunday. Our own custom is to reckon from Trinity. This is not, as has sometimes been asserted, a post-reformation custom. The Dominican rite reckons "post Octavum Trinitatis"; while in the Carthusian rite, which is based upon the use of the diocese of Lyons, our own order may be found exactly, and our method of reckoning from the Feast of Trinity also. During all the Lessons, except the Gospel, the people were sitting. *Ordo Rom.* i. speaks of the sub-deacon beginning when the clergy were "resedentes," and the people would follow their example.

The rubric "the people all standing up," enforces the ancient attitude of reverence at the reading of the Gospel. Sozomen, writing in the fifth century, knew "only one exception to this custom, which was that of the Bishop of Alexandria."

At this point in old days (and in the Roman Communion to-day) the sermon followed—intended, according to St. Germanus, to be an explanation of the Gospel passage.¹ Duchesne says,² the custom

¹ "Homiliae autem Sanctorum quae leguntur pro sola praedicatione ponuntur, ut quicquid Propheta, Apostolus vel Evangelium mandavit, hoc doctor vel pastor Ecclesiae apertiori sermone populo praedicet."

² p. 197.

was better observed in Gaul than in Rome. In our own rite this is now transferred until after the Creed.

The Creed itself is in the nature of an innovation. All liturgies now possess the Creed—and that the Nicene Creed—except the Church of America, which at times uses the Apostles' Creed at this point. The rubric which orders the people to stand, requires this attitude as testifying to the corporate faith of the congregation in the Gospel.

The Creed is not an ancient part of the Eucharistic rite, being early mediæval. Originally it was the baptismal formula, and as such the Apostles' Creed is still used. What we know now as the Nicene or Eucharistic Creed is the one profession of faith in common use throughout the Church. It is probably the Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, revised by St. Cyril, who added to it a section taken from the Creed of the Council of Nicæa. The added clause, "filioque," was added in a Canon of the Synod of Toledo in 447. It gradually passed into the Toledan text of the Creed, and thence into the Constantinopolitan form. From Spain it passed into Southern Gaul, and was then inserted into the "Quicumque vult." The "filioque" clause was accepted in England at the Synod of Hatfield in 680 by Archbishop Theodore. At Antioch it was introduced in A.D. 471.¹ Its first appearance in the liturgy in the West was in Spain.² The Second Canon of the Third Synod of Toledo (589) inserts it after the Consecration and before

¹ Pullan, p. 23.

² Fortescue, p. 287.

the Paternoster,¹ where it is still said in the Mozarabic rite. From Spain it spread to Gaul under Charles the Great. There, as in Spain, it was used as a practical protest against heresy. At the end of the eighth century it was used only for the instruction of candidates for baptism, not at all at Mass, unless we are prepared to accept Probst's unlikely explanation of Pope Leo III's letter²—that there was a Creed, but that it was said, not sung.

Berno of Richenau tells us³ that it was introduced into the Roman Mass at the instance of the Emperor Henry II. In 1014 he was at Rome for his coronation, and missed in the Mass the Creed to which he had been accustomed in his German home. It seems to be the opinion of liturgists (*e. g.* Blunt, Fortescue, Pullan) that it dates as a general custom in the Roman rite from the Pontificate of Benedict VIII. Since the eleventh century it has been used throughout the West in its present form, with the clause "filioque." We find it in the fifth and sixth *Roman Ordines*, and also in the second, but from comparison with Micrologus, it may be assumed that it is interpolated in this last.

It was not used, however, every time the Eucharist was celebrated. Our own custom dates from 1552, and is somewhat of a novelty. Previous to that time (and elsewhere to-day all over the Western Church) it was used only upon certain days, and that is still

¹ Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles*, iii. 225.

² Mansi, xiv. 19.

³ *De quibusdam rebus*, Migne, cxlii. 1061.

the custom except in England. The rubric of the first Prayer Book of 1549 allowed its omission on work days, that is to say, upon days which were not "holidays." This rubric was withdrawn when the second Prayer Book was issued.

The position of the Creed in various rites is not uniform. In the Roman, the Anglican, and the Gallican rites it comes after the Gospel; the Ambrosian rite, following Byzantine custom, has it after the Offertory; the Greek St. James, the Jacobite rites, the Coptic and Abyssinian rites have it before the Kiss of Peace at the beginning of the Liturgy of the Faithful; the Liturgy of St. Mark has it after the Kiss, with which, in Eastern rites, it seems always to have been connected. The Nestorian rites have it after the Diptychs, while the Mozarabic rite, as we have said, gives it, according to the Spanish custom, just before the Paternoster.¹

There cannot be much doubt that the rubric intends the Creed to be sung by the whole body of worshippers, though this is not so clear now as it was in the Prayer Book of 1549. This was the general mediæval custom.

¹ Fortescue, p. 290. And the references there given to Brightman.

CHAPTER III

THE OFFERTORY

FOLLOWING the Creed come certain rubrics.

The first concerns the general notices which may have to be given out to the people. Fasting days and holy days for the following week are to be announced, in accordance with the Sixty-fourth Canon.

Then notice is to be given of celebrations of the Communion (which Blunt says is a remnant of "bad times"); and should not need to be given "where Holy Communion is regularly celebrated."

It should be noticed that there is an omission here in the wording of the rubric. After the word "Communion" it should read: "And the banns of Matrimony published." The omission is illegal, and is due to the unauthorised action of the King's printers, the delegates of the University Press at Oxford, and the syndics of the University Press at Cambridge some sixty years since. The Marriage Act of Lord Hardwicke¹ ordered the publication of banns at the morning service—or, if there were no morning service, then after the Second Lesson at evening service. Morning service is assumed by the Act to consist

¹ *English Constitutional History*, by Medley: 5th Edition, p. 654.

of Matins, Litany and Holy Communion (or Ante-Communion), in which case the banns would be published in the proper place after the Creed. The introduction of new customs—early services of Holy Communion, and the dropping of the old way of saying Ante-Communion after Litany on Sunday, and the introduction of twelve o'clock Communion after what was wrongly considered to be the principal service of the day—led to a misconstruction of the wording of the Act. It permits the publication of banns during Divine Office after the Second Lesson in the evening, and that only in cases where there is no morning service. The publication of them at Matins after the Second Lesson is simply an analogy from Evensong, and one not really permitted by the Act. It had, however, become general, and the alteration was made unlawfully.

Then are to be read briefs, citations and excommunications. Briefs are letters patent issued by the sovereign. Citations are summonses to appear under certain circumstances; the only one now read being the "Si quis" of an intending ordination candidate. The discipline of excommunications has practically ceased in England.

The second rubric prescribes that the "sermon" is to follow at this point. This rubric is of some importance, because this is the only place where the Prayer Book *orders* a sermon at all. The Forty-fifth Canon orders one sermon each Sunday. The rubric ensures that it is to be preached at the Eucharist. It assumes the presence of the general congregation at

this, the principal service of the day. The Exhortation to the Godfathers and Godmothers at the end of the rite for the Public Baptism of Infants seems, on the same line of reasoning, to require that children will be brought to the Sunday Eucharist, and as no rubric orders the withdrawal of non-communicants, we may conclude that they are intended to remain until the end. It is, no doubt, possible to put too much strain upon this contention, but it is reasonable.

The Fifty-fifth Canon gives the Bidding Prayer, which is an example of the "bidding" which is to precede the sermon—it is quite lawless to use a Collect or Invocation in its place. Bishop Wren tells us that Cartwright, the Puritan, was the first to abandon it. The ascription at the end of a sermon is merely customary, but a custom stretching back as far as St. John Chrysostom.¹

The Bidding Prayer may be regarded as a parallel to the ancient "Prayers of the Faithful," which were in litany form and came at this point. The Benedictine scholars Dom Ferdinand Cabrol and Dom Cagin think that at this point originally the Diptychs were read, both in the Roman and in the Gallican rites. These have disappeared, unless they may be included under "what shall be proclaimed or published in the Church during the time of Divine Service," which is possible, as it usually includes those for whom prayers are desired, both living and dead.

The sermon itself is sometimes regarded as being simply an element of the reformed service. This is

¹ *Ritual Conformity*, p. 34.

obviously erroneous. An instruction on the Scripture Lessons read in the Eucharist is usual in most rites, and may possibly be a tradition born of St. Paul's practice as described in Acts xx. Justin refers to it as being the normal practice of his own days, and much of the Patristic literature which has come down to us consists of homilies composed upon passages of the Gospels read in the Eucharist. The instruction of the Church that the canonical sermon of Sunday shall be preached at the Eucharist (which does not either involve that a sermon must be preached at every celebration, or that sermons may not be preached at other suitable times) determines that the general congregation should in these days, as in times gone by, attend the Lord's service on the Lord's day, and that they should be regularly "instructed on the liturgical Gospels and Epistles as being the basis of Christian dogma."

The Creed being a later interpolation, the *Missa Catechumenorum* ended with the Gospel and the sermon or instruction on the Gospel. In the English rite it is quite clear that the line of division is after the sermon. (The Ante-Communion proceeds to the end of the Church Militant Prayer, but grew up from a different idea.) At the same time it is necessary to remember that, although this is the true meeting-point of the two halves of the liturgy, "in some cases, the later more important part has drawn to itself some of the elements of the earlier part."¹ The Gospel and sermon are historically part of the Liturgy of the

¹ Wickham Legg, p. 15.

Catechumens. Yet instances exist of their dismissal before the Gospel.¹ The Sermon, moreover, is postponed sometimes until after the singing of the Creed. This is the case with our own rite and is not peculiar to it. It seems clear from Durandus² that the sermon was preached after the Creed. Lynewode says³ that in England it came after the Offertory.⁴ It has even been known to have occurred as late as after the Sanctus at Sienna.⁵ All these, however, are exceptions to what must originally have been the invariable rule.

There is now no dismissal of the catechumens, which was such a marked feature of the early discipline. The old form remains in Constantinople; and at the end of the sixth century the formula was still used in the Church of Paris: "Ne quis catechumenus, catechumeni recedant";⁶ but even by that time it seems to have become a barren phrase. By the eighth century it had practically disappeared everywhere as an actual fact. The Church's discipline had been altered, and there were not, as a rule, any adult catechumens at all.

The third rubric brings us to the Offertory, the beginning of the *Missa Fidelium*: "Then shall the Priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory, saying," etc. The two first rubrics at the end of the service—that, namely, which immediately follows

¹ Amalarius, *De Eccl. Off.* III. c. xxvi., and *Ordo Rom.* vii.

² *Rat. Div. Off.* IV. c. xxvi. p. 1.

³ Pullan, p. 57.

⁴ *Provinciale v.*, ed. Oxford, 1679, p. 291.

⁵ Wickham Legg, p. 16.

⁶ Duchesne, p. 202.

the Blessing and that which follows the Collects which come after it—seem to make it clear that the Offertory in the English rite extends from this point to the end of the Prayer for the Church Militant. The first indicates six “Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion”; the second orders these Collects to be recited on those occasions at “the end of the general prayer (for the whole state of Christ’s Church Militant here in earth).”

The Sentences now given to be said, “one or more” according to the celebrant’s discretion, represent the old Offertory Chant. The Prayer Book clearly intends the Sentences to be used as the old chant was used, *i. e.* to cover the pause, since it proceeds in the next rubric after the Sentences with the words: “Whilst these Sentences are in reading,” etc.

Originally the “Sentence” (Offertorium) was a whole psalm with its antiphon. It is not mentioned in *Apost. Const.* viii., but as the celebrant there is praying privately, it is thought perhaps that the psalm may have been sung. St. Augustine refers to it.¹ It must be remembered that the psalter was the hymn-book of the early Church. “Hymni . . . de Psalmorum libro,” are St. Augustine’s words in the passage referred to above.

A gradual process of shortening had by the time of the Gregorian Antiphonary reduced the psalm to a few verses. This is the testimony also of *Ordo Rom.* ii.:² “Canitur offertorium cum versibus.” The subsequent omission of the verses left only the Anti-

¹ *P. L.* xxxii. 63.

² *P. L.* lxxviii. 641, 972.

phon, which survives to-day in the Sentence. It never refers to the Oblations, and almost always in our own rite refers to the alms which the rubric, after the Sentences, orders the deacons and others to collect. The celebrant is permitted at his discretion to "say one or more of these Sentences." This is not a novelty. Its effect, when carried out, is to restore partially the use of the old Offertory Chant, and even so it has parallels in the Antiphona post Evangelium with its offerenda of the Ambrosian Liturgy, and in the Sacrificium or Offertorium with its lauds of the Mozarabic rite, both of which have more than one verse.

Of necessity the Offertory is a very primitive part of the Eucharistic rite, and in origin is purely practical. It was simply the provisions of the elements of bread and wine required for use in the service itself, though Justin tells us that, in his day, they were not brought up until immediately before they were wanted for consecration. He says that "the bread and the cup of wine and water are brought to the president of the brethren"¹ after the Kiss of Peace, and before the "president" sends up "praise and glory to the Father." The simple ceremony was gradually elaborated, and by mediæval days had gathered round it prayers of its own, which were only incorporated into the rite in later times. We are already able to trace the beginning of that line of cleavage between official and semi-official prayers at the Altar, of which our own office, following primitive models, gives only the former.

¹ 1 *Apol.* lxx. 3.

The Offertory itself marks a division in liturgical procedure. In all Eastern rites and in the Gallican Mass the necessary elements were prepared before the beginning of the Liturgy at the prothesis. Sometimes the preparation of them was elaborate, and the custom of preparing the Offertory at that point continues not only in the East, but in the West also, among the Dominicans. It was the practice under the Sarum use. The Carthusians put the wine into the chalice and the Host on the paten before the Mass begins—the water at the Offertory. Being prepared, they were left upon the prothesis or credence, and were brought up to the Altar at the beginning of the Liturgy of the Faithful. The Roman rite alone kept to the principle of preparing them at the point when it was customary to put them upon the Holy Table. The English rite gives us no prayers at the Offertory, which is a true note of its fidelity to antiquity. The Coronation Service, however, following mediæval usage, gives a prayer when the sovereign offers bread and wine. The true Offertory Prayer in Western liturgies is the "Secret"—the "*Oratio super oblata.*" It corresponds presumably to *Apost. Const.* viii., xii. 3, 4, where we are told that "the deacons bring the gifts to the bishop at the Altar . . . the bishop having prayed privately." This obviously is the Offertory Prayer, but the later development obviated the necessity for another offertory prayer. The Roman custom is the older.

The other prayers at the Offertory now given in all the Western rites except the English are, as we

have seen, later and mediæval. They are not native Roman at all—witness the Gregorian Sacramentary —“*deinde offertorium et dicitur oratio super oblata,*”¹ the “*oratio*” being said secretly because the Offertory Psalm was still being chanted. These prayers were formerly looked upon as the private prayers of the celebrant, like the prayers before Communion and the prayers at the foot of the Altar. According to *Micrologus* (eleventh century), no prayer was appointed in the Roman rite after the Offertory until the Secret. The mediæval prayers are described as a “Gallican order,” but they are “not from any law, but as an ecclesiastical custom.”² The prayers referred to are the “*Veni Sanctificator*” and the “*Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas.*”³ This did not begin to come into the Roman Liturgy until the fourteenth century, and did not become finally stereotyped until the Missal of Pius V in 1570. The omission of them here cannot, therefore, be regarded as in any sense a liturgical defect, nor is it necessary for any priest to interpolate them. The Prayer Book aims at a return to primitive ideas, liturgically as well as doctrinally, and a careful study of its Eucharistic rite shows how faithfully, though perhaps not always quite consciously, this object has been attained.

Of the two really primitive elements of the Offertory, the Chant and the Secret, the former alone remains, except in so far as the Secret can be

¹ *P. L.* lxxviii. 25.

² *Ibid.* cli. 979-84.

³ Paris edition index of *Micrologus* in British Museum by Hittorp, col. 9.

recognised in the opening sentence of the Prayer for the Church. This does not seem really to correspond to it, as will be seen later.

The Sentence is the remaining specimen of a group of four psalm chants used in the Eucharist in the early Church, the Introit, the Gradual, the Offertory, and the Communion psalm. They are not Roman in origin, but were adopted at Rome very early.

The Introit was a complete psalm, or good portion of a psalm, sung during the entrance of the celebrant and his approach to the Altar. The first *Ordo Romanus* speaks of the "antiphona ad introitum." The Gallican Liturgy called it the "antiphona ad prælegendum"; in the Ambrosian it is the "Ingressa"; in the Mozarabic, Calced Carmelite, Carthusian, Dominican and Sarum Missals it is the "Officium." It was sung most probably as a psalmus responsorius¹—the response or antiphon being repeated by all between each verse, as with the Invitatorium in the Breviary Matins (though the Carthusian Breviary also gives the Invitatory to be said exactly according to the Prayer Book manner, for week-days from Trinity to All Saints). The custom, which was as old as *Ord. Rom. i.*,² of cutting the psalm off when the celebrant was ready to begin the Mass, led

¹ Mr. Wyatt sends me this valuable comment: "I think you are mistaken in classing the Introit as a psalmus responsorius. Both it and the Communion came under the head of antiphonal psalmody, while the chants between the Epistle and Gospel were responsorial. The difference is, that the latter consists of a solo (or perhaps a small body of voices), responded to by the people, while the antiphonal implies an alternation between two bodies of voices."

² Ed. Atchley, p. 128.

gradually to its being cut down to one verse, with Gloria Patri and the antiphon before and after, with slight variations in some uses, *e.g.* the Calced Carmelite and Sarum Missals. The first Prayer Book of 1549 included the Introits—and these, in their primitive form, as a complete psalm. They were omitted in 1552. Their loss is much to be regretted, but there seems to be no reason why they should not still be sung. Certainly they are much to be preferred to the collections of introits taken from the later missals.

The Gradual or Grail was quite the oldest and the most important of the four chants. The other three were sung to cover the natural pauses of the liturgy; the Gradual, on the contrary, was sung for the especial reason of singing psalms between the Scripture Lessons. We can see in the Lessons and gradual psalms of the Catechumens' Liturgy the beginning of the structure of the Divine Office. It is the synagogue tradition perpetuated in Christian worship. Originally they were whole psalms. The *Apostolical Constitutions* mentioned them. St. Augustine refers to them also: "We have heard first the Lesson . . . then we sang a psalm."¹ They were sung for their own sake, as we sing them in the Divine Office. It "was the ancient chanting of the psalms which, in the primitive Church, alternated with the lections from Holy Scripture."² The singing of the whole psalm remained at least until the time of Leo I.³ The

¹ *Sermo*, clxxvi. 1.

² *Sermo II*, In anniv assump.

³ Duchesne, p. 169.

present Gradual consists of the psalmus responsorius (shortened), which was sung between the Lessons, and the Alleluia with its verses, which was sung between the Epistle and Gospel, except from Septuagesima to Easter, when it was replaced by the psalmus tractus (*i. e.* sung through by the cantor without any choir responses).

The Communion (*Antiphona ad Communionem*) was the psalm sung while the communicants received the Holy Sacrament. The Ambrosian rite calls it the *Transitorium*. Originally also a whole psalm with an antiphon, it was sung until the distribution of the Sacrament was finished. A sign was then given by the celebrant, and the rest of the psalm was left out, the *Gloria* sung immediately and the antiphon was repeated.¹ It has now been cut down to a single verse and put after the Communion. Durandus speaks of it as being part of the Thanksgiving.² The first Prayer Book preserved it (in this jejune form, curiously enough), but ordered it to be sung in the ancient manner while the people communicated.

Of these chants the Offertory or Sentence alone remains in the English rite, and that in its most jejune form, though restored to some extent to its ancient use.

It may be doubted whether anything at all remains which corresponds to the Secret. The words in the opening paragraph of the Prayer for the Church hardly serve the purpose, and, moreover—since the whole paragraph corresponds to the “*Te Igitur*,” or opening prayer of the Latin Canon—must refer to the

¹ *Ordo Rom.* i., ed. Atchley, 144.

² *Rationale*, iv. 56.

phrase "haec dona, haec munera" if, that is to say they refer to the actual oblation of bread and wine at all. Pullan¹ contends that they do not, and that the word "oblations" was introduced in 1661, "apparently in the mediæval sense of money offerings for the maintenance of the clergy."

The rubric immediately preceding the Prayer for the Church is the true Offertory rubric. "The Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." Three questions here arise for solution: the first, the time for the preparation of the elements; the second, the question of leavened or unleavened bread; the third, the question of the mixed chalice.

In regard to the first, strictly speaking, our liturgy does not give any directions for the actual preparation of the elements, but only for their being placed upon the Holy Table at a certain point. It should be remembered that our service comes to us through the Sarum rite, which directed that they should be prepared before the service began.² The rubric in the Book of 1549 (concerning the mixing of the chalice), which seemed to imply that the preparation would take place at the Offertory, was withdrawn in the later revisions. There is no doubt that weighty and widespread liturgical custom is on the side of preparing the elements before the service begins.³ It

¹ p. 135.

² At High Mass between the Epistle and the Gospel.

³ Cf. "Comparative Study of the Time in the Christian Liturgy at which the Elements are Prepared." Wickham Legg, *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* vol. iii. 49-85.

was the general English custom in old days,¹ and is preserved in the West in the old rite of the Dominican Order, in a few other "regular" uses, and in the Mozarabic rite. It is, moreover, as we have seen, the invariable custom of the Orthodox Eastern Church. It may safely be assumed, therefore, that this rubric implies simply "the great entrance," not the preparation of the elements. The present English rite has extraordinary resemblances to the primitive Roman rite, but the old English custom must be the correct interpretation if the family trait of our liturgy is to be preserved, and this was the attitude taken by the ecclesiastical authorities in the Lincoln Judgment.

With regard to the second question—the use of Azyme bread—the fifth rubric, at the end of the service, tells us that "It shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten."

In the Order of 1548 the bread was ordered to be the same "as heretofore hath been accustomed," *i. e.* unleavened wafer bread. In 1549 the rubric read, "unleavened and round . . . through all this realm, after one sort and fashion."

This rubric can only mean one thing, *viz.* that either usage is permissible in the English Church. A reference to the service for the Public Baptism of Infants, where we read, "But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it," makes it clear that the phrase, "it shall suffice," in Prayer Book language means that a certain method

¹ *Westm. Missal*, col. 485.

of procedure is valid if for any true reason a certain other and better custom cannot be followed. There can be no question that either use is valid, and the Western Church has always maintained that to be so. There is no real dogmatic importance attached to the matter at all. It is a question of ancient custom, of practical convenience, and of ecclesiastical discipline. If the Church of England has any preference, this rubric clearly shows that it is for the use of unleavened bread. If wheaten bread be used, it must be the "best and purest . . . that conveniently may be gotten," and it is not easy in these days to get really pure wheaten bread, unless it be specially made for the purpose. Our Lord's own practice in the matter cannot be ascertained indubitably, seeing that St. John and the Synoptists admit of divers interpretations. The general feeling in the West, perhaps, has been that the Last Supper was the Passover meal, in which case our Lord must have used unleavened bread. Similarly, the Apostolic practice cannot be really ascertained.

In the Western Church it has always been maintained that leavened or unleavened bread is equally valid as the element for consecration. The use of the latter kind has been universal in the West since the ninth century, save in England since 1552, where either kind is permitted. The Easterns, apparently from a desire also to emphasise the difference between the Jewish and Christian Passover, use leavened bread. The practice of the Uniates¹ is valuable testi-

¹ They use leavened bread, though part of the Latin Church.

mony to the fact that no real principle is involved either way. Yet this much may be added: Azyme bread was used by the Jews in sacrifice, and was especially commanded for their use at the time of the Passover. There are many references to it in Holy Scripture, both in the Old Testament, where it is called the "bread of affliction," and in the New Testament, where St. Paul speaks of the "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," so that its use is fitting and proper. At the same time, it would be a hazardous statement to say that its use is necessarily primitive. The first notice of it, in fact, which we possess comes from the Venerable Bede, that is to say, from the eighth century.¹

The third question is that of the mixed chalice. This originated, there is every reason to think, in simple necessity. It is the Eastern custom to mix water with wine, and wine in the East is commonly so thick in quality as to necessitate the addition of water in order to make it palatable to drink. It cannot, therefore, be doubted, on any reasonable grounds, that our Lord Himself used a mixed cup at the institution of the rite. Justin refers to it,² so does Irenæus,³ and the picture of the African Liturgy sketched for us by St. Cyprian of Carthage in the third century shows us the same.

St. Cyprian, in his Sixty-third Epistle, is especially emphatic about the matter. In fact, he seems to deny

¹ But see Woolley, *The Bread of the Eucharist*. Alcuin Club Tract, p. 15. Dr. Woolley contends that "panem nitidum" is not wafer bread, but merely "white bread."

² 1 *Apol.* lxvii. 5.

³ *Adv. Haer.* v. 1.

the validity of the unmixed cup altogether: "In sanctifying the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be used, just as wine cannot." He bases the practice on our Lord's example, and draws out fully the doctrinal signification: "We see His people figuratively represented in the water there and His blood in the wine." The doctrinal defect of the use of an unmixed chalice is made clear also: "If wine alone be offered, there indeed is the blood of Christ, but then we are not with it; or if water alone, the people will be without Christ; but by the mixture of both together the Sacrament is completed."

The practice is, as we have seen, primitive, and could be called "œcumenical"—as far as any ceremony can be. There is nothing in the Prayer Book rubrics to forbid it. The rubric proceeds in the matter of the wine on the same principle as in the matter of the bread, viz. what "shall suffice." The Lincoln Judgment laid down that "no rule has been made to change or abolish the all but universal use of a mixed cup from the beginning" (the Armenians, in fact, seem to be the only people using an unmixed chalice as a rule). It is entirely consonant with the Church of England's appeal to the "laudable practice of the whole Church of Christ."

The Prayer for the Church is prefaced by an invitation which is addressed directly to the whole congregation, and formed from the title to an ancient prayer for the living and the dead in the *Directorium Anglicanum* of 1531. It is simply the longer form of "Oremus dilectissimi," which we have already

considered under the invitation, "Let us pray," which precedes the Collects for the King. It stands in the same place as the "Orate fratres" of the Roman rite, but this latter is a prayer and response directly connected with the offering of the Sacrifice itself, rather than the Intercessions.

"Now begins the great Eucharistic prayer, or rather series of prayers, which we sometimes call the Canon, or better, Anaphora. . . . There are interruptions in the shape of the Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words, and of the Prayer of Humble Access. The Prayer for the Church Militant begins the Anaphora."¹

This prayer contains the Eucharistic Intercession brought together and placed immediately after the Offertory. This is a gain, and denotes once more a return to primitive custom. The place of the Intercession in the Eucharist is not always the same in different rites, but the bulk of evidence leads us to conclude that the original and most general position for it was after the Offertory. The *Apostolical Constitutions* and the Antiochene family of rites have the Litany of the Faithful at the Offertory with an Intercession after the Communion; the Alexandrine Liturgy of St. Mark has them here and in the Preface; in the Gallican rite the Diptychs are read after the Offertory just before the Kiss of Peace;² in the Roman rite they are inserted in the Canon in two blocks.

¹ Cuthbert Atchley, *English Ceremonial*, p. 22.

² "Nomina defunctorum ideo hora illa qua pallium tollitur" (Germanus). Cf. Duchesne, p. 208.

With regard to the arrangement of the Intercessions in the Roman Canon, it may be noticed that French Benedictine scholars maintain that the *Mementos of the Living and of the Dead*, the *Nobis quoque* and the *Communicantes*, do not belong to the Canon at all. Duchesne, too,¹ notes that the first part of the Canon "corresponds, on the whole, with the recitation of the Diptychs prescribed in the Gallican and Eastern Liturgies, but which were placed in these liturgies before the beginning of the Preface." He admits that this latter arrangement is the more primitive and natural, but at the same time emphasises the fact that the Roman Canon, as we know it, had assumed its present form by the beginning of the fifth century. It seems certain, however (from the letter of Innocent to Decentius, 416), that previous to that time the Diptychs had been read in Rome, as elsewhere, at this time.

In the Prayer Book of 1549, the existing arrangement was maintained, save only that the Intercession for the Dead was brought forward and put before the Consecration; otherwise the principle of having the Intercession and the Consecration united in one prayer was maintained. This arrangement was broken up at the revision of 1552, and the Intercessions were brought forward and put at the Offertory. The collection and offering of money at the Eucharist is the later alternative of the collection and offering of the actual elements for the Sacrifice, much of which must have been after distributed to

¹ p. 180.

the poor for general purposes. The idea is the same, but the quantity actually needed at this point in any case is small, so the offering is made in money, out of part of which the elements are provided. We can trace the formation of the prayer in broad correspondence with the wording of the Latin Canon. The first part, down to "administer Thy holy Sacrament," is equivalent to the *Te igitur*. The words, "accept our oblations," would seem, at first sight, to be the Secret. If, however, they refer to the elements at all, they must correspond to the "*haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata.*" It does not, however, seem to be quite clear that the word "oblations" does indicate the elements.¹ The passage beginning, "and to all Thy people," and ending with the words, "all the days of their life," is the *Memento of the Living*. The rest of the prayer corresponds to the *Communicantes*, and probably also to the *Memento of the Dead*. The words, "departed this life in Thy faith and fear," can refer equally to the saints and the faithful dead, the difference between the two is one simply of degree. The phrase, "we and all thy whole Church," in the Prayer of Oblation is a prayer for the Church Expectant, no doubt, as well as for the Church Militant; but the deliberate removal of the Intercessions back to their ancient position at the Offertory requires that we shall interpret the last passage of the Prayer for the Church as including the faithful dead, otherwise the Intercession would be incomplete.

¹ Cf. Pullan, p. 135.

CHAPTER IV

THE PREPARATION FOR COMMUNION

AFTER the Prayer for the Church are printed the three Exhortations. Of these the third is obviously intended to be used at every Eucharist, though in practice it is rarely ever read. The second is for occasional use. The use of the first is meant to depend upon the number of times the Holy Communion is celebrated. The first and the second Exhortations are to be used after the sermon or homily. The third is meant to be used apparently where it stands, as it was originally used in the "Order of Communion."

In actual fact they are used but little. The need for them has, to some extent, passed away, and Blunt even goes so far as to say that they are "out of character with the habits of a church in which there is a regular celebration of Holy Communion on all Sundays and holy days."

The author of the first Exhortation is unknown. It formed part of the "Order of Communion" used in 1548, which was altered in 1552, and assumed its present form in 1661.

The second was inserted in 1552 (as we learn from Bishop Cosin) at the instance of Bucer. This

one contained, in its original form, a strongly worded passage against non-communicating attendance—remaining “to gaze” without receiving. The third came in the “Order of Communion,” immediately before the Short Exhortation, as it does now, and contained the phrase, “If any man be an open blasphemer,” now transferred to the first Exhortation. This third one was based upon a writing of Hermann of Cologne, but appears to have come originally from the pen of Wolfgang Volprecht, the prior of the Augustinian Canons of Wittenberg, who accepted the reformed doctrines. The first and third Exhortations were given in the first book of 1549.

We pass on to a group of formulæ beginning with the Short Exhortation and ending with the Comfortable Words. These forms (together with the Prayer of Humble Access) are taken almost verbally from the “Order of Communion.” This document was drawn up by a body of bishops and divines, and was published on March 8, 1548, to come into use on Easter Day of that year (April 1). The Sunday before, an exhortation was to be read which is mainly the first Exhortation at present in the Prayer Book. On the day itself the Latin Mass was to be said as usual, but the new “order” was to be inserted after the priest’s communion. It consisted of a long Exhortation (practically the third of those now in the Prayer Book), the Short Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, and the Administration of Communion with almost the same form of words which now constitute the

first half of the present form. The communicants were then dismissed from the Altar with the prayer which now constitutes the "Peace" at the end of our present service, without the Blessing, which would be given in the normal way at the celebration of the Mass. This "order" was based upon the *Simple Decision concerning the Reformation of the Churches of the Electorate of Coln*, published in 1543. It was the work of Bucer, Melanchthon and Sarcerius, drawn up at the request of Hermann, the Prince Archbishop of Cologne. This, in its turn, owed much to the forms in use among the Lutherans of Brandenburg, Nurnberg and Cassel. It was translated into English in 1547, under the title of *A Simple and Religious Consultation of us, Hermann, by the Grace of God Archbishop of Cologne*.

All this block of prayers, including the Prayer of Humble Access, came in 1549 after the Consecration. They were moved, in 1552, to their present position.

Some form of confession of sins is common to most rites. The two great parent liturgies of the East began with the celebrant's confession.¹ In the West the Mass began with the Introit psalm. The Confession was of the nature of a private preparation—it belonged to the sacristy rather than the sanctuary. The idea of making confession part of the public service is, in the West, mediæval rather than primitive.

Blunt draws out the analogy between the Comfortable Words and the psalms sung before the

¹ Brightman, pp. 31, 116.

Consecration in the Liturgies of St. Mark and St. James, but this seems fanciful. The Comfortable Words are, in fact, simply the expansion of the Absolution, to which they belong. They are peculiar to our English rite. The text of them is not taken from any particular version.

CHAPTER V

FROM THE SURSUM CORDA TO THE END OF THE CONSECRATION

WITH the Sursum Corda we enter upon the most solemn part of the rite: the Anaphora or Consecration prayer. The Versicles and Responses which form the prelude are extremely ancient, possibly from a Hebrew tradition based upon Lam. iii. 41,¹ which came into Christian use with Jewish converts in the very earliest days. They are found in the *Canones Hippolyti*, St. Cyprian's Treatise on the Lord's Prayer,² and in the *Apostolical Constitution*. They form, in fact, one of the earliest liturgical fragments of which we have any knowledge. The celebrant catches, as it were, the idea of the last response and proceeds with the Preface. This, the first part, strictly speaking, of the Eucharistic prayer, has alone retained the idea of the "giving of thanks." The thanksgiving prayer was sometimes of great length,³ including thanks for all things temporal and spiritual, leading up to the Incarnation, Passion and Death of Christ, into which scheme the recitation of the Institution fell naturally.

¹ Brightman, p. 556.

² "Adeo et sacerdos ante orationem prae-fationis . . . parat fratrum mentes dicendo: Sursum Corda," etc. Migne, iv. 539.

³ *Apost. Const.* viii. xii. iv-xxxix. Egyptian, cf. Brightman, pp. 125-33. Antiochene, *ibid.* pp. 50-2.

The mention of the Angels, which is universal, led to the Sanctus—the angelic song of Isaiah vi.—which caused a slight interruption in the Anaphora. In the Eastern rites the break is not very marked. In the West it has split the Anaphora into two parts, known to us as the Preface and Canon.¹ The singing of the Preface and Sanctus has accentuated this, as also, in the English rite, has the awkward insertion at this point of the Prayer of Humble Access. It is, however, important to remember, in spite of the fact that this latter prayer has obscured it, that the Preface belongs to the Eucharistic prayer, to which, as its Western name implies, it is introductory.

The ancient thanksgiving prayers² contained long lists of motives of thanksgiving. Those of the Leonine book, however, have the truly Roman characteristics of brevity and terseness. There seems, therefore, to have been a ruthless abbreviation of the Preface before this Sacramentary came into being. The words "et ideo" mark the omitted list and are now rather unnecessary. Every reference is excluded except that to the Angels, which had to remain, apparently, to connect up the idea of thanksgiving with the Sanctus. The Western Preface is changeable. These changes (Proper Prefaces) were originally numerous. The Leonine book has 267, the Gelasian fifty-four. These were gradually reduced in the Roman rite to eleven, in our own rite to five. Two of these, those namely for Christmas Day and Whit-

¹ *Ordo Rom.* i. 16.

² As in Clement of Rome, 1 Cor. lx., lxi.

sun Day, date from 1549, the rest are taken almost verbally from the old Latin. Indeed, our Preface, as a whole, runs closely to the wording of the Latin rite.¹

The name "preface" is Roman. In other liturgies (except the Ambrosian, which has borrowed from the Roman) the Preface is simply the opening part of the Anaphora, and has no special name. In the Byzantine and Syrian rites the enumeration of benefits remains, but is comparatively short. In the Liturgy of St. Basil it is long, in that of St. Chrysostom short. The shortest form is the Armenian; the longest, perhaps, the Egyptian;² but this clearly contains later interpolations.

The Sanctus is simply the continuation of the Preface and is introduced by the mention of the Angels. It is based upon the third verse of the sixth chapter of Isaiah, and it is found in every rite except the Ethiopic Church Order.³ We have very early evidence of it. It is quoted by Clement of Rome,⁴ and in Origen,⁵ and it is constantly referred to by St. Athanasius,⁶ St. John Chrysostom,⁷ Germanus of Paris,⁸ and many others. The Leonine and Gelasian books do not actually give it, but they indicate clearly that it was said. Yet Dom Cabrol inexplicably contends that it is a later addition.⁹ The older texts

¹ The present wording of the Preface is a mistranslation of "Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Everlasting God."

² Brightman, pp. 125-32.

³ *Ibid.* p. 190.

⁴ *In Isai. Hom.* I and 2.

⁵ *P. G.* lv. 393.

⁶ I Cor. xxxiv. 6-7.

⁷ *P. G.* xxvii. 434.

⁸ Duchesne, p. 214.

⁹ *Les Origines Liturgiques*, p. 329. Paris, 1906.

give the reading, "Lord God of Sabaoth," which we have changed into "Lord God of Hosts." The final verse in the English rite, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High," is really a free translation of "Hosanna in Excelsis." In 1549 it read, "Hosanna in the Highest," and continued with the Benedictus, ending with the words, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord, in the Highest." The Benedictus was cut off in the revision of 1552. The intention of this omission was bad,¹ but it is not without justification. It is probable that the words were used originally to greet the celebrating bishop as he entered at the time of the Little Entrance, as is still the case with the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. In the *Apostolical Constitutions*² they occur just before Communion. They do not occur in the Clementine Liturgy nor in the Egyptian rite, and their aptness to the occasion may be questioned. Blunt says that "Benedictus is not part of the Song of the Angels, and is therefore inconsistent, strictly speaking, with the words of the Preface." At Rome the Sanctus is called, in *Ordo Rom.* i., "hymnus angelicus," and *Ordo Rom.* ii. notes the double hosanna.³ Possibly this indicates the point when the Benedictus began to be added to the Sanctus—originally to greet the bishop, later as referring to the Eucharist. Cuthbert Atchley⁴ thinks that it is a Gallican addition to the Roman rite of the eleventh century. There is no rubric ordering Sanctus to be said, or sung by the people, but in

¹ Pullan, p. 108.

² viii. xiii. 13. Brightman, p. 24.

³ *P. L.* lxxviii. 974.

⁴ *Ordo Rom.* i. 90-5.

common practice it is done everywhere. It is not without dramatic effect, and seems to have been usual as early as Clement of Rome. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*¹ it was due to Sixtus I. It seems, in fact, to be a tradition which goes back to the beginning.

The Prayer of Humble Access, which in the English rite comes at this point, is, as has been said, a part of the "Order of Communion" of 1548. In the first Prayer Book it was placed, with the Confession and other prayers, after the Consecration. In 1552 (for Protestant reasons, suggested, no doubt, by the opposition to the doctrinal statements in Gardner's *Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith touching the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar*, published in 1551) these prayers were brought forward in the service, and this particular prayer was placed here. It did not seem advisable, in 1661, to alter it again. Its presence here, however, is not an improvement. Liturgical propriety would require the priest to pass straight from the Preface to the Prayer of Consecration. Yet a Prayer of Humble Access is not in itself a novelty. Such a prayer occurs in the Mozarabic rite after the Offertory, where it is ordered to be said "with bowed head"—the ancient equivalent to the attitude required by the present rubric. In Eastern liturgies the corresponding prayer is called the "prayer of inclination," and comes immediately before the people's Communion. Its equivalent in Western rites generally is found in

¹ Edition by Duchesne, i. 128.

the prayers before Communion which follow the Canon and the Fraction, which, however, are only mediæval and of a quasi-private nature. The wording of the prayer seems to include the "Domine non sum dignus."

The Prayer of Consecration is, of course, the nucleus of this and every extant rite. The English form is possibly derived from the Mozarabic rite through the form used among the German Protestants in Brandenburg and Nurnberg.¹

The rubric which precedes it says that the priest is to be "standing before the Table." This seems to settle definitely what is to be the position of the priest at this point, at any rate, and it is that position which is usual; the Latin rubrics give, "stans ante medium" ("in the middes," 1549) "Altaris." It is, in fact, the normal position of the priest when offering sacrifice—it signifies "at the head of" the people, as their representative, and in full view of them. In 1552 the rubric simply directed the priest to stand up after the Prayer of Humble Access. The rubric in its present form dates from 1661, and implies the eastward position. It is not modified by the subsequent phrase "before the people," which, as we shall see later, only refers to the Fraction. This is, no doubt, what the bishops intended to convey. The

¹ Pullan, pp. 108-9. Cf. however, Brightman, *The English Rite*, pp. cviii-ix, where it is shown that this need not be the source at all. The result of putting together the N. T. records is the same, so also is the result of combining the N. T. features of the Roman and Mozarabic rites, or the rites of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom.

same question in principle had been raised at the Savoy Conference, where the Puritans desired that the minister should face the people during the whole of the service, as being "most convenient." The bishops denied this altogether, and asserted that when speaking to God for them the exact opposite was more significant. They based this answer upon ancient Catholic order, quoting St. Augustine as their reference."¹

The rubric instructs that he shall so stand that he may "with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people and take the Cup into his hand." The importance of the phrase "break the Bread" should be noted, because of its accentuation in all liturgies. It is one of the Lord's own actions at the institution of the rite, and therefore is vested with an unusual sanctity. This, indeed, has always been recognised, and every liturgy gives directions for the Fraction. The Lincoln Judgment also drew attention to it, and stated that, "if any ceremony is to be visible to the people, this action of Christ unquestionably ought to be so."² The Fraction is to take place "before the people,"³ that is to say, in their presence. The Puritans in 1661 demanded the words, "in the sight of the people,"⁴ but the bishops deliberately chose this phrase.⁵

It means simply that the priest shall not conceal

¹ *Serm. Dom. in Monte.*, Book ii. (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 353.)

² *Lincoln Judgment*, p. 51.

³ In Bright and Medd's Latin Prayer Bk. "coram populo."

⁴ Dearmer, p. 388.

⁵ *P. L.* i. 657.

the Fraction, and it refers solely to this action, not necessarily to the whole Consecration.

The final phrase of the rubric, "He shall say the Prayer of Consecration," means, of course, that he shall say it aloud. It is not quite easy to say what is the origin of the secret recitation of the Canon, which holds throughout the rest of the Western Church to-day. That it is not regarded as an inviolable principle is demonstrated by the Ordinal of the Roman rite. The recipients of priesthood recite the Canon aloud with the celebrant. The custom of silent recitation was in existence at the date of the second *Roman Ordo*, the only part said aloud being the Ekphonesis. For three centuries certainly the Canon was said aloud--Tertullian¹ and St. Ambrose² are witness to this. It would seem that the "disciplina arcani" would render its silent recitation unnecessary, and the name "Secret" attached to the Offertory Prayer obviously implies that the silent recitation of that prayer is in contrast to the rest of the liturgy. We find comparatively early a tendency for the priest to go on with his own part of the service in a low voice during the singing or saying of other things, and this accounts also for the appearance of certain kinds of devotions, viz. the Approach, Offertory Prayers, prayers before Communion, said respectively during the Introit, Offertory Psalm and Communion Psalm. The real reason seems, consequently, to have been the desire to telescope the service.

To recite it in silence now is, for us in England,

¹ *P. L.* i. 651.

² *de mysteriis* ix. 54; *P. L.* xvi. 407.

sheer absurdity ; to mumble it is worse than absurd, and needs to be mentioned only to be reprobated. The Church, in fact, seems always to have objected to the practice, though her protest was gradually over-ridden by the weight of other expedients. As late as 1200, in the Synod of London, we get the decree, " Verba Canonis rotunde dicantur et distincte," which, although it does not necessarily mean that the Canon is to be said aloud, certainly seems to imply that the existing custom left a good deal to be desired.

The first part of the Consecration Prayer, down to the words, " until His coming again " (with the phrase in the Prayer of Oblation, " by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ and through faith in His Blood "), must be the Anamnesis. Eastern liturgies, as a rule, mention the Passion, the death and the resurrection of our Lord, and especially His second advent. The Roman rite mentioned the passion, the resurrection and the ascension. Our own liturgy mentions, with great stress, the Passion and the death of our Lord, and refers clearly to the second advent in the words, " Until His coming again."

This first part is, in fact, the substance of the prayer, " unde et memores," in the Roman Canon, expanded and emphasised in order to bring out more clearly the doctrinal statement of the fulness and completeness of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and to put an end for ever to any possible recrudescence of the mediæval mistake that, in the Sacrifice of the

Eucharist, there was something in the nature of a repetition rather than a re-presentation.

There is, in the Eighth Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a parallel to this double anamnesis. The Anamnesis, properly so called, follows the act of Consecration, but the Eucharistic prayer contains the recitation in outline of the Passion before the words of institution. Doctrinally there is no difficulty in the matter. Consecration is the answer of God to the whole Canon.¹

The second part of the prayer, beginning with, "Hear us, O merciful Father," and ending with the words, "His most blessed Body and Blood," is obviously an invocation or epiclesis, but not of the Holy Spirit. It is probably an adaptation of the "Quam oblationem" of the Roman Canon. The phrase, "partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood," is clearly an adaptation of the words, "corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui."

The whole question of the Epiclesis is extremely difficult. It is, generally speaking, understood as being an invocation of the Holy Ghost to effect the consecration of the elements. Its normal position would be after Consecration, the mention of the Holy Ghost following the commemoration of the Ascension. In all Eastern rites this is quite definite, *e.g.* the Byzantine St. Basil, where it follows immediately the Commemoration of the Passion and Resurrection. In the Western rites, the corresponding prayer would

¹ To quote an ancient phrase, it is performed "intuitu totius orationis,"

be in the Gallican the Post-Secreta, in the Roman the Supplices; but of these the former is not always, and the latter not ever, an invocation of the Holy Spirit. E. Bishop¹ and W. C. Bishop² think that the Epiklesis in the Roman rite is the prayer, "Quam oblationem," already referred to, but this seems unlikely. The Roman rite does not now contain any clear epiklesis at all.

Its absence, therefore, from the English rite, as an invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not without parallel. In the first Prayer Book of 1549 it was retained, thus, "Hear us (O Merciful Father), we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts, and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." This form was almost certainly modelled upon the form in the Liturgy of St. Basil. The prayer later in the Canon, corresponding to the Supplices of the Roman rite, was then made to read, that "our prayers and supplications" might be brought before the sight of God's Divine Majesty. This epiklesis was removed in 1552 in favour of the present prayer.

It is one of the greatest difficulties in the Roman Liturgy to account for the absence of the Epiklesis, and the similarity of the Roman and English rites in this particular is, in the light of history, the nemesis of ignorance.

The first witness to the Invocation of the Holy

¹ In Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, pp. 135-9.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1908.

Ghost at this point is St. Cyril of Jerusalem.¹ Before this time there is no evidence to prove its existence, but it soon after appears throughout the East, and is found also in the West. It seems, therefore, that during the fourth century it became general. Normally, as we have said, it comes after Consecration, following naturally from the Commemoration of the Ascension. This does not, however, prove that it always came at this point. There is a double epiklesis, before and after Consecration, in the Alexandrine Liturgies.²

If the *Quam Oblationem* (to which our prayer, "Hear us, O Merciful Father," corresponds) be regarded as the Epiklesis of the Roman rite, it is but another example of the Invocation before Consecration.

The Invocation of the Holy Spirit to bless and sanctify the offerings is a common idea, and may be traced in various places in different rites. If it be remembered that a liturgy is, in reality, a single thing, a united act, it matters little where the Invocation comes. Apparently its usual and natural position, at the end of the Anamnesis, is fixed by the idea of Pentecost.

It has been disputed whether the Roman rite ever had an Epiklesis of the Holy Ghost. It seems probable that it did. Pope Gelasius I, at the end of the fifth century, seems to refer to it: "*Quomodo ad divini mysterii consecrationem coelestis Spiritus invocatus adveniet, si . . .*" Though both Mgr.

¹ *Cat. myst. P. G.* xxxiii. 1072 et seq.

² Salaville, *La double Epiclèse*, p. 133.

Batiffol¹ and E. Bishop seem to be against such a view, it is difficult to assign any other reasonable meaning to the words. The "Supplices," as it now stands, is the remainder of the old Roman Invocation. "The prayer, Supplices te rogamus . . . both by its place and its form . . . plainly suggests the ghost of an Invocation with all the essential part left out."²

To account for the omission is not an easy matter, but it is probable that, in the attempt to define the "form" of the Sacrament, the growing conviction in the West that Consecration was effected solely by the use of our Lord's words, had much to do with it. In the *De Sacramentis* of the Pseudo-Ambrose (*d.* 400) the passage occurs: "Ubi venit ut conficiatur venerabile Sacramentum jam non suis verbis utitur sacerdos sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit Sacramentum." By the time of St. Thomas Aquinas this opinion had become general: "Alii dixerunt quod haec dictio *hoc* in hoc locutione facit demonstrationem non ad sensum, sed ad intellectum, ut sit sensus: Hoc est corpus meum, id est, significatum per hoc, est corpus meum. Sed nec hoc stare potest, quia cum in sacramentis *hoc efficiatur quod significatur* non fieret per hanc formam ut Corpus Christi sit in hoc sacramento secundum veritatem," *et seq.*³ The Epiklesis of the Holy Spirit had disappeared by the time of the Gelasian Sacramentary.

¹ *Revue du Clergé Français*, Dec. 1908.

² Fortescue, pp. 110, 111. ³ *Sum. Theol.* iii. q. lxxviii. art. 5.

The Invocation in the English rite is addressed to the Father. This practice of an invocation, but not of the Holy Spirit, is not, however, an isolated phenomenon. The Liturgy of St. Mark in the Coptic Church¹ has an invocation addressed to God the Son, so has the Mozarabic rite. The Prayer Book of Sarapion also gives an Epiklesis of the Logos immediately following the Consecration.

The third part of the prayer gives us the actual words of consecration. The form is composite. The phrase, "in the same night," is, as we have seen, the Eastern form—the usual form in the West is "qui pridie." The Consecration of the Bread is, broadly speaking, Pauline, with the addition, "gave it to His disciples," from the Gospel of St. Matthew, and the words, "which is given for you," from St. Luke. The Consecration of the Chalice is based on St. Matthew, with the Pauline addition, "This do in memory of Me." With the single exception of the Didache, which puts the chalice first in order, all rites consecrate first the bread and then the wine.

The formula, "Likewise after supper," is general in all liturgies, and makes it clear that this refers to the fourth or Hallel cup.

The manual acts are of considerable importance, and give in comparative detail the method by which the Church of England expects her clergy to order themselves at this point. The first instructs: "Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands." This is the first mention of the paten. Originally it was

¹ Brightman, p. 148.

a large, flat silver dish¹ used for the purpose of collecting the offerings of bread and wine made by the faithful, and afterwards to distribute the loaf broken by the celebrant to the communicants. It was not always made of precious metal: it is probable that wood and copper were used in early days, and glass patens are mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis*.²

The use of these large patens fell into abeyance with the decline of frequent communion, *i. e.* towards the ninth century. A writer of the eleventh century tells us that by this time the offering of bread and wine by the faithful at the Offertory had ceased.³ The custom grew up for the priest to use a paten (naturally a smaller one) on the Altar, to obviate the possible irreverence which might result from the scattering of crumbs. In the East the "discus" is used, much larger in size than a modern paten. The old practice was to consecrate upon the corporal, but the rubric makes it quite clear that this is not the intention of our rite to-day.

The second rubric reads, "And here to break the Bread."⁴ This is an ancient ceremony, and particular emphasis is laid upon it in our rite. It is found in the Gospel narratives, and it has been consistently used in the Church. In fact, few ceremonies are more primitive. There is, moreover, considerable mediæval testimony to its continued use as an important manual act. In 1546 Bishop Gardiner of

¹ "patenae ministeriales." ² i. 61, 139. ³ Pullan, p. 57.

⁴ Cf. for a different and unfavourable view of the manual acts in the English rite, Staley, *The Manual Acts* (Alcuin Club P. Bk. Revision Pamphlets).

Winchester issued a pamphlet called, *A Detection of the Devil's Sophistries*, in which the presence of the faithful at the Latin Eucharist is described in the words, "When they saw the Host broken in the Mass." A fifteenth-century MS. contains the words, "Like as ye see the Host divided."¹ The prominence which is given to the action in the Prayer Book is an accentuation of an ancient and divine ceremony, a ceremony which is full of meaning, and which, in Apostolic days, gave its name to the whole service.

Apparently, since the Fraction is to take place in the presence of the people, the priest is intended to put the paten down again and to break the bread somewhere about shoulder high, so as to be seen by those around him. There is no direction, and certainly no precedent for his turning half-way round to do so. The Fraction before Consecration is unusual, and is peculiar to the Church of England. It is, perhaps, of ancient existence in England.²

The fourth direction is, "Here he is to take the Cup into his hand." The reading "hand" is not absolutely certain.³ Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode's *Book of Common Prayer from the Original MS.* prints "hands," but in any case "hands" is the meaning, as the rubric before the prayer says. The Roman Canon also says, "venerabiles manus." It may have been the fact that our Lord so handled the chalice

¹ Wickham Legg, *Tracts on the Mass*, p. 27.

² Blunt, *op. cit.* ad loc.

³ In the facsimile of the *MS. Annexed* it is plainly "hands," but in the printed book of 1636, from which the MS. was written, it is clearly "hand."

Himself. Ancient chalices often had two handles, e. g. the famous fresco "Fractio panis," for instance, in the so-called "Capella Graeca" in the catacomb of St. Priscilla on the Via Salaria Nova, which shows a two-handled cup standing immediately before the celebrant.

The fifth direction, "And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated," is parallel to the third, "And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread." These directions seem to have been added for actual certainty as to what is intended to be consecrated. The ceremony is new, but it is sufficiently sober and indicative to be obvious and acceptable. The Twentieth Canon speaks of "a clean and sweet standing pot or stoup of pewter, if not of purer metal," which may be what the rubric means by flagon. It was apparently simply a large cruet, such as were known in old days, as, for instance, the "two gilt cruets, that did hold a quart apiece."¹

The chalice is the most ancient of all Eucharistic vessels, and the most important. What exactly the cup used by our Lord at the Last Supper was like we cannot say for certain. The fresco preserved above, which suggests that the two-handled chalice was in very early use among Christians, supplies us with an old tradition, but this suggests only a probability that our Lord may have used this shape of chalice. The story of the Holy Grail is of late date and is quite untrustworthy, so that it gives no help.

¹ *Rites of Durham*, Surtees Society, p. 8.

In the sixth century a relic purporting to be the actual cup used in the Upper Room was shown in Jerusalem ; two others were shown in later centuries, one at Genoa of green glass, the other at Valencia of agate.

In early days chalices, according to Hefele, seem to have been made of glass, ivory, wood, clay, and of base metals, but the precious metals must have been preferred for the purpose at an early date. Both St. Augustine¹ and St. Chrysostom² speak of gold chalices, the latter says set with jewels.

Three forms of chalice were in use in early days. The amulæ, which were very large, were used at the Offertory. They may correspond to what the rubric refers to later as a "flagon." The calix sanctus was the sacrificial chalice used by the priest for ordinary purposes in the Mass. The calices ministeriales were used for giving Communion to the faithful, especially on big feasts when large numbers communicated.

The Prayer of Consecration ends with a solemn "Amen," which, from its being printed in italics, must be understood as being intended to be said by the whole congregation present. It is a Hebrew word which means to "confirm" or "strengthen." "So frequent was this Hebrew word in the mouth of our Saviour that it pleased the Holy Ghost to perpetuate it in the Church of God," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent. It is a Biblical feature in the liturgy, suggested, no doubt, by St.

¹ *Contra Cresc.* iii., cxxix.

² *Hom. i. in Matt.*

Paul's phrase in 1 Cor. xiv. 16. The Apostle's *τὸ ἀμήν* seems to indicate a recognised and known response. It comes always at the end of the Canon, but in our own rite when the Canon was broken in two it was added at this point. The *Explicatio Missæ*, published by Gerbert, explains it thus: "Amen is a ratification by the faithful of that which has been said, and it may be interpreted in our tongue as if they all said, May it so be done as the priest has prayed." Justin, in his description of the Eucharist, refers to it in his day, "When he" (*i. e.* the president) "has ended the prayers and thanksgiving," (*i. e.* after Consecration) "all the people that are present forthwith answer with acclamation, Amen."¹

The rubrics give no directions for the priest to genuflect after consecrating. This is a recurrence to an older state of things. Genuflection, in the form in which we know it now, is peculiar to the Roman rite of post-mediæval days. The older Roman Missals make no mention of it. It was recognised in a semi-official manner first somewhere about the year 1500. Its first incorporation into the rubrics of Roman Liturgy (to which it is peculiar) dates only from the Missal of Pope Pius V in the year 1570. It is not the universal custom of the Roman Communion even to this day. The Carthusians have never, strictly speaking, adopted it;

¹ 1 *Apol.* lxx., *P.G.* vi. 428. See the history of the use of the word in Cabrol and Le Clercq, *Dict. d'arch. Chrét.*, i. 1554-73.

while the Cistercians still only bow. This was the original, natural and primitive custom, and, as will be seen later, this is the practice which the Prayer Book seems to assume will be continued. The absence of constant and explicit directions on this point constitutes no argument against the use of a bodily reverence, for the simple reason that ceremonial directions are the growth of later days. The older missals left them always to that tradition and custom which was handed down from one generation of priests to another. That the English Prayer Book was composed under the influence of this tradition is clearly manifest in several places, seeing that directions for the most necessary things are omitted. It is assumed that the priest will know what is the Church's habit with regard to the matter.

The rubrics are quite silent, moreover, as to the practice of elevation. By elevation we mean that elevation immediately after the Consecration of the Elements which is so familiar a feature of Eucharistic worship to-day.

The primitive practice was to elevate the consecrated elements at the time of the communion of the people. This, of course, must always happen in some form or other, and it was accentuated partly to exhibit to the faithful the holy gifts of which they were about to partake, and partly to indicate that the actual time of communion had arrived.

This, however, is a ceremony of a different nature. Since the ninth century, or before, it had been the custom to elevate slightly the elements at

the "omnis honor et gloria," at the very end of the Canon. Dom Cabrol sees in this an invitation to the people to worship at the time when the Consecration Prayer had come to an end. The later custom of elevation immediately after each separate consecration is a modern ceremony. The earliest directions with regard to it are those of Eudes de Sully, the Bishop of Paris, at the close of the eleventh century. The custom had been, at the Consecration of the Bread, to lift it as high as the breast, to hold it so during the Consecration, and then to lay it down again. This may be the origin of our own rubric: "break the Bread before the people." The custom grew up of holding it a few minutes longer to stimulate the worship of the people. Father Thurston, S. J.,¹ denies that this is the same thing as the modern elevation. He traces this latter, not to the protest against the heresy of Berengarius, but to a desire to disown and oppose the teaching of Peter Manducator, the chancellor, and Peter Cantor, one of the professors of the University of Paris in the thirteenth century. This teaching was, that the separate consecrations were not effective by themselves, and that the Consecration of the Bread did not come to pass until the Consecration of the Chalice. The Adoration of the Host immediately after its consecration, and the elevation to show it to the people for the same purpose, formed a practical denial of this teaching. There was no such motive in Elevation of the

¹ *The Tablet*, Oct. 19, Oct. 26, Nov. 2, 1907.

Chalice, and the custom of so doing was only slowly introduced. St. Alban's Abbey did not adopt it until nearly the middle of the fifteenth century, and the Carthusian Order have no real Elevation of the Chalice even to this day.

The Reformers were particularly averse from elevation. In the Order of Communion (1548) a second elevation was forbidden if a reconsecration of wine was required, but it was not forbidden in its ordinary place. In 1549, however, the first Prayer Book provided that the Consecration was to take place "without any elevation or showing the Sacrament to the people." This rubric was left out in 1552, and so were all the other directions for manual acts. The spirit of the 1552 book is such that it is impossible to contend that the omission of the prohibition restored the practice. It is more likely that elevation had ceased, and therefore required no more thought.

In answer to a widespread desire to do what the Lord did, as well as to say what He said, the manual acts were reinstated in the book of 1662. Our Lord's "taking" of the elements was to be continued by the priest. This, of necessity, involved a lifting or elevation, but no further instructions were added, though the rubrical direction that the Fraction is to take place "before the people," of necessity implies that, at that point, the bread will be lifted shoulder high: these ceremonies, however, have a different rationale from the usual elevation after Consecration. The latter is not in terms forbidden,

but it is entirely out of harmony with the tone and temper of the English rite, and modern Roman theologians¹ have been compelled to admit that the practice, with all those ceremonies which have become its adjuncts, has gradually tended to throw the emphasis upon unnecessary and ceremonial actions, and to distract attention from those central acts of consecration and communion, which are, of course, the very essence of the Eucharist.

“The last revision of the Book of Common Prayer restored to our Church a complete representation of what our Lord is recorded to have said and done ‘in the same night that He was betrayed.’ We ‘take the bread’ and ‘take the cup’ as He Himself did, we say the words of institution which we believe that He said, we break the bread and bless the cup as He did, and we perform these significant actions openly in the sight of the people, and thus ‘proclaim the Lord’s death till He come.’”²

¹ e. g. Fortescue, p. 345.

² Bp. Drury, *Elevation in the Eucharist*, p. 181. It is interesting to find a prelate of Dr. Drury’s school of thought stating thus clearly that the “memorial” in the Eucharist is made by the Consecration, not merely by individual reception of Communion.

CHAPTER VI

THE COMMUNION AND OBLATION

THE rubric which follows gives the instructions for the act of communion: "Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself." Whether this is dogmatically necessary to a valid Eucharist is not to our present point. What is to be noticed is that the Church does not allow any such practice as celebration without the priest's communion, nor have we any historical evidence that she ever did allow it. Without, therefore, making any doctrinal statement on the matter, we are safe in saying that, as a matter of discipline, the celebrating priest's communion is essential at every Eucharist. The Twenty-first Canon clearly enforces this as the law of the Church of England: "Every Minister, as oft as he administereth the Communion, shall first receive that Sacrament himself"—in the second place, it is to be administered to the other clergy who are present—"and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner (if any be present)"—thirdly, to the faithful, "and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling." The order for the clergy, naturally, is that of their ecclesiastical rank, as the wording of

the rubric suggests ; save only that the celebrant, by universal custom and by the instructions of our rubric, communicates first, no matter who may be present in the church. The order for the people is the traditional order, which comes down to us from the Jewish Church, of men first and then women. That the Church early felt that ecclesiastical rank should be preserved in the receiving of Holy Communion is witnessed to by the fact that, as early as the First Council of Nicæa, a rule was issued forbidding the deacons to communicate before the priests.

The administration of Communion to the laity is assumed by the Prayer Book to be the work of two ecclesiastics, that is to say, the celebrant and the minister. The minister, of course, means a deacon, or a priest acting as a deacon for the time being, who would always administer the chalice. This custom seems to have come down from the beginning. Communion is to be given to the people "into their hands."¹ This is a clear return to primitive ways. Dionysius of Alexandria² tells us that it was the custom in Egypt in his day, and Tertullian³ bears witness to the same custom, so does St. Cyprian⁴ and St. Augustine ;⁵ St. Cyril, in his Fifth Catechetical Lecture, gives the same testimony. St. Cæsarius of Arles and the Council of Auxerre both refer to Communion being given into the hand—the man's

¹ The Bp. of Truro in Henson, *Church Problems* (p. 186 n.), sees in this the emphasis of lay priesthood.

² *Epist.* iv. ; *P. G.* v. 27 A.

³ *De Idol.* 7.

⁴ *P. L.* iv. 478.

⁵ *Ibid.* xliii. 58.

hand being bare, the woman's hands wrapped in the "dominicalis," or linen cloth. This custom seems to have continued until the ninth century, though the Communion of the laity into the mouth was known as early as Pope Gregory I.

The laity are instructed to communicate "meekly kneeling." This is not the original position. In early days the people stood to receive the Holy Sacrament, and still do so under the Greek rites in the East and in the Balkan Peninsula.¹ In Western liturgies the custom survives only in the Pontifical Mass of the Roman rite, where the deacon still receives standing. Bingham suggests that the laity received Communion on fast days kneeling, on other days standing, that is, they received it in whatever position they happened to be according to the liturgical necessities of the season. The Puritans opposed it systematically in England. It would have been forbidden in the Prayer Book of 1552 save for Cranmer's intervention,² and one of the demands in the Millenary Petition in 1603 was that kneeling at Communion should be abolished. The present Black Rubric (which will be discussed later) dates from 1552. It was not intended to condemn the primitive practice, but because kneeling had come to be identified with belief in the truth of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ, the contrary practice had come to be revived, as being the signal for those who denied it. In itself the attitude bears testimony to the corporate faith of the English Church

¹ *Bona. Rerum Liturg.* ii. 17, § 8.

² Pullan, p. 108.

in the Presence, otherwise to insist upon it would be meaningless.

The two phrases of the rubric, "when he delivereth the Bread," and "the Minister that delivereth the Cup," read together, show that the Church in this land knows no such custom as communion in one kind.

The practice of receiving the consecrated bread alone in Holy Communion, whatever reasons may be alleged in justification, is a grave liberty. Until the twelfth century communion in both kinds was universal. Certain exceptions to the practice existed, or had existed, but they were clearly exceptions. Such were:—

- A. The practice (not infrequent) of domestic communion, in the form of bread only.¹
 - B. Communion of the sick, in the form of bread only, *e.g.* the death-bed of St. Basil.²
 - C. Communion of infants, usually in the form of wine only.³
 - D. *Intinctio panis*—both kinds received *per modum cibi*. Forbidden by the Council of Braga, 675, but reintroduced in the eleventh century.⁴ Forbidden again at Council of London, 1175.
 - E. Communion in the Mass of the Presanctified.⁵
- These are obviously deviations from the general

¹ Tertullian, *Ad Uxor*, 5.

² *Vita Basilii*; *P. G.* xxix. 315.

³ St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, 25 (by implication).

⁴ *Micrologus* xix.; *P. L.* cli. 989 *et seq.*

⁵ *P. L.* lxxiv. 1105. Cf. also *Bona. Rerum Liturg.* ii. xviii.

rule. The withdrawal of the chalice from the laity came to pass gradually. In the time of St. Thomas Aquinas it was not general, for the saint speaks of it as customary only "in quibusdam ecclesiis."¹ In 1281 the Council of Lambeth directed the laity to receive unconsecrated wine. The Council of Trent² and the Council of Constance³ (1415), forced the practice on the Latin obedience generally. The custom is simply Latin. The Roman theologians do not attempt to claim that there is anything peculiarly Catholic about it,⁴ though the average Anglican would find it difficult to endorse Dr. Fortescue's dictum that "whether the communicant receive one kind or both . . . is a matter of ceremony merely . . . the Church never made a principle of communion under both kinds."⁵ There must be some special fruit of the chalice, otherwise it would not have been instituted, and there is nothing to justify a distinction between celebrant and communicants in the matter. Yet there have been, and are, exceptions to the present rule. The Council of Basle (1433) allowed the Calixtines of Bohemia to communicate under both kinds, on condition that they acknowledged the doctrine of concomitance, though this privilege was withdrawn in 1462 by Paul II. In 1564 Pius IV permitted it in certain of the dioceses of Germany, but withdrew it in the following year. It was allowed to the Kings of

¹ *Summa Theol.* iii., q. lxxx., art. 12.

² Session XXI.

⁴ Fortescue, p. 376.

³ Session XIII.

⁵ pp. 376, 377.

France at coronation and on their death-bed.¹ At St. Denis, in Paris and at Clugny, the deacon and sub-deacon at High Mass received in both kinds. To-day the deacon and sub-deacon at the Solemn Mass of the Pope receive so; and millions of Uniates are communicated under both kinds. Among the Carthusians it appears that, viz. "Aux principales fêtes . . . Le diacre communiait alors sous les deux especès."²

Communion in one kind was due, no doubt, to a desire for greater reverence, seeing that the necessity of communicating a number of people from a single chalice requires, obviously, considerable care, if accidental spilling of the contents is to be avoided. We feel, however, that all possible difficulties must have been foreseen by God's wisdom, and that to revise and correct our Lord's institution is a questionable way of showing reverence. Our present custom is a return to the primitive practice.

The words with which Holy Communion is now administered are two forms put together in one. The first part, down to the words "everlasting life," was given in the first Prayer Book (1549), slightly altered from the Order of Communion, 1548. The second part comes from the second Prayer Book (1552). The combination dates from 1559. The omission of the "Amen" should be noticed, as it was the communicant's act of faith in answer to the priest's statement. The original form for the Administration

¹ Benedict XIV. *De Miss. Sac.* ii., xxii., n. 32.

² Cabrol and Le Clercq, *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.*, c. 1047.

of Communion seems to have been a simple statement by the priest as to what the element was that he was delivering.¹ The first part of our present form is this statement expanded into a prayer, the latter part was a new composition to express the reformed attitude towards sacramental doctrine.

“If the consecrated Bread and Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more according to the Form before prescribed.” This rubric, giving directions as to what is to be done in the case of re-consecration, simply makes the best of an admittedly difficult business. No rubric of the kind existed either in the book of 1549 or in that of 1552. It was the outcome of experience. The practice had grown up among the Puritans of administering unconsecrated elements under these circumstances, and this rubric, introduced in 1661, was intended to prevent it. The early mediæval custom had been to increase the contents of the chalice by pouring into it unconsecrated wine, which, it was assumed, would become incorporated with what was already there—consecrated, as it were, by contact. The later practice was to re-consecrate.

One Eucharist can, of course, strictly speaking, have but one Consecration of the Elements, and to repeat this consecration is more or less an act of confusion. The fact, however, remains, that should the elements become exhausted before the communion of the laity is finished, something must be done, and it is in order

¹ e. g. *Apost. Const.* viii., xiii. 15. “Σῶμα χριστοῦ” or “Ἄιμα χριστοῦ ποτήριον ζωῆς.” Brightman, p. 25.

to settle *what* is to be done that the rubric is given. At the same time it seems clear that the Prayer Book does not assume that the priest will have to re-consecrate as a normal thing. The rubric at the Offertory orders him to place upon the Holy Table "so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient," which implies that he will take some care to ascertain how much he requires; and this form of re-consecration is simply given to cover cases of emergency.

"When all have communicated, the Minister shall return to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated Elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth."

This rubric, inserted in 1661, ensures the reverent and respectful handling of the Holy Sacrament, and its ceremonial veiling during the latter part of the Canon. It seems to be clear from the word "reverently" that the "bow" is the form of bodily ceremonial with which the Prayer Book assumes the elements will be honoured. It would be pedantic to press the interpretation over much, but it is reasonable to assume that the adverb "reverently" implies "with a reverence," which, in the light of its history, is exactly what the rite might be expected to prescribe.

The veiling of the elements is a suggestive ceremonial injunction, which cuts the ground from under the "receptionist" theory, viz. that the Church of England regards the Eucharistic species as sacred only for the act of communion. The seventeenth-century English divines, inheriting the doctrine of

the primitive Church, reiterated the old injunction to cover the chalice, when not actually in use, with a corporal.

Something in the nature of a corporal must have been used from the earliest times. The second *Roman Ordo*¹ speaks of it as being so big that the deacon and an assisting deacon fold it up between them—unless this really implies what we now know as the “fair white linen cloth” which is spread upon the Lord’s Table before the service begins. At any rate, by the tenth century it had assumed normal proportions, as it was a common custom to fold it up at the end of the Mass and put it away between the leaves of the missal. Even then, however, it was much larger than it is now, and when spread on the Altar, the further part of it was brought up from the back to cover the vessels. This is still the manner of the Carthusians, who have never departed from the ancient custom. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, probably from an idea of greater convenience, the corporal was cut in half, and the old custom of doubling gave way to the new custom of using a “pair of corporals,” one of which was spread on the Altar, the other (folded) was laid on the mouth of the chalice. Our present rubric seems to imply that a folded corporal will have been used in the ordinary way, and that at this point the priest will *unfold* the second corporal and spread it over the vessels.² The use in England of the continental “pall” to cover the chalice is a breach of ecclesiastical order. The

¹ c. x.

² Dearmer, p. 399.

“pall” (palla) is no doubt the same thing as the “corporal” (palla corporalis). It seems to be simply the folded corporal stitched round the edge and stiffened. But this would not unfold, and therefore could not be used at this point as a “veil,” as the rubric directs.

We pass on now to the Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Oblation which follows it. Strictly speaking, this latter is the end of the Canon, and came immediately after Consecration, followed by the Lord's Prayer. The Communion came then after the Lord's Prayer. So it stood in the Book of 1549, but in 1552, owing, no doubt, to Protestant influence, this order was abandoned in favour of the present arrangement. Their position in this place is abnormal and anomalous. It cannot be denied that this is the great defect of our liturgy as it stands to-day.

The Lord's Prayer is common to all Eucharistic rites except the Eighth Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. Its position is not uniform. St. Augustine¹ says clearly that it came in the African Liturgy at the end of the Canon and before the Peace—just where it comes in the Roman rite to-day. St. Gregory I, however,² tells us that he moved it to this position. It seems to have stood before this time after the Communion.(?) In the East it comes immediately before the elevation and Fraction.³ The Gallican, Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites have it after

¹ *Serm.* vi. *P. L.* xlvi. 836.

² *Epist.* ix. 12. *P. L.* lxxvii. 957.

³ Brightman, pp. 136, 339.

the Fraction.¹ It is admittedly no part of the Canon. With regard to its present position in our service, Blunt says, that "it was put to be recited among the Sarum post-communion vestry prayers." "It is probable, therefore, that this custom influenced its present position . . . after Communion as well as after Consecration, the public and the private recitation of it being thus combined." As an act of corporate thanksgiving its position at this point is a devotional advantage, but at the same time it is liturgically unusual. "Then shall the Priest say the Lord's Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition." This rubric was obviously intended for times when a majority of the congregation would, in many districts, be unable to read. It has been altered by tacit and universal custom into repeating it "with" the priest. Yet the practice ordered by the rubric is not an innovation. In all Eastern rites and in the Gallican Liturgy² it is so said. In the Mozarabic rite the people say "Amen" to each clause.³ In this place the Lord's Prayer ends with a Doxology—which is almost identical with that given in the Byzantine rite.⁴

The Embolism is really the interpretation or expansion of the last clause of the prayer, "deliver us from evil." The Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom do not contain it, but most Eastern rites have it. It exists in the Roman rite, and in similar

¹ Duchesne, p. 211.

² *Ibid.* p. 221.

³ Migne, lxxxv. 559.

⁴ Brightman, pp. 339-40, but it has no Embolism.

forms in the Gallican, Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites. In this last the Embolism is very beautiful, and is said also after the Lord's Prayer at Lauds and Vespers.

The Prayer of Oblation, which follows at this point, is, as we have said, the later part of the Canon, and is out of its place. This position for it is not justifiable by any liturgical precedent, and the interpolation of the priest's and people's communion, followed by the Lord's Prayer, into the middle of the Canon is without parallel. So far liturgically, but doctrinally there is no necessary harm done. "If we remember always that the whole Canon is one prayer . . . it matters very little in what order. God answers that one prayer by changing the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord, and no doubt He does so (according to our idea of time) before the whole prayer has been spoken." These words of Dr. Fortescue¹ are used in a slightly different connection, but they exactly express the solution of the difficulty before us. The prayer itself is based fairly consecutively on the second part of the old Roman Canon. Its opening phrase, down to the words, "praise and thanksgiving," corresponds to the "Unde et memores," but the Anamnesis is gone, and one phrase of it is put below. From thence, down to the words, "His passion," corresponds to the "Supra quae," and the next part, down to "heavenly benediction," is a comparatively close rendering of parts of the prayer "Supplices." The rest is practically based upon the

¹ p. 353.

spirit of the "nobis quoque." It is possible that the phrase, "we and all Thy whole Church," is meant to represent the Memento of the Dead, but it is much more probable that it is simply a repetition of the thought, and that the true Memento of the Departed is at the end of the Prayer for the Church, which would be its true place.

CHAPTER VII

TO THE END OF THE SERVICE

THE Thanksgiving is now added as an alternate prayer, and it forms (when said) a fixed thanksgiving, instead of the variable post-communions of the older rites. It was composed in 1549. The opening sentences are adapted from the Sarum prayer placed immediately after the priest's communion. The phrasing reminds us also forcibly of the *Consumatio Missæ* in the Stowe and St. Gall Missals, viz. "Gratias tibi agimus . . . qui nos corporis et sanguinis Christi filii tui communionem satiasti," a comparatively frequent form in earlier thanksgivings. The Thanksgiving is a beautiful prayer, replete with primitive feeling, and has as melodious a cadence as any prayer in the rite.

The *Gloria in Excelsis* forms a magnificent but unusual addition to the Thanksgiving. It is a purely Roman element in the Eucharist. None of the Eastern liturgies contain the *Gloria*, nor does the Gallican.¹ It is found now in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites, but it was inserted under Roman influence in the seventh or eighth century. Its original position was at the beginning of the service, after the *Kyries*. So it was used in the Prayer Book

¹ Duchesne, p. 166.

of 1549. In 1552 it was moved to this point—why, exactly, is not clear, though in some ways it is a great gain.

The Gloria is a version of an ancient Greek hymn, which goes back in one form or another possibly to the first century. In one form it occurs at the beginning of a morning prayer in the *Apostolical Constitutions*.¹ A similar form is found in Pseudo-Athanasius *De Virginitate*.² It is sung in a slightly fuller form at the Orthros in the Byzantine Church. It was probably brought to the West by St. Hilary of Poitiers in the fourth century. Originally it was used only by bishops, though its use was allowed to priests from about the tenth century, first at Easter only, and then at all times.

The first Prayer Book permitted it, like the Creed, to be omitted on work days, but its use now is intended to be constant, and we have no right, in any circumstances, to omit it. It is worthy of notice that the address, "O Lamb of God," in the English version of the Gloria is given in a threefold form. It corresponds almost verbally with the ancient "Agnus Dei"—a communion anthem inserted in the time of Pope Sergius (700)³ to be sung during the space occupied by the Fraction. It was ordered, in 1549, to be sung, "during the time of communion," but in 1552, under the pressure of Puritan influence, it was omitted. It is by no means essential, though it was a beautiful addition. It is wanting in the Gallican

¹ vii. xlvi.

² § 29. *P. G.* xxviii. 275.

³ *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 376.

rite and in the Mozarabic. Its use in the Ambrosian Liturgy at Requiems is a borrowing from Rome. At first it was sung once; in the eleventh century twice; in the twelfth century it had assumed its present form. The ancient ritual Mass of Holy Saturday still has no Agnus.

The rubric of the Ordinal seems to assume that a Collect will be said here before the Blessing. The rubric reads, "after the last Collect and before the Benediction." It is possible that the last Collect here referred to may simply be the Prayer of Thanksgiving, which stood in this position before the removal of the Gloria, and that when this latter took place the rubric remained unaltered. It seems more probable, however, that it was advisedly allowed to remain unaltered, and that the six Collects which are printed after the Blessing were intended to be used at this point also.¹

The Liturgy is to finish with the Peace and the Blessing, though the whole form is called by the latter name. The Peace, according to St. Germanus, came after the reading of the Diptychs. In the Roman rite (the distinction between the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful having entirely disappeared) this symbol of unity was moved to the time of communion, an arrangement which is as old as the early fifth century.² In our present rite this is impossible, as it came before the Fraction.

¹ Dearmer, p. 400.

² Letter of Innocent I to Ducentius of Gubbio in 416. *P. L.* xx. 553.

It is, therefore, given here in a form which is taken from the Order of Communion of 1548, though there is no real reason why it should not have been equally well restored to its original place.

Natural as the Blessing¹ seems in this position, it is not a primitive element of the Eucharistic rite. It was customary, doubtless, quite in early days for the Pontiff to bless the people as he went away when the Liturgy was done—and Micrologus tells us² that priests had begun to do likewise by the eleventh century, but the Blessing was no part of the liturgical text. It is, in fact, a mediæval custom only. It was probably common at Low Mass by the early fifteenth century, but it is not to be found in the early missals. The form given in the Prayer Book is taken from the form originally used by celebrating bishops at the end of the Canon, and is analogous to the one given in the Exeter Pontifical. The rubric still orders that, if the bishop be present, he shall give the Blessing in preference to the celebrant. The phrase, "shall let them depart," indicates that the Blessing, like the old, "Ite, missa est," is the dismissal.

A series of six Collects follow the Blessing. They are ordered to be used "one or more" after the Church Militant prayer at Ante-Communion ("when

¹ Brightman, *The English Rite*, cxi. "The Blessing, which is an anticlimax after Communion, and no doubt came into use just because the people had not, as a rule, communicated in the Mass, never found its way into the English missals, though it was sometimes used. It appears in the first edition of the Roman Missal, 1474."

² Migne, cli. 991.

there is no Communion"). A permissive use of them is granted "after the Collects," either of Matins, Evensong, Communion or Litany. It may be assumed from this that they may be used as post-communions also, between the Gloria in Excelsis and the Blessing. Of these prayers the fifth and sixth were composed in 1549—the first, second, fourth and possibly the third are from ancient sources. The first is taken from the old Sarum Mass for Travellers, the second comes from the "Pretiosa," or short office said at Prime after the reading of the Martyrology, the fourth is an old Sarum Collect appointed for use on the Second Sunday in Lent. It is possible that the third is from a prayer in the Liturgy of St. James, but it seems more probable that it, too, was composed in 1549.

The final rubrics—dating from 1552 and superseding longer ones in the first Prayer Book—are of considerable interest, and of no little importance.

The first has been partly dealt with already. It gives directions for Dry Mass or Ante-Communion to be said on all Sundays and holy days upon which Holy Communion is not celebrated. *Missa Sicca* was common in the West in the Middle Ages, but has gradually either given way, happily, to more frequent Eucharists, or has in some countries been forbidden by authority. It consisted simply of the introductory and final prayers of the Liturgy, omitting the Consecration.

There was not any necessary connection in the

earliest time between the Christian assembly for prayer and the celebration of the Eucharist. More usually they followed one another, but, as we have seen in Pliny, they were not regarded as one, or as necessary to one another. Dom Cabrol traces the origin of the Mass of the Catechumens; or Ante-Communion, to the Vigil Meeting.¹

It seems a pity that the assumption of Dr. Lee and Mr. Purchas, that Ante-Communion is simply a bad product of English Protestantism, should have gained so much credence as it has. "A sham rite, unfortunately peculiar to the modern Church of England,"² is a combination in one phrase of two big blunders.

In the fifth century "Table Prayers" were in use on Wednesdays and Fridays in the Egyptian Church, and the same service, known as "typica," exists even to this day in both the Greek and Russian branches of the Orthodox Church. In the Middle Ages in the West, under the name "Missa Sicca," the same is met with. Durandus gives us two descriptions of it—one the Epistle, Gospel, Pater and Blessing read in a stole; the other said in full vestments, and consisting of the office of Mass to the end of the Offertory, with the Preface and Post-Communion added at discretion. We have knowledge of this form of service being said at sea for the devotion of St. Louis of France in 1254.

John Burchard, master of ceremonies in the Papal

¹ *Revue du Clergé Français*. Août, 1900, p. 561.

² *Direct. Angl.* 292.

Chapel, 1500, gives us a similar description of Dry Mass in his day—said out of devotion when two special masses fell on the same day—the Dry Mass following immediately on the Mass and the Post-Communion being added at the end.¹

Among the Carthusians the Dry Mass survives to this day. Dom Degand gives us the following description of it, as it was said in 1337. "Nous avons vu combien était répandu la pratique du 'nudum officium' conventuel; il est bon de dire un mot de son mode de célébration. Il suivait toujours une messe à laquelle il se rattachait sans interruption, et le même prêtre qui avait chanté la messe célébrait aussi le 'nudum officium.' Pour cela, les cierges restant allumés, il différait la 'complende' et le 'Placeat.' Après l'évangile, le prêtre disait au milieu de l'autel, sans se tourner, 'Dominus vobiscum, Oremus,' puis 'ad cornu epistolæ' l'offertoire et la Communion qui suivait la 'complende' ou post-communion de la messe qui avait précédé le 'nudum officium.' L'office se terminait par le 'Dominus vobiscum,' le 'Benedicamus Domino' et le 'Placeat.'" ² This describes the form of service when the Dry Mass was said at the Altar after the Community Mass. Later on, when the revision of the Carthusian Books came to pass in 1581, the same writer tells us: "Le 'nudum officium' est supprimé, et on le remplace par un messe privée." This is a Low Mass

¹ Wickham Legg, p. 20 *et seq.*

² Cabrol and Le Clercq, *Dist. d'Arch. Chrét.* fasc. xxvii. col. 1061.

of Our Lady said daily, and the old Dry Mass is now put after the office of Prime "de Beata" (*i. e.* of the little office of Our Lady), and is said by each monk in his cell.

The same was ordered for the Dominican friars by Humbert de Romains, who first brought their liturgical books into order, and the Carmelites used it also.

In the diocese of Milan, also, on Good Friday, Easter Eve and the Rogations, the Dry Mass is still said, and in Belgium it lasted until the end of the sixteenth century. A great crusade, however, was carried on by Estius and Cardinal Bona against the practice, and almost everywhere on the continent it has now been forbidden. Bona speaks of Dry Mass¹ as "monstrous and repugnant to the institution and custom of the Church," which ought to be "reproved and detested." The language seems unnecessarily strong, and not quite applicable when it is remembered that the Roman Missal as used to-day contains a "locus classicus" of the *Missa sicca* in the service for the blessing of palms on the "Dominica in Ramis."

It is, of course, obvious that the Ante-Communion service can be wrongly used by making it a substitute for the celebration of the Eucharist, which the Church assumes will take place wherever it is possible; but for the purpose for which it is given to us, *viz.* to be used on days when, for some valid reason, Holy Communion cannot be celebrated, it serves now, as it

¹ *Rerum Liturg.* i. xv.

did in centuries gone by, a useful purpose of devotion.¹ The new elements in it as it stands in our own Prayer Book are the addition of the Creed as a fixed element, and the Intercession which, in the Roman rite, would have been included in the Canon.

The second rubric was inserted owing to the infrequency with which the laity had come to receive Holy Communion. "The laity allowed the clergy to do what they ought to have done for themselves: they liked the priest to communicate often, but they disliked doing so themselves."² The primary object of this rule, therefore, was not to restrain the priest from celebrating often, so much as to stimulate the laity to more frequent communion.

The third rubric accentuates the second, and prevents the Solitary Mass, an evil which all Christendom reprobates.³ It does seem to make the priest's ability to celebrate dependent upon the devotion of the laity. Whether this was always understood subsequently as being the case does not seem to be quite so certain. Bishop Cosin, for instance, says: "Better were it to endure the absence of the people than for the minister to neglect the usual and daily sacrifice of the Church

¹ The rubric of 1549 allowed it on "other days except Wednesdays and Fridays"; in 1552 it was restricted to holy days, and in 1661 even to Sundays.

² Pullan, p. 44.

³ The Decree of the Council of Trent, although it is not obeyed, is worth noting in this connection: "Optat quidem sacrosancta Synodus ut in singulis missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicent." Sess. XXII. Decretum de Sacrific. Missae, cap. 6.

by which all people, whether they be there or no, reap so much benefit." ¹

The fourth rubric pursues the same line of endeavour, by insisting that wherever the conditions of the previous rubrics may be assumed, there shall at the least be an administration of the Eucharist every Sunday.

With the fifth we have already dealt.

The sixth was inserted in 1661 to prevent profanity. Some of the puritanically-minded clergy had been guilty of removing what remained of the Holy Sacrament to their homes, to be treated as ordinary food. This instruction is intended to put an end to such an abuse. "In recent times this rubric has been interpreted as a prohibition of reservation of the Sacrament for the sick, but there appears to be no evidence to show that any such prohibition was intended." ² This practice is often dictated by sheer necessity. To reserve for the sick is of extreme antiquity. Justin Martyr ³ mentions it as ordinary in his own time. St. Cyprian ⁴ speaks of it in the third century, and from those times till now there has never been any break in the custom. There can be little doubt that this is the ablutions rubric, and that all it is intended to prevent is either the desecration of the sacred elements, or the inefficient cleansing of the sacred vessels. Something in the nature of ablutions must have existed from the earliest times, though Christian fervour and reverence rendered it unnecessary to issue

¹ *Works*, v. 27.

³ *I Apol.* lxxxvii.

² Pullan, p. 136.

⁴ *De lapsis* 26.

any instructions about the matter. The mention of a towel, and the fact that an acolyte "held the water," in *Ordo Romanus* i.¹ and ii.,² make it seem probable that an ablution was made. By the time of the *Ordo Romanus* xiv. the instructions were detailed and complete.

Thus the development of the ablutions into a ceremony with prayers and actions of its own is mediæval. The Eastern rites, the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies have not so developed it, and the Ambrosian rules are borrowed from Rome. This necessary and practical custom, dictated solely by reverence, and which could only be opposed in the spirit of factiousness, was clearly recognised by the Lambeth Judgment: "The cleansing of the vessels appears to be not an improper completion of this act (*i. e.* the consumption of what remains) which is ordered to follow the close of the service without any break or interval."³ This is the opinion also of Proctor and Frere. "The rubric was not intended to touch upon the question of the reservation of the Sacrament for the communion of the sick; it is only concerned with the consumption of what remains, and authorised the ablutions by which this consumption is reverently and adequately carried out." The fact that, if necessary, "such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him" are to help consume what remains, removes all excuse for neglecting to carry out this instruction. The assistance of the laity in carrying out the ablutions was

¹ *P. L.* lxxviii. 947.

³ *Lambeth Judgment*, p. 15.

² *Ibid.* 976.

an English mediæval custom¹ and the present rubric may have arisen from that custom.

The seventh and ninth rubrics are purely practical and need not detain us here.

The eighth rubric, however, is important, partly as declaring what the Church of England considers to be the minimum for her people in the receiving of Holy Communion, partly as being a revival of earlier and better precedents in the matter than were common in the first half of the sixteenth century. "Every Parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one."

It was very dear to the heart of the Church in this land to restore the early practice of frequent communion. "To turn the Mass into a Communion" was, indeed, a laudable object in view of the prevalent slackness about receiving the Holy Sacrament. It only became a false objective when it was assumed that by encouraging the communion of the laity the Mass ceased in some way to be the Mass.

The facts that this great sacrament was instituted in the elements of bread and wine, *i. e.* natural daily food, and that the manna, which was gathered daily, is used by our Lord as a type of the Eucharist, seem to suggest that it was intended to be received frequently for the nourishment of the soul.

The writer of the Acts² seems to imply that in the earliest days at Jerusalem the faithful received daily. Whether this were the general custom or not, there is ample evidence that the Holy Sacrament was always

¹ Fortescue, p. 381.

² ii. 46.

administered on the "Lord's day," the "first day of the week."¹ Later on there is also abundant testimony to the daily celebration of the Christian mysteries.² The general idea of the Church was frequent communion for all, but even by the time of St. John Chrysostom it appears that the practice was below the ideal. By the time of St. Augustine there was a diversity of custom both as to celebrating and as to receiving.³ The decline of fervour and the spread of the Church, which of necessity brought with it an infusion of worldliness, had led to a continual lowering of the standard. In 734 the Venerable Bede is heard lamenting the rarity of communion in England.⁴ The degradation was, however, destined to continue, and the Middle Ages witnessed the nadir. The Fourth Lateran Council had to make the yearly Easter communion binding on all the faithful under pain of excommunication, and later on the Council of Trent was constrained to express the wish that "at every Mass the faithful who are present should communicate." Almost at the same time the Church of England turned her face towards more frequent communion, an example which the rest of Europe in these later years has seen fit to follow. The first Prayer Book retained the rule of one communion, but in 1552 the older requirement was restored, and at the

¹ Acts xx. 6-11; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Didache xiv.; Justin, 1. *Apol.* lxvii. 37.

² E.g. St. Cyprian, *De Orat. Dom.* cxviii.; St. Ambrose in *Psalm* cxv.; *P. L.* xv. 1461.

³ *Ep.* liv.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 200.

⁴ *Epist. ad Egbert*; *P. L.* xciv. 665.

last revision this rule was adhered to. The history of the rubric makes it quite clear that the other two times in the year to which it refers are Christmas and Whitsuntide.

The final rubric is the famous "Black Rubric." We have already noticed that the primitive method of receiving Holy Communion was probably to receive it standing, but, after the publication of the first Prayer Book, the extreme Puritan party objected to the attitude of kneeling, not because it was a subsequent development, but because it expressed a faith in the Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. The whole controversy is unpleasant reading, but the fact of the case was that this rubric, with a phrase which does not now exist in it categorically denying the Real Presence, was inserted under Puritan pressure into the Prayer Book of 1552. Seven years later this rubric was deleted, and its omission became one of the regular grievances of the Puritan party. The Savoy Conference stated quite clearly that it was unnecessary to replace it at all, on the ground that "the world being now more in danger of profanation than of idolatry," they considered the statements of the Twenty-eighth Article to be adequate to the purpose.

At the last revision, however, in 1661, the question was brought up again and the bishops ultimately decided to re-insert the rubric. But before this was done, the words "real and essential Presence" were exchanged for the phrase which now stands in it, viz. "Corporal Presence." The effect of this change,

which was due to Dr. Peter Gunning,¹ was to turn the rubric into a protest against the doctrine of a material presence of Christ's Body. Unless it had been intended to teach the doctrine of the real and essential Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament, it is difficult to see why any change was made at all.

* * * * *

There are, perhaps, no words with which this book could be more aptly closed than the noble statement of Archbishop Bramhall: "We acknowledge an Eucharistic Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative Sacrifice, or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the eyes of His Heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of His Passion, by way of real prayer; and lastly, an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His merits unto our souls. Let him that dare go one step further than we do, and say that it is a suppletory Sacrifice to supply the defects of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Or else let them hold their peace and speak no more against us in this point of Sacrifice for ever."²

¹ Burnet, *Hist. Ref.*, preface to vol. iii.

² *Works*, i. Desc. iii.